



RECEIVED  
JAN 29 2019  
SC Court of Appeals

## The Supreme Court of South Carolina

DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE  
CLERK OF COURT

BRENDA F. SHEALY  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11330  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1080  
FAX: (803) 734-1499

January 29, 2019

Robert Michael Dudek, Esquire  
P.O. Box 11589  
Columbia, SC 29211

Re: The State v. Wayne Hankinson  
Appellate Case No. 2017-002603

Dear Counsel:

Enclosed is correspondence received from your client which is apparently related to the above case which is pending before the South Carolina Court of Appeals. Since you represent him in this case, no action will be taken on this *pro se* correspondence by this Court. *Miller v. State*, 388 S.C. 347, 697 S.E.2d 527 (2010); *Jones v. State*, 348 S.C. 13, 558 S.E.2d 517 (2002); *State v. Stuckey*, 333 S.C. 56, 508 S.E.2d 564 (1998); *Foster v. State*, 298 S.C. 306, 379 S.E.2d 907 (1989).

Very truly yours,

CLERK

Enclosure

cc: John Benjamin Aplin, Esquire (with copy of correspondence)  
The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings (with copy of correspondence)  
Mr. Wayne Hankinson

THANK  
You for  
Your Time

RECEIVED

JAN 28 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

To Whom it may Concern:

My name is Wayne Hankinson im a prisoner at Evans Correctional institution and we are always on lockdown so we never get sufficient time in the law library, even when we are not on lockdown were only allowed to go Once a week. I barely know anything about the law or the legal system, but I do know that Im innocent. I've been accused of some of the worse charges known to man and I've been convicted of those same charges and Im now ~~being~~ three years in to a twelve year sentence. Everyday Im reading through my transcripts, wondering how I was convicted when the evidence used by the state proves that the "victim" in my case is lying. The case was one word against another and the "victims" lies are obvious. All you have to do is read the Court transcripts in order to see the fraudulent testimony. I can point out every obvious lie that was sworn to be true. ① The victim stated that my hand was cut because I grabbed the blade of the knife but I provided photos of the cut which is on the outside of my hand. ② When questioned by the solicitor the victim stated that she swung the knife at me, fell down and then I grabbed the knife out of her hand. While questioned by my public defender she says that I grab the knife out of her hand and then pushed her down. (She never said that I came at her with the knife in either testimony, so if I grabbed the blade of the knife like she stated and there was no physical altercation with the knife like I stated how did she get cut, IF I grabbed the blade it would be impossible for her

Rach

to get cut. ③ She also stated that the knife was a butter knife and even went as far as describing a actual butter knife. My Public Defender failed to provide photos of the knife but the investigator Stuart Graybeal found the knife and he was the one that actually took the photos of the knife. He testified to the knife being a fixed blade hunting knife. ④ The victim also stated that I was dragging her by her neck into the bedroom and that she was grabbing onto the furniture to prevent from going into the room but the photos show nothing moved none of the furniture was out of place. ⑤ She also stated that when we fell into the living room on top of the boxes and I released the choke hold she saw the knife by the entrance of the den and launched for it with me still behind her she turned around facing me with the knife, I took the knife and pushed her and she fell back on the boxes, but after me supposedly getting up and following her the boxes would have been behind me. The photos and all of the other evidence proves the victims perjury.

Government may not knowingly use false evidence including false testimony to obtain a tainted conviction, regardless of whether the government solicited testimony it knew or should have known to be false or simply allowed such testimony to pass uncorrected U.S. v. Barth Evidence offered by prosecution may be false either because it is verjured or though not itself factually inaccurate because it creates a false impression of the facts which is known not to be true. U.S. v. Barth

I dont know if you can help or how if you can. Im waiting on my appeal and it seems like it could be A while before I could receive it So this was a shot in the dart It feels and how P. A. P. I