

# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

The State, Respondent,

v.

Ray Edward Chestnut, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2025-001447

---

## ORDER

---

On April 29, 2026, Appellant filed a motion to relieve counsel and appoint substitute counsel. On May 4, 2026, Appellant filed a motion to reject the brief filed pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967) and order full briefing on various issues. Finally, on May 12, 2026, Appellant filed a "supplemental notice and argument in support of [his] motion to relieve counsel . . . and for further briefing." After careful consideration, we deny Appellant's motion to relieve counsel and appoint substitute counsel. To the extent Appellant requests relief beyond relieving counsel, we take no action because Appellant is represented by counsel. *See Miller v. State*, 388 S.C. 347, 347, 697 S.E.2d 527, 527 (2010) ("Since there is no right to 'hybrid representation' that is partially pro se and partially by counsel, substantive documents, with the exception of motions to relieve counsel, filed pro se by a person represented by counsel are not to be accepted unless submitted by counsel.").

 J.  
FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Ray Edward Chestnut, 00304094

Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire

Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire

**FILED**  
**May 21 2026**

Wesley Chandler Norville, Esquire