

- Cover Letter -

January 15, 2016

Daniel E. Shearouse Clerk  
P.O. Box 11330  
Columbia, S.C. 29211

Re: Appellate Case No. 2015-001026, and Rule 204 SCAR,  
The Supreme Court's jurisdiction.

Honorable Mr. Shearouse,

Because of unusual circumstances which have prevailed in this case, as above, and because the circumstances involve "an issue of significant public interest or a legal principle of major importance", the enclosed motion is an extension to the relevancy of the phrase just quoted.

Thereby, can you please review the enclosed motion for the purpose of determining its proper application?

Thank you Sincerely



**RECEIVED**

JAN 19 2016

S.C. SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

The State, Respondent

v.

Ronald Lee Legg, Appellant

Motion For Extended  
Review From Rule 204  
SCACR

Appellate Case No. 2015-001026

**RECEIVED**

JAN 19 2016

**S.C. SUPREME COURT**

The Supreme Court of South Carolina has adopted my case, Appellate No. 2015-001026 citing Rule 204 SCACR, "Case involves an issue of significant public interest or a legal principle of major importance." Thereby, transferring jurisdiction over to the Supreme Court.

Because of a statute involved in my case, § 17-23-175, from which the Higher Courts have historically called into question its application by the State for improperly expanding the prosecution's operation, the Court's have continuously admonished the lower Court's for various rules and due process violations over the statute. Thereby, the issue most certainly is timely for the Supreme Court to resolutely address this issue specifically because of certain relevant elements and principles contained within my case.

Because of the complex nature of my case, I feel that my Appellate counsel Robert Dudek does not fully appreciate these important elements and principles I represent, and therefore, I fear an important opportunity may be missed by the Supreme Court.

Most importantly, there has been an obvious arbitrary and capricious exercise over the application of said statute in my case, which I believe continues to elude description. And I feel Appellate Counsel's argument is vague and does not respect the case's real potential for more concrete resoluteness. There is more available objective information which I feel the Supreme Court should have the privilege of entertaining for the purpose of making a more importunate conclusion over the matter.

I am fully aware of the uniqueness of law science, that first considers my prejudicial position, regardless, a passion also unique, arises when a person's life and principle of innocence is on the line, and certain advantages of studious participation should not be discounted, from which, I am sure is not an alien concept for efficacious opportunities before this Court.

This is not to say that I do not respect or appreciate the method or practice for which Appellate Counsel Dudek employs. However, circumstances have prevailed which does not change the fact that I have something to offer the Court, as I have studied the case for two years and have written a treatise which I feel is necessary applicable criterion this Court should have privilege to, from which Appellate Dudek has declined to review.

Secondarily, my case has involved an extrinsic fraud conspiracy in suppression of evidence from which the treatise I have written bring to light, which inevitably shows what previously intruded upon this Court's opportunity to perceive more fully the circumstances surrounding the issue this Court may not know without the treatise I have written. As such a conspiracy is established on trial transcript minus the suppressions, but certain by the nature of the whole case.

The material evidence I have established in the treatise I have written, is asserted by me to be of the relevant

portion which at present is not available to this Court, but due to the merits in the treatise, if the Supreme Court does not have the privilege to review it, a sure injustice to the course of jurisprudence would prevail over the Court's analysis of the case.

I would like to know if I could file a pro se addition to the direct appeal? I have not had any participation in the appeal as it will be presented to this Court, as it presently stands. And this has not been from any decision on my part.

My proposition, is as a request for a neutral-associate justice to review a 100 page treatise. I have written on the case, to assess the treatise's viability. And because the subject matter is defense privilege, I am therefore cautious about sharing this information, howbeit, if the Supreme Court were to deem the relevancy significant, I would not hesitate for the treatise to become part of the argument.

Because of the institutional policy here at Evans where I am housed, they will not make copies of hand written legal papers by inmates even though inmates are willing to pay the cost. Under such a circumstance, I would request the Clerk of Court make a complete copy of the treatise and return it to me. I am indigent and cannot pay the cost at this time. Can the clerk return a clock stamped copy?

I am informed by Robert Dudek that this case is scheduled to be heard around Feb. 9, 2016. As a result of this treatise, if a minor delay was resultant, I would not disagree with that decision.

With warm, personal regards, I am,  
Sincerely,  
January 15, 2016

