

LEGAL MAIL

QUESTION PRESENTED

DID THE S.C. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT IN ERROR DISMISSED A TIMELY FILE CLAIM OF NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE IN VIOLATION OF JUVENILE OFFENDER 5TH AND 8TH AND 14TH AMEND TO THE U.S. CONST; WHERE PRISONER WAS INSTRUCTED BY PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO NOTIFY THE BOARD IF HIS FILE CONTAIN ANY INADEQUACIES ON OCTOBER-10-2018 WHERE THIS INVESTIGATION WAS CONFIRMED ON JANUARY-13-2025 THAT DETERMINE PRISONER PAROLE FILE WAS PRIOR INCORRECT CONFIRMED THAT PAROLE AUTHORITIES WAS USING THE WRONG IDENTIFIED CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL RECORD SINCE PRISONER INITIAL PAROLE HEARING THAT HAS CURRENTLY CAUSED JUVENILE OFFENDER TO HAVE NOT RECEIVED NO REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN RELEASE DO TO UNAWARE PRIOR INCORRECT RECORD WHERE PRIOR NEGLIGENCE CAUSED PRISONER TO NOT RECEIVE AFFORDED REHEARINGS PRIOR BEFORE OCT-23-2024 WHERE INJURY EFFECTIVELY CAUSED PRISONER LIFE SETENCE WITH THE POSSIBILITY TO NOW EFFECTIVELY RESEMBLE LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE THAT COMES INDIRECT CONFLICT WITH STATE V. MITCHELL 2021 6066794

LEGAL MAIL

CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 IS A 1991 JUVENILE OFFENDER OF HOMICIDE (16-3-10) S.C. CODE OF LAWS. JUVENILE ON AUGUST-4-1992 WAS SENTENCED TO NATURAL LIFE BY THE HONORABLE R. HENRY MCKELLAR SEE DOCUMENT A. DOING THIS TERM OF 1992.....

"ONE" WHO PLEA GUILTY TO HOMICIDE UNDER S.C. CODE OF LAWS TITLE 16 ARTICLE 1. HOMICIDE (MUST) BE PUNISHED IMPRISONMENT FOR LIFE AND IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR PAROLE UNTIL THE SERVICE OF TWENTY YEARS. NO PERSON SENTENCED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBSECTION MAY RECEIVE ANY WORK-RELEASE, EARN WORK CREDITS, GOOD-TIME CREDITS OR ANY OTHER CREDIT THAT WOULD REDUCE THE MANDATORY IMPRISONMENT REQUIRED BY THIS SUBSECTION.

SEE 26 S.C. JUR. PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON (11) V. PAROLE 11. DEFINITION, NATURE, AND PURPOSE OF PAROLE: STATES..... LIKE PROBATION, THE ESSENCE OF PAROLE IS A GRANT OF CONDITIONAL FREEDOM. [UNLIKE] PROBATION, PAROLE IS A FORM OF EARLY RELEASE FROM PRISON, BEFORE THE COMPLETION OF SENTENCE BASED ON THE PRISONER'S AGREEMENT TO ABIDE BY CERTAIN CONDITIONS DURING THE BALANCE OF HIS SENTENCE.

IN THE CASE OF JUVENILE OFFENDER THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS STATED THAT CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 WAS NOT ONE OF THE CLASS OF OFFENDERS WHO WAS NOT ENTITLED TO RESENTENCING BECAUSE HE WAS NOT SENTENCED TO LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE..... SEE STATE V. MITCHELL 2021 6066794.

SEE MAJOR VS. S.C. DEPT OF PROBATION AND PAROLE AND PARDON SERVS 384 S.C. 457, 465 S.E 2D 795, 799 (2009) [A] SENTENCING COURT IS NOT AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE PAROLE ELIGIBILITY. SEE ADAMS V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES 2016 WL 6092509. SEE ATWELL V. STATE 197 SO. 3d 1040 AT [4] CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: PARDON AND PAROLE STATE..... THE JUDICIARY HAS NO INPUT AS TO THE OPERATION OF THE PAROLE SYSTEM.

LEGAL MAIL

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER STATE AT THIS POINT THE SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES HAS NOT INFORMED JUVENILE OFFENDER BY LEGAL MAIL DOCUMENT THAT [HE'S] NONPAROLE ELIGIBLE. SEE DOCUMENT A., JUVENILE SENTENCE COURT TRIAL GUILTY PLEA TRANSCRIPT CLEARLY REVEAL THAT THE SENTENCING COURT [ORALLY PRONOUNCED] THAT JUVENILE OFFENDER BE COMMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION FOR THE TERM OF HIS NATURAL LIFE. SEE U.S. V. DEMARTINO 112 F.3D 75..... STATE IT IS THE ORAL SENTENCE WHICH CONSTITUTES THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT AND WHICH IS AUTHORITY FOR EXECUTION.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER STATE JUST AS IN MAJOR 384 S.C. 457, 465 S.E 795, 799 IF THE SENTENCING COURT IS NOT AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE PAROLE ELIGIBILITY AND JUVENILE WAS [ORALLY SENTENCE] TO NATURAL LIFE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION UNDER STATUTE CODE 16-3-20 (A) THAT DO NOT AUTHORIZE ANY FORM OF EARLY RELEASE.....
... THAT WOULD REDUCE THE "MANDATORY" IMPRISONMENT WHERE THE S.C. JUR (26) (V) PAROLE DEFINITION CLEARLY STATE [PAROLE] IS A FORM OF EARLY RELEASE FROM PRISON BEFORE THE COMPLETION OF SETENCE.....
... TO INCLUDE JUVENILE OFFENDER WAS CLAIM BY THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS TO [NOT] BE ONE OF THE CLASS OF OFFENDERS OF AIKEN VS. BYARS, 410, 534 765 SE. 2D 572 (2014) NOT ENTITLED TO RESENTENCING BECAUSE HE WAS CLAIM TO HAVE LIFE WITH PAROLE ELIGIBLE, COMPELS THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WITH RESPECTFUL COMPETENT TO REVIEW JUVENILE OFFENDER UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE HE SUCCESSFULLY DEMONSTRATE HIS LIFE SENTENCE WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE EFFECTIVELY RESEMBLE LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE UNDER THE SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE BOARD AUTHORITY.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 BEGIN BY PRESENTING HIS UNIQUE INDIVIDUAL CASE BEFORE OUR SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS THAT INORDER TO BE ENTITLED TO RELIEF HE FIRST MUST MAKE A SUCCESSFUL THRESHOLD SHOWING THAT HE AS A INDIVIDUAL EFFECTIVELY RECEIVED A SENTENCE OF LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE A [SENTENCE] THAT FAILED TO AFFORD HIM A MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE.

LEGAL MAIL

SEE.....MILTON JAY JR. V. THE STATE OF FLORIDA
252 SO. 3D 326 AT [2] SENTENCING AND PUNISHMENT
BELOW:

JUVENILE OFFENDERS STATE IN ORDER TO RAISE AN
8TH AMENDMENT CHALLENGE FOR CRUEL AND UNUSUAL
PUNISHMENT IN THE CASE OF A JUVENILE OFFENDER SENTENCED
WITH LIFE IMPRISONMENT. JUVENILE MUST EITHER HAVE
BEEN SENTENCED WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR
JUVENILE'S LIFE SENTENCE WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE
MUST EFFECTIVELY RESEMBLE A LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE
SENTENCE. U.S. CONST. AMEND.

SEE VENNISEE V. STATE, 42 FLA L WEEKLY D2170
235 SO. 3D 947 (FLA. 3D DCA OCT.-11,- 2017).

SEE ROOKS V. STATE, 224 SO. 3D 272 (FLA. 3D DCA 2017)

PRISONER CONFIRM IN THESE ABOVE CASES JUST AS IN
STATE VS. MITCHELL 2021 6066794 [EACH] INDIVIDUAL
WAS NOT ENTITLED TO RELIEF BECAUSE THEY WERE CLAIM
TO NOT HAVE BEEN SENTENCE TO LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE
HOWEVER..... A OBVIOUS [DIFFERENCE], MILTON JAY
JR. AND VENNISEE AND ROOKS WERE AFFORDED A
"REALISTIC" MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO RELEASE AS
THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRE UNDER GRAHAM, 560 U.S. 48,
75 (2010) UNLIKE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER
CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 UNIQUE
INDIVIDUAL CASE BEFORE OUR SOUTH CAROLINA COURT
OF APPEALS..... HE WAS NOT AFFORDED NO MEANINGFUL
OPPORTUNITY TO RELEASE.

PRISONER BEFORE OUR SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS CASE
IS NOT BASED ON AN EXPECTANCY OF RELEASE NOR DO HE
EXPECT PAROLE BOARD NOR PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO A
FAVORABLE ENTITLEMENT TO RELEASE. IN GRAHAM V. FLORIDA
560 U.S. 48, 75 (2010) HOLDING [A] STATE IS NOT
REQUIRED TO GUARANTEE EVENTUAL FREEDOM HOWEVER THE
CONSTITUTION DO EXPECT PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO
RESPECTFULLY PROVIDE A REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY
TO OBTAIN RELEASE BASED ON DEMONSTRATED MATURITY
REHABILITATION. PRISONER CONFIRM BASED ON HIS
INDIVIDUAL CASE HISTORY HE WAS COMPLETELY DENIED NO
REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO RELEASE.

LEGAL MAIL

JUVENILE OFFENDER TRIAL GUILTY PLEA TRANSCRIPT CLEARLY REVEAL THAT SENTENCING COURT JUDGE ORALLY PRONOUNCED THAT HE BE COMMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION FOR THE TERM OF HIS NATURAL LIFE. JUVENILE OFFENDER BELIEVE NATURAL CLEARLY MEANS JUST AS IT IS PLAINLY PRONOUNCED WITHOUT RELEASE NON PAROLE GRANT SENTENCE AND THAT THE ORAL SENTENCE CONSTITUTES THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT SENTENCE AND THE WRITTEN COMMITMENT ORDER IS MERE EVIDENCE OF SUCH AUTHORITY.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM NATURAL LIFE SENTENCE WAS NOT PROCEDURALLY BAR UNDER 16-3-20 (A) (SUPP 1991) BECAUSE THIS STATUTE IS A LIFE OR DEATH PENALTY STATUTE PUNISHMENT. SEE STATE V. TORRENCE 305 S.C. 45, SEE 24-21-640 CIRCUMSTANCES WARRANTING PAROLE HOWEVER..... ACCORDING TO MILLER VS. ALABAMA 132 S.C.T. AT 2464 THIS TYPE OF SENTENCE WAS "CATEGORICAL BAN WHEN THE SENTENCING COURT DID NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT HOW "CHILDREN ARE CONSTITUTIONALLY DIFFERENT FROM ADULTS FOR PURPOSE OF SENTENCING."

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM WHILE STATUTE 16-3-20 (A) (SUPP 1991) ADDRESSED PAROLE ELIGIBILITY THIS SUBSECTION PROVISION RESTRICTED ALL FORMS OF ANY TYPE OF SENTENCE REDUCEMENT FROM HIS SENTENCE. JUVENILE OFFENDER STATE AFTER THE SERVICE OF TWENTY YEARS TO BECOME ELIGIBLE HIS RELEASE IS STILL BEING RESTRICTED BECAUSE ACCORDING TO 16-3-20 (A) [SUPP. 1991]..... NOTHING CAN REDUCE THIS STATUTE MANDATORY IMPRISONMENT NOT EVEN WORK-RELEASE, EARN WORK CREDITS, PROGRAM CREDITS TO INCLUDE PAROLE. SEE S.C. JUR (26) (V) PAROLE DEFINITION BELOW :

PAROLE 11 (V.). STATES [PAROLE] IS A FORM OF EARLY RELEASE FROM PRISON BEFORE THE COMPLETION OF SENTENCE.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM ALL FORMS OF EARLY RELEASE FROM HIS SENTENCE WAS RESTRICTED BEFORE 20 YEARS OF ELIGIBLE AND AFTER.

LEGAL MAIL

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM THE SENTENCING COURT DID NOT AUTHORIZED PAROLE ELIGIBILITY BEFORE SENTENCING AND THAT THE SENTENCING COURT SENTENCE JUVENILE TO NATURAL LIFE ON AUGUST - 4 - 1992.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE REVEAL BEFORE SENTENCING ON AUGUST - 4 - 1992 STATUTE 16 - 3 - 20(A) WAS ALREADY A RESTRICTED STATUTE OF PAROLE ELIGIBILITY AND ANY FORMS OF EARLY SENTENCE REDUCTION OF HIS SENTENCE PUNISHMENT.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM (BEFORE) JUVENILE COMPLETED 20 YEARS OF SERVICE TO APPLY FOR CONSIDERATION FOR PAROLE EARLY RELEASE ("PAROLE GRANT") WAS AGAIN PRIOR RESTRICTED IN (1995 AMEND OF 16-3-20(A) AS A NO PAROLE OFFENSE.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM PAROLE ELIGIBILITY BEFORE 1995 AMEND WAS STILL CONSIDER A PRIVILEGE FORM OF EARLY RELEASE FROM HIS NATURAL LIFE MANDATORY IMPRISONMET PUNISHMENT UNDER 16-3-20(A) THAT WAS RESTRICTED INCLUDING WORK-RELEASE, GOOD TIME CREDITS, PROGRAM CREDITS WHICH NO PERSON UNDER THIS PROVISION MAY NOT RECEIVE.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM [IF] PAROLE AUTHORITIES CLAIM THAT PAROLE IS A FORM OF EARLY RELEASE FROM THE REMAINDER OF A PRISONER SENTENCE AND JUVENILE WAS SENTENCE TO NATURAL LIFE..... UNDER STAUTE 16-3-20(A) (SUPP. 1991) THAT RESTRICTED ALL FORMS OF SENTENCE REDUCEMENT SUCH AS PAROLE, WORK RELEASE, EARN WORK CREDITS, PROGRAM CREDITS, OBVIOUS RELEASE WILL NOT BE POSSIBLE BECAUSE THESE ARE ALL FORMS OF EARLY RELEASE TO INCLUDE A JUVENILE OFFENDER DEMONSTRATED MATURITY AND REHABILITATION THAT THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES PAROLE SYSTEMS TO OFFER "SOME" MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE SEE GRAHAM V. FLORIDA, 560 U.S. 48, 75 (2010) SEE MONTGOMERY V. LOUISIANA 136 S. CT. AT 736.

HISTORY

ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018, PRISONER AND COUNSEL MRS LAURA W. YOUNG OF BLUME, FRANKLIN AND YOUNG, LLC OF COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA RESPECTFULLY NOTIFIED THE BOARD DOING A RECORDED VIDEO CONFERENCE PAROLE HEARING THAT A INTRODUCTION BY PAROLE BOARD OF CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RECORD WAS NOT PRISONER RECORD BEFORE BOARD AND THAT RECORD COULD BE PRISONER FATHER RECORD.

PRISONER AND COUNSEL WAS WITHOUT PAROLE FILE REVIEW BEFORE THE COURT RULING OF [KELSEY V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE, AND PARDON SERVICES 441 S.C. 373, 893 S.E2D 588 2023 WL 5598698, SEE BLACKWELL V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE, AND PARDON SERVICES 2024 WL 2956900. CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER DID NOT APPEAL HIS OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 PAROLE DENIAL DO TO BEFORE KELSEY AND OBVIOUSLY AFTER KELSEY PRISONERS DID NOT HAVE TO FILE APPEAL WITH THE S.C. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT [INORDER] TO NOTIFY THE BOARD THAT PRISONER THINK HIS OR HER FILE CONTAIN SOME ERROR OR OTHER INACCURACY. [ACCORDING] TO FORM 1212 SEE DOCUMENT B, ADVISE PRISONERS TO NOTIFY THE BOARD OF THE SPECIFIC ERROR OR INACCURACY WHERE THE BOARD WILL INVESTIGATE THE INQUIRY AND NOTIFY THE INMATE OF THE ACTION. COMPELLING EVIDENCE REVEAL FORM 1212 DID NOT STATE HOW LONG A INVESTIGATION WILL TAKE TO BECOME FINALIZE WHEN REPORTED ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018, EVIDENCE REVEAL BY REASONABLE LOGIC [ONCE] THE INVESTIGATION BECAME FINALIZE ONE WOULD ASSUME TO BE NOTIFIED ACCORDING TO FORM 1212.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM HE HAD NO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO DEMAND A SPECIFIC TIME FRAME TO FINALIZE THE INVESTIGATION REPORTED ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018, SEE BARKER V. WINGO 92 S.C.T. 2182 AT [6] CRIMINAL LAW LENGTH OF DELAY

THERE IS NO CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS FOR QUANTIFYING INTO A SPECIFIED NUMBER OF DAYS OR MONTHS THE SPEEDY TRIAL RIGHT U.S. C. A. CONST AMEND 6.

EVIDENCE CONFIRM [ONCE] THE BOARD BECAME NOTIFIED OF THE SPECIFIC ERROR ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 REHEARING WAS MANDATORY WHETHER PRISONER WOULD HAVE APPEALED SEE [KELSEY] OR [AFTER] THE INVESTIGATION BECAME FINALIZED THAT DETERMINE A IDENTIFIED ERROR WHETHER IT TOOK DAYS MONTHS OR YEARS TO BECOME FINALIZE. PRISONER CONFIRM HE NEVER WAIVED HIS RIGHT TO REHEARING NOR APPEAL, SEE BAKER 92 S.C.T 2182 AT [8]

ESTOPPEL NATURE AND ELEMENTS OF WAIVER. [WAIVER] IS AN INTENTIONAL RELINQUISHMENT OR ABANDONMENT OF A KNOWN RIGHT OR PRIVILEGE. SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE REVEAL PAROLE AUTHORITIES WAIVED CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO REHEARING OF THE OCTOBER-10-2018 IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS WHERE PAROLE GRANT COULD HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE IF NOT PAROLE AUTHORITIES WAIVER OF ERROR SEE DOCUMENT C.

ON OCTOBER-23-2024, CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER WAS OFFER FOR THE FIRST TIME TO REVIEW HIS PAROLE FILE AFTER THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT RULING OF KELSEY 441 S.C. 373 IS WHERE PRISONER DISCOVERED REPORTED CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HAD WENT UNCORRECTED. [IN] ADDITION PRISONER DISCOVERED INACCURATE PREJUDICE RECORDS RANGING FROM 1977 TO 1988 THAT WERE NOT CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CRIMINAL RECORD HISTORY. ON OCTOBER-23-2024 PRISONER WAS DENIED PAROLE WHERE ON NOVEMBER-18-2024 PRISONER CONTACTED BELOW:

1. MR. JODI D. GALLMAN (ACTING DIRECTOR) OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA; DEPT OF PROBATION PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES.
2. MRS VALERIE SUBER (ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR) OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT OF PROBATION PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES.

SEE DOCUMENT D PAGES (1-9), CONVICTED JUVENILE REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION IN VIOLATION OF CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER EIGHT AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND IN VIOLATION OF AIKEN V. BYARS, 410 S.C. 534 765 S.E. 2D 572 (2014). SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE REVEAL ON PAGE (5) OF 1-9..... PAROLE AUTHORITIES WERE PRIOR MADE AWARE IN SPECIFIC ERROR THAT CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RECORD REPORTED ON OCTOBER-10-2018 BY PRISONER AND COUNSEL THAT RECORD DID NOT BELONG TO CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER. PRISONER ADVISED S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES ON PAGE (7) OF DOCUMENT D, THAT ALL PAROLE BOARD HEARINGS [MUST] ALL BE REHEARD WHICH WAS NOT A HARMLESS ERROR DO TO COMPELLING EVIDENCE PAROLE AUTHORITIES WERE USING PREJUDICE FALSIFIED RECORDS TO REJECT CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER A REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE [SINCE] PRISONER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING WHERE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER REQUEST TO REMDY THE DUE PROCESS VIOLATION TO GRANT PAROLE..... WHERE

THERE WERE PRIOR POSSIBILITIES TO A MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN RELEASE BEFORE OCTOBER - 23 - 2024 IF NOT FOR PAROLE AUTHORITIES PRIOR INCORRECT RECORD THE OUTCOME COULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT SEE DRUMGOLD V. CALLAHAN 707 F.3d 28.

SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE REVEAL THE "EXTREMELY" UNEXPLAINED UNREASONABLE LONG DELAY IT TOOK THE SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO REMOVE THEIR PRIOR INADEQUATE, INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION OF FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD FOUND BY PRISONER IN HIS PAROLE FILE SEE DOCUMENT D. PAGE (5) 1-9 THAT WERE PREPARED AT INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF (2012), THAT WAS FINALLY DECIDED TO BE REMOVED BY S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025; NO DOUBT EFFECTIVELY PREJUDICE AND INJURY CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM HE HAS FOUND A IDENTIFIED ERROR THAT IS A SUCCESSFUL CHALLENGE OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THE CASE OF A JUVENILE OFFENDER SENTENCE TO LIFE WITH PAROLE ELIGIBILITY WHERE SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES PRIOR RECORD ERROR HAS ACTIVELY PREJUDICE PRISONER THAT REQUIRE ATTENTION AND A RESPECTFUL REMDY OF THE WRONG WHERE THE FAILURE TO AFFORD A CORRECTIVE REMDY WOULD CONSTITUTE DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS..... WHERE AFTER THE REMOVAL OF THE CONFIRMED INADEQUATE INFORMATION THAT HAD CONTRIVED TO EFFECTIVELY HELP CAUSED PRISONER TO NOT BE AFFORDED NO PRIOR REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN RELEASE BEFORE JANUARY - 13 - 2025 SEE DOCUMENT D. PAGE (5) 1-9 WHERE THE AFFORDED PAROLE REHEARING HELD ON..... MARCH - 26 - 2025 NOT ONLY DENIED PAROLE OBVIOUS S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES USED THE "EXACT" SAME REASONS TO REJECT JUVENILE OFFENDER PAROLE GRANT REHEARING THAT WERE EXACT SAME REASONS PRISONER PAROLE GRANT WAS BEING DENIED WHEN PAROLE FILE RECORD CONTAINED FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS SINCE PRISONER INITIAL PAROLE HEARING REPORTED ON HIS "REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION SEE DOCUMENT D. PAGES (3) (4) 1-9..... SEE DOCUMENT F., MARCH - 26 - 2025 NOTICE OF REJECTION.

PRISONER CONFIRM THE PRIOR USAGE OF FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS FOUND IN CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 PAROLE FILE ON OCTOBER-23-2024 WERE MISIDENTIFICATION OF RECORDS WHICH WAS INVESTIGATED TO BE JUVENILE OFFENDER FATHER CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS IDENTIFIED IN ERROR AS CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CRIMINAL HISTORY SEE DOCUMENT 6 [SLED CATCH] CITIZENS ACCESS TO CRIMINAL HISTORIES.

PRISONER CONFIRM WHEN SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES INITIALLY PREPARED THE WRONG RECORDS SINCE (2012) IN ERROR WITHOUT PROPER IDENTIFICATION OF RECORDS HISTORY FOR EXAMPLE SEE SLED CATCH PAGE (5) HIGHLIGHT DOCUMENT 6 AND PAGE (8) INFORMATION SUBMITTED INDICATES PRISONER FATHER IS A CONVICTED FELONY OF VIOLENCE [AND] THE MISIDENTIFICATION CRIMINAL HISTORY FOUND IN JUVENILE OFFENDER PAROLE FILE IDENTIFIED IN ERROR EFFECTIVELY WRONGFULLY CLASSIFIED CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER AS A PRIOR "VIOLENT" OFFENDER CRIMINAL THAT THE PRIOR PAROLE BOARD MEMBERS IN ERROR FROM INITIAL HEARING TO OCTOBER-23-2024 CLASSIFIED PRISONER AS ONE NOT AUTHORIZED FOR PAROLE GRANT. SEE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA 1976 ANNOTATED 24-21-640 CONFIRMED ON JANUARY-13-2025. CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM THE CONFIRMED MISIDENTIFICATION OF RECORDS THAT WAS FOUND BY PRISONER ON OCTOBER-23-2024 SEE DOCUMENT D. PAGE (5) 1 AND 2 WERE BOTH REMOVED ON JANUARY - 13- 2025 HOWEVER..... THE UNREASONABLE LONG DELAY "SEE MATTER OF WELFARE OF J. G. B. 443 N.W. 2d 867 CRIMINAL LAW THE BALANCING TEST EFFECTIVELY PREJUDICE AND INJURY JUVENILE OFFENDER FROM (2012) TO THE PRESENT DO TO NO REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE WAS AFFORDED BECAUSE THE PRIOR RECORD WAS CONFIRMED INCORRECT.

JUVENILE OFFENDER STATE THE PRIOR INCORRECT RECORD FROM INITIAL HEARING OF (2012)..... THAT WAS FINALLY REMOVED ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 LEFT THE PRISONER JUVENILE OFFENDER WITH NO REHEARINGS FROM (2012) TO (2022) WHICH WAS OBVIOUS NOT THE FAULT ERROR OF PRISONER AND NOT KNOWN TO PRIOR COURTS TO INCLUDE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS.

**DUE PROCESS VIOLATION OVERLOOK BY PAROLE AUTHORITIES
BELOW:**

IF..... CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER "CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL" # 00189424 REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION DOCUMENT D., PAGE (5) 1- 9 SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS IN HIS PAROLE FILE RECORD BELOW:

1. CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DATED 6 / 5 / 1992 WAS NOT HIS CRIMINAL RECORD HISTORY

2. FOUND ADDITIONAL CRIMINAL RECORDS RANGING FROM 1977 TO 1988 WAS NOT HIS CRIMINAL RECORD HISTORY WHERE IN RESPONSE TO HIS [FOUND IDENTIFIED ERROR CORESPONDENCE LETTER] RECEIVED IN AGENCY OFFICE ON 11-25-2024 ACCORDING TO DOCUMENT E., DATED JANUARY-13-2025 " WHERE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES DID NOT [REFUTE] NOR CHALLENGE NOR DISAGREE CRIMINAL FALSE RECORDS FOUND THAT PRISONER CONFIRM EFFECTED WRONGFUL DECISION MAKING BY PAROLE AUTHORITIES SINCE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER INITIAL HEARING OF (2012). CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM ACCORDING CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA 1976 ANNOTATED 24-21-640 CIRCUMSTANCES WARRANTING PAROLE, PAROLE AUTHORITIES USAGE OF CONFIRMED FALSE RECORDS BY COMMON SENSE UNDER STATUTE EFFECTIVELY MADE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER [UNAUTHORIZED] INELIGIBLE FOR PAROLE GRANT WHICH READS AS FOLLOW BELOW:

" THE BOARD MUST NOT GRANT PAROLE NOR IS PAROLE AUTHORIZED TO [ANY] PRISONER SERVING A SENTENCE FOR A SECOND OR SUBSEQUENT CONVICTION, FOLLOWING A SEPARATE SENTENCING FOR A PRIOR CONVICTION, FOR VIOLENT CRIMES AS DEFINED IN SECTION 16-1-60. PROVIDED THAT WHERE MORE THAN ONE INCLUDED OFFENSE SHALL BE COMMITTED WITHIN A ONE-DAY PERIOD TO ONE CONTINUOUS COURSE OF CONDUCT, SUCH MULTIPLE OFFENSES MUST BE TREATED FOR PURPOSES OF THIS SECTION AS ONE OFFENSE.

SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE REVEAL, ONCE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CORRECTLY PIN POINTED THE IDENTIFIED FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS OF (1.) CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DATED 06-05-1992 AND FOUND ADDITIONAL CRIMINAL RECORDS RANGING FROM 1977 TO 1988 [ALL]..... [SPECIFICALLY] ADDRESSED IN PRISONER " DOCUMENT REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION SEE DOCUMENT D. PAGES (5) AND (7) 1-9..... IT IS OBVIOUS OBSERVABLE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES DID NOT [REFUTE] NOR [DISAGREE] NOR [CHALLENGE] STILL NOT YET OF THIS DAY SEE DOCUMENT E. PRISONER CONFIRM DESPITE PAROLE AUTHORITIES " GRANTED" PRISONER A REHEARING FOR THE 10-23-2024 PAROLE DENIAL, AND REMOVED THE FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS A FACT STILL [OBSERVABLE] AND ACTIVE APPEALABLE, THAT PAROLE AUTHORITIES NEVER ADVISED THE S.C. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT RATHER AGENCY PRIOR KNEW THEY PERPARED FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS [OR] AGENCY DISCOVERED FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS AFTER PRISONER REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION DATED 11-18-2024.

EVIDENCE REVEAL ON DOCUMENT E. JANUARY-13-2025 IT IS UNCLER [RATHER] PAROLE AUTHORITIES WERE [UNAWARE] THEIR AGENCY PREPARED INCORRECT RECORDS, AND GRANTING PAROLE REHEARING FOR 10-23-2024 WOULD NOT [CONSTITUTE] MOOT CLAIM BECAUSE..... HAVING ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE OF USING FALSE RECORDS SINCE PRISONER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING [VERSE] BEING UNAWARE OF USING FALSE RECORDS SINCE PRISONER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING IS OBVIOUS [TWO] DIFFERENT THINGS WITH TWO DIFFERENT RESULTS BY REVIEWING THE FACTS BELOW:

IF SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES CLAIM "ISSUE IS MOOT AND MATTER SHOULD BE DISMISSED" BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS [MOOT] CLAIM WOULD COME IN DIRECT CONFLICT OF CONTROVERSIAL WITH THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS "DECISION OF STATE V. MITCHELL 2021 6066794. IN STATE VS. MITCHELL "COURT CLAIM" CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL II 00189424 CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER WAS NOT ONE OF THE CLASS OF OFFENDERS ENTITLED TO RESENTENCING BECAUSE HE WAS SENTENCE TO LIFE WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE..... [SPECIFICALLY] ADDRESSING GRAHAM V. FLORIDA, 560 U.S. AT 75

["HOLDING"]..... A STATE IS NOT REQUIRED TO GUARANTEE EVENTUAL FREEDOM BUT MUST PROVIDE " SOME MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE BASED ON DEMONSTRATED MATURITY AND REHABILITATION SEE..... MONTGOMERY V. LOUISIANA 577 U.S. 190 212 (2016).

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL #00189424 "CONFIRM" MOOT CLAIM OR MOTION TO DISMISS BEFORE THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS WOULD DRAW FULL ATTENTION TO THE "HOLDING" IN GRAHAM V. FLORIDA IN VIOLATION OF S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES ADMITTED "PREPARATION OF FALSE RECORDS" SINCE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING WOULD "ABSOLUTELY" NOT SATISFY FAIR "FUNDAMENTAL DUE PROCESS REQUIREMENT TO A MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE.

PRISONER CONFIRM "THE USAGE OF THE FALSE RECORDS" PRIOR CONVICTIONS [BEFORE] REMOVING ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 TOTALLY ELIMINATED ALL PRIOR AVAILABLE POSSIBLE OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN RELEASE TO DEMONSTRATE MATURITY GROWTH AND REHABILITATION FROM 2012 TO 2025. COMPELLING EVIDENCE WOULD REVEAL THE PREPARED FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS BY PAROLE AUTHORITIES OBVIOUSLY CREATED A "NEGATIVE" CHARACTER OF A "IRREDEEMABLE" CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER THE [RARE] TOTAL OPPOSITE OF ONE WHO'S NOT FIT TO RETURN TO "SOCIETY. THE FALSE PRIOR CRIMINAL RECORDS USAGE FROM 2012 TO 2024 CONFIRMED OF JANUARY - 13 - 2025 "INDICATE" ONE WHO LACKS MATURITY GROWTH AND LACK OF REHABILITATION SEE A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF CASES BELOW:

VENNISEE V. STATE 42 FLA L WEEKLY [D2170], 235 SO. 947 (FLA. 3d DCA OCT-11-2017)..... "HOLDING" THAT A DEFENDANT IS NOT ENTITLED TO RELIEF UNDER MILLER WHERE HE CAN NOT "MAKE" A THRESHOLD SHOWING THAT THEY EFFECTIVELY RECEIVED A SENTENCE OF LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE [OR] A SENTENCE THAT FAILED TO AFFORD THEM A MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE.

IN [VENNISEE V. STATE 235 SO.3d] COURT CASE "DEFENDANT SENTENCED AS A JUVENILE TO LIFE IN PRISON WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE WAS NOT ENTITLED TO RELIEF WHERE HE HAD BEEN RELEASED ON PAROLE AND HIS PAROLE WAS REVOKED..... "BECAUSE" HE COMMITTED A NEW OFFENSE AS AN ADULT. SEE ROGERS V. STATE, 223 SO.3D 281 (FLA.4TH DCA 2017) THE FORTH DISTRICT HELD..... "WHAT" [GRAHAM VS. FLORIDA] REQUIRE AND WHAT S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES "OVERLOOKED" IN IN ROGERS VS. STATE THAT HE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY FOR RELEASE WHERE INFACIT RELEASED TWICE ON PAROLE..ID AT 282, SEE CURRIE V. STATE 219 SO.3d 960 [FLA 1ST DCA 2017].

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER BEFORE OUR SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES CONFIRM [UNLIKE] VENNISEE, ROGERS, AND CURRIE V. STATE ABOVE..... "THEY" WERE AFFORDED A REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO RELEASE HOWEVER IN THE CASE OF S.C. CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 FROM HIS "INITIAL" PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 TO 3-26-2025 PAROLE REHEARING NO REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE WAS AFFORDED "DO TO THE PREPERATION OF FALSE RECORDS BEGINNING AT INITIAL HEARING 2012 "EFFECTIVELY" MADE PRISONER [UNAUTHORIZED] FOR PAROLE GRANT UNDER 24-21-640 UNTIL JANUARY-13-2025 WHEN PAROLE AUTHORITIES "CLAIM" THEY REALIZE PRISONER PAROLE FILE PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT IS WHAT VIOLATE CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONST; THAT CAN NOT AND WILL NOT "SATISFY DUE PROCESS" [MOOT] CLAIM BY PAROLE AUTHORITIES..... "JUST BECAUSE" PAROLE AUTHORITIES REMOVED THE IDENTIFIED FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS AND GRANTED PRISONER (1) REHEARING WHERE EVEN REHEARING HELD ON 3-26-2025 STILL RESULTED IN A CLEAR DEMONSTRATION FUNCTIONALLY EQUIVALENT TO "LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE.

SEE MILTON JAY JR APPELLANT 25 SO. 3D 326 DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA AT [2].

SUFFICIENT SUBSTANTIAL REASONS TO RESPECTFULLY
REQUEST FOR GRACE OF CONDITIONAL RELEASE:

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER EIGHTH AMENDMENT OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT "COME INTO PLAY" THAT ONCE SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES CONFIRMED ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 THAT PAROLE AUTHORITIES PRIOR RECORD WERE INCORRECT..... IT IS TO BE CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD PRISONER "REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION" WAS TO COMPEL SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO STOP USING FALSE RECORDS TO REPEATIVELY REJECT CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER A REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE OBVIOUSLY IT IS TO BE CLEARLY NOTICE ON THE FACE OF PRISONER REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION SEE DOCUMENT D. PAGE (1) FOR CONFIRMATION.

IN THE CASE OF CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL #00189424..... PRISONER [HAD TO REQUEST] FOR A REHEARING, BECAUSE PAROLE AUTHORITIES REPEATEDLY REFUSE TO REMOVE PREJUDICE FALSE RECORDS FROM PRISONER PAROLE FILE RECORD THAT HAD CAUSED "MULTIPLE" WRONGFUL DECISION MAKING SINCE PRISONER INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF HIS ONLY AFFORDED [MECHANISM] TO OBTAIN RELEASE WAS BY GRACE OF PAROLE GRANT BY "PROVIDING" SUBSTANTIAL PROOF OF FOUND FALSE CRIMINAL HISTORY LOCATED IN PRISONER PAROLE FILE RECORD SEE DOCUMENT D. PAGES (5) AND (7) 1-9.

SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE CONFIRM THE REMOVAL OF THE FALSE RECORD AND THE NEW HEARING SCHEDULE ON MARCH - 26 - 2025 OBVIOUSLY DID NOT CURE VIOLATION OF THE 8TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT TO THE U. S. CONST; DO TO THE REHEARING WAS MANDATORY REGARDLESS WITHOUT HAVING BEING FORCE TO REQUEST FOR IT..... SEE KELSEY V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES 441 S.C. 373. EVIDENCE REVEAL IF PRISONER WOULD NOT HAVE REQUESTED FOR REHEARING SEE DOCUMENT D. PAGES 1-9

SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES WOULD NOT HAVE REMOVED THE FALSE RECORD AND NO REHEARING WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN AFFORDED.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM THE [RESCHEDULE] REHEARING HELD ON MARCH - 26 - 2025 THAT STILL RESULTED IN A EFFECTIVE PAROLE DENIAL IS CHALLENGE UNDER THE 8TH AMENDMENT LEAVING CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER ONLY OPTION IS TO RESPECTFULLY REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL RELEASE.

LEGAL MAIL

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM IF FORM 1212 SEE DOCUMENT B. "CRITERIA" FOR PAROLE CONSIDERATION CONFIRM S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES PREPARE RECORDS FOR THE PAROLE BOARD AND IT COMES PART OF THE INMATE PAROLE FILE..... WHERE OBVIOUS FROM A REVIEW OF DOCUMENT E. ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 PAROLE AUTHORITIES DETERMINE THEIR (OWN) AGENCY PREPARED INCORRECT PRIOR RECORDS IDENTIFIED BY PRISONER [OBVIOUS] MANDATE REOPENING OF JUVENILE OFFENDER INITIAL PAROLE HEARING TO ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE THE 8TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT OF U.S. CONST; VIOLATION DO TO THE JANUARY - 13 - 2025 ADMITTED LETTER IS CONSIDER "NEW INFORMATION" THAT WOULD REVEAL TO "COMPETENT COURT" SEE THE HONORABLE CHIP HUGGINS 2010 WL 4982611 S.C. CODE 24-21-13 (A)(2)(B). THAT BY LOGIC "PAROLE BOARD" DO NOT PREPARE THE RECORD BECAUSE ACCORDING TO FORM 1212 THE RECORD IS PREPARED THROUGH INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED FOR THE PAROLE BOARD [WHO] IS RELYING ON INITIAL INVESTIGATION INFORMATION TRANSFERRED TO THEIR DEPARTMENT TO RELY ON AND WHICH COMES PART OF THE INMATE PAROLE FILE. EVIDENCE REVEAL BY LOGIC THE PAROLE BOARD COULD NOT HAVE KNOWN AT INITIAL PAROLE HEARING THAT PAROLE AUTHORITIES PREPARED [PREJUDICE] FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS. SEE CARL J. MONROE V. THIGPEN 932 F.2D 1437 AT [2], PARDON AND PAROLE "EVIDENCE AND MATTERS CONSIDERED CONFIRM..... "WHILE" PAROLE STATUTE CONFERRED NO LIBERTY INTEREST IN PAROLE IT DID NOT GRANT BOARD DISCRETION TO RELY UPON ADMITTEDLY FALSE INFORMATION IN DETERMINING WHETHER TO GRANT PAROLE CONST. AMEND 14. SEE STRADER V. TROY, 571 F.2D 1263, 1266 (4TH CIR. 1978). SEE TOWNES V. JARVIS 577 F.3d 543 AT [1] FOR CONTROVERSY TO BE MOOT, IT MUST LACK AT LEAST ONE OF THREE REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF ARTICLE III STANDING: (1) INJURY IN FACT, (2) CAUSATION, OR (3) REDRESSABILITY CONST ART. 3 2, CL 1.

LEGAL MAIL

CONVICTED FIRST TIME JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00 189424 CONFIRM JUST AS THE PAROLE BOARD THAT HE COULD NOT HAVE KNOWN AT THE BEGINNING OF HIS INITIAL PAROLE HEARING THAT THE PAROLE BOARD WERE RELYING ON FALSE RECORDS SINCE (2012)..... ESPECIALLY WHEN PRIOR FILES WERE CONSIDER BY STATUTE CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGE SEE DOCUMENT E., PRISONER CONFIRM THESE FILES WERE CONFIDENTIAL FROM HIS FIRST PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 TO 2024.

SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE CONFIRM WHEN S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES FINALLY NOTIFIED CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER ON JANUARY- 13 - 2025 IS A RESPECTFUL " REDRESSABILITY CLAIM..... BECAUSE OBVIOUS JUVENILE OFFENDER WAS "CLEARLY" INJURY. ACCORDING TO UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION UNDER GRAHAM V. FLORIDA .560 AT 75, [CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00 189424 CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER " REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE BASED ON DEMONSTRATED MATURITY AND REHABILITATION..... WAS SUPPOSE TO START AT HIS INITIAL HEARING OF 2012 HIS REALISTIC MEANINGFUL RELEASE..... WAS NOT SUPPOSE TO START AFTER PAROLE AUTHORITIES DECIED TO REMOVE THE FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD ON JANUARY- 13 - 2025 IT IS A CLEAR 8TH AMENDMENT VIOLATION..... OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT. CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CLAIM THE UNREASONBLE DELAY TO AFFORD JUVENILE OFFENDER HIS REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE BEFORE JANUARY- 13 - 2025 VIOLATES THE PLEA STATUTE OF 16- 3 - 20(A) (SUPP 1991) IF SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS CLAIM PRISONER WAS SENTENCE TO PAROLE ELIGIBILITY.

LEGAL MAIL

SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE CONFIRM "WHEN S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES BOARD BECAME ACTUALLY AWARE ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018..... THAT PRISONER THINK HIS FILE CONTAINED INADEQUACY INFORMATION PRISONERS DON'T HAVE TO APPEAL TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT [INORDER] TO NOTIFY THE BOARD BEFORE "KELSEY V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES 441 S.C. 373 EVIDENCE CONFIRM OF DOCUMENT B. CRITERIA FOR PAROLE CONSIDERATION "PRISONERS" HAD TO WAIT ON PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO NOTIFY THE INMATE OF THE ACTION TAKEN OBVIOUS AFTER THE INVESTIGATION WHERE FORM (1212) CAN NOT LIE. FOR PROOF PRISONER FILE HIS SECOND REQUEST FOR REHEARING ON NOVEMBER - 18 - 2024 BEFORE HE FILED HIS APPEAL TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT ON DEC - 9 - 2024, HIS REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION SEE DOCUMENT D., SEE DOCUMENT E JANUARY - 13 - 2025 LETTER IN RESPONSE PAROLE AUTHORITIES CONFIRM THEY RECEIVED MY CORRESPONDENCE LETTER IN THEIR OFFICE ON 11-25-24 PROVE THAT JUVENILE OFFENDER ON OCT-10-2018 DID NOT HAVE TO FILE AN APPEAL TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT BEFORE [KELSEY V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT OF PROB, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES IN ORDER TO NOTIFY THE BOARD THAT HE THINK HIS FILE CONTAIN SOME ERROR OR INADEQUACY.

SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE CONFIRM S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES INTENTIONLY WAIVED CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER OCTOBER - 28 - 2018 REQUEST FOR REHEARING OF OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 HIS FIRST OFFICIAL REQUEST FOR A REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN BASED ON DEMONSTRATED MATURITY AND REHABILITATION REQUIRE UNDER GRAHAM V. FLORIDA 560 AT 75 AND DENIED AGAIN ON MARCH - 26 - 2025.

LEGAL MAIL

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM BEFORE OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ACCORDING TO "NAPUE V. ILLINOIS" 360 U.S. AT 269, 79 S. CT. 1173 TO..... ESTABLISH A NAPUE VIOLATION, A DEFENDANT [MUST] SHOW THAT THE STATE KNOWINGLY SOLICITED FALSE TESTIMONY OR KNOWINGLY ALLOWED IT TO GO UNCORRECTED WHEN IT APPEARED, AND IF THE DEFENDANT MAKES THAT SHOWING, A NEW TRIAL IS WARRANTED SO LONG AS THE FALSE TESTIMONY "MAY HAVE" HAD AN EFFECT ON THE OUTCOME OF THE TRIAL, "Id AT 272, 79 S. CT 1173 - THAT IS IF IT IN ANY REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD [COURT HAVE AFFECTED THE JUDGMENT OF THE JURY OR IN CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CASE THE PAROLE BOARD AND PAROLE AUTHORITIES DECISION MAKING.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER [NO DOUBT] HAS SUCCESSFULLY DEMONSTRATE TO OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEAL'S AND OUR S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES A "SUCCESSFUL" NAPUE VS. ILLINOIS VIOLATION BY COMPELLING EVIDENCE AND MILLER V. ALABAMA, 132 S. CT. 2455 (2012), SEE AIKEN V. BYARS, 410 S.C. 534, 544 (2014) SEE GRAHAM V. FLORIDA, 560 U.S. 48, 75 (2010), SEE MONTGOMERY V. LOUISIANA, 136 S. CT. AT 736..... WHERE THIS COURT GAVE EXAMPLES OF SPECIFIC EVIDENCE THAT WOULD BE RELEVANT TO PAROLE CONSIDERATIONS FOR MONTGOMERY TO REMEDY THE MILLER VIOLATION BY CONSIDERING THEM FOR PAROLE, RATHER THAN RESENTENCING THEM., MARYLAND RESTORATIVE JUSTIC INITIATIVE V. HOGAN NO. CV ELH-16-1021, 2017 WL 467731 (D. Md. FED. 3, 2017). SEE MILTON JAY JR. V. THE STATE OF FLORIDA 252 SO. 3D 326.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM HIS 5TH AND 8TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONST. ARE BEING VIOLATED THAT WHEN CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER WAS FINALLY (NOTIFIED) ON JANUARY-13-25 SEE DOCUMENT E., THAT HIS PRIOR RECORD WAS

LEGAL MAIL

INCORRECT, "COMPELLING EVIDENCE REVEAL" CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MITCHELL #00189424 WAS NOT ONLY "ENTITLED" TO THE OCTOBER - 23 - 2024 REHEARING; PRISONER WAS ACTUALLY ENTITLED TO ALL WRONGFUL PAROLE DENIALS THAT WERE EFFECTED BY THE USAGE OF THE FALSE RECORD TESTIMONY BEFORE (2024). CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CLAIM BY COMPELLING EVIDENCE TO OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, PAROLE AUTHORITIES OBVIOUS UNEXPLAINED UNREASONABLE LONG DELAY TO REMOVE THE FALSE RECORDS ENTER AT JUVENILE OFFENDER INITIAL HEARING IN SERIOUS ERROR AND THE UNREASONABLE LONG DELAY TO NOTIFY PRISONER IN A TIMELY FASHION "WHEN" ALSO BOUGHT TO THE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES FULL ATTENTION ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 LIVE PAROLE CONFERENCE HEARING NO DOUBT HELP CAUSE..... JUVENILE OFFENDER LIFE WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE UNDER S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITY TO EFFECTIVELY "RESEMBLE" LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE. SEE MILTON JAY JR. THE STATE OF FLORIDA 252 SO. 3d 1326.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM. BEFORE OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS THAT WHEN PRISONER AND COUNSEL REPORTED ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 THAT HIS FILE CONTAINED FALSE RECORDS DOING HIS LIVE RECORDED PAROLE HEARING, AND BY OF PRISONER REQUEST FOR PAROLE REHEARING DATED OCTOBER - 28 - 2018 SEE DOCUMENT C. SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM NONREFUTE PAROLE AUTHORITIES WERE NOTIFIED PRIOR MADE AWARE.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM ON OCTOBER - 23 - 2024 HE DISCOVERED THAT HIS PRIOR REPORT NOTIFY TO THE PAROLE BOARD AND PAROLE AUTHORITIES REPORT OF FALSE RECORDS WENT UNCORRECTED FROM 2018 WHERE HE ALSO FOUND FALSE RECORDS IN HIS PAROLE FILE FROM 1977 TO 1988 ALL REPORTED IN HIS REQUEST FOR PAROLE

RECONSIDERATION SEE DOCUMENT D. PAGES (1-9). SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE CONFIRM WHEN PAROLE AUTHORITIES CONFIRMED ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 THAT CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL# 00189424..... IDENTIFIED AN ERROR THAT DETERMINE PAROLE AUTHORITIES PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT NOT (ONLY) MANDATED REHEARING FOR THE OCTOBER - 23 - 2024 IT ALSO CONFIRMED WHEN PRISONER WAS "FINALLY" NOTIFIED FROM HIS OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 REPORT OF FALSE RECORD THAT PRISONER THINK WAS IN HIS FILE AS "INSTRUCT BY FORM (1212) TO INVESTIGATE AND NOTIFY PRISONER OF THE ACTION TAKEN.

SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE CONFIRM THE EXTREMELY LONG OBVIOUS "UNEXPLAINED" DELAY TO REMOVE THE FALSE PREJUDICE RECORDS BOUGHT TO PAROLE AUTHORITIES ATTENTION ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 BY PRISONER COUNSEL AND PRISONER BY WAY OF LIVE RECORDED PAROLE VIDEO CONFERENCE CLEARLY PREJUDICE JUVENILE OFFENDER FROM PRIOR RECEIVING ANY REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO PRIOR RELEASE BASED ON DEMONSTRATED MATURITY AND REHABILITATION THAT THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES PAROLE SYSTEMS TO OFFER.

PRISONER STATE WHEN HE FINALLY BECAME NOTIFY JANUARY - 13 - 2025 THAT HIS PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT DID NOT PROCEDURALLY BAR THE REHEARING FOR OCTOBER - 10 - 2018, do TO PRISONER NOTIFY REPORT WAS CONFIRMED THAT HIS PAROLE PRIOR FILE WAS INCORRECT, WHEN IT WAS BOUGHT TO THE PAROLE AUTHORITIES ATTENTION AND IF THE PAROLE AUTHORITIES WERE MANDATED TO [RESCHEDULE] THE OCTOBER - 23 - 2024 FOR REHEARING SEE DOCUMENT E., OBVIOUS THE OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 PAROLE DENIAL WAS MANDATED AS WELL SEE DOCUMENT C., OCTOBER - 28 - 2018 REQUEST FOR PAROLE REHEARING. PRISONER STATE THE FAILURE TO AFFORD PRISONER HIS CONSTITUTION RIGHT TO OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 REHEARING AFTER THE INVESTIGATION DETERMINE PAROLE PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 VIOLATE NAPUE V. ILLINOIS UNDER NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE, 79 S. CT. 1173..... WHEN PAROLE AUTHORITIES ALLOWED FALSE RECORD REPORTED TO GO UNCORRECTED TO BE EFFECTIVELY USED TO REJECT JUVENILE OFFENDER ANY REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN RELEASE.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CLAIM HE HAD (1) YEAR FROM JANUARY- 13 - 2025 TO JANUARY - 13 - 2026 TO APPEAL FROM DATE OF DISCOVERED EVIDENCE SEE (17 - 27 - 45); PRISONER TIMELY FILE NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE APPEAL ON NOVEMBER - 20 - 2025 SEE DOCUMENT K.

SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE CONFIRM THE MARCH - 26 - 2025, REHEARING (ONLY) ACCOUNT FOR THE OCTOBER - 23 - 2024, PAROLE DENIAL SEE DOCUMENT E. WHICH CONFIRM HOW LONG THE REPORTED FALSE RECORD INVESTIGATION WENT UNCORRECTED BEFORE PRISONER WAS NOTIFIED ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 AS REQUIRE BY FORM (1212) SEE DOCUMENT B.

NOTE: FORM 1212 " CRITERIA FOR PAROLE CONSIDERATION " DID NOT STATE HOW LONG AN INVESTIGATION SHALL TAKE ONCE THE BOARD BECOME NOTIFY.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM "JUST BECAUSE PAROLE AUTHORITIES DECIDED IN ERROR TO NOTIFY PRISONER ON (JANUARY - 13 - 2025) FROM A (OCTOBER - 10 - 2018) REPORT OF FALSE RECORD OF MISIDENTIFICATION OF RECORD THAT WAS CONFIRMED TO BE PRIOR INCORRECT RECORD..... DO NOT PROCEDURALLY BAR JUVENILE OFFENDER CHALLENGE OF 8TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION WHEN INVESTIGATION BECAME FINALIZED WHERE PRISONER CHALLENGE CLAIM ON NOVEMBER - 25 - 2025 SEE DOCUMENT K., IN VIOLATION OF NAPUE V. ILLINOIS " THAT PAROLE AUTHORITIES KNOWINGLY ALLOWED FALSE RECORDS TO GO UNCORRECTED WHEN IT APPEARED TO THEIR ATTENTION ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 SEE DOCUMENT C. AND ALLOWED THE USAGE OF THE FALSE RECORD TO CONTINUE TO BE USED BY THE PAROLE BOARD AS MEANS TO HELP REJECT JUVENILE OFFENDER PRIOR AVAILABLE OPPORTUNITIES WHERE PAROLE GRANT RELEASE COULD HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE IF NOT FOR THE USAGE OF CONFIRM PRIOR INCORRECT RECORD JUVENILE LIFE WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE WOULD NOT EFFECTIVELY RESEMBLE LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE SEE MILTON JAY JR. V. THE STATE OF FLORIDA 252 SO. 3D 326.

CONCLUSION:

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER ONLY OPTION IS A RESPECTFUL REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL RELEASE FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES GRACE AND MERCY TO RESOLVE THE CLEAR 8TH AND 14TH AMEND VIOLATION TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM WITHIN HIS BRIEF HE DID NOT (BEFORE) JANUARY-13-2025 RECEIVED [NO] REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO RELEASE DO TO IT WAS CLEARLY CONFIRMED HIS PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT. SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE CONFIRM [REHEARING] HELD ON MARCH-26-2025 ALSO RESULTED IN PAROLE DENIAL..... WHERE PAROLE GRANT COULD HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE BEFORE MARCH-26-2025 IF NOT FOR PRIOR INCORRECT RECORD BEFORE JANUARY-13-2025 WHERE PAROLE AUTHORITIES ADMITTED ERROR SEE DOCUMENT E. SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE CONFIRM PAROLE AUTHORITIES NO DOUBT INJURY JUVENILE OFFENDER THAT HAS EFFECTIVELY LEAD CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER LIFE WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE TO EFFECTIVELY RESEMBLE LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE SEE..... MILTON JAY JR. V. THE STATE OF FLORIDA 252 SO. 3D 326.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER HERE WITHIN THIS BRIEF HUMBLY REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL RELEASE TO DEMONSTRATE MATURITY AND REHABILITATION BY OUR S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES GRACE AND MERCY.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER STATE IF GRACE AND MERCY OF CONDITIONAL RELEASE STILL IS NOT POSSIBLE, JUVENILE OFFENDER RESPECTFULLY ASK THIS S.C. COURT OF APPEALS..... "WHAT REMDY" IS DUE WHEN NO PRIOR REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN RELEASE TO DEMONSTRATE MATURITY AND REHABILITATION WAS AFFORDED DO TO THE PRIOR RECORD BEFORE JANUARY-13-2025 WAS CONFIRM INCORRECT, WHERE EVEN AFTER THE REMOVAL OF THE FALSE RECORD REHEARING STILL RESULTED IN REJECTION WHERE

IF NOT FOR THE PRIOR INCORRECT RECORD BEFORE
JANUARY-13-2025..... THERE WAS A POSSIBILITY
PAROLE GRANT COULD HAVE BEEN AFFORDED ESPECIALLY
WHEN THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS
CLAIM CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES
MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 UNDER STATE V.
MITCHELL 2021 6066794 WAS NOT ENTITLED TO
RESENTENCING BECAUSE HE WAS SENTENCE TO
LIFE WITH PAROLE. SEE ATWELL V. STATE 197 SO.
3D 1040, SEE MILTON JAY JR V. THE STATE OF FLORIDA
252 SO 3D 326 AT [2].

Charles Michael Mitchell
CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL
00189424
ALLENDALE C.I. I.N.S.T.
P.O. BOX 1151, HWY 47
FAIRFAX S.C. 29827