

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

June 23, 2016

Mr. George Cleveland, III, #357770
Turbeville Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 252
Turbeville SC 29162

Re: George Cleveland, III v. Greenville Co. Sheriff's Office
Appellate Case No. 2016-000498
Lower Court Case No. 2014CP2305661

Dear Mr. Cleveland:

Enclosed is an order that has been issued in response to your letters dated April 6 and April 11, 2016.

I note that a copy of the petition for writ of certiorari and appendix in *Cleveland v. SCDC*, Appellate Case No. 2016-000701,¹ had mistakenly been filed in this case. Those documents have now been removed from this case. Therefore, the reference to a petition for a writ of certiorari in my letter of April 1, 2016, was in error.

Very truly yours,

CLERK

cc: Charles Franklin Turner, Jr., Esquire
Anne Ross Culbreath, Esquire
The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings

¹ This case was Appellate Case Number 2015-000957 before the South Carolina Court of Appeals.

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

George Cleveland, III, Petitioner,

v.


Greenville County Sherriff's Office, Respondent.


Appellate Case No. 2016-000498

Lower Court Case No. 2014CP2305661

ORDER

The South Carolina Court of Appeals sent the remittitur in this case on March 28, 2016.¹ The sending of the remittitur ended appellate jurisdiction over this case. *Wise v. S.C. Dept. of Corr.*, 372 S.C. 173, 642 S.E.2d 551 (2007). Therefore, no action will be taken on the motions that have been filed with this Court.²





FOR THE COURT

C.J.

cc: Charles Franklin Turner, Jr., Esquire
Anne Ross Culbreath, Esquire
Mr. George Cleveland, III
The Honorable Paul B. Wickensimer
The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Esquire

¹ Before the Court of Appeals, the Appellate Case Number was 2015-000697.

² In letters dated April 6 and April 11, 2016, petitioner argues that the Court of Appeals erred in sending the remittitur. If there is any basis to recall the remittitur, that was a matter that petitioner should have raised by timely motion to the Court of Appeals.