

RE: REMITTANCE RESPONSE [2014-002196].

AS OF FEBRUARY 24TH, 2017, THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS
FINALIZED THEIR JUDGMENT IN CASE NUMBER 1992-GS-02-0396 /
D319417.

ALTHOUGH THIS PETITIONER APPEARED AND TESTIFIED BEFORE DOCKET A
EARLY III, THE SECOND CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR AIKEN COUNTY, WHERE THE
CONVICTION TOOK PLACE DECEMBER 10TH, 1992: EVIDENCE WHICH OPENLY
QUESTIONED THE STATE'S ALLEGATION THAT "DNA TESTS" WERE ACTUALLY
SUFFICIENT TO JUSTIFY "TRUE IDENTITY OF PERPETRATOR" OF THIS HEINOUS
CRIME COMMITTED WELL OVER A QUARTER CENTURY AGO.

ON JULY 3RD, 2017, A CORRESPONDENCE WAS RECEIVED FROM CHIEF
DEPUTY CLERK FOR THE CRIMINAL DIVISION OF AIKEN COUNTY, WRITTEN
JUNE 27TH, 2017, INFORMING PETITIONER THAT "YOU DO NOT HAVE ANY
OTHER PENDING CASES WITH US TO FILE YOUR PAPERWORK IN." * "IF YOU
ARE WANTING TO "APPEAL THE DECISION OF THE APPELLATE COURT" YOU
WOULD SEND YOUR APPEAL TO THE "SUPREME COURT"."

ACCORDING TO SOUTH CAROLINA CODE ANN § 17-27-100, PETITIONER
HAS THE UNDENIABLE RIGHT TO "APPEAL ANY UNFAVORABLE DECISION
AGAINST HIM": THIS IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS CORRESPONDENCE; TO
APPEAL 2014-002196 REMITTANCE SENT BACK TO THE LOWER COURT
TO ROBERT J HARTE.

1 COPY: SC SUPREME CT
1 COPY: SC ATTORNEY GENERAL
- MAILED JULY 11TH -

RECEIVED

JUL 13 2017


S.C. SUPREME COURT


LEGAL

1992-GS-02-0396 / D319417

CONT. "REMITTITUR RESPONSE" [2014-002196].

PETITIONER IS "INDIGENT" AND UNABLE TO PROVIDE "LEGAL ASSISTANCE" IN EFFORTS TO CHALLENGE THE TESTIMONIES GIVEN DURING THE FOUR DAY TRIBUNAL DECEMBER 7TH THRU 10TH, 1992 ON "INCOMPLETE DNA TESTS." IN GOOD FAITH, ACKNOWLEDGE THE RECEIPT OF THIS CORRESPONDENCE BY "DATE-STAMPING", COPYING AND MAILING COPIES TO BOTH THIS PETITIONER, AS WELL AS, ATTORNEY GENERAL WHO OPPOSES EXONERATION OF THIS PETITIONER SENDING THIS "APPEAL" TO THIS HONORABLE COURT.


JOHN JAMES BELL, PETITIONER PRO SE.

 BEFORE ME July 6, 2017

Collette A. Ameca

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires December 22, 2018

RETURN ADDRESS: SCNC #192526 / Kershaw Prison - MAGE #17
4848 GOLD MINE HWY / Kershaw, SC 29067-8069

SEE ATTACHED FOR RULE 221, 227<C> 224<C-3> AND 225 PROOFS TO SUPPORT "SUPERSEDEAS" OF FEBRUARY 24TH, 2017 "REMITTITUR" TO Aiken County.

1992-GS-02-0396 / D319417

JOHN JAMES BELL
PETITIONER PRO SE.

VS

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
RESPONDENT

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

MOTION OF MANDAMUS

SC CODE ANN §17-27-100

TO CASE NUMBER 1992-GS-02-0396
[REMITTITUR 2014-002196]

PETITIONER, JOHN JAMES BELL [SCDC #192526] HOUSED AT
KERSHAW PRISON, RECEIVED AN AFFIRMED FINDING FROM THE
SOUTH CAROLINA APPELLATE COURT FEBRUARY 10TH, 2017 AND
THE REMITTITUR MARCH 3RD, 2017.

LEGAL AIDE PAUL ANDREW ANDERSON POSTED A CORRESPONDENCE
AFFIRMING THE DENIAL MAY 31ST, 2017, RECEIVED JUNE 3RD, 2017.
DURING THIS TIME ANDERSON HAD A FEBRUARY 13TH, 2017 TYPED
ATTACHED WITH MAY 31ST, 2017 CORRESPONDENCE.

SC CODE ANN §17-27-100 EXPLAINS PETITIONER'S RIGHT TO APPEAL.
PAUL ANDREW ANDERSON TOTALLY NEGLECTED HIS DUTY TO THIS
APPELLATE PROCESS BY ALLOWING VALUABLE TIME TO BE SPENT IN
NO ACTIVE PURSUIT OF SC CODE ANN §17-27-100 FOR PETITIONER.

PETITIONER WILL PROVIDE WHAT PAUL ANDREW ANDERSON DELIBERATELY
NEGLECTED TO PURSUE IN LIGHT OF A NEGATIVE RULING FROM THE
AUGUST 27TH, 2017 HEARING BEFORE JUDGE A. EARLY III 2ND CIRCUIT.

SUBSCRIBED BEFORE ME July 6, 2017

Notary Public

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC

MY TERM EXPIRES My Commission Expires December 22, 2018

1992-GS-02-0396 / D319417

Aiken County Clerk of Court

PO Box 583

Aiken, SC 29802

To whom it may concern: John Bell

This office is returning your motion to you, Andy Anderson is listed as your attorney in this case. You will need to send this motion to your attorney and in turn your attorney may submit this motion for filing. Please see notation below on hybrid representation.

Thank you,

Charles Westall

Deputy Clerk

Date: March 25, 2013

MAR 29 2013
MAIL ROOM (SOUTH)

****Hybrid representation. There is no right to hybrid representation under the Sixth Amendment or the state constitution. Hence, substantive documents filed *pro se* by a person represented by counsel are not accepted unless submitted by counsel. This order does not limit any party from filing a *pro se* motion seeking to relieve his counsel or from filing a brief in cases submitted pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967) and *Johnson v. State*, 294 S.C. 310 364 S.E.2d 201 (1988). *State v. Stuckey*, Order (S.C. Sup. Ct., Nov. 5, 1998) (Shearouse Adv. Sh. #35)**

12
MAR 29 2013
MAIL ROOM (SOUTH) SIX

Kershaw CI

Kershaw

WB48

FINANCIAL CERTIFICATE
FOR THE
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

APR 07 2015

(for use in § 1983, Bivens, and non-habeas civil actions filed by prisoners)

RECEIVED
MAIL ROOM

I request that an authorized officer of the institution in which I am confined, or other person designated to review financial information in relation to inmate trust funds, complete this Certificate. If I have insufficient funds in my account that prohibit me from paying the full filing fee required by 28 U.S.C. § 1914, I will send with my complaint an initial installment payment, required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915, equal to the amount calculated and entered on line four by the authorized officer signing this form.

MR. JOHN JAMES BELL ^{AK} A CHIEF AZEELAL MUMIT #192526
INMATE NAME (PRINTED) INMATE (PRISONER) NUMBER
my John x Bell ^{أحمد محمد} ^{محمد}
INMATE SIGNATURE PLACE OF CONFINEMENT KERSHAW

- ♦ (1) Average monthly deposits to the inmate's account.....\$ 39.68
- ♦ (2) Average monthly balance in the inmate's account calculated for the prior six months period.\$ 1.73
- ♦ (3) Current Balance\$ 0
- ♦ (4) Initial Installment Payment (Take 20 percent of the greater of lines 1 or 2).....\$ 0

I hereby certify that as of this date, the above financial information is accurate for the above named inmate.

Authorized Officer's Signature

Date

Authorized Officer's Name and Title

1992-GS-02-0396

INMATE TRUST FUND ACCOUNT REPORT
for SOUTH CAROLINA COURT FILING FEES

Nershaw
C.I.

msls

Anchor

APR 07 2012

INSTRUCTIONS TO INMATE: Complete top portion then give to your mailroom. When returned from Accounting, you must mail this form with any payment to the Court.

By signing my name below, I am asking the Financial Accounting Office of the South Carolina Department of Corrections to complete this report. In accordance with SC Code of Laws §24-27-100 and 150, I authorize payment of the full filing fee. If I have insufficient funds in my account at this time to pay the court's full filing fee, I authorize SCDC to deduct the initial and subsequent payments until payment is completed.

INMATE NAME (print): MR. JOHN JAMES BELL AL OMAR ABDEL-AL-MU'MIT

SCDC # 192526

INMATE SIGNATURE: [Signature]

I plan to file this action in the SC County of LANCASTER

The section below is for SCDC - Financial Accounting Branch's use ONLY.

- (1) Total deposits to inmate's account for preceding six months' period* \$ 237.25
- (2) Twenty percent (20%) of line 1 \$ 47.45
- (3) Account balance - current date \$ 0.
- (4) PAYMENT AMOUNT **
(lesser of line 2 or line 3)
Enclosed check # \$ 0

****NOTE to COURT:** If payment is for partial fee, Court must notify SCDC once case is accepted and filed. Send notice with case # and balance owed to address below. SCDC will NOT process any additional payments until notification is received from Court.

South Carolina Department of Corrections
Financial Accounting - Room 234
PO Box 21787
Columbia, SC 29221-1787

*Admission date is noted here if inmate incarcerated less than six months ____/____/____

1992-GS-02-0396

4/2/15

RE: BROICERING A SETTLEMENT 1992-GS-02-0396.
(CD319417)

ACCORDING TO THE FEBRUARY 24TH, 2017 REMITTITUR FROM A FAILED ATTEMPT BY AIKEN COUNTY SOLICITOR AND OFFICERS OF THE COURT TO CONTINUE DEFENDANT OMAR 'ABDEL-AL-MU' MIT S/W JOHN JAMES BELL IN SOUTH CAROLINA'S PENAL SYSTEM: AT THIS WRITING, AT THIS TIME FLAG DAY 2017, DEFENDANT WOULD LIKE TO BRIEFLY ADDRESS THE READER OF THIS 'EFFORT TO LET "DUE PROCESS OF THE LAW" BE OBEYED IN FULL.

IN GOOD FAITH, DEFENDANT HEREBY REQUESTS AN "AUDIENCE" BETWEEN PARTIES SEEKING TO PROLONG JUSTICE BEING DONE IN THIS CASE 1992-GS-02-0396 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ROBERT J HARTE.

AS HUMAN BEINGS, WE MUST FOLLOW "PROTOCOL", EVEN IF IT IS "AGAINST OUR "PERSONAL FEELINGS", REGARDLESS OF WHAT THAT MIGHT BE." KEEP IN MIND, THIS CASE BEFORE THIS READER "LACKED CONVINCING EVIDENCE"; IF "SPECULATION" WASN'T MISTAKEN FOR "ACTUAL FACTS", THIS BROICERAGE WOULD NOT BE IMPORTANT TO ALL CONCERNED.

* HOW TO BEGIN NEGOTIATED TERMS FOR A QUARTER CENTURY LOSS OF LIFE SPENT IN THE "HORRIFIC PENAL SYSTEM" OF SOUTH CAROLINA. * PROTECTION OF LIFE AND LIBERTY, THIS WAS NEVER A PART OF THE "DUE PROCESS" AFFORDED TO PEOPLE WHO PLEAD "NOT GUILTY" TO THEIR INDICTMENTS, WHETHER "TRUE BILL", OR NOT; "DUE PROCESS" IS NOW PART OF THIS "REMITTITUR" FOR CASE 1992-GS-02-0396.

SOUTH CAROLINA HAS ITS OWN MANNERISMS APPROVING AND DISAPPROVING "COMPENSATIONS OWED OUT", THIS CASE WILL NOT SUFFER ANY FURTHER "DELAY", OR "CALCULATED INJUSTICE" - ACCORDING TO PERSONAL DISAPPOINTMENT.

* 1992-GS-02-0396 NEEDS "OFFICIAL CLOSURE": THIS WRITING 5/11/17

SIGNED TO BEFORE ME
May 10, 2017

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY COM. EXPIRES Jan 27, 2025

CE 0360.

INDIGENT DEFENSE.

APPELLATE RECORD OF APPEALS FOR "DUE PROCESS".

Judge EARLY And Anderson

FILED

May 10

Robert J. Harte
C.C.P. & G.S.

Cheryl J. Westman
Deputy Clerk

LEGAL

2

1992-GS-02-00396 (D319417)

OMAIR 'ABDEL-AL-MU'MIT
S/N JOHN JAMES BELL
DEFENDANT, PRO SE.

VS.

AIKEN COUNTY AND SC
ATTORNEY GENERAL.
RESPONDENTS.

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
AIKEN COUNTY SOUTH CAROLINA

MOTION FOR "MANDAMUS" TO
"QUASH" ALL INDICTMENTS.

CASE NUMBER 1992-GS-02-0396

THE ABOVE MOTION COMES AS A DIRECT RESULT OF THE STATE'S
UNSENDING TACTICS TO UNDERMINE THE "DUE PROCESS" THAT
WAS NEVER INTENDED TO ALLOW "JUSTICE" TO PREVAIL IN THE
VERDICT TO REOPEN A CASE CLEVERLY NAILED SHUT BY A
BOGUS "MAXTON" RULING IN 2009; THE SAME YEAR "DRAFTS"
CAME ABOUT - § 17-28-30 - OF WHICH THIS REVERSAL CAME ABOUT.

AT THIS POINT, IT WOULD BE A PURE SENSELESSNESS WASTE OF TIME
TO CONTINUE PROVING A "CONSPIRACY TO CONVICT" TOOK PLACE IN 1992;
SO AT TIMES COURT DISREGARDED PREVIOUS ATTEMPTS FOR RESULTS,
THIS ABOVE MOTION WILL BE BASED ON THE FOLLOWING ISSUES.
AIKEN COUNTY'S DELIBERATE CONCEALMENT OF INFORMATION FROM
STATE ASSIGNED LEGAL AIDES, WHO FAILED TO AVOID "CONFLICT OF
INTEREST" BY NOT ESTABLISHING "ALIBI DEFENSE"; PROPERLY CALLING
WITNESSES IN THE COURT ROOM THAT DAY OF THE DECEMBER TRIBUNAL.
BECAUSE OF THIS, 1992-GS-02-0396 WAS ALLOWED TO HAPPEN.
THIS MOTION IS BASED ON "UNTRUTHFUL ACTS" BY THE STATE AND THE
SWORN OFFICERS OF THE COURT, WHO FAILED TO SERVE THEIR CAPACITY
SEEKING TO SOLVE A CRIME BEFORE THE GENERAL SESSIONS COURT.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF AIKEN
I, Robert J. Harte, Clerk of Court of Common Pleas and General
Sessions for Aiken County, South Carolina do hereby certify
that the foregoing constitutes a true and correct copy of the
original documents which have been filed in my office this
10 day of May 2017

Robert J. Harte
C.C.P. & G.S., Aiken County, S.C.
George S. Westall, Jr.
Deputy Clerk

Copies Judge Early
Solicitor
Andy Anderson
Mr. Bell

FILED May 10 20 17
Robert J. Harte
C.C.P. & G.S.
George S. Westall, Jr.
Deputy Clerk

LEGAL

3

PAGE TWO - CONCLUSION TO MOTION TO "QUASH".

DISCOVERY IS THE MAJOR CONCERN IN THIS "MOTION TO QUASH" THE PENDING INDICTMENTS AGAINST THE DEFENDANT, WHO HAS SAT PATIENTLY OBSERVING HOW DEVIOUS SAID OFFICERS OF THE COURT COULD BE, EVEN WHEN FACTS CLEARLY SHOW "WRONG PERSON" WAS BEING TRIED FROM THE VERY START. "IGNORANCE", "RACISM" AND THE NEWS MEDIA PROMOTING "EMOTIONALISM" IN THIS CASE, MADE IT "VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO RECEIVE A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIAL".

SADLY ENOUGH, THE TRUTH WASN'T BROUGHT FORTH DECEMBER 1992, IT WOON'T BE BROUGHT OUT NOW, MAY 2017 - NEARLY TWENTY-FIVE YEARS LATER - WITH THOSE OFFICERS OF THE COURT CLAIMING A LOSS OF MEMORY.

ACTUALLY, THE "SUPPRESSION OF EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE" IS IN "DIRECT VIOLATION" OF THE NINE PROCESS OF THE SIXTH AMENDMENT AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

THIS CASE 1992-GS-D2-0396 WAS ALLOWED TO BE SWEEP UNDER THE LEGAL INSCRIPTION OF "FRIVOLOUS", AND OR, "SUCCESSIVE". WHEN IN FACT, THE "NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE" OF INCOMPETENCE ON THE PART OF THE STATE APPOINTED "LEGAL AIDE" FELL WELL BELOW THE REQUIRED STANDARD OF JUST SHOWING UP ON TIME FOR COURT.

THE REAL DEAL BEHIND THIS MOTION IS THAT OMAR 'ABDEL-AL-MU'MIT WAS NEVER INVOLVED WITH ANYTHING THAT OCCURRED AT 480 NESOTO DRIVE - "BUYING ROCK COCAINE" AND "LEAVING" THAT ADDRESS WAS ALL MADE UP BY HUFF AND HIS CREW; WHO SHOULD BE ARRESTED AND GIVEN A PRISON CELL. AGAIN, NONE OF THE OFFICERS ACTUALLY BELIEVE IN THE BOOK THEY SWORE ON, BECAUSE IT STATES CLEARLY AGAINST LYING.

AFFIDAVIT: ALL OF THE FORESTATED IS A PART OF AN "ON-GOING" ACT REQUIRING AN END TO 1992-GS-D2-0396 BY QUASHING INDICTMENTS.

PROOF OF SERVICE: DEFENDANT IS HEREBY REQUESTING CLERK OF COURT TO "DATE-STAMP", COPY AND SEND TO DEFENDANT AND ALL WHO OPPOSE "EXONERATION" OF OMAR 'ABDEL-AL-MU'MIT SKI JOHN JAMES BELL.

WITNESSE BEFORE ME Cheryl R. Funder, Notary Public, May 2, 2017.

CHERYL R. FUNDER, NOTARY PUBLIC. EXPIRES Jan 27, 2025.

DONALD J. TRUMP [ACTUAL INNOCENCE CLAIM].

US ATT GEN [FOR INTERNAL AFFAIRS].

SC ATT GEN [SEEKING ASSISTANCE FOR EXONERATION].

APPELLATE RECORDS ON-GOING TO DATE.

Re: "DUE PROCESS VIOLATION OF SC CODE ANN §17-27-100"

4

Mrs GODARD,

12/19/14

I AM ADDRESSING AN APPLICATION SENT BACK TO ME "UNPROCESSED" WITH A STIPULATION FROM THE SC SUPREME CT. STATING I CANNOT FILE ANY FURTHER APPLICATIONS OR PETITIONS WITHOUT THEIR PERMISSION, YET THIS RECENT POST CONVICTION RELIEF APPLICATION WAS "NEVER FILED BEFORE" AND THE SAME JUSTICE OVER THE SC SUPREME CT. HAS, HERSELF, ARGUED IN FAVOUR OF SC CODE ANN §17-27-100 [EVEN AS THE APPLICATION RULED ON WAS HELD AS "SUCCESSIVE" IN NATURE]. THIS APPLICATION IS NO DIFFERENT. * CASE IN POINT: ODOM v STATE, 523 SE 2D 753; STATE v JOHNSON, 360 SE 2D 317 [SC CODE ANN §1-23-350; UNDER RULE 65]. *

SOMETHING OF THIS MAGNITUDE CAN NEVER BE BRUSHED UNDER THE LEGAL RUG OF "SUCCESSIVE" OR "UNTIMELY"; BUT FOR TWENTY-THREE YEARS A BLACK CLOUD FULL OF NEGATIVITY HAS ALWAYS SUPPORTED THE LIES THAT COVERED THE TRUTH OF WHO DONE IT TO BABY JANE; TRULY THE DOOR OF THIS TRAIL OF "WHAT IF EVIDENCE", "NEVER STOOD TRIAL" AND AT THIS LATE STAGE OF THE TURN OF EVENTS, PROBABLY NEVER WILL.

ALTHOUGH THE SAME GROUP OF OFFICERS OF THE COURT, SWORN TO "UPHOLD THE LAW", NEVER ONCE QUESTIONED THE PILES OF RESEARCHED EVIDENCE PROVIDED PREVIOUSLY TO SHOW AND PROVE I NEVER WAS AT THE PLACES THE SOLICITOR CLAIMED I WAS ... THERE WAS NEVER ANY "PHYSICAL EVIDENCE" TO CONNECT MY PARTICIPATION IN THIS CRIME FROM DAY ONE [READ THE TRANSCRIPT]. IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN YOU WERE THERE MOST OF MY TRIAL. [12-7 THRU 12-10-92]

BECAUSE I NEVER GOT THAT "BITE OF THE APPLE OF APPEAL UNDER THE POST CONVICTION RELIEF ACT" [DUE TO THE OPEN VIOLATION OF JUDGE BROWN STATING FOR THE RECORD, IN OPEN COURT THAT HE KNEW NOTHING OF MY APPEAL, WHEN HE, HIMSELF, RULED AGAINST MY "NOTION FOR SPEEDY TRIAL": JUNE 16TH, 1992]

* IT IS OBVIOUSLY TRUE THAT WHEN LIES ARE ACCEPTED AS THE TRUTH AND THEY THAT LIED ARE NEVER SUBPOENAED TO CORRECT THE "MISGIVINGS SUFFERED FROM THROUGH THAT LIE"; THE ONE LIED ON IS LEFT WITH NOTHING BUT THE EFFECTS OF "A GROSS MISCARriage OF JUSTICE" AN APOLOGY WILL NEVER CORRECT OR JUSTIFY, WHEN IN FACT THE SYSTEM ITSELF IS CORRUPT. *

I WOULD ASK THAT THIS LETTER BE "TIME STAMPED" COPIED AND SENT TO JEAN H TOAL, SC ATT GEN AND RETURNED TO ME FOR PROOF OF SERVICE.

IN "GOOD FAITH", SEEKING AN END TO THIS AGE OLD NIGHTMARE: WITH THE DUE FEAR OF LYING BEFORE GOD ALMIGHTY, WHO NEVER DIED

Omar Abdel-Al-Mu'min s/n Mr John James Bell
CASE # 1992-GS-02-0396, 0397 AND 0784.

ATTACH WASHINGTON v STATE, 478 SE 2D 833 TO THE ABOVE ARGUMENTS.

1992-GS-02-0396

10

16
SEVENTH

5

Re: "DUE PROCESS"

ATTENTION SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERAL: - 12/26/14 -



ON AUGUST 27TH, 2014, I APPEARED BEFORE JUDGE DOYET A. EARLY, III [WHO HAS PREVIOUSLY "DENIED" EVERY EFFORT I'VE MADE TO CORRECT INACCURATE EVIDENCE THAT CONVICTED ME TWENTY-TWO YEARS AGO THIS MONTH IN AILEEN COUNTY] CHALLENGING THE LIMITED FINDINGS BY SLED THROUGH THEIR "DEGRADED BLOOD" THEORY, WHICH NEVER COMPLIED TO A "COURT ORDER" GIVEN BY THEN SENIOR CIRCUIT JUDGE RODNEY A. PEEPLES.

THIS HEARING WAS DENIED. I REQUESTED THE LAWYER ASSIGNED BY THE SAME JUDGE EARLY, TO APPEAL THE DECISION ON THE GROUNDS THAT THE STATE FAILED TO COMPLY WITH RULE FIVE REGARDING "DISCOVERY" AS ORDERED THROUGH A "SPEEDY TRIAL" MOTION EXPLAINED TO AND DENIED BY JUDGE LUKE N. BROWN, JR. [WHO ALSO HEARD AND DENIED MY ORIGINAL POST CONVICTION RELIEF APPLICATION DECEMBER 13TH, 1995 ON FEBRUARY 28TH, 1996 - WHICH, IN FACT, CLEARLY VIOLATES FLOYD V STATE, 400 SE 2D 145].

I HAVE SINCE FILED AN APPLICATION NOTARIZED TO HAVE MY RIGHT TO APPEAL CONSIDERED BASED ON SC CODE ANN §17-27-100.

THIS APPLICATION WAS RETURNED TO ME WITH A RULING FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT FROM 2012 - THE SAME YEAR I RECEIVED PERMISSION TO CHALLENGE THE DNA TEST RESULTS [NOVEMBER 28, 2012 FROM JUDGE DOYET A. EARLY, III - AFTER I GOT THE RUN AROUND THROUGH YOUR VERY OFFICE [SALLEY ELLIOTT]: I EXPOSED THE FACT THAT NO TESTS EVER WERE RELEASED BY SLED TO THE DEFENSE FOR EXPERT EVALUATION... THUS PRESENTING A ONE-SIDED AFFAIR.

IN GOOD FAITH, I AM SENDING WHAT I PRESENTED TO THE CLERK OF COURT TO HAVE YOUR OFFICE DIRECT MS LIZ GODARD TO PROVIDE COPIES TO JUDGE DOYET A. EARLY, III, MYSELF, AND CHIEF JUSTICE JEAN H. TOAL FOR EXECUTION OF MY RIGHT ACCORDING TO SC CODE ANN §17-27-100.

 
 "OMAR ABDEL-AL-MUT" MIT 5/11 MR. JOHN JAMES BELL, PRO SE.

SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS DAY December 29, 2014

Catharine A. Cameron SC NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY COMMISSION TERMINATES My Commission Expires December 22, 2018

1992-GS-02-0396

17

-Two-

6

- AFFIDAVIT -

THE CONTENTS OF THIS BRIEF DISCLOSURE OF "FACTS" ARE CORRECT AND EXACT TO THE VERY BEST OF MY CONSCIOUS EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE "DUE PROCESS" OF THE GOVERNING LAWS OF THIS LAND.

- PROOF OF SERVICE -

I HEREBY SUBMIT THIS "ORIGINAL DOCUMENT OF BRIEF DISCLOSURE" TO THE OFFICE OF THE HONOURABLE LIZ GODARD, Aiken County Clerk of Court, TO BE "TIME-STAMPED", COPIED AND SENT TO BOTH THE CHIEF JUSTICE JEAN H. TOL of the SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND A COMPLETE COPY OF THIS QUESTIONABLE IMPACT ON WITH SC CODE ANN §17-27-100 IS NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS APPELLATE PROCESS TO THIS CASE BEFORE THIS COURT: CITING A JUDGMENT MADE IN ITS FAVOUR UNDER THE WASHINGTON V STATE CASE [478 SE 2D 833] REF. 83 SCT 792 ALSO. IN "GOOD FAITH" THIS PACIFIC OF TRANSCRIPT TO SUPPORT PROOF OF "GROSS NEGLIGENCE" REGARDING "EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW" [INSCRIBED, NOT CASUALLY INTERPRETED, AS WAS DONE THROUGHOUT THIS CASE BEFORE THIS COURT OF APPEALS]; RESPECTFULLY ARGUED AND SUBMITTED;

عمر عبد المومن *my John x Bell*
 OMAR ABDEL-AZIM MIT /N MR JOHN JAMES BELL, PROSE.

SWORN BEFORE ME December 29, 2014

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC Catharine A. Chmura

MY COMMISSION TERMINATES My Commission Expires December 22, 2018

cc: ERIC HOLDER, US ATT. GEN.
 INNOCENCE PROJECT-AYC.
 ANDREW ANDERSON.
 APPELLATE RECORDS.

* SPECIAL NOTE TO SUPPORT REQUEST FOR COPIES OF THIS DISCLOSURE HEREIN IS BECAUSE "PRISON POLICY" WILL NOT PROVIDE COPIES OF "SO-CALLED" SELF-GENERATED DOCUMENT, WHICH WOULD COVER "ALL" LEGAL DOCUMENTS OUTSIDE OF A TRIAL TRANSCRIPT, SO PLEASE COPY THIS DISCLOSURE FOR THE PETITIONER'S APPELLATE RECORDS.*

1492-GS-02-0396

18

-ONE-

LEGAL

SOUTH CAROLINA LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION
FORENSIC SERVICES LABORATORY REPORT

7
CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, Jr.
GOVERNOR



ROBERT M. STEWART
CHIEF

Latent Print Department
December 11, 1991
SLED Lab No: L91-15090
Your Case No: 91-637
Incident Date: 11-2-91
(S) John James Bell
(V) Krystal Scurry

Inv. W. E. Ross
Inv. Bennie Williams
Aiken County Sheriff's Office
420 Hampton Avenue
Aiken, SC 29801

This is an official report of the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division Forensic Services Laboratory and is to be used in connection with an official criminal investigation. These examinations were conducted under your assurance that no previous examinations of person(s) or evidence submitted in this case has been or will be conducted by any other Laboratory or agency.

Robert M. Stewart, Chief
South Carolina Law Enforcement Division

ITEM(S) SUBMITTED:

- 3 One James Foxe Imported Canadian Whiskey bottle.
- 29 One piece of tin foil (not processed for latent prints).

RESULTS OF EXAMINATION: Item 28 was examined and processed for latent prints with negative results; no ridge detail was developed.

These examinations were conducted by S/A Charles Counts, Examiner with this Division.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Charles E. Counts".

Charles E. Counts, Special Agent

CEC/ahj

CC: Coroner Sue R. Townsend

1 Q. Were you here when Captain Huff from the
2 sheriff's department testified?

3 A. Part of the testimony.

4 Q. Did you hear the testimony about seeing stains
5 on the shirt?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Did you hear testimony about seeing stains on
8 the shoes?

9 A. No.

10 Q. I believe your direct testimony was you
11 couldn't see blood on these shoes, could you?

12 A. No.

13 Q. And you're a trained serologist?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. Would you agree that the stains on those pieces
16 of material are very light?

17 A. Very light? Yes.

18 Q. And you used up all this material basically?

19 A. Yes, I did.

20 Q. Nobody else could come behind you and check
21 your work, can they?

22 A. No.

23 Q. You're involved in criminal investigations all
24 over the state. Don't you expect that might want to be
25 something a defendant would want to do? Why don't you save

1 some of it is what I'm asking you.

2 A. It depends on the amount of sample. In this
3 case there wasn't enough to save. We wouldn't' have been
4 able to do the test we did on it if we had to save part of
5 it for defense.

6 Q. Enough for you to test but not enough to save
7 for anybody else?

8 A. That's correct in this case.

9 Q. And of course did you take any photographs of
10 these stains before you cut them up?

11 A. I took a photograph of the rug in the car.

12 Q. Sitting in the car?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Did you take any photographs of these shirts?

15 A. No, I did not.

16 Q. Didn't take any photographs of the shoes or
17 nothing like that?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Then the rug was sitting in the car on the
20 driver's seat, right?

21 A. That's right.

22 Q. And I think you found blood on the backside of
23 the driver's pants, his blood, human blood?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. No further questions.

IX. SOUTHERN BLOTTING OF GELS ONTO NYLON MEMBRANES

1. Slide the gel from the tray into a plastic box that contains 0.4M NaOH. Gently shake for 30 minutes.

Soak BRL blot pad in a separate container of 0.4M NaOH for 15 minutes. Discard the dirty NaOH and refill with fresh NaOH for an additional 15 minutes. During the same time period, fill a sponge with 0.4M NaOH and place it into a plastic dissecting tray. In a separate container, immerse Biodyne B (Pall) membrane (exactly 11 X 12.5 cm) in 0.4M NaOH for 15 minutes. Membrane should be handled only with gloved hands.

2. Place the soaked blot pad onto the sponge.

3. Carefully remove the gel from the NaOH. When removed, cover with a glass plate. The top of the gel is defined as the gel surface that contains the formed wells. Invert the gel, remove the top glass plate and slide the gel onto the blot pad. The original gel top should now be face down on the blot pad with the gel origin nearest to you. With gloved fingers, press down carefully on the gel to remove any air bubbles.

4. Without delay, place the presoaked Biodyne B membrane onto the gel. Be sure the edges of the membrane are square with the gel edges. Roll a glass pipette up and down the membrane several times to remove any air bubbles.

Cover the membrane with a piece of Whatman #3 that has been cut to 11 X 12.5 cm and wetted with 0.4M NaOH. Roll the surface.

Place 9 blot pads on top of the Whatman #3.

Place 2 - 15 X 20 X 0.4 cm glass plates on top of the sandwich.

5. Allow the transfer to proceed for 6 hours at room temperature.

6. Remove blot pads and 3 mm paper. Grasp the membrane at the right corner (origin end), remove and turn it over. Label the membrane with a pen where your thumb touched the membrane.

7. Wash the membrane once with 0.2 M Tris, pH 7.5 + 2X SSC for 15 minutes with gentle shaking. Blot the membrane on a sheet of Whatman #3.

8. Sandwich each membrane between 3 mm Whatman (tape edges) and place in an 80°C oven for 30 minutes.

* 4/27/17 - THE SEVEN REQUIRED DNA TESTS *

Normally 60 ml of hybridization solution is needed in the hybridization containers when hybridizing 11 X 12.5 cm membranes. Add the membranes to the hybridization solution one at a time, making certain that each is covered with solution before the next is added. As many as 6 membranes can be hybridized in the same container. After membranes are in the solution, tilt the container to pool the hyb solution at one corner. Add the labelled probes (VNTR probe and size marker probes) and agitate container to mix. Incubate at 65C overnight with constant shaking.

HYBRIDIZATION SOLUTION

20.4 ml STERILE H₂O
12.0 ml 50% PEG
4.5 ml 20X SSPE
21.0 ml 20% SDS
57.9 ml

+ probe (Volume = 2.1 ml + x uL probe)
See Appendix C, step 12

17

18

EXHIBIT 3

XI. POST-HYBRIDIZATION WASHES

1. Pour off the hybridization solution slowly. The membranes will stick to the bottom of the container. Capture the last drops that collect at the corner of the container with a Kimwipe. Discard the Kimwipe into a radioisotope waste container.

2. Carry out the following washes, using enough wash solution to fill the container one-half full.

A. 15 minutes in 2X SSC + 0.1% SDS at room temperature

B. 15 minutes in 2X SSC + 0.1% SDS at room temperature

C. 0.1X SSC + 0.1% SDS at 65C. The conditions of this final, high stringency, wash(es) will vary according to the probe that has been used:

<u>Probe (locus)</u>	<u>Number of washes</u>	<u>Length of each wash</u>
YNH24 (D2S44)	1	10 min
V1 (D17S79)	1	10 min
MS-1 (D1S7)	2	30 min
PH30 (D4S139)	2	30 min
CMM101 (D14S13)	1	30 min
3'HVR (D16S85)	1	10 min
TBQ7 (D10S28)	2	30 min

NOTE: The 0.1X SSC + 0.1% SDS used for the final stringency washes must be at 65C before it is added to the membranes.

3. Lightly blot the membrane on #3 Whatman - DO NOT LET THE MEMBRANE DRY OUT!

12.07.90

Dec

10
VII. AUTORADIOGRAPHY

1. Wrap the damp membranes in Glad or Saran wrap. Do not use the Reynolds food wrap for this step! In the darkroom under red light illumination, place the membranes DNA side down onto XAR film. Tape the membranes to this film. You can record the locations of membranes in contact with the film by writing directly on the film with a ball point pen. Place another sheet of XAR onto the back of the membranes and close the cassette. Place the cassette at -80°C .
2. The XAR film on the back side of the membranes can be removed after a short exposure period which can be as short as a few hours or as long as several days. The back film is to be used as a guide for determining the length of time the front film needs to be left in place.

19
XIII. BLOT STRIPPING PROCEDURE

1. Remove plastic wrap from membranes.
2. Place membranes in the following solution:
 - 110 ml formamide
 - 20 ml 20X SSPE
 - 10 ml 20% SDS
 - Q.S. with H₂O to 200 ml.
3. Shake membranes for 45-90 minutes at 65°C
4. Rinse the stripped blot in 200 ml of 0.1X SSC + 0.1% SDS for 1 minute at room temperature.
5. Place the blot on filter paper to remove excess fluid. Relabel the membrane with ballpen if required.
6. Place the blot in the hybridization solution for the next probing.

NOTE: If membranes are to be stored for an indefinite period of time, carry out the stripping and rinsing steps as described. Then, rewrap the membranes with plastic wrap and freeze at -80.

20
12.07.90

Dec

20

14

EXHIBIT 6

XIV. RESOLUTION OF SPERM CELL DNA AND VAGINAL CELL DNA

1. Remove the swab from the applicator stick and place into a 1.5 ml tube.

2. Add:
- 400 uL Tris/EDTA/NaCl (TNE)
 - 25 uL 20% sarkosyl
 - 75 uL H₂O
 - 5 uL PaseK
 - 505 uL

Mix tube contents and place at 37C for 2 hours.

3. Punch a hole in the cap of the tube. Place the swab into the cap and spin the tube for 5 minutes.

4. Remove the supernatant fluid and place it into a new 1.5 ml tube. This is the fraction that contains female DNA. Discard the swab. Be careful not to disturb the pellet on the bottom of the tube.

5. Place a new cap on the original tube.

6. To the pellet in the original tube add:

- 150 uL TNE
- 50 uL 20% sarkosyl
- 40 uL 0.39M DTT
- 150 uL H₂O
- 10 uL PaseK

Mix tube contents and place at 37C for 2 hours.

7. Extract both tubes (i.e. the tube containing the female fraction as well as the tube containing the sperm cell heads) with an equal volume of phenol:chloroform:isoamyl alcohol. Continue to process each of the samples as you would a regular stain extract.

21

12.07.90

QEC

54

21
PA
EXHIBIT 7
XV. ASSESSMENT OF AUTORADIOGRAPHY DATA

There are four major steps in the assessment of autoradiographic (autorad) data. Each of these steps will be described.

A. Visual evaluation of autorads

1. Examine the lane containing the allelic control specimen K562. There must be either one or two bands, depending on which RFLP locus has been probed. If the allelic control specimen does not exhibit the expected number of bands for the locus being probed, the autorad cannot be assessed further.
2. Visually inspect the allelic control band(s) for their position relative to the adjacent size markers. Depending on the locus being probed, the allelic control band(s) should be located in an expected position on the autorad. If the allelic control band(s) are not found in a visually expected position, the autorad cannot be assessed further.
3. Visually inspect the lanes that contain size markers. The bands in these lanes must be of sufficient intensity to enable them to be used as size references for the allelic control, the known, and the questioned specimen bands. If regions of the size ladder lanes are not visible, specimen bands cannot be sized in these regions.
4. Visually inspect the lanes that contain known or questioned specimen DNA to assess the quality of the fragment bands. Determine if the bands in these lanes are extremely broad or exhibit pronounced band curvature. These band irregularities can signal potential mobility shifts. If any fragment band for a specimen has migrated to a position that is greater than the position of the 10,094 bp size marker band, the evaluation of that specimen at that locus is considered inconclusive.
5. Based on the assessments of band quality and band position, decide which of the specimens will be subjected to the computer-assisted band sizing procedure.

B. Computer-assisted band size determination

The determination of band size is carried out using the "DNA IMAGE ANALYSIS" program that can be run on MS-DOS-based computers. The analyst will be guided through the imaging and sizing procedures by text display on the computer screen. The computer program enables an objective determination of the sizes of the DNA fragments in each test specimen and the allelic control. The sizing program ends by printing out the calculated fragment sizes, in base pairs, for each of the specimens and the allelic control specimen.

C. Confirmation of visual matches

Visual matches must be confirmed or rejected through application of the appropriate mathematical procedures. In the absence of a computer program to accomplish this procedure, the following steps can be carried out manually.

1. For each fragment band in the known specimen, calculate a value that is 2.5% of the base pair size determined by the sizing procedure. Add the calculated value to the base pair size of the fragment. Subtract the calculated value from the base pair size of

22
12.07.90
Dca

55
20

the fragment.

2. For each fragment in a questioned specimen that has been determined to be presumptively equal in size to a fragment in a known specimen, calculate a value that is 2.5% of the base pair size of the questioned fragment determined by the sizing procedure. Add the calculated value to the base pair size of the fragment. Subtract the calculated value from the base pair size of the fragment.

3. Compare the calculated ranges of base pair values for the known and questioned specimen bands. If these ranges overlap, the presumptive equality has been confirmed. If the ranges do not overlap, the presumptive equality of fragment sizes is either inconclusive or exclusionary.

D. Determination of Point Estimate values

If specimen fragment size equalities have been confirmed, the best estimate values can be determined for the fragment bands in the appropriate specimen by using the appropriate computer program.

23

56

23

SOUTH CAROLINA LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION

FORENSIC SERVICES LABORATORY REPORT

CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, Jr.
GOVERNOR



ROBERT M. STEWART
CHIEF

Department of Serology
and DNA Analysis

FINAL REPORT

May 15, 1992

SLED Lab No: L91-15090

Your Case No: 91-637

Incident Date: 11/02/91

(S) John James Bell

(V) Crystal Scurry

Inv. W. E. Ross/Bennie Williams
Aiken County Sheriff's Office
420 Hampton Avenue
Aiken, SC 29801

This is an official report of the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division Forensic Services Laboratory and is to be used in connection with an official criminal investigation. These examinations were conducted under your assurance that no previous examinations of person(s) or evidence submitted in this case has been or will be conducted by any other Laboratory or agency.

Robert M. Stewart, Chief
South Carolina Law Enforcement Division

ITEM(S) SUBMITTED

- 1.1 Cutting from a shirt
- 1.4.1 Cutting from pants
- 1.4.2 Cutting from pants
- 3.1 Cutting from quilt
- 3.2 Cutting from quilt
- 4. Cutting from rug
- 9. Blood standard from Krystal Scurry
- 22.6 Cutting from one piece suit
- 34.5 Blood standard from John Bell

RESULTS OF EXAMINATION(S)

24

Deoxyribonucleic (DNA) profiles for genetic loci D2S44, D10S28, D17S79, D4S139 and D1S7 were developed from Hae III digested high molecular weight DNA extracted from item 1.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 3.1, 9., and 34.5. Based on these results the D2S44, D4S139, D10S28, and D1S7 profile from item 1.4.1 matches item 9 (Krystal Scurry). The probability of selecting an unrelated individual at random having a DNA profile matching item 9 (Krystal Scurry) is one in 230 million Blacks and one in 53 million Caucasians.

51

24

RESULTS OF EXAMINATION(S) CONTINUED:

Results for item 1.4.1 were uninterpretable at locus D17S79, but item 9 (Krystal Scurry) could not be excluded as the contributor of the material. The DNA extracted from blood on items 1.1 and 3.1 also matches the DNA profile of item 9 (Krystal Scurry).

The DNA extracted from the blood on item 1.4.2 matches the DNA profile of item 34. 5 (John Bell) and thus could not have been contributed by item 9 (Krystal Scurry).

No Deoxyribonucleic Acid (DNA) profile was developed from items 3.2, 4., and 22.6 due to insufficient DNA.

These examinations were conducted by S/A David L. McClure, Forensic DNA Analyst with this Division.

David L. McClure
David L. McClure
Special Agent

MAY 15, 1992
Date

jsb

25

58

For all the reasons set forth herein, Applicant shows that funding and appointment of this Expert and/or State production of this Expert is necessary and should be Ordered.

26

Respectfully submitted,

ANDERSON & ANDERSON LLP



P. Andrew Anderson
Attorney for Applicant Bell
211 York Street, NE
Aiken, South Carolina 29801
803.648.6000 - phone
803.648.0888 - facsimile
aanderson@andersonandanderson.com

August 19, 2014.

27

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jamie A. Altman, legal assistant for Anderson & Anderson LLP, counsel for the aforementioned Applicant, do hereby certify that I have served the documents hereinafter specified on the attorney(s) hereinafter named on the date indicated below by hand-delivery addressed as follows:

DOCUMENT(S) SERVED:

PHOTOCOPY OF:

- 1) Applicant's Motion For Expert Witness

SERVICE ON:

Via Hand-Delivery

David Miller, Esquire
Second Circuit Solicitor's Office
Aiken County Courthouse
Aiken, South Carolina 29801

Jamie A. Altman
Jamie A. Altman

August 19, 2014.

RE: Bell v. State of South Carolina
Case No.: 1992-GS-02-0396/0397/0784

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF Aiken

I, Liz Gedard, Clerk of Court of Common Pleas and General Sessions for Aiken County, South Carolina do hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and correct copy of the original documents which have been filed in my office this

220 August 2011
Liz Goodell
COCOA BEACH, FLORIDA
Cocoa Beach, FL 32931
Cocoa Beach

70

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

COUNTY OF AIKEN)

JOHN JAMES BELL, #192526,
Applicant.)

vs.)

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Respondent.)

) IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
) FOR THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

) Case No.: 1992-GS-02-0396, 1992-GS-02-0397,
) 1992-GS-02-0784

ORDER

Date of Hearing:	August 27, 2014
Presiding Judge:	Doyet A. Early, III
Court Reporter:	Bethanie Patterson
Attorney for Applicant:	P. Andrew Anderson
Attorney for Respondent:	David Warren Miller

This matter came before the Court pursuant to Applicant's Application for Forensic DNA testing pursuant to South Carolina Code Ann. § 17-28-10, *et. seq.* Applicant was convicted of murder following a jury trial. Applicant appeared with his attorney and the State was represented by the 2nd Circuit Solicitor's Office. Applicant's attorney and the State's attorney met with the Aiken County Clerk of Court and confirmed that evidence from Applicant's trial (relevant to this case) has been preserved in the Clerk of Court's vault. The parties stipulated that: the evidence is available, it has been maintained appropriately and the chain of custody is sufficient, and the evidence is material to the issue of Applicant's identity as the perpetrator of the alleged murder. These are the first three (3) required elements of South Carolina Code § 17-28-90 (B) that must be established by the Applicant. This Court heard testimony from Applicant and arguments from both attorneys. This Court also reviewed the file in this matter (which includes numerous documents filed by Applicant independently from his attorney). The parties agreed for this

35

21

29

matter to be heard in Lexington County as the Judge over this matter was just reassigned to hold court in Lexington after this matter had been scheduled to be heard.

Based upon the testimony at the hearing, the attorneys' arguments, and this Court's review of the extensive file in this matter, this Court makes the following findings:

1. The first three (3) requirements of § 17-28-90 (B) have been met by stipulation.
2. It is clear in reviewing the transcripts of S.L.E.D. DNA expert David McClure's testimony at both a pre-trial hearing and the Applicant's jury trial that the State's DNA evidence against Applicant was unreliable.
3. Retesting the evidence is material to the issue of Applicant's identity as the perpetrator of this murder.
4. Scientific advances since Applicant's conviction have improved reliability of DNA testing.
5. Applicant's shirt and pants and a quilt contain DNA evidence, have been appropriately maintained, have sufficient chain of custody, and are material to Applicant's identity as the perpetrator of the murder in question. These items must be tested.
6. The requested DNA testing could very well produce exculpatory results which would create new evidence which would probably change the result of Applicant's conviction.
7. While the evidence in question has been tested, new testing (in light of the

36

30

30
unreliability of the original testing in this matter and advances in technology) would provide a substantially more probative and reliable result.

8. This application was made to demonstrate Applicant's innocence, not merely to delay the administration of justice.
9. At trial, the gravaman of Applicant's defense was tied to photographs produced by the defense showing that the State's eyewitness's testimony was unreliable. These photographs were anticipated to convince a jury that the eyewitness could not have seen the victim in Applicant's car. The Court ruled the photographs inadmissible. This totally foiled the defense and left Applicant with little to offer in the trial.
10. Applicant was not afforded a DNA expert or blood spatter expert. Both experts would have been material and necessary for his defense.
11. It is appropriate, therefore, for the evidence held by the Aiken County Clerk of Court to be tested by S.L.E.D.

Now, therefore, based upon the above findings and this Court's review of the evidence, testimony, and arguments in this matter, Applicant's/Defendant's shirt, pants and the quilt shall be DNA tested by S.L.E.D. The results of this testing shall be shared with Applicant (through his attorney) and the State.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this _____ day of _____, 2014.

Doyet A. Early, III
Judge, Second Judicial Circuit

C/AZ
9/22/2014
31

RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 25TH, 2014
- 3 COPIES / 3 PAGES -

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA) IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
COUNTY OF AIKEN) SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,)

VS)

JOHN JAMES BELL #192526)
Defendant.)

ORDER DENYING POST-
CONVICITON DNA TESTING

Indictment Nos. 1992-GS-02-0396, (D3947)
1992-GS-02-0397, and 1992-GS-02-0784 (p. Indict)
(D 319 luko)

This matter came before the Court on Applicant's Petition for Forensic DNA testing pursuant to South Carolina Code Ann. §17-28-10, *et. seq.* (the "Access to Justice Post-Conviction DNA Testing Act"). The hearing in this matter was originally set to be heard in Aiken County during an assigned term of Common Pleas/Non-Jury, however this Court was subsequently assigned to preside over a General Sessions term in Lexington County that week. Accordingly, the hearing was held at the Lexington County Courthouse on Wednesday, August 27, 2014. Counsel for the Applicant and the State consented to having this matter heard in Lexington County in lieu of Aiken County. At the hearing, the Applicant appeared with his attorney P. Andrew Anderson. The State was represented at the hearing by Deputy Solicitor David Miller and Assistant Solicitor Cassie Hall.

Following a jury trial, the Applicant was convicted of Kidnapping (1992-GS-02-0396), Murder (1992-GS-02-0397) and Criminal Sexual Conduct with a Minor (1992-GS-02-0784). Applicant received concurrent sentences of life for the Murder conviction and 30 years for the Kidnapping conviction. He received a consecutive 30 year sentence for the CSC with a Minor conviction. The victim in this matter was a small child who lived in the home with the Applicant and his mother. Evidence was offered during the trial regarding hairs consistent with the victim's hair located on a quilt inside the Applicant's vehicle. Evidence was also offered that the victim's blood was found on the Applicant's clothing he was wearing at the time of his arrest. Additionally, an eyewitness testified that he saw the victim in the Applicant's car the day she disappeared. The Applicant denied that the victim was in his car on the day of her disappearance.

C. Copy
32
Mr. Bell
Solicitor Miller
Andy Anderson

ME
#1

30
September 22 2014
Leiz Godard
C.C.C.P. & G.S.
Cheryl Gulestall / CWR
LOCAL 1000

32

Following his conviction, Applicant filed many post-trial actions, including multiple PCR and habeas claims. After receiving this Petition, Applicant's attorney and the State's attorneys reviewed the various filings of the Applicant, including numerous letters/motions sent to the various attorneys, the Clerk of Court, and the Court. Additionally, the attorneys met with the Aiken County Clerk of Court to review the evidence retained in the case. Following that review, the attorneys conferred with Captain Wendy Hall from the SLED Forensics Laboratory to determine its potential ability to analyze evidence in this case.

Following this preparation, the State and the Defense were able to stipulate to several facts required by the Act. Specifically, the parties stipulated as follows:

1. the physical evidence or biological material to be tested is available and is potentially in a condition that would permit the requested DNA testing (§17-28-90(B)(1));
2. the physical evidence or biological material to be tested has been subject to a chain of custody sufficient to establish it has not been substituted, tampered with, replaced, or altered in any material aspect, or the testing itself may establish the integrity of the physical evidence or biological material (§17-28-90(B)(2));
3. the physical evidence or biological material sought to be tested is material to the issue of the applicant's identity as the perpetrator of, or accomplice to, the offense (§17-28-90(B)(3));
4. the DNA results of the physical evidence or biological material sought to be tested would be material to the issue of the applicant's identity as the perpetrator of, or accomplice to, the offense (§17-28-90(B)(4)).

At the hearing, the Applicant was called to testify regarding the remaining requirements of §17-28-90. In his Petition, the Applicant did not identify the specific items of evidence he wished to be tested for DNA or how he hoped such testing would serve to exonerate him. Additionally, during his testimony at the hearing, the Applicant could not allege any factual basis to justify DNA testing in this case as required by §17-28-90(B)(5) or (6). Specifically, neither the Applicant nor his counsel could articulate what would constitute an "exculpatory" result of any potential testing of the items of evidence.

At trial, the defense alleged that the victim's blood was on his clothing because the victim had previously fallen and been injured. The Applicant testified that he had picked up the victim and taken her into the house. Therefore, further testing confirming the presence of the victim's

39



33


33
blood on the Applicant's clothing would not be exculpatory. Similarly, any testing that could be done of the samples of the hair taken from the quilt in the Applicant's vehicle would only serve to further implicate the Applicant in this crime, notwithstanding the fact that there is no way to know when the hairs were left in the vehicle.

This Court has reviewed the file in this matter, including the numerous documents filed by the Applicant independently from his attorney, and considered the arguments of counsel and the Applicant's testimony. Based on the foregoing, I find as follows:

1. The first three (3) requirements of § 17-28-90 (B) have been met by stipulation.
2. Retesting the evidence in this matter would not lead to material evidence on the issue of Applicant's identity as the perpetrator of this murder.
3. While scientific advances since Applicant's conviction have improved reliability of DNA testing, any further testing of the evidence in this case for the presence of the victim's DNA would only serve to further implicate the Applicant in these crimes.
4. The DNA testing requested by the Applicant would not serve to demonstrate Applicant's innocence.
5. Any claims regarding the trial court's rulings on admissibility of photographs and eyewitness testimony have been previously ruled upon in other actions filed by the Applicant. To the extent those claims were not previously ruled upon, they are not properly before the Court in this action, which is limited to claims solely related to request(s) for DNA testing.
6. Applicant's motions for the appointment of a DNA expert and blood spatter expert are likewise not properly before this court and are, therefore, denied.

Based on the foregoing, I hereby find the Applicant has failed to meet his burden of proof as to the requirements of §17-28-90 inasmuch as Applicant has offered insufficient evidence to prove his allegations as to subsections five, six or seven of the statute by the preponderance of the evidence. Accordingly, the Applicant's Petition should be, and hereby is, DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED!


Doyet A. Early, III
Resident Judge,
Second Judicial Circuit

September 16, 2014
Aiken, South Carolina

40

34



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN
DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

February 08, 2017

Mr. Paul Andrew Anderson, Esquire
211 York St., NE
Suite 2
Aiken SC 29801

Mr. Donald J. Zelenka, Esquire
PO Box 11549
Columbia SC 29211-1549

Re: John James Bell v. State
Appellate Case No. 2014-002196

Dear Counsel:

Enclosed is the decision of the Court. The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules.

Very truly yours,

Jenny A. Kitchings /LK7
CLERK

cc: John James Bell, 00192526
Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
John W. McIntosh, Esquire
The Honorable Doyet A. Early, III

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals**

John James Bell, Petitioner,

v.

State of South Carolina, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2014-002196

Appeal From Aiken County
Doyet A. Early, III, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2017-UP-069
Submitted December 1, 2016 – Filed February 8, 2017

AFFIRMED

Paul Andrew Anderson, of Anderson & Anderson, LLP,
of Aiken, for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Chief Deputy
Attorney General John W. McIntosh, and Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General Donald J. Zelenka, all
of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following
authorities: *State v. Lynch*, 375 S.C. 628, 632, 654 S.E.2d 292, 294 (Ct. App. 2007)

("In criminal cases, this [c]ourt reviews errors of law only."); *id.* ("An appellate court is bound by the trial court's factual findings unless they are clearly erroneous."); S.C. Code Ann. § 17-28-90(B) (2014) ("The court shall order DNA testing of the applicant's DNA and the physical evidence or biological material upon a finding that the applicant has established each of the following factors by a preponderance of the evidence: . . . (4) the DNA results of the physical evidence or biological material sought to be tested would be material to the issue of the applicant's identity as the perpetrator of, or accomplice to, the offense notwithstanding the fact that the applicant may have pled guilty or nolo contendere or made or is alleged to have made an incriminating statement or admission as to identity; (5) if the requested DNA testing produces exculpatory results, the testing will constitute new evidence that will probably change the result of the applicant's conviction or adjudication if a new trial is granted and is not merely cumulative or impeaching; (6) the physical evidence or biological material sought to be tested was not previously subjected to DNA testing, or if the physical evidence or biological material sought to be tested was previously subjected to DNA testing, the requested DNA test would provide a substantially more probative result . . .").

AFFIRMED.¹

LOCKEMY, C.J., and KONDUROS and MCDONALD, JJ., concur.

¹ We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.

p. andrew anderson

kristina m. anderson*

*Licensed in SC & GA

anderson anderson

trial attorneys and counselors at law

February 13, 2017


John James Bell SCDC # 192526
Kershaw Correctional Institution
4848 Goldmine Hwy
Kershaw, South Carolina 29067

RE: State of South Carolina v. John James Bell
Appellate Case No.: 2014-002196

Dear Omar:

I am enclosing a copy of the Order we just received from the Court in your case. As you can see, the Court of Appeals has Affirmed the ruling of the lower Court. Obviously, we are disappointed by this result. I had hoped we would be able to get new testing performed for you in this. The letter and Order indicates that you are being copied on these, but I wanted to be sure you received them.

Very truly yours,


P. Andrew Anderson

PAA/jaa
Enclosures

38



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN
DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

February 24, 2017

The Honorable Robert J. Harte
PO Box 583
Aiken, SC 29802

REMITTITUR

Re: John James Bell v. State
Lower Court Case No. 1992GS0200396, 1992GS0200397, 1992GS0200784
Appellate Case No. 2014-002196

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

V. Claire Allen, Deputy

CLERK

Enclosure

cc: John James Bell, 00192526
Paul Andrew Anderson, Esquire
Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Donald J. Zelenka, Esquire
John W. McIntosh, Esquire

p. andrew anderson

kristina m. anderson*

*Licensed in SC & GA

anderson anderson

trial attorneys and counselors at law

March 10, 2017

John James Bell SCDC # 192526
Kershaw Correctional Institution
4848 Goldmine Hwy
Kershaw, South Carolina 29067


RE: State of South Carolina v. John James Bell
Appellate Case No.: 2014-002196

Dear Omar:

Hope this letter finds you still doing well. I am enclosing the Remittitur we received in your case following the prior Order of the Court of Appeals. This returns the matter to the lower Court and concludes the DNA PCR on your behalf. As a result, I am closing my file on this matter.

I really enjoyed meeting you and getting to know you throughout this process.

Very truly yours,



P. Andrew Anderson

PAA/jaa
Enclosures

40

p. andrew anderson

kristina m. anderson*

*Licensed in SC & GA

anderson ^{and} anderson LLP
trial attorneys and counselors at law

May 31, 2017

John James Bell SCDC # 192526
Kershaw Correctional Institution
4848 Goldmine Hwy
Kershaw, South Carolina 29067

RE: State of South Carolina v. John James Bell
Appellate Case No.: 2014-002196

Dear Omar:

I hope this letter finds you doing well. I am contacting you because we received copies of some things that you have sent to the Aiken County Clerk for filing. It looks like you filed documents seeking a resolution in your case or a settlement conference and also asking that counsel be appointed for you. I just received these documents this week. I wanted to be sure that you understand that there is not any current issue pending in Aiken County for the Court or the Clerk to rule on in your case.


We handled your DNA PCR and when it was denied in Aiken, we filed an appeal on your behalf. The Court of Appeals granted the right to brief the issue on your DNA PCR for consideration by the Court. We did that and the State filed a response with the Court of Appeals refuting our contentions that you should have been granted relief on your DNA PCR. The remedy in the Appeal would have been that the Court of Appeals could have Reversed the lower Court in Aiken, but only as it related to your DNA PCR. That would mean that if we were successful in your Appeal, you would have been granted DNA re-testing of the evidence in your case. If that had happened, it may have uncovered evidence that could have been used to exonerate you in your criminal case and may have allowed the Court to re-open your original conviction based upon the new evidence. Unfortunately, we received the Court of Appeal's Order in your case dated February 8, 2017, and rather than Reversing the Court in Aiken County and granting you DNA re-testing, the Court of Appeals simply Affirmed the lower Aiken County Court's ruling. This means that the Court of Appeals upheld the denial of your DNA PCR and you do not get re-testing. The Court then sent the Remittitur back to the Aiken County Court on February 24, 2017, informing them of the disposition of the Appeal and essentially closing the Court of Appeal's file on the matter.

I am enclosing copies of our letters to you dated February 13, 2017, and March 10, 2017, which transmitted copies of the Order and Remittitur. Because the Court of Appeals Affirmed the Aiken County Court, there is currently nothing pending, of which I am aware, regarding your case. The Remittitur back to Aiken County does not return any issue to Aiken County for the Court to handle. I do not know what the Clerk's Office in Aiken will do with the new documents that you have submitted or even if they are able to take any action.

I hope this makes sense. If you have questions about all of this, please don't hesitate to call me and I will be glad to talk to you. I don't know if the Clerk in Aiken County will issue some kind of letter or Order to you about the documents that you have sent for filing. I just want to be sure that you understand what is going on procedurally.

With best regards, I am

Very truly yours,



P. Andrew Anderson

PAA/twm
Enclosures



Robert J. Harte
Aiken County Clerk of Court

P.O. Box 583
Aiken, SC 29802

June 27, 2017

John James Bell #19252
Kershaw Correctional Inst
4848 Goldmine Hwy
Kershaw, SC 29067

Re: 1992-GS-02-00396

Mr. Bell,

I am returning the paperwork that you sent to be filed in this office. Your DNA-PCR was denied and your attorney, Mr. Anderson, appealed the case and the Appellate Court denied the appeal. You do not have any other pending cases with us to file your paperwork in.

If you are wanting to appeal the decision of the Appellate Court you would send your appeal to the Supreme Court.

I am also including a copy of an Order filed with us on April 2, 2012 from the Supreme Court in reference to further filings.

Thank you,

Cheryl S. Westall
Chief Deputy Clerk
Criminal Division

1992GS0200784
D 319417
D 319660

2010CP0700598

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

John James Bell,

Petitioner,

v.


State of South Carolina,

Respondent.

ORDER

Petitioner has filed a notice of appeal from an order of the circuit court denying and dismissing petitioner's fifth application for post-conviction relief (PCR). Petitioner has also submitted the explanation required by Rule 243(c), SCACR. We find petitioner has failed to show there is an arguable basis for asserting the determination by the lower court was improper. Accordingly, we dismiss the notice of appeal in this matter.

Moreover, we hereby prohibit petitioner from filing any further collateral actions in the circuit court challenging his convictions from 1992 for kidnapping, murder and criminal sexual conduct with a minor, first degree, without first obtaining permission to do so from this Court.


C. J.
FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

March 29, 2012

cc: Appellate Defense
John James Bell #192526
Assistant Attorney General Mary S. Williams
The Honorable Liz Godard, Aiken County Clerk of Court

4.2.12
Liz Godard
A.C.C.P. & G.S.
Anita Knoepfle 10:00
Deputy Clerk

CC-GS

1992-GS-02-0396

14

2012

-Four-



**Aiken County Clerk of Court
Criminal Division
P. O. Box 583
Aiken, S.C. 29802-0583
Phone: 803-642-1715**

January 7, 2015

1992-GS-02-00396 (D319417)
1992-GS-02-00397 (D319660)
1992-GS-02-00784 (DI)


Mr. John Bell #192526
KCI/MAG B-48
4848 Gold Mine Hwy
Kershaw, SC 29067-8136

Mr. Bell,

I spoke with Judge Early and he instructed me to return this paperwork to you. He said per the order of the Supreme Court issued March 29, 2012 you would first have to obtain written permission in the form of an Order from them to file anymore collateral actions challenging your conviction from 1992.

That Order would need to be on file with this office before we can accept anymore filings from you.

Thank you,


Cheryl S. Westall
Chief Deputy Clerk
Criminal Division

RE: DELIBERATE DELAY: APPELLATE INDIFFERENCE.

TO WHOM THIS MAY CONCERN:

5-8-17

Kershaw Prison HAS BECOME A LITERAL CONCENTRATION CAMP, RUN BY IMMATURE AND UNFOUNDED INDIVIDUALS SEEING TO ESTABLISH AUTHORITY AMONGST THEMSELVES THROUGH "CRUEL AND UNUSUAL" TREATMENT OF THOSE HOUSED AT THIS LUNATIC BEND.

UNDER THE CODE 34 LOCKDOWN - MAIL NEITHER GOES OUT OR COMES IN. COURT DEAD LINES ARE IGNORED COMPLETELY UNDER THE GUISE THAT "THERE'S NOT ENOUGH PERSONAL TO MAN THE FORT"... THAT DOESN'T SAY MUCH FOR HOW THE CAMP IS BEING FACILITATED.

CASE IN POINT: LEGAL MAIL, LEGAL SUPPLIES ARE BOTH BEING DELAYED "COMING AND GOING" [DEBIT FORMS ARE WEEK BEHIND MAKING ONE WONDER "IF" THE MAILED ITEMS ACTUALLY WERE EVEN "MAILED OUT OF THE PRISON AT ALL"???] ITS BEEN THREE WEEKS SINCE THE LEGAL SUPPLY REQUESTS WERE MADE - A PERSON SICK, OR OTHER WISE ELSEWHERE, SHOULD NOT CAUSE A "COURT DEAD LINE" TO BE MISSED; OR ACTIVELY PREVENT "LEGAL DOCUMENTS" FROM SECURELY MAILED OUT TO A COURT WHEREIN PROCEDURES HAVE ALREADY BEEN ORGANIZED. THIS HAS HAPPENED TO ME HERE AT THIS CONCENTRATION CAMP: WHILE NO ONE IS HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR ANYTHING; "COMING OR GOING".

JMC

SWORN TO BEFORE ME May 9, 2017

Caroline A. Conway

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY TERM EXPIRES December 23 2018

CC ATTORNEY GENERAL SOUTH CAROLINA.
APPELLATE RECORDS.

EXHIBIT 9

AMASON
REFUSED TO
USE NOTARY
STAMP

THE BIBLE IS NO LONGER "HOLY" IN THE HANDS OF A "LIAR", AND ANYONE ELSE WHO DOESN'T BELIEVE IN TELLING THE "WHOLE TRUTH AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH" BECAUSE GOD AIN'T A FACTOR IN THE "EQUATION" - THERE AIN'T NO CONSEQUENCES FOR LYING... HEH, IT AIN'T STOP YET SINCE ARREST NOVEMBER 2ND, 1991 - THE DEVIL'S HORNS BEEN RAPPED AROUND THIS CAPPED CONVICTION NON-STOP, AND STILL ROLLING ON. JUST TO THINK A MINUTE OVER HOW MANY PETITIONS WERE UNMAILED - OPENED OUT OF MY PRESENCE AND RESEALED - "COMING AND GOING" OUT OF THIS HELL-HOLE OF A PRISON.

THE BIGGEST PROBLEM LIES IN THE LACK OF QUALIFICATION FOR THE POSITIONS BEING HELD AND THE UNPROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR RUNNING A JOINT LIKE THIS.

IN GOOD FAITH, I, OMAR 'ABDEL-AL-MU' MIT [A MUSLIM SINCE YALL'S WAR IN VIETNAM - PROBABLY ONE YOU YOURSELF DUCKED OUT ON], SEEK TO HAVE THE RUNNING OF THIS PLACE INVESTIGATED AND PEOPLE CHARGED WITH ON-GOING "CRIMINAL ACTS" ON THIS STATE INSTITUTION UNDER STATE LAW; VIOLATING ESTABLISHED LAWS AND REGULATIONS ACCORDING TO POLICY!

Juc

SWORN TO BEFORE ME May 9, 2017

Cathleen A. Amador

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY TERM EXPIRES December 22, 2018

CC ATTORNEY GENERAL SOUTH CAROLINA.
APPELLATE RECORDS.

-28-

EXHIBIT 10

AMASON
REFUSED TO
USE NOTARY
STAMP

49

- AFFIDAVIT -

FROM BEGINNING TO THE "END" - SAME FACES, DIFFERENT PLACES:
THE WHOLE OBJECTIVE IS SURROUNDING "DUE PROCESS" NOTHING MORE.
ONE PARTY AFFIRMING THE TRUTH, THE OTHERS RIDING ON A LIE -
QUESTION REMAINS, WHO IS TELLING WHAT? OR DOES IT REALLY MATTER.
I FEAR ALLAH, AND I HAVE TOLD THE TRUTH FROM THE VERY BEGINNING.

- PROOF OF SERVICE -

THIS HAS BEEN A BOUNDLESS ATTEMPT TO EXPOSURE THE UNEXPOSED;
THUS FAR, NO WORDS HAVE PENETRATED THE SEELERS OF CRIME SOLVING
PERSONAGE, SO NOTHING POSITIVE IN RETURN FROM THE MASSIVE EFFORTS
MADE.

THE FUNNY THING SURROUNDING ALL OF THIS DRAMA, IS THAT CRIMINALS
HOUSE ME AT BOTH ENDS OF THIS CONTINUOUS ORDEAL [IN HERE AND OUT
THERE READING THIS IN OPPOSITION OF RELEASE THROUGH DUE PROCESS]

I'M NOT GONNA ASK FOR "DATE-STAMP", "COPY" AND "RETURN TO ME":
YALL AIN'T NEVER DONE IT BEFORE AND ACT LIKE THIS WASN'T EVER
RECEIVED FOR A REPLY... WHAT INJUSTICE... WHAT IGNORANCE; BUT,
"IF" THE SHOE WAS ON THE OTHER FOOT... YOU WOULD BE A THURTOR OF ME.

JMC

SWORN TO BEFORE ME 12 May 9, 2017,
Catherine A. Amrose

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY TERM EXPIRES December 22, 2018

CC ATTORNEY GENERAL SOUTH CAROLINA.
APPELLATE RECORDS.

AMASON
REFUSED TO
USE NOTARY
STAMP

RE: "MANDAMUS MOTION"

THIS WOULD BE MY SECOND "MANDAMUS MOTION" BEFORE THIS COURT SEEKING "EXONERATION" FROM A "WRONGFUL CONVICTION" HELD DECEMBER 1992 BASED UPON INCOHERENT EVIDENCE AND TESTIMONY INCONSISTANT WITH TRUE FACTS SURROUNDING CHARGES.

THIS MOTION CONSISTS OF STATEMENTS MADE BY APPELLATE COURT AND NEWLY APPOINTED COUNSEL WHICH PRETTY MUCH CONTRADICTS WHAT WAS PLAINLY DOCUMENTED FEBRUARY 8TH AND 24TH OF 2017.

AN OPEN CHALLENGE TO SC ANN §17-28-90^(B) AND §17-25-50 "RESPECTIVELY", SEEKING CLARITY PERTAINING TO THIS CONVICTION.

A "SPEEDY TRIAL MOTION" WAS ALSO SUBMITTED PREVIOUSLY AND NO DIRECT RESPONSE WAS TAKEN FROM THIS.

IN GOOD FAITH: SEEKING RELIEF THROUGH THIS PROCESS:

SENT TO Cheryl R. Lee

Jan 15, 2017

SCARLETTA NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY TERM EXPIRES Jan 27, 2025

PLEASE DATE STAMP, COPY AND RETURN TO SENDER AND SEND

TO CLERK AND ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR APPELLATE RECORD:

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE, SO HELP ME GOD, I TRUST IN TRUTHFULNESS.

PRISON LOCKDOWN 6-15-17

SHORT OF STAFF:
NO NOTARY AVAILABLE
AT PRISON FACILITY.

- 2 COPIES: COURT / ATTORNEY GENERAL -

51

EXHIBIT 12

ONE

EXHIBIT 13

DMAR 'ABDEL-AL-MU' MIT
S/N JOHN JAMES BELL
MOVANT, PROSE.

VS.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
RESPONDANT.

IN THE GENERAL SESSIONS
COURT: COUNTY OF AIKEN.

SC CODE ANN §§ 17-27-100,
17-25-50, 17-28-30 AND
17-28-90(B).

"MANDAMUS MOTION" TO BE
GIVEN SIXTH AND 14TH
U S CONSTITUTIONAL AMEND-
MENT RIGHTS IN APPEAL.

THIS MOTION COMES BEFORE THIS HONOURABLE COURT SEEKING TO
ESTABLISH INCONSISTENCIES THROUGHOUT THIS "WRONGFUL CONVICTION"
WHICH WAS ALLOWED TO OCCUR DECEMBER 7TH THRU 10TH, 1992 IN
AIKEN COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA, UNDER THE 1992-GS-02-0396,
0397 AND A "DIRECT INDICTMENT" 0784 [SATURDAY JUNE 6TH, 1992
WITHOUT "TRUE STAMP", OR GRAND JURY SIGNATURE ATTACHED].

ON MAY 19TH, 2017, MOVANT/PETITIONER, RECEIVED NOTICE THAT ONE
PAUL ANDREW ANDERSON ATTORNEY AT LAW WAS "REAPPOINTED TO
REPRESENT ME". HOWEVER, A LETTER DATED MAY 31ST, 2017, THIS
ATTORNEY STATED THERE WAS NO BOOKING IN AIKEN COUNTY TO HEAR
MY APPEAL FOR JUSTICE BEING DONE IN THIS TWENTY FIVE YEAR OLD
"WRONGFUL CONVICTION".

THE WISH IS FOR A "FAIR HEARING" WITH "SUBPOENAED ADVERSARIES"
PRESENT SO AS TO GET THE TRUTH OF THIS "CONSPIRACY TO CONVICT" HEARD
OUT IN THE OPEN ONCE AND FOR ALL.

*THE 2014-DD2196 HEARING ON DNA TESTING HAD NO SUBPOENAED
WITNESSES FOR OR AGAINST PCR EVIDENCE, LEAVING JUST MY TESTIMONY
WHICH WAS CONVENIENTLY DENIED BY DOYET A EARLY, YET AGAIN*

SUBPOENA TO EXHIBIT ME Cheryl R. Jones

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

2017

PRISON LOCKDOWN 6-15-17

SHORT OF STAFF;
NO NOTARY AVAILABLE
AT PRISON FACILITY.

LEGAL

52
TWO

IF IN FACT AGENT SKARBA WHO EXAMINED AND MADE A FINDING APRIL 2ND, 1992 AND GAVE TESTIMONY ON DECEMBER 8TH, 1992 THAT "ELIMINATED" ANY FURTHER TESTING: DNA OR OTHERWISE [SEE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT PP 370-371] NOTHING LEFT TO MANAGE SCRUTINY... "IF" THIS TRAIL OF TALES THE DNA PCR WAS OF NO RESOLVE AND THIS WOULD SHOW AND PROVE AGENT DAVID MC CLURE WAS DECEITFUL IN HIS VIEW GIVEN IN OPEN COURT ON THE 9TH OF DECEMBER PP 438-473 OR THEREABOUT — PAUL ANDREW ANDERSON USED MC CLURE'S TESTIMONY, BUT NOT SKARBA'S ELIMINATION OF FURTHER TESTING FOR ANYTHING; ESPECIALLY NOT DNA BECAUSE THE FBI GAVE WHAT HAS TO TAKE PLACE TO PROVE "OWNERSHIP" OR "GUILT BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT" — THIS "WRONGFUL CONVICTION" NEVER ENJOYED THIS "RECALL", THE TRUETOOK A VACATION DURING THIS FOUR DAY TRIBUNAL.

ANDERSON BROUGHT OUT "BLOOD SPLATTER" AS A MAJOR CONCERN, AND THIS NEVER CAME OUT ONCE DURING THE CIRCUS TRIBUNAL HELD IN FRONT A HAND-PICKED JURY BY THOSE PROSECUTING AN INNOCENT MAN. THE GUILTY PARTY SAT IN THE COURTROOM AS A "SPECTATOR".

* THE BIAS JURY NEVER UNDERSTOOD THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN "ALIBI" - ELSEWHERE, OR "BLOOD SPLATTER" FROM "BLOOD TRANSFER"... *

—> A BAT WOULD CAUSE "SPLATTER" AND THE BRUSHING AS IN BASKETBALL WOULD CAUSE "BLOOD TRANSFER". [WONDER WHY THIS WASN'T EXPLAINED] THE AGE OLD CONSPIRACY IS STILL IN FULL EFFECT THROUGH THIS CONTINUED INCARCERATION... THE GUILTY PARTY IS PROBABLY DEAD AND GONE.

SUBSCRIBED BEFORE ME Cheryl R. Hunt J.C. ✕
JAN 15, 2017
NORTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.
MY TERM EXPIRES Jan 27, 2025

* PRISON LOCKDOWN 6-15-17 *

SHORT OF STAFF:
NO NOTARY AVAILABLE
AT PRISON FACILITY.

EXHIBIT 15

- CONCLUSION -

* "IF" TRIAL TRANSCRIPT 370-371 WAS INDEED "TRUTHFUL":
WHAT WAS THE "DNA HEARING" REALLY FOR - THERE'S NOTHING
TO BE TESTED - THERE NEVER WAS "CONCLUSIVE BLOOD RELATION"
TO WHO THE "REAL" GUILTY PARTY WAS.*

THE KEY TO THIS UGLY "JUST PIN THE TAIL ON THE DONKEY" CASE, IS
THAT SOMEBODY DID IT AND I GOT BLAMED FOR IT OFF THE CUFF;
MAINLY BECAUSE "TWO PEOPLE WERE MISSING" I WAS THE OTHER.
REMEMBER THE MISCONNECTION - "BOLO FOR CAR LOOKING FOR
CHILD... WHAT A CASE, BASED UPON SUSPICION - MY SIDE
WAS NEVER TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION... NOT THEN, NOT NOW!

ACCORDING TO TURNER V LOUISIANA, 85 SCT 546: CRIMINAL
LAW: "RESPONSIVENESS TO ISSUES" - "JUROR'S VERDICT" MUST BE
BASED UPON EVIDENCE DEVELOPED AT TRIAL "REGARDLESS" OF THE
"HEINOUSNESS" OF CRIME CHARGED, APPARENT GUILT OF OFFENDER
OR STATION IN LIFE WHICH HE OCCUPIES."

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: "IMPARTIALITY" - "A FAIR TRIAL IN A FAIR
TRIBUNAL" IS A BASIC REQUIREMENT OF "DUE PROCESS."

IT WAS CLEARLY STATED TO MR ANDERSON "SUBPOENAS" WOULD
HAVE TO BE SWORN AND DELIVERED - THIS CASE NEGLIGENCE
FROM ACTUAL TRIAL TO DNA HEARING NEVER HAD AN INVESTIGATION
SUITABLE FOR AN "EXONERATION" OF A FALSELY ACCUSED MAN.

SC CODE ANN § 17-25-50 SPEAKS CLEARLY OF ITSELF: THE LIFE
AND THIRTY "RUNNING WILD" IS AN "IMPROPER SENTENCE" STEMMING
FROM THE SAME SPECULATION OF WHAT "SUPPOSED" TO HAVE TOOK PLACE
ON THE DAY OF MY ABDUCTION - NOVEMBER 2ND, 1991 FOR THIS CRIME.

SWORN TO BEFORE ME Cheryl R. Lee, JMC #
June 15, 2017

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC
MY TERM EXPIRES Jan 27, 2025

* PRISON LOCKDOWN 6-15-17 *

SHORT OF STAFF:
NO NOTARY AVAILABLE
AT PRISON FACILITY.

- AFFIDAVIT - **EXHIBIT 16**

IT WOULD BE A GREATER INJUSTICE TO THIS "WRONGFUL CONVICTION"
FOR THE WRONGFULLY CONVICTED TO BE UNTRUTHFUL AT ANY POINT.

- Proof of Service -

THIS MOTION FOR JUSTICE TO BE APPLIED TO THIS CASE IS BEING
SENT DIRECTLY TO THOSE WHO ACTIVELY OPPOSED THE APPELLATE
PROCESS TO THIS "WRONGFUL CONVICTION": HOWEVER, IN GOOD
FAITH, I ASK THAT MY ABSENT "DUE PROCESS" BE ATTACHED TO
MY RIGHT TO HAVE THIS MOTION ATTACHED, "TIME-STAMPED",
COPIED AND RETURNED TO SENDER, AND SENT TO THE GOVERNOR
OF THE GREAT SOUTHERN STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AS MY
"BURDEN OF PROOF" THAT A CONSPIRACY STILL EXISTS IN THIS
"WRONGFUL CONVICTION" BEFORE THIS HONOURABLE COURT.

SEEN BEFORE ME Cheryl R. Lucas,
Jan 15, 2017

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY TERM EXPIRES Jan 27, 2025

CC SC INDIGENT DEFENSE.
SC ATTORNEY GENERAL
PETITIONER'S APPELLATE FILES.

SHORT OF STAFF:
NO NOTARY AVAILABLE
AT PRISON FACILITY.

* PRISON LOCKDOWN 6-15-17 *


- AFFIDAVIT -


PETITIONER HEREBY ADHERES TO THE PENALTY FOR PERJURY
AND WITH THIS IN MIND STANDS AFFIRMED LIKEWISE TO THE
TRUTH AND ACCURACY OF THE FACTS HEREIN.


- PROOF OF SERVICE -


IN GOOD FAITH, THE INFORMATION PRESENTED TO THIS HONORABLE
COURT IS COMPLETE AS REQUIRED BY RULES 221, 227 <C>, 224 <C-3>
AND 225.


PETITIONER HAS FORWARDED COPIES TO THIS HONORABLE COURT AND
TO THIS STATE'S ATTORNEY GENERAL TO CLARIFY ALL MISGIVINGS
PREVIOUSLY RULED ON IN ERROR ACCORDING TO THE DNA REQUIRE-
MENT FOR HEARING AUGUST 27TH, 2014 AND OVER-ALL JUDGEMENT
BY APPELLATE COURT REMITTUR TO AIKEN COUNTY ROBERT J HARTE.
PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THESE SUDEN DOCUMENTS:


JOHN JAMES BELL, PETITIONER PRO SE.

 SUBSCRIBED TO BEFORE ME July 4 2017


A. Chneson

 SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC

 MY TERM EXPIRES My Commission Expires December 22, 2019

1992-GS-02-0396 / D319417

RE: REMITTITUR RESPONSE [2014-002196].

AS OF FEBRUARY 24TH, 2017, THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS
FINALIZED THEIR JUDGMENT IN CASE NUMBER 1992-GS-02-0396 /
D319417.

ALTHOUGH THIS PETITIONER APPEARED AND TESTIFIED BEFORE DOCKET A
EARLY III, THE SECOND CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR AIKEN COUNTY, WHERE THE
CONVICTION TOOK PLACE DECEMBER 10TH, 1992: EVIDENCE WHICH OPENLY
QUESTIONS THE STATE'S ALLEGATION THAT "DNA TESTS" WERE ACTUALLY
SUFFICIENT TO JUSTIFY "TRUE IDENTITY OF PERPETRATOR" OF THIS HEINOUS
CRIME COMMITTED WELL OVER A QUARTER CENTURY AGO.

ON JULY 3RD, 2017, A CORRESPONDENCE WAS RECEIVED FROM CHIEF
DEPUTY CLERK FOR THE CRIMINAL DIVISION OF AIKEN COUNTY, WRITTEN
JUNE 27TH, 2017, INFORMING PETITIONER THAT "YOU DO NOT HAVE ANY
OTHER PENDING CASES WITH US TO FILE YOUR PAPERWORK IN." * "IF YOU
ARE WANTING TO "APPEAL THE DECISION OF THE APPELLATE COURT" YOU
WOULD SEND YOUR APPEAL TO THE "SUPREME COURT"."

ACCORDING TO SOUTH CAROLINA CODE ANNO § 17-27-100, PETITIONER
HAS THE UNDENIABLE RIGHT TO "APPEAL ANY UNFAVORABLE DECISION
AGAINST HIM": THIS IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS CORRESPONDENCE; TO
APPEAL 2014-002196 REMITTITUR SENT BACK TO THE LOWER COURT
TO ROBERT J HARTZ.


1 COPY: SC SUPREME CT
1 COPY: SC ATTORNEY GENERAL
- MAILED JULY 11TH -


1992-GS-02-0396 / D319417

LEGAL

CONT. "REMITTITUR RESPONSE" [2014-002196].

PETITIONER IS "INDIGENT" AND UNABLE TO PROVIDE "LEGAL ASSISTANCE" IN EFFORTS TO CHALLENGE THE TESTIMONIES GIVEN DURING THE FOUR DAY TRIBUNAL DECEMBER 7TH THRU. 10TH, 1992 ON "INCOMPLETE DNA TESTS." IN GOOD FAITH, ACKNOWLEDGE THE RECEIPT OF THIS CORRESPONDENCE BY "DATE-STAMPING", COPYING AND MAILING COPIES TO BOTH THIS PETITIONER, AS WELL AS, ATTORNEY GENERAL WHO OPPOSES EXONERATION OF THIS PETITIONER SENDING THIS "APPEAL" TO THIS HONORABLE COURT.


JOHN JAMES BELL, PETITIONER PRO SE.

 BEFORE ME July 6, 2017

Colashe A. Amosa

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires December 22, 2018

RETURN ADDRESS: SCNC #192526 / Kershaw Prison - MAG A #17
4848 GOLD MINE HWY / Kershaw, SC 29067-8069

SEE ATTACHED FOR RULE 221, 227(C), 224(C-3) AND 225 PROOFS TO SUPPORT "SUPERSEDEAS" of FEBRUARY 24TH, 2017 "REMITTITUR" TO Aiken County.

1992-65-02-0396 / D319417

2
LEGAL

JOHN JAMES BELL
PETITIONER PRO SE.

VS

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
RESPONDENT

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

MOTION OF MANDAMUS

SC CODE ANN §17-27-100

TO CASE NUMBER 1992-GS-02-0396
[REMITTITUR 2014-002196]

PETITIONER, JOHN JAMES BELL [SCDC #192526] HOUSED AT
KERSHAW PRISON, RECEIVED AN AFFIRMED FINDING FROM THE
SOUTH CAROLINA APPELLATE COURT FEBRUARY 10TH, 2017 AND
THE REMITTITUR MARCH 3RD, 2017.

LEGAL AIDE PAUL ANDREW ANDERSON POSTED A CORRESPONDENCE
AFFIRMING THE DENIAL MAY 31ST, 2017, RECEIVED JUNE 3RD, 2017.
DURING THIS TIME ANDERSON HAD A FEBRUARY 13TH, 2017 TYPED
ATTACHED WITH MAY 31ST, 2017 CORRESPONDENCE.

SC CODE ANN §17-27-100 EXPLAINS PETITIONER'S RIGHT TO APPEAL.
PAUL ANDREW ANDERSON TOTALLY NEGLECTED HIS DUTY TO THIS
APPELLATE PROCESS BY ALLOWING VALUABLE TIME TO BE SPENT IN
NO ACTIVE PURSUIT OF SC CODE ANN §17-27-100 FOR PETITIONER.

PETITIONER WILL PROVIDE WHAT PAUL ANDREW ANDERSON DELIBERATELY
NEGLECTED TO PURSUE IN LIGHT OF A NEGATIVE RULING FROM THE
AUGUST 27TH, 2017 HEARING BEFORE DOCKET A EARLY III 2ND CIRCUIT.

SUBSCRIBED BEFORE ME July 6, 2017

Notary Public A. Amers

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC

MY TERM EXPIRES My Commission Expires December 22, 2018

1992-GS-02-0396 / D319417

Aiken County Clerk of Court

PO Box 583

Aiken, SC 29802

To whom it may concern: John Bell

This office is returning your motion to you, Andy Anderson is listed as your attorney in this case. You will need to send this motion to your attorney and in turn your attorney may submit this motion for filing. Please see notation below on hybrid representation.

Thank you,

Cheryl Westall

Deputy Clerk

Date: March 25, 2013

RECEIVED
MAR 29 2013
MAIL ROOM (SOUTH)

****Hybrid representation. There is no right to hybrid representation under the Sixth Amendment or the state constitution. Hence, substantive documents filed pro se by a person represented by counsel are not accepted unless submitted by counsel. This order does not limit any party from filing a pro se motion seeking to relieve his counsel or from filing a brief in cases submitted pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967) and *Johnson v. State*, 294 S.C. 310 364 S.E.2d 201 (1988). *State v. Stuckey*, Order (S.C. Sup. Ct., Nov. 5, 1998) (Shearouse Adv. Sh. #35)**

12
MAR 29 2013
MAIL ROOM (SOUTH) SIX

Kershaw CI

Kershaw

MBLS

FINANCIAL CERTIFICATE
FOR THE
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

APR 07 2015

(for use in § 1983, Bivens, and non-habeas civil actions filed by prisoners)

RECEIVED
JAILHOUSE

I request that an authorized officer of the institution in which I am confined, or other person designated to review financial information in relation to inmate trust funds, complete this Certificate. If I have insufficient funds in my account that prohibit me from paying the full filing fee required by 28 U.S.C. § 1914, I will send with my complaint an initial installment payment, required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915, equal to the amount calculated and entered on line four by the authorized officer signing this form.

MR. JOHN JAMES BELL ^{AKA} A. OMAR AZEEL AL-MUMIT #192526
INMATE NAME (PRINTED) INMATE (PRISONER) NUMBER
my John x Bell ^{محمد الجورج}
INMATE SIGNATURE PLACE OF CONFINEMENT KERSHAW

- ♦ (1) Average monthly deposits to the inmate's account.....\$ 39.68
- ♦ (2) Average monthly balance in the inmate's account calculated for the prior six months period.\$ 1.73
- ♦ (3) Current Balance\$ 0
- ♦ (4) Initial Installment Payment (Take 20 percent of the greater of lines 1 or 2).....\$ 0

I hereby certify that as of this date, the above financial information is accurate for the above named inmate.

Authorized Officer's Signature

Date

Authorized Officer's Name and Title

J. Smith for Actg.

4/2/15

1992-GS-02-0396

6

INMATE TRUST FUND ACCOUNT REPORT
for SOUTH CAROLINA COURT FILING FEES

Norshaw
C.I.

msls

Anchor

APR 07 2015

INSTRUCTIONS TO INMATE: Complete top portion then give to your mailroom. When returned from Accounting, you must mail this form with any payment to the Court.

By signing my name below, I am asking the Financial Accounting Office of the South Carolina Department of Corrections to complete this report. In accordance with SC Code of Laws §24-27-100 and 150, I authorize payment of the full filing fee. If I have insufficient funds in my account at this time to pay the court's full filing fee, I authorize SCDC to deduct the initial and subsequent payments until payment is completed.

INMATE NAME (print): MR. JOHN JAMES BELL AL OMAR ABDEL-AL-MU'MIT

SCDC # 192526

INMATE SIGNATURE: [Signature]

I plan to file this action in the SC County of LANCASTER

The section below is for SCDC - Financial Accounting Branch's use ONLY.

- (1) Total deposits to inmate's account for preceding six months' period* \$ 237.25
- (2) Twenty percent (20%) of line 1 \$ 47.45
- (3) Account balance - current date \$ 0.
- (4) PAYMENT AMOUNT **
(lesser of line 2 or line 3)
Enclosed check # \$ 0

****NOTE to COURT:** If payment is for partial fee, Court must notify SCDC once case is accepted and filed. Send notice with case # and balance owed to address below. SCDC will NOT process any additional payments until notification is received from Court.

South Carolina Department of Corrections
Financial Accounting - Room 234
PO Box 21787
Columbia, SC 29221-1787

*Admission date is noted here if inmate incarcerated less than six months ____/____/____

1992-GS-02-0396

4/2/15

RE: BROICERING A SETTLEMENT 1992-GS-02-0396. (CD319417)

ACCORDING TO THE FEBRUARY 24TH, 2017 REMITTITUR FROM A FAILED ATTEMPT BY AIKEN COUNTY SOLICITOR AND OFFICERS OF THE COURT TO CONTINUE DEFENDANT OMAR 'ABDEL-AL-MU' MIT S/W JOHN JAMES BELL IN SOUTH CAROLINA'S PENAL SYSTEM: AT THIS WRITING, AT THIS TIME FLAG DAY 2017, DEFENDANT WOULD LIKE TO BRIEFLY ADDRESS THE READER OF THIS 'EFFORT TO LET' "DUE PROCESS OF THE LAW" BE OBEYED IN FULL.

IN GOOD FAITH, DEFENDANT HEREBY REQUESTS AN "AUDIENCE" BETWEEN PARTIES SEEKING TO PROLONG JUSTICE BEING DONE IN THIS CASE 1992-GS-02-0396 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ROBERT J HARTE.

AS HUMAN BEINGS, WE MUST FOLLOW "PROTOCOL", EVEN IF IT IS "AGAINST OUR 'PERSONAL FEELINGS'", REGARDLESS OF WHAT THAT MIGHT BE". KEEP IN MIND, THIS CASE BEFORE THIS READER "LACKED CONVINCING EVIDENCE"; IF "SPECULATION" WASN'T MISTAKEN FOR "ACTUAL FACTS", THIS BROICERAGE WOULD NOT BE IMPORTANT TO ALL CONCERNED.

* HOW TO BEGIN NEGOTIATED TERMS FOR A QUARTER CENTURY LOSS OF LIFE SPENT IN THE "HORRIFIC PENAL SYSTEM" OF SOUTH CAROLINA. * PROTECTION OF LIFE AND LIBERTY, THIS WAS NEVER A PART OF THE "DUE PROCESS" AFFORDED TO PEOPLE WHO PLEAD "NOT GUILTY" TO THEIR INDICTMENTS, WHETHER "TRUE BILL", OR NOT; "DUE PROCESS" IS NOW PART OF THIS "REMITTITUR" FOR CASE 1992-GS-02-0396.

SOUTH CAROLINA HAS ITS OWN MANNERISMS APPROVING AND DISAPPROVING "COMPENSATIONS OWED OUT"; THIS CASE WILL NOT SUFFER ANY FURTHER "DELAY", OR "CALCULATED INJUSTICE" - ACCORDING TO PERSONAL DISFAVOR.

* 1992-GS-02-0396 NEEDS "OFFICIAL CLOSURE": THIS WRITING 5/1/17

SUBJECT TO BEFORE ME Cheryl R. Harte, 2017

SOUTH CAROLINA A NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY COM. EXPIRES Jan 27, 2025

NOTARY # 360.

INDIGENT DEFENSE.

APPELLATE RECORD OF APPEALS FOR "DUE PROCESS".

Judge EARLY and Anderson

FILED

May 10
Robert J. Harte
C.C.P. & G.S.

Cheryl S. Harte
Deputy Clerk

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF AIKEN
Robert J. Harte, Clerk of Court
for Aiken County, South Carolina
the foregoing constitutes a true and correct copy of the original documents which have been filed in my office

day of May 2017

Cheryl S. Harte
C.C.P. & G.S., Aiken County, S.C.

LEGAL

2

1992-GS-02-00396 (D319417)

OMAIR 'ABDEL-AL-MU'MIT
S/N JOHN JAMES BELL
DEFENDANT, PRO SE.

VS.

AIKEN COUNTY AND SC
ATTORNEY GENERAL.
RESPONDENTS.

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
AIKEN COUNTY SOUTH CAROLINA

MOTION FOR "MANDAMUS" TO
"QUASH" ALL INDICTMENTS.

CASE NUMBER 1992-GS-02-0396

THE ABOVE MOTION COMES AS A DIRECT RESULT OF THE STATES' UNENDING TACTICS TO UNDERMINE THE "DUE PROCESS" THAT WAS NEVER INTENDED TO ALLOW "JUSTICE" TO PREVAIL IN THE VERDICT TO REOPEN A CASE CLEVERLY NAILED SHUT BY A BOGUS "MAXTON" RULING IN 2009; THE SAME YEAR "BIA TEST" CAME ABOUT - § 17-28-30 - OF WHICH THIS REVERSAL CAME ABOUT.

AT THIS POINT, IT WOULD BE A PURE SENSELESSNESS WASTE OF TIME TO CONTINUE PROVING A "CONSPIRACY TO CONVICT" TOOK PLACE IN 1992; SO AT TIMES COURT DISREGARDED PREVIOUS ATTEMPTS FOR RESULTS, THIS ABOVE MOTION WILL BE BASED ON THE FOLLOWING ISSUES. AIKEN COUNTY'S DELIBERATE CONCEALMENT OF INFORMATION FROM STATE ASSIGNED LEGAL AIDES, WHO FAILED TO AVOID "CONFLICT OF INTEREST" BY NOT ESTABLISHING "ALIBI DEFENSE"; PROPERLY CALLING WITNESSES IN THE COURT ROOM THAT DAY OF THE DECEMBER TRIBUNAL. BECAUSE OF THIS, 1992-GS-02-0396 WAS ALLOWED TO HAPPEN. THIS MOTION IS BASED ON "UNTRUTHFUL ACTS" BY THE STATE AND THE SWORN OFFICERS OF THE COURT, WHO FAILED TO SERVE THEIR CAPACITY SEEKING TO SOLVE A CRIME BEFORE THE GENERAL SESSIONS COURT.

I, Robert J. Harte, Clerk of Court of Common Pleas and General Sessions for Aiken County, South Carolina do hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and correct copy of the original documents which have been filed in my office this 10 day of May 2017.

Robert J. Harte
C.C.P. & G.S., Aiken County, S.C.
George J. Westlake
Deputy Clerk

Copies Judge Early
Solicitor
Andy Anderson
Mr. Bell

FILED May 10 20 17
Robert J. Harte
C.C.P. & G.S.
George J. Westlake
Deputy Clerk

LEGAL

3

PAGE TWO - CONCLUSION TO MOTION TO "QUASH".

DISCOVERY IS THE MAJOR CONCERN IN THIS "MOTION TO QUASH" THE PENDING INDICTMENTS AGAINST THE DEFENDANT, WHO HAS SAT PATIENTLY OBSERVING HOW DEVIOUS SAID OFFICERS OF THE COURT COULD BE, EVEN WHEN FACTS CLEARLY SHOW "WRONG PERSON" WAS BEING TRIED FROM THE VERY START. "IGNORANCE", "RACISM" AND THE NEWS MEDIA PROMOTING "EMOTIONALISM" IN THIS CASE, MADE IT "VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO RECEIVE A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIAL".

SADLY ENOUGH, THE TRUTH WASN'T BROUGHT FORTH DECEMBER 1992, IT WOON'T BE BROUGHT OUT NOW, MAY 2017 - NEARLY TWENTY-FIVE YEARS LATER - WITH THOSE OFFICERS OF THE COURT CLAIMING A LOSS OF MEMORY.

ACTUALLY, THE "SUPPRESSION OF EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE" IS IN "DIRECT VIOLATION" OF THE DUE PROCESS OF THE SIXTH AMENDMENT AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

THIS CASE 1992-GS-D2-0396 WAS ALLOWED TO BE SWEEP UNDER THE LEGAL INSCRIPTION OF "FRIVOLOUS" AND OR "SUCCESSIVE". WHEN IN FACT, THE "NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE" OF INCOMPETENCE ON THE PART OF THE STATE APPOINTED "LEGAL AIDE" FELL WELL BELOW THE REQUIRED STANDARD OF JUST SHOWING UP ON TIME FOR COURT.

THE REAL DEAL BEHIND THIS MOTION IS THAT OMAR 'ABDEL-AL-MU'MIT WAS NEVER INVOLVED WITH ANYTHING THAT OCCURRED AT 480 NESOTO DRIVE - "BUYING ROCK COCAINE" AND "LEAVING" THAT ADDRESS WAS ALL MADE UP BY HUFF AND HIS CREW; WHO SHOULD BE ARRESTED AND GIVEN A PRISON CELL. AGAIN, NONE OF THE OFFICERS ACTUALLY BELIEVE IN THE BOOK THEY SWORE ON, BECAUSE IT STATES CLEARLY AGAINST LYING.

AFFIDAVIT: ALL OF THE FORESTATED IS A PART OF AN "ON-GOING" ACT REQUIRING AN END TO 1992-GS-D2-0396 BY QUASHING INDICTMENTS.

PROOF OF SERVICE: DEFENDANT IS HEREBY REQUESTING CLERK OF COURT TO "DATE-STAMP" COPY AND SEND TO DEFENDANT AND ALL WHO OPPOSE "EXONERATION" OF OMAR 'ABDEL-AL-MU'MIT ~~VS~~ JOHN JAMES BELL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me Cheyl R. Fries,
Notary Public, on May 2, 2017.

My term expires Jan 27, 2025.

DONALD J TRUMP [ACTUAL "INNOCENCE" CLAIM].

US ATT GEN [FOR INTERNAL AFFAIRS].

SC ATT GEN [SEEKING ASSISTANCE FOR EXONERATION].

APPELLATE RECORDS ON-GOING TO DATE.

Re: "DUE PROCESS VIOLATION OF SC CODE ANN §17-27-100"

4

Ms GODARD,

12/19/14

I AM ADDRESSING AN APPLICATION SENT BACK TO ME "UNPROCESSED" WITH A STIPULATION FROM THE SC SUPREME CT. STATING I CANNOT FILE ANY FURTHER APPLICATIONS OR PETITIONS WITHOUT THEIR PERMISSION, YET THIS RECENT POST CONVICTION RELIEF APPLICATION WAS "NEVER FILED BEFORE" AND THE SAME JUSTICE OVER THE SC SUPREME CT. HAS, HERSELF, ARGUED IN FAVOUR OF SC CODE ANN §17-27-100 [EVEN AS THE APPLICATION RULED ON WAS HELD AS "SUCCESSIVE" IN NATURE]. THIS APPLICATION IS NO DIFFERENT. * CASE IN POINT: OLMY v STATE, 523 SE 2D 753; STATE v JOHNSON, 360 SE 2D 317 [SC CODE ANN §1-23-350; UNDER RULE 65]. *

SOMETHING OF THIS MAGNITUDE CAN NEVER BE BRUSHED UNDER THE LEGAL RUG OF "SUCCESSIVE" OR "UNTIMELY"; BUT FOR TWENTY-THREE YEARS A BLACK CLOUD FULL OF NEGATIVITY HAS ALWAYS SUPPORTED THE LIES THAT COVERED THE TRUTH OF WHO DONE IT TO BABY JANE; TRULY THE DOER OF THIS TRAIL OF "WHAT IF EVIDENCE", "NEVER STOOD TRIAL" AND AT THIS LATE STAGE OF THE TURN OF EVENTS, PROBABLY NEVER WILL.

ALTHOUGH THE SAME GROUP OF OFFICERS OF THE COURT, SWORN TO "UPHOLD THE LAW", NEVER ONCE QUESTIONED THE PILES OF RESEARCHED EVIDENCE PROVIDED PREVIOUSLY TO SHOW AND PROVE I NEVER WAS AT THE PLACES THE SOLICITOR CLAIMED I WAS ... THERE WAS NEVER ANY "PHYSICAL EVIDENCE" TO CONNECT MY PARTICIPATION IN THIS CRIME FROM DAY ONE [READ THE TRANSCRIPT]. IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN YOU WERE THERE MOST OF MY TRIAL. [12-7 THRU. 12-10-92]

BECAUSE I NEVER GOT THAT "BITE OF THE APPLE OF APPEAL UNDER THE POST CONVICTION RELIEF ACT" [DUE TO THE OPEN VIOLATION OF JUDGE BROWN STATING FOR THE RECORD, IN OPEN COURT THAT HE KNEW NOTHING OF MY APPEAL, WHEN HE, HIMSELF, RULED AGAINST MY "NOTION FOR SPEEDY TRIAL": JUNE 16TH, 1992]

* IT IS OBVIOUSLY TRUE THAT WHEN LIES ARE ACCEPTED AS THE TRUTH AND THEY THAT LIED ARE NEVER SUBPOENAED TO CORRECT THE "MISGIVINGS SUFFERED FROM THROUGH THAT LIE"; THE ONE LIED ON IS LEFT WITH NOTHING BUT THE EFFECTS OF "A GROSS MISCARriage OF JUSTICE" AN APOLOGY WILL NEVER CORRECT OR JUSTIFY, WHEN IN FACT THE SYSTEM ITSELF IS CORRUPT. *

I WOULD ASK THAT THIS LETTER BE "TIME STAMPED" COPIED AND SENT TO JEAN H TOAL, SC ATT GEN AND RETURNED TO ME FOR PROOF OF SERVICE.

IN "GOOD FAITH", SEEKING AN END TO THIS AGE OLD NIGHTMARE: WITH THE DUE FEAR OF LYING BEFORE GOD ALMIGHTY, WHO NEVER DIES

10
Omar Abdel-Al-Mu'min s/n Mr John James Bell
CASE # 1992-GS-02-0396, 0397 AND 0784.

ATTACH WASHINGTON v STATE, 478 SE 2D 833 TO THE ABOVE ARGUMENTS.

SEVENTH

5

Re: "DUE PROCESS"



ATTENTION SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERAL: - 12/26/14 -
ON AUGUST 27TH, 2014, I APPEARED BEFORE JUDGE
DOYET A. EARLY, III [WHO HAS PREVIOUSLY "DENIED" EVERY EFFORT
I'VE MADE TO CORRECT INACCURATE EVIDENCE THAT CONVICTED ME
TWENTY-TWO YEARS AGO THIS MONTH IN AILEEN COUNTY] CHALLENG-
ING THE LIMITED FINDINGS BY SLED THROUGH THEIR "DEGRADED
BLOOD" THEORY, WHICH NEVER COMPLIED TO A "COURT ORDER" GIVEN
BY THEN SENIOR CIRCUIT JUDGE RODNEY A. PEEPLES.

THIS HEARING WAS DENIED. I REQUESTED THE LAWYER
ASSIGNED BY THE SAME JUDGE EARLY, TO APPEAL THE DECISION
ON THE GROUNDS THAT THE STATE FAILED TO COMPLY WITH RULE FIVE
REGARDING "DISCOVERY" AS ORDERED THROUGH A "SPEEDY TRIAL"
MOTION EXPLAINED TO AND DENIED BY JUDGE LUKE N. BROWN, JR.
[WHO ALSO HEARD AND DENIED MY ORIGINAL POST CONVICTION
RELIEF APPLICATION DECEMBER 13TH, 1995 ON FEBRUARY 28TH, 1996 -
WHICH, IN FACT, CLEARLY VIOLATES FLOYD V STATE, 400 SE 2D 145].

I HAVE SINCE FILED AN APPLICATION NOTARIZED TO HAVE
MY RIGHT TO APPEAL CONSIDERED BASED ON SC CODE ANN § 17-27-100.

THIS APPLICATION WAS RETURNED TO ME WITH A RULING
FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT FROM 2012 - THE SAME
YEAR I RECEIVED PERMISSION TO CHALLENGE THE DNA TEST RESULTS
[NOVEMBER 28, 2012 FROM JUDGE DOYET A. EARLY, III - AFTER I
GOT THE RUN AROUND THROUGH YOUR VERY OFFICE [SALLEY ELLIOTT]: I
EXPPOSED THE FACT THAT NO TESTS EVER WERE RELEASED BY SLED TO THE
DEFENSE FOR EXPERT EVALUATION... THUS PRESENTING A ONE SIDED AFFAIR.

IN GOOD FAITH, I AM SENDING WHAT I PRESENTED TO THE
CLERK OF COURT TO HAVE YOUR OFFICE DIRECT MS LIZ GONARAS TO PROVIDE
COPIES TO JUDGE DOYET A. EARLY, III, MYSELF, AND CHIEF JUSTICE JEAN
H. TOAL FOR EXECUTION OF MY RIGHT ACCORDING TO SC CODE ANN § 17-27-100.

 
OMAR ABDEL-AL-MUT 5/11 MR. JOHN JAMES BELL, PRO SE.

SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS DAY December 29, 2014
Cathleen A. Amerson SC NOTARY PUBLIC.
MY COMMISSION TERMINATES My Commission Expires December 22, 2018

1992-GS-02-0396

17

-Two-

6

- AFFIDAVIT -

THE CONTENTS OF THIS BRIEF DISCLOSURE OF "FACTS" ARE CORRECT AND EXACT TO THE VERY BEST OF MY CONSCIOUS EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE "DUE PROCESS" OF THE GOVERNING LAWS OF THIS LAND.

- Proof of Service -

I HEREBY SUBMIT THIS "ORIGINAL DOCUMENT OF BRIEF DISCLOSURE" TO THE OFFICE OF THE HONOURABLE LIZ GODARD, Aiken County Clerk of Court, TO BE "TIME-STAMPED", COPIED AND SENT TO BOTH THE CHIEF JUSTICE JEAN H. TOAL OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND A COMPLETE COPY OF THIS QUESTIONABLE IMPACT ON WHY SC CODE ANN §17-27-100 IS NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS APPELLATE PROCESS TO THIS CASE BEFORE THIS COURT: CITING A JUDGMENT MADE IN ITS FAVOUR UNDER THE WASHINGTON V STATE CASE [478 SE 2D 833] REF. 83 SCT 792 ALSO.

IN "GOOD FAITH" THIS PACIC OF TRANSCRIPT TO SUPPORT PROOF OF "GROSS NEGLIGENCE" REGARDING "EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW" [INSCRIBED, NOT CASUALLY INTERPRETED, AS WAS DONE THROUGHOUT THIS CASE BEFORE THIS COURT OF APPEALS]: RESPECTFULLY ARGUED AND SUBMITTED;

عمر عبد الحميد Omar 'ABDEL-AZIM MIT X Mr John James Bell, PROSE.

SWORN BEFORE ME December 29, 2014

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC Catherine A. Chmura

MY COMMISSION TERMINATES My Commission Expires December 22, 2018

CC: ERIC HOLDER, US ATT. GEN.

INNOCENCE PROJECT NYC.

ANDREW ANDERSON.

APPELLATE RECORDS.

* SPECIAL NOTE TO SUPPORT REQUEST FOR COPIES OF THIS DISCLOSURE HEREIN IS BECAUSE "PRISON POLICY" WILL NOT PROVIDE COPIES OF "SO-CALLED" SELF-GENERATED DOCUMENT, WHICH WOULD COVER "ALL" LEGAL DOCUMENTS OUTSIDE OF A TRIAL TRANSCRIPT, SO PLEASE COPY THIS DISCLOSURE FOR THE PETITIONER'S APPELLATE RECORDS.*

1492-65-02-0396

18

ONE-

LEGAL

SOUTH CAROLINA LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION
FORENSIC SERVICES LABORATORY REPORT

7
CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, Jr.
GOVERNOR



ROBERT M. STEWART
CHIEF

Latent Print Department
December 11, 1991
SLED Lab No: L91-15090
Your Case No: 91-637
Incident Date: 11-2-91
(S) John James Bell
(V) Krystal Scurry

Inv. W. E. Ross
Inv. Bennie Williams
Aiken County Sheriff's Office
420 Hampton Avenue
Aiken, SC 29801

This is an official report of the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division Forensic Services Laboratory and is to be used in connection with an official criminal investigation. These examinations were conducted under your assurance that no previous examinations of person(s) or evidence submitted in this case has been or will be conducted by any other Laboratory or agency.

Robert M. Stewart, Chief
South Carolina Law Enforcement Division

ITEM(S) SUBMITTED:

- 3 One James Foxe Imported Canadian Whiskey bottle.
29 One piece of tin foil (not processed for latent prints).

RESULTS OF EXAMINATION: Item 28 was examined and processed for latent prints with negative results; no ridge detail was developed.

These examinations were conducted by S/A Charles Counts, Examiner with this Division.

Charles E. Counts, Special Agent

CEC/ahj

CC: Coroner Sue R. Townsend

15

13

1 Q. Were you here when Captain Huff from the
2 sheriff's department testified?

3 A. Part of the testimony.

4 Q. Did you hear the testimony about seeing stains
5 on the shirt?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Did you hear testimony about seeing stains on
8 the shoes?

9 A. No.

10 Q. I believe your direct testimony was you
11 couldn't see blood on these shoes, could you?

12 A. No.

13 Q. And you're a trained serologist?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. Would you agree that the stains on those pieces
16 of material are very light?

17 A. Very light? Yes.

18 Q. And you used up all this material basically?

19 A. Yes, I did.

20 Q. Nobody else could come behind you and check
21 your work, can they?

22 A. No.

23 Q. You're involved in criminal investigations all
24 over the state. Don't you expect that might want to be
25 something a defendant would want to do? Why don't you save

1 some of it is what I'm asking you.

2 A. It depends on the amount of sample. In this
3 case there wasn't enough to save. We wouldn't' have been
4 able to do the test we did on it if we had to save part of
5 it for defense.

6 Q. Enough for you to test but not enough to save
7 for anybody else?

8 A. That's correct in this case.

9 Q. And of course did you take any photographs of
10 these stains before you cut them up?

11 A. I took a photograph of the rug in the car.

12 Q. Sitting in the car?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Did you take any photographs of these shirts?

15 A. No, I did not.

16 Q. Didn't take any photographs of the shoes or
17 nothing like that?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Then the rug was sitting in the car on the
20 driver's seat, right?

21 A. That's right.

22 Q. And I think you found blood on the backside of
23 the driver's pants, his blood, human blood?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. No further questions.

IX. SOUTHERN BLOTTING OF GELS ONTO NYLON MEMBRANES

1. Slide the gel from the tray into a plastic box that contains 0.4M NaOH. Gently shake for 30 minutes.

Soak BRL blot pad in a separate container of 0.4M NaOH for 15 minutes. Discard the dirty NaOH and refill with fresh NaOH for an additional 15 minutes. During the same time period, fill a sponge with 0.4M NaOH and place it into a plastic dissecting tray. In a separate container, immerse Biotrans B (Pall) membrane (exactly 11 X 12.5 cm) in 0.4M NaOH for 15 minutes. Membrane should be handled only with gloved hands.

2. Place the soaked blot pad onto the sponge.

3. Carefully remove the gel from the NaOH. When removed, cover with a glass plate. The top of the gel is defined as the gel surface that contains the formed wells. Invert the gel, remove the top glass plate and slide the gel onto the blot pad. The original gel top should now be face down on the blot pad with the gel origin nearest to you. With gloved fingers, press down carefully on the gel to remove any air bubbles.

4. Without delay, place the presoaked Biotrans B membrane onto the gel. Be sure the edges of the membrane are square with the gel edges. Roll a glass pipette up and down the membrane several times to remove any air bubbles.

Cover the membrane with a piece of Whatman #3 that has been cut to 11 X 12.5 cm and wetted with 0.4M NaOH. Roll the surface.

Place 9 blot pads on top of the Whatman #3.

Place 2 - 15 X 20 X 0.4 cm glass plates on top of the sandwich.

5. Allow the transfer to proceed for 6 hours at room temperature.

6. Remove blot pads and 3 mm paper. Grasp the membrane at the right corner (origin end), remove and turn it over. Label the membrane with a pen where your thumb touched the membrane.

7. Wash the membrane once with 0.2 M Tris, pH 7.5 + 2X SSC for 15 minutes with gentle shaking. Blot the membrane on a sheet of Whatman #3.

8. Sandwich each membrane between 3 mm Whatman (tape edges) and place in an 80°C oven for 30 minutes.

* 4/27/17 - THE SEVEN REQUIRED DNA TESTS *

Normally 60 ml of hybridization solution is needed in the hybridization containers when hybridizing 11 X 12.5 cm membranes. Add the membranes to the hybridization solution one at a time, making certain that each is covered with solution before the next is added. As many as 6 membranes can be hybridized in the same container. After membranes are in the solution, tilt the container to pool the hyb solution at one corner. Add the labelled probes (VNTR probe and size marker probes) and agitate container to mix. Incubate at 65C overnight with constant shaking.

HYBRIDIZATION SOLUTION

20.4 ml STERILE H₂O

12.0 ml 50% PEG

4.5 ml 20X SSPE

21.0 ml 20% SDS

57.9 ml

+ probe (Volume = 2.1 ml + x uL probe)

See Appendix C, step 12

17

18

EXHIBIT 3

XI. POST-HYBRIDIZATION WASHES

1. Pour off the hybridization solution slowly. The membranes will stick to the bottom of the container. Capture the last drops that collect at the corner of the container with a Kimwipe. Discard the Kimwipe into a radioisotope waste container.
2. Carry out the following washes, using enough wash solution to fill the container one-half full.
 - A. 15 minutes in 2X SSC + 0.1% SDS at room temperature
 - B. 15 minutes in 2X SSC + 0.1% SDS at room temperature
 - C. 0.1X SSC + 0.1% SDS at 65C. The conditions of this final, high stringency, wash(es) will vary according to the probe that has been used:

<u>Probe (locus)</u>	<u>Number of washes</u>	<u>Length of each wash</u>
YNH24 (D2S44)	1	10 min
V1 (D17S79)	1	10 min
MS-1 (D1S7)	2	30 min
PH30 (D4S139)	2	30 min
CMM101 (D14S13)	1	30 min
3'HVR (D16S85)	1	10 min
TBQ7 (D10S28)	2	30 min

NOTE: The 0.1X SSC + 0.1% SDS used for the final stringency washes must be at 65C before it is added to the membranes.

3. Lightly blot the membrane on #3 Whatman - DO NOT LET THE MEMBRANE DRY OUT!

18
12.07.90
Dec

51

18
VII. AUTORADIOGRAPHY

1. Wrap the damp membranes in Glad or Saran wrap. Do not use the Reynolds food wrap for this step! In the darkroom under red light illumination, place the membranes DNA side down onto XAR film. Tape the membranes to this film. You can record the locations of membranes in contact with the film by writing directly on the film with a ball point pen. Place another sheet of XAR onto the back of the membranes and close the cassette. Place the cassette at -80°C .
2. The XAR film on the back side of the membranes can be removed after a short exposure period which can be as short as a few hours or as long as several days. The back film is to be used as a guide for determining the length of time the front film needs to be left in place.

19
XIII. BLOT STRIPPING PROCEDURE

1. Remove plastic wrap from membranes.
2. Place membranes in the following solution:
 - 110 ml formamide
 - 20 ml 20X SSPE
 - 10 ml 20% SDS
 - Q.S. with H₂O to 200 ml.
3. Shake membranes for 45-90 minutes at 65°C
4. Rinse the stripped blot in 200 ml of 0.1X SSC + 0.1% SDS for 1 minute at room temperature.
5. Place the blot on filter paper to remove excess fluid. Relabel the membrane with ballpen if required.
6. Place the blot in the hybridization solution for the next probing.

NOTE: If membranes are to be stored for an indefinite period of time, carry out the stripping and rinsing steps as described. Then, rewrap the membranes with plastic wrap and freeze at -80.

20

14

EXHIBIT 6

XIV. RESOLUTION OF SPERM CELL DNA AND VAGINAL CELL DNA

1. Remove the swab from the applicator stick and place into a 1.5 ml tube.

2. Add:
- 400 uL Tris/EDTA/NaCl (TNE)
 - 25 uL 20% sarkosyl
 - 75 uL H₂O
 - 5 uL PaseK
 - 505 uL

Mix tube contents and place at 37C for 2 hours.

3. Punch a hole in the cap of the tube. Place the swab into the cap and spin the tube for 5 minutes.

4. Remove the supernatant fluid and place it into a new 1.5 ml tube. This is the fraction that contains female DNA. Discard the swab. Be careful not to disturb the pellet on the bottom of the tube.

5. Place a new cap on the original tube.

6. To the pellet in the original tube add:

- 150 uL TNE
- 50 uL 20% sarkosyl
- 40 uL 0.39M DTT
- 150 uL H₂O
- 10 uL PaseK

Mix tube contents and place at 37C for 2 hours.

7. Extract both tubes (i.e. the tube containing the female fraction as well as the tube containing the sperm cell heads) with an equal volume of phenol:chloroform:isoamyl alcohol. Continue to process each of the samples as you would a regular stain extract.

21

54

Qec

21
XV. ASSESSMENT OF AUTORADIOGRAPHY DATA

EXHIBIT 7

There are four major steps in the assessment of autoradiographic (autorad) data. Each of these steps will be described.

A. Visual evaluation of autorads

1. Examine the lane containing the allelic control specimen K562. There must be either one or two bands, depending on which RFLP locus has been probed. If the allelic control specimen does not exhibit the expected number of bands for the locus being probed, the autorad cannot be assessed further.
2. Visually inspect the allelic control band(s) for their position relative to the adjacent size markers. Depending on the locus being probed, the allelic control band(s) should be located in an expected position on the autorad. If the allelic control band(s) are not found in a visually expected position, the autorad cannot be assessed further.
3. Visually inspect the lanes that contain size markers. The bands in these lanes must be of sufficient intensity to enable them to be used as size references for the allelic control, the known, and the questioned specimen bands. If regions of the size ladder lanes are not visible, specimen bands cannot be sized in these regions.
4. Visually inspect the lanes that contain known or questioned specimen DNA to assess the quality of the fragment bands. Determine if the bands in these lanes are extremely broad or exhibit pronounced band curvature. These band irregularities can signal potential mobility shifts. If any fragment band for a specimen has migrated to a position that is greater than the position of the 10,094 bp size marker band, the evaluation of that specimen at that locus is considered inconclusive.
5. Based on the assessments of band quality and band position, decide which of the specimens will be subjected to the computer-assisted band sizing procedure.

B. Computer-assisted band size determination

The determination of band size is carried out using the "DNA IMAGE ANALYSIS" program that can be run on MS-DOS-based computers. The analyst will be guided through the imaging and sizing procedures by text display on the computer screen. The computer program enables an objective determination of the sizes of the DNA fragments in each test specimen and the allelic control. The sizing program ends by printing out the calculated fragment sizes, in base pairs, for each of the specimens and the allelic control specimen.

C. Confirmation of visual matches

Visual matches must be confirmed or rejected through application of the appropriate mathematical procedures. In the absence of a computer program to accomplish this procedure, the following steps can be carried out manually.

- 22
1. For each fragment band in the known specimen, calculate a value that is 2.5% of the base pair size determined by the sizing procedure. Add the calculated value to the base pair size of the fragment. Subtract the calculated value from the base pair size of
- 55

12.07.90

20

22

EXHIBIT B

the fragment.

2. For each fragment in a questioned specimen that has been determined to be presumptively equal in size to a fragment in a known specimen, calculate a value that is 2.5% of the base pair size of the questioned fragment determined by the sizing procedure. Add the calculated value to the base pair size of the fragment. Subtract the calculated value from the base pair size of the fragment.
3. Compare the calculated ranges of base pair values for the known and questioned specimen bands. If these ranges overlap, the presumptive equality has been confirmed. If the ranges do not overlap, the presumptive equality of fragment sizes is either inconclusive or exclusionary.

D. Determination of Point Estimate values

If specimen fragment size equalities have been confirmed, the best estimate values can be determined for the fragment bands in the appropriate specimen by using the appropriate computer program.

23

12.07.90

DE

56

21

23

SOUTH CAROLINA LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION

FORENSIC SERVICES LABORATORY REPORT

CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, Jr.
GOVERNOR



ROBERT M. STEWART
CHIEF

Department of Serology
and DNA Analysis

FINAL REPORT

May 15, 1992

SLED Lab No: L91-15090

Your Case No: 91-637

Incident Date: 11/02/91

(S) John James Bell

(V) Crystal Scurry

Inv. W. E. Ross/Bennie Williams
Aiken County Sheriff's Office
420 Hampton Avenue
Aiken, SC 29801

This is an official report of the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division Forensic Services Laboratory and is to be used in connection with an official criminal investigation. These examinations were conducted under your assurance that no previous examinations of person(s) or evidence submitted in this case has been or will be conducted by any other Laboratory or agency.

Robert M. Stewart, Chief
South Carolina Law Enforcement Division

ITEM(S) SUBMITTED

- 1.1 Cutting from a shirt
- 1.4.1 Cutting from pants
- 1.4.2 Cutting from pants
- 3.1 Cutting from quilt
- 3.2 Cutting from quilt
- 4. Cutting from rug
- 9. Blood standard from Krystal Scurry
- 22.6 Cutting from one piece suit
- 34.5 Blood standard from John Bell

RESULTS OF EXAMINATION(S)

Deoxyribonucleic (DNA) profiles for genetic loci D2S44, D10S28, D17S79, D4S139 and D1S7 were developed from Hae III digested high molecular weight DNA extracted from item 1.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 3.1, 9., and 34.5. Based on these results the D2S44, D4S139, D10S28, and D1S7 profile from item 1.4.1 matches item 9 (Krystal Scurry). The probability of selecting an unrelated individual at random having a DNA profile matching item 9 (Krystal Scurry) is one in 230 million Blacks and one in 53 million Caucasians.

24

51

24

RESULTS OF EXAMINATION(S) CONTINUED:

Results for item 1.4.1 were uninterpretable at locus D17S79, but item 9 (Krystal Scurry) could not be excluded as the contributor of the material. The DNA extracted from blood on items 1.1 and 3.1 also matches the DNA profile of item 9 (Krystal Scurry).

The DNA extracted from the blood on item 1.4.2 matches the DNA profile of item 34. 5 (John Bell) and thus could not have been contributed by item 9 (Krystal Scurry).

No Deoxyribonucleic Acid (DNA) profile was developed from items 3.2, 4., and 22.6 due to insufficient DNA.

These examinations were conducted by S/A David L. McClure, Forensic DNA Analyst with this Division.

David L. McClure
David L. McClure
Special Agent

MAY 15, 1992
Date

jsb

25

58

For all the reasons set forth herein, Applicant shows that funding and appointment of this Expert and/or State production of this Expert is necessary and should be Ordered.

Liz Cochran, Clerk of Court of Common Pleas and General Sessions for Alameda County, South Carolina do hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and correct copy of the original document which have been filed in my office this 03/09/2011.

day of February 2015
City of
County of
State of

26

Respectfully submitted,

ANDERSON & ANDERSON LLP



P. Andrew Anderson
Attorney for Applicant Bell
211 York Street, NE
Aiken, South Carolina 29801
803.648.6000 - phone
803.648.0888 - facsimile
aanderson@andersonandanderson.com

August 19, 2014.

27

27

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF AIKEN)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jamie A. Altman, legal assistant for Anderson & Anderson LLP, counsel for the aforementioned Applicant, do hereby certify that I have served the documents hereinafter specified on the attorney(s) hereinafter named on the date indicated below by hand-delivery addressed as follows:

DOCUMENT(S) SERVED:


PHOTOCOPY OF:

- 1) Applicant's Motion For Expert Witness

SERVICE ON:

Via Hand-Delivery

David Miller, Esquire
Second Circuit Solicitor's Office
Aiken County Courthouse
Aiken, South Carolina 29801




Jamie A. Altman

August 19, 2014.

RE: Bell v. State of South Carolina
Case No.: 1992-GS-02-0396/0397/0784

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF AIKEN
I, Liz Gedard, Clerk of Court of Common Pleas and General Sessions for Aiken County, South Carolina, do hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and correct copy of the original documents which have been filed in my office this

20 day of August 2014


Liz Gedard, Clerk of Court
Aiken County, South Carolina
Sentry Court

28

20

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

COUNTY OF AIKEN)

JOHN JAMES BELL, #192526,
Applicant.)

vs.)

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Respondent.)) IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
) FOR THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT) Case No.: 1992-GS-02-0396, 1992-GS-02-0397,
) 1992-GS-02-0784**ORDER**

Date of Hearing:	August 27, 2014
Presiding Judge:	Doyet A. Early, III
Court Reporter:	Bethanie Patterson
Attorney for Applicant:	P. Andrew Anderson
Attorney for Respondent:	David Warren Miller

This matter came before the Court pursuant to Applicant's Application for Forensic DNA testing pursuant to South Carolina Code Ann. § 17-28-10, *et. seq.* Applicant was convicted of murder following a jury trial. Applicant appeared with his attorney and the State was represented by the 2nd Circuit Solicitor's Office. Applicant's attorney and the State's attorney met with the Aiken County Clerk of Court and confirmed that evidence from Applicant's trial (relevant to this case) has been preserved in the Clerk of Court's vault. The parties stipulated that: the evidence is available, it has been maintained appropriately and the chain of custody is sufficient, and the evidence is material to the issue of Applicant's identity as the perpetrator of the alleged murder. These are the first three (3) required elements of South Carolina Code § 17-28-90 (B) that must be established by the Applicant. This Court heard testimony from Applicant and arguments from both attorneys. This Court also reviewed the file in this matter (which includes numerous documents filed by Applicant independently from his attorney). The parties agreed for this

35

21

29

matter to be heard in Lexington County as the Judge over this matter was just reassigned to hold court in Lexington after this matter had been scheduled to be heard.

Based upon the testimony at the hearing, the attorneys' arguments, and this Court's review of the extensive file in this matter, this Court makes the following findings:

1. The first three (3) requirements of § 17-28-90 (B) have been met by stipulation.
2. It is clear in reviewing the transcripts of S.L.E.D. DNA expert David McClure's testimony at both a pre-trial hearing and the Applicant's jury trial that the State's DNA evidence against Applicant was unreliable.
3. Retesting the evidence is material to the issue of Applicant's identity as the perpetrator of this murder.
4. Scientific advances since Applicant's conviction have improved reliability of DNA testing.
5. Applicant's shirt and pants and a quilt contain DNA evidence, have been appropriately maintained, have sufficient chain of custody, and are material to Applicant's identity as the perpetrator of the murder in question. These items must be tested.
6. The requested DNA testing could very well produce exculpatory results which would create new evidence which would probably change the result of Applicant's conviction.
7. While the evidence in question has been tested, new testing (in light of the

36

30

30
unreliability of the original testing in this matter and advances in technology) would provide a substantially more probative and reliable result.

8. This application was made to demonstrate Applicant's innocence, not merely to delay the administration of justice.
9. At trial, the gravaman of Applicant's defense was tied to photographs produced by the defense showing that the State's eyewitness's testimony was unreliable. These photographs were anticipated to convince a jury that the eyewitness could not have seen the victim in Applicant's car. The Court ruled the photographs inadmissible. This totally foiled the defense and left Applicant with little to offer in the trial.
10. Applicant was not afforded a DNA expert or blood spatter expert. Both experts would have been material and necessary for his defense.
11. It is appropriate, therefore, for the evidence held by the Aiken County Clerk of Court to be tested by S.L.E.D.

Now, therefore, based upon the above findings and this Court's review of the evidence, testimony, and arguments in this matter, Applicant's/Defendant's shirt, pants and the quilt shall be DNA tested by S.L.E.D. The results of this testing shall be shared with Applicant (through his attorney) and the State.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this _____ day of _____, 2014.

Doyet A. Early, III
Judge, Second Judicial Circuit

C/Ar
9/22/2014
31

RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 25TH, 2014
- 3 COPIES / 3 PAGES -

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA) IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
COUNTY OF AIKEN) SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,)
VS)
JOHN JAMES BELL #192526)
Defendant.)

ORDER DENYING POST-
CONVICITON DNA TESTING

Indictment Nos. 1992-GS-02-0396, (D3947)
1992-GS-02-0397, and 1992-GS-02-0784 (D Indict)
(D 319 440)

This matter came before the Court on Applicant's Petition for Forensic DNA testing pursuant to South Carolina Code Ann. §17-28-10, *et. seq.* (the "Access to Justice Post-Conviction DNA Testing Act"). The hearing in this matter was originally set to be heard in Aiken County during an assigned term of Common Pleas/Non-Jury, however this Court was subsequently assigned to preside over a General Sessions term in Lexington County that week. Accordingly, the hearing was held at the Lexington County Courthouse on Wednesday, August 27, 2014. Counsel for the Applicant and the State consented to having this matter heard in Lexington County in lieu of Aiken County. At the hearing, the Applicant appeared with his attorney P. Andrew Anderson. The State was represented at the hearing by Deputy Solicitor David Miller and Assistant Solicitor Cassie Hall.

Following a jury trial, the Applicant was convicted of Kidnapping (1992-GS-02-0396), Murder (1992-GS-02-0397) and Criminal Sexual Conduct with a Minor (1992-GS-02-0784). Applicant received concurrent sentences of life for the Murder conviction and 30 years for the Kidnapping conviction. He received a consecutive 30 year sentence for the CSC with a Minor conviction. The victim in this matter was a small child who lived in the home with the Applicant and his mother. Evidence was offered during the trial regarding hairs consistent with the victim's hair located on a quilt inside the Applicant's vehicle. Evidence was also offered that the victim's blood was found on the Applicant's clothing he was wearing at the time of his arrest. Additionally, an eyewitness testified that he saw the victim in the Applicant's car the day she disappeared. The Applicant denied that the victim was in his car on the day of her disappearance.

C. Copy
32
Mr. Bell
Solicitor Miller
Andy Anderson

ME
#1

30
September 22 2014
Leij Godard
C.C.C.P. & G.S.
Cheryl Gulestall
Deputy Clerk

32

Following his conviction, Applicant filed many post-trial actions, including multiple PCR and habeas claims. After receiving this Petition, Applicant's attorney and the State's attorneys reviewed the various filings of the Applicant, including numerous letters/motions sent to the various attorneys, the Clerk of Court, and the Court. Additionally, the attorneys met with the Aiken County Clerk of Court to review the evidence retained in the case. Following that review, the attorneys conferred with Captain Wendy Hall from the SLED Forensics Laboratory to determine its potential ability to analyze evidence in this case.

Following this preparation, the State and the Defense were able to stipulate to several facts required by the Act. Specifically, the parties stipulated as follows:

1. the physical evidence or biological material to be tested is available and is potentially in a condition that would permit the requested DNA testing (§17-28-90(B)(1));
2. the physical evidence or biological material to be tested has been subject to a chain of custody sufficient to establish it has not been substituted, tampered with, replaced, or altered in any material aspect, or the testing itself may establish the integrity of the physical evidence or biological material (§17-28-90(B)(2));
3. the physical evidence or biological material sought to be tested is material to the issue of the applicant's identity as the perpetrator of, or accomplice to, the offense (§17-28-90(B)(3));
4. the DNA results of the physical evidence or biological material sought to be tested would be material to the issue of the applicant's identity as the perpetrator of, or accomplice to, the offense (§17-28-90(B)(4)).

At the hearing, the Applicant was called to testify regarding the remaining requirements of §17-28-90. In his Petition, the Applicant did not identify the specific items of evidence he wished to be tested for DNA or how he hoped such testing would serve to exonerate him. Additionally, during his testimony at the hearing, the Applicant could not allege any factual basis to justify DNA testing in this case as required by §17-28-90(B)(5) or (6). Specifically, neither the Applicant nor his counsel could articulate what would constitute an "exculpatory" result of any potential testing of the items of evidence.

At trial, the defense alleged that the victim's blood was on his clothing because the victim had previously fallen and been injured. The Applicant testified that he had picked up the victim and taken her into the house. Therefore, further testing confirming the presence of the victim's



33

39


33
blood on the Applicant's clothing would not be exculpatory. Similarly, any testing that could be done of the samples of the hair taken from the quilt in the Applicant's vehicle would only serve to further implicate the Applicant in this crime, notwithstanding the fact that there is no way to know when the hairs were left in the vehicle.

This Court has reviewed the file in this matter, including the numerous documents filed by the Applicant independently from his attorney, and considered the arguments of counsel and the Applicant's testimony. Based on the foregoing, I find as follows:

1. The first three (3) requirements of § 17-28-90 (B) have been met by stipulation.
2. Retesting the evidence in this matter would not lead to material evidence on the issue of Applicant's identity as the perpetrator of this murder.
3. While scientific advances since Applicant's conviction have improved reliability of DNA testing, any further testing of the evidence in this case for the presence of the victim's DNA would only serve to further implicate the Applicant in these crimes.
4. The DNA testing requested by the Applicant would not serve to demonstrate Applicant's innocence.
5. Any claims regarding the trial court's rulings on admissibility of photographs and eyewitness testimony have been previously ruled upon in other actions filed by the Applicant. To the extent those claims were not previously ruled upon, they are not properly before the Court in this action, which is limited to claims solely related to request(s) for DNA testing.
6. Applicant's motions for the appointment of a DNA expert and blood spatter expert are likewise not properly before this court and are, therefore, denied.

Based on the foregoing, I hereby find the Applicant has failed to meet his burden of proof as to the requirements of §17-28-90 inasmuch as Applicant has offered insufficient evidence to prove his allegations as to subsections five, six or seven of the statute by the preponderance of the evidence. Accordingly, the Applicant's Petition should be, and hereby is, DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED!


Doyet A. Early, III
Resident Judge,
Second Judicial Circuit

September 16, 2014
Aiken, South Carolina

40



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN
DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

February 08, 2017

Mr. Paul Andrew Anderson, Esquire
211 York St., NE
Suite 2
Aiken SC 29801

Mr. Donald J. Zelenka, Esquire
PO Box 11549
Columbia SC 29211-1549

Re: John James Bell v. State
Appellate Case No. 2014-002196

Dear Counsel:

Enclosed is the decision of the Court. The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules.

Very truly yours,

Jenny A. Kitchings /LK7
CLERK

cc: John James Bell, 00192526
Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
John W. McIntosh, Esquire
The Honorable Doyet A. Early, III

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals**

John James Bell, Petitioner,

v.

State of South Carolina, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2014-002196

Appeal From Aiken County
Doyet A. Early, III, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2017-UP-069
Submitted December 1, 2016 – Filed February 8, 2017

AFFIRMED

Paul Andrew Anderson, of Anderson & Anderson, LLP,
of Aiken, for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Chief Deputy
Attorney General John W. McIntosh, and Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General Donald J. Zelenka, all
of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following
authorities: *State v. Lynch*, 375 S.C. 628, 632, 654 S.E.2d 292, 294 (Ct. App. 2007)

("In criminal cases, this [c]ourt reviews errors of law only."); *id.* ("An appellate court is bound by the trial court's factual findings unless they are clearly erroneous."); S.C. Code Ann. § 17-28-90(B) (2014) ("The court shall order DNA testing of the applicant's DNA and the physical evidence or biological material upon a finding that the applicant has established each of the following factors by a preponderance of the evidence: . . . (4) the DNA results of the physical evidence or biological material sought to be tested would be material to the issue of the applicant's identity as the perpetrator of, or accomplice to, the offense notwithstanding the fact that the applicant may have pled guilty or nolo contendere or made or is alleged to have made an incriminating statement or admission as to identity; (5) if the requested DNA testing produces exculpatory results, the testing will constitute new evidence that will probably change the result of the applicant's conviction or adjudication if a new trial is granted and is not merely cumulative or impeaching; (6) the physical evidence or biological material sought to be tested was not previously subjected to DNA testing, or if the physical evidence or biological material sought to be tested was previously subjected to DNA testing, the requested DNA test would provide a substantially more probative result . . .").

AFFIRMED.¹

LOCKEMY, C.J., and KONDUROS and MCDONALD, JJ., concur.

¹ We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.

p. andrew anderson

kristina m. anderson*

*Licensed in SC & GA

anderson anderson

trial attorneys and counselors at law

February 13, 2017


John James Bell SCDC # 192526
Kershaw Correctional Institution
4848 Goldmine Hwy
Kershaw, South Carolina 29067

RE: State of South Carolina v. John James Bell
Appellate Case No.: 2014-002196

Dear Omar:

I am enclosing a copy of the Order we just received from the Court in your case. As you can see, the Court of Appeals has Affirmed the ruling of the lower Court. Obviously, we are disappointed by this result. I had hoped we would be able to get new testing performed for you in this. The letter and Order indicates that you are being copied on these, but I wanted to be sure you received them.

Very truly yours,



P. Andrew Anderson

PAA/jaa
Enclosures

38



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN
DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

February 24, 2017

The Honorable Robert J. Harte
PO Box 583
Aiken, SC 29802

REMITTITUR

Re: John James Bell v. State
Lower Court Case No. 1992GS0200396, 1992GS0200397, 1992GS0200784
Appellate Case No. 2014-002196

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

V. Claire Allen, Deputy

CLERK

Enclosure

cc: John James Bell, 00192526
Paul Andrew Anderson, Esquire
Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Donald J. Zelenka, Esquire
John W. McIntosh, Esquire

p. andrew anderson

kristina m. anderson*

*Licensed in SC & GA

anderson anderson

trial attorneys and counselors at law

March 10, 2017

John James Bell SCDC # 192526
Kershaw Correctional Institution
4848 Goldmine Hwy
Kershaw, South Carolina 29067


RE: State of South Carolina v. John James Bell
Appellate Case No.: 2014-002196

Dear Omar:

Hope this letter finds you still doing well. I am enclosing the Remittitur we received in your case following the prior Order of the Court of Appeals. This returns the matter to the lower Court and concludes the DNA PCR on your behalf. As a result, I am closing my file on this matter.

I really enjoyed meeting you and getting to know you throughout this process.

Very truly yours,



P. Andrew Anderson

PAA/jaa
Enclosures

240

p. andrew anderson

kristina m. anderson*

*Licensed in SC & GA

anderson and
trial attorneys and counselors at law

May 31, 2017

John James Bell SCDC # 192526
Kershaw Correctional Institution
4848 Goldmine Hwy
Kershaw, South Carolina 29067

RE: State of South Carolina v. John James Bell
Appellate Case No.: 2014-002196

Dear Omar:

I hope this letter finds you doing well. I am contacting you because we received copies of some things that you have sent to the Aiken County Clerk for filing. It looks like you filed documents seeking a resolution in your case or a settlement conference and also asking that counsel be appointed for you. I just received these documents this week. I wanted to be sure that you understand that there is not any current issue pending in Aiken County for the Court or the Clerk to rule on in your case.


We handled your DNA PCR and when it was denied in Aiken, we filed an appeal on your behalf. The Court of Appeals granted the right to brief the issue on your DNA PCR for consideration by the Court. We did that and the State filed a response with the Court of Appeals refuting our contentions that you should have been granted relief on your DNA PCR. The remedy in the Appeal would have been that the Court of Appeals could have Reversed the lower Court in Aiken, but only as it related to your DNA PCR. That would mean that if we were successful in your Appeal, you would have been granted DNA re-testing of the evidence in your case. If that had happened, it may have uncovered evidence that could have been used to exonerate you in your criminal case and may have allowed the Court to re-open your original conviction based upon the new evidence. Unfortunately, we received the Court of Appeal's Order in your case dated February 8, 2017, and rather than Reversing the Court in Aiken County and granting you DNA re-testing, the Court of Appeals simply Affirmed the lower Aiken County Court's ruling. This means that the Court of Appeals upheld the denial of your DNA PCR and you do not get re-testing. The Court then sent the Remittitur back to the Aiken County Court on February 24, 2017, informing them of the disposition of the Appeal and essentially closing the Court of Appeal's file on the matter.

I am enclosing copies of our letters to you dated February 13, 2017, and March 10, 2017, which transmitted copies of the Order and Remittitur. Because the Court of Appeals Affirmed the Aiken County Court, there is currently nothing pending, of which I am aware, regarding your case. The Remittitur back to Aiken County does not return any issue to Aiken County for the Court to handle. I do not know what the Clerk's Office in Aiken will do with the new documents that you have submitted or even if they are able to take any action.

I hope this makes sense. If you have questions about all of this, please don't hesitate to call me and I will be glad to talk to you. I don't know if the Clerk in Aiken County will issue some kind of letter or Order to you about the documents that you have sent for filing. I just want to be sure that you understand what is going on procedurally.

With best regards, I am

Very truly yours,



P. Andrew Anderson

PAA/twm
Enclosures



Robert J. Harte
Aiken County Clerk of Court

P.O. Box 583
Aiken, SC 29802

June 27, 2017

John James Bell #19252
Kershaw Correctional Inst
4848 Goldmine Hwy
Kershaw, SC 29067

Re: 1992-GS-02-00396

Mr. Bell,

I am returning the paperwork that you sent to be filed in this office. Your DNA-PCR was denied and your attorney, Mr. Anderson, appealed the case and the Appellate Court denied the appeal. You do not have any other pending cases with us to file your paperwork in.

If you are wanting to appeal the decision of the Appellate Court you would send your appeal to the Supreme Court.

I am also including a copy of an Order filed with us on April 2, 2012 from the Supreme Court in reference to further filings.

Thank you,

Cheryl S. Westall
Chief Deputy Clerk
Criminal Division

1992GS0200784
D 319417
D 319660

2010CP0200598

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

John James Bell,

Petitioner,

v.

State of South Carolina,

Respondent.

ORDER

Petitioner has filed a notice of appeal from an order of the circuit court denying and dismissing petitioner's fifth application for post-conviction relief (PCR). Petitioner has also submitted the explanation required by Rule 243(c), SCACR. We find petitioner has failed to show there is an arguable basis for asserting the determination by the lower court was improper. Accordingly, we dismiss the notice of appeal in this matter.



Moreover, we hereby prohibit petitioner from filing any further collateral actions in the circuit court challenging his convictions from 1992 for kidnapping, murder and criminal sexual conduct with a minor, first degree, without first obtaining permission to do so from this Court.


FOR THE COURT C. J.

Columbia, South Carolina

March 29, 2012

cc: Appellate Defense
John James Bell #192526
Assistant Attorney General Mary S. Williams
The Honorable Liz Godard, Aiken County Clerk of Court

4.2.12

Liz Godard
C.C.P. & G.S.

Anita Knoepfle
Deputy Clerk

CC-GS

1992-GS-02-0396

14

2/14

-Four-



**Aiken County Clerk of Court
Criminal Division
P. O. Box 583
Aiken, S.C. 29802-0583
Phone: 803-642-1715**

January 7, 2015

1992-GS-02-00396 (D319417)
1992-GS-02-00397 (D319660)
1992-GS-02-00784 (DI)

Mr. John Bell #192526
KCI/MAG B-48
4848 Gold Mine Hwy
Kershaw, SC 29067-8136

Mr. Bell,

I spoke with Judge Early and he instructed me to return this paperwork to you. He said per the order of the Supreme Court issued March 29, 2012 you would first have to obtain written permission in the form of an Order from them to file anymore collateral actions challenging your conviction from 1992.

That Order would need to be on file with this office before we can accept anymore filings from you.

Thank you,


Cheryl S. Westall
Chief Deputy Clerk
Criminal Division

RE: DELIBERATE DELAY: APPELLATE INDIFFERENCE.

TO WHOM THIS MAY CONCERN:

5-8-17

Kershaw Prison HAS BECOME A LITERAL CONCENTRATION CAMP, RUN BY IMMATURE AND UNFOUNDED INDIVIDUALS SEEING TO ESTABLISH AUTHORITY AMONGST THEMSELVES THROUGH "CRUEL AND UNUSUAL" TREATMENT OF THOSE HOUSED AT THIS LUNATIC BEND.

UNDER THE CODE 34 LOCKDOWN - MAIL NEITHER GOES OUT OR COMES IN. COURT DEAD LINES ARE IGNORED COMPLETELY UNDER THE GUISE THAT "THERE'S NOT ENOUGH PERSONAL TO MAN THE FORT"... THAT DOESN'T SAY MUCH FOR HOW THE CAMP IS BEING FACILITATED.

CASE IN POINT: LEGAL MAIL, LEGAL SUPPLIES ARE BOTH BEING DELAYED "COMING AND GOING" [DEBIT FORMS ARE WEEK BEHIND MAKING ONE WONDER "IF" THE MAILED ITEMS ACTUALLY WERE EVEN "MAILED OUT OF THE PRISON AT ALL"???] ITS BEEN THREE WEEKS SINCE THE LEGAL SUPPLY REQUESTS WERE MADE - A PERSON SICK, OR OTHER WISE ELSEWHERE, SHOULD NOT CAUSE A "COURT DEAD LINE" TO BE MISSED; OR ACTIVELY PREVENT "LEGAL DOCUMENTS" FROM SECURELY MAILED OUT TO A COURT WHEREIN PROCEDURES HAVE ALREADY BEEN ORGANIZED. THIS HAS HAPPENED TO ME HERE AT THIS CONCENTRATION CAMP: WHILE NO ONE IS HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR ANYTHING; "COMING OR GOING".

JMC

SWORN TO BEFORE ME May 9, 2017

Catherine A. Cinner

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY TERM EXPIRES December 23 2018

CC ATTORNEY GENERAL SOUTH CAROLINA.
APPELLATE RECORDS.

EXHIBIT 9

AMASON
REFUSED TO
USE NOTARY
STAMP

THE BIBLE IS NO LONGER "HOLY" IN THE HANDS OF A "LIAR", AND ANYONE ELSE WHO DOESN'T BELIEVE IN TELLING THE "WHOLE TRUTH AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH" BECAUSE GOD AIN'T A FACTOR IN THE "EQUATION" - THERE AIN'T NO CONSEQUENCES FOR LYING... HELL, IT AIN'T STOP YET SINCE ARREST NOVEMBER 2ND, 1991 - THE DEVIL'S HORNS BEEN RAPPED AROUND THIS CAPPED CONVICTION NON-STOP, AND STILL ROLLING ON. JUST TO THINK A MINUTE OVER HOW MANY PETITIONS WERE UNMAILED - OPENED OUT OF MY PRESENCE AND RESEALED - "COMING AND GOING" OUT OF THIS HELL-HOLE OF A PRISON.

THE BIGGEST PROBLEM LIES IN THE LACK OF QUALIFICATION FOR THE POSITIONS BEING HELD AND THE UNPROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR RUNNING A JOINT LIKE THIS.

IN GOOD FAITH, I, OMAR 'ABDEL-AL-MU' MIT [A MUSLIM SINCE YALL'S WAR IN VIETNAM - PROBABLY ONE YOU YOURSELF DUCKED OUT ON], SEEK TO HAVE THE RUNNING OF THIS PLACE INVESTIGATED AND PEOPLE CHARGED WITH ON-GOING "CRIMINAL ACTS" ON THIS STATE INSTITUTION UNDER STATE LAW; VIOLATING ESTABLISHED LAWS AND REGULATIONS ACCORDING TO POLICY!

Jmc

SWORN TO BEFORE ME January 9, 2017

Carlton A. Amador

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY TERM EXPIRES December 22 2018

CC ATTORNEY GENERAL SOUTH CAROLINA.
APPELLATE RECORDS.

-28-

EXHIBIT 10

AMASON
REFUSED TO
USE NOTARY
STAMP

49

- EXHIBIT 24 -

- AFFIDAVIT -

FROM BEGINNING TO THE "END" - SAME FACES, DIFFERENT PLACES:
THE WHOLE OBJECTIVE IS SURROUNDING "DUE PROCESS" NOTHING MORE.
ONE PARTY AFFIRMING THE TRUTH, THE OTHERS RIDING ON A LIE -
QUESTION REMAINS, WHO IS TELLING WHAT: OR DOES IT REALLY MATTER.
I FEAR ALLAH, AND I HAVE TOLD THE TRUTH FROM THE VERY BEGINNING.

- PROOF OF SERVICE -

THIS HAS BEEN A BOUNDLESS ATTEMPT TO EXPOSURE THE UNEXPOSED;
THUS FAR, NO WORDS HAVE PENETRATED THE SEEKERS OF CRIME SOLVING
PERSONAGE, SO NOTHING POSITIVE IN RETURN FROM THE MASSIVE EFFORTS
MADE.

THE FUNNY THING SURROUNDING ALL OF THIS DRAMA, IS THAT CRIMINALS
HOUSE ME AT BOTH ENDS OF THIS CONTINUOUS ORDEAL [IN HERE AND OUT
THERE READING THIS IN OPPOSITION OF RELEASE THROUGH DUE PROCESS].

I'M NOT GONNA ASK FOR "DATE-STAMP", "COPY" AND "RETURN TO ME":
YALL AIN'T NEVER DONE IT BEFORE AND ACT LIKE THIS WASN'T EVER
RECEIVED FOR A REPLY... WHAT INJUSTICE... WHAT IGNORANCE; BUT,
"IF" THE SHOE WAS ON THE OTHER FOOT... YOU WOULD BE A MIRROR OF ME.

JMC

SWORN TO BEFORE ME 12 May 9, 2017,
Catherine A. Amos.

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY TERM EXPIRES December 22, 2018.

CC ATTORNEY GENERAL SOUTH CAROLINA.
APPELLATE RECORDS.

AMASON
REFUSED TO
USE NOTARY
STAMP

-24-

EXHIBIT II

60

RE: "MANDAMUS MOTION"

THIS WOULD BE MY SECOND "MANDAMUS MOTION" BEFORE THIS COURT SEEKING "EXONERATION" FROM A "WRONGFUL CONVICTION" HELD DECEMBER 1992 BASED UPON INCOHERENT EVIDENCE AND TESTIMONY INCONSISTANT WITH TRUE FACTS SURROUNDING CHARGES.

THIS MOTION CONSISTS OF STATEMENTS MADE BY APPELLATE COURT AND NEWLY APPOINTED COUNSEL WHICH PRETTY MUCH CONTRADICTS WHAT WAS PLAINLY DOCUMENTED FEBRUARY 8TH AND 24TH OF 2017.

AN OPEN CHALLENGE TO SC ANN §17-28-90^(B) AND §17-25-50 "RESPECTIVELY", SEEKING CLARITY PERTAINING TO THIS CONVICTION.

A "SPEEDY TRIAL MOTION" WAS ALSO SUBMITTED PREVIOUSLY AND NO DIRECT RESPONSE WAS TAKEN FROM THIS.

IN GOOD FAITH: SEEKING RELIEF THROUGH THIS PROCESS:

ADDRESSED TO Cheryl R. Lee

Joe

June 15, 2017

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY TERM EXPIRES Jan 27, 2025

PLEASE DATE STAMP, COPY AND RETURN TO SENDER AND SEND

TO CLERK AND ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR APPELLATE RECORD:

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE, SO HELP ME GOD, I TRUST IN TRUTHFULNESS.

PRISON LOCKDOWN 6-15-17

SHORT OF STAFF:
NO NOTARY AVAILABLE
AT PRISON FACILITY.

- 2 COPIES: COURT / ATTORNEY GENERAL -

51

EXHIBIT 12

ONE

EXHIBIT 13

DMAR 'ABDEL-AL-MU' MIT
S/N JOHN JAMES BELL
MOVANT, PROSE.

VS.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
RESPONDANT.

IN THE GENERAL SESSIONS
COURT: COUNTY OF AIKEN.

SC CODE ANN §§ 17-27-100,
17-25-50, 17-28-30 AND
17-28-90(B).

"MANDAMUS MOTION" TO BE
GIVEN SIXTH AND 14TH
U S CONSTITUTIONAL AMEND-
MENT RIGHTS IN APPEAL.

THIS MOTION COMES BEFORE THIS HONOURABLE COURT SEEKING TO
ESTABLISH INCONSISTENCIES THROUGHOUT THIS "WRONGFUL CONVICTION"
WHICH WAS ALLOWED TO OCCUR DECEMBER 7TH THRU 10TH, 1992 IN
AIKEN COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA, UNDER THE 1992-GS-02-0396,
0397 AND A "DIRECT INDICTMENT" 0784 [SATURDAY JUNE 6TH, 1992
WITHOUT "TRUE STAMP", OR GRAND JURY SIGNATURE ATTACHED].

ON MAY 19TH, 2017, MOVANT/PETITIONER, RECEIVED NOTICE THAT ONE
PAUL ANDREW ANDERSON ATTORNEY AT LAW WAS "REAPPOINTED TO
REPRESENT ME". HOWEVER, A LETTER DATED MAY 31ST, 2017, THIS
ATTORNEY STATED THERE WAS NO BOOKING IN AIKEN COUNTY TO HEAR
MY APPEAL FOR JUSTICE BEING DONE IN THIS TWENTY FIVE YEAR OLD
"WRONGFUL CONVICTION".

THE WISH IS FOR A "FAIR HEARING" WITH "SUBPOENAED ADVERSARIES"
PRESENT SO AS TO GET THE TRUTH OF THIS "CONSPIRACY TO CONDUCT" HEARD
OUT IN THE OPEN ONCE AND FOR ALL.

* THE 2014-002196 HEARING ON DNA TESTING HAD NO SUBPOENAED
WITNESSES FOR OR AGAINST PCR EVIDENCE, LEAVING JUST MY TESTIMONY
WHICH WAS CONVENIENTLY DENIED BY DOWYET A EARLY, YET AGAIN *

52
SUBPOENA TO APPEAR ME Cheryl R. Jones
9-20-18 2017

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

NOTARY EXPIRES ON 27.2025

* PRISON LOCKDOWN 6-15-17 *

SHORT OF STAFF:
NO NOTARY AVAILABLE
AT PRISON FACILITY.

LEGAL

IF IN FACT AGENT SKARBA WHO EXAMINED AND MADE A FINDING APRIL 2ND, 1992 AND GAVE TESTIMONY ON DECEMBER 8TH, 1992 THAT "ELIMINATED" ANY FURTHER TESTING: DNA OR OTHERWISE [SEE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT PP 370-371] NOTHING LEFT TO MANAGE SCRUTINY... "IF" THIS TRAIL OF TALES THE DNA PCR WAS OF NO RESOLVE AND THIS WOULD SHOW AND PROVE AGENT DAVID MC CLURE WAS DECEITFUL IN HIS VIEW GIVEN IN OPEN COURT ON THE 9TH OF DECEMBER PP 438-473 OR THEREABOUT — PAUL ANDREW ANDERSON USED MC CLURE'S TESTIMONY, BUT NOT SKARBA'S ELIMINATION OF FURTHER TESTING FOR ANYTHING; ESPECIALLY NOT DNA BECAUSE THE FBI GAVE WHAT HAS TO TAKE PLACE TO PROVE "OWNERSHIP" OR "GUILT BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT" — THIS "WRONGFUL CONVICTION" NEVER ENJOYED THIS "RECALL", THE TRUE TOOK A VACATION DURING THIS FOUR DAY TRIBUNAL.

ANDERSON BROUGHT OUT "BLOOD SPLATTER" AS A MAJOR CONCERN, AND THIS NEVER CAME OUT ONCE DURING THE CIRCUS TRIBUNAL HELD IN FRONT A HAND-PICKED JURY BY THOSE PROSECUTING AN INNOCENT MAN. THE GUILTY PARTY SAT IN THE COURTROOM AS A "SPECTATOR".

* THE BIAS JURY NEVER UNDERSTOOD THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN "ALIBI" - ELSEWHERE, OR "BLOOD SPLATTER" FROM "BLOOD TRANSFER"... *

→ A BAT WOULD CAUSE "SPLATTER" AND THE BRUSHING AS IN BASKETBALL WOULD CAUSE "BLOOD TRANSFER". [WONDER WHY THIS WASN'T EXPLAINED] THE AGE OLD CONSPIRACY IS STILL IN FULL EFFECT THROUGH THIS CONTINUED INCARCERATION... THE GUILTY PARTY IS PROBABLY DEAD AND GONE.

NOTED BEFORE ME Cheryl R. Hunt JMC
Jan 15, 2017
NORTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.
MY TERM EXPIRES Jan 27, 2025

* PRISON LOCKDOWN 6-15-17 *

SHORT OF STAFF:
NO NOTARY AVAILABLE
AT PRISON FACILITY.

EXHIBIT 15

- CONCLUSION -

* "IF" TRIAL TRANSCRIPT 370-371 WAS INDEED "TRUTHFUL":
WHAT WAS THE "DNA HEARING" REALLY FOR - THERE'S NOTHING
TO BE TESTED - THERE NEVER WAS "CONCLUSIVE BLOOD RELATION"
TO WHO THE "REAL" GUILTY PARTY WAS.*

THE KEY TO THIS UGLY "JUST PIN THE TAIL ON THE DONKEY" CASE, IS
THAT SOMEBODY DID IT AND I GOT BLAMED FOR IT OFF THE CUFF;
MAINLY BECAUSE "TWO PEOPLE WERE MISSING" I WAS THE OTHER.
REMEMBER THE MISCONNECTION - "BOLO FOR CAR LOOKING FOR
CHILD... WHAT A CASE, BASED UPON SUSPICION - MY SIDE
WAS NEVER TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION... NOT THEN, NOT NOW!

ACCORDING TO TURNER V LOUISIANA, 85 SCT 546: CRIMINAL
LAW: "RESPONSIVENESS TO ISSUES" - "JUROR'S VERDICT" MUST BE
BASED UPON EVIDENCE DEVELOPED AT TRIAL "REGARDLESS" OF THE
"HEINOUSNESS" OF CRIME CHARGED, APPARENT GUILT OF OFFENDER
OR STATION IN LIFE WHICH HE OCCUPIES."

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: "IMPARTIALITY" - "A FAIR TRIAL IN A FAIR
TRIBUNAL" IS A BASIC REQUIREMENT OF "DUE PROCESS."

IT WAS CLEARLY STATED TO MR ANDERSON "SUBPOENAS" WOULD
HAVE TO BE SWORN AND DELIVERED - THIS CASE NEGLIGENCE
FROM ACTUAL TRIAL TO DNA HEARING NEVER HAD AN INVESTIGATION
SUITABLE FOR AN "EXONERATION" OF A FALSELY ACCUSED MAN.

SC CODE ANN § 17-25-50 SPEAKS CLEARLY OF ITSELF: THE LIFE
AND THIRTY "RUNNING WILD" IS AN "IMPROPER SENTENCE" STEMMING
FROM THE SAME SPECULATION OF WHAT "SUPPOSED" TO HAVE TOOK PLACE
ON THE DAY OF MY ABDUCTION - NOVEMBER 2ND, 1991 FOR THIS CRIME.

SWORN TO BEFORE ME

June 15, 2017

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC

MY TERM EXPIRES Jan 27, 2025

* PRISON LOCKDOWN 6-15-17 *

SHORT OF STAFF:
NO NOTARY AVAILABLE
AT PRISON FACILITY.

- AFFIDAVIT - **EXHIBIT 16**

IT WOULD BE A GREATER INJUSTICE TO THIS "WRONGFUL CONVICTION"
FOR THE WRONGFULLY CONVICTED TO BE UNTRUTHFUL AT ANY POINT.

- Proof of Service -

THIS MOTION FOR JUSTICE TO BE APPLIED TO THIS CASE IS BEING
SENT DIRECTLY TO THOSE WHO ACTIVELY OPPOSED THE APPELLATE
PROCESS TO THIS "WRONGFUL CONVICTION": HOWEVER, IN GOOD
FAITH, I ASK THAT MY ABSENT "DUE PROCESS" BE ATTACHED TO
MY RIGHT TO HAVE THIS MOTION ATTACHED, "TIME-STAMPED",
COPIED AND RETURNED TO SENDER, AND SENT TO THE GOVERNOR
OF THE GREAT SOUTHERN STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AS MY
"BURDEN OF PROOF" THAT A CONSPIRACY STILL EXISTS IN THIS
"WRONGFUL CONVICTION" BEFORE THIS HONOURABLE COURT.

SEEN BEFORE ME Cheryl R. Lee,
Jun 15, 2017

SOUTH CAROLINA NOTARY PUBLIC.

MY TERM EXPIRES Jan 27, 2025

CC SC INDIGENT DEFENSE.
SC ATTORNEY GENERAL
PETITIONER'S APPELLATE FILES.

SHORT OF STAFF:
NO NOTARY AVAILABLE
AT PRISON FACILITY.

* PRISON LOCKDOWN 6-15-17 *

- AFFIDAVIT -


PETITIONER HEREBY ADHERES TO THE PENALTY FOR PERJURY
AND WITH THIS IN MIND STANDS AFFIRMED LIKEWISE TO THE
TRUTH AND ACCURACY OF THE FACTS HEREIN.

- PROOF OF SERVICE -

IN GOOD FAITH, THE INFORMATION PRESENTED TO THIS HONORABLE
COURT IS COMPLETE AS REQUIRED BY RULES 221, 227 <C>, 224 <C-3>
AND 225.

PETITIONER HAS FORWARDED COPIES TO THIS HONORABLE COURT AND
TO THIS STATE'S ATTORNEY GENERAL TO CLARIFY ALL MISGIVINGS
PREVIOUSLY RULED ON IN ERROR ACCORDING TO THE DNA REQUIRE-
MENT FOR HEARING AUGUST 27TH, 2014 AND OVER-ALL JUDGEMENT
BY APPELLATE COURT REMITTUR TO AIKEN COUNTY ROBERT J HARTE.
PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THESE SUDDEN DOCUMENTS:


JOHN JAMES BELL, PETITIONER PRO SE.

 SUBSCRIBED TO BEFORE ME July 4 2017

Signature A. Chmesan

NOTARY PUBLIC

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES My Commission Expires December 22, 2018

1992-GS-02-0396 / D319417

JOHN JAMES BELL
SCDC #192526
KERSHAW PRISON MA#17
KERSHAW, SC 29067

AGENCY
MAIL

DOCUMENTS
MAILED JULY 11TH, 2017

317-27-100
CLERK OF COURT

SC SUPREME COURT
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA
CLERK OF COURT

AGENCY
MAIL

SC Supreme Ct.
7-11-17

192526
SAT

" AGENCY
MAIL "

PRIORITY LEGAL MAIL FOR THE
SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT
APPELLATE DIVISION c/o CLERK OF COURT