

Dear Honorable Chief Justice Donald Beatty

Re: Keiron K. Coleman v. State Appellate case No.
2018-000088

Your Honor I read your two news articles in the news paper one By Noelle Phillips and the other by Glenn Smith, at a Myrtle Beach Lawyers Conference you addressed the abuse of power by prosecutor's and that you would be holding judges accountable as well. My Case is soon to be heard by South Carolina Supreme Court and my fear is that I will face another sabotaged appeal. The Court as well as Counsel have ignored my strong claims stemming from a question asked by Judge Larry B Hyman during my trial my codefendant Jordan Dudley made a plea where he was asked by Judge Hyman "Trp 85" when the house was entered? you were there when your codefendant removed things from the house? Is that your position? p 4-6 Mr Dudley yes, sir. The plea offer was made right after opening statement I stressed that Judge Hyman questioning was improper and deprived me my presumption of innocence and that Mr Dudley's answer would influence the court's judgement especially during directed verdict. which if you listen to the court's directed verdict and the question he asked Mr Dudley you can hear the same language was used to deny my directed verdict.

My most recent issue comes from PCR
During my bite of the apple I mentioned a state v
Brian K Spears which my trial judge Larry B. Blyman
resided over which he failed to conduct a balancing test
which the case was reversed in my case counsel failed
to request a test after hearing that the state was going
to introduce res gestae testimony that counsel and
the court knew was going to come in there was no
balancing test. Last the PCR court decision denying
my mere presence claim had nothing to do with
the meaning of finding of the facts and conclusion
of law counsel's reason failed to meet Strickland v
Washington the argument counsel made at PCR should
have been enough to prove the allegation. The Court
said that counsel had conflicting feelings on requesting
a extended instruction where the court only gave a
partial instruction leaving out the second part
of mere presence which explains that merely being
present near where contraband is found does not
mean the defendant was guilty. That was left out
when there was testimony that suggested the second
part be addressed. and that he felt that my testimony
or defense did not hinge on mere presence when
in fact not only it did during closing counsel
used my codefendants lawyer opening statement
which suggested mere presence and he used
that same testimony to describe my role to the
jury this contradicts counsels testimony at PCR.

Last the court said because the court gave
a instruction on mere presence and what counsel
said he was denying my claim that counsel failed
to request a mere presence charge which he did
and the improper partial instruction given by the
court should have never been considered where in
state & queen further south Carolina law dictates
when giving an instruction on the law it was
to be given in its entirety. And the court failed
to do so which failed to correct the prejudice the
state implied when they kept mentioning how
the contraband was found under my car seat
seven times throughout trial if the the jury
would have know that that did not necessary
mean that i was guilty would have made my
trial fair. over all my trial was unconstitutional
by every meaning of the word in my case of burglary
1st there was not one single piece of evidence
could show i entered the house the state claimed
that the house was entered through a window on
the side of the house which was in view of states
witness ms oswan but her statement and testimony
is as follows she said she saw us walk to the front
door then to the back of the house then back to her
car then i was supposed to get a cigarette from her
and then she said we went some where she did not
know but when we came back we had stuff.

After walking back to her car there is no where in her testimony that we ever went back to the victims house even though the state said there was a cigarette found in the house and that i dropped which is impossible if i never returned to the home or went through the window as the state never said that there was a possibility that the house may have been entered when we went to the back of the house which the witness never said in any of her testimony that when we came from in back of the house we had stuff but instead we went some where meaning after leaving the victims house that we returned with the contraband which any where can be any where by her testimony which i testified i never left the car and she couldnt see mr Dudley enter through the window because i was in her line of view but this was never heard by the court or jury i did not enter or know that a burglary was going to take place and i stand by that thank you.

I understand that i would not be able to speak at this hearing in person but this is my last chance to have the court consider what i had to say thank you again.

My freedom depends on the little i have to share.

RECEIVED
JUN 04 2018