

RECEIVED

OCT 09 2018

10-1-18

Ms. Jenny Kitcher **SC Court of Appeals** Pro se brief: Ineffective Counseling
Mr. Alan Wilson: Argument briefs
Ms. Melody Brown: Cruel and unjustice

I defendant Maurice Demon Mitchell understand this case has reached to the court of Appeal with the state of South Carolina with the hereby names listed above. Ms. Kathrine H. Hudgins has filed a brief without legal merits, now this case is on a Argument brief Anders v. California. I defendant Maurice Dem Mitchell has (45) days to file with the court a pro se brief addressing any issue that I believe the court should consider in this appeal. Ineffective Counseling is with or on the statements Miranda Rights. The officer David Deloach stated that he read the Defendant his rights on the arresting scene with his fellow officers on October 28, 2017 the hereby defendant was read (2.) different Miranda Rights pg. 57 Line 21-27 says: If you give up this right anything you say may be used against you in a court of law but officer Nick Ginn miranda right says: pg 69 Lines 18-20 if you give right, anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of law this was spoken on (2.) different procedures and thats ~~unusual~~ unusual then it also says: that you can decide at any time to exercise these rights and not make any statements which there are (4) miranda rights in total, DNA, Article to collect clothing, DNA oral swabs, and the officers procedure which I have spoken with my Public Defender Steven Plexico to exercise those rights which leads to ineffective counseling on both the statement, miranda Right Next, the south Carolina court of Appeal Appellate case no 2017-002474 argument was on the trial judge erred in refusing to suppress identifications

MEMORANDUM

DATE: 11/10

testimony and evidence when identification procedure used was
unnecessarily suggestive rendering the identification which was unreliable.
I defendant Maurice Demon Mitchell would like to continue the correct
argument on States Exhibits #1, 2, 3, 4 therefore with my and yours
the states conclusion based on the above argument that the court
should overturn the convictions and sentences and remand the
case for a new trial, For indictment for murder 2016-GS-25-229,
for indictment for possession of cocaine base 2015-GS-25-369,
for indictment for Burglary in the first degree 2015-GS-25-375, for
indictment for possession of a weapon during the commission of a
violent crime 2016-GS-25-373. These are all first time offenses
in all indictments charges these are not one of your prior convictions
or suspect with multiple charges of those accused crime, nor are these
repeated offenses that's being held against me that's cruel and unjust
for one its cruel to have someone with capital charges like murder
Burglary, crack cocaine, a weapon charge when they never found the
now deceased victim dead during the accused crime and its unjust
to have a photographic line-up as evidence be brought against
the defendant when the officer doesn't know where the photos came from
or who gave it to him. Its cruel to have a accused suspect have a life
sentence without the possibility of parole when false evidence been brought
against any defendant. Its unjust for a jury or judge not follow
states procedure dealing with capital charges like murder, Burglary
Drugs, violent weapons. Its cruel to be thrown in states imprisonment
for the rest of his/her life with false accusation. Its unjust for
my court judicial system judges, juries, officers, solicitors be misleading
family's. With all due respect in the state of South Carolina court of Appeal
have mercy on state charges Murder, Burglary, crack cocaine, weapon offenses.

Maurice Mitchell 331615 EA 47

L.C.I

P.O. Box 205

Ridgeville S.C. 29472

CHARLESTON SC 294

OCT 09 2018



RECEIVED

OCT 09 2018

SC Court of Appeals

S.C. Court of Appeals
Jenny ABBott Kitchens
P.O. Box 11629
Columbia, SC 29211

RECEIVED

OCT 03 2018

MAILROOM
LIEBER Q1

29211-162929

