

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Supreme Court

---

RECEIVED

MAY 08 2017

CERTIORARI TO SUMTER COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Brooks P. Goldsmith, Circuit Court Judge

---

S.C. SUPREME COURT

GREGORY WRIGHT,

PETITIONER,

V.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2016-000815

---

APPENDIX

---

LANCE S. BOOZER

The Boozer Law Firm, LLC  
1400 Laurel Street, Suite 4A  
Columbia, SC 29201  
803-608-5543

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

ALAN WILSON  
Attorney General

JULIE COLEMAN  
Assistant Attorney General  
P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211-1549  
803-734-3737

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

INDEX

INDEX .....i

TRIAL TRANSCRIPT DATED JANUARY 12, 2009 .....1

FINAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT .....402

FINAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT .....412

STATE V. WRIGHT, OP. NO. 2013-UP-326 (S.C. Ct. App. Filed July 17, 2013).....427

APPLICATION FOR POST-CONVICTION RELIEF .....429

RETURN.....436

AMENDMENT TO PCR APPLICATION .....442

PCR HEARING TRANSCRIPT DATED MARCH 17, 2016.....444

ORDER OF DISMISSAL.....520

INDICTMENTS AND SENTENCING SHEETS .....532

1 Not with the language that was in there. I mean, I know  
2 what the words say. But the -- what -- what's implied by  
3 the language, given the circumstances of these guys all  
4 getting arrested was really kind of damning.

5 Q Do you think that there was any way to -- to -- to  
6 suggest that Mr. Wright was -- was just basically advising  
7 everyone of they don't have to talk to anyone and he didn't  
8 have anything to do with this? Do you think there was any  
9 way to do that?

10 A Well, I tried to make that -- that -- that explanation  
11 to the jury inferentially. But, I mean, when you got a  
12 piece of evidence like that that is -- is so hurtful,  
13 sometimes the more you play around with it, the more you  
14 get burned.

15 And unfortunately, because of Greg's record and his  
16 decision not to take the stand, I didn't have a real good  
17 way of explaining the content of the letter. So sometimes  
18 when something hurts that bad, you kind of try and stay  
19 away from it as much as you can.

20 Q And -- and did y'all discuss his testifying or his  
21 right to testify or whether he should or should not testify

22 ---

23 A Certainly.

24 Q --- at trial?

25 What was sort of the nature of that discussion?

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BOOZER - CAMERON LITTLEJOHN 58

1 A Well, I advised Mr. Wright it was -- it was totally  
2 his right to testify and his decision; it was not my  
3 decision; wasn't the Court's decision; wasn't anybody  
4 else's. But he decided not to testify because of the fact  
5 that he had all these prior drug convictions that would've  
6 come into evidence as impeachment matters. And so the jury  
7 would've been aware of them. And he -- he made the  
8 decision not to testify.

9 Q Do you think the most harmful thing in this case was  
10 the letter?

11 A I don't -- you'd have to ask the jury that. Certainly  
12 didn't help.

13 MR. BOOZER: Court's indulgence, Your Honor?

14 THE COURT: Certainly.

15 (Whereupon, Mr. Boozer and the applicant conferred.)

16 Q Mr. Littlejohn ---

17 A Yes, sir.

18 Q --- regarding the letter, did you -- did you review  
19 with Mr. Wright sort of -- if -- if it were to come in, a  
20 defense to it or how you would -- how you would confront  
21 that letter?

22 A Mr. Boozer, I don't remember specifically. I'm sure  
23 we talked about the content of the letter. I'm sure I told  
24 him how -- how bad it looked. From the standpoint of  
25 explaining to him how I was going to deal with it, I -- I

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GOURLEY - CAMERON LITTLEJOHN 59

1 think I just -- you know, I -- I believe I told him that we  
2 were going to try and stay away from it as much as we  
3 could.

4 Q Did y'all have any discussion, I guess, other than  
5 staying away from it, explaining it?

6 A Well, as -- as I indicated earlier, there was no real  
7 good way of doing that without Mr. Wright's testimony,  
8 which was not available.

9 MR. BOOZER: Your Honor, I don't have any further'  
10 questions at this time.

11 Q Thank you, Mr. Littlejohn.

12 A Yes, sir.

13 THE COURT: Thank you. Cross-examination.

14 MR. GOURLEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 CROSS-EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. GOURLEY:

17 Q Good morning, Mr. Littlejohn.

18 A Good morning, Mr. Gourley.

19 Q Do you have a copy of the transcript up there?

20 A I do, sir.

21 Q Can you turn to page 164 for me.

22 MR. GOURLEY: And, Your Honor, this is going to be the  
23 cross-examination of Investigator Mays.

24 Q Let me know when you're there.

25 A All right.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GOURLEY - CAMERON LITTLEJOHN 60

1 Q I'm going to start on line 2.

2 A Okay.

3 Q And, Mr. Littlejohn, is this not the cross-examination  
4 of Mr. Mays regarding the letter that Mr. Wright wrote?

5 A Yes, sir.

6 Q Okay. And -- and just to kind of briefly summarize  
7 it, you basically read a portion of the letter that -- and  
8 I'll read it for the Court -- "Please, don't nobody talk to  
9 these investigators because they will put stuff on paper  
10 that people say -- people really don't say." And then, the  
11 next, I guess, three pages, if you will, kind of deal with  
12 the issue of Frank -- Frankie -- Frank Lee Wilson accepting  
13 the responsibility of the drugs ---

14 A Right.

15 Q --- and -- and submitting and affidavit and then  
16 subsequently pleading guilty, correct?

17 A Yes, sir.

18 Q Is that your way of kind of drawing an inference that  
19 maybe Mr. Wright was sending out this letter to Hammer to  
20 say, "Hey, you know, somebody's going to accept  
21 responsibility for these drugs," and then pointing out to  
22 the jury that somebody already has and they've already  
23 implicated him, but to maybe make sure Mr. Wilson doesn't  
24 put it back on Mr. Wright? Is that what you were trying to  
25 do or -- or please explain your thought process on that, if

1 you can.

2 A Well, inferentially, I mean, it was -- it was a little  
3 maybe more straightforward than that, which was Mr. Wilson  
4 had -- had signed the affidavit admitting possession. He  
5 pled guilty.

6 Q Uh-huh.

7 A He was about to be sentenced. He did it with the  
8 advise of counsel. And I tried to harp on that during his  
9 cross-examination and closing argument.

10 Q Okay. And in doing so, that was trying to potentially  
11 -- I guess what I'm trying to get at is: Why would you put  
12 the letter out front and then do the -- the Wilson  
13 examination, I guess? Was that trying to take away some of  
14 maybe the prejudice of the letter?

15 A Well, I guess in -- it -- in an indirect way, yes.

16 Q Okay.

17 A Yes.

18 Q Thank you, sir.

19 A I mean, the whole -- the issue being Wilson saying  
20 that Gregory didn't have anything to do with the drugs.  
21 And then, if you look at the letter, you know, maybe the  
22 jury would say, Well, maybe he's trying to do something  
23 righteous here and just protect his -- protect himself  
24 because he's innocent.

25 Q Yes, sir. Mr. Wright has alleged that you were

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GOURLEY - CAMERON LITTLEJOHN 62

1 ineffective for failing to either appear at the preliminary  
2 hearing or -- or -- or request a preliminary hearing. I  
3 guess my question to you is: Hypothetically speaking, if  
4 you were successful at a preliminary hearing, can -- can  
5 the state still indict the charges?

6 A Oh, definitely.

7 Q Okay.

8 A Assuming you're successful at prelim, which is about 1  
9 percent of the cases.

10 Q Yes, sir. In your practice why do you typically  
11 request preliminary hearings and attend them, if -- if you  
12 do?

13 A Primarily, just to -- if -- to fill -- if you don't  
14 have discovery, kind of ---

15 Q Yes, sir.

16 A --- get an idea of the case. If you do ---

17 Q Yes, sir.

18 A --- have discovery, kind of fill in some of the --  
19 some of the holes in the case. A lot of times, we use it  
20 just to meet the officer and find out what his temperature  
21 is and see where we're at in the case.

22 Q Okay.

23 A I mean, you get -- you glean much more information  
24 from the discovery than you do from the investigator  
25 reading an incident report at a prelim.

1 Q Yes, sir. Mr. Wright also said you were ineffective  
2 or has alleged that you were ineffective for failing to  
3 present business documents ---

4 A Right.

5 Q --- stuff like that.

6 A Right.

7 Q I -- I think, if you may have heard his testimony on  
8 direct, that he presented a briefcase full of various  
9 documents. Do you have any recollection about that?

10 A Well, I do. I -- I -- I recall asking them if they  
11 had any current documents that would've shown cash payments  
12 coming into them to show a legitimate source of funds that  
13 would account for the -- I think it was \$6100 that was  
14 found in the house.

15 Q Yes, sir.

16 A And there were no concurrent -- I -- I -- they didn't  
17 produce anything that would show cash receipt that ---

18 Q Okay.

19 A --- we could've put into evidence to justify that.  
20 There were contracts that he had and some old records, but,  
21 you know, nothing that I -- I could really tie in to -- to  
22 the \$6100 without looking like we were trying to blow a  
23 bunch of smoke.

24 Q Yes, sir. And you actually called Mr. Wright's wife  
25 to kind of get up on the stand and explain why they had

1 cash without any kind of supporting documents, right?

2 A Exactly.

3 Q Okay. And, Mr. Littlejohn, regarding the letter, of  
4 course, Mr. Wright indicated to you that that was his  
5 letter, correct?

6 A Yes, sir.

7 Q Regardless of that, can -- can the state just produce  
8 anybody that's familiar with Mr. Wright's handwriting to  
9 authenticate that letter?

10 A If they had somebody that was familiar with his  
11 writing?

12 Q Yes, sir.

13 A Yes. They could've done that.

14 Q So regardless of whether or not the witness wanted to  
15 come in and subpoena, of course the state has a right to  
16 subpoena him. If he did not testify, they could've easily  
17 found somebody else that was familiar with Mr. Wright's  
18 handwriting, whether it be an expert or somebody ---

19 A Yes. Well, I mean, Mr. -- Mr. Scott said they were  
20 going to make a motion for handwriting exemplars ---

21 Q Yes, sir.

22 A --- which would've -- I mean, that would've done the  
23 job if the expert had come in and said that was his  
24 handwriting.

25 Q Yes, sir. Mr. Wright was -- has also alleged that you

1 were ineffective for failing to object to the weight of the  
2 drugs. Obviously, on -- on direct or cross-examination, we  
3 pointed out that you made an appropriate directed-verdict  
4 motion regarding the weight.

5 A Right.

6 Q Did you see any basis to then further object to the  
7 judge charging the lesser-included offense?

8 A Well, I couldn't object to the weight of the drugs  
9 because the weight of the drugs was the weight of the  
10 drugs. But I ---

11 Q Yes, sir.

12 A --- did get the -- the chemist to -- to, you know,  
13 total it out to -- she was reluctant. But ---

14 Q Yes, sir.

15 A --- she finally said it was 13 grams. We made a  
16 motion for directed verdict on that ---

17 Q And -- I apologize for cutting you off.

18 A --- other count and -- and the judge granted it. So  
19 ---

20 Q Yes, sir.

21 A --- I don't know what else I could've done with that.

22 Q Yes, sir. And regarding the motion for severance and  
23 -- and I know you noted it on direct examination, but the  
24 judge did charge the jury to consider each charge  
25 separately, correct?

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BOOZER - CAMERON LITTLEJOHN 66

1 A Correct.

2 Q Okay.

3 MR. GOURLEY: Your Honor, I don't have any other  
4 questions.

5 Q Thank you, Mr. Littlejohn.

6 A Yes, sir.

7 MR. BOOZER: Redirect, Your Honor?

8 THE COURT: Certainly.

9 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. BOOZER:

11 Q Going back to the preliminary hearing, do you recall  
12 codefendants with Mr. Wright -- do you recall any  
13 codefendants other than Mr. Wilson?

14 A There were other codefendants. Yes.

15 Q Who were -- do you know who the others were?

16 A I think they're named in the -- in the transcript. I  
17 think there's a -- a Mr. Hammer, Mr. -- I -- I can't  
18 remember their names.

19 Q Do -- do you recall the names of Larry Rose and Ervin  
20 Bracey?

21 A Seems like those were the names. I ---

22 Q Do you ---

23 A I could look it up and tell you. But ---

24 Q And -- and ---

25 A --- it -- it's ---

1 Q --- certainly ---

2 A --- right there.

3 Q --- if -- if you want to do that, that's fine. What I  
4 was going to ask you is: Do you know if they were charged  
5 with the same crimes that Mr. Wright was charged with?

6 A Mr. Boozer, I better say I'm not sure. I don't know.

7 Q Okay.

8 A I mean, I was concerned with Mr. Wright. I wasn't  
9 really that concerned with them. And this is the first  
10 issue I've heard about the prelim. I -- I mean, I -- I  
11 just heard that this morning. And -- and you may be very  
12 well right. I -- I don't have any -- I don't have my file  
13 where I could tell you what happened.

14 Q And to be fair, you wouldn't know whether those  
15 charges were dismissed or not at the preliminary hearing  
16 with regard to Larry Rose or Ervin Bracey?

17 A I'm not sure. There's some discussion in the  
18 transcript about it, but ---

19 Q And, I guess, is that something that's possible at a  
20 preliminary hearing is that the -- the charges can be  
21 dismissed at -- at a preliminary hearing?

22 A Sure.

23 Q Okay.

24 MR. BOOZER: Court's indulgence?

25 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GOURLEY - CAMERON LITTLEJOHN 68

1 (Whereupon, Mr. Boozer and the applicant conferred.)

2 Q Thank you, Mr. Littlejohn. I have ---

3 A Yes, sir.

4 Q --- no further questions.

5 MR. GOURLEY: Very briefly, Your Honor.

6 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

7 BY MR. GOURLEY:

8 Q Mr. Littlejohn, I know you may not be familiar with  
9 Mr. Bracey or Mr. Rose's case. But did either one of them  
10 own the property that the drugs were found on?

11 A No.

12 Q It was Mr. Wright's property, correct?

13 A That's my understanding. Yes, sir.

14 Q And to the best of your recollection, did you recall  
15 if any drugs were found on Mr. Bracey or Mr. Rhodes'  
16 persons? And if you do not recall, that's perfectly fine.  
17 The record will speak for itself.

18 A I -- after reading the transcript, I don't think they  
19 were. But, I mean, the transcript -- the officers  
20 testified as to where they found the various quantities of  
21 drugs. So I don't think so.

22 Q Yes, sir.

23 MR. GOURLEY: Thank you, Judge.

24 Q Thank you, Mr. Littlejohn. That's -- no further  
25 questions.

1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. You may step  
2 down.

3 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

4 MR. GOURLEY: And we'd be -- we'd ask for him to be  
5 relieved, Your Honor.

6 MR. BOOZER: Certainly.

7 THE COURT: Yes, sir. You're relieved from your  
8 subpoena.

9 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

10 THE COURT: Yeah.

11 THE WITNESS: Nice to see you.

12 (Whereupon, the witness exited the witness stand.)

13 MR. BOOZER: And, Your Honor, may I take one moment?  
14 I may or may not call one other witness.

15 THE COURT: Certainly.

16 MR. BOOZER: Thank you.

17 (Off the record briefly.)

18 MR. BOOZER: Thank you, Your Honor. There are no  
19 further witnesses on behalf of the applicant.

20 MR. GOURLEY: No witnesses from the state, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: All right. Brief argument.

22 MR. BOOZER: Yes, Your Honor. And -- and before -- if  
23 it pleases the Court, before I do that, the issue of  
24 whether or not Mr. Littlejohn appeared at the preliminary  
25 hearing, that was something that was testified to today.

1 And it -- it was new testimony to me. I have not -- had  
2 not discussed that with my client. That being said, Judge,  
3 I would at this time, I guess, make a motion for the  
4 pleadings to conform with the evidence that was presented  
5 today ---

6 MR. GOURLEY: Your Honor ---

7 MR. BOOZER: --- to add that as an allegation.

8 THE COURT: All right.

9 MR. GOURLEY: Your Honor, the state doesn't have any  
10 objection to that.

11 THE COURT: Motion's granted.

12 MR. BOOZER: Thank you, Your Honor. Judge, I guess  
13 with regard to some of the failures to object, I'll let the  
14 testimony and evidence stand on its own with regard to --  
15 to some of those individual claims that Mr. Wright has.

16 However, with regard to the preliminary hearing, his  
17 testimony is that I guess he appeared a preliminary hearing  
18 and Mr. Littlejohn was not present. I would submit on the  
19 applicant's behalf, that that's -- could be a critical  
20 juncture at this -- at that stage in a -- in a case. There  
21 could be a possibility that charges could be dismissed. I  
22 know that's something that we certainly don't know. But I  
23 do think that -- that that's a -- somewhere his lawyer  
24 should've appear if he didn't appear on his behalf.

25 Your Honor, furthermore, with regard to severing the

1 charges, I -- I guess at this time, as the testimony has  
2 indicated, this is a time when the Michael Vick issue was  
3 going on, which I know we're all certainly familiar with  
4 regarding Mr. Vick's involvement in dogfighting. And that  
5 was kind of a hot-button issue all over the news at that  
6 time.

7 I would submit on the applicant's behalf that at least  
8 they should've entertained a motion to sever the charges  
9 when you've got sort of -- considering the evidence or lack  
10 of evidence, coupled with the drugs, and then you've got  
11 possession of a weapon, and then you've got the dogs. I  
12 think that that certainly could've prejudiced his -- his  
13 trial, having all that coupled together. It may have been  
14 a hard yard for the jury to get past -- get past that.

15 With regard to the letter, I think that that was  
16 really the biggest issue in this case for Mr. Wright. It  
17 -- you know, it -- it was interesting how, when the letter  
18 comes up, the letter is objected to. But the letter has  
19 already been stipulated to, so the letter ends up coming  
20 in.

21 And this really is the only supporting evidence in the  
22 trial transcript upon my review that supported the state's  
23 theory of the case, which it was presenting to the jury  
24 that Mr. Wright was sort of the -- the ringleader of this  
25 crowd and could get them to do whatever they wanted to do.

1 And the only thing that that jury heard was from the state,  
2 is that this -- this letter confirmed that, that he was  
3 telling folks, even after he was arrested, what to do.

4 Even if they couldn't keep the letter out, there was  
5 really no way to put Mr. Wright's spin or his position on  
6 the letter, that that's not what he was trying to do. So I  
7 -- I think the letter is really -- is -- is really what --  
8 what hurt his case.

9 Judge, for all these reasons, especially with regard  
10 to the failing to sever the charges, as well as -- as well  
11 as the admission of the letter, I would submit that  
12 applicant is entitled to a new trial and he's shown that  
13 counsel was ineffective and that he was prejudiced by the  
14 ineffectiveness. Thank you, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Gourley?

16 MR. GOURLEY: Yes, Your Honor. I would ask that you  
17 deny this application. Regarding the failure-to-object  
18 allegation, obviously, it's been testified to by Mr.  
19 Littlejohn that he made the appropriate directed-verdict  
20 motion regarding the weight of the drugs. He was  
21 successful on that motion and got the judge to charge the  
22 lesser-included at weight.

23 In regard to the preliminary-hearing allegation, as  
24 Your Honor knows, there's no constitutional right to a  
25 preliminary hearing in the first instance. Second, Your

1 Honor, don't know if Mr. Littlejohn was present or not.  
2 But regardless, as Mr. Wright alleges, if he were somehow  
3 to be successful in a preliminary hearing, the state can  
4 always come back and indict them. Your Honor, I would  
5 submit there's no prejudice on that.

6 Regarding the sever of charges, Your Honor, as Mr.  
7 Littlejohn testified, the judge, during his jury charge,  
8 charged the jury that they should find Mr. Wright beyond a  
9 reasonable doubt on each individual charge.

10 Regarding the letter, Your Honor, as you heard today,  
11 Mr. Wright has no argument that that was not his letter. I  
12 think counsel certainly, within the reasonable,  
13 professional norms, is stipulating to the letter. Even if  
14 he had objected to the letter and not stipulated it, I'm --  
15 you know, it's -- they can bring in an expert or somebody  
16 like that to -- to provide evidence that that was Mr.  
17 Wright's letter.

18 Your Honor, as we've been here this week, it's kind of  
19 been discussed, the overwhelming-evidence-analysis argument  
20 being made. I would just like to put on the record that  
21 the state does believe that there was overwhelming evidence  
22 that Mr. Wright did constructively possess these drugs. I  
23 would cite to the record for that, Your Honor.

24 But just very briefly, Investigator Mays testified on  
25 page 102 that powder cocaine, crack cocaine, marijuana, and

1 scales were found in the shed on Mr. Wright's property.  
2 That was again elicited on cross-examination that Mr.  
3 Wilson was living in that shed but the drugs were found in  
4 the shed, on Mr. Wilson's person, and around Mr. Wilson.  
5 That was, again, on page 143, Your Honor.

6 Investigator Tarbell testified that she located a bag  
7 of crack cocaine in the shed found on Mr. Wright's  
8 property. She also found police scanners in Mr. Wright --  
9 on Mr. Wright's property and they also found black digital  
10 scales in the shed located on Mr. Wright's property.

11 So for those reasons, Your Honor, I would certainly  
12 submit that there was ample evidence for this jury to find  
13 that Mr. Wright constructively possessed the drugs found on  
14 his property. Thank you, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Boozer, I'm -- I am  
16 compelled to deny applicant's motion. I agree with the  
17 position of the state on each of the issues raised by the  
18 applicant, with -- with the exception of the last statement  
19 made by the attorney general concerning overwhelming  
20 evidence. I'm -- I'm going to yield to the trial judge,  
21 who said that there -- in his opinion, there was not  
22 overwhelming evidence. But he nonetheless thought it was  
23 sufficient evidence for the matters to go to the jury.  
24 And I believe that's on page 390.

25 Mr. Gourley, would you please prepare an order?

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

MR. GOURLEY: Yes, Your Honor. I'll be happy to.

Thank you, Judge.

(Whereupon, Mr. Boozer and the applicant conferred.)

(Whereupon, the proceeding was concluded at 11:51 a.m.)

--- END OF TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD ---

**CERTIFICATE**

I, THE UNDERSIGNED MARYANN S. NEVERS, CERTIFIED  
VERBATIM REPORTER - MASTER, CERTIFICATE OF MERIT,  
OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER FOR THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL  
CIRCUIT OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, DO HEREBY  
CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE, ACCURATE, AND  
COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD IN THE HEARING OF THE  
CAPTIONED CAUSE, RELATIVE TO APPEAL, IN THE CIRCUIT  
COURT FOR SUMTER COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA, ON THE 17TH  
DAY OF MARCH, 2016.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I AM NEITHER OF KIN,  
COUNSEL, NOR INTEREST IN ANY PARTY HERETO.



---

MARYANN S. NEVERS, CVR-M-CM

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

SEPTEMBER 15, 2016

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF CLARENDON

RECORDED

2016 APR -7 PM 3:07

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
FOR THE THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Gregory Wright, #166553, JAMES G. CAMPBELL  
Applicant, CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY, S.C.

Case No. 2015-CP-14-275

v.

State of South Carolina,  
Respondent.

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

This matter comes before the Court by way of a post-conviction relief (PCR) application filed on June 8, 2015. Respondent made its return on July 9, 2015. An evidentiary hearing in to the matter was convened on March 17, 2016, at the Sumter County Courthouse. Applicant was present at the hearing and was represented by Lance Boozer, Esquire. Respondent was represented by Assistant Attorney General Daniel Gourley of the South Carolina Attorney General's Office.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

The records before this Court indicate that Applicant is presently confined in the South Carolina Department of Corrections pursuant to orders of commitment of the Sumter County Clerk of Court. In July 2008, the Sumter County Grand Jury indicted Applicant for Possession of Firearm During Commission of a Violent Crime (2008-GS-43-927), Applicant for Owning Animals for the Purpose of Fighting (2008-GS-43-929), Animal Fighting (2008-GS-43-930), Ill treatment of Animals (2008-GS-43-931), Trafficking in Cocaine (2008-GS-43-932), Possession with Intent to Distribute Marijuana (2008-GS-43-933), Trafficking in Crack Cocaine (2008-GS-43-934). Cameron B. Littlejohn, Jr., Esquire, represented Applicant. On January 12-14, 2009, Applicant proceeded to a jury trial before the Honorable Michael G. Nettles and. The jury found

Applicant guilty as indicted for Possession of Firearm during Commission of a Violent Crime (2008-GS-43-927), Applicant for Owing Animals for the Purpose of Fighting (2008-GS-43-929), Animal Fighting (2008-GS-43-930), Ill treatment of Animals (2008-GS-43-931) and Trafficking in Crack Cocaine (2008-GS-43-934). The jury found Applicant guilty of the lesser included offenses of Trafficking in Cocaine (2008-GS-43-932), Possession with Intent to Distribute Marijuana (2008-GS-43-933). Judge Nettles sentenced Applicant for each charge as follows:

- Possession of Firearm During Commission of a Violent Crime – 5 year term of imprisonment
  - Applicant for Owing Animals for the Purpose of Fighting – 5 year term of imprisonment
  - Animal Fighting – 5 year term of imprisonment
  - Ill treatment of Animals – 5 year term of imprisonment
  - Trafficking in Cocaine – 25 year term of imprisonment
  - Possession of Marijuana – 30 day imprisonment
  - Trafficking in Crack Cocaine – 25 year term of imprisonment
- All sentences were to run concurrently.

Applicant filed a timely notice of appeal. Robert M. Pachak, Esquire, of the Office of Appellate Defense. The South Carolina Court of Appeals affirmed all convictions in an unpublished opinion filed July 17, 2013. State v. Wright, Op. No. 2013-UP-326. In an Order dated August 22, 2013, the South Carolina Court of Appeals denied the Petition for Rehearing. Appellate Counsel then submitted a Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the South Carolina Supreme Court. The South Carolina Supreme Court dismissed the appeal as improvidently granted in a memorandum opinion filed March 18, 2015. State v. Wright, Op. No. 2015-MO-011 (S.C. Ct. App. filed March 18, 2015). The remittitur was returned to the circuit court on March 19, 2015.



**ALLEGATIONS**

In his current Application, Applicant alleges that he is being held in custody unlawfully for the following reasons:

1. Ineffective assistance of counsel.
  - a. "Counsel Failed To Make Timely Objections...Counsel did not make objections to the evidence at trial"
  - b. "Counsel Failed to Sever Charges...Counsel failed to object to the charges being tried together"
  - c. "Conviction Obtained in Violation of Constitutional Rights"

Applicant filed an amended application on January 28, 2016, alleging ineffective assistance of counsel for stipulating to the letter introduced at trial. During the evidentiary hearing, Applicant requested to amend his application to include an allegation of ineffective assistance of counsel for failing to move to dismiss his charges during the preliminary hearing. The State had no objection to the amendment.

**SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY PRESENTED**

At the evidentiary hearing, Applicant testified on his own behalf. The State presented testimony from Cameron Littlejohn, Esquire. (hereinafter "Trial Counsel"). This Court also had before it a copy of the trial transcript, the Sumter County Clerk of Court records, Applicant's South Carolina Department of Correction records, appellate records, the PCR application, and return.

During the evidentiary hearing, Applicant testified that he understood that he is seeking a new trial on all charges. Applicant stated that he was convicted of various drug charges and dog fighting. Applicant stated Trial Counsel was retained. Applicant stated that he met with Trial Counsel seven or eight times prior to trial. Applicant stated that they reviewed the evidence against him.



Applicant claimed the drug charges should have been dismissed because his tenant, Frank Lee Wilson, pled guilty to possessing all the drugs. Applicant stated Mr. Wilson signed an affidavit taking responsibility for all the drugs. Applicant explained that Mr. Wilson lived in a shed on his property. Applicant claimed that the drugs were either found on Mr. Wilson's person or in his shed. Applicant recalled that Mr. Wilson testified during Applicant's trial and claimed responsibility for all the drugs. Applicant stated that he discussed this information with Trial Counsel prior to trial. Applicant stated that it was his understanding the he would not have to proceed to trial on the drug charges due to Mr. Wilson's guilty plea.

Applicant claimed Trial Counsel was ineffective for failing to move to sever the charges. Applicant claimed the dog fighting charges were prejudicial because he was proceeding to trial around the same time Michael Vick was being charged with dog fighting. Applicant stated that dog fighting was a hot button societal issue at the time of his trial. Applicant claimed Trial Counsel should have filed a motion to sever the charges as a result of the dog fighting charges. Applicant stated that they did not have any discussion about a motion to sever the charges.

Applicant claimed that Trial Counsel should have objected to the introduction of the various pictures of the drugs. Applicant claimed that the police took pictures of the drugs inside of Applicant's trailer. Applicant stated that Trial Counsel should have objected because there were never any drugs found inside his trailer. However, Applicant acknowledged that Trial Counsel cross-examined the investigating officers and was able to elicit testimony that no drugs were found inside the trailer. Applicant further stated that Trial Counsel should have objected to the chemical analysis of the drugs because the weight did not meet the threshold weight for which he was originally indicted. However, Applicant acknowledged that Trial Counsel was



successful in his direct verdict motion and the judge charged the lesser included offense due to the weight of the drugs.

Applicant claimed Trial Counsel should have objected to the introduction of a letter written by him to various co-defendants. Applicant stated that the State used to letter to bolster their argument that Applicant was the ring leader of the group. Applicant claimed Trial Counsel was ineffective for stipulating to the authenticity of the letter. Applicant noted that the trial court allowed the contents of the letter into evidence due to Trial Counsel's stipulation. Applicant stated that he did write the letter and was not disputing whether it was his handwriting. Applicant further stated that he told Trial Counsel that he wrote the letter.

Applicant stated Trial Counsel was ineffective for failing to use various documents and business records provided to Trial Counsel the day of the trial. Applicant explained that he owned a demolition and construction business and hired day workers. Applicant stated that he dealt with cash and paid his employees in cash. Applicant further explained that he and his family was getting ready to go on vacation and they had an excess amount of cash inside the house. Applicant stated Trial Counsel should have used the various documents and business documents to corroborate his wife's testimony about their business. However, Applicant acknowledged that his wife testified to their business operations and as to why they had an excessive amount of cash inside their home.

Applicant stated Trial Counsel was ineffective for failing to be present during his preliminary hearing. Applicant stated Trial Counsel could have made a motion to dismiss the charges due to the lack of evidence that Applicant ever possessed any of the drugs. Applicant reiterated that Mr. Wilson pled guilty and claimed ownership of all the drugs. Applicant stated that he did not testify at trial because of his prior record.



Following Applicant's testimony, Trial Counsel was called to testify. Trial Counsel testified that he was retained and met with Applicant at least seven or eight times. Trial Counsel stated that he met with Applicant and his wife at their residence. Trial Counsel stated that he took photographs of the Applicant's residence. Trial Counsel could not specifically recall whether Applicant had a preliminary hearing. Trial Counsel stated that he typically uses preliminary hearing as a tool to retrieve discovery. Trial Counsel stated that he had received all discovery early on in the case. Trial Counsel stated that even if he had attended the preliminary hearing, the State could simply indict the Applicant.

Trial Counsel stated that there was a lot of evidence not in Applicant's favor. Trial Counsel stated there was no overwhelming evidence; however it was going to be up to the jury to decide if Applicant constructively possessed the drugs found on his property. Trial Counsel stated that he did not see a reason to sever the charges. The Trial judge charged the jury that they were to find the Applicant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt for each individual charge. Trial Counsel further stated that all the charges stemmed from one search warrant.

Trial Counsel stated that he did not recall any plea offers. Trial Counsel noted that Applicant consistently maintained his innocence of the charges. Trial Counsel stated it was their trial strategy to argue that Mr. Wilson one the guilty party. Trial Counsel noted that Mr. Wilson pled guilty, admitted to possessing the drugs, and claimed ownership over the drugs. Trial Counsel further stated that he attempted to argue to the jury that the dogs found on Applicant's property were pets.

Trial Counsel stated that he stipulated to the authenticity of the letter because Applicant told him it was his letter. Trial Counsel stated that he saw no reason to require the State to bring in a hand writing expert to authenticate the letter. Trial Counsel noted that the State was



prepared to authenticate the letter had he not stipulated to it. Trial Counsel stated that he attempted to argue to the jury that the letter merely advised his co-defendants that the State was trying to pin the drugs on him. Trial Counsel stated that the letter fell in line with their strategy of placing the guilty on Mr. Wilson. Trial Counsel stated there was no real way to defend the letter.

Trial Counsel stated that he moved for a directed verdict motion at the close of the State's case on all the charges. Trial Counsel stated he was successful on some of his directed verdict motions and the trial judge dismissed the drug charges. However, Trial Counsel stated the trial judge charged the lesser included offense. Trial Counsel stated he had no basis to object to the lesser included offense being charged. Trial Counsel further testified that the business records provided by Applicant did not match up with the amount of cash that he had at his house. Trial Counsel stated it would have appeared to the jury that they were attempting to hide something.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

This Court has had the opportunity to review the record in its entirety and has heard the testimony at the post-conviction relief hearing. This Court has further had the opportunity to observe the witnesses presented at the hearing, closely pass upon their credibility, and weigh their testimony accordingly. Specifically, this Court finds Trial Counsel's testimony credible and Applicant's testimony not credible. Set forth below are the relevant findings of facts and conclusions of law as required pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §17-27-80 (1985).

#### **INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL**

In a post-conviction relief action, the applicant has the burden of proving the allegations in the application. Rule 71.1(e), SCRCP; Butler v. State, 286 S.C. 441, 334 S.E.2d 813 (1985). Where ineffective assistance of counsel is alleged as a ground for relief, the Applicant must



prove that "counsel's conduct so undermined the proper functioning of the adversarial process that the trial cannot be relied upon as having produced a just result." Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, (1984); Butler, 286 S.C. 441, 334 S.E.2d 813 (1985).

The proper measure of performance is whether the attorney provided representation within the range of competence required in criminal cases. Courts presume that counsel rendered adequate assistance and made all significant decisions in the exercise of reasonable professional judgment. Butler, 286 S.C. 441, 334 S.E.2d 813 (1985). The applicant must overcome this presumption to receive relief. Cherry v. State, 300 S.C. 115, 386 S.E.2d 624 (1989).

Courts use a two-pronged test in evaluating allegations of ineffective assistance of counsel. First, the Applicant must prove that counsel's performance was deficient. Under this prong, attorney performance is measured by its "reasonableness under professional norms." Cherry, 300 S.C. at 117, 385 S.E.2d at 625 (citing Strickland). Second, counsel's deficient performance must have prejudiced the applicant such that "there is a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different." Cherry, 300 S.C. at 117-18, 386 S.E.2d at 625.

**1. Ineffective assistance of counsel for failing to move for dismissal of charges during Applicant's preliminary hearing.**

This Court finds Applicant's allegation that Trial Counsel was ineffective for failing to move for dismissal of his charges during the preliminary hearing is meritless. Every criminal defendant is entitled to notice of his right to a preliminary hearing "to determine whether sufficient evidence exists to warrant [his] detention and trial." Rule 2(a), SCRCrimP. If a defendant makes a timely request for a hearing, one should be held within ten days. Rule 2(a)-(b), SCRCrimP. However, the hearing "shall not be held. . . if the defendant is indicted by a grand



jury . . . before the preliminary hearing is held." Rule 2(b), SCRCrimP; see also State v. Hawkins, 310 S.C. 50, 54-55, 425 S.E.2d 50, 53 (Ct. App. 1992) (holding trial court did not err in refusing to quash defendant's indictments because he did not receive a requested preliminary hearing because he was indicted before a preliminary hearing was held). Furthermore, a defendant has no constitutional right to a preliminary hearing. State v. Keenan, 278 S.C. 361, 365, 296 S.E.2d 676, 678 (1982). Thus, although Applicant could have timely requested a preliminary hearing, his right to have the hearing ended with the grand jury's indictment.

This Court finds that Counsel's performance was reasonable according to professional standards. It is clear there was probable cause to support the charges. Furthermore, this Court finds that Applicant cannot establish any resulting prejudice, as a preliminary hearing would not have resulted in dismissal of the charges, and therefore, there is no likelihood that the result of the proceeding would have been different. This Court finds that this allegation must be denied and dismissed with prejudice.

**2. Ineffective assistance of counsel for failing to object to the indictment because the weight of drugs did not match the indictment.**

This Court finds Applicant's allegation that Trial Counsel was ineffective for failing to object to the indictment because the State did not prove that he possessed twenty-eight to one-hundred grams of cocaine is without merit. This Court finds that Counsel's performance was reasonable according to professional standards. Notably, Trial Counsel moved for a directed verdict as to the indictment and was successful. (Tr. p. 288-289). The Trial Court dismissed the charge and charged the jury on the lesser included offense. This Court finds that this allegation must be denied and dismissed with prejudice.

**3. Ineffective assistance of counsel for failing to move to sever the charges.**

This Court finds Applicant's allegation that Trial Counsel was ineffective for failing to move to sever the charges is meritless. This Court finds Trial Counsel's performance was well within reasonable professional norms. Trial Counsel noted that all charges stemmed from one event and one search warrant. This Court agrees with Trial Counsel's assertion and finds that there was no reasonable basis to make a motion to sever the charges.

Additionally, this Court finds Applicant can show no prejudice as a result of Trial Counsel's alleged deficiency for failing to file a motion to sever the charges. Notably, the Trial Judge charged the jury that "each indictment charges a separate and distinct offense, and you must decide each indictment separately on the evidence and the law applicable to, uninfluenced by your decision to any other indictment." (Tr. p. 352 lines 12-18). It is clear that the trial judge instructed the jury to decide the Applicant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to each individual charge. This Court finds that Counsel's performance was reasonable according to professional standards. As a result, Applicant can show no prejudice. Therefore, this Court finds that this allegation must be denied and dismissed with prejudice.

**4. Ineffective assistance of counsel for stipulating to the authenticity of the letter.**

This Court finds Applicant's allegation that Trial Counsel was ineffective for stipulating to the authenticity of his letter is meritless. This Court finds Trial Counsel acted well within reasonable professional norms when stipulating to the letter. Notably, both Trial Counsel and Applicant stated that the letter was written by Applicant. Trial Counsel stated that there was no point in challenging the authenticity of the letter due to Applicant's admission that he wrote the letter. Furthermore, Trial Counsel stated that they attempted to mitigate the letter's content by



arguing to the jury that the letter was implying that the State was attempting to push the drugs on him when he they were not his drugs. This Court finds Trial Counsel's actions were not deficient when he stipulated to the drugs. Furthermore, Applicant can show no prejudice due to Trial Counsel's stipulation because Applicant freely admitted that he wrote the letter. As a result, this Court finds that this allegation should be denied and dismissed with prejudice.

**ALL OTHER ALLEGATIONS**

As to any and all allegations that were raised in the application or at the hearing in this matter and not specifically addressed in this Order, this Court finds the Applicant failed to present any testimony, argument, or evidence at the hearing regarding such allegations. Accordingly, this Court finds the Applicant has abandoned any such allegations.

*[Signature to follow]*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be a stylized name, located in the bottom right corner of the page.

**CONCLUSION**


Based on all the foregoing, this Court finds and concludes that the Applicant has not established any constitutional violations or deprivations that would require this court to grant his application. Therefore, this application for post-conviction relief must be denied and dismissed with prejudice.

This Court notes that that Applicant must file and serve a notice of appeal within thirty days from the receipt by counsel of written notice of entry of judgment to secure the appropriate appellate review. See Rule 203, SCACR. Pursuant to Austin v. State, 305 S.C. 453 (1991), an Applicant has a right to an appellate counsel's assistance in seeking review of the denial of post-conviction relief. Rule 71.1(g), SCRCR, provides that if the applicant wishes to seek appellate review, post-conviction relief counsel must serve and file a Notice of Appeal on the Applicant's behalf. Applicant is directed to South Carolina Appellate Court Rule 243 for appropriate procedures for appeal.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:**

1. That the Application for Post-Conviction Relief must be denied and dismissed with prejudice; and
2. The Applicant must be remanded to the custody of the Respondent.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED this 30 day of March, 2016.

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Brooks P. Goldsmith  
 Presiding Judge  
 Third Judicial Circuit

2  
 \_\_\_\_\_, South Carolina

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF Sumter  
STATE

INDICTMENT/CASE# 2008 GS 43 927

vs.  
Greg Wright

AW#: Direct Presentment

AKA:

Date of Offense: 5/25/07

Race: B Sex: M Age: 39

S.C. Code §: 16-23-490

DOB: 1969 SS#:

CDR Code #: 549

Address: 4915 Sila Rd.

City, State, Zip: Sumter SC

SENTENCE SHEET

DL# SID#

In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was  CONVICTED OF or  PLEADS TO: Possession of a firearm during commission of a violent crime

in violation of § 16-23-490 of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 549

NON-VIOLENT  VIOLENT  SERIOUS  MOST SERIOUS  Mandatory GPS  \$17-25-45 (CSC w/minor 1<sup>st</sup> or Lewd Act)

The charge is:  As Indicted,  Lesser Included Offense,  Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury. (defendant initial)

The plea is:  Without Negotiations or Recommendation,  Negotiated Sentence,  Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: [Signature] Solicitor [Signature] Defendant [Signature] Attorney for Defendant [Signature] SC Bar #

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the  State Department of Corrections,  County Detention Center, for a determinate term of 5 days/months/years or  under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed \_\_\_\_\_ years and/or to pay a fine of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; provided that upon the service of \_\_\_\_\_ days/months/years and/or payment

of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; plus costs and assessments as applicable; the balance is suspended with probation for \_\_\_\_\_ months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or  CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 1-14-09

The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code §24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections.

The Defendant is to be placed on Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION:  Deferred  Def. Waives Hearing  Ordered PTUP \_\_\_\_\_

Total: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ plus 20% fee: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ days/hours Public Service Employment

Payment Terms: Obtain GED

set by SCDPPPS Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp. \_\_\_\_\_

Recipient: May serve W/E beginning \_\_\_\_\_

\*Fine: Substance Abuse Counseling

\$14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5%) \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Random Drug/Alcohol Testing

\$14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge) \$100 \$ 100.00 Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly

\$14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge) \$100 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ pmts. of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Beginning \_\_\_\_\_

\$56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment) \$12 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_ paid to Public Defender Fund

\$35.13 (Public Def/Prob) \$500 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

\$73.3, 1B TP (Law Enforce. Funding) \$25 \$ 25.00

\$33.7, 1B-TP (Drug Court Surcharge) \$100 \$ \_\_\_\_\_

\$50-21-114(BUI Breath. Test Fee) \$50 \$ \_\_\_\_\_

\$56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment) \$40/ea \$ \_\_\_\_\_

3% to County (if paid in installments) \$ 3.90

\$90.11 TP (SCGJA Surcharge) \$5 \$ 5.00

TOTAL \$ 133.90

James C. Campbell  
Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk

PRESIDING JUDGE [Signature]

Court Reporter: M. Sullivan

Judge Code: 2-1-40  
Sentence Date: 7-14-09

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF SUMTER )

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY  
OF ORIGINAL FILE  
*B. C. [Signature]*  
DEPUTY CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY  
SOUTH CAROLINA

**INDICTMENT**

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on July 17, 2008, the Grand Jurors  
of Sumter County present upon their oath:

**POSSESSION OF FIREARM DURING COMMISSION OF A VIOLENT CRIME**

That Greg Wright did in Sumter County on or about May 25, 2008, possess a  
firearm during the commission of a violent crime as defined in Code §16-1-60, to wit:  
Trafficking in Cocaine and Trafficking in Crack Cocaine, in violation of §16-23-490,  
THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, (1976), as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such  
cases made and provided.

*Henry McMaster*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HENRY MCMASTER (CDS)  
SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY

**WITNESSES**

Inv. Tripp Mays

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**ARREST WARRANT NUMBER**

Direct Presentment

**ACTION OF GRAND JURY**

*Tom Bill*  
*William Parker*

Foreperson of Grand Jury  
Date: *7/17/08*

**VERDICT**

Foreperson of Petit Jury  
Date:

Docket Number 2008-GS-43- **927**

The State of South Carolina  
County of Sumter

**COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS**

July 2008 Term

**THE STATE**

vs.

**Greg Wright**

**DEFENDANT**

**INDICTMENT FOR**

**POSSESSION OF FIREARM DURING  
COMMISSION OF A VIOLENT CRIME**

**S.C. CODE §16-23-490  
CDR Code: 0549  
FELONY CLASS F**

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Defendant**

I, \_\_\_\_\_  
hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Defendant**

Witness:

\_\_\_\_\_  
C.C.C. Pls. And G.S.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF Sumter  
STATE \_\_\_\_\_

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2008 -GS- 43 - 929

AKA: Greg Wright

A/M#: Direct Presentment

Race: B Sex: M Age: 39

Date of Offense: 5/25/07

DOB: 1969 SS#: \_\_\_\_\_

S.C. Code §: 16-27-30 (a)

Address: 4915 Silo Rd.

CDR Code #: 540

City, State, Zip: Sumter SC

DL# \_\_\_\_\_ SID# \_\_\_\_\_

SENTENCE SHEET

In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was  CONVICTED OF or  PLEADS

TO: Owning an Animal for the Purpose of Fighting

in violation of § 16-27-30 (a) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 540

NON-VIOLENT  VIOLENT  SERIOUS  MOST SERIOUS  Mandatory GPS  \$17-25-45  
(CSC w/minor 1<sup>st</sup> or Lewd Act)

The charge is:  As Indicted,  Lesser Included Offense,  Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury, \_\_\_\_\_ (defendant initial)

The plea is:  Without Negotiations or Recommendation;  Negotiated Sentence;  Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Solicitor Defendant Attorney for Defendant SC Bar # \_\_\_\_\_

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the  State Department of Corrections,  County Detention Center, for a determinate term of 5 days/months/years or  under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed \_\_\_\_\_ years and/or to pay a fine of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; provided that upon the service of \_\_\_\_\_ days/months/years and/or payment of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; plus costs and assessments as applicable\*; the balance is suspended with probation for \_\_\_\_\_ months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or  CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 1-14-09

The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code §24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections;

The Defendant is to be placed on Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION:  Deferred  Def. Waives Hearing  Ordered PTUP: \_\_\_\_\_

Total: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ plus 20% fee: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ days/hours Public Service Employment

Payment Terms: \_\_\_\_\_ Obtain GED

set by SCDPPPS \_\_\_\_\_ Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp. \_\_\_\_\_

Recipient: \_\_\_\_\_ May serve WE beginning \_\_\_\_\_

\*Fine: \_\_\_\_\_ Substance Abuse Counseling

\$14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5%) \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Random Drug/Alcohol Testing

\$14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge) \$100 \$ 100.00 Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly

\$14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge) \$100 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ pmts. of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Beginning \_\_\_\_\_

\$56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment) \$12 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_ paid to Public Defender Fund

\$35-13 (Public Def/Prob) \$500 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

\$73.3, 1B TP (Law Enforce. Funding) \$25 \$ 25.00

\$33.7, 1B TP (Drug Court Surcharge) \$100 \$ \_\_\_\_\_

\$50-21-114(BUI Breath Test Fee) \$50 \$ \_\_\_\_\_

\$56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment) \$40/ea \$ \_\_\_\_\_

3% to County (if paid in installments) \$ 3.90

\$90-11 TP (SCGJA Surcharge) \$5 \$ 5.00

TOTAL \$ 733.90

James C. Campbell

PRESIDING JUDGE Michael H. Hester

Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk

Judge Code: 2140

Court Reporter: M. Sullivan

Sentence Date: 1-14-09

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF SUMTER )

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

DEPUTY CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY  
SOUTH CAROLINA  
B. J. [Signature]  
DEPUTY CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY  
SOUTH CAROLINA


INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on July 17, 2008 the Grand Jurors of Sumter County present upon their oath:

OWNING ANIMALS FOR THE PURPOSE OF FIGHTING

That on or about May 25, 2007, Gregory Wright, did, in Sumter County, own animals for the purpose of fighting or baiting, such animals being identified as pit bull dogs, including one or more of the following animals identified by the Sumter County Sheriff's Office as: the animal identified as #1; and/or the animal identified as #3; and/or the animal identified as #6; and/or the animal identified as #10; and/or the animal identified as #12; and/or the animal identified as #13; and/or the animal identified as #15; and/or the animal identified as #21; and/or the animal identified as #23; and/or the animal identified as #24; and/or the animal identified as #26; and/or the animal identified as #29; and/or the animal identified as #33; and/or the animal identified as #36; and/or the animal identified as #37. This in violation of § 16-27-30 of the S.C. Code of Laws, 1976, as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

  
HENRY MCMASTER (CDS)  
SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERAL

**WITNESSES**

Inv. Tripp Mays

Docket Number 2008-GS-43-929

The State of South Carolina  
County of Sumter

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

**COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS**

July 2008 Term

I, \_\_\_\_\_  
hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

**ARREST WARRANT NUMBER**

Direct Presentment

THE STATE

vs.

GREGORY WRIGHT

DEFENDANT

Defendant

**ACTION OF GRAND JURY**

Witness:

C.C.C. Pls. And G.S.

*True Bill*  
*William Sanchez*

**INDICTMENT FOR**

**OWNING AN ANIMAL FOR THE  
PURPOSE OF FIGHTING**

S.C. CODE §16-27-30  
CDR Code: 540

Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date: 7/17/08

**VERDICT**

Foreperson of Petit Jury

Date:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF Sumter  
STATE

INDICTMENT/CASE# 2008 GS 43 - 930

VS.  
Greg Wright

A/W#: Direct Presentment

AKA: \_\_\_\_\_  
Race: B Sex: M Age: 39

Date of Offense: 12/25/07

DOB: 1969 SS#: \_\_\_\_\_

S.C. Code §: 16-27-30(b)

Address: 4915 Silo Rd.

CDR Code #: 540

City, State, Zip: Sumter, S.C.

**SENTENCE SHEET**  
SOUTH CAROLINA  
SUMTER COUNTY

DL# \_\_\_\_\_ SID# \_\_\_\_\_

In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was  CONVICTED OF or  PLEADS TO: Animal Fighting

In violation of § 16-27-30(b) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 540

NON-VIOLENT  VIOLENT  SERIOUS  MOST SERIOUS  Mandatory GPS  §17-25-45  
(CSC w/minor 1<sup>st</sup> or Lewd Act)

The charge is:  As Indicted,  Lesser Included Offense,  Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury, \_\_\_\_\_ (defendant initial)

The plea is:  Without Negotiations or Recommendation;  Negotiated Sentence,  Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_ Solicitor \_\_\_\_\_ Defendant \_\_\_\_\_ Attorney for Defendant \_\_\_\_\_ SC Bar # \_\_\_\_\_

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the  State Department of Corrections,  County Detention Center, for a determinate term of 5 days/months/years or  under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed \_\_\_\_\_ years and/or to pay a fine of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; provided that upon the service of \_\_\_\_\_ days/months/years and/or payment of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; plus costs and assessments as applicable\*, the balance is suspended with probation for \_\_\_\_\_ months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or  CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 1-14-09  
 The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code §24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections.  
 The Defendant is to be placed on Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:  
 RESTITUTION:  Deferred  Def. Waives Hearing  Ordered \_\_\_\_\_ PTUP \_\_\_\_\_

Total: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ plus 20% fee: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ days/hours Public Service Employment

Payment Terms: \_\_\_\_\_ Obtain GED:   
 set by SCDPPPS \_\_\_\_\_ Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp. \_\_\_\_\_

Recipient: \_\_\_\_\_ May serve W/E beginning \_\_\_\_\_  
Substance Abuse Counseling   
Random Drug/Alcohol Testing   
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly  
pmts. of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Beginning \_\_\_\_\_  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_ paid to Public Defender Fund  
Other: \_\_\_\_\_

|  |         |                  |
|--|---------|------------------|
| *Fine:                                 | \$      | _____            |
| §14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5%)         | \$      | _____            |
| §14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge)      | \$100   | \$ <u>100.00</u> |
| §14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge)        | \$100   | \$ _____         |
| §56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment)            | \$12    | \$ _____         |
| §35-13 (Public Def/Prob)               | \$500   | \$ _____         |
| §73-3, 1B TP (Law Enforce. Funding)    | \$25    | \$ <u>25.00</u>  |
| §33-7, 1B TP (Drug Court Surcharge)    | \$100   | \$ _____         |
| §50-21-114 (BUI Breath Test Fee)       | \$50    | \$ _____         |
| §56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment)     | \$40/ea | \$ _____         |
| 3% to County (if paid in installments) |         | \$ <u>3.90</u>   |
| §90-11 TP (SCCJA Surcharge)            | \$5     | \$ <u>5.00</u>   |
| TOTAL                                  |         | \$ <u>133.90</u> |

James C. Campbell  
Clerk of Court/Deputy Clerk

PRESIDING JUDGE: Michael J. [Signature]

Court Reporter: M. Sullivan

Judge Code: 2140  
Sentence Date: 1-14-09

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF SUMTER )

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY  
*B. ...*  
DEPUTY CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY  
SOUTH CAROLINA

**INDICTMENT**

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on July 17, 2008 the Grand Jurors of Sumter County present upon their oath:

**ANIMAL FIGHTING**

That on or about November 26, 2006 through May 25, 2007, Gregory Wright, in Sumter County, on at least one occasion, was party to and/or caused the fighting or baiting of animals, to wit: Gregory Wright was party to and/or caused fights between pit bull dogs against one another. This in violation of § 16-27-30(b) of the S.C. Code of Laws, 1976, as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

  
HENRY MCMASTER (CDS)  
SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERAL

**WITNESSES**

Inv. Tripp Mays

**ARREST WARRANT NUMBER**

Direct Presentment

**ACTION OF GRAND JURY**

*True Bill*  
*William Beaulieu*

Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date: *7/17/08*

**VERDICT**

Foreperson of Petit Jury

Date:

Docket Number 2008-GS-43-*930*

The State of South Carolina  
County of Sumter

**COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS**

July 2008 Term

**THE STATE**

vs.

**GREGORY WRIGHT**

**DEFENDANT**

**INDICTMENT FOR**

**ANIMAL FIGHTING**

**S.C. CODE §16-27-30(b)**  
**CDR Code: 540**

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

I, \_\_\_\_\_  
hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

Defendant

Witness:

\_\_\_\_\_  
C.C.C. Pls. And G.S.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF Sumter  
STATE

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2008-GS-43-931

VS.  
Greg Wright

A/W#: direct presentment

AKA:  
Race: B Sex: M Age: 39

Date of Offense: 8/25/07

DOB: 1/19/69 SS#: [REDACTED]

S.C. Code §: 47-1-40(B)

Address: 4915 Silo Rd.

CDR Code #: 2804

City, State, Zip: Sumter SC

DL# \_\_\_\_\_ SID# \_\_\_\_\_

SENTENCE SHEET

In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was  CONVICTED OR  PLEADS

TO: Ill Treatment of Animals

in violation of § 47-1-40(B) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 2804

NON-VIOLENT  VIOLENT  SERIOUS  MOST SERIOUS  Mandatory GPS  \$17-25-45  
(CSC w/minor 1<sup>st</sup> or Lowd Act)

The charge is:  As Indicted,  Lesser Included Offense,  Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury. (defendant initial)  
The plea is:  Without Negotiations or Recommendation,  Negotiated Sentence,  Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: [Signature] Solicitor [Signature] Defendant [Signature] Attorney for Defendant [Signature] SC Bar # \_\_\_\_\_

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the  State Department of Corrections,  County Detention Center, for a determinate term of 5 days/months/years or  under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed \_\_\_\_\_ years and/or to pay a fine of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; provided that upon the service of \_\_\_\_\_ days/months/years and/or payment of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; plus costs and assessments as applicable\*, the balance is suspended with probation for \_\_\_\_\_ months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or  CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 1-14-09  
 The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code §24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections.  
 The Defendant is to be placed on Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:  
 RESTITUTION:  Deferred  Def. Waives Hearing  Ordered PTUP: \_\_\_\_\_

Total: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ plus 20% fee: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ days/hours Public Service/ Employment

Payment Terms: \_\_\_\_\_ Obtain GED   
 set by SCDPPPS \_\_\_\_\_ Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp. \_\_\_\_\_

Recipient: \_\_\_\_\_ May serve W/E beginning \_\_\_\_\_  
Substance Abuse Counseling

|  |         |    |                |
|--|---------|----|----------------|
| *Fine:                                 |         | \$ |                |
| §14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5%)         |         | \$ |                |
| §14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge)      | \$100   | \$ | <u>100.00</u>  |
| §14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge)        | \$100   | \$ |                |
| §56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment)            | \$12    | \$ |                |
| §35-13 (Public Def/Prob)               | \$500   | \$ |                |
| §73-3, 1B TP (Law Enforce. Funding)    | \$25    | \$ | <u>25.00</u>   |
| §33-7, 1B TP (Drug Court Surcharge)    | \$100   | \$ |                |
| §50-21-114(BUI Breath Test Fee)        | \$50    | \$ |                |
| §56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment)     | \$40/ea | \$ |                |
| 3% to County (if paid in installments) |         | \$ | <u>3.90</u>    |
| §90-11 TP (SCCJA Surcharge)            | \$5     | \$ | <u>5.00</u>    |
| TOTAL                                  |         | \$ | <u>1339.00</u> |

Random Drug/Alcohol Testing   
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly pmts. of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Beginning \_\_\_\_\_ paid to Public Defender Fund  
Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Appointed PD or appointed other counsel, §35-13 TP  
 Requires \$500 be paid to Clerk during probation.

James C. Campbell  
Clerk of Court/Deputy Clerk

PRESIDING JUDGE: [Signature]

Court Reporter: M. Sullivan

Judge Code: 2140  
Sentence Date: 1-14-09

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF SUMTER )

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY  
OF ORIGINAL  
FILED  
DEPUTY CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY  
SOUTH CAROLINA

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on July 17, 2008 the Grand Jurors of Sumter County present upon their oath:

ILL TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

That on or about the period beginning November 26 2007 until May 25 2007, Gregory Wright, did, in Sumter County, torture, torment, needlessly mutilate, cruelly kill, or inflict excessive or repeated unnecessary pain or suffering upon an animal, to wit: he did own a number of pit bulldogs which he fought against other animals, including other dogs. This in violation of § 47-1-40 (B) of the S.C. Code of Laws, 1976, as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

  
HENRY MCMASTER (CDS )  
SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERAL

**WITNESSES**

Inv. Tripp Mays

**ARREST WARRANT NUMBER**

DIRECT PRESENTMENT

**ACTION OF GRAND JURY**

*True Bill*

*William Bando*

Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date: *7/17/08*

**VERDICT**

Foreperson of Petit Jury

Date:

Docket Number 2008-GS-43-931

The State of South Carolina  
County of Sumter

**COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS**

July 2008 Term

**THE STATE**

vs.

**GREGORY WRIGHT**

**DEFENDANT**

**INDICTMENT FOR**

**ILL TREATMENT OF ANIMALS**

**S.C. CODE § 47-1-40 (B)**

**CDR Code: 2804**

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

I, \_\_\_\_\_  
hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

Defendant

Witness:

C.C.C. Pls. And G.S.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF Sumter  
STATE

INDICTMENT/CASE# 2008 GS 43 932

vs.  
Greg Wright

AW#: J-289915

AKA:  
Race: B Sex: M Age: 39

Date of Offense: 5/25/07

DOB: 1969 SS#: [REDACTED]

S.C. Code §: 44-53-370(e)(2)(a)(3)

Address: 4915 Silo Rd

CDR Code #: 147 NOTIFIED TRUE COPY

City, State, Zip: Sumter SC

SENTENCE SHEET

DL# \_\_\_\_\_ SID# \_\_\_\_\_

In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was  CONVICTED OF or  PLEADS  Trafficking in Cocaine

in violation of § 44-53-370(e)(2)(a)(3) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 147

NON-VIOLENT  VIOLENT  SERIOUS  MOST SERIOUS  Mandatory GPS  §17-25-45  
(CSC w/minor 1<sup>st</sup> or Lewd Act)

The charge is:  As Indicted;  Lesser Included Offense;  Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury, \_\_\_\_\_ (defendant initial)

The plea is:  Without Negotiations or Recommendation;  Negotiated Sentence;  Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: [Signature] Solicitor [Signature] Defendant [Signature] Attorney for Defendant [Signature] SC Bar # [REDACTED]

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the  State Department of Corrections,  County Detention Center, for a determinate term of 25 days/months/years or  under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed \_\_\_\_\_ years and/or to pay a fine of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; provided that upon the service of \_\_\_\_\_ days/months/years and/or payment of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ plus costs and assessments as applicable\*, the balance is suspended with probation for \_\_\_\_\_ months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or  CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 1-14-09

The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code §24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections.

The Defendant is to be placed on Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION:  Deferred  Def. Waives Hearing  Ordered PTUP \_\_\_\_\_

Total: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ plus 20% fee: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ days/hours Public Service/ Employment \_\_\_\_\_

Payment Terms: \_\_\_\_\_

Obtain GED

set by SCDPPPS \_\_\_\_\_

Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp. \_\_\_\_\_

Recipient: \_\_\_\_\_

May serve W/E beginning \_\_\_\_\_

Substance Abuse Counseling

|  |         |          |
|--|---------|----------|
| *Fine:                                 | \$      |          |
| \$14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5%):       | \$      |          |
| \$14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge)     | \$100   | \$100.00 |
| \$14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge)       | \$100   | \$       |
| \$56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment)           | \$12    | \$       |
| \$35.13 (Public Def/Prob)              | \$500   | \$       |
| \$73.3, 1B-TP (Law Enforce. Funding)   | \$25    | \$25.00  |
| \$33.7, 1B-TP (Drug Court Surcharge)   | \$100   | \$100.00 |
| \$60-21-114(BUI Breath Test Fee)       | \$50    | \$       |
| \$56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment)    | \$40/ea | \$       |
| 3% to County (if paid in installments) |         | \$6.90   |
| \$90.11 TP (SCCJA Surcharge)           | \$5     | \$5.00   |
| TOTAL                                  |         | \$236.90 |

Random Drug/Alcohol Testing

Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly

pmts. of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Beginning \_\_\_\_\_  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_ paid to Public Defender Fund

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Appointed PD or appointed other counsel, \$35.13 TP

Requires \$500 be paid to Clerk during probation.

James C. Campbell  
Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk

PRESIDING JUDGE [Signature]

Court Reporter: M. Sullivan

Judge Code: 2140  
Sentence Date: 1-14-09

ARREST WARRANT

J-289915

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/  Municipality of

Sumter

THE STATE

against

Gregory Wright

Address: 4915 SILO RD

Sumter, SC 29150-

Phone: [Redacted] SSN [Redacted]

Sex: M Race: B Height: [Redacted] Weight: [Redacted]

DL State: SC DL #: [Redacted]

DOB: [Redacted] 1969 Agency ORI #: SC0430000

Prosecuting Agency: Sumter County Sheriff

Prosecuting Officer: Trevor Brown - 0457

Offense: Drugs / Trafficking in cocaine, 28 g or more, but less than 100 g - 3rd or sub. offense

Offense Code: 0148

Code/Ordinance Sec: 44-53-0370(e)(2)

This warrant is CERTIFIED FOR SERVICE in the

County/  Municipality of

The accused

is to be arrested and brought before me, to be dealt with according to the law.

(L.S.)

Signature of Judge

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

RETURN

A copy of this arrest warrant was delivered to defendant on Gregory Wright 5-27-07

Signature of Constable/Law Enforcement Officer

RETURN WARRANT TO:

Sumter County General Sessions  
141 N. Main St., Rm 308  
Sumter, SC 29150

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/  Municipality of

Sumter

Personally appeared before me the affiant Trevor Brown who

being duly sworn deposes and says that defendant Gregory Wright

did within this county and state on or about 05/25/2007

State of South Carolina (or ordinance of  County/  Municipality of Sumter

in the following particulars:

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE: Drugs / Trafficking in cocaine, 28 g or more, but less than 100 g - 3rd or sub. offense.  
JAMES G. CARROLL  
CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY, S.C.

I further state that there is probable cause to believe that the defendant named above did commit the crime set forth and that probable cause is based on the following facts:

That on May 25, 2007 in the county of Sumter the defendant did have in his possession a quantity of cocaine, more than 28 grams but less than 100 grams. Said offense having occurred at 4915 Silo Rd. During an execution of a search warrant a large quantity of suspect cocaine was found in the shed in the backyard of the said location. The defendant has prior convictions for drugs. The defendant resides at the residence. Law enforcement will attest to same.

VERIFIED TRUE COPY OF ORIGINAL FILE  
JAMES G. CARROLL  
CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY  
SOUTH CAROLINA

Signature of Affiant

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/  Municipality of

Sumter

Affiant's Address: 107 East Hampton Street

Sumter, SC 29150-

Affiant's Telephone: (803)436-2790

ARREST WARRANT

TO ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OF THIS STATE OR MUNICIPALITY OR ANY CONSTABLE OF THIS COUNTY:

It appearing from the above affidavit that there are reasonable grounds to believe that

on or about 5/25/2007 defendant Gregory Wright

did violate the criminal laws of the State of South Carolina (or ordinance of

County/  Municipality of Sumter ) as set forth below:

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE: Drugs / Trafficking in cocaine, 28 g or more, but less than 100 g - 3rd or sub. offense

Having found probable cause and the above affiant having sworn before me, you are empowered and directed to arrest the said defendant and bring him or her before me forthwith to be dealt with according to law. A copy of this Arrest Warrant shall be delivered to the defendant at the time of its execution, or as soon thereafter as is practicable Sworn to and subscribed before me

on 05/25/2007

Signature of Judge (L.S.)

Bryan Keith Griffin

Judge Code: 5043

Judge's Address: 115 N. Harvin St.

Sumter, SC 29151-1428

Judge's Telephone: (803)436-2283

Issuing Court:  Magistrate  Municipal  Circuit

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

AFFIDAVIT

Form Approved by S.C. Attorney General April 21, 2003 SCCA 518

545

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
COUNTY OF SUMTER )

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY  
OF ORIGINAL FILE

*B. Adams Phage*  
DEPUTY CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY  
SOUTH CAROLINA

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on July 17, 2008, the Grand Jurors of Sumter County present upon their oath:

TRAFFICKING IN COCAINE

That Gregory Wright did in Sumter County on or about May 25, 2007, knowingly sell, manufacture, cultivate, deliver, purchase or bring into this State, or did provide financial assistance or did otherwise aid, abet, attempt, or conspire to sell, manufacture, cultivate, deliver, purchase or bring into this State, or did knowingly actually or constructively possess or did knowingly attempt to become in actual or constructive possess more than (28) twenty-eight grams, but less than (100) one hundred grams of Cocaine, a schedule II controlled substance, in violation of §44-53-370 (e)(2)(b)3, THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, (1976), as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such cases made and provided.

*Henry McMaster*  
HENRY MCMASTER (CDS)  
SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY

**WITNESSES**

Inv. L.C. Mays, III

Docket Number 2008-GS-43- 932

The State of South Carolina  
County of Sumter

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

**COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS**

July 2008 Term

I, \_\_\_\_\_  
hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

**ARREST WARRANT NUMBER**

J-289915

**THE STATE**

vs.

**GREGORY WRIGHT**

**DEFENDANT**

Defendant

**ACTION OF GRAND JURY**

Witness:

C.C.C. Pls. And G.S.

*Time Bill*

*William Bondo*

Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date: 7/17/08

**INDICTMENT FOR**

**TRAFFICKING IN COCAINE**

S.C. CODE §44-53-370 (e)(2)(b)3

CDR Code: 148

**VERDICT**

Foreperson of Petit Jury

Date:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF Sumter  
STATE

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2008 GS 43 933

AKA: Greg Wright  
NS.

AW#: J-289916

Race: B Sex: M Age: 39

Date of Offense: 5/25/07

DOB: 1969 SS#: [REDACTED]

S.C. Code §: 44-53-370(d)(3)

CDR Code #: 659 CERTIFIED TRUE COPY OF ORIGINAL FILE

Address: 4915 Silo Rd.

City, State, Zip: Sumter SC

SENTENCE SHEET  
DEPUTY CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY  
SOUTH CAROLINA

DL# \_\_\_\_\_ SID# \_\_\_\_\_

In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was  CONVICTED OF or  PLEADS

TO: Possession of Marijuana

in violation of §: 44-53-370(d)(3) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 659

NON-VIOLENT  VIOLENT  SERIOUS  MOST SERIOUS  Mandatory GPS  \$17-25-45  
(CSC w/minor 1<sup>st</sup> or Lowd Act)

The charge is:  As Indicted,  Lesser Included Offense,  Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury. \_\_\_\_\_ (defendant initial)  
The plea is:  Without Negotiations or Recommendation,  Negotiated Sentence,  Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: [Signature] Solicitor [Signature] Defendant [Signature] Attorney for Defendant SC Bar # \_\_\_\_\_

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the  State Department of Corrections,  County Detention Center,  
for a determinate term of 30 days/months/years or  under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed \_\_\_\_\_ years  
and/or to pay a fine of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; provided that upon the service of \_\_\_\_\_ days/months/years and/or payment  
of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; plus costs and assessments as applicable\*; the balance is suspended with probation for \_\_\_\_\_  
months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation,  
which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or  CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 1-14-09

The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code §24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State  
Department of Corrections.

The Defendant is to be placed on Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION:  Deferred  Def. Waives Hearing  Ordered: PTUP \_\_\_\_\_

Total: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ plus 20% fee: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ days/hours Public Service Employment

Payment Terms: \_\_\_\_\_ Obtain GED   
 set by SCDPPPS: \_\_\_\_\_ Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp. \_\_\_\_\_

Recipient: \_\_\_\_\_ May serve WE beginning \_\_\_\_\_  
Substance Abuse Counseling

|  |         |          |
|--|---------|----------|
| *Fine:                                 | \$      | _____    |
| \$14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5%)        | \$      | _____    |
| \$14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge)     | \$100   | \$100.00 |
| \$14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge)       | \$100   | \$       |
| \$56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment)           | \$12    | \$       |
| \$35.13 (Public Def/Prob)              | \$500   | \$       |
| \$73.3, 1B TP (Law Enforce. Funding)   | \$25    | \$25.00  |
| \$33.7, 1B TP (Drug Court Surcharge)   | \$100   | \$100.00 |
| \$50-21-114 (BUI Breath Test Fee)      | \$50    | \$       |
| \$56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment)    | \$40/ea | \$       |
| 3% to County (if paid in installments) | \$      | \$6.90   |
| \$90.11 TP (SCCJA Surcharge)           | \$5     | \$5.00   |
| TOTAL                                  |         | \$236.90 |

Random Drug/Alcohol Testing   
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly  
pmts. of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Beginning \_\_\_\_\_  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_ paid to Public Defender Fund  
Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Appointed PD or appointed other counsel, \$35.13 TP  
 Requires \$500 be paid to Clerk during probation.

James C. Campbell  
Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk

PRESIDING JUDGE [Signature]

Court Reporter: M. Sullivan

Judge Code: 2140  
Sentence Date: 1-14-09

ARREST WARRANT

J-289916

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/ Municipality of

Sumter

THE STATE

against

Gregory Wright

Address: 4915 SILO RD

Sumter, SC 29150-

Phone: SSN:

Sex: M Race: B Height: Weight:

DL State: SC DL #:

DOB: 1969 Agency ORI #: SC0430000

Prosecuting Agency: Sumter County Sheriff

Prosecuting Officer: Trevor Brown - 0457

Offense: Drugs / Manuf., poss. of other sub. in Sch. I,II,III or flunitrazepam, w.i.t.d. - 3rd or sub. offense

Offense Code: 0188

Code/Ordinance Sec: 44-53-0370(b)(2)

This warrant is CERTIFIED FOR SERVICE in the

County/ Municipality of

The accused

is to be arrested and brought before me to be

dealt with according to the law.

(L.S.)

Signature of Judge:

Date:

RETURN

A copy of this arrest warrant was delivered to

defendant Gregory Wright

on 5-27-07

Signature of Constable or Enforcement Officer:

RETURN WARRANT TO:

Sumter County General Sessions
141 N. Main St., Rm 308
Sumter, SC 29150

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/ Municipality of

Sumter

Personally appeared before me the affiant Trevor Brown who

being duly sworn deposes and says that defendant Gregory Wright

did within this county and state on or about 05/25/2007

violate the criminal laws of the State of South Carolina (or ordinance of County/ Municipality of Sumter)

in the following particulars:

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE Drugs / Manuf., poss. of other sub. in Sch. I,II,III or flunitrazepam, w.i.t.d. - 3rd or sub. offense

I further state that there is probable cause to believe that the defendant named above did commit the crime set forth and that probable cause is based on the following facts:

That on May 25, 2007 in the county of Sumter, the defendant did aid, abet, attempt or conspire to manufacture, distribute, dispense, deliver, purchase and or possess marijuana, with the intent to manufacture, distribute, dispense, deliver, or purchase marijuana, a controlled substance or a controlled substance analogue classified in Schedule I (b) and (c) which is a narcotic drug or lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) or in Schedule II which is a narcotic drug. Said offense having occurred at 4915 Silo Rd. During an execution of a search warrant a large quantity of suspect marijuana was found in the shed in the backyard of the said location. The defendant has prior convictions for drugs. The defendant resides at the residence. Law enforcement will attest to same.

Signature of Affiant

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/ Municipality of

Sumter

Affiant's Address 107 East Hampton Street

Sumter, SC 29150-

Affiant's Telephone (803)436-2790

ARREST WARRANT

TO ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OF THIS STATE OR MUNICIPALITY OR ANY CONSTABLE OF THIS COUNTY:

It appearing from the above affidavit that there are reasonable grounds to believe that

on or about 5/25/2007 defendant Gregory Wright

did violate the criminal laws of the State of South Carolina (or ordinance of

County/ Municipality of Sumter) as set forth below:

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE: Drugs / Manuf., poss. of other sub. in Sch. I,II,III or flunitrazepam, w.i.t.d. - 3rd or sub. offense

Having found probable cause and the above affiant having sworn before me, you are empowered and directed to arrest the said defendant and bring him or her before me forthwith to be dealt with according to law. A copy of this Arrest Warrant shall be delivered to the defendant at the time of its execution, or as soon thereafter as is practicable

Sworn to and subscribed before me

on 05/25/2007

(L.S.)

Signature of Issuing Judge

Bryan Keith Griffin

Judge Code: 5043

Judge's Address 115 N. Harvin St.

Sumter, SC 29151-1428

Judge's Telephone (803)436-2283

Issuing Court: [X] Magistrate

[ ] Municipal

[ ] Circuit

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

AFFIDAVIT

Form Approved by S.C. Attorney General April 21, 2003 SCCA 518

RECORDED

2007 MAY 31 AM 10:20

JAMES C. CAMPBELL
CLERK OF COURT
SUMTER COUNTY, S.C.

549

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF SUMTER )

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY  
OF ORIGINAL FILE

*B. Shaffer*

DEPUTY CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY  
SOUTH CAROLINA

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on July 17, 2008, the Grand Jurors of Sumter County present upon their oath:

POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE MARIJUANA

That Gregory Wright did in Sumter County on or about May 25, 2007, knowingly sell, manufacture, distribute, dispense, deliver, purchase or aid, abet, attempt, or conspire to manufacture, distribute, dispense, deliver, or purchase, or possess with intent to manufacture, distribute, dispense, deliver, or purchase a controlled substance, to wit: A quantity of Marijuana, a schedule 1 controlled substance under provisions of §44-53-370 (b)(2), THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, (1976), as amended, such possession not having been authorized by law.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such cases made and provided.

*Henry McMaster*

HENRY MCMASTER (CDS)  
SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

I, \_\_\_\_\_ hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

Defendant

Witness:

C.C.C. Pls. And G.S.

Docket Number 2008-GS-43-933

The State of South Carolina  
County of Sumter

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

July 2008 Term

THE STATE

vs.

GREGORY WRIGHT

DEFENDANT

INDICTMENT FOR

POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO  
DISTRIBUTE MARIJUANA

S.C. CODE §44-53-370 (b)(2)  
CDR Code: 188

**WITNESSES**

Inv. L.C. Mays, III

**ARREST WARRANT NUMBER**

J-289916

**ACTION OF GRAND JURY**

*Time Bill*  
*William Sankle*

Foreperson of Grand Jury  
Date: *7/17/08*

**VERDICT**

Foreperson of Petit Jury  
Date:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF Sumter  
STATE

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2008 GS 43 934

vs.  
Greg Wright

AW#: J-289914

AKA: \_\_\_\_\_  
Race: B Sex: M Age: 39

Date of Offense: 5/23/07

DOB: 1/19/69 SS#: \_\_\_\_\_

S.C. Code §: 44-53-375(c)(2)(c)

Address: 4915 Silo Rd.

GDR Code #: 349

City, State, Zip: Sumter SC

SENTENCE SHEET COURT

DL# \_\_\_\_\_ SID# \_\_\_\_\_

SUMTER COUNTY

In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was  CONVICTED OF or  PLEADED GUILTY TO: Trafficking in Crack Cocaine

in violation of § 44-53-375(c)(2)(c) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing GDR Code # 349

NON-VIOLENT  VIOLENT  SERIOUS  MOST SERIOUS  Mandatory GPS  §17-25-45 (CSC w/minor, 1<sup>st</sup> or Lewd Act)

The charge is:  As Indicted,  Lesser Included Offense,  Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury, \_\_\_\_\_ (defendant initial)

The plea is:  Without Negotiations or Recommendation,  Negotiated Sentence,  Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: [Signature] Solicitor [Signature] Defendant [Signature] Attorney for Defendant SC Bar # \_\_\_\_\_

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the  State Department of Corrections,  County Detention Center, for a determinate term of 25 days/months/years or  under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed \_\_\_\_\_ years and/or to pay a fine of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; provided that upon the service of \_\_\_\_\_ days/months/years and/or payment of \$ \_\_\_\_\_; plus costs and assessments as applicable; the balance is suspended with probation for \_\_\_\_\_ months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or  CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 1-14-09  
 The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code §24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections.  
 The Defendant is to be placed on Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-136.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:  
 RESTITUTION:  Deferred  Def. Waives Hearing  Ordered PTUP \_\_\_\_\_

Total: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ plus 20% fee: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ days/hours Public Service Employment

Payment Terms: \_\_\_\_\_ Obtain GED

set by SGDPPTS \_\_\_\_\_ Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp. \_\_\_\_\_

Recipient: \_\_\_\_\_ May serve W/E beginning: \_\_\_\_\_ Substance Abuse Counseling

\*Fine: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Random Drug/Alcohol Testing

\$14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5%) \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly

\$14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge) \$100 \$100.00 prmts. of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Beginning

\$14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge) \$100 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_ paid to Public Defender Fund

\$56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment) \$12 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

\$35.13 (Public Def/Prob) \$500 \$ \_\_\_\_\_

\$73.3, 1B TP (Law Enforcement Funding) \$25 \$25.00

\$33.7, 1B TP (Drug Court Surcharge) \$100 \$100.00

\$50-21-114 (BUI Breath Test Fee) \$50 \$ \_\_\_\_\_

\$56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment) \$40/ea \$ \_\_\_\_\_

3% to County (if paid in installments) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

\$90.11 TP (SCCJA Surcharge) \$5 \$5.00

TOTAL \$236.90

James C. Campbell Clerk of Court/Deputy Clerk  
M. Sullivan Court Reporter  
PRESIDING JUDGE [Signature]  
Judge Code: 3140  
Sentence Date: 1-14-09

ARREST WARRANT

J-289914

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/  Municipality of

Sumter

THE STATE 07057108

against

Gregory Wright

Address: SILO RD

Sumter, SC 29150-

Phone. SSN

Sex: M Race: B Height: Weight:

DL State: SC DL #

DOB: Agency ORI #: SC0430000

Prosecuting Agency: Sumter County Sheriff

Prosecuting Officer: Trevor Brown - 0457

Offense: Drugs / Trafficking in ice, crack or crack - 28 g or more, but less than 100 g - 3rd or sub. (Fel., 25Y to

Offense Code: 0349

Code/Ordinance Sec: 44-53-0375(C)(2)

This warrant is CERTIFIED FOR SERVICE in the  County/  Municipality of

The accused is to be arrested and brought before me to be dealt with according to the law.

(L.S.)

Signature of Judge

Date:

RETURN

A copy of this arrest warrant was delivered to defendant Gregory Wright on 5-27-07

Signature of Constable/Law Enforcement Officer

RETURN WARRANT TO:

Sumter County General Sessions  
141 N. Main St., Rm 308  
Sumter, SC 29150

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/  Municipality of

Sumter

Personally appeared before me the affiant Trevor Brown who being duly sworn deposes and says that defendant Gregory Wright did within this county and state on or about 05/25/2007 violate the criminal laws of the State of South Carolina (or ordinance of  County/  Municipality of Sumter) in the following particulars.

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE: Drugs / Trafficking in ice, crack or crack - 28 g or more, but less than 100 g - 3rd or sub. (Fel., 25Y to 30Y)

I further state that there is probable cause to believe that the defendant named above did commit the crime set forth and that probable cause is based on the following facts:

That on May 25, 2007 in the county of Sumter the defendant did have in his possession a quantity of crack cocaine, more than 28 grams but less than 100 grams. Said offense having occurred at 4915 Silo Rd. During an execution of a search warrant a large quantity of suspect crack cocaine was found in the shed in the backyard of the said location. The defendant resides at the residence. The defendant has prior convictions for drugs. Law enforcement will attest to same.

Signature of Affiant

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/  Municipality of

Sumter

Affiant's Address: 107 East Hampton Street, Sumter, SC 29150-  
Affiant's Telephone: (803)436-2790

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY OF ORIGINAL FILE

Barbara Stanga  
CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY  
SOUTH CAROLINA

ARREST WARRANT

TO ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OF THIS STATE OR MUNICIPALITY OR ANY CONSTABLE OF THIS COUNTY:

It appearing from the above affidavit that there are reasonable grounds to believe that

on or about 5/25/2007 defendant Gregory Wright did violate the criminal laws of the State of South Carolina (or ordinance of  County/  Municipality of Sumter) as set forth below:

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE: Drugs / Trafficking in ice, crack or crack - 28 g or more, but less than 100 g - 3rd or sub. (Fel., 25Y to 30Y)

Having found probable cause and the above affiant having sworn before me, you are empowered and directed to arrest the said defendant and bring him or her before me forthwith to be dealt with according to law. A copy of this Arrest Warrant shall be delivered to the defendant at the time of its execution, or as soon thereafter as is practicable Sworn to and subscribed before me

on 05/25/2007

Signature of Issuing Judge

Bryan Keith Griffin

Judge Code: 5043

(L.S.)

Judge's Address: 115 N. Harvin St., Sumter, SC 29151-1428  
Judge's Telephone: (803)436-2283

Issuing Court:  Magistrate  Municipal  Circuit

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

Form Approved by S C Attorney General April 21, 2003 SCCA 518

AFFIDAVIT

RECORDED

2007 MAY 31 AM 10:19

JAMES C. CAMPBELL  
CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY, S.C.

553

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF SUMTER )

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY  
OF ORIGINAL FILE  
B. J. [unclear]  
DEPUTY CLERK OF COURT  
SUMTER COUNTY  
SOUTH CAROLINA

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on July 17, 2008, the Grand Jurors of Sumter County present upon their oath:

TRAFFICKING IN CRACK COCAINE

That Gregory Wright did in Sumter County on or about May 25, 2007, knowingly sell, manufacture, deliver, purchase or bring into this State, or did provide financial assistance or did otherwise aid, abet, attempt, or conspire to sell, manufacture, deliver, purchase or bring into this State, or did knowingly actually or constructively possess, or did knowingly attempt to actually or constructive possess more than (28) twenty-eight grams, but less than (100) one hundred grams of Crack Cocaine, a schedule II controlled substance, in violation of §44-53-375(C)(2)(c), THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, (1976), as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such cases made and provided.

  
HENRY MCMASTER (CDS)  
SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY

**WITNESSES**

Inv. L.C. Mays, III

**ARREST WARRANT NUMBER**

J-289914

**ACTION OF GRAND JURY**

*True Bill*  
*William Dombro*  
Foreperson of Grand Jury  
Date: *7/12/08*

**VERDICT**

Foreperson of Petit Jury  
Date:

Docket Number 2008-GS-43- 934

The State of South Carolina  
County of Sumter

**COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS**

July 2008 Term

**THE STATE**

vs.

**GREGORY WRIGHT**

**DEFENDANT**

**INDICTMENT FOR**

**TRAFFICKING IN CRACK COCAINE**

S.C. CODE §44-53-375(C)(2)(c)  
CDR Code: 349

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

I, \_\_\_\_\_  
hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

Defendant

Witness:

C.C.C. Pls. And G.S.

555