

RECEIVED

JUL 23 2019

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

J. C. Nicholson, Jr, Circuit Court Judge
Trial Court Case No. 2017-CP-10-03226

Appellate Case No. 2017-002621

John Gilbert Singletary,..... Appellant,

v.

The State,Respondent.

1. Request to Amend Initial and Reply Brief predicated upon The Supreme Court of South Carolina Commission on Lawyer Conduct Receiver's just finding and forwarding Appellant's case file documents sought after by Appellant since previous attorney was disbarred. Received July 16, 2019. See Exhibit #1.
2. Notice of Release of Attorney McMullen.
3. Motion Request for Default or the alternatives below after release of counsel granted
4. Request for Sanctions after release of counsel granted
5. Request for Discovery and Adverse Inference after release of counsel granted
6. Request for 90 days find new counsel after release of counsel granted

Dear Appellate Court,

Comes Now Appellant John Singletary informs this court of new documents sent by the Supreme Court of South Carolina Commission on Lawyer Conduct to Appellant on July 11, 2019 and received on July 16, 2019 regarding additional documents found from previous attorney Mayer's (who was disbarred) inventory which are crucial to the matters in the Appeal. Appellant, for good cause, requests to have leave from the court to amend the Initial Brief and Reply Brief to include the documents that Appellant requested previously several times from the Receiver but was unable to obtain until now. The additional the time will not prejudice the Respondents and will only allow the court to consider all of the pertinent documents in the interest of justice. Crucial is the opportunity for an the accused to present pertinent facts to the court particularly when as in this case a Trial in Absentia was conducted without any notice of trial to Appellant and the prosecutor did not comply with any of the requisite items listed to adjudicate under South Carolina TIA mandates. Appellant was among other constitutional denials such as right to council, etc. also denied all discovery under rule 5 at the Municipal Level and denied his written motion for discovery at the Circuit Appeal. Upon, the initial disbarment of the previous attorney, Appellant made clear all documents were not received and the Receiver made note that they receive corrupt files and were not able to retrieve all necessary documentation for Appellant at that time. For such good cause Appellant request leave to amend the Initial and Reply Brief to present the facts and truth based upon evidence to the court.

In addition Appellant informs the court of present counsel's release as counsel. The letter of release is included because present counsel has been notified of his release. Attorney McMullen submitted documents subsequent to knowing he was released. The newly submitted documents by Attorney McMullen contains fabricated documents that have been newly constructed and are contained nowhere else in the case except with opposing counsel who just constructed the fabricated documents.

1. Appellant's attorney has abandoned his good faith efforts to represent Appellant by knowingly submitting information that is false, inconsistent with the written record, and disinformation purposefully designed to assist the Respondent. Attorney McMullen in his Initial Brief acknowledged the existence of a Municipal Return from Judge Coleman. Attorney McMullen pointed out the incompleteness of the Municipal Return and devoted an entire section with the heading titled "Judge Coleman's Return". Although incomplete Attorney McMullen cogently pointed out the alterations of the Municipal Return which on its face was rendered suspect because of the removal of pertinent data through the use of whiteout. The Municipal Return was void of the required documents listed in the Summary Court Return policy, and concealed an email that was referenced in the return. Such manipulation of original information was confirmed by opposing counsel, Robin Jackson, and characterizes as "factually false" in the Circuit Court transcript. In a shocking

turn of events attorney McMullen in his Reply Brief with gross contradicts of himself directly by stating " The Municipal Court Judge filed **no Return** with the Circuit Court." This statement is shocking because the record reflects a return was filed and each party in the litigation has acknowledged the Municipal Return. The Municipal Return consisted of a fraudulent document and a false statement by the Municipal Judge Coleman where the underlying document proving its falsehood was concealed until recently. The documented emails between the Appellants Attorney and the Respondent's attorney constitute evidence of fraud upon the court. The Appellant's attorney claims to have submitted the record on appeal on July, 15, 2015 when in fact the Opposing Attorney clearly states in her email she did not send him one of the documents that was newly constructed, a document that never existed prior in the record below to Attorney McMullen. The question becomes how could Attorney McMullen construct a record on appeal and include a document he did not have in his possession? The document also has false data and is a fabrication. Also, another email from Appellant's Counsel, Attorney McMullen, thanks the Respondent's attorney and her Assistant, Missy, for helping him to construct the Record on Appeal. Appellant delivered all necessary documents to his attorney at the onset of the case on a USB drive still in possession of Attorney McMullen. The record on appeal contains some of the documents, but more telling is the fact that the record on appeal contains documents only in the possession of the Respondent's attorney and exhibits with Respondent's stamp that were only in possession of the opposing counsel and unnecessary to be used by Appellant's attorney because Appellant's attorney already had them in his possession. The sum total of the emails show the two working in concert to submit to the courts rushed record on appeal containing false documents after Appellant requested Attorney McMullen no submit any further documents on his behalf to the courts. Attorney McMullen further exacerbates the situation by filing the late Reply Brief without the knowledge or consent of the Appellant, even after an agreement to review all documents prior to submission was made. Attorney McMullen then goes into hiding and refuses to correspond, answer phone calls, answer text messaged, or respond to emails. Finally, communication is reconnected and Attorney McMullen informs the Appellant "Nothing can be done about it now". Far worst than a simple disagreement Attorney McMullen's actions has caused great harm to Appellant's legal position, is designed to assist the opposing party, caused great financial damages to Appellant, and represents an abandonment of his duty and good faith obligations to is client after being paid in full. Attorney McMullen's actions appear to be conspiratorial. After release of Attorney McMullen he has sent items to Appellant that were sent months ago, but he never informed Appellant of documents until after he was released from the case. A deluge of documents showing communication between Appellant's Attorney and Opposing counsel with content never seen

or discussed with Appellant. Concealment of information from client is inconsistent with the duty attorney McMullen has to client. The new document was first produced by opposing counsel on 5/15/2019 sent to Appellant's attorney McMullen on May 16, 2019 with a statement it is a new exhibit, one never seen before by Appellant, but appearing in Appellant's attorney proposed final documents and the documents of the opposing counsel. The document is in fact a new document from a new computer system that did not exist previously. Appellant's attorney goes on to thank opposing counsel and her Assistant "Missy" for assisting in helping him to construct Appellant's record on appeal even though Appellant gave his attorney McMullen every document necessary to construct such appeal. Attorney McMullen could not have constructed the July 15, 2019 document because he did not have in his possession the necessary exhibits to file until the next day. In addition several of the exhibits for which were contained in the July 15, 2019 filing possesses North Charleston stamps on them. Appellant gave the very same documents to Attorney McMullen at the onset of the case. There was no need to use North Charleston documents when in fact Attorney McMullen had his own.

2. Attorney McMullen after correctly stating the Appellant had no notice of trial and no notice of any order or disposition after Trial in Absentia whatsoever changed his position with out any conversation with the Appellant. Knowingly and purposefully Attorney McMullen without the agreed upon review of the Appellant placed a two sentence Reply Brief in the court erroneously stating, "Appellant concedes..." This statement was false and reflected no conversation Attorney McMullen ever had with Appellant. Every conversation Attorney has had with Appellant, Appellant was crystal clear that at no time has he in the past, present, or ever will in the future agree that any notice of any kind was ever given until May, 26 2019 for which an immediate request for a new trial was filed within the requisite ten (10) day period. Once again, without any notice to Appellant or any consent to do so Attorney McMullen submits a Reply Brief that forecloses on Appellant's due process rights to notice and right to be heard in a criminal case. The precise use of "Concedes" is contrary to any and all conversations ever had between Appellant and Attorney McMullen. In the Town of Hilton Head v. Godwin the use of the word "concede" was the lynch pin that ended the case against the Appellant because there was a concession to notice. Here Attorney McMullen injects wording to assist the opposing side in a victory over his client the Appellant and does so without review by Appellant then goes in to hiding. Attorney McMullen's action in submitting the first Initial Brief was disingenuous, detrimental to the Appellants ability to present the true facts to the court, and misleads the court with false information all to benefit the opposing litigant. Attorney McMullen's false statements are in fact malicious, destroys Appellant's case, and warrants Attorney McMullen's removal for good cause.

3. Emails and correspondences between Appellant and Attorney McMullen support Appellant's contention of conspiracy. At every turn since the Initial Brief Attorney McMullen has kept the opposing side abreast of every single item discussed between him and Appellant. However Appellant has been kept in the dark of several developments, newly created documents, fabricated documents, a conversation that happened between the opposing side and Attorney McMullen. Appellant only found out of the conversation through reading the barrage of emails sent to him after requesting any and all documents and conversation between Attorney McMullen and the opposing counsel. Appellant upon information and belief submits that not all correspondences between Appellant's attorney McMullen and opposing counsel have been released as stated.
4. Attorney McMullen in an action of connivance says to Appellant he felt obligated to inform the court he did not know of the FOIA request and the Case History Report when in fact he devoted attention in the Initial Brief to the false statements and the total contradictions within the Case History Report such as: 1) the 5 entries of a bond hearing then the opposing attorney statement that no bond hearing ever occurred, 2) the claim of notice by phone when no local ordinance of such an unconstitutional form of notice exists contrary to the opposing attorney's statement. The attempt to misconstrue a fraudulent Case History Report as notice when the opposing counsel admits to the falsehood of the Case History Report is totally contrary to Attorney McMullen's statements in the Initial Brief. Attorney McMullen must be removed because he has demonstrated in action a shift in loyalty from Appellant to the opposing litigants. Attorney McMullen's actions appear to be conspiratorial, under minds the entire position of Appellants defense, and provided factually false information, and statements to the court. Now a total of three (3) different Case History Reports exists each with different information, in different formations and different chronological orders and contradicting each other. The latest Case History Report incomplete with all previous items dates, explanations, etc. The latest even inserts items from 2010 in the middle of items from 2017 and leaves out all other 2010 dates and data points. See exhibit.
5. Attorney McMullen tries to narrow Appellant's issues to a meager "Timeliness Issue" when in fact even the opposing side mentions at least six issues named in the Initial Brief. Timeless is one of the issues, but the triggering point to which the calculation begins is critical. The opposing counsel agrees with the statute and constitution mandates that written notice of disposition is required which did not occur until May 26, 2017. Attorney McMullen in his Reply Brief tries to narrow Appellant's case in order to give an advantage to the opposing counsel. Appellant's issues stated in the Initial Brief are still valid.
6. After making mention of the Municipal Return, then changed to deny a Municipal Return Attorney McMullen reviewed the email referred to by the Circuit Judge

and the Municipal Judge only to witness the email was totally contradictory to the statements of both judges. The email from Attorney Mayer in no way whatsoever gives any acknowledgement by the Appellant as to any notice of anything. The email only states it was learned the city was claiming a conviction which turned out to be false. Attorney Mayor also in open court directly refuted the characterization that there was an acknowledgment of learning of a conviction. The Municipal Judge purposefully concealed the reference email in order to mislead the Circuit Court. Attorney McMullen's failure and refusal to bring this to the attention of the court is crucial as such egregious actions must not be allowed to assist with a miscarriage of justice. In addition the opposing litigant has displayed a pattern and practice of falsifying information and presenting it to the courts one such example is the William "Billy" Mills case for which North Charleston altered evidence, use it fraudulent by submitting it to the court to influence a miscarriage of justice outcome, was then sued for their actions, and settled out of court to avoid public ridicule. That case was also a solicitation case as the case at bar is. Documents from that case will be submitted to show a pattern and practice of North Charleston's falsifying evidence, documents, and providing misleading statements to the court to influence adjudications. Attorney McMullen after review of all such data refuses to discuss mediation or settlement with the opposing side.

7. Attorney McMullen was well aware of the following denials of Appellant's Constitutional rights:

1. no charge read
2. no bond hearing
3. no right to counsel
4. no required warning for TIA
5. no notice of trial (or summons to appear in court)
6. no order of trial outcome
7. no disposition of case
8. no confrontation (opportunity to face accuser)
9. no response to written rule 5 request
10. no evidence presented against defendant in TIA
11. no response to request for new trial
12. no completed return
13. no record of trial documents as requires
14. no retention of required docs (Summary Court Record Retention Chart)
15. no opportunity to be heard
16. no fair or impartial judge (bond/trial/appeal)
17. no order on right to completed return

18. no trial in criminal case (no records to prove an trial ever existed)
19. no protection of required court records
20. no accuser (unreleasable juvenile same as unnamed undercover cop)

In conclusion, the critical and newly found document by the South Carolina Commission of Misconduct Receiver if not allowed to be incorporated into the Initial Brief and Reply Brief would only serve to create a miscarriage of justice. All newly found documents were previously requested by Appellant and thru no fault of Appellant were not obtained. The Receiver's latten discovery of the documents does not minimize the importance of the documents in reaching a fair adjudication of the case predicated upon the truthful facts.


Attorney McMullen's direct contradictions the Initial Brief as apposed to the Reply Brief leaves not question as to competing loyalty issues. This matter brings into question actions of Attorney McMullen that have risen to a level that appear to be conspiratorial, shows abandonment of duties to client, provides false statements of fact to the court, appears to constitution fraud upon the court, and delivers a Coup de grace to Appellant's case. In addition for the first time since 2010 Respondents through Attorney McMullen produces a new document, which is neither in the Municipal Return nor in the Responsive Brief. Without conversation with Attorney McMullen the Respondent would not have know such crucial missing document necessary to assist with prosecutor's was even discussed, as is was discussed only between Appellant and Attorney McMullen. Appellant for the first time on July 16 received a barrage of emails regarding conversations between Appellant's Attorney and opposing Attorney Producing a document to try and justify a question only discussed between attorney and client and not made public is troubling. Attorney McMullen falsely stating Appellant concedes when in fact no such concession was ever made, and Attorney McMullen's placing false statement in total contradiction of what he placed in his initial brief leaves Appellant questioning Attorney McMullen's loyalty and the fact of his submittal confirm such suspicion. Appellant respectfully submits to the court the release of Attorney McMullen and request 90 days in order to find new counsel while proceeding pro se with discovery.

Comes Now Appellant request this honorable court, based upon opposing litigants submittal of fabricated and altered document submitted in order to purposefully, knowingly, and with impunity to create a miscarriage of justice through fraud upon the court. The denial of any and all Rule 5 compliance, the denial of Circuit Court to address the Appellant Motion for Discovery and Respondents continual creation of fabricated documents coupled with Respondents admission that no record or testimony exists or was included in the Municipal Return against Appellant to show any crime or guilt or any crime. A claim of guilt without any evidence whatsoever put up in the Municipal or Circuit Court of any wrongdoing or crime is preposterous and in contravention to an accused constitutional right to remain innocent until proven guilty. Respondent has a history of engaging in patterns and practice of fabrication of evidence. The only document in the Municipal Return was a document with white out over critical information. Also to show the pattern and practice of falsification of documents enclosed is an excerpt from Respondent's own emails where previous prosecutors refuse to prosecute North Charleston City illegal "Reverse Prostitution Sting" cases. In addition the email from same case shows the prosecutor stating no case law exist to refute the defense position. The email goes on to say and agreement was reached to help the case go away quietly in the night. The case was eventually settled out of court by North Charleston for defamation of the accused in William Mills v North Charleston in Federal Court. Appellant request this honorable court to grant a Summary Default Judgment in favor of Appellant and void both the Circuit and Municipal Proceedings.


In the alternative Appellant request discovery granted by this Court of Appeals, as no discovery has been allowed since the initial charges filed against Appellant. Appellant's written request for Rule 5 and discovery was denied at every level. Appellant request an inverse inference for all documents with alterations and fabrications. In addition Appellant requests an adverse inference for all document denied through discovery and the authority to proceed with discovery pro se while seeking new counsel. Appellant request 90 days to find new counsel while proceeding pro se in order no to prolong bring all pertinent facts before the trier of facts. Exhibits attached.

RECEIVED
JUL 23 2019
SC Court of Appeals

Respectfully submitted,


John Singletary
4321 Waterview Circle
North Charleston
South Carolina 29418
Phone: 843-693-2823

Pro se Attorney for Appellant



The Supreme Court of South Carolina
COMMISSION ON LAWYER CONDUCT

Peyre T. Lumpkin
Receiver

1220 Senate Street, Suite 305
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

(803) 734-1186
Fax: (803) 734-0227

July 11, 2019

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. John Singletary
4321 Waterview Circle
North Charleston, South Carolina 29418


RE: In the Matter of Aaron Cole Mayer
Receiver's Case Number: 18-REC-013

Dear Mr. Singletary:

Enclosed please find additional documents found in Mr. Mayer's inventory which pertain to your matter.

Please contact our office with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,


Patty Lundy
Program Coordinator

/pwl

Enclosure

John Singletary

4321 Waterview Circle • North Charleston, SC 29418
Phone: 843-693-2823 • E-Mail: john@singletaryphotography.com

Date: July 16, 2019

Attorney McMullen
1720 Main Street, Suite 301
Columbia, SC 29201

To Attorney McMullen:

Attorney McMullen Please accept this letter as formal notice that you are hereby released from any obligation and or contract to litigate on my behalf or to represent me as legal counsel, effective immediately.

Please forward to me our agreement was a flat fee for which you have been paid in full. Please forward any and all records, transcripts, correspondence with the opposing party and documents relating to my case.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please contact me at once.

Sincerely,

John Singletary
843-693-2823

Mail Address Book Files Calendar RSS Settings

Back Compose Reply Reply a Forwar Delete Move Print Spam Mark More

Inbox	2083
Drafts	
Sent Items	
Spam	154
Trash	
Deleted Items	
Junk Mail	
Old Inbox	16

Re: John Singletary's Reque...

Message 10 of 30

From Michael D. McMullen
To John Singletary
Date 2019-06-22 14:36

After toiling in the yard for a while, and after pondering this matter some more, I am convinced this is quite a development. I don't know yet what to do but I do know something must be done. I feel certain the attorney on the other side must know the content of that email and I feel certain, as I think you do, that it was no mistake that the magistrate omitted inclusion of that email. Give me some more time to work on this and be assured that is exactly what I'm doing.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 21, 2019, at 8:14 PM, John Singletary <john@singletaryphotography.com> wrote:

Attorney McMullen below is the email for which is mentioned in the first page of the Municipal Return. Judge Coleman stated "Finally, an email from defense counsel was submitted on June 13, 2017. Said email contained and acknowledgment that Defendant learned of his Prostitution conviction in 2015." Attorney McMullen there is no other way to describe this accept, it is in fact a lie, and constitutes "fraud on the court". The clear reason he did not included the document he refers to is it does in no way, shape, or form say what he purports it to say. The email is below. Attorney Mayer says "to clarify that Mr. Singletary learned only in 2015 that the City was claiming he'd been convicted of this offense. He was surprise for two big reasons:....." Attorney McMullen this is more than just a simple mistake or any inadvertent mishap. This is egregious enough that such "Rambo-Judging" is a stain on the machinery of the court and the entire process has been corrupted. On the civil proceedings a 60(b)(3) deals with fraud upon the court for which has been committed several times for opposing counsel. As for this judge (Judge Coleman) it appears that Canon's 1,2,3,5,6, and 7 have all been violated under the Judicial Code of Conduct. More than just an issue of integrity and Canon's is the fact that this judge altered the ticket. This matter is going to require a face to face to discuss what measure of damage control and remedy we must consider.

To make such a calculated untrue statement and then conceal by omission the document for which he refers in criminal. The fact that the Circuit Judge Nicholson relied upon the fraudulent statements of Judge Coleman is intrinsic fraud and voids all decisions in the case. Clearly, on page 5 of the transcript Judge Nicholson says "I'll read it to you, so you'll be aware of it." If it was not in the return then how did Judge Nicholson have a copy of it to read? The record reflects that nothing had been handed up to the Judge at that point, yet he had a copy of a document from the lower court judge not in the record. Whether ex parte communication or any other means somehow this document was in possession of Judge Nicholson when it should not have been. I have some ideas I would like to discuss with you. Please give me a date and time to have a face to face conference.

Sincerely,

John Singletary
843-693-2823

Begin forwarded message:

From: Aaron Mayer <aaron@mayerlawpractice.com>
Subject: FW: John Singletary's Request for New Trial

Subject **Re: John Singletary's Request for New Trial**
From Michael D. McMullen <Lawyerinsc@aol.com>
To John Singletary <john@singletaryphotography.com>
Date 2019-06-22 11:35

Thank you for providing this.

I would very much like some time to come up with a recommended course of action/response to this new information. I also need to do some things around the house, but I find that's a good time to think. I will get back to you soon.

Again, I am glad you found this.

Michael

Michael D. McMullen
1720 Main St., Ste 301
Columbia, SC 29201

Phone: 803-252-4433
Fax: 803-799-4059

Lawyerinsc@aol.com

mcmullenlawsc.com

On Jun 21, 2019, at 8:14 PM, John Singletary <john@singletaryphotography.com> wrote:

Attorney McMullen below is the email for which is mentioned in the first page of the Municipal Return. Judge Coleman stated "Finally, an email from defense counsel was submitted on June 13, 2017. Said email contained and acknowledgment that Defendant learned of his Prostitution conviction in 2015." Attorney McMullen there is no other way to describe this except, it is in fact a lie, and constitutes "fraud on the court". The clear reason he did not included the document he refers to is it does in no way, shape, or form say what he purports it to say.

The email is below. Attorney Mayer says "to clarify that Mr. Singletary learned only in 2015 that the City was **claiming** he'd been convicted of this offense. He was surprise for two big reasons:....." Attorney McMullen this is more than just a simple mistake or any inadvertent mishap. This is egregious enough that such "Rambo-Judging" is a stain on the machinery of the court and the entire process has been corrupted. On the civil proceedings a 60(b)(3) deals with fraud upon the court for which has been committed several times for opposing counsel. As for this judge (Judge Coleman) it appears that Canon's 1,2,3,5,6, and 7 have all been violated under the Judicial Code of Conduct. More than just an issue of integrity and Canon's is the fact that this judge altered the ticket. This matter is going to require a face to face to discuss what measure of damage control and remedy we must consider.

To make such a calculated untrue statement and then conceal by omission the document for which he refers in criminal. The fact that the Circuit Judge Nicholson relied upon the fraudulent statements of Judge Coleman is intrinsic fraud and voids all decisions in the case. Clearly, on page 5 of the transcript Judge Nicholson says "I'll read it to you, so you'll be aware of it." If it was not in the return then how did Judge Nicholson have a copy of it to read? The record reflects that nothing had been handed up to the Judge at that point, yet he had a copy of a document from the lower court judge not in the record. Whether ex parte communication or any other means somehow this document was in possession of Judge Nicholson when it should not have been. I have some ideas I would like to discuss with you. Please give me a date and time to have a face to face conference.

Sincerely,

John Singletary
843-693-2823

Begin forwarded message:

From: Aaron Mayer <aaron@mayerlawpractice.com>
Subject: FW: John Singletary's Request for New Trial
Date: June 16, 2017 at 10:34:31 AM EDT
To: "john@singletaryphotography.com" <john@singletaryphotography.com>

For your records...below

Aaron Mayer, Attorney
Licensed in North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida

Mayer Law Firm
Harrell Square
2000 Sam Rittenberg, Ste. 2011
Charleston, 29407
T: 843-225-7240
F: 888-446-3963
www.mayerlawpractice.com

From: Aaron Mayer
Sent: Friday, June 16, 2017 10:34 AM
To: 'colemans@northcharleston.org'
Cc: 'Vaughn, Samantha'
Subject: RE: John Singletary's Request for New Trial

I would welcome the opportunity to have an off-the-record conversation among the three of us to figure out a satisfactory resolution of this matter. I am available Monday and Tuesday next week...would a time one of those days potentially work?

Best,

Aaron Mayer, Attorney
Licensed in North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida

Mayer Law Firm
Harrell Square
2000 Sam Rittenberg, Ste. 2011
Charleston, 29407
T: 843-225-7240
F: 888-446-3963
www.mayerlawpractice.com

From: Aaron Mayer
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 3:02 PM
To: 'colemans@northcharleston.org'
Cc: 'Vaughn, Samantha'
Subject: John Singletary's Request for New Trial

Dear Judge Coleman, I'm writing to relay that Mr. Singletary did receive Ms. Vaughn's response to his motion

for a new trial, and to clarify that Mr. Singletary learned only in 2015 that the City was claiming he'd been convicted of this offense. He was surprised for two big reasons: first, he'd never been provided notice of a trial after he'd requested the Rule 5 information; and second, he received a check from North Charleston returning his bond money. In 2015, upon hearing this allegation, he promptly asked the clerk's office (and other North Charleston offices) multiple times in 2015 and 2016 for all the disposition documents from this 2010 case. He received clerical / docketing type documents only. Documents that he firmly believed were inaccurate or mistyped, and so he kept pressing for an actual disposition sheet. Finally he obtained a disposition sheet with a judge's signature on it on May 26, 2017. The attached is what he finally received.

Unlike the other matters Ms. Vaughn raised in her response, Mr. Singletary is not trying to sue the City here. He wants merely what any of us would want in his shoes: to have his good name cleared. Please let's nip this in the bud by granting a new trial, allowing discovery on the charge, and disposing of this case properly.

Best,

Aaron Mayer, Attorney
Licensed in North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida

Mayer Law Firm
Harrell Square
2000 Sam Rittenberg, Ste. 2011
Charleston, 29407
T: 843-225-7240
F: 888-446-3963
www.mayerlawpractice.com

Subject **Re: This attorney Robin Jackson is and has been filing false reports to the courts state and federal even after she has been warned to stop**
From Michael D. McMullen <lawyerinsc@aol.com>
To John Singletary <john@singleteryphotography.com>
Date 2019-05-28 21:39

I read that. I'm not sure what has to do with Robin Jackson. Maybe I'm missing something.

Sent from my iPhone

On May 28, 2019, at 7:21 PM, John Singletary <john@singleteryphotography.com> wrote:

| <SC judge arrested for filing false police report.pdf>

Mail Address Book Files Calendar RSS Settings

Back Compose Reply Reply a Forwar Delete Move Print Spam Mark More

Inbox	2083
Drafts	
Sent Items	
Spam	154
Trash	
Deleted Items	
Junk Mail	
Old Inbox	16

Re: SLED Report from 2014...

Message 20 of 30

From **Michael D. McMullen**
To **John Singletary**
Date **2019-05-28 21:43**

I appreciate that you are probably upset after reading the City's brief. My task is to ask the court of appeals to stay on track and not consider matters that are not part of the record below. These matters are irrelevant to the appeal. They would have us get off on tangents. I think that is unwise. We should stay the course.

Sent from my iPhone

On May 28, 2019, at 7:18 PM, John Singletary <john@singleteryphotography.com> wrote:

This SLED report from 2014 shows not conviction or disposition listed for the arrest of the solicitation charge. The attorney states on page 3 of the Responsive Brief a conviction was how the reporter got the story from the SLED report, that is false. The attorney stated in court during the federal hearing before Judge Seymour she could go back and add that disposition at SLED and the SLED records shows the date and time of the city added that false charge was after that hearing. Her statements are simply false. In addition nothing to the present date says a conviction for any online accessed documents form North Charleston because the Case History Report is not a public documents online and has never been.

<sled.pdf>

Re: John Singletary's Request for New Trial

From: Michael D. McMullen <>
To: John Singletary <>
Date: 2019-06-22 14:36

After talking in the yard for a while, and after considering this matter some more, I am convinced this is quite a development. I don't know yet what to do but I do know something must be done. I feel certain the attorney on the other side must know the content of that email and I feel certain, as I think you do, that it was no mistake that the magistrate omitted inclusion of that email. Give me some more time to work on this and be assured that is exactly what I'm doing.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 21, 2019, at 8:14 PM, John Singletary <johnsingletaryphotos@csby.com> wrote:

Attorney McMullen below is the email for which is mentioned in the first page of the Municipal Return. Judge Coleman stated "I finally, an email from defense counsel was submitted on June 12, 2017. Said email contained and acknowledged that Defendant learned of his Prosecution conviction in 2015." Attorney McMullen there is no other way to describe this account, it is in fact a lie, and constitutes "fraud on the court". The clear reason he did not include the document he refers to is it does in no way, shape, or form say what he purports it to say. The email is below. Attorney Mayer says "to clarify that Mr. Singletary learned only in 2015 that the City was claiming he'd been convicted of this offense. He was surprised for two big reasons....." Attorney McMullen this is more than just a simple mistake or any inadvertent in that. This is egregious enough that such "kumbaya-judging" is a stain on the mastery of the court and the entire process has been corrupted. On the civil proceedings a 603(b)(3) deals with fraud upon the court for which has been committed several times for opposing counsel. As for this judge (Judge Coleman) it appears that Canon's 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 have all been violated under the judicial Code of Conduct. More than just an issue of integrity and Canon's is the fact that the judge altered the sheet. This matter is going to require a face to face to discuss what measure of contempt control and remedy we must consider.

To have seen a calculated and then context by omission the document for which he refers in entirety. The fact that the Circuit Judge Nicholson told upon the fraudulent statements of Judge Coleman is not just fraud and voids all decisions in the case. Clearly, on page 5 of the transcript Judge Nicholson says "I'll read it to you, so you'll be aware of it." If it was not in the record then how did Judge Nicholson have a copy of it to read? The record reflects that nothing has been handed up to the judge at that point, yet he had a copy of a document from the lower court judge not in the record. Whether or not communication or any other means somehow this document was in possession of Judge Nicholson when it should not have been. I have some ideas I would like to discuss with you. Please give me a date and time to have a face to face conference.

Sincerely,

John Singletary
919-993-2623

Begin forwarded message:
From: Aaron Mayer <aaron@mayerlawpractice.com>
Subject: Re: John Singletary's Request for New Trial
Date: June 16, 2017 at 10:34:31 AM EDT
To: "johnsingletaryphotos@csby.com" <johnsingletaryphotos@csby.com>

For your records...below
Aaron Mayer, Attorney
Licensed in North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida

Mayer Law Firm
Harrell Square
2000 Sam Rittenberg, Ste. 2011
Charleston, 29407
T: 843-225-7240
F: 888-446-3953
www.mayerlawpractice.com

From: Aaron Mayer
Sent: Friday, June 16, 2017 10:34 AM
To: "colemanj@northcharleston.org"
Cc: Vaughn, Samantha
Subject: RE: John Singletary's Request for New Trial

I would welcome the opportunity to have an off-the-record conversation among the three of us to figure out a satisfactory resolution of this matter. I am available Monday and Tuesday next week...would a time one of those days potentially work?

Best,
Aaron Mayer, Attorney
Licensed in North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida

Mayer Law Firm
Harrell Square
2000 Sam Rittenberg, Ste. 2011
Charleston, 29407
T: 843-225-7240
F: 888-446-3953
www.mayerlawpractice.com

From: Aaron Mayer
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 3:02 PM
To: "colemanj@northcharleston.org"
Cc: Vaughn, Samantha
Subject: John Singletary's Request for New Trial

Dear Judge Coleman, I'm writing to relay that Mr. Singletary did receive Ms. Vaughn's response to his motion for a new trial, and to clarify that Mr. Singletary learned only in 2015 that the City was claiming he'd been convicted of this offense. He was surprised for two big reasons: first, he'd never been provided notice of a trial after he'd requested the Rule 5 information; and second, he received a check from North Charleston returning his bond money. In 2015, upon hearing this allegation, he promptly asked the clerk's office (and other North Charleston offices) multiple times in 2015 and 2016 for all the disposition documents from this 2010 case. He received clerical / docketing type documents only. Documents that he firmly believed were inaccurate or mistyped, and so he kept pressing for an actual disposition sheet. Finally he obtained a disposition sheet with a judge's signature on it on May 26, 2017. The attached is what he finally received.



Unlike the other matters Ms. Vaughn raised in her response, Mr. Singletary is not trying to sue the City here. He wants merely what any of us would want in his shoes: to have his good name cleared. Please let's nip this in the bud by granting a new trial, allowing discovery on the charge, and disposing of this case properly.

Best,
Aaron Mayer, Attorney
Licensed in North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida

Mayer Law Firm
Harrell Square
2000 Sam Rittenberg, Ste. 2011
Charleston, 29407
T: 843-225-7240
F: 888-446-3953
www.mayerlawpractice.com

Re: Appellate Brief



From: Michael D. McMullen 
To: John Singletary 
Date: 2019-07-08 17:04

Message 7 of 30



Would you be so kind as to forward me the document to which you refer, the "Reply" you would have me submit on your behalf in this case?

If you can please get me that prior to meeting, I certainly can be more prepared when we do get together.

Thank you, Mr. Singletary.

Sincerely,

Michael




Michael D. McMullen
1720 Main St., Ste 301
Columbia, SC 29201


Phone: 803-252-4433
Fax: 803-799-4059

Lawverinsc@aol.com

Appellate Brief

Message 8 of 30

 From: Michael D. McMullen 
To: John Singletary 
Date: 2019-07-02 12:50



Mr. Singletary:

I still hope that you will give me the go-ahead to complete the record on appeal and submit the final brief. As we have discussed, I was initially hired only to prepare a record on appeal and final brief, and to argue the case if the Court of Appeals allows oral arguments. When I read the briefs previously submitted by your former lawyer, we discussed my opinion that I should seek the Court's permission to "start over," to ask the Court's permission to file a new initial brief and if necessary a reply brief, then proceed with the record on appeal, final brief, and oral argument, if the Court wants oral argument.

I know you want sanctions against the City and the judges involved with your case, and possibly against the attorney/attorneys for the City. I remain of the opinion that the Court of Appeals will see the facts as we have presented them and will present them. Thus, we essentially have reported the conduct giving rise to your desire for sanctions, and the Court can act on its own Motion or sua sponte, to impose sanctions or refer the matter(s) to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) and/or the Office of Judicial Conduct (OJC), if the Court sees fit. If they do not choose to do so, I believe the Court also would choose not to impose sanctions. This avenue allows you to make and file a complaint or complaints as you see fit, and allows me to proceed forward with the brief in order to seek a favorable outcome from the Appellate Court.



I hope you will agree this is the best approach. I want to do a good job for you on the Appeal. After that, clearly you have all your options open, and you can decide what, if anything, you would wish to file, such as a complaint to ODC and OJC. I hope to hear from you soon.

Thank you.

Michael

our appeal



From Michael D. McMullen 
To John Singletary 
Date 2019-07-11 19:01

Message 4 of 30



Mr. Singletary:

I am working on an e-mail to you about the status of our appeal and our situation. I can have that completed in the morning and would ask that you read it as with the significant attention you consistently devote to this matter. If you will please do that, I think we will be better able to proceed from there as you see fit.

Michael D. McMullen
1720 Main St., Ste 301
Columbia, SC 29201

Phone: 803-252-4433
Fax: 803-799-4059

LawyerInsc@aol.com

mcmullenlawsc.com

Mail

Address Book

Files

Calendar

RSS

Settings

Back

Compose

Reply

Reply a

Forwar

Delete

Move

Print

Spam



Mark

More

Inbox	2083
Drafts	
Sent Items	
Spam	154
Trash	
Deleted Items	
Junk Mail	
Old Inbox	16

Re: Release of Council

Message 3 of 393

From **john@singleteraryphotography.com** 
 To **Lawyerinsc@aol.com** 
 Date **Mon 17:53**



You are incorrect you did file a document on the 15th after we spoke of your termination. You were not authorized to file the document that North Charleston actually did and had you submit it. The document also contains a newly falsified document never introduced in any record anywhere. All documents you have filed in the case will be stricken from the record. The opposing council comes to the court with unclean hands and only prolongs the process. Providing fails information to the courts constituted fraud upon the court. I am surprised you wold opt to join in their conspiracy to prevent civil rights. As I stated earlier I will deal with that on another level.

Sincerely

John Singletary

On 2019-07-22 15:04, lawyerinsc@aol.com wrote:

Mr. Singletary:

In accordance with your wishes, I have not filed anything further with the Court of Appeals on your behalf. However, unless you file something with that Court by Wednesday (and kindly let me know you have), I will file something on Thursday with the Court to notify the Court you have "released" me as your attorney as of July 16, 2019 at 11:08 pm.

Thank you for your immediate attention to this important matter.

Michael D. McMullen

P.S.

As I previously advised you, the Final Briefs are due twenty days

Back Compose Reply Reply a Forwar Delete Move Print Spam Mark More

Inbox	2083
Drafts	
Sent Items	
Spam	154
Trash	
Deleted Items	
Junk Mail	
Old Inbox	16

Re: Fwd: PDF of ROA I sent ...

Message 10 of 393

From john@singleteryphotography.com
To Lawyerinsc@aol.com
Date Wed 14:46



Attorney McMullen, you were not authorized to send any document to the court on my behalf. I spoke with the court regarding your release. The documents you sent have factually false statements and altered document in them. In addition, I am going through the emails you sent that contain disturbing false statements and documents. Your are requested to resend your submittal to the appellate court. This is further proof of your wrong doing and I will have no choice accept to file a complaint and action against you.

Sincerely,

John Singletary

On 2019-07-16 17:21, lawyerinsc@aol.com wrote:

I sent this today. This should be every piece of correspondence between Ms. Jackson and me.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Michael D. McMullen" <Lawyerinsc@aol.com>
Subject: PDF of ROA
Date: July 16, 2019 at 4:42:07 PM EDT
To: Robin Jackson <robin@sennlegal.com>

Ms. Jackson:

I am attaching a PDF of the Record on Appeal I mailed you Sunday and I filed yesterday. I hope this saves you from having to scan it.

- Mail
- Address Book
- Files
- Calendar
- RSS
- Settings

- Back
- Compose
- Reply
- Reply a
- Forwar
- Delete
- Move
- Print
- Spam
- Mark
- More

Inbox	2083
Drafts	
Sent Items	
Spam	154
Trash	
Deleted Items	
Junk Mail	
Old Inbox	16

Re: our appeal

Message 2 of 37

From john@singleteraryphotography.com

To [Michael D. McMullen](#)

Cc john@singleteraryphotography.com

Bcc carla@singleteraryphotography.com

Date 2019-07-14 10:09

Dear Attorney McMullen,

I did not receive the proposed final Reply Brief from you. In addition to an emphatic and clear cut statement that no notice of any kind was given until May 26, 2017 it is important to at least address the major disingenuous statements made by the opposing attorney. As I stated earlier I will file among other things a request for an 18 U.S.C. 241 & 242 & 1519 complaint with the Local Prosecutor, the State Attorney General, and the FBI/DOJ. The other civil lawsuit I will file will include among other causes of action a 42 U.S.C. 1983 action in federal court.

Attorney McMullen I still believe there is a way for you to remove yourself from the connection to North Charleston that was created with Reply Briefs #1 and #3. I still would like to see your final proposed brief to submit and talk with you regarding what I think is a workable solution. North Charleston probably did not inform you that they are under at least two SLED investigation that are extremely serious for similar wrong doing. They are trying to keep the matters out of the public. You may want to ask them about the investigations to see if they are truthful with you. Because the right to a fair trial is of great importance to the public as I stated earlier I will be joined by other Civil Rights organizations concerning North Charleston's patten and practice of such denials. The announcement with be done in a press conference in Columbia and Charleston.

Once again, It is my desire to amicably resolve the situation with you as representation. I can only imagine that North Charleston in some way convinced or coerced you into assisting them. The only other option is you of your own free will for some unknown reason decided to transgress your good faith efforts, client trust, client duties, client obligations, to breach your attorney-client relationship and further the cause of the opposing side by joining in their efforts to deny my civil right to a fair trial. The relation back doctrine would place you at the inception of their actions which from the beginning is riddled with problems.

Having said all that I still believe you and I can come to a place that

EXHIBIT B

August 7, 2002

RECEIVED
SEP 15 2003
BY: *QWB*


MEMO

TO: RICH & BRADY
FM: DALE
RE: MILLS CASE (PROSTITUTION STING)

Gentlemen:

As you know, when I was previously doing the prosecutions for the City I was highly skeptical of the legality of the prostitution reverse sting cases- in fact, I refused to prosecute them as prostitution cases. The Mills case is a problem for the City in that the transcript clearly shows, in my opinion, that if not directly entrapped the Defendant at the very least did not "solicit" anyone for anything. The cop did all the soliciting. A copy of the transcript is attached. Additionally, the brief submitted by the Defendant hits the nail on the head and I cannot find any S.C. case law to refute the defense position. This may be "high profile" but it is also a dead dog loser. In my opinion we should schedule this for either argument before the Court or let the Court decide the issue on the briefs. Since we have not submitted a brief it should be easy for the Court to reach a decision.

Attached is a Motion from Bill McGuire, who has offered to sign a release to help make this go away quietly. We need to think about going quietly into the night and putting this all behind us.

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dale". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large loop at the beginning and a long, sweeping tail that extends to the right.

#1

North Charleston Municipal Court CASE HISTORY FOR CASE 70055FB

State v. John Gilbert Singletary

LED DATE: 01/31/2010

JUDGE:

STATUS: Closed

CASE TYPE: CR

ARRESTING AGENCY: North Charleston Police Department

LAW ENFORCEMENT CASE #: 2010003762

ASE PARTIES:

Defendant Singletary, John Gilbert
Officer Glenn # 227, J
Bond Company Singletary, Sheldon Morris

ASE HISTORY FOR CASE 70055FB

ingletary, John Gilbert

2937 Albama Drive
North Charleston, SC 29405

Age: 55
DL#: 008043950
Total Paid: \$ 470.00

DOB: 12/25/1961
SSN: 248-88-9924
Balance Due: \$ 0.00

CHARGE

	VIOL. DATE	DISPOSITION	DISP. DATE
13-22(1)/Prostitution 13-22(1) SENTENCING 470.00 Dollar(s) Bail Forfeited	01/26/2010	Tried in Absence (Bail Forfeited)	05/04/2010

COST

Charge: Prostitution 13-22(1) Assessment - City/County	AMOUNT	PAY PRIORITY
Assessment - State	\$24.00	5
CJA Training Fund	191.00	5
Conviction Fee	5.00	3
Fine	25.00	4
Law Enforcement Surcharge	200.00	5
	25.00	3
Total:	\$470.00	

DATE	TIME	EVENT DESCRIPTION
05/23/2017	7:54 am	Note added
05/23/2017	7:53 am	Note added
		Singletary, John Gilbert carpentr recorded the following Case Action Note: 5/23/2017 Envelope dropped off at cashier window (after hours) See attached - Forward to Angela rc
05/06/2010	1:52 pm	Disposition added, Tried in Absence (Bail Forfeited)
		Singletary, John Gilbert
05/04/2010	1:00 pm	Court event: Court Date Judge Name:
		Singletary, John Gilbert
04/19/2010	1:00 pm	quickr recorded the following Case Action Note: NO SHOW FOR PRIOR COURT
		Singletary, John Gilbert
04/14/2010	1:00 pm	Court event: Court Date Judge Name:
		Singletary, John Gilbert
04/12/2010	1:00 pm	quickr recorded the following Case Action Note: NOTIFIED BY BURGESS
		Singletary, John Gilbert
03/09/2010	1:00 pm	Court event: Court Date Judge Name:
		Singletary, John Gilbert
02/26/2010	1:00 pm	behrenl recorded the following Case Action Note: Def notified by phone of new court date and time 02/25/2010 LB

int Date: 05/26/2017
int Time: 12:35:52PM
requested By: grayac

ASE HISTORY FOR CASE 70055FB

02/23/2010 1:00 pm Singletary, John Gilbert
Court event: Court Date Judge Name:
Singletary, John Gilbert
Edwardss recorded the following Case Action Note: Def. req. a cont. on 2-23-10...fwd Linda/Def notified by phone of new court date and time.LB 02/25/2010

02/03/2010 7:43 pm Received payment of \$470.00 from Sheldon Morris Singletary for John Gilbert Singletary . Printed receipt #183859.
Singletary, John Gilbert

02/03/2010 12:00 am Bond was posted in the amount of 470.00 by Sheldon Morris Singletary
Singletary, John Gilbert

01/31/2010 9:00 am guthris recorded the following Case Action Note: BONDED OUT
Singletary, John Gilbert

01/27/2010 9:00 am Court event: Bond Hearing Judge Name:
Singletary, John Gilbert

01/26/2010 12:00 am Bond 96574 was set in the amount of 470.00 by
Singletary, John Gilbert

2

HOME

Ticket Search

[Back to Case List](#)

Case Information

Case #	Caption	Filed Date	Status
70055FB	State v. John Gilbert Singletary	01/31/2010	Closed

Case Parties

Name	DOB
Singletary, John - (Defendant)	12/25/1961
Glenn # 227, J - (Officer)	
Singletary, Sheldon - (Bond Company)	
Mayer, Aaron - (Defendant Attorney)	

Case Charges

Citation Number	Charge Description	Offense Date	Charge Disposition	Plea Descrip
70055FVB	Prostitution 13-22(1)	01/26/2010	Tried in Absence (Bail Forfeited)	

Case History

Action Date	Action Time	Action Description	View Document
05/23/2017	07:54 AM	Note added	
05/31/2017	09:05 AM	Note added	
06/19/2017	11:44 AM	Note added	
06/20/2017	08:27 AM	Note added	
06/22/2017	11:45 AM	Note added	
06/22/2017	12:39 PM	Note added	
06/26/2017	03:49 PM	Note added	
06/29/2017	11:05 AM	Note added	
11/17/2017	03:10 PM	Note added	
12/27/2017	02:44 PM	Note added	
02/23/2010	01:00 PM	Court Date	
01/27/2010	09:00 AM	Bond Hearing	
03/09/2010	01:00 PM	Court Date	
04/14/2010	01:00 PM	Court Date	
05/04/2010	01:00 PM	Court Date	
05/06/2010	01:52 PM	Disposition added, Tried in Absence (Bail Forfeited)	
05/23/2017	07:53 AM	Note added	
05/31/2017	09:04 AM	Motion for New Trial or Reduction	
06/29/2017	11:04 AM	Appeal	
07/03/2017	11:23 AM	Jacket Labels for Files	

Ticket Search

#3

HOME Ticket Search

[Back to Case List](#)

Case Information

Case #	Caption	Filed Date	Status
70055FB	State v. John Gilbert Singletary	01/31/2010	Closed

Case Parties

Name	DOB
Singletary, John - (Defendant)	[REDACTED]
Glenn # 227, J - (Officer)	
Singletary, Sheldon - (Bond Company)	
Mayer, Aaron - (Defendant Attorney)	

Case Charges

Citation Number	Charge Description	Offense Date	Charge Disposition	Plea Description
70055FVB	Prostitution 13-22(1)	01/26/2010	Tried in Absence (Bail Forfeited)	

Case History

Action Date	Action Time	Action Description	View Document
05/23/2017	07:54 AM	Note added	
05/31/2017	09:05 AM	Note added	
06/19/2017	11:44 AM	Note added	
06/20/2017	08:27 AM	Note added	
06/22/2017	11:45 AM	Note added	
06/22/2017	12:39 PM	Note added	
06/26/2017	03:49 PM	Note added	
06/29/2017	11:05 AM	Note added	
11/17/2017	03:10 PM	Note added	
12/27/2017	02:44 PM	Note added	
02/23/2010	01:00 PM	Court Date	
01/27/2010	09:00 AM	Bond Hearing	
03/09/2010	01:00 PM	Court Date	
04/14/2010	01:00 PM	Court Date	
05/04/2010	01:00 PM	Court Date	
05/06/2010	01:52 PM	Disposition added, Tried in Absence (Bail Forfeited)	
05/23/2017	07:53 AM	Note added	
05/31/2017	09:04 AM	Motion for New Trial or Reduction	
06/29/2017	11:04 AM	Appeal	
07/03/2017	11:23 AM	Jacket Labels for Files	

Ticket Search

UNIFORM TRAFFIC TICKET

CITY OR COUNTY OF North Charleston VERSUS
 FIRST NAME John MIDDLE NAME Gilbert LAST NAME Singletary Jr

STREET AND NO. 4321 Waterview Cir. CITY North Charleston STATE SC ZIP CODE 29418

STATE LICENSED SC DRIVER'S LICENSE NO. 008013950 CDL YES NO DRI. LIC. CLASS D

VEH. LIC. NO. STATE SC MAKE OF VEH. YEAR Ford COMM. VEH. AUTO 16 PSGR. VEH. COMB.
 HAZ. MT. MOPED MTRCYCL. OTHER

YOU ARE SUMMONED TO APPEAR BEFORE THE TRIAL OFFICER

NAME OF TRIAL OFFICER Mon. Ct. STREET AND NO. 2500 City Hall Lane

DATE OF TRIAL 2/23/2010 TIME OF TRIAL 1300 CITY North Charleston STATE SC ZIP CODE 29405

VIOLATION - COURT APPEARANCE REQUIRED: YES NO VIOLATION SECTION NO. 13-22

OWNER OF VEHICLE Solicitation of Prostitution DATE OF ARREST 1/26/2010

ADDRESS OF OWNER [Redacted] DATE OF VIOLATION 1/26/2010

BAIL DEPOSITED Just NAME OF ARRESTING OFFICER Gen. H. He RANK Pfc

DESCRIPTION OF ACCUSED: RACE B SEX M BIRTH DATE 2/25/1961 HT. 510 HAIR Blk WT. 25 YES NO COUNTY Charleston NUMBER 10

DATE BAIL REC'D. 20 BY [Redacted] BADGE 227 DISTRICT 6

CASE BEFORE: MAGISTRATE MUN. COURT CIRCUIT COURT FAMILY COURT FEDERAL COURT TIME OF VIOLATION 1318 WEATHER AM-1 PM-2

NAME OF TRIAL OFFICER IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE: [Redacted] DISTANCE IN FEET FROM INTERSECTION OF Remount AND Modder

DEFENDANT: DID NOT APPEAR APPEARED

NOLLE PROSSED. DISPOSITION: GUILTY FORFEITED BOND PLED NOLO CONTENDERE

TRIAL BY: TRIAL OFFICER [Redacted] JURY DATE OF TRIAL IF ANY 20

VERDICT OF TRIAL IF ANY: GUILTY NOT GUILTY

JAIL SUSPEND FINE 400 AMT. COLLECTED 400 AMT. SUSPENDED

COMMITTED TO: Vehicle Searched Yes Arrest as Result of Collision No OFFENSE CODE 94 B.A. LEVEL 70055 FB

CERT. [Signature] DATE 5/9/10

DRIVER'S RECORD COPY

\$ 170.00

CLERK OF COURT
NORTH CHARLESTON, SC

May 26, 2014

DOCKET NO.

2010003762

15/1/10

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

RECEIVED
JUL 23 2019
SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

J. C. Nicholson, Jr, Circuit Court Judge
Trial Court Case No. 2017-CP-10-03226

Appellate Case No. 2017-002621

John Gilbert Singletary,..... Appellant,


v.

The State,Respondent.

Certificate of Service

I certify that a true copy of the request to amend initial brief, release of counsel, request for default, request for sanctions, request for discover, and request find new counsel was mailed through US mail postage prepaid to Robin Jackson Post Office Box 12279. Charleston, SC 29422

Respectfully submitted,



John Singletary
4321 Waterview Circle
North Charleston
South Carolina 29418
Phone: 843-693-2823
Pro se Attorney for Appellant