

RECEIVED

Sep 10 2026

SC Court of Appeals

JAMES JOSEPH PATTERSON III
#368709 F3B. RM. 230
EVANS C.I. 610 HWY. 9 WEST
BENNETTSVILLE, S.C. 29512

IN RE: CASE 2023-001474 MOTIONING TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR,
REINSTATE THE APPEAL, PRESERVE APPELLATE JURISDICTION AND
SUBSTITUTE APPOINTED COUNSEL.

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,

THE ATTACHED PLEADING IS BEING FILED FOR THE PURPOSE
OF SEEKING TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR AND OTHER RELIEF SOUGHT
WITHIN THE (12) PAGE DOCUMENT. PLEASE FILE IT IN THE ABOVE
CAPTIONED CASE AND FORWARD IT FOR ADJUDICATION. THANK YOU IN
ADVANCE. STILL REMAIN,

RESPECTFULLY,

JAMES JOSEPH PATTERSON III

SEPTEMBER 10, 2026

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

Sep 10 2026

SC Court of Appeals

CASE DOCKET NO. 2023-001474

APPEAL FROM LEXINGTON COUNTY
THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

INDICTMENT NO.(S) 2022-GS-32-6146, 6147

JAMES JOSEPH PATTERSON III,

APPELLANT

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT


AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

I, JAMES JOSEPH PATTERSON III, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT I HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; EMERGENCY MOTION TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR, REINSTATE APPEAL, PRESERVE APPELLATE JURISDICTION, AND SUBSTITUTE CONFLICT-FREE COUNSEL, ON THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221, ATTORNEY MOLLY M. KEEGAN OF THE

OFFICE OF INDIGENT DEFENSE 1330 LADY STREET, SUITE 401, COLUMBIA,
S.C. 29211-3332, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 11549,
COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221, BY U.S. MAIL AND OR PDF, POSTAGE PREPAID BY
DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON SEPTEMBER 10, 2026.

RESPECTFULLY,

JAMES J. PATTERSON III



SEPTEMBER 10, 2026

CC: THE OFFICE OF INDIGENT DEFENSE
THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL
JAMES J. PATTERSON III
THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

CASE DOCKET NO. 2023-001474

APPEAL FROM LEXINGTON COUNTY
THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

INDICTMENT NO.(S) 2022-GS-32-6146, 6147

JAMES JOSEPH PATTERSON III,

APPELLANT

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; EMERGENCY
MOTION TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR, REINSTATE APPEAL,
PRESERVE APPELLATE JURISDICTION, AND SUBSTITUTE
CONFLICT APPELLATE COUNSEL

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

ATTACHED THE COURT WILL FIND SEVERAL EXHIBITS THAT ARE
3-of-12

RECEIVED

Sep 10 2026

SC Court of Appeals

THE SOURCE OF THE CONTROVERSY. THE APPELLANT IN THE ABOVE CAPTIONED MATTERS RESPECTFULLY MOVES THIS COURT FOR AN EMERGENCY ORDER RECALLING THE REMITTITUR, REINSTATING THE APPEAL TO THE ACTIVE DOCKET, PRESERVING APPELLATE JURISDICTION PENDING SUPREME COURT REVIEW, AND PERMITTING SUBSTITUTION OF APPELLATE COUNSEL. THE MOTION ARISES FROM EXTRAORDINARY PROCEDURAL CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH APPELLANT TIMELY ATTEMPTED TO PRESERVE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES FOR FURTHER APPELLATE REVIEW AFTER ~~RECEIVED~~ APPOINTED APPELLATE COUNSEL EXPRESSLY INFORMED THE APPELLANT THAT COUNSEL WOULD NOT SEEK REHEARING. APPELLANT THEREAFTER PERSONALLY SUBMITTED A TIMELY PETITION FOR EMERGENCY REHEARING BY PDF/ELECTRONIC FILING. RATHER THAN TREATING THE APPELLANT'S FILING AS AN ATTEMPT TO PRESERVE HIS APPELLATE RIGHTS REQUEST FOR SUBSTITUTE COUNSEL AS SUCH, THE FILING WAS CONSTRUED AS AN ATTEMPT TO PROCEED PRO SE OR AS AN IMPERMISSIBLE HYBRID REPRESENTATION. APPELLANT RESPECTFULLY SUBMITS THAT THIS CHARACTERIZATION DID NOT ACCURATELY REFLECT THE RELIEF REQUESTED. APPELLANT SOUGHT SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL, NOT SIMULTANEOUS REPRESENTATION BY COUNSEL AND HIMSELF. THE COURT THEREAFTER DISPOSED OF THE REHEARING REQUEST AND TRANSMITTED THE REMITTITUR THE SAME DAY, NOTWITHSTANDING RULE 221(b), SCACR.

RELIEF REQUESTED:

THE APPELLANT RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS OF THIS COURT:

- (1) RECALL THE REMITTITUR IMMEDIATELY;
- (2) REINSTATE THE APPEAL TO THE ACTIVE APPELLATE DOCKET;
- (3) DETERMINE THAT THE REMITTITUR WAS PREMATURELY TRANSMITTED IF IT WAS SENT BEFORE EXPIRATION OF THE RULE 242(c), SCACR, CERTIORARI PERIOD;
- (4) RECOGNIZE THAT APPELLANT'S TIMELY REHEARING PETITION WAS FILED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PRESERVING CONSTITUTIONAL AND

JURISDICTIONAL QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER APPELLATE REVIEW;

(5) CLARIFY THAT APPELLATE'S REQUEST WAS FOR SUBSTITUTION OF APPOINTED APPELLATE COUNSEL, NOT HYBRID REPRESENTATION OR SIMULTANEOUS PRO SE REPRESENTATION;

(6) PERMIT THE APPELLANT TO OBTAIN CONFLICT-FREE APPELLATE COUNSEL PURSUANT TO RULE 264, SCACR, OR OTHERWISE PROVIDE APPROPRIATE RELIEF CONCERNING COUNSEL;

(7) PRESERVE APPELLANT'S RIGHT TO PETITION THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI; AND

(8) GRANT SUCH OTHER RELIEF THE COURT WOULD DEEM JUST, FAIR AND PROPER AS WOULD BE NECESSARY TO PREVENT THE LOSS OF APPELLATE'S CONSTITUTIONAL AND APPELLATE RIGHTS.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY:

(1) THE COURT OF APPEALS ENTERED ITS JUDGMENT ON JULY 22, 2026.

(2) APPELLANT WAS REPRESENTED BY BY APPOINTED APPELLATE COUNSEL IN THE FORM OF MOLLY M. KEEGAN.

(3) ON OR ABOUT JULY 28, 2026 APPOINTED COUNSEL SENT APPELLANT WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE INFORMING HIM THAT COUNSEL THAT COUNSEL WOULD NOT SEEK REHEARING.

(4) THE APPELLANT DID NOT AGREE TO ABANDON FURTHER APPELLATE REVIEW.

(5) APPELLANT EXPRESSLY SOUGHT TO CONTINUE LITIGATING THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE CONCERNING THE SCOPE OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND THE VALIDITY OR SCOPE OF THE PRECEDENT UPON WHICH THE COURT(S) RELIED.

(6) APPELLANT FURTHER SOUGHT SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL BECAUSE HE BELIEVED APPOINTED COUNSEL'S REFUSAL TO PREVENT AND PRESERVE THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE CREATED A FUNDAMENTAL CONFLICT CONCERNING THE OBJECTIVE OF THE REPRESENTATION.

(7) APPELLANT DID NOT REQUEST HYBRID REPRESENTATION.

(8) APPELLANT DID NOT REQUEST TO SIMULTANEOUSLY ACT AS HIS OWN ATTORNEY WHILE REMAINING REPRESENTED BY APPOINTED COUNSEL.

(9) INSTEAD, APPELLANT SOUGHT SUBSTITUTE COUNSEL WHO WOULD PRESENT THE ISSUES APPELLANT HAD DIRECTED COUNSEL TO PRESERVE.

(10) THE COURT NEVERTHELESS CONSTRUED APPELLANT'S REQUEST AS IMPLICATING PRO SE OR HYBRID REPRESENTATION.

(11) APPELLANT ATTEMPTED TO CLARIFY THAT THE REQUEST WAS FOR SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL.

(12) THEREAFTER, APPELLANT TIMELY SUBMITTED AN EMERGENCY PETITION FOR REHEARING BY PDF/ELECTRONIC FILING ON AUGUST 5, 2026.

(13) THE FILING WAS ACTUALLY RECEIVED BY THE COURT OF APPEALS AUGUST 5, 2026 WITHIN THE PERIOD PRESCRIBED BY RULE 221(a), SCACR.

(14) THE PETITION EXPRESSLY SOUGHT PRESERVATION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL JURISDICTIONAL QUESTION, THE COUNSEL/AUTONOMY ISSUE, AND APPELLANT'S ABILITY TO SEEK REVIEW BY THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT.

(15) THE COURT DISPOSED OF THE REHEARING PETITION ON

BY CLERK OF COURT LETTER DATED AUGUST 31, 2026.

(16) THE REMITTITUR WAS TRANSMITTED ON THAT SAME DATE, AUGUST 31, 2026.

(17) AT THE TIME THE REMITTITUR WAS TRANSMITTED, THE PERIOD PRESCRIBED BY RULE 242(c), SCACR, FOR SEEKING SUPREME COURT REVIEW HAD NOT EXPIRED.

III. RULE 221(b) REQUIRED WITHHOLDING OF THE REMITTITUR:

RULE 221(b), SCACR, PROVIDE THAT WHEN A PETITION FOR REHEARING HAS BEEN RECEIVED BEFORE THE REMITTITUR IS SENT, THE REMITTITUR SHALL NOT BE SENT WHILE THE REHEARING PETITION IS PENDING. MORE IMPORTANTLY, WHERE REHEARING HAS BEEN DENIED, RULE 221(b) PROVIDE THAT THE COURT OF APPEALS SHALL NOT SEND THE REMITTITUR UNTIL THE TIME TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI UNDER RULE 242(c) HAS EXPIRED. IF CERTIORARI IS FILED, THE REMITTITUR REMAINS WITHHELD UNTIL THE SUPREME COURT ACTS. ACCORDINGLY, DENIAL OF REHEARING DID NOT ITSELF AUTHORIZE IMMEDIATE TRANSMISSION OF THE REMITTITUR. THE RULE CREATES A SECOND PERIOD OF PROTECTION AFTER REHEARING HAS BEEN DENIED.

IV. RULE 242(c) CONFIRMS THAT SUPREME COURT REVIEW REMAINED AVAILABLE:

RULE 242(c), SCACR, PROVIDES THE PROCEDURE AND TIME PERIOD FOR SEEKING SUPREME COURT REVIEW AFTER DISPOSITION OF REHEARING. APPELLANT'S FILING WAS INTENDED TO PRESERVE THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THAT REVIEW.

V. THE APPELLANT'S REQUEST WAS FOR SUBSTITUTE COUNSEL, NOT HYBRID REPRESENTATION:

APPELLANT'S REQUEST SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD ACCORDING TO IT'S ACTUAL SUBSTANCE: REPLACE APPOINTED COUNSEL BECAUSE COUNSEL HAD EXPRESSLY DECLINED TO PURSUE THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

APPELLANT DIRECTED COUNSEL TO PRESERVE. IT WAS NOT A REQUEST FOR SIMULTANEOUS HYBRID REPRESENTATION. APPELLANT SOUGHT SUBSTITUTE COUNSEL.

VI. THE MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTE COUNSEL WAS NEVER JUDICIALLY ADJUDICATED:

APPELLANT'S REQUEST FOR SUBSTITUTION MUST BE EVALUATED ACCORDING TO THE RELIEF ACTUALLY SOUGHT, NOT ACCORDING TO THE CHARACTERIZATION PLACED UPON IT BY AN ADMINISTRATIVE COMMUNICATION. APPELLANT SOUGHT REPLACEMENT OF APPOINTED APPELLATE COUNSEL. HE DID NOT REQUEST PERMISSION TO REPRESENT HIMSELF WHILE COUNSEL REMAINED COUNSEL OF RECORD. THE DISTINCTION IS MATERIAL. A REQUEST FOR SUBSTITUTE COUNSEL UNDER RULE 608, SCACR, ASKS THE COURT TO EXERCISE JUDICIAL DISCRETION CONCERNING CONTINUED REPRESENTATION. A REQUEST FOR HYBRID REPRESENTATION ASKS FOR SIMULTANEOUS PARTICIPATION BY THE DEFENDANT AND COUNSEL. THOSE ARE DIFFERENT REQUESTS REQUIRING DIFFERENT INQUIRIES. HERE, THE COURT DID NOT ENTER AN ORDER DENYING THE SUBSTITUTION REQUEST. INSTEAD, THE CLERK ISSUED A LETTER STATING THAT THERE WAS NO HYBRID DEFENSE. IF THE RECORD CONFIRMS THAT NO JUDGE EVER ENTERED AN ORDER ADJUDICATING SUBSTITUTION, THE LETTER CANNOT BE TREATED AS A JUDICIAL DISPOSITION OF THE MOTION MERELY BECAUSE IT COMMUNICATED A POSITION ATTRIBUTED TO THE COURT. APPELLANT THEREFORE RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS THAT THIS COURT EXAMINE THE DOCKET AND RECORD TO DETERMINE WHETHER ANY JUDICIAL ORDER ACTUALLY RULED ON THE SUBSTITUTION MOTION, WHAT RELIEF THE MOTION REQUESTED, AND WHAT AUTHORITY, IF ANY, PERMITTED THE CLERK TO DISPOSE OF OR FORECLOSE THAT JUDICIAL REQUEST WITHOUT AN ORDER OF THE COURT. THE ABSENCE OF A JUDICIAL RULING IS PARTICULARLY CONSEQUENTIAL BECAUSE THE SUBSTITUTION REQUEST AROSE AFTER APPOINTED COUNSEL EXPRESSLY STATE THAT SHE WOULD NOT SEEK REHEARING, WHILE APPELLANT EXPRESSLY SOUGHT CONTINUED REVIEW AND PRESERVATION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES. THE UNRESOLVED REQUEST THEREFORE CONCERNED THE MEANS BY WHICH APPELLANT SOUGHT TO CONTINUE EXERCISING HIS APPELLATE RIGHTS, NOT AN ATTEMPT TO

CONDUCT A HYBRID DEFENSE.

VII. THE SIXTH AMENDMENT AUTONOMY PRINCIPLE RECOGNIZED IN
McCOY v. LOUISIANA:

IN McCOY v. LOUISIANA, 584 U.S. 414 (U.S.2018), THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HELD THAT THE 6TH. AMENDMENT GIVES A CRIMINAL DEFENDANT AUTHORITY OVER FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVES OF THE DEFENSE AND THAT COUNSEL MAY NOT USURP A DECISION RESERVED TO THE DEFENDANT. THE COURT IDENTIFIED DECISIONS RESERVED TO THE DEFENDANT, INCLUDING TO FOREGO APPEAL, ID. AT. 422-23. THE APPELLANT DID NOT CHOSE TO ABANDON APPELLATE REVIEW. TO THE CONTRARY, APPELLANT EXPRESSLY SOUGHT CONTINUED APPELLATE LITIGATION, PRESERVATION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES, REVIEW OF STATE v. GENTRY, AND EVENTUAL S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. APPELLANT THEREFORE SUBMIT THAT COUNSEL'S UNILATERAL REFUSAL TO PURSUE FURTHER REVIEW SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN TREATED AS DISPOSITIVE OF APPELLANT'S EXPRESSLY STATED APPELLATE OBJECTIVE.

VIII. THIS IS NOT MERELY A STRATEGIC DISAGREEMENT:

APPELLANT RECOGNIZES THAT COUNSEL ORDINARILY CONTROLS TACTICAL AND STRATEGIC DECISIONS. THE ISSUE HERE IS WHETHER COUNSEL COULD UNILATERALLY ABANDON FURTHER APPELLATE REVIEW OF AN EXPRESSED IDENTIFIED CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIM AFTER THE DEFENDANT AFFIRMATIVELY DIRECTED THAT THE ISSUE BE PURSUED AND REQUESTED SUBSTITUTE COUNSEL BECAUSE EXISTING COUNSEL REFUSED TO PURSUE IT.

IX. APPELLANT SEEKS TO CHALLENGE, NOT EVADE, THE STATE v. GENTRY RULING:

APPELLANT RECOGNIZES THAT STATE v. GENTRY, 363 S.C. 93, 610 S.E.2d. 494(S.C.App.2005), ADDRESSES SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND DISTINGUISHES THAT CONCEPT FROM INDICTMENT SUFFICIENCY. APPELLANT NEVERTHELESS SEEKS TO CHALLENGE THE

CONTINUED APPLICATION OR SCOPE OF GENTRY INsofar AS IT IS UNDERSTOOD TO FORECLOSE CONSIDERATION OF A DISTINCT CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATION UPON THE STATE'S AUTHORITY TO OBTAIN OR MAINTAIN A CRIMINAL JUDGMENT. THE PROPOSED CHALLENGE DOES NOT MERELY RELITIGATE WHETHER AN INDICTMENT WAS TECHNICALLY SUFFICIENT. IT ASKS WHETHER THE CONSTITUTIONAL SOURCE AND LIMITS OF CRIMINAL JUDICIAL POWER CAN BE COMPLETELY SUBSUMED WITHIN A STATUTORY ELEMENT OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION SUCH THAT THE CONSTITUTIONAL DEFECTS AFFECTING THE STATE'S AUTHORITY TO PROSECUTE OR OBTAIN A CONVICTION ARE RENDERED LEGALLY IRRELEVANT.

X. ALLEGED FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND THE HISTORICAL BASIS OF GENTRY:

APPELLANT ALLEGES THAT CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE DEVELOPMENT AND SUBSEQUENT APPLICATION OF GENTRY WARRANT JUDICIAL EXAMINATION, INCLUDING ALLEGED OMISSIONS, MISCHARACTERIZATIONS, OR OTHER CONDUCT THAT MAY HAVE PREVENTED FULL CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL DIMENSIONS OF THE JURISDICTIONAL QUESTION. APPELLANT DOES NOT ASK THIS COURT TO ACCEPT THOSE ALLEGATIONS MERELY UPON ASSERTION. RATHER, APPELLANT REQUESTS EXAMINATION OF THE UNDERLYING RECORD AND PRESERVATION OF THESE ISSUES FOR REVIEW.

XI. THE REMITTITUR SHOULD NOT HAVE DEPRIVED APPELLANT OF S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEW:

RULE 242(d)(1), SCACR, MAKES PRESERVATION IN THE COURT OF APPEALS AND IN THE PETITION FOR REHEARING SIGNIFICANT TO SUPREME COURT REVIEW. APPELLANT TIMELY FILED HIS REHEARING PETITION SPECIFICALLY TO PRESERVE THESE ISSUES. TRANSMISSION OF THE REMITTITUR BEFORE EXPIRATION OF THE CERTIORARI PERIOD THEREFORE RISKED DEFEATING THE SUPREME COURT-REVIEW MECHANISM THE RULES PROVIDE.

XII. CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF:

WHEREFORE, APPELLANT RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THIS COURT:

(A) RECALL THE REMITTITUR;

(B) REINSTATE THE APPEAL;

(C) DETERMINE WHETHER TRANSMISSION OF THE REMITTITUR BEFORE EXPIRATION OF THE RULE 242(c) PERIOD WAS PREMATURE AND INCONSISTENT WITH RULE 221(b);

(D) RECOGNIZE APPELLANT'S TIMELY REHEARING PETITION AS AN EFFORT TO PRESERVE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES FOR S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEW;

(E) CLARIFY THAT APPELLANT SOUGHT SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL RATHER THAN HYBRID REPRESENTATION;

(F) GRANT APPROPRIATE RELIEF CONCERNING APPOINTED COUNSEL PURSUANT TO RULE 264, SCACR AND RULE 608, SCACR;

(G) PERMIT APPELLANT TO OBTAIN CONFLICT-FREE APPELLATE REPRESENTATION UNDER RULE 608, SCACR;

(H) PRESERVE APPELLANT'S RIGHT TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT; AND

(I) GRANT SUCH ADDITIONAL RELIEF AS JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS REQUIRES.

RESPECTFULLY,

JAMES J. PATTERSON III

James J. Patterson III

SEPTEMBER 10, 2026

CC: THE OFFICE OF INDIGENT DEFENSE
THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL
JAMES J. PATTERSON III
THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

CATHERINE S. HARRISON
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE (803) 734-1890
FAX (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

August 31, 2026

James Joseph Patterson, III, 00368709
Evans Correctional Institution
610 Highway #9, West
Bennettsville SC 29512

Re: The State v. James J. Patterson, III
Appellate Case No. 2023-001474

Dear Mr. Patterson:

We are in receipt of your recent correspondence dated August 5, 2026. As stated in this Court's letters dated April 13, 2026, April 24, 2026, and June 1, 2026, because you are represented by counsel, we are returning your filing without action. *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.").

Very truly yours,

Jasmine D. Smith, Deputy
CLERK

cc: Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Melody Jane Brown, Esquire
John Benjamin Aplin, Esquire
Donald J. Zelenka, Esquire
Samuel R. Hubbard, III, Esquire
Molly Marie Keegan, Esquire



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

CATHERINE S. HARRISON
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

August 31, 2026

James Joseph Patterson, III, 00368709
Evans Correctional Institution
610 Highway #9, West
Bennettsville SC 29512

Re: The State v. James J. Patterson, III
Appellate Case No. 2023-001474

Dear Mr. Patterson:

We are in receipt of your recent correspondence dated August 5, 2026. As stated in this Court's letters dated April 13, 2026, April 24, 2026, and June 1, 2026, because you are represented by counsel, we are returning your filing without action. *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.").

Very truly yours,

Jasmine D. Smith, Deputy
CLERK

cc: Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Melody Jane Brown, Esquire
John Benjamin Aplin, Esquire
Donald J. Zelenka, Esquire
Samuel R. Hubbard, III, Esquire
Molly Marie Keegan, Esquire



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

CATHERINE S. HARRISON
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

August 31, 2026

The Honorable Lisa M. Comer
205 East Main Street
Suite 128
Lexington SC 29072

REMITTITUR

Re: The State v. James J. Patterson, III
Lower Court Case No. 2022GS3206146, 2022GS3206147
Appellate Case No. 2023-001474

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

Jasmine D. Smith, Deputy
CLERK

Enclosure

cc: Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Melody Jane Brown, Esquire
Donald J. Zelenka, Esquire
Samuel R. Hubbard, III, Esquire
Molly Marie Keegan, Esquire
Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire

