

5

RECEIVED

FEB 08 2017

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of General Sessions
Steven H. John. Trial Judge

Appellant Case # 2016-002081

State of South Carolina

County of Horry

Respondent

v.

Ardon P. Cato II

Appellant

INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Ardon P. Cato II #316535
Evans C.I. Cheraw A 271
610 Highway 90 West
Bennettsville, SC 29512
Pro Se Appellant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	pg. 2
Statement Issues on Appeal	pg. 3
Statements of the Case	pg. 3
Facts/Arguments	pg. 3
Conclusion	pg. 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Jamison v. State, Opinion No. #27454
(S.C. Supreme Court Filed October 22, 2014)

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Rule 29(b)
Rule 59(e)

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

- 1) DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR IN DISPOSING OF ORAL ARGUMENTS AND DENYING APPLICANT'S MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL BASED ON AFTER DISCOVERED EVIDENCE?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant Ardon P. Cato, II, proceeded as Pro Se Applicant, filled a Motion for new trial Based on After Discovered Evidence, pursuant to Rule 29(b) S.C.R. Crim. Pro. dated March 8, 2016, and was clocked stamped with the Horry County Clerk of Court on March 14 2016.

Respondent filed a Response to Pro Se Applicants Motion for New Trial based on After Discovered Evidence clock stamped April 6, 2016.

The Honorable Steven H. John issued an Order Disposing of Oral Arguments and Denying Applicants Motion for a New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence dated July 18, 2016, filed July 19, 2016. Appellant received this order at Lieber C.I. Mailroom on July 29 2016.

Appellant filed a motion to Alter or Amend Judgement of the Order Disposing of Oral Arguments and Denying Applicants Motion for New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence pursuant to Rule 59(e) of the S.C.R.C. P., dated August 5 2016, clocked stamped with the Clerk of Court on August 10, 2016.

The Honorable Steven H. John issued on Order Denying Applicants Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment Dated September 14, 2016, filed on September 15, 2016. Appellant Received this order at Evans C.I. Mailroom on September, 27 2016.

Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal to S.C. Court of Appeals dated October 3, 2016.

This is Appellant's initial Brief which proceeds as follows:

FACTS /ARGUMENTS

- I) Trial Judge did err in Disposing of Oral Arguments and denying Appellant's Motion for a New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence, failing to properly and correctly rule on the findings of the facts and conclusions of law on the issue of the guilty plea

Rule 29(b), S.C.R. Crim. Pro. Uses a five prong Spann test in regards to newly discovered evidence, stating that...(1) the newly discovered evidence is such that it would probably change the result is a new trial were granted.

The Respondent is claiming that the newly discovered evidence will not change the outcome of the guilty plea, arguing that the plea itself binds the Appellant to the charges despite the new facts presented.

The issue of the accused presenting newly discovered evidence after the guilty plea has been addressed in the justice system of South Carolina, particularly in Jamison v. State, Op. No 27454 (S.C. Sct filed October 22, 2014). The South Carolina Supreme Court sets forth the Interest of Justice standards in *Jamison*. This Court held that when examining new evidence from guilty pleas “.....establishing that,.....The new evidence is of such weight and quality that under the facts and circumstances of the particular case the Interest of justice requires Applicant’s guilty plea to be vacated,” Adding that”.....the guilty plea may be withdrawn when necessary to correct a manifest injustice.”

Quoting *Jamison*: [...we must reject the states claim that the waiver of the trial and admission of guilt encompassed guilty plea necessarily preclude....relief in all cases.]...*Jamison* quoting Riese, 192 P. 3d at 995 (“finding defendant may withdraw his guilty plea on the basis of newly discovered evidence only when necessary to correct a manifest justice”) Defendant, [“ is bound by his plea and conviction... unless he can demonstrate the interest of justice requires that they be vacated.”] (the newly discovered evidence is of such weight and quality that, under the facts and circumstances of that particular case, “ the Interest of Justice” requires the defendant guilty plea be vacated”) [Respondent has never argued that he pled guilty as a result of ineffective assistance of counsel”].

The present case is clear contrast from *Jamison* where Appellant clearly overcomes the burden *Jamison* could not. Appellant case separates from *Jamison* wherein Appellant indeed argued that his plea came as a result of counsel’s ineffectiveness with a failure to properly investigate the ballistics evidence and advise his client of a constructed defense in the event of trial. (See Appendix pg. 49, line 19 pg 54, line 25. Attached is the testimony of Appellant Cato Exhibit #2 of this Brief where the Appellant’s position of having no knowledge of the ballistics evidence is well documented, (Also, see Exhibit (G) of Appellant Rule 29 (b) Motion for New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence attached as Exhibit #1 of this Brief, where Appellant

requested to SLED the Ballistics Report on March 27, 2007. SLED's office received the request on April 3, 2007. The PCR hearing was convened on April 3, 2007. At the time of the hearing Appellant was not in possession of the Ballistics Report. As a matter of fact, He was not in receipt of the report until May 3, 2007, a date well after the hearing was convened. Nevertheless, the PCR Judge left the file of the Ballistics evidence open for reference and review.)

Appellant's attorney who failed to properly investigate and advise his client of a constructed defense, was unaware of the inconsistencies and/or ineffectiveness of his performances. Ultimately in Appellant's case there is a grave manifest injustice that needs to be corrected by the granting of a new trial in the interest of justice. The manifest injustice is that Appellant was by way of ineffective assistance of counsel convicted by an invalid Ballistics Report that erroneously pairs a .380 shell casing with a .9mm bullet. A .9mm bullet cannot come from a .380 shell casing. (See Exhibit (D) of Appellant's Motion for a New Trial Due to After Discovered Evidence. Attached as Exhibit #1 of this Brief.

Presently there is more than a scintilla of evidence that, had been exposed and/ or known to the defense, it would have been used to change the outcome of the Appellant's case. The Appellant was deprived of a fair and impartial proceeding by not being able to put on an affirmative defense due to his lack of access to evidence of a Ballistics Report that substantiates the accuracy for his role during the night in question.

As the facts and circumstances of this Appellant's particular case, the newly discovered evidence is of such weight and quality with witnesses on the scene hearing people actually plotting to do harm to someone, and then hearing shots fired from totally different directions, establishing the fact that there was someone, (who is not Appellant), on the inside of the club shooting and inflicting harm on the victims, (See Exhibits (A), (B), (D), (E) and (F) of Appellant's Motion for a New Trial based on After Discovered Evidence attached as Exhibit #1 of this Brief, wherein Appellant is positioned on the outside of the exit door in the front of the nightclub.)

This newly discovered evidence is material and necessary in the determination of correcting a manifest injustice. The newly discovered evidence, is evidence of material facts that pertains to the two shooter theory defense mentioned at Appellant's PCR Hearing. (See Appendix page 76, line 12- pg. 78, line 15, attached as Testimony of J. M. Long III Exhibit #3 of this Brief.) Appellant's attorney testified to not moving forward with, nor making appellant

aware of the relevant two shooter theory based on the Ballistics Report being valid and correct. Appellant's attorney was ineffective for failing to properly investigate the Ballistics report to see the errors in it, make his client aware of the discrepancies in the report, and advising his client of a constructed defense in the event of trial by using the invalid Ballistics Report to corroborate the two shooter theory.

(Note: The attorney who represented the Appellant, a Mr. J.M. Long, III was suspended from his law practice for indecently exposing himself as reported some 20-30 times on January 01, 2006 which was during the time he represented the Appellant. Thus proving he was not at all utilizing competency which is expected of reasonableness.) (See Article on J.M. Long, III attached as Exhibit #4 of this Brief.)

The manifest injustice would be to have appellant remain convicted of the charges when new evidence is presented that someone, (who is not Appellant), was inside the club shooting and inflicting harm on the victims. In addition, the Ballistics report cannot be used to unequivocally prove Appellant guilty of the charges. It is a manifest injustice to use the Ballistics Report that erroneously pairs a .380 shell casing and a .9mm bullet as a part of the record to unequivocally convict the Appellant of the charges.

As our justice system uses the lens of fundamental fairness, Appellants new evidence clearly meets the Interest of Justice standard in regards to the plea and a new trial with witnesses who were on the scene of incident hearing someone plotting to do harm to people, also hearing shots fired from totally different directions, establishing that there was someone, (who is not Appellant), on the inside of the club shooting and inflicting harm on the victims. (See Exhibits (A), (B), (D), (E), and (F); Analysis pg. 3-6, of the Appellants Motion for New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence attached as Exhibit #1 of this Brief) This new evidence raises pertinent questions to be answered in a new trial. Those questions are: Who was on the inside of the club shooting and inflicting harm on the victims?... Where did that person go?... Why were there originally four victims with a total of (7) gunshots wounds?... with another fired bullet that (only) hit an upper wall, with no blood or body tissue? ...Why was each victim shot in different body parts while being situated in different areas of the nightclub?... Why were there two different types of ammunition erroneously paired on the Ballistics report?... With the new evidence presented, the Interest of Justice requires these question be answers in a new trial.

II) Trial Judge did err in Disposing of Oral Arguments and Denying Appellant motion for New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence, failing to Properly and correctly rule on the findings of facts and conclusions of the law on issue of Appellant satisfying five prong criteria for Spann Test pursuant to Rule 29(b) S.C.R. Crim. Pro.

The newly discovered evidence clearly satisfies the five prong criteria of the Spann Test...

1) The newly discovered evidence not only warrants a new trial, it would change the result if a new trial were granted because it implicates the fact that while Appellant was standing on the outside of the exit door in the front of the nightclub,...(See Analysis pg. 3-6 of Appellants Motion for a New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence; Also see Exhibits (A), (B), (D), (E), and (F) of Appellant's Motion for a New Trial attached as Exhibit # 1 of this Brief.) witnesses on the scene of the incident hearing someone plotting to do harm, and then hearing of shots fired from totally different directions establishes that someone was on the inside of the club shooting and inflicting harm on the victims with a deadly weapon.

The newly discovered evidence of hearing someone plotting to do harm, and the hearing of shots fired from totally different directions brings clarity to why the victims were shot in different body parts while being situated in different areas of the night club.

This newly discovered evidence answers the question, why are there two different types of ammunition erroneously paired in the Ballistics Report.

Together for the foregoing reasons, the new evidence of witnesses who were on the scene of incident having heard someone, (who is not the Appellant), on the inside of the club plot to do harm and heard shots fired from totally different directions, would change the result if a new trial were granted, because now there is more than a reasonable doubt, which can lead to Appellant being not guilty of the convictions.

2) Have been discovered since Appellants trial. Appellant was convicted on July 17, 2006. The evidence of Ms. Twila Beckman was discovered on June 22, 2015. The evidence of Mr. Willie Edwards was discovered on August 19, 2015. This evidence has been discovered approximately (9) years after Appellant's trial and was presented to the lower Court within the one year time limit, pursuant to Rule 29(b), S.C.R. Crim. Pro. (See Exhibits (A) and (B) of Appellant's Motion for a New Trial Based on After Discovered evidence attached as Exhibits #1 of this Brief.)

3) Could not in the exercise of due diligence have been discovered prior to trial... it was a chaotic environment, and credible witnesses were able to leave the scene of incident without being interviewed. The witnesses who were interviewed were unable to identify others who were there. There is no amount of due diligence that this evidence could have been discovered prior to trial. This can only come by way of newly discovered evidence.

4) This new evidence is evidence of material facts with witnesses on the scene of the incident hearing someone plotting to do harm to people, and hearing shots fired from totally different direction, which establishes that someone, (who is not the Appellant), was on the inside of the club shooting and inflicting harm on the victims. (See Analysis pg. 3-6; Exhibits (A), (B), (D), (E), and (F) of Appellant's Motion for New Trial Based on After Discovered evidence attached as Exhibit #1 of this Brief).

The new evidence is evidence of material facts because it raises critical questions to be answered in a new trial... Who was it on the inside of the club shooting and inflicting harm on the victims with a deadly weapon... Where did that person go?... Why were there originally four victims with a total of (7) gunshot wounds?... Also another bullet fired that only hit an upper wall with no blood or body tissue?... Why was each victim shot in different body parts while being situated in different areas of the nightclub?... Why were there two different types of ammunition erroneously paired in the Ballistics Report?

The newly discovered evidence is evidence of material facts that pertains to the two shooter theory defense mentioned at Appellant's PCR Hearing. (See Appendix pg. 76, line 12- pg. 78, line 15 attached as Testimony of J.M. Long, III Exhibit #3 of this Brief) Appellant's attorney testified to not moving forward with, nor making Appellant aware of the relevant two shooter theory based on the Ballistics Report being valid and correct. Appellants attorney was ineffective for failing to properly investigate the Ballistics Report to see the errors in it, make his client aware of the discrepancies in the Report, and advising his client of a constructed defense in the event of trial by using the invalid Ballistics Report to corroborate the two shooter theory.

5) The newly discovered evidence is not cumulative nor impeaching because no one has ever given testimony of hearing someone plotting to do harm, nor hearing shots fired from totally different directions. There were no sworn statements of such given under oath to accumulate or impeach.

CONCLUSION

After careful review of this Initial Brief, this court should find that the Trial Judge did err in disposing of oral arguments and denying Appellant's Motion for New Trial Based on After Discovered Evidence. Appellant respectfully request that this Court reverse the lower Courts decision and grant an Order for New Trial.

10/31/16

Date

Ardon P. Cato II #316535

Ardon P. Cato II #316535

Evans C.I. F3A 193

610 Highway 9 West

Bennettsville, SC 29512

Pro Se Appellant

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM Horry COUNTY

Court of General Sessions

Steven H. John. Trial Judge

RECEIVED

FEB 08 2017

SC Court of Appeals

Appellant Case # 2016-002081

State of South Carolina

County of Horry

Respondent

v.

Ardon P. Cato II

Appellant

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

The undersigned certified that this Initial Brief complies with rule 208 S.C.A.C.P.

10/31/16
Date

Ardon P Cato II #316535
Ardon P. Cato II #316535
Evans C.I. F3A 193
610 Highway 9 West
Bennettsville, SC 29512
Pro Se Appellant

Other Counsel of record:\

Jimmy Richardson
Office of Solicitor
PO Box 1276
Conway. SC 29526

Alan McCrory Wilson Esquire
Donald J. Zelenka Esquire
PO Box 11549
Columbia SC, 29211

Ardon P. Cato II #316535
Evans CI F3A 193
610 Highway 9 West
Bennettsville, SC 29512

RECEIVED

FEB 08 2017

SC Court of Appeals

February 6, 2017

SC Court of Appeals
J A Kitchings, Clerk
PO Box 11629
Columbia SC 29211

Re: The State vs Ardon P Cato II Appellate Case No. 2016-002081

Dear Clerk,


This correspondence is in regards to your letter to me dated January 27, 2017 that I received on February 1, 2017 at Evans CI mailroom. Enclosed is proof of service of Initial Brief of Appellant and Designation of Matter served on Respondents (State) within the time frame this court provided me to do so. In addition, the Office of the Solicitor, Jerry Richardson, made note in their database that they did receive, Initial Brief of Appellant on November 1, 2016.

With kind regards,

Ardon P Cato, II
Pro se Appellant

cc: Jimmy Richardson, Solicitor
Alan McCrory Wilson, Atty General
Donald J Zelenka, Asst Atty General

Ardon P. Catott #316535
Evans CI A3 193
601 Hwy 9 west
Bennettesville SC 29512



RECEIVED

FEB 08 2017

SC Court of Appeals

SC Court of Appeals
J. A. Kitchings Clerk
P O Box 11629
Columbia, SC 29211