

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Douglas Turner, Petitioner,

v.

State of South Carolina, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2017-001850

ORDER

Pursuant to *Dennison v. State*, 371 S.C. 221, 639 S.E.2d 35 (2006),¹ petitioner's counsel has advised this Court that he cannot provide a good faith explanation under Rule 243(c) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR), and has advised petitioner of his ability to submit a *pro se* explanation. Petitioner has now filed a document which appears to be asking that counsel be appointed to assist him in preparing his *pro se* response.

The request to appoint counsel is denied. If petitioner desires to submit a *pro se* response under *Dennison*, the response shall be filed with the Court within twenty

¹ In relevant part, *Dennison* states:

[I]f counsel does not have a good faith explanation to provide pursuant to [Rule 243(c)], counsel shall provide the Court with a letter stating that as an officer of the Court, counsel is unable set forth any arguable basis for asserting the determination by the PCR judge that the PCR application was successive and barred by the statute of limitations was improper. Counsel shall further advise the petitioner by copy of the letter that the petitioner should notify the Court, no later than twenty (20) days from the date of the letter, of any arguable basis the petitioner may wish to assert that the determination that the PCR application was successive and barred by the limitations was improper.

(20) days of the date of this order.


_____. A.C.J.
FOR THE COURT

Beatty, C.J., not participating.

Columbia, South Carolina
October 24, 2017

cc: Richard W. Vieth, Esquire
Valerie Garcia Giovanoli, Esquire
Mr. Douglas Turner