

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Nathaniel Teamer, Respondent-Petitioner,

v.

State of South Carolina, Petitioner-Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2013-001284

Lower Court Case No. 2010-CP-42-04049


ORDER

The State filed a petition for a writ of certiorari in this matter. In response, respondent-petitioner filed a "Reply to Petition for Writ of Certiorari," which, in addition to responses to the questions raised in the State's petition for a writ of certiorari, contains additional sustaining grounds three of which are actually allegations of error on the part of the post-conviction relief (PCR) judge. The State moves this Court to require petitioner to re-caption the reply as a return, strike the additional sustaining grounds from the return and hold the State's time to file a return to respondent-petitioner's petition for a writ of certiorari in abeyance until such petition is served and filed.

The motion is granted. The reply filed by respondent-petitioner is hereby stricken. Respondent-petitioner shall file a *return* to the State's petition for a writ of certiorari which only includes responses to the questions raised by the State in its petition for a writ of certiorari and any actual additional sustaining grounds. See Rule 243(g), SCACR; *I'On, LLC v. Town of Mt. Pleasant*, 338 S.C. 406, 526 S.E.2d 716 (2000). Respondent-petitioner shall file a separate petition for a writ of certiorari containing his allegations of error on the part of the PCR judge.

The times for service and filing of a return to respondent-petitioner's petition for a writ of certiorari shall commence upon service of the petition for a writ of certiorari. Any replies to the returns to the petitions for a writ of certiorari shall be

served and filed as set forth in Rule 242(h), SCACR.



J.

FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

June 12, 2014

cc:

Suzanne H. White, Esquire

C. Rauch Wise, Esquire