

# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Michael E. Hamm, Petitioner,

v.

State of South Carolina, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2016-001052

Lower Court Case No. 2013CP1801859

---

## ORDER

---

This matter is hereby reinstated. Any *pro se* response under *Dennison v. State*<sup>1</sup> shall be filed within twenty (20) days of the date of this order.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John G. Heise", written over a horizontal line.

C.J.

FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

July 13, 2016

cc: Rodney Duane Davis, Esquire  
James Clayton Mitchell, III, Esquire  
Mr. Michael Hamm (with copy of counsel's letter dated June 29, 2016)

---

<sup>1</sup> 371 S.C. 221, 639 S.E.2d 35 (2006) ("[I]f counsel does not have a good faith explanation to provide pursuant to Rule [243(c), of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules], counsel shall provide the Court with a letter stating that as an officer of the Court, counsel is unable set forth any arguable basis for asserting the determination by the PCR judge that the PCR application was successive and barred by the statute of limitations was improper. Counsel shall further advise the petitioner by copy of the letter that the petitioner should notify the Court, no later than twenty (20) days from the date of the letter, of any arguable basis the petitioner may wish to assert that the determination that the PCR application was successive and barred by the limitations was improper.").