

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE APPELLATE COURT

APPEAL FROM GREENVILLE COUNTY
COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

RECEIVED

FEB 08 2017

R. KEITH KELLY, CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

SC COURT OF APPEALS

CASE NO. B287896; B287940; B287941;
B350004; B352028;

THE STATE
v.
ROBERT CAMPBELL

RESPONDENT.
APPELLANT.

[MOTION]

REQUEST TO HAVE THIS [UNCONSTITUTIONAL]
[GUILTY PLED] TAKING BACK. SEE COURT DOCUMENTS FOR EVIDENCE.

For S.C. Court of Appeal Records.

SEE AND REVIEW GENERAL SESSION COURT DOCUMENTS

RECEIVED

FEB 08 2017

SC Court of Appeals

Attachment;

[2] Pages of [The order of Commitment] - Dated -
September 27, 1985 NOTE: This Court order -
HAS NOT BEING FOR FILLED AS STATED BY THE COURT?

[11] Pages of The [DECEMBER 19, 2001 P.C.R. HEARING].

→ ATTENTION: REVIEW PAGES [5 AND 6]. THESE'S PAGES
IS WHERE THE COURT KNOW'S AND TALKED ABOUT ME
BEING ON MEDICATION BEFORE AND AFTER BEING -
IN PRISON. PAGE # 6 ALL SO STATES HOW I PLED
Guilty to charges i didnot commit. ———

STATEMENT FOR RECORD;

WHEN I WENT TO COURT IN FEB. OF 1986. THE [STATE] -
DONE HAD ME ON [4 TO 5] DIFFERENT KINDS OF NO NAMES
[UNEXPERIMENT MEDICATION].

AND THIS MATTER ALL SO STOP ME FROM FILING MY FIRST P.C.R. -
APPLICATION ON TIME. THIS IS WHY [ALL] S.C. COURTS IS DENIED
ME. THE COURT SAID. IT'S A UNTIMELY FILE. OR A VIOLATION OF THE
S.C. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS. PLEASE REVIEW [ORDER OF COMMITMENT].
THIS COURT ORDER HAS NOT BEEN COMPLETED AS ORDER. SEE NUMBER 1 THOUGH

3. MY [MENTAL HEALTH DOCTOR] IN PRISON TELL ME. I NEED TO WRITE
TO THE COURT ABOUT THIS - THERE IS [NOTHING] IN MY
MEDICAL FILES ON THAT THE COURT ORDER HAD ORDER FOR THE
STATE TO COMPLETE ON ME. AT THAT SEPT. 27. 1985 HEARING.
THE [JUDGE] STATED: "IT APPEARS TO THE COURT THAT THE
ABOVE-NAME DEFENDANT, CHARGE WITH ROBBERY, ABHIAN, AR,
HB, AH AR, GL, CSC, MAY NOT BE FIT TO STAND TRIAL BECAUSE -
THE DEFENDANT LACKS THE CAPACITY TO UNDERSTAND THE
PROCEEDINGS AGAINST HIM AND TO ASSIST IN HIS OWN DEFENSE.
SEE [ORDER OF COMMITMENT] DATED - SEPT. 27. 1985.

THIS IS WHY I AM REQUESTING FOR THIS COURT TO
ALLOW ME TO TAKE BACK THIS UNCONSTITUTION
GUILTY PLED. SEE EVIDENCE OF GENERAL SESSIONS COURT
DOCUMENTS. WHEN THE TRUTH COMES OUT. IT WILL
SHOW AND PROVE THAT. I BEEN INNOCENCE TO ALOT OF -
THEM CHARGES.

DATE FILED 2/3/2017

ROBERT CAMPBELL

NOTE: HOW COULD THIS BE A SPEEDED APPEAL?.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF GREENVILLE)

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

The State,)

vs.)

ROBERT BERNARD CAMPBELL)

ORDER OF COMMITMENT

APR 15 4 48 PM '85
COURT

It appears to the Court that the above-named defendant, charged with ABHAN(2)/AR(3)/HB(1)/Att AR(1)/GL(1)CSC(2) ROBBERY(1), may not be fit to stand trial because the defendant lacks the capacity to understand the proceedings against him and to assist in his own defense.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the defendant be committed to the South Carolina Department of Mental Health for a psychiatric evaluation, pursuant to Section 44-23-410, Code of Laws of South Carolina.


IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that at the conclusion of the observation period today ordered, the designated examiners shall make a written report to the Court which shall include:

- Not done • (1) A diagnosis of the person's mental condition, and
- Not done • (2) Clinical findings bearing on the issues of whether or not the person is capable of understanding the proceedings against him and assisting in his own defense and if there is a substantial probability that he will attain that capacity in the foreseeable future.
- Not done • (3) A clinical examination of the person's mental capacity pursuant to the M'Naghten standard as to whether or not the person knew the difference between right and wrong on the date of the alleged offense, ^{3/17/85...4/5/85...4/13/85...} S, 4/17/85...5/25/85 .

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that subject to the provision of Section 44-23-410 the said defendant may be retained in the custody of the South Carolina Department of Mental Health for such period of time as is necessary to complete the examination.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if the designated examiners conclude that the defendant is mentally ill, the defendant shall be retained by the South Carolina Department of Mental Health until such time as the hearing, required and provided for by Section 44-23-430, may be conducted by this Court.


IT IS SO ORDERED.



Judge, Thirteenth Judicial Circuit


Greenville, South Carolina
September 27, 1985

I SO MOVE:



Attorney for the State

I CONSENT:



Attorney for the Defendant

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF GREENVILLE)

IN THE COURT OF
COMMON PLEAS

ROBERT CAMPBELL,)
)
APPLICANT,)

99-CP-23-982

-vs-

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)

DECEMBER 19, 2001
GREENVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA

B E F O R E:

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. KITTREDGE

A P P E A R A N C E S:

SYMMES CULBERTSON, Esquire
Attorney for the Applicant

WILLIAM BRYAN DUKES, Esquire
Assistant Attorney General

DAWN V. KOFFSKEY
Court Reporter

INDEX

	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
MOTION	3

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

NO EXHIBITS WERE ENTERED INTO EVIDENCE DURING THIS HEARING.

1 **THE COURT:** ALL RIGHT. THE NEXT MATTER IS ROBERT
2 CAMPBELL, WHO I BELIEVE IS PRESENT REPRESENTED BY MR.
3 CULBERTSON. AND I UNDERSTAND THAT THERE IS A MOTION THAT
4 NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED, AND IF THE MOTION IS DENIED, THEN WE
5 HAVE SOME ISSUES ON WHETHER OR NOT THE HEARING CAN GO FORWARD
6 TODAY.

7 AND IS THIS YOUR MOTION, MR. DUKES?

8 **MR. DUKES:** YES, YOUR HONOR.

9 **THE COURT:** IF YOU WOULD, GIVE ME SOME BACKGROUND,
10 BRING ME UP TO SPEED AND TELL ME WHAT YOUR MOTION IS, PLEASE,
11 SIR,

12 **MR. DUKES:** BASICALLY, THE FIRST MOTION IS A MOTION TO
13 DISMISS. IT WAS FILED JUNE 9TH OF 1999. BASICALLY IT IS A
14 STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS MOTION.

15 ON AUGUST THE 10TH OF 1999, JUDGE JOSEPH WATSON SIGNED A
16 CONDITIONAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL. THERE IS NOT A FINAL ORDER
17 ENTERED FROM THE CONDITIONAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL, SO, I
18 BELIEVE, THAT'S WHERE WE STAND RIGHT NOW. WE HAVE A
19 CONDITIONAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL, AND I ASSUME WE'RE GOING TO
20 HAVE REPLY TO THAT CONDITIONAL ORDER.

21 **THE COURT:** LET ME -- DID THE CONDITIONAL ORDER REQUIRE
22 THE APPLICANT TO RESPOND WITHIN A CERTAIN TIME PERIOD?

23 **MR. DUKES:** YES, SIR. USUALLY IT'S TWENTY DAYS. AND
24 IN THIS ONE IT WAS TWENTY DAYS FROM THE DAY OF SERVICE WHY
25 THIS ORDER SHOULD NOT BECOME FINAL. I BELIEVE I INCLUDED A

1 COPY OF THE CONDITIONAL ORDER.

2 THE COURT: WELL, COULD I HAVE THE PACKET? OR IS THIS
3 IT?

4 MR. DUKES: YES, SIR.

5 THE COURT: (REVIEWS FILE) I HAVE THE ORDER. IT WAS
6 SIGNED BY JUDGE WATSON ON AUGUST 10TH OF '99. SO APPARENTLY
7 HE WAS GRANTED TWENTY DAYS TO SHOW WHY THE ORDER SHOULD NOT
8 BECOME FINAL. APPARENTLY HE HAS FILED SOMETHING, AND THAT'S
9 WHY WE'RE HERE.

10 WHAT WAS THE RESPONSE OF MR. CAMPBELL TO THE CONDITIONAL
11 ORDER OF DISMISSAL THAT KEPT THIS CASE ALIVE?

12 MR. CULBERTSON: YOUR HONOR, I WAS SERVED A COPY OF THE
13 CONDITIONAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL, AND I WAS DOUBLE CHECKING TO
14 SEE EXACTLY WHEN IT WAS I WAS APPOINTED TO REPRESENT MR.
15 CAMPBELL ON HIS PCR. AND I APOLOGIZE TO THE COURT, I DON'T
16 KNOW THE EXACT DATE. MY FEELING IS, THOUGH, YOUR HONOR,
17 THERE HAS NOT BEEN A RESPONSE FILED THROUGH MY OFFICE IN
18 REGARDS TO THE CONDITIONAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL BECAUSE THERE'S
19 NOTHING -- THERE WAS NOTHING FORTHCOMING FROM MY OFFICE ABOUT
20 THAT. AND I CAN ONLY ASSUME IT HAD TO DO WITH THE TIME I WAS
21 APPOINTED AND THE TIME HE ACTUALLY HAD HIS FIRST HEARING.

22 YOUR HONOR, HE TAKES THE POSITION THAT HE JUST DIDN'T
23 KNOW THAT THERE WAS A TIME LIMIT. INITIALLY, HE DIDN'T KNOW
24 THERE WAS A TIME LIMIT WITH REGARD TO THE FILING OF HIS
25 APPLICATION FOR HIS PCR. I CANNOT ADEQUATELY SPEAK TO WHY HE

1 DID NOT FILE A RESPONSE TO THE CONDITIONAL ORDER.

2 THE COURT: OKAY. I GIVE YOU THE BENEFIT OF THAT. SO
3 APPARENTLY WE'RE JUST BACK TO A SITUATION WHERE THE STATE
4 CONTENTS THAT THE APPLICATION IN THE FIRST INSTANCE WAS NOT
5 FILED WITHIN THE STATUTORY PERIOD?

6 MR. CULBERTSON: YES, SIR.

7 MR. DUKES: YES, YOUR HONOR.

8 THE COURT: ASSUMING I OVERLOOK THE PRIOR ORDER AND
9 IGNORE THE TWENTY-DAY TIME PERIOD, I'D LIKE TO HEAR FROM YOU
10 IN RESPONSE TO THE SUBSTANCE OF THAT MOTION.

11 MR. CULBERTSON: WELL, YOUR HONOR, WHAT I CAN SPEAK TO
12 ABOUT THAT IS IT SOMEWHAT BLENDS INTO THE ISSUES THAT HE HAS
13 RAISED ON HIS PCR APPLICATION, AND THAT IS INEFFECTIVE
14 ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.

15 HE INFORMS ME, NUMBER ONE, THAT HE WAS NEVER NOTIFIED OF
16 ANY RIGHT HE HAD TO FILE AN APPEAL AFTER HIS CONVICTION BY
17 WAY OF GUILTY PLEA.

Start →

18 HE AT THE TIME OF HIS GUILTY PLEA, YOUR HONOR, WAS
19 UNDERGOING PSYCHIATRIC CARE. IN FACT, IT WAS ORDERED BY THE
20 COURT HE BE TESTED TO SEE IF HE WAS COMPETENT TO STAND TRIAL.
21 HE WAS GIVEN MEDICATION AT THAT TIME, WAS ON THAT MEDICATION
22 NOT ONLY AT THE TIME OF HIS PLEA BUT ALSO FOR SOME PERIOD OF
23 TIME AFTER HIS INCARCERATION. I WOULD ALLEGE THAT NOT ONLY
24 WAS HE NOT INFORMED AND DID NOT HAVE ANY KNOWLEDGE OF HIS
25 ABILITY TO FILE A PCR APPLICATION BUT ALSO THAT MEDICATION

MOTION

1 INFRINGED ON HIS ABILITY TO FIND OUT AND CHECK ON HIMSELF AND
2 SEE WHAT RIGHTS HE ACTUALLY HAD.

3 YOUR HONOR, THE PCR APPLICATION SPEAKS TO -- AND I KNOW
4 IT'S REALLY A SECONDARY ISSUE THAT WE'RE NOT TO YET, BUT IT
5 SPEAKS TO INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL OF HIS APPOINTED
6 LAWYER, MR. LONG. NOT ONLY WAS HE NOT INFORMED OF HIS RIGHT
7 TO FILE AN APPEAL, BUT THERE WERE ALSO CERTAIN OTHER
8 DISCOVERY MATTERS THAT HE SAYS MR. LONG NEVER ENGAGED IN.

9 THIS WAS A SERIES OF CASES INVOLVING SOME
10 HOUSEBREAKINGS, SOME BURGLARIES, TWO CRIMINAL SEXUAL CONDUCT
11 CHARGES. ^v HE TELLS ME THAT HE WAS INFORMED THROUGH MR. LONG
12 THAT HE WAS ONLY PLEADING -- AND HE HAD ONLY AGREED TO
13 PLEADING -- TO THE HOUSEBREAKING CHARGES, GRAND LARCENY
14 CHARGES AND, I THINK, A POSSESSION OF A FIREARM CHARGE. ^v WHEN
15 HE ACTUALLY ENTERED THE PLEA, IT WAS FOR THIS WHOLE SLEW OF
16 INDICTMENTS -- TWO BURGLARIES, TWO CRIMINAL SEXUAL CONDUCTS
17 AND SOME OTHER CHARGES. HIS POSITION IS HE WAS NEVER TOLD
18 PRIOR TO THE PLEA THAT THAT'S WHAT HE WAS ENTERING A PLEA TO.

19 AND I NOTE THAT -- AND AGAIN, AS I POINTED OUT EARLIER,
20 YOUR HONOR, THERE IS NOT A TRANSCRIPT FROM THAT PLEA. I CAN
21 ONLY ASSUME THAT HE WAS INFORMED BY THE TRIAL -- OR PLEA
22 JUDGE OF THE CHARGES THAT HE WAS PLEADING TO, BUT I DON'T
23 KNOW THAT FOR A FACT BECAUSE I DON'T HAVE A TRANSCRIPT. HE
24 OBVIOUSLY WAS NOT IN A STATE OF MIND OR IN A POSITION AT THAT
25 TIME -- AND HE CAN'T DO IT AGAIN TODAY -- TO TELL ME WHAT IT

1 WAS HE ACTUALLY PLED TO OTHER THAN WHAT THE ATTORNEY
2 GENERAL'S OFFICE TELLS ME.

3 THE COURT: OKAY. WHEN DID HE PLEAD?

4 MR. CULBERTSON: FEBRUARY OF '97, YOUR HONOR. I'M
5 SORRY, FEBRUARY OF '87.

6 MR. CAMPBELL: '86.

7 MR. CULBERTSON: '86.

8 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

9 MR. CULBERTSON: FEBRUARY OF '86.

10 THE COURT: ASSUMING YOU HAVE, FOR THE SAKE ARGUMENT,
11 VALID PCR ISSUES---

12 MR. CULBERTSON: YES, SIR.

13 THE COURT: ---HOW DO YOU OVERCOME THE ONE-YEAR
14 STATUTE? I DON'T KNOW HOW TO OVERCOME THAT OBSTACLE.

15 MR. CULBERTSON: I'M GRASPING AT STRAWS, YOUR HONOR.

16 MR. DUKES: YOUR HONOR, IF I COULD SPEAK TO THAT REAL
17 QUICKLY. IN TALKING WITH MR. LONG, THIS IS, I BELIEVE, THE
18 VERY SITUATION THE LEGISLATURE WAS TRYING TO AVOID. THIS IS
19 A FIFTEEN-YEAR-OLD CASE. AFTER SPEAKING WITH MR. LONG, HE
20 HAS NO RECOLLECTION OF THE CASE. HE HAS NO FILE FIFTEEN
21 YEARS LATER. IT'S SOMEWHAT AN ENCUMBRANCE ON A PRIVATE
22 ATTORNEY TO EXPECT HIM TO SAVE A FILE FOR FIFTEEN YEARS. AND
23 CERTAINLY I DON'T SEE ANY REASON -- I DON'T SEE ANY REASON
24 AROUND THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN THIS CASE. BUT I HAVE
25 SPOKEN WITH MR. LONG, AND I CAN MAKE HIM AVAILABLE.

1 **MR. CULBERTSON:** UNLESS, OF COURSE, YOU LOOK AT THE
2 OVERRIDING CONCERN MY CLIENT HAS, AND THAT IS THAT HE WAS
3 NEVER INFORMED, NUMBER ONE, OF HIS RIGHT TO FILE AN APPEAL
4 AND, NUMBER TWO, THAT THE INVESTIGATIVE STAGE PRIOR TO THE
5 PLEA WAS COMPLIED WITH BY MR. LONG. IF HE WAS NEVER INFORMED
6 HE HAD A RIGHT TO FILE AN APPEAL, THEN THAT FORMS THE BASIS
7 FOR HIS RIGHT FOR THIS PCR. WE CAN ONLY ASSUME THAT HE ALSO
8 HAD NO KNOWLEDGE OF THE REQUIREMENT TO TIMELY FILE HIS PCR
9 APPLICATION.

10 I KNOW THERE IS A GREAT -- I SEE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
11 RISING. I'M SURE HE'S GOING TO SPEAK TO THE FACT THAT HE
12 SHOULD HAVE KNOWN THAT OR PEOPLE WOULD HAVE TOLD HIM THAT IN
13 PRISON AND THIS THAT AND THE OTHER. BUT WE CAN'T ASSUME
14 THAT, AND I DON'T KNOW HOW WE CAN SADDLE THIS MAN WITH THE
15 BURDEN OF KNOWING WHAT HIS RIGHTS WERE, HIS LEGAL RIGHTS
16 WERE, WHAT THE TIME LINE WAS THAT HE HAD TO COMPLY WITH IN
17 ORDER TO RESERVE THESE RIGHTS HE IS NOW CLAIMING TODAY.

18 **MR. DUKES:** YOUR HONOR, I WAS JUST GOING TO SPEAK TO
19 THE CASE THAT YOU QUOTED NUMEROUS TIMES, WEATHERS v. STATE.
20 ABSENT EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES, IN A GUILTY PLEA COUNSEL
21 DOES NOT NEED TO ADVISE A CLIENT OF HIS APPELLANT RIGHTS.

22 **THE COURT:** OKAY. ANYTHING ELSE ON THE MOTION TO
23 DISMISS BASED ON THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS? IS THERE
24 ANYTHING FURTHER FROM THE STATE?

25 **MR. DUKES:** NO, YOUR HONOR. I JUST -- THE STATE'S

1 POSITION IS THIS CASE IS JUST TOO STALE. THERE IS NO WAY HE
2 CAN CARRY HIS BURDEN OF PROOF. THE INTENT OF THE
3 LEGISLATURE, I BELIEVE, IS CLEAR.

4 THE COURT: ANYTHING FURTHER ON THE STATUTE OF
5 LIMITATIONS ISSUE?

6 MR. CULBERTSON: NO, SIR, NOT AS TO THE STATUTE OF
7 LIMITATIONS ISSUE.

8 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IF THE CASE GOES FORWARD, YOU
9 DON'T -- WHEN YOU RAISED THE ISSUE EARLIER, I THOUGHT MAYBE
10 THERE WAS A TRANSCRIPT AVAILABLE, IT JUST HADN'T SURFACED
11 YET.

12 MR. CULBERTSON: I DON'T KNOW.

13 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT GOING TO BE ONE.

14 MR. CULBERTSON: I'VE REQUESTED IT BOTH FROM THE
15 ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE AND TRIED TO GET MR. LONG'S FILE.
16 I UNDERSTAND IT'S A FIFTEEN-YEAR-OLD CASE AND HE PROBABLY
17 DOES NOT HAVE THAT FILE. AND I ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT GIVEN
18 THE NATURE OF THE TIME THAT THERE IS PROBABLY NOT A
19 TRANSCRIPT EITHER.

20 THE COURT: YEAH. ARE THE OTHER FOLKS IN THE COURTROOM
21 HERE ON BEHALF OF MR. CAMPBELL?

22 MR. CULBERTSON: THEY ARE HERE, BOTH HIS FAMILY MEMBERS
23 AND, ASSUMING WE GET TO THE ISSUE OF HIS APPLICATION, SOME OF
24 THEM ARE WITNESSES THAT WE WOULD PROPOSE TO PRESENT THAT
25 SPEAK TO THE ISSUE OF INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AT

1 THE GUILTY PLEA.

2 THE COURT: (PAUSE) I'VE GOT TO DO SOME RESEARCH ON
3 THE MOTION TO DISMISS. IT MAY BE A VALID MOTION. IN THE
4 EVENT THE MOTION IS DENIED, THE HEARING CAN TAKE PLACE AT THE
5 NEXT PCR TERM. I DON'T WANT TO HAVE THE HEARING IF THE
6 STATE'S POSITION IS CORRECT. SO I'M GOING TO HOLD THE OTHER
7 ISSUE IN ABEYANCE WITHOUT PREJUDICE. THAT WILL GIVE ME AN
8 OPPORTUNITY TO DO SOME RESEARCH ON THE MOTION TO DISMISS.

9 I WILL ISSUE AN ORDER. AND IF IT'S GRANTED AND THE
10 MOTION TO DISMISS PREVAILS AND THE PCR APPLICATION IS OVER,
11 THEN MR. CAMPBELL HAS RIGHTS OF APPEAL FROM MY DECISION. IF
12 I DENY THE MOTION TO DISMISS, THEN I'M GOING TO ORDER IT TO
13 BE PLACED ON THE NEXT PCR DOCKET FOR HEARING. I JUST DON'T
14 WANT TO BE REQUIRED TO MAKE THIS IMPORTANT DECISION WITHOUT
15 THE BENEFIT OF REVIEWING THE FILE VERY CAREFULLY.

16 I APPRECIATE ALL OF YOU FOLKS BEING HERE. I THANK YOU
17 FOR THAT. AND THANK YOU, MR. CAMPBELL.

18 MR. DUKES: YOUR HONOR, JUST TO INFORM HIS FAMILY AND
19 THE APPLICANT, THE NEXT TERM OF COURT WILL BE IN LATE
20 FEBRUARY.

21 THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.

22 -----END OF REQUESTED TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD-----

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I, THE UNDERSIGNED, DAWN V. KOFFSKEY, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER FOR THE 13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE, ACCURATE AND COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD OF ALL THE PROCEEDINGS HAD AND EVIDENCE INTRODUCED IN THE TRIAL OF THE CAPTIONED CASE, RELATIVE TO APPEAL, IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR GREENVILLE COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA, ON THE 19TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2001.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I AM NEITHER OF KIN, COUNSEL, NOR INTEREST TO ANY PARTY HERETO.

OCTOBER 14, 2002



DAWN V. KOFFSKEY
COURT REPORTER

ROBERT CAMPBELL # 131941

LIEBER COR. INST. A-A-29

P.O. BOX 205

RIDGEVILLE S.C. 29472

RECEIVED

FEB 08 2017

SC Court of Appeals

S.C. Court of Appeals

KENNETH A. RICHSTAD, CLERK

P.O. BOX 11629

COLUMBIA S.C. 29211

RECEIVED

FEB 06 2017

MAILROOM
JEBER CI