




I attempted by all means to have otherwise obtained representation by the Division of Appellate Defense, South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense. If the Division of Appellate Defense should have represented me, then the Division of Appellate Defense should have taken the appropriate actions so to have ordered the transcripts, etc... or so I was informed by the Division of Appellate Defense.

I received further correspondence from the Division of Appellate Defense on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2012 via a letter dated 6<sup>th</sup> September 2012. The letter stated an erroneous conclusion insofar as the Chief attorney's belief that a civil appeal was taken from a magistrate's court and the Division of Appellate Defense was therefore unable to have assisted me. The appeal was taken from a post-conviction relief case (a civil action), but was taken from the Court of Common Pleas for Charleston County. The appeal was not taken from a magistrate's court, and the Division of Appellate Defense may have represented me evidently.

I have respectfully asserted that the Order of 5<sup>th</sup> September 2012, which dismissed this matter, was unconstitutional insofar as the due process and/or equal protection clauses of the federal Constitution for reasons above.

What I have said herein was true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

17<sup>th</sup> September 2012

  
Donald J. Hurlbert  
2704 Country Ln.  
Erie, PA 16506  
814-602-7469  
*Pro Se*

**RECEIVED**

SEP 24 2012

S.C. SUPREME COURT