RECEIVED
Jun 18 2026
SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Greenville County

Honorable Jessica A Salvini, Circuit Court Judge
Honorable Christopher D. Taylor, Circuit Court Judge

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

SHARHONDA NICOLE JENKINS,

APPELLANT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2025-001563

RECORD ON APPEAL

W. CHANDLER NORVILLE
Appellate Defender

South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense
Division of Appellate Defense
PO Box 11589
Columbia, SC 29211-1589
(803) 734-1330

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General

MARK R. FARTHING
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General
1000 Assembly Street, Room 519
Columbia, SC 29201
(803)734-4117

CYNTHIA SMITH CRICK
Solicitor, Thirteen Judicial Circuit
305 East North Street, Suite 325
Greenville, SC 29601
(864) 467-8647

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

INDEX

INDEX i

TRIAL TRANSCRIPT DATED JUNE 11, 2025, VOLUME I OF III 1

DEFENSE MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE BY MR. ARMSTRONG 7

RESPONSE BY MR. MILLER 9

CONTINUED MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE BY MR. ARMSTRONG 11

COURT DEFERS RULING 14

DEFENSE MOTION *IN LIMINE* TO EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY OF WITNESS W. MOLIERE AND MOTION TO DISMISS BY MR. ARMSTRONG 14

RESPONSE AND STATE'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY REGARDING PROBATE COURT MATTER BY MR. MILLER 17

CONTINUED MOTION TO DISMISS AND RESPONSE TO MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY REGARDING PROBATE COURT MATTER BY MR. ARMSTRONG 19

COURT'S RULING DENYING DEFENSE MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY OF WITNESS W. MOLIERE, DENYING DEFENSE MOTION TO DISMISS, AND DEFERRING RULING ON THE STATE'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY REGARDING THE PROBATE COURT MATTER 21

STATE'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE THIRD-PARTY GUILT EVIDENCE BY MR. MILLER 23

RESPONSE BY MR. ARMSTRONG 24

COURT DEFERS RULING ON MOTION TO EXCLUDE THIRD-PARTY GUILT EVIDENCE 26

COURT'S RULING DENYING DEFENSE MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE 27

JURY *VOIR DIRE* 32

JURY SELECTION 41

TESTIMONY

ELLIOTT TURNER
Direct Examination *in-camera* by Ms. Scott 49

Cross-Examination *in-camera* by Mr. Armstrong 53
Redirect Examination *in-camera* by Ms. Scott 55

STATE'S MOTION FOR FINDING THAT THE DEFENDANT STATEMENT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT WAS FREELY AND VOLUNTARILY GIVEN BY MS. SCOTT 55

RESPONSE CONCEDING THE STATEMENT WAS FREELY AND VOLUNTARILY GIVEN BY MR. ARMSTRONG 56

COURT'S RULING FINDING THE DEFENDANT STATEMENT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT ADMISSIBLE PURSUANT TO *JACKSON V. DENNO* 56

STATE'S MOTION TO ALLOW WITNESSES W. MOLIERE AND N. MOLIERE TO BE EXEMPTED FROM SEQUESTRATION BY MS. SCOTT 58

DEFENSE OBJECTION TO EXEMPTING WITNESSES W. MOLIERE AND N. MOLIERE FROM SEQUESTRATION BY MR. ARMSTRONG 59

COURT DEFERS RULING ON PRESENCE OF WITNESSES W. MOLIERE AND N. MOLIERE 59

OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. SCOTT 66

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. ARMSTRONG 69

TESTIMONY

BRITTANEY WILLIAMS
Direct Examination by Ms. Scott 72
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 83
Redirect Examination by Ms. Scott 92
Recross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 95

BARBARA CANTRELL
Direct Examination by Mr. Miller 96
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 113
Redirect Examination by Mr. Miller 114

MIRANDA OWENS
Direct Examination by Mr. Miller 117
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 118

FRED DOUGLAS GARRETT, JR.
Direct Examination by Ms. Scott 119
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 125

Redirect Examination by Ms. Scott 128

DEFENSE RENEWAL OF OBJECTION TO MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY REGARDING THE PROBATE COURT MATTER BY MR. ARMSTRONG 131

CONTINUED MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY REGARDING THE PROBATE COURT MATTER BY MR. MILLER 132

RESPONSE BY MR. ARMSTRONG 132

COURT DEFERS RULING ON STATE'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY REGARDING THE PROBATE COURT MATTER 133

TRIAL TRANSCRIPT DATED JUNE 12, 2025- VOLUME II OF III 135

COURT'S RULING FINDING PROBATE COURT ORDER INADMISSIBLE OVER DEFENSE OBJECTION 136

DEFENSE MOTION TO EXCLUDE 2023 DMV CHANGE OF ADDRESS FOR THE DEFENDANT BY MR. ARMSTRONG 137

RESPONSE BY MR. MILLER 137

COURT'S RULING DENYING STATE'S MOTION TO ALLOW WITNESSES W. MOLIERE AND N. MOLIERE TO BE EXEMPTED FROM SEQUESTRATION 138

TESTIMONY

BARRY DOWNS
Direct Examination by Ms. Scott 139
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 148

WILLIE MAE MOLIERE
Direct Examination by Mr. Miller 152
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 166
Redirect Examination by Mr. Miller 177

DARRELL FREEMAN
Direct Examination by Mr. Miller 179
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 187

NATASHA MOLIERE
Direct Examination by Ms. Scott 190
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 197

SHERIKA ROBERSON
Direct Examination by Mr. Miller 198
Cross-Examination *in-camera* by Mr. Armstrong 214
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 218

DEFENSE MOTION TO EXCLUDE STATE'S EXHIBIT NO. 20 (ATM VIDEO) BY MR. ARMSTRONG 221

RESPONSE BY MS. SCOTT 222

CONTINUED MOTION TO EXCLUDE STATE'S EXHIBIT NO. 20 (ATM VIDEO) BY MR. ARMSTRONG 222

COURT'S RULING FINDING STATE'S EXHIBIT NO. 20 ADMISSIBLE OVER DEFENSE OBJECTION 222

TESTIMONY

ANDREW JAMES MISOCKY
Direct Examination by Ms. Scott 223

DEFENSE RENEWS MOTION TO EXCLUDE STATE'S EXHIBIT NO. 20 233

COURT'S RULING ADMITTING STATE'S EXHIBIT NO. 20 (ATM VIDEO) OVER DEFENSE OBJECTION 233

TESTIMONY

ANDREW JAMES MISOCKY
Continued Direct Examination by Ms. Scott 234
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 235

LARRY WILLIAMS
Direct Examination by Mr. Miller 246
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 258

ELLIOTT TURNER
Direct Examination by Mr. Miller 259
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 272
Redirect Examination by Mr. Miller 276

JOHN ALLAN JAMIESON
Direct Examination by Ms. Scott 277
Cross-Examination by Mr. Armstrong 285

STATE RESTS 288

DEFENSE MOTION FOR A DIRECT VERDICT AS TO BOTH CHARGES.....288

RESPONSE BY MR. MILLER.....288

COURT'S RULING DENYING DEFENSE MOTION FOR DIRECTED VERDICT.....290

TESTIMONY COLLOQUY WITH DEFENDANT.....290

TESTIMONY

JASENDA BARTON
Direct Examination by Mr. Armstrong.....293
Cross-Examination by Ms. Scott.....297

DEFENSE RESTS.....299

CHARGE CONFERENCE.....300

TRIAL TRANSCRIPT DATED JUNE 13, 2025- VOLUME III OF III.....303

CONTINUED CHARGE CONFERENCE.....304

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MR. MILLER.....306

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MR ARMSTRONG.....330

CLOSING ARGUMENT IN REPLY BY MR. MILLER.....338

CHARGE ON THE LAW.....341

JURY NOTE WITH QUESTIONS REGARDING WARRANTS, CHARGE ON THE LAW, DURABLE POWER OF ATTORNEY, AND WITNESS W. MOLIERE.....359

DEFENSE CONSENTS TO COURT'S PROPOSED RESPONSES.....360

STATE CONSENTS TO COURT'S PROPOSED RESPONSES.....360

COURT'S RESPONSE TO JURY QUESTIONS.....361

JURY NOTE WITH QUESTION REGARDING CHARGE ON THE LAW OF FORGERY AND REQUEST FOR STATE'S EXHIBITS 8, 9, 21, AND 22.....364

STATE'S PROPOSED RESPONSE.....366

STATE CONSENTS TO COURT'S PROPOSED RESPONSE.....367

DEFENSE CONSENTS TO COURT'S PROPOSED RESPONSE 367

COURT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR STATE'S EXHIBITS 8, 9, 21, AND 22 AND RECHARGE ON THE LAW OF FORERY 368

VERDICT 373

DEFENSE MOTION TO POLL THE JURY 373

POLLING OF THE JURY 374

SENTENCING 383

STATE'S EXHIBIT NO. 1 (DEED (2007)) 385

STATE'S EXHIBIT NO. 2 (POA (EROL MOLIERE)) 389

STATE'S EXHIBIT NO. 5 (DEED TO DARRELL FREEMAN) 393

STATE'S EXHIBIT NO. 6 (DEED TO LARRY WILLIAMS) 395

STATE'S EXHIBIT NO. 11 (REQUEST FOR CHANGE IN LANDLORD 398

INDICTMENTS 399

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL 403

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	) COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
	)
COUNTY OF GREENVILLE	) THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	) NO. 2022-GS-23-3629 and -3631
	)
VS.	) TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD
	) PRETRIAL, JURY SELECTION,
SHARHONDA NICOLE JENKINS	) JURY TRIAL
	)
	) Vol. I of III, Pages 1-134

B E F O R E:

THE HONORABLE JESSICA A. SALVINI; THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER D. TAYLOR, JUDGE; AND A JURY

DATE: June 11, 2025
Greenville, South Carolina

A P P E A R A N C E S:

ASHTON TUCK SCOTT, ESQUIRE, ASSISTANT SOLICITOR
ANDREW PRESTON MILLER, ESQUIRE, ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

Attorneys for the State

JOSEPH GARY ARMSTRONG, ESQUIRE

Attorney for the Defendant

Reported by: Cathy J. Provost, RMR, Official Court Reporter

INDEXES

	PAGE:
Pretrial Motions	6-32,48-59
Matter(s) of Law 131,135,177,213,241,243,299,302,357,361	
Jury Selection	32
Jury Strike Sheet	
Jury sworn	60
The Court's opening instructions	60
Opening Statements:	
For the State, by Ass't. Solicitor Scott	66
For the Defense, by Attorney Armstrong	69
Defendant's Fifth Amendment Rights Colloquy	298
Closing Statements:	
For the State, by Ass't. Solicitor Miller	304,336
For the Defense, by Attorney Armstrong	328
Jury Charge	339
Jury question(s)	357,359,361
Verdict	370
Sentencing	373
Statement(s) given during sentencing:	
Kenneth C. Gibson, Esquire	375
Willie Mae Moliere	377
Natasha Moliere	379
Sharhonda Nicole Jenkins	380
Sentence of the Court	381
Certificate(s) of Reporter	134,301,382

INDEX TO WITNESSES

WITNESSES:	DIRECT:	CROSS:	REDIRECT:	RECROSS:
ELLIOTT TURNER				
(Proffered - without jury)				
By Ass't. Sol. Scott	49	--	55	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	53	--	--
BRITTANEY WILLIAMS				
By Ass't. Sol. Miller	72	--	92	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	83	--	95
BARBARA CANTRELL				
By Ass't. Sol. Miller	95	--	114	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	113	--	--
MIRANDA OWENS				
By Ass't. Sol. Miller	117	--	--	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	119	--	--
FRED DOUG GARRETT JR.				
By Ass't. Sol. Scott	119	--	128	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	125	--	--
BARRY DOWNS				
By Ass't. Sol. Scott	138	--	--	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	147	--	--
WILLIE MAE MOLIERE				
By Ass't. Sol. Miller	151	--	176	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	165	--	--
DARRELL FREEMAN				
By Ass't. Sol. Miller	179	--	--	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	187	--	--
NATASHA MOLIERE				
By Ass't. Sol. Scott	189	--	--	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	196	--	--
SHERIKA ROBERSON				
By Ass't. Sol. Miller	197	--	--	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	217	--	--
(Proffered - without jury)				
By Attorney Armstrong	213	--	--	--

INDEX TO WITNESSES (cont.)

WITNESSES:	DIRECT:	CROSS:	REDIRECT:	RECROSS:
ANDREW MISOCKY				
By Ass't. Sol. Scott	222	--	--	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	234	--	--
LARRY WILLIAMS				
By Ass't. Sol. Miller	245	--	--	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	257	--	--
ELLIOTT TURNER				
By Ass't. Sol. Miller	258	--	275	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	271	--	--
JOHN JAMIESON				
By Ass't. Sol. Scott	276	--	--	--
By Attorney Armstrong	--	284	--	--
JASENDA BARTON				
By Attorney Armstrong	293	--	--	--
By Ass't. Sol. Scott	--	296	--	--

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

	IDENTIFIED:	ADMITTED:
STATE'S EXHIBITS:		
1 - Deed (2007)	57	100
2 - POA (Erol Moliere)	57	101
3 - B Ridgeway deed	57	103
4 - Notice of Breach of Contract	57	105
5 - Deed to Darrell Freeman	57	107
6 - Deed to Larry Williams	57	109
7 - POA to Larry Williams	57	112
9 - Erol Moliere obituary (ID'd only)	57	--
10 - Photograph (A Ridgeway)	180	194
11 - Request for change in landlord	180	201
12 - Direct deposit authorization	180	203
13 - Voided check from Woodforest	180	204
14 - Letter from Woodforest	180	204
15 - Declaration Statement (2/26/20)	180	205
16 - Tax report	180	207
17 - HAP Contract	180	208
18 - Payment spreadsheet	180	211
19 - Bank statements (41 pages)	220	226
20 - ATM video	220	232
23 - Barry Downs' signature standards	243	269
24 - Willie Mae signature standards	243	269

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS:

(No exhibits marked.)

	IDENTIFIED:
COURT'S EXHIBITS:	
1 - DVD	48
2 - Jury note (foreperson)	116
3 - Jury note	241
4 - Declaration	241
5 - Jury question	360
6 - Jury question	366

6

-- P R O C E E D I N G S --

(Court is called to order, without the jury.)

PRETRIAL MOTIONS

THE COURT (TAYLOR): I'll let the solicitor go ahead and call the case.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Judge, this is the case against Defendant, Sharhonda Jenkins, Warrant Nos. 2021A232024554 for Obtaining Goods Under False Pretences, and Warrant No. 2021A2330204553 for Forgery.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. And is Mr. Jenkins present? Okay. You can have a seat up here at the table. And Mr. Armstrong?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Good to meet you. Right now we have a jury set to come at, I think, about 10:15, so we're planning on striking at 10:30, but there are a number of motions, I think State motions and Defense motions, related to this particular trial. So we'll take up both motions now.

Where I can make a ruling, I will. I may take some things under advisement until after we pick the jury and kind of have them situated, and I'll come back with rulings on some of these motions. But I want to get some more background on what I read. I think I understand it, but I want you all to kind of explain it to me. Okay.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. So I guess the State, you may go.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Mr. Armstrong, do you still have a motion for a continuance?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): I had talked to Judge Morgan. He said he had not ruled on that, so Judge Taylor will address that first, and then we'll go from there.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): All right. Happy to hear from you.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please the Court. We had filed a motion to continue for a continuance in this matter. It was provided to the State last week and filed with the Court on Monday.

The motion, it's comprised of us receiving discovery from -- according to the motion, and we've had one more. The State has -- I'm sorry, Your Honor -- filed, I believe it's, nine total pieces of discovery since this case was placed on the trial docket. It's nine, with more than 16 packets of evidence to review, some equaling 35 pages or more. I actually received some discovery Monday night, or Monday after 5:00, which is the week of trial.

A lot of this production relates to handwriting analysis, handwriting expert. We believe that there are videos and files that were uploaded that we didn't have before. This is the

8

discovery in the case, Your Honor, so it's not quite as simple as everyone would indicate. The motion's based upon the General Sessions Docket Management Order, and obviously (a)(2)(A) of that order provides timing to complete production is paramount in these cases so that we can move forward.

In this case we are maintaining that the State had disregarded this obligation to get to us, leading me to feel like I can't safely go forward and defend my client without a handwriting analysis expert based upon what they've given us. We're prepared to go receive that, or go get one, and I believe that the matter should be continued to a later date pursuant to Section (b)(3)(4). That would be the remedy, to transfer it to another date.

I believe the Court well knows I'm not afraid to try a case. Been doing 30 years. But I want my client, based upon the severity of the allegations, to be able to get a fair trial and I want to be able to adequately represent her.

So we respectfully request the Court grant the motion to even a term that is going to allow me to get an expert, produce that, because it's going to be about an expert. This is a circumstantial case. There's no direct evidence, or very little direct evidence, in the case, it's completely circumstantial, and so that's going to make that expert testimony even more important.

So for that reason, we respectfully request that the Court

grant our motion for continuance. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, in response, I'll just point out that the expert report he's referencing, the latest one that was shared, was shared in April of 2024. That report did reference that known standards were taken from a witness in the case that were submitted to SLED and examined, the originals of which are in Property and Evidence.

Your Honor, in our reciprocal discovery motion shared on June 18th, 2021, it clearly states that to "please contact our office regarding a convenient times to view evidence pursuant to discovery rules which may be in Property and Evidence." Those originals have been sitting there, and the Defense has been aware that the originals were in Property and Evidence for well over a year at this point.

Your Honor, additionally, they are nontestimonial. It's a sheet of paper, or sheets of paper, with the witness's signature repeated over and over again. There is no substantive evidence there. They are not of any use or any prejudice unless they were to retain their own expert, in which case their expert would want the originals to compare the questioned document. The questioned document was shared back in 2021.

Your Honor, it's my understanding that we didn't really have to upload copies of the underlying samples because they are samples, they're not testimonial. They're essentially physical

10

evidence.

Just in preparation for trial and cleaning things up, we had Property and Evidence upload copies of the originals and shared them, the originals which are referenced in the report that was shared well over a year ago.

The other documents that were shared within the last week or two are documents we came across during preparation for trial. A lot of it is posts from the Defendant's own social media made in reference to the case and other things relevant to the case, one of which is the Defendant's own three-year driving record from the Department of Motor Vehicles which we were made aware of might be relevant about two weeks ago, but it's the Defendant's own record.

Your Honor, as to any of the other documents, several of them were created by the Defense and shared with us, at which point they were loaded into our system and shared back. So there are actually documents that were created by the Defendant and shared with us, and I don't believe there's anything to prejudice the Defendant by going forward today, or at least not unfairly prejudice.

The handwriting expert analysis, again, was shared well over a year ago. It references all of the originals that were sitting in P&E. In that time and well over a year there's been no reference to hiring an independent expert until Monday.

Your Honor, additionally, continuing this case would

seriously prejudice the victims in this case. This case deals with quitclaim deeds for properties that were forged and taken out of a victim's name who is since deceased, and the property is now in probate.

The Defendant still, as of April of this year, is still trying to sell these properties to third parties, so if this case gets continued it's almost without a doubt she's going to continue to try to sell these properties to third parties and continue to harm the victim if this case is continued, so the continuance would result in great prejudice to the victims in this case, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): And is there a civil matter related to this case?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor, there is.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Mr. Armstrong, what do you say about the fact that this, I guess, has been shared with you over a year ago?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, I was unaware that they were going to have their expert testify, that their key witness, Willie Mae Moliere -- or that the expert was going to testify as to her signature being false.

I knew their expert was going to testify to as a notary, Barry Downs', signature being involved because it was part of the original police report. But now we've got this expert that's going to testify that on the subject deed that is the subject of

12

this case at least two signatures were forged in his expert opinion. I don't believe that to be the case, certainly not the notary. I believe that is his signature.

And I just want to be able to explore, with the gravity of the case and the seriousness of the charges, whether a different expert would differ on that.

So respectfully we would request -- I mean, I find it interesting that it was in Property and Evidence but not uploaded until the week before trial, because I can tell you the former assistant solicitor, I pointblank asked him what was forged, and he said the notary signature. Well, I've looked at the notary signature, and it looks exactly the same.

So respectfully, Your Honor, I'm not sure about the prejudice the State is referred to, but my client -- the property's not in my client's name, so I'm not sure how she's selling the properties.

And so our position is I just want to be able to have a fair trial for her. A guilty conviction would substantially change her life, obviously, with two children at home and the financial burden that would come with that.

And so respectfully, Your Honor, we would request that it be continued 30 days for me to get an expert. And if they want to put a lis pendens on all the properties in the interim, why not? We're agreeable to that.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): How long was this case continued?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, I believe this is a 2021 case. I am not the first solicitor to have this, myself and Ms. Scott. Obviously this was passed through several individuals.

I will say that based on our system the SLED report regarding the signature of the notary, Mr. Barry Downs, was shared on January 27th of 2023.

The SLED report regarding the handwriting samples of Ms. Willie Mae Moliere and the conclusions of the SLED analyst were shared on April 3rd of 2024.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Shared?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I was unaware of it. And, Your Honor, the assistant solicitor participated -- or not participated, but was at the probate litigation that took place in this case, and therein lies -- the solicitor sort of waited to see what was going to happen with the Willie Mae may witness, and the Probate Court found she's not the ex-wife -- I mean, she is the ex-wife of the deceased, as well as presented a false death certificate to the police to get this whole thing started that listed her as the deceased spouse.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Well, now, that's beyond your continuance. That's the other motion.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor. I'm sorry. I'm getting into the other motions. But I just --

14

THE COURT (TAYLOR): What you're asking for is time to get an expert in order to make another comparison of the notary signature?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Of the notary and of Ms. Moliere.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Ms. Moliere.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Or Moliere. Yes, Your Honor. And that can't take that long. I'll jump on it immediately.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Just a moment.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. What I'm going to do right now, we're going to go ahead and argue the other motions, and we're going to take the continuance motion under advisement.

And from my reading of what you have, some of the other motions, I may also take those under advisement while we're pending the jury to come in. So let's just go forward with the motions, and then let me look at the continuance motion, especially in regards to maybe what I think about some of these other pretrial motions.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. There are actually two, or three, Motions in Limine, I think two by the State and one by Ms. Jenkins. So do you want to go first, Mr. Armstrong?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor. And then the State, I assume, will argue their two motions. Our motion in limine to

Exclude Evidence is basically to exclude the testimony of Ms. Moliere as being, as being untrustworthy. And this is based upon the probate court order, which is as Exhibit A to our motion, that she was not the wife of Erol; that she was married, not married to -- that a woman named Ginouchka Eugene was married to Erol at the time of his death; that she is not an heir of the probate estate which she opened with the death certificate that was referenced earlier; that the Greenville County Sheriff's Department investigation that led to this, to these charges being levied against the Defendant, was started by her going in there with the death certificate.

And the officer actually states she's the victim. So I've been trying to figure out who the victim in the case is. Because she then goes down to the probate court, opens up a small claims estate, and doesn't include any of the properties in the estate. That was overturned as the wife, the real wife, petitioned through Sharhonda and her power of attorney -- she lives in Canada -- to have her removed as personal representative, which was granted. The Court found that neither party was fit to be personal representative and appointed a local CPA.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Was that Cheryl Borum?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: That's correct, Your Honor. And she's under subpoena.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: As to Obtaining Goods Under False

16

Pretences, the evidence is going to show that Ms. Willie Mae was actually signing deeds -- I mean signing leases to property after Erol died, and receiving HUD rents.

Because basically, as I understand the State's argument, they're saying that a deed had forged signatures on it; that that deed was then filed; that it transferred hands; and that HUD monies from that deed went into an account, not Ms. Jenkins' but that Ms. Jenkins had a power of attorney over, and they're saying that that's somehow obtaining goods under false pretences.

And there was a big hullabaloo down at HUD related to this property about who owned it. Willie Mae maintained that she owned it. Well, these folks maintained that they owned it, and culminating in Willie Mae doing the probate stuff, ultimately being removed as personal representative of the estate.

And our point is I'm not sure how the State can meet the burden of proof without Willie Mae's testimony, and that her testimony is, by the nature of itself and her actions during the pendency of the scenarios that are going on, in and of itself unreliable.

And so for these reasons we move to exclude her testimony from the case, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Oh, yes. And we move to dismiss the warrants against her on that basis, both facially and with the facts that we have now been given. We feel like there cannot be

substantial circumstantial evidence to support moving forward on this. And so respectfully, Your Honor, we would move that the warrants be dismissed.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Let me ask. You said facially. In the four corners of the indictment, you think it should be dismissed because of that, what's in it?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I believe it lists Ms. Moliere, the ex-wife, as a victim.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Not the housing authority?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Not the housing authority.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Is that all you have?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: That's all I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Thanks.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, just to correct one thing. The Obtaining Goods Under False Pretences indictment lists the victim as the Estate of Erol Moliere. Whatever the probate court may determine be representative of the estate, the estate itself is the victim in this case, Your Honor.

Basically Ms. Moliere -- I don't want to get too far into the details, I've put a lot in the written motion -- she took care of this person; they carried themselves as married; she was his power of attorney; took care of his properties, his banking, basically everything, all the duties of a spouse.

But there was a divorce filed in 1989. She kind of, she will freely, when she does testify, will admit that, yes, there

18

was a divorce filed in 1989. And if Defense wants to cross-examine her and say, You weren't legally married to him at the time of death, she'll say yes. She'll say she considered herself his spouse, she took care of him and did all those things, but legally she was not. I don't see how her testimony can be excluded based on that.

And this all kind of ties back into our motion to exclude basically everything from this probate case -- from the trial of this criminal case. This forged deed was executed before Mr. Erol Moliere died. Whatever happened in the probate case is pretty much irrelevant to whether this deed, that was purportedly executed before he died, purportedly signed by him, purportedly signed by Ms. Moliere as his power of attorney, purportedly notarized by Mr. Barry Downs, was executed well before he died. Whatever happened to the probate case is completely irrelevant. And we would ask to exclude that under Rule 401.

Additionally, it appears the Defendant injected herself into the probate court using a power of attorney purportedly executed in Quebec, that is very dubious appearing, to get into the probate court and basically turn the probate case into a circus. And, Your Honor, we do not want that happening here. We want the jury to be able to focus on this deed, was it forged, did the Defendant take control of this property basically using relatives' names; that she then used that forged deed to collect rent payments from Greenville Housing Authority that should have

been going to the Estate of Erol Moliere or whoever would have inherited the property, had the property properly pass through probate, which it never did. It never did because the deed was executed before his death, so the property was out of the name. It never went through probate, Your Honor.

And for those reasons, as well as the ones in our written motion, I don't believe a lot of these things are appropriate for extrinsic evidence on impeachment. I believe that the Defense can ask, You weren't legally married to him at the time of his death, and she will answer honestly, I believe, Your Honor.

So that is the basis of -- our response to the Defense motion, as well as our motion to exclude the probate matters as well.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Do you have anything else in reply?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor, very briefly. I find it interesting that the State is taking the position that the estate is the victim when Ms. Moliere went to the police, I believe it was, in late 2018 making all these allegations; then she went and opened up the probate estate she's the one that didn't include the property to the estate. Then a professional came in and had monies that she was collecting from HUD put into the estate fund and then ultimately distributed to the heirs.

I find it interesting that they say that the estate is the victim but they don't want the certified probate court orders

20

coming in for a jury's consideration related to what the facts were in this case and how we got here.

That having been said, I don't see how we have a victim, because the estate's closed. And so for that reason, I would say that certainly matters of public record, certainly court orders finding that she established an estate and claimed to the ex-wife -- I mean claimed to be the wife of the deceased and is actually the ex-wife. And we vehemently dispute the loving nature aspect of their description of the relationship between the deceased.

She was under investigation for exploitation of a vulnerable adult by Greenville County at the time when he passed. That information has been provided to the State, and so I don't see how that loving relationship somehow gets them down the road to excluding court records that relate to this lady and these charges when she began the whole thing by going to the police.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Right. But, I mean, the solicitor, I think, is saying the basis of the original charge of forgery is the deed that was done before Mr. Moliere passed away.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): And then that's what their, the crux of the case is, I think. Regardless of the probate matter, what they are prosecuting is the forgery itself on that particular document that was done before anything happened in probate.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Well, I mean, there's no witness or

evidence or testimony that the Defendant signed anything or did anything or directed anyone to do anything. It's a completely circumstantial case. No one's going to say, I saw her sign these.

And she had a power of attorney that was executed when he was in the mental health hospital in 2014 and was using it. The deed was executed close in time to his death, I believe, like in June. And he died in July. So respectfully, Your Honor, we believe it's appropriate for cross-examination. Thank you.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Mr. Armstrong, in regards to your first motion to exclude testimony, I will respectfully deny that motion. I don't think there's any legal basis for that to be excluded.

In regards to your motion to dismiss, generally I think in criminal cases there is a motion you can make after the close of the State's case for a directed verdict. I think that would probably be the more appropriate time to make that kind of motion that you're seeking.

And in regards to the probate matters, what I would ask the State to do, as we travel into the trial and before any of that stuff, before tries to introduce that, bring that to me and probably a proffer. Let me hear what you're offering it for, because I am interested to kind of hear what -- I've got some idea of what happened in probate court. I'm not entirely clear

22

about how that would relate to the particular indictment itself, at least based on what I think is the State's theory. But to keep that from being in front of the jury, we can handle that by proffer, see what we've got, and then we can determine whether or not that information gets in front of them.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): And we'll take a quick break on the motion to continue. I'm not the chief administrative judge here, so the way I understand it, that the chief administrative judge is the one who makes some decision about that. I know this case is here during the term that I'm here, but based on what you said I'd like to review that with the chief administrative judge as far as a continuance on this case because it's an old case, and it needs to be resolved. I know there are certainly questions that the State has that this property may still be influx in some ways, and even a 30-day continuance could still create some problems in regards to what the State is trying to prevent.

So let's take a quick break. I'll talk to the chief administrative judge about the continuance motion, and then I can make a ruling on that, and then by that time I think the jury will be coming back in.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, we do have the third-party guilt motion filed, as well, and there are a couple of issues I wanted to raise to the Court before we got in front of the jury. Would you like to do it now or after a break?

THE COURT (TAYLOR): You can go ahead now.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, the basis of the third-party guilt motion is, in relation to the forgery, the State has some concern that there may be a third party that we don't know about that she may try to name to subject things, and we ask that anything offered comply with *Gregory*.

In relation to the obtaining property under false pretences, the Defense has alleged that Ms. Moliere continued to collect rents on these properties after the properties were improperly removed out of her late spouse ex-spouse's name. I believe the testimony will show that, under Greenville Housing Authority policy, they continue just paying rent until they're notified of the new landlord. They were not notified of the new landlord until this Defendant, on her grandfather's behalf, filed paperwork to have the property changed to his name with her as power of attorney and her collecting rent payments.

I believe pointing to Ms. Moliere and saying you were wrongly collecting rent on a property that was stolen from your deceased spouse, not spouse, is improper before this jury. It's irrelevant. It will confuse them as to issues in this case. It's essentially, it's almost a selected prosecution claim. It's not really a third-party guilt claims in itself, saying, We may have wrongly collected rents after moving property to grandfather's name but this lady was wrongfully collecting rents previously. That's not really relevant to the guilt or innocence

24

of this Defendant, and I believe it would cause too much confusion for the jury over the issue actually before them.

Your Honor, I do want to address one thing before we got too far in. The Defense motion also mentioned excluding any reference to additional charges. The State does not plan to introduce any evidence of additional charges, although she is charged with forging, I believe, four or five other deeds.

There will be some witnesses who, that when they testify, it's going to be difficult for them to say "property" instead of "properties". I don't believe that would cause any sort of prejudice. They will not mention the charges, that she's charged with anything, other than this gentleman owned properties and there may have been deeds out there. But we do not plan to introduce any evidence about the other charges at this time.

We do not plan to introduce any 404 evidence as to the other properties and deeds in question unless the Defense were to open the door. Based on her testimony I don't see that happening, but if it were we would make the Court aware that we believe the door's been opened and we may need to mention the other properties if it becomes necessary.

And I believe my cocounsel may have a request to sequester some witnesses in this case.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Let me hear from Mr. Armstrong on the third party.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Well, Your Honor, I mean, our opinion

is we have a right to go into third-party guilt, and it may be Ms. Moliere had this deed done this way because she had allowed these properties -- they're going to tax sale. The State's getting ready to get them. She transferred three properties in April before he died in July while he was in the hospital.

And so I don't know the games that were in play. However, I feel that we have the right to bring up evidence of third-party guilt if it is inconsistent with the guilt of my client. And if somebody else did it that's showing that my client didn't do it.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): But I'm not hearing insistency, is sort of what my problem is, at least from what I get from the State. It's not two people. Two people could be responsible to different degrees. Third-party guilt means that she can't be responsible, that somebody else did it, not that she did 20 percent and it was 80 percent somebody else, but it's zero percent to her. And that's what I'm not hearing.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I'm not quite sure I understand that. If we pause (ph) the position that someone else did it, in my brain that's saying that she didn't do it.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Well, I haven't heard the -- we haven't gotten to that point. I guess I haven't heard that kind of testimony so it may still be something to take into account. But, I mean, you can't just -- it has to be something that would exclude, the way I understand it -- maybe you can help me -- that would exclude her as being responsible, not that somebody else is

26

a little bit more responsible than her, or more culpable than she is, but that she has no culpability at all. And maybe I just haven't heard that. It may be missing what the State's saying. I may be missing what you're saying.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I never faced a motion to exclude third-party guilt. I tried to read the cases to understand it as to -- I read the case as saying, Oh, well, he did it, too, or, He did it, I didn't do it. But I'm not -- and maybe the State can tell me again how excluding evidence of third-party guilt in this matter. I guess I'll have to wait on the objection to it. I mean, I don't know what to say.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Well, we can -- that may be something else for us to consider as the testimony moves along. Is there anything else at this point?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I have --

THE COURT (TAYLOR): I know there's sequestration of a witness.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor. That would be our last request.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): And do you have anything to --

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Assuming we move forward on that, I don't have a problem granting that motion. But we'll take a break. Let me talk to the chief admin and kind of get an idea on this continuance, and then we'll come back. When the jury comes

back in, if we go forward, we'll go ahead and strike them and get started.

(Court recesses at 10:12 a.m. and reconvenes at 10:27 a.m., without the jury.)

THE COURT: We're back on the record in The State versus Jenkins. I considered the motions by Mr. Armstrong for a continuance related to the additional information and some of the comparisons you wanted to make, but I find that I'm going to deny the motion to continue at this time. I don't find that there are any *Brady* violations by the State in this case.

It sounded like there was testimony, or at least arguments, that this is some information that Ms. Jenkins may have been in possession of for quite some time, and so I don't think there's anything nefarious on the State as far as to prejudice her at this point in the trial.

There are a number of different issues related to who signed it, who didn't. I think, from what I gather from the parties, that testimony at this time would be sufficient to cover that. I don't think you need additional time for an expert to flesh out that part of your case.

So while I do understand your arguments, I certainly can appreciate that, I would deny your motion at this time.

There was some additional arguments in regards to admitting testimony of third-party guilt and also some other motions. At this time I will let the Defendant renew -- you can renew your

28

motions as the trial progresses at this point.

And as I mentioned to the State, there were issues about probate matters as arguments that Mr. Armstrong may try to make in terms of validity of the documents and that kind of thing. We will take a break or at least proffer that information before we get it in front of the jury. I want to protect Mr. Armstrong's arguments for the record.

At this point I don't -- I'm not ruling in your favor but I think as the trial progresses that we can bring that testimony before the Court out of the presence of the jury to evaluate it further in regards to what we receive as testimony in the case.

So it sounds like this can be complicated, is what this sounds like. You've got a lot of documents. There's some matters in probate court and some other places. So I think in this instance it's better to just kind of hear the evidence as it comes in. You can renew your objections where appropriate, whether it's the State or the Defendant, and we may take breaks periodically to proffer that information outside of the presence of the jury. I don't think it will necessarily inconvenience the jury a whole lot, but I think in the context of at least what I'm hearing it's important to just kind of get testimony out and see where we are, and then as the objections come up we can take breaks as necessary to develop the objections.

THE COURT (SALVINI): All right. So I've got a State's witness list. Mr. Armstrong, do you have a witness list to give

Judge Taylor? Anybody have any additional voir dire? The jury's here, they are checked in, and we're getting ready to send them up to strike.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, the State does not have any additional voir dire, and our witness list has been shared.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I think most of those are duplicative.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I don't know if we've seen a Defense witness list.

THE COURT (SALVINI): It looks like there's not a -- looks like Mr. Armstrong handed up some voir dire questions, and he's got a list of potential witnesses on the top. Are those potential witnesses, Mr. Armstrong, that you might call?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Have you seen that?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Donna, do you need a copy?

THE CLERK: Yes, please.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Any objection to his additional voir dire, Mr. Armstrong's additional voir dire? We haven't seen it yet.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Okay. It sounds like Judge Morgan is charging his jury now and going to send them out for deliberation, so as soon as he sends the jury out I may ask Lauren to notify Adam, his law clerk. Maybe you all will pop

30

over and see what he wants to do with you all as far as any request for a continuance, substitute counsel, and all that, he said he would address.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Thank you.

THE COURT (SALVINI): So he should be -- and, Donna, you said he started charging at?

THE CLERK: 10:11.

THE COURT (SALVINI): 10:11. So it takes him about 30 minutes to charge, on average, so he should be freeing up in about, I don't know, 10:45ish. And before you all go anywhere, let's see if he wants to address that.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Thank you. And, Judge, just briefly, we did have a *Jackson v. Denno.* It should be very quick. Whenever you would like us to present that, we are prepared.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. All right.

THE COURT (SALVINI): So, Joe, how long do you think that *Jackson v. Denno* is going to take?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Brief, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Are we talking 15 minutes or are we talking 30 minutes?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Less than 15, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Is there a video or anything that Judge Taylor needs to watch?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: There is a video. I'm not -- unless he wants to watch it. I'm not sure that the State -- the Defense

would dispute it. It wold just be the voluntariness of the statement.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Because if we strike, if it takes 30 minutes to strike the jury, let's just assume it takes 30 minutes, then that only put us at 11:00. We can give the jury a break but neither Judge Taylor or I want the jury sitting back there for an hour while you all argue a *Jackson v. Denno.* But if it's like 30 minutes we could give them a break.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I don't believe it's really contested. I believe it will just take a little bit of testimony to protect the record and admit a video as a court's exhibit if the Court would like to watch it. But I don't believe Defense is actually contesting it. But it's my understanding that we are required to prove the voluntariness and have a finding on the record to be able to use the statement. So it's just to protect the record, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): How long that is video, Judge Taylor wants to know?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: About 40 minutes.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Okay.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: The probate court told her to go down to the police.

THE COURT (SALVINI): So it is contested? Joe's saying it's contested. He's going to want to watch it, so.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Okay.

32

THE COURT (SALVINI): It sounds like what we're going do is strike the jury, send them on to lunch, and have them come back, and I'll let Judge Taylor decide whether that's at 1:00 or 2:00, depending on how long. If the video's 40 minutes, he wants to see it before he rules on the *Jackson v. Denno*.

Because it is contested, right, Joe?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): If it's contested, he's going to want to watch it, especially if you're making it a court's exhibit.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Okay. You all get ready to strike the jury then. What about the voir dire? Do you have any objections?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No, Your Honor, I don't believe so. And there is an individual on the Defense witness list that is not on ours that just stepped out, but we ask that he need to be sequestered as well. I'll leave that in their discretion. He's not on our witness list. It's Mr. Thompson.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes.

THE COURT (SALVINI): I believe Judge Taylor ruled on that. All witnesses are sequestered.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

JURY SELECTION

(Panel of prospective jurors enter the courtroom at 10:46 a.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Good morning. This is Hump Day, for better or for worse. So we're back in. We are getting ready to strike a jury on a second case today. Of course my name is Judge Chris Taylor. I will be presiding over this trial. Judge Salvini is helping me out, which I greatly appreciate that. Violet Carr is my law clerk.

So today we have another criminal matter. And you probably already heard this, but it's now my chance, I haven't had a chance to tell you this. But I do appreciate, the State appreciates your time and effort in resolving these cases. Without you jurors a lot of these matters, we could not take care of, so we are appreciative of that, the Defendant, as well as the State, for your involvement in this case.

We are getting ready to strike a jury in the case of the State of South Carolina versus Sharhonda Jenkins. Again, this case is obviously being prosecuted by the State of South Carolina. At this time I will have the solicitors involved in this case stand up, introduce themselves to you and any witnesses that they may have present with them today.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Good morning. I am Assistant Solicitor Ashton Scott. This is my cocounsel.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I'm Andrew Miller with the Thirteenth Circuit Solicitor's Office. And this is our legal investigator, Emily, and our lead investigator, Elliott Turner.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Does any member of the jury

34

pool have any -- do you know either of the prosecutors or investigators involved in this case? If so, please stand. No response.

All right. Mr. Armstrong, I'll have you please stand up and introduce yourself and anyone at your table.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor. My name's Joe Armstrong. I'm a local attorney here in Greenville. I have here with me the Defendant, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins, as well as my parallel, Shayna Henderson.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Thank you. Is anybody on the jury pool familiar with Mr. Armstrong, Ms. Jenkins, or anybody else at defense table? If so, please stand. Okay. No response.

Prior to you coming in I got a list of potential State's and Defense witnesses. Let me reiterate, this is potential witnesses. I'll give you some more instructions later about burden and that kind of thing, but this is just to relay to you that the Defense at this point is announcing that it could have potential witnesses. They have no obligation to present any, but we're just reviewing this now to make sure in the event they do present witnesses that it's not a conflict if you may know somebody that they decide to put on the stand.

But I'll review the State's witnesses first, and then witnesses from the Defense. So in regards to State's potential witnesses: Willie Mae Moliere. Is that how you pronounce it?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I believe it's Moliere, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Moliere, Willie Mae Moliere. Anyone familiar with her, please stand. No response. Natasha Moliere, anyone familiar with her? No response. Darrell Freeman? No response. Brittaney Williams? No response. Larry Williams, Jasenda Barton, Barry Downs, Doug Garrett, Miranda Owens with the Greenville County Register of Deeds, Barbara Cantrell with Greenville County Register of Deeds, Sherika Roberson, the Greenville Housing Authority, Andrew Misocky. Is that -- I don't know if I'm pronouncing it right.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): With Woodforest Bank. Is anyone familiar with him? John Jamieson, South Carolina Law Enforcement Division, and Elliott Turner with Greenville County Sheriff's Office.

Okay. No response on anyone to State's potential witnesses.

In regards to Defendant's potential witnesses, I'll repeat it. I already said this name, a couple of names already, but I'll just repeat them for the sake of the record: Jasenda Barton, Master Deputy Elliott Turner who I think is with the Greenville County Sheriff's Office, U A Thompson. Is that -- Mr. Armstrong, that's initials for?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Uldrick Antonio.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Uldrick Antonio Thompson?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Correct.

36

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Anyone familiar with him? Brittaney Williams, and Cheryl Borum who is a certified public accountant. Is she here in Greenville, Mr. Armstrong?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: She is, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Anyone familiar with any of the names I've just called that may relate to potential State or Defense witnesses? And no response.

Is anyone related to or associated with someone in the Thirteenth Circuit Solicitor's Office?

(Prospective juror stands.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Would you please stand and give me your juror number.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror 237. My wife works as a victim advocate in the solicitor's office.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Given the fact of your wife's employment, can you set that fact aside and be fair and impartial in a case in which the Thirteenth Solicitor's Office is prosecuting the case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (237) Absolutely.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Now I have some voir dire questions from Ms. Jenkins. Mr. Armstrong, I think we've covered this, does anyone know any witnesses that we have that I mentioned.

Does anyone have any friends or family members that are law enforcement employees or work at a courthouse? If so, please

raise your hand.

(Prospective jurors stand.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. All right. You can stand. Sir, I'll start here, and we'll work forward, and then to the back. Well, okay, starting with juror in the red shirt.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (98) My grandmother works for --

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Tell me your number.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Ninety-eight.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. And what association do you have?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (98) My grandmother works for family court here.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. And given that in this case, could you still be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (98) Yes, sir.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. And you're Juror 98?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (98) Yes, sir.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. You may have a seat. In the white shirt here.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror No. 58. I have two brother-in-laws that are detectives for the Kentucky State Police.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Given that fact, could you still be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (58) Yes.

38

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Thank you. All right. In the black shirt.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror 149. Several family members are in law enforcement.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): You have several family members in law enforcement. Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (149) Yes. They're --

THE COURT (SALVINI): Okay. Given that -- I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (149) They're retired now, but they were.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Given that fact, could you still be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (149) Yes, sir.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Thank you. Have a seat. Ma'am.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror 123. I have -- my sister-in-law's a public defender in Mauldin, Fountain Inn.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Given that fact, could you still be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (123) Yes.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, what was that juror number?

THE COURT (TAYLOR): 123, I think.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Right in the front.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 214. I know an officer that works here at this courthouse.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): And given that information, could you still be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (214) Yes, sir.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. You can have a seat.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Forty-five. My uncle is a circuit court judge in South Carolina, Bill Seals.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Okay. All right. Given that fact, could you still be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (45) Yes.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Thank you. You may have a seat. Yes, ma'am.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 164.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): 164?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (164) Yes. I have police officers that worked for me at my facility and I currently employ one that works there like full time. He's a Pickens County officer. But I also have a lot of relationships with Anderson, Easley, Pickens, and Greenville County because of what I do.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Given that information, can you still be fair and impartial to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (164) Yes.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Thank you. You can have a seat. Now, I have two questions. I will read both questions

40

together. If these questions apply to you I'm not going to make you stand up in front of the crowd. I'll ask you just to line up and we'll come down to this other side of the bench to discuss them. And there are two different questions. Listen to both of them. If they apply to you, just stand up, we'll make a line, and you can come down and tell me and the parties about it.

All right. Has anyone been the victim of identity theft or forgery -- all right. Has anyone been charged with theft? So have you been a victim of identity theft, or forgery, or actually been charged with theft? If those, either one of those questions, or both, apply to you I'll ask you to stand up, we'll make a line, and we'll come down and talk about it in private. All right. We have one. Okay.

THE COURT (SALVINI): You all want to come on up, Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Miller.

(In camera colloquy of Prospective Juror 101 as follows:)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): What's your juror number?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 101.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): 101. All right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (101) About two years ago my identity was stolen by somebody out of Boston, Massachusetts, wanted by the police in New York, and she raided our mailboxes and took my identity so she could get an ID to go back to New York.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. All right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (101) The Easley Police is the one that

was investigating it, and the one that came and saw me was a Travelers Rest detective.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Given that situation, could you still set that aside and be fair and impartial to both parties?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (101) Probably not.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Probably not. Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (101) Because I don't know if they found her, what they did with her, or what happened.

THE COURT (SALVINI): So Juror 101 will be stricken for cause. But, ma'am, you've got to wait with us still for now.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (101) I know.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Thanks for coming up.

(End of in camera colloquy.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Armstrong, in regards to No. 6 of your voir dire request, I am not going to -- I'm not going to ask that question. There will be an instruction, I think, at the end of the case that will cover that.

So members of the jury panel, does anyone have any bias or prejudice that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this matter? If so, please stand. No response.

THE COURT (SALVINI): All right. Madam Clerk, then I believe we are ready to strike our jury.

THE CLERK: When I say your name, please stand and wait for

42

further instruction. Juror No. 112, Tricia Johnson. What says the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.

THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror, Your Honor.

THE CLERK: Ma'am, please gather your things and have a seat in the jury box. Juror No. 221, Josephine Vance. What says the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.

THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror, Your Honor.

THE CLERK: Ma'am, please gather your things and have a seat in the jury box. Juror No. 214, Rebekah Thomason. What says the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.

THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please strike the juror, Your Honor.

THE CLERK: Ma'am, you may be seated. You've been excused from this case. Juror No. 132, Andrea Martinez. What says the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.

THE CLERK: Says the Defendant?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror, Your Honor.

THE CLERK: Ma'am, please have a seat in the jury box. Juror No. 113, Phillip Jones. What says the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.
THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please excuse the juror, Your Honor.
THE CLERK: Sir, you may be seated. You've been excused from this case. Juror No. 97, Jessica Hill. What says the State?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.
THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror, Your Honor.
THE CLERK: Ma'am, please have a seat in the jury box. Juror No. 205, Lindsay Stutzman. What says the State?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.
THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror, Your Honor.
THE CLERK: Ma'am, please have a seat in the jury box. Juror No. 237, David Wilson. What says the State?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.
THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please strike the juror, Your Honor.
THE CLERK: Sir, you may be seated. You've been excused from this case. Juror No. 203, Charles Studer. What says the State?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.
THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror.

44

THE CLERK: Sir, please have a seat in the jury box. Juror No. 32, Xiera Brown. What says the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please strike this juror.

THE CLERK: Ma'am, you may be seated. You've been excused from this case. Juror No. 199, Michael Solberg. What says the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.

THE CLERK: Says the Defendant?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please strike the juror.

THE CLERK: Sir, you may be seated. You've been excused from this case. Juror No. 218, Lori Tripp. What says the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.

THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: What was the juror number?

THE CLERK: 218.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: 218?

THE CLERK: Yes.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror.

THE CLERK: Ma'am, please have a seat in the jury box. Juror No. 55, Crystal Emus. What says the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.

THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror.

THE CLERK: Ma'am, please have a seat in the jury box. Juror No. 109, Rebekah Jarrett. What says the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.
THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror.
THE CLERK: Ma'am, please have a seat in the jury box. Juror No. 117, Dianne Kilgore. What says the State?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.
THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror.
THE CLERK: Ma'am, please have a seat in the jury box. Juror No. 151, Eddie Murillo. What says the State?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.
THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat this juror.
THE CLERK: Sir, please have a seat in the jury box. Juror No. 197, Christina Sims. What says the State?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.
THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror.
THE CLERK: Ma'am, please have a seat in the jury box.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): That is 12. So now alternates.
THE CLERK: We will now pick for alternates. Juror No. 73, Ray Freeman. What says the State?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.
THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please strike the juror, Your Honor.

46

THE CLERK: Sir, you may be seated. You've been excused from this case. Juror No. 101, Tracie Holder.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, I believe this juror was struck.

THE CLERK: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I wrote it on a different page. I apologize. Juror No. 122, Deanna Larson.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.

THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please strike the juror.

THE CLERK: Ma'am, you may be seated. You've been excused from this case. Juror No. 18, Brenda Belue. What says the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.

THE CLERK: What says the Defendant?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please strike the juror, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Counsel, on alternates I believe it's 1 and 2. Am I incorrect about that, Mr. Miller and Mr. Armstrong?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I believe that's correct, Your Honor.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I believe that's correct. Is that two?

THE COURT (SALVINI): You had two. Ms. Belue, that means you're our lucky next juror. Come on up and join our group here in the jury box.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 93, Kimberly Heller.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Please seat this juror.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please seat the juror.

THE CLERK: Ma'am, please have a seat in the jury box.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Are there any exceptions to the jury selection process? From the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): From the Defendant?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): All right. Then, ladies and gentlemen that are still here in our courtroom, you are going to go back downstairs to talk with Ms. Jannine and just wait for further instructions. All right. Thank you.

(Prospective jurors not selected on the jury exit the courtroom at 11:11 a.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Congratulations. We have got some legal matters to take up out of your presence. That's going to take us a little while. So instead of having you sit in the jury room and wait while we go through this, we're going to have an extended lunch break. So I'll ask you to be back in your jury room at 2:30.

Now, this admonition: You haven't been sworn yet, but there's nothing for you to talk about. So when you leave out and you come back into the jury room, don't talk to anybody, don't call anybody, Hey, I think I'm on the jury. Don't communicate with anybody. Just be back in your jury room at 2:30. Hopefully we should have a hard start at 2:30 because we're taking quite a

48

big break to kind of make sure we get these pretrial matters taken care of.

Well, you all have a great lunch. I appreciate it. And we'll see you at 2:30.

(Jury escorted out of the courtroom at 11:14 a.m.)

THE COURT (SALVINI): All right. You all ready to do the *Jackson v. Denno*? You need a couple minutes to get your witnesses, or?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: If I can run to the restroom first, please.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Let's do a restroom break, get a drink of water, and then let's be prepared to start *Jackson v. Denno* in about five minutes.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Perfect.

(Court recesses at 11:14 a.m. and reconvenes at 11:23 a.m.)

PRETRIAL MOTIONS

(Court's Exhibit 1 is marked for identification.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): This is a *Jackson v. Denno* hearing in the matter of State versus Ms. Jenkins. The State ready?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Please proceed.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: The State would like to call Investigator Elliott Turner to the stand.

///

///

ELLIOTT TURNER,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Elliott Turner.

PROFFERED DIRECT EXAMINATION

(without the jury)

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:

Q Good morning. Where do you work, Investigator Turner?

A The Greenville County Sheriff's Office.

Q And how long have you worked with the Greenville County Sheriff's Office?

A Roughly 14 years.

Q What is your position there?

A I'm an investigator with Office of Professional Standards.

Q Was this your position back in 2021 -- 2022 and 2021?

A No. At that point in time I was investigator with Economic Crimes Unit.

Q Did you ever interview the Defendant in this case, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins?

A Yes.

Q How many times did you interview her?

A Once.

Q And where was the Defendant's statement taken?

A It was taken at the Law Enforcement Center within CID, in

our interview room.
Q Do you recall when that took place?
A That was in 2021 February timeframe.
Q Did the Defendant appear to have any mental or physical disabilities that prevented her from understanding what was happening?
A No.
Q Did she appear to be under the influence of drugs or alcohol?
A No.
Q How old would you say she was at the time you spoke with her?
A Uh, mid to late 30s.
Q Did the Defendant come in to speak with you freely and voluntarily?
A Yes.
Q Who was present when you questioned her?
A Myself and the Defendant.
Q Where was she seated?
A She was seated in the interview room in the Law Enforcement Center within Criminal Investigations Division.
Q And where were you?
A I was in the same interview room.
Q Around what time did that interview occur?
A That, I don't recall. Possibly afternoon, but I'm not, I'm

not 100 percent sure on that.
Q Did it occur during the day?
A Yes.
Q How long did you speak with the Defendant?
A It was probably about 30 to 40 minutes.
Q Did she ask for access to a phone?
A No.
Q Did she ask for access to a bathroom?
A No.
Q What about anything to eat or drink?
A No.
Q Were there any promises or threats made to the Defendant about her statement?
A No.
Q Did the Defendant indicate she wanted to speak with you?
A Yes.
Q Was she under arrest at the time you spoke with her?
A No.
Q Was she in custody at the time of the interview?
A No.
Q Was she even a suspect to this case at the time of the interview?
A No.
Q Was the Defendant free to go at any time or stop questioning when she wanted?

A Yes.
Q Did should voluntarily speak with you?
A Yes.
Q Was she advised of her *Miranda* rights?
A No.
Q Why not?
A She wasn't a suspect. She wasn't on my radar at all as being a suspect, so she was almost like a third-party information coming in, so.
Q Was the statement audio or video recorded?
A Yes.
Q How was this interview recorded?
A It was audio and video recorded.
Q I'm going to pass to you what's been marked as Court's Exhibit 1.
A Okay.
Q What is this?
A This is a copy of the recording.
Q Have you viewed the statement on that disk?
A I have.
Q Is that your signature on the disk?
A It is.
Q Is it a true and accurate depiction of the Defendant's statement?
A Yes.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Your Honor, at this time the State moves to admit the statement for the purposes of this hearing.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Armstrong?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: May it please the Court, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objections to this coming in as a court exhibit?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: The video?

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yes.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: None.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Admitted for purposes of a court exhibit.

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:

Q Those are all the questions I have for you. Please answer any Defense may have.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Armstrong.

PROFFERED CROSS-EXAMINATION

(without the jury)

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q Did you have an investigation going on related to the substance of the matter that we're here about today at the time she came in?

A Yes.

Q Yet you say that she was not a suspect?

A That's correct.

Q Did she tell you why she came in?

A She did.
Q What did she say?
A She wanted to give me information about Willie Mae Moliere.
Q Uh-huh.
A And it was in reference to some accusations against Willie Mae regarding some fraudulent activity.
Q Okay. Did you inform her that giving this information could lead to her arrest?
A No.
Q Did it lead to her arrest?
A It was part of it. There was multiple things, but yes.
Q Did you inform her that it was being recorded?
A I don't recall.
Q Did she tell you that she was there because the probate court told her to come down and talk to you?
A Uh, I don't recall. I don't know if that was part of the, if she was instructed to come down.
Q Did she come down with a bunch of documents that you all reviewed?
A She did.
Q Did you keep a copy for the sheriff's file?
A Uh, I'd have to go back and look. It's been too long for me to remember what documentation I kept that day.
Q How long was the interview?
A It was about 30 to 40 minutes.

Q Thirty to 40 minutes. Was she offered anything to drink or eat during that timeframe?
A She would have been offered, when we first started, if she wanted something to drink, but it wasn't an interrogation. She wasn't in custody or anything.
Q So do you feel that she knew that she was free to leave?
A Absolutely.
Q And did she freely leave?
A Yes, she did.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: That's all the questions I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Anything on redirect from the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Just briefly.

PROFFERED REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:
Q Did the Defendant come in unannounced to speak with you?
A Yes.
Q Did you call her to speak with you at any point in time?
A No.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No further questions. At this time the State would ask the Court find the Defendant's statements to law enforcement were made freely and voluntarily; the Defendant freely and voluntarily spoke with law enforcement; she was not under arrest; she was not in custody; she was not even a suspect at the time she spoke; she came in unannounced; and law

enforcement simply spoke with her as they would any other person that came in.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, at this point ... At this point Defense will take the position that there was an interview that appeared to be, uhm ... No objection, Your Honor. I'm going to withdraw that. I'm withdrawing any objection to the *Jackson - Denno* motion. She showed up voluntarily.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Based on Mr. Armstrong's statement to the Court, I will find that the statement that Ms. Jenkins made to Detective Turner was voluntary, freely -- knowingly and voluntarily statement for the reasons cited by the State and for the fact that Ms. Jenkins has withdrawn her objections as the relate at least to the statement, so we will find that that statement can be admitted and provided in evidence.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): I'm sorry. Go ahead.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Thank you. Anything else?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Nothing from the Defense.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. From the State?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Nothing regarding the *Jackson v. Denno.* I just wanted to bring something to the Court's attention. There are several witnesses on the witness list that are family members of the Defendant that in some way participated in the acts that

we anticipate may come across as hostile witnesses, start denying their statements, so the State may need to question them using some leading questions under Rule 611 and impeach our own witnesses under 607.

I wasn't sure -- I didn't want to make this too choppy to the jury. I didn't know if we needed to address those in advance or just as it comes up deal with it, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): We'll just take that up as it comes up.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Anything else?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Nothing, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. We'll be back at 2:30. All right.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Thank you.

(Court recesses at 11:33 a.m. and reconvenes at 2:28 p.m.)

(State's Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 are premarked for identification.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Before we bring the jury in, is there anything from the State?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Just very, very briefly. I spoke with Mr. Armstrong about the evidence we are seeking to keep out, that Your Honor would ask to be proffered before determining whether it can come in or not. About mentioning it in opening, I don't

58

believe -- I believe he intends to steer around that, but I don't know. I don't want to speak for him.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I was going to, but I talked to them. It's not in evidence yet, and since it's not in evidence I think it would probably be improper for me to mention it during my opening.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yeah. Just to be on the safe side.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I can sort of get around it, but I found that --

THE COURT (TAYLOR): So nothing about probate. Is that what you're talking about?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. And we have one other question. For the sequestration, the surviving -- Willie Mae Moliere and Natasha Moliere are sitting outside. I'm not sure if they want to sit on any of the trial. But Natasha is the surviving daughter of the deceased victim, and Willie Mae was power of attorney over him. It's my understanding, under the Victim's Bill of Rights, that they have a right to be in the courtroom if they would like, but I don't know if they'd like to.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I'm not sure how they're victims, Judge.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Say that again?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: How are they victims?

THE COURT (SALVINI): He said the estate, Joe, was the victim, and they're the heirs.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No. Willie Mae is not an heir.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: But it's -- I believe the South Carolina Constitution --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: -- the victim includes either child, or it includes also the lawful representative of a deceased victim. She was power of attorney over him at the time of his death whether she is a rightful heir or not. And I'm not sure if she wants to sit in or not.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Right.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I just wanted to clarify if she has the option.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I'm going to object to, certainly, Willie Mae. And Natasha's got a civil lawsuit going on against Sharhonda right now. And again, the estate's closed. The estate has been closed. It's been opened, argued, and closed, so I'm not sure how the estate can be the victim when the estate never even made an allegation related to these properties.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): As we make openings, let me think about it. I'm kind of inclined to let her come back in after her testimony. But we'll cover that when we get to it.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: And just for reference, it's Article I, Section 4, of the South Carolina Constitution is just what I was reading from.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Anything else?

60

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No, Your Honor. Nothing from the State.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Bring the jury in, please.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 2:33 p.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you had a good lunch. It was lengthy, but I think we're ready to start. Madam Clerk, can you swear in the jury.

(Clerk of Court administers oath to jurors.)

OPENING REMARKS TO THE JURY

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Before we actually start taking testimony and hearing from witnesses and exhibits I'll give you what we have, what we call, a general charge to the jury. And this is just basically an outline of what you can expect. This is not evidence or anything in the case but this is just to kind of acclimate you on what we're getting ready to do and sort of the procedure.

What I will now say is intended to serve as an introduction to the trial in this case. These are marks, not a charge on the law in this case. I will instruct you on the law applicable to this case at the end of the trial before you retire to consider your verdict. This is merely an explanation of the procedure that we will follow in the trial of this case so that you may better understand what's going on.

This may come up in your mind in regards to note-taking.

You will not be permitted to take notes during this trial. There are different reasons. I guess different judges have opinions about it. For this case, that won't be allowed. I want you to pay attention to the witnesses and not necessarily focus on trying to write notes to keep up with things.

The Defendant in this case, Ms. Sharhonda Nicole Jenkins, has been charged by way two of indictments filed in this court. One is with the crime of forgery; the second is with the crime of obtaining goods by false -- under false pretences. The elements of each of these indictments will be explained to you later, but just know that the indictments are simply the charges by which the case is brought to you into court and is not, in any sense, evidence of any of the allegations contained therein.

The Defendant has pled not guilty to these indictments. The State, therefore, has the burden of proving each of the elements beyond a reasonable doubt. And it will be your duty, ladies and gentlemen, to decide whether the State meets that burden.

Your purpose as jurors is to find and determine the facts. You are the sole judges of the facts. If, at any time, I make any comment regarding the facts, you must disregard that. You are to determine the facts from the testimony you hear and from other evidence introduced in court. It is up to you to determine the inferences which you feel may properly be drawn from the evidence.

It is especially important that you perform your duty of

62

determining the facts diligently and conscientiously because ordinarily there is no way to correct an erroneous determination of the facts by a jury.

On the other hand and with equal emphasis, the same law that makes you judges of the facts makes me judge of the law. The law, as given by the Court, is the only law that you may consider. You must accept and follow it even though you may disagree with it. I cannot tell you what the facts are, and you cannot disagree with me about what the law is or should be.

Your job is to take the law as I give it to you and apply it to the facts as you find them from the testimony and other evidence that's introduced. After doing that you will render your verdict, a true and just verdict, under the solemn oath that you just took as jurors.

Until I advise you to begin deliberations, you must not discuss this case with anyone, including fellow jurors, friends, family, and anyone involved in the case. This includes discussions face-to-face, and those by telephone, email, texts, blogs, or other methods of communication. When I came along phones were new to me, so people may be better with technology, but you can't get on the phone, don't talk to anybody, don't send out text messages or anything like that. You are not to research the case. Don't Google it, don't look for news articles, or anything to that effect. What you will make your decision on is based on what you hear from the witness stand and exhibits that

may be introduced in the case.

After the case is submitted to you, you must discuss it only in the jury room with your fellow jurors.

The attorneys and parties in this case have been advised that they are not to talk to you at all, so if you see anyone involved in the case and they do not even say hello they are not being unfriendly, they are just following my instructions.

It's important that you keep an open mind and not decide any issue in the case until all of the evidence has been presented, the parties have made their closing arguments, and I have instructed you on the law in the case.

It is your solemn responsibility to determine the guilt or innocence of the Defendant, and your verdict must be based solely on the evidence as it is presented to you in this trial and on the law as I instruct you during the close of the trial.

In just a moment the solicitor will make what is called an opening statement in which the solicitor will explain to you the issues in this case, or at least what the solicitor thinks the issues are in this case. The Defendant, through attorney for the Defendant, may also make an opening statement, although she is not required to do so.

What the attorneys tell you during their opening statements is not evidence in this case, it is only their contention as to what the issues are.

The evidence in this case will be presented to you by the

64

testimony of sworn witnesses from this witness stand and/or by exhibits that may be introduced into evidence. From time to time during the trial you may hear one of the lawyers say something like, Your Honor, I believe we have a question of law or a matter of law to discuss with you, or, Your Honor, may we approach the bench, or sometimes I, myself, may find it necessary to excuse you from the courtroom for a short while so the attorneys and I can discuss a matter of law.

The reason for this is because you are the judges of the facts, and sometimes when I'm discussing matters of law with the attorneys it may be necessary for me to make comments as to the facts in connection with the ruling in ruling whether or not a particular law applies in this case. I am not supposed to tell you what I think of the facts, so I will excuse you from the courtroom while these discussions take place so that you will in no way be influenced by anything that I might say or do in connection with the facts.

In determining what the true facts are in this case, you must decide whether or not the testimony of the witnesses is believable. It will be my responsibility to rule as a matter of law as to whether certain testimony is admissible at all or not, but once that testimony is admitted whether or not you believe it is solely for you to determine.

In deciding whether to believe a witness you have a right to consider the interest of any witness, bias of any witness,

prejudice of any witness, the opportunity for the witness to have seen the matters and things about which the witness would testify, and the way in which the witness acts on the witness stand.

You have a right to consider anything that is in the record that would help you evaluate the testimony of the witnesses. That means that it is your duty to pay close attention to these witnesses, to observe the witnesses, to listen to the witnesses, and to pay close attention to the attorneys and to the Court. Don't let your thoughts wander but give strict attention to the testimony in this case so that at the end of all the testimony, after the arguments of counsel and the charge on the law by the Court, you will then be in a position to determine what the true facts are and to apply the law to those facts, and thus render a true and just verdict.

It is your added duty ... Oh. So with those preliminary instructions I think we will be prepared to go forward in the case. Now, normally we will request, or I'll ask, you to appoint a foreperson on the jury in the jury room. Right now we won't do that. We'll start testimony. While I've been sitting with different judges, they have different opinions about it, so I may decide to let you all as a group decide who you think the foreperson should be, or I may important one. But at this point we won't need to get into that. Okay. All right.

With those preliminary instructions, the Court recognizes

66

the State.

OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE STATE

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please the Court. Thank you all for being here. My name is Ashton Scott. This is my cocounsel, Andrew Miller. We are assistant solicitors/prosecutors with the Greenville County Solicitor's Office, and this is our opportunity to give you a brief roadmap on the case against the Defendant, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins.

This case centers around a forged deed to a home that belonged to the late Mr. Erol Moliere. Before his death Mr. Moliere suffered dementia, and for the last portion of his life he was in hospice, he could barely eat, and he could not even write his own name. Yet a mere 12 days before Mr. Moliere passed away, he supposedly executed a deed to transfer a home to a complete stranger for $2,500. This stranger just happened to be the Defendant's uncle. Then a three full months after he passed away the forged deed was finally recorded with the Register of Deeds.

Mr. Moliere's partner, Ms. Willie Mae Moliere, found out about the forged deed. Law enforcement got involved.

And the evidence will show the Defendant forged another deed to move the property from her uncle's name to her elderly grandfather's name. Then she conveniently obtained power of attorney over her grandfather.

The timing isn't the only odd thing about these deeds. The

evidence will show the notary on the deeds, the Defendant's colleague for a very briefly time, didn't notarize them; that none of the parties involved are familiar with any of these supposed witnesses on the deeds; and how Ms. Moliere's signature on the deeds was forged.

Why go to all this trouble? Money, of course. This property collected $1,100 every single month from the Greenville Housing Authority. With the Defendant's grandfather owning the property, and as his new power of attorney, she was able to set up a bank account in his name and have the funds deposited each month into the new account, an account which she retained full control over as his power of attorney.

The Defendant, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins, was smart enough not to put anything in her own name. Instead she used vulnerable, elderly family members. But as you will see through the course of this trial, there's only one person who profits from this scheme, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins. And she profits handsomely.

Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins is charged with forgery and obtaining goods under false pretences for these actions.

At the end of the trial you will hear from the Judge about the law. And I want you to listen to the law as he provides it to you, but I'll give you a brief overview so you know what to expect. The State of South Carolina defines forgery as falsely making, forging, or counterfeiting, or causing, or willfully acting, or assisting in the false making, forging, or

68

counterfeiting of any writing.

In this case the Defendant fraudulently signed, or caused to be signed, the names of a notary, the late Mr. Erol Moliere, Ms. Willie Mae Moliere, and several witnesses in order to move the property of Mr. Erol Moliere into her family members' names so that she could control it.

The State of South Carolina defines obtaining goods under false pretences as falsely and deceitfully obtaining possession of any money or things of another person by means of false statement, pretence, or representation.

Here Ms. Jenkins obtained over $10,000 in rent payments from the Greenville Housing Authority using a bank account in her grandfather's name and under her control as a result of the fraudulent deeds.

Myself and Mr. Andrew Miller have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty of these crimes. What does beyond a reasonable doubt mean? Proof that leaves you firmly convinced of the Defendant's guilt. There are very few things in this world we know with absolute certainty, and beyond a reasonable doubt is not absolute certainty.

During this trial you're going to hear testimony from the notary on the deeds who will say he did not notarize or sign them, from a handwriting expert regarding the signatures on the deeds, and the Defendant's uncle whose name appears on them. You will hear from the Register of Deeds Office, from law enforcement

who investigated the case, from the bank who opened the account, and the Greenville Housing Authority who deposited the funds.

But most importantly, you will hear from the Molieres themselves, Natasha, Mr. Moliere's daughter, and Willie Mae, her mother, who will say that home belonged to their loved one and it was wrongfully stolen from his estate in the wake of his death.

Ladies and gentlemen, after hearing all this evidence, the State will ask that you find the Defendant guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): The Court recognizes Mr. Armstrong.

OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor. Good afternoon, you all. I really appreciate you being here today and giving your time. Like the Judge told you all in jury qualification, jury service is the only way we resolve conflicts in society. It's the best, the absolutely best, way to resolve these conflicts.

But what's your conflict here today? The State's charging Ms. Jenkins with forgery and obtaining goods under false pretences. Now, the State has the burden of proof to prove every element of each of those offenses beyond a reasonable doubt.

What's a reasonable doubt? It's the highest standard that's out there. You may be familiar with the scales of justice in a civil standard, and if it just tips a little bit then the plaintiff in a car wreck case wins. If it's equal or tips a little bit back this way the Defendant wins. Well, that's not

70

the case here in criminal court.

In criminal court, it's a higher standard than that. It's a standard that would cause you to hesitate. What's that mean? If you go, Uhm, I'm not sure - not guilty. Remember, the State's got the burden of proof. The State is the one bringing these charges. The State is the reason that we're here, because they want to charge Sharhonda with these two crimes, which are very serious crimes or we wouldn't be sitting here.

So what I want you to focus on during the State's presentation of evidence is what is and what is not. I'm not going to run through the facts. We'll see what the State produces and we'll see what the witnesses say. But what I will say the witnesses won't say is that Sharhonda signed anything. What I will tell you that the witnesses won't say is that money was transferred into her name. What I will tell you the witnesses won't say is that she in any way began this scheme.

Because the State is taking her to trial based exclusively on circumstantial evidence, so there's no direct evidence here that she did anything. The circumstantial evidence that the State wants to argue shows that she might have done something. Well, that's a reasonable doubt, period.

Now, what I do want you to consider is, as they put the witnesses up, any bias, any prejudice that they may have in giving their testimony. Did Ms. Moliere -- was she even the wife of the deceased, Erol Moliere? No, she wasn't. She was divorced

for 20 years.

And pay close attention to what she did after -- I'm going to call him Erol, because that last name, it's just, it's hard for me with a southern accent. But I want you to pay particular attention by what she did after he passed and what representations she made to the funeral home about her marriage, and what representations she made to others about her marriage. Because if you find out those representations are false, that would be evidence of bias. I want you to consider that.

This case has, and always will be to me, about not what it is but it's about what it isn't, what evidence they don't have. And we feel like we shouldn't even be here today. And we submit respectfully that if you pay attention, you will find the same way. Again, thank you for your time here today.

And one more thing. There is going to be evidence and testimony about how she got charged and about people going to the sheriff's office, and in this situation there's going to be and evidence testimony about multiple people going to the sheriff's office and getting this ball rolling.

And the sheriff's office, we submit, decided on the narrative that she ended up on the wrong side of the stick with. They could have easily decided on his different narrative. They could have easily decided to charge others. And we're going to hear about that.

If you pay attention to that, I mean, we have an Innocence

72

Project for a reason in this country. Just because she's charged don't make her guilty. And once that snowball gets rolling downhill, it's got to get through me. Well, I'm not the biggest guy in the world, you know what I mean, so I'm going to do my best to represent Sharhonda and show that this is a snowball going downhill and that at the end of the day she should be acquitted. Thank you all.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Thank you, Mr. Armstrong.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): We will recognize the State. And you may call your first witness.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. The State calls Brittaney Williams.

BRITTANEY WILLIAMS,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Brittaney Williams.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Ms. Williams, where are you from?

A Greenville, South Carolina.

Q What is your relationship to the Defendant, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins?

A That's my sister.

Q What is your relationship to Mr. Darrell Freeman?
A That is my uncle.
Q And what is your relationship to Mr. Larry Williams?
A That is my grandpa.
Q What is Ms. Jenkins' relationship to Larry Williams?
A His granddaughter.
Q At some point did Mr. Williams also adopt Ms. Jenkins?
A Well, that's what makes them, him our grandfather. Uhm, I'm not sure if it's like actually through the courts but him and my grandmother raised us. I know my grandmother adopted us at some point.
Q Do you sometimes refer to Mr. Williams as your father?
A Yes, because he's the only person that I knew as my father.
Q What's the Defendant's middle name?
A Nicole.
Q Does she sometimes go by Nicole?
A I'm not sure.
Q Do you and the Defendant have the same parents?
A We have the same mother. Yes, sir.
Q Did you grow up in the same household?
A Yes, sir.
Q What was going on in your life in 2018?
A In 2018? I was pregnant. Uhm, I was just a single mother trying to make it.
Q At some point during 2018, what was your relationship like

with your sister at that point?
A We didn't have a good relationship. I'll say in our adult years we wasn't close. Like we grew up in the same house, but we never -- it was, it was kind of weird. We didn't have a sisterly bond that most sisters would have growing up, I mean, as an adult.
Q At some point in 2018 when you were pregnant with your child did the Defendant come to your house with some documents?
A Uhm ... I think -- I -- I can't remember like exactly what the documents was or anything like that, but I, I do remember her, you know, just letting me know like pretty much what she inherited or what she got, or something like that.
I really wasn't too much interested because I didn't get anything or anything like that. It wasn't beneficial to my life at all, so I really didn't ask too many questions.
Q But again, did she show you some documents that at the time you thought were deeds?
A Yes.
Q That time when she showed you those documents did she also tell you about a plan she had?
A Yeah. I'm, I'm not going to say a plan but it was just pretty much like how this was going to be beneficial to, you know, a lot of people in my family. You know, this is going to be helpful. This is helpful.
Q Did she tell you about a plan to make a bunch of money

really quick, in her words?
A I don't know if those were her exact words but I do know it was going to be beneficial.
Q Did she tell you that she knew a man that had passed away?
A Yes.
Q Did she tell you that there was a house just there for the taking?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, I'm going to have an objection. May we approach the bench?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yes.
(Off-the-record discussion at sidebar.)
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Did your sister ever tell you about a house, anything about a house, involved in when she came by?
A Yeah. She, she stated that it was, you know -- I'm not going to say like she told me like in depth, but she stated like our family came into some houses.
Q How did she say she came into those houses?
A At that point I don't think she really just told me. She, uhm -- I don't really think I really just asked too many questions because, again, I don't know if I was jealous or what. I just, I was just like, okay. You know. Good for you all.
Q And are you testifying -- or did you testify just a minute ago that she told you that she inherited some houses? Is that what you just testified to?

A Well, what I'm saying, like I'm not in -- it was like, it -- without going into like the whole details, but like when I was about 30 she found out that someone was supposed to be her father, so I didn't know if the houses was supposed to come from that. I didn't know. I just, that was just my assumption. I knew it was an older man that passed away is how the houses were obtained.

Q Do you recall going to the Law Enforcement Center on McGee Street back in February of 2021?

A Yes, sir.

Q And did you give an interview with Investigator Turner, seated right back here, on that day?

A I know I gave an interview with someone. I'm not for sure if that was him or not.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, if I may approach?

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q I'll show you a photograph still from the videotaped interview. Is that -- what does that still photo depict?

A That is me.

Q And is that you sitting in the interview room --

A Yes, sir.

Q -- that was recorded?

A Uh-huh. For the record, I was not aware that the conversation was recorded.

Q Okay.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Are you marking that as an exhibit?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No. Just to help her identify.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Is what you're testifying to here today what you told Investigator Turner on that day?
A I can't remember exactly verbatim what I testified to Investigator Turner, but I can say it was a lot that went on that day, a lot of, uhm, promises that was made by like the sheriff, like the big man. I was under a lot of pressure that day. I remember it vividly because my uncle was on the news. And so when I came down there --
Q Okay. We're getting a little past things know.
A Okay. I'm sorry.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point the State would ask permission to not admit extrinsic evidence but to confront to find out about a prior statement that was given to law enforcement so she can explain or deny that statement, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Has she denied the actual statement?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. Well, she's testified differently today.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I object, Your Honor. She hasn't denied anything. She said she went down and made a statement.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): My recollection is she said she just

can't recall, but she --

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I did. I'm sorry. But I did make a statement to -- I did go and make a statement, but it was the reason why I made that statement is what I'm saying, like my uncle ...

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Well, let's wait, Ms. Williams.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Ms. Williams, if I showed you a transcript of how you answered the question I just asked a second ago to Investigator Turner, would it help you remember that?

A Yeah. I mean, I've seen it. I've seen the -- the attorney show me. But like the day, I don't remember.

Q I want you to read for yourself what is marked here.

A She was saying pretty much that --

Q This is for to you read to yourself --

A Oh, to myself. Okay. I'm sorry.

Q -- to refresh your memory.

A Okay. Sorry.

Q So on that date you went in there did you tell Investigator Turner that she inherited these houses?

A No. I told Investigator Turner what I was told by somebody else to say prior to going in there.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, may we approach quickly?

(Off-the-record discussion at sidebar.)

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q What did you tell Investigator Turner that day about where these properties were coming from?
A I told him that they were pretty much up for grabs, like pretty much like it was a house that, if my relative paid the taxes on them, then would be theirs.
Q Now, did you eventually confront your sister about this plan?
A I don't understand.
Q Did you and your sister ever have an argument about this plan that she was referencing here?
A Again, I don't know if it was coming out of jealousy or what, but I was just like, you know, what's really going on. You know, I just didn't understand. And again, I didn't ask too many questions because I didn't, I didn't know. But I did ask her, you know, like, you know, like when she was telling me like some details about like between the families or I was just asking her like, you know, just make sure everything is everything. You know. In other words --
Q At some point did you grow concerned about what was happening?
A Yes.
Q When you realized what was happening did you try to warn anyone?
A What do you mean?

Q Did you reach out to your uncle, Mr. Freeman?
A At what point --
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, if I may approach?
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q -- do you recall in that same interview discussing with Investigator Turner what you -- about warning the family members?
A I just know at one point there was a lot on social media, that with us not being really close I didn't -- it was kind of like an influence because I was learning about so much stuff via social media via people just going at it. So once I found that out, that's when I said something to my uncle, and ...
Q When you said something to your uncle, what did you think this plan was that your sister had come up with?
A I didn't -- again, I just knew that it was gonna be money. You know. I just knew it was money, like, you know, people own houses, people -- people come into money. You know. That's the only thing I just knew of, it was profit.
Q Did you think it was legitimate?
A I guess. I -- that wasn't up to me to think.
Q When you contacted your uncle did you think this was a legitimate deal?
A At what point did I contact my uncle?
Q Do you remember discussing this with Investigator Turner in that same interview?
A About speaking with my uncle?

Q Yes, at 7 minutes and 54 seconds into that interview.
A About -- the only thing that me and my uncle spoke about, I don't know like if I, per se, called him, but we might have spoke about the feud that him and Sharhonda was going through when it came down to the financial aspects.
Q If I showed you a transcript of that portion of the conversation, might it help you to refresh your memory?
A I mean, if you would like.
Q You can read for yourself the portion at 7 minutes and 54 seconds.
A But again, that was, that was my personal opinion based off my dislike against Sharhonda.
Q When you called your uncle and warned him, or contacted him on social media like you were saying, did you think this was a legitimate transaction?
A I didn't believe everything at that time. No, I didn't.
Q What did you think this was?
A I just -- I don't know if I could say if I thought it was a scam or not. I just, I just -- it was just, I just didn't believe. I just didn't.
Q What did you tell Investigator Turner this was?
A I told him that I thought that it was a scam.
Q At that point whose name was this house in, to your knowledge?
A My uncle.

Q Were you concerned about your uncle?
A Yes.
Q What happened to the properties after they were in your uncle's name, to your knowledge?
A He sold them to my grandfather. All I know is it was -- it went to my grandfather. Like they went from my uncle, because the business, him and Sharhonda wasn't getting along as far as like the business part. He didn't want -- he just wanted to sell them and get, you know -- and so that's when he sold them to my grandfather.
Q To your knowledge, who came up with this plan?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Objection, Your Honor. It calls for speculation.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained.
A Well, see --
THE COURT (SALVINI): Hold on. The Judge sustained it. You've got to wait for his next question.
THE WITNESS: Oh. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q When your sister, as you testified, came to your house with paperwork, how was she acting?
A I mean, focused like, like a businesswoman, like handling, you know -- just stopping by. And she was very focused that day.
Q When about in 2018 do you think this was?
A I don't know.

Q When was your child born?
A My child was born in [redacted] of 2019.
Q Okay. So you earlier testified that it was during the time you were pregnant with your child. Do you remember about how far along you were when this all happened?
A I was early. I was really early. I can't say like exactly when but I do know I wasn't big and pregnant.
Q I don't believe I have any further questions right now. Please answer any Defense may have.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Cross?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Hi, Ms. Williams.
A Hey, how are you?
Q Good. I'm going to ask you a couple of questions. But today's not the first time we met, is it?
A No, sir.
Q When did we meet?
A Uh ...
Q I don't need an exact date. Recently?
A Yesterday. Day before yesterday.
Q Yeah. Did you ever come up to my office and sign an affidavit?
A Yes, sir.

Q Could that possibly have been in November of 2024? That sound about right?
A Yes, sir.
Q So that was recent.
A Uh-huh.
Q I know the assistant solicitor keeps asking you about what happened in 2018. How's your memory on what happened in 2018?
A Not very vague.
Q Not very vague, or vague?
A Oh. Vague. Vague. I'm sorry.
Q All right. And were you and Sharhonda not getting along or getting along back then?
A In 2018?
Q Yeah. Do you remember?
A We were not getting along.
Q Okay. And I think you were saying that there was even a family feud going on. Right?
A Yeah.
Q Okay. Were you on one side and she was on the other back then?
A I was all to myself back then.
Q Okay. So you were switching on them back then?
A Yeah. It was a lot.
Q Okay. Well, let's get to the facts as we understand it. Now, you had indicated that Mr. Freeman -- was he going to get

arrested, or had he been arrested when you went down to talk with the police?
A He was going to get arrested. He was on the news, uhm, --
Q Yes, ma'am.
A -- prior, maybe like two days prior, to that. It was some big session that they had on Friday nights called Greenville's Most Wanted, and it had my uncle. I actually didn't see the news but his ex-girlfriend sent it to me, and it showed where pretty much everything they had against my uncle, so.
Q And you care about your uncle?
A Yes. Because when I reached out to him he was, he, you know, he was just pretty much just, I don't know what to do. I'm on the news. He walked out of his job. Like he quit his job. He threw away his cellphone. Like he pretty much went on the run like from that moment.
So I, I just wanted to help. Like, I didn't know, like when I got in a conversation he was just like pretty much -- at that time Sharhonda wasn't talking, so I got -- and he was just telling me like, Sharhonda did this. She did this. And so I was -- I was just trying to help, is the only reason I went down there to talk to the officer that day.
Q Well, now you had testified earlier that someone had talked to you --
A Yes, sir.
Q -- and asked you to go down there and give a statement. Who

was that someone?
A That was a gentleman named U A Thompson.
Q U A Thompson?
A Yes, sir.
Q Had you met U A Thompson before 2018?
A No, sir.
Q Okay. How did U A Thompson come to contact you about this that we're here about today?
A Well, he actually didn't contact me. I contacted him, because on social media him and Sharhonda was going back and forth. So --
Q When you say back and forth, what do you mean?
A They were like, it was like some other stuff they had going on like one person would go live, the other person go live. It was like, it was getting serious. Like this was like viral before viral was even viral. It was so bad to where he was like -- I don't know if he's a political figure or whatever, but he's like something in the community and he did not want that. So when my uncle got on the news --
Q Okay. So hold on a second. You've got a mouthful here. You said "don't want that." He didn't want what?
A He did not want Sharhonda to put his business on the internet because I guess they were both going like low, like below the belt, and Sharhonda went lower, like she was pulling up, like, dirt like he had molested a little boy, he had been

caught with heroin. Like she was pulling up all this information where he's never been to jail for any of this, and she was putting it on the internet, and he did not want the public to know that.

Q Okay. So that explains U A Thompson and Sharhonda clearly didn't get along, correct?

A Correct.

Q And so you called U A Thompson about your uncle, Darrell Freeman; is that correct?

A Yes, sir, because --

Q Wait. Wait. Wait.

A Okay.

Q Is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q Okay. What was your purpose for calling U A? Did you think he could help your uncle?

A At that time I kind of knew that he could help him because he had like pull like within the court system. And my uncle girlfriend told me to reach out to him because when U A Thompson went live, he pretty much told how much pull he had and that how he the one starting this investigation, he the one that got all of it started. So when my uncle -- cause my uncle girlfriend the one that told me to reach out.

Now, I knew about it, but at the time I didn't think anything about this man, I didn't think he could help my uncle

because my uncle, like I say, he had five warrants and he had a child support warrant. So if he would have got a bond for the bond warrants, he would have still been in jail for the child support warrant. So I was just trying to help.

So when I called the U A Thompson man, cause I called, him he did not call me, I was calling him on the sole purpose to help my uncle.

Q Okay. All right. That's fair enough. Because you loved your uncle, right?

A Because I love my uncle. Yeah.

Q Did you tell U A about him being arrested? Was he arrested at the time you called him?

A No. He was on the news, but --

Q Oh, he was still on the run at this point?

A He was on the run. But U A already knew. He already knew that he was on the run because at the time I called him it was like he was happy. He was like, I knew something was gonna come about with this. I knew something was gonna come about with this. I know that --

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Objection, Your Honor. We're getting into hearsay. And I object to relevance as well. I mean, I think we're getting beyond the scope of.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Repeat the question again.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I'll withdraw it.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q I'm going to get to talking a lot, and then we get to bringing multiple issues in.
A Oh. I'm sorry.
Q Okay. You had a conversation with U A; is that correct?
A Yes, sir.
Q The purpose of that conversation was to have your uncle helped who had these outstanding warrants?
A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. As a result of that conversation with U A did he ask you to go down to the police station, or did the police call you? I mean, the State says you gave a statement. Right?
A Uhm, so in -- when I was conversating with Mr. U A Thompson, he contacted Sheriff Hobart Lewis on a three-way and he asked if I can get my uncle on the line.

At first my uncle was hesitant because he didn't want to speak with the sheriff. But I got him on the line, and that's when they were pretty much telling us about the whole case against Sharhonda, and that they knew they didn't want Darrell, they wanted Sharhonda, and that if Darrell will agree to come to the police station by 5:00, I think it was, the next day, if he agreed to come to the police station by 5:00 and pretty much tell them what they wanted to hear, then they would lock all five of the warrants in the drawer -- well, all six of the warrants, because there was five with the forgery and sixth with the child

support, and let him walk free.
Q Okay.
A And that's exactly what happened.
Q That's what happened. He walked? They served him with these warrants that day, and he walked?
A Yes, sir.
Q Did U A tell you what --
A They didn't serve him with any warrants that day.
Q They didn't serve him the warrants?
A No, sir.
Q He was on TV, Greenville's Most Wanted.
A Yes, sir. But the sheriff promised him an amnesty day. He said that if he came in and say what he needed to say --
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Objection, Your Honor. Hearsay.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained.
BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Can't tell me what the sheriff said. He's not here.
A Okay. Sorry.
Q Okay. As a result of the conversation with the sheriff, however, Mr. Freeman, who had formerly been on TV as Greenville's Most Wanted, walked right out of the police station that day?
A Yes, sir.
Q Did U A Thompson discuss with you what you were supposed to say to the police when you went regarding Sharhonda's involvement?

A Yes. He gave me --
Q What did he say?
A He gave me a brief rundown. He told me that it was a feud with Sharhonda and --
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Objection, Your Honor. Hearsay.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained.
BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Okay. We'll ask it this way: Did he give you directions on what to say when you went to talk to the sheriff?
A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. Did you follow those directions when you went to talk to the sheriff?
A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. Are the directions that you were given true and correct as we sit here today?
A No, sir.
Q Okay. Regarding Sharhonda's conduct? I broke that question poorly, so I'll reword it. U A Thompson gave you directions to go talk to the sheriff and you say certain things, correct?
A Correct.
Q And those certain things involved Sharhonda, correct?
A Yes.
Q The things you shared, are they correct today?
A No, sir.

Q All right. That's all the questions I have. Thank you.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any redirect by the State?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes. Briefly, Your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Do you recall how long you spoke with Investigator Turner that day?
A It wasn't long. It was probably about 10, 15 minutes.
Q If I showed you the end of the transcript, it might help you remember how long that was?
A Say that again.
Q If I show you the timestamps towards the end of the transcript might that help remind you how long it was?
A I mean, if it actually has the time on there.
Q So how long would you say you spoke with Investigator Turner that day?
A Thirty minutes.
Q Actually it was a little over 30 minutes?
A Yes, sir.
Q Is it your testimony here today that this U A Thompson person told you everything you needed to say?
A Majority of what I said, yes, sir.
Q Earlier I believe you testified that your sister did come to your house with paperwork and showed you it; is that correct?
A Yes.

Q Did he tell you to say that?
A Again, what I just stated was majority of the statement that I said, you know, I guess that's why, the reason why, I went to save my uncle, because of the speculations that I had at that time.
Q Earlier you testified also about her either inheriting property or you told Investigator Turner that she had a scheme to get this property. Did he tell you to say -- did he tell you to say that?
A Yes.
Q Did he tell you to say what you're testifying to here today, that she told you that she inherited some property, or did he tell you to say what you said back then, that she had a scheme to get this property?
A I'm confused.
Q Okay. So is your testimony as to what actually happened, that she came to you with the paperwork and said, "I've inherited some property?" is that your testimony about what actually happened?
A When she came to me about the houses, I didn't -- my testimony was I didn't ask any questions on how she got.
Q So you're saying this isn't U A Thompson told you to say this; you're saying she actually came to you with stuff about a house?
A Prior to the -- prior to the conversation with Officer

Turner, did I know?
Q Yes.
A Yes. I knew about her having a house.
Q Okay. Which portion are you saying that you were coached to say that we've discussed?
A About the whole, the in-depths of the -- the whole case, like what I went to actually said, I didn't know any of that to be true. I learned majority of that ...
Q Okay. So you're saying you were coached on the details?
A Correct.
Q But are you saying your sister actually did come to your house in 2018 with the paperwork?
A Yeah.
Q And with the paperwork, and she was talking about the property. In 2018 when she came to your house, I'm talking about. Is that what you're testifying actually happened?
A Yes.
Q Earlier you testified that you did either reach out by telephone, social media to your uncle because you were concerned. Did that actually happen?
A Again, I can't say I if I reached out to him or he reached out to me, but it was some concern being shared.
Q Okay. So that actually did happen?
A That did happen.
Q So were you coached by this Mr. Thompson to say that?

A No.
Q Okay. No further questions at this point. Answer any Defense may have.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Do you know whose name the house was in when all this stuff went down with the sheriff?
A Yes.
Q Whose name was the house in?
A Darrell Freeman.
Q Was there also a probate proceeding going on?
A Yes.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained. We hadn't got to that. We hadn't got to that issue.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: That's not the purpose that I was asking that question.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Well, you need to limit -- I'm letting you go to finish behind the State on their redirect, so you need to limit it to just --
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Okay. I'll withdraw.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any further questions for this witness?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: None from the State, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. you're excused.
THE WITNESS: Forever?

THE COURT (SALVINI): She's asking if she can be released from her subpoena.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No objection from the State.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Yes, forever.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Call your next witness.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, the State calls Barbara Cantrell.

BARBARA CANTRELL,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Barbara Cantrell.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Ms. Cantrell, where are you currently employed?

A Greenville County Register and Deed's Office.

Q And what is your position there?

A I'm a deputy register.

Q For purposes for those of us that don't know, what is the Register of Deeds?

A Oh, we house real estate documents for Greenville County.

Q Is this a private or a governmental office?

A It's a government office.

Q Are your records that are kept, are they publicly available,

or?
A They are.
Q Where is the Office of the Register of Deeds?
A It's on University Ridge, downtown Greenville.
Q Is that in Greenville County?
A It is.
Q And generally what is a deed? What is this document?
A It shows ownership of land in Greenville County.
Q Does it also show transfer of ownership?
A It does. We don't actually transfer, but we house the documentation that does.
Q And who can register a deed?
A Anybody.
Q And what process do they go through when doing that?
A They would, of course, have the deed executed, and in order to enter it in the public record, they would bring it to our office. We would ask them for the submittal information, check their ID and their phone number and check their document to meet state recording laws, take their money, process the document, scan it, and give it back to them.
Q What are the state recording requirements that you look for?
A We're looking for a proper property description, one that can be used to transfer by another department. We're looking for it to have a mailing address for the tax information and other correspondence from the county to go to. It's got to be properly

signed, witnessed, and notarized. Things like that.
Q By properly witnessed, are there a certain number of witnesses that are required?
A It requires two witnesses and also requires one of two types of notarization.
Q What are the types of notarization?
A One is called probate. One is called an acknowledgment. A probate is where the notary is notarizing one of the witnesses that has witnessed the document. The other is where the notary is present and says they saw them sign.
Q Does the register of deeds do anything to authenticate the signatures on a document?
A No. We have no way to do that.
Q Does the register of deeds record other documents or additional deeds?
A We do.
Q What sort of documents do they record?
A Powers of attorneys, mortgages, certain types of liens. Anything that would pertain to real estate for Greenville County.
Q And what is a power of attorney generally?
A It gives somebody the right -- it's basically whatever is on the document -- to conduct business for another person or another entity.
Q If someone -- specifically we're talking about this timeframe back in 2018 -- brought in a document that was not

quite a deed or a power of attorney or a document you normally accept, do you still sometimes accept it?
A We do. There's a miscellaneous category. If it pertains something in Greenville County, land, we would record that if it was properly executed.
Q And for the purposes of today were you asked to bring some certified copies of documents?
A Yes, sir.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Your Honor, if I may approach? And there may be a couple of times.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yes, sir.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I have a number of documents.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Ms. Cantrell, I'm showing you what's been premarked as State's Exhibit 1 for identification purposes. Can you tell us what that document is?
A It's a deed.
Q And is this a certified copy of a deed from your office?
A It is.
Q Has it been altered in any way?
A No.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point we'd move to admit State's Exhibit 1 and publish to the jury.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objections?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I'm objecting on the basis of relevancy

that relate to the subject property.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Ms. Cantrell, what property does that deed relate to?
A A Ridgeway Drive in Greenville.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Objection withdrawn, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Admitted. State's Exhibit No. 1 is admitted. You can publish to the jury.
(State's Exhibit 1 is admitted into the record.)
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Ms. Cantrell, what is this stamp we see at the top of the document?
A That's our recording information that we put on a document once we enter it in the record before we scan it.
Q And does it include the date this document was recorded by register of deeds?
A It has the date and the time.
Q And what date was this document recorded?
A Looks like June 18th, 2007. I'm blind sometimes.
Q And down here we have, there's mention of, an amount of money. What is that?
A That's the money that was exchanged between the buyer and the seller that they're required to pay transfer taxes on. So we're required to use that for calculations.
Q Does it appear then that this property was sold to a Mr. Erol Moliere for a $28,000?

A It does.
Q And that property, is that what we see down here?
A Yeah, A Ridgeway Drive.
Q Now, Ms. Cantrell, I'm going to show you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 2. Can you identify this document for us?
A Yes. It's a power of attorney.
Q And is this a certified document provided by the Greenville County Register of Deeds?
A It is.
Q Has it been altered in any way?
A No.
Q And whose power of attorney does it appear to be?
A Mr. Moliere's.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: At this point the State would move to admit Exhibit 2.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Has Mr. Armstrong seen it?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 2 admitted, without objection.
(State's Exhibit 2 is admitted into the record.)
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q And, Ms. Cantrell, as this document, as I believe you stated, does this appear to be a power of attorney for Mr. Erol Moliere?
A It does.

Q And who does it appoint as his power of attorney on the document?
A It looks like Willie Mae Moliere.
Q Based on the stamp, can you tell -- it might be kind of hard to see here. Based on the execution date on the signatures, when does it appear that this document was executed?
A June 18th, 2014.
Q And when you referenced the required signatures, is that what we see, I believe, on this page?
A It appears to be.
Q And which type of notary does this appear to be?
A It's an acknowledgment.
Q Is this an acceptable form of notary for the register of deeds?
A It is.
Q Ms. Cantrell, if I may show you what's been premarked State's Exhibit 3. Ma'am, what does this document appear to be?
A It's also a deed.
Q What property does it appear to be in reference to?
A B Ridgeway Drive.
Q Is this a certified copy of a document provided by the register of deeds?
A It is.
Q Has it been altered in any way?
A No, sir.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at point the State would move to admit State's Exhibit 3.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Any objection?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: May I speak with the assistant?

(Counsel confer off the record.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 3 admitted, without objection.

(State's Exhibit 3 is admitted into the record.)

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Ms. Cantrell, what properties does this deed appear to reference?

A [redacted]Ridgeway Drive, [redacted]Crestfield Road, and [redacted]South Estate Drive.

Q And based on this deed, who does it appear sold those properties?

A Mr. Moliere.

Q And how much was paid for those properties?

A $110,000.

Q And who purchased those?

A Glendlin Homes, LLC.

Q And what date was this deed executed?

A April 6, 2018.

Q And who are the two signatures on the left side?

A Those are the witnesses to the signature.
Q And who is the signature on the right?
A It says it's Willie Mae, his attorney-in-fact, for Mr. Moliere.
Q And down here, is this also the notary?
A Yes.
Q And what is this reference down here?
A That says that it was prepared by The Buddins (ph) Law Firm.
Q And we said this was -- I believe you testified to this -- executed on April 6th. And are you able to tell on the stamp what date it was recorded with register of deeds?
A April 6, 2018.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: If I may approach?
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Ms. Cantrell, I'd like to show you what he's been premarked as State's Exhibit 4 for identification purposes. And what is this document?
A It's a miscellaneous document. It says it's a Notice of Breach of Contract. Someone is saying that they had an equitable property -- equity in the property, and they wanted to enter it in the record.
Q Is this a certified copy of the document provided by the register of deeds?
A It is.
Q Has it been altered in any way?

A It has not.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point we'd move to admit State's Exhibit 4, and publish to the jury.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Without objection.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 4 admitted, without objection. You may publish to the jury.

(State's Exhibit 4 is admitted into the record.)

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Who does it appear as providing notice of a breach of contract here?

A It says that Sharhonda Jenkins and her fiancee, Chad Chapman, have an equitable interest with Erol and Willie Mae Moliere.

Q And what property is she claiming an interest in?

A [redacted]South Estate Drive.

Q And as we've previously looked at State's Exhibit 3, what property was sold on April 6, 2018?

A [redacted] South Estate Drive.

Q And what date did Sharhonda Jenkins, the Defendant, come in and file this with the register of deeds?

A April 12th, 2028 (sic).

Q And actually, who are the witnesses on this document?

A Actually that is myself and recorder at the register's office.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, may I approach?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sure. Yes.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Ms. Cantrell, I'd like to show you what's been premarked for identification purposes State's Exhibit 5. What does this document appear to be?
A It's a quitclaim deed.
Q And what property does this deed reference?
A [redacted] Ridgeway Drive.
Q And what is a quitclaim deed?
A A quitclaim deed means they're not guaranteeing the title to be free and clear. They're just waiving any claim they would have in the past, in the present, and in the future to the property.
Q Okay. Is there a difference in filing a standard deed and a quitclaim deed?
A A warranty deed requires the seller to warranty if something should go wrong with the title, if they find liens or something on it. A quitclaim deed is just something, like a lot of times if it's a tax estate, you don't have a clear title, you can just quitclaim it. That way you don't have to guarantee the free -- ownership free and clear.
Q And this quitclaim that you have there, is that a certified copy of a document from the register of deeds?
A It is.

Q Has it been altered in any way?
A No, sir.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point the State would move to admit and publish State's 5.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: None, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): State's 5 is admitted, without objection. You may publish.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
(State's Exhibit 5 is admitted into the record.)
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q As you testified, what property does this quitclaim deed reference?
A [redacted] Ridgeway Drive in Greenville.
Q And who does it say has sold [redacted] Ridgeway Drive?
A Erol Moliere.
Q And how much does this deed reference was paid to Erol Moliere for that property?
A $2,500.
Q Is it, in fact, the same property we discussed with Exhibit 1?
A [redacted] Ridgeway Drive, yes, sir.
Q And in 2007 how much does this deed say that Erol Moliere paid for [redacted] Ridgeway Drive?
A $28,000.

Q Back to this deed. Based on this quitclaim deed, what day was this deed executed?
A Twenty-eighth day of June, 2018.
Q And who is the purported signature on the top left?
A Erol Moliere.
Q And on the top right?
A Willie Mae Moliere.
Q And who is labeled as grantee?
A Darrell Freeman.
Q And for deeds to be accepted does the grantee need to sign?
A No.
Q Does the grantee normally sign?
A No. But sometimes if an attorney doesn't prepare the document, people think everybody needs to sign so a lot of times you will see sometimes the grantee sign, but by law they're not required to because they have no interest to sign away.
Q And whose notary does that appear to be?
A Barry Downs.
Q Do you know who any of these individuals are?
A No.
Q And as we said a minute ago, what date was this -- does this appear to be executed on?
A Twenty-eighth day of June, 2018.
Q Based on the register of deeds stamp, can you tell, when was this document recorded with the register of deeds?

A October the 10th, 2018.
Q Ms. Cantrell, I am showing you what's been premarked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 6 now. Can you identify that document?
A It's a quitclaim deed.
Q And what property does that quitclaim deed reference?
A [redacted] Ridgeway Drive in Greenville.
Q And is that a certified copy of the document from the register of deeds?
A It is.
Q And has it been altered in any way?
A No, sir.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point the State would move to admit and publish State's Exhibit 6.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: None, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's No. 6 is admitted, without objection. And you may publish to the jury.
(State's Exhibit 6 is admitted into the record.)
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Ms. Cantrell, when does this document appear to have been executed?
A Sixteenth day of December, 2019.
Q And who is it identified as the property, as the person that sold [redacted] Ridgeway Drive?

A Darrell Freeman.
Q And who is it identified as having purchased A Ridgeway Drive?
A Larry Williams.
Q How much does it indicate was paid for A Ridgeway Drive?
A $4,553.49.
Q And again, is this the same property from State's Exhibit 1?
A Yes, A Ridgeway Drive. Yes.
Q And based on the stamp from the register of deeds, when was this deed recorded?
A January the 31st, 2020.
Q And based on the signature page, who is the grantor in this situation?
A Darrell Freeman.
Q And who is the grantee?
A Larry Williams.
Q And is the notary on this page?
A No. The notary signature isn't there.
Q Is the notary, in fact, on a third page by itself?
A It is.
Q Is that unusual?
A It's not something that's real common, but sometimes documents print off differently when they're sent over from somebody's printer, and every now and then you will see it. But very rarely.

Q And who purportedly notarized this document?
A Barry Downs.
Q Is that the same name that was on the previous deed we looked at for A Ridgeway Drive?
A I believe it is.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, may I approach with what's identified as State's Exhibit 7?
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Ms. Cantrell, can you please identify what's been marked for identification purpose as State's Exhibit 7?
A It's a power of attorney.
Q And who's supposedly getting a power of attorney appointed by this document?
A Larry Williams.
Q And is this a certified copy of the document provided by the register of deeds?
A Yes, it is.
Q Has it been altered in any way?
A No.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: At this point the State would move to admit State's Exhibit 7, and publish to the jury.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 7 admitted, without objection. You may publish.

(State's Exhibit 7 is admitted into the record.)
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Ms. Cantrell, as you mentioned, who is having a power of attorney appointed by this document?
A Larry Williams.
Q And what does this power of attorney grant essentially? Or what kind of power of attorney uses this document to do?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I was going to say, I object. I think it's calling for a legal conclusion on what the document did. I don't mind him wording it a little bit differently if he wants to ask her a direct question about does it give single powers.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: That's fine. Withdrawn, Your Honor.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q I apologize. Who was designated as Mr. Larry Williams' power of attorney by this document?
A Nicole Jenkins.
Q And whose signature does that appear to be?
A Tabatha (ph) Crawford.
Q Or above that where it says agent's signature, who does that appear to be?
A It looks like the initial, Jenkins, Nicole Jenkins.
Q And when does it appear this document was notarized by Ms. Crawford?
A Looks like 3/4/2020. I can't see the actual date.
Q I apologize. This might make it a little easier. When does

it appear this document was notarized?
A The 4th day of March, 2020.
Q And based on the stamp from the register of deeds, can you tell when this document was recorded at the register of deeds?
A July 14th, 2020.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, I don't believe I have any further questions from this witness.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Please answer any the Defense may have.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Cross?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Hello, ma'am.
A Hi.
Q Have we met before?
A I don't think so.
Q Well, nice to speak with you today. State's No. 2, I believe, was the power of attorney. Actually, I will hand you State's 2. Does this give an address for Erol?
A An address for who?
Q Erol Moliere.
A It does. It has [redacted] South Estate Drive in Greenville.
Q [redacted] South Estate Drive in Greenville?
A Uh-huh.

Q Okay. Thank you. I knew I had that written down for a reason. Does it tell you where it's dated, the location, what town it was dated?
A I'm sorry. What was the question?
Q I'm sorry. I didn't mean to turn my back on you.
A Are you talking about where it says Anderson, South Carolina?
Q Anderson, South Carolina.
A Yes. That's where it was dated and I'm assuming where it was executed.
Q Thank you. Do you know what this address is in Anderson, 130 Howard 252?
A I do not.
Q Thank you.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Any redirect?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Just very briefly.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Why might people obtain a power of attorney?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Objection. Calls for speculation.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Withdrawn. No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Thank you. You may step down. Let me

see the lawyers up here for just a moment once the witness clears the stand.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, can Ms. Cantrell be excused from her subpoena?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yes.

(Off-the-record discussion at sidebar)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Members of the jury, we're going to take a 10-minute bathroom break. We'll be back in at 4:20. We're going to run a little bit longer today. I guess we giveth, and now we taketh away, but you had a long break for lunch and now you'll have to stay a little bit past 5:00. So if somebody needs to make phone calls and stuff now, see if you can get that done during the break.

My admonition. Still, at this point, don't discuss the case. Don't talk about it. You haven't had it yet. All the witnesses haven't been put in, and all the witnesses haven't spoken. So with that said, let's be back in the courtroom at 4:20.

(Jury exits the courtroom at 4:11 p.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Anything we need to take up right at this moment, or?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Not from the Defense, Your Honor.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We'll come back at 4:20. All right.

116

(Court recesses at 4:12 p.m. and reconvenes at 4:25 p.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Bring the jury back in.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 10:27 p.m.)

(Court's Exhibit 2 is marked for identification.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Let the record reflect that all the jurors are present. The Defendant is also present in the courtroom. We were notified that you all have picked a foreperson, Juror No. 97. Is that you?

THE FOREPERSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Great. That will be your seat throughout the duration of the trial. Okay. All right.

Is there anything else before we start with the next witnesses?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. The State can call the next witness.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: State calls Miranda Owens.

MIRANDA OWENS,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Miranda Owens.

///

///

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Ms. Owens, where are you currently employed?

A Greenville County Register of Deeds.

Q And what is your current with the register of deeds?

A Recorder.

Q And were you working in that same capacity on October 10th, 2018?

A Yes, sir.

Q And were you, in fact, at work on October 10th, 2018?

A Yes, sir.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, if I may approach?

Q I show you what's been admitted as State's Exhibit 5. And can you identify, just without putting it on the projector, what is that document?

A This is a deed document.

Q And what property is that deed showing a transfer of?

A Transferring from, uh -- excuse me. I may mispronounce the names here, but it's going to Darrell Freeman from Moliere.

Q And what date was that date recorded at the register of deeds?

A October 10th of 2018.

Q Do you recall an individual bringing that deed in that day?

A I do.

Q And did anything stand out to you about that?

A It just seemed, he seemed a little odd, the way he was acting. And it was very late in the day with multiple documents.
Q And was this a -- what did this person generally look like to you?
A He was a male and African American.
Q And did you do anything to authenticate his identity?
A I took down his driver's license number. Asked him for his driver's license, and took his information from there.
Q And do you do that with every deed?
A We do. We ask for a driver's license as soon as they come up and offer or want to enter in documentation in the record.
Q Do you know who that individual was based on checking their driver's -- who they purported to be by checking their driver's license?
A Mr. Freeman.
Q I don't believe I have any further questions. Please answer any Defense may have.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any cross?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor, very brief.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Did you see the Defendant, Ms. Jenkins, that day?
A I did not.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. No further questions?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No redirect, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: And the State would ask that she be excused from her subpoena.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): She is excused. Ms. Owens, you may step down. Thank you. Call your next witness.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Your Honor, the State would call Mr. Doug Garrett.

FRED DOUGLAS GARRETT, JR.,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.
THE WITNESS: Doug Garrett. And my full name is Fred Douglas Garrett, Jr.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:

Q Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett. Where do you work?
A Watkins, Garrett & Woods Mortuary.
Q Is that here in Greenville County?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q And how long have you worked at Watkins, Garrett & Woods?
A Uhm, for over -- almost 50 years.
Q What is your title?
A I'm currently the manager.
Q And what are some of your duties and responsibilities as a

manager?
A As a manager, I see to the daily operations of the business, and meet with clients, oversee the embalming operations, oversee funerals.
Q As part of those responsibilities do you sometimes hire and fire personnel?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q Did you ever have volunteers work at the funeral home?
A Sometimes. Yes, ma'am.
Q What is the process to become a volunteer there?
A Well, generally people, you know, sometimes you have young people that may have like a school project where they need to come work at the mortuary. So we have helped people that have had community service that they've had to do. And sometimes people would just come to the mortuary and ask and they volunteer, and on some occasions we allow them to do so.
Q How many paid employees do you have at Watkins, Garrett & Woods?
A Uhm, meaning full time or just --
Q How about both.
A Well, full time, about 10. And completely with staff, part time and whatnot, about 30 people.
Q And how many volunteers do you typically have?
A Uhm, one or two at a time. Currently we don't have any volunteers.

Q Are you familiar with the Defendant, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins?
A Yes, I am.
Q Did she ever work at Watkins, Garrett & Woods?
A She didn't work. She had came to help as she was on community service and needed some place to come to serve out some community service.
Q So she was a volunteer?
A She was a volunteer in that capacity.
Q Do you remember the approximate dates that she volunteered there?
A I know it was in 2018, I believe, from -- for a few months. I can't give you the specific dates.
Q And as a manager were you one of her supervisors?
A I would have been.
Q What was her role at the funeral home?
A Uhm, some clerical, answering the phone, receptionist type duties. If someone came in, greet them, those type of things. Nothing too in-depth.
Q Was this full time?
A No, this was not full time.
Q Do you remember what her hours might have been?
A They were really the hours that, you know, she could come in in order to fulfill the time element that she had to do for her community service.
Q What are the typical hours of the --

A Our hours of operation are from 8:00 to 6:00 from the office standpoint, but we close at usually 7:30 to 8:00 in the evening.
Q So typically volunteers would volunteer during those hours?
A Yes.
Q And how long did she work as a volunteer?
A Uhm, a month or so. A month or two.
Q Was she hired on as a paid employee after volunteering?
A Oh, no. No. No.
Q Why not?
A Because we didn't, you know, need her as a paid employee.
Q Where in the funeral home did she volunteer?
A In the front office. Reception area mostly.
Q Is that located near Mr. Barry Downs' desk?
A Mr. Barry Downs' desk is -- he would be -- it would be in the prep room area. So she would be in the front and he would have been in the rear area.
Q And how many people typically work in the area that she volunteered in?
A Probably usually two other persons.
Q Was she ever alone in that area?
A At some point, I'm sure. Yes.
Q Does Watkins, Garrett & Woods sometimes offer notary service to its clients or members of the public?
A Yes, ma'am, we do.
Q Do you require everyone signing the document to be present

before someone at Watkins, Garrett & Woods will notarize?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q Are you familiar with the Moliere family?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q How do you know them?
A We handled the services for their family.
Q Who were those services for?
A Uhm, I can't think of Mr. Moliere's first name, but his -- uhm, man, if you hadn't asked me I would be able to think of it right off. But I'm sorry. We serve many people so sometimes, you know.
Q You said it was a Mr. Moliere, though?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q And as part of this service, does Watkins, Garrett & Woods, did they write an obituary for Mr. Moliere?
A Yes, ma'am, we did.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: May I approach the witness, Your Honor?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): You may.
BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:
Q I'm going to hand you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 9.
A Yes, ma'am.
Q Do you recognize that document?
A Yes. That would have come from my website.
Q What is it?

A It is part of the online obituary.
Q Does Watkins, Garrett & Woods typically write obituaries for its clients as a way to notify the community of a service?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q And where do you get that information from?
A From the family.
Q Was that written by Watkins, Garrett & Woods?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q Was it published online by Watkins, Garrett & Woods?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q Does this appear to be the same document as what was published online to Watkins, Garrett & Woods?
A Yes, it does.
Q Is it altered in any way?
A I wouldn't -- I don't think so, looking at it. No, ma'am.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Your Honor, at this time the State would mover to enter Exhibit 9 into evidence.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I'm objecting to relevance, Judge. And we can approach, if you'd like.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Sure.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

(Off-the-record discussion at sidebar.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): State's 9 is withdrawn?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor.

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:
Q Do you recall when Mr. Moliere's services were held?
A It would have been on the date set, or listed on the information that you showed me. I can't, you know, remember exactly.
Q Do you recall anyone coming into the funeral home before his death to notarize any deeds?
A No, ma'am.
Q Do you recall seeing a funeral service for a relative of Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins?
A Yes. We handled arrangements for her family as well.
Q Who was that relative?
A Uhm, we've had several people over the years in her family, but just like Mr. Moliere, so I wouldn't be able to, you know, name names specifically.
Q Those are all my questions. Please answer any Defense may have.
A Okay.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Any cross?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Mr. Garrett --
A Yes, sir.
Q -- I'm Joe Armstrong. I represent Mr. Sharhonda Jenkins --

A Yes, sir.
Q -- on these charges. Just a couple questions.
A All right.
Q You had indicated that you thought the Defendant worked for you in 2018. Is that right?
A I think around that time. Yeah.
Q Is it possible it could have been 2015?
A Uhm, no. It wouldn't have been 2015, I don't think.
Q Why are you here today? Did you get subpoenaed?
A Yes, I was.
Q Pursuant to that subpoena did you ever meet with the State or any of their investigators?
A Yes, I did.
Q How many times did you meet with them?
A Just once.
Q Okay. Do you recall how that went? Did they tell you when Sharhonda worked there?
A Uhm, no. I'd recall based on that. No.
Q All right. And do you recall if Willie Mae was the wife of Erol?
A Yes, I do remember that.
Q So she held herself out --
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained.
A I don't know if she was the wife. She was --

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Hold on.
A -- put it this way.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Garrett --
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): -- I sustained the State's objection to that last question.
THE WITNESS: All right. Okay.
BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q So would the information put in that Watkins, Garrett would have be gained from the family?
A That's correct.
Q In this situation was Willie Mae maybe the family that gave you all the information? Do you remember?
A She was the next of kin.
Q Do you recall if she was listed as the wife on --
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Objection, Your Honor.
BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q -- his death certificate?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): State your basis.
A I wasn't --
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Relevance.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Armstrong.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I believe it's relevant to the central issues in the case, particularly to the cross-examination of Willie Mae.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Your Honor, we would also object based on pretrial motions.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): I'm going to sustain that objection based on our previous pretrial motions. And we can take that up later if we need to.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor. Well, I have no further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Any redirect?

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Is Barry Downs an employee at Watkins, Garrett & Woods?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q What does he do?

A He's, uhm, for better or worse of a term, we call him kind of a strong boss.

Q What does that mean?

A That means he's -- he's kind of like one of my right hands. He sees to a lot of the other operations in the mortuary outside of the things that I have to, you know, oversee, so from some plant management type of things, making sure that we get, you know, everyone follows out what I would ask them to do as far as making sure folks are dressed properly and things that we have, you know, to do for the funeral services. Those type of things.

Q Is he a notary?

A He is a notary.

Q Does he have a notary stamp?
A Yes, he does.
Q Do you know where he keeps that notary stamp?
A We keep our notary stamps up front in the reception office.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, at this point I'm going to have to object. I'm not quite sure how these questions go to anything that I have cross-examined him about. She's just going on a --
THE COURT (TAYLOR): I sustain the objection.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: -- rollercoaster ride.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No further questions.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Mr. Garrett, you can step down.
THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): You're welcome. Any objection to Mr. Garrett being released from his subpoena?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: None from the State.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Armstrong?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Thank you. All right. State, call your next witness.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, our next witness would be Mr. Downs. I believe he had to pick up a relative at the airport. He was hoping he would be back right now, but we have not seen him quite yet.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Do you have another witness in place of him, in place of Mr. Downs?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. We could probably move on. It might be a slightly lengthier witness, though.

THE BAILIFF: No response in the hallway, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Downs is under subpoena, correct?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. I believe he was going to try to get here at the same time as Mr. Garrett, but he must have been held up.

THE COURT: Can you all approach for just a minute.

(Off-the-record discussion at sidebar.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Members of the jury, I am going to change my idea again. So instead of going until 5:30, I'm going to go ahead and let you go now. We've got some other matters we may need to take up in the time between now and 5:30, but there's no reason for you all to sit back there waiting on us to take care of that.

I will ask you to be back in the jury room tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m., and we'll get started back with the case again.

Remember my previous admonition. You don't know anything. The case hasn't been turned over to you again. We're still taking testimony. So don't discuss it. Don't look it up tonight. Don't tell anybody about anything. When the case is over and when it's done you'll have the time to talk to whoever you'd like to about it, but right now I just strongly admonish

131

you not to have any conversation with anybody. Don't look up anything or don't do any research, or anything like that. Do you understand? All right. Sounds good. We'll see you tomorrow morning at 9:00. Have a good night.

(Jury dismissed for the day at 4:55 p.m.)

MATTER(S) OF LAW

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Mr. Armstrong, on our sidebar we requested that you do a proffer. I know you want to get into some probate matters. The State is objecting to that.

Now that we let the jury go and they're out of the courtroom, I'd ask you to proffer your questions to the Court so we can evaluate that. I'm not saying I'll make a ruling on that tonight. I know that's a big issue for you. Perhaps tomorrow. But go ahead and make your proffer as to what you want to try to get in and why it's relevant.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor. I was going to try to get in the probate court order finding Ms. Willie Mae not to be the wife. I believe it's attached as Exhibit A to my motion this morning, but on the purpose of bias, prejudice, and on truthfulness because she went and opened up a probate estate saying that she was his heir, and then the judge found that, no, you're not his heir; in fact, you testified twice that you agreed you're not his heir.

And that was my purpose for going into that.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Remind me. I think you mentioned

132

earlier that that particular question, you think, the witness may --

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, I believe, when I had spoken with Ms. Willie Mae before she acknowledges that, Yes, we were married at one point, yes, we had a divorce in 1989, never remarried, but during the later parts of his life we basically carried on as if they were married.

I don't think she -- also, I believe the case law is pretty clear that Defense counsel can ask her to try to impeach her to say that, You weren't legally bound to be the heir, were you?

But I don't believe you can, under Rule 608 or any of those rules, really get into extrinsic evidence of a collateral issue. I don't believe you can start admitting all sorts of exhibits. He can ask a question, certainly, You weren't found to be the legal heir, were you?, but I don't think any extrinsic evidence is admissible under Rule 608 and case law on that. And I believe I laid some of that out in our written motion.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Armstrong, do you have any response to that? There's a different standard in the probate court anyway as far as the proof as it relates to that particular document. So the witness -- if you ask a question and the witness admits what you're asking, I don't see any reason why that document should come in.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I understand, Your Honor. I guess the whole purpose I wanted to put it in is that it's for her

untruthfulness or uncandor with the tribune.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Well, given that, we can't predict the future, so we don't know what she's going to say.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, sir.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): So I'll take it under advisement. Since we're starting back at 9:00, are you going to start back with Mr. Downs tomorrow morning then?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: We would ideally like to, but we'll just take whoever we can get here in whatever order we need.

There is one case I'd like to cite based on this. That's *State v. Williams*, 409 S.C. 455. Discussing impeachment on a collateral matter and the admissibility of extrinsic evidence that finds that when a witness denies an act involving a matter collateral to the case in chief the inquiring party is not permitted to introduce contradictory evidence to impeach the witness. Essentially, you just take the answer and you can't go down a rabbit hole of introducing documents collateral to the actual matter in the case.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): I think Mr. Armstrong is trying to say that is -- that is part of what you think the case is.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Let's -- we'll take it up tomorrow when Ms. Moliere actually testifies, and I'll take it under advisement. I'm inclined not to let you get into that, but we'll see how that shakes out in the morning.

134

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. See you at 9:00. Thanks.

(End of Transcript of Record.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Cathy J. Provost, Official Court Reporter for the Fourteenth Judicial Circuit of the State of South Carolina, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete Transcript of Record of the proceedings had and evidence introduced in the trial/proceedings of the captioned case in the Court of General Sessions for Greenville County, South Carolina, on the 11th day of June, 2025.

I do further certify that I am neither of kin, counsel, nor interest to any party hereto.

Date: March 17, 2026

\s\ Cathy J. Provost
Cathy J. Provost, RMR
Official Circuit Reporter

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	) COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
	)
COUNTY OF GREENVILLE	) THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	) NO. 2022-GS-23-3629 and -3631
	)
VS.	)
	) TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD
SHARHONDA NICOLE JENKINS	)
	) Vol. II of III, Pages 135-301

B E F O R E:

THE HONORABLE JESSICA A. SALVINI, JUDGE; THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER D. TAYLOR, JUDGE; AND A JURY

DATE: June 12, 2025
Greenville, South Carolina

A P P E A R A N C E S:

ASHTON TUCK SCOTT, ESQUIRE, ASSISTANT SOLICITOR
ANDREW PRESTON MILLER, ESQUIRE, ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

Attorneys for the State

JOSEPH GARY ARMSTRONG, ESQUIRE

Attorney for the Defendant

Reported by: Cathy J. Provost, RMR, Official Court Reporter

-- P R O C E E D I N G S --

(Indexes contained in Vol. I, dated June 11, 2025.)

(Court is called to order, without the jury.)

MATTER(S) OF LAW

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Armstrong, I considered your request to admit the probate order. After considering that, I'm going to respectfully deny that motion. We are still trying to sort of decipher how this case is going, which direction it may take. So if Ms. Moliere takes the stand, you can cross-examine her as to her truthfulness.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Correct.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: If she denies it, I think you can present that document, you can mark that document as a court exhibit, to try to refresh her memory. But we're not going to admit that as evidence in this case.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor. I finally got my head around which way it was going yesterday.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Is there anything else you want to take up?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No, Your Honor, not at this point. The State has kind of a lengthier argument about the veracity of what happened in probate court and some of the documents behind all of this and where the money went. I believe there's actually a little bit of an investigation into that going on currently. So we were trying to avoid getting into that and turning this into a

giant circus, but if that's going to be excluded I won't get into that argument.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): I thought that's what you wanted. I thought that's what you were asking the Court, to make sure that stays out.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. We just have additional argument to keep it out if --

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yeah. I don't intend to let that in.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, sir.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, I only have one other issue.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sure.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: The State had given me a three-year driver's history for the Defendant, indicating that in 2003 she changed her driver's license -- 2023. I said 2003. In 2023 she changed her driver's license address to the property address here. These are good properties. She's the recipient. I can't see how that's probative of what happened in 2018, so we would move to have that piece of evidence excluded as not being relevant to the issue as to whether a forgery was committed in 2018.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Let me hear from the State.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, the address -- she changed her address at the DMV --

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Tell me what address.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: It's the address of the property in question.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. And we did receive a letter at this point from Mr. Larry Williams, a witness in this case who was also named on the deeds, but basically a blanket assertion of the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination. It's my understanding that you can't assert a blanket right. The question has to be asked first that might incriminate him before he can assert that. I guess we'll address that when he's called.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: And one last time. One last thing. Ms. Willie Mae and Natasha were asking if they were allowed to sit in court. I believe -- I couldn't remember how the Court ruled on whether they are lawful representatives under the Victims' Bill of Rights or not.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): I will allow them to be in the courtroom once they testify.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Once they testify. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Anything else before we bring the jury in?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Please bring in the jury.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 9:06 a.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Good morning. Looks like all the jurors are present, and smiling. Defendant is in the courtroom. So we can begin. I'll recognize the State, and you may call your next witness.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Thank you, Your Honor. The State calls Mr. Barry Downs.

BARRY L. DOWNS,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Downs, just take a seat. Make sure you speak up loud and into the microphone.

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Barry L. Downs.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:

Q Good morning, Mr. Downs. Where do you work?

A Watkins, Garrett & Woods Mortuary.

Q Is that here in Greenville County?

A Yes.

Q And how long have you worked there?

A About 19 year.

Q What is your role there?

A Something like a strong boss. I keep a lot of things going on. Keep the boss man happy.

Q So what are some of your duties and responsibilities?
A Well, most of the time in the morgue. Do funeral pick-up.
Q Where in the funeral home do you typically perform those?
A Ma'am?
Q Where in the funeral home do you typically work?
A What funeral home do I work at?
Q Where in the building?
A Well, in the morgue, up front, in the back. All over, to tell you the truth.
Q Okay. So you aren't someone that sits at a desk all day?
A I'm not at the desk all day.
Q How much time do you spend sitting at a desk?
A At the desk? Maybe about five or ten minute. I come get the paperwork and then go on back to the morgue to the deceased name and get the clothes. I do most of the dressing of the deceased body.
Q Do you ever serve as a notary for clients at Watkins, Garrett & Woods?
A Every now and then. I may do about two a week and when the secretary out for lunch.
Q How long have you been a notary?
A Oh, I'd say about 15 year or more.
Q And how many notary stamps do you have?
A One.
Q Where do you keep that stamp?

A They all belong up front in the desk drawer.
Q Can you describe the layout of that room?
A That room? Well, when you walk in the front door you got like four office on one side, and we keep our stamp in the first office in the left-hand drawer.
Q Does that desk have a lock on it?
A No.
Q Do other people work in that area?
A Uh-huh. We got two secretary work in that area.
Q So anyone in the office can technically get that stamp?
A Uh-huh. All they have to, go in and pull it out.
Q Who do you notarize documents for at Watkins, Garrett & Woods?
A Who do I notarize for?
Q Uh-huh?
A Whoever. People that come in that need a paper notarized.
Q What type of documents do you typically notarize?
A Most of them, most of what I do is people going back to school, like that. That's the most thing.
Q So what kind of documents do they bring in?
A They be from the school, if they decide to get their kid in school, paperwork.
Q Do you notarize documents for clients?
A No.
Q Do you ever notarize property deeds?

A Uh-uh.
Q Would notarizing something like a property deed stand out to you as abnormal?
A No.
Q It wouldn't stand out to you as abnormal even though you never notarized property deeds?
A Uh-uh.
Q Would you ever go to someone's home or hospice to notarize a document?
A No, ma'am.
Q Would you ever notarize a document for someone that's clearly incapacitated or mentally ill?
A No.
Q Would you ever notarize a document for someone with late-stage dementia?
A No.
Q Who serves as witnesses when you have to notarize a document?
A We find somebody in the office that want to, like the secretary.
Q So employees of the funeral home?
A Uh-huh.
Q Do you ever notarize a document without all the parties present?
A Okay. If they need a witness. Some of them don't need no

witness.
Q Would you ever sign -- notarize a document without the appropriate amount of witnesses there?
A No.
Q Do you keep a log of what you notarize?
A Uh-uh.
Q Why not?
A We just notarize, you know, sign it, and give the paper back to them.
Q Okay. Are you familiar with the Defendant, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins?
A I met her through the funeral home.
Q How did you meet her?
A She came in and did some work for the funeral home.
Q Did you know her before she started volunteering at the funeral home?
A No.
Q Do you remember how long she volunteered at the funeral home?
A It wasn't too long. I'd say about a month. Something like that.
Q Can you describe where in the funeral home she volunteered?
A She was at the front desk, the main office.
Q Is that near why you keep your notary stamp?
A Uh-huh.

Q Did you ever authorize her to use your notary stamp?
A No.
Q Did you ever authorize anyone to use your notary stamp?
A Uh-uh.
Q Did you ever notarize any documents for her?
A No.
Q All right. I'm going to show you what's been admitted as State's Exhibit 5 and 6. Do you recognize those documents?
A No, ma'am.
Q Are you able to tell what they are?
A I ain't never seen this before. I don't know none of these people on here either.
Q I'm going put it on the projector so it might be a little easier for everyone to see, and then I'll ask some questions.
THE COURT (SALVINI): It's going to take one second for it to just load. It's warming up.
BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:
Q Have you ever seen this document?
A No, ma'am.
Q Is that your notary seal on the document?
A That's my notary seal.
Q How do you know?
A I just going by the name and the "S" and -- and the --
THE REPORTER: Mr. Downs, speak up for me.
A Oh. I'm going by the seal.

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:
Q Okay. Is this your signature on the document?
A It look like my name.
Q Is it your signature?
A That's my signature, but the "N" and the "S", that not mine.
Q I'm going to try to zoom in so it might be a little easier for you. You said the "N" and the "S" aren't yours?
A Uh-uh.
Q Do you remember signing this?
A No, ma'am.
Q Do you think if you would have signed it you would have remembered?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q Okay. I'm going to show you --
A That's in '23.
Q I'm sorry?
A And that's back in '23.
Q It says the date's from 2018.
A That's, clear up in there in the corner, '23.
Q I'm going to show you the next deed. This is State's Exhibit 6. Have you ever seen this document?
A No, ma'am.
Q Is this your notary seal?
A Yes. Yes, ma'am.
Q Did you notarize this document?

A That there is way off, the name, the last name.
Q I'm sorry?
A The last name is way off.
Q Are you talking about the signature?
A Over the line and everything.
Q Are you talking about the signature?
A Yeah, the last name.
Q Is that your signature?
A That's not. Uh-uh.
Q Earlier you testified that you're frequently away from your desk and that Ms. Jenkins worked in the same area as your desk when she volunteered. Does your desk have our documents with your signature on them?
A No, ma'am.
Q And these are for a specific address. Are you familiar with A Ridgeway Drive in Greenville, South Carolina?
A No, ma'am.
Q Have you ever heard of that address?
A No, ma'am. Uh-uh. Not Ridgeway.
Q This is the second page. Are you familiar with a Darrell Freeman?
A No, ma'am.
Q Are you familiar with a Larry Williams?
A No, ma'am.
Q Are you familiar with Willie Nelson?

A No, ma'am.
Q This last signature is hard to read. Do you know that person?
A No, ma'am. I can't make it out nohow.
Q Are you familiar with Larry Williams?
A No, ma'am.
Q I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 5 one more time. Are you familiar with a Mr. Erol Moliere?
A No, ma'am. And on paper like that, the person have to be in person at the funeral home before we can sign a document like that. We don't sign no paper like that if the person is not there.
Q Who all would have to be here for you to notarize?
A All the people's names on there.
Q Every single name?
A Uh-huh. And none of these not employed at Watkins, Garrett & Woods.
Q I'm sorry?
A I say ain't none of them names employed at Watkins, Garrett & Woods.
Q None of them work at Watkins, Garrett & Woods?
A Uh-uh.
Q Do you know a Willie Mae Moliere?
A No, ma'am.
Q Do you know a Kenya Anson (ph)?

A No, ma'am.
Q Do you know an Amie (ph) Jackson?
A No, ma'am.
Q Did you notarize these deeds?
A No, ma'am.
Q No further questions. Please answer any questions the Defense may have.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Cross-examine?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Hey, Mr. Downs, I'm Joe Armstrong. We met? Have we met before?
A We did?
Q Did we?
A No, sir. I don't remember you.
Q I don't think so. I just wondered if you had met me before.
A No. I never met you.
Q You're here today. Are you under subpoena to be here?
A They called me to be mere.
Q They called you to be here?
A Uh-huh.
Q Okay. Who's they?
A The two young lady. The one that I got do the talking to.
Q Okay. And did they tell you why they wanted you to be here?
A They said I needed to be here about the notarizing paper.

Q About the notarizing paper?
A Uh-huh.
Q Okay. And your testimony was a little bit confusing as to what was your notary and what -- did they give you these documents and say, Is that your signature or not?
A Yeah, they give them to me.
Q Okay. Did you talk to anybody else from the State of South Carolina about whether that was your signature?
A No.
Q No?
A No.
Q Did you talk to an expert or anybody?
A No.
Q Now, you say you do know the Defendant?
A I met her through the funeral room --
Q Through the funeral home.
A -- when she came and did a little work.
Q Do you remember about when that was?
A It been so long I can't remember.
Q Could it have been 2015?
A I can't remember what year she came there. Like I said, I don't hang around at the front, around the front. I'm mostly in the back.
Q So don't you know? You can't remember?
A I can't remember the year that she came there.

Q Did your notary seal ever get stolen?
A Not from my acknowledgment. No.
Q Okay.
A Anybody can walk in there and look in the desk drawer.
Q Did you ever see the Defendant take your notary seal?
A No.
Q Okay.
A Like I said, I don't be up front all the time.
Q Is it your position that she took the seal but you never saw her take it?
A No, I ain't never saw her take it. I'm not up front at the desk all the time.
Q And you're not aware of your seal ever been missing?
A No.
Q Okay. Have you ever reported your seal missing to the state?
A No. Anybody that come in there knew I put it back in the same drawer.
Q How often did you meet with prosecutors in the case?
A How often? This is my second time seeing them.
Q Sir?
A My second time.
Q This is your second -- this is your second time?
A Uh-huh.
Q Okay.

A We talked one time before.
Q Did you have occasion to go down to the Greenville County Sheriff's Office in March of 2021?
A Yeah. I met with some man down there.
Q Okay. And did you give them a statement?
A A what?
Q A statement.
A Uh-uh.
Q You didn't sign a statement for them?
A I can't remember.
Q Why did you go down there?
A They told me to come down there and write my name 15 time --
Q Okay.
A -- fifteen -- 15 or 20 time.
Q Who's they?
A It was a solicitor down at the sheriff's office.
Q One of the prosecutors.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Any redirect?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Thank you. Mr. Downs, you can step down. Thank you. The State can call its next witness.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: The State calls Willie Mae Moliere. Your Honor, can Mr. Downs be excused from his subpoena?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. He is excused. Thank you.

WILLIE MAE MOLIERE,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please say your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Willie Mae Moliere.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Ms. Moliere, where are you from?

A Greenville, South Carolina.

Q Have you lived in Greenville your whole life?

A Uh-uh. I went to school in Brooklyn, New York, for 10 years.

Q When did you live in New York?

A Uhm, uhm, uhm, from probably '77 -- '76 until 1980. I mean -- no. Yeah. Not -- no. I don't know. There's so much going on.

Q If you can't remember exactly, just a rough estimate is fine.

A Natasha was born in '80, so we stayed there like 1980. So it would be '70, '68. Somewhere along there. I don't know.

Q Well, were you living in New York when your daughter, Natasha, was born?

A Oh. Yes. Natasha was born in Brooklyn.

Q What year was she born?
A 1980.
Q And how long after she was born did you move back to Greenville?
A Uhm, she wasn't even quite -- when we moved back to Greenville she wasn't quite a year old.
Q And when you say "we" who are you talking about?
A Erol and I. I came first, and then Erol came later on.
Q And when did you meet Erol?
A Probably like 1972 or something like that.
Q And where did you all meet?
A Well, I was going to college in New York, and Erol was going to college for an EKG technician, and his cousin that was from Haiti introduced us.
Q And where was that, in New York?
A In Brooklyn.
Q After you finished school what did you do for work?
A While I was still in school I worked at DJJ. Then when I came to Greenville I worked for Greenville County DSS. And after that I worked for Piedmont Skills. And my last job was with SHARE Head Start as a family advocate.
Q And are you now retired?
A Yes, I am.
Q What did Erol do for work?
A Well, when he was in New York he was working as an EKG

technician. And then when he came to South Carolina he was working at Claussen (ph), used to be Claussen's Bakery. And then after that he was just working on his own, like purchasing houses and selling them.

Q At some point did you and Erol get married?

A Yes.

Q Do you remember when that was?

A We got married in New York, so that was, I'd say, around '76 or something like that.

Q So at some point did you and Erol's relationship take a bit of a downturn?

A Yes.

Q At one point did you actually file for divorce?

A Because of a situation, yes.

Q And do you remember approximately when that was?

A Uhm --

Q Even if it's just like --

A About, I would say, around 1980. Cause Natasha was born. I would say about '85, '86, something like that.

Q Did you ever, after you filed for divorce, did you ever rekindle the relationship?

A Yes, I did. There was a lot of things going on, and there were comments. Erol got sick and people was taking advantage of him. I started taking care of him, and he came over, and it went from there.

Q When would you estimate that you started taking care of him? So a rough estimate's fine. I know it's tough to remember.
A I would say about '85 or '86, something like that, kind of.
Q During that time between the divorce being filed and rekindling your relationship, did you keep in touch with Erol?
A Yeah. He would come back on occasion to see Tasha.
Q And I know we may have jumped ahead a little bit, but who is Tasha?
A Our daughter, Natasha.
Q And is Natasha you and Erol's daughter?
A Yes.
Q Is she the only child of you and Erol?
A Yes.
Q At what point -- or, did you start to notice some health issues with Mr. Moliere?
A Yes.
Q Do you know when you started to notice those?
A Somewhere along 2015, 2016, or something like that.
Q And what health issues was he having?
A He was starting the stages of dementia, and then he had some other situations like hallucinations and some other stuff like that. And so those were the main things. And people would call me and I would go over there, and he would calm down.
Q Was Mr. Moliere, when you were taking care of him, ever hospitalized?

A On numerous times. Yes.
Q When he was hospitalized did you go with him to the hospital or check on him?
A No. They would take him by ambulance or whatever, and you don't go where he was.
Q Did Mr. Moliere have any other caregivers during this time?
A He was with different agencies. And then they put him up on the hospice.
Q Was any other family helping take care of Erol during this time?
A Tasha would. And then sometimes I would pay different people, when I was trying to work, pay different people to take care of him.
Q Where was Erol at the time of his passing?
A He was at [redacted] South Estate Drive.
Q And what is that address? What is that address? Whose residence is that?
A Well, it was both of ours, both of us staying there. It's over in Belle Meade. I think they call it the Bell Meade section.
Q And did you say, was he in hospice care at that time?
A Yeah. When his situation got worse they put him in hospice. I mean, you know, he was on hospice but he was still at home.
Q Do you know about when he was placed on hospice care?
A I ...

Q Or just a rough estimate of how long before he passed away that was?
A He died 2018, so I would say like maybe '82 or something along in there, '85. He died in 2018, so I would say like 2015 or something like that, or maybe before.
Q Had his condition been deteriorating for a number of years by 2018?
A His starting out slowly, but then he started getting worse. His went -- as I was told, his went faster than usual because he went from stage a 2 to 4 in six or eight months or so.
Q As you visited him in the hospital did you discuss his conditions with doctors and such?
A Well, when I first went I told them what the situations were, and they were telling me some different recommendations and stuff like that.
Q By the time 2018 rolled around what were Erol's abilities like in a day-to-day life? What was he able to do for himself?
A Are you talking about 2018?
Q In 2018.
A Well, he started deteriorating, because he would like call me different names, and he wasn't recognizing a lot of people. And that's when they were saying that his condition was getting worse.
Q And a couple years before that was a power of attorney appointed to help him with his business?

A I was. Yes.
Q By the time 2018 rolled around was Erol -- well, let's take a step back. Did Erol ever purchase a property?
A He purchased numerous properties.
Q What did he do with these properties?
A He would fix them up. And then he only rented out a couple of them, and then he would start renting them out. Then when his condition got worse, that's when Natasha and I would went to try to take care of that.
Q How would he pay for these properties?
A How did he pay for them?
Q Yes.
A Out of his account. Out of the account.
Q Do you know the Defendant -- prior to all this, did you know the Defendant, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins?
A Well, how it all started, the guy she was talking to kept calling me to rent the property. And I didn't know anything about her, Sharhonda.
Q Okay. Who's the guy you're talking about?
A Chad Chapman. I think his last name is Chapman.
Q And do you know which property you're talking about?
A [redacted] South Estate Drive.
Q And did you ever meet the Defendant, or did they, in fact, rent [redacted] South Estate Drive?
A Well, Chad was renting the place. Like I said, when I

rented to Chad I didn't know anything about Ms. Jenkins. It was just Chad. So it was him, and I think his sons came back and stuff like that, but it was never a mention of her. I signed the contract with Chad. Her name was not on the application.

Q Are you aware if there was ever a deal to sell F South Estate Drive?

A We had discussed that. And then with Erol's condition, I said, well, we getting ready to turn this over to an agent. We turned it to Hugh Tinsley. And I let her know. And she was in the process of wanting to buy it, so I explained to her about what was going on with Mr. Tinsley, and so -- and it was -- I told her he was going to be coming and collecting the rent, et cetera.

Q Did you all ever -- did you ever sign any paperwork with Mr. Chapman or the Defendant regarding selling this property?

A I think in the past something -- about selling the property?

Q Yes.

A Are you talking about F ?

Q Yes.

A Well, I sold it to this other guy. I forget the name of the company. But I let them know that that they were taking, that Hugh Tinsley was taking over, and the other thing. I gave them the information.

Q By the time you sold F South Estate Drive what was Erol's abilities like to conduct business?

A He couldn't, not to the extent he was in the past.
Q Was he able to sign documents?
A Toward the end? No. He couldn't even hold a pen, and he couldn't even make an X.
BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:
Q I'm going to show you what's been previously admitted as State's Exhibit 3, if you don't mind. I'll put it up on that screen for you, ma'am. The one right there next to you.
A Oh, okay.
Q Ms. Moliere, this document has already been admitted.
A Okay.
Q And is this -- as we see here, is this the deed where you sold [redacted] South Estate Drive?
A Yes.
Q And do you recall -- and it looks like there were a number other properties included in the same deal. Is that correct?
A Yes.
Q Looks like three properties total; is that correct?
A Yes.
Q And do you remember how much was paid for those three properties?
A They combined them. They combined the three to make it come to the total 110.
Q And is that, the amount listed on the deed, is that correct --

A Yes.
Q -- $110,000?
A Yes.
Q And on this one, when F South Estate Drive was sold, is this, in fact, your signature as power of attorney for Mr. Moliere?
A Yes.
Q Did Erol Moliere sign this document?
A No. The guy told me since he wasn't able to sign it I had permission to sign it. The attorney.
Q Now, when you say the told you --
A The attorney.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Objection. Hearsay.
A What did you say?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, it's not for the truth of the matter asserted. It's a command. "He told me to sign."
A I mean an attorney.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Wait a minute, please, Ms. Moliere. I'll allow it.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q And when you're saying the guy told you to sign it, was this because --
A He said I could sign for him since Erol wasn't able to sign for himself.
Q And was the folks at this law firm that prepared this deed?

A Yes.
Q And this was executed on April 6th of 2018; is that correct?
A Uh-huh.
Q Ms. Moliere, before all this happened did you know a Darrell Freeman?
A No.
Q Did you know a Larry Williams?
A No.
Q Did you ever sell a property to a Darrell Freeman?
A No.
Q Prior to Erol Moliere's death did you ever sell A Ridgeway Drive?
A No. A Ridgeway was not -- we had put that in the thing for the property to sell that was confiscated.
Q Ms. Moliere, I'm showing you what's been previously admitted as State's Exhibit 5. Now, as this quitclaim deed states, it was purportedly executed on June 28th, 2018. Did you sign this document?
A No, because I don't sign my name like that.
Q Did Mr. Moliere sign this document?
A No, he did not.
Q Did you ever meet Darrell Freeman?
A No, I did not. I don't even know him. The first time I met him was when they had arrested him for the situation like that. That was my first time seeing him.

Q Do you know who either of these people are?
A I don't know any of those people.
Q Do you know Mr. Barry Downs?
A No. I don't know him. I don't know any of those people. Kenya, Amie -- I don't know any of them.
Q And as this deed states, how much was purportedly paid for A Ridgeway Drive?
A 2,500.
Q Would you have sold A Ridgeway Drive to anyone for $2,500?
A No, because we put 12,000 more money into that house to renovate it.
Q So you say you put $12,000 into it?
A I'm just estimating, but we did a lot of work at that house, at A Ridgeway.
Q So you estimate about $12,000 in renovations were done? Is that what you said?
A Yeah, you know, to bring it up to par.
Q And do you recall how much Erol Moliere paid for that property originally?
A I can't recall because there's so many, and I can't remember.
Q I'll show you what's previously been admitted as State's Exhibit 1. This was established as the deed that was originally paid for that property. How much did Erol Moliere pay for A Ridgeway Drive?

A 28,000.
Q So putting those together, and you Mr. Moliere would have had about $40,000 invested in A Ridgeway Drive, correct?
A Yes. Yes.
Q Would you have given a property to Mr. Darrell Freeman?
A I didn't know him at the time, and I don't think so. I don't even -- I didn't even know him.
Q At the time this all occurred do you know if a tenant was residing at A Ridgeway Drive?
A She was. Somebody from the housing authority was renting it.
Q Do you know how much money in rent that property was making per month? If you don't recall, it's okay.
A I can't remember, because there was like three other or four other's we was collecting from. So I don't know if it was 600-and-some. I don't have the paperwork because I turned it over to Hugh Tinsley.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: To whom? I couldn't understand what name she said.
THE WITNESS: What did he say?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Repeat the last name you just said, you sold it.
THE WITNESS: I said at the time I had turned all the rental property to Hugh Tinsley. They were the ones who were collecting the rent.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Okay.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q At what point did you realize there was an issue with the deed to A Ridgeway Drive?
A Well, when I went to pay the taxes on it. Then when I went to pay the taxes, I was told that my name wasn't on it and it had other people's names on it I didn't know. And that's when I went to see the white-collar police officer.
Q Do you recall when that was, roughly?
A It was, it was, I'm going to say, '18, 2018.
Q And are you in any way related to the Defendant, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins, to your knowledge?
A No.
Q When Mr. Moliere passed away who arranged his funeral?
A I did.
Q And who paid for that?
A I did out of the account.
Q And what account are you referencing?
A The one that we put the funds in when we collected rent.
Q And were both of your names on that account?
A Yes.
Q No further questions at this point. Please answer any Defense may have.
A Okay.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Any cross-examination?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q Hi, Ms. Moliere.

A Hi.

Q Have we met before?

A We met many times. Yes.

Q When Erol was sick in the 'teens (ph) did he ever spend any time in a facility in Anderson?

A Yes, he did.

Q Do you remember what the name of that facility was?

A I can't remember the exact name.

Q Could it be Patrick B. Harris?

A Yes. I think that's the name of it. Because he went to different, many places. That might be the one in Anderson County.

Q And what was he in that facility for?

A Well, he was having some issues, like he would get kind of violent, and he was doing all kinds of -- and having hallucinations, and stuff like that.

Q Okay. Let me show you what's been marked as State's Exhibit No. 2 and ask you if you've ever seen that.

A I've seen this before.

Q Now, this has already been admitted into evidence. Let's see if my technology works. So this is the general power of

attorney that the State --

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Armstrong, just a minute. I'm sorry. We're trying to get that broadcast.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Oh, it's not on? Did I turn it on? Okay.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Thank you.

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q On the screen here, on page 2 it says June 18th, 2014. Now, this is the power of attorney from Erol to you. Is that correct?

A Yes. Yes.

Q So you had a power of attorney in 2014. And it says 130 Highway 252 in Anderson. Did he own any houses in Anderson or anything like that?

A Uh-huh.

Q So it would have been the facility that you were discussing earlier. He was in the facility when he signed this power of attorney. Is that correct?

A Yes, he was.

Q Now, the properties for Mr. Erol, did you ever have any tax issues with them?

A Have any tax issues? That's what I said earlier. When I went to pay the tax on the property it was already in somebody else's name.

Q Did the taxes get behind on the property?

A Uhm, no. I was going to -- at one point in time they did,

but then that's when I went to pay the taxes, and they said it was in someone else's name.

Q Do you know if there were tax liens from Greenville County filed against the property?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. I believe we're talking about properties not related to the

A Ridgeway Drive here.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Say that again. I'm sorry.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: He's asking about tax liens on other properties that I don't believe have anything to do with the property in question in this case.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): I'll let it go for just a bit, but keep it -- Mr. Armstrong, try to could keep it focused in on --

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I will, Your Honor.

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q Part of your duties under your power of attorney, were they to pay taxes?

A As I said, when I went to pay the taxes before they then said I couldn't pay them because they was already paid from someone else. Now, I understand it is my duty. And I said earlier, that was my plan, to pay the taxes.

Q So part of your plan was to pay the taxes. Would you know if there was a lien on the property?

A No. When they sent papers out, yes.

Q Do you know or did ever you have any discussion about

Greenville County having tax liens?
A Did I have any discussion with whom?
Q Anybody.
A I went and talked to the people there. Then, as I said, when I went down to pay them, that's when I was told that somebody else's name was on the thing.
Q I'm just trying to find out if you knew if there was a tax lien on the property.
A And as I said earlier, when I found out -- you asked me the same question again and again. I went to pay the taxes on the property, and they had some other people's name on it that I didn't even know. And they told me if I paid the taxes they would go toward the person's name that was on the paper.
Q Do you know how long the liens were on there?
A When I found them, I went down to pay the taxes again, and that's whey they to told me -- and I had the money to pay them, and they said somebody else's name was on them.
Q Did you have occasion to go down and talk to the Greenville County Police Department or Greenville County Sheriff's Office regarding this property?
A Yes. When I noticed the names that were on the documents that was not mine I went and told them about it.
Q Okay. And when you went down there did you tell them that you were the deceased --
A At the time Erol was not -- I'm trying to -- Erol was still

alive when we got -- he died -- and I had told them ... I don't remember, but I had went and paid the taxes, and I told them what needs -- I'm trying to think. When I went down there, Erol was still alive when I found out that somebody had put their names on that that was not Erol.

Q So it's your testimony that you went down when Erol was alive?

A Yeah. Well, Erol was still alive in 2018, at the early part of '18 --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- and that's when I found out about some names on there I didn't even know.

Q Okay.

A And that's when I went to the police.

Q Uh-huh.

A And then again when I went later, that's when Erol had died, and I said Erol couldn't have signed these papers because Erol was not even living.

Q Did you tell them that you were divorced from Erol?

A At once upon a time I -- I don't know. I may have.

Q Or did you tell them that you were his widow?

A At the time I was -- I think. I don't know. But I went and told -- I think I did say -- I don't know. But I went and told them -- I think I did say, in fact, I said we were doing a reconciliation, and I was with him. I may have said, I probably

said wife, but at the time we had been living -- you know -- I don't know.
Q So is the answer yes, you represented yourself to the Greenville County Sheriff's Office as the widow of the deceased, Erol Moliere?
A I said I was his widow at the time. I was his wife, acting as his wife, because we had started back together. But, you know. So I don't know whatever the -- I don't know.
Q Is that a yes?
A Okay. You're telling me as far as Erol's wife?
Q That you were the widow of him, you were legally married to him, when he died. And that's not true, is it?
A We were living -- I don't know you can answer that when we was still making, having a reconciliation. And I told the lady at Social Security that, too.
Q Okay. Let's assume you were making a reconciliation. My question is simply did you make that representation to the sheriff that got all this snowball rolling downhill, why we ended up here today?
A It's not a snowball. Those things was done illegally. I didn't sign any of those papers. I told you earlier I did not sign those papers.
Q Okay. Do you know who did?
A No. As I told you, I don't know those people. When he showed the paper I didn't know any of those people.

Q Did you see the Defendant sign it?
A I don't have to see him sign it. All I know is when the guy came over there, he was saying something and mentioned her name.
Q So, no, you didn't see the Defendant sign?
A No. I didn't. Like I said, I wasn't there at the time.
Q Did anybody tell you the Defendant signed it?
A Well, when the lady came to my house and the guy was doing some work, had said she had sent her over there because --
Q Okay. I don't want to know what somebody said to you. I asked you if anyone informed you that she signed that deed.
A Well, on my phone I think it was her sister signed a paper, and it had on there to tell Ms. Moliere that --
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Objection, Your Honor. We're getting into some hearsay here.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I agree. The Court's indulgence, Your Honor.
BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Now, on this property, on A Ridgeway, was the Greenville Housing Authority involved with that property?
A Yes, they was.
Q Okay. Do you know if there was any investigation related to this property by Greenville Housing Authority?
A They was one of the ones that were on the list that had been -- somebody else had put their names on.

Q Do you know what the result of that investigation was?
A Well, this is the investigation that's been going on since 2018.
Q Okay. Do you know -- I mean, did you quit receiving rentals back then?
A Yes, I did, from the housing authority.
Q From the housing authority. What, did the housing authority make the determination that someone else owned it?
A I don't know. I really don't know how that took place, but I took the paperwork down in front of them, published a copy that it was someone else had signed the deed that I didn't sign.
Q Do you know Ms. Jasenda Barton?
A Who?
Q Jasenda Barton.
A Are you talking about the tenant? I don't know.
Q Yes, ma'am. I'm talking about the tenant.
A Yeah, she was there. But, as I said, I don't know when she moved out.
Q Did you have her sign a lease for the property?
A Yes. She did sign a lease.
Q Okay. Well, how did the lease say to make things payable?
A What did you say? I couldn't hear you.
Q How was she supposed to pay the rent, who to?
A It was listed as the Moliere property at the bank, at Wells Fargo Bank.

Q Could you have possibly listed your name also, Willie Mae or Moliere Properties?
A No. On the thing, it had both our names, Erol and my name. And the housing authority knew about it.
Q Yes, ma'am. Ultimately did Jasenda move out? Do you know?
A As I said, I don't know when she moved out because the next thing I know Sharhonda was over there in that house. And so I don't what all took place. There was other stuff going on at the time.
Q Okay. I'm not sure what you mean by "other stuff".
A I was trying to get the deeds situated with Erol dying and some other things that had taken place. And again, I didn't know Sharhonda had moved in until later on, and as far as I knew the tenant was still there.
Q Do you know U A Thompson?
A Who?
Q U A Thompson.
A He had called me at one point in time.
Q Okay. He did?
A And he was telling me he had some issues with Ms. Jenkins, too.
Q Okay. Is this before or after you went to the Greenville County Sheriff's Office and filed your report?
A Might have been that same period, or before. I don't know.
Q Did he accompany you --

A No, he did not.
Q -- to the sheriff's office?
A No, he did not.
Q Did you discuss what you were going to tell the police with him?
A We went over a lot of things. He was telling me things, the problems he had had with her, and so different things like that.
Q Did you discuss with him this piece of property, A Ridgeway?
A He already knew about that. Like I said, he knew about it. Like I said, we were talking about a lot, numerous things.
Q He already knew about it?
A We were talking about numerous things about the property and things like that. But as far as talking about how -- he had told me about Ms. Jenkins and how she was trying to get him to evict me and some other stuff, he was saying, so I don't know. I didn't even know what was going on at the time until he told me.
Q Okay. But you did discuss this piece of property with him before you went --
A No, I did not.
Q -- to the sheriff's department?
A When I discovered what was going on with the property I went to the sheriff. And in between that I had seen -- but it was, like I said, different things were going on. But he's the one who told me that she had paid him to do something to me to get me evicted.

Q That he was managing the property. Were you in this property then?
A I was in a property. Yes.
Q Not --
A I wasn't --
Q You weren't in A Ridgeway?
A I was in A Ridgeway for a while. Then I moved. And that's when the other tenant moved in there.
Q Jasenda?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Could that have been in 2020 maybe?
A No. She was in -- she was in there when Erol was still alive. And then as far as ...
Q So you think she -- was she in there before or after, or both? Do you recall? Do you recall?
A If she was in there before or after Erol died? Mr. Thompson? That's what you're asking me, right?
Q Jasenda Barton --
A Yes.
Q -- was she leasing the property prior to Erol's death?
A Uh, yes, she was. Yeah. And then we moved in there temporary, and then moved over to Ridgeway. I mean, not Ridgeway, South Estate Drive.
Q All right. And did she move in --
A I don't --

Q -- again to the property?
A Like I said, I don't know when she -- I didn't know when she moved out and then Sharhonda moved in there. It was like, I had told the housing authority about it. So I don't know if they let her move. I don't know because I didn't even know she was staying over there until after.
Q Okay. That's all the questions I have. Thank you, ma'am.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any redirect?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Briefly, Your Honor. But I may want to approach quickly, if I may.
(Off-the-record discussion at sidebar.)

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Ms. Moliere, is it sometimes difficult for you to remember exact dates as to when things happened?
A Pinpoint exactly, you know, it might be hard because so much has happened in between that time.
Q Whose names were on the Moliere Properties account?
A Mine and Erol.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No further questions, Your Honor.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Nothing further.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Thank you, Ms. Moliere. You can step down. Do you have another short witness, or?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I'm not sure how short he will be. Also, our next witness may need a little help getting in here.

He is wheelchair bound.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Let's take a 15-minute break, bathroom break, and we can get things situated in the courtroom. Okay. Again, when you retire to your jury room don't discuss the case. There's nothing for you to talk about at this point. We'll be back at 10:25.

(Jury exits the courtroom at 10:10 a.m.)

(Court recesses at 10:25 a.m. and reconvenes at 10:24 a.m., without the jury.)

MATTER(S) OF LAW

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, I've been made aware of one issue with one of our other witnesses. It is the individual that dropped off a piece of paper at our office either last night or this morning stating he was asserting the Fifth Amendment privilege in blanket form.

Our office apparently received a call from someone claiming to be his son who did not leave a call-back number or name stating that he's in the hospital today and will not be here.

He is guess under subpoena, but we don't know -- he's not here, and we don't know anything about the validity or lack therefore, or any of that.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): They didn't say which hospital?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I ...

DEPUTY SOLICITOR McCALL: I don't believe so. Your Honor, Brittany McCall on behalf of the solicitor's office. I received

the information on behalf of our secretary. I will confirm with her, but I don't believe so. I think the only information she got was that it was his son calling on behalf of him, stating that he was in the hospital and that if he got more information he would apprise us of that. But that was all the information we had.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Thank you. All right. We'll go ahead with Mr. Freeman. And once this concludes, we'll have to take a lunch break in a little bit, so we won't close, or have you close, until we make sure what your situation is.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, sir. I just wanted to make the Court aware of the developing situation.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sure. Thank you. All right. Anything else before we bring the jury back in?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Please bring in the jury.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 10:27 a.m.)

THE COURT: We are -- all members of the jury, are present. The Defendant is present. So, State, you can call your next witness.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. The State calls Mr. Darrell Freeman.

///

///

DARRELL FREEMAN,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Mr. Freeman, how old are you?

A Fifty-six.

Q Where do you currently reside?

A In a nursing home.

Q What happened that put you in that nursing home?

THE COURT (SALVINI): Give me one second. Let's see if we can turn this mic up. It's really, really -- you're very soft-spoken, sir, so let's see if we can't get this mic to really pick up your voice. Thank you.

(Off-the-record discussion concerning courtroom technology.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Members of the jury, until we figure out the electronic situation, I'm going to send you back to your jury room. Again, don't begin deliberate. Normally I send you back, tell you to come back in 10 minutes, 15 minutes. We just don't know how long it may take. So we'll be diligently working on it, but I think it would be better for you all to be in the back while we get this straightened out. Okay. Again, don't discuss the case. And we'll call you back soon. Thank you.

(Jury escorted out of the courtroom at 10:35 a.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): The jury is out of the courtroom.

(Pause in the proceedings.)
(Proceedings were moved to another courtroom.)
(State's Exhibits 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 are premarked for identification.)
(Jury enters the courtroom at 11:02 a.m.)
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. We are trying to keep you on your toes, so we're in a new courtroom. I think we're ready. The audio and everything should be -- a little bit more distance in this courtroom, but the audio and stuff is working like I think it should. So the jury's present in the courtroom. The Defendant's present. I'll recognize the State.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you Your Honor.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Mr. Freeman, we'll start over now that we have working microphones. Mr. Freeman, how old are you?
A Fifty-six.
Q And where do you currently reside?
A I don't know. It's at an apartment. I don't know the name. I can't tell you the name of it.
Q What sort of apartment is it? What type of apartment do you live in?
A Right now I'm in the nursing home.
Q And what happened that put you in that nursing home?
A I just passed out, I guess. I just woke up and I was in a nursing home, so I don't know.

Q And prior to all of this, around the time of 2018 did you have other health issues?
A I have diabetes.
Q And has that diabetes ever caused you any serious issues that you recall?
A Not that I recall.
Q Are you related to the Defendant, Ms. Jenkins?
A That is my niece.
Q That's your niece. Are you related to Mr. Larry Williams?
A My stepfather.
Q Your stepfather. Do you know Mr. Erol Moliere?
A No.
Q Have you ever met someone named Erol Moliere?
A No.
Q Did you ever buy a property from someone named Erol Moliere?
A No. I don't know him.
Q Do you know a Ms. Willie Mae Moliere?
A No. I think she was in the courtroom when they first arrested me, but I don't know her.
Q Prior to any of this happening in courtrooms had you ever met her?
A No.
Q Do you know a Barry Downs?
A No.
Q Did you, in 2018, ever purchase a property?

A No.
Q Did you ever own a property at A Ridgeway Drive?
A I don't even know where that is.
Q I'm going to show you what's been already admitted as State's Exhibit 5. Sice we don't have a way to show it to you on the screens, I'll just say that this is a quitclaim deed executed in June of 2018.
THE COURT (SALVINI): Mr. Miller, we have the ability to -- the IT checked all this. If you want to put it on the screen -- oh, since he doesn't have a screen in front of him. Okay.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I don't believe he'll be able to see the screen.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Mr. Freeman, do you recognize this document?
A No, not really.
Q You said "not really." Have you ever seen it before?
A Not that I know of.
Q Not that you know of. Okay. This document purports that you paid Mr. Moliere $2,500 for a property at A Ridgeway Drive. Did you ever do that?
A No.
Q I'm going to show you what's been previously admitted as State's Exhibit 6. It's a quitclaim deed from December 2019 regarding that same property and a transfer to Larry Williams. Mr. Freeman, do you recognize this document? You can take a

minute to flip through the pages, if you would like.
A I don't remember.
Q This document states that Larry Williams paid you $4,553.49 for the property at A Ridgeway Drive. Did that happen?
A No.
Q Mr. Freeman, I know your memory's tough but, on October 10th, 2018, did you go to County Square?
A I went to County Square, but I don't remember the dates.
Q Around that time why did you go to County Square?
A I thought I paid the money on something, but I can't remember what it was. It was like ... I can't -- I don't remember.
Q Do you recall giving an interview with Investigator Turner, seated right here, on February 26 of 2021?
A At the nursing home?
Q No, sir. This would have been at Law Enforcement Center on McGee Street.
A I don't really remember stuff that's really far back.
Q If I showed you a picture from that day might it help refresh your memory?
A I don't even remember that. I remember going up there, though.
Q You do remember going up there?
A (Nods head.)
Q Okay. Do you remember going up to the Law Enforcement

Center, or you remember going --
A The Law Enforcement Center.
Q Oh, the sheriff's office?
A It's the same thing, ain't it?
Q Yes, sir. Do you remember going up there?
A To record. Yeah, to the sheriff thing.
Q Okay. And on that date did you give an interview to law enforcement, or did you speak with somebody for a while?
A Yeah. I don't remember who.
Q Okay.
A I didn't get no, what's their name.
Q During that -- do you know if they asked you the same question that I just asked you a second ago, about going to County Square?
A What about it?
Q Do you recall if they asked you about that that day when you went up there to Law Enforcement Center?
A No.
Q If I showed you a transcript of the time you were asked about that might it help you remember?
A I mean, it could. I don't know.
Q Okay. Mr. Freeman, if you want to read to yourself quietly this portion right here marked 5 minute and 50 seconds to 6 minutes and 20 seconds.
Do you recall how you answered the investigator when he

asked about you going to County Square?
A Yeah. I thought it was property -- I mean, I paid cash money, so I thought it was property tax.
Q So you thought it was property taxes?
A That's what -- I think that's what it was.
Q And were these, what you thought were property taxes, were they your own property taxes or was this for somebody else?
A It was for somebody else.
Q And who was that somebody else?
A My niece.
Q Your niece. And is your niece the Defendant, Ms. Jenkins?
A Sharhonda.
Q Do you recall why you went up there for her and she didn't go herself?
A I think -- I can't even remember that far back, but ... I can't even remember the reason.
Q Okay. That same interview we just talked about, do you recall the investigator asking you that same question that I just asked you?
A No.
Q If I showed you a transcript of when he asked that you question, might it help you remember?
A (Nods head.)
Q Mr. Freeman, if you want to read the portion marked 6:38 to 7:06 just to yourself quietly.

A Right here?
Q Right here. Yes, sir.
A I don't, really, but I kind of remember.
Q Okay. What did you tell the investigator that day about why you went up there instead of Ms. Jenkins?
A That she wasn't able to or something because -- I don't remember the exact reason.
Q Did she promise you anything?
A To my knowledge, no. I don't remember that.
Q In the interview of the transcript I just showed you, do you recall the investigator asking if she promised you anything?
A No.
Q If I showed you that transcript, might it help you remember?
A If I looked at it, it probably would. I don't remember.
Q It's the last two lines of this paragraph right here.
A I don't remember that conversation, period.
Q Okay.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point the State would request permission to confront the witness with that portion of the statement that he says he does not remember as a --
THE COURT (TAYLOR): He looked at the transcript. I think you're stuck with the answer he gave you.
THE WITNESS: Excuse me?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): No, sir. He was asking me a question.

THE WITNESS: Oh.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Don't. I'm sorry.

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Just to clarify, have you ever purchased any property?

A No.

Q Have you ever owned property?

A No.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Beg the Court's indulgence.

Q No further questions at this point. Please answer any the Defense may have.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Thank you. Mr. Armstrong?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please the Court.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q Hey, Mr. Freeman. Have we ever met before?

A No.

Q I'm the attorney that represents your niece, Sharhonda. Okay. I'm just going to ask you just a couple questions. This condition that you currently have, is it hard for you to remember things?

A I guess. They said it was, like ...

Q The State said it was, that table over there?

A I mean -- I don't know the ...

Q Okay. Do you understand that we're here in the trial of a

criminal case against Sharhonda?
A Yeah. I mean, I -- yeah.
Q Okay.
A I guess.
Q You're being called as a witness in the case. Do you understand that?
A (Nods head.)
Q Is that a yes; yes, sir?
A Yes. Yes, sir.
Q What do you remember about going down to the sheriff's office? Did you go down there --
A Yeah.
Q -- go ahead.
A I saw myself on TV.
Q You saw yourself on TV?
A Yeah. I was at work, and then people called me and told me I was on TV.
Q Okay. And did you go down there with anybody?
A My niece. My other niece.
Q Your other niece. Do you remember her name?
A Brittaney and Kendall.
Q Did you know a man named U A Thompson?
A (Shakes head.)
Q You don't know a man named U A Thompson? Okay. You never talked to him?

A I don't know him.
Q Okay.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any redirect?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No redirect, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Freeman.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, the State would ask if Mr. Freeman can be excused from his subpoena in the case.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Mr. Freeman, you're excused.
The State can call its next witness.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Thank you, Your Honor. The State calls Natasha Moliere.

NATASHA MOLIERE,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.
THE WITNESS: Natasha Moliere.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:
Q Good morning, Ms. Moliere.
A Good morning.
Q Where do you live?

A [redacted] Greenwood Lane, Greenville, South Carolina.
Q Is that here in Greenville County?
A Yes. It's Greenville, South Carolina.
Q And when were you born?
A [redacted] 1982.
Q Were you born in Greenville County?
A I wasn't.
Q Where were you born?
A In New York.
Q And when did you move to Greenville?
A Uhm, I was probably like one when we moved back here.
Q Have you lived anywhere else?
A No.
Q Do you have any siblings?
A I don't.
Q No half-siblings?
A No.
Q Are you related to the Defendant, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins, in any way?
A No.
Q Who are your parents?
A Willie Mae Moliere and Erol Moliere.
Q Are they both still living?
A My mother is. My father's dead.
Q When did he pass away?

A In 2018.
Q And what did he pass away from?
A He had dementia.
Q Do you recall when he first started getting sick with dementia?
A Uhm, it was around 2014, '15ish.
Q How do you know?
A Uhm, because my mother -- the neighbors had called and they was saying that my father was, you know, doing weird things like sleeping in the yard and stuff, so the police was called and my mother came and got my father and was taking care of him.
Q When did the dementia start getting bad?
A Uhm, it was around about '15, '16, around there.
Q Did your mother move in with your father at some point?
A Yeah. We were all living together at one point.
Q When did he move in -- when did she move in with him?
A Uhm, somewhere around 2014.
Q Had they rekindled their relationship at that point?
A Yeah. They was together.
Q When did they rekindle their relationship?
A It was around 2014.
Q Do you have any other family in Greenville that could have helped your father?
A No.
Q Can you tell me a little bit more about the condition in the

-- of his condition in the weeks before his death?
A Well, he wasn't eating or talking or anything. He was just there, I mean, laying there.
Q When did that start?
A Uhm, it was probably about 2017 or something like that. I'm not really sure around the, you know.
Q Could he read?
A No.
Q Could he write?
A No.
Q Could he walk?
A No.
Q Was he able to drive?
A No.
Q Could he hold a pen?
A No.
Q Could he feed himself?
A No.
Q Could he sign his name?
A No.
Q At what point would you say he stopped being able to sign his name?
A Can I say I'm not sure? I'm not --
Q Absolutely.
A Okay.

Q And do you recall whether hospice was called in at some point?
A They was.
Q Did they come to your house or where he was living?
A Where he was staying with my mother.
Q And do you recall when that -- when they came?
A I'm not sure.
Q In the weeks before his death, or months before his death?
A It was probably months before because, you know, they was trying to, you know, give him, you know, morphine and stuff like that to keep him, you know, make him comfortable.
Q And do you recall the date of his death?
A Not the date, I don't. I know it was 2018.
Q Do you remember the month or the season?
A I know it was warm outside.
Q Are you familiar with the property A Ridgeway Drive in Greenville County?
A I am.
Q Would you recognize a picture of this property if I showed you one?
A I would.
Q I'm going to bring you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 10. Is this a picture of that property?
A It is.
Q Is it a true and accurate depiction of what it looks like?

A It is.
Q Has it been altered in any way?
A No.
Q Are those your initials at the bottom?
A It is.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: At this time the State would move to admit Exhibit 10 into evidence.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: None, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 10 is admitted into evidence, without objection.
(State's Exhibit 10 is admitted into the record.)
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Permission to publish, Your Honor?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): You have permission.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Thank you.
BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:
Q What county is this located in?
A Greenville County.
Q And how many bedrooms does this home have?
A Uhm, it's like three.
Q How many bathrooms?
A One.
Q Has it always been a rental property for your family?
A Yes.
Q Who lived there at the time your father passed away?

A Uhm ... I want to say Sharhonda was at the time.
Q Does she still live there now?
A Yes.
Q How do you know?
A Because I stay right around the corner.
Q Was this property associated with the Greenville Housing Authority program at any time?
A It was.
Q Do you recall when that might have been?
A Uhm, I'm not sure of the --
Q Maybe before your dad died or --
A Oh, yeah. It was before my father passed.
Q -- right after your dad's death?
A Yes.
Q Is it still associated with the Greenville Housing Authority program?
A It is not.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Beg the Court's indulgence.
BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:
Q No further questions. Please answer any Defense may have.
A Okay.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any cross-examination?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Briefly, Your Honor.
///
///

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q Good morning, Natasha.

A Good morning.

Q We met before, haven't we?

A We have.

Q This picture of this house that's got your initials on it --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- when did you put your initials on it?

A Uhm, whenever we all met, the prosecutors and solicitor.

Q The prosecutor called you in and showed you this picture and you put your initial on it?

A I did.

Q How many times have you met with the prosecutor related to Sharhonda's case?

A Uhm, I'm not sure how many now, but it's been frequently.

Q Frequently?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Have you ever lived at A Ridgeway?

A I haven't.

Q But your mama did?

A Yeah, one time.

Q One time?

A Yes.

Q All right. That's all the questions I have. Thank you.

A Uh-huh.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any redirect?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. You can step down from the witness stand. Can this witness be excused?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor. Please.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. You're excused. State can call their next witness.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: The state calls Sherika Roberson.

SHERIKA ROBERSON,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Sherika Roberson.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Okay, Ms. Roberson. Where you are currently employed?

A The Greenville Housing Authority.

Q And what is your position with Greenville Housing Authority?

A I'm the housing choice voucher director.

Q And what generally is the Greenville Housing Authority?

A It is an entity that provides housing to low-income families.

Q And how would a tenant obtain a place to live through the

Greenville Housing Authority?
A Well, from the Housing Choice Voucher Department, we select people from a waiting list.
Q And how does a landlord become involved with basically getting a tenant through the Greenville Housing Authority?
A Well, in order for us to provide housing we have to have willing landlords, so they are able to rent their units to participants. They have to sign up for the program, as well, once they receive a request for tenancy approval, which is a packet.
Q What procedures do landlords have to follow to be approved as part of this program?
A There is a packet of documents that they would need to complete and proof of ownership before we would allow them to receive a housing assistant payment.
Q When a property is sold or deeded to a new owner is Greenville Housing Authority automatically made aware of that?
A No, not automatically.
Q How are you made aware of that?
A Usually the new owner will contact us because a tenant is residing there, and we'll usually put the payment on hold once we are aware that the owner is no longer that owner.
Q And what documentation does the new owner have to provide in order to start receiving rent payments?
A They would have to provide a deed or some information from

the Court that states that they own the property.
Q Is there also a number of other paperwork they have to fill out?
A Yes. There is a new owner packet, or new landlord packet, that they have to fill out. They are forms that Greenville Housing Authority has created just for us to have on file for someone who states they own a property.
Q And whenever you receive those forms are they -- how are they stored?
A Right now they are stored electronically.
Q Are they always kept in the course of business of the Greenville Housing Authority?
A Yes. We do keep documents for a number of years before sending them off to storage.
Q And are they kept in the normal course of business at Greenville Housing Authority?
A Yes.
Q And are they kept for a business purpose for Greenville Housing Authority?
A Yes.
Q Until the Greenville Housing Authority is notified of a change in landlord and there's a request for payment what happens with the payments?
A Before we know that there's is new owner, we continue to pay the old owner. So most owners have a bank account set up with

us. We have some type of ACH that we deposit for them, so we continue to deposit money into that account until we're made aware.

Q So is it fair to say that Greenville Housing Authority continues their course of business until they're notified?

A Correct.

Q I want to move on the property in this case. In 2020 was there a Greenville Housing Authority tenant living at A Ridgeway Drive in Greenville?

A Yes.

Q I am going to --

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, if I may approach?

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yes.

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q I'm going to show you what's been premarked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 11. Can you identify that document?

A Yes.

Q And what is it?

A That is a request for a change of landlord owner.

Q And is this a form that is produced by Greenville Housing Authority?

A Yes.

Q And once it's filled out and returned to Greenville Housing Authority is it kept in the normal course of business?

A Yes.
Q Is it kept as part of the file of this property?
A Yes.
Q And has that been altered in any way since Greenville Housing Authority received it?
A No.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point we would move to admit and publish State's Exhibit 11.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Has he seen that?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. I went ahead and showed it to him.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Any objection?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's No. 11 admitted, without objection.
(State's Exhibit 11 is admitted into the record.)
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Permission to publish this to the jury?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yes.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q And, Ms. Roberson, what are we -- can you explain what we're looking at here?
A This document is something that we use when you are either a new owner or you need to change some information as an owner. So we ask them to fill it out completely and then provide proof before we actually input it in the system.

Q And what property is this in reference to?
A Uhm, it says A Ridgeway, Greenville, South Carolina. I can't read that last. I don't know if that's Wade (ph) Drive.
Q And who is the new landlord submitting information using this form?
A Larry Williams.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: If I may approach?
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Ms. Roberson, I am going to show you what's been premarked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 12. Can you identify what this document is?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes. That's the authorization for a direct deposit. We ask for those to completed prior to us sending a housing assistance payment to an owner.
Q And is this kept and stored in the same manner as the previous document?
A Yes.
Q And is it stored actually with the previous document?
A Yes.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point the State would move to admit and publish State's Exhibit 12.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection, Judge.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 12 is admitted, without objection. You may publish.

(State's Exhibit 12 is admitted into the record.)
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q And this is Authorization for Direct Deposit, but that what exactly is this document doing for Greenville Housing Authority?
A It's having the owner to complete information about his or her banking account and verifying the routing and account number, and just validating that they are who they are.
Q Does this appear to also be submitted by Mr. Larry Williams?
A Yes.
Q And is this associated with the same property as the previous form we just looked at?
A Yes.
Q I'm going to show you what's been premarked as State's Exhibit 13. Can you identify this document?
A Yes.
Q And what is that?
A It looks like a starter check for a bank account. However, there has to be another part of this, because we wouldn't accept this without it having a preprinted name and address on it.
Q Now I'll show you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 14 as well. What is this document?
A This is a letter from the financial institution, the bank, I'm assuming verifying this starter check and this starter account.
Q Were both of these documents received and stored in the same

manner as the previous documents we discussed as part of the file on A Ridgeway Drive?
A Yes.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point the State would move to admit and publish State's Exhibit's 14 and 15.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 13 and 14 admitted, without objection. You may publish.
(State's Exhibits 13 and 14 are admitted into the record.)
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Ms. Roberson, what are we looking at here?
A Just a blank. Looks like a starter check.
Q And is this part of the packet to authorize payment to a new landlord?
A Yes.
Q And does this have the name Larry Williams on it as well?
A Yes.
Q And State's Exhibit 14, you had mentioned it was a starter check and you would require more documentation. Is this what you were referencing?
A Yes. Because it's a starter check, so we would need more verification before just accepting that.
Q And what is this document generally?
A It's a letter from the bank just verifying that this is

Mr. Larry Williams' account number, routing number, and the date that the bank account was opened.

Q And what date was that bank account opened?

A 3/4/2020.

Q Ms. Roberson, I am going to show you what's been premarked as State's Exhibit 15. Would you identify what that document is?

A Yes. It's the declaration statement. We actually give tenants and landlords the opportunity to self-certify certain things and leave letters for either the housing specialist or management.

Q Was this part of the same file on A Ridgeway Drive in Greenville Housing Authority?

A Yes.

Q Was it stored in the same manner as all the others?

A Yes.

Q Is it kept in the regular course of business?

A Yes.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point the State would move to admit and publish State's Exhibit 15.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 15 admitted, without objection. You may publish.

(State's Exhibit 15 is admitted into the record.)

///

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q This is a declaration statement. What generally is that?
A That's just really a tenant or a landlord writing a letter to somebody in leadership or, like I said, an employee of the Greenville Housing Authority. We normally keep them upright so they are able to write whatever they want to say to us, basically.
Q And what date was this declaration statement provided?
A It's 2/26 -- well it was actually stamped in on June 22nd, 2021.
Q What does this declaration statement purport to say?
A It's saying that Larry Williams gives permission to his daughter, Nicole Jenkins, to handle all affairs, and she can move without me personally. So basically just saying he's giving her a POA without a POA.
Q I show you what's been premarked as State's Exhibit 16, Ms. Roberson. Can you identify this document?
A Yes. This is something you can pull up on like a property appraisal so it states who's the owner, the address, just details about the actual home or condo -- property.
Q And can it be submitted by a landlord to show proof of ownership?
A Yes.
Q In this case was it submitted to show proof of ownership of 7 Ridgeview Drive?

A Yes.
Q And was it part of the same file as all the other documents we discussed?
A Yes.
Q Were they all kept in the normal course of business?
A Yes.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point the State would move to admit State's 16 and publish.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 16 admitted, without objection. You may publish.
(State's Exhibit 16 is admitted into the record.)
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q So as you were saying -- what is this document exactly?
A It's like a property appraisal. You can pull it off line. It just tells us information about the property that the landlord is showing ownership for. So it just gives us information, basically, and shows details. Details about the property mainly.
Q And who does it show as the owner of this property?
A Larry Williams.
Q And does this document also contain the taxable value of the property?
A Yes.
Q And what, at this time, was the taxable value of this

property?
A $26,040.
Q Ms, Roberson, at this point I would like to show you what's been premarked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 17. Can you tell us what this document is?
A This document is a HAP contract.
Q What is a HAP contract?
A It's a -- HAP stands for Housing Assistance Payment. It's a contract that we enter in with the owner. It's just basically a contract with them to let them know that we are agreeing to pay a percentage of a participant's rent.
Q And is this the HAP contract pertaining to the property at
A Ridgeway Drive?
A Yes.
Q And was it kept in the same course of business as all of the other documents we just discussed?
A Yes.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point the State would move to admit and publish State's Exhibit 17.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: None Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 17 admitted, without objection. You may publish.
(State's Exhibit 17 is admitted into the record.)
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Based on this contract who is the tenant who will be residing at A Ridgeway Drive?
A Jasenda Barton.
Q And when did the term of this lease begin?
A January 1st, 2020.
Q And how much was Greenville Housing Authority paying in rent to that owner of that property?
A $1,100 a month.
Q So would that be $1,100 a month starting on January 1st, 2020?
A Correct.
Q And what date was this contract executed?
A On -- I'm sorry. April 14th, 2020.
Q And who is Lois Bishop?
A Lois Bishop, at the time, was a HCV supervisor. That's what -- that means housing choice voucher supervisor. That's what HCV stands for.
Q And over here where it says Larry Williams, is that where the owner of the property signs?
A Yes.
Q And to your knowledge, once the -- what is the last step before payments are authorized when a new landlord takes over?
A The HAP -- well, I'm sorry. Repeat the question.
Q When a new landlord takes over, what is the last step before

payments are authorized?
A The HAP contract.
Q When payments are issued by Greenville Housing Authority do they keep track of how much is paid, the dates, and where it went?
A Yes.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, if I may approach?
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 18. Ms. Roberson, can you identify this document?
A Yes. It's a ledger.
Q Was this ledger kept by Greenville Housing Authority in the regular course of business?
A Yes.
Q And what does it appear to show?
A It just shows payment that we've issued to Larry Williams beginning March -- I'm sorry, April 2020, all the way up to March 1st, 2021. Yeah, 2021.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point the State would move to admit and publish -- I believe that was -- Exhibit 18.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's No. 18 admitted,

without objection. You can publish that.

(State's Exhibit 18 is admitted into the record.)

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Ms. Roberson, when was the, according to State's Exhibit 18 which is the ledger you just described, when was the first payment made to Larry Williams?

A The first payment was 4/16/2020. Even though that one was voided, there was another issued 4/20.

Q So April 20th, 2020?

A Yes.

Q And how much was that payment for?

A $4,400.

Q And why was that one 4,400?

A Because the original HAP contract was effective 1/01/2020, and sometimes there's a delay in getting the HAP contract and lease and all the owner's information, so what we do is we will retro the money forward.

Q And was this date, April 20th, 2020, was that within, I believe, a week of the last HAP contract we just discussed?

A Yes.

Q And these payments above here, what are those showing?

A Those are showing the $1,100 that's stated on the HAP contract. That's the monthly contribution from the Section 8 Department.

Q And the ledger that was provided by Greenville Housing

Authority -- I don't mean to make you count, but -- approximately how many months does it appear Mr. Larry Williams was paid rent on this property?

A Almost a year. So it was -- well, he's gotten payments almost a year, from 4/2020 -- well, you can go back to January, so a little bit over a year. So, say, from January 1st, 2020, all the way to 3/1/2021, so we'll say a year and three months -- and two months.

Q Is it fair to say it was over $10,000 in rent payments for this time?

A Yes. Yes.

Q And the payments shown on this ledger, were they made to the bank account that was with the voided check and what we discussed earlier?

A Yes.

Q I don't believe I have any further questions at this point, but please answer any Defense may have.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Cross-examination?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor. May we approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yes.

(Off-the-record discussion at sidebar.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Ladies and gentlemen, there's a matter of law that we need to take up outside of your presence, so I'm going to let you go back to your jury room just

for a few minutes while we handle this. We should not be too long. Again, my admonition is the same. Don't discuss the case. There's nothing to talk about at this point. Okay. So we will call for you shortly.

(Jury exits the courtroom at 11:51 a.m.)

MATTER(S) OF LAW

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Mr. Armstrong.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

PROFFERED DIRECT EXAMINATION

(without the jury)

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q Ms. -- is it Roberson?

A Roberson.

Q Roberson. Okay. Hi, Ms. Roberson. I'm Joe Armstrong --

A Hello.

Q -- attorney for the Defendant. Now, you work at the Greenville Housing Authority; is that correct?

A I do.

Q Did you review the entire file of the Greenville Housing Authority related to A Ridgeway Drive?

A Did I review the whole file?

Q Uh-huh.

A No, I didn't.

Q As far as the documents that were admitted into evidence, were you given those documents by the prosecutor's office?

A No. Those documents were submitted through our CFO.
Q Through your CFO. Explain that to me.
A Well, our CFO was actually at the housing authority during the time that this situation occurred, so she actually submitted those documents. And the reason that I was asked to come here and testify is because I'm the director over the HCV Department and I'm familiar with the information.
Q Let me show you a document that's marked 18-2000880 (ph) and ask you if that was part of the investigation. Have you seen that document before?
A No, I have not.
Q Okay. Thank you. Do you know if it was part of the file do kept in the -- does it look like it is?
A Yes, it does. I mean, it's our form. It was sent in. So yes, it is a part of Greenville Housing Authority's documents.
Q Here's page 2 of that. Have you ever seen that document before?
A Yes. I've seen this document before.
Q And how did you go about seeing that?
A This document was on the top of another packet that the CFO had actually submitted.
Q Okay. And you read it?
A No, I have not read through it.
Q But you do know it is part of the housing authority?
A Yes, I do.

Q So you could testify that that is kept in the ordinary course of business?
A Yeah. Uh-huh.
Q Okay. Do you know why something like this would have been in there?
A Usually we do things like this when we are trying to create a timeline of things. For example, a client can have something going on for a hearing or something like that and we would need an order of events, so this is something that someone would type up just to have an order of events.
Q Have an order of events?
A Uh-huh.
Q But you didn't type this up?
A No, I did not.
Q Do you know who typed it up?
A No, I don't.
Q Do you recognize any handwriting or whose initials those would be?
A I see this person's name here, Lois Bishop, but I've never met her and I wasn't here when she -- I wasn't there when she was here.
Q All right. Thank you.
A You're welcome.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: So at this point, Your Honor, we would want to have this marked and have her questioned that this is a

true and correct document that came from the housing authority as it relates to A Ridgeway Drive.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): But that's not her document.

THE WITNESS: No.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No.

THE WITNESS: No, it's not my document.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: None of these documents were her documents.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): But what you're asking for -- are you going to question her about this document?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: The --

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Excuse me?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I want to. I mean, the housing authority had an investigation related to who the -- who was the rightful owner on the property, and who would have the right to receive rents. And obviously they decided that Larry Williams had a right to receive the rents because they were sending them to him.

THE WITNESS: We didn't conduct an investigation.

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q Huh?

A We don't investigate anybody. The only thing we do is we make them submit documentation. But we don't investigate it. We're not calling to say, Are you Larry Williams? Did you sign this? We're not doing that.

Q No. That's not what I mean.
A Yeah. I mean, I'm just saying. You said --
THE COURT (TAYLOR): I'll let you -- I mean, you can cross. I'm not going to let you admit that statement, the summary, into evidence.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Is that what you're trying to do?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: All right. Thank you. Nothing further, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any redirect?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: None, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. We'll bring the jury in. Can you bring the jury back in.
(Jury enters the courtroom at 11:58 a.m.)
THE COURT: All right. All the juror are present. Thank you for your patience. Defendant's in the courtroom. Mr. Armstrong.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Ms. Roberson, just a few brief questions. These documents you submitted, did you review them before testifying today?
A No.

Q So your purpose of testimony today is?
A Is based on what I know of the practices of the Greenville Housing authority.
Q Okay. And that they were generated in the normal course?
A Correct.
Q Okay. And do you know the Defendant?
A No.
Q Never met her?
A I don't know anybody from Greenville. I've only been here three months.
Q Okay. In your research of these, is there/was there a declaration statement that you saw in the file?
A In the pile of --
Q In the file.
A What I saw was -- what I saw was that first sheet that you showed me, was the order of events.
Q Is this the sheet you're talking about?
A No. I'm talking about the sheet that is --
Q Okay. You've never seen this one?
A No.
Q But you don't have any personal knowledge about what went on in 2020, 2021, 2022 with the property?
A No. I was not here.
Q In your review of these documents did you see the Defendant's name on anything?

A I saw that first sheet. And I don't even know what exactly is that. I never read through it.
Q Okay.
A I just know that it looks like an order of events because I typed up one before.
Q Okay.
A But I don't know the words of it.
Q Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any redirect?
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Thank you.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, the State would ask that Ms. Roberson be excused from her subpoena.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Ms. Roberson, you are excused.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Thank you. All right. The State can call its next witness.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Apologize, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): No worries.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, the State may request, if it's okay, a quick just five-minute break. The next witness will be a records custodian from out of town. We need to authenticate what it is because we've never been able to meet with him personally prior to his testimony.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I'm not objecting to having a five-minute break.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Well, we'll take a -- we'll take a five-minute break and bring you back in. Again, don't discuss the case at this point.

(Jury exits the courtroom at 12:03 p.m.)

(State's Exhibits 19 and 20 premarked for identification.)

(Court recesses at 12:03 p.m. and reconvenes at 12:12 p.m.)

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, we have an issue to discuss with the evidence and probably should discuss it before this next client -- I mean next witness is called.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Basically the State is going to introduce the bank account of Larry Williams. And pursuant to the HUD documents, there was about a timeframe from April of 2020 through March of 2021, and they have a video of the Defendant withdrawing, it looks like, $200 from the account on Valentine's Day of 2021.

Now, the Defendant had a valid POA for Larry Williams at the time filed with the register of deeds. So my objection with getting this video in is it's unduly prejudicial. It's going to act like she was taking all this money that Larry Williams had, and there's no evidence that the money was going from Larry Williams to her.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. The State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Your Honor, the Defendant is charged with obtaining goods under false pretences, and as part of that charge we have to prove that she was receiving money in someone else's name. And that's exactly what this ATM video seeks to demonstrate as part of the evidence. All evidence is prejudicial. This goes directly to one of the two charges we're here to try.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): So you're saying that this video shows her getting the money, or?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: She got $200 out of an ATM three years after after the incident in question while the HUD contract was still in effect on Valentine's Day, and they have a video of her going to an ATM. Now, this is three years after the fact of the date of the deed. And she had a valid POA. And I can't see any way that this can't be unduly prejudicial evidence. The account's in Larry Williams' name, not in her name.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yeah, but she has access to the account.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: She has access to it.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Right?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): I'm going to overrule your objection on this.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yes. Anything else?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No, Your Honor. I just needed to fix one of the exhibit stickers on this real fast with the court reporter, if I may.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Just for the record, I find that -- sorry. That you objection -- the evidence is not unduly prejudicial, from what I understand the State's position is.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Please bring in the jury.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 12:18 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. All the members of the jury are back. The Defendant is present. And I will recognize the State for their next witness.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Thank you, Your Honor. The State would call Andrew Misocky.

ANDREW JAMES MISOCKY,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: It's Andrew James Misocky.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:

Q Good morning, Mr. Misocky.

A About morning.

Q It's your first time testifying?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q Where do you work?
A At Woodforest National Bank.
Q And where is that headquartered?
A In Houston, Texas.
Q Where do you work out of?
A I work in the upstate area in Greenville.
Q What is your role with Woodforest?
A They call us a market manager. We're over numerous branches.
Q So what areas do you cover?
A Spartanburg, Greenville, Anderson, Laurens, Greenwood.
Q And where are Woodforest Banks typically located in South Carolina?
A They're all inside of Walmart.
Q What are some of your duties and responsibilities with the bank?
A To make sure we open and close on time; make sure we're well staffed; make sure customers are taken care of. I'm the final stop for complaints and things like that, so.
Q Are you familiar with WoodForest Bank statements and account agreements?
A Yes, ma'am.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: May I approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): You may.

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:
Q I'm going to pass you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 19. Do you recognize these documents?
A Yes.
Q You can take a minute to flip through them if you need to.
A This is our signature card.
Q What are they?
A So when anyone opens an account this is the most binding legal document. It's indicating who is on the account and who is able to access the account.
Q What else is it used for?
A To identify their signatures. If they come in and take out funds we always look and make sure their signature matches this particular document.
Q What else is in that packet?
A What else is in this packet?
Q Uh-huh.
A I have to look through and make sure it's the same. There are bank statements showing bank activity for Mr. Williams. And also that signature card also shows when the account was opened, by whom, at what location, things like that. And the rest of these are the bank statements for while the account was active at our bank.
Q And can you explain the process WoodForest uses to issue bank statements?

A Uhm, some people would choose to get them electronically. Some people get them sent to their home just in paper form.
Q How often are they issued?
A Once a month.
Q Do they include every transaction on the account?
A Yes.
Q Are these documents generated regularly as part of the bank's ordinary course of business?
A Yes.
Q Does every account holder with Woodforest have an account agreement and regularly generated bank statements?
A Yes.
Q How are those records stored and preserved with Woodforest?
A Uhm, I would guess electronically because we give access to our customers up to 24 months.
Q Do those documents appear to be a true and accurate depiction of the records generated by Woodforest Bank?
A So I did do homework and I have this same set of documents. So, yes. I have looked at them, and I looked at every transaction just out of curiosity, but yes, these are definitely our bank statements that we issue every month.
Q Do they appear to be altered in any way?
A No, ma'am.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: At this time the State would move to enter Exhibit 19 into evidence.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 19 admitted, without objection.

(State's Exhibit 19 is admitted into the record.)

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Permission to publish, Your Honor?

THE COURT (TAYLOR): You may.

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:

Q I'm going to put them on the projector and ask you some questions. And you can stand right there.

A All right.

Q All right. What is it?

A That's, again, what we call our account agreement signature card which shows the account holders' signatures. They initial what account and how it's being set up. So if it's a single-party account as this one was, it's just Mr. Williams is the only one who has access to this account.

Q Okay. And so who is that agreement for?

A For Larry Williams.

Q And what's the address on that agreement?

A [redacted]Crestfield Road, Greenville, South Carolina.

Q What day was this agreement signed?

A Yeah. It was opened on March 4th of 2020.

Q Would this be the same day the bank account was opened?

A Yes.

Q If someone's opening an account on behalf of someone else as

a power of attorney would that power of attorney need to present their own ID?
A Well, the power of attorney would need to be presented to one of the bank officers, and then that would have to be submitted to our legal department. At the bank level neither me or any of my employees can review a power of attorney and make a decision. None of us have that ability, so we send it to our legal department.
Q And would they sign their own name or the name of the new account holder?
A Typically the legal department will tell them how they need to sign it. Typically they will sign their name acting as power of attorney to show that they've been given permission by the bank.
Q And how often does that happen, in your experience?
A That people get a power of attorney?
Q Uh-huh.
A Well, a lot of our older customers, it's typically a family member, that's how things -- so I would say -- I don't know. We see a couple a month across 21,000 customers.
Q I'm not going to ask you questions about every page. All right. What are we looking at here?
A So that's just the daily activity. That's the first page of the period of April 10th to May 9th. So during that particular period it will show you what was taken out, what was credited,

your closing balance. So this appears to be the first month of activity because you've got the $4,400 credit from, I'm told that's, the housing. HAP is -- I can't remember what it stands for.

Q Okay. So this is the first activity of the bank account?

A Yeah.

Q And what does the description say?

A ACH from HAP.

Q Okay. And how was that money deposited?

A That one was an ACH. It looks like the next one was, too.

Q When does the next deposit occur?

A On May 4th.

Q And what is that description?

A The ACH, HAP made out to Larry Williams.

Q Is that the same place as the first one?

A Yes.

Q And this says cash check. Can you explain what that is?

A Yes. So when our customer walks up to the bank and they'll fill out basically one of our checks, we call them a cash-almost check, or a countercheck, and they're able to, once we verify signature, they're able to get cash.

Our ATMs dispenses 800, but if somebody needs more than 800, like that 2,000, that would be how they would get the 2,000.

Q So if they need more than 800 they have to come in person?

A (Nods head.)

Q Okay. And what's the date on that?
A That's May 4th.
Q And what is the amount?
A 2,000.
Q Is that an image of that?
A Yes.
Q I'm going to zoom in. Can you explain what we're looking at here?
A Yes. So those are the counterchecks I just spoke of. If they come up to the counter and say we need more than what the ATM will dispense, they are to fill out one of these. We cross-reference their ID. We're supposed to match up the signature with the signature card, which you saw earlier that signature's different than Mr. Williams'.
Q Okay. And what's the name on this?
A Sharhonda Jenkins.
Q And what's the date?
A That's also May 4th, 2020.
Q So less than two weeks after the account was opened?
A Uh-huh.
Q And what does that say? Are you able to tell?
A Yes. It's okay to cash. Somebody -- our tellers have limits, what they're allowed to do, especially new ones that may have no limit, they have to ask for approval for everything. Apparently this particular teller did that have the ability to

approve 2,000 so somebody else did.
Q Okay. I'm going to just go through a few of these statements and ask you questions about the transactions that we see.
A Okay.
Q What is this transaction?
A It is a Victoria Secret for $111.71 on May 29th.
Q Okay. What is this transaction?
A The ACH from the housing authority, again for 1,100 --
Q Okay. What's the amount on that?
A -- on July 2nd for 1,100.
Q Okay. What's this transaction?
A On July 27th, $23.95 for Smith Liquors in Greenville.
Q What is this transaction?
A Again, it's an ACH on August 4th for $1,100 from the housing authority to Mr. Larry Williams.
Q What's this transaction?
A Seventy-one dollars. The debit card was swiped at Sassy Nails of Piedmont.
Q What is this transaction?
A On August 13th, $18.93 at Beauty -- KI Beauty King in Greenville.
Q What's that transaction?
A On August 24th, $62 at Sassy Nails in Piedmont, South Carolina.

Q What's this transaction?
A The ACH, the monthly ACH, on September 3rd from the housing authority for $1,100.
Q Okay. What's this transaction?
A On October 2nd, $1,100 from the housing authority to Mr. Larry Williams.
Q What's this transaction?
A On October 17th, $65 to Sassy Nails of Piedmont, South Carolina.
Q What's this transaction?
A November 4th, $1,100. It's an ACH from the housing authority to Larry Williams.
Q What is that?
A On December 3rd, another $1,100 to Larry Williams from the Greenville Housing Authority.
And then on January 4th, another $1,100 from the Greenville Housing Authority to Larry Williams.
Q What is this transaction?
A That is an ATM withdrawal on February 15th from our branch on Woodruff Road in Greenville, South Carolina.
Q As part of this case was a video of this ATM withdrawal provided to law enforcement?
A Yes.
Q I'm going to bring you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 20. What is that?

A It's a copy of the video the bank provided at their request of somebody using our ATM.
Q Have you viewed the contents of that disk?
A Yes.
Q Is that your signature on the front of the disk?
A Yes.
Q Is it a true and accurate depiction of the footage provided to law enforcement?
A Yes.
Q Has it been altered in any way?
A No.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: At this time the State moves to enter Exhibit 20 into evidence.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Properly authenticated. No objection.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): No objection to Exhibit 20?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor. We will renew our objection as being unduly prejudicial and irrelevant to the facts of this defense (sic). It's unduly prejudicial.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Your objection is noted. We will admit State's Exhibit no. 20, over Defendant's objection. You can publish that to the jury. Thank you, Your Honor.

(State's Exhibit 20 is admitted into the record.)

(Video published.)

///

///

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:
Q Where is this ATM located?
A That is our branch on Woodruff Road. I can tell that from the bottom left-hand corner. We number all our branches. That one's 8007.
Q And that's inside of a Walmart?
A Yes.
Q And what's the date on this video?
A It's February 14th of 2021.
Q Are you able to see a time?
A Yes. It's 9:14 (sic) p.m. -15, -16. Yeah. It's between -- yeah. It's between 19:14 and 19:18 -- or, well, 19:21. It's a seven-minute view.
Q And whose account is this being withdrawn from?
A I'm sorry. Could you repeat --
Q Whose account is this being withdrawn from?
A From Mr. Larry Williams.
Q Is this the same transaction that we just discussed --
A Yes.
Q -- on the bank statements?
A Yes.
Q And how many debit cards are associated with this account?
A One.
Q How do you know?
A Our system shows us how many cards are there. And when it's

a single-party account we don't, we're not allowed to issue another debit card to somebody else, even if they ask. They have to be added to the account.

Q And this was a single-party account?

A Yes.

Q No further questions. Please answer any Defense may have.

A Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Cross-examination?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q I'm Joe Armstrong. I'm attorney for the Defendant.

A Nice to meet you, Joe.

Q How were you -- nice to meet you. How were you contacted to be up here today?

A Uhm, through their office via email.

Q The solicitor's office?

A Uh-huh.

Q Okay. Did you ever talk to law enforcement prior to that?

A No. They probably would have went to one of our branches to subpoena the records that they have. But again, I don't work in a branch on a typical day. I just go make sure the branches are running. So I wouldn't have probably been there when I was a branch manager if law enforcement came in with a subpoena. Then we'd forward that subpoena our legal department.

Q Were you the one that produced these records originally to the solicitor's office?
A No. Our legal department does that.
Q Your legal department did that. I've got a couple questions about these records but I want to start initially with, have you ever met Larry Williams?
A There's a chance. I've worked at the bank since 2018 so there's a chance, but I wouldn't be able to say that.
Q And how long was this account open? Do you know?
A Yeah. From the records, it looks like about 18 months.
Q About 18 months?
A Yeah. I think that's what the records show.
Q Okay. And you don't know -- I mean, explain to me again. The solicitor, the assistant solicitor, was asking you about check withdrawals. Would Mr. Williams have had to sign those?
A Yes.
Q Okay. So it would be he is giving his money in his account to whoever he wants, right? I mean, your bank would have checked his ID.
A Are you referring to the one that we looked at?
Q Yes.
A That wasn't signed by Larry Williams.
Q Who signed it?
A Sharhonda Jenkins.
Q Explain to me how Wood (sic) Bank would do that, could do

that?
A Yeah. They shouldn't have.
Q Oh, okay. Do you know -- do you know what -- well, of course you don't. That would call for speculation. Do you know why the money would have been used? Could it have been for any purpose? A business purpose? Personal purpose?
A I don't understand your question.
Q Okay. What did you do in preparation of being here today? Did you talk to the solicitor's office?
A Yeah. I talked to my legal department. Talked to the solicitor's office. Reviewed the documents that we provided them.
Q Now, you talked about if a POA person had to have a signature authority, right, they'd have to come in and get -- is like that getting named on the account as POA that's authorized to sign?
A Yeah. So we accept them sometimes, and sometimes we don't, depending on how they've been prepared.
Q Sure.
A And people get frustrated if we don't approve them. But if they're not written -- we're in 18 states, so our legal department looks at each state, says is this a power of attorney valid for the state. You can't just willy-nilly write a power of attorney at your kitchen table. So it has to be done with all the state guidelines.

So if we approve that, it's approved at the legal department. So me and my team of bankers have no say in who gets a power of attorney.

Q Do you know if the Defendant had a power of attorney over Mr. Williams?

A I don't.

Q Now, in Mr. Williams' account, if he wanted to, if he wanted to give somebody his ATM to go access his account, there's nothing wrong with that, is there?

A Yes.

Q What's wrong with it?

A We have a legal agreement with them. And when they fill out our new account form, it says that they are not to give their debit card or their PIN number to anybody. That invalidates our agreement with them.

Q Okay. Did you make a determination as to whether that was invalidated? So you're telling me that a grandfather can't give his granddaughter his ATM card and say, Go to Walmart. Go have a good weekend?

A I think that's two different questions, but --

Q It is.

A -- they're not allowed to have the PIN to access the ATM, and they're not allowed to use that debit card in any way.

Q What fine print did you all -- is that in some of these documents, these voluminous documents, that were produced?

A Uhm, about the ATM card?
Q Yes.
A I don't know if it's in those documents, but that could easily be provided. It's provided, it's probably been provided, 20 times since I've been sitting here. Any debit card agreement has -- and we actually give them a form saying here's what you should do and not do, and at the top of the list is do not give anyone your PIN; do not give anyone your card.
Q Well, I think that that's common knowledge, but what about if a husband's got an account solely in his name? Can't his wife take his ATM and go use it?
A No.
Q So I can't give my secretary my business card to run up to Home Depot and pick stuff up if I was with your bank?
A Correct.
Q Okay. So really these records don't show anything about who, what, when, where, and why the monies came out, but you're saying that the use of an ATM card by anyone other than Larry Williams is a violation of your bank agreement?
A Yeah.
Q Is it a violation of the law, to your knowledge?
A The documents they sign are legal documents, so yeah. I think if I got your debit card and ran around and used it you probably seek law enforcement.
Q How about if my wife did?

A If you're estranged -- I see that all the time, and they seek law enforcement.
Q How about if I gave it to my wife voluntarily and said, Hey, go have a good weekend; go to Victoria Secret; go down to the beach for the weekend.
A I mean, if you want to break our bank agreement it's up to you. There's a lot of choices in life.
Q Well, I mean, let's zero back around to my question. Is it against the law to do it, or is it against your agreement to do it?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Objection, Your Honor. He is not an attorney. He can't proffer as to the law.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Also, this was asked and answered multiple times.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained.
BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Okay, sir. These other withdrawals with Mr. Williams, other than the one that you said your bank shouldn't have cashed would Mr. Williams have had to have signed those?
A Yes, if there wasn't a power of attorney.
Q Would your bank had checked his ID?
A Yes.
Q So clearly the man was there agreeing to whatever that transaction number is, correct?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Objection. Calls for speculation.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained.
BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Clearly the man was there if he would have had his ID checked, correct?
A I would have to check his ID number against that withdrawal slip.
Q I thought you said the bank policy was -- I thought you just testified that all the other ones, he would have had to have been present because his ID would have been checked. Is that not what you said?
A I said that the signature of that was not Larry Williams.
Q On that one?
A Well, that's the only one we have, we've looked at.
Q Right, only one. But you were asked by the State about several other, basically counterchecks I think they're called or something like that.
A That was the only one we looked at.
Q Okay. And so that's the only one you looked at. Okay. Well, thank you. No further questions.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Any redirect?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Mr. Misocky, you can step down.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: May he be excused from his subpoena?

THE COURT (TAYLOR): He may. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Thank you. All right. I think this is gay time for to us take a lunch break. So we will -- I'll have you back in the jury room at 2:30. Okay. We may have some matters to take up with the lawyers. I'll check on that now before we take a break ourselves and head out so we have everything resolved before you come back. But we'll see you back at 2:30. Again, my admonition is the same. Don't discuss the case with anyone. Okay. Thank you. Have a good lunch.

(Jury exits the courtroom at 12:52 p.m.)

MATTER(S) OF LAW

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Armstrong, there were two documents that you wanted to try to get in through one of the witnesses. I don't know if you want to mark this, have it marked, as court exhibits. I overruled your objection.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): I think those will be Court Exhibits 2 and 3.

THE REPORTER: 3 and 4, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

(Court's Exhibits 3 and 4 are marked for identification.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Did you tell me you all had an issue with Mr. Williams?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. Mr. Larry Williams

was up here yesterday, I believe, with this Defendant. It is her adoptive father/grandfather. We got a -- our office received a call. He is under subpoena. Our office received a call purportedly from his son stating he's in the hospital. I don't believe we received any other details. I don't know. I haven't been able to go up and check with them yet to see if any detail has been provided or any kind of documentation, but he is under subpoena and he is a pretty important witness in the case as the properties were moved into his name.

He also was the one that dropped off, this morning, a note saying he basically blanket wanted to plead the Fifth. But the State does intend to call him as a witness, and he is under subpoena, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Is he going to be your next witness? If he was here would he be your next witness?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: If he were here, most likely. Yes, Your Honor. I believe we only have like three witnesses left, one of which is an expert who's driving up and should be here right after lunch, and then our lead officer.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Let's have the attorneys come back at 2:15 so we can update the Court on where you stand with Mr. Williams.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Anything else?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Nothing from the Defendant, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. See you at 2:15.

(Court recesses at 12:56 p.m. and reconvenes at 2:18 p.m.)

MATTER(S) OF LAW

THE COURT (TAYLOR): How are you on the witness, Mr. Williams?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. An investigator from our office went by his house and he apparently was there even though he's not answering our phone calls. He told the investigator he would be headed this way. We can try to call some witnesses out of order to give him a few minutes to get here. As long as he's here by the time we call him, we're good to go.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right.

(State's Exhibits 23 and 24 for identification.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Is there anything we need to take up before we bring the jury back in?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No, Your Honor, other than the one witness issue that hopefully will resolve itself here in the next few minutes.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. All right. Mr. Armstrong, anything we need to take up?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Let's bring the jury back

in.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, our next witness would be the one that tried to make a blanket Fifth Amendment assertion, so I'm assuming that may come up while he's testifying.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Hold the jury.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I apologize. I should have --

THE COURT (TAYLOR): No. That's all right. So how do you want -- how do you want to handle that? Do you want to do it in front of the jury or in camera?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, however Your Honor would like to handle it. I plan on asking a lot of questions that would not implicate any sort of Fifth Amendment issue --

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: -- but there may be some when we get into the facts of the subject matter of these deeds and these properties. I don't know if he would like to assert the Fifth Amendment at that point or not.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Well, we'll address them as we get to them.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 2:31 p.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Members of the jury, they are all back in the courtroom. I hope you had a good lunch. Defendant is present. Court would recognize the State. Call your next witness.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, the State calls Larry Williams.

LARRY WILLIAMS,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Larry Williams.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Mr. Williams, I'm Andrew Miller from the solicitor's office. Have we met before?

A Sir?

Q Mr. Williams, have we met before?

A No.

Q Has the solicitor's office reached out to you in the past?

A No.

Q No?

A Talking about the cops?

Q The solicitor's office, did we attempt to set up a meeting with you?

A I can't understand. I can't understand what you're saying.

Q Has anyone attempted to meet with you --

A No.

Q -- prior to this?

A No.

Q No. Okay. How old are you?
A Seventy-eight.
Q Where are you from?
A I'm from Spartanburg but I live in Greenville now.
Q How long have you lived in Greenville?
A Oh, about, going on, probably going on about 40 years.
Q And where do you live in Greenville?
A Crestfield. Uh, [redacted] Crestfield Road, Greenville.
Q And how did you get here today?
A In my car.
Q Do you drive yourself?
A Yes.
Q Were you living at that same address in 2019 and 2020, around that time?
A 2019?
Q Or, how long have you lived at that address in Crestfield?
A Well, I live in an apartment, so I've been living in an apartment for about two years.
Q Okay. So do you live -- is that an apartment on Crestfield?
A Huh?
Q Where is the apartment you live in?
A Crestfield Road.
Q Okay. How are you related to the Defendant, Ms. Jenkins?
A How do I know Defendant?
Q How are you related to the Defendant, Ms. Jenkins?

A My granddaughter.
Q Granddaughter. Okay. Do you -- what is her middle name?
A Nicole.
Q Do you ever call her by her middle name?
A No.
Q Do you have use her middle name in paperwork sometimes?
A No.
Q Do you ever refer to her as your daughter sometimes?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And why is that?
A I -- me and my wife raised her from a baby.
Q So I'm going to show you what's been marked and admitted as State's Exhibit 15. I'm going to put it up on this so you can take a look at it. Okay. Mr. Williams, do you recognize this document?
A Yes.
Q Did you write this note?
A Yes.
Q Okay. What does this note say?
A I, Larry Williams, give permission to my daughter, Nicole Jenkins, to handle all affairs, and she can -- what is it -- move without being present.
Q Are you having a little trouble reading your handwriting?
A Huh?
Q Is that in your handwriting?

A Yeah. That's my handwriting.
Q Now, who are you referring to as your daughter, Nicole Jenkins?
A Sharhonda Jenkins. Her name is Sharhonda Nicole Jenkins.
Q Sorry?
A Her name is Sharhonda Nicole Jenkins.
Q Okay. So just to clarify, in this document you did refer to her as her middle name; is that correct? Right here. Is that correct?
A Yeah. I guess so.
Q Mr. Williams, do you have a bank account?
A Yes, sir.
Q Where is your bank account?
A Bank of America.
Q How long have you had that account?
A Oh, 30, 40 years.
Q Do you handle all of your business dealings through that account?
A Yes, sir.
Q Do you have an account at Woodforest Bank?
A With who?
Q Woodforest Bank.
A With Forest?
Q Woodforest.
A I used to.

Q When did you have that account?
A Uhm, about four or five years ago.
Q And what was the purpose of that account?
A Save money.
Q Save money. Where did the money you were saving in that Woodforest account come from?
A Cover my checks.
Q Okay. What checks are you referring to?
A Social Security check.
Q So your Social Security checks went into a Woodforest Bank account?
A No. I put money into it. I opened up a Woodforest money account, checking account, savings account. I kept money in all of my bank accounts, just spare money to spend.
Q Okay. So to clarify, where did your Social Security check go, you're saying?
A My Social Security check went in Bank of America.
Q And then what were you putting in the Woodforest Bank account?
A Oh, I put a hundred dollars. I don't have it anymore.
Q Mr. Williams, I'm going to show you what's been previously admitted as State's Exhibit 10. Put it on here. Do you recognize this house?
A It look familiar.
Q How does it look familiar?

A But I don't know the address to it.
Q Okay. Do you own this house?
A Yes.
Q Okay. How do you know you own this house?
A The way it looks.
Q Okay. When was the last time you were at this house?
A I guess this morning.
Q This morning. What were you doing at that house this morning?
A Uhm, to check on it.
Q Check on it. Who lives there now?
A My daughter.
Q So this is your daughter's house?
A Yes.
Q This is Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins' house now?
A For right now.
Q Does your daughter own this house?
A No.
Q Do you manage your own finances or does someone do it for you?
A Do I manage my own finance?
Q Yes, sir.
A I manage my money, if that's what you're saying.
Q Okay. Did you grant at any point anyone power of attorney over your accounts?

A Yes.
Q Who did you grant as power of attorney over your accounts?
A My granddaughter.
Q Your granddaughter. By saying that, are you referring to the Defendant?
A Yes.
Q Mr. Williams, I'm going to show you what's previously been admitted as State's Exhibit 6. Do you recognize this document? I'll give you a second.
A I used to live at [redacted]Crossbow Way.
Q Okay. Well, this -- did you use to live at [redacted]Augusta Street?
A A mailbox.
Q Okay. And who is Darrell Freeman?
A My stepson.
Q And who is this, the grantee on this deed?
A That's my name.
Q Have you seen this document before?
A No.
Q Now, this document says you paid Darrell Freeman an amount of money.
A Say what?
Q According to this document, you paid Darrell Freeman $4,553.49. Did you do that?
A Yes.

Q How did you pay him?
A Cash.
Q Okay. How did you come up with that amount?
A I don't know.
Q Okay. It's a pretty exact amount. What does that amount mean to you?
A I don't know.
Q And what property is this deed in reference to? What property is this deed in reference to? It's right there on a piece of paper for you. It's right there. Is this in reference to A Ridgeway Drive?
A Yes.
Q And did you just testify a second ago that you had never seen this document?
A I have never seen the property.
Q You've never seen the property, is that what you're saying right now?
A No. I passed through there.
Q You passed through there, okay. To your knowledge -- I show you what's been previously admitted as State's Exhibit 10. Do you know whether or not this property is A Ridgeway Drive?
A I can't say.
Q Now, just to clarify, you say you've never seen this document that I just showed you, this quitclaim deed that says you paid Darrell Freeman $4,553 for A Ridgeway Drive. Is that

correct?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Turning to the next page, is that your signature on this document?
A Yes.
Q How did you sign this document if you've never seen it before?
A I got it from him.
Q Got it from whom?
A Darrell Freeman.
Q So you have seen this document before?
A Say what?
Q So you have or have not seen this document before?
A That was the first I seen it when I signed it.
Q Okay. But you testify just a minute ago that your first time seeing it was today, though?
A You said house.
Q Where were you when you supposedly signed this document?
A I can't remember.
Q You don't remember. Who is Willie C. Nelson?
A Who is who?
Q Willie C. Nelson.
A I don't know.
Q And do you know what this name is, the second witness on this deed?

A Looks like a Jamie (ph) Jenkins.
Q Did you know anyone by that name?
A No.
Q Did you see Darrell Freeman sign this document?
A Did I what?
Q It appears that there is a signature purported to be Darrell Freeman's on this document. Did you watch him sign this document?
A No.
Q Okay. So you and Darrell Freeman did not sign this document at the same time; is that correct?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And there is a third page on this document which contains a notary stamp. Do you know Mr. Barry Downs?
A No.
Q Was he present when you signed this document?
A No.
Q Did he notarize this document in front of you?
A Not as I can remember.
Q Have you ever had documents notarized?
A Uh, my veteran.
Q When did you last have a document notarized?
A Been quite a while. I can't remember.
Q Do you remember where you took that document to have notarized whenever the last time you did?

A My marriage license.
Q Where'd you take that?
A It's in my check box.
Q No. Where did you take it to get it notarized?
A Over at the courthouse.
Q Have you ever taken documents to a funeral home to get notarized?
A To where?
Q A funeral home.
A No.
Q Mr. Williams, did you testify that you do own the property at A Ridgeway Drive?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Do you claim legal ownership of that property?
A Yes.
Q Do you know if there was a tenant present at that property at a point in time?
A No.
Q Do you know if there was a tenant from Greenville Housing Authority present at that property at a certain time?
A No.
Q Did you ever collect rent from a tenant at that property?
A I went and charged (sic) it -- I gave my daughter everything to take care of. I wasn't around at the time.
Q Okay.

A I was sick at the time. I had prostate cancer, so I was laid up for a while.
Q So if there was a tenant present in 2020 or 2021 would you have knowledge of that?
A No.
Q I show you what's been previously admitted as State's Exhibit 18. Did you have any knowledge that that property was collecting $1,100 a month in rent?
A No.
Q Do you know that that property had been collecting $1,100 in rent for well over a year?
A No.
Q Have you seen any of the approximately, I believe it's somewhere between, 15- and $20,000 that was collected, have you seen any of that money?
A No.
Q Where did that money go?
A I don't know.
Q Who was managing that property for you?
A My granddaughter.
Q And by your granddaughter do you mean the Defendant, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins?
A Yes.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Beg the Court's indulgence.
///

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q No further questions at this point. Please answer any the Defense may have.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any cross?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Briefly, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q Hello, Mr. Williams.

A How are you doing?

Q Okay. You say you gave your daughter and/or granddaughter power of attorney?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And was it okay for her to manage your affairs?

A Yes.

Q And was she managing your affairs when you were sick? Was she managing your affairs when you were sick?

A Yes.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No further questions.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any redirect?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No redirect, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: We'd just ask that this witness be excused.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sure. Mr. Williams, you may step down. You're excused. Thank you. State, call your next witness.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: The State would call Investigator Elliott Turner.

ELLIOTT TURNER,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Elliott Turner.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Investigator Turner, what is your current position with the Greenville County Sheriff's Office?

A I'm an investigator with the Greenville County Sheriff's Office.

Q And what division of the Greenville County Sheriff's Office are you working in know?

A I am currently in the Office of Professional Standards.

Q And what is that?

A It's basically internal affairs.

Q And what were you doing before that?

A Economic Crimes.

Q And how long were you an Economic Crimes investigator?

A Roughly eight years.

Q And when an economic crime is reported what process did it go through to get to you?

A After the initial report it will be assigned to someone in

Economic Crimes, uhm, just to kind of take a look at the preliminary information, make contact with the victim.

Q And is that the process that took place in this case?

A Yes.

Q And did this case come to you?

A Yes.

Q Who was the first person to report all of this to law enforcement?

A Willie Mae Moliere.

Q Do you know around when that happened, when that occurred?

A It was November of 2018.

Q And when did you first meet Ms. Moliere?

A Ten days or two weeks after the initial complaint. It would have still been November.

Q Is that a usual amount of time?

A Yes.

Q Without getting into what was said, what was your impression of the situation of your initial meeting with Ms. Moliere?

A From what I recall, she was upset about what had occurred with the properties.

Q What steps did you then take in your investigation?

A She provided some deeds, marriage certificates, some other documentation. I looked at a doctor's statement, I looked over that, and began to reach out to register of deeds and then just started looking at some documentation.

Q Do you know when you contacted the register of deeds, approximately?
A That would have been probably November. It would have been within the same couple weeks. Probably a couple days after meeting with her.
Q What sort of documentation were you asking for at the register of deeds?
A I was looking for basically anything that was submitted to them on pieces of property, real estate.
Q Did you ask if they had any video available of this transaction?
A I did.
Q Did they?
A No.
Q Did you meet with Ms. Miranda Owens?
A I did.
Q And during the course of your investigation did you also obtain a death certificate for Mr. Erol Moliere?
A Yes.
Q Based on your investigation were you able to determine what date he passed away?
A I think it was July 10th of 2018.
Q Do you recall what the cause of death listed was?
A Natural.
Q Do you recall what the exact cause of death was?

A I don't.
Q If I showed you a copy of that, might it refresh your memory?
A Yes.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: If I may approach?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): You may.
A Advanced dementia.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q And so what was that cause of death?
A Advanced dementia.
Q What did you find during your initial investigation of the deed in this case?
A I found that it was quitclaim -- it was a quitclaim deed that was signed over to a Darrell Freeman. It was notarized by Barry Downs.
Q At some point was an arrest warrant issued?
A Yes.
Q And who was that warrant for?
A For Darrell Freeman.
Q And do you know approximately when that was issued?
A That was in February of 2019.
Q Was that warrant served or was Mr. Freeman arrested anytime soon after that?
A No.
Q Was he arrested anytime in 2020 that you know of on that

warrant?
A No.
Q And when did you first come to meet Mr. Darrell Freeman?
A I was contacted in February of '21 by supervision. I don't recall exactly who. I remember that he was going to come in and speak with us, or with me. U A Thompson had arranged something with the sheriff, if I recall correctly, and we were going to let him come in and speak to us that day and let him -- not serve those warrants that day.
Q Between taking out the arrest warrant for Darrell Freeman in early 2019 and this occurring did you know anything else about this property in question?
A No.
Q Did you have any knowledge about the second deed to Larry Williams at this point?
A No.
Q A few days before your meeting with Darrell Freeman did you meet with the Defendant?
A Yes.
Q And what was the circumstances of that meeting?
A She -- again, I was notified by, I believe, the front desk that day that she was in the lobby and wanted to speak with me, or with the investigator that was looking into the case.
Q Had you called and asked her to come in?
A No.

Q At that point did you know who she was?
A No.
Q Did you know of any involvement in this case?
A No.
Q Without getting into what was said, what was the nature of what she was coming to talk to you about?
A She came in with some documentation. She was wanting to talk about the situation with Ms. Moliere. She said that she was actually Mr. Moliere's daughter and that Willie Mae had fraudulently made up all this documentation that was submitted for investigation.
Q How long did this conversation last with you?
A Thirty to 40 minutes.
Q Did you ask her about the deed to Darrell Freeman?
A I asked her if she knew who signed the deed or who the subject was, and she mentioned that she didn't believe the deed was forged; that it was just something Willie Mae was creating, making up.
Q And was that the extent of what she had to say about the deed at that time?
A As I recall, yes.
Q Did it ever come up that Darrell Freeman was her uncle?
A No.
Q Did it ever come up that the properties were now in Larry Williams' name?

A No.
Q So a few days after that meeting on February 21st with the Defendant, is that when you met Darrell Freeman?
A That's correct.
Q And I think we got into a little bit of it, but how did that meeting come about?
A So again, I was contacted by someone with the sheriff's office, supervision, that U A Thompson contacted the sheriff, Hobart Lewis, and said that he could arrange a meeting for Darrell to come in, for Mr. Freeman to come in, with the understanding that we wouldn't -- we would interview him and he could maybe shed on light on the case, but we wouldn't make an arrest that day, just listen to what he said to say.

So he came in, Mr. Thompson, Darrell Freeman, and Brittaney Williams.
Q Who is your understanding of who Mr. Thompson is?
A It was my understanding that he -- Willie Mae had confided in him, was talking with him about the property, some frustration she had with issues going on with the ownership and the forgeries and such. I don't know how in-depth those conversations were, but they were talking about it.

And at the same time, he was hired by Ms. Jenkins as a property manager of sorts.
Q Before we get too far that way, did Mr. Thompson know anything firsthand about this property at A Ridgeway Drive?

A Not that I recall.
Q Other than setting up this meeting, what role did he play in your investigation?
A That was it.
Q After you spoke with him that day did you ever speak with him again?
A No.
Q So that same day you also said you spoke with Ms. Brittaney Williams?
A Correct.
Q I believe we discussed that a little bit. Did she appear to have some firsthand knowledge about this case?
A She did.
Q What was your impression of her demeanor when she was talking to you?
A She seemed concerned for her uncle, for Darrell, Mr. Freeman. Maybe a little shocked by what was going on, but not overly knowledgeable either.
Q What was your impression of Darrell Freeman at that time?
A Uhm, he seemed a little confused, uhm, didn't really understand the gravity of what was going on. He had an understanding that he was told to, you know, take these deeds, go pay taxes, but I don't know if he really had enough knowledge to -- other than that.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Overruled.
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q Had Mr. Freeman had a stroke by that time?
A No.
Q Was he able to walk into the interview room?
A He was.
Q Did he have much trouble speaking at that time?
A No.
Q So until that meeting, those meetings on February 26, did you have any idea of the Defendant's involvement in this case?
A No.
Q By that time, on February 26, do you know how much rent had been collected on [redacted] Ridgeway Drive?
A Do I know as of today's date?
Q No. As of the date Ms. Jenkins came in to talk --
A I didn't know anything about rent being collected.
Q Not at that time but -- I'm going to show you what's been previously admitted as State's Exhibit 18. As you testified, I believe it was, you said, February of 2021 when she came in to speak with you?
A Correct.
Q Had she been collecting rent on [redacted] Ridgeway Drive for a number of months by that point?
A Yes.
Q After Darrell Freeman and Brittaney Williams came to speak

with you what, were the next steps in your investigation?
A Well, I took what they had to tell me, but I wanted to do some more verification. I was told about the housing authority. I reached out to them. I believe it was a Mr. Sam Loft (ph) at the time who might have been -- he was some type of supervision over there, I reached out to him and requested documentation for the property, the Ridgeway property, which they provided. They also advised that the -- they could tell me where the funds were going for the rental property.
Q And based on that, did you locate a bank account?
A I did. It was a -- I was told it was a Woodforest Bank account in Larry Williams' name. There was a canceled check, things of that nature, so that gave me enough information to put together an order for Woodforest.
Q And did you submit that order to Woodforest Bank?
A I did.
Q And is where the records we seen came from?
A That's correct.
Q Did you reach back out to the register of deeds office at that point or after they came to speak with you?
A After our initial meeting?
Q Yes. Or did you eventually obtain the second deed?
A Right. That stuff is available online. I believe -- I could have reached out to them, but I think I may have gotten it online just to show the new ownership for Mr. Williams.

Q And after that initial meeting with Ms. Williams did you attempt to set up anymore meetings?
A I wanted to speak with Larry Williams. I tried to reach out to him, both through Brittaney -- I wasn't successful. I was never able to speak with him. I think that was about it.
Q At some point did you also meet with the folks at the Watkins, Garrett & Woods Funeral Home?
A I did.
Q And what did you learn there?
A I met with Mr. Garrett and Mr. Downs at the funeral home. We went over some of the documentation that had Mr. Downs' signature on it. He did not recognize it as him notarizing it so I got a quick statement from him, a written statement from him, on that day.
Q Did you also obtain any handwriting samples in this case?
A I did. I got handwriting samples for Mr. Downs and for Ms. Moliere.
Q And how did you conduct that procedure?
A With those, you have to get them -- they both were done in our Law Enforcement Center, in our interview room. And you would have -- for example, Ms. Moliere, you would have her sign 20 times stronghand and then weak hand five times on separate pieces of paper. Then there's some documentation I fill out and I take it down to SLED for them to take a look at it.
Q And did you follow that procedure for both Ms. Moliere and

for Mr. Downs?
A I did.
Q I'm going to show you what's been premarked for identification purposes as State's Exhibits 23 and 24. And can you identify those?
A Those are the documents that I was talking about, the different pieces of paper that I had Mr. Downs and Ms. Moliere sign.
Q And are those authentic copies of those documents?
A Yes.
Q And were those produced in your presence?
A Yes.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, at this point the State would move to admit State's Exhibit 23 and 24.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. State's 23 and 24 in evidence, without objection.
(State's Exhibits 23 and 24 are admitted into the record.)
BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:
Q In your capacity do you have the ability to access South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicle records?
A Yes.
Q Were you able to access Department of Motor Vehicle records for this Defendant?
A Yes.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Beg the Court's indulgence.

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Based on the document you were able to receive from Department of Motor Vehicles did you ever find that the Defendant changed her address a number of times?

A Yes.

Q Were you able to find if she ever changed her address to A Ridgeway Drive?

A Yes, she did.

Q Do you recall around the time when that occurred?

A I don't.

Q If I was able to show you the South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles driving record, might it refresh your memory?

A Yes. It would have been June 2023.

Q On that date the Defendant changed her address with the Department of Motor Vehicles to A Ridgeway Drive; is that correct?

A That's correct.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, I don't believe we have any other questions at this moment. Please answer any Defense may have.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Cross-examination?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor. May it please the Court.

///

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q Hello, Master Deputy.

A How are you?

Q I'm okay. I hope you are.

A I am.

Q So I want to talk a little bit about your investigation into this matter because I believe your name appears on the warrants. Is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q So you had decision-making process of generating them and issuing them and the wording on them, et cetera, correct?

A Yes.

Q You talked initially about Ms. Willie Mae coming in to talk to you.

A Correct.

Q And that she brought you some documents.

A That is correct.

Q I believe you said she brought you in -- tell us again what the documents were she brought you?

A If I recall -- it has been a number of years ago -- it was the quitclaim deeds, it was a death certificate, I believe a marriage certificate.

Q Willie's marriage certificate?

A Are you asking me?

Q That was Willie Mae's certificate, question mark?
A Willie Mae and Erol.
Q Were married?
A Correct.
Q Did you believe that they were married at the time he died?
A Yes.
Q Did you list him as a widow on both your report and in the warrants? Or her as the widow?
A Yes.
Q As we sit here today, do you believe that they were married at the time of his death?
A No.
Q That's information that subsequently come about after Ms. Jenkins was arrested on these warrants?
A Correct.
Q I mean, to your knowledge.
A Correct.
Q Was the fact that you thought she was a widow, was that a consideration for you in determining whether to issue the warrants?
A Yes.
Q Otherwise you wouldn't have prepared the warrant, right?
A Right.
Q To you, in all the years of investigation, does it make a difference whether she was really the widow or just the caretaker

or someone living with him, or anything?
A Does it make a difference as far as?
Q As far as -- I mean, you listed her as a widow.
A Right.
Q Do you recall if the death certificate listed her as a widow?
A I know that she was a person that notified, or notification. I believe it did.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. I think we're getting a little far afield.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained.
BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:
Q Do you know who the funeral home was that just issued the death certificate?
A I don't recall.
Q Okay. Fair enough. Now, did Ms. Jenkins, you said, also came in?
A Yes.
Q And did she provide you with documentation?
A Yes, she did.
Q Do you recall what documentation that was?
A I believe she also brought in a death certificate. She brought in some power-of-attorney paperwork for an individual, some identification for that individual.
Q Sure.

A Could have been some other things, but I remember that stuff.
Q Okay. Did she bring this paperwork in before the warrants were issued?
A Yes. That would have been when we met in February of '21.
Q February '21. Ultimately you issued these warrants against her. Did you issue warrants against anybody else related to these transactions?
A Darrell Freeman.
Q Darrell Freeman?
A Uh-huh.
Q And when Darrell Freeman -- the day Darrell Freeman was interviewed, was anybody else interviewed?
A Yes. Mr. Freeman and Brittaney Williams was interviewed. I spoke with U A Thompson briefly. It wasn't really much of an interview.
Q Okay. Was Mr. Freeman served with those warrants that day?
A No.
Q So he was allowed to leave?
A That's correct.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: One moment, Your Honor. The Court's indulgence.
Q Do you recall, when you were talking with Sharhonda, if she brought in the divorce decree between --
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sustained. Sustained.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Withdrawn. No further question, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any redirect?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Just very briefly, Your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. MILLER:

Q Investigator Turner, in your years of law enforcement, does it make a difference, someone's relationship to a victim that they come report a crime?

A No. It's also about what happened to the victim.

Q Does whether Willie Mae Moliere and Erol were legally married at the time of death, would that play any role in your investigation?

A No. I still would have had a thorough investigation just the same.

Q Looking back, what is your impression of the Defendant's interview and what she was trying to accomplish?

A I felt like she -- knowing what I now know, I felt like she was trying to divert my attention off of what I was looking at, what I was trying to look at.

Q And on cross, that Mr. Freeman was allowed to leave that day, is that unusual?

A Yes.

Q Did Mr. Freeman eventually turn himself in?

A He was eventually arrested. I don't recall if it was him turning himself in, but those warrants were eventually served.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No further questions.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Detective Turner, you can step down.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: The State would ask that he be excused from his subpoena.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objection?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: What was your question?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Just to excuse him from his subpoena.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: He's excused from my subpoena.

THE COURT: Okay. State, call your next witness.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: The State would call John Jamieson.

JOHN ALLAN JAMIESON,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: John Allan Jamieson. And Allan is spelled A-l-l-a-n, and Jamieson is spelled J-a-m-i-e-s-o-n.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:

Q Good afternoon, Mr. Jamieson.

A Hi.

Q Where do you work?

A I work at the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division, also known as SLED. And I work in the forensic lab.
Q And what's your title?
A I am a questioned document examiner.
Q Can you describe your academic qualifications for that?
A Yes. I have a bachelor of science, honors in biochemistry and chemistry, as well as a certificate in criminology.
Q And what training do you have as a document examiner?
A The training, in order to become a questioned document examiner, is much like an apprenticeship type program as school for document examination in North America. It's conducted under the tutelage of senior examiners where you perform selected readings of journals, notes, and things like that. Then you do casework, casework that has been set aside over the years to demonstrate various aspects of the questioned document examination. You also work cases directly under the supervision of the senior examiners. And it's followed up with numerous quizes, tests, essays, and stuff like that that you work through, if you will, the apprenticeship.

At the midpoint there is a mock trial examination where I pick a case, I work the case, and then a senior examiner works the case, and then we have a mock court situation where the director, deputy director, and the section chief act as the attorneys. And then there's --
Q And --

A I'm sorry.
Q No problem.
A There's ongoing training as a questioned document examiner. There's several associations that hold annual or biannual meetings. There's also a document examiner web thing that is sent out through emails with different articles and stuff like that.
Q And what are your duties as a questioned document examiner?
A I examine and compare handwriting, handprinting, signatures, and numerals. I also look at mechanical impressions. These are such things as computer printouts, check writers, rubber stamps, and the like. I also look for alterations, obliterations, and erasures on documents. I also look at documents for indented impressions.

An indented impression is one where you write on the top sheet of paper, you indent your writing under the sheets below it, so that can be important in anonymous note cases and stuff like that.

I also examine pens, papers, and some pencils.
Q And approximately how many cases have you completed as a questioned document examiner?
A I've completed over 3,500.
Q Have you ever been accepted as an expert witness in questioned document examination before?
A Yes.

Q Approximately how many times have you testified as a questioned document examiner?
A I've testified over 250 times.
Q Have you ever been accepted as an expert witness in a General Sessions Court in South Carolina?
A Yes.
Q Do you always testify for the prosecution?
A No. If the case warrants it, I testify for the Defense. It doesn't happen very often because if I am testifying for the Defense it's likely that the prosecution will drop the case before I get to the stand.
Q What professional organizations do you belong to?
A I belong to the Southern Association of Forensic Document Examiners, as well as the Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists.
Q Do you participate in ongoing training as a questioned document examiner?
A Yes. I go to the occasional scientific meeting. We also pass papers around in the document examination web.
Q Do you have any special instrumentation to assist you with your work in the lab?
A Yes. Primarily we have a stereoscopic microscope which magnifies the document, but more importantly it's got two eye pieces, and what it does is serve to magnify the image of the document and does it in three dimensions so that you get depth

perception on the microscope.

We also have various magnifying devices, scales, rulers, and things like that.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Your Honor, at this time I'm requesting Mr. Jamieson be allowed to testify as an expert witness in the field of questioned document examination.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I'm not going to object, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. He's so qualified.

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:

Q Can you explain the process you undergo to examine a questioned document?

A It's a comparative process. And basically what I'll do is I'll look at the questioned document. And if it's only one, I'll look to see if it's freely and naturally written, whether or not it's actually original, whether or not it has identifiable features in it, and whether or not these identifiable features that are present are sufficient upon which to base a comparison.

I also -- if it was several questioned documents I would also go through them to see, if possible, if I can determine the number of writers, i.e., was it written by one person or not.

The second stage of the process is I go through the known documents in the manner similar to the questioned document. I look to see if it's original, whether or not it's freely and naturally written, whether or not it contains identifiable features, whether or not these identifiable features are present

in sufficient quantity in order to base a comparison. And then I also look at the known documents to make sure they're all written by one person. And then the other part I do with the known documents is I have to check to see if they're comparable to the questioned documents. If they're not comparable the examination stops right there.

My one-to-one comparison, I look at features such as the slant or slope of the writings, the formations of the letters, the relative heighth between letters, the alignment of the letters on the line, and the line quality of the writings.

Then I compare them for features in common or dissimilarities.

Q And once you prepare those documents do you issue an opinion or a report on your findings?

A Yes.

Q And what is the range of opinion that's normally expressed when it comes to handwriting-related exams?

A The range of opinions is much like a spectrum. On either end of the spectrum, we have the person as identified as having written the writings, or on the other side the spectrum is eliminated, i.e., he did not write the writings. Right in the middle of the spectrum is I don't know, it can't be determined whether a person did or did not write the questioned document.

Moving out from the middle, we have indications that the person either did or did not write the questioned document, and

that means there's a likelihood either the person either did or did not.

Moving a little further out, we got probable, be that the person probably wrote the questioned document, or probably did not write the questioned document.

Then moving further to just under the identification or elimination is strong probability, and that means that the examiner, or I, am virtually certain the person wrote it.

The difference between the different degrees of opinions is governed by the amount of questioned material at times, the comparability of the known, and factors such as line quality and ranges of variation.

Q And what does elimination mean?

A Elimination means the person did not write it.

Q I'm going to hand you what has already been admitted as State's Exhibits 23 and 24. All right. What are those?

A These are copies of the known documents that were submitted to me for comparison. Exhibit No. 23, I was told that it was the known writings of Barry Downs, and Exhibit No. 24 is the known standards from Willie Mae Moliere.

Q And what did you do with those documents?

A I used them in the comparison against the questioned document.

Q And what were the questioned documents?

A The questioned document was a two-page machine copy of a

quitclaim deed, No. 18-220880 dated 28th of June, 2018, labeled as PG4679.

Q And what were your conclusions when you compared those two documents?

A I produced two reports in this case, one dealing with Mr. Downs. And in my report, it it's my opinion that, there's indications that Mr. Downs did not write his name on the questioned document. That means the created likelihood that he did not write his name.

And on the second part I eliminated Mr. Moliere as having written his name on the document, i.e., he did not write that signature on the document.

Q So when you say indications, you mean there's a more than 50 percent chance that he did not sign the document?

A Yes. There's a degree of likelihood that he did not.

Q Okay. And just to clarify, when you say Mr. Moliere, is that Willie Mae Moliere?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And that is fully eliminated? Is that what you said?

A That's correct. Yes.

Q Does this mean someone could have attempted to copy or simulate the signature?

A In the case of Mr. Downs, that possibility of simulation, i.e., coping, is a possibility in it. It bears pictorial similarities between Mr. Downs' real signature, but there are

indications that it's not freely and naturally written. There are a couple of unnatural pen lifts within that signature -- actually, there's two signatures -- and that would -- that displays features of a simulation or an attempt to copy.

With respect to Mr. Moliere's, there is no attempt to copy. It's just completely different.

Q So as a questioned document expert you're able to conclusively say that Ms. Willie Moliere did not sign it?

A That's correct.

Q No further questions from the State. Please answer any Defense may have.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: May it please the Court, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Yes.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q You had indicated that you did testify for the Defense sometimes.

A Yes.

Q Out of those 200, how many would you say you testified for the Defense?

A Maybe about five.

Q Okay. And how were you contacted to render this opinion?

A The case was submitted through the SLED Forensic Lab system.

Q Do you know if that comes from the prosecutors or from Greenville County?

A It came from -- the submitter of record is from Greenville County, Mr. Elliott Turner.
Q We heard from Mr. Turner earlier. Other than the signatures that were provided to you for you to render your opinion, did you go out and do any research to see if there were other writings that may contain their signatures?
A No, sir.
Q So no register of deeds searches or anything like that?
A No, sir.
Q Now, I'm interested in -- I think you said one of the signatures, maybe was Ms. Willie Mae's, was eliminated.
A Yes.
Q Is that like -- is it eight different levels, or six, or?
A Nine, I think.
Q Nine different levels.
A Wait a minute. Three, six -- seven. Wait a minute. Nine.
Q Okay. So we've got indication?
A Right.
Q Strong probability meaning almost. Probable meaning high degree of likelihood. Indications meaning a degree of likelihood. No conclusions.
A Yes, sir.
Q Indications not. Probably did not. Strong probability did not. And elimination. So indications is about four out of nine?
A Well, it's on both sides of the scale so it's, it's just one

up from the item no.
Q Okay. All right. I was trying to figure out if you were able to determine, in your expert opinion, who signed those signatures.
A No, sir.
Q So you have no opinion on who signed those documents?
A No, sir.
Q You were only rendering an opinion on what law enforcement gave you?
A Yes. That is correct.
Q And they're the ones that collected those signatures?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Thank you, sir.
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any redirect?
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: May I be excused, Your Honor?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): You may step down.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Your Honor, may he be excused from his subpoena?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No objection.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): You're excused. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: And the State rests its case.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we reached an appropriate stopping point -- it's not for the day, just we'll have to take a break for a minute. I have a couple matters to take up with the lawyers at this time. So let's say have you all back in the courtroom in, let's say, 15 minutes. Again, don't discuss the case with anyone.

(Jury exits the courtroom at 4:36 p.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Are there any motions at this time from the Defense?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Ms. Jenkins would move for a directed verdict of acquittal on both charges. We believe that there are suspicions and implications and are mostly opinions of guilt and are not based upon facts and circumstances that amount to the proof.

Very specifically, during the State's entire case said, Did anybody see her do it?, Did anybody hear her direct someone to do it? And so for those reasons, we believe that the case, the charges should not be submitted to the jury, and we respectfully request that directed verdict be granted.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Let me hear from the State.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. As to the forgery charge, I believe there was testimony today that Mr. Freeman was

sent into the register of deeds with those forged deeds in question; that the Defendant was obviously the one behind that.

And the forgery statute does include, and the indictment does include not just actual forging in presenting the document but causing, procuring. That language is within there, so the person behind the forgery is also guilty of the forgery.

There's also been plenty of evidence the document itself was forged, and a number of people testified that they did not sign their own names that are present on there, as well as the handwriting expert that can eliminate Willie Mae Moliere as having signed the document she is charged with forgery.

There's also been evidence the subject of the forgery was worth over $10,000, including the tax value of the property, the money Ms. Willie Mae testified that she put in there totaling approximately $40,000, which is well above the $10,000.

As to the obtaining charge, there has been evidence that the Defendant used a bank account in her grandfather's name that her grandfather testified he had no control over, that his granddaughter collected all that rent payment, that was over $10,000; that they utilized the subject of the forged deed to do so under false pretences by submitting themselves as the owner of this property falsely to the Greenville Housing Authority.

And the Defendant did, as well, through her grandfather and as herself, communicated with Greenville Housing Authority to do so under false pretences.

So at this point the State would ask the Court to deny the directed verdict motion and let the case go to the jury.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Based on the arguments of counsel, considering the evidence that I've seen in the court, at this point I would respectfully deny the Rule 19 directed verdict motion by Ms. Jenkins. I do believe that there is competent evidence that could be tending to prove the charges in the indictment. And at this point we're just really trying to consider the existence and nonexistence of evidence, not its weight. That's what the jurors are for.

So I think the State has met its burden at this point, and I respectfully deny the motions.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Now we also need to take up the matter of Ms. Jenkins, whether or not she may wish to testify. So Ms. Jenkins -- or just let me -- Mr. Armstrong, do you need any more time, or have you already discussed about whether or not Ms. Jenkins will testify?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: We have discussed that, Your Honor, and Ms. Jenkins does not wish to testify.

DEFENDANT'S FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS COLLOQUY

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Ms. Jenkins, will you stand. I'm going to ask the clerk to place you under oath.

SHARHONDA NICOLE JENKINS, THE DEFENDANT, SWORN IN

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Ms. Jenkins, there's a couple things I

want to make sure that you understand. You do understand in this case that the State has the burden of proof, meaning that you don't have the obligation to prove anything in this case, that rests entirely with the State?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): You do also have the absolute right to testify or not testify, but that decision is yours, it's not Mr. Armstrong's. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): You understand that if you do not -- understand if you do not testify, I will instruct the court -- I'm sorry, instruct the jury that they cannot consider that, in any way, in determining your guilt or innocence?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): That will be my instruction to them before they deliberate. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Do you have any questions at this time of the Court in regard to your testifying?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Is that still your decision, not to testify?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Have you had enough time to talk to your attorney about this decision?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Do you, in any way, feel threatened, forced, or coerced into making the decision not to testify?
THE DEFENDANT: Not in the decision to testify. No, sir.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): That's your decision alone?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Mr. Armstrong, is there anything else you want to put on the record in regards to this issue as to Ms. Jenkins testifying?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Armstrong, for -- are you planning on presenting a case?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: One witness, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): You have one witness?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: She's here.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. I think I asked the jury to come back at 3:50, so now will be a good time for a quick restroom break for us, and then we'll come back at 3:50 and you can start presenting your case.
ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: And just for scheduling purposes, are you thinking we would argue and charge this afternoon after his case, or?
THE COURT (TAYLOR): How long do you think your witness will be?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Short.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): I think once we come back I think we'll put up your witness and then cross on that witness, and then in the morning we'll close and charge to the jury.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Anything from the State before we bring the jury back in?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): From the Defense?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Let's bring the jury in.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 3:55 p.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Ladies and gentlemen, the jury is back in the courtroom. The Defendant is present. The State has rested its case. The Court would now recognize Mr. Armstrong.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Please, Your Honor. We would call Jasenda Barton.

JASENDA E. BARTON,

having first been duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Jasenda Barton.

///

///

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG:

Q Hi, Ms. Barton.

A Hi.

Q Can you state your full name for the record again.

A I'm Jasenda Edreka Barton.

Q Okay. And where do you live, Ms. Barton?

A Now I stay at [redacted] Burbank Drive, Greenville, South Carolina, 29605.

Q And was there a time that you lived at [redacted] Ridgeway Drive?

A Yes.

Q Do you remember how long ago that was?

A Probably going on six years now.

Q Six years?

A I know it was like 2019.

Q 2019. How long were you there?

A Maybe ... I have no clue. A couple years, maybe.

Q You had at least lease?

A Uh-huh.

Q Okay. Who was your landlord?

A Willie Mae Moliere.

Q Willie Mae Moliere was your landlord?

A Yes.

Q She brought a lease to you to sign?

A Yes.

Q And this was 2019, not 2018?
A Yes.
Q Okay. I don't want to scare you now. Who were you paying?
A Willie Mae.
Q So you were paying Willie Mae rents on A Ridgeway 2019 - 2020?
A Yeah.
Q Okay. Anything ever happen regarding Willie Mae being your landlord?
A Yes. Uhm, so it started with me receiving news that she didn't own the home.
Q Okay.
A And she told me to stop answering the phone calls and that her lawyer was dealing with it.
Q Okay. Let me stop you there. Her lawyer ever contract you?
A No.
Q Okay.
A And of course I'm asking questions because I don't know what's going on. But she wouldn't really give me an explanation, just that her lawyer was handling it.
Q Okay. Then what happened, anything?
A I finally went to Section 8 and told them that I had been receiving calls and that she's not really answering my questions so I didn't know what to do.
Q Okay.

A And they told me the same thing, that they didn't know who owned the house either and they had been looking into it for a while.
Q And so this is 2019 - 2020 timeframe?
A Uh-huh.
Q All right. Ultimately did you end up having to move?
A Yeah.
Q Okay. Why did you have to move?
A Uhm, it was due to other personal reasons, but it wasn't --
Q Okay. Well --
A -- nothing to do with this.
Q Nothing to do with this. Did you seek any counsel or anything related to --
A Like while I was trying to figure out --
Q -- like who was --
A Yes.
Q Like what was going?
A My dad actually put me in contact with like someone he knew that was like a retired judge. He was like, Hey, I think you should talk to her. Maybe you all can get on the phone and figure it out.
Q As a result of that conversation did you end up leaving? Or you left for personal reasons, right?
A Right.
Q Okay. And -- well, I can't ask you that. I can ask you

what housing told you. Were they trying to determine who owned it?

A Yes.

Q So they had an investigation going on as to who owned it?

A Yeah.

Q Okay. And ultimately you end up in a new place?

A Yeah. I bought a home, actually.

Q So you had?

A Yes.

Q That's good. Well, I appreciate your time being here today. Please answer any questions the State may have for you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Any cross-examination?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor. Just briefly.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT:

Q Hey, Ms. Barton.

A Hello.

Q So when you say that you received news that Ms. Willie Mae didn't own the home, what do you mean by that?

A I had received a couple of phone calls that she wasn't owning the home and that like if my payments weren't turned over to the right person that I would have to leave, basically.

Q And who were those phone calls from?

A Uhm, Larry and Nicole.

Q Did Nicole give you a last name?

A No.
Q So you spoke with Larry?
A Yeah. He actually put me in contact with her, though.
Q And Nicole wouldn't give you a last name?
A Well, I didn't even ask because she didn't own it, so.
Q Did she say she represented herself on behalf of Larry Williams?
A He told me that she was working on behalf of him.
Q And what exactly did they say to you?
A That Willie Mae didn't own the home and that they should be receiving payment.
Q Did they threaten you?
A No. I mean, other than saying I would have to move. But that's not a threat, you know, if you don't pay your rent.
Q So they threatened to evict you?
A No. They just said I would have to move. They didn't use the word "evict" but that's what happens when you don't pay rent.
Q They said that you would have to involuntarily move?
A Just move.
Q Are you related to the Defendant?
A No.
ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No further questions.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any further questions?
ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Nothing further, Your Honor.
THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. You may -- Ms. Barton, you

may step down. Thank you.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: We would ask that Ms. Barton be released from the subpoena, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any objections?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Thank you, Ms. Barton. You're excused. You may call your next witness if you have one.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I do not have one, Your Honor. That's the Defense case.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): The Defense rests?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I mean Defense rests.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Members of the jury, we have now reached the end of testimony in this case, so you won't hear any other witnesses or take on any other exhibits.

But right now we're not ready to hand the case to you. There are some other things we need to talk to you about before you actually start deliberating. So instead of -- it's kind of late in the afternoon, so instead of -- trying to push through tonight, I'm just going to ask you to come back at 10:00 tomorrow morning. When you come back in we should be ready to go.

The lawyers and I may take up a couple matters this afternoon or in the morning, but we should have that cleared up by the time you get back in the jury room tomorrow morning. So at that time we'll give you further instructions about the duration of the case, but the testimony in the case is over at

point. Okay.

So I'll ask you just to have a nice evening, and we will see you tomorrow at 10:00 a.m. And again, you know what I'll say. Don't discuss the case with anybody. Thank you.

(Jury is dismissed for the day at 4:04 p.m.)

MATTER(S) OF LAW

THE COURT (TAYLOR): As far as jury charges, is the State going to email us some proposed --

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. I was going to do that at lunch and then we completely got caught up in the tracking-down-Mr.-Williams thing. I will, as soon as we get back to our office, put that together and email it to you and your clerk, as well as Mr. Armstrong, our requests for charges.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, I had some requests for charge. I'm sure that the Court's requests for charge are probably better than I drafted. And they basically just deal with probable cause, cloak of innocence, those kind of things that we discussed earlier.

A charge on forgery just literally talks about beyond a reasonable doubt, and that the charging/arresting indictment is not evidence. Those are the ones I have. And if the Court's going to cover those with the standard ones, I'm fine with.

I'm not sure where they want to go, probably to ...

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: The standard forgery charge, I believe,

covers a lot of things that are not part of this case, so a lot of what we were doing was just taking that out. And I also notice the standard charge does not include the dollar amount in the elements of the offense, so we added that in. There are just some minor charges from the pattern charges that we have a copy of. But I will send that. As soon as I get back to my office I can email it.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Well, just like I said, forward those to us and Mr. Armstrong. Mr. Armstrong, we'll take a look at it in the morning. My plan is to have the jury charges ready, proposed charges ready, in the morning. I'll have you all come back at 9:30, so we'll take a look at it again.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sounds like you may not have much to add to it. I think our charges may cover some of the things that you mentioned. But if there's something that comes to you, like I want to make sure that's in there, or see if we can try to get it in, I would ask you to just go ahead and email it, and to the State, so we have a chance to look at it tonight.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Does anybody have any questions/concerns at this point?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Nothing from the Defense.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay.

(End of Transcript of Record.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Cathy J. Provost, Official Court Reporter for the Fourteenth Judicial Circuit of the State of South Carolina, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete Transcript of Record of the proceedings had and evidence introduced in the trial/proceedings of the captioned case in the Court of General Sessions for Greenville County, South Carolina, on the 12th day of June, 2025.

I do further certify that I am neither of kin, counsel, nor interest to any party hereto.

Date: March 17, 2026

\s\ Cathy J. Provost
Cathy J. Provost, RMR
Official Circuit Reporter

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	) COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
	)
COUNTY OF GREENVILLE	) THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	) NO. 2022-GS-23-3629 and -3631
	)
VS.	)
	) TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD
SHARHONDA NICOLE JENKINS	)
	) Vol. III of III, Pages 302-382

B E F O R E:

THE HONORABLE JESSICA A. SALVINI, JUDGE; THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER D. TAYLOR, JUDGE; AND A JURY

DATE: June 13, 2025
Greenville, South Carolina

A P P E A R A N C E S:

ASHTON TUCK SCOTT, ESQUIRE, ASSISTANT SOLICITOR
ANDREW PRESTON MILLER, ESQUIRE, ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

Attorneys for the State

JOSEPH GARY ARMSTRONG, ESQUIRE

Attorney for the Defendant

Reported by: Cathy J. Provost, RMR, Official Court Reporter

-- P R O C E E D I N G S --

(Indexes contained in Vol. I, dated June 11, 2025.)

(Court is called to order, without the jury.)

MATTER(S) OF LAW

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Mr. Armstrong, have you had a chance to look at the State's proposed charges in this case?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I have, Your Honor. And I concluded all the -- everything that I was using, on the standard charges -- I think they changed the dollar amount on there.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Your Honor, I believe the standard charge does not include the minimum dollar amount for the charge, so we just put that portion in.

The forgery charge also includes a lot about alteration of an existing document. We took that portion out and just made it basically match the statute, Your Honor. It's pretty much word for word on the elements.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: And we did that to comport with the facts as they were presented in the trial.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. So the State's proposed charges as to forgery and obtaining property by false pretences, those will be charges that we'll make to the jury.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): And the other language, the standard

language, you've seen those? Okay. We'll let you see the other general charges, I guess, we give to the jury, and let you look at those real quick and see if you have any objections to that.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): And a copy of the verdict form, I think, we may have.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Donna, do you have the verdict form?

THE CLERK: I do.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Do you see any issues with it?

THE CLERK: No.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Do you mind printing two copies so that they can look at it while violet gets the charge ready for them to review? Thank you.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 10:05 a.m.)

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning. I hope you all had a great night. We are now obviously resuming the case of The State versus Sharhonda Jenkins.

We are at this point in the trial, as I said yesterday, all the testimony have been put in, the exhibits have been put in. At this time both the State and the Defense will make closing arguments to you. That should not take too terribly long. But once that's concluded, we will take a jury charges, and I will explain to you about deliberations, give you elements on the two charges which Ms. Jenkins faces.

But at this point this is just the State and the Defense

giving you their summation of what the evidence you've seen and the testimony that you've heard to this point. So with that, I will recognize the State.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

CLOSING ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF THE STATE

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, as you've heard in the last couple of days, on October 10th, 2018, a deed was recorded for A Ridgeway Drive in Greenville County. That deed was fraudulent. It was a forgery. It was filed well after Erol Moliere, the property owner, was dead, and backdated a mere 12 days before his death after a long battle with dementia.

A fraudulent deed was then used by this Defendant in the name of her grandfather to collect over 10,000 in rent payments from Greenville Housing Authority.

And before I get too far into the facts I want to talk a little bit about some issues of law that are going to come up. The Judge will instruct you on the law here in just a minute. And if anything I say or the Defense says differs from what the Judge says, what the Judge says goes. But I wanted to discuss a little bit of things in detail and give a couple of points.

The first is reasonable doubt. This will come up a lot. The State has to prove every element of a criminal offense beyond a reasonable doubt. The Defense has no burden to prove anything to you. It's our job to present the evidence that convinces you of the Defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Beyond a reasonable doubt is not beyond all doubt, it is not a mathematical certainty, and it doesn't have to exclude every far-fetched theory that someone can come up with. The key word is "reasonable." It's beyond a reasonable doubt.

Another way to phrase that is it's the kind of doubt that would cause a reasonable person to hesitate to act. And I don't mean when you get back in your deliberation room, but you stop and think about the evidence, to really consider everything. You're supposed to do that. You're supposed to deliberate. This is after you deliberate, after you consider all the evidence and you've exhausted considering the evidence. If you still hesitate, I submit to you, no, the evidence in this case is clear beyond that reasonable doubt.

Now, we talked a lot about evidence. What is evidence? Evidence is not what I'm saying to you. It's not what the Defense attorney is going to say to you. It's the testimony that was received from that witness stand, and from Mr. Freeman in front of the witness stand, and all these documents and the videos that you'll have with you back in deliberations. I encourage you look to through those on your own time. Take a deep look at any documents. Look a little closer at anything you'd like to.

Now, what evidence is allowed in court is governed by the South Carolina Rules of Evidence. I'm not going to bore with a discussion on that, but I wanted to make one point clear.

There's a lot of discussion about recorded interviews and things. And you may ask yourselves, Why didn't they just show us those interviews? The reason is they're not allowed by the South Carolina Rules of Evidence. No one's trying to hide the law; we just have to follow the rules of evidence.

And there's also two types of evidence that we'll discuss. That's direct evidence, direct testimony from someone who saw an event. They saw it. They are giving their direct point of view about it. Circumstantial evidence is a proof of a chain of facts and circumstances indicating the existence of a fact. What does that mean exactly? A simple example is if we're in a windowless room here in court all morning. If someone walked in with an umbrella, a jacket on, and their shoes are all wet, he didn't say it was raining outside, you didn't see it raining outside, but that chain of facts lets you know that is true.

The law makes no distinction between circumstantial evidence and evidence direct evidence. That is entirely up to you, as the judges of the evidence, how much weight you want to give to each.

Now, circumstantial evidence is important in this case. When someone uses a creative scheme and covers their tracks well, it's hard to find direct evidence. There will be a little bit. You heard Darrell Freeman say exactly the Defendant gave him this paperwork -- he thought it was tax paperwork -- and he took it into County Square court. That's direct evidence.

A lot of what you heard is circumstantial evidence, because

she did cover her tracks well. This trial would have been very simple if the Defendant simply put the property in her own name. It would be a much shorter trial. But I want to make one thing clear about the circumstantial evidence you heard in this case. It all points to one conclusion. And I'll get into that in a minute.

Now, as we said, we have to prove the elements of each offense beyond a reasonable doubt. Nothing more, nothing less, just the elements. And I wanted to give you these at the beginning so you'd have a checklist of kind of what we're going through and what you need to look for.

So for a forgery, there must be, there must be a making or a material alteration of some written instrument; and must be done, caused, procured, or willingly assisted therein by the Defendant with fraudulent intent or the intent to defraud or prejudice another.

Now, what does that mean? It means the pen doesn't have to be in her hand. She doesn't have to walk the deeds in there. The person behind this deed is just as guilty as the person with the pen in their hand, the person that took the deeds into the register of deeds office.

Now, the instrument must be of some apparent legal efficacy and apparently valid. What does that mean? It's a piece of paper that means something in a legal sense. It transfers a right. It transfers a property. It's a check that has value.

And the subject of the written instrument must have a value of over $10,000. Now, the subject in this case would be that property, A Ridgeway Drive.

For obtaining goods or property under false pretences -- it sounds like there's a lot of elements. I'll walk through them real quick. It's simpler than it sounds. The Defendant made a false pretence or false representation of fact; the Defendant knew it was false at the time she made it; the Defendant used the false pretence or false representation to obtain the signature of a person to obtain property from another person, or any chattel, money, valuable security, or other property. Really, we've got money, property, something of value from someone using a false representation. Next, the person must actually be deceived by the false representation, meaning they fell for the false representation; and the Defendant had the intent to deprive a person of this property; and again, the value of what was taken was over $10,000.

And it seems like a mouthful and a lot of elements, but I'll give you a simple example of one that comes up all the time that's easy to understand. If someone steals an item, say tools, lawnmower, something, they have unlawful possession or control over that. They take into it a pawn shop and say, This is mine. I want to pawn this. They get money from the pawn shop. That's obtaining property under false pretences. What we have here is simply that on a larger scale, with a couple of steps to cover

tracks in between.

Now I'm going to walk through a timeline of what we saw in this case. I know there was a lot thrown at you, a lot of dates, a lot of confusing dates. We'll start at the beginning. This all began June 18th, 2007. Erol Moliere legitimately purchased A Ridgeway Drive for $28,000. Ms. Moliere testified he bought a number of properties to fix up, rental properties and that sort of thing. You've seen photos of A Ridgeway Drive. We have a photo here. It's a three-bedroom house. It seems like $28,000, he got a pretty good deal into it. Ms. Moliere said they put about $12,000 in renovations into this property. So he legitimately purchased it then.

Now, as you heard, he started, Mr. Moliere started, to get sick for several years prior to his death. He was in and out of hospitals. He was suffering from dementia. He was struggling. As you heard, Natasha and Willie Mae were his only family around here. Someone had to step up and take care of his dealings. Someone had to do it. They're the only two people around.

Willie Mae stepped up and executed a power of attorney so she could handle his properties while he's in and out of the hospital. He's struggling. He was having trouble understanding things, suffering from hallucinations. This is not someone who can manage their own accounts and manage rental properties. Willie Mae had to step up and do it, so she did.

Now, April 6th, 2018. And this document is in evidence.

You'll get all of these documents. This is State's Exhibit 3. And I want to point out State's Exhibit 3 is a legitimate deed for the sale of the property executed by Ms. Willie Mae Moliere on behalf of Erol Moliere. As you can see, they sold three properties, including [redacted] Ridgeway Drive right down the street from [redacted] Ridgeway Drive, and a [redacted] South Estate Drive that will come up here in just a minute. They sold these properties for $110,000. That's three properties for $110,000. Roughly $30,000 and some change for each.

When someone is in and out of the hospital like this it's common knowledge it gets very expensive. If someone's assets are a couple of rental properties they own, makes sense, sell a couple off, get a quick $110,000 to help cover all those bills that are piling up.

Now, this was also April 6th of 2018. The same here. Take a look at that deed. Mr. Moliere didn't sign that deed because he couldn't by that point. His dementia had gotten so severe that he could not sign documents on his own behalf. This was prepared by a lawyer at a lawyer's office.

As we'll see, somehow he managed to sign one much later than this, or purportedly sign one. Which gets us to April 12th, a mere six days after she sells those three properties. The Defendant goes to the register of deeds and files State's Exhibit 4, a notice of breach of contract.

You can see, and you heard, her fiancee and her were renting

F South Estate Drive. She was under the impression that they were going to buy it from the Molieres. I don't know, but her own statement says there's as a nonrecorded contract. I'm not sure exactly what happened there but whatever deal they had or didn't have fell apart, and this Defendant was mad.

Now, this is kind a rare thing. Defendant, who was mad over a property dispute, puts it in writing, and it's even notarized by witnesses you heard from. This is your motive in this case, and it's even notarized.

Then on July 10th, 2018, Mr. Moliere passed away, passed away at his home at E South Estate Drive, as you heard. He was in hospice care at the time. The cause of death was advanced dementia. The funeral was held at Watkins, Garrett & Woods Funeral Home. You heard from Doug Garrett. Ms. Willie Mae made all the arrangements to pay for the funeral. Did everything that someone that was caring for him would do.

Now we get to State's Exhibit 5. This is the deed recorded for A Ridgeway Drive three months after Mr. Moliere passes away. As you see, this says that Darrell Freeman paid Erol Moliere, 12 days before he died, $2,500 for this property. As I mentioned, it's purportedly signed by Mr. Moliere, by Willie Mae, and Darrell Freeman, and notarized by Barry Downs, and then witnessed by two mysterious people who no one seems to know who they are. We'll get more into that here in a minute.

February 2019 an arrest warrant is issued for Darrell

Freeman for the forged deed. At this point all law enforcement knows is there was a forged deed filed. It's in the name of Darrell Freeman. They took out a warrant for Darrell Freeman. The property's in his name. That seemed like a pretty clear-cut case. Investigator Turner takes out a warrant. He thinks his case is pretty much closed at that point. He's just waiting on his suspect to be apprehended.

Meanwhile, December 16th, 2019, A Ridgeway Drive is then conveyed to Larry Williams. It's taken from the Defendant's uncle, under State's Exhibit 5, and given to her grandfather, under State's Exhibit 6. Claims there was a sale for $4,553.49. I submit to you, no one ever saw that money. That's not -- that's just a number they threw on there. I asked Mr. Williams, Where did that number come from? Couldn't answer. No idea. It's pretty exact amount. He had no idea where it came from.

This deed is supposedly signed by Darrell Freeman, Larry Williams, once again two witnesses that no one knows who they are. This time, though, the notary, it's again from Mr. Barry Downs, it appears on a back page all by itself. It's funny how that happens. It's almost as if the person who made this deed no longer had access to the actual notary stamp anymore. What they did have is copies of other documents with a notary stamp on it that you could attach with a third, back page all by itself. This deed also wasn't recorded until January 31st of 2019, well after it was supposedly executed.

Now, after that, actually before the deed is even recorded, three days before, there is a request for change in landlord submitted to Greenville Housing Authority. Like you heard, Darrell Freeman stopped playing along with the Defendant's scheme. He didn't want any part of this anymore. So they put it in Larry Williams' name, someone that she could manipulate, and goes down there and tries to start collecting rent.

You saw February 26, 2020, this declaration statement was given to Greenville Housing Authority. It says: I, Larry Williams, give permission to my daughter, Nicole Jenkins, to handle all my affairs. Larry is the Defendant's biological grandfather who did adopt and raise her and sometimes refer to each other as father and daughter.

Now, he testified before seeing this document that he has never referred to his daughter by her middle name in any document ever. I showed him this and says, Oh, yeah, I did write that. I submit to you, just look at this document and use your good common sense. Look at the other document in the case. Mr. Williams didn't write this. The Defendant wrote this herself. She tries to use her middle name, again, to continue covering her tracks. Even though she can't fully cover her tracks, but she has to have something that gives her authority to speak to the Greenville Housing Authority on behalf of Mr. Williams.

On March 4th, 2020, a power of attorney is executed for

Mr. Williams. Now, this legal document then gave her full control over Mr. Larry Williams' properties, his bank accounts, gave her authority to go operate bank accounts in his name, everything she needed to basically reap the benefits without having anything in her own name.

And look at that. On the exact same day she opens -- this Woodforest Bank account, is opened. This bank account is exactly where all the money from Greenville Housing Authority went, and all the money was funneled back to this Defendant's pocket.

On April 14th, 2020, the contract is executed. It's the final document to authorize payment to Larry Williams. The lease term began on January 1st, so there was four months' rent back. The contract is for $1,100 a month of Greenville Housing Authority funds to be paid into the account belonging to Larry Williams. And as you saw, on April 16th of 2020 those payments began, first with a $4,400 payment, $1,100 thereafter each month, adding up to well over $10,000.

Now I want to get to the interviews. At this point, February 22nd, Investigator Turner has no idea who the Defendant, Ms. Jenkins, is; has no idea of anything to do with this scheme. She shows up. He hasn't called her in. She shows up, and she just wants to talk.

She goes in not to discuss the forged deeds, but in an attempt to misdirect law enforcement before Darrell Freeman and Brittaney Williams get there. She goes in accusing Ms. Willie

Mae Moliere of all kinds of misdeeds, all sorts of things. She even claims to be the daughter of Erol Moliere when she goes in there. It's all smoking mirrors. Investigator Turner doesn't know who she is. He's just hearing her out. She's showing him things.

It makes a lot more sense a couple days later. On February 26th, four days later, when Brittaney Williams and Darrell Freeman give their interviews, at that point the case breaks wide open. Law enforcement finally knows who the Defendant is and what her role behind this whole thing is.

Ms. Brittaney Williams, as I'm sure you can tell, did not want to be here, did not want to testify. She made all sorts of excuses about what she told law enforcement that day. She claims she was coached on the details by some mysterious U A Thompson guy who Investigator Turner told you was there to help set up a meeting. I guess a concerned citizen that heard Willie Mae's plight, helped set up this meeting, said, hey, law enforcement really needs to look at this. But he had no firsthand knowledge of his own. He didn't have anything really to contribute to the investigation; he just set up a meeting.

Now, whether you believe Ms. Williams' statements then or statements now, there are some facts that are consistent. Now, sometime on the 28th her sister, the Defendant, came to her to talk about some property and had some paperwork with her. The conspiracy theory doesn't include that part. She says that

really happened. She testified that her sister claimed she inherited the property and their family was about to come into some money.

Now, I'm no expert on inheritances, but it's my understanding and common sense that to inherit some property a person usually is deceased before that happens, not signing it over with a forged deed 12 days before they die.

Now, she also testified to the fact that she did, in fact, grow concerned for her uncle due to the property being in his name. That part apparently wasn't coached, either. That part, she says, actually happened. Now she also conceded, but she says it's different now, that she told Investigator Turner that it was a scam and told him about it for over 30 minutes.

You all are all intelligent people. That's why you're selected for the jury. I'm sure you can see what's happened here. Ms. Williams regrets telling Investigator Turner the truth. Her uncle, her grandfather, her sister have all been tied up in this mess. Her family did actually come into some property and some money based on all this. You can see what's happening here.

Now, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Freeman has had a rough go. He told Investigator Turner then and he told you now he saw himself on the news for these unserved warrants. Now, I'm not sure the exact date he saw himself on the news, but it serves fairly best that maybe the fact that he's on the news might be why the

Defendant shows up four days before to try to get in there before all this breaks to try to misdirect him.

Now, he told you the Defendant gave him some stuff to take to County Square. He wasn't really sure what it was. He thought it was tax paperwork. Investigator Turner told you when he spoke to him it seemed like he didn't really know what was going on. He was kind of just coached into this thing. He doesn't know any of the people on those deeds. He's never met any of them. He said he didn't buy any property from Erol Moliere. That he didn't sell any property to Larry Williams.

The Defendant used her uncle. She took advantage of him. She knew putting things in her own name would be too obvious. Walking the deed in there herself would be too risky. She gets her uncle, and coaches him into this mows.

Now I want to discuss a little bit of points about the forged deed itself. As I pointed out earlier, the forged deed says the property was sold for $2,500 after being purchased for $28,000. Ms. Moliere said she put another 12,000 in there. Also, this property made $1,100 a month in rent. $2,500 wasn't a sale. It was a gift. It makes absolutely no sense why the Molieres would have given the property to someone they don't know for peanuts, next to nothing, when it was a real income property and, as you saw from the other sale, hospital bills adding up, they could have probably really used the money at that point.

And as Darrell Freeman testified right here, he never paid

anybody for this property. He had no idea whose this is. His name's on it. It says he owns the property. He doesn't know what it is. He doesn't claim to own the property.

Another big problem with this are the dates. It says executed June 28th, 2018. I submit to you that is not the date that this document was created. It wasn't recorded at the register of deeds until October 10th. Three months after Mr. Moliere passed away.

I submit to you the Defendant hatched this plan after Mr. Moliere died. You heard from Ms. Willie Mae, this nice lady. But sometimes she gets her dates mixed up. I'm willing to bet the paperwork is probably not quite in order for an easy target. An easy target, but she has to backdate the paperwork to a time when he is still alive to make it try to look somewhat legitimate.

Now, we talked about the signatures. Again, how on earth did Mr. Moliere, when he could not sign anything several months prior, he's on hospice, he dies 12 days later from dementia -- he didn't sign this. There's no way. It's impossible.

Ms. Willie Mae tells you she didn't sign this. SLED handwriting analysis confirmed she's eliminated. Not just probably didn't sign it, eliminated. She did not sign this. Barry Downs looked at this and said, No. There's no way. It doesn't fit the procedure that I'm required to follow and I always follow, said, and the signature doesn't even -- it looks

close, but it's not quite. SLED handwriting analysis found that while it is close, it looks a little bit like it, there's indications it looks like someone tried to copy it, like someone is trying to slowly write it, and keeps lifting the pen. It's not a consistent stroke like a real signature.

Mr. Barry Downs said he doesn't know any of these people. He's never met Darrell Freeman. Doesn't know who the witnesses are. For him to notarize they would have all had to have been present, would have all had to have come down to the funeral home, including Mr. Moliere. That didn't happen. This document is absolutely, clearly forged.

Now I want to point out a little bit here about the two deeds. And I encourage you to look at them yourselves side by side. I believe it's State's Exhibit 3 and 5. You'll find a couple differences. One, the signature. Erol Moliere's signature present, that is on the right, is what it looks like when a person signs as a power of attorney for someone who is disabled.

On the right, a legitimate deed. Now, the legitimate deed was executed and then recorded on the exact same day. That seems reasonable. You have a legal document that says you bought some property. This is a pretty big deal. You want to make sure it gets filed and recorded immediately. This other one was 104 days between the date of execution and the date of recording. Doesn't make any sense.

Again, the prices. $2,500. It was $110,000 for three properties. It just doesn't make any sense. Again, on the forged deed there's no indication it's a quitclaim deed. It wasn't prepared by a real estate attorney. Wasn't a proper sort of closing like if you ever bought property. It wasn't done that way. Ms. Moliere knew how to do that. She had a real estate attorney she consulted on this other sale. They went and did the sale. Paperwork was prepared by the attorney. She knew how to do it right. It makes no sense. The document's forged.

Next, this transfer to Larry Williams in December of 2019. As you heard the testimony, Darrell Freeman and the Defendant had a falling-out. He stopped cooperating with her scheme. Didn't want to play along anymore and she needed a new family member that she could take advantage of, and landed on her grandfather.

Now, I'm no handwriting expert, and we didn't have known standards from Mr. Jamieson to compare, but there is Mr. Freeman's, on the top, signature transferring the property to Larry Williams. On the bottom is his signature buying the property from Erol Moliere. No expert, but I don't think it takes an expert to say the same person didn't sign both of those. They are absolutely nothing alike.

Also, again I'll point out that the notary, conveniently again Mr. Barry Down's notary, on a separate page all by it. I encourage you to look at that document on your own time and just look how conspicuous that looks. There's no reason for it to be

on a separate page all by itself except for the fact we had to copy it onto a page and it was very difficult to do onto this page.

So also with Barry Down's notary, Doug Garrett and Barry Downs both said to notarize a document like this it has to be done at the funeral home and everyone had to be present. Did all of these people come down to the funeral home twice and have deeds notarized by Mr. Downs who doesn't know any of the details? No. Absolutely not. It doesn't make any sense.

Now, like I said, the Defendant did try very hard to cover her tracks. She didn't put anything in her own name. She was careful. But I want to point out a couple of things. Who is the one connection to Erol Moliere, Willie Mae Moliere, Darrell Freeman, Larry Williams, and Watkins, Garrett & Woods Funeral Home? Somehow there's one connection with all these people and places. There's only one. The Defendant. She's the only one who knows all of these people.

Who sent Darrell Freeman into the register of deeds? He told you the Defendant did. "I thought I was going to County Square to pay tax paperwork. I didn't really know what it was." That's what it was, it was a deed. Miranda testified that he is, in fact, the person that walked it in there. She thought it was a little odd, but she accepted it. They don't check authenticity of things at the register of deeds, they just check for two signatures and a notary, and that's what they did.

Again, who had access to Mr. Downs' notary stamp? Now, as you heard, the Defendant volunteered at the funeral home. She spent a lot of time in the front office where the notary stamp was kept in an unlocked desk door. Mr. Downs worked in the back. I submit to you she had plenty of opportunity to grab that notary stamp and stamp anything she wanted. Also, it's not that hard to find a document with Barry Downs' signature on it to easily just work on and copy.

Now, who had a motive to financially harm the Molieres? Who was mad at them over a property dispute? They were supposed to get F South Estate Drive. The Defendant. Puts it in writing and had it notarized. And you know what? She eventually did get the property, and she didn't even have to pay for it. That's what this is all about.

Now, who benefited financially from this? I want you to think about that. What did Darrell Freeman get out of this? All he got himself was an arrest warrant and confused. That's all he got. He never saw a dime. Didn't get anything except a bunch of trouble.

Larry Williams? As you heard, he didn't even have a debit card to the account where this money was going. There was one debit card. The Defendant had it. He also just -- the property might be in his name. He saw a picture of that property. He didn't even recognize it. He doesn't know what it is. And then he said, oh, it might be the Defendant's house. You know what?

It is the Defendant's house, technically, because she took it using a forged deed.

Now, did the Molieres get anything out of this, Willie Mae and Natasha? No. They lost the property, property that should have passed through probate and been divided up to Mr. Moliere's heirs. That never happened.

The only person who got anything out of this financially or property-wise is the Defendant. The Defendant, after five years of transferring this property using this paperwork, five years after this dispute, she finally got a house from them and she didn't even pay for it. She got her revenge five years later.

As you heard from Natasha who lives in the neighborhood, Defendant was actually living at A Ridgeway Drive at one point. As you heard from Investigator Turner, she went into the Department of Motor Vehicles and changed her address to A Ridgeway Drive. It's her house. She's just not putting it in her name so she can hide it. And it's her house because she stole it using a forged deed. Defrauded them.

Now I want to get into the allegations behind obtaining a property under false pretences. What we're alleging is the Defendant used a forged deed to steal a house, or held it in family members' names, just like the person at a pawn shop who takes a, took a lawnmower, took some tools. Same way. She just took a house and held it in somebody else's name.

The Defendant then used that stolen property to fraudulently

apply for payment from the Greenville Housing Authority. She walked up to that counter, presented the stolen property, and got money for it. The Defendant got money for it. She got over $10,000. That's what we're alleging. That's what obtaining property under false pretences means.

So I'm going to walk through a little bit of that evidence. I know I'm long, so I'll try to speed it up here. She presents her grandfather as the rightful owner of A Ridgeway Drive. Again, look at the paperwork in evidence. Mr. Williams didn't fill this out. He didn't know what was going on. He also testified that he had no idea there was a tenant from Greenville Housing Authority living in that property. If he has no idea there's a tenant from Greenville Housing Authority involved with that property, why on earth would he go up there and fill out the declaration statement at their office? Makes no sense. He didn't do this. The Defendant did. Was using his naming.

Again, a power of attorney March 4th, 2020. Now she formally has control over his assets, has formal control over that house, formal control over the bank account.

Again, collects payments. First one rolls in less than a week after that contract was executed, $4,400. Every month after that, another $1,100. All those bank statements are in there. Now, feel free to look through them. I'll get into that in just a second.

The Woodforest Bank evidence. As you heard, there's only

one debit card associated with this account. The Defendant had that debit card the whole time. Mr. Williams has never seen that. He never saw a dime of this money. There are charges to Victoria Secret, Sassy Nails, Beauty King, all sorts of things. Do we think Larry Williams is making all those purchases? Feel free to flip through there and look at all them yourself.

There's also a $500 Cash App transfer that you'll see in there to Mr. Chad Chapman. Do you remember who he is from this breach of contract here? "My fiancee, Chad Chapman, and I were supposed to buy a property at F South Estate Drive." So she sent him $500. I'm not sure what for, but she did. Captures it on the ATM video. She's using the only debit card associated with the account.

There's also that $2,000 cash withdrawal made just weeks after that first $4,400 comes in. That comes in, and she goes and gets two grand right out.

Now I want to come back to the elements and real quick go through how the elements are met. So for forgery there must be a false statement, or a false making or material alteration of some written instrument. A false document. State's Exhibit 5. It is clearly, clearly false. That element is met.

Must be done, caused, procured, or willfully assisted therein by the Defendant with fraudulent intent. As we've seen, the Defendant's the only one who profited from this situation. The Defendant was right there behind all of this. The Defendant

did cause, procure, or willfully assist in this. I submit to you since she was the only one with access to Barry Downs' notary stamp in this situation -- Darrell Freeman didn't, Larry Williams didn't -- it's likely that she made this herself. Very likely. But we don't have to prove that; we just have to prove that she's the one behind the scheme.

Now, the instrument must have some apparent legal efficacy and apparently valid. This, when it was received by the register of deeds, was apparently a valid deed, a legal instrument. That element is meant as well.

And the subject of the written instrument must have a value over 10,000. This was that house at A Ridgeway Drive. Every way you look at it, it's worth well over 12,000. The tax paperwork that was submitted to Greenville Housing Authority listed the taxable value as still around $28,000 at the time. Ms. Moliere says she put another $12,000 into it. Probably the market value is probably well higher than the taxable value. Any way you look at it, it's worth over 10,000.

Now obtaining property or goods under false pretences. Defendant made a false pretence or a false representation of fact. The Defendant falsely represented that her grandfather was the rightful owner of A Ridgeway Drive and she was authorized to act on his behalf. The Defendant knew it was false. The Defendant was responsible for the forgery herself. She was responsible for stealing the property in the first place. She

knew that statement was false. The defendant used a false pretence or false representation to obtain -- and I'm skipping ahead a little bit -- a chattel, money, valuable security, or other property. She secured well over $10,000 in rent payments.

The victim must be deceived. The evidence clearly shows the Defendant, in fact, did, in fact, complete this transaction, received the rent funds for well over a year. They were deceived. The defendant had the intent to cheat and defraud the person of the property. The Defendant knew that she or her grandfather rightfully owned that property. She used that falsehood to trick them into giving her $1,100 a month for well over a year.

And the fact that that is over 10,000, that is all your elements. That's what we have to prove. Nothing more, nothing less.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have all the evidence you need here. I encourage you to look through it, take your time, truly deliberate, and discuss everything amongst yourselves, if you wish. One thing I can't give you is your good common sense. This Defendant was smart. She came up with a good scheme. She was careful not to put any property or really anything in her own name. She instead took advantage of vulnerable relatives.

If you really look at all the evidence, though, you can see right through her scheme. Just behind every corner of the document, who is there? The Defendant.

Throughout the testimony Defense has tried to make points about whether Willie Mae and Erol were legally married at the time of his death, just like the Defendant did when she went to go misdirect Investigator Mr. Turner. What does that have to do with any of the elements we just discussed of the offenses? What we're here is to see if those elements were meant. Have anything to do with any of this? No, it doesn't.

All that would affect is if this property was returned to the Estate of Erol Moliere, who would get it through probate court, that's all it affects. It doesn't affect whether the property was stollen. Doesn't affect what the deed was for. Doesn't affect whether Greenville Housing Authority was tricked into giving her over 10,000. Absolutely nothing. It's misdirection, just like Brittaney Williams' Mr. Thompson conspiracy theories. He provided nothing of material value in this case. He provided none of the evidence you heard today. None of it. Has nothing to do with this case.

I just want to thank you for your time, and I encourage you not to fall for the smoking mirrors tricks of this Defendant. I encourage you to focus on the actual evidence in this case, apply it to those elements, and I ask you to find this Defendant guilty of both charges. Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): For the Defense.

CLOSING ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning.

Well, we made it. And John Grisham would be proud, what you all just heard.

I'll focus you guys back to my opening statement about the cloak of innocence that follows any defendant that's being tried by the State. The reason is, if the State focuses on you they've got a whole lot more resources than an individual has.

Secondly, burden of proof. They have to show beyond doubt, any doubt that can make you hesitate, that the Defendant did these things. Remember, we're talking about what is and what is not. What did they show; what did they not show?

I want you to focus what they didn't show. They didn't show that Ms. Jenkins signed anything or did anything. There's no direct evidence that Ms. Jenkins hired somebody to draft this document. There's no witness testimony to that effect. It's the cloak of innocence that they have to break because they're the ones that decided that they were going to bring these serious charges against Ms. Jenkins.

I mean, this entire case started with a falsehood given to the police that Willie Mae was the wife and widow of Erol. She's simply not. She's simply not. And that is clear to me that that makes a difference because, if you look at the documents in evidence, you will see that, and listen to the testimony -- to me, I like testimony because you get to determine, you know, you get to get a feel for them and where they come from and who you think's telling the truth and who's not.

Now, I'm not sure how they're saying that Ms. Jenkins did this to take money from another. I mean, if she was really going to pull off this scheme and she really had control of Larry Williams, who's been charged in the case but not tried, why didn't she stick a for-sale sign on it, sell it, get Larry Williams to give her the money? I mean, if she was really out to make a hit, that's what she would have done.

Instead, Mr. Williams sold the property to her grandfather. Her grandmother got prostate cancer and gave her power of attorney, and she was helping run his affairs.

Now, you know, once the State gets on you and once the solicitor's office decides to prosecute you it's tough. They have all the weight and all the money of the State. But everything started out with, Who's the victim? I still haven't heard who the victim is. I don't know who the victim is. The State says the probate estate is the victim. I didn't hear nobody from the probate estate testify other than -- I mean, nobody said, Hey, we are going put this money in the estate. So why are we being prosecuted today?

You're being prosecuted because Master Deputy Turner made a decision that he was going to charge Sharhonda. And there were four people. Four. Sharhonda, Willie Mae, Darrell Freeman whose name is on there -- and I thought his testimony was that was his signature, though I've never really had a man in that bad of shape on the stand in any trial that I've tried in the last 30

years of my career -- and U A Thompson.

So U A Thompson's not some fictitious character. He's for real. And I thought that the very telling thing, to me, was the first witness the State called, Brittaney Williams. You all got to look at her right out of the box. Right out of the box. She comes in and says U A Thompson was having a fight with Sharhonda. U A goes to Brittaney and says, I can help Darrell. He's been on Greenville's Most Wanted. He's got to turn himself in. He's on the run. I know the sheriff. I know the sheriff.

So what happens? They go down there and get statements, five warrants are put in a drawer, and he's allowed to leave. I asked Master Deputy Turner, I said, Is that normal? Is that normal?

So when I told you about if the State gets laser focused on you, they're going to try to get a conviction. And I hope nobody is ever going to be in that situation.

But Darrell Freeman, who is now a stroke victim, I didn't hear his testimony about anything until the State was pulling out and saying, Read this right here. Isn't that what you said way back when? He didn't know. He's getting bullied by the State and he has to believe the State that that's what was said because we can't prove this. Played those interviews. I agree with the solicitor on that. We can't play those interviews.

Apparently U A Thompson knew enough to get Darrell Freeman released from the police department. And clearly Darrell

Freeman's name is on the deed that's the subject of this case.

I want you to compare all of the signatures you see of Willie Mae, because I think they could be the same signature. Look at the Ls in the middle. But I'm not an expert witness on signatures.

Now, Darrell Freeman acknowledges his signature, but then he can't remember anything, which he looked to be in pretty bad shape. I didn't wear him out, you know, on cross. He's in court in a wheelchair, and he was on Greenville's Most Wanted, and benefited from U A Thompson's presence in this case.

Barry Downs and Doug Garrett -- I'm not sure Mr. Downs remembered a whole lot. I don't know. I don't know. But one thing's for sure, the State prepared him for testimony today.

Same thing with Doug Garrett. State prepared him for testimony today. And I'm still trying to figure out what's going on with him. Now, my understanding is that in certain communities funeral home's a pretty big thing, and they give services to the community and they do notarize documents for people, but I don't know whose document that they notarize.

Then you have Amanda Owens from the register of deeds. She's a records custodian. Never testified that they saw Sharhonda coming in there and file something. They saw Darrell Freeman come in there and Darrell Freeman went in to file the deed.

And the ownership. Greenville Housing Authority. Well, if

Mr. Freeman owns the property, then that's who should get the money from the tenant. Darrell then sells to it Sharhonda's grandfather. And Sharhonda has a power of attorney. He told you when he had prostate cancer he gave Sharhonda a power of attorney.

That money, whether it's used for -- can be used for anything. I mean, it's his money. And it's not like that they're not providing a service for the money they're receiving from Greenville Housing Authority. The tenant's living in a nice house.

Then you've got the Woodforest Bank guy who thinks that you can't give, who testified that I can't even allow someone, my daughter, to take my debit card and then give her my PIN and go to the grocery store. I thought that was interesting, to say the least.

Then the SLED expert. He really couldn't say whether Barry Downs' notary was tampered with or not. You know, I had him go through all nine -- we're at no. 4 here. Well, he excluded Ms. Moliere. I'd ask for you to look at it.

But to me, the importance in this case is the presumption of innocence and the reasonable doubt standards in our jurisprudence are extremely important. They go back a long, long way. And they start -- part of the reason we had the Revolution from England is that the crown was to come in your house, take quarter in your house, stay in your house, put you on trial, and then the

crown had all of that power that, We said he did it, let's hang him. America comes along and says, Nah, the State's got to do a little more than that. The State's got to have evidence that they did it, a witness that they did it. No witnesses here.

The conspiracy aspect of the case saddens me. I grew up in a law enforcement family. My dad was a Deputy U.S. Marshal. This whole scenario of one person getting treated one way and one person getting treated another, for calling in favors. I mean, you all get to talk about who you all believe and who you all didn't when you go back in the jury room to deliberate.

But not guilty is the only reasonable verdict that I see, simply because the State's produced no evidence. They are having to put all these documents together, put all this chain together, and say, well, Sharhonda must have done on it. How is Sharhonda going to do it? The only person that signed the deed was Darrell Freeman. Darrell Freeman should be sitting over there, not Sharhonda.

I mean, to me, that's a reasonable doubt. I'd be going -- -- I'd be looking at all this stuff, going, Whoa, whoa. Maybe the State's theory is right, maybe it's not. If that's the case, she's not guilty. Any defendant that's sitting in that chair expects a jury to listen to the judge's charge on the law, and if you hesitate a bit that the State's failed to prove their case that's not guilty.

Again -- and it's interesting to me -- if she was going to

device this wild scheme to steal this property, then it got into her grandfather's name, why didn't they just sell it? They'd make more money. And put it in their pocket. Instead, she's going to create all this chain where grandpa's saying, Take care of my properties. If you want to buy something, buy it. If the property needs a roof, put it roof on it. You know. I mean, that's as reasonable a theory as she's smart and she can hide things and all this kind of stuff.

I mean, what happened is she made the mistake of walking into the Greenville County Sheriff's Office and giving them evidence that Willie Mae's not the wife of Erol. And I believe Master Deputy Turner testified -- you all can remember it how you remember it -- about the uncommonness of all those warrants being outstanding. I mean, this is Greenville's Most Wanted. Right. Getting served on him, and stuck in a drawer, and he gets released.

Now, when you go back there and you're deliberating, I understand that each of you will have your own opinions as to the case. If you truly believe, hold on to your opinions. That's the whole purpose of deliberation, of course, is that you guys will come together and make a decision. The decision here is, Hey, this smells bad, let's convict. No.

The decision here is, she's presumed -- the evidence, did the State produce sufficient evidence to show that she's guilty of each and every element of the crime, each and every one?

Exhibits 4 and 5 are the ones I wanted you to compare their signatures to. And remember, the witness I called, the tenant has the property owned to Mr. Williams. He was exercising ownership and control over the property.

So based upon those facts, I respectfully submit that there is reasonable doubt as to whether the State proved their case, and we would ask you to come back with two not guilty verdicts.

Thank you guys for your time.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Thank you. The Court recognizes the State for any reply.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

FURTHER CLOSING ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF THE STATE

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: I just want to come up to make a couple of points to respond with. First, he made a big point that she didn't sell the property. I'd like to point out she didn't sell the property by the time all this started coming unraveled. She did, however, collect over 10,000 of rent on the property, and she did, however, mentioned she lived in the property herself, used it as her own address.

Now, he made a big deal over who was the victim in this case. The victim is Mr. Erol Moliere. It was his house. He died from dementia in on July 10th, 2018. He died. His only close relatives may not have been that organized with all this stuff. You know what I mean. Made them easy target. The fact that Mr. Moliere isn't here to testify as the victim cannot be

held against him. He's deceased. We had to bring the next best thing, his two closest living relatives. That's what we do.

Now, this case is all about misdirections and tricks. I encourage you not to fall for them. Look at the real evidence. Look at all this. You're intelligent people. You can figure it out. You can see through the tricks.

Now, I want you to remember, forgery, the person behind the scene is just as guilty as the person with a pen in their hand and the person that walks the document into the register of deeds. When someone's smart about it, they misdirect but they don't put things in their own name. They get other people to do things for them, try not to trace it back to them. But once you do, they're just as guilty as the others.

I encourage you, there's plenty of evidence here. Take your time. Look through it all. Once again, I encourage you to find this Defendant guilty of both charges.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Thank you. At this time, members of the jury, we're going to take a brief recess, probably about 10 minutes or so. The next phase is I will give you, charge you on the law. That may take 30 minutes or so for me to do that. So instead of sitting without a break, we'll take a break, 10 minutes or so, bring you back in, and then we'll take up that phase of the trial.

Again, don't discuss the case. Even though you heard closing arguments, don't discuss the case at this point. Okay.

(Jury exits the courtroom at 11:08 a.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Have both sides had a chance to look at the final charge?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Are there any objections/corrections by the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: None from the State.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: None from the Defense.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Okay. Great. So we'll take about five minutes to take a quick bathroom break and make sure we're all back in before the jury gets back in, and we'll start with the charge.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Your Honor.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Court recesses at 11:09 a.m. and reconvenes at 11:17 a.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): We are back on the record. Any questions or concerns from the State or from the Defense before we bring the jury back in?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: None, Your Honor.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: No, your Honor. I just wasn't sure -- I'll leave it to the Court's discretion. I'm sure you know better than I do. I wasn't sure if the dollar amounts needed to be included on the verdict form or if we just need to ... I just wasn't sure. I know there's no, I guess no, lesser-included

charge, so.

THE COURT (SALVINI): There isn't.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: That may not be an issue then.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): It's not alleged in the indictment.

THE COURT (SALVINI): I know it's in the statute but I don't know if there has to be a finding. What says you, Joe?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: I like it the way it is.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Okay. I'm fine with it. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. We can bring the jury back in.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 11:20 a.m.)

JURY CHARGE

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. All members of the jury are present. The Defendant is present. Members of the jury, it is now my duty as the trial judge to instruct you on the law applicable to this case, and in that regard it is your duty as jurors to accept and apply the law as I now state it to you.

Furthermore, it is your exclusive duty to decide all the issues of fact in this case, and to determine the effect, value, and weight of the evidence. All the parties have the right to expect that you will carefully consider and evaluate the evidence and apply the law of this case to it so that in the end all parties will receive a fair and impartial trial.

As I instructed you in my preliminary comments, the

indictments charge the Defendant with forgery and obtaining goods under false pretences. I remind you that the fact the Defendant was arrested, charged, and indicted in this case is not evidence in this case and cannot be considered by you as evidence of her guilt, nor does it create any presumption or inference of guilt. Those documents are simply the formal written instruments containing the charges made against the Defendant.

I remind you that during this trial you and I have certain duties to perform. As the trial judge, it is my responsibility to preside over the trial of this case, and I also have the duty to rule on the admissibility of evidence offered during this trial.

You are to consider only the competent evidence before you. If there was any testimony ordered stricken from the record during this trial, you must disregard that testimony. You are to consider only the testimony which has been presented from this witness stand, any exhibits which have been made part of the record, and any stipulations of counsel.

Now, as I charge you on the law applicable to this case, it is your duty, as jurors, to accept and apply the law as I state it to you. If you already have any idea as to what the law is or what the law ought to be and it does not agree with what I now tell you the law is, you must abandon this idea because you are sworn to accept the law and apply the law exactly as I state it to you.

In every case tried in this court before a jury the jury becomes the sole and exclusive judge of the facts in a case. The trial judge cannot intimate, state, comment on, or make any statement to a trial jury about the facts in a case since you, the jury, are the sole judges of the facts in this case. You are not to infer from what I have said during the progress of this trial in ruling on the admissibility of evidence or otherwise, or anything that I may now say during these instructions to you that I have any opinion about the facts in this case. The law does not allow me to have an opinion about the facts in this case. This is a matter solely for you, the jury, to determine.

As jurors it is your duty to determine the effect, value, weight, and truth of the evidence presented during this trial.

The indictments in this case allege several different offenses against the Defendant. The charges are: Indictment No. 1, forgery; Indictment No. 2, obtaining goods under false pretences. Each of these charges are separate and distinct offenses. You must decide each charge separately on the evidence and the law applicable to it, uninfluenced by your decision as to any other charges.

The Defendant may be convicted or acquitted on any or all of the offenses charged. You will be asked to write a separate verdict of guilty or not guilty for each indictment.

The Defendant has pled not guilty to these indictments, and that puts -- that plea puts the burden on the State to prove the

Defendant guilty.

A person charged with committing a criminal offense in South Carolina is never required to prove herself innocent. I charge you that it is an important rule of law that a defendant in a criminal trial, no matter what the seriousness of the charge may be, will always be presumed innocent of the crime for which the indictment was issued unless guilt has been proven by evidence satisfying you of that beyond a reasonable doubt.

The presumption of innocence does not end when you begin your deliberations but it accompanies the Defendant throughout the trial and until you reach a verdict of guilt or not guilty based on the evidence satisfying you of that guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Presumption of innocence is not a mere legal theory. It is not just a legal phrase. It is a substantial right to which every Defendant is entitled unless you, the jury, are satisfied from the evidence of the Defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The State has the burden of proving the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. In addition, the State has the burden of proving each element beyond a reasonable doubt.

Some of you may have served as jurors in civil cases where you were told that it was only necessary to prove that a fact is more likely true than not true such as by the greater weight or preponderance of the evidence.

In criminal cases the State's proof must be more powerful

than that. It must be beyond a reasonable doubt. Reasonable doubt is the kind of doubt that would make a reasonable person hesitate to act.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced of the Defendant's guilt. There are very few things in this world that we know with absolute certainty, and in criminal cases the law does not require proof that overcomes every possible doubt.

If, based on your considerations of the evidence, you are firmly convinced that the Defendant is guilty of a crime charged, you must find the Defendant guilty. If, on the other hand, you think that there is a real possibility that the Defendant is not guilty, you must give this Defendant the benefit of the doubt and find her not guilty.

Facts and circumstances that merely place upon the Defendant a grave suspicion of the crime charged or that merely raise a speculation or conjecture of the defendant's guilt are not sufficient to authorize a conviction of a defendant.

There are two types of evidence which are generally presented during a trial; direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence directly proves the existence of a fact and does not require deduction. Circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of facts or circumstances indicating the existence of a fact.

Crimes may be proven by direct and/or circumstantial

evidence. The law makes no distinction between the weight or value to be given to either direct or circumstantial evidence. However, to the extent the State relies on circumstantial evidence, all of the circumstances must be consistent with each other and, when taken together, point conclusively to the guilt of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt. If these circumstances merely portray the Defendant's behavior as suspicious the proof has failed.

The State has the burden of proving the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The burden rests with the State regardless of whether the State relies on direct, circumstantial -- direct evidence, circumstantial evidence, or some combination of the two.

The following things are not evidence and you must not consider them as evidence in deciding the facts of this case: (1) Statements and arguments of the attorneys; (2) Questions and objections of the attorneys, and; (3) Any testimony that may have been stricken by the Court.

While arguments of counsel is a beneficial part of every trial, you should remember that the statements made by counsel are not evidence. In presenting arguments counsel often refer to evidence; however, you should base your verdict on the evidence as you remember it. Therefore, if there are any conflicts between the recollection of counsel about the evidence and your own recollection, you should rely on your own understanding of

the evidence.

Necessarily when you -- excuse me. Necessarily you must determine the credibility of witnesses who have testified in this case. Credibility simply means believability. It becomes your duty as jurors to analyze and to evaluate the evidence and determine which evidence convinces you of its truth.

In determining the believability of witnesses who have testified in this case, you may believe one witness over several witnesses, or several witnesses over one witness; you may believe a part of the testimony of a witness, and reject the remaining part of the testimony of that same witness; you may believe the testimony of a witness in its entirety, or reject the testimony of a witness in its entirety; you may consider whether any witness has exhibited to you any interest, bias, prejudice, or other motive in this case; you may also consider the appearance of a witness while on the witness stand.

The rules of evidence ordinarily do not permit witnesses to testify to opinions or conclusions. An exception to this rule exists for witnesses we call expert witnesses. A witness who, by education and experience, has become an expert in some art, science, profession, or calling may state an opinion as to relevant and material matter in which the witness claims to be an expert, and may also state the reasons for that opinion.

You should consider any expert witness -- excuse me -- any expert opinion received in evidence in this case and, like any

other evidence, give to it the weight you think it deserves. If you decide that the opinion of an expert witness is not based on sufficient education and experience, or if you conclude that the reasons given in support of the opinion are not sound, or that the opinion is outweighed by other evidence, you may disregard the opinion entirely.

An expert witness's testimony is to be given no greater weight than that of any other witness simply because the expert is a -- because the witness is an expert. Further, you are not required to accept an opinion, an expert's opinion, even though it is not contradicted.

I instruct you and emphasize that the fact the Defendant did not testify is not a factor to be considered by you in any way in your deliberation and in your consideration of the question of guilt or innocence of the Defendant. It must not be considered by you in any manner whatsoever.

A Defendant has the constitutional right to remain silent, and the assertion of this right must not be considered by you in your deliberations. I repeat, under your oath you are to draw no conclusions whatsoever from the fact that the Defendant in this case did not testify. The fact that this Defendant did not testify should not even be discussed in the jury room.

The burden of proof, as I have stated it to you, is on the State. The Defendant is not required to prove her innocence. The burden of proof remains on the State to prove guilt beyond a

reasonable doubt.

In order to establish criminal liability criminal intent is required. For example, the mental state required to be proven by -- the mental state required to be proven by the State for a particular crime might be purpose, intent, knowledge, recklessness, or criminal negligence. Criminal intent must be proven by the State beyond a reasonable doubt.

Criminal intent is always a matter that must be determined by the jury from the circumstances surrounding the situation. There is no way to prove intent to a mathematical certainty. There's no way medical science can dissect a person's brain and determine what the person had in mind so the law says that criminal intent may be inferred from the circumstances shown to have existed. This is how you make a determination of whether or not the element requiring intent was present.

It is not necessary to establish intent by direct and positive evidence, but intent may be established by inference in the same way as any other fact, by taking into consideration the acts of the parties and all the facts and circumstances of the case.

Criminal intent is a mental state, a conscious wrongdoing. It is up to you to determine what the Defendant intended to do based on the circumstances shown to have existed. Criminal intent can rise from action or a failure to act. It may arise from negligence, recklessness, or an indifference to duty, or the

consequences that is considered by the law to be the equivalent of criminal intent.

Intentionality means willfully, intending the result -- excuse me. Intentionally means willfully, intending the result which actually occurs, not accidentally or involuntarily. Intent may be shown by the acts and conduct of the Defendant and other circumstances from which you may naturally reasonably infer intent.

In this case the Defendant is charged with forgery. Section 13 -- 16-13-10(A) of the South Carolina Code of Laws provides that it is unlawful for a person to, (1) Falsely make, forge, or counterfeit, or cause or procure to be -- or cause -- excuse me -- (1) Falsely make, forge, or counterfeit, cause, or procure to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited, or willfully act or assist in the false making, forging, or counterfeiting of any writing or instrument of writing; (2) Utter, or publish as true, any false, forged, or counterfeited writing or instrument of writing; (3) Falsely make, forge, counterfeit, alter, change, deface, or erase, or cause, or procure to be falsely made, forged, counterfeited, altered, changed, deface, or erase any record or plat of land, or, (4) Willfully act or assist in any other premises with an intention to defraud the -- with intention to defraud any person.

Forgery consists of the fraudulent making or altering of a writing by one intending to defraud, prejudice, or damage another

person. It has also been defined as a false making of an instrument which purports, on its face -- excuse me -- which purports, on the face of it, to be good and valid for the purpose for which it was created with a design to defraud, prejudice, or damage another. Forgery is the false making or materially altering with intent to defraud any writing which, if genuine, might apparently -- which, if genuine, might apparently be a legal efficacy or the foundation of a legal liability.

The State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the following elements of forgery: (1) There must be a falls making or material alteration of some written instrument; (2) It must be done, caused, procured, or willfully assisted therein by the Defendant with fraudulent intent or with the intent to defraud or prejudice another, and; (3) that an instrument must be of some apparently legal efficacy and apparently valid. The subject of a written instrument must have a value of over $10,000.

The State must prove each of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If any of the elements is not proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you cannot convict the Defendant of forgery.

The false making or alteration of an instrument is an essential element to the crime of forgery. In making, or alteration of a written instrument, it must be performed by, caused by, procured, or willfully assisted by the Defendant. To constitute forgery, the name alleged to be forged need not be that of a person in existence, it may be wholly fictitious.

The element of fraudulent intent to injure or defraud another is an essential requirement of forgery. The intent required for a forgery conviction is the intent to defraud. If one, in good faith or ignorance of the effect of his act, without intent to defraud, makes or alters an instrument, he is not guilty of forgery.

An intent to defraud is an intent to deceive another person for the purpose of gaining some material advantage over him or to induce him to part with property, or to alter his position to his injury or risk, and to accomplish that purpose by some false statement, false pretence, wrongful concealment, or suppression of truth, or by any artifice or act intended to deceive.

The intent need not necessarily include the expectation of personal advantage to the accused. He need not have profited or intended to profit by the deception. It's sufficient if the intention to prejudice or to assist in prejudicing some other person existed.

To constitute the crime of forgery, it is not necessary that anyone should have been actually injured or defrauded by a false writing or alteration. It is sufficient that the false instrument was made with the intent to defraud and that it is of such a character that it might prejudice the rights of another accepting it as true.

The intention need not be to defraud any particular person but it would be sufficient if there is a possibility or

probability of some person being defrauded. A change made in the date, amount, name of a party to, or subject matter of an instrument where the change was made with fraudulent intent constitutes forgery.

To constitute forgery, it is essential that an instrument falsely made or altered possess some apparent legal efficacy because otherwise it would have no tendency to defraud. The instrument need not be a perfect one. It is sufficient if it is shown to have some legal effect. Any writing which may defraud or prejudice another or which, if genuine, would have legal effect or operate as to the foundation of another man's liability, or the evidence of his right, may be the subject of forgery or alterations in the nature of a forgery.

It is sufficient if the instrument forged, supposing it to be genuine, might have operated to prejudice another. It is not a person -- it is not a defense that the person committing the crime was or considered himself justly entitled to what he would obtain by means of the forgery. Further, it is no defense that the act was done under the instructions or orders of another. Likewise, it is no defense if it was done in partnership or in cooperation with another person.

The Defendant is also charged with obtaining property by false pretences. Section 16-13-240 of the South Carolina Code of Laws provides: A person who, by false pretence of representation, obtains a signature of a person to a written

instrument, or obtains from another person any chattel, money, valuable security, or other property, real or personal, with intent to cheat and defraud a person of that property is guilty of obtaining property by false pretences.

The State must prove the elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. The elements of the offense of obtaining property by false pretences are (1) The Defendant made a false pretence or false representation of fact; (2) The Defendant knew it was false; (3) The Defendant used the false pretence or false representation to obtain the signature of a person to a written instrument, or to obtain from another person in chattel, money, valuable security, or other property; (4) The victim must be deceived; and (5) The Defendant had the intent to cheat and defraud a person of his property; and (6) The property was valued over $10,000.

This offense requires a false pretence, or a false representation, of a past or existing fact by one who knows of its falsity in order to induce the person to whom it is made part with something valuable.

A false pretence is such a fraudulent representation of an existing or past act by one who knows it not to be true as is adapted to induce a person to whom it is made to part with something of value. A false pretence is a false statement about some past or existing fact. It is not a promise, an opinion, or a statement about an event which is to take place in the future.

A false pretence must relate to a past or present fact. A mere opinion is not false pretence.

The Defendant's knowledge or falsity of the statement is relevant to your determination of his intent to defraud.

The victim must also be deceived. As long as the victim was, in fact, deceived it does not matter that an ordinary, reasonable person would not have been, or that the victim itself would not have been had he been more circumspect.

The express terms of Section 16-13-240 provide that intent to cheat and defraud is not -- excuse me. That an intent to cheat and defraud is an essential element of the crime of obtaining property by false pretences. There must be not only a false pretence or misrepresentation, but it must be made with intent to defraud and cheat -- to cheat and defraud. To defraud means to cause injury or loss to a person by deceit.

Intent to defraud by the false pretence, or false representation, is an essential element of the crime. To act with intent to defraud means to act willfully and with the intent to deceive or cheat. In making a false representation, it is not of itself criminal; it becomes so only when knowingly made, and further than that, when made with an intention of defraud in their mind. In the absence of such an intent, the crime cannot be committed.

In order to constitute the offense of obtaining property by false pretences, there must be an intent to defraud at the time

when the property or signature to an instrument is obtained.

To constitute an obtaining by false pretences, it is essential that it show the intention to deprive the owner wholly of the property obtained. The intent is the gist of the offense. Proof of intent necessarily rests upon the totality of the circumstances surrounding the transaction.

Making a false pretence or false representation is not, of itself, criminal. It becomes so only by being accompanied with fraudulent intent. In the words of the statute, it must be made with intent to cheat and defraud a person. This intent is part of the substance of the offense and must be proved by beyond a reasonable doubt. How? According to the nature of the transaction, or about which the false pretence or representation has been made.

What does criminal intent mean in the law? Criminal intent is a state of mind which operates jointly with an act or omission in the commission of a crime. Criminal intent is a mental state of conscious wrongdoing. Criminal intent includes those circumstances which represent the very purpose for which the act is done or are known to be substantially certain to result regardless of one's desire.

Intent may be shown by acts and conduct of a defendant and other circumstances from which you may naturally and reasonably infer.

Fraud is unfair dealing. It is deceitful practices in

depriving or endeavoring to deprive another of his known right by means of some artifice, device, or plan contrary to the known rules of common honesty.

Fraud has been defined as conduct that acts prejudicially as to the rights of another and it is solely intended. It is deception practice to induce another to part with property or surrender some legal right in which accomplishes the end desired.

In rendering your verdict you cannot consider any possible penalty for any particular crime. The punishment for the crimes is a matter for the Court to determine and should never be considered by you in any way whatsoever in arriving at an impartial verdict.

I hope that each of you are mindful of the importance of your responsibility. You are not often called upon to serve as jurors. The proper performance of the duty requires each of you to reach the height of freeing your mind of all improper influences.

As a presiding officer of this court, I am vitally concerned that whatever verdict you find will be the result of your going into the jury room, and confining your consideration to the evidence and the law that you have heard in the courtroom, weighing it fairly and impartially, as I have every confidence you will do.

Your verdict in this case cannot be based on sympathy, compassion, prejudice, or emotion, or some other consideration

not found in the evidence.

Remember, your verdict must be unanimous.

I will now explain the verdict form and the possible verdicts. There are two possible verdicts for each charge in which you may find in this case. There's no significance whatsoever in the order in which I state the possible verdicts; it's simply that one must be stated first. So as to each charge, there are only two possible verdicts, guilty or not guilty.

Ladies and gentlemen, your verdict must be a unanimous one.

Foreperson, when the jury agrees on the verdict you will write the verdict on the verdict form, and then sign your name as foreperson. And you will have a copy of this. Then knock on the jury room door and inform the bailiff that you have reached a verdict. At that time we will receive you back into the courtroom.

Also to the foreperson. If the jury has any questions, please write the questions on a piece of paper, not the verdict form, and give it to the bailiff.

In the event you encounter a division in coming to a unanimous decision, please do not disclose your numerical split.

I ask that you now return to your jury room, but do not begin deliberations until you are told by the clerk or the bailiff to do so.

(Jury exits the courtroom at 11:51 a.m.)

THE COURT (SALVINI): Any objection or exception to him

releasing the alternates?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: None from the State, Your Honor.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Okay. Larry, you can pull them out.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Are there any objections to the form of the jury charge from the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): From the defense.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): All right. Then, Madam Clerk, if you'll get everybody's cellphone number, and we'll send the jury the verdict form and all the exhibits back to the jury room, and we will be at ease.

(Court recesses at 11:52 a.m. and reconvenes at 2:35 p.m.)

JURY QUESTION

MATTER(S) OF LAW

THE COURT (TAYLOR): We will go back on the record now. We have a question, actually a series of questions, from the jury. So I will have this marked as Court Exhibit 5, I think.

I'll read to you what the questions are and what my proposed answers will be, and we can take up if you have any questions or concerns about that.

First questions is: When the warrants issued for Darrell Freeman? And it's in the Court's view that that information, that's not something I can give them an answer to. They received

all the evidence in the case, and they have to make that factual determination.

Second question is: Can we have a written copy of the laws on the charges? I will tell them if they want me to reread the charges on forgery and obtaining goods by false pretences, I can do that, but they will not be able to have a copy of those instructions in the jury room.

The third question relates to the durable power of attorney. They are asking: Is the prosecution saying this one is forged? Same response to No. 1. That's a factual determination that they need to make, and that have received all the evidence, and I cannot answer that question for them.

And the final question is: Dates Willie Mae went to pay taxes and talked to, I think it was, the investigator? Again, that's the same factual question that all the evidence has been put in for, and they have to make that determination. It's not something I can answer for them. Are there any concerns about ...

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: The Defense thinks that those are correct responses, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Prosecution?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's get the jury back.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 2:39 p.m.)

///

JURY QUESTION

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. All the members of the jury have returned to the courtroom. The Defendant is present.

Ladies and gentlemen, we did receive your note from the jury room. There were four questions, I think, that you sent out the questioned answers for. So what I will do is go through the questions and give you the Court's response. I've talked to the attorneys already about my proposed response, so I think that there are no objections as to that, but let's go through it.

The first question was: "When were the warrants issued for Darrell Freeman?" That is a factual determination that I cannot give you an answer for. You received all the evidence in the case. The case is closed at this point so you'll have to, as part of your deliberation, you'll have to make that determination for yourself.

In regards to -- the second question is: Can we have a written copy of the laws on the charges? I can recharge you on the law regarding forgery and obtaining goods by false pretences, but you cannot have a copy of either charge in the jury room. That is up to you all to decide if you want me to do it again. I don't have an issue doing it again, but we can't give you those charges back in the jury room.

Third question relates to the durable power of attorney: Is the prosecution saying this one is forged? Again, that is a factual determination that you, as jurors, must make. I cannot

answer that question. The same -- there's evidence that you have to consider yourself to determine the answer to that question.

The final question is: The dates Willie Mae went to pay taxes and talk to the investigator? Same as 1 and 3. Those are -- that is a factual determination. That's why we have you here, for you to make that decision. You received all the evidence in the case, and so you collectively, as a body, have to make a determination on that. So I remind you you have to base your decision on the testimony and the exhibits that you received into evidence. Okay.

With that said, we're going to mark this as Court Exhibit No. 5, and I'll have you retire to your jury room.

(Jury exits the courtroom at 2:41 p.m.)

(Court's Exhibit 5 is marked for identification.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Any questions/exceptions to what I read to the jury, the Court's responses to the jurors' questions? From the State?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: None from the State.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Well, everybody stay close by. Ms. Jenkins, I'll ask that you stay in the courtroom. There's a possibility that -- courthouse. Excuse me. There may be a possibility that we have other questions come up and it's getting later in the afternoon, so if another question does come up we want to make sure you're here so we can get to that as

quickly as we can.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right.

JURY QUESTION

(Court recessed at 2:42 p.m. and reconvened at 3:27 p.m.)

MATTER(S) OF LAW

THE COURT (SALVINI): Did they give you a note?

THE BAILIFF: No.

THE COURT (SALVINI): So tell us exactly what happened since we're on the record.

THE BAILIFF: She just asked me, the jury wanted the Judge to reread the fraud charges to them again.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Yes. So normally the way a communication works, no matter what, is that it has to be put in writing, signed by the foreperson, and marked as an exhibit, and not just relayed to the bailiff. And so I would suggest to counsel, if you have no objection to this, is that Ms. Eleanor go back and say, I relayed to the Court that you all have an additional request. Madam Foreperson, put that in writing, whatever your request is, and sign it. Does the State agree?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Defense agree?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Okay. So have her do that, Ms. Eleanor.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE BAILIFF: Your Honor, they have a second request, and I had them write it down on the note also.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Oh. Cathy, do you have your exhibit list? Can Judge Taylor and I look at it?

(The Reporter approaches the bench.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. We have another note from the jury. Two questions. First is: Can we please have the law concerning forgery? So it sounds like they obviously want that reread to them. Are there any objections from the State or the Defense as to that?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: No, Your Honor.

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. The other question is a little bit more perplexing because it asks: Also, were we given the State's Exhibits 8, 9, 21, and 22?

THE COURT (SALVINI): And so I asked the court reporter for her log. And then also, this was very helpful from the State as to what the proposed exhibits were. Exhibit No. 8 listed on the State's Exhibit list is, it says, Hattie Williams' obituary, but that did not come in. And that was the one that the witness, Mr. Garrett, had testified to that Mr. Armstrong objected to, so that did not come in.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Exhibit No. 9 was Mr. Erol's obituary,

which I'm not even certain you all sought to introduce. I can't remember. But that did not come in.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Yes. We withdrew Mr. Moliere's obituary. And we did not seek to introduce Ms. Williams' obituary at all.

THE COURT (SALVINI): And then Exhibit 21 is the death certificate which was not marked for identification and was not admitted, at least from your State's list. But it's not on -- it did not come in, obviously, because it's not on the court reporter's list.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): And 22 was the Defendant's driving record which you all did not mark or admit either. So I think it would be safe to say -- well, I think the Court's response would be Exhibits 8, 9, 21, and 22 were not admitted into evidence, and leave it at that. What does the State think of that? I think that's how I would normally respond, with no explanation, just those were exhibits that were marked but they were not admitted. You all think about it. We're not rushing you. Mr. Armstrong, do you have a position?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Defense is fine with that.

THE COURT (SALVINI): And here's the other option. I'm just tossing something out that, my law clerk, when she was just whispering something to me, made my little brain click for a second.

I just want to make sure. Maybe it's a question for Donna and not a question for Ms. Eleanor or Larry. All the exhibits that are on Cathy's list, they went -- you walked them back there. So they have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, all the way to 24?

THE CLERK: I did not look through them. Counsel looked through them.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Counsel looked. Were all the exhibits -- because then Judge Taylor may be correct, these may just be numbers that are missing, so they're wondering why they're out of order.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. And I think what we may say is, what I would propose is say that, I guess, 8, 9, 21, and 22 were not admitted. The numbers themselves are arbitrary, or something, or that it's not ...

THE COURT (SALVINI): It's up to you all.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: And we ultimately didn't admit them because of pretrial matters.

THE COURT (SALVINI): I know. They don't have a copy of this list, but they have -- you all, counsel, checked the exhibits. Ms. Donna didn't. So, you all, they have every exhibit, correct?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. They have all the ones that were admitted.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Yes.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Obviously they do not have --

THE COURT (SALVINI): Not anything that's marked for identification of excluded. All right. Give us a second.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT (SALVINI): Did you hear what I said to Judge Taylor? Is I think maybe what we would say -- I think what they're doing is is that -- they don't have this list, just so you all know, they just have the exhibits. I think you've got a very diligent jury who's laid out the exhibits on the table in the jury room, and there's like, there's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, how we looked at everything. They're seeing they're missing a number. And so I think maybe to clear it up will just be for Judge Taylor to tell them Exhibits 8, 9, 21, and 22 were not admitted based on the Court's pretrial rulings. Do you agree? Does the State agree with that?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. I think that would be an appropriate response --

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: -- without reading too much into that.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Okay. I got a little worried that maybe they were missing some exhibits and I had a little panic attack up here, because I don't know how to cure that. But, okay.

(Jury seated in the courtroom at 3:42 p.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. We are back on the record. All members of the jury are present, as well as the Defendant.

There is a second jury note that's come out with two questions on that, on this note. I'll answer both questions for you. First is: Can we please have the charge of the law concerning forgery? And the answer to that is yes. I will re-read that to you in full in just a moment.

Second question is: Also, were we given State's Exhibits 8, 9, 21, and 22? My answer to that is that, based on some pretrial rulings, 8, 9, 21, and 22 were not admitted into evidence.

THE COURT (SALVINI): The jury looks relieved.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Madam Court Reporter, we'll mark this note as Exhibit 6, I believe.

(Court's Exhibit 6 is marked for identification.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. I will recharge you on the law regarding forgery. The Defendant is charged with forgery. Section 16-13-10(A) of the South Carolina Code of Laws provide: It is unlawful for a person to, (1) Falsely make, forge, or counterfeit, cause, or procure to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited, or willfully act, assist in the false making, forging, or counterfeiting of any instrument or instrument of writing; (2) To utter, or publish as true, any false, forged, or counterfeit writing, or instrument of writing; (3) Falsely make, forge, counterfeit, alter, change, deface, or erase, or cause, or procure to be falsely made, forged, counterfeited, altered, changed, defaced, or erased any record or plat of land; or, (4) Willfully act or assist in any of the premises -- the three I

mentioned -- with an intention to defraud any person.

Forgery consists of the fraudulent making or altering of a writing by one intending to defraud, prejudice, or damage another person. It has also been defined as a false making of an instrument which purports, on the face of it, to be good and valid for the purpose for which it was created, with a design to defraud, prejudice, or damage another.

Forgery is the false making or materially altering with intent to defraud of any writing which, if genuine, might apparently be of legal efficacy or the foundation or legal liability.

The State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the following elements of forgery: (1) There must be a false making or material alteration of some instrument; (2) It must be done, caused, procured, or willfully assisted therein by the Defendant with fraudulent intent or with the intent to defraud or prejudice another person, and; (3) The instrument must be of some apparent legal efficacy and apparently valid; and the subject of the written instrument must also have a value over $10,000.

The State must prove each of the elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If any of the elements is not proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you cannot convict the Defendant of forgery.

The false making or alteration of a written instrument is an essential element of the crime of forgery. Making an alteration of a written instrument must be performed by, caused by,

procured, or willfully assisted by the Defendant. To constitute forgery, the name allegedly forged need not be that of a person in existence, it may be wholly factitious.

The element of fraudulent intent to injure or defraud another person is an essential requirement of forgery. The intent required of a forgery conviction is the intent to defraud. If one, in good faith or ignorance of the effect of his act, without intent to defraud makes or alters an instrument, he is not guilty of forgery.

An intent to defraud is an intent to deceive another person for the purposes of gaining some material advantage over him, or to induce him to part with property, or to alter his position to his injury or risk and to accomplish the purpose by some false statement, false pretence, wrongful concealment, or suppression of truth, or by any other artifice or act intended to deceive.

The intent need not necessarily include the expectation of personal advantage to the accused. He need not have profited or intended to profit by the deception. It is sufficient if the intention to prejudice or to assist in prejudicing some other person existed.

To constitute the crime of forgery it is not necessary that anyone should have actually been injured or defrauded by the false writing or alteration. It is sufficient that the false instrument was made with intent to defraud and that it is of such character that it might prejudice the rights of another accepting

it as true.

The intention need not be to defraud any particular person, but it would be sufficient if there was a possibility or probability of some person being defrauded. The change in the date, amount, name of a party to, or subject matter of an instrument where the change is made with fraudulent intent constitutes forgery.

To constitute forgery it is essential that the instrument falsely made or altered possess some apparent legal efficacy because otherwise it would have no tendency to defraud.

The instrument need not be a perfect one. It is sufficient if it is shown to have some legal effect in writing, which may defraud or prejudice another or which, if genuine, would have a legal affect or operate as the foundation of another man's liability, or the evidence of his right, may be subject to forgery or alterations in the nature of forgery. It is sufficient that the instrument forged, supposing it to be genuine, might have operated to the prejudice of another.

It is not a defense that the person committing the crime was or considered himself justly entitled to -- excuse me. It is not a defense that the person committing the crime was or considered himself justly entitled to what he would obtain by means of the forgery. Further, it is no defense that the act was done under the instructions or orders of another. Likewise, it is no defense if it was done in partnership or cooperation with another

person.

That is a re-charge of the law by the Court on the charge of forgery. All right. I will ask you to return to your jury room. Don't begin deliberation until one of the bailiffs let you know it's okay.

(Jury escorted out of the courtroom at 3:50 p.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): The jury is out of the courtroom. Any objections or exceptions to the charge as read to the jury? From the State?

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: None from the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): From the Defense?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Please let the jury know they can resume deliberations.

THE BAILIFF: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT (SALVINI): All right. We'll be at recess.

(Court recessed at 3:51 p.m. and reconvenes at 4:00 p.m.)

VERDICT

THE COURT (SALVINI): Let's go ahead and bring the jury in.

(Jury enters the courtroom at 4:01 p.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. All members of the jury are present, as well as the Defendant. Madam Foreperson, I understand that the jury has reached a verdict in this case. Is that correct?

THE FOREPERSON: Yes, Your Honor.

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: Can you hand the verdict form to the bailiff.

(The Court inspects the verdict form.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): And the jury verdict form has been signed by the foreperson. Madam Clerk, you may publish the verdict.

THE CLERK: Your Honor, this is Case No. 2022-GS-23-3629 and 2022-GS-23-3631, the State of South Carolina versus Sharhonda Jenkins. As to the charge of forgery, we, the jury, unanimously find the Defendant guilty. As to the charge of obtaining goods under false pretences, we, the jury, unanimously find the Defendant guilty. Signed by our foreperson.

Ladies and gentlemen, if this is the verdict you reached in your deliberation room and this is still your verdict now please raise your right hand.

(Jurors respond by raising their right hands.)

THE CLERK: Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Any question by the State at this point?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: None from the State, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Any from the Defense?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: May we poll the jury, Your Honor?

ASS'T. SOL. SCOTT: I think the clerk is -- we can, but I think -- okay.

THE COURT (SALVINI): Madam Clerk, poll the jury.

THE CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen, the verdict I have published was the verdict you reached in the jury room. I ask you, Was it your verdict then and is it your verdict now? When I call your number please answer yes or no. Juror No. 112.

JUROR NO. 112: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 221.

JUROR NO. 221: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 132.

JUOR NO. 132: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 97.

JUROR NO. 97: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 205.

JUROR NO. 205: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 203.

JUROR NO. 203: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 218.

JUROR NO. 218: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 55.

JUROR NO. 55: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 109.

JUROR NO. 109: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 117.

JUROR NO. 117: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 151.

JUROR NO. 151: Yes.

THE CLERK: Juror No. 197.

JUROR NO. 197: Yes.

THE CLERK: Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Anything further, Mr. Armstrong?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Members of the jury, if you will please step back in your jury room for just a moment, I'll come back and see you in just a few minutes.

(Jury exits the courtroom at 4:05 p.m.)

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. At this time we will move forward with sentencing. I will ask the State to prepare the sentencing sheets.

THE COURT (SALVINI): And we're going to just step back and release the jury while you all get ready for the next step. Okay.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

SENTENCING

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. I'll ask the State to present the sentencing sheets. Okay. Thank you. All right. At this time the Court will recognize the State.

ASS'T. SOL. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor is familiar with the facts of this case, but the State would like to provide a little more context.

The Defendant does have credit for one day spent at the jail.

Your Honor, only one property was before the Court today, but the Defendant is charged, actually, with taking five properties and was part of a similar scheme. Those other properties are still pending.

Your Honor, on November 9th, 2021, the solicitors who had this case before us extended an offer in writing of a guilty plea to those charges with a recommendation of a five-year active sentence with a condition that if the Defendant surrenders the homes to the Estate of Erol Moliere the amount of time could be reduced and negotiated to a lower amount if the homes were returned. That was in 2021.

Your Honor, none of the homes have been returned to the Estate of Erol Moliere at this time or gone through the proper channels. They are still all in the name of Larry Williams.

The Defendant has actually done quite the opposite. On October 10th, 2023, there was another deed recorded on one of the properties where it was attempted to be sold to a third party for $37,000. Again, on December 12th, 2024, there was another one recorded to a third party for $30,000. And as recently as April 16th, 2025, there was another deed recorded for sale of a property for $30,000.

Your Honor, this has been obviously ongoing for a very long time, and I would just like to point out that instead of showing any remorse it is actually been quite the opposite in this case.

Your Honor, I believe the victim's attorney, Mr. Gibson,

would like to make a statement as well. And Ms. Moliere and Ms. Natasha Moliere may like to speak on behalf of Mr. Erol Moliere.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Sure. Be glad to hear from them.

ATTORNEY GIBSON: Thank you, Your Honor. For the record, I am Ken Gibson, and I am here in representation of the family, Natasha Moliere and Willie Mae Moliere. On behalf of the family, Your Honor, we are asking that you impose substantial and consecutive jail time in this case.

This has been an absolute nightmare for this family. I mean, I cannot imagine what it is like to have your inheritance stolen from you the way that Natasha's inheritance has been stolen from her.

As Mr. Miller stated, while we are here on one property, there are actually five properties that she forged and stole from this family. Three of those properties were being used as rental units and providing substantial income to the family. This was the desire of Erol Moliere, to provide for his family after he was gone. That has been taken away from them.

As you've heard, Your Honor, from just the sales of the properties Ms. Jenkins has amassed almost $97,000, plus the $20,000 that she received from GHA, and none of that money will ever be recovered for this family.

I am in the process of trying to get these properties back. There are two of them that were sold so quickly that I don't know if I'm going to ever be able to get those properties back. Three

of them I think I have a decent shot at getting back, but that's not certain either.

As Mr. Miller said, Your Honor, there has been no remorse shown in this particular case by Ms. Jenkins. Normally when a defendant is charged with a crime it chastens their actions, it makes them sort of back off. It has had the absolute opposite effect with Ms. Jenkins. Every opportunity that she has had to double and triple down on this forgery and on this step, she has done so.

I, as an attorney, I have personally defended at least two eviction actions where she has gone to court and tried to have Ms. Willie Mae Moliere and Natasha Moliere kicked out of homes that they were living in, all the while she was living rent-free at A Ridgeway Drive. There was one such incident, one eviction, where I had to go to court, and thank God each of the magistrate courts have seen through this and refused to evict them from these homes, but there was one instance where I went to court on an eviction to defend, we got the case dismissed, and then shortly thereafter, without an eviction, without a proper eviction order, Ms. Sharhonda Jenkins caused goons come to the house and force Ms. Willie Mae out of the house she was living in.

Again, Your Honor, I don't think that she has much of a prior record but despite that her action in this case have been deplorable. She has caused a nightmare for this family. She has

benefited from it greatly. There will be no recompense from her because, like I said, I don't think she has any more of the money left for us to get even if I'm able to get a judgment against her.

There are harms that have been done to this family that will never be rectified, ever. So, Your Honor, we're asking that you render the proper punishment in this case and put her in jail for a substantial amount of time and consecutive amount of time. Thank you.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. I will hear from Mrs. Moliere.

MS. WILLIE MAE MOLIERE: Hello. My name is Willie Mae Moliere. And I thank God for what has taken place today. From 2018 until now you don't know what I've gone through. My grandkids and I would come from church, and we were followed. And my grandma said, Grandma, why are those people following us? And then I say, I don't know, just leave them alone. Then another time some guys came to my house, which I know that know -- I'm not going to -- I'm going to let the lawyer handle that -- and offered me $200,000 to drop the case. I said I'm not willing to do that.

Then some of my church members had concided (sic) with her and they tell me, Ms. Moliere, why don't you go ahead and give her what you owe her? I said, I don't owe her anything. Why would I give something I don't owe her?

Then I had just come from a cancer treatment, and the guy that did work for me and Erol said, Ms. Moliere, are you moving? I said, No, I'm not moving. Where am I supposed to move to? He said, Well, over at your house they put all your stuff out on the street. So they kicked me out of my house. I had just come from a cancer treatment, then I got that.

Then my doctor just told me a couple weeks ago that I have bleeding on the brain. I was supposed to go for a CAT scan yesterday. I didn't get to go because I was here.

Then right now I said Thank the Lord, if I don't get to see another day -- cause they gonna have to go -- I had two strokes. Then they told me I have an aneurysm and they have to go inside my head and drill because I have bleeding on the brain. And they told me the more stress I get up under, the more I will have to go in and out of the hospital. I don't like going to the hospital.

But I say, Thank you, Jesus. I have faith. I have closure now. Even after the operation if I don't make it back I say, Well, God, thank you, I got to see this, and my grandkids. But you don't know what things I have gone through.

Some people that's in this court now, I helped them, even Sharhonda. When she was behind on her rent I said, You know, I'm not going to evict you. I gave her time to get the money that she needed. And then another person needing help, I helped her, too.

And the things I heard today, that hurt. I helped her. I help a lot of people. My daughter get on my case a lot of time, Mom, you help people too much. I said, No. The Lord has blessed me in all kinds of ways, so I'm going to help them. So regardless of what has said today, I know what I have done. God know what I have done.

And then with everything that happened today, thank you, Jesus. Even if I don't make it after the operation I can say that I have closure today, and my grandkids hopefully will get to see what I may not be able to see.

But anyway, thank God for you today. And, like I said, when I go home I don't know what the outcome's going to be, but right now I am so thankful to be here today and see all you people here. And God has been in the presence, because when I left this morning -- yeah. But anyway, I say thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Moliere. Anyone else?

MS. NATASHA MOLIERE: Well, I don't need a microphone. I want to say thank you all for everything you've all done, even for prosecution team, because I want to see my family have closure. Because my dad didn't come all the way from Haiti and make sacrifies to try to help our family for somebody to come in and just bluntly take something away from you like it's nothing and just run around and still do the same thing. You can make a mistake once. You don't keep making it over and over again.

But I just want to say that because I do get emotional, and

my mom said enough -- so for me, we good. But I appreciate it, and wish you all well.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): Thank you. The Court will hear from Mr. Armstrong. Do you have anything on behalf of your client?

ATTORNEY ARMSTRONG: Yes, Your Honor. My client lives in her home with two teenage sons. She has no criminal history. Everything is nonviolent. Obviously there are a lot of moving parts in this or it wouldn't be such a long deliberation. Some of the houses the estate are referring to were sold by her grandfather, not her.

That having been said, we would hope that the Court would grant leniency to her based upon her past, even if it could be a lengthy HIP sentence followed by PTUP.

And again, respectfully, thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. Ms. Jenkins, the Court's happy to hear anything from you. Do you wish to say anything?

THE DEFENDANT: Uhm, yes, Your Honor. A lot of the things that were said today were not true. I have been apologetic about the situation. I've been in contact with the family. I'm not sure why that's not been stated in court today.

I do appreciate you guys giving me the opportunity to prove my innocence. I believe there is a lot of discrepancies with the case and how the things were said and was going on, and I don't believe that it was fair, but I do appreciate that.

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. What we're going to do -- I

know members of the jury are waiting to kind of see the outcome of this -- I'm going to take a five-minute break and come back with my decision. Okay. All right. We'll be in recess for five minutes.

(Court recesses at 4:38 p.m. and reconvenes at 4:43 p.m.)

SENTENCE OF THE COURT

THE COURT (TAYLOR): All right. We are back on the record in State versus Sharhonda Nicole Jenkins. You have been found guilty at Indictment 2022-GS-23-3631, of obtaining property under false pretences, and 2022-GS-23-3629, forgery over $10,000.

I have listened to, obviously listened to, the testimony in this case, seen the exhibits, and I heard from Ms. Moliere, her representative. I heard from you.

The Court recognizes that you have gotten one day in jail based on this event, but the Court is very troubled by the circumstances of this case. They appear to be a blatant violation of to unnecessarily victimize people who had no right to be or did not deserve to be victims in this case.

I hear what you say about some remorse but I don't feel like you truly are remorseful about what happened, and I agree with the solicitor that this was one way and probably the only way to stop you from doing what you were doing.

So taking that into account, it is the SENTENCE of this Court, in Indictment 2022-GS-23-3629, forgery over $10,000, the SENTENCE of the Court is three years, without probation. You'll

be given credit for one day time served.

In regards to Indictment No. 2022-GS-23-3631, obtaining property under false pretences, the SENTENCE of the Court is time served.

So at this time those are the sentences of the Court. You will be taken into custody to serve the sentence of this Court.

All right. That concludes the hearing in this matter. Thank you.

(End of Transcript of Record.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Cathy J. Provost, Official Court Reporter for the Fourteenth Judicial Circuit of the State of South Carolina, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete Transcript of Record of the proceedings had and evidence introduced in the trial/proceedings of the captioned case in the Court of General Sessions for Greenville County, South Carolina, on the 13th day of June, 2025.

I do further certify that I am neither of kin, counsel, nor interest to any party hereto.

Date: March 17, 2026

\s\ Cathy J. Provost
Cathy J. Provost, RMR
Official Circuit Reporter

2007060408 DEED
4 PGS
Book DE 2273 Page:1180-1183
June 18, 2007 10 21.34 AM Cons:$28,000 00
Rec:$10.00 Cnty Tax:$30 80 State Tax:$72.80
FILED IN GREENVILLE COUNTY,SC

STATE'S EXHIBIT L 6-11-25 CP

State of South Carolina,
County of Greenville

Grantee Address:
[redacted] WOODMONT LANE
GREENVILLE, SC 29605

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, THAT

CARRIE LEE SIMS

In the State aforesaid for/and in consideration of the sum of

Twenty Eight Thousand dollars & no cents ($28,000.00)

To her in hand paid at and before the sealing of these presents by

EROL MOLIERE
in the State aforesaid, County aforesaid the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, have/has granted, bargained, sold and released,

and by these Presents do(es) grant, bargain, sell and release unto the said **EROL MOLIERE**

the following described property to wit·

ALL THAT LOT OF LAND WITH THE BUILDINGS AND IMPROVEMENTS THEREON IN GREENVILLE COUNTY, GANTT TOWNSHIP, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, KNOWN AND DESIGNATED AS LOT NO. 65 ACCORDING TO PLAT OF PROPERTY OF WOODFIELDS, INC., A SUBDIVISION LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST SIDE OF THE AUGUSTA ROAD, SAID LOT HAVING THE FOLLOWING METES AND BOUNDS AS SHOWN ON PLAT MADE BY DALTON & NEVES, ENGINEERS, MARCH 1947, RECORDED IN THE RMC OFFICE FOR GREENVILLE COUNTY IN PLAT BOOK S AT PAGE 7:

BEGINNING AT AN IRON PIN ON THE NORTHWEST SIDE OF RIDGEWAY DRIVE, JOINT FRONT CORNER OF LOT NO. 64 AND LOT NO. 65 AND RUNNING THENCE WITH RIDGEWAY DRIVE N. 44-09 E. 70 FEET TO AN IRON PIN, JOINT FRONT CORNER OF LOT NO. 66; THENCE WITH THE LINE OF LOT NO. 66, N. 45-51 W. 201.8 FEET TO AN IRON PIN; THENCE S. 42-45 W. 70 FEET TO AN IRON PIN, JOINT REAR CORNER OF LOT NO. 64; THENCE WITH THE LINE OF LOT NO. 64 S. 45-51 E. 200.2 FEET TO AN IRON PIN ON RIDGEWAY DRIVE, THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

TMS #0370.00-01-006.00

PROPERTY ADDRESS:
A RIDGEWAY DRIVE
GREENVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA 29605

DERIVATION:
THIS BEING THE SAME PROPERTY CONVEYED TO CLIFTON O. ZIMMERMAN BY DEED OF KATHARINE SEVIER SMITH BY HER ATTORNEY-IN-FACT LESTER LEIGH SMITH, JR. DATED OCTOBER 19, 1983 AND RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE

JUN 06 2025
DATE
CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF DOCUMENT ON FILE IN THIS OFFICE
Timothy L Ramsey
REGISTER OF DEEDS, GREENVILLE COUNTY

REGISTER OF DEEDS FOR GREENVILLE COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA ON NOVEMBER 2, 1983 IN BOOK 1199 AT PAGE 747. CLIFTON O. ZIMMERMAN DIED TESTATE ON JUNE 25, 2006 AS REFERENCED IN PROBATE FILE NO. 06ES2301292. SEE THAT DEED OF DISTRIBUTION FROM THE ESTATE OF CLIFTON OSCAR ZIMMERMAN, SR. TO CARRIE LEE SIMS RECORDED ON JUNE 18, 2007 IN DEED BOOK 2273 AT PAGE 1177 IN THE REGISTER OF DEEDS OFFICE FOR GREENVILLE COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA.

TOGETHER with all and singular, the Rights, Members, Hereditaments and Appurtenances to the said Premises belonging, or in anywise incident or appertaining.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD, all and singular, the said Premises before mentioned unto the said **EROL MOLIERE** his Heirs and Assigns forever.

AND **CARRIE LEE SIMS** do(es) hereby bind her Heirs, Assigns, Executors and Personal Representatives to warrant and forever defend, all and singular, the said Premises unto the said **EROL MOLIERE** his Heirs and Assigns, against herself and her Heirs and Assigns, and all persons whomsoever as may be lawfully claiming, or to claim the same or any part thereof.

WITNESS my/out Hand(s) and Seal(s), this June 14, 2007

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED
IN THE PRESENCE OF

Witness — Carrie Lee Sims (L.S.)
CARRIE LEE SIMS

Witness — (L.S.)

The State of South Carolina,

Greenville County.

PERSONALLY appeared before me the undersigned witness and made oath that he/she saw the within named CARRIE LEE SIMS, sign, seal, and as her act and deed, deliver the within written Deed, and that he/she with notary public witnessed the execution thereof.

SWORN to before me, this June 14, 2007

(SEAL) — Witness

Notary Public of South Carolina
My Comission Expires 2/15/12

WILLIAM J. McDONALD NOTARY PUBLIC SOUTH CAROLINA

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF GREENVILLE)

AFFIDAVIT

PERSONALLY appeared before me the undersigned, who being duly sworn, deposes and says:
1. I have read the information on this affidavit and I understand such information.

2. The property being transferred is located at [redacted]RIDGEWAY DRIVE, Greenville, South Carolina 29605, bearing County Tax Map Number 0370.00-01-006.00, was transferred by Carrie Lee Sims to Erol Moliere on 06/1[redacted]/2007.

3. Check one of the following: The deed is

(a) [x] subject to the deed recording fee as a transfer for consideration paid or to be paid in money or money's worth.

(b) [ ] subject to the deed recording fee as a transfer between a corporation, a partnership, or other entity and a stockholder, partner, or owner of the entity, or is a transfer to a trust or as a distribution to a trust beneficiary.

(c) [ ] exempt from the deed recording fee because (See Information section of affidavit):

(If exempt, please skip items 4 - 7, and go to item 8 of this affidavit.)

If exempt under exemption #14 as described in the Information section of this affidavit, did the agent and principal relationship exist at the time of the original sale and was the purpose of this relationship to purchase the realty? Check Yes [] or No []

4. Check one of the following if either item 3(a) or item 3(b) above has been checked (See Information section of this affidavit.):

(a) [x] The fee is computed on the consideration paid or to be paid in money or money's worth in the amount of $28,000.00

(b) [ ] The fee is computed on the fair market value of the realty which is

(c) [ ] The fee is computed on the fair market value of the realty as established for property tax purposes which is

5. Check Yes [ ] or No [x] to the following: A lien or encumbrance existed on the land, tenement, or realty before the transfer and remained on the land, tenement, or realty after the transfer. If A Yes, the amount of the outstanding balance of this lien or encumbrance is: [ ].

6. The deed recording fee is computed as follows:

(a) Place the amount listed in item 4 above here: [$28,000.00]

(b) Place the amount listed in item 5 above here: [-0-]
(If no amount is listed, place zero here.)

(c) Subtract Line 6(b) from Line 6(a) and place result here: [$28,000.00]

7. The deed recording fee due is based on the amount listed on Line 6(c) above and the deed recording, fee due is: [$113.60].

8. As required by Code Section, 12-24-70, I state that I am a responsible person who was connected with the transaction as: [Grantor].

9. I understand that a person required to furnish this affidavit who wilfully furnishes a false or fraudulent affidavit is guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Carrie Lee Sims
Responsible Person Connected with the Transaction

SWORN to before me this 14th day JUNE of 2007

CARRIE LEE SIMS
Print or Type Name Here

Notary Public for South Carolina
My Commission Expires: 2/15/11

WILLIAM J. McDONALD NOTARY PUBLIC SOUTH CAROLINA

INFORMATION

Except as provided in this paragraph, the term "value" means the consideration paid or to be paid in money or money's worth for the realty Consideration paid or to be paid in money's worth includes, but is not limited to, other realty, personal property, stocks, bonds, partnership interest and other intangible property, the forgiveness or cancellation of a debt, the assumption of a debt, and the surrendering of any right The fair market value of the consideration must be used in calculating the consideration paid in money=s worth Taxpayers may elect to use the fair market value of the realty being transferred in determining fair market value of the consideration In the case of realty transferred between a corporation, a partnership, or other entity and a stockholder, partner, or owner of the entity, and in the case of realty transferred to a trust or as a distribution to a trust beneficiary, value means the realty's fair market value A deduction from value is allowed for the amount of any lien or encumbrance existing on the land, tenement, or realty before the transfer and remaining on the land, tenement, or realty after the transfer Taxpayers may elect to use the fair market value for property tax purposes in determining fair market value under the provisions of the law

Exempted from the fee are deeds:

(1) transferring realty in which the value of the realty, as defined in Code Section 12-24-30, is equal to or less than one hundred dollars,

(2) transferring realty to the federal government or to a state, its agencies and departments, and its political subdivisions, including school districts,

(3) that are otherwise exempted under the laws and Constitution of this State or of the United States,

(4) transferring realty in which no gain or loss is recognized by reason of Section 1041 of the Internal Revenue Code as defined in Section 12-6-40(A),

(5) transferring realty in order to partition realty as long as no consideration is paid for the transfer other than the interests in the realty that are being exchanged in order to partition the realty,

(6) transferring an individual grave space at a cemetery owned by a cemetery company licensed under Chapter 55 of Title 39,

(7) that constitute a contract for the sale of timber to be cut,

(8) transferring realty to a corporation, a partnership, or a trust in order to become, or as, a stockholder, partner, or trust beneficiary of the entity provided no consideration is paid for the transfer other than stock in the corporation, interest in the partnership, beneficiary interest in the trust, or the increase in value in such stock or interest held by the grantor However, the transfer of realty from a corporation, a partnership, or a trust to a stockholder, partner, or trust beneficiary of the entity is subject to the fee even if the realty is transferred to another corporation, a partnership, or trust,

(9) transferring realty from a family partnership to a partner or from a family trust to a beneficiary, provided no consideration is paid for the transfer other than a reduction in the grantee=s interest in the partnership or trust A Afamily partnership@ is a partnership whose partners are all members of the same family A A family trust@ is a trust, in which the beneficiaries are all members of the same family The beneficiaries of a family trust may also include charitable entities AFamily@ means the grantor and the grantor=s spouse, parents, grandparents, sisters, brothers, children, stepchildren, grandchildren, and the spouses and lineal descendants of any the above AAcharitable entity@ means an entity which may receive deductible contributions under Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code as defined in Section 12-6-40(A),

(10) transferring realty in a statutory merger or consolidation from a constituent corporation to the continuing or new corporation,

(11) transferring realty in a merger or consolidation from a constituent partnership to the continuing or new partnership, and,

(12) that constitute a corrective deed or a quit claim deed used to confirm title already vested in the grantee, provided that no consideration of any kind is paid or is to be paid under the corrective or quit claim deed.

(13) transferring realty subject to a mortgage to the mortgagee whether by a deed in lieu of foreclosure executed by the mortgagee or deed--pursuant to foreclosure proceedings

(14) transferring realty from an agent to the agent=s principal in which the realty was purchased with funds of the principal, provided that a notarized document is also filed with the deed that establishes the fact that the agent and principal relationship existed at the time of the original purchase as well as for the purpose of purchasing the realty

(15) transferring title to facilities for transmitting electricity that is transferred, sold, or exchanged by electrical utilities, municipalities, electric cooperatives, or political subdivisions to a limited liability company which is subject to regulation under the Federal Power Act (16 U S C Section 791(a)) and which is formed to operate or to take functional control of electric transmission assets as defined in the Federal Power Act

FILED FOR RECORD IN GREENVILLE COUNTY,SC ROD
2007060408 Book:DE 2273 Page:1180-1183
June 18, 2007 10:21:34 AM
Timothy L Mauney

STATE'S EXHIBIT 2 6-11-25 CP

GENERAL POWER OF ATTORNEY

2014042549 4 Pgs
P/ATTY Book: DE 2446 Page: 2638 - 2641
June 19, 2014 02:04:29 PM
Rec: $15.00
FILED IN GREENVILLE COUNTY, SC Timothy L. Hannah

NOTICE: THE POWERS GRANTED BY THIS DOCUMENT ARE BROAD AND SWEEPING. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THESE POWERS, OBTAIN COMPETENT LEGAL ADVICE. THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT AUTHORIZE ANYONE TO MAKE MEDICAL AND OTHER HEALTH-CARE DECISIONS FOR YOU. YOU MAY REVOKE THIS POWER OF ATTORNEY IF YOU LATER WISH TO DO SO.

I, Ecol Molliere [YOUR FULL LEGAL NAME], residing at
E 3. Estate Dr, Greenville SC 29605 [YOUR FULL ADDRESS], hereby appoint
Willie M.c Molliere of Greenville, _____,
_____, as my Attorney-in-Fact ("Agent").

If my Agent is unable to serve for any reason, I designate N/A, of
_____, _____, _____ _____, as my successor Agent.

I hereby revoke any and all general powers of attorney that previously have been signed by me. However, the preceding sentence shall not have the effect of revoking any powers of attorney that are directly related to my health care that previously have been signed by me.

My Agent shall have full power and authority to act on my behalf. This power and authority shall authorize my Agent to manage and conduct all of my affairs and to exercise all of my legal rights and powers, including all rights and powers that I may acquire in the future. My Agent's powers shall include, but not be limited to, the power to:

DATE JUN 06 2025 CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF DOCUMENT ON FILE IN THIS OFFICE
REGISTER OF DEEDS, GREENVILLE COUNTY

1. Open, maintain or close bank accounts (including, but not limited to, checking accounts, savings accounts, and certificates of deposit), brokerage accounts, and other similar accounts with financial institutions.

a. Conduct any business with any banking or financial institution with respect to any of my accounts, including, but not limited to, making deposits and withdrawals, obtaining bank statements, passbooks, drafts, money orders, warrants, and certificates or vouchers payable to me by any person, firm, corporation or political entity.

b. Perform any act necessary to deposit, negotiate, sell or transfer any note, security, or draft of the United States of America, including U.S. Treasury Securities.

c. Have access to any safe deposit box that I might own, including its contents.

2. Sell, exchange, buy, invest, or reinvest any assets or property owned by me. Such assets or property may include income producing or non-income producing assets and property.

3. Purchase and/or maintain insurance, including life insurance upon my life or the life of any other appropriate person.

4. Take any and all legal steps necessary to collect any amount or debt owed to me, or to settle any claim, whether made against me or asserted on my behalf against any other person or entity.

5. Enter into binding contracts on my behalf.

6. Exercise all stock rights on my behalf as my proxy, including all rights with respect to stocks, bonds, debentures, or other investments.

7. Maintain and/or operate any business that I may own.

8. Employ professional and business assistance as may be appropriate, including attorneys, accountants, and real estate agents.

9. Sell, convey, lease, mortgage, manage, insure, improve, repair, or perform any other act with respect to any of my property (now owned or later acquired) including, but not limited to, real estate and real estate rights (including the right to

remove tenants and to recover possession). This includes the right to sell or encumber any homestead that I now own or may own in the future.

10. Prepare, sign, and file documents with any governmental body or agency, including, but not limited to, authorization to:

a. Prepare, sign and file income and other tax returns with federal, state, local, and other governmental bodies.

b. Obtain information or documents from any government or its agencies, and negotiate, compromise, or settle any matter with such government or agency (including tax matters).

c. Prepare applications, provide information, and perform any other act reasonably requested by any government or its agencies in connection with governmental benefits (including military and social security benefits).

11. Make gifts from my assets to members of my family and to such other persons or charitable organizations with whom I have an established pattern of giving. However, my Agent may not make gifts of my property to the Agent. I appoint N/A, of _____, _____, _____, as my substitute Agent for the sole purpose of making gifts of my property to my Agent, as appropriate.

12. Transfer any of my assets to the trustee of any revocable trust created by me, if such trust is in existence at the time of such transfer.

13. Disclaim any interest which might otherwise be transferred or distributed to me from any other person, estate, trust, or other entity, as may be appropriate.

This Power of Attorney shall be construed broadly as a General Power of Attorney. The listing of specific powers is not intended to limit or restrict the general powers granted in this Power of Attorney in any manner.

Any power or authority granted to my Agent under this document shall be limited to the extent necessary to prevent this Power of Attorney from causing: (i) my income to be taxable to my Agent, (ii) my assets to be subject to a general power of appointment by my Agent, and (iii) my Agent to have any incidents of ownership with respect to any life insurance policies that I may own on the life of my Agent.

My Agent shall not be liable for any loss that results from a judgment error that was made in good faith. However, my Agent shall be liable for willful misconduct or the failure to act in good faith while acting under the authority of this Power of Attorney.

I authorize my Agent to indemnify and hold harmless any third party who accepts and acts under this document.

My Agent shall be entitled to reasonable compensation for any services provided as my Agent. My Agent shall be entitled to reimbursement of all reasonable expenses incurred in connection with this Power of Attorney.

My Agent shall provide an accounting for all funds handled and all acts performed as my Agent, if I so request or if such a request is made by any authorized personal representative or fiduciary acting on my behalf.

This Power of Attorney shall become effective immediately and shall not be affected by my disability or lack of mental competence, except as may be provided otherwise by an applicable state statute. This is a Durable Power of Attorney. This Power of Attorney shall continue effective until my death. This Power of Attorney may be revoked by me at any time by providing written notice to my Agent.

Dated June 18, 2014 at 130 Hwy 252, Anderson S.C. 29621.

YOUR SIGNATURE:

M. EROL MOLIERE

YOUR PRINTED FULL LEGAL NAME:

Erol Moliere

WITNESS' SIGNATURE:

Lloyd Isman

WITNESS' PRINTED FULL LEGAL NAME:

Lloyd Isman

WITNESS' SIGNATURE:

Kathleen Ryder

WITNESS' PRINTED FULL LEGAL NAME:

Kathleen Ryder

Acknowledgement:

STATE OF South Carolina

COUNTY OF Anderson

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 18 day of June, 2014 by Erol Moliere [YOUR FULL LEGAL NAME], who is personally known to me or who has produced _____ as identification.

Susan H. Harbin

Signature of person taking acknowledgment

Susan H. Harbin

Name typed, printed, or stamped

Notary Public

Title or rank

07/18/19 exp. date

Serial number (if applicable)

This document was prepared by:

Name: Lloyd Isman

Address: P.O. Box 2907

Anderson SC 29622

May 16, 2014

I Errol Moliere, give Willie Mae Moliere permission to handle all of my affairs, Bank Accounts, All of my Houses, and anything that has my Name on it. I Errol Moliere do hereby do declare + Declare that she may, Willie Mae Moliere + no one else to handle my affairs. This day 16 May 16, 2014.

Errol Moliere

Willie Mae Moliere

Notary, Susan L Nadeau
Comm. Expires Apr 22, 2018

393
STATE'S EXHIBIT
5
6-11-25 CP

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF GREENVILLE)

Quit Claim Deed

2018077586
QCD Book: DE 2549 Page: 4678 - 4679 2 Pgs
October 10, 2018 04:57:02 PM Cons: $2,500.00
Rec: $10.00 Cnty Tax: $2.75 State Tax: $6.50
FILED IN GREENVILLE COUNTY, SC

KNOW ALL MAN BY THE PRESENTS THAT, I , EROL MOLIERE , herein referred to as Grantor , for the consideration of the sum of Two Thousand And Five Hundred DOLLARS (2,500) the receipt of which is herby acknowledge , have granted , bargained, sold, and released unto DARRELL FREEMAN, his heirs and assigns forever , herein referred to as Grantee, all my undivided interest in the below described real property :

All that certain piece , parcel or lot of situate , lying and being in the County of Greenville, State of South Carolina being showed as designated lot 65, Woodfields Subdivision , District 156 , a plat of which is recorded in a Plat Book "S", at page 7.

Tax Map Number: 03730000100600

The above describe property is subject to any and all easements and/or right of way for roads, utilities, drainage, etc. as may appear of record and/or on the premises and to any and all restrictions , covenants or zoning ordinance affecting such property as may appear for record .

Grantee's Address: [redacted] Crossbow Way, Greenville, SC 29605

Property Address: A Ridgeway Drive, Greenville, SC 29605

Together with all and singular, the rights, members, hereditaments and appurtenances to said premises belonging or in anywise incident or appertaining.

To HAVE AND TO HOLD all and singular the said premises before mentioned unto the Grantee herein above name and the Grantee heirs, successors and assigns forever.

AND THE GRANTOR does herby bind the Grantor/s heirs and assigns, to warrant and forever defend all and singular the said premises unto the said Grantee, against Grantor and Grantor's heirs and against every person whomsoever lawfully claiming or to claim the same or any part thereof.

DATE JUN 0 6 2025
CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY
OF DOCUMENT ON FILE IN THIS OFFICE
REGISTER OF DEEDS, GREENVILLE COUNTY

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

COUNTY OF GREENVILLE

THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT WAS ACKNOWLEDGED BEFORE ME ON THE 28TH, DAY OF JUNE, 2018 BY EROL MOLIERE.

Erol Moliere (Grantor)

Willie Mae Moliere
Power of Attorney for Erol Moliere

(Grantee) Darrell Freeman

Notary

Witness 1

Witness 2

Sworn to and Subscribed Before Me, on
This 28 Day of June 2018
Signed:
Notary Public of South Carolina
My Commission Expires: 12-30-2023

BARRY L. DOWNS NOTARY PUBLIC My Commission Expires 12/30/2023 SOUTH CAROLINA

2020007747
QCD Book: DE 2586 Page: 2918 - 2920 3 Pgs
January 31, 2020 03:46:36 PM Cons: $4,553.49
Rec: $15.00 Cnty Tax: $5.50 State Tax: $13.00
FILED IN GREENVILLE COUNTY, SC

QUIT CLAIM DEED

THIS QUIT CLAIM DEED, executed this 16th day of December 2019, by

First party, Grantor, Darrell Freeman, whose mailing address is [redacted] Crossbow Way, Greenville, SC 29607

To second party, Grantee, Larry Williams, whose mailing address is: [redacted] Augusta St [redacted] Greenville, SC 29605

All that certain piece, parcel, or lot situate, lying between in the County of Grenville, State of South Carolina being shown as designated lot 65, Woodfield Subdivision, District 156, A plat Book "S" at page 7.

WITNESSETH, that the said first party, for good and valuable consideration in the sum of four thousand five hundred fifty three dollars and forty-nine cents ($4,553.49) paid by the said second party, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, does hereby remise, release and quitclaim unto the said second party forever, all the right, title, interest and claim which the said first party has in and to the following described parcel of land, and improvements and appurtenances there to, in the County of Greenville, State of South Carolina, to wit:

STATE'S EXHIBIT 6 6-11-25

Parcel/TMS# 0370-00-01-006.00

Address A **Ridgeway Drive Greenville, SC 29605**

JUN 06 2025
DATE
CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF DOCUMENT ON FILE IN THIS OFFICE
REGISTER OF DEEDS, GREENVILLE COUNTY

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said first party has signed and sealed these presents the day and year first above written. Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:

Darrell Freeman
Darrell Freeman
Grantor

Larry Williams
Larry Williams
Grantee

willie C. Nelson

Virginia Jones

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

) ACKNOWLEDGMENT

COUNTY OF GREENVILLE)

I, the undersigned Notary Public do certify that Darrell Freeman, personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the due execution of the foregoing instrument.

Witness my official seal this the 19 day of Dec., 19.

Barry L. Downs

Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission Expires: 12-30-2023

18 - 200880

The Greenville Housing Authority
HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER PROGRAM
122 Edinburgh Court
Greenville, South Carolina 29607
(864) 467- 4250 / TTY/TDD (864) 467-4302

Request for New Landlord or Change in Landlord Information

Please select: ☑ New Landlord ☐ Landlord Info Update ☑ New Agent
☐ Change of Agent ☐ Other (specify): _____

Landlord Name: Larry Williams
Address: [redacted] Augusta St [redacted]
Greenville, SC 29605
Phon[redacted] e-mail: Larry.williams[redacted]

Larry Williams | Larry Williams | 1/28/20
Name | Signature | Date

If New Landlord:

Attach completed W-9 form (matching address on this form), copy of picture ID, proof of ownership (title, deed, etc.), proof mortgage is current (if applies) and proof taxes are current.

Agent Name: _____
Address: [redacted] ridge way Drive
Greenville, SC 29605

Phone: _____ e-mail: _____

_____ | _____ | _____
Name | Signature | Date

If New Landlord/Agent:

In addition of all the documents above, a completed W-9 form for the agent and a copy of the management agreement is required.

TGHA will not process this request until ALL the correct documentation is received.

Office use only:

Landlord #: _____ Agent #: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

RECEIVED
FEB 04 2020

STATE'S EXHIBIT
11
6-12-25-CP

2021 JUL 22 AM 11:40

ajy/06/23/2021 09:30:41

399

WITNESSES

Eliott D Turner Eliott Turner 4/3/22

Greenville County Sheriff's Office

5/21/2021

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

2021A2330204553

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

TRUE BILL

FOREMAN GRAND JURY

Foreperson of Grand Jury

VERDICT

Foreperson of Petit Jury

Date:

AMENDED INDICTMENT

DOCKET NO. 2022-GS-23-003629

EJW

The State of South Carolina

County of Greenville

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

November TERM 2024

THE STATE

vs.

SHARHONDA NICOLE JENKINS

Amended Indictment for

3437

FORGERY

VIOLATION § 16-13-0010(A)

ENTERED ACCT BK

400

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF GREENVILLE)

AMENDED INDICTMENT FOR
FORGERY

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on NOV 1 2 2024 the Grand Jurors of Greenville County present upon their oath:

That SHARHONDA NICOLE JENKINS did in Greenville County, on or about the 28th day of June, 2018, with intent to defraud, falsely make, forge, counterfeit, cause or procure to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited utter and publish as true, or willfully act or assist in any of the foregoing, in regard to an instrument of writing, to wit: a QUITCLAIM DEED for the property located at A RIDGEWAY DRIVE bearing the name of EROL MOLIERE and presented to GREENVILLE COUNTY REAL PROPERTY SERVICES. This is in violation of §16-13-0010 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (1976) as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

SOLICITOR BAR # 104275

401

WITNESSES

Eliott D Turner

Greenville County Sheriff's Office

5/21/2021

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

2021A2330204554

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

TRUE BILL

FOREMAN GRAND JURY

Foreperson of Grand Jury

VERDICT

Foreperson of Petit Jury
Date:

DOCKET NO. 2022-GS-23-
EJW
003631

The State of South Carolina

County of Greenville

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

June TERM 2022

THE STATE

vs.

SHARHONDA NICOLE JENKINS

Indictment for

3471

OBTAINING GOODS UNDER FALSE PRETENSES

VIOLATION § 16-13-0240

ENTERED ACCT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF GREENVILLE)

INDICTMENT FOR
OBTAINING GOODS UNDER FALSE PRETENSES

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on JUN 14 2022 the Grand Jurors of Greenville County present upon their oath:

That SHARHONDA NICOLE JENKINS did in Greenville County, on or about the October 18, 2018, with intent to cheat and defraud the victim, THE ESTATE OF EROL MOLIERE to obtain rent payments valued at more than Ten Thousand Dollars from the victim by means of false pretenses and representations, to wit: by collecting monthly rent payments from the GREENVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY using a bank account in the name of LARRY WILLIAMS which was under the exclusive dominion and control of SHARHONDA NICOLE JENKINS. This is in violation of §16-13-0240 of South Carolina Code of Laws (1976) as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

SOLICITOR BAR # 104275

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL FOR APPELLANT

Counsel for appellant certifies that this Record on Appeal contains all material proposed to be included by any of the parties and not any other material and that this Record on Appeal complies to the best of my ability with the April 15, 2014 order from the South Carolina Supreme Court entitled "Revised Order Concerning Personal Identifying Information and Other Sensitive Information in Appellate Court Filings."

Respectfully Submitted,

W. Chandler Norville
Appellate Defender

South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense
Division of Appellate Defense
PO Box 11589
Columbia, SC 29211-1589

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

This 18th day of June, 2026.

RECEIVED
Jun 18 2026
SC Court of Appeals