

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

The State, Respondent,

v.

Londell Lashun Alston, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2025-000197

ORDER

On September 11, 2026, counsel for Appellant filed the record on appeal and a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*.¹ On December 5, 2025, Appellant filed his pro se response brief. On July 27, 2026, Appellant moved to amend and supplement his pro se brief. The State did not file a return.

After careful consideration, we grant Appellant's motion to supplement his pro se response brief; his September 11, 2026 supplement to his pro se response is accepted as filed.

Also on July 27, 2026, Appellant filed two motions for relief based upon prosecutorial misconduct and constitutional due process violations. We take no action on this filing because Appellant is represented by counsel. *See Miller v. State*, 388 S.C. 347, 347, 697 S.E.2d 527, 527 (2010) ("Since there is no right to 'hybrid representation' that is partially *pro se* and partially by counsel, substantive documents, with the exception of motions to relieve counsel, filed *pro se* by a person represented by counsel are not to be accepted unless submitted by counsel.").



FOR THE COURT

J.

¹ 386 U.S. 738 (1967).

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Londell Lashun Alston, 00308837

Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire

Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire

Wanda H. Carter, Esquire

FILED
Aug 20 2026