IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM THE S.C. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT
THE HONORABLE RALPH K. ANDERSON
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

CASE NO: 2026-000521

RECEIVED
SEP 08 2026
SC Court of Appeals

CHARLES MITCHELL # 00189424 APPELLANT

VS.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES RESPONDENT

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

CHARLES M. MITCHELL
00189424
ALLENDALE CORRECTIONAL INST
P.O. BOX 1151 HWY 47
FAIRFAX S.C. 29827

LEGAL MAIL

QUESTION PRESENTED

DID THE S.C. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT IN ERROR DISMISSED A TIMELY FILE CLAIM OF NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE IN VIOLATION OF A CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION WHEN PRISONER WAS INSTRUCTED BY PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO NOTIFY THE BOARD IF HE THINK HIS FILE CONTAIN ANY INADEQUACIES ON OCTOBER-10-2018 WHERE FORM 1212 CRITERIA FOR PAROLE CONSIDERATION ADVISED PRISONER THAT PAROLE AUTHORITY BOARD WILL INVESTIGATE AND NOTIFY PRISONER..... WHERE THIS INVESTIGATION FROM OCTOBER-10-2018 WAS FINALIZED ON JANUARY-13-2025 THAT DETERMINE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT SINCE PRISONER INITIAL PAROLE OF 2012, THAT PRISONER CLAIM DO TO PAROLE AUTHORITIES SERIOUS ERROR EFFECTIVELY CAUSED PRISONER TO NOT RECEIVE NO CONSTITUTIONAL REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN RELEASE FROM INITIAL HEARING WHERE IF NOT FOR ERROR OF NEGLIGENCE BY S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES PRISONER LABEL LIFE WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE WOULD NOT EFFECTIVELY NOW RESEMBLE LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE.....IN DIRECT CONFLICT WITH HAYDEN V. KELLER 134 F. SUPP 3D 1000 AND ATWELL V. STATE, 197 SO. 3D 1040 AND STATE VS. MITCHELL 2021 6066794, AND JAY V. STATE 252 SO. 3D 326

CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 IS A CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER OF HOMICIDE (16-3-10) S.C. CODE OF LAWS. JUVENILE PLEAD ON AUGUST-4-1992 AS INDICTED AND WAS SENTENCE TO NATURAL LIFE BY THE HONORABLE R. HENRY MCKELLAR SEE DOCUMENT A.

APPELLATE STATE DOING THIS TERM OF 1992 ONE WHO PLEA GUILTY TO HOMICIDE UNDER STATUTE (16-3-20) (A) (SUPP 1991 AND 1992) TITLE 16 ARTICLE 1, HOMICIDE (MUST) BE PUNISH IMPRISONMENT FOR LIFE AND IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR PAROLE UNTIL THE SERVICE OF TWENTY YEARS. IN ADDITION NO PERSON SENTENCED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBSECTION MAY RECEIVE ANY WORK-RELEASE, EARN WORK CREDITS, GOOD-TIME CREDITS OR ANY OTHER CREDIT THAT WOULD REDUCE THE MANDATORY IMPRISONMENT REQUIRED BY THIS SUBSECTION.

SEE 26 S.C. JUR. PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON (11) CLEARLY STATE ..... "LIKE" PROBATION THE ESSENCE OF PAROLE IS A GRANT OF CONDITIONAL FREEDOM. UNLIKE PROBATION PAROLE IS A FORM OF EARLY RELEASE FROM PRISON BEFORE THE COMPLETION OF SENTENCE BASED ON THE PRISONER'S AGREEMENT TO ABIDE BY CERTAIN CONDITIONS DURING THE BALANCE OF THE SENTENCE.

IN THE CASE OF JUVENILE OFFENDER BEFORE THIS COURT OF S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IT WAS STATED CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 WAS NOT ONE OF THE CLASS OF OFFENDERS WHO WAS NOT ENTITLE TO RESENTENCING BECAUSE HE WAS NOT SENTENCE TO LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE SEE STATE VS. MITCHELL 2021 6066794.

SEE MAJOR VS. S.C. DEPT OF PROBATION AND PAROLE AND PARDON SERVS 384 S.C. 457, 465 S.E 2D 795, 799 (2009) [A] SENTENCING COURT IS NOT AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE PAROLE ELIGIBILITY. SEE ADAMS V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES 2016 WL 6092509.

SEE ATWELL V. STATE 197 SO. 3d 1040 AT [4] CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: PARDON AND PAROLE STATE THE JUDICIARY HAS NO INPUT AS TO THE OPERATION OF THE PAROLE SYSTEM.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER STATE AT THIS POINT THE SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES HAS NOT INFORMED JUVENILE OFFENDER BY LEGAL MAIL DOCUMENT THAT HE'S NON PAROLE ELIGIBLE. SEE DOCUMENT A., JUVENILE SENTENCE TRIAL GUILTY PLEA TRANSCRIPT CLEARLY REVEAL THAT THE SENTENCING COURT [ORALLY PRONOUNCED] THAT JUVENILE OFFENDER BE COMMITED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION FOR THE TERM OF NATURAL LIFE. SEE U.S. V. DEMARTINO 112 F.3D 75 STATE IT IS THE ORAL SENTENCE WHICH CONSTITUTES THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT AND WHICH IS AUTHORITY FOR EXECUTION. THE WRITTEN COMMITMENT ORDER IS MERE EVIDENCE OF SUCH AUTHORITY SEE DOCUMENT COMMITMENT ORDER OF CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 DOCUMENT B.

APPELLATE STATE JUST AS IN MAJOR 384 S.C. 457, 465 S.E 795, 799....., IF THE SENTENCING COURT IS NOT AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE PAROLE ELIGIBILITY AND JUVENILE OFFENDER WAS ORALLY SENTENCE TO NATURAL LIFE TO THE DEPT OF CORRECTION ON AUGUST-4-1992 UNDER STATUTE CODE OF LAWS 16-3-20(A) (SUPP. 1991) THAT DO NOT AUTHORIZE ANY FORM OF EARLY RELEASE THAT WOULD REDUCE THE MANDATORY IMPRISONMENT..... TO INCLUDE S.C. JUR (26) (V) PAROLE DEFINITION CLEARLY STATE [PAROLE] IS A FORM OF EARLY RELEASE FROM PRISON BEFORE THE COMPLETION OF SENTENCE FOLLOWING JUVENILE OFFENDER WAS CLAIM BY THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS TO [NOT] BE ONE OF THE CLASS OF OFFENDERS OF AIKIN VS. BYARS, 410, 534 765 S.E. 2D 572 (2014) NOT ENTITLE TO RESENTENCING BECAUSE HE WAS CLAIM TO BE SENTENCE BY THE COURT TO LIFE WITH PAROLE ELIGIBLE, COMPELS THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WITH RESPECTFUL COMPETENT TO REVIEW JUVENILE OFFENDER UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE APPELLATE SUCCESSFULLY DEMONSTRATE HIS CLAIM OF LIFE WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE EFFECTIVELY RESEMBLE

LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE UNDER THE SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE BOARD AUTHORITY.

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 BEGIN BY PRESENTING HIS UNIQUE INDIVIDUAL CASE BEFORE OUR S. C. COURT OF APPEALS THAT INORDER TO BE ENTITLE TO RELIEF THAT THIS COURT SEE'S CONSTITUTIONAL JUSTICE OF RELIEF HE THE APPELLATE MUST MAKE A SUCCESSFUL THRESHOLD SHOWING THAT HE AS A INDIVIDUAL JUVENILE RECEIVED A SENTENCE OF LIFE WITH PAROLE THAT EFFECTIVELY RESEMBLE LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE A SENTENCE THAT FAILED TO AFFORD HIM A REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE BASED ON DEMONSTRATED MATURITY REHABILITATION. APPELLATE CONFIRM BASED ON HIS INDIVIDUAL CASE HISTORY HE WAS COMPLETELY DENIED NO REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE.

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

JUVENILE OFFENDERS:

IN MILTON IN ORDER TO RAISE AN 8TH AMENDMENT CHALLENAGE FOR CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THE CASE OF A JUVENILE OFFENDER SENTENCE WITH LIFE IMPRISONMENT "JUVENILE" MUST EITHER HAVE BEEN SENTENCE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE [OR] JUVENILE LIFE SENTENCE WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE MUST EFFECTIVELY RESEMBLE A LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE SENTENCE U.S. CONST AMEND.

A. SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CLEARLY REVEAL THAT JUVENILE OFFENDER APPELLATE BEFORE THIS S.C. COURT OF APPEALS SEE DOCUMENT A. CONFIRM SENTENCING COURT ORALLY PRONOUNCED THAT HE BE COMMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION FOR THE TERM OF HIS NATURAL LIFE. JUVENILE OFFENDER BELIEVE THE TERM NATURAL LIFE SENTENCE CLEARLY MEAN JUST AS IT IS PLAINLY PRONOUNCED WITHOUT RELEASE A NON PAROLE GRANT SENTENCE. SEE DOCUMENT B.

B. SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM "NATURAL LIFE" SENTENCE WAS NOT PROCEDURALLY BAR UNDER 16-3-20(A) (SUPP 1991) BECAUSE THIS STATUTE IS PUNISHABLE PROCEEDING TO DETERMINE WHETHER SENTENCE SHOULD BE DEATH OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT. (NOTE) ALTHOUGH A TRIAL JUDGE HAS DISCRETION IN SENTENCING A JUVENILE HOMICIDE OFFENDER, THE SENTENCE CANNOT EXCEED THE STATUTORY LIMITS NOR CAN IT RESULT FROM PARTIALITY OR PREJUDICE.

C. SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM ALTHOUGH STATUTE 16-3-20(A) (SUPP. 1991), ADDRESSED PAROLE ELIGIBILITY HOWEVER IT ALSO GAVE SENTENCING COURT THE DISCRETION TO DETERMINE WHICH PRISONER PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE DEATH OR NATURAL LIFE BECAUSE A SENTENCING COURT CAN NOT DETERMINE PAROLE ELIGIBILITY. SEE STATE V. TORRENCE 305 S.C. 45, SEE MAJOR VS. DEPT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVS 384 S.C. 457, 465 S.E 2D 795, 799 (2009) [A] SENTENCING COURT IS NOT AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE PAROLE ELIGIBILITY. SEE ATWELL V. STATE 197 SO. 3D 1040 AT [4] CONSTITUTIONAL LAW UNDER PARDON AND PAROLE CLEARLY STATE THE JUDICIARY HAS NO INPUT AS TO THE OPERATION OF THE PAROLE SYSTEM.

D. SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM THAT APPELLATE SENTENCE STATUTE PUNISHMENT OF 16-3-20 (A) (SUPP. 1991) RESTRICTED ALL FORMS OF [ANY] TYPE OF SENTENCE REDUCEMENT SUCH AS..... WORK RELEASE, GOOD TIME CREDITS, PROGRAM CREDITS TO INCLUDE PAROLE ELIGIBILITY UNTIL A MANDATORY 20 YEARS OF SERVICE. AFTER THE FULL SERVICE OF APPELLATE MANDATORY 20 YEARS APPELLATE STATUTE STILL RESTRICTED ALL FORMS OF SENTENCE REDUCEMENT TO INCLUDE PAROLE.

ACCORDING TO S.C. JUR. PROBATION, PAROLE (26) (V).....PAROLE IS A FORM OF EARLY RELEASE FROM PRISON BEFORE THE COMPLETION OF SENTENCE.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM STATUTE 16-3-20 (A) (SUPP. 1991) ADDRESSED PAROLE ELIGIBILITY HOWEVER STATUTE ALSO RESTRICTED ALL FORMS OF EARLY RELEASE FROM HIS MANDATORY IMPRISONMENT SENTENCE [DEMONSTRATE] IF PAROLE AUTHORITIES CONFIRM "PAROLE IS A FORM OF EARLY RELEASE" PAROLE GRANT MAY NOT BE POSSIBLE THAT REQUIER APPELLATE TO JUDICIAL REVIEW OF SENTENCE TO DETERMINE WHETHER SENTENCE COULD BE MODIFIED BASED ON DEMONSTRATED MATURITY AND REHABILITATION. U.S. CONST AMEND SEE PHILLIPS V. STATE 286 SO. 3D 905 SEE DOCUMENT C. NUMBERS (1-22).

APPELLATE CONFIRM PAROLE GRANT IS STILL BEING RESTRICTED DESPITE STATUTE 16-3-20 (A) (SUPP. 1991) ADDRESSED PAROLE ELIGIBILITY THIS PROVISION SUBSECTION STATE [NO] PERSON SENTENCE UNDER THE PROVISION OF THIS SUBSECTION MAY RECEIVE WORK RELEASE, CREDITS, GOOD-TIME CREDITS OR ANY OTHER CREDIT THAT WOULD REDUCE THE MANDATORY IMPRISONMENT REQUIRED BY THIS SUBSECTION..... WHICH DEMONSTRATE, IF WORK RELEASE CREDITS, GOOD TIME CREDITS, EARN WORK CREDITS, PROGRAM CREDITS ETC..... ARE ALL FORMS OF EARLY RELEASE FROM PRISON THAT WERE RESTRICTED PRIOR BEFORE COMPLETION OF HIS MANDATORY 20 YEARS TO BE CONSIDER FOR PAROLE ELIGIBLE TO INCLUDE PAROLE IS ALSO A FORM OF EARLY RELEASE FROM PRISON EVIDENCE DEMONSTRATE NOTHING CAN REDUCE PRISONER MANDATORY IMPRISONMENT UNDER SUBSECTION PROVISION. APPELLATE CONFIRM JUVENILE LIFE WITH PAROLE ELIGIBLE STATUTE SENTENCE EFFECTIVELY RESEMBLE LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE. SEE MILTON JAY JR V. THE STATE OF FLORIDA 252 SO.

APPELLANT CONFIRM IN EFFECTUATING A SENTENCING COURT'S ORDER SEE DOCUMENT B. AND DOCUMENT A., THE DEPT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES HAS THE SOLE AUTHORITY TO [LOOK] TO THE STATUTES TO DETERMINE WHETHER A DEFENDANT IS ELIGIBLE FOR PAROLE, SEE MAJOR V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES 384 S.C. 457. APPELLANT CONFIRM ONCE A STATE ESTABLISHES A SYSTEM OF PAROLE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDERS HAS RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM "UNCONSTITUTIONAL BURDENS WHEN AVAILING HIM OR HER SELF OF "EXISTING WAYS" TO ACCESS BENEFIT OF EARLY RELEASE OF PAROLE [WHERE] NO (MILLER) MANDATES WAS AFFORDED SEE STATE V. MITCHELL 2021 6066794 SEE MILLER V. MARSHALL 682 F. SUPP 3D 559, SEE CRUZ V. ARIZONA SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES 598 U.S. 17.

APPELLATE CONFIRM BEFORE OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS STATUTE 16-3-20(A) (SUPP. 1991) NOT ONLY RESTRICTED (ALL FORMS) OF EARLY RELEASE AGAINST APPELLATE BEFORE HE BECAME ELIGIBLE FOR PAROLE CONSIDERATION [PAROLE AUTHORITIES] ALSO REPEATED THE SAME RESTRICTIONS OF NO EARLY RELEASE AFTER HE BECAME ELIGIBLE..... BECAUSE WORK RELEASE, EARN WORK CREDITS, GOOD TIME CREDITS AND PAROLE ARE STILL RESTRICTED BY STATUTE 16-3-20(A) (SUPP. 1991). PROVISION STATE NOTHING CAN REDUCE THE MANDATORY IMPRISONMENT NOT EVEN PAROLE BECAUSE PAROLE AUTHORITIES POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANUAL CONFIRM PAROLE IS A FORM OF EARLY RELEASE FROM PRISON. SEE DOCUMENT D., PREFACE THE PAROLE SYSTEM IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

E. SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM IN THE INDIVIDUAL CASE BEFORE OUR SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 LIFE WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE EFFECTIVELY RESEMBLE LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE. SEE ATWELL V. STATE 197 SO. 3D 1040

HISTORY

ON OCTOBER-10-2018, CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # DO 189424 AND FORMAL COUNSEL MRS LAURA W. YOUNG OF BLUME FRANKLIN-BEST AND YOUNG, LLC 900 ELMWOOD AVENUE, SUITE 200 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201 ALONG WITH PRISONER FAMILY APPEARED BEFORE THE S.C. PAROLE BOARD BY LIVE VIDEO CONFERENCE.

WHILE CONDUCTING THIS LIVE PAROLE BOARD HEARING THE BOARD INTRODUCED A CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RECORD QUESTIONING PRISONER CONCERNING THE RECORD INFORMATION. PRISONER AND COUNSEL ASSUMED PAROLE AUTHORITIES COULD HAVE BEEN REFERING TO PRISONER [BIOLOGICAL FATHER] DO TO FATHER AND SON BOTH SHARE IDENTICAL FIRST, MIDDLE AND LAST NAMES.

PRISONER AND COUNSEL RESPECTFULLY VERBALLY NOTIFIED THE BOARD DOING THE LIVE RECORDED PAROLE HEARING AS INSTRUCTED BY FORM (1212) SEE DOCUMENT E., THAT THE RECORD INTRODUCED DID NOT BELONG TO CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER BEFORE PAROLE BOARD ON OCTOBER-10-2018 AND THAT RECORD COULD BELONG TO HIS FATHER.

[NOTE]..... CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER AND COUNSEL ON OCTOBER-10-2018 WAS WITHOUT PAROLE FILE REVIEW BEFORE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT RULING OF "KELSEY V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES 441 S.C. 873, 893 S.E 2D 588 2023 WL 5598698, SEE BLACKWELL V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES 2024 WL 2956900.

AFTER JUVENILE OFFENDER WAS DENIED PAROLE GRANT ON OCTOBER-10-2018 PRISONER DID NOT HAVE TO FILE AN APPEAL TO THE S.C. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT [INORDER] TO NOTIFY BOARD THAT PRISONER THINK HIS OR HER FILE CONTAIN SOME ERROR OR OTHER INACCURACY NOT ACCORDING TO FORM 1212 THAT THE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIS WANTS THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS TO BELIEVE BEFORE KELSEY V. SCDPPPS.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM [ONCE] S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES BECAME NOTIFIED OF THE SPECIFIC ERROR ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 THAT RECORD CONTAINING CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE POSSIBLE COULD BE PRISONER BIOLOGICAL FATHER RECORD MANDATED AN INVESTIGATION SEE DOCUMENT E. AND AFTER THE INVESTIGATION IF DETERMINE A IDENTIFIED ERROR WAS FOUND BY S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES "REHEARING" WAS MANDATORY SPECIFICALLY FOR OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 WHETHER INVESTIGATION WOULD HAVE TOOK (30) DAYS, (1) YEAR OR MORE TO BECOME [FINALIZE] IS IRRELEVANT BECAUSE (FORM 1212) SEE DOCUMENT SOUTH CAROLINA CRITERAL FOR PAROLE CONSIDERATION DID NOT STATE HOW LONG THE INVESTIGATION WOULD TAKE BEFORE A PRISONER TO BECOME NOTIFIED.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM ONCE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES BECAME NOTIFIED ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL#00189424 COULD NOT DEMAND WHEN FORM 1212 INVESTIGATION SHOULD BECOME FINALIZE. EVIDENCE CONFIRM ACCORDING TO [BARKER VS. WINGO, 92 S.CT. 2182 AT [6]] CRIMINAL LAW LENGTH OF DELAY ....."THERE IS NO CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS FOR QUANTIFYING INTO A SPECIFIED NUMBER OF DAYS OR MONTHS TO THE SPEEDY INVESTIGATION AND TRIAL RIGHT U.S.C.A CONST AMEND 6.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM CLEARLY BEFORE OUR SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS WHEN PRISONER ORIGINALLY FIRST REPORTED THE IDENTIFIED ERROR ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 [REVEAL] ONCE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES BECAME NOTIFIED OBVIOUS PRISONER HAD TO WAIT ON THE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO [NOTIFY] THE PRISONER [ACCORDING] TO FORM 1212 SEE DOCUMENT E.

SUBSTANIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER [NEVER WAIVED] HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHT TO HIS OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 INVESTIGATION AND REHEARING BECAUSE PAROLE AUTHORITIES HAD TO FIRST COMPLETE THE INVESTIGATION INORDER FOR PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO NOTIFY THE PRISONER FACTS.

SEE BARKER V. WINGO 92 S.CT. 2182 [ESTOPPEL]
NATURE AND ELEMENTS OF WAIVER: STATE "WAIVER" IS AN INTENTIONAL RELINQUISHMENT OR ABANDONMENT OF A KNOWN RIGHT OR PRIVILEGE

SEE DOCUMENT EXAMPLE: F., CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER FORM 1333 INITIAL INTERVIEW INFORMATION [SECTION A.] REQUESTED TO BE CONSIDER FOR PAROLE DOING ALL HIS PAROLE HEARINGS PRISONER HAS NEVER WAIVED OR ABANDONMENT HIS PRIVILEGE TO BE CONSIDER FOR PAROLE. APPELLATE CONFIRM BEFORE THIS S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IF PRISONER WISH TO HAD WAIVE HIS PAROLE CONSIDERATION PRISONER WOULD NEVER WOULD SIGNATURE SECTION A. SECTION B. WAIVER OF PAROLE CONSIDERATION WOULD HAVE BEEN SIGNED.

ON OCTOBER-28-2018 SEE DOCUMENT G., CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 FORWARD HIS REQUEST TO THE S.C. PAROLE BOARD CHAIRMAN MR. HENRY ELDRIDGE AND TO MR. JERRY B. ADGER DIRECTOR FOR A REQUEST REHEARING WITHIN A TIMELY FASHION. SEE DOCUMENT H., PRISONER ALSO WROTE A LETTER TO HIS MOTHER ADVISING HER OF HIS EFFORTS OF DUE DILIGENCE IN REQUESTING FOR REHEARING. [NOTE] APPELLATE MOTHER HAVE THE ORIGINAL LETTER IF THIS S.C. COURT OF APPEALS REQUEST FOR REVIEW YOU CAN REACH HER AT dorthymitchell@FTC-i.net SEE DOCUMENT I.

AS DAY'S, MONTHS, YEARS PASSED BY FROM CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL# 00189424 OCTOBER-10-2018 PAROLE HEARING REPORT THAT CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RECORD DID NOT BELONG TO HIM BUT RECORD COULD BELONG TO PRISONER BIOLOGICAL FATHER WHO BOTH SHARE IDENTICAL NAMES, TO INCLUDE PRISONER REQUEST FOR PAROLE REHEARING REQUESTED ON OCTOBER-28-2018 S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES NEVER PER-YEAR AFTER OCTOBER-10-2018 NEVER MENTION NOR ADDRESSED PRISONER REPORT CONCERNS OF CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE NOR DID S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES ADDRESSED PRISONER REQUEST FOR PAROLE REHEARING.

ON OCTOBER - 23 - 2024, CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 APPEARED BEFORE HIS SEVENTH PAROLE BOARD HEARING WHERE HE WAS OFFER FORM TBD SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES "ACKNOWLEDGE OF PAROLE FILE REVIEW SEE DOCUMENT J. PRISONER WAS OFFER TO REVIEW HIS FILE [AFTER] S.C. COURT RULING OF KELSEY 441 S.C. 373 IS WHERE HE DISCOVERED REPORTED CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE WENT UNCORRECTED FROM OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 WHERE [ORIGINALLY] REPORTED BY PRISONER AND COUNSEL.

IN ADDITION PRISONER ALSO DISCOVERED IN HIS PAROLE FILE REVIEW INACCURATE PREJUDICE CRIMINAL RECORDS RANGING FROM 1977 TO 1988 THAT WERE NOT CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CRIMINAL RECORD HISTORY.

NOTE:..... DOING THE OCTOBER - 23 - 2024, PAROLE HEARING PRISONER [ONLY] MENTION THE CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RECORD THAT OBVIOUS WENT UNCORRECTED WHEN ORIGINALLY REPORTED ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 THAT CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DID NOT BELONG TO CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424. PRISONER DID NOT MENTION THE ADDITIONAL FOUND CRIMINAL RECORDS LOCATED IN FILE REVIEW ON OCTOBER - 23 - 2024 TO THE PAROLE BOARD BECAUSE BASED ON COMMON SENSE THE FOUND ADDITIONAL INACCURATE CRIMINAL RECORD DATE BEGAN (1977) WHICH WOULD PLACE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER AT (3) YEARS OLD SEE DOCUMENT K. SEE STATE V. MITCHELL 2021 6066794.

ON OCTOBER - 23 - 2024 CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 WAS DENIED PAROLE. ON NOVEMBER - 18 - 2024 PRISONER CONTACTED THE BELOW:

1. MR. JODI D. GALLMAN (ACTING DIRECTOR) OF SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES.

2. MRS VALERIE SUBER (ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR) OF SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES.

SEE DOCUMENT K., PAGES (1-9) CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION IN VIOLATION OF A CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER EIGHTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND VIOLATION OF SOUTH CAROLINA DUE PROCESS UNDER AIKEN V. BYARS 410 S.C. 534 765 S.E. 2D 572 2014.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM ON DOCUMENT K. PAGE (5) PRISONER BOUGHT TO S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES FULL ATTENTION THAT PAROLE AUTHORITIES WERE ALREADY PRIOR MADE AWARE THAT CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE WAS NOT CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CRIMINAL RECORD REPORTED ON OCTOBER-10-2018 SEE DOCUMENT G..

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM ON DOCUMENT K. PAGE (5) PRISONER BOUGHT TO S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES FULL ATTENTION THAT ADDITIONAL FOUND CRIMINAL RECORD HISTORY DATES RANGING FROM (1977) TO (1988) ALSO DID NOT BELONG TO CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM ON DOCUMENT K. PAGES (1-9) "SIGNIFICANT" FAVORABLE COMPELLING EVIDENCE WHY CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 WAS MANDATED TO HAVE ALL PAROLE DENIALS REHEARD WERE DO TO S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES WENT EXTREMELY BEYOND THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL BOUNDS OF REASONABLENESS BY EFFECTIVELY USING PREJUDICE FALSIFIED CRIMINAL RECORDS TO REJECT A SOUTH CAROLINA CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER [HIS] ONLY AFFORDED MECHANISM TO OBTAIN A MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO RELEASE WAS BY PAROLE GRANT BASED DEMONSTRATED MATURITY AND REHABILITATION AS OUTLINED IN GRAHAM V. FLORIDA, 560 U.S. AT 75, SINCE PRISONER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012. SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRMED ON DOCUMENT K., WHETHER S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES

USAGE OF INACCURATE CRIMINAL RECORDS WERE INTENTIONAL OR ACCIDENTAL WAS IRRELEVANT. THE CONSTITUTIONAL FACT WAS CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER WAS FULLY ENTITLE TO ALL FAIR APPROPRIATE BALANCE PAROLE HEARINGS IN SOUTH CAROLINA WITHOUT [RACISM], DISCRIMINATION, BIAS, PREJUDICE NOR CORRUPTION.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OF DOCUMENT K. PRESENTED TO SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES AGENCY DEMONSTRATED FAIR AND APPROPRIATE PAROLE HEARINGS WERE MANDATED 'WHEN A STATE'..... IS FACED WITH CONVICTED JUVENILE HOMICIDE OFFENDERS WHO COULD FACE LIFE AND DEATH IMPRISONMENT SEE ATWELL V. STATE 197 SO. 3d 1040. SEE VENNISEE V. STATE, 235 SO. 3d 947. CRIMINAL LAW KEY [3]. SEE ROOKS V. STATE 224 SO. 3d 272 [INFANTS] KEY [1]. SEE CURRIE V. STATE 219 SO. 3d 960. SEE STERN V. STATE 240 SO. 3d 131.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRMED ON DOCUMENT K. THAT CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL #00189424 AS A INDIVIDUAL WAS NOT AFFORDED NO MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE BEGINNING AT HIS FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 TO OCTOBER - 23 - 2024..... BECAUSE HE DISCOVERED BY REVIEW OF PAROLE FILE THAT S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES WERE CONSIDERING THE WRONG CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL CRIMINAL RECORDS IN ERROR TO BE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 CRIMINAL RECORD IN ERROR BASED ON MISIDENTIFICATIONS OF RECORDS.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM BY DOCUMENT K., THAT CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER RESPECTFULLY REQUESTED FROM S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO REMDY THEIR NEGLIGENCE OF INJURY AGAINST PRISONER SEE DRUMGOLD V. CALLAHAN 707 F. 3D 28

SEE MILLER V. ALABAMA, 132 S. CT. 2455 (2012), SEE MONTGOMERY V. LOUISIANA 136 S. CT. AT 736, SEE VENNISEE V. STATE 235 SO. 3d 947, SEE ROGERS V. STATE 223 SO. 3d 281..... SEE CURRIE V. STATE 219 So. 3d 960, SEE ROBERT STERN V. STATE OF FLORIDA 240 SO. 3d 131, BECAUSE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 HAD LOST MULTIPLE OPPORTUNTIES TO POSSIBLE GRANT OF PAROLE IF NOT FOR THE UNAWARE USAGE OF FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD BY S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES SINCE PRISONER INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 THE OUT COME COULD HAD BEEN DIFFERENT SEE DOCUMENT L., LETTER TO MR. JERRY B. ADGER FORMAL DIRECTOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES DATED SEPTEMBER - 10 - 2018.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM "DESPITE" S.C. PAROLE STATUTE CONFERRED NO LIBERTY INTEREST IN PAROLE SEE GRAHAM V. FLORIDA, 560 U.S. AT 75, IT DID NOT GRANT S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES DISCRETION TO RELY UPON ADMITTEDLY FALSE INFORMATION IN DETERMING WHETHER TO GRANT PAROLE CONST AMENDMENT 14TH..... WHICH WAS CONFIRMED BY S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES IN [RESPONSE] TO PRISONER DOCUMENT K., ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 AS THIS HISTORY UNFOLDS!

ON DECEMBER - 9 - 2024, CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER FILED HIS FIRST APPEAL TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT DEMONSTRATING A CLEAR VIOLATION OF HIS 8TH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION APPLYING [MILLER V. ALABAMA] 132 S.CT. 2455 (2012) AND GRAHAM V. FLORIDA, 560 U.S. 48, 75 (2010) AND AIKEN V. BYARS, 410 S.C. 534, 544 (2014).

ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 SEE DOCUMENT M., S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES RESPONDED TO CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 CORRESPONDENCE LETTER REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION. SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE WILL CONFIRM BEFORE THIS S.C. COURT OF APPEALS BELOW THAT:

1..... WHEN S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES CONFIRMED ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 PAROLE AUTHORITITES AGENCY RECEIVED PRISONER CORRESPONDENCE LETTER ON 11/25/2024 REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM SEE DOCUMENT G., THAT PRISONER [FIRST] CORRESPONDENCE LETTER DATED OCTOBER - 28 - 2018 REQUEST FOR PAROLE REHEARING CLEARLY ALERTED S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITES PRISONER REQUESTED FOR A PAROLE REHEARING FOR THE OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 PAROLE DENIAL, [BECAUSE] EVIDENCE REVEAL PRISONER [SECOND] CORRESPONDENCE LETTER SEE DOCUMENT K., RECEIVED IN AGENCY OFFICE ON 11/25/2024 BY REVIEW WERE THE EXACT SAME IDENTICAL ALLEGATIONS COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION [ORIGINALLY] REPORTED ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 SEE DOCUMENT G., WHY REHEARING WAS NECESSARILY NEEDED.

2..... SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE SUPPORT WHEN S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES FINALIZED THE INVESTIGATION INTO THE CRIMINAL HISTORY OF CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER BIOLOGICAL FATHER CRIMINAL RECORD SEE DOCUMENT N. SLED CATCH CITIZENS ACCESS TO CRIMINAL HISTORIES PAGE ( ).....PAROLE AUTHORITIES REALIZED THEY WERE USING FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS AGAINST CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER SINCE HIS FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING IN ERROR BASED ON MISIDENTIFICATION OF RECORD. EVIDENCE CONFIRM BY DOCUMENT M. PAROLE AUTHORITIES REALIZED THEIR ERROR AND DETERMINE THEIR PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT.

LEGAL MAIL

AND DECIDED TO [WAIVE] PRISONER OCTOBER - 28 - 2018 FIRST OFFICAL REQUEST FOR PAROLE REHEARING WHEN S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES WAS FIRST ORIGINALLY NOTIFIED ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 SEE DOCUMENT G. . SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM PAROLE AUTHORITIES [ONLY] CONSIDER PRISONER [SECOND] OFFICAL REQUEST FOR PAROLE RECONSIDERATION THAT DENIED PAROLE ON OCTOBER - 23 - 2024.

3..... SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM THE JANUARY-13 - 2025 NOTIFIED REPORT CREATED NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE IN FAVORABLE OF THE PRISONER THAT ENTILE HIM TO RAISE AN EIGHTH AMENDMENT CHALLENAGE FOR CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT..... DO TO WHEN S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES [CONFIRM] HE IDENTIFIED AN ERROR THAT THEIR PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT "THE ERRONEOUS" FALSE INFORMATION THAT WAS CONTAINED IN PAROLE FILE [SINCE] CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING THAT WERE RELIED ON BY THE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES AND THE S.C. PAROLE BOARD PUT PRISONER CONDITIONAL LIBERTY AT STAKE CALLING DUE PROCESS INTO PLAY, SEE PAINE V. BAKER 595 F.2D 197 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOURTH CIRCUIT.

PRISONER CLAIM THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT CHALLENAGE FOR CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IS DEMONSTRATED THROUGH DOCUMENT E. S.C. DEPT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES CRITERIA FOR PAROLE CONSIDERATION FORM 1212.

LEGAL MAIL

IN SUPPORT OF CHALLENAGE OF EIGHTH AMENDMENT OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT EVIDENCE SUPPORT CLAIM THAT [FORM 1212] S.C. CRITERIA FOR PAROLE CONSIDERATION STATE **THE RECORD IT SELF IS PREPARED THROUGH INVESTIGATION [CONDUCTED] FOR THE BOARD AND IT BECOMES A PART OF THE INMATE PAROLE FILE.** EVIDENCE CONFIRM S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES ADMITTED THEIR PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT BASED OFF PRISONER IDENTIFIED A ERROR SEE **DOCUMENTS** K. AND M., DEMONSTRATE WHEN S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES PREPARED THE ERRONEOUS FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS THROUGH THEIR INVESTIGATION AT PRISONER FIRST INITIAL **HEARING** OF (2012) SEE DOCUMENT K. PAGE (5) 1-9 FORM 1212 CONFIRM **STRONG** EVIDENCE THE BOARD IS RELYING ON WHAT WAS TRANSFERED AND PREPARED FOR THE BOARD BY THE **S.C.** PAROLE AUTHORITIES.

IN ADDITION EVIDENCE CONFIRM FORM 1212 REVEAL CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER "COULD NOT HAVE KNOWN" S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES AND PAROLE BOARD WAS RELYING ON ERRONEOUS FALSE RECORD BEGINNING AT HIS INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012.....BECAUSE **FORM 1212** CLEARLY STATE FILES ARE MAINTAINED BY THE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES AND BY **STATUTE** PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL AND IS FAR REACHING WERE INMATES THEMSELVES HAVE NO RIGHT TO INSPECT THE CONTENTS OF THEIR FILES [BEFORE] KELSEY V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES **441** S.C. **873**, **893** S.E. 2D 588 2023 WL 5598698.

LEGAL MAIL

4..... APPELLATE CONFIRM BY STRONG EVIDENCE BEFORE OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS [BEFORE] KELSEY 441 S.C. 873, 893 S.E. 2D 588 2023 WL 5598698 PRISONER AND COUNSEL ON OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 NONDISPUTED BY S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES "DID NOTIFY" THE BOARD THAT RECORD OF CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE WAS NOT CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER RECORD.
APPELLATE CONFIRM DESPITE PRISONER AND COUNSEL WERE WITHOUT PAROLE FILE REVIEW BEFORE S.C. COURT RULING IN [KELSEY] STRONG EVIDENCE CONFIRM THE BOARD WAS NOTIFIED TO INCLUDE [FORM 1212] SEE DOCUMENT E. PROVIDE SUBSTANTIAL DUE PROCESS PROTECTION.

APPELLATE POINT OUT FOR ATTENTION FOR OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS REVIEW OF FORM 1212 THAT ONCE A PRISONER HAS A [INQUIRY] CONCERNING HIS OR HER FILE.....IT IS THE INQUIRY THAT IS BEING INVESTIGATED [HOWEVER] FORM 1212 DO NOT STATE [WHEN] NOR [HOW LONG] THE INQUIRY INVESTIGATION SHALL TAKE FOR A PRISONER TO BE NOTIFIED. PRISONERS DO NOT HAVE TO FILE AN APPEAL TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT [INORDER] TO NOTIFY THE BOARD THAT HE OR SHE THINK FILE CONTAINS SOME ERROR OR OTHER INACCURACY [BEFORE OR AFTER] KELSEY 441 S.C. 873, 893 S.E. 2D 588 2023 WL 5598698. IN SUPPORT OF CLAIM SEE DOCUMENT O. PRISONER FILED AN APPEAL TO THE S.C. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT ONE MONTH AND SIXTEEN DAYS LATER AFTER HIS OCTOBER - 23 - 2024 PAROLE DENIAL HOWEVER S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES CLAIM THEY RECEIVED PRISONER CORRESPODENCE LETTER IN THEIR OFFICE ON 11/25/2024 SEE DOCUMENT M.

LEGAL MAIL

APPELLANT CONFIRM CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER DID NOT HAVE TO FILE AN APPEAL FOR THE OCTOBER-10-2018 PAROLE DENIAL TO S.C. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT INORDER TO NOTIFY BOARD UNDER FORM 1212 THAT HE THINK HIS FILE CONTAIN SOME ERRORS OR OTHER INACCURACY IN 2018.

5.....SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM WHEN PRISONER OCTOBER-10-2018 NOTIFY REPORT INVESTIGATION BECAME FINALIZED ON JANUARY-13-2025 SEE DOCUMENT M., THAT DETERMINE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT SINCE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING ADDRESSED IN HIS CORRESPONDENCE LETTER TO BE [CONFIRM] BY S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES SEE DOCUMENT K., THE JANUARY-13-2025 NOTIFY LETTER REPORT TO CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL #00189424 WAS THE OCTOBER-10-2018 [NOTIFIED RETURN REPORT] DESPITE HOW LONG PAROLE AUTHORITIES CLAIM IT TOOK TO FINALIZE HIS INQUIRY INVESTIGATION.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM BEFORE OUR SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS THAT THE OCTOBER-23-2024 WRONGFUL PAROLE DENIAL DEMONSTRATE JUST HOW LONG THE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES AND THE PAROLE BOARD WERE RELYING ON THE ERRONEOUS FALSE RECORD SINCE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING "WITHOUT" NOTIFING PRISONER UNTIL PRISONER CORRESPONDENCE LETTER WAS CONFIRMED ON JANUARY-13-2025 SEE DOCUMENT M..

LEGAL MAIL

6.....SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL #00189424 NEVER WAIVED HIS OCTOBER-10-2018 PAROLE REHEARING SEE DOCUMENT G., NEITHER DID PRISONER WAIVED AFTER THE OCTOBER-10-2018 INVESTIGATION BECAME FINALIZED ON JANUARY-13-2025 WHEN HE WAS NOTIFIED MANDATED BY FORM 1212 SEE DOCUMENT E..

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM THE SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES INAPPROPRIATELY AND ARBITRARILY AND CAPRICIOUSLY [WAIVED] CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER TIMELY REQUEST FOR PAROLE REHEARING THAT WAS WELL REQUEST YEARS PRIOR BEFORE THE OCTOBER-10-2018 WAS DETERMINE ON JANUARY-13-2025, SEE DOCUMENT G. SEE DOCUMENT K..

APPELLATE CONFIRM BEFORE OUR SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS PRISONER COULD NOT DEMAND A SPECIFIED TIME OR DATE NUMBER OF DAYS OR MONTHS OR YEARS THE OCTOBER-10-2018 NOTIFIED REPORT INVESTIGATION WOULD BE FINALIZE TO BRING PRISONER TO TIMELY REHEARING SEE..... BARKER V. WINGO 92 S.CT. 2182.

LEGAL MAIL

SEE MATTER OF WELFARE OF J.G.B. 443 N.W. 2d 867
CRIMINAL LAW: IN GENERAL BALANCING TEST

APPELLATE CONFIRM JUST AS IN MATTER OF WELFARE OF J.G.B ABOVE..... TO DETERMINE WHETHER CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF APPELLATE ARE VIOLATED ON BASIS OF UNTIMELINESS OF BRINGING CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER TO HIS TIMELY REQUEST FOR THE OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 PAROLE REHEARING WHERE STRONG SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM PRISONER WAS FINALLY NOTIFIED ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025, [COURT] MUST [CONSIDER] TO DETERMIE WHETHER CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF DEFENDENT ARE VIOLATED ON BASIS OF UNTIMELINESS OF BRINGING PRISONER TO HIS TIMELY REQUEST FOR REHEARING FOR OCTOBER-10-2018, THE LENGTH OF DELAY, REASON FOR DELAY AND WHY THE TIMELY REQUEST FOR PAROLE REHEARING FOR OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 WAS DENIED AFTER THE OCTOBER - 10 - 2018 INVESTIGATION BECAME CONCLUDED AND PRISONER ASSERTION OF RIGHT AND PREJUDICE TO PRISONER.

7..... APPELLANT CONFIRM BEFORE OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IF CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER PAROLE FILE RECORD WAS NO DOUBT CONFIRM PRIOR INCORRECT SINCE HIS FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF [2012] SEE DOCUMENT K. CORRESPONDENCE LETTER PAGES (1-9) SEE DOCUMENT M. S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES RESPONSE TO PRISONER CORRESPONDENCE LETTER. [IF] THIS COURT TAKE NOTICE

LEGAL MAIL

TO PRISONER CORRESPONDENCE LETTER DOCUMENT K., PAGE (5) 1-9 AND COMPARE TO S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES RESPONSE TO PRISONER CORRESPONDENCE LETTER DOCUMENT M. DATED JANUARY-13-2025 NOTICE..... S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES NEVER DENIED NOR DISPUTED CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER [FOUND] IDENTIFED CRIMINAL RECORDS ADDRESSED IN HIS CORRESPONDENCE LETTER OF 1. CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD DATED 06/05/1992 [AND] 2. ADDITIONAL FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS RANGING FROM 1977 TO 1988.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL COULD NOT HAVE RECEIVED NO MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO RELEASE FROM FIRST INITIAL HEARING OF [2012] TO JANUARY-13-2025 BECAUSE THE PRIOR RECORD WAS CONFIRMED INCORRECT IN VIOLATION OF 'GRAHAM VS. FLORIDA 560 U.S. AT 75. APPELLANT CLAIM AS WELL BEFORE THIS S.C. COURT OF APPEALS THE PRIOR INCORRECT RECORD FROM 2012 THAT WENT UNCORRECTED UP TO JANUARY-13-2025 AS CONFIRMED BY PRISONER CORRESPONDENCE LETTER TO S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITY SEE DOCUMENT M. EFFECTIVELY AFFECTED THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS RULING OF STATE VS. MITCHELL 2021 6066794 UNDER NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE DO TO PRISONER NOR THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WERE AWARE THE SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES WERE RELYING ON FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS TO REJECT A CONVICTED

LEGAL MAIL

JUVENILE OFFENDER MANDATED MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE BASED ON DEMONSTRATED MATURITY AND REHABILITATION. SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM UNDER NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE THIS MANDATED MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE WAS NOT OFFER BECAUSE THE PRIOR RECORD WAS CONFIRM INCORRECT " AFTER THE "SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS" RULING OF STATE V. MITCHELL 2021 6066794 SEE DOCUMENT M. FOR [CONFIRMATION].

CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CONFIRM IF NOT FOR SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES RELYING ON PREPARED FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS TRANSFERED TO THE PAROLE BOARD TO BE RELIED ON TO BECOME PART OF PRISONER PAROLE FILE TO BE USED AGAINST THE JUVENILE OFFENDER WHO IS BEING CONSIDER FOR PAROLE AS HIS [ONLY] AFFORDED [MECHANISM]..... THE OUTCOME COULD HAVE [DIFFERENT]. SEE ATWELL V. STATE 197 SO. 3d 1040, SEE CARL J. MONROE V. THIGPEN 932 F.2D 1437 AT [2] PAROLE AND PARDON STATE "WHILE PAROLE STATUTE CONFERRED NO LIBERTY INTEREST IN PAROLE IT DID NOT GRANT BOARD DISCRETION TO RELY UNPON ADMITTEDLY FALSE INFORMATION IN DETERMING WHETHER TO GRANT PAROLE CONST AMEND 14TH. SEE..... STRADER V. TROY 571 F.2D 1263, 1266 (4TH CIR 1978). SEE TOWNES V. JARVIS 577 F.3d 543 AT [1] FOR CONTROVERSY TO BE MOOT IT MUST LACK AT LEAST ONE OF THREE REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF ARTICLE III STANDING:

LEGAL MAIL

1. INJURY IN FACT
2. CAUSATION
3. REDRESSABILITY.

APPELLANT CONFIRM BEFORE OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS THAT WHEN S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES FINALLY REALIZED THEIR PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT SINCE PRISONER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF [2012] SEE DOCUMENT M., BASED OFF PRISONER CORRESPONDENCE LETTER SEE DOCUMENT K. IS A INJURY IN FACT, CAUSATION AND A RESPECTFUL REDRESSABILITY CLAIM BASED ON NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE "BECAUSE" CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER SUFFER MULTIPLE VARIOUS INJURIES BEFORE THE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES FINALLY NOTIFIED PRISONER HIS PRIOR RECORD WAS CONFIRMED INCORRECT ON JAN-13-2025.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OF INJURY SUFFER THAT APPELLANT LOST ALL RIGHT TO PRIOR PAROLE REHEARINGS BEFORE OCTOBER-23-2024 [AFTER] S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES FINALLY NOTIFIED PRISONER ON JANUARY-13-2025 THAT PRISONER WERE ENTILE TO BASED ON NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE AS ADDRESSED IN PRISONER CORRESPONDENCE LETTER [BEFORE] PAROLE AUTHORITIES FINALIZED THE INVESTIGATION SEE DOCUMENT K. PAGE (7) 1-9.

IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT CLAIM SEE THE HONORABLE CHIP HUGGINS 2010 WL 4982611 ADDRESSING PAROLE AND PARDON OPERATION MANUAL PART III REHEARINGS OF PAROLE CASES PAGE 44. EVIDENCE CONFIRM NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE IS A SUBSTANTIAL

DUE PROCESS PROTECTION THAT APPELLANT WAS DENIED BY THE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO NOT REOPEN CASE OF HIS FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 WHERE THE ENTER OF THE PREPARED FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD CAME INTO EXISTENCE THAT WAS NOT CONSIDER AT THE TIME OF THE INITIAL HEARING TO REMDY THE 8TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT U.S. CONST VIOLATION.

APPELLANT CONFIRM BY DOCUMENT M., IF HIS CORRESPONDENCE LETTER CONFIRMED BY S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES VERIFIED HE IDENTIFIED AN ERROR THAT PAROLE AUTHORITIES PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT BASED OFF MISIDENTIFICATION OF CRIMINAL RECORD USED EFFECTIVELY AGAINST PRISONER SINCE HIS INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 SEE DOCUMENT K. PAGE (5) 1-9, APPELLANT CLAIM BEFORE OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS THE ONLY "COMMON SENSE" TO REMDY EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT U.S. CONST VIOLATION WAS TO OFFER PAROLE GRANT.....[BECAUSE] NO PRIOR MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN A 'REALISTIC' RELEASE WAS NOT AFFORDED.

IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT CLAIM BEFORE OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS REVIEW VENNISEE V. STATE 235 SO. 3D 947, SEE CURRIE V. STATE 219 SO. 3D 960, SEE ROGERS V. STATE 223 SO. 3D 281, SEE ROBERT STERN V. STATE OF FLORIDA 240 SO. 3D 131; WHERE THE COURT HOLDING IN THESE CASE'S AS MANY OTHER STATE'S JURISDICTION STATE DEFENDANTS WHO

LEGAL MAIL

WERE SENTENCED AS JUVENILES TO LIFE IN PRISON WITH POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE WAS NOT ENTITLED TO RELIEF WHO WERE REALISTICALLY AFFORDED A MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO RELEASE [WHO] HAVE BEEN RELEASED ON PAROLE [AND] WHO HAVE RETURNED BACK TO PRISONER BY PAROLE REVOKE OR HAS COMMITTED A NEW OFFENSE AS AN ADULT ARE NOT ENTITLE TO RELIEF.....TO INCLUDE NO DEMONSTRATION OF MATURITY AND REHABILITATION.

APPELLANT CONFIRM BY SUBSTANTIAL COMPELLING EVIDENCE BEFORE OUR SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS IF SOUTH CAROLINA CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 PRIOR RECORD WAS CONFIRM INCORRECT SINCE HIS FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 AFTER FINALIZING THE INVESTIGATION SEE DOCUMENT M. THAT HIS PRIOR RECORD CONTAINED FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS IDENTIFIED AS (1)..... CRIMINAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (2) CRIMINAL RECORDS RANGING FROM 1977 TO 1988 SEE DOCUMENT K. NOTIFING PRISONER ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025.. OBVIOUS SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM THE FOUND FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD "EFFECTIVELY" HELP S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO NOT AUTHORIZE PAROLE [BECAUSE] STATUTE 24-21-640 DO NOT AUTHORIZE A GRANT OF PAROLE FOR PRIOR VIOLENT CRIMES NOR PRIOR CONVICTIONS.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM THE USAGE OF THE FALSE CRIMINAL RECORDS SINCE PRISONER INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 "EFFECTIVELY" MADE JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARACTER OF ONE WHO IS IRREDEEMABLE

LEGAL MAIL

THE RARE JUVENILE OFFENDER WHO'S NOT FIT TO RE-ENTER SOCIETY. THE FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD ENTER BY THE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES AT 2012 PREPARED FOR THE PAROLE BOARD TO BECOME PART OF PRISONER FILE THAT WENT UNCORRECTED UP TO OCTOBER-23-2024 CONFIRMED ON JANUARY-13-2025. SEE DOCUMENT E. AND DOCUMENT G. AND DOCUMENT K. ALL CONFIRM ON DOCUMENT M. NO DOUBT [PLACED] A UNCONSTITUTION HEAVY BURDEN ON CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER WHEN AVAILING HIMSELF OF EXISTING WAYS TO ACCESS BENEFIT OF EARLY RELEASE OF PAROLE SEE CARL J. MONROE V. THIGPEN 932 F.2D 1437 AT [2].

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM BEFORE OUR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS [UNLIKE]..... PEOPLE V. BARRETT 2025 WL 2731430, S.C. CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 WAS NOT AFFORDED THE [LUXURY] OF EARLIER RELEASE THROUGH WORK CREDITS, GOOD TIME CREDITS, PROGRAM CREDITS, WORK RELEASE BECAUSE STATUTE [16-3-20(A)] (SUPP. 1991) ELIMINATE ALL SUCH EARLY RELEASE EVEN PAROLE BEFORE ELIGIBILITY AND AFTER ELIGIBILITY. APPELLANT CONFIRM THE ONLY MECHANISM FOR A MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN PAROLE EARLY RELEASE WAS BY A DEMONSTRATION OF MATURITY AND REHABILITATION WHICH WAS HIS [ONLY] AFFORDED PRIVILEGE ACCORDING TO SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS IN STATE VS. MITCHELL 2021 6066794 [RELYING] ON GRAHAM VS. FLORIDA, 560 U.S. AT 75 [HOWEVER] CONFIRM NOT

LEGAL MAIL

POSSIBLE [ACCORDING] TO SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 BECAUSE THE PRIOR RECORD WAS CONFIRMED INCORRECT SINCE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 UP TO OCTOBER - 23 - 2024 SEE DOCUMENT K. AND DOCUMENT M. .

SUBSTANTIAL STRONG EVIDENCE CONFIRM BEFORE OUR SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS CONFIRM IF THE PRIOR RECORD WAS OBVIOUS CONFIRMED INCORRECT SINCE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 CONFIRMED ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 BY [LOGIC] CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 DID NOT RECEIVED NO REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN RELEASE. APPELLATE CONFIRM BY COMMON SENSE [ALL] HIS PAROLE HEARINGS FROM 2012 UP TO OCTOBER - 23 - 2024 WERE AFEECTED TAINED WITH USAGE OF FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD..... IS A SERIOUS INJURY A CAUSATION AND A RESPECTFUL REDRESSABILITY.

APPELLANT CONFIRM BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IN MANIFEST OF INJUSTICE A RECALL OF REEVALUATION OF RESENTENCING IS OBVIOUS REQUIRE BECAUSE PAROLE GRANT IS NOT POSSIBLE THAT COME IN DIRECT CONFLICT IN STATE VS. MITCHELL 2021 6066794.
APPELLATE CONFIRM WHY ORDER OF RESENTENCING IS OBVIOUS NECESSARY ARE DO TO..... THE REHEARING HELD ON MARCH - 26 - 2025 IN REPLACE FOR THE

LEGAL MAIL

OCTOBER - 23 - 2024 WRONGFUL PAROLE DENIAL WHERE THE FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD WAS DISCOVERED THAT WENT UNCORRECTED SINCE (2012) INITIAL PAROLE HEARING SEE DOCUMENT G. AND DOCUMENT K. AND DOCUMENT M. , CONFIRM THE REHEARING HELD ON MARCH - 26 - 2025 [DID NOT CURE] THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT VIOLATION TO UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION NOR DID REHEARING QUALIFY FOR MOOT..... DO TO SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES EFFECTIVELY USED THE EXACT SAME FINDINGS OF FACT REASON NOTICE OF REJECTION TO NOT AFFORD NO REALISTIC MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE SEE DOCUMENT Q. ..... WHICH WAS THE EXACT SAME FINDINGS OF FACTS REASON NOTICE OF REJECTION THAT WERE EFFECTIVELY BEING USED TO REJECT CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER PRIOR AVAILABLE OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN A REALISTIC MEANINGFUL RELEASE WHEN THE PRIOR RECORD WAS CONFIRMED INCORRECT SINCE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 SEE DOCUMENT G. , SEE DOCUMENT K. SEE DOCUMENT M. FOR CONFIRMATION.

APPELLANT CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER CHARLES MICHAEL MITCHELL # 00189424 CONFIRM HIS EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION IS BEING VIOLATED THAT HIS LABEL LIFE SENTENCE WITH PAROLE EFFECTIVELY

LEGAL MAIL

RESEMBLE A LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE SENTENCE SEE MILTON JAY JR V. THE STATE OF FLORIDA 252 SO. 3D 326 AT [2].

SEE HOWARD V. COONROD 134 F. 4TH 1136 APRIL -15- 2025 [SENTENCING AND PUNISHMENT] LENGTH OF SENTENCE CONFIRM..... A STATE MAY NOT EVADE THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT "SCRUTINY" SIMPLY BY LABELING A SENTENCE LIFE WITH PAROLE WHEN IN SUBSTANCE, IT IS A LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE SENTENCE U.S. CONST AMEND 8TH.
SEE HAYDEN, 134 F. SUPP. 3D AT 1011; IN HAYDEN THE COURT STATED IF A JUVENILE OFFENDER'S LIFE SENTENCE, WHILE OSTENSIBLY LABELED AS ONE WITH PAROLE IS THE FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT OF A LIFE SENTENCE WITHOUT PAROLE, THEN THE STATE HAS DENIED THAT OFFENDER THE 'MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE BASED ON DEMONSTRATED MATURITY AND REHABILATATION..... THAT THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT DEMANDS, ID AT 1009.

APPELLANT CONFIRM BY COMPELLING EVIDENCE THAT IF SOUTH CAROLINA PAROLE AUTHORITIES HAD TO REMOVE THEIR PREPARED FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD THAT WENT UNCORRECTED SINCE JUVENILE OFFENDER FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING OF 2012 SEE DOCUMENT K. PAGE (5) 1-9, WHICH WAS CONFIRMED ON JANUARY-13-2025, [INORDER] TO PROVIDE CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER A "MEANINGFUL"

LEGAL MAIL

OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE..... SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE NO DOUBT CONFIRM APPELLANT BEFORE THIS S.C. COURT OF APPEALS OBVIOUS WAS NOT AFFORDED NO MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN RELEASE BASED ON DEMONSTRATED MATURITY AND REHABILATATION THAT THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT DEMAND CONFIRMED BY S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES ON JANUARY - 13 - 2025 BECAUSE THE PRIOR RECORD WAS CONFIRMED INCORRECT SEE DOCUMENT M. ..... [THAT] S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES ALLOW TO GO UNCORRECTED AND USED AGAINST CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER SEE NAPUE VS. ILLINOIS 360 U.S. 264

APPELLANT CONFIRM THAT IF S.C. COURT OF APPEALS CLAIM APPELLANT BEFORE THIS COURT HAS LIFE WITH PAROLE SEE STATE VS. MITCHELL 2021 6066794 SEE STATUTE 16 - 3 - 20(A) (SUPP. 1991)..... OBVIOUSLY S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES ALSO VIOLATED CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND CRUEL OR UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONSTITUTION ..... BECAUSE ACCORDING TO STATE VS. MITCHELL ABOVE IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER " MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE BASED ON DEMONSTRATED MATURITY AND REHABILATATION [SUPPOSE] TO START [2012].

APPELLANT CONFIRM ACCORDING TO STATE VS. MITCHELL 2021 6066794 STATUTE 16 - 3 - 20 (A) (SUPP. 1991) IS A 20 TO LIFE BASED ON A PLEA OF GUILT. APPELLANT SUPPOSE TO BE CONSIDER FOR PAROLE

LEGAL MAIL

AFTER THE SERVICE OF [20] YEARS BEGINNING AT APPELLANT FIRST INITIAL PAROLE HEARING 2012 SEE DOCUMENT P.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CONFIRM APPELLANT MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO BE CONSIDER FOR PAROLE TO OBTAIN RELEASE WAS NOT SUPPOSE TO BE....AFTER JANUARY-13-2025 WHEN THE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES REALIZE THEIR PRIOR RECORD WAS INCORRECT SEE DOCUMENT P. AND DOCUMENT M., BECAUSE THAT'S WELL OVER (30) YEARS TO BE CONSIDER FOR PAROLE DO TO THE PRIOR RECORD WAS CONFIRMED INCORRECT AND APPELLANT COULD NOT PRIOR BEFORE OCT-23-24 BE CONSIDER FOR PAROLE OFF MISIDENTIFICATION OF CRIMINAL RECORDS.

APPELLANT CONFIRM BEFORE OUR SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS [IN ORDER] FOR S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES TO HAD AFFORD CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER A "REALISTIC" MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE [FIRST] THE FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD HAD TO BE REMOVED SEE DOCUMENT M., THE PRIOR INCORRECT RECORD [HAD] TO BE CORRECTED [FIRST].....AND ONCE THE INADEQUATE MATERIAL FALSE CRIMINAL RECORD WAS REMOVED THEN A REHEARING HAD TO BE HELD, CONFIRM THE MARCH-26-2025 PAROLE REHEARING VIOLATE APPELLATE STATUTE OF 16-3-20(A)(SUPP. 1991) DO TO CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER WOULD BE FINALLY CONSIDER FOR PAROLE FOR A MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN RELEASE AFTER [30] YEARS IN OBVIOUS

LEGAL MAIL

UNDER A STATUTE OF ONE WHO PLEA GUILTY MUST BE CONSIDER FOR PAROLE AFTER THE SERVICE OF [20] YEARS..... BUT DO TO THE PRIOR INCORRECT RECORD OBVIOUS CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER WAS CONSIDER FOR PAROLE AFTER [30] YEARS THAT VIOLATES HIS GUILTY PLEA STATUE OF 16-3-20 (A) (SUPP. 1991)..... OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT OF THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE BAN ON CRUEL OR UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONSTITUTION.

SEE HAYDEN V. KELLER 134 F. SUPP. 3D 1000 AT [7], SEE ATWELL V. STATE 197 SO. 3D 1040 SEE JAY V. STATE 252 SO. 3D 326 AT [1] AND [3], SEE GRAHAM V. FLORIDA, 560 U.S. 48, 75 SEE ROOKS V. STATE, 224 SO. 3D 272 (FLA. 3D DCA 2017, SEE VENNISEE V. STATE, 235 SO. 3D 947 (FLA. 3D DCA 2017, SEE STATE V. MITCHELL 2021 WL 6066794, SEE STATE V. GRAHAM 2025 WL 3471474 IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS.

CONCLUSION:

APPELLANT CONFIRM BEFORE THIS SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS THAT HIS LIFE WITH PAROLE LABELED SENTENCE IN THIS INDIVIDUAL CASE FUNTIONALLY EQUIVALENT RESEMBLE LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE AND THE ONLY [LOGIC] REMDY IS RESENTENCING OR SOME OTHER FORM OF RELEASE ORDER, BECAUSE PAROLE GRANT IS NOT POSSIBLE DO TO THE SERIOUS NATURE OF ERROR

LEGAL MAIL

CONDUCTED BY THE S.C. PAROLE AUTHORITIES PLACED ON CONVICTED JUVENILE OFFENDER THAT A CLAIM OF MOOT NOR MOTION TO DISMISSAL CAN NOT AND WILL NOT SATISFY THE 8TH AMENDMEND VIOLATION TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE BAN ON CRUEL OR UNUSUAL PUNISHMENTS IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONSTITUTION.

Charles M. Mitchell

CHARLES M. MITCHELL
#00189424