

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

The State, Respondent,

v.

Miquell Lutron Bryan, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2020-000075

ORDER

Appellant's counsel moves for an order relieving counsel and allowing Appellant to proceed pro se in this matter. Appellant may proceed pro se in this matter only after knowingly and intelligently waiving the right to counsel. *See Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975); *State v. Brewer*, 328 S.C. 117, 492 S.E.2d 97 (1997). We take this opportunity to warn Appellant that this Court requires pro se parties to fully comply with all applicable rules. Appellant is certain to be unlearned in other aspects of the law as well. Representation by an attorney trained in the law would be highly beneficial, and we strongly encourage Appellant to continue with representation by counsel or the Division of Appellate Defense.

After considering this information, Appellant shall, within thirty days of the date of this order, notify this Court whether he wishes to proceed pro se or continue to be represented by the Division of Appellate Defense. If Appellant notifies this Court that he wishes to proceed pro se despite the dangers and disadvantages of doing so, this Court will then determine if it will allow him to do so. *Cf. State v. Roberts*, 364 S.C. 583, 614 S.E.2d 626 (2005) (no right to proceed pro se on appeal). If Appellant fails to notify this Court within thirty days, counsel will continue to provide representation in this matter.


FOR THE COURT

FILED
May 21 2020

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire

William M. Blicht, Jr., Esquire

Stephanie Bianco Linder, Esquire

Robert Michael Dudek, Esquire

Jason Todd Mikell, Esquire