1-16-15

Dear,

Honourable Jean Toal,

I am Writing to you In Reguard Concern I have with my Appellate Defender, SUSAN B. Hackett. First I would like to start by Saying I have tried to work with Mrs. Hackett. But she just Refuses to Listen to my Concerns, or address certain Arguements In my Appeal that I feel has very favorable merits on my case, I've written to her on several occassion Asking her to address my Concern Issues. Mrs. Hackett Constantly Refuses to do as I ask of her, but jumps to UnReasonable Conclusion As to what happen in my case. Without Even researching what I have requested to see if I'm Correct on What I'm Asking. But Instead She fight me every opportunity She gets when it comes to my case, only to retract her statement when I point-out the obvious which her correspondence letters will Reflect. I enclose my First, and Second letters, each-one dated dressing my concerns to Mrs. Hackett. Also I wrote Judge John Few of the Court of Appeals, About this Issue since he had sent Mrs. Hackett an (order) of the Court to Recite my (brief) And address All arguable merit issues. I enclosed a copy of that order also which she had still Refuse to do but Instead Resubmitted the same one Issue She had already Rejected, and Argue back into the Court. I Informed (Judge Few) of this matter But he, has Yet to Respond, So I filed a motion In the Court of Appeals for Dismissal of Counselor on (5-12-14) because She has been Ineffective In Assisting me; And I feel She doesn't have my best Interest at hands here also are the (Issues) I Informed (Mrs. Hackett

All were presented to the court by my Trial Attorney. Wrongful Arrest, Illegal Search, and Seizure of (Tainted) Evidence, and Wrongful Identity. This is all I'm asking for is a fair shot at my Appeal, I'm not asking for any Special treatment just Due-process which I've already been denied once, through Trial proceeding. So please I'm asking that this matter be looked into as well as I be having the opportunity to address my issues, As the Court requested. So your help in this matter will truely be deeply greatful as well as truely appreciate also I thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to address my concerns, and issues. About my Attorney conduct and actions which are clearly reflected in her correspondence letters forwarded me. only to retract her statements in a second corresponding letter to me as being right in what I was stating, and pleading to her. once again I thank you for your time Mrs. Neal.

Sincerely,

Christopher Hipp

Dated: 1-16-15

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

The State, Respondent

v.

Christopher Shippy, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2011-197607

ORDER

Counsel has submitted a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and a motion to be relieved as counsel. We deny the motion to be relieved as counsel and direct the parties to brief the following issues and any other issues of arguable merit:

> Did the trial court err in admitting Rita Chapman's in-court identification of Shippy? In addition to issues regarding suggestiveness and reliability, the parties should address whether the State's action of showing a photo of Shippy to Chapman immediately before trial constituted an "identification procedure?"

Appellant shall serve and file a brief on this issue within thirty days of the date of this order. Thereafter, respondent shall have thirty days to serve and file its brief.

FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

cc: Susan Barber Hackett
Salley W. Elliott

Wrongful Arrest

The Law Enforcement of Spartanburg Public Saftey Department subjecting the appellant to a wrongful arrest. When they failed to establish probable/reasonable cause for arrest. When the appellant did not fit the discription of suspect at time of arrest under Title 17-13-50 section (A)(B) State v. Frazier 394 S.C. 213, 715 S.E. 2d 650, S.C. App 201 (No.4818) 35K.63 . 4(1) grounds for warrants of arrest is whether probable cause existed to make the arrest U.S.C.A. Const. Amend 4 Also State v. Bell 263 S.C. 239, 209 S.E. 2d 870,S.C. Nov 1974 (NO.19907) Spartanburg Publice Saftey Law Enforcement Officers alleged that there was a eye witness that seen appellant comitting the allege crime also a second eye witness that supposively seen the appellant fitting the same discription which the first eye witness had given the law enforcement officers. But they failed to use either witness to testify appellant as the actual suspect. When he was detained since he was not wearing the clothing of the suspect in questioning. 397 U.S. 358; In the matter of Samuel Winship App. No. 788. Coffin v. U.S. , supra 156 U.S. at 453, 15 S.Ct. at 403 section (4)(5)(6). The arrest by law enforcement officers was basis to the point of singled out the appellant. When their was no evidence or eye witness to place him at the scene of the crime. See Mapp v. Ohio U.S. -S.C. (1961) Also Jones, 343 S.C. at 574-76, 541 S.E.2d.at 819 -20. Which shows Officer Boggs, profiled appellant, when she stated she knew him personally. Tr.313 Ln 12. State v. Gonzales 360 S.C. 263, 600 S.E. 2d. 122 S.C. App 2007. Which establish a illegal arrest and violation of Miranda Rule. Miranda v Arizona 1966 U.S. S.Ct. On behalf of the Spartanburg Public

Saftey Department When they failed to advise appellant of certain appellant rights he had See: Albright v. Oliver (1959)4th Amend Right State v. Roderiquezz 323 S.C. 484, 476 S.E. 2d.161 S.C. App 1996 Aug 1996 section (3)(4) in determining whether an enforcement official and citizen constitutes a (seizure) and thereby implicates 4th Amend protection the correct inquiry is whether, considering all of the circumstances surrounding the encounter, a reasonable person would have believed he was free to leave. Mendenhall, 446 U.S. at 545, 100 S.Ct at 1872-73 Id at 544, 100 S.Ct. at 1877. Oqburn-Matthes v. Loblotty Partners (Rice Fields) subdivision S.C. App.1994 332 S.C. 551, 505 S.E. 2d. 598. Which shows that the appellate was indeed subjected to constitutional trial proceeding When,

Admissible Evidence

The State , claim was they presented at Trial (two) kinds of evid -ence "Direct Evidence and Circumstantial Evidence (tr.261 Ln 23-25) The first was direct evidence , being Rita Chapman as alleged eye witness of the crime being commited by appellant (Tr.262 Ln 4 -7) Yet her statement was extremely vague as to the identificat- of appellant stating ,she saw a black male, giving no other details of significance. This Direct Evidence of the State is "Passion Fruit" since the evidence (shirt) that was shown to the witness "Rita Chapman" was tainted because it was illegally seized by law enforcement officers, without a search warrant (Tr. 37 Ln 12-20) at the beginning of the investigation and arrest in order to try and establish probable cause. (Tr. 38 Ln 12-25) (Tr.41 Ln 2-5). The State , waited to at least a year, or more before calling upon "Rita Chapman" as their (States) eye witness, after (DNA) analysis results was not a match for appellant. Second, the Trial Court established at pre-trial that appellant was never identified by anyone (Tr. 40 Ln 12-18) which should have been enough to dismiss. Third, the Solisitor showed key witness " Rita Chapman " A single photo of appellant only hours before trial begin. (Tr. 47 Ln 15-17) utlizing tainted and inadmissible evidence as " direct evidence" That should have been excluded from trial (Tr.51 Ln. 15-25) Tr. 39 Ln 13-15) The Trial Court Erred in allowing pro secution to present photographs of scene, implicating blood, and photo of appellant wearing different clothing from that which wit ness described. Which was inadmissible evidence " Used in order to persude the jury virdect. This is based on The States actions of dismisssing (DNA) results and originial warrants of arrest at the preliminary hearing. Only to destory warrants was bias, and prejudice; See: State v. Singleton (S.C. 1995) 219 S.C. 312, 460 S.E. 2d. 573. Only To rewrite Void Warrants to indict upon without

probable cause or just merits . The credibility of (SLED) DNA Analysis of no match of human blood, or fingerprints of appellant ,which was the sole basis for the arrest through law enforcement officer " Melissa Buggs" investigative report. No other physical evidence was seized, or presented to link appellant to the crime. This "direct evidence" of The State's own action to how the inves -tigation and Trial proceedings was handled. The State claim " that circumstantial evidence" (Tr. 261 Ln. 23-25) Also being " Rita Chapman" as the key witness of the crimes" Jeff Tillerson" being a witness that seen appellant a few (mins) later after " Rita Chapman" discription was given out by dispatch(Tr.263 Ln. 7-14) This to was admissible evidence" , being law enforcement officers refused to utilize either witness before, or during investigation of appellant when he was being detained against his will for questioning. Thus Violating APPELLANT (4th Amend Right) Albright v. Oliver (1995) See also State v. Rodriquez 323 S.C. 484, 476 S.E.2d. 161 S.C. App. 1996. Mendenhall, 446 U.S. at 545, 100 S.Ct. at 1872-73. Id. at 554, 100S.Ct. at 1877. When He "the appellant" did not fit or meet the discription of the suspect in question, nor after the arrest did law enforcement use either wit -ness to make a actual positive id (PID) of the appellant as being the person either one had seen. Which is enough to discredit "cricumstantial evidence", which is not a actual facts, being " Rita Chapman statement was extremely vague in identification and " Jeff Tillerson " never stated or testified that he saw or had seen appellant committing the allege crime, nor seen appellant fleeing the scene of the allege crime, Which is basically hearsay being The State never established a foundation of circumstantial evidence. The State abused its authority, by placing a witness on

" " the stand " before hand , while already having knowledge of (DNA) results to testify to the facts that the appellant was bleeding "Profusely" (Tr. of Ruth Young testimony) (Tr.116 Ln. 1-10 and Tr. 167 Ln. 1-8) " Jeff Tillerson " (Tr. 175 Ln. 17-18 and Ln. 23 Tr. 185 Ln. 7,11,and 26) Officer Melissa Boggs " (Tr. 223 Ln. 18,25, Tr. 225 Ln. 3,9 Tr. 228 Ln.1-2) Yet The "State" never once mention in law enforcement investigation incident report, or doing " Trial " that appellant recieved any type of medical atten -tion , nor the "true fact" that there wasn't any actual blood finding, due to (DNA) results which shows the conduct of the pro-secutor leading the witness to testify to "fabricated evidence" to persude the juriors.

First Letter

Mrs. Hackett, 7-8-14

I informed you awhile back about the (DNA) And you told me that they dis-miss that issue; because it was irrelevant. But it was revelent, and still is. You see Mrs. Hackett based upon officer Melissa Boggs, and Jeff Tillerson testimony as well as the solicitor Arguement for the State; was All based upon (DNA) Blood. Listen, first (officer Boggs) claim through a sworn affidavit to the magerstate court to obtain A warrant for my Arrest base upon her claim that I had blood, cuts on both my hands, and Arms which supposibly was consistent with the Air Conditioning unit that was Vandalize had blood on it. See (Te. pg. 227 Ln. 22 over to pg. 228 Ln. 1-4) The state called witness Jeff Tillerson a city official to the stand to testify to the same claim (See; Te. pg. 175 Ln. 23-25 Also pg. 185 Ln. 7-11, and 22-25 over to pg. 186 Ln. 1-4) All based upon blood (DNA) This was the state claim through the whole trial, also in the solicitor closing Arguement see, (Te. pg. 264 Ln. 8-25 over to pg. 265 Ln. 1-25) In stating All this, lets go back a second (ok) officer Boggs was able to obtain a warrant for my Arrest solely on basis of (DNA) but at preliminary (see; Te. pg. 10 Ln. 2-11) SLED Analysis Revealed that there was no human blood to match against mines, no finger prints, nothing. In him stating this on "Record" discredit their claim as well as merits for Arrest, Also the Warrant officer Boggs obtain. Her testimony Dis-puted, and dis-credit the nature of the warrant as well as the substance within the body of it's Entirety which made it ~~Void~~, of no-Affect. With-out blood the warrant was

useless because this is what they based their sole arrest upon. So the arrest wasn't legal, and not valid, Now the original warrant was Grand-Larcey, and malicious Injury to property (one) Charge. Now based upon Ste'D testimony, and Evidence the warrant is no-longer any good. But they took that same dead warrant and split the one charge Into (two) and got (two) direct Indictments which are also Invalid because there's no valid warrant to support the Indictment I have been subjected to A Illegal Arrest, A unconstitutional Trial Proceeding All because I was profiled for a crime I didn't Comitt. And the Evidence is overwhelming In my Favor, You tell me, You ~~Are~~ here to help me then please help me Mrs. Hackett. Listen from the very start they profiled me, and rail Read me they Illegally Arrest me when I never fitted the profile of the suspect. They lied to obtain a warrant for my arrest stating I was bleeding "Profusely" But there is never no mention of me receiving medical Attention. Are a band-Aid, or stiches are them taking precaution as to puting on gloves are Anything of that nature. And then there's the Indictments themselves which are no-good because there's no "June" Court In the 7th Circut general session. I never got arriegment on the Indictment which was a direct violation of my Constitutional Rights. The Illegal search, and seizure of my home, the Solicitor Showing a witness a single photo of me the day ~~of~~ of my trail. The Judge Refusing to let the Indictments go back to the Jury So that they could review them In it's Entirety (See Tr. Pg. 14/24-16) knowing that they were legal documents, as well as part of Evidence. That's why they didn't Kno What Grand-Larcey was

7-5-14

(See; Tr. pg. 300 Ln. 16-25 over to pg. 301 Ln. 1-15) This malicious conduct of the court is un ethical as well as unconstitutional, and everything I'm saying to you mrs. Hackett is truely revelant. And of importance to me that's why I asked you to do a rebrief. I have A loving family a mother, and father a wife, and children as well as grandchildren who miss me, and want me home. And have stood by me from the beginning of my trial, and All we are asking for is fairness, and justice. Mrs. Hackett Everything I'm claiming is in this transcript I'm not making this stuff up it's all in there if you truely willing to look, and help me as you stated to me. And I pray to god that you really do mean to help because I am totally in need of help in this matter.

Sincerely,

First Response

(1)

SCCID

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON INDIGENT DEFENSE

Division of Appellate Defense
1330 Lady Street, Suite 401
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-3332
Post Office Box 11589
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1589
Telephone: (803) 734-1330
Facsimile: (803) 734-1397

Robert M. Dudek, Chief Appellate Defender
Wanda H. Carter, Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

January 15, 2014

Mr. Christopher Jerome Shippy, #222423
Kershaw Correctional Institution
Oak-B-Room 53
4848 Gold Mine Highway
Kershaw, SC 29067-8069

Re: Your case

Dear Mr. Shippy:

I received your undated letter stamped received by my office on January 15, 2014. In the letter, you want me to include the lack of DNA and fingerprints presented by the prosecution to support our argument on the identification issue. I filed the brief of appellant on January 6, 2014. My recollection of the transcript is that the red substance on the AC unit was not blood; therefore, there was no DNA to match. Also, the officer testified to recovering no fingerprints from the unit. The Court has the entire trial transcript and will be able to review those portions of the transcript when reviewing the issues we presented. (Prec) → Although those are facts that weigh in favor of your innocence, those facts do not concern whether the witness's identification was reliable or whether the identification procedure used was suggestive. As a result, I did not highlight those facts in the brief.

Sincerely,

Susan B. Hackett

Susan B. Hackett
Appellate Defender

SBH/

First Response

(2)

SCCID

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON INDIGENT DEFENSE

Division of Appellate Defense
1330 Lady Street, Suite 401
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-3332
Post Office Box 11589
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1589
Telephone: (803) 734-1330
Facsimile: (803) 734-1397

Robert M. Dudek, Chief Appellate Defender
Wanda H. Carter, Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

July 15, 2014

Mr. Christopher Jerome Shippy, #222423
Kershaw Correctional Institution
4848 Gold Mine Highway
Kershaw, SC 29067-8069

Dear Mr. Shippy:

I received your letter dated July 8, 2014. Your letter makes reference to blood and DNA. I addressed the matter of blood/DNA on the AC unit in my January 15, 2014 correspondence. I stand by that letter. ~~Your most recent correspondence talks about how the officers relied upon blood. "What do you want me to do with that?"~~ There was no ~~challenge to the probable cause to arrest you based on the cuts on your arms being consistent with blood on the AC unit.~~ The motion concerning probable cause found at page 41 of the transcript dealt with the witness's identification of you. The entire argument was based upon the shirt. In fact, the arrest warrant was not even made an exhibit at your trial to be used for the record on appeal.

I have addressed the indictment issue recently. Concerning the illegal search of your home, the judge excluded the shirt that was recovered during the search.

Sincerely,

Susan B. Hackett

Susan B. Hackett
Appellate Defender

Second Response

8-12-14

Mrs. Hackett,

You Address some of my issues on to different occasion one dated July 15- And again July 28. On the 15th you stated In your letter that the Entire Argument was based on the Shirt. But it was (three) Motions (Tr. pg. 33) starting at 16 25 First motion was to suppress the Shirt, that was seized illegally from lack of A Search warrant. Second out of Court identification, and Third Illegal Arrest. I beg the different on (pg. 41 of Tr. starting at Ln. 6) the Judge ask Are we challenging the probable cause to Arrest, And my Lawyer inform the Court on Ln 10-12 of the third motion for attacking the illegal arrest. So Yes, there was a challenge, but as you see there is no mention of the Judge Ruling on the motion of probable cause. Yet he Ruled on Suppressing the (Shirt) (in pg. 40 Ln. 18-21) he also Ruled on the Identification by allowing my lawyer to question (mrs. Chapman) (Tr. pg. 42 Ln. 1-5) But it shows that the Court clearly over looked the fact that the "Solicitor" had already Implicated that (mrs. Chapman) made the out-of-Court Identification, when (HE) Stated "She" Identified me as the actual person wearing the (Shirt) Tr. pg. 39 Ln. 11 But when my lawyer mention his (third) motion challenging probable Cause. He only "States" okay (Tr. pg. 41 Ln. 13) So now you can clearly see that, it was not just a motion based entirely on the "Shirt," Mrs. Hackett. But a motion for out-of-Court Identification, as well as probable cause As I have pointed-out in the transcript itself. unless I'm Reading it Incorrectly. You also Stated In your letter dated July-(28-14) That there was no arrest warrant for that particular charge malicious Injury to property. But A direct Indictment, how can

This be when it's a magstrates charge alone. So If what you say In your letter Is true, then what probable cause did they have, and based on what value. Also what happen to the original charges for my arrest land me In jail. What; they just forgot about those charges and just went on to another charge without In forming or notifing me of these new indictments. So Are you telling me they drop the original charges, to pursue new ones. Please explain to me how after I was found not guilty for Grand-Larcey that I was still tried In General session for malicious Injury to property. when General session lost it's juridiction when I was found not guilty of felony Grand-Larcey. the charge for malicious Injury Itself should have been refered back to magstrates Court since there was nothing to "substain" the enhancement after I was found not guilty of Grand-Larcey. because If I didn't steal Anything, or take Away anything as the "Law" clearly states. Then how did I damage it without a probable cause of a value under Title § 22-3-710(2). I feel that these concerns, and ISSues That Im addressing you with are arguable merits with-In my case. Your help In these matters would be deeply greatful. So thank you for your time, and Effort God Bless.

Sincerely,

Second Response

(1)

SCCID
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON INDIGENT DEFENSE

Division of Appellate Defense
1330 Lady Street, Suite 401
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-3332
Post Office Box 11589
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1589
Telephone: (803) 734-1330
Facsimile: (803) 734-1397

Robert M. Dudek, Chief Appellate Defender
Wanda H. Carter, Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

July 28, 2014

Mr. Christopher Jerome Shippy, #222423
Kershaw Correctional Institution
4848 Gold Mine Highway
Kershaw, SC 29067-8069

Dear Mr. Shippy:

I received your letter dated July 24, 2014. Your letter asks that I provide you with copies of any and all documents or paperwork generated as a result of allegations or suspicion on the charges of grand larceny and malicious injury to real property leading to your arrest on the same. I am uncertain what documents you want. There is no discovery process during the appeal. I cannot ask the solicitor for your discovery. If you want the discovery that was released by the solicitor to your defense attorney, you should contact your trial lawyer. I do not have those materials.

Previously, I have provided you with a copy of the trial transcript, the Anders brief and Record on Appeal (which included the indictment for malicious injury to property), the Court of Appeals' order instructing me to file a Brief of Appellant, the Brief of Appellant, and the Brief of Respondent. In an effort to comply with your most recent letter, I am sending you the notice of appeal dated August 15, 2011, proof of service, and cover letter. I am also providing you with the sentence sheet.

Recd → " I do not have the arrest warrant in my file. I have no need for the arrest warrant because no objections were made at trial. There was no question posed by your lawyer concerning the lack of probable cause for arrest." The indictment for malicious injury to property states that it is a "direct indictment" meaning there was no arrest warrant for that particular charge. Instead, the police went to the grand jury and asked the grand jury to indict you.

Sincerely,

Susan B. Hackett

Susan B. Hackett
Appellate Defender

Second Response

SCCID
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON INDIGENT DEFENSE

Division of Appellate Defense
1330 Lady Street, Suite 401
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-3332
Post Office Box 11589
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1589
Telephone: (803) 734-1330
Facsimile: (803) 734-1397

Robert M. Dudek, Chief Appellate Defender
Wanda H. Carter, Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

August 18, 2014

Mr. Christopher Jerome Shippy, #222423
Kershaw Correctional Institution
4848 Gold Mine Highway
Kershaw, SC 29067-8069

Dear Mr. Shippy:

Recd → I received your letter dated August 12, 2014. Your lawyer did say on page 41 that she was challenging probable cause for the arrest. As your letter admits, there is no ruling on the motion about probable cause. Therefore, at a minimum, this issue is not preserved for appellate review because there is no ruling – this is required for preservation. **The issue must be raised to and ruled upon by the judge.** Additionally, it appears to me that your lawyer abandoned the issue by not arguing the motion after the in camera testimony. The argument appears only to cover the identification. This is what I meant by your lawyer did not raise the issue. After one sentence, it does not appear in the transcript again.

You have asked a series of questions about your arrest and what happened to other charges. I have no knowledge of other charges, and I have not been appointed to represent you on those. I have no need to make inquiries of those. I have explained the direct indictment process in my previous letter. Your question about a formal notification sounds like an arraignment question. We are way past that. If you wanted to be arraigned, you needed to discuss that with your trial attorney.

You asked about the General Sessions Court losing jurisdiction over the malicious injury charge when you were found not guilty of grand larceny. That is not how it works. The General Sessions had concurrent jurisdiction over the malicious injury charge. See S.C. Const. Art. V, § 11; S.C. Code Ann. § 22-3-540. When there is concurrent jurisdiction, the solicitor picks where to try the case. S.C. Code Ann. § 14-9-230.

You appear to be making an argument about inconsistent verdicts when you say that you could not have been convicted of damaging the item if you had been found not guilty of grand larceny. South Carolina no longer recognizes the Rule prohibiting inconsistent verdicts. See State v. Alexander, 303 S.C. 377, 401 S.E.2d 146 (1991).

Second Response

I trust this letter answers your questions. The brief has been filed in your case and we are waiting on a decision from the Court. Please bear in mind that we may not amend your brief – we have discussed this point previously.

Sincerely,

Susan B. Hackett

Susan B. Hackett
Appellate Defender

Second Response

SCCID
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON INDIGENT DEFENSE

Division of Appellate Defense
1330 Lady Street, Suite 401
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-3332
Post Office Box 11589
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1589
Telephone: (803) 734-1330
Facsimile: (803) 734-1397

Robert M. Dudek, Chief Appellate Defender
Wanda H. Carter, Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

July 11, 2014

Mr. Christopher Jerome Shippy, #222423
Kershaw Correctional Institution
4848 Gold Mine Highway
Kershaw, SC 29067-8069

Dear Mr. Shippy:

I received your letter dated July 2, 2014. Your letter makes reference to the fourth, fifth, and fourteenth amendments and then says "See S.C. Const." There are no such amendments to the S.C. Constitution. Perhaps you mean the U.S. Constitution. Your letter says that you do not have "two priors of the same charges as the law clearly states I must have to fall into this criteria." According to the transcript on page 307, the state presented two convictions to qualify – both were for larceny. You did not object to the priors, see page 308 of the transcript. Therefore, any issues related to this are not preserved for review.

Your issues concerning what your trial attorney did or did not do are PCR issues and not proper for direct appeal. I see no evidence of the grand jury convening outside of the statute in your case. I have read your letter concerning "invalid proceedings on void indictment." I simply do not understand your allegation. The grand jury returned a true bill indictment against you. I am familiar with the statutes conferring terms of court. I am also familiar with the statutes permitting special sessions of circuit courts. The Supreme Court, through Court Administration, designated a term of court for General Sessions in June 2010.

Read High Life

I trust this answers your questions.

Sincerely,

Susan B. Hackett

Susan B. Hackett
Appellate Defender

To,

Mrs. Roselan Fraison,

I would like to Request A copy of the Court Docketh of the 7th Circut Court for The Month of June, 2010; for the Court of General Session In the County of Spartanburg S.C. your help In this matter Is truely - greetful and deeply Appreciative.

Sincerely,

Dated: 5-30-14

Second Response

(2)

South Carolina Court Administration

South Carolina Supreme Court

Columbia, South Carolina

1015 SUMTER STREET, SUITE 200
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201

September 2, 2014

Christopher J. Shippy #222423
Kershaw Correctional Institution
Hickory-B-Rm 274
4848 Goldmine Hwy
Kershaw, SC 29067

Dear Mr. Shippy:

This letter is in response to your letter received on June 4, 2014 by this office.

Court Administration cannot assist you with your request because this office does not maintain or have ready access to the records you have requested.

Sincerely,
Court Services Section

P.S. This letter was about me requesting a copy of the docketts for the Grand Jury convening in the month of June of the 7th circuit court to review indictments. I found no supreme court Judge who ever seen this jury nor did Mrs. Hackett produce any document, or proof when I asked her. as well as the letter I sent to the federal court in Spartanburg S.C. as to reference to there so-call new indictments.

Jean Toal

ice of the Supreme Court

urt Bldg., 1231 Gervais St.

Columbia, S.C.

29211