



# SCCID

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON INDIGENT DEFENSE

Division of Appellate Defense  
1330 Lady Street, Suite 401

Columbia, South Carolina 29201-3332  
Post Office Box 11589  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1589  
Telephone: (803) 734-1330  
Facsimile: (803) 734-1397

Robert M. Dudek, Chief Appellate Defender  
Wanda H. Carter, Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

ORIGINAL

June 08, 2017

RECEIVED

JUN 08 2017

SC Court of Appeals

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
Clerk, South Carolina Court of Appeals  
Post Office Box 11629  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Re: Cedric L. Woods v. State  
Appellate Case No. 2016-002367

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

The transcript in the above case was received in our office on May 31, 2017. Subsequently, a letter was sent to the Clerk of the South Carolina Supreme Court indicating as much. A copy of that letter is attached (Exhibit A). I would like to clarify the posture of and our involvement with this case.

This matter has a convoluted procedural history: Mr. Woods was tried in 2000 for multiple indictments and found guilty on several charges and not guilty on others. Following his incarceration, Mr. Woods was notified that he would be required to register as a sex offender upon release. He filed a declaratory judgment action in Aiken County on or about April 4, 2014. Judge Early placed the matter on the PCR docket based on the understanding that Mr. Woods' trial counsel had not requested the relief which Mr. Woods sought.


Soon thereafter, the South Carolina Supreme Court issued an opinion in State v. Thompson, 415 S.C. 560, 785 S.E.2d 189 (2016). Thompson indicated that cases such as this one are properly designated declaratory judgment actions, so Mr. Woods' case was transferred off the PCR docket and back onto the Common Pleas docket.

As you can see from the first page of the hearing transcript (attached hereto as Exhibit B), dated September 21, 2016, a cursory glance indicates that this is a "Post-Conviction Relief Hearing". Only after a substantive review of the transcript is it revealed that this was a declaratory judgment action (p. 4, ll. 13 - 21). As you can see from the attached index card (Exhibit C) which is a part of our internal file-creation process, this case was mistakenly characterized as a PCR which led to its acceptance by our office.

As you probably know, this office does not handle declaratory judgment actions, since they are civil actions. However, if the Court so desires, because we accepted this one, we will file a brief on behalf of Mr. Woods with the understanding that this is a singular exception. Please let me know what the court desires given the mistake we made accepting this case.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Taylor D Gilliam". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Taylor" and last name "Gilliam" clearly distinguishable.

Taylor D Gilliam  
Appellate Defender

TDG/tg

Enclosures

cc: Julie Coleman, Esquire  
Lance S. Boozer, Esquire  
Cedric L. Woods

1 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

CIRCUIT COURT  
2014-CP-02-00784

2 COUNTY OF AIKEN

3  
4 CEDRIC L. WOODS,  
Applicant,

5 -vs-

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD

6 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,  
7 Respondent.

8  
9 Post-Conviction Relief Hearing

10 Heard on Wednesday, September 21, 2016

11 Aiken, South Carolina

12  
13 BEFORE:

14 THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. HOOD

15  
16  
17 APPEARANCES:

Counsel on Behalf of the Applicant:  
18 David W. Miller, Esq.

19  
20 Counsel on Behalf of the Respondent, State of SC:  
Lance S. Boozer, Esq.

21  
22  
23 Cheri L. Young, RPR  
24 Circuit Court Reporter  
P O Box 5232  
25 Aiken, SC 29803-5232

EXHIBIT INDEX

(NO EXHIBITS IDENTIFIED/INTRODUCED.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2016 AT 11:57 A.M.:

2 THE COURT: Everybody ready?

3 MR. MILLER: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: We're on the record in Cedric Woods  
5 against the State of South Carolina. This is  
6 2014-CP-02-784.

7 All right. Who wants to help me with what's going on  
8 here? Are you Mr. Woods?

9 THE APPLICANT: Yes, sir.

10 THE COURT: And where did you come in from?  
11 Turbeville?

12 THE APPLICANT: Turbeville.

13 THE COURT: All right. Thanks for being here. And  
14 you got your lawyer with you, Mr. Boozer?

15 THE APPLICANT: Yes, sir.

16 THE COURT: Y'all help me with exactly what we're  
17 doing here.

18 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, Mr. Woods was tried on a  
19 number of indictments in 2000 here in Aiken County and was  
20 found guilty of several charges and found not guilty of  
21 several charges. One of the charges that he was found  
22 guilty of was kidnapping. And pursuant to the law that  
23 was then in effect, Mr. Woods was notified subsequent to  
24 his incarceration that he would be required to register as  
25 a sex offender upon his release because the trial court

1 never made a finding on the record that his kidnapping  
2 conviction did not involve a sexual crime or attempted  
3 sexual crime.

4 At the time of his trial, and I believe the procedure  
5 is the same today, his defense attorney should have asked  
6 the judge to make that finding. And the judge would have  
7 made either the finding that, yes, it was, or no, it  
8 wasn't. But the importance of it is, without the judge  
9 affirmatively making a finding that the kidnapping offense  
10 did not involve a sexual component, the default is you  
11 have to register on the sex offender registry.

12 THE COURT: Right.

13 MR. MILLER: And so when Mr. Woods found out -- at  
14 least according to his petition, when Mr. Woods found out  
15 that he would be required to register as a sex offender  
16 upon his release, he filed a declaratory judgment action,  
17 came into court so we could have it heard by Judge Early.  
18 And at that time he didn't have an attorney. Judge  
19 Early -- this was back in 2015 or 2014, Judge Early  
20 decided that he thought it should be a PCR action because  
21 his trial counsel had not requested it of the Court.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MR. MILLER: So we moved it to the PCR docket and  
24 that allowed Mr. Boozer to be appointed to represent him.

25 Subsequent to the case being moved to the PCR docket,

1 the South Carolina Supreme Court issued an opinion in  
2 State versus Thompson, or Thompson versus State. It is  
3 415 South Carolina 560. And I have a copy of that for the  
4 Court if Your Honor would like to see it.

5 THE COURT: Yes.

6 MR. MILLER: Mr. Boozer is very familiar with it as  
7 well. And the Supreme Court held in that case under  
8 similar circumstances that, yes, in fact it should be a  
9 declaratory judgment action and it's not properly a PCR so  
10 it came off the PCR docket and went back onto the common  
11 pleas docket as a DJ action.

12 So, all of that is to stay this: Mr. Woods contends  
13 that his kidnapping conviction did not involve a sexual  
14 offense or attempted sexual offense. And the State  
15 challenges that, the State disagrees with that.

16 If this Court determines that the kidnapping  
17 conviction did involve a sexual offense or an attempted  
18 sexual offense then Mr. Woods has to register upon his  
19 release under the law as it's stated now. Or  
20 alternatively if the Court says, no, the kidnapping  
21 conviction did not involve a sexual offense or an  
22 attempted sexual offense then that pretty well ends it, he  
23 does not have to register because there's not a provision  
24 by which he would have to register for any of his other  
25 offenses that he was convicted of.

1           The Thompson case lays out a pretty straight forward  
2 framework of how this has to happen. And under Thompson  
3 Mr. Woods is entitled to have this Court render a judgment  
4 of did it involve a sexual offense or not. However,  
5 Thompson also makes it clear that any determination by the  
6 Court of whether he would have to register upon his  
7 release from incarceration would merely be advisory  
8 because there's no way for the Court to know what the law  
9 is going to be at the time that he is released from  
10 incarceration.

11           THE COURT: Okay.

12           MR. MILLER: So the issue of whether or not he has to  
13 register is not ripe. But the issue of whether or not his  
14 crimes for which he was convicted involve a sexual or  
15 attempted sexual offense is ripe for this Court to  
16 adjudicate.

17           Your Honor, I have prepared, and Mr. Boozer also has  
18 a copy, the transcript of the trial in its entirety. And  
19 that transcript is -- we actually had to get it from the  
20 PCR appellate appeal file but it is a true and accurate  
21 copy of the entire trial transcript. It is some 541  
22 pages. And I have that here for -- to hand up to the  
23 Court. And I also have a copy of State versus Thompson  
24 which was a March 2016 case from the Supreme Court. It  
25 talks about the procedure to use in this.

1 Mr. Boozer and I have agreed on what the procedure is  
2 or should be. And we, I think, have agreed that -- with  
3 what the Court can do today or after you review the  
4 transcript and with what the Court can't do which is say  
5 what the law is going to be sometime down the road  
6 whenever he is, Mr. Woods is released.

7 And I would, if there's no objection, hand up the  
8 trial transcript so that the Court can review it --

9 THE COURT: Okay.

10 MR. MILLER: -- as time permits.

11 THE COURT: All right.

12 MR. BOOZER: No objection, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Mr. Boozer, do you want to jump in here?

14 MR. BOOZER: Yes, sir, Your Honor. If it pleases the  
15 Court.

16 Judge, this first is just a housekeeping matter. I  
17 just wanted to make sure that this Court is right now  
18 currently in the proper jurisdiction. This is not a PCR  
19 case but it is a declaratory judgment in common pleas.

20 THE COURT: Right. And I have obtained jurisdiction  
21 this week to hear any second circuit non-jury common pleas  
22 matters because I did one yesterday so I have that for the  
23 entire week.

24 MR. BOOZER: And, Judge, let me start by saying,  
25 because it's kind of a unique procedure history in this

1 case as well as the uniqueness of the case itself, the  
2 solicitor's office has been great in responding to items  
3 that I need and discussing the case. So I do appreciate  
4 that.

5 Your Honor, just by way of a little bit of background  
6 to fill in. I do agree with the history that's been  
7 recited by the solicitor's office. He was originally  
8 charged with and indicted for a CSC first, attempted armed  
9 robbery, kidnapping and burg first. When he goes to trial  
10 in April of 2000 he's found guilty before Judge Cooper of  
11 the burglary first, the ABHAN -- an ABHAN conviction and  
12 not CSC first, kidnapping as well as the attempted armed  
13 robbery.

14 As Mr. Miller has stated in Mr. Woods' petition for  
15 declaratory judgment, following that conviction it is  
16 basically automatic that on the kidnapping you're going to  
17 have to register. He doesn't have to register now as he's  
18 obviously incarcerated but once he's released he will then  
19 have to register. And as Mr. Miller mentioned, his lawyer  
20 should have requested that the judge make that finding  
21 that it's not subject to registration based on the  
22 kidnapping.

23 Judge, what we're asking Your Honor to do is  
24 certainly Your Honor has a copy of the transcript, but, in  
25 this particular instance what Mr. Woods believes Your

1 Honor -- the proper procedure for Your Honor to consider  
2 is to look only at the kidnapping offense itself and to  
3 determine whether only the kidnapping contained any sexual  
4 elements or any sort of sexual act or attempted act with  
5 regard to just the kidnapping. And so what we're asking  
6 Your Honor to do respectfully is to isolate basically the  
7 rest of it and only look at the kidnapping. Because the  
8 ABHAN is not what's subjecting him to the sex offender  
9 registry. So I don't believe it would be proper for Your  
10 Honor to consider the ABHAN issue. That's something that  
11 back at the time of the trial if the ABHAN were going to  
12 subject him to any part of the sex offender registry, then  
13 at that point the solicitor's office would give cause to  
14 have to show that the ABHAN did contain some sexual  
15 offenses to it and that obviously didn't happen. So  
16 that's why we would only ask that Your Honor consider the  
17 kidnapping

18 THE COURT: How do you want me to do that? That's my  
19 question.

20 MR. BOOZER: Judge --

21 THE COURT: I'm not saying I'll do it or not but I'm  
22 saying in reality how do you want me to familiarize myself  
23 with the situation and isolate it only to the kidnapping?

24 MR. BOOZER: And certainly, Judge, we would obviously  
25 defer to your judgment on that but I guess certainly Your

1 Honor is going to have to look at the entire transcript to  
2 read what occurred at the trial but as far as considering  
3 whether the kidnapping contained the sexual element, I  
4 mean under code -- SC Code 23-3-430, the Court may make a  
5 finding the offense did not include a criminal sexual act  
6 or attempted criminal sexual act. And so we're only  
7 talking about this offense.

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 MR. BOOZER: And of course that can be up to Your  
10 Honor in considering --

11 THE COURT: Well, we can speculate about --  
12 Mr. Woods, I don't know anything about your case. I mean,  
13 literally I do not know anything about it or the facts of  
14 it. I mean, I think in processing through the transcript,  
15 understanding the difference between, you know, I would  
16 need to figure out who the victim of the kidnapping was  
17 and what other -- what if any other victims were even  
18 present in the house, and look at the indictment to  
19 understand the different players that are involved in the  
20 case. I mean, I think I can sufficiently look at the  
21 kidnapping charge in and of itself and make a  
22 determination without, you know, considering -- I don't  
23 want to say not considering but taking them individually  
24 as opposed to corporately with everything else involved.

25 MR. BOOZER: And, Judge, I think Mr. Woods' position

1 in all of this is that, and I want to make it clear that  
2 this is the argument and the position that we're taking.  
3 We're not saying that the ABHAN did involve some sort of  
4 sexual act because his position is, well, I was charged  
5 with a CSC, obviously the jury did not agree with that.

6 THE COURT: Right.

7 MR. BOOZER: And they found it was ABHAN. Obviously  
8 I don't have to recite to Your Honor the elements of ABHAN  
9 but in the section itself there's no real sexual  
10 connotation with an ABHAN conviction as it stands with the  
11 elements. So that's why we think you should not consider  
12 the ABHAN or the allegations regarding the CSC but only  
13 the offense per the statute of the kidnapping itself.

14 THE COURT: Okay. All right. And, I mean, and of  
15 course now you got to remember we're under the old ABHAN  
16 law in 2000. And one of the old elements of the ABHAN  
17 law, one of the elements of aggravation is obviously a  
18 difference in the sexes or inappropriate liberties, you  
19 know, with a female. And we haven't used that in so long  
20 I can't even remember all the different factors but I'll  
21 certainly -- I mean, I think the kidnapping offense is the  
22 only offense that he was convicted of that triggers the  
23 sex offender registry. The ABHAN does not. The State  
24 could have made their motion at the time that the ABHAN  
25 does, and that's why the registry needs to kick in. But I

1 understand what you're saying in trying to take that, I  
2 don't want to say in a vacuum but really isolate it down  
3 to the kidnapping and the crime involved in the kidnapping  
4 based upon the indictment's allegation.

5 MR. BOOZER: And to that end, I may have already  
6 mentioned this but we would ask Your Honor to certainly  
7 look at the indictment on the kidnapping and allegations  
8 that were made in the indictment as well as they've not  
9 listed any sort of sexual connotation in that.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MR. BOOZER: And, Your Honor, if I may have one  
12 moment with my client.

13 THE COURT: You may. Yes, sir.

14 (Mr. Boozer confers with Applicant.)

15 MR. BOOZER: Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Hold on.

17 (Pause.) Okay.

18 MR. BOOZER: Your Honor, Mr. Woods has asked me to  
19 make, I guess, sort of a statement or a request to the  
20 Court and as an officer of the Court, I'm not sure that  
21 Your Honor has any authority to do this but on behalf of  
22 Mr. Woods --

23 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

24 MR. BOOZER: -- his request is that if you're in  
25 agreement that there is no sexual offense or conduct

1 related to the kidnapping, that you find his attorney  
2 ineffective in regard to that for failing to do this in  
3 the first place.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MR. BOOZER: I've explained to him that I don't  
6 believe Your Honor has authority.

7 THE COURT: Okay. And I understand that request,  
8 Mr. Woods. And I understand how in your mind or in the  
9 mind of someone who doesn't sit in here and do this,  
10 that's a natural and logical flow-through process. If I  
11 went to lunch and said it to somebody who didn't have a  
12 lawyer they would say, well, yeah, it flows naturally that  
13 if I found that then your lawyer should have asked that  
14 and therefore your lawyer was ineffective.

15 The way the case is postured at this time because of  
16 it being a declaratory judgment action, I do not have the  
17 authority and even if you had a PCR, frankly, it would be  
18 time barred based upon the passage of the statute of  
19 limitations on those. But I do not have the authority to  
20 make the determination that your lawyer was ineffective as  
21 a matter of law. Does that make sense --

22 THE APPLICANT: (Nods head.)

23 THE COURT: -- in not requesting that? I think I  
24 have the authority under this Thompson case that came out  
25 in the spring of this year to determine whether or not --

1 to make a finding as to whether or not your kidnapping  
2 offense involved a sexual or attempted sexual offense.

3 But I can't, I can't declare as a matter of law that  
4 whoever your -- I don't even know who your attorney was.  
5 Whoever your attorney was at the time was ineffective  
6 under the parameters set forth in the ineffective  
7 assistance of counsel law.

8 Mr. Miller, did you want to respond to anything?

9 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, just to in some respects  
10 agree with Mr. Boozer that I do think that it is  
11 appropriate that -- as I believe even Mr. Woods in his  
12 petition stated, that the Court's inquiry focus on the  
13 kidnapping offense itself because in the sexual, the sex  
14 offender registry statute subsection 15 does specifically  
15 talk about kidnapping.

16 And, in point of fact, there's this catchall at the  
17 end that says anything that has a sexual component to it  
18 the solicitor can present evidence to justify the person  
19 having to be on the registry. And, Your Honor, I don't  
20 think that we need to go that far. I don't think that the  
21 Court needs to consider that. I do believe, Your Honor,  
22 that it would be unfair for them to say, okay, the State  
23 couldn't present any evidence now to show that the ABHAN  
24 conviction had a sexual component to it when there was no  
25 need for the solicitor to make that argument at the trial,

1 at the conclusion of the trial because you have to look at  
2 the statute. The statute says unless the Court does this  
3 then you're on the sex offender registry.

4 So there's absolutely no reason since the Court  
5 didn't do that, there's no reason for the solicitor to  
6 stand up and try to present evidence to say that this was  
7 or was not -- the ABHAN was or was not a sexual offense  
8 because as Mr. Boozer pointed out, there's nothing  
9 inherently sexual in nature about an ABHAN even though in  
10 this case it was a lesser included or it was found as a  
11 lesser included of the CSC first indictment.

12 Your Honor, the other thing is, I want to be clear  
13 and I'm not sure how to -- I'm not sure that the -- what  
14 the answer to this question is. It's something I haven't  
15 been able to find any kind of precedent on or any kind of  
16 instruction on. The statute makes it clear this has  
17 nothing to do with the jury verdict. This is a decision  
18 to be made by the Court based upon the evidence that is  
19 presented at the trial of the case. And it is very clear  
20 based upon Thompson as well as some other cases that this  
21 is civil in nature and is not criminal in nature.

22 So I don't know if it is a preponderance of the  
23 evidence standard. I don't know if it is a beyond a  
24 reasonable doubt standard or a clear and convincing  
25 standard.

1           And, the statute itself doesn't speak in terms of  
2 anyone having a burden of proof because the statute talks  
3 about upon a conviction for kidnapping the judge can make  
4 this finding. And I know the legislature didn't give the  
5 Court or us a lot of guidance on that, but what is clear  
6 from the statute is that the Court's decision as to  
7 whether or not it has, the offense has a sexual component  
8 that would require the registration under the sex offender  
9 registry is not tied to the jury's verdict in any way,  
10 shape or form. It's a decision for the Court to make.

11           There was a qualifying conviction, that being  
12 kidnapping, period. Now the Court has to determine if  
13 that kidnapping conviction had a sexual component or not  
14 and specifically the language from the statute it says,  
15 except when the Court makes a finding on the record that  
16 the offense did not include a criminal sexual offense or  
17 an attempted criminal sexual offense.

18           So I just want to make sure that that distinction is  
19 noted, that the jury verdict doesn't control in any way  
20 and the fact that the jury did not find him guilty of the  
21 CSC first is not material to the Court's actual ability to  
22 make the determination one way or the other.

23           THE COURT: I understand what you're saying. All  
24 right.

25           So, I think I can get this read and processed by the

1 end of next week because it's a no-court week. So -- and  
2 I'm not going to any conferences. So I think I can  
3 legitimately sit down and get this read and processed  
4 quickly.

5 So if y'all want to submit anything on what type of  
6 standard or if y'all want to do any research on what type  
7 of standard if any I should be applying to this  
8 determination, you know, do it by next Friday. And then  
9 I'll make -- I'll let y'all, you know, I'll process  
10 through that. But if you don't you don't and I understand  
11 that and I understand your reasoning for not doing so.  
12 But if you want to let me know that by next Friday. I  
13 think I can get, based upon what I now have under  
14 advisement and what I know I have coming up, I think I can  
15 get through this transcript next week.

16 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I have a proposed order.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. MILLER: And I'll be e-mailing that --

19 THE COURT: That's fine.

20 MR. MILLER: -- to you, obviously copying Mr. Boozer.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Great. Anything else,

22 Mr. Boozer?

23 MR. BOOZER: Nothing further, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Mr. Miller?

25 MR. MILLER: Nothing further, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Mr. Woods, you've been in custody now for  
2 16-plus years so I'm not going to let this thing linger  
3 around. Okay?

4 THE APPLICANT: I'm telling you.

5 THE COURT: I don't think that's fair for you.  
6 You've been waiting for two years for this one to come up  
7 and I'm going to jump on this next week and give it my  
8 undivided attention. Next week I don't have court so I'll  
9 be able to shut my door and read your transcript and  
10 process through it and process through the different  
11 issues presented. So I'll be able to give it my undivided  
12 attention. Okay?

13 And I'm not going to let it linger for long. You  
14 need a decision and you need a decision to move forward  
15 and you've come before the Court very respectfully and  
16 politely and I appreciate that. I'm going to get it on it  
17 real quick. Okay?

18 THE APPLICANT: (Nods head.)

19 THE COURT: Thank you all very much.

20 MR. BOOZER: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 END OF CASE: 12:15 P.M.

22

23

24

25

## 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER


2 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )

3 COUNTY OF AIKEN )

4 I, Cheri L. Young, Registered Professional Reporter  
5 and Official Court Reporter for the State of South  
6 Carolina, Second Circuit-At Large, do hereby certify that  
7 the foregoing proceedings were written stenographically by  
8 me using computer-aided translation; further, that the  
9 foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record, to the  
10 best of my skill and ability, of all the proceedings had  
11 and evidence introduced in the hearing of the captioned  
12 case, relative to appeal, in the Court of Common Pleas for  
13 Aiken County, on the 21st day of September, 2016.

14 I do further certify that I am neither of kin,  
15 counsel, nor interest to any party hereto.

16 I have hereunder set my hand this 16th day of May,  
17 2017.

18  
19  
20   
21 Cheri L. Young, RPR  
22 Official Court Reporter  
23  
24  
25



# SCCID

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON INDIGENT DEFENSE

Division of Appellate Defense  
1330 Lady Street, Suite 401

Columbia, South Carolina 29201-3332

Post Office Box 11589

Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1589

Telephone: (803) 734-1330

Facsimile: (803) 734-1397

Robert M. Dudek, Chief Appellate Defender  
Wanda H. Carter, Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

May 31, 2017

The Honorable Daniel E. Shearouse,  
Clerk, S. C. Supreme Court  
P. O. Box 11330  
Columbia, SC 29511

Dear Mr. Shearouse:

The following case falls under the 60 day rule for appeals, and the date we received the transcript is listed to the side.

Cedric L. Woods v. The State  
Appellate Case No. 2016-002367

5/31/2017

I would appreciate you beginning our time limits from the above date, and if you need additional information, or have any questions please contact me.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Paula Murdoch  
Administrative Coordinator

CASE 17-94

v. State

Court Reporter(s) Cheri Young TDG

Inmate # 265289 Institution Oleandale AG

County: Aiken Judge: Robert E. Hood Circuit

Req. trans. by: 4-10-17 PCR Hrg: September 21, 2016

<u>3-16-17</u>	Req'd trans.	Cert Granted Y or N	
<u>5-15-17</u>	to be rec'd <sup>(over)</sup>	BOP due	
<u>5-31-17</u>	rec'd	1 <sup>st</sup> ext _____ 2 <sup>nd</sup> ext _____	* CR EXTENSIC
<u>7-31-17</u>	Pet. for cert due		* Ext. _____ Ext. _____
1 <sup>st</sup> ext _____ 2 <sup>nd</sup> ext _____ 3 <sup>rd</sup> ext _____			* Ext. _____ Ext. _____
	Return due		* Ext. _____ Ext. _____
1 <sup>st</sup> ext _____ 2 <sup>nd</sup> ext _____ 3 <sup>rd</sup> ext _____			

Tr. Pg. # 19

App. Pg. #

Charges: attempted armed robbery; Kidnaping; ABHA; burglary 1<sup>st</sup> degree

Attorney at PCR HRG Jance S. Poozer

