

April 3rd...

Case No.: 2016-001553

Dear S.C. Supreme Court, I need both indictments in the Appendix etc, Also I need An PARTICULAR APPEAL Bond petition And frivolous motion petition that is in the S.C. Supreme Court records. The following documents are examples of what the documents look like, I Also need other records to go with petitions I'm filing...

*Very urgent*

I need these documents very soon...

**RECEIVED**

APR 06 2017

S.C. SUPREME COURT

(Indictment Situation)

Never upon the Record did it ever reflect that I had seen or waived presentment of any Indictments. Also I never received an Indictment until being sent to prison however the initial drafted Indictment specifically addresses oral Allegations etc that were never in any reports or Allegations against me from Victim and the later Indictment only alleges an sexual battery occurred and left that broad description to meet in my defense however at trial the prosecutor erroneously testified to an fissure being and examination finding by expert witnesses. It was never a fissure however the state used a fissure finding to constitute Rape.

Furthermore, I had counsel relieved, and no jury trial and was denied counsel all while not being indicted / having an amended Indictment introduced before trial when I was pro se facing life having no time to prepare a defense.

**RECEIVED**

APR 06 2017

S.C. SUPREME COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SUPREME COURT

TREY WILLIAMS, 341036

Applicant,

- VS -

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Respondant.

In the South Carolina Supreme Court

Docket No.: 2016-001553

MOTION FOR APPEAL BOND  
PURSUANT TO RULE 243 (K)

April 3rd 2017

TO: The South Carolina Supreme Court:

Please Be ~~Added~~ Advised that the Applicant, through his

undersigned attorney, moves for a ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~  
Appeal Bond in the above captioned matter, for the following reasons:

The authority to grant bail will be exercised with caution and only in exceptional cases. In deciding whether to exercise the discretionary authority to admit an applicant to bail, the following factors will be considered: <sup>1</sup> the probability the applicant will prevail on appellate review.

Upon the courts reviewing this matter, the record and associated materials to be reviewed considering the totality of this case, the proceedings, discovery documents,

PER YORK COUNTY Clerk of Court and S.C. Supreme Court Records and the frivolous petition filed in the S.C. Supreme Court you will see incontrovertible evidence that the states Appeal should and probably will be dismissed. None of the cases

granting per, or facts etc in the order granting per and in question, opposition or adverse to S.C. Supreme Court law and Federal U.S. Law. All are in

compliance and harmony with S.C. Supreme Court law and the Attorney General of per hearing record is in compliance with me winning the waiver issue

and I did that Attorney General testified that the record is not in compliance with due process concerning my waiver and he did not appeal the judges decision

in granting a per order and I should be in the lower court county jail now. I was not indicted at the time I relieved counsel and the trial indictment

was erroneously introduced prior to trial beginning months before I relieved counsel and waived a jury trial that the judge abused discretion and denied

upon my request. I was denied counsel in general sessions, fast and speedy trial motions, evidentiary hearings to suppress and dismiss the case and I was

denied a public trial. The entire proceedings of my case was a total miscarriage of justice all the way up until now and full supporting

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

TREY WILLIAMS, 341036

Applicant,

-VS-

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Respondant.

IN THE SUPREME  
COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Docket No.: 2016-001553

MOTION FOR Dismissal

of Appeal Case No.: 2016-001553

Pursuant to Rule 269.

Frivolous Appeals, Petitions,  
Motions, OR RETURNS/RULE 11, SCRA

PLEASE BE ADVISED that the Applicant, ~~through his undersigned~~ <sup>PRO-SE</sup>

~~attorney~~, moves to dismiss the states appeal in the above listed case matter for the following reasons... (Also please see attachments that set forth the pg. numbers/lines of PCR transcripts that supports motion.

Under rule 11, SCRPC A party and/or the party's Attorney may be sanctioned for filing of frivolous pleadings, motions, petitions or making frivolous arguments.

Runyon v. Right (S.C. 1996) 322 S.C. 15, 471 S.E. 2d 160 Lawkey 24 (Attorney client privilege)

Rule 269. South Carolina Appellate Court Rules states where an appeal,

petition, motion or return is frivolous or taken solely for the purposes of delay, or is not in compliance with these Rules, the appellate court may upon its own motion or that of a party, after ten days notice, impose upon offending

attorneys or parties such sanctions as the circumstances of the case and discouragement of like conduct in the future may require. The state/

Attorney General may only appeal a PCR Judge Ruling if he feels that the PCR Judge made an error of law in rendering a PCR Decision and ruling in the findings of facts and conclusions of law. In Lower Court Docket No.:

2013-CP-46-1797 The Judge did not make an error of law in the final order of that case involving the issues that was granted. Furthermore

the PCR Judge asked the attorney General at hearing on the record if he felt that the waiver was in compliance with Farretta v. California and his response was "to be honest your honor it is not." He went on to state "it does not have to

be if counsel had advised the client the proper dangers & disadvantages before the waiver was done." Counsel told the Judge at PCR that he advised his client nothing above and beyond what was on the trial record. The trial record clearly with incontrovertible evidence shows invalid procedure.

All Parties Agreed At hearing. Pg. 10 of 20

LEGAL MAIL

The PCR hearing testimony, PCR Application and Amended PCR Application, testimony by Trey Williams, Attorney General J. Tutledge Johnson, the PCR Judge order all Agree and Agreed the Waiver of Relief of Counsel WAS and is INVALID not in compliance with FARETTA v. STATE, STATE vs. GAMBER, PRINCE v. STATE, DUE PROCESS OF LAW etc According to the record AS A whole And the record And Counsel's testimony at PCR stated that he AS the other source did not Advise his Client nothing Above and beyond what WAS on the record. The Attorney General J. Tutledge Johnson filed a Frivolous return and Attempted to proceed with Frivolous arguments in this case but ultimately told A little truth, in his own words At PCR hearing he said "Honest" he WAS being about the Waiver not being in compliance with FARETTA when Asked BY the PCR Judge. Furthermore The Supreme court must affirm the PCR courts findings if they are supported by any competent evidence of probative value in the record. See e.g., Webb v. State, 281 S.C. 237, 314 S.E. 2d 819 (1984), The hearing courts findings of facts are binding on the appellate court under any evidence of probative value to support the PCR courts findings of facts standard. See Greene v. State, 276 S.C. 213, 277 S.E. 2d 481 (1981). Factual findings in State hearings carry a presumption of correctness in federal habeas corpus proceedings; see Sumner v. Mata, 449 U.S. 539, 101 S.Ct. 764, 662 L.Ed 2d 722 (1981). Once the PCR Judge Asked the Attorney General representing the State at the PCR hearing on 11-18-2014 in the York County court house about his ethical, professional, legal opinion on A matter of fact and law involving a case he has an oath to challenge or not challenge based upon the meritorious issues, facts etc presented And the Attorney General said "Honestly" that the case topic WAS not in compliance with federal U.S. constitutional law, State law, and due process etc and he stated the only way he felt that it did not have to be for it to still be challenged and he said it depended on counsel. Once counsel testified on the stand under oath and said that he did not Advise his client of nothing Above and beyond what WAS on the record involving the Waiver and the Attorney General Agreeing that the Record WAS void of due process on that issue he should not, would not and did not Appeal. Justin James Hunter is An Attorney General on this case After the PCR WAS done, over A year After and have no legal ground to Appeal the Granted PCR issues. See Waiver transcripts, PCR transcripts And order granting PCR Along with this motion.

TREY A. WILLIAMS, #341236  
L.C. I. LOCK UP #205  
P.O. BOX 205  
RIDGEVILLE, SC 29472

RECEIVED

APR 03 2017

MAILROOM  
LIEBER CI

JAN 07 2017

S.C. Supreme Court  
1231 Gervais St.  
Columbia SC, 29201