

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Trey Williams, Respondent,

v.

State of South Carolina, Petitioner.

Appellate Case No: 2016-001553

ORDER

The State filed its notice of appeal in this case on July 27, 2016. Respondent filed a pro se notice of appeal on August 9, 2016, and another notice of appeal through his then-counsel, Nathan Sheldon, later that month.¹ Respondent subsequently moved several times to relieve Sheldon and proceeded pro se, and the supreme court granted Respondent's request on March 14, 2017. On April 10, 2017, Darren S. Haley filed a motion for an appeal bond on Respondent's behalf. That same day, the supreme court sent a letter to Haley acknowledging he was Respondent's counsel of record. On May 1, 2017, Respondent filed a motion to relieve Haley and proceed pro se. In a return to the motion, Haley stated he was retained to represent Respondent only "for the separate matter of obtaining an appeal bond." However, on July 14, 2017, Respondent moved to withdraw his motion to relieve Haley, and on July 20, 2017, Haley notified the supreme court he "agreed to become the attorney [of] record" for Respondent's appeal. On August 8, 2017, the supreme court granted Respondent's withdrawal motion, noted Haley "will continue to be counsel of record" for Respondent's appeal, and denied Respondent's motion for an appeal bond. No further motions regarding Respondent's representation were filed for more than a year.

In August 2018, Respondent filed several letters with this court seeking, among other things, reconsideration of the supreme court's denial of his motion for an appeal bond. Upon receiving notification from this court that it would not act on

¹ Respondent ultimately moved to withdraw his appeal, which the supreme court granted on March 3, 2017.

his letters due to his representation by Haley, Respondent filed several motions to relieve counsel and proceed pro se. After careful consideration, these motions are denied. Accordingly, this court declines to act on Respondent's remaining requests. *See Miller v. State*, 388 S.C. 347, 347, 697 S.E.2d 527 (2010) ("Since there is no right to 'hybrid representation' that is partially *pro se* and partially by counsel, substantive documents, with the exception of motions to relieve counsel, filed *pro se* by a person represented by counsel are not to be accepted unless submitted by counsel.").



FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

cc: Darren S. Haley, Esquire
Janell Gregory, Esquire
Trey Williams, 341036
The Honorable Alison Renee Lee

FILED

Sept. 26, 2018
27