

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
G. Thomas Cooper, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No.: 2014-002483

RECEIVED
SEP 09 2016
SC Court of Appeals

The StateRespondent

v.

John Henry Dial Jr.....Appellant

FINAL REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Robert W. Mills
1728 Main Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 252-9648
Attorney for the Appellant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities.....ii

Argument

RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO CONTRADICT THAT THE CIRCUIT COURT ERRED BY NOT REVERSING THE CASE AND REMANDING IT FOR ANEW TRIAL WHEN THE TRIAL COURT ERRED BY FAILING TO WARN THE APPELLANT OF THE DANGERS OF PROCEEDING TO TRIAL WITHOUT AN ATTORNEY PURSUANT TO FARETTA V. CALIFORNIA.....1

Conclusion.....4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806, 95 S.Ct. 2525, 45 L.Ed.2d 562 (1975).....2

Prince v. State, 301 S.C. 422, 424, 392 S.E.2d 462, 463 (1990) 2

In re Christopher H. 359 S.C. 161, 596 S.E.2d 500 (S.C. App. 2004)..... 2

Gardner v. State, 351 S.C. 407, 412-13, 570 W.E.2d 184, 186-87 (2002)..... 3

ARGUMENT

RESPONDENT HAS FAILED TO CONTRADICT THAT THE CIRCUIT COURT ERRED BY NOT REVERSING THE CASE AND REMANDING IT FOR A NEW TRIAL WHEN THE TRIAL COURT ERRED BY FAILING TO WARN THE APPELLANT OF THE DANGERS OF PROCEEDING TO TRIAL WITHOUT AN ATTORNEY PURSUANT TO FARETTA V. CALIFORNIA

Respondent has failed to demonstrate that the Appellant knew of the dangers of self-representation and Respondent has failed to demonstrate that he was aware of the requirements the trial court would require of him during the trial. While correctly citing the factors this court may consider to determine if the accused has sufficient background to understand the dangers of self-representation, Respondent ignores the portions of the record which indicate that Appellant did not have sufficient background to properly represent himself. As stated in Appellant's Brief, during the trial, objectionable information was introduced without objection by the Appellant. The opening statement of the prosecuting officer included a statement that the Appellant was on probation. (Trial Transcript p. 17, R.p.31 ll. 11-12). Since the Appellant did not have counsel, there was no objection to this prejudicial statement. Also, no curative instruction was given to the jury by the trial court. Furthermore, objectionable hearsay evidence which was not a statement against interest of the accused was introduced during the testimony of David Hutchinson. (Trial Transcript p. 22, R.p.36 ll. 1-3). The witness also raises bad character evidence of the accused. (Trial Transcript p. 28, R.p. 42 ll. 11-15). The Appellant being on probation is again raised by witness Wendy Bass. (Trial Transcript p. 44, R.p. 58 ll. 15-19). Also, the Appellant attempted to produce good character evidence and was denied this opportunity by the trial

court. (Trial Transcript p. 60, R.p. 74, ll. 1-19, T.p. 62, R.p. 76, l. 20-T.p. 63, R.p. 77 l.4, T.p. 65, R.p. 79, ll. 6-13). Respondent has failed to contradict that Appellant's conduct during the trial demonstrates that he did not have requisite understanding to be able to properly represent himself. Therefore, while the Appellant did participate in the trial, his participation indicates his lack of knowledge of legal challenges he could raise in defense to the charges against him and his lack of knowledge of the rules of evidence and procedure at trial that resulted in detrimental, inadmissible evidence being presented against him.

“Faretta allows an accused to waive his right to counsel if he is (1) advised of his right to counsel, and (2) adequately warned of the dangers of self representation.” Prince v. State, 301 S.C. 422, 424, 392 S.E.2d 462, 463 (1990) as quoted in In re Christopher H. 359 S.C. 161, 596 S.E.2d 500 (S.C. App. 2004). In the absence of a specific inquiry by the trial judge addressing the disadvantages of a *pro se* defense as required by the second Faretta prong, [the appellate court] will look to the record to determine whether petitioner had sufficient background or was apprised of his rights by some other source. To determine if an accused has sufficient background to comprehend the dangers of self-representation, courts consider a variety of factors including:

- (1) the accused's age, educational background, and physical and mental health;
- (2) whether the accused was previously involved in criminal trials;
- (3) whether the accused knew the nature of the charge(s) and of the possible penalties;
- (4) whether the accused was represented by counsel before trial and whether that attorney explained to him the dangers of self-representation;

- (5) whether the accused was attempting to delay or manipulate the proceedings;
 - (6) whether the court appointed stand-by counsel;
 - (7) whether the accused knew he would be required to comply with the rules of procedure at trial;
 - (8) whether the accused knew of the legal challenges he could raise in defense to the charge(s) against him;
 - (9) whether the exchange between the accused and the court consisted of merely *pro forma* answers to *pro forma* questions; and
 - (10) whether the accused's waiver resulted from either coercion or mistreatment.
- Gardner v. State, 351 S.C. 407, 412-13, 570 W.E.2d 184, 186-87 (2002).

Respondent has failed to contradict that legal issues arose during the trial where the *pro se* Appellant was disadvantaged by being unrepresented by counsel. Furthermore, Respondent has failed to contradict that Appellant was denied his Sixth Amendment right to counsel since he was not advised of the dangers of self-representation.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, as well as those addressed in the Appellant's Initial Brief to this Court, the Appellant now asks that the judgment against him be reversed and that his case be remanded for a new trial.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Mills
1728 Main Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 252-9648
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

This 9th day of September, 2016

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
G. Thomas Cooper, Circuit Court Judge

RECEIVED
SEP 09 2016
SC Court of Appeals

Appellate Case No.: 2014-002483

The State Respondent

v.

John Henry Dial Jr. Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

The undersigned certifies that this Final Reply Brief of Appellant complies with Rule 211(b), SCACR, and the April 15, 2014 order from the South Carolina Supreme Court entitled, "Revised Order Concerning Personal Identifying Information and Other Sensitive Information in Appellate Court Filings."



Robert W. Mills
1728 Main Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 252-9648
Attorney for the Appellant

September 9, 2016