

**LAW OFFICE OF CAROLINE M. HORLBECK**

*101 Whitsett Street  
Greenville, South Carolina 29601  
(864) 315-9919/Fax (864) 232-4756*

*To: The Supreme Court of South Carolina*

*From: Caroline M. Horlbeck, Esquire*

*Date: October 10, 2014*

*Re: Copy of correspondence to Mr. Johnny Hitt in response to  
your correspondence of September 22, 2014*

*Fax No.: (803) 734-1499*

*No. Pages: 3 4*

**RECEIVED**

OCT 10 2014

S.C. SUPREME COURT

**CAROLINE M. HORLBECK**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW

101 WHITSETT ST.  
GREENVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA 29601  
horlbecklawfirm@gmail.com

(864) 315-9919  
Fax(864) 232-4756

September 25, 2014

**RECEIVED**

OCT 10 2014

S.C. SUPREME COURT


Mr. Johnny Hitt #339641  
Evans C.I. SMU-217B  
610 Hwy. 9 West  
Bennettsville, SC 29512

2014 - 001873

Dear Mr. Hitt,


Enclosed please find a copy of additional correspondence from The Supreme Court of South Carolina. As you recall, I advised you in my letter of September 18, 2014 to immediately file with the Court a pro se explanation of any arguable basis that the judge's determinations were improper. Please be advised that my advice that you respond immediately to the Court's request for a pro se explanation was erroneous. Rather, you have twenty (20) days from the date of this letter to file with the Court a pro se explanation under Rule 243(c) SCAC and/or a pro se explanation under Rule 203(d) SCAC of any arguable basis that the Court's rulings were improper.

Yours very truly,



Caroline M. Horlbeck

CMH:kmo  
Enclosures



## The Supreme Court of South Carolina

DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE  
CLERK OF COURT

BRENDA F. SHEALY  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11330  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA  
29211

1231 GERVAIS STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1080  
FAX: (803) 734-1499  
www.sccourts.org

September 22, 2014

Ms. Caroline M.W. Horlbeck, Esquire  
101 Whitsett Street  
Greenville SC 29601

Re: Johnny Randy Hitt v. State  
Appellate Case No. 2014-001873

Dear Counsel:

This responds to your letter dated September 18, 2014. This letter does not comply with the requirements of *Dennison v. State*, 371 S.C. 221, (2006).<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, it will be necessary for you to send this Court and your client a revised letter that clearly indicates to petitioner that he may file with this Court a *pro se* explanation under Rule 243(c), SCAC, and/or a *pro se* explanation under Rule 203(d)(1)(B), SCACR. This letter should also advise him that any *pro se* explanation must be submitted within twenty (20) days of the date of that letter.

<sup>1</sup> "[I]f counsel does not have a good faith explanation to provide pursuant to [Rule 243], counsel shall provide the Court with a letter stating that as an officer of the Court, counsel is unable set forth any arguable basis for asserting the determination by the PCR judge that the PCR application was successive and barred by the statute of limitations was improper. *Counsel shall further advise the petitioner by copy of the letter that the petitioner should notify the Court, no later than twenty (20) days from the date of the letter, of any arguable basis the petitioner may wish to assert that the determination that the PCR application was successive and barred by the limitations was improper.*" (emphasis added).

This revised letter should be sent within ten (10) days of the date of this letter.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

CLERK

cc: Karen Christine Ratigan, Esquire