

State of South Carolina

Melanie L. Lawson

Clerk of Court



Clerk of Court Union, South Carolina

July 6, 2018

William Brannon

In response to your letter I received indictments are not clocked and stamped. They are only stamped true billed, signed and dated by the foreman.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Melanie L. Lawson".

Melanie L. Lawson

Clerk of Court

Melanie L Lawson
Clerk of Court
PO Box 703
Union, SC 29379

July 4, 2018

FILED FOR PROCEEDINGS
2018 JUL 5 PM 1:02
CLERK OF COURT
UNION, SC

Dear Ms Lawson,

I am writing to inform you that it appears that you are discriminating against me with responding directly to me concerning matters with receiving "records of proceedings" in accordance to Rule 109(c) reads in part: Any action taken pursuant to this rule, shall be entered in the records of the Clerk of Court pursuant to procedures now or hereafter.

However, when I asked you for copies of the indictments reflecting a stamp elected date and time how else will one know if its official concerning the twenty-four (24) pursuant section (c).

Also let me inform you I realize that this is an oppressive tactic that is orchestrated by John Anthony and the Public Defender office, to assist with getting plea conviction from each defendant whether they are innocent or guilty, now it appears that you are acting along with the plan. Let me remind you that judicial misconduct has been reported by your office and is being investigated. As you already know you can be held liable once it is demonstrated that you knowingly participated.

It appears that the Clerk, Erik Delaney and John Anthony has stepped outside the realm of colorable laws of this State to give rise to constitutional violations thereto.

the 1st, 4th, 5th, 8th and 14th amendment rights of the accused in the County of Union by impeding, circumventing and obstruction of justice of the Bill of Rights and Human Rights.

Additionally this is the very reason why I've submitted a motion for relief of counsel in accordance to Rule 116 of SCCR.

Again in accordance to the Canon Rules requesting a prompt response with getting copies of all clocked stamped indictments directly from you to me as mandate therein Rule 109(c).

Sincerely

William Branham, Prose

cc: Supreme Court Clerk
Alan Wilson
File

FILED
F.P.P. RECORD
JAN 01 5 12 PM '02
CLERK OF COURT
JAN 01, 02

State of South Carolina
County of Union

In The General Sessions
Court

Case: 2017002969

The State

v

William Brannon
Defendant

Motion To Dismiss
or Quash A Invalid
Indictment

FILED FOR RECORD
2018 JUN 21 PM 1:20
CLERK OF COURT
UNION, SC

The defendant moves now by and through the court assigned counsel for a hearing in accordance to Rule 110 (a) (2) (1) of SCCR for an order to quash or dismiss a invalid indictment stated herein.

The Fifth Amendment of the Constitution requires that every person shall be held to answer for crimes, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, The State has to present a warrant charging the defendant with a particular offense, along with sufficient evidence to support the offense in the warrant, See Rule 112 (a) of SCCR requires the Grand Jury twenty four (24) hours to return with the outcome. i.e No Bill, True Bill, or Dismissal

In the defendant William Branno case, the Grand Jury convened on March 8, 2018. But the record of the proceeding fails to demonstrate to establish a sufficient chain of custody for the drug evidence. See State v Hatcher, 384 S.C. 372, 681 S.E.2d 925 (Ct. App. 2009)

The forensic scientist at SLED receive the Best Evidence Kit B278908 from Brandon Vaughan until March 16, 2018. Considering the fact, that no forensic scientist that was qualified to perform, and test the controlled substance using a legally reliable forensic laboratory procedures approved by SLED, therefore any evidence that was not submitted under these procedures makes any evidence of a controlled substance unreliable and illegal to use in any court of law, as mandated therein Title 44, Chapter of SC Code of Law. (See Exhibit A Indictment dated March 8, 2018 and Exhibit B Forensic Lab Report dated March 16, 2018 - June 4, 2018)

Based on the facts stated herein that the State submitted a insufficient chain of custody to the Grand Jury and unreliable and unlawful results this case should be dismiss and quash the indictment.

FILED
JUN 21 5 PM 12 20
CLERK OF COURT
S.C.

Date: June 17, 2018

William Brannon

State of South Carolina
County of Union

In the Court of General
Session

The State

Case

v

William Brannon
Defendant

Objection To The
Chemical Analysis or
Chain of Custody

FILED FOR RECORD
JUN 22 PM 1:22
CLERK OF COURT
UNION

The defendant moves now, by and through his
Public Defender objecting to the Chemical Analysis
and Chain of Custody in accordance to Rule 14
(a)(e) in that the report lacks a physical chain
of custody to support evidence to substantiate the state-
ment says the substance was delivered to the Grand
Jury substantially the same condition as when it was
received and that the sworn statement states that
the weight was less than a 0.1 of a gram = 0.00
resulted in zero of controlled substances.

Dated June 21, 2018

William Brannon

Clerk, please return a stamped
file copy of the same