RECEIVED
OCT 29 2026
SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Georgetown County
Honorable Roger M. Young, Circuit Court Judge

THE STATE, RESPONDENT,

VS.

JODY LYNN WARD, APPELLANT.

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2025-002597

APPELLANT'S (45) DAY ANDER'S BRIEF

Jody Lynn Ward, #300644
Tyger River C.I 4-1-B-#117
200 Prison Rd.
Enoree, S.C. 29335
Appellate Pro-se

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . . (i)-(iiii)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES . . . . . (iiiii)

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL 1-2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 3

STATEMENT OF FACTS 4-5

STANDARD OF REVIEW 6

ARGUMENTS

1.) The Circuit Court Judge Roger Young Abused his ROA pg 833 discretion which Amounted to an ERROR of LAW when he signed a proposed ORDER from Solicitor MARY Ellen Walter of ATTORNEY TRISTAN SHAFFER Motion for a New TRial Based on After Discovered Evidence he filed on Actual INNOCENCE on July 15, 2023, after a witness named Rhonda Jones Haithcock gave a statement to Him & Solicitors office that BRIAN Elliott confessed to her that he killed Both alleged victims in Appellants case, and since his JURY WAS CHARGED with 3RD party Guilt of BRIAN Elliott and since there is "NO Hybrid Representation", pursuant to Miller vs. State, 388 S.C. 347, 697 S.E. 2d 527 (2010); AND Foster vs. State 298 S.C. 306, 379 S.E. 2d 907 (1989) Appellate Defender Jessica SAXON CAN only BRIEF ATTORNEYS ISSUE ONLY AND

This Court should; Issue ORdering her to Re-do her Brief and not to Be Relieved as Counsel Because the S.C. Supreme Court said that it is a Directive in Foster vs. state, supra not to accept substantive Documents and since Appellate Defender Ms. Jessica Saxon, Left out of the Appendix Attorney Tristan Shaffer, Esq. Brief and only added as Appendix the Amended Substantive Documents that was partically Pro-se must Be striken from Appendix And Voided all out pursuant to Foster vs state, supra; And State vs. Stuckey, 333 S.C. 56, 508 S.E. 2d 564 (1998); Miller vs. state, supra, Based off this issue alone S.C. Court of Appeals should order Appellate Defender Jessica Saxon to only Raise Attorney Tristan shaffer (1) Issue and only his Appendix filed and used as a Matter of Laws, an not to Be Relieved a Counsel pursuant to Anders vs. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396 (1967) No Partially Pro-se; Partially By Counsel.

2.) Did Appellate Defender Jessica M. Saxon unreasonibly violate Anders vs. California, supra clearly Established Federal Law when she did not Brief an arguable Legal issue which arose during the Motion for a New Trial filed on July 15, 2023, By paid Attorney Tristan Shaffer, against Miller vs State, supra; Foster vs. state, supra; state vs. Stuckey, supra, when she Briefed all pro-se issues, that this Court can not even Rule on due to no partically Pro-se and completely Leaving out Attorneys Brief filed on July 15, 2023 out of the Appendix as this is not a pro-se case and Judge Roger Young denied Appellates motion to Relieve Counsel and Leave him By Stand-By counsel, this Court should Order Appellate Counsel to do further Briefing, pursuant to clearly Established Federal Law.

3.) Did Appellate Defender Jessica M. Saxon violate clearly Established Federal Law Anders vs. California, supra, by failing to File a "Motion to Remand" Due to the signing of Order was "Abuse of Discretion" for the Circuit court Judge Roger Young to sign an Order that violates Miller vs. state, supra; state vs. stuckey, supra; and Foster vs. state, supra, "No Hybrid Representation", as outlined in Pennsylvania vs. Finley, 481 U.S. 551, 107 S.Ct. 1990, 95 L.Ed. 2d 539 (1987) clearly Established Federal Law.

4.) Did the Circuit Court Judge Roger Young & Solicitor Mary Ellen Walters & Appellate Defender Jessica Saxon violate Laws of the state of South Carolina when solicitor Mary Ellen Walters never served a copy of states Response to motion for new Trial dated May 1, 2025, the same day as D.N.A. Testing Hearing Appendix page 810 to 818 and Order signed By Judge Roger Young Appendix 819 to 826, which is violation theres NO "certificate of service", "NO partial Hybrid Representation", violation of Rule 11; violation of Pennsylvania vs. Finley, supra; Foster vs. state, supra; state vs. Stuckey, supra; Miller vs. state, supra, See: R.O.A. pg. 833

Relevant Facts 7

Discussion 7-9

CONCLUSION 10

OBJECTION TO APPELLATE DEFENDER Being Relieved

As counsel ..... 11 of 11.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Anders vs. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396 (1967) . . . . 1-2 §6

Foster vs. State, 398 S.C. 306, 379 S.E. 2d 907 (1989) . . (i) 1-2 §6

Miller vs. State, 388 S.C. 347, 697 S.E. 2d 527 (2010) . . (i) 1-2 §6

State vs. Stuckey, 333 S.C. 56, 508 S.E. 2d 564 (1998) . . 1-2 §6

Pennsylvania vs. Finley, 481 U.S. 551, 107 S.Ct. 1990, 1-2 §6
95 L.Ed. 2d 539 (1987) . . . . . (iii) §6

Towers vs. Glover, 467 U.S. 914, 104 S.Ct. 2820, 81
L.Ed. 2d 758 (1984) . . . . . (3) §6

Martinez vs. Ryan . . . . . (5) §6

Rules:

Rule 11(c) South Carolina Rules of civil Procedure 1-10

Rule 29(b), South Carolina Rules of Criminal Procedure . . . 1-10

Rule 407, South Carolina Appellate Court Rules of Professional
conduct 1-10

Rule 501, South Carolina Appellate Court Rules of Judicial
Conduct 1-10

STATEMENT OF ISSUE ON APPEAL

1) whether the Circuit Court erred in signing an Order with mixed Attorney's Motion for a New Trial based on afer discovered evidence and partially Pro-se filings in a violation of Miller vs. State, supra; and Foster vs. state, supra; State vs. Stuckey, supra where the S.C. Supreme Court gave a Directive not to accept substantive Documents and/or Rule on partially Pro-se filings as Attorney Tristan Shaffer filed motion for a New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence on July 15, 2023, which was completly left out of the Order of Dissmissal; and Appellate Defender Jessica Saxon's Appendix is clearly in violation of clearly Established Federal Law Pennsylvania vs. Finley, supra; Arder vs. Calif. supra, see: R.O.A. pg. 833

2.) whether Judge Roger Young Abused his discretion After all same issues he signed Order on July 7, 2025 and Filed on July 15, 2025; not same day July 15, 2023 when Attorney Tristan Shaffer Filed Motion For a new Trial Based on Actual Innocence, when Rhonda Jones Haithcock told Attorney Brian Elliott confessed to her he was Responsible for (2) killing in Appellants

case, But Judge Young had already Recieved in month of May An Amended Application for Post-conviction Relief S.C.R.Civ.P. Rule 15 was already Filed; clock-stamp to more Issues to Civil Court he still signed pro-se Filings Instead of Attorney Filings is Abuse of Discretion Amounting to an "ERROR of LAW" in clearly Established "Federal and State Law it's Actually Towers vs. Glover, a conspiracy to violate all my U.S. and Const. Rights as a South Carolian and U.S. citizen. On This Issue alone this Appeal should be Remanded to Lower Court for Further proceedings. See: R.O.A. pg. 833 and Attached R.O.A. pg. 837-885 May 1, 2025 Hearing Date
2.-2.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In July 2003, Appellant was indicted By a Georgetown County grand Jury for two counts of murder (* note) Court of common pleas NON-Jury TRIAL in the deaths of Wilford Brown and Elton Rutledge, Jr. The deaths were alleged to have occurred on or about August 3, 2002. R. 827-830. On March 15, 2004, the state called the case to trial Before the Honorable Paula H. Thomas and a Jury. Appellant was represented By Margaret Ann Kneece and J. Wesley Locklair, III. J. Gregory Hembree and Robert B. Bryan Represented the state. R.I.

After a four-day TRIAL, Appellant was found guilty as indicted. R. 651, ll. 1-19. Judge Thomas sentenced him to concurrent terms of life imprisonment. R. 659. Appellants' direct Appeal was dismissed pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967) State v. Ward, 2007-UP-048 (S.C.Ct.App. filed Jan. 26, 2007). Appellant timely pursued post-conviction relief, which was denied, as was the subsequent petition for writ of certiorari, On July 15, 2023 Attorney Tristan Shaffer filed a motion for a new trial Based on after discovered Evidence which Been Left out of Appendix; all other Pro-se filings are BARRED By Pennsylvania vs. Finley, supra; Foster vs. state, supra; Miller vs. state, supra; State vs. Stuckey, so filings And ORder are void Abi intio Appellate Defender is in a violation of Towers vs. Glover, 467 U.S. 914, 104 S. Ct. 2820, 81 L.Ed. 2d 758 (1984). Appeal Follows:

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On July 15, 2023 Attorney Tristan Shaffer Filed a S.C.R.Crim.P. Rule 29(B) motion For a New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence. see: Judge's Order Appendix page 810 - 818, signed on April 29, 2025 and Filed on May 1, 2025 same day as Hearing also Transcript Attached as Exhibit/Appendix proof of no service on Attorney Tristan shaffer and/or Pro-se Filings. This Court should note that there was a Taped statement on North Carolina woman who stated to the Georgetown County Solicitor's office off of the direction of Attorney Tristan Shaffer that Appellate's alleged co-defendant Brian Elliott killed Both alleged men that Appellates in prison serving Life sentence's for. Judge at Trial charged Jury with 3rd party Guilt and Hands of one Hands of all even though State gave Brian Elliott an Alibi at Home through his wife who wasn't even Home.

Attorney Tristan Shaffer's Motion For A New Trial Has Not Been Ruled on as of Date By own Judges Order Says "Appendix Pg. 819 "This matter is Before the Court on Defendant Jody Lynn Wards motion For New Trial Filed on October 4, 2024. Not motion For a new Trial Dated July 15, 2023 (Footnote(1)) Filed By Attorney Tristan Shaffer. Appellate Defender Jessica M. Saxon, Knows that state failed to send me a copy of there Retrun to his Pro-se motions sent them to Attorney Tristan shaffer who failed to Answer my Pro-se motions, Because he couldn't. This is Martinez Vs. Ryan, (5) prongs; Ineffective Assistance Counsel on Tristan shaffer; Judicial misconduct on Judge Roger Young; Prosecutorial misconduct on Solicitor Mary Ellen Walters; Judicial Lynching. see: Attorneys motion to Relieve Counsel not Filed/Ruled on until After notice of Appeal. Fraud upon the court By Judge & officers.

Footnote 1 see: R.O.A. pg. 833 #3 & #4

STANDARD OF REVIEW

"A motion for a new Trial Based on after discovered evidence is addressed to the sound discretion of the trial Judge." State vs. Harris, 391 S.C. 539, 544-45, 706 S.E. 2d 526, 529 (Ct. App. 2011) (quoting State vs. Irvin, 270 S.C. 539, 545, 243 S.E. 2d 195, 197 (1978) (Internal quotation marks omitted). "The credibility of newly discovered evidence is for the trial Court todetermine." Harris, 391 S.C. at 545, 706 S.E. 2d at 529 (citing State vs. Porter, 269 S.C. 618, 621, 239 S.E. 2d 641, 643 (1977)." Only the trial Court and not the appellate Court has the power to weigh the evidence; the trial court's judgment will not be disturbed except for error of Law or Abuse of discretion". Id. (citing Porter, 269 S.C. at 621, 239 S.E. 2d at 643). On review, the appellate court may not make its own findings of fact. The deferential standard of review constrains the Appellate court to affirm the trial court if reasonably supported by the evidence. Id. (citing State vs. Mercer, 381 S.C. 149, 166, 672 S.E. 2d 556, 565 (2009)).

A Circuit Court Judge can not sign a Partial Pro-se Filings and Partial Attorney filings Pursuant to the S.C. Supreme Court Rulings in Foster vs. State, 298 S.C. 306, 379 S.E. 2d 907 (1989); Miller vs. state, 388 S.C. 347, 697 S.E. 2d 527 (2010); State vs. Stuckey, 333 S.C. 56, 508 S.E. 2d 564 (1998). Nor can a Circuit Court Judge sign a Pro-se Order only; and Attorney File a Notice of Appeal on Pro-se Filings, it's Judicial Lynching; Fraud upon the Court.

ARGUMENTS

The circuit Court Judge erred in signing a Proposed Order denying Appellants' Pro-se motion for a new Trial Based on after Discovered Evidence and not Ruling on Attorney Tristan shaffers motion for a new Trial Based on after Discovered Evidence that he filed on July 15, 2023, in a violation of pennsylvania vs. Finley; Foster vs. State; state vs. stuckey; Miller vs. state, supra; And Appellate Defender is in violation of Anders vs. Calif., Supra; S.C.A.C.R. Rule 407; and Towers vs. Glover; Chewning vs. Ford motor comp.; Hazel Atlas Glass co vs. Empire Co. Relevant Facts see: R.O.A. pg. 833 #3 & #4 R.O.A. pg. 837-885

Attorney Tristan shaffer filed a Motion for a New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence on Actual Innocence on July 15, 2023. [see: Attached motion to Relieve Counsel and petition for extention of time to request Transcript of May 1, 2025 also Attached as Record on Appeal @ #.3.) says: 3.) on July 15, 2023, Applicant filed a subsequent motion for a new Trial Based on after discovered Evidence.] This motion was never Ruled on; only all pro-se motions which this Court is without Jurisdiction to even hear pro-se motions is why Appellate Defender

should be made to go BACK and Brief only Attorney Issues per S.C. Supreme Court cases and U.S. Supreme Court cases as a matter of CAW. See: Pennsylvania vs. Finley, supra; Foster vs. State, supra; State vs. Stuckey, supra; Miller vs. State, supra, As she has Briefed no arguable issue pursuant to Anders vs. California, supra. Go look @ the ORDER ON Appendix page 810 - And page 819, she is in an Attempt to make this Court Believe this is a Pro-se case only. It's very Ironic that Georgetown County clerk of court clocked stamped filed the ORDER on July 15, 2025 in an Attempt to file ORDER on the same day 2 days Later from Attorney TRISTAN shaffers filing of his Brief/ Motion for a new TRIAL on July 15, 2023.

See: R.O.A. pg. 853 #3 & #4

1.) Its Judicial misconduct in violation of S.C.A.C.R. Rule 501.

2.) Its Judicial misconduct to only Rule on Pro-se Issues and know Attorney has a Brief filed on July 15, 2023 not yet Ruled on. see: Transcript of May 1, 2025 proof he had already Granted Hearing on merits @ a later date. see: R.O.A. pg. 833 #3 & #4

3.) Both Attorney Tristan Shaffer and Appellate Defender Jessica Saxon is violation of Rule 407 S.C.A.C.R. Rules of Professional Conduct.

4.) How can Attorney Tristan Shaffer file a Notice of Appeal on my Pro-se Filings I never even got a copy of, Response to Answer; or File Notice of Appeal.

5.) When ordered Both Transcripts May 1, 2025; and Oct. 19, 2023 Both Transcripts were not Complete nor Accurate, I'm Being Judicial Lynched By Solicitor Mary Ellen Walters; paid Attorney Tristan Shaffer; Appellate Defender Jessica Saxon (Raises "Butler standard" Totally Shocking to universal sense of (9.) Responsibly. Respectfully Submitted

Cody Ward

CONCLUSION

Based on the Foregoing Arguments along with exhibits/ Attachment/Appendix, Appellant respectfully ask this Court to Rule that Appellate Defender Jessica M. Baxon, Be ordered to Further Briefing And/or Remand this case Back to the Court of General sessions since Judge Did not sign An Order of Attorney Tristan Shaffers (2) July 15, 2023 Footnote(3) Motion for a New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence, that has a Tape statement of witness who was Intimidated in a violation of State vs. Brad Williams, 326 S.C. 130, 485 S.E. 2d 99 1997 [Rhonda Jones Haithcock], Appendix proof its Filings on Order was October 4, 2024. Attorney "Filed its motion on July 15, 2023. Isn't it "IRONIC" that Order was Filed on July 15, 2025 exactly 2 years Apart. "Lol"

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Jody Lyn Ward, #300644

Jody Lynn Ward, # 300644
Appellant Pro-se

Date: October 26th, 2026

Footnote(3) Proof of Issues
R.O.A. pg. 833 #3 & #4
R.O.A. pg. 837-885

RECEIVED
OCT 29 2026
SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Georgetown County
Honorable Roger M. Young, Circuit Court Judge

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

VS.

JODY LYNN WARD,

APPELLANT,

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2025-002597

RECORD ON APPEAL

pages 832 - 885

Jody Lynn Ward, #300644
Tyger River C.I. 1-B-#117
200 Prison Rd.
Enoree, S.C. 29335
Appellate Pro-se

Volumne 3

INDEX

1.) Motion to Relieve Counsel and petition for extension of time to Request Transcript filed By Tristan Shaffer Attorney of Record . . . . . pg. 831-836

2.) Transcript of Record, dated May 1, 2025 Hearing, Before Honorable Roger Young pg. 837-885

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM GEORGETOWN COUNTY
Court of General Sessions

Roger M. Young, Sr., Circuit Court Judge

The State of South Carolina,

Respondent,

v.

Jody Lynn Ward,

Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2025-001703

Motion to Relieve Counsel and Petition for Extension of Time to Request Transcript

---

Appellant would respectfully request a 30-day extension to request a transcript in the above–referenced case. Additionally, Counsel Shaffer would respectfully request to be relieved as counsel on this case. In support of this motion, counsel would respectfully show the Court the following:

1. Counsel was initially retained in 2015. See Appellate Case Number 2021-000402 & 2021-00072.
2. In late 2020 Counsel agreed to assist Appellant on a Motion for Post-Conviction DNA testing and a subsequent PCR (2021CP2200344).

3. On July 15, 2023, Applicant filed a subsequent motion for a new trial based on after discovered evidence.

4. On May 1, 2025, a hearing was convened on the 2021 PCR; Application for Post-Conviction DNA testing; and 2023 Motion for a New Trial based on after discovered evidence. During this hearing, Appellant indicated that he wanted to discharge Counsel Shaffer.

5. The Honorable Roger Young, ruled that Appellant had 30 days to either work out his relationship with Counsel Shaffer or retain substitute counsel. If Appellant did not meet this deadline the Court indicated that Mr. Shaffer would be relieved and new counsel would be appointed. (See Exhibit A).

6. Prior to issuing an order relieving Counsel Shaffer and appointing substitute counsel, Judge Young ruled on the matters that are the subject of this appeal.

7. Judge Young then relieved Counsel Shaffer on the 2021 PCR which is still pending in the circuit court. (See Exhibit B).

8. On September 30, 2025, Counsel Shaffer spoke with Appellant via video conferencing concerning the appeal. Appellant confirmed that he wanted Counsel Shaffer relieved in this case. Appellant indicated that he intended to seek new counsel.

9. On October 7, 2025, Appellant filed a pro se motion asking that Counsel Shaffer be relieved and new counsel be appointed.[1]

1 Counsel Shaffer does not agree with all the allegations made by Appellant in his pro se motion.

10. Counsel Shaffer has not received a formal affidavit of indigency[2] from Appellant, but the circuit court has seen fit to appoint counsel to represent Appellant for the PCR. (See Exhibit B).

11. Appellant wishes Counsel Shaffer to be discharged and Counsel Shaffer wishes to be relieved.

12. Additionally, in order to provide Appellant or his substituted Counsel an opportunity to obtain the transcript, Appellant requests a 30-day extension requests the transcript in the above referenced case.

13. Counsel makes this request in good faith and not for the purposes of delay.

WHEREFORE, the undersigned counsel would respectfully request an order to relieve Mr. Shaffer as counsel of record in this case. Additionally, Appellant requests a 30-day extension in which to request a transcript in this case. Counsel requests that the time limits for this appeal be held in abeyance pending a ruling on this motion.

s/ Tristan Shaffer

Tristan M. Shaffer (SC Bar 77565)
4701 Oleander Drive
Myrtle Beach, SC 29577
(843) 916-9300
tristan@gotaxelrod.com

Other Counsel of Record:
Melody Brown

2 Over the last 10 years, Counsel and his prior employer were paid approximately $8,500.00 for representation of Appellant. These funds came from Appellant and his family. Counsel Shaffer and Appellant have agreed that upon being relieved, Counsel Shaffer will provide a partial refund $3000.00. This partial refund was requested by Appellant. Although Counsel Shaffer believes that any fee was earned over the past 10 years, Counsel Shaffer is willing to provide the partial refund to facilitate getting relieved. Counsel mentions this for the sake of candor with the Court. However, due to the fact that Appellant is serving a life sentence, this partial refund should not significantly impact the court's determination of whether he qualifies for appointed counsel.

FORM 4

035

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF GEORGETOWN
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE
CASE NUMBER 2021CP2200344

Jody L Ward 300644		South Carolina State of	
PLAINTIFF(S)		**DEFENDANT(S)**	
Submitted by:		**Attorney for:** ☐ Plaintiff ☐ Defendant ☐ Self-Represented Litigant	

DISPOSITION TYPE (CHECK ONE)

☐ **JURY VERDICT.** This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.

☒ **DECISION BY THE COURT.** This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered. ☐ See Page 2 for additional information.

☐ **ACTION DISMISSED (*CHECK REASON*):** ☐ Rule 12(b), SCRCP; ☐ Rule 41(a), SCRCP (Vol. Nonsuit); ☐ Rule 43(k), SCRCP (Settled); ☐ Other: _____

☐ **ACTION STRICKEN (*CHECK REASON*):** ☐ Rule 40(j) SCRCP; ☐ Bankruptcy; ☐ Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award; ☐ Other: _____

☐ **STAYED DUE TO BANKRUPTCY**

☐ **DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (CHECK APPLICABLE BOX):**
☐ Affirmed; ☐ Reversed; ☐ Remanded; ☐ Other: _____

NOTE: ATTORNEYS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING LOWER COURT, TRIBUNAL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT RULING IN THIS APPEAL.

FILED
GEORGETOWN COUNTY, S.C.
2025 MAY -1 PM 1:05
ALMA Y. [illegible]
CLERK OF COURT

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED: ☐ See attached order; (formal order to follow) ☐ Statement of Judgment by the Court.

ORDER INFORMATION

The Plaintiff has 30 days to find a new private attorney or work out his relationship with Mr. Shaffer. If this does not happen, the Court will appoint new counsel on June 2, 2025.

This order ☐ ends ☒ does not end the case.
Additional Information for the Clerk: _____

INFORMATION FOR THE JUDGMENT INDEX

Complete this section below when the judgment affects title to real or personal property or if any amount should be enrolled. If there is no judgment information, indicate "N/A" in one of the boxes below.

Judgment in Favor of (List name(s) below)	Judgment Against (List name(s) below)	Judgment Amount To be Enrolled (List amount(s) below)

If applicable, describe the property, including tax map information and address, referenced in the order:

The judgment information above has been provided by the submitting party. Disputes concerning the amounts contained in this form may be addressed by way of motion pursuant to the SC Rules of Civil Procedure. Amounts to be computed such as interest or additional taxable costs not available at the time the form and final order are submitted to the judge may be provided to the clerk. **Note: Title abstractors and researchers should refer to the official court order for judgment details.**
E-Filing Note: In E-Filing counties, the Court will electronically sign this form using a separate electronic signature page.

Circuit Court Judge

2134
Judge Code

5/1/2025
Date

CPFORM4Cm
SCCA SCRCP Form 4C (Revised 2/17)

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM GEORGETOWN COUNTY
Court of General Sessions

Roger M. Young, Sr., Circuit Court Judge

The State of South Carolina,

Respondent,

v.

Jody Lynn Ward,

Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2025-001703

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned Counsel certifies that on October 20, 2025, the Motion to Relieve Counsel and Petition for Extension of Time to Request Transcript was served on the Respondent via email. Counsel also certifies that on October 20, 2025, a copy of the Motion to Relieve Counsel and Petition for Extension of Time to Request Transcript was sent to Appellant via U.S. Mail.

s/ Tristan Shaffer
Tristan M. Shaffer (SC Bar 77565)
4701 Oleander Drive
Myrtle Beach, SC 29577
(843) 916-9300
tristan@gotaxelrod.com

Other Counsel of Record:
Melody Brown

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF GEORGETOWN)

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD

CASE NO. 2003-GS-2201030
2003-GS-22-01031

May 1, 2025

BEFORE: The Honorable Roger Young

State of South Carolina,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Jody Lynn Ward,

Defendant.

APPEARANCES:

Mary Ellen Walter, Esq.
Solicitor for the State.
Brian Hall, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General

Tristan Shaffer, Esq.
Attorney for the Defendant.

Official Court Reporter,
Cynthia D. Weaver

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

THE COURT: All right. We're here on the State vs. Jody Lynn Ward, which are indictments 2003-GS-22-01030 and -1031. Those were applications for DNA testing and then also Mr. Ward filed a PCR Case 2021-CP-22-0344, and both of those have now been assigned to me they're both scheduled for today.

MS. WALTER: Your Honor, if I may. I believe there is also a pending motion for a new trial and my understanding and I confirmed with your law clerk that the two GS motions are the motion for DNA and a motion for a new trial.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So those go under the criminal indictment numbers?

MS. WALTER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. That's where we're at. And, Mr. Ward, you have Mr. Shaffer as your lawyer and he's been -- from time to time over the years you've moved to have him relieved and then added back and relieved and added back. We had a status conference back in November I believe to address your pending motion then. You said you were fine with keeping him on. He tells me this morning that you have decided yet again you want to have him relieved. I don't have a formal motion pending in front of me, so I'm asking what the status in on that.

839

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, approximately ten days before today, he give my family these subpoenas to pass out. I haven't even seen him. He didn't come visit me, he didn't file the amendment that you ordered. I'm saying there's no way I'm going to be able to go forward with him. I got -- I had wrote you a letter of things that I've got that's pending like pro se stuff that I filed, some of that stuff was filed prior to him even being my counsel.

I'm saying -- I'm saying that there's no way that he's going to be ready for this to come in here today and putting it on my family, you know what I'm saying, to pass out these subpoenas and stuff. That's not due process of the law, protection, or anything. I'm saying that past Martinez vs. Ryan, that's United States vs. Swanson.

I'm saying I don't want to represent myself but at the same time with me coming in today none of my witnesses are here, due to him giving my family, and then I had -- my brother had a heart attack or something and that's who he gave the subpoenas to and then it went from there and it went to my aunt. I'm saying I've got two boxes of legal work, this is like a government conspiracy is what it is.

I've been on lockup approximately 12 weeks since December and all my legal work taken, they take two legal boxes, right now it's taking the attorney general that was over my case, Christina Bigelow was my PCR attorney general

840

in 2008, at my first PCR and she's the general counsel over at SCDC and she's ping ponging me around from yard to yard and lock up to lock up, and took two legal boxes of my legal work, said my lawyer could come and get that, which he never did. And I'm saying -- I'm saying what's being done it not feasible.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: It's corrupt.

THE COURT: Mr. Shaffer, what's your position on this?

MR. SHAFFER: Your Honor, I'm more than happy to be relieved if he wants me to be relieved. He's been telling me he's been wanting me to be relieved basically every time we're not in court or in front of you for years.

Your Honor, here's the thing about the subpoenas and I think it's incumbent upon me to at least explain what's going on here with that.

For a long time maybe, I would say -- we almost had a hearing about a year or two, Your Honor. And in that situation he said give them to my aunt, all of these subpoenas of all of these witnesses that I want there, give them to my aunt, my aunt will go serve them. She did the last time that we were there.

For the last couple of months he's been telling me or I've been hearing that he wanted me to give them to his

84H

brother. I confirmed that on April 18th when I spoke to Mr. Ward, that I spoke -- a phone conference with the jail, with the prison, but I was not there in person, but I did confirm with him that he wanted me to send them to his brother. He wanted me to subpena about 20 different people. I did not think that all of those people were necessarily people who I would call if I was representing him.

However, he felt that they were necessary because of the fact that he was saying that he was going to discharge me at this hearing, I thought that, out of an abundance of caution, I would do those subpoenas. So I issued about 20 subpoenas and I sent them to his brother and his brother apparently -- well, later that night, first of all, I got contacted from a different attorney saying that they were going to hire him. I was like, fine, but then the Monday after that apparently they weren't going to hire the other attorney. And I got -- I was informed that his brother over the weekend had gotten admitted to the hospital.

He then asked me to try to reach out to his wife, which I did try to reach to his wife to communicate with her to get her to serve these subpoenas. His wife after attempting to get her to do that or attempt to contact her and get her onboard with that, I realized that she probably wasn't the most viable candidate for doing that. He then

told me to contact his aunt, the previous person who had served the subpenas and had successfully done so at a previous court date.

I sent those to her and it looks like April 24th.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this: Are these subpoenas do they relate to the DNA case or the PCR case?

MR. SHAFFER: I think in Mr. Ward's mind they relate to all cases put together. And I'm sorry to give you an evasive answer, Your Honor. Like I said, these are a lot of people who I don't think are -- I would not call if I was his attorney necessarily. But out of an abundance of caution and looking out for his interest I wanted to make sure that the subpoenas were issued.

Unfortunately, now we're here and there's absolutely no one here including his aunt and his uncle who had previously given affidavits and were potential witnesses they apparently are not here neither is anyone else, but I did send them to them.

Your Honor, I arranged to send them through them because of the fact that he said that those are the people that can get them served. I mean, he asked me to send them to family members, it's not just I'm just out of nowhere, go serve all of these subpenas. And to be fair to him these witnesses a lot of them he's been demanding to come to court for the last year or two and, you know, I did send them off

on the 13th after I had a chance to speak to him because I was going to try to talk him out of it.

Quite honestly, I was going to try to talk him out of subpoenaing some of them because I didn't think they would necessary for the hearing and then our conversation didn't go great and, you know, I didn't do a whole lot of talking him out of it and I said okay fine I'll just issue all of them.

So I wanted to clarify that for the Court just to put on the record, I'm not saying, yeah, I just randomly -- way it may it sound was I randomly just sent off a bunch of subpoenas to his family and said serve them. That's not exactly the full picture, Your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I got -- I got -- I got subpoenas going to Columbia, Myrtle Beach, Conway, Georgetown, Greenville, it's impossible to get that to my family in six days before the hearing and expect them to pass them out. That's don't even sound right in law period. I mean, in this -- I'm saying, like I've told him before, like with my PCR that's pending right now, this is general sessions court today, this ain't the court of common pleas, the court of common pleas id for PCR. General session court -- PCR is not even in the picture today because this is general sessions court, this ain't -- they can't hear my PCR, the Judge just told me at this hearing that if I didn't

844

get a new trial on this and we would do the PCR within about six months later. You said that at the last hearing we went to and I'm saying this is beyond -- I'm saying I'm dealing with investigative misconduct, general prosecutor misconduct, I'm dealing with conflict interest of trial counsel. I'm saying --

MS. WALTER: Your Honor, may the State be allowed to respond at some point?

THE COURT: At some point. Let me hear from them -- let me ask you this: The DNA case, I guess, Mr. Shaffer, you might be in a better position to answer this, what is your position on a hearing on that today? What were you planning on doing to go forward with on that?

MR. SHAFFER: Your Honor, I think that the big thing is there' nothing to test, that's my understanding is that there's nothing to test.

MS. WALTER: Right. And so that's why I wanted to respond. I think, number one, we've got a little far off field as to whether or not Mr. Shaffer is going to remain as counsel or not. But the State's position is that there has never been a ruling that a hearing is warranted and the State has made filings saying that the defendant's application fails on its face to meet the requirements for a hearing and so therefore there should be no hearing which means that the witnesses would not be necessary.

But it is also true, I believe that there is nothing to test and the defendant's arguments seem to focus on the, what I'll call, the remains that have been identified through pattern of life evidence as belonging to Elton Rutledge. There was no -- DNA was not extracted from those bones, there was mitochondria DNA testing, but there was never STR DNA testing with a conclusive identification that the remains were, in fact, Elton Rutledge's, his identity was established through pattern of life evidence, including, statements by the defendant that Elton Rutledge was one of the people killed that night.

So the DNA testing, really, even if it were appropriate which the state argues it is not, it would not change the result of a trial, it would not change the identity of who was established to have been the victims in this case.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. WALTER: The state's position has always been that the defendant has not even made a sufficient showing to warrant a hearing.

THE COURT: All right. And you're representing the 15h Circuit Solicitor's Office on the DNA case, you're no part of the PCR case?

MS. WALTER: No. I'm representing the solicitor's office on the DNA and the motion for a new trial, the

general sessions matters.

THE COURT: Got you. Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, in Mill vs. Pate, 87 SCT 785, 1967, the United States Supreme Court ruled in Mill vs. Pate that the prosecution deliberately misrepresented the truth held at the last page at Number 3, It's more than 30 years ago the Court held that the 14th Amendment cannot tolerate a state criminal conviction obtained by the knowing use of false evidence. Mooney vs. Holohan, There has been no deviation from that established principle. Napa vs. Illinois.

MR. SHAFFER: And, Your Honor, can I explain something about the DNA which may provide a little context?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. SHAFFER: My understanding is that there's nothing to test absent maybe, you know, his pro se motion to actually exhume bones and have those tested. Absent that, I don't think that there's necessarily anything that they have to test, that's my understanding from talking with the solicitor's office is essentially they wouldn't have anything to actually give over and that is also my understanding from talking to the people over in California, the Siri lab that did the mitochondrial DNA when the case originally here 20 years ago, that they wouldn't have any samples to actually test either.

So my understanding of his argument and the purpose behind this, and this is basically my understanding, is he's trying to essentially show that the State presented a witness, recalled a witness in order to identify some shoes that were not the shoes of one of the victims and he wanted to prove that that context and that testimony was incorrect and inaccurate and I think he -- if I was in prison for 20 years, I'd probably be susceptible to a bunch of hyperbole. But in his view, that's what he's saying is fraud upon the Court, Your Honor. And I understand, like, if I was -- that's probably interpreting that as him saying, you know, that that testimony was wrong, and I want to prove it's wrong by getting the DNA test off of the bones, but my understanding is there's no bones to actually test with absent exhuming them.

THE DEFENDANT: Where are they?

MR. SHAFFER: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm saying --

THE COURT: Mr. Ward, have a seat, let me -- let me -- I'm just trying to sort through preliminarily where we're at and a route to take forward today.

Now, as far as the -- the witnesses to call in the DNA case, did you have any witnesses to call, Mr. Shaffer?

MR. SHAFFER: I would not call any witnesses in the DNA case.

848

THE DEFENDANT: He's fired. He's ain't even my lawyer no more. I ain't no way this man's gonna tell me Arizona vs. Youngblood is bad faith on the prosecution and defendants, not shoes -- they said -- they got -- they got -- they got at trial transcript page --

MR. SHAFFER: Your Honor, may I explain something?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SHAFFER: The reason I'm stating that is that the -- in order to do -- the remedy he's seeking is to have something tested.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MS. WALTER: And the problem is if there's nothing to test then I don't know how we're going to have something tested. That's what I'm saying, there's no evidence out there to test, then I don't understand how we're going to actually have it tested. If there was evidence, if they had bones or something like that, I would probably be in a different boat, Your Honor, and say something different. It's just my understanding is they have nothing to test. I'm not saying that -- what I'm not trying to waive his prosecutorial misconduct claim that he's trying to raise. I'm not trying to waive that, but I am saying that the remedy for that particular motion is to have something tested and if they don't have it, I certainly don't have bones from 20 years ago, you know, we don't have bones -- I

849

mean, I just don't know what we would do with that.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, the last time that we was in court before you, Ms. Alicia -- Alicia Richardson, she stipulated on the record and those stipulations was that they consented that they gave knowing perjured testimony to them shoes. They knew in advance that them shoes did not belong to Evelyn Rutledge. They put Latrese Rutledge on the stand and Elton Rutledge, Sr. on the stand to say that that was his shoes and they already knew in advance that those shoes wasn't put on him from the preliminary -- the preliminary hearing transcript.

MS. WALTER: And, Your Honor --

THE DEFENDANT: That's just two knowingly perjured testimonies right there. They said at trial transcript 684: Did you run a test for human blood or DNA on the shoes of the defendant? No, sir. They were not submitted to the lab.

Your Honor, I'd like to submit to the record right now the DNA results from my shoes. It says a pair of tennis shoes, no hair found, no DNA detected.

THE COURT: Mr. Ward --

THE DEFENDANT: That's knowingly perjured testimony.

THE COURT: I'll give you --

THE DEFENDANT: That's just one.

THE COURT: All right. I'm just --

THE DEFENDANT: And that other one was two. I can keep right on going.

THE COURT: I'll let you -- just let me get through --

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- procedurally what I need to get through and then I'll tell you what we're going to do.

All right. You had something you wanted to say?

MS. WALTER: Well, I just want to say that if the defendant is going to allege that Ms. Richardson -- Judge Richardson now, stipulated that the State submitted perjured testimony, I would like to see a transcript of that or some communication from Judge Richardson indicating that she did in fact make that admission, because I do not believe that for an instant.

THE DEFENDANT: What year and date was that?

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

THE DEFENDANT: Hey, Your Honor -- Your Honor, can I -- can I say one other thing?

THE COURT: What is that?

THE DEFENDANT: My trial attorney, Margaret Ann Muffy Kneece was a major conflict of interest. The fabrication of exculpatory evidence, evidence that may lead

to exoneration, the introducing false evidence, false testimony of several witnesses. Defendant has submitted affidavits and evidence and clear and convincing evidence that facts exist that require DNA in this case be subject to first time scientific analysis for first time identifying the bones and DNA submitted by the State as those of the alleged victims in this case.

Margaret Ann Muffy Kneece failed to disclose to the defendant in her conflict the interest as officer of the court fraudulent representation, obstruction of justice, not disclosing being a material fact witness is a structure error in proceedings where ex 15th Circuit Solicitor's Office Margaret Ann Muffy Kneece Only days after leaving the 15th Circuit Solicitor's Office became a court appointed legal counsel, co-counsel to John Wesley Locklair from Joye Law Firm who is now disbarred, committed to felonious acts of destruction of justice, known spoliation of the alleged crime scene of this case and the destruction removal of evidence and 20 plus years of fraudulent concealment of said felonies acts that created a conflict of interest pursuit to Collier vs. Sullivan, United States Supreme Court case on conflict of interest which she did not object to South Carolina Rules Evidence, Rule 401, irrelevant bone evidence not connected to the alleged crime or victims, State vs. Hamilton, State vs. McConnell.

852

Her acts to remove evidence, tampering with the evidence and obstruction of justice rendered her false felonous misrepresentation being an error not amenable to harmless error analysis under McKaskle vs. Wiggins, prejudice beyond obvious. She could not challenge or question the State's DNA perjury testimony of four State's witnesses and the DNA of known presentation of false bones and size 9 Adidas shoes and or purged testimony of the DNA on the shoes of the defendant due to her complicity of the destruction of the evidence in this very alleged crime scene itself.

The fact of her collecting evidence at the alleged crime scene created her now a material fact witness that would mandate outright dismissal of the cases and reverses defendant's convictions and sentences as legal foundation as black letter law Faye vs. Knowing.

In fact, as a sworn officer of the court, she had an ethical and legal duty to disclose to her client defendant the court that she was now a material fact witness and could not be defense counsel she, however, fraudulently concealed her being a material fact witness in pursuit of Colby vs. Sullivan, supra., it created an inherited conflict interest as her testimony could have been ended the whole trial while incriminating herself in the felonious acts of going to the alleged original crime scene with a third party

853

and collecting live bullets, beer cans, empty shell cases and a trash bag of bones, was a clear violation of the United states Constitution Amendment 5th and 6th and the South Carolina Appellate Court Rule 407.

There's other affidavits of Rodney Ward and Carol Ward who was also witnesses to the collusion of the State of South Carolina law enforcement that Margaret Ann Muffy Kneece originally employed until she became involved in defending Jody Ward's case, her conduct allowed false evidence to be presented in Adidas shoes with bones never connected to the victim, crime, or even shown to be human and then destroyed that evidence when given to the alleged victim's family in order to spoliate proof bones entered with size 9 Adidas shoes when State all officers of the courts knew in advance that the alleged victim, Elton Rutledge Jr., wore a size 11 shoes Nike brand shoes, by missing reports made by his sister, Latrese Rutledge and the State gave knowingly purged testimony of Latrese Rutledge and Elton Rutledge, Sr. when the State put them back on the stand knowing the shoes was not his and did not belong to him.

Margaret Ann Muffy Kneece's conduct and concealment were part of presentation of false evidence being not subject to adversal (sic) testing process and it proved she was in collision with the State. She clearly

854

failed to disclose to her client and the defendant that she took a third party to gather evidence and being a material fact witness and gathering illegal disposal and evidence is shocking to the universal sense of justice and clear violation of Cody vs. Sullivan and a violation of the 6 and 14th amendment.

Your Honor, I mean this is beyond -- I got affidavit and my counsel, I know he's protecting them, because they're lawyers and he's hiding it, and he don't want to put it to the Court. He's trying to hide it from the victim's family. I got it right here. The incident report made Ellen Rutledge, Jr., Nike brand shoes.

I got --

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ward --

THE DEFENDANT: I got transcripts.

THE COURT: -- I'll give you a chance.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: In a minute. Have a seat.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So as far as -- and that sounds like it's going towards the motion for a new trial, I gather, is what I want to do first is let's address the DNA case. I want to have the lawyers make their arguments to me and then I will have any witnesses that need to be called or not and then I will take that under advisement and give Mr. Ward the

855

opportunity to submit any briefs or anything that he wants to file after that. I'm going to leave Mr. Shaffer on the case as his attorney and then normally that would be, as far as the rules of court go, I don't allow -- we don't allow dual representation, but I will allow Mr. Ward to submit anything that he wants to in writing after the hearing is over for in way of briefs.

I know he's filed a number of things with the Court, but what he can -- I'll give him the opportunity to after today, this morning's hearing, supplement the record with his argument as it pertains to the DNA case and after we're done with the DNA case, I'll let you know what we'll do on the PCR case.

So as to the DNA case -- now, Mr. Shaffer, let me ask you this, Sir, are you appointed or retained?

MR. SHAFFER: Your Honor, I got retained like 10 years ago to represent him in something and we've taken it to the Supreme Court and basically had a separate agreement that, like, five or six years ago, something like that, they paid for. Several years back I had a separate agreement to handle some additional stuff for him, but basically that was after -- while the case was pending in the Supreme Court.

So I am a retained counsel for the purposes of this hearing. Yeah, I'm -- I'm retained, Your Honor. I don't think he has any money. I do think he's indigent.

B56

Your Honor. I know he's made several claims that he is indigent in the past, so.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. Your Honor, Your Honor, can I get you to appoint me a counsel? I don't want him as lawyer. He said he's not even going to call no witnesses and he's the reason that I don't have no witnesses here today. I'm not going forward with him. I don't want him as my lawyer. I do not want him, this man as my lawyer. He's already done this already before. This is the second time that he's done this. I told you at that hearing that we went to on the thing that he was going to do this and this is exactly what he did.

The 29B that he filed, he ain't never even give me a copy, no amendments filed. I got 17 things filed right now. I got 17 things filed in this court and I'm saying it's never been heard. I mean, a lot of this stuff is newly discovered stuff is because I got my own motion for a new trial based on after discovered evidence, this is filed and amended three times.

Now I have -- I can go through a list of all the stuff that I have. I got notice of witnesses for the hearing. I got motion to proceed pro se attorney Tristan Shaffer as stand-by counsel pending. I got request for a hearing pending. Motion to proceed pro se with Tristan Shaffer as stand-by counsel on the DNA hearing pending.

857

Motion for receiving Respondents to provide all the chain of custody on the DNA. Motion for expenditure of funds expert witnesses on the DNA. Motion to sequester all the witnesses at the DNA hearing. Motion to compel the State to produce the DNA test of State's Exhibit 39 Adidas shoes. Notice of motion, a motion disqualified 15 Circuit Solicitor's Office from the DNA testing hearing due to prosecutorial misconduct. Renewal of defendant's motion for disqualified 15th Circuit Solicitor's Office for participation in the DNA testing.

Prior to my trial -- I'm going to finish this.

Motion to resume misidentified bone pursuit to South Carolina code in 17-28-50, 17-725. South Carolina code in 17-725 autopsy on unidentified body preservation of DNA samples were not done by the coroner making this a miscarriage justice. I got a memorandum of law in support of DNA investigative prosectorial misconduct.

At the preliminary hearing --

THE COURT: Mr. Ward -- Mr. Ward, let me stop you there.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And I'm going to tell you how I'm going to proceed. I'm going to leave Mr. Shaffer on the DNA test case -- DNA testing case today. I'm going to have -- it doesn't sound like we're going to have any witnesses for

either side, I asked the State, but I'll find out here in a second, but it'll be a relatively short factual hearing. I'll hear the legal arguments on that and then I will allow you to supplement the record on the DNA case as I've been calling it.

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

THE COURT: And then we will address the PCR case separately and whether or not I'll leave Mr. Shaffer on or allow you to get new counsel. That will necessarily require a substantial probably period of time to get another lawyer on case and up to speed on that. But the DNA case sounds more like a legal argument at this point than a factual argument.

So I want to hear as much as I can today on that. I will not rule today, but I will give you the opportunity to supplement the record on the DNA issue, issue my order on that, but then we will not address the DNA issue probably today. I'll be thinking about it, but I want to dispense, if nothing else, with the legal arguments and any factual record that needs to be made on the DNA case today, and that's how we'll proceed.

So I'm going to hear from Mr. Shaffer first and then y'all want to --

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, Your Honor, I don't want to go forward with no DNA hearing today because my

859

witnesses ain't here.

THE COURT: Well, you don't need any witnesses, it sounds like on the DNA case, you may very well need them on the PCR case.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, you -- you -- you saying that right? But on the preliminary transcript, Gary Todd says that was Willfred Brown as far as some dental records. It's my understanding that the first set of remains were identified as Wilford Brown. The second set is all that, that y'all called them, the foot bone that was sent to SLED for DNA comparison. I'm saying that completely, before pretrial, even when the trial even got there, them Adidas shoes didn't have nothing to do, period, with Mr. Elton Rutledge.

THE COURT: I'll allow Mr. Shaffer to maybe address that argument --

THE DEFENDANT: But I'm saying I'm due the DNA --

THE COURT: -- I was telling you I'm going to allow you to make that argument to me in writing, all right. Because I'm not going to rule on it today. I'm going to listen to the arguments that need to be made on the record and I will allow you to supplement the record in writing and I'll make a determination as to whether or not I need to hear from any more witnesses. But I want to do something today and not just, I think this case got assigned to me

about three years ago and because of other cases that come up, and I know the AG's office at one time got a lot of people pulled off to go work on the Murdaugh case. It just takes a little while to get all the pieces lined up. And here we are two-and-a-half years later without having had a hearing on the merits. I don't want to walk out of here and go, well, we did nothing yet again.

So we're going to do something today, and that is at the very least, hear legal arguments and hear from any witnesses that either side needs to call today. I'm not foreclosing your arguments on the DNA. It's just because of the nature of a dual representation bar, I don't normally let the lawyer or the pro se litigant, but we got unusual circumstances and I'll allow you to supplement the record. You may change my mind, but that's the way I'm proceeding today is with Mr. Shaffer remaining on the case, on the DNA case today.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, there's an affidavit right here, and this is pertaining to the DNA.

THE COURT: Okay. And I will allow you --

THE DEFENDANT: And I want to read it out loud on the record --

THE COURT: No. No. I'm going to allow you to --

THE DEFENDANT: I want everybody to hear this, Willfred Brown was my friend.

THE COURT: Sir.

THE DEFENDANT: I did not kill -- I did not kill him.

THE COURT: I'm going to allow you to supplement that.

THE DEFENDANT: Allow my lawyer to read it then, I want the victim's family to hear this today.

THE COURT: He may want to read it. Let him look at it.

THE DEFENDANT: Read it, Mr. Shaffer, please, sir.

I asked you to read that, please, sir.

Since you said we don't need no witness for the DNA. Would you be please read that, sir?

MR. SHAFFER: Your Honor, I'm actually going to read this out loud, because I'm refreshing myself. I have definitely seen this because it was attached to a pro se filing. You have this, but it's an affidavit from him from the 30th of March of last year, but I am going to actually read it just because of the fact that it's probably going to take a lot of time.

THE COURT: Go ahead. Go ahead.

MR. SHAFFER: One, during November of 2003, I was contacted by Muffy Kneece about my brother Jodie Ward. Attorney Kneece and Attorney Locklair wanted me to show them some dirt roads off of Gapway Road in Georgetown. I did

show them different areas upon their request, one and a half request -- one and a half hours. Attorney Kneece and Attorney Locklair asked me, have I seen human bones or bullets or shotgun shells? Attorney Kneece and Attorney Locklair was questioning me about human and bullets. I saw Attorney Kneece and Attorney Locklair gathering bones and bullets and shells. Attorney Kneece was questioning me about what type of bones and shells they are. I told them I do not know. They continued collecting bones and shells.

Approximately an hour and a half later, Attorney Kneece and attorney -- and I think it should have said Attorney Locklair -- dropped me off at home. I shared this information with my brother, Jody Ward, during the early, early year of 2024. So he did submit this affidavit saying that Jamie Ward, who was the brother, remember the one guy originally sent to subpena to the State --

THE DEFENDANT: Did you send the subpoena to James Ward.

THE COURT: I saw that.

THE DEFENDANT: Did you send a subpoena to James Ward to be in court today, yes or no? If you did, I want the Court to put a contempt of court on him for not showing up.

MR. SHAFFER: He did not get properly served with the subpoena. He got an email subpoena, which he was the

one who was actually originally going to pass out the subpoenas.

MS. WALTER: And, Your Honor, that attachment was actually in one of the amendments for a motion for a new trial, not anything having to do with the DNA testing.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm addressing DNA testing.

MR. SHAFFER: Yes, sir.

Your Honor, with the exception of you granting Mr. Ward's request to actually exhume bones, I think that that would -- you would have the power to do that, I'm not saying you don't, but that would be the only way that there will be something could actually test in this case that's still in existence today.

So if you are inclined to grant his request to exhume bones, I think at that point, then you probably should do DNA testing, Your Honor, I think that we've met the requirements. However, if but for that, there's no relief you can actually grant because there's nothing to test. I don't think that you're going to get any sort of viable sample off of anything that's been in the clerk's office and my understanding is the State doesn't have the same physical evidence that they would have 20-something years ago because the case is now over with. I think that's basically what Ms. Richardson did tell me is that the case

864

is essentially -- yeah, they've closed the case long ago, so there's not going to be stuff for -- that they have in their possession where they can hand us to test absent you exhuming bones, Your Honor, I think that that's the only way you would be able to grant any relief of the post conviction DNA stuff.

If you were to do that, it would actually provide some information because it would be impeachment evidence to Latrese Rutledge's testimony that those were her brother's shoes, I think that that would be essentially the value that you would get out of it is some fairly strong impeachment evidence. And clearly the State thought that it was an important piece of evidence for her to identify that because they actually recalled her in order to identify the bones and the shoes in the original trial transcript.

So if you are inclined to exhume bones, Your Honor, at that point, I think that then, you know, it would add impeachment value that could actually affect the trial because of the fact that it would impeach that previous testimony, Your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, under Arizona vs. Youngblood, it's the duty to preserve DNA and all in any evidence under the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution in due process to equal protection. It's clearly showing bad fake deception on the part of the police

B65

investigation and solicitor's office and she's continuing to hide it.

My lawyer told me this morning that the CD that they recorded from the jail conversation that she saying that they don't have the CD where my lawyer said that me and my wife was talking about her on Margaret Ann Muffy Kneece. All right. I'll also show Banks vs. Dretke it is not the solicitor's job to hide and seek not defendant's got to seek Banks vs. Dretke, 124 SCT 1256, 2004.

MR. SHAFFER: And, Your Honor, back with Mr. Hixson with the solicitor's office represented the State on this, he provided me a copy of the discovery that they had still and, Your Honor, there's no CD in that. I spoke to Ms. Walter, maybe, a week ago or so and said have you heard of this CD? Do you know what I'm talking about? And she's saying that she's never seen either.

I'm making the assumption that if Mr. Hixson never provided it to me, it means that it's not in existence, Your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor -- Your Honor, if Kenny Johnson is the coroner during that time, which that's my grandfather's cousin, he would have needed to be here for the DNA. Why he didn't save -- why he didn't save DNA samples, and he would have to be here to today to tell where those bones went. We know where the bones went. You know

where the bones went. I know where the bones went. And they know where it was. Willfred Brown's family is the one that buried those bones of the same shoes that they presented as Elton Rutledge, Jr.'s in my case. That's the only person's testimony, they knew in advance, they knew at the preliminary hearing, they knew prior to trial. I got the transcript right here, if you want a copy of the preliminary hearing transcript, I got it right here. You can you more than happy to have a copy. I got all the investigative notes. How Margaret Ann Kneece where to go is a map right here from -- and she got out of the investigative -- the investigative notes from Gary Todd and Ernest Stamp (ph) right here, that's it right there. And she went there and collected whatever she collected. And I'm saying that's beyond -- I'm saying I would want those bones tested. I would want the beer cans fingerprinted. I would want -- because I did not do this crime.

MR. SHAFFER: Your Honor, can I, can I clarify something?

There's two sets of bones he's talking about. One, the ones that got buried. And then there's also -- he -- which was the subject of a motion for a new trial based off had to discover evidence. He's saying that his brother, back in 2024, had informed him that he had gone with his trial counsel, his original trial counsel, and

867

investigator went out and looked at an area and found some shell casings and some bones, okay.

At that point in time -- at that point in time, these two attorneys were actually working for him, not working for the State, you know, and I say that because Ms. Kneece, during the initial part of his, his case was actually assistant solicitor, left the solicitor's office and became one of his attorneys, which was addressed in the trial transcript. But that being said, Your Honor, the -- this newly new thing that Jamie Ward, his brother, had put forth to him back last year, this piece of -- this is a separate set of bones. The State's not in possession of those bones, as my understanding they've never been in possession of those bones. I don't know if you can order post conviction DNA testing. Ms. Kneece has never told me she's in possession of them, but, you know, I don't know if post conviction DNA testing is meant to require a third party who's not the State to get items tested that they collected related to the case.

THE COURT: All right. From the State.

MS. WALTER: Your honor, I am going to confine my argument to the DNA, which is what I believe Your Honor wanted, not all of this extraneous new trial stuff, which presumably we'll deal with later. And, Your Honor, I would ask you to consider the previously filed State responses,

B6B

one by Mr. Hixson on March 28th of 2018, and a more comprehensive one by Ms. -- again, Ms. Richardson, now, Judge Richardson, on October 28th, 2022. And I think it's important to look at the context of what the defendant has said he wants tested and the reason for. And I will begin with again, his application for a hearing on DNA testing is woefully inadequate. But it seems that what he is focusing on is whether or not the sneakers that were recovered with the victim's bones and they're not alleged victims, they were killed, so they're victims. The sneakers that were recovered with the victim's bones, he is arguing, could not have belonged to Elton Rutledge. So that's got nothing to do with bones.

So to suggest that this Court should put this family, who has suffered through 20 years of frivolous filing by the defendant through the exhumation of the few bones that they have left of their loved ones is, quite frankly, ridiculous. The defendant's argument is focusing on sneakers. The State is not in possession of the sneakers because once they were admitted at trial, they become an exhibit for the court, and I believe the clerk's office actually keeps them. But regardless of whether those sneakers belonged to Mr. Rutledge or not, that has absolutely nothing to do with what, I believe it was Judge John, termed the overwhelming evidence of guilt of the

defendant. And Mr. Hixson cites to Judge John's final order of dismissal on the second page of his response and nowhere in listing all of that evidence of the defendant's guilt does Judge John once mention DNA or the seekers that were bound with the victim's bones. There is nothing about that testing that would go to exonerate the defendant. Nothing.

Again, by the defendant's own statements, he was with both victims. At one point, when he's trying to pass blame on another person, he even says that that other person killed Mr. Brown and Mr. Rutledge. So there is no question about the victims in this case and therefore any sort of DNA testing would be inappropriate. It's not going to serve to exonerate the defendant. It is not going to change the results of his trial and that is even on top of the fact that his application is woefully inadequate.

The bones of Mr. Rutledge were tested. Those results were provided to the defendant. So the DNA testing has been done. There has been absolutely no argument, no evidence about what any further testing would do and, again, the defendant is asking for the sneakers to be tested, not the bones.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm asking for --

MS. WALTER: As to.

THE COURT: Mr. Ward, you stay seated.

MS. WALTER: As to -- and I said I wouldn't stray

870

into the motion for a new trial, but just because one of his grounds alleges that his trial counsel found new bones, there's no evidence of that, save for the affidavit of a clearly biased witness, the defendant's brother. And I do agree with Mr. Shaffer that there is certainly no authority in the act for the Court to order trial counsel to turn over evidence that may not even exist.

So we would ask that you deny the defendant's motion for post conviction DNA testing.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I've already been granted this in, she's talking about twice, this is the third, maybe the fourth time I've been granted. I mean, I'm on YouTube winning this. How many times I got to win it?

THE COURT: Mr. Shaffer.

MR. SHAFFER: Your Honor, I understand that me and Mr. Ward may not see eye to eye on everything. I do think that if you were to grant his request for exhuming the bones, that there would actually be something to test, because DNA has made huge leaps and bounds since 20 years ago. If you were to do that, I think that there would be grounds to actually test it. As for the shoes, Your Honor, I think in a previous hearing in front of you, I said that it's possible that you could look at the shoes and I don't think I addressed that.

Your Honor, it's -- the problem with trying to get

 871

DNA off of that right now is that it's been in presumably a storage facility along with a bunch of other evidence that were part of his case at that point. So I think that we are in a little bit tougher spot to say there's 20 year old touch DNA. Could there be touch DNA? Yeah, but the problem with that is that if we pull it off the shoes. The problem with that, the State says what they want t to say.

The State's going to argue it's been in a box with a bunch of other items that could have transferred the DNA in there and because of that, I don't know if it necessarily gets us where we need to go. That's the reason I did not focus on the shoes. I think that if you were to grant the request for the exhuming the bones, there would be something to test, but like I said before, without something to test, I don't know what remedy we can ask for.

So I think it's really dependent upon whether or not you're going to grant his pro se motion to have the bones exhumed.

MS. WALTER: And, Your Honor, I just want to address that one last time because even the defendant in his most self serving statement said that the two people killed were Willfred Brown and Elton Rutledge.

So again, to ask a family to have their pitiful remains of their loved one exhumed for something that the defendant has already admitted is true, that Mr. Rutledge

872

was the one who was killed is really just such -- would be such a miscarriage of justice and we would ask that you deny any such motion.

THE COURT: All right.

THE DEFENDANT: It's fraud. It's fraud. June vs. Ford Motor Company Incorporated. That's what it is. Hazel Atlas Glass Code vs. Hartford Empire Code and in re Gentry Data Text Incorporated 204 F3d 124 130 4th Circuit 2000, brought upon the court includes fraud by the officer of the court, includes attorneys. Even him. He's fraudulent, too, because he's covering up and he's hiding and stuff. I'm an old man now. I done did 23 years of my life for a crime I did not commit, two crimes, and he -- he -- he -- he -- he knows that -- and the Court knows because -- well, she's holding that affidavit back, too, that's where another witness came forward. Brian Elliot was charged with -- was never a witness in my case and his wife was put on the stand by alibi to say that he was at home, but she was at work and he tried to kill her since then anyway, he went to jail for that.

But by saying all this, third-party guilt was charged with my jury and my jury didn't hear of Rhonda Jones's where she said that Brian admitted that he did it.

MR. SHAFFER: And, Your Honor, just say we're all clear. Throughout this, I would expect Mr. Ward to make

873

accusations against me because of the fact that he has made accusations against me and just did. By me not addressing them, it's me reading the room and thinking that it's probably not something the Court wants to get off on a side tangent to talk about. It's not me saying, yes, he's right, okay? Because I'm not in cahoots with anybody to cover anything up. I'm not doing any of that. I represent my clients. I do a good job. I'm not just saying, you know, not -- not or I'm not trying to protect anyone or anything like that.

So if Your Honor wants to hear from me on any of the allegations he makes, I'm glad to provide information on it. However, I would not like my silence to be construed as an admission that I did something wrong.

THE COURT: Thank you. Were you retained for the PCR case as well?

MR. SHAFFER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHAFFER: That was the additional thing that got added in while I was representing him in the other matter. And I told him I would jump on the DNA testing. And quite honestly, I told him, in my view, an accurate viewpoint of what I thought about the DNA testing before I got in the case.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I'd still ask the

Court to appoint me counsel, please. Somebody that's going to properly pass out subpoenas, that's going to properly talk to witnesses before they go to the hearing, that's going to properly talk to the client before the hearing, not wait. This hearing was granted in December the 2nd, and I think it was December the 2nd, I ain't talking to this man. He comes into court today, he don't know what to say. I got -- I got -- I got my witnesses and stuff, the questions wrote down for him because he don't know what to say. He don't know how to act because he's too busy doing other cases and I understand that and if he's too busy doing other cases, that makes him ineffective. That makes him Martinez vs. Ryan, that makes him violating my fifth, my sixth constitution -- it's the United States Constitution. I'm saying there's no way possible I'm gonna come in here and win anything in this courtroom with him. I'm saying because he's against me. I'm saying at this point, it's United States vs. Swanson. I'm saying he's friendly to the prosecution.

THE COURT: All right. What I'm going to do --

THE DEFENDANT: I mean, if he's that much of a friend with him, he needs to just move his chair over there and I'll fight all of them.

THE COURT: All right. Here's what we're going to do, Mr. Ward, please. All right. I'm going give -- I'll

875

take this under advisement today and I will --

THE DEFENDANT: I want to testify.

THE COURT: What?

THE DEFENDANT: I want to testify.

THE COURT: Not today. Here's what we're going to do. I will give you 15 days to supplement the record with any arguments that you want to submit, any affidavits that you want to, and then I will give the lawyers 30 days to submit proposed orders. And so your -- Mr. Ward, your deadline is May 16th, you sound like you could probably easily make that because you've already got most of it, and I probably got most of it. I just don't know what it is exactly that you want to have me focus on, but you can have until May 16th. You submit any affidavits, arguments, proposed order that you want to. I'll give then the lawyers until June 2 to submit proposed orders for and against.

And then as to the PCR case, I'm not sure that your -- you go back and forth with Mr. Shaffer, and I would like to think that you could mend your relationship with him, because I know you sometimes feel like he can represent you, sometimes not. That's not an unusual position for somebody in your position to take. But nevertheless, I'll give you 30 days to obtain a new private lawyer in that case, in the PCR case, if you want and if you don't want to get a new private lawyer or cannot get a new private lawyer

and you can't represent or you can't work out a relationship with Mr. Shaffer to continue as your PCR lawyer, then you can ask the Court at that point to appoint new counsel for PCR. But we won't deal with the PCR today, we'll deal with the DNA only so that I'll give you an opportunity to see if you can get a new private lawyer. If you can't get a private lawyer, if you can't work out your differences with Mr. Shaffer, then by June, early June, June the 2nd as well, I guess, is 30 days, then you can ask the Court to appoint you new PCR counsel and I'll entertain that petition at that time. But that won't necessarily delay the hearing for PCR.

I hate to do that, but --

MR. HALL: Judge, may I respond on behalf of the State, before you issue a ruling on the motion to relieve for the PCR case?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. HALL: May it please the Court.

Assistant Attorney General Brian Hall, representing the State in Mr. Ward's PCR case.

Your Honor, we asked this Court to not only reconsider allowing Mr. Ward to receive new counsel in the PCR case, but we ask that Your Honor hear the motions in the PCR -- on the PCR case.

Your Honor, we are here simply for really three motions in the PCR case. They're fairly simple and we'd ask

Your Honor to just hear the legal arguments on those motions and leave Mr. Shaffer on. We don't believe that new counsel is necessary for Mr. Ward. This is Mr. Ward's fifth PCR.

Your Honor, the motions that are pending before this Court, this case has already been dismissed by, I believe it was, Judge Seals issued a final order of dismissal. Mr. Shaffer filed a motion, I think a motion to reconsider, as well as a Rule 60B, order to be relieved -- or motion to be relieved from judgment and, Your Honor, we are here on those motions. Simply, the State is asking for this Court to just issue a ruling on those two pending motions so that this case can be resolved. And at the end of those motions, Your Honor, the State would make a motion for a maximum order to restrict Mr. Ward from filing any future PCR cases because he has filed several successive PCR cases all of which have been summarily dismissed, except for his PCR -- his first PCR, which was heard on the merits and was subsequently appealed. And the first PCR Court's denial of that PCR was affirmed on appeal.

So, Your Honor, we just -- the State would ask that this Court hear those motions. They were simply legal arguments, I believe. I won't speak for Mr. Shaffer, but I believe Mr. Shaffer is prepared to make those arguments, and we can tie up the loose ends in that PCR case without having to kick the can down the road.

878

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, that was conflicted out and that's the reason you was represented, because both of the judges, Judge Benjamin Culbertson has conflicted out, and he's the one that did the conditional order of dismissal and then he took it back. There's not no conditional order dismissal until this day. It has to be a conditional order dismissal before it can be a final order which Judge John did, which he had already done stated in 2015 that he was a conflict of interest and that's the reason that she was appointed by Judge Bennett.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I still think my plan of action is not my first choice, but it is, I think the choice that we're going to have to go with because the nature of the relationship between Mr. Shaffer and Mr. Ward is, well, it's kind of a day-to-day thing and I want to be fair to everyone. I certainly do take the victims in their -- I ask and beg for their patience that this will eventually get resolved one way or the other, but we sometimes have to take it one day at a time and Mr. Shaffer may still be able to represent him on that, but without having witnesses subpoenaed for today, and I just think that's the best course of action to give it one more chance to see if they can work that out, but if not, it might be necessary to get new counsel. But I do want to take the opportunity while we're here to deal with the DNA case, that

was the first case that got assigned to me. The PCR thing kind of got tagged on much later in the game. So the PCR thing was first, and that's what I intend to resolve first once way or the other.

THE DEFENDANT: The motion for the new trial based on after-discovered evidence 29B, that that's going to be heard at a later date?

THE COURT: No, you can go ahead and submit whatever arguments that you want to submit. Send me the motions, affidavits, etc., by May the 16th, Mr. Ward, and then the lawyers can submit, submit proposed orders by 6/2 or June the 2nd.

If you want to submit a proposed order, you can by that date as well, but the lawyers I want to have proposed orders in by June the 2nd.

MS. WALTER: And, Your Honor, that's for both the DNA and for the motion for new trial.

THE COURT: Correct.

THE DEFENDANT: So we ain't even had a hearing yet.

MR. HALL: Judge.

THE DEFENDANT: It's already been granted. I'm being bamboo.

THE COURT: What?

THE DEFENDANT: I being bamboozled if I -- if I'm

not -- I mean, it was already granted for a hearing for the day and the --

THE COURT: I heard the arguments for today.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: It was simply on legal issues because neither side had witnesses to call. Right.

So that's what we're going to do and then once I get those orders in and make the case on the DNA, then you let me know if you still by June the 2nd, Mr. Ward, let me know if you want new PCR counsel or have you been able to get new private lawyer or you're able to work things out with Mr. Shaffer and we'll move forward on your PCR case after that. That's separate from the timeline and timeframe of the DNA/motion for a new trial case.

MR. HALL: Judge, regarding the motion to relieve counsel, if we could just place on the record, speaking on behalf of both the Attorney General's office and the Solicitor's office, the State will object to any further motions to relieve counsel and we ask this Court to issue a ruling stating that if he can't work out things with Mr. Shaffer and does not obtain private counsel, that he be appointed a new lawyer, but that he will not be -- this Court will not entertain any further motions to relieve counsel.

Your Honor, the reason we are asking for this is

881

because it seems as though Mr. Ward's motions are simply to further delay this case and to not resolve the case and we just want -- we want to protect ourselves and not continue to kick the can down the road in this case. We believe that this case has gotten to the point where there must be some finality in this case and without something preventing Mr. Ward from relieving future counsel, we believe that he would come back and do the same thing at a later time.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not kicking the can, I'm just trying to figure out an orderly way to handle this. I cannot foreclose any arguments that he might have in the future with regards to other counsel, but I have what you asked for on the record, all right?

MR. SHAFFER: Your Honor, before we leave, I want to make the Court aware of something.

Essentially, in my view, if I say his attorney, and I've told this to Mr. Ward before, and I told this to the other side, in my view, a lot of the motions for a new trial, the amendments and the motions for a new trial, are actually, should have been brought or should be brought as essentially PCR claims. I would actually ask that you interpret them, and I had some case law saying that you can interpret habeas as PCRs and things like that, but I would ask that you interpret those as actual PCR allegations because I think that especially related to the conflict of

882

interest and actually related to most of his amendments to the 29B issue, they are properly brought as PCR issues, not as 29B issues because they don't fit under the factors, Your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, can I put on the record?

THE COURT: Yeah.

THE DEFENDANT: From this day forward right here, I don't have nothing, me or my family don't have anything to do with no subpoenas whatsoever because I don't even have no correspondence with him and he don't write back and stuff like that. So I'm saying my hands is tied. I mean, they ping-pong me around, keep me on lockup, taking my legal work. I'm saying I'm dealing with all that, too, now. I'm sure time I go back, they'll lock me up and then I won't have no legal work to even file for your deadline. That's what I've been going through because of collusion with Ms. Christina Catoe Bigelow that somebody's putting her up to that as general counsel, and that's what they're doing to me.

MR. HALL: Judge, if I could respond to Mr. Shaffer asking this Court to interpret the new PCR allegations. We would again state for the record that his PCR case has already been dismissed by the court. Simply, the only motions that are pending before this Court are post

883

dismissal motions. There's already been a judgment in this case and so we argue that any new allegations are procedurally barred not only by the fact that this case was dismissed, but they are procedurally barred by the statute of the limitations and the Supreme Court's rulings on successive allegations and successive applications.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SHAFFER: Your Honor, there's two ways you could go about this. One, you could have been under Rule 15, and I actually have case law saying that you could actually interpret new allegations all the way until the 60 days has occurred. However, you could also interpret those as actually new PCR filings because you can raise them under material facts that you learned within a year.

So I would ask that you interpret essentially all his pro se filings under 29B as PCR allegations because, you know, you've gotten three or four of those and those are essentially PCR allegation to ineffective assistance of counsel.

THE COURT: It seemed to me on that, on the surface, that would probably be the better way to do it, but if you would address that in your proposed order.

MR. SHAFFER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. All right. Well, we won't schedule another hearing just yet until we figure

884

out where we stand after the June 2nd submissions. All right. Until then, we're adjourned.

END OF REQUESTED PROCEEDINGS

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

State of South Carolina)

County of Georgetown)

I, Cynthia D. Weaver, Official Court Reporter for the State of South Carolina, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete Transcript of Record of the evidence produced in the hearing of the above-captioned case, relative to appeal, in General Sessions Court for Georgetown County, South Carolina, on the 1st day of May, 2025.

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

August 15, 2026

Cynthia D Weaver

Cynthia D. Weaver,
Official Court Reporter
State of South Carolina

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Georgetown County
Honorable Roger M. Young, Circuit Court Judge

The state, Respondent,

vs.

Jody Lynn Ward Appellant.

Appellate case no. 2025-002597

Designation of matter to be
Included in Record on Appeal

Appellant proposes the following be included in the Record on Appeal:

1.) Attorney Tristan Shaffers motion to Relieve Counsel and petition for extention of time to Request Transcript.

2.) Transcript of Hearing dated May 1, 2025

I certify that this designation contains no matter which is irrelevant to this Appeal.

Respectfully submitted

October 26, 2026 /s/ Jody Lynn Ward

Jody Lynn Ward
Appellant Prose

1. of 1.

RECEIVED
OCT 29 2026
SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Georgetown County
Honorable Roger M. Young, Circuit Court Judge

THE STATE, RESPONDENTS,

VS.

JODY LYNN WARD, APPELLANT PRO-SE,

Appellate Case No. 2025-002597

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a True and correct copy of Appellates Pro-se Anders Brief was Filed on the Below Named and Addressed parties ON This 26th DAy of October 2026 By way of U.S. postal mail; postage prepaid.

1.) Attorney Generals office
For S.C. Attn:
Attn: Melody J. Brown, Asst.
P.O. Box 11549
Columbia, S.C. 29211

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Jody Lynn Ward
Jody Lynn Ward
Appellate Pro-se

1. of 1.

Jody Lynn Ward, #300644
Tyger River C.I. U-1-B-#117
200 Prison Rd.
Enoree, S.C. 29335

October 26, 2026

RECEIVED
OCT 29 2026
SC Court of Appeals

S.C. Court of Appeals
Attn: Ms. Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Clerk
P.O. Box 11629
Columbia, S.C. 29211

RE: Filing of Anders Brief (45) Pro-se Brief
Case # 2025-002597; Attached objection to Appellate Defender Being relieved as Counsel; Exhibits/Attachments/ Record on Appeal as proof of Anders Brief Issues.

Dear Ms. Kitchings,

Please find here enclosed an Original Courts Copy for filing in the above case. please clock-stamp and send me a clocked copy for my files. I thank you for all your time & help with this matter.

Respectfully submitted,
s/Jody Lynn Ward, #300644
Jody Lynn Ward, #300644
Appellate Pro-se

cc: File
S.C. Attorney General

Jody L. WARD, #300644
Tyger River U-1-B-#117
200 Prison Rd.
Enoree, S.C. 29335

RECEIVED
OCT 29 2026
SC Court of Appeals

RECEIVED
OCT 26 2026
TYGER RIVER MAILROOM

S.C. Court of Appeals
Attn: Ms. Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Clerk
Post office Box 11629
Columbia, S.C. 29211

LEGAL MAIL