

RECEIVED

MAY 13 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

**STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT**

JASON A. WEST, 2018-001732

PETITIONER

V.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMAS ,SUMMARY JUDGEMENT,
AND MOTION TO AMEND JOHNSON PETITION**

JASON A.WEST,2018-001732

PRO SE PETITIONER

320 REGENT STREET

SUMMERVILLE SC,29483

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

JASON WEST 2018-001732
PETITIONER,
MOTION

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AND
TO AMEND JOHNSON PETITION

- VS -

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
RESPONDENT,

NOW COMES THE PETITIONER, MR JASON A.WEST,MOVING THIS HONORABLE COURT FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS,SUMMARY JUDGEMENT,AND MOTION TO AMEND JOHNSON PETITION.PETITIONER IS CURRENTLY APPEALING APPELLATE COURT DECISION DUE TO DISPOSITIVES,CLEAR ERRORS OF LAW,AND DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS.

STATEMENT OF CASE

ON MAY 21, 2018 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ROGER M.YOUNG, SR, CHRISTOPHER MURPHY REPRESENTED PETITIONER ,KELLY OPPENHEIMER REPRESENTED THE STATE AND, AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE HEARING,JUDGE YOUNG GRANTED THE STATE'S MOTION TO HOLD THE RECORD OPEN TO ALLOW THE STATE TO PRESENT TESTIMONY FROM **PLEA COUNSEL**.DUE TO INEFFECTIVENESS OF **PCR COUNSEL** ENLIGHT OF INFORMATION KNOWN COUNSEL UNAMBIGUOUSLY REFUSED TO PRESENT CONTRADICTORY EVIDENCE CRUCIAL TO STATE'S WITNESS TESTIMONY(**SEE EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE ON CROSS EXAMINE**).DUE TO **PLEA COUNSELS** INEFFECTIVENESS SIGNATURE ISSUES,LACK OF CI RELIABILITY,PROBABLE CAUSE ISSUANCE,OMITTED FACTS,AND FABRICATION OF CRIME BY THE STATE(**N.C.P.D**) ensued.THE HONORABLE JUDGE ROGER M.YOUNG CERTIFIED CREDIBILITY OF PLEA COUNSEL AND ASSISTANT SOLICITOR ENLIGHT OF KNOWINGLY **OMITTED FACTS(CONTROLLED BUY DATE AND**

TIME, CI RELIABILITY), LACK OF STATUTORY AND CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS, PRIOR MISCONDUCT OF PLEA COUNSEL AS WELL AS AN 2017 SOUTH CAROLINA BAR FEE DISPUTE BOARDS "REPORT AND RECOMENDATION AGAINST PLEA COUNSEL". ASSISTANT SOLICITOR ADMITS TO EXISTENCE OF TWO SEARCH WARRANTS(SEE MAY 21, 2018 TRANSCRIPT PG 25 LINES 24 -5) WHERE SOLITOR STATES"THE MAGISTRATE SIGNS MULTIPLE COPIES OF THE SAME WARRANT, AND SO THEY WERE THE SAME SIGNATURES OF THE SAME PERSON, THEY WERE JUST DONE IN SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT MANNERS, AND THAT WAS DONE WHEN THE MAGISTRATE WAS SIGNING THE DIFFERENT COPIES, ONE BEING A COPY FOR MR. WEST, ONE BEING A COPY FOR THE CASE FILE, AND ONE BEING A COPY FOR NORTH CHARLESTON'S FILE."
NOTE THE EXECUTED SEARCH WARRANT IS NON- EXISTENT ON ANY AGENCY RECORD(SEE **MAPPS V OHIO**) AS WELL AS **DATE AND TIME** OF PROBABLE ISSUANCE (CONTROLLED BUY) OMITTED NON-EXISTENT CI RELIABILITY REQUIRED BY LAW .PLEA COUNSEL AS STATE'S WITNESS TESTIFIED THE HONORABLE JUDGE DEADRA JEFFERSON MADE A RULING ON THE SIGNATURE ISSUE AS FRIVOLOUS(SEE TRANSCRIPT PG 5-6 LINES 22-1)YET NO RULING EXIST ON RECORD.BY ORDER ON SEPTEMBER 20, 2018,JUDGE YOUNG DENIED PETITIONER RELIEF ENLIGHT OF DISPOSTIVES BY STATE AND WITHOUT EXPLANATION.ON SEPTEMBER 20,2018,PETITIONER SERVED HIS NOTICE OF APPEAL.

LEGAL ARGUMENT

WE THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN ORDER TO FORM A MORE PERFECT UNION AND ESTABLISH JUSTICE DID ORDAIN AND ESTABLISHED THE CONSTITUTION FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.THE PETITIONER CONTENDS THE **4TH AMENDMENT** ORDAINS "NO SEARCH WARRANT SHALL BE ISSUED UNLESS PROBABLE CAUSE IS ESTABLISHED FOR ISSUANCE.SOUTH CAROLINA STATE STATUTORY **LAW 17-13-140** DOES NOT REQUIRE A JUDGE TO SIGN THE SEARCH WARRANT.THE STATUE HOWEVER REQUIRES THE SEARCH WARRANT TO BE ISSUED.ISSUANCE UNDER THE STATE REQUIRES A **JUDGE SIGNATURE**,THIS IS TO ENSURE PROBABLE CAUSE EXIST FOR THE ISSUANCE OF **THE SEARCH WARRANT** AND VALIDATES THAT THE WARRANT IS LEGAL AS LAW REQUIRES.EVIDENCE WOULD SHOW THE RESPONDENTS CONDUCTED A SEARCH OF THE PETITIONERS RESIDENCE WITHOUT MEETING STATUTORY AND CONSTITUTIONS REQUIREMENTS AND NO SWORN TESTIMONY OF CI EXIST ON RECORD OF ANY AGENCY. DULLY **NOTE EXECUTED SEARCH WARRANT DOES NOT EXIST ON RECORD YET IS ADMITTEDLY DIFFERENT IN MOST CRUIAL AREA BEING SIGNATURES AND NO ORIGINAL IS ACCOUNTED FOR ON ANY AGENCY RECORD(SEE MAPPS V OHIO 367 US 643. SEE SECTION 17-13-150** REQUIRES SAID WARRANT BE A **COPY** BY DEFINITION A **ORIGINAL WRITTING** WOULD MEAN ANY SLIGHT ALTERATION TO **JUDGE'S SIGNATURE** IN OR ON SEARCH WARRANT EXECUTED WOULD DEEM SEARCH WARRANT OF RECORD INVALID AND SIGNED AFTER SEARCH VIOLATING PETITIONERS **4TH AMMENDMENT** RIGHTS(SEE SEARCH WARRANT ENCLOSED AND WARRANT OF RECORD EXHIBIT). OMITTED FACTS OF PROBABLE CAUSE ISSUANCE (**SWORN CI STATEMENTS OF RELIABILITY,PRERECORDED CURRENCY,DATE AND TIMES OF CONTROLLED BUY, VIDEO/AUDIO CHAIN OF CUSTODY,NO DECLARATION OF CORROBORATION**)

CONSTITUTES BRADY VIOLATIONS, DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS, AND PREJUDICE LEADING TO COERCION OF PLEA. PLEA COUNSEL (SEE PG 7 JULY 26, 2018 LINES 7-16) TESTIFIES AUDIO CONNECTED PETITIONER TO ALLEGED CONTROLLED BUY YET, THE AGENCY EXECUTING THE SEARCH LEGAL DEPARTMENT HAS NO RECORD OF ANY SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NO CHAIN OF CUSTODY LOG IN/EVIDENCE TAG FOR AUDIO/VIDEO) ON RECORD AFTER SEVERAL F.O.I.A REQUEST (SEE EMAIL FROM LEGAL DEPARTMENT). THIS STATEMENT CHALLENGE THE INTEGRITY OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND VIOLATES PETITIONERS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS BECAUSE, NO EVIDENCE FACT EXIST SUPPORTING THIS CLAIM. A DVD WAS RELEASED JANUARY 24, 2019 BY BETH WOODALL N.C.P.D LEGAL DEPARTMENT CONTAINING ONLY 38 PICTURES OF THE DAY THE SEARCH WARRANT WAS EXECUTED OCTOBER 2, 2013 AND IS SAID TO BE ALL NCPD'S LEGAL DEPARTMENT HAS IN THEIR POSSESSION (NOTE DVD WAS NEVER LOGGED IN CHAIN OF CUSTODY SEE RULE 5). NOTHING SUPPORTING ANY VIDEO/AUDIO WAS MENTION IN BODY OF SEARCH WARRANT AS LAW REQUIRES. LACK OF THESE CRUCIAL ELEMENTS BY STATE CONSTITUTES CONSTRUCTION OF A CRIME BY STATE AS WELL AS BLATANT ACTS OF PERJURY COMMITTED BY STATE'S WITNESS (PLEA COUNSEL) AND FRAUD UPON THE COURT FOR PLEA THROUGH COERCION DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS THROUGH FABRICATED FACTS (SEE NAPUE V. ILLINOIS 360 US 264, 79S CT. 1173, 3.L.E d 2d 1217). ASSISTANT SOLICITOR CERTIFIED KNOWINGLY NON -EXISTENT FABRICATED FACTS LEADING TO COERCION OF PLEA (SEE TRANSCRIPT JANUARY 7, 2016 PG 7 LINES 18-20 AND RULE 5). ASSISTANT SOLICITOR TESTIFIES (ALSO SEE TRANSCRIPT LINES 20- 21) THE NORTH CHARLESTON POLICE THE STATES EXECUTING AGENCY'S RETURN WAS MADE OUTSIDE OF THE TEN DAYS REQUIRED BY LAW ESTABLISHING THAT ANY OMITTED FACTS FROM RETURN WERE NON-EXISTENT AND OR DELIBERATELY WITHHELD (SEE 38 PAGE RULE 5 AND TRANSCRIPT). PLEA COUNSEL STATES THE HONORABLE JUDGE JEFFERSON MADE DETERMINATION THERE WAS NO BASIS ON THE SIGNATURE ISSUE LABELING AS FRIVOLOUS AT PLEA HEARING (SEE TRANSCRIPT PG 5-6 LINE 23- 3) NOTE NO RULING EXIST ON RECORD CLEAR ERROR OF LAW MADE BY JUDGE ACCORDING TO ATTORNEY GENERAL OPINION SEE STATE V CONVERT, 628 SE 2d 482. DUE TO PLEA COUNSELS and PCR COUNSEL INEFFECTIVENESS THESE ISSUES WERE NEVER ADDRESSED BEFORE NEGOTIATION OF PLEA NOR AT PCR HEARING ENLIGHT OF STATE V COVERT, 628 SE 2d 482. STATES ATTEMPT TO JUSTIFY MULTIPLE JUDGES SIGNATURES AND MULTIPLE SEARCH WARRANTS FOR THE SAME SEARCH CREATES A SERIOUS DISPOSITIVE. STATUTORY LAW 17-13-140 REQUIRES A JUDGE'S SIGNATURE NOT SIGNATURES AS THE STATE ATTEMPTS TO LEGITIMIZE A NON- EXISTENT SEARCH WARRANT THAT WAS EXECUTED YET, NOT ON ANY AGENCYS RECORD. SECTION 17-13-150 CLEARLY ESTABLISHES THE PERSONS BEING SERVED ARE TO RECEIVE AN COPY OF SAID SEARCH WARRANT AFTER JUDGE'S SIGNATURE VALIDATES IT. AGAIN I NOTE SIGNATURE SINGULAR NOT PLURAL AND WELL AS LAW UNAMBIGUOUSLY STATES THE SEARCH WARRANT SINGULAR. FURTHERMORE BLACK'S LAWS DEFINES COPY; COPYING. A TRANSCRIPT, DOUBLE, IMITATION, OR REPRODUCTION OF AN ORIGINAL WRITTING, PAINTING, INSTRUMENT, OR THE LIKE. UNDER BEST EVIDENCE RULE, A COPY MAY NOT BE INTRODUCED UNTIL ORIGINAL IS ACCOUNTED FOR (NOTE THE EXECUTED

SEARCH WARRANT DOES NOT EXIST ON RECORD).ASSISTANT SOLICITOR EVEN TESTIFIES THREE WARRANTS EXIST(SEE MAY 21,2018 TRANSCRIPT PG 25,26 LINES 24-5) "THE MAGISTRATE SIGNS MULTIPLE COPIES OF THE SAME WARRANT,AND SO THEY WERE THE SAME SIGNATURES OF THE SAME PERSON THEY WERE JUST DONE IN SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT MANNERS, AND THAT WAS DONE WHEN THE MAGISTRATE WAS SIGNING THE DIFFERENT COPIES,ONE BEING A COPY FOR MR.WEST,ONE BEING A COPY FOR THE CASE FILE, AND ONE BEING A COPY FOR NORTH CHARLESTON'S FILE (CLEAR ERROR OF LAW SEE 17-13-140).QUESTION OF LAW COULD NOT THE OFFICER JUST SIGN THE SEARCH WARRANT HIMSELF SEARCH FIND WHAT HE/SHE WANTS PRINT THE SAME WARRANT AND THEN HAVE A JUDGE ON DUTY THAT DAY SIGN THE OTHER WARRRANT AND VOUCH HE/SHE SIGNED THEM BOTH? IF SO WHAT WOULD BE THE NEED OF STATUTORY OR CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND THE IMPORTANCE OF A JUDGES SIGNATURE?IT IS CLEARLY STATED IN STATE V COVERT ,628 SE 2d 482 THE IMPORTANTANCE OF A SIGNATURE IS CRUCIAL.(SEE MOTION OF DENIAL BASED ON NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE WHERE ASSISTANCE SOLICITOR STATES MR WEST(WHO DID NOT TAKE THE BAR) "COULD HAVE REALIZED THERE WERE MULTIPLE COPIES OF THE SAME WARRANT SIGNED BY THE SAME JUDGE". THE STATE ATTEMPTS TO REINTERPET CLEARLY DEFINED LAW" SECOND DISPOSTIVE BEING THE LACK OF INFORMATION ON FACE OF WARRANT AND OMITTED RECORD NEEDED TO ESTABLISH PROBABLE CAUSE ISSUANCE"IN JOHNSON AS HERE THE AFFIDAVIT DID NOT CONTAIN ANY INFORMATION REGARDING THE RELIABILITY OF THE INFORMANT NOR WAS THERE ANY CORROBORATION.OUR SUPREME COURT DECLINED TO APPLY THE GOOD FAITH EXCEPTION IF THE UNDERLYING AFFIDAVIT DOES NOT INCLUDE SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO ALLOW A MAGISTRATE TO DETERMINE PROBABLE CAUSE JOHNSON;302 S.C 248.395 S.E.2d.IT IS ESSENTIAL"that the magistrate perform his neutral and detached function and not serve merely as a rubber stamp for the police". in kuhn v smith.DUE TO PCR COUNSEL INEFFECTIVENESS THESE ISSUES AND KNOWN ACTS OF PERJURY WERE UNCHALLENGED IN CROSS-EXAMINATION OF PLEA COUNSEL AND SOLICITOR AS WELL AS UNPERSERVED IN HIGHLY REQUESTED 59E(see email correspondences WITH PCR COUNSEL AND TRANSCRIPT) citing US V FISHER 711 .3d 460 2013 "GIVEN THE TOTALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS CASE - A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER INTENTIONALLY LYING IN A AFFIDAVIT THAT FORMED THE SOLE BASIS FOR SEARCHING THE DEFENDANT'S HOME,WHERE EVIDENCE FORMING THE BASIS OF THE CHARGE INTO WHICH HE PLED QUILTY WAS FOUND DEFENDANT'S PLEA WAS INVOLUNTARY AND VIOLATED DUE PROCESS RIGHTS.UNDER THESE EGREGIOUS CIRCUMSTANCES, DEFENDANT WAS DECEIVED INTO MAKING THE PLEA, AND DECEPTION PREVENTS HIS ACT FROM BEING A TRUE ACT OF VOLITION."LASSITER V. TURNER 423 F.2d 897,900(4TH CIR 1970). DUE TO INEFFECTIVENESS OF PLEA COUNSEL 1) never filing motion to suppress based on omitted facts,OMITTED DATE AND TIME OF CONTROLLED BUY,OMITTED NON EXIST LOG IN OF VIDEO/AUDIO,NON EXISTENT CI RELIABILITY,NON EXIST DECLARATION OF CORROBORATION 2) NOT DOING A REASONABLE INVESTIGATION ALLOWED THESE OMITTED CRUCIAL ELEMENTS OF THE STATE'S CASE THAT ARE NON-EXISTENT ON ANY AGENCY RECORD TO BE REFERED TO AS FACTS 3)NOT PRESENTING ADVERSIAL CHALLENGE WHEN THE

RECORD REVEALS LACK OF STATUTORY AND CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS. (SEE RULE 5 SEARCH WARRANT ,EXECUTED SEARCH WARRANT,TRANSCRIPT AND N.C.P.D RECORD ALSO SEE KOLLE V STATE 690 SE 2d 73,386 SC 578, STATE V. ADOLPHE 441 SE 2d 832 AND MAPPS V OHIO. FURTHERMORE THE INEFFECTIVENESS OF PLEA COUNSEL LED PETITIONER TO BELIEVE AUDIO MAY EXIST WHEN THE RECORD REVEALS NO VIDEO/AUDIO EXIST(SEE TRANSCRIPT JULY 26,2018 PG 7 ,RULE 5 AND AGENCY RECORD).DUE TO PCR COUNSEL INEFFECTIVENESS TO PRESENT PROOF OF KNOWN PAST MISCONDUCT BY PLEA COUNSEL(SEE SOUTH CAROLINA BAR FEE DISPUTE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION FEBRUARY 6, 2017 ALSO SEE MAY 18,2009 SUSPENSION) PERJUDICE WAS ENSUED AGAINST PETITIONER.JUDGE YOUNG DEEM PLEA COUNSEL CREDIBLE ENLIGHT OF FACTS KNOWN ON RECORD ABOUT STATE'S WITNESS.JUDGE YOUNG ALSO COMMENTED CLEAR ERROR BY MAKING DETERMINATION OF CREDIBILITY WITHOUT ANY FACTUAL FINDINGS.CITING SCHWARTZ V. KOMINSKI,25 I11 APP.3d 789,324 N.E.2d 91,93 any omissions are indeed errors of no errors in fact or some fact is supposed to exist which really does not. " an abuse of dicretion arises from error of law or a factual conclusion that is without evidentiary support" state v kirton 2008. DUE TO PCR COUNSEL INEFFECTIVENESS BRADY VIOLATONS WERE NOT RAISED ENLIGHT OF FILING MADE BY PETITIONER OCT 31,2017 REQUESTING PCR ATTORNEY PRESENT ISSUES ON REORD SEE FILING)

CONCLUSION

PETITIONER RESPECTFUL REQUEST THIS COURT GRANTS RELIEF IN FORM OF VACATE OF SENTENCE AND CONVICTION WITH STATEMENT OF FACTS AND CONCLUSION INCLUDED.AND OR REMAND FOR NEW TRIAL.




JASON A.WEST PRO SE

PETITIONER

2018-001732

THIS 11th DAY OF MAY 11, 2019

SWORN TO BEFORE ME
THIS THE 11th DAY OF
May, 2019



RAYBURNE J. TURNER
My Commission Expires:
August 21, 2024

Charleston County)	South Carolina Bar
)	Fee Dispute Resolution Committee
In Re: Jason West)	
)	
vs.)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
)	
Louis Moore, Esq.)	
_____)	

The South Carolina Bar referred this matter to me to conduct an investigation and following that, to make a written report and recommendation pursuant to Rule 11 of the Fee Dispute Resolution Rules (Rule 416 of the *South Carolina Appellate Court Rules*). I have talked to the complainant, Mr. West, by telephone. I also met with Mr. Moore at his office to discuss this claim as well as to review his entire file to aid me in my recommendation. Please see attached investigation timeline and notes created contemporaneously with my investigation.

Based on my review of the testimony, the documents provided to me by all parties and my interview with the parties, I find that the following are the material facts:

1. Mr. West hired Mr. Moore on or about November 11, 2015 to represent him on two charges in General Sessions Court related to cocaine possession and distribution. Very serious charges.
2. The amount of the fee agreed to is in dispute and after investigation and examination of Mr. Moore's records, remains unclear. Mr. Moore's records contained an invoice showing that the fee was \$7,500.00 with a \$2,500.00 down payment on November 11, 2015. It is undisputed that this down payment notation was incorrect. The fee agreement (unexecuted copy) reviewed during my office visit noted a \$7,500.00 fee, but also included an hourly fee of \$175.00 per hour, and made no indication that prices would vary based on plea or trial.
3. It is undisputed that Mr. West paid Mr. Moore \$4,500.00 toward fees, but the balance is unclear as no solid documentation existed as to what the actual fee was to be. The \$4,500.00 was paid over time with multiple payments, but both parties agreed to the amount paid and received.

Proof of Ineffectiveness

4. Mr. Moore was hired while a trial date was pending, so Mr. Moore asked for a continuance to properly prepare. His initial representation and discovery motions were riddled with mistakes, some of which named the wrong defendant as well as naming himself incorrectly as Melissa Gay. The file showed no evidence of the receipt of any discovery, other than a rap sheet and the warrant. It also contained a print out of the applicable criminal statute, but it should be noted that the time and date stamp on that paper was dated the day I visited his office to review the file.
5. Mr. West entered a guilty plea on January 7, 2016 to Trafficking of Cocaine 10g but < 28g, 1st. SC Code of Laws 44-53-0370(e)(2)(a)(1) and received a sentence of 5 years with credit for time served.


Based on my investigation into the facts of this claim, I conclude that Mr. West and Mr. Moore entered into an attorney/client relationship for an uncertain sum, but \$4,500.00 was paid in approximately fourteen (14) installments. I conclude that the scope of the representation required Mr. Moore to represent Mr. West until the conclusion of his cases, be it by plea or trial. I conclude the legal fee charged in the amount of \$4,500.00 was an extremely reasonable fee to pay for the pending charges against Mr. West. Mr. Moore made multiple visits with Mr. West, most of which were in regard to payment being made for legal fees, but some matters of law were discussed at those meetings. Mr. Moore made two court appearances, once for a roster meeting and another for the plea date. However, although Mr. Moore's file contained a time sheet illustrating that 24.4 hours had been spent on Mr. West's case, the file contained no work product other than initial filings. Mr. Moore was given ample opportunity to provide my office with supplemental documentation such as notes, e-mails, records of phone calls, etc. This investigator was repeatedly told that they were forthcoming, but have never been received.

Based on the foregoing, I conclude and recommend that \$2,500.00 of the legal fee collected by Mr. Moore should be refunded to Mr. West. Most of Mr. West's statements

Proof of Ineffectiveness

made to me during the course of my investigation were in regard to the quality of the representation and not the reasonableness of the fee charged and whether or not the services provided justified the fee. Although I conclude that the fee was very reasonable related to the charges Mr. West was facing, I saw very little evidence of any actual time spent on the case. I conclude that the services provided did not justify the fee charged to Mr. West without taking into account quality of services or the outcome of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Adam Mlynarczyk, Esq.
KOONTZ MLYNARCZYK, LLC
1058 E. Montague Avenue
North Charleston, SC 29405
Phone: 843-225-4252
Fax: 843-277-9120
adam@kmlawsc.com

Member S. C. Bar Fee Dispute Resolution
Committee

February 6, 2017
North Charleston, SC

REQUEST FOR PRESENTMENT OF ADVERSARIAL CHALLENGE ON RECORD THROUGH PCR
AMENDMENT IN ORDINANCE WITH RULE 71.1(d)SCRCP

GROUND OF INEFFECTIVENESS

(1) COERCION OF PLEA THROUGH DEFICIENT PERFORMANCE (a) ILL-ADVISEMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS REGARDING THE SEARCH WARRANTS (2) LACK OF ADVERSARY CHALLENGE (a) FALSE STATEMENT ALLOWANCE "THERE ARE A FEW POTENTIAL ISSUES WITH THE SEARCH WARRANT. THE STATE'S OPINION IS THAT THE SEARCH WARRANT WOULD STAND UP" (see TRANSCRIPT pg 9 lines 1-3) "THIS OCCURRED OCTOBER 1, 2013" (see TRANSCRIPT pg 7 lines 13-14) "FURTHERMORE HE STATED THAT HE SOLD DRUGS OUT OF THE HOUSE" (see TRANSCRIPT pg 8 lines 10-11) (also see RULE 5 pg 14)

"IN CONSIDERING AN ALLEGATION ON PCR THAT A QUILTY PLEA WAS BASED ON INACCURATE ADVISE OF COUNSEL, THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE QUILTY PLEA HEARING WILL BE CONSIDERED TO DETERMINE WHETHER ANY POSSIBLE ERROR BY COUNSEL WAS CURED BY THE INFORMATION COMEYED AT THE PLEA HEARING" in STALK V. STATE 2007

(3) LACK OF INVESTIGATION (a) FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE PRESENCE OF TWO (2) SEARCH WARRANTS (b) FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE ARREST WARRANT DATED OCTOBER 1, 2013 (c) FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE SUPPORTING AFFIDAVIT OF ARREST WARRANT DATED OCTOBER 1 & 2 AS DATE OF OCCURANCE (d) FAILURE TO REQUEST OMITTED DATE AND TIME OF ALLEGED CONTROLLED BUY (e) FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE RULE 5 pg 10 dated 9/24/13 9:56pm (4) SERIOUS ERRORS (a) NEGOTIATED A PLEA FOR OCTOBER 1, 2013 FOR NON-EXISTENT CRIME (b) ALLOWANCE OF SUPPRESSION BY PROSECUTION OF EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE (c) FAILURE TO PERFORM ADVERSARY DUTIES REQUIRED BY LAW

GROUND FOR BRADY VIOLATION

"A BRADY CLAIM IS COMPLETE IF THE ACCUSED CAN DEMONSTRATE (1) THE EVIDENCE WAS FAVORABLE TO THE ACCUSED (2) IT WAS IN THE POSSESSION OR KNOW TO THE PROSECUTION (3) IT WAS SUPPRESSED BY THE PROSECUTION AND (4) IT WAS MATERIAL OR PUNISHMENT" in SHEPPARD V. STATE 2004 (1) FAVORABLE EVIDENCE (a) INCOMPETENT EVIDENCE ASSEMBLED IN & OMITTED FROM RULE 5 AFTER NOTICE REQUEST (2) IN POSSESSION OF (a) (ARREST WARRANT DATED 10/01/2013 NON-CRIME, SUPPORTING AFFIDAVIT DATED 10/01/2013 & 10/02/2013 SAME CRIME) (b) SUPPRESSED BY PROSECUTION EXISTENCE OF TWO (2) SEARCH WARRANTS UNPRODUCED/UNRECORDED IN ANY AGENCY RECORDS (a) PROBABLE CAUSE REQUIRED BY LAW FOR ISSUANCE OF SEARCH (b) DATE AND TIME OF SEARCH (c) PRERECORDED U.S CURRENCY DESCRIBED IN SEARCH WARRANT (d) STATEMENTS (e) CHAIN OF CUSTODY SHEET FROM ON SCENE K-9

FILED
OCT 31 AM 9:43
CLERK J. GENTRONG

FOIA.

Woodall, Beth

From: Clark, Ellen
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 10:21 AM
To: Woodall, Beth
Subject: FW: Freedom of information act request

Ellen Clark
Municipal Clerk

RECEIVED

SEP 28 2018

LEGAL DEPARTMENT

From: Jason West [mailto:megabucks843@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 6:30 AM
To: Clark, Ellen <ellenclark@northcharleston.org>
Subject: Freedom of information act request

My name is Jason Antonio west there is said to be audio and possible video for warrant 2013A1010205385 /OCA number 2013033155 UNRELEASED TO ME IN PREVIOUS FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST FOR ANY AND ALL EVIDENCE INVOLVED OR ASSOCIATED WITH CASE NUMBER OR WARRANT NUMBER STATED ABOVE. I AM AGAIN REQUESTING THIS INFORMATION AT YOUR EARLIEST CONVENIENCE FOR PICK UP OR A LETTER HEAD STATING NO INFORMATION EXISTS OR HAS EXISTED IN THE FORM OF AUDIO OR VIDEO FOR CASE/WARRANT NUMBER STATED ABOVE. SINCERELY JASON WEST

OK JR
9/28/18
BWC is FOIA exempt

cheif



Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>

FOIA

Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>
Draft

Thu, Jan 24, 2019 at 1:50 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Woodall, Beth** <bwoodall@northcharleston.org>
Date: Thu, Jan 24, 2019, 2:48 PM
Subject: FOIA
To: megabucks843@gmail.com <megabucks843@gmail.com>

Hi Mr. West,

I have a DVD for you with responsive data to your FOIA request. This data is all that the City has which is not exempt under Title 30, SC Code of Laws. Please provide me with an address and I'll be happy to drop this in the mail to you.

Beth Woodall

Legal Assistant

City of North Charleston

2500 City Hall Lane

North Charleston, SC 29406

bwoodall@northcharleston.org

Tel: 843.740.2550

Fax: 843.745.1082

www.northcharleston.org**a great place to live, work, or play** cid:image001.jpg@01CA7F32.DA178FB0

Please do not print this e-mail unless necessary.

2 attachments**image001.jpg**

warrant left at residence

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County of Charleston

City of North Charleston

SEARCH WARRANT

OCA: 2013033155

Location:

**7674 Peppercorn Lane
North Charleston, SC 29418**

Date: 09-26-2013

Officers: Detective D. Pritchard

warrant left at residence

OCA# 2013033155

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

AFFIDAVIT

COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

Personally appeared before me, one D. Pritchard
who, being duly sworn, says that there is probable cause to believe that certain property subject to seizure under provisions of Section 17-13-140, 1976 Code of Laws of South Carolina, as amended, is located on the following premises in this County:

INTRODUCTION

I am a Detective with the North Charleston Police Department currently assigned to the Narcotics Unit. I have been employed with the City of North Charleston since 2007. I have been trained in various aspects of law enforcement, particularly the investigation of narcotics. During my employment with the City of North Charleston, I have participated in over three hundred search warrants related to drug investigations. I have been a Police Officer for approximately eleven years and have made hundreds of drug related arrest to include being the case agent and or assistant case agent on over one hundred search warrants. I am the case agent leading this case. I am responsible for coordinating and overseeing all aspects of the current investigation and thoroughly familiar with all information contained in this affidavit.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY SOUGHT

1. Illegal drugs commonly known as marijuana but not limited to, also cocaine, cocaine base (crack), methamphetamine, heroin, opiates, LSD, hashish, prescribed controlled medication and any other illegal drug or controlled substances.
2. Paraphernalia used for the administration of illegal drugs by oral, intravenous, subcutaneous, inhalation, to include, but not limited to, small hollow metal/glass pipe, copper in color mesh, drinking straws, rolling papers, syringes, spoons and any other instrument fashioned in such a way as to assist in the administration of illegal or controlled substances.
3. Books, records, notes, ledgers and other papers relating to the transportation, ordering, purchasing and distribution of controlled substances. Narcotic traffickers commonly "front" (provide narcotics on consignment) narcotics to their clients; and that the aforementioned books, records, receipts, notes, ledgers, etc: are maintained where the traffickers have ready access to them.
4. Papers, tickets, notes, schedules, receipts and other items relating to domestic and international travel.
5. Books, electronic documents, records, receipts, bank statements / records, currency drafts, letters of credit, money orders, cashier's checks, passbooks, bank checks, safe deposit box keys and other items evidencing the obtaining, secreting, transfer, concealment, and/or expenditure of currency.
6. United States currency (or currency from abroad), precious metals, jewelry, financial instruments, including but not limited to, stocks and bonds in the amount indicative of the proceeds of illegal drug enterprising.
7. Photographs, in particular photographs of conspirators and co-conspirators, of assets and/or controlled substances, still photographs, negatives, video tapes, cassette tapes, films, undeveloped film, slides and undeveloped film and the contents therein.
8. Electronic related device that may house information pertaining to sales, purchase, co-conspirators information or any information pertaining to illegal drug enterprising. To include but not limited to computers, floppy disc, compact disk, lap top, hard drive, organizers, cellular phones and pagers.
9. Papers, records and any other item showing a combination or relationship among conspirators and co-conspirators by real or alias names, correspondence, papers, records and any other items showing employment or lack of employment, or reflecting income or expenses.

(2)

10. Paraphernalia for packaging, manicuring, weighing and distributing illegal drugs, including but not limited to, scales, measuring devices, bags, grinders, diluters, wrapping boxes and tape.
11. Indicia of occupancy, residency and/or ownership of the premises described above, including but not limited to, utility bills, telephone bills, water bills, concealed envelopes, keys and misc. bills or letters identifying such occupant / owner.
12. Firearms and ammunition, including but not limited to, handguns, pistols, revolvers, rifles, shotguns or any other weapons and any receipts or records pertaining to firearms and ammunition.
13. Receipts for items evidencing the expenditure of the proceeds of drug distribution, including but not limited to, clothing, furniture and electronic equipment or any other fruits of illegal drug sales.
14. That drug traffickers very often place their assets, including but not limited to automobiles, residences, phones and bank accounts in names other than their own in order to avoid detection of these assets by government agencies.
15. That drug traffickers often store information relating to their drug trafficking activities in home safes, lock boxes, and other sealed containers.
16. That drug traffickers utilize cellular telephones, e-mail accounts and other communications devices to transmit information relating to their drug trafficking activities and that these devices store information of such communications.

DESCRIPTION OF PREMISES (PERSON, PLACE OR THING)
TO BE SEARCHED

The location to be searched is located at 7674 Peppercorn Lane North Charleston, SC 29418. This location is better described as a single family home with a finished room above the garage on the right side of the residence. The home has red brick, white trim and burgundy shutters. The numbers "7674" are clearly posted on the front door, visible from the roadway.

Based on information detailed later in this affidavit, I have reason to believe that the residents at this address have used and continue to use 7674 Peppercorn Lane to commit violations connected to illegal drug use and distribution. To get to this location from North Charleston City Hall located at 2500 City Hall Lane, one would turn left onto Mall Dr. and then merge onto I-26 west bound. Continue on I-26 west bound until one reaches Ashley Phosphate Rd. One would then make a left on Ashley Phosphate Rd and continue until one reaches Peppercorn Lane on the right. A right would be made onto Peppercorn Lane and one would continue on Peppercorn Lane until one reaches "7674 on the right.

This search warrant is to include all rooms, attics, basements, closets, cabinets, safes, false walls, and any other location that could conceal illegal narcotics or evidence of illegal narcotics trafficking and/or sales. Also to include any out buildings or storage areas located on the property and the grounds within the property's borders. The location has been identified as a place where illegal narcotics are used, sold, or stored, and it is common in such places that subjects conceal illegal narcotics and/or weapons on their person, therefore, also to include all persons located at the residence at the time the search is executed. Also in these locations, it is common to have numerous vehicles coming to and from the residence, and that illegal narcotics are transported in these vehicles, therefore, also to include any vehicles located at or associated with the residence at the time the search is executed.

Warrant left at residence

OCA # 2013033155

REASON FOR AFFIANTS BELIEF THAT THE
PROPERTY SOUGHT IS ON THE SUBJECT PREMISES

Trailwood mobile p

+

Since the affidavit is being submitted for the limited purpose of securing authorization to search 5427 Lee St North Charleston SC 29418. I have not included each and every fact known to me concerning this investigation. I have only set forth the facts and circumstances that I believe are sufficient to establish the requisite amount of probable cause to support the issuance of a search warrant for that location.

1. The North Charleston Police Department Narcotics Unit utilized a confidential informant to purchase an illicit substance from this residence. The confidential informant was escorted to the location by an undercover detective. Once on scene the C/I exited the vehicle and made contact with a subject at this residence. The illicit substance was obtained in exchange for prerecorded U.S. Currency. At the conclusion of the transaction the illicit substance was turned over to the undercover detective. The substance field tested presumptive for an illicit drug and was placed in evidence.

Conclusion

Wherefore, I respectfully submit that there is probable cause to believe that upon service of this warrant at 7674 Peppercorn Lane North Charleston, SC 29418 will contain material and relevant evidence of drug trafficking, distribution and packaging activities related to the violations of the state and city offenses enumerated here in above.

Sworn to and Subscribed before me

this 20th day of September, 2013.

[Signature]
Signature of Judge (L.S.)

[Signature]

Affiant

Address: 2500 City Hall Lane
North Charleston, SC 29406
Phone: 554-5700

4-17
[Signature]

Warrant left at residence

OCA # 2013033155

REASON FOR AFFIANTS BELIEF THAT THE PROPERTY SOUGHT IS ON THE SUBJECT PREMISES

Trailwood mobile pr

Since the affidavit is being submitted for the limited purpose of securing authorization to search 5427 Lee St North Charleston SC 29418. I have not included each and every fact known to me concerning this investigation. I have only set forth the facts and circumstances that I believe are sufficient to establish the requisite amount of probable cause to support the issuance of a search warrant for that location.

- 1. The North Charleston Police Department Narcotics Unit utilized a confidential informant to purchase an illicit substance from this residence. The confidential informant was escorted to the location by an undercover detective. Once on scene the C/I exited the vehicle and made contact with a subject at this residence. The illicit substance was obtained in exchange for prerecorded U.S. Currency. At the conclusion of the transaction the illicit substance was turned over to the undercover detective. The substance field tested presumptive for an illicit drug and was placed in evidence.

Conclusion

Wherefore, I respectfully submit that there is probable cause to believe that upon service of this warrant at 7674 Peppercorn Lane North Charleston, SC 29418 will contain material and relevant evidence of drug trafficking, distribution and packaging activities related to the violations of the state and city offenses enumerated here in above.

Sworn to and Subscribed before me this 26th day of September, 2013. Signature of Judge (L.S.)

Affiant Address: 2500 City Hall Lane North Charleston, SC 29406 Phone: 554-5700

4-17

warrant left at residence

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

SEARCH WARRANT

COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

TO ANY BONDED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OF THIS STATE OR COUNTY OR OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF NORTH CHARLESTON.

It is appearing from the attached affidavit that there are reasonable grounds to believe that certain property subject to seizure under provisions of Section 17-13-140, 1976 Code of Laws of South Carolina, as amended, is located on the following premises:

DESCRIPTION OF PREMISES (PERSON, PLACE OR THING) TO BE SEARCHED

The location to be searched is located at 7674 Peppercorn Lane North Charleston, SC 29418. This location is better described as a single family home with a finished room above the garage on the right side of the residence. The home has red brick, white trim and burgundy shutters. The numbers "7674" are clearly posted on the front door, visible from the roadway.

Now, therefore, you are hereby authorized to search the subject premises for the property described below and to seize such property if found:

DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

-See Affidavit-

This Search Warrant shall not be valid for more than ten days from date of issuance.

A written inventory of all property seized pursuant to this Search Warrant shall be made to Issuing Judge within ten days from the date of this warrant, such inventory to be signed by the officer executing this warrant, and a copy of such inventory shall be furnished to the person whose premises are searched if demand for such copy is made.

A copy of this Search Warrant shall be delivered to the person in charge of premises searched at the time of such search if practicable, and if not, to such person as soon thereafter as is practicable; in the event the identify of the person in charge is not known or if such person cannot be found after reasonable diligence in attempting to locate the person, a copy shall be attached to prominent place on such premises.

[Signature], S. C. 2013.

[Signature] (L.S.)
Signature of Judge

This warrant is not on the record and its clear the signatures are different and the difference between the two are very clear the way the date is written and the signature. The body of the warrants are the same and North Char. Police Dept's records contain only one warrant and that the warrant done after the Dec



Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>

Plea Agreement

POA 59 Required

Christopher Murphy <cmurphy@rlattorneys.com>

Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 6:06 AM

To: Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>, "Christopher L. Murphy, Esq." <chris@chrismurphyfirm.com>

Cc: Jodi Hanshaw <jhanshaw@rlattorneys.com>

Jason – I can't make much sense your emails other than you disagree with the language of the order and specifically, the courts findings. However that is the purpose of the appeal which I filed. I did not file a Rule 59(e) motion since the original order preserves the issues for appeal and then some. The 59(e) motion is not required to file an appeal and I have filed the appeal with the Supreme Court in your matter. As such, I am no longer your attorney and you can contact the Office of Appellate Defense.

As for the tangential issues, I am glad you keep you keep all my emails and letters. That is the purpose so you will have a record of everything I did on your case. I responded to all emails; always returned calls and met with you whenever you requested. If you think I committed an error, you can file a claim against me which is your right and you know the process. You can also report me to the judge if you wish. The case law you submitted doesn't apply to you and the statutes and cannons you cite are also inapplicable.

Regardless, I wish you the best with your appeal. My representation of you in this matter is over.

Christopher L. Murphy, Esquire

Admitted in South Carolina

234 Seven Farms Drive, Suite 128


Charleston, SC 29492

cmurphy@rlattorneys.com

direct line 843-494-5454

cell 843-926-0146

Contact Information





Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>

What can be attacked at this hearing

*Request of PCR
counsel*

Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>

Sun, Jul 22, 2018 at 2:04 PM

To: "Christopher L. Murphy, Esq." <chris@chrismurphyfirm.com>

Can i only attack his lack of performance?can I attack his credibility?you have yet to meet with me or discuss any plans so I use each email to you to document my request!the brady violations?the signature issue which you know no matter what the judge told you legally he could NOT have signed any search warrant due to lack of information better yet evidentiary FACTS.and before you lie to me again I have a freedom of information act request you really might want to see.so if you plan say the officers gave him oral testimony you better be perpare to answer for that statement.case law I'll give you US v holtzclaw 2018,and 33 similar citations,US V CAMPBELL 2016 AND 21 SIMILAR CITATIONS,US V WELLMAN 2009 AND 17 SIMILAR,US V. GARY 2006,i can go on and on all i asks is you do your job as law requires stop trying to play remember iam SHARP AS YOU CALLED ME.SO IF THE JUDGE WILL HAVE TO RULE OVER SEVERAL PRECEDENT CASE NOT TO RULE IN MY FAVOR.SO I HAVE REALLY LOOKED AT THIS TRANSCRIPT EVERYONE IS DOING EXACTLY WHAT I EXPECTED EXSPECALLY YOU MY GOAL IS TO GET THE BALL OUT OF THE HANDS OF THE LOWER COURTS WHO HAVE NOT STOP THE PREJUDICE YET.SO THINK CAREFULLY BEFORE YOU REPLY.ONE WHAT CAN BE ATTACK IN CROSS EXAMINE.AND HAVE Why I gotta a copy of the first to transcript I requested from you ?



Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>

What can be attacked at this hearing

Chris Murphy <chris@chrismurphylawfirm.com>

Mon, Jul 23, 2018 at 4:39 AM

To: Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>, "Christopher L. Murphy, Esq." <chris@chrismurphylawfirm.com>

Good morning Jason – I am not sure what you are trying to say or imply in this email, but we will get a chance to listen to your attorney and cross exam him on issues. We are not attacking him and instead want him to tell the truth. We can present the emails you want and admit them into evidence. We are much more effective being nice. Please send me the emails you want to admit for me to review.

[Quoted text hidden]

*Request Request from
~~on~~ per*





Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>

West v. State (Status)

Christopher Murphy <cmurphy@rlattorneys.com>

Wed, Nov 1, 2017 at 11:10 AM

To: Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>

Cc: Christopher Murphy <cmurphy@rlattorneys.com>, Jodi Hanshaw <jhanshaw@rlattorneys.com>

I spoke with Judge Duffy who confirmed that he signed the search warrants. Therefore any argument that he did not sign them is moot.

Also, I know you understand §1983 law and I am concerned your judgment may be clouded by a big payday. You need to face a lot of risk to get to the point of having standing to file a §1983 claim and that fact is that you admitted selling drugs and drugs were found in the house which will be admissible in a civil matter. This is a lot different than a plaintiff who got strip searched for no reason.

From: Jason West [mailto:megabucks843@gmail.com]**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2017 4:55 PM**To:** Christopher Murphy <cmurphy@rlattorneys.com>**Subject:** Re: West v. State (Status)

New trail will also bring into play that fact I was convicted of a crime that never happened and no one caught it or attempted to correct it before hand

[Quoted text hidden]


4/28/2019

cmurphy@rlattorneys.com

direct line 843-494-5454

cell 843-926-0146

Contact Information



ALBUQUERQUE | BAKERSFIELD | CH.
SACRAMENTO | SALT LAKE CITY | SA

www.rlattorneys.com

This message is confidential and may be
mailed. If you receive this message in erro

SACRAMENTO | SALT LAKE CITY | SAN DIEGO | TAMPA

www.rlattorneys.com

This message is confidential and may contain priv
error, please discard the message and advise the



Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>

West v. State (Status)

Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>

Thu, Dec 7, 2017 at 8:16 PM

To: Christopher Murphy <cmurphy@rlattorneys.com>

I am again requesting That FULL RULE 5 motion given to you by the AG Louis never filed for a RULE 5 THIS IS IN BLACK AND WHITE FROM THE BAR INVESTIGATION REPORT AS WELL AS THE CLERK OF COURT, AND UNLESS YOUR CALLING LEON A LIAR THERE IS NO VIDEO/AUDIO AS WELL AS NO PRERECORDED CURRENCY, NO CONTROL BUY, NO RELIABLE CI ONLY HEARSAY ON THE PART OF THE NCPD I HAVE FULLY INVESTIGATED THIS! SO AGAIN I REQUEST THE FULL RULE 5 YOU SPEAK OF AND IF THE PROSECUTOR HAS A VIDEO THEY WITHHELD I NEED THAT OR SET A APPOINTMENT FOR MY FAMILY TO VIEW IT TO SEE MY INVOLVEMENT AND ANY WRONG DOING! YOU WERE WITH THE AG SO HE SHOULD N YOU SHOULD HAVE A COPY OF EVERYTHING NOT WHAT I GAVE YOU ONLY! IF I NEVR GAVE YOU ANY HOW AND WHAT WERE YOU GOING TO TELL OR DO FOR ME. YOU HAVE SHOWN ME YOU ARE NOT MAKING ANY ATTEMPT to get MY PAPERWORK AND THESE OTHER THINGS I REQUEST. THE JUDGE SAID YOU ARE HERE TO ASSIST ME AND THOSE SIMPLE THINGS SHOULD BE NO PROBLEM TO GET IF THEY EXIST. 1) THE Full RULE 5 You speak of and I said you and I quote "u may have not seen the whole discovery"! 2) You said in court December 6 and I quote "the "WEAK WARRANT" WAS THE REASON THE PROSECUTOR MADE THE PLEA AGREEMENT"! last time I check weak-adjective, not strong, fragile, feeble, lacking strength. I need both transcripts or a price I can pay to get them asap as my appointed attorney use can get them but you continue to stall so this is your formal notice! 3) Not once did u state there are two (2) Warrants and there is no justifiable reason for the same warrant to be sign two especially when it does not meet the statutory requirements which are stricter then federal which u already know! I have no fear of the state and have already written a rebuttal for any appeal they can think of just In case I don't get another attorney on time and you chose to assist your colleagues who have break all kinds of sc RULES OF COURT and CONSTITUTIONAL LAW and not me as the judge request. you do like me knowing from reading my paperwork I was set up by the police all because I refused to be a informant. The threatened me with arresting my kids I sign a statement against myself to make sure my kids wasn't involved. told two lawyer you making three the cops planted that cocaine the both lied to me about what I needed to do as you also did. don't care if u don't like me I just need the same defense you would give slager or roof, they were guilty beyond a reason dout one should have got life and the other should be sentence to death but this is forgive. Remember Ravenal was a born rich drug trafficker but you would have gave him every thing the law requires u to do with no hesitation! get my RULE 5 PLEASE STOP STALLING

[Quoted text hidden]



Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>

West v. State (Status)

Jason West <megabucks843@gmail.com>
To: Christopher Murphy <cmurphy@rlattorneys.com>

Sat, Nov 4, 2017 at 10:35 AM

Also I need the complete rule I have 38 pages so the missing pages containing the controlled buy, reliable statements, and date n time of this control buy used to secure the warrant the prosecutor stated as FACT on my transcript cause besides what I Gaven u when your appointed you given the history of my case or u can not defend it!and you info comes direct from the attorney general office!THIS IS MY THIRD(3RD) N FINAL REQUEST FOR YOUR RELEASE FROM MY CASE!RECAP(1) YOUR STATEMENT DUFFY ADMITTED TO YOU HE SIGNED BOTH(TWO) WARRANTS(2)THE COMPLETE RULE 5 (3)AND THE TRANSCRIPT FROM THE "STATUS HEARING"IN FROM OF JUDGE JEFFERSON

On Sep 28, 2017 8:43 AM, "Christopher Murphy" <cmurphy@rlattorneys.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

From: Jason West [mailto:megabucks843@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 4, 2017 1:35 PM
To: Christopher Murphy <cmurphy@rlattorneys.com>
Subject: Re: West v. State (Status)

Also I need the complete rule I have 38 pages so the missing pages containing the controlled buy, reliable statements, and date n time of this control buy used to secure the warrant the prosecutor stated as FACT on my transcript cause besides what I Gaven u when your appointed you given the history of my case or u can not defend it!and you info comes direct from the attorney general office!THIS IS MY THIRD(3RD) N FINAL REQUEST FOR YOUR RELEASE FROM MY CASE!RECAP(1) YOUR STATEMENT DUFFY ADMITTED TO YOU HE SIGNED BOTH(TWO) WARRANTS(2)THE COMPLETE RULE 5 (3)AND THE TRANSCRIPT FROM THE "STATUS HEARING"IN FROM OF JUDGE JEFFERSON

[Quoted text hidden]

RECEIVED

MAY 13 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SUPREME COURT

JASON A. WEST,

PETITIONER

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true copy of the PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMAS, SUMMARY JUDGEMENT, AND MOTION TO AMEND JOHNSON PETITION and a copy OF EXHIBITS in the above referenced case has been serviced upon DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE, CLERK OF SUPREME COURT P.O BOX 11330 COLUMBIA, SC 29211, THIS 11th day of May, 2019.



JASON A. WEST

PRO SE PETITIONER

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me

this 11th day of May, 2019

Rayburne J. Turner (L.S)

Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission Expires: **RAYBURNE J. TURNER**
My Commission Expires:
August 21, 2024