

RECEIVED

APR 09 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Cover Page

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Jamel Williams,
Petitioner

v.
State of South Carolina,
Respondent.

Case No.: No. 2025-001289

Notice of Clarification of Legal Issue,
Questions Presented, And Statement of The
Case (Pro se Supplemental Filing)

RECEIVED

APR 09 2026

SC Court of Appeals

Notice of Clarification of Legal Issue

Petitioner respectfully submits this Notice to clarify a central legal issue raised in Petitioner's Pro Se Response and to ensure that the Court is aware that the primary issue presented is Procedural and Constitutional in nature.

This case involves the denial of a Pretrial Stand-Your-Ground immunity hearing under the South Carolina Protection of Person and Property Act. A Pretrial Immunity hearing is intended to determine whether a defendant is immune from prosecution and should not be required to stand trial.

During the PCR hearing, trial Counsel admitted that he did not request a Stand-Your-Ground immunity hearing because he believed doing so would give the State "two bites at the apple". This decision resulted in Petitioner being forced to stand trial without first receiving a judicial determination on immunity.

The PCR Court concluded that Petitioner was not prejudiced because Petitioner was permitted to argue self-defense at trial. However, immunity is not merely a defense presented to a jury at trial; it is a statutory right not to be subjected to trial ~~at all~~ at all where immunity applies. Therefore, the loss of the immunity hearing itself constitutes prejudice because Petitioner was deprived of a separate proceeding that could have resulted in dismissal of the charges before trial.

Petitioner respectfully submits this Notice to clarify that the issue presented is whether the loss of a Pretrial Immunity hearing due to counsel's failure to request the hearing can be considered non-prejudicial simply because the defendant was allowed to argue self-defense at trial.

Petitioner further submits that additional issues of ineffective assistance of counsel occurred at the trial, PCR, and appellate levels, and that the cumulative effect of these errors deprived petitioner of due process of law and a fair trial.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jamel Williams, Pro Se
4-2-2026

Questions Presented

- I. Whether trial Counsel was Constitutionally ineffective for failing to request a pretrial Stand-Your-Ground immunity hearing where the Statute provides for a Judicial determination of immunity from Prosecution.
- II. Whether trial Counsel was ineffective under Strickland v. Washington for failing to investigate and present evidence related to threats, intimidation allegations, and witness influence discussed on the record.
- III. Whether ~~the~~ the denial of the immunity hearing allowed the State two bites at the apple by forcing Petitioner to present Self-defense to the Jury after being denied statutory immunity Procedures.
- IV. Whether trial Counsel was ineffective for failing to request a voluntary manslaughter Jury instruction where evidence of heat of Passion and legal Provocation was presented.
- V. Whether PCR Counsel was ineffective for failing to raise and properly develop meritorious Claims of ineffective assistance of trial Counsel.
- VI. Whether appellate and PCR appellate Counsel were ineffective for failing to raise preserved and meritorious issues on appeal and in the Johnson petition for writ of Certiorari.

VII. Whether the cumulative effect of counsel's errors deprived Petitioner of due process of law and a fair trial under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments.

Statement of the Case

Petitioner was indicted in Alameda County in 2018 for murder, att. murder, and poss. of a weapon during the Commission of a Violent Crime. The case proceeded to trial in January 2020, and Petitioner was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment.

Self-defense and justification were central issues at trial. Evidence presented at trial included testimony regarding threats, fear, and a confrontation immediately preceding the shooting. Despite the presence of evidence supporting self-defense and voluntary manslaughter, trial counsel did not request a pretrial Stand-Your-Ground immunity hearing and did not request a voluntary manslaughter jury instruction supported by the evidence.

During ~~the~~ the PCR evidentiary hearing, trial counsel admitted that he did not request a Stand-Your-Ground immunity hearing because he believed doing so would give the state "two bites at the apple." The PCR court found this decision to be reasonable trial strategy and concluded that Petitioner was not prejudiced because Petitioner was permitted to argue self-defense at trial and the jury rejected that defense.

The record also reflects that allegations of threats and witness intimidation were discussed during the proceedings and influenced custody and witness-related matters. Trial counsel did not fully investigate or present evidence related to these matters in support of the defense theory.

Petitioner contends that the PCR court applied the wrong legal standard in evaluating prejudice because stand-your-ground immunity hearing is a pretrial determination that can result in dismissal of charges and immunity from prosecution, and the loss of that hearing ~~constitutes~~ constitutes prejudice independent of the jury's verdict.

This Petition for writ of certiorari follows the denial of petitioner's application for post-conviction relief.

RECEIVED

APR 09 2026

Certificate of Service

S.C. SUPREME COURT

I hereby certify that I have served a copy of this Notice of Clarification of Legal Issue, questions Presented, and Statement of the Case by Placing the same in the institutional mail, properly addressed to the following:

Clerk of Court
The Supreme Court of South Carolina
P.O. Box 11330
Columbia SC 29211

This April day of 2, 2026

Jamel Williams, Pro Se

RECEIVED

APR 09 2026

SC Court of Appeals

Jamel Williams #348445
Lieber Corr. Inst.
P.O. Box 205
Ridgeville SC 29472

RECEIVED

APR 09 2026

SC Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

APR 09 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Date: 4-2-2026

Clerk of the Supreme Court of South Carolina
P.O. Box 11330
Columbia, SC 29211

RE: Jamel Williams v. State of South Carolina
Pro se Supplemental Filing - Notice, Questions Presented,
and Statement of the Case

Dear Clerk:

Please accept the enclosed Pro se supplemental filing in the above-referenced case. This filing is submitted to clarify the legal issues presented in Petitioner's response to the Johnson Petition for Writ of Certiorari and to preserve important Constitutional and statutory issues for this Court's review.

This Supplemental filing includes:

1. Notice of Clarification of Legal Issue
2. Questions Presented
3. Statement of the Case
4. Certificate of Service

RECEIVED
JAN 10 2012
CLERK OF COURT
JAN 10 2012
Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court
consider these issues in its review of the
petition for writ of certiorari, as the case
involves the denial of a Pretrial Stand-Your-
Ground immunity hearing, ineffective assistance
of counsel, and cumulative Constitutional
error affecting the fairness of the Proceedings

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jamel Williams, Petitioner, Pro Se

Jamel Williams 348445 A017
Lieber Corr. Inst.
P.O. Box 205
Ridgeville, SC 29472



RECEIVED

APR 09 2026

SC Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

APR 09 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

FOR LEGAL USE ONLY

The Supreme Court of South Carolina
Patricia A. Howard, Clerk of Court
P.O. Box 11330
Columbia SC 29211

RECEIVED

APR 03 2026

MAIL ROOM
LIEBER C.I.

