

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

Appeal from Charleston  
County Common Pleas Court  
Kristi L. Harrington, Circuit  
Court Judge  
Appellate Case No. 2013-000692

JAN 08 2015

SC Court of Appeals

Larry G. Harvin,

Appellant,

V.

State of South Carolina,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

LARRY G. HARVIN

Prisoner I.D. No.: 253468

M.C.I. F-1-125.B

386 Redemption Way

McCormick, SC 29849

- APPELLANT PRO. SE.

ASHLEIGH R. WILSON

- Asst. Atty. Gen., S.C.

Post Office Box 11549

Columbia, SC 29211

- ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT

## INTRODUCTION

Appellant ("Harvin") brings this Petition for a Rehearing, under South Carolina Appellate Court Rules ('SCACR') 221 (a), following this Court's December 23, 2014 Order, for review of the October 1, 2014 Order of the Honorable Justice Jasper M. Cureton [see ATTACHMENT ("ATT.") 1] compelling Harvin to Amend the 'Record on Appeal' upon Respondent's 'Motion to Require ...' [ATT. 4].

For brevity purposes, Harvin intends for the 'Citation of Authorities' (page 2.) to be construed as the 'Memorandum with Citation of Authorities' as required by SCACR 240 (c)(2).

CITATION OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

• Babb v. Thompson, 2004 WL 6334949, \* 2  
(S.C. App. 2004)

3

COURT RULES

• South Carolina Appellate Court Rule ('SCACR')

- 209 (b)

3

- 211 (a)

3

- 221 (a)

1

- 240 (c)(2)

1

## POINTS OVERLOOKED

1.- Justice Cureton probably didn't notice that Respondent

(a)- In 'Initial Brief...' [ATT. 2, Pp. 5 to 9], the arguments do not cite nor rely upon items enumerated as 1 to 29, 31 to 36, 38, within Respondent's 'Designation of Matter' [ATT. 3];


(b)- Failed to state what 'relevance' noted items 1 to 29, 31 to 36, 38 [ATT. 3] have in Harvin's Appeal — as required by SCACR 209(b), and this Court's opinion in Babb v. Thompson, 2004 WL 6334949, \*2 (S.C. App. 2004) — ; and

(c)- Did not comply with the established twenty (20) day period for serving their Final Brief (see SCACR 211(a)), opting, instead, to attempt entering irrelevant matters into this Court's record as outlined in (a) & (b), supra.

CONCLUSION

For the above-stated reasons, this Court should effectively VACATE Justice Cureton's October 1, 2014 Order, thus allowing Harvin's Appeal to resume processing.

Respectfully Submitted,



Larry G. Harvin

Prisoner I.D. No.: 253468

M.C.I. F.1 - 125-B

386 Redemption Way

McCormick, SC 29899

1 - 5 - 15

DATE

# ATTACHMENTS

AFFIDAVIT TO ATTACHMENTS

I, Larry G. Harvin, do declare before below-signed Notary Public that the below-enumerated documents are, by "ATT." designation, submitted to the Court in the same form of which I received them; such documents appear in tandem to this Affidavit thus:

"ATT."

- < > 1. - ORDER, Honorable Justice Jasper M. Cureton, S.C. Court of Appeals (Filed October 1, 2014) (1 Pg.)
- < > 2. - 'Initial Brief of Respondent' (dated March 28, 2014) (10 Pgs.)
- < > 3. - 'Designation of Matter to be Included in the Record ON Appeal', (Respondent's) (dated March 28, 2014) (2 Pgs.)
- < > 4. - 'Motion to Require the Appellant Amend [sic] the Record ON Appeal Pursuant to Rule 210 (b)', (Respondent's) (dated July 25, 2014) (3 Pgs.)

- In so declaring, by Notary endorsement, I further stand sincere in the truthfulness of my declarations herein.

Sworn and Subscribed to before me this 25 day of JAN, 2015

15/ J. J. Miller  
Notary Public, South Carolina  
\* My Commission Expires: 12-16-2019

15/ L. G. Harvin  
Larry G. Harvin  
Prisoner I.D. No.: 253468  
MEC.I. F.1-125.B  
386 Redemption Way  
McCormick, SC 29899

# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Larry G. Harvin, Appellant,

v.

State of South Carolina, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2013-000692


---

## ORDER

---

Respondent has filed a motion to compel Appellant to amend the record on appeal. Respondent asks this Court to require Appellant to include in the record all matters designated by Respondent. Appellant has not filed a return.

We grant Respondent's motion. Within twenty days, Appellant must serve an amended record on appeal that contains all items listed in both parties' designations of matter. The amended record shall contain only those matters designated by the parties. The parties must serve and file their final briefs within twenty days of the service of the amended record.



FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

**FILED**

SF 10/1/14

cc: Larry G. Harvin, 00253468  
Matthew J. Friedman, Esquire  
Ashleigh Rayanna Wilson, Esquire

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

---

Appeal from Charleston County  
Honorable Kristi L. Harrington, Circuit Court Judge

---

Lower Court Case No. 2010-CP-10-4462  
Appellate Case No. 2013-000692

LARRY G. HARVIN,

Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Respondent.

---

**INITIAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT**

---

ALAN WILSON  
Attorney General

ASHLEIGH R. WILSON  
Assistant Attorney General

Post Office Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
(803) 734-3737  
#100269

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... ii

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL .....1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....2

ARGUMENT.....5

CONCLUSION.....10

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases:

<u>Auto-Owners Ins. Co. v. Rhodes</u> 385 S.C. 83, 682 S.E.2d 857 (S.C. App. 2009) rehearing denied, affirmed in part, reversed in part 748 S.E.2d 781.	6
<u>Bell v. Bennett</u> , 307 S.C. 286, 414 S.E.2d 786 (Ct. App. 1992).	9
<u>Foran v. USAA Casualty Ins. Co.</u> , 311 S.C. 189, 427 S.E.2d 918 (Ct. App. 1993).	9
<u>Riedman Corp. v. Greenville Steel Structures, Inc.</u> , 308 S.C. 467, 419 S.E.2d 217 (1992).	9
<u>Sealy v. Dodge</u> , 289 S.C. 543, 347 S.E.2d 504 (1986).	9
<u>Smith Companies of Greenville, Inc. v. Hayes</u> 311 S.C. 358, 428 S.E.2d 900 (S.C. App. 1993).	6
<u>State v. Harvin</u> , 345 S.C. 190, 547 S.E.2d 497 (2001).	2
<u>Tench v. South Carolina Dept. of Educ.</u> 347 S.C. 117, 553 S.E.2d 451 (2001).	6

### Other Authorities:

Rule 41, SCRPC

Rule 52, SCRPC

Rule 60, SCRPC

S.C. Code Ann. Section 16-23-490(A) (2010).

**STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL**

1. Whether the lower court properly denied the Appellant's Motion for Relief from Judgment pursuant to Rule 60(b), SCRCPC and the lower court's order denying relief was sufficient?
2. Whether this Court should review the denial of the Appellant's State Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus after the lower court's denial of relief was already reviewed once by this Court on appeal and a second review should be barred by the doctrine of *res judicata*?

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

This matter is before this Court by way of Appellant's appeal of the denial of his Motion for Relief from Judgment. The Appellant is presently confined in the South Carolina Department of Corrections pursuant to orders of commitment from the Charleston County Clerk of Court. The Appellant was indicted during the July 1997 term of the Charleston County Grand Jury for the murder of Bertha Joan Wilson (1997-GS-10-4288), armed robbery (1997-GS-10-4290) and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime (1997-GS-10-4289). The Appellant was represented by D. Ashley Pennington and Sharon Crummey, Esquires. The Appellant proceeded to trial on October 12-16, 1998 and was found guilty. The Honorable Daniel F. Pieper sentenced the Appellant to life imprisonment for murder and thirty years for armed robbery<sup>1</sup>.

The Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal. His appeal was perfected by Robert Dudek, Esquire. The South Carolina Supreme Court affirmed the Appellant's convictions and sentences on May 29, 2001. State v. Harvin, 345 S.C. 190, 547 S.E.2d 497 (2001). The Remittitur was issued on June 22, 2001.

The Appellant filed his first application for post-conviction relief on August 9, 2001 (2001-CP-10-2971). The Respondent filed its Return on February 1, 2002. After a full evidentiary hearing, the Honorable Victor Rawl dismissed and denied the Appellant's application by Order filed October 29, 2002. The Appellant subsequently filed a Motion to Alter and Amend which was denied by the Court on May 23, 2009.

The Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus in the United States District Court. The Respondent filed a Return and Motion for Summary Judgment on May 21, 2003. On

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. Section 16-23-490(A) (2010), Judge Pieper did not sentence the Appellant on the possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime charge.

October 6, 2003, the Honorable Joseph McCrorey filed a Magistrate's Report and Recommendation. By Order filed January 16, 2004, the Honorable G. Ross Anderson, Jr. granted the Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment and dismissed the Appellant's petition. The Appellant subsequently appealed to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. This appeal was dismissed on August 10, 2004. The Appellant also filed a Motion to Vacate and a Motion for Relief from Judgment in the United States District Court which were both dismissed on January 11, 2007 and September 13, 2011, respectively.

The Appellant filed his second application for post-conviction relief on March 3, 2010 (2010-CP-10-1709). The Respondent filed a Return and Motion to Dismiss dated June 24, 2010. The Honorable R. Markley Dennis signed a Conditional Order of Dismissal which was filed on July 6, 2010. The Appellant's second application was dismissed by Final Order which was filed on November 12, 2010.

The Appellant subsequently filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (2010-CP-10-4462) in the circuit court on June 1, 2010. The Respondent filed a Return and Motion to Dismiss dated October 20, 2011. The Honorable Kristi L. Harrington signed a Conditional Order of Dismissal which was filed on December 8, 2011. The petition was dismissed by Final Order on December 16, 2011.

The Appellant then filed a second Motion for Relief from Judgment in the United States District Court. The appeal was dismissed and certificate of appealability was denied on February 28, 2012.

The Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal challenging the denial of his State Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. The Appellant filed a Petition for Rehearing which was denied by this Court on April 9, 2012. The Court denied the Appellant's Petition for Rehearing on July 20,

2012. A Remittitur was issued on August 20, 2012, but later recalled. The South Carolina Supreme Court denied the Appellant's Petition for Writ of Certiorari on August 21, 2012. The Remittitur was issued on October 9, 2012.

The Appellant then filed a Motion for Relief from Judgment pursuant to Rule 60(b), SCACR in the circuit court dated January 31, 2013 challenging the denial of his state habeas petition. The Honorable Kristi L. Harrington denied the Appellant's motion by Order filed February 28, 2013. This appeal follows.

**ARGUMENT**

This matter is before this Court by way of an appeal of the lower court's denial of the Appellant's Motion for Relief from Judgment pursuant to Rule 60(b), SCRPC. In his Motion for Relief from Judgment, the Appellant challenged the lower court's denial of his state habeas petition and asked the lower court to vacate the conditional and final orders of dismissal and grant him an evidentiary hearing. The Appellant alleged the conditional and final orders of dismissal were void because they did not give clear notice of a change in law requiring non-PCR allegations to be raised in a PCR action and they were not consistent with due process. By Order dated February 22, 2013 and filed February 28, 2013, the Honorable Kristi L. Harrington denied the Appellant's motion. The Order stated "[u]pon review of the Motion for Relief from Judgment, the Applicant's Memorandum in Support, as well as the original pleadings and the records attached thereto, the Applicant's Motion for Relief from Judgment is respectfully DENIED." (Habeas Order p.1).

On appeal, the Appellant alleges the lower court committed an abuse of discretion by failing to state findings of fact and conclusions of law in its Order denying his Rule 60(b), SCACP motion. The Respondent submits this allegation is without merit and the lower court did not abuse its discretion by denying the Appellant's Rule 60(b), SCRPC motion.

Rule 60(b), SCRPC states as follows:

"On motion and upon such terms as are just, the court may relieve a party or his legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b); (3) fraud, misrepresentation, or other misconduct of an adverse party; (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged, or a prior judgment upon which it is based had been reversed or otherwise vacated, or it is no longer equitable that the judgment should have prospective application."

A party seeking to set aside a judgment has the burden of presenting evidence entitling him to the requested relief. Auto-Owners Ins. Co. v. Rhodes 385 S.C. 83, 682 S.E.2d 857 (S.C. App. 2009) rehearing denied, affirmed in part, reversed in part 748 S.E.2d 781. Whether to grant or deny a motion to set aside a judgment is within the sound discretion of the trial court. Id. A party may not invoke rule for relief from judgment where it could have pursued the issue on appeal. Tench v. South Carolina Dept. of Educ. 347 S.C. 117, 553 S.E.2d 451 (2001). Relief from judgment should not be considered a substitute for appeal from final judgment, particularly when it is clear the party seeking relief could have litigated at trial and on appeal claims he now makes by motion. Smith Companies of Greenville, Inc. v. Hayes 311 S.C. 358, 428 S.E.2d 900 (S.C. App. 1993).

**The lower court properly denied the Appellant's Motion for Relief from Judgment and the Order denying the motion was sufficient when the claims raised in the motion could have been and were litigated on appeal and the Order denying the motion did not have to include findings of fact and conclusions of law.**

First, the Respondent submits denial of the Appellant's motion for relief from judgment was proper because the allegations made in the Appellant's motion could have been and were litigated on appeal. The Appellant on appeal from the lower court's denial of his state habeas petition alleged in his written explanation pursuant to Rule 203(d)(1)(B)(vi), SCACR that the lower court's denial of his habeas petition was improper because the issues raised in his habeas petition could not have been raised in a post-conviction relief application as the lower court claimed. (App. Written Explanation p. 2).<sup>\*</sup> After review of the Appellant's written explanation, this Court dismissed the appeal finding the Appellant's explanation did not "contain sufficient facts, argument, and citation to legal authority to show that there is an arguable basis for asserting the determination by the lower court was improper."<sup>\*</sup> (Court of Appeals Order filed April 9, 2012).

In the Motion for Relief from Judgment challenging the denial of Appellant's state habeas petition, the Appellant made the exact same argument to the lower court that he made to this Court on appeal from the denial of the Appellant's habeas petition. On both appeal and in the Appellant's Motion for Relief from Judgment, the Appellant challenged the lower court's ruling that the issues raised in the Appellant's state habeas petition are non-PCR allegations and could not be raised in a PCR action. Because a motion for relief from judgment is not a substitute for appeal and it is clear in the motion the Appellant was trying to litigate a claim this Court had already reviewed on appeal, the lower court's dismissal of the Appellant's motion was proper.

Second, the Respondent submits the lower court's Order denying the Appellant's motion was sufficient. Pursuant to Rule 52(a), SCRCP, "findings of fact and conclusions of law are unnecessary on decisions of motions under Rules 12 or 56 or any other motion except as provided in Rule 41(b) (emphasis added)." Based on Rule 52(a), unless a party's motion is made pursuant to Rule 41(b), the court's decision does not have to include findings of fact and conclusions are law. The Appellant's Motion for Relief from Judgment was based on Rule 60(b), SCRCP and made no reference to Rule 41(b)<sup>2</sup>, therefore, the lower court did not have to include findings of fact and conclusions of law in its order denying the Appellant's motion.

The Respondent also submits the language in the lower court's Order denying the Appellant's motion was sufficient. The Order stated the case's procedural history and the type of relief the Appellant was requesting from the court. The Order also noted the documents reviewed by the court prior to its ruling. (Order Denying Appellant's 60(b) Motion). Finally, the Order concluded "the Applicant's Motion for Relief from Judgment is respectfully DENIED." The

---

<sup>2</sup> Rule 41(b), SCRCP describes a motion filed by the defendant for dismissal of an action or claim against him based on the "failure of the plaintiff to prosecute or comply with these rules or any order of court".

Respondent submits the lower court did not abuse its discretion by denying the Appellant's Motion for Relief from Judgment and the lower court's Order denying the motion was sufficient.

**This Court should not review the denial of the Appellant's state habeas petition when this Court already reviewed the lower court's denial of relief on appeal and a second review of the lower court's denial should be barred by the doctrine of *res judicata*.**

The Appellant claims this Court should address the issue of whether or not the lower court committed an abuse of discretion by denying the Appellant's state habeas petition. The Respondent submits this issue is not properly before this court in the Appellant's appeal of the denial of his Rule 60(b), SCRCF motion. The Respondent also submits this Court has already reviewed the lower court's denial of the Appellant's state habeas petition and the doctrine of *res judicata* should bar the Appellant from having this Court review the issue a second time.

First, the denial of the Appellant's habeas petition has already been reviewed by this Court on appeal. After the lower court denied the Appellant's petition for habeas corpus, the Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal with this Court which was filed on January 17, 2012. (Notice of Appeal from Denial of Appellant's Habeas Petition p. 1). The Appellant also filed with his Notice of Appeal a Written Explanation of Improper Determination. (App. Written Explanation). By Order filed April 9, 2012, this Court, after review of the Appellant's Written Explanation, dismissed the Appellant's appeal. (Court of Appeals Order filed April 9, 2012). The Remittitur was issued on August 21, 2012, then recalled by Order filed August 24, 2012. (Remittitur Issued August 21, 2012, Order Filed August 24, 2012). The Court then denied the Appellant's Petition for Rehearing by Order filed July 20, 2012. (Order Filed July 20, 2012). The Appellant filed a Petition for Writ of Certiorari in the South Carolina Supreme Court which was denied on September 21, 2012. The Remittitur was issued on October 9, 2012. It is clear from the prior proceedings of this Court that the Appellant has already challenged the denial of his state habeas

petition in this Court and this Court dismissed his appeal after review of the Appellant's written explanation.

Second, since the Appellant has already challenged the denial of his state habeas petition once, he should be barred from challenging the denial of relief a second time by the doctrine of *res judicata*. *Res judicata* prohibits subsequent actions by the same parties on the same issues. Bell v. Bennett, 307 S.C. 286, 414 S.E.2d 786 (Ct. App. 1992). A final judgment on the merits in a prior action bars subsequent consideration of those issues in a new action. Foran v. USAA Casualty Ins. Co., 311 S.C. 189, 427 S.E.2d 918 (Ct. App. 1993). *Res judicata* also bars any issues that could have been raised in the former action. Id. To establish *res judicata*, the defendant must prove the following three elements: (1) identity of the parties; (2) identity of the subject matter; and (3) adjudication of the issue in the former suit. Riedman Corp. v. Greenville Steel Structures, Inc., 308 S.C. 467, 419 S.E.2d 217 (1992); Sealy v. Dodge, 289 S.C. 543, 347 S.E.2d 504 (1986).

In both the Appellant's appeal of his state habeas petition and this current appeal of the denial of the Appellant's Motion for Relief from Judgment, the parties are the Appellant and the State of South Carolina. In both the Appellant's prior appeal and this current appeal, the subject matter of the proceeding was the lower court's denial of the Appellant's state habeas petition. Lastly, the Appellant's appeal from his state habeas was dismissed by this court after review of the Appellant's written explanation and the Remittitur was issued. The Respondent submits this Court should not review the denial of the Appellant's state habeas petition and find a second review of this issue is barred by the doctrine of *res judicata*.


**CONCLUSION**

For all the foregoing reasons, the Respondent respectfully asks this Court to affirm the lower court's judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

ALAN WILSON  
Attorney General

ASHLEIGH R. WILSON  
Assistant Attorney General

BY:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ashleigh R. Wilson

Office of the Attorney General  
Post Office Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
(803) 734-3737

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

March 28, 2014

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

---

Appeal from Charleston County  
Honorable Kristi L. Harrington, Circuit Court Judge

---

Lower Court Case No. 2010-CP-10-4462  
Appellate Case No. 2013-000692

LARRY G. HARVIN,

Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Respondent.

---

**DESIGNATION OF MATTER TO BE INCLUDED IN THE RECORD ON APPEAL**

---

Pursuant to Rule 209, SCACR, the Respondent submits the following materials should be included in the Record on Appeal in this matter:

1. Appellant's murder indictment and sentencing sheet (1997-GS-10-4288)
2. Appellant's possession of a weapon during commission of a violent crime indictment and sentencing sheet (1997-GS-10-4289)
3. Appellant's armed robbery indictment and sentencing sheet (1997-GS-10-4290)
4. Opinion affirming the Appellant's convictions on direct appeal
5. Remittitur issued on May 29, 2001 concluding the Appellant's direct appeal
6. Appellant's first PCR application filed August 9, 2001 (2001-CP-10-2971)
7. Respondent's Return to Appellant's first PCR Application dated February 1, 2002
8. Order denying Appellant's first PCR filed October 29, 2002
9. Order denying Appellant's Motion to Alter and Amend filed May 23, 2009
10. Appellant's Federal Habeas Petition dated February 26, 2003
11. Respondent's Return and Motion for Summary Judgment filed May 21, 2003
12. Magistrate's Report and Recommendation filed October 6, 2003
13. Order granting Respondent's Motion to Dismiss filed January 16, 2004
14. Order denying appeal to Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals dated August 10, 2004
15. Order denying Appellant's Motion to Vacate order granting of summary judgment dated January 11, 2007

16. Order denying Appellant's Motion for Relief from Judgment granting summary judgment dated September 13, 2011
17. Appellant's second PCR application filed March 3, 2010 (2010-CP-10-1709)
18. Respondent's Return and Motion to Dismiss Appellant's second PCR applicant dated June 24, 2010
19. Conditional Order of Dismissal of Appellant's second PCR filed July 6, 2010
20. Appellant's Response to signed Conditional Order of Dismissal filed August 6, 2010
21. Final Order of Dismissal of Appellant's second PCR filed November 12, 2010
22. Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed in the circuit court on June 1, 2010
23. Respondent's Return and Motion to Dismiss Appellant's habeas petition dated October 20, 2011
24. Conditional Order of Dismissal of habeas petition filed November 8, 2011
25. Appellant's Response to signed Conditional Order of Dismissal filed December 5, 2011
26. Final Order of Dismissal of Appellant's habeas petition filed December 16, 2011
27. Order from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals dismissing and denying certificate of appealability dated February 28, 2012
28. Notice of Appeal initiating appeal from state habeas petition dated January 13, 2012
29. Appellant's Written Explanation pursuant to Rule 203(d)(1)(B)(vi) in appeal of state habeas petition dated January 13, 2012
30. Order dismissing appeal of denial of Appellant's state habeas petition filed April 9, 2012
31. Remittitur issued on August 21, 2012
32. Order recalling August 21, 2012 Remittitur filed August 24, 2012
33. Order denying Appellant's Petition for Rehearing dated July 20, 2012
34. Order denying Appellant's Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court filed August 21, 2012
35. Remittitur issued on October 9, 2012 concluding appeal of Appellant's state habeas petition
36. Appellant's Motion for Relief from Judgment dated January 31, 2013
37. Order from the Honorable Kristi L. Harrington denying Appellant's motion filed February 28, 2013
38. Notice of Appeal initiating present appeal

Counsel for the Respondent, State of South Carolina, certifies this Designation contains no matter which is irrelevant to this appeal.

ALAN WILSON  
Attorney General

ASHLEIGH R. WILSON  
Assistant Attorney General  
#100269

BY: Ashleigh R. Wilson 3/28/14  
Ashleigh R. Wilson

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

---

Appeal from Charleston County  
Honorable Kristi L. Harrington, Circuit Court Judge

---

Appellate Case No. 013-000692

LARRY G. HARVIN,

Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Respondent.

---

**MOTION TO REQUIRE THE APPELLANT AMEND THE RECORD ON APPEAL  
PURSUANT TO RULE 210(b)**

---

COMES NOW, Respondent, by and through undersigned counsel, making its Motion to Require the Appellant to Amend the Record on Appeal pursuant to Rule 210(b) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. The Respondent respectfully shows this Court:

I.

The Respondent is in receipt of the Record on Appeal compiled by the Appellant in this matter. The Respondent respectfully requests this Court require the Appellant to amend the Record on Appeal to include the matters designated to be included in the Record on Appeal by the Respondent. South Carolina Appellate Court Rule 210(b) states "The Record on Appeal shall include all matter designated to be included by any party under Rule 209." (emphasis added). The Respondent submits the Appellant has only included five of the thirty-eight documents the Respondent designated to be included in the Record on Appeal.

## II.

The Respondent submits the following documents designated to be included in the Record on Appeal by the Respondent were excluded by the Appellant in the Record on Appeal:

1. Appellant's murder indictment and sentencing sheet (1997-GS-10-4288)
2. Appellant's possession of a weapon during commission of a violent crime indictment and sentencing sheet (1997-GS-10-4289)
3. Appellant's armed robbery indictment and sentencing sheet (1997-GS-10-4290)
4. Opinion affirming the Appellant's convictions on direct appeal
5. Remittitur issued on May 29, 2001 concluding the Appellant's direct appeal
6. Appellant's first PCR application filed August 9, 2001 (2001-CP-10-2971)
7. Respondent's Return to Appellant's first PCR Application dated February 1, 2002
8. Order denying Appellant's first PCR filed October 29, 2002
9. Order denying Appellant's Motion to Alter and Amend filed May 23, 2009
10. Appellant's Federal Habeas Petition dated February 26, 2003
11. Respondent's Return and Motion for Summary Judgment filed May 21, 2003
12. Magistrate's Report and Recommendation filed October 6, 2003
13. Order granting Respondent's Motion to Dismiss filed January 16, 2004
14. Order denying appeal to Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals dated August 10, 2004
15. Order denying Appellant's Motion to Vacate order granting of summary judgment dated January 11, 2007
16. Order denying Appellant's Motion for Relief from Judgment granting summary judgment dated September 13, 2011
17. Appellant's second PCR application filed March 3, 2010 (2010-CP-10-1709)
18. Respondent's Return and Motion to Dismiss Appellant's second PCR applicant dated June 24, 2010
19. Conditional Order of Dismissal of Appellant's second PCR filed July 6, 2010
20. Appellant's Response to signed Conditional Order of Dismissal filed August 6, 2010
21. Final Order of Dismissal of Appellant's second PCR filed November 12, 2010
22. Respondent's Return and Motion to Dismiss Appellant's habeas petition dated October 20, 2011
23. Appellant's Response to signed Conditional Order of Dismissal filed December 5, 2011
24. Order from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals dismissing and denying certificate of appealability dated February 28, 2012
25. Notice of Appeal initiating appeal from state habeas petition dated January 13, 2012
26. Appellant's Written Explanation pursuant to Rule 203(d)(1)(B)(vi) in appeal of state habeas petition dated January 13, 2012
27. Order dismissing appeal of denial of Appellant's state habeas petition filed April 9, 2012
28. Remittitur issued on August 21, 2012
29. Order recalling August 21, 2012 Remittitur filed August 24, 2012
30. Order denying Appellant's Petition for Rehearing dated July 20, 2012
31. Order denying Appellant's Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court filed August 21, 2012

32. Remittitur issued on October 9, 2012 concluding appeal of Appellant's state habeas petition
33. Notice of Appeal initiating present appeal

III.

In view of the foregoing, the Respondent respectfully requests this Court compel the Appellant to amend the Record on Appeal to include the matters designated for inclusion by the Respondent. The Respondent also asks this Court to hold in abeyance the filing of the Respondent Final Brief until the Respondent has been served an amended copy of the Record on Appeal.

IV.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully requested that this motion be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

ALAN WILSON  
Attorney General

ASHLEIGH R. WILSON  
Assistant Attorney General  
S.C. Bar # 100269

P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, S.C. 29211  
(803) 734-3737

By:



---

**Attorney for the Respondent**  
Columbia, South Carolina  
July 25, 2014

Respectfully Submitted,

151 *Larry G. Harvin*

Larry G. Harvin

Prisoner I.D. No. 253468

M.C.I. F.1-125.B

386 Redemption Way

McCormick, SC 29849

1 - 5 - 15

DATE

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Charleston  
County Common Pleas Court  
Kristi L. Harrington, Circuit  
Court Judge  
Appellate Case No. 2013-000692

RECEIVED

JAN 08 2015

Larry G. Harvin,

Appellant,

SC Court of Appeals

V.


State of South Carolina,


Respondent.

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

I Certify and Declare before below-signed Notary Public that, while forwarding an Original Draft of my 'Petition For Rehearing' and 'ATTACHMENTS' to Clerk of S.C. Court of Appeals, I've also served a true & exact copy of 'Petition...' on opposing counsel [Ashleigh R. Wilson, Asst. Atty. Gen., S.C., P.O. Box 11549, Columbia, SC 29211] by depositing both sets of documents into the custody of the M.C.I. Mail Room Clerk (below-signed Notary Public) for immediate submission of same into the U.S. Postal System with sufficient Postage attached.

Sworn and Subscribed to  
before me this 05  
day of Jan, 2015

1/5/15   
Larry G. Harvin  
Prisoner I.D. No.: 253468  
M.C.I. F-1-125-B  
386 Redemption Way  
McCormick, SC 29899

1/5/15   
Notary Public, South Carolina  
\* My Commission Expires: 12-16-2019

Larry G. Harvin  
Prisoner I.D. No. 253468

McCormick Correctional Institute  
386 Redemption Way  
McCormick, SC 29899

**RECEIVED**

JAN 08 2015

**SC Court of Appeals**

Attn: Clerk, S.C. Court of Appeals  
P.O. Box  
Columbia, SC

LEGAL  
MAIL

McCORMACK CORRECTIONAL INST  
S.O. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS HAS NOT  
INSPECTED OR RECORDED THIS MAIL THEREFORE  
THE DEPARTMENT DOES NOT ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY  
FOR ITS CONTENTS.

RECEIVED  
JAN 05 2015  
MCCI  
MAIL ROOM