

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM ORANGEBURG COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

L. Casey Manning, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2001-CP-38-1240

Sammie Louis Stokes,

Appellant,

v.

State of South Carolina,

Respondent.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Sammie Louis Stokes appeals the order and judgment of Circuit Judge L. Casey Manning, dated February 13, 2013, in the above-captioned action. Appellant received written notice of entry of the order and judgment on February 26, 2013.

RECEIVED

MAR 27 2013

S.C. SUPREME COURT

By: Keir M. Weyble
Keir M. Weyble
Cornell Law School
158-B Myron Taylor Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
607 255 3805

Robert Lominack
126 South Sims Ave.
Columbia, SC 29205
803 351 0436

March 26, 2013

Other counsel of record:
Donald J. Zelenka
South Carolina Attorney General's Office
PO. O. Box 11549
Columbia, S.C. 29211
803-734-3601

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM ORANGEBURG COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

L. Casey Manning, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2001-CP-38-1240

Sammie Louis Stokes,

Appellant,

v.

State of South Carolina,


Respondent.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the Notice of Appeal in the above-captioned case has been served upon the respondent, via U.S. mail, first-class, postage prepaid, at the following address:

Donald J. Zelenka
Office of the Attorney General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, SC 29211


This the 26th day of March, 2013.


Jill Rider

BLUME WEYBLE & NORRIS, LLC


ATTORNEYS AT LAW

900 ELMWOOD AVENUE, SUITE 101
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201



Honorable Daniel Shearouse
Clerk
Supreme Court of South Carolina
Post Office Box 11330
Columbia, SC 29211


29211#1330 BOSS



THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
1701 Main Street, Richland County Judicial Center
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

L. Casey Manning
Resident Judge
(803) 576-1773
(803) 576-1744 Fax

Reply to :
P.O. Box 192
Columbia, S.C. 29202



October 21, 2010

The Honorable Winnifa B. Clark
Orangeburg Clerk of Court
Post Office Box 9000
Orangeburg, SC 29116

2010 OCT 22 AM 11:52
CIRCUIT COURT
ORANGEBURG, SC

Re: Sammie Louis Stokes vs. State of South Carolina
C/A No. 01-CP-38-1240

Dear Sirs:

Per our conversation over the phone this morning, enclosed please find the original signed Order of Dismissal pertaining to the application for post-conviction relief in Sammie Louis Stokes, #5069 v. State of South Carolina, Orangeburg County, C/A No. 01-CP-38-1240.

Thank you in advance for your courtesy and attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

William P. Walker, III
Law Clerk to the Honorable L. Casey Manning

Enclosure

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF ORANGEBURG)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

SAMMIE LOUIS STOKES, #5069)
)
Applicant,)
)
vs.)
)
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,)
)
Respondent.)
_____)

C/A No. 01-CP-38-1240

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
ORANGEBURG COUNTY
SOUTH CAROLINA
OCT 17 2001

This matter comes before this Court by an initial application filed October 17, 2001. An amended application was filed by his court-appointed counsel, Robert Lominack and Keir Weyble of Columbia, South Carolina. The Respondent made a Return to the initial application on July 3, 2002. The matter was initial set for a hearing on September 13, 2004. On August 9, 2004, the Applicant made an amended application. The matter was initially continued by Order of Continuance dated August 26, 2004 to allow the South Carolina Department of Disabilities and Special Needs complete an evaluation of the Applicant on whether he possessed the disability of mental retardation. On October 22, 2007, the Department submitted a report to this Court that opined the Petitioner was not mentally retarded.

On June 4, 2009 a status conference was held in Richland County. During the conference, the Applicant's counsel advised the Court that it was abandoning the issue concerning lethal injection. Upon inquiry, the Court was also advised that it was abandoning the issue concerning mental retardation raised in the amended application. The Court scheduled a hearing for August

5, 2009 in Orangeburg County. The Respondent made a Return to the Amended Application on August 5, 2009.

On August 5, 2009 a hearing was convened in Orangeburg County before this Court. The Applicant was present and represented by appointed counsel Weyble and Lominack. The Respondent was represented by Donald J. Zelenka. Testimony was received from prior appellate counsel Joseph Savitz (PCR Tr.p. 19-39), Jeffrey Bloom (PCR Tr.p. 40-48), prior trial counsel Thomas Sims (PCR Tr.p. 49-98) and Virgin Johnson (PCR Tr.p. 100-108).. The Applicant did not testify. At the conclusion of the hearing, it was agreed that simultaneous briefing would occur after receipt of the transcripts. On December 28, 2009, Applicant's counsel advised Respondent's counsel that he was abandoning allegation 9(a) and only proceeding on allegations 9(b), 9(c), and 9(d). Post hearing memorandum were prepared and sent on February 16, 2010 by both parties.

This Court has reviewed the evidence, pleadings and memorandum of law. It is constrained to make the following findings of fact and conclusions of law and dismiss and deny the application, as amended, in its entirety, pursuant to S.C. Code § 17-27-80, 160.

I.

PRIOR PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On May 17, 1999, an Orangeburg County Jury indicted Sammie Louis Stokes for murder, kidnapping, first degree criminal sexual conduct, and criminal conspiracy in the death of Connie Lee Snipes. The State sought the death penalty in the case. The Applicant was represented by Thomas R. Sims and Virgin Johnson

There were two pretrial hearings. The first, on January 19, 1999, before the Honorable Duane Shuler, concerned the qualification of defense counsel and a request for an evaluation.

ROA, p. 1500 - 1508. The second, on October 14, 1999, concerned pretrial motions before Judge Paul Burch. ROA 1510-1642.

The trial began on October 25, 1999 and ended on October 31, 1999. Judge Paul M. Burch presided at the pretrial hearings and at trial. Following the guilt phase of the trial, the jury found Mr. Stokes guilty of all charges. Following the sentencing phase, Mr. Stokes exercised his statutory right to make a closing argument. The jury found four aggravating circumstances and recommended death, which Judge Burch affirmed. He also sentenced Mr. Stokes to 30 years for first degree criminal sexual conduct, and to five years for conspiracy. Mr. Stokes later pleaded guilty to murdering Mr. Ferguson, for which he received a life sentence.

The Direct Appeal

The Applicant appealed to the South Carolina Supreme Court. On appeal, he was represented by Joseph L. Savitz of the South Carolina Office of Appellate Defense. In his Final Brief of Appellant, he asserted the issues on appeal as follows:

- I. The judge erred by refusing to allow the defense to introduce the portion of appellant's letter to the police the state had redacted, which indicated that the decedent had willingly accompanied appellant, Syphrette and Martin as the member of a conspiracy to kill Doug Ferguson.
- II. The judge erred at sentencing by refusing to allow appellant to tell the jury during allocution that he had asked God to forgive him for his crimes.

State v. Stokes, Final Brief of Appellant, p. 3. The Respondent restated the issues as:

- I. The trial judge properly denied the defense request to admit statements redacted from a letter introduced by the State because the statements were unnecessary and irrelevant to a fair and complete determination of the defendant's guilt.
- II. The trial judge properly barred the defendant from arguing religious matters during his statutory closing argument.

The South Carolina Supreme Court denied the appeal in *State v. Stokes*, 345 S.C. 368, 548 S.E.2d 202 (2001) on May 29, 2001. On July 2, 2001, a petition for rehearing was denied..

STATE'S VERSION OF THE FACTS

Not long after his arrest, Mr. Stokes wrote a letter to the police confessing his involvement in Ms. Snipes' murder. At trial, the State introduced the letter as evidence and supplemented it with other testimony, including that of Mr. Stokes' cohort, Norris Martin.

In the letter, Mr. Stokes confessed that he had agreed to kill Ms. Snipes for \$2,000 at the request of his cellmate, James Roy Toothe, and Mr. Toothe's mother, Pattie Syphrette. Ms.

Snipes and her two children by Mr. Toothe, Brian and Nicole, lived with Ms. Syphrette.

Apparently, the desire to have Ms. Snipes killed originated in Ms. Snipes' behavior regarding Mr. Toothe and the children, especially when she caused Nicole to be taken by the Department of Social Services. *See Stokes Confession* (Court's Exhibit 4), R. pp. 1658-59.

On May 22, Mr. Stokes called Ms. Syphrette. She said that Ms. Snipes "got to go and tonight." The reason she gave for the sudden urgency was that DSS had given her an ultimatum: to evict Snipes from her home or face losing the remaining grandchild, Brian. *Id.* at 1661-62. Then, as related by Mr. Stokes, the situation developed as follows:¹

I said well, I talked with Norris and everything is straight on his end. She said I'll pick you up at Woody's Pawn Shop at 9:30 P.M. She said Connie thinks we are going to kill Doug and she thinks we already got him tied up in Branchville somewhere. She said I wish that were true so we could do all both of them. She said that Connie can't stand Doug and wants to be there to help us and besides she wants to meet you anyway, I know you've been talking

¹Although the original confession was transcribed as one long non-paragraphed statement, paragraphs are asserted into this passage for ease of review.

to her on the phone when Roy calls and I wasn't home.² You just better not flip on me for her. I laughed and said see yall at 9:30 P.M.

They both showed up at 9:30 at Woody's and I went to the passenger side and Connie got out. I said what's up girl, pulled her to me and hugged her tight. She said ain't nothing. So I got in and we drove off. While riding to Branchville, Connie said Doug ain't shit and I'd love to see him get his. She said I had plans tonight but this is better.³ I just laughed and looked at Pattie.

We got to Branchville and rode straight through town and came up through shake-rag and came on a back street, but you can still see the town. I spotted Norris or thought I did, but it wasn't him. So we went to his apartment and Connie went and knocked on the door, but there wasn't no answer. We drove back down town the same back route. That's when I spotted Norris coming out the store walking over to two parked cars with a bag in his hand. So we stopped and was trying to decide who should go call him. So Connie said fuck it, I'll go get him and she got out and walked down the road and called Norris. They both came back and got in. I asked him what's up bro and he said that he came down town to get some beer.

So we went down that dirt road passed Owen's home and I told Pattie to stop. Norris and I got out and I asked him was he ready to handle the business. He said yeah, but let's go back to my apartment so I can get the pussy first. I said we can't go there because people is out walking about in the projects. I said well I know that I can get the pussy because she likes me anyway. I said you want Pattie. He said I'd rather have the other one first. Well I was thinking right there, I know she isn't going to be willing to do it with him. So I said well once you get her in your spot, handle your business. I asked him where did he want to go and he said I'll show you. So we got back in the car and he showed us the spot.

² This phrase was redacted from the Confession published to the jury during the guilt phase. See R. at 969, ll.16-17.

³This phrase also was redacted from the Confession published to the jury during the guilt phase. See R. at 969, ll.22-23.

Then once we got there I got the gun out from behind the seat and passed it to Norris. Then we all got out and Pattie opened the trunk and tried to pass me the shovel, but I wouldn't take it. Then she gave it to Norris. Then Connie say let's go and Pattie said, I'll stay here and watch the car just in case anybody comes, I'll say I'm tricking and we all laughed. Then Connie and Norris walked off and Pattie said is he going to fuck her too. I said yes. Then she said you better not.

I ran and caught up with them and we walked over some bushes and broken limbs and got to the back of the field or on the side. That's when Connie said well where is he at. I said baby, I'm sorry, but it's you that Pattie wants dead and Connie said [oh] my god, that fat bitch. She said, yall don't trust her because she will only turn on yall too. I said she is paying us \$2,000. Connie said that fat bitch hasn't got two cents. Then Connie said please don't kill me

....

Stokes Confession, R. pp. 1662-63.

Then, Mr. Martin had sex with the victim. *Id.* At trial, Mr. Martin testified that afterwards, Mr. Stokes took a knife and stabbed the victim in the chest, cut the nipple off of her right breast, then penetrated her anally while she was screaming from the injuries he inflicted on her. R. at 1155, 1.4-1157, 1.2⁴. Afterwards, Ms. Snipes was shot twice in the head; one shot struck her jaw and the other--fatal--shot struck her in the back of the head. *Id.* at 853, 1.4-854, 1.10. Although it is medically impossible to tell which shot came first, Mr. Martin testified that the defendant fired both shots, and that the victim was screaming after the first shot. *Id.* at 893, 1.5-22. Mr. Stokes stated that both he and Mr. Martin each fired one shot, but that Mr. Martin fired the first shot and he fired the second one. Stokes Confession, R. p.1663. Mr. Martin testified that Mr. Stokes scalped the victim and tossed her hair into the woods, *id.* at 1160, 11.13-23, then cut

⁴This testimony was elicited during the sentencing phase, and not during the guilt phase.

her vagina out. *Id.* at 1160, 1.24-1161, 1.10. A pathologist confirmed these injuries. *Id.* at 1218, 1.8-1221, 1.13.

On May 28, 1998, Mr. Stokes was at Ms. Syphrette's house with Faith Lapp, Ms. Syphrette, and Brian. *Id.* at 1330, 11.20-23. Ms. Syphrette left to get Mr. Ferguson and bring him to the house. *Id.* at 1334, 11.10-19. Ms. Lapp testified that, while they waited, Mr. Stokes told her that if she said anything, he would do to her what he did to Ms. Snipes and, "if he couldn't get to [her], he was going to get to my family and then he said that he was going to have to come back in twenty years and get the baby." *Id.* at 1335, 11.6-11.

When Mr. Ferguson arrived, he sat down on the couch. *Id.* at 1340, 1.9; Stokes Confession, R. p. 1667. Mr. Stokes, who had been hiding in an adjacent bedroom, came out and asked, "[D]o you know me." R. at 1340, 1.15-1341, 1.16. Mr. Ferguson kept saying no. *Id.* at 1341, 11.16-17; Stokes Confession. Then, Mr. Stokes said, "Motherfucker, you're going to know me." *Id.* at 1341, 11.19-20. Lapp testified that, at that point, she took Brian out of the room while Mr. Stokes and Ms. Syphrette wrapped duct tape around Mr. Ferguson. *Id.* at 1342, 11.19-25. In his confession, Mr. Stokes stated that he punched Mr. Ferguson while he lay on the floor. Stokes Confession, R. p.1668. The pathologist described how they wrapped the duct tape around Mr. Ferguson:

The unusual thing about his body was that he was wrapped in duct tape. His ankles were taped together, his wrists were taped together and his arms were taped together and then that was taped to his chest and then his face and head was [sic] fully taped.

R. at 1194, 11.4-11. Because they wrapped tape around his nose, his mouth, and his entire head, Mr. Ferguson could not breathe and he died from suffocation. *Id.* at 1206, 11.1-9.

II. Allegations

Prior to the entry of the stay and assignment order on October 17, 2001, appellate counsel for Mr. Stokes initially filed an application for post-conviction relief in Orangeburg County. In the application, it was alleged that he received “ineffective assistance of counsel” and that it was based upon a “failure to present mitigating evidence.” On May 6, 2002, the Respondent received the “First Amended Application for Post-conviction Relief.” In the 2002 Application, made by current counsel, Stokes alleged the following:

9(a) *Applicant was denied the effective assistance of counsel in violation of the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and Article I, § 14 of the South Carolina Constitution. Williams v. Taylor, 529 U.S. 362 (2000); Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984).*

10(a) Trial counsel unreasonably failed to submit the autopsy data generated by the state’s medical examiner to a qualified, independent pathologist for review. As a result, counsel were unprepared and unable to challenge the state’s version of how the crime occurred, and what actions, if any, were taken by Applicant in connection with the vents surrounding the victim’s death. But for trial counsel’s deficient performance, there exists a reasonable probability that the result of Applicant’s trial would have been different.

9(b) *Applicant was denied the effective assistance of counsel during the sentencing phase of his trial in violation of the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and Article I, § 14 of the South Carolina Constitution.*

10(b) The facts supporting the claim are as follows:

1. Trial counsel failed to investigate and present available mitigating evidence during the sentencing phase of Applicant’s trial. Had counsel investigated and presented mitigating evidence, there is a reasonable probability that the result of Applicant’s sentencing proceeding would have been different. *Williams v. Taylor, 529 U.S. 362 (2000); Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1894); Jolly v. State, 314 S.C. 17, 443 S.E.2d 566 (1994).*

2. During closing argument, the prosecutor argued that life in prison without parole would reward Applicant, because the prison system would exert no control over his behavior. The prosecutor inaccurately argued that the prison system could only take away canteen privileges or lock Applicant down for a short time if he misbehaved. In the end, the prosecutor, based on this inaccurate portrayal, argued that the death penalty was the only punitive sentence. Although the prosecution's argument violated Applicant's rights as guaranteed by the Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, as well as applicable state law, trial counsel raised no objection. Had counsel properly objected to the prosecution's inaccurate and prejudicial closing argument, there is a reasonable probability that the result of Applicant's sentencing proceeding would have been different. *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984); *see also, e.g., Beck v. Alabama*, 447 U.S. 625 (1980); *Gardner v. Florida*, 430 U.S. 349 (1977); *State v. Plath*, 281 S.C. 1, 313 S.E.2d 619 (1984); *State v. Atkinson*, 253 S.C. 531, 172 S.E.2d 111 (1970); *State v. Reed*, 293 S.C. 515, 362 S.E.2d 13 (1987).

On August 9, 2004, Respondent received a pleading styled "Amended Application for Post-Conviction Relief" dated August 6, 2004. In the application, he raised the following:

1. *Applicant was denied the effective assistance of counsel during the sentencing phase of his trial in violation of the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and Article I, § 14 of the South Carolina Constitution, as a result of trial counsel's failure to object to the solicitor's mischaracterizations of life in prison during closing argument. 9(a)*
 - a. The facts supporting the claim are as follows: During closing argument, the prosecutor argued that life in prison without parole would reward applicant, because the prison system would exert no control over his behavior. The prosecutor inaccurately argued that the prison system could only take away canteen privileges or lock applicant down for a short time if he misbehaved. In the end, the prosecutor, based on this inaccurate portrayal, argued that the death penalty was the only punitive sentence. Although the prosecution's argument

violated applicant's rights as guaranteed by the Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, as well as applicable state law, trial counsel raised no objection. Had counsel properly objected to the prosecution's inaccurate and prejudicial closing argument, there is a reasonable probability that the result of applicant's sentencing proceeding would have been different. *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984); *see also, e.g., Beck v. Alabama*, 447 U.S. 625 (1980); *Gardner v. Florida*, 430 U.S. 349 (1977); *State v. Plath*, 281 S.C. 1, 313 S.E.2d 619 (1984); *State v. Atkinson*, 253 S.C. 531, 172 S.E.2d 111 (1970); *State v. Reed*, 293 S.C. 414, 362 S.E.2d 13 (1987). 10(a)

2. *Applicant's right to the effective assistance of counsel as guaranteed by the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and South Carolina law was denied as a result of appellate counsel's failure to raise on direct appeal the trial judge's failure to determine what statutory mitigating circumstances were supported by the evidence and his failure to hold a charge conference prior to instructing the jury in the sentencing phase of the trial.* 9(b)

a. Prior to instructing the jury at the sentencing phase of the trial, the trial judge was required to make an initial determination of which statutory mitigating factors were supported by the evidence and then to conduct a charge conference. *State v. Victor*, 300 S.C. 220, 387 S.E.2d 248 (1989). In this case, the trial judge failed to follow the clear rule set out in *Victor*. Furthermore, this failure to apply existing state law deprived applicant of due process. *See, e.g., Vitek v. Jones*, 445 U.S. 480 (1980); *Hicks v. Oklahoma*, 447 U.S. 343 (1980); *Greenholtz v. Nebraska Penal Inmates*, 442 U.S. 1, 7 (1979); *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471 (1972); *Gagnon v. Scarpelli*, 411 U.S. 778 (1973). Appellate counsel failed to raise this claim on direct appeal; had counsel done so, there exists a reasonable probability that the result of applicant's appeal would have been different. *Williams v. Taylor*, 120 S.Ct. 1495 (2000); *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984); *Douglas v. California*, 372 U.S. 353 (1963); *Southerland v. State*, 337 S.C. 610, 524 S.E.2d 833 (1999). 10(b).

3. *Applicant's right to the effective assistance of counsel as guaranteed by the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and South Carolina law was denied as a result of appellate counsel's failure to raise on direct appeal the trial judge's failure to submit for the jury's consideration a statutory mitigating circumstance.* 9(c)

a. S.C. Code § 16-3-20(C) provides that the trial judge "shall include in his instructions to the jury for it to consider...the following...mitigating circumstances which may be supported by the evidence." In this case, the trial judge failed to instruct the jury on § 16-3-20(C)(b)(3) (the victim was a participant in the defendant's conduct or consented to the act), despite the fact that there was evidentiary support for this mitigating circumstance. *See State v. Pierce*, 289 S.C.

430, 346 S.E.2d 707 (1986) (trial judge required to instruct the jury on statutory mitigating circumstances), *overruled on other grounds*, *Torrence*, 305 S.C. 45, 406 S.E.2d 315 (1991); *State v. Rogers*, 338 S.C. 435, 521 S.E.2d 101 (2000). Appellate counsel failed to include this claim on direct appeal had counsel done so, there exists a reasonable probability that the result of applicant's appeal would have been different. *See Douglas v. California*, 372 U.S. 353 (1963); *Southerland v. State*, 337 S.C. 610, 524 S.E.2d 833 (1999). 10(c)

4. *Applicant's right to counsel as guaranteed by the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and South Carolina law was violated as a result of his representation by counsel who labored under an actual conflict of interest.* 9(d)
 - a. The facts supporting the claim are as follows: From approximately 1981 until 1992, Thomas Sims, who would subsequently be appointed as lead defense counsel for applicant, was employed as an assistant solicitor in the First Circuit Solicitor's Office. In his capacity as assistant solicitor, Mr. Sims prosecuted applicant for a violent offense against his ex-wife. Largely on the strength of applicant's ex-wife's testimony, elicited at the trial by Assistant Solicitor Sims, a jury found applicant guilty of aggravated assault and battery, for which he received a substantial prison sentence. Later, in the capital trial challenged in this application, the prosecution began its sentencing phase presentation with evidence, again offered by applicant's ex-wife, of the offense for which Mr. Sims had previously prosecuted applicant. On cross-examination of the complaining witness, Mr. Sims did not explore several lines of inquiry which, had they been explored, would have mitigated the seriousness of the offense described by the witness and undermined the accuracy of her account. The record of proceedings before the trial court in this case contains no discussion or waiver of the conflict of interest arising out of Mr. Sims' successive involvement as prosecutor then defender of applicant. *See, e.g., Cuyler v. Sullivan*, 466 U.S. 335 (1980); *Holloway v. Arkansas*, 435 U.S. 475 (1978); *Thomas v. State*, 346 S.C. 140, 551 S.E.2d 254 (2001); *United States v. Swartz*, 975 F.2d 1042 (4th Cir. 1992); *Hoffman v. Leeke*, 903 F.2d 280 (4th Cir. 1990); *United States v. Zeigenhagen*, 890 F.2d 937, 940-41 (7th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Kitchin*, 592 F.2d 900 (5th Cir. 1979). 10(d)
5. *Applicant's sentence of death may not be carried out consistently with the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution because he has mental retardation.* 9(e)
 - a. The facts supporting the claim are as follows: Applicant suffers from significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior and manifested during the developmental period, as evidenced by a full scale IQ that is below the accepted threshold for mental retardation, and

by historical information indicating that his adaptive skills are deficient. *Atkins v. Virginia*, 536 U.S. 304 (2002); *Franklin v. Maynard*, 356 S.C. 276, 588 S.E.2d 604 (2003). 10(e)

6. *Pursuant to Article I § 11 of the South Carolina Constitution and the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, the trial court lacked jurisdiction to sentence applicant to death as a result of the omission from the indictments of the aggravating factor(s) essential to expose him to punishment greater than life in prison.* 9(f)
 - a. The facts supporting the claim are as follows: Applicant was separately indicted for murder, conspiracy, criminal sexual conduct, and kidnapping. Applicant's eligibility for a sentence of death rested on the jury's finding of four statutory aggravating circumstances: murder during the commission of kidnapping; murder during the commission of criminal sexual conduct; murder for hire; and commission of murder as the agent of another. None of the indictments alleged that the victim's murder occurred "during the commission of" either criminal sexual conduct or kidnapping. Likewise, none of the indictments made any reference to murder for hire or commission of murder as the agent of another. See S.C. Code § 16-3-20; *Ring v. Arizona*, 122 S.Ct. 2428 (2002); *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000); *Jones v. United States*, 526 U.S. 227 (1999); *Hooks v. State*, 353 S.C. 48, 577 S.E.2d 211 (2003); *State v. Grim*, 341 S.C. 63, 66, 533 S.E.2d 329, 330 (2000); *State v. Brown*, 24 S.C. 224 (1886). 10(f)

7. *Applicant's sentence of death by lethal injection cannot be carried out because the procedures and policies for executing such a sentence presently followed by the State of South Carolina will result in unnecessary pain, torture and suffering in violation of the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.* 9(g)
 - a. The facts supporting the claim are as follows: The lethal injection procedures and protocols followed by the South Carolina Department of Corrections fail to ensure, *inter alia*, that qualified personnel perform the tasks necessary to carry out a lethal injection without causing unnecessary pain and suffering, or that appropriately humane chemicals are administered during the execution process. Because of these and other deficiencies, South Carolina's methods for carrying out sentences of death by lethal injection are inconsistent with evolving standards of decency. See, e.g., *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825 (1994); *In re Kimmler*, 136 U.S. 436 (1890). 10(g)

During the status conference on June 4, 2009, counsel for the Applicant advised the Court and opposing counsel that he was withdrawing amended ground 7 set out as 9(g) [Applicant's

sentence of death by lethal injection cannot be carried out because the procedures and policies for executing such a sentence presently followed by the State of South Carolina will result in unnecessary pain, torture and suffering in violation of the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution]. [The Respondent had made a motion to dismiss the allegation on August 25, 2004 under SCCP 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) as beyond the jurisdiction of the court in a state post-conviction relief proceeding under *Al-Shabazz v. State*, 338 S.C. 354, 527 S.E.2d 742 (2000)].

During the proceeding on June 4, 2009, counsel for the Applicant also advised the Court and opposing counsel that he was abandoning ground five - allegation 9(e) [*Applicant's sentence of death may not be carried out consistently with the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution because he has mental retardation*]. [The October 22, 2007 submission by the South Carolina Department of Disabilities and Special Needs opined that Stokes did not meet the diagnostic criteria for mental retardation].

Finally, during post-hearing briefing, the Applicant abandoned allegation 9(a). [*counsel's failure to object to the solicitor's mischaracterizations of life in prison during closing argument*].

III.

GENERAL LAW RELATED TO INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL CLAIMS.

In Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052 (1984), the United States Supreme Court held that a convicted defendant's claim that counsel's assistance was so defective as to require a reversal of a conviction requires that the defendant show (1) that counsel's performance was deficient, and (2) that the deficient performance so prejudiced the defense as to

deprive the defendant of a fair trial. 466 U.S. at 687. Respondent submits that the Record on Appeal from the Applicant's trial and sentencing hearing conclusively demonstrate that appointed counsel were not deficient in their performance nor was the Applicant prejudiced in any way by their performance. To the contrary, the Record from each proceeding demonstrates that the Applicant's attorneys were diligent in their representation of the Applicant, performed well within the range of competence demanded of attorneys in criminal matters and performed within the wide range of reasonable professional assistance. State v. Pendergrass, 270 S.C. 1, 239 S.E.2d 750 (1977); Marzullo v. Maryland, 561 F.2d 540 (4th Cir. 1977); Butler v. State, 286 S.C. 441, 34 S.E.2d 813 (1985); Hill v. Lockhart, 474 U.S. 52, 106 S.Ct. 366 (1985).

At this stage, the review of counsel's performance is quite deferential. The Supreme Court has instructed reviewing courts to "indulge a strong presumption that counsel's conduct falls within the wide range of reasonable professional assistance." Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 689, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 2065, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (1984). Thus we ask not whether, with the benefit of hindsight, counsel would have conducted the defense differently. In the wake of a conviction and death sentence such a conclusion "is all too tempting." *Id.* Rather, the court must place itself in the shoes of Stokes' attorneys and ask only whether their choices were objectively unreasonable. We cannot say that counsel's efforts in this case failed to satisfy Strickland's standard.

The Applicant contends he was deprived of constitutionally required effective assistance of counsel during the guilt and sentencing phases of his trial. To prevail on this claim, Stokes bears the burden of demonstrating that their attorney's "representation fell below an objective standard of reasonableness" and "that there is a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's

unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different." Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 688, 694, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 2064-64, 2068, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (1984). In assessing counsel's performance, courts bear in mind that the review is "highly deferential." *Id.* at 689, 104 S.Ct. at 2065. Indeed, it affords a strong presumption that counsel's performance was within the extremely wide range of professionally competent assistance. See *Id.* And, to eliminate the deceptive effects of hindsight on its consideration, the court looks to "the reasonableness of counsel's challenged conduct on the facts of the particular case, viewed as of the time of counsel's conduct." *Id.* at 690, 104 S.Ct. at 2066. Moreover, even those instances in which counsel's conduct fell below an objective standard of reasonableness generally will not justify setting aside a conviction unless the error affected the outcome of the proceeding. See *Id.* at 691-92, 104 S.Ct. at 2066-67. Therefore, deficiencies in the Applicant's attorney's conduct would warrant the grant of habeas relief only if Petitioners convince the court that in the absence of unprofessional errors by their attorney there is a reasonable probability--i.e., one adequate to undermine our confidence in the result-- that "the result of the proceeding would have been different." See *id.* at 694, 104 S.Ct. at 2068.

"[C]ounsel has a duty to make reasonable investigations or to make a reasonable decision that makes particular investigations unnecessary." *Id.* at 691, 104 S.Ct. at 2066; see Satcher v. Pruett, 126 F.3d 561, at 572 (4th Cir 1997)(explaining that "[i]n any ineffectiveness case, a particular decision not to investigate must be directly assessed for reasonableness in all the circumstances, applying a heavy measure of deference to counsel's judgments" (quoting Strickland, 466 U.S. at 691, 104 S.Ct. at 2066)).

9 (A) - Ineffective Assistance in Failing to Object to Penalty Phase Closing Argument.

In his first amended allegation, Stokes, through counsel, contends that counsel should have objected to the prosecution penalty phase argument about the impact of a life sentence in the Department of Corrections. This issue was specifically abandoned in the post-hearing briefing. This Court dismisses the ground for lack of prosecution.

9(b) - Ineffective Assistance of Counsel on Appeal - Failure to Hold A Charge Conference on Mitigating Circumstances.

9(c) - Ineffective Assistance of Counsel on Appeal - Failure to Brief Failure to Instruct on Statutory Mitigating Circumstance (b)(3) - the victim was a participant in the defendant's conduct or consented to the act.

In specification 9(b) and 9(c), the Applicant asserts that appellate counsel Joseph Savitz, Chief Attorney of the South Carolina Office of Appellate Defense was deficient in failing to present two separate grounds in the appeal - the alleged failure to hold a charge conference on the record and the particular failure to instruct on the statutory mitigating circumstance 16-3-20(C)(b)(3) that "the victim was a participant in the defendant's conduct or consented to the act." This Court concludes that appellate counsel cannot be found deficient because neither issue was preserved for review by objection or ruling by the trial court. He has failed in his burden of proof on the initial prong under Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668(1984). These claims must be dismissed.

Standard of Review for Ineffective Appellate Counsel Claims

A PCR applicant has the burden of proving appellate counsel's performance was deficient. Anderson v. State, 354 S.C. 431, 581 S.E.2d 834 (2003); Southerland v. State, 337 S.C. 610, 524 S.E.2d 833 (1999). A defendant is constitutionally entitled to the effective assistance of appellate counsel. Evitts v. Lucey, 469 U.S. 387, 105 S.Ct. 830, 83 L.Ed.2d 821 (1985); Thrift v. State, 302

S.C. 535, 397 S.E.2d 523 (1990); Tisdale v. State, 357 S.C. 474, 475, 594 S.E.2d 166, 167 (2004); Southerland v. State, 337 S.C. 610, 615, 524 S.E.2d 833, 836 (1999).

The proper standard for assessing a claim of ineffectiveness of appellate counsel is that set forth in Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (1984). Smith v. Robbins, 528 U.S. 259, 285, 120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756 (2000)(following Smith v. Murray, 477 U.S. 527, 535-36, 106 S.Ct. 2661, 91 L.Ed.2d 434 (1986)). The petitioner must show both (1) constitutionally deficient performance, by demonstrating that his counsel's conduct was objectively unreasonable, and (2) resulting prejudice, by demonstrating a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's unprofessional error(s), the result of the proceeding--in this case the appeal--would have been different. *Id.* at 285 (applying Strickland).

Although appellate counsel is required to provide effective assistance of counsel, "appellate counsel is not required to raise every nonfrivolous issue that is presented by the record." Thrift v. State, 302 S.C. 535, 539, 397 S.E.2d 523, 526 (1990) citing Jones v. Barnes, 463 U.S. 745, 103 S.Ct. 3308, 77 L.Ed.2d 987 (1983) (emphasis supplied). "For judges to second-guess reasonable professional judgments and impose on ... counsel a duty to raise every 'colorable' claim suggested by a client would disserve the very goal of vigorous and effective advocacy...." Jones, 463 U.S. at 754, 103 S.Ct. 3308. "Furthermore, to render effective assistance, an attorney is not required to raise every conceivable constitutional claim available at trial and on appeal. Holladay v. State, 629 So.2d 673 (Ala.Cr.App.1992), McCoy v. Lynaugh, 874 F.2d 954, 965-66 (5th Cir.1989). Rather, counsel must be given some discretion in determining which claims possibly have merit, and thus a better chance of success, and which claims do not have merit, and thus have little chance of success. Smith

v. Murray, 477 U.S. 527, 106 S.Ct. 2661, 91 L.Ed.2d 434 (1986); Engle v. Isaac, 456 U.S. 107, 102 S.Ct. 1558, 71 L.Ed.2d 783 (1982)." Davis v. State, 720 So.2d 1006, 1014 (Ala.Crim.App.1998).

" '[E]xperienced advocates have emphasized the importance of winnowing out weaker arguments on appeal and focusing on one central issue if possible, or at most on a few key issues. Selecting the most promising issues for review has assumed a greater importance in an era when the time for oral argument is strictly limited in most courts and when page limits on briefs are widely imposed.'

Jones v. Barnes, 463 U.S. 745, 746, 103 S.Ct. 3308, 77 L.Ed.2d 987 (1983).⁵

In applying the [Strickland] test to claims of ineffective assistance of counsel on appeal ..., reviewing courts must accord appellate counsel the "presumption that he decided which issues were most likely to afford relief on appeal." Pruett v. Thompson, 996 F.2d 1560, 1568 (4th Cir.1993). see also Smith v. South Carolina, 882 F.2d 895, 899 (4th Cir. 1989). Indeed, "'[w]innowing out weaker arguments on appeal and focusing on' those more likely to prevail, far from being evidence of incompetence, is the hallmark of effective appellate advocacy." Smith v. Murray, 477 U.S. 527, 536, 106 S.Ct. 2661, 91 L.Ed.2d 434 (1986) (quoting Jones, 463 U.S. at 751); see also Smith, 882 F.2d at 899 (counsel's failure to raise a weak constitutional claim may constitute an acceptable strategic decision designed "to avoid diverting the appellate court's attention from what [counsel] felt were stronger claims"). Although recognizing that "[n]otwithstanding Barnes, it is still possible to bring

⁵The purpose of ineffectiveness review is not to grade counsel's performance. See Strickland, 104 S.Ct. at 2065; see also White v. Singletary, 972 F.2d 1218, 1221 (11th Cir.1992) ('We are not interested in grading lawyers' performances; we are interested in whether the adversarial process at trial, in fact, worked adequately.'). Representation is an art, and an act or omission that is unprofessional in one case may be sound or even brilliant in another. Strickland, 104 S.Ct. at 2067. Different lawyers have different gifts; this fact, as well as differing circumstances from case to case, means the range of what might be a reasonable approach at trial must be broad. To state the obvious: the trial lawyers, in every case, could have done something more or something different. So, omissions are inevitable. But, the issue is not what is possible or 'what is prudent or appropriate, but only what is constitutionally compelled.' Burger v. Kemp, 483 U.S. 776, 107 S.Ct. 3114, 3126, 97 L.Ed.2d 638 (1987).

a Strickland claim based on counsel's failure to raise a particular claim" on direct appeal, the Supreme Court has recently reiterated that "it [will be] difficult to demonstrate that counsel was incompetent." Robbins, 120 S.Ct. at 765. "'Generally, only when ignored issues are clearly stronger than those presented, will the presumption of effective assistance of counsel be overcome.'" Id. (quoting Gray v. Greer, 800 F.2d 644, 646 (7th Cir.1986)). Bell v. Jarvis, 236 F.3d 149, 164 (4th Cir.2000) (en banc).

Appellate counsel is not deficient for failing to raise on appeal an issue that was not preserved for review. Legge v. State, 349 S.C. 222, 562 S.E.2d 618 (2002); Gilchrist v. State, 612 S.E.2d 702, 705 (S.C. 2004) (appellate counsel not ineffective where trial counsel's submission of the request to charge, without any further explanation of his point, was insufficient to preserve for review the trial court's failure to charge the specific language regarding "a right to act on appearances."). See State v. Hicks, 330 S.C. 207, 499 S.E.2d 209, cert. denied, 525 U.S. 1022, 119 S.Ct. 552, 142 L.Ed.2d 459 (1998) (issue must be raised to and ruled upon by trial court to be preserved for review); State v. Dickman, 341 S.C. 293, 534 S.E.2d 268 (2000) (party may not argue one ground at trial and an alternate ground on appeal).

To prove prejudice, the applicant must show that, but for counsel's errors, there is a reasonable probability he would have prevailed on appeal. Strickland, supra; Johnson v. State, 325 S.C. 182, 480 S.E.2d 733 (1997). That is, the Applicant must prove prejudice by showing he would have prevailed on appeal had a writ been filed by counsel and granted by this Court. See, Simpkins v. State, 303 S.C. 364, 401 S.E.2d 142 (1991) (appellate counsel ineffective in failing to raise issue, preserved below, which would have entitled defendant to reversal on appeal).

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWED

The record reveals that at the outset of the penalty phase, Judge Burch made inquiry of the state and defense of the aggravating and mitigating factors it intended to pursue. Counsel Sims advised Judge Burch at that time that:

....under section B(3), *the victim was a participant in the defendant's conduct or consented to the act, we think there is ample evidence in the record that the victim participated up to a point by being involved in the actions of the defendant at the time and we would think that it would be a mitigating circumstance.* Your honor, we also intend to – what we consider to be mitigating, his adaptability to prison and there would be a third matter (which concerned the medical condition of Stokes).

ROA 1083, ll. 1-22. (Emphasis added).

In counsel Sims' opening penalty phase opening statement, he discussed their intent to present adaptability to prison evidence, but did not present any statement concerning the victim's involvement or provocation factor. ROA 1109.

Prior to the penalty phase closing arguments after the evidence was presented, Judge Burch declared that: "I'll review my checklist." ROA 1429. During the closing arguments, the solicitor made general references to evidence in mitigation concerning adaptability to prison. ROA 1446, 1451. Stokes made a personal statement of remorse. ROA 1459-1460. Counsel Sims made his argument concerning former warden James Aiken's testimony that Sims would never be a free man and in a maximum security prison and the factors for a maximum security prison. ROA 1466-1467.

Pre-charge objections were made which did not include either of the presently challenged issues. ROA 1468. During the jury charge, Judge Burch addressed mitigation circumstances. ROA 1479-1481. In particular, he stated: " Now there are such things as statutory mitigating circumstances which are not alleged or brought forth in this case and then there are what we call non-statutory mitigating circumstances ..." ROA 1480, ll. 3-6. Judge Burch did not instruct the jury to consider any specific statutory mitigating circumstance.

After the instructions, there were no objections to the failure to instruct any particular statutory mitigating factor nor the failure to hold an on the record charge conference. ROA 1486 (no objection to the charge by the defense).

During the PCR hearing, former appellate counsel Joseph Savitz declared that he reviewed the trial record, but did not highlight any portion where there was a discussion concerning whether the victim was provoked or was a participant in the crime. PCR Tr.p. 24. He concluded that he could not recall what he was thinking when he was preparing the brief, but suggested that it was something similar to what he had argued in *State v. Humphries*, *State v. Victor* and *State v. Evans*. He asserted that it was his opinion that trial judges should do more and specifically make inquiry as to each mitigating factor on the record. However, Savitz conceded that the Court ultimately said it was not required. PCR Trp. 25. He could not recall why he would not have argued to have the matters addressed on the record as he had been arguing in the same time period - albeit unsuccessfully. PCR 25.

On cross-examination, Savitz admitted that when he raised non-objected statutory mitigating factors that it was usually related to issues of intoxication. PCR 26. He admitted that he had reviewed the trial judge's instructions prior to briefing. PCR 27. He admitted that he realized that the judge did not instruct on any specific statutory factors. PCR 27, l. 13. He recognized that the trial judge further concluded that there were no mitigators in the case. PCR 27-28. Mr. Savitz further admitted that he reviewed the objections made to the jury instructions and determined that no objection had been made to the failure to give statutory mitigating circumstances. PCR 28, l. 8. He further was aware that there was no objection to the failure to have an on the record discussion concerning the mitigators. PCR 28, l. 9-12.

Counsel Savitz further admitted that he was aware of the existence of a statutory mitigating factor of the victim was a participant in the crime or consented to the act at the time of the briefing. PCR 28. Further, he acknowledged that he was aware of the existence of evidence in the record and the fact that the judge did not give the instruction. PCR 28-29.

However, Savitz questioned whether in *State v. Humphries* the Supreme Court had held that a failure to object to a trial court's failure to give an instruction did not preserve the issue for appeal. PCR 29. He felt that the Supreme Court did not resolve this procedural bar until the *Kamell Evans* case when he was arguing for a procedure to require the judge to go through each specific mitigating factor on the record. PCR 29. In admitted hindsight, Savitz stated that the judge has the discretion to hold a charge conference any time he wants to and admits that Judge Burch did hold a charge conference and mentioned the mitigator during the conference. However, Savitz stated that it was never mentioned again after the beginning of the penalty phase. Savitz suggested that he missed this issue and would have raised it had it seen it because this was an issue he was raising at the time in other cases. PCR 30. However, he recognized that he probably would not have won the issue, but thought that the law was uncertain at the time he briefed the appeal. PCR 30.

Savitz admitted that in *State v. Humphries* in 1993 the Supreme Court held that a failure to make a specific request for a statutory mitigating circumstance waived the right to raise the omission on appeal. He stated that he may have been missing the message that the Court was sending, because he still raised the issue in *Kamell Evans* contending that the law was uncertain concerning preservation of the issue. PCR 31-32. He admitted that in *Evans*, the Supreme Court made clear that a request for the factor had to be made to preserve the issue when it was not charged. PCR 33. However, he had no idea why he did not raise the issue in *Stokes* appeal brief. PCR 33, l. 5.

Counsel Sims conceded that he did not object to the failure to give the particular statutory mitigating circumstance instruction. PCR 65.

ANALYSIS

This Court concludes the Applicant has failed to show either deficient performance or prejudice under *Strickland v. Washington*. Appellate counsel Savitz cannot be *Strickland* deficient in failing to raise these two particular issues because neither issue was presented to the trial court by a timely objection on the record. Absent a specific request by counsel to charge a mitigating circumstance at trial, the issue of whether the mitigator should have been charged is not preserved for appellate review. *State v. Evans (Kamell)*, 371 S.C. 27, 32, 637 S.E.2d 313, 315 (2006).

In *State v. Victor*, 300 S.C. 220, 224, 387 S.E.2d 248, 250 (1989), the Supreme Court set forth the proper procedure for submission of statutory mitigating factors to the jury in the penalty phase of a capital case:

Once the trial judge has made an initial determination of which statutory mitigating circumstances are supported by the evidence, the defendant shall be given an opportunity on the record: (1) to waive the submission of those he does not wish considered by the jury; and (2) to request any additional mitigating statutory circumstances supported by the evidence that he wishes submitted to the jury.

See, *State v. Stanko*, 376 S.C. 571, 577-578, 658 S.E.2d 94, 97 - 98 (S.C.,2008) (not preserved).

One of the earlier cases addressing this assertion was handled by appellate counsel Savitz prior to his handling in the instant case resulted in rejection of the argument as not preserved. *State v. Humphries*, 325 S.C. 28, 36, 479 S.E.2d 52, 57 (1996). The Court has constantly rejected this claim absent request and objection , except in the intoxication evidence area which was corrected in *Evans*. The recent cases have stated that absent a request by counsel to charge a mitigating circumstance at trial, the issue whether the mitigator should have been charged is not preserved for

review. See *State v. Vazquez*, 364 S.C. 293, 301, 613 S.E.2d 359, 363 (2005); *State v. Bowman*, 366 S.C. 485, 494, 623 S.E.2d 378, 383 (2005); and *State v. Sapp*, 366 S.C. 283, 621 S.E.2d 883, n. 3 (2005).

In the instant case, trial counsel did not request an instruction on the particular statutory mitigator and did not object to the failure to give an instruction of the mitigating factors. ROA 1486-87. Since there was no objection, nothing was preserved for the appeal. Reasonable appellate counsel cannot have raised the issue on appeal since there was no objection. This Court concludes that appellate counsel Savitz was not deficient in failing to brief an unpreserved claim.

Further, there was nothing in the record to show that the trial court failed to hold a charge conference. Similarly, there was no showing that the defense objected to the lack of a charge conference to preserve the issue for an appeal. Appellate counsel cannot be found to be deficient when the issue was not raised at trial.

Since there is no showing that the trial court refused to hold a charge conference or that the defense objected to the failure to instruct on the particular mitigating factor, reasonable appellate counsel could not have been required under the Constitution to assert these unpreserved claims, particularly in 2000 when the appellant's brief was written after the decision in *Humphries*. His claims set forth in these two specifications must be dismissed. ⁶

⁶This Court does not need to address whether there was any evidence of the statutory mitigating factor that "the victim was a participant in the defendant's conduct or consented to the act" under Section 16-3-20(b)(3), because the specific request was not made by trial counsel and a Sixth Amendment claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel is not raised. However, even if asserted as a trial counsel claim under the Sixth Amendment, the "prejudice" prong cannot be satisfied where the evidence revealed that the victim's death was the idea and the plan by the Applicant was to create a subterfuge. Simply put, Connie Snipes did not consent to the violence that was about to strike her involving the violent rape, stabbing, maiming and ultimately shooting. There is no reasonable probability that the result would have been different had request for the instruction

9(d) - Conflict of Interest - Thomas Sims as Prosecutor in 1991.

The Applicant in this specification asserts that counsel Thomas Sims had an actual conflict of interest in representing Stokes because he had previously personally prosecuted Stokes on Indictment 91-GS-38-0190 involving the December 2, 1990 incident involving the assault on Audrey Smith that resulted in a 1991 conviction for assault and battery of a high and aggravated nature and sentence of 10 years after a jury trial before Judge John H. Smith. The record also reveals that Sims signed the indictment for assault and battery with intent to kill and personally handled the trial. Further, the evidence of the 1991 conviction and sentence was introduced by the State in the penalty phase in State Exhibit One in the chart [ROA 1110-1111] and also through the penalty phase testimony of Audrey Smith. It should be noted that counsel Sims cross-examined Smith in the matter. The record reveals that there is no indication on the record before the jury that Sims had prosecuted Stokes.

This Court finds as a fact, based upon the credible testimony of both Virgin Johnson and Thomas Sims, that Stokes knowing and voluntarily waived a conflict of interest and with full knowledge of the conflict and ability to have a different lawyer desired to have Thomas Sims continue to represent him in the trial. Applicant failed in their burden of proof at the PCR hearing and failed to timely call the Applicant to contradict the testimony of either Mr. Johnson or Mr. Sims. The belated presentation of a statement of Applicant after the hearing is insufficient to satisfy their burden of proof under these discrete circumstances.

How This Issue Was Presented

been made or if the instruction had been given. Any suggestion otherwise is groundless in light of this horrific factual record of malice against the victim.

Judge Shuler appointed Thomas Sims after initially appointing Virgin Johnson. A pretrial hearing was held on January 19, 1999 in Stokes presence by Judge Shuler. During the qualification, Sims noted that he was in the Solicitors Office from 1982 -1993. ROA 1502-1504. No objection is made to the representation by either Sims or Stokes. Nothing is stated on the record about Sims prior prosecution of Stokes in the earlier matter involving Audrey Smith. A review of the trial record reveals no further on the record inquiry concerning the prior representation. In the penalty phase of the trial, the Solicitor indicates that he is presenting the chart, State Exhibit One, rather than the indictments to remove any potential prejudice. ROA 1085.

The Stokes-Audrey Smith Trial

This Court has before it the transcript of the March 12, 1991 trial of Stokes for the incident against Audrey Smith. Plaintiff Exhibit 1. The 1991 record reveals that Sims personally prosecuted the case and signed the indictment against Stokes. The victim, Audrey Smith, the ex-wife of Stokes was the primary witness. The crime involved a December 2, 1990 incident between them. At the trial, Stokes was represented by Reddick Bowman. However, Stokes chose to waive his presence in court during the trial. 1991 Tr.p. 4-14. Audrey Smith testified in the 1991 trial that Stokes had gone on a walk with her to a schoolyard and then took her clothes off and forced her to have sex with him after she refused. 1991 Tr.p. 43. She stated that he had a letter that stated he was going to kill her that night and he told her that he had changed his mind. 1991 Tr.p. 44. He later took out an extension cord and put it around her neck and held it tight until she became unconscious. 1991Tr.p. 46. She later woke up in the field and called 911 from a nearby house. 1991 Tr.p. 46-47.

During cross-examination by Mr. Bowman, Smith stated that when she woke up she reached for her shoes and hid when she saw some automobiles because she thought that Stokes was

returning. 1991 Tr.p. 48-49. She admitted that Stokes did not own an automobile, but had friends who did. She said he was supposed to arrive at 6 the evening before , but did not get there until 7 PM at Turnkey Apartments in Branchville. 1991 Tr.p. 50. She stated that they traveled across the open field. She stated that they went up there at the schoolyard swinging and two of his friends came by. 1991 Tr.p. 52-53. A little while after the friends left, she stated that they had sex. 1991 Tr.p. 53. She stated sometime after that he put the cord around her neck but she could not be definite about the time. 1991 Tr.p. 54.

Counsel Bowman then inquired of her concerning matters presented at a preliminary hearing. 1991 Tr.p. 56. Smith stated that she thought she did say to the police that Stokes took the letter back from her because he feared that she would take it to the police. 1991 Tr.p. 59. She admitted that she was afraid of Stokes who did not let her talk to his friends, however, she did not scream in fear that date nor have any conversation with his friends. 1991 Tr.p. 60-61. She stated that they would not have help her anyway because they were his friends. 1991 Tr.p. 62.

After Smith testified, Stokes remained outside of court due to his dissatisfaction with appointed counsel and the court's refusal to delay the matter to allow him to attempt to retain counsel. 1991 Tr.p. 67-68.

Solicitor Sims next asked Smith on re-direct examination concerning why she did not request help from the two men at the schoolyard when they came up. She stated that she had not seen the threatening letter yet and that they were just sitting and talking then. 1991 Tr.p. 71-72.

Audrey Smith's Testimony in the 1999 Penalty Phase

In the State's case in aggravation in 1999, Solicitor Bailey put in record the following criminal record concerning Stokes:

March 9, 1998 Assault and Battery of A High and Aggravated Nature -
8 years and 5 years probation.

August 31, 1990 - Paroled from conviction.

March 13, 1991 - Assault and Battery of a High and Aggravated Nature.
10 year sentence.

April 3, 1991 - Parole from first sentence revoked.

February 11, 1993 Assault and Battery of a High and Aggravated Nature
3 years consecutive.

ROA. 1110-1111.

The state also presented the testimony of Audrey Smith, the Applicant's ex-wife who testified about incidents where Stokes assaulted her. The incidents included a November 1987 incident when Stokes held a knife to her throat which resulted in a tussle and her hands getting cut when she tried to grab the knife and held her hostage and threatened to kill her children and brother if she made a sound. ROA 1115-1117. She later attempted to call for her brother after he placed her in a ditch and Stokes stabbed her three times in the back and then he fled. ROA 1118-1119. She then stated she went to the hospital. ROA 1119. He was convicted in March due to that assault.

Ms. Smith next described an incident on December 2, 1990. ROA 1119. Stokes had gotten out on an early release program. Smith was staying at her mother's home. Stokes came by and they went for a walk up the hill implicitly to get something that a lady was making for him. However, he forced her to have intercourse with him and then went to the high school and gave her a letter that stated he was going to kill her that night. ROA 1120-21. She said they walked away and that Stokes

declared that he was looking for guns that he left in a field. Unable to find the guns, Stokes pulled out an extension cord with knots on it and put the cord around her neck and she passed out. When she awoke, she was bleeding and fled to the emergency room. ROA 1125. She stated that she was in the hospital for 3 to 4 weeks. ROA 1125. She stated that this included being in the regular part of the hospital for 8 days and then being placed in the Rose Center, a place for people with mental and emotional problems for 11 to 12 days to deal with returning to Branchville. ROA 1126. Smith testified that as a result of this assault on March 31, 1991, Stokes received a ten year sentence. Id.

Smith testified that while being locked up he wrote her a series of threatening letters towards her or anyone who may attempt to aid her. State Exhibit 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. ROA 1127- 1138. She denied that she had ever done anything to cause him to stab her or attempt to strangle her. ROA 1138.

On cross-examination, defense counsel Simms had her confirm that Stokes had no direct contact with her after he got out of prison and had not come around or called her in 1998. She stated that it had been a couple of years since Stokes had written her. ROA 1139-1140. She asserted that Stokes had told her when they were having problems that he was on drugs and jealous, and possessive of her. ROA 1140 - 41. She confirmed that in a number of the letters Stokes wrote that he was asking to be able to talk and write him and that he was trying to get his head straight. Id.

On re-direct examination, she stated that she had to go to Branchville Police Department and the Parole Department to get the letters stopped. ROA 1141.⁷

⁷ The State also put into evidence various prison violations. In particular, the state presented a chart [State Exhibit 9] which included the following:

July 1, 1998 - fighting without a weapon

January 4, 1992 - refusing or failing to obey promptly or properly a direct order.

January 22, 1992 - out of place, lying to employees.

ANALYSIS

This Court concludes as a matter of law that Thomas Sims's prior prosecution of Stokes does not create an actual conflict of interest and/or require a new trial. First, this Court finds as a fact based upon credible evidence presented at the hearing that counsel Sims and counsel Johnson had discussions with the Applicant about his right to have new counsel other than Sims because of the

January 26, 1992 - out of place.

February 26, 1992 - exciting or creating a disturbance, refusing or failing to obey promptly and properly a direct order.

April 11, 1992 - out of place.

July 12, 1992 - possession of a weapon.

July 29, 1992 - fighting without a weapon.

December 3, 1993 - gambling.

July 28, 1993 - lying to employees.

ROA 1142-43.

The state called Roy Stevens, a former criminal investigator at the South Carolina Department of Corrections who testified about the incident with Jackie Williams which resulted in the February 11, 1993 conviction for assault and battery of a high and aggravated nature. ROA 1144. He stated that Stokes and Jackie Williams were inmates at Allendale Correctional Institution. He described and presented photographic evidence of Jackie Williams slashed face from a box cutter used by Stokes in a restroom fight. ROA 1145 - 46. State Exhibits 10, 11, 12, 13. The photos revealed sutures and a number of cuts on Williams face. ROA 1147-49. There were 10 sutures. 1149-1150.

He stated that he was not aware of any other fights between Williams and Stokes. ROA 1151.

The state also presented testimony concerning the Orangeburg- Calhoun Regional detention Center. Evidence was presented from Keith Simmons, a former correctional officer that on July 27, 1999, after 5 PM, a fight broke out between Stokes and another inmate Shawn Windburn, a houseman with small privileges. When food was being delivered to Stokes, they had words and Stokes started hitting on Windburn. ROA 1278-79. He described seeing Stokes hitting Windburn in the head numerous times. ROA 1279. It required Windburn being sent to the hospital. ROA 1279. He said that Stokes was locked down as a result.

On cross-examination, he described that fights in the jail are not uncommon. However, Simmons stated that he personally placed Stokes in the cell, but that Stokes did not try to hit him nor be aggressive. He stated that the only thing that happened to Stokes was an incident report and that his canteen privileges and no visitations were allowed for five days. ROA 1283, l. 17-25. He stated there was nothing unusual about the punishment. ROA 1283-84.

On re-direct, this incident was described as a major infraction. ROA 1284.

earlier prosecution and Stokes advised them then and since that he desired to have Mr. Sims represent him in the matter. Further, this Court finds credible evidence that Stokes, aware of the prior involvement of Sims in the Smith prosecution wanted to have Sims continue to represent him in this matter.

Testimony of Counsel

Counsel Thomas Sims testified at the hearing that he did recall representing the state in the 1991 Stokes prosecution. PCR 51. He stated that he signed the indictment and handled the prosecution, but did not recall the details at this time. PCR 52. He stated that he subsequently entered private practice after losing his race for Solicitor against Walter Bailey. PCR 52. He stated that he had no further involvement with Audrey Smith after the 1991 prosecution in any civil matter. PCR 53-54. Sims stated that he was appointed by Judge Shuler . He stated that during the qualification hearing, his prosecution trial experience was presented, but he did not specifically state that he had previously prosecuted Stokes at that time. He stated that the question was never asked. PCR 55.

Importantly, Sims stated that he discussed his prior prosecution with Stokes:

...after going through the information we did discuss with Mr. Stokes , my role, who I was, and what my role had been in the previous matter with him. We discussed , me and Attorney Johnson. We did discuss it . He never expressed any desire not to have me as his attorney.

PCR 55. As to whether he could have another lawyer represent him, Sims stated that we talked about it, but could not state under oath that he said to Stokes: "if you want another lawyer you can get one."

PCR 55. However, he testified that the discussion was that he was told that Sims had prosecuted him and sent him to jail and "do you still want me as your lawyer , and he says yes."

Sims opined that it was clear from his discussions that Sammie could have said he didn't want you as his lawyer and he said he wanted him to continue. PCR 56. In support of this understanding, Sims noted that after the trial and sentencing, after the Smith testimony and death sentence, that Stokes contacted him and told him that his appellate lawyer thought that they were going to win the case and that Stokes stated that he wanted Sims as his lawyer again "because you're top flight...I want you back." PCR 57. In fact, Sims did continue to represent Stokes on the remaining charges. PCR 57.⁸

Sims was firm in his recollection that Stokes never indicated any desire to have him removed as his lawyer in the case. PCR 58.

Counsel Sims stated that he was aware that the prosecution was providing him information concerning the statutory aggravating circumstances. PCR 58-59. He stated that he was aware that they planned to use letters that he had written his girlfriend and Stokes prior convictions. PCR 59. Sims stated that they talked about the matters in depth. Sims stated that he would look at the issue from both sides and try to develop a defense. He stated that he anticipated that both the conviction and that Audrey Smith would testify in the penalty phase. PCR 59-60. He stated that he reviewed these matters with Stokes. PCR 60. As to the Smith incident, Sims stated that he knew it was coming in and that he needed to address it with a showing of remorse. PCR 60.

Counsel Sims stated that he cross-examined Smith in the penalty phase. PCR 60. He denied that the fact that he had previously prosecuted Stokes for the same incident affected the manner that he handled the testimony. He stated that if he thought that he could not have represented Stokes to

⁸ Counsel Sims recollection of Mr. Jeffrey Bloom's role and advice was different that Mr. Bloom's. Particularly, he recalled contacting Mr. Bloom to assist, but that he was involved in a major trial in Aiken and would not be able to assist. PCR 57. Sims had no recollection of any discussion with Bloom concerning the conflict of interest issue. PCR 58.

the best of his ability that he would not have been in the case. PCR 61. He declared that there was nothing that he learned in the earlier prosecution that inhibited his defense. PCR 61.

Counsel did not recall whether they made any formal motion about the earlier prosecution in the 1999 trial, but thinks it was more fully developed in the record in the second case. Sims asserted that Virgin Johnson, his co-counsel, never expressed any concern about Sims continuing in the case. PCR 61.

On cross-examination, Sims stated that he research the admissibility of prior convictions prior to trial. PCR 68-69. He noted that other issues they researched concerned kidnapping, criminal sexual conduct and mitigation. PCR 71. He noted that he looked at *State v. Lyle* and Rules 404(b), 608 and 609. PCR 72. Counsel Sims stated that he attempted to present an argument in an attempt to keep out the prior convictions in the penalty phase, trying to rely upon these rules. PCR 74-80. Counsel stated that he was trying to keep out the evidence of the prior convictions. PCR 80.

Counsel Sims stated that he made sure that Stokes knew that he was the person who prosecuted him and had sent him to jail previously. PCR 83. He stated that they talked about the indictment that he had signed also. PCR 83. However, he stated that he could not stated that he asked him if he still wanted him on the case. PCR 83-84.

Counsel Sims again confirmed that he had no recollection of any discussion with Jeff Bloom concerning a conflict of interest. PCR 84. However, counsel Sims thought that there was a discussion with a judge at some time concerning the prior prosecution. PCR 85.

Counsel Sims, on redirect, confirmed that he anticipated that Audrey Smith would testify in the penalty phase. PCR 87. Sims further confirmed that this concern was raised with the trial court

at the October 14 hearing because Sims's name appeared on the indictment. PCR 87, ROA 1636.⁹ It was agreed his name would be removed from any document being presented to the jury. PCR 87. See also, ROA 1085. Counsel Sims stated that he wanted to be sure that there were no slips ups in trial court concerning his name on the indictment. PCR 88.

Counsel Sims clarified that Stokes knew that he had been the one to prosecute him and his practice was to state that did he have any problems with that. Further, he recalled that after the trial Stokes wanted Sims to represent him again. Sims felt that Stokes knew that if he had any problem, he only had to speak up and let them know. PCR 88-90. He stated that Mr. Johnson was present during the discussions. PCR 89. Sims stated he knew that the state intended to introduce prior bad act evidence, that this information was included in his evidence in aggravation and that the state would try to introduce it. PCR . 89-90. Counsel stated that he expected the material to be introduced. PCR 93-94, 98. He re-confirmed that he anticipated the 1991 conviction evidence to be introduced prior to its introduction. PCR 98.

Co-counsel Virgin Johnson testified concerning his representation of Stokes in 1999. He stated that he was initially first chair, but when Mr. Sims was appointed, he became second chair. PCR 101. Johnson stated that at some point during the preparation he learned that Sims had prosecuted Stokes previously. Johnson stated that recalled Sims discussing the prior prosecution with Sammie at the beginning of his representation. He recalled Sims telling Stokes that he put him in jail and that Sammie recalled that Sims had been the prosecutor. PCR 102. Johnson stated that they went through questions of do you have a problem with me representing you, do you think - -

⁹It is therefore evident to the State and Judge, as well as Sims about the potential introduction of the Audrey Smith evidence on October 14.

you know do you want somebody else and he [Stokes] said no. PCR 102, I. 8-13. Johnson confirmed that Stokes never requested other counsel be appointed throughout the trial. To the contrary, he asserted that their relationship was good throughout both trials. He also recalled after the conviction while the matter was on appeal, Stokes expressed a desire to have Sims represent him. PCR 102.

Johnson recalled Audrey Smith testifying at the trial concerning the prior assaults. Johnson recalled the fact that Stokes was told prior to the trial that the evidence of the prior conviction could possibly be presented. PCR 103. Johnson stated that Stokes did not request that Sims be removed. Further, Johnson never saw Sims hesitate to act on Stokes behalf at any time. PCR 104. He stated that Sims did his very best. The prior prosecution did not have any effect. PCR 104.

Johnson stated that in the discussions, we discussed the fact that it could be prejudice related to Audrey Smith's testimony. PCR 105. ¹⁰

I. No Per Se Conflict of Interest.

This Court concludes, independent of the apparent waiver of the conflict of interests, there is no *per se* conflict based upon the prior prosecution involving a different crime. In *State v. Childers*, 373 S.C. 367, 645 S.E.2d 233, 235 (S.C. 2007), the Supreme Court of South Carolina

¹⁰In the PCR hearing, the Applicant called Richland County attorney Jeff Bloom to testify. Mr. Bloom described being asked to assist in the case preparation concerning jury matters. PCR 41-43. However, unlike Sims testimony, Mr. Bloom suggested that he recalled a discussion about a potential conflict of interest which Bloom was concerned about based upon the prior prosecution. PCR 43. Bloom stated that he tried to emphasize this to Mr. Sims who Bloom contended did not fully understand why it would be a problem. Bloom contended that he told Sims that at a minimum he must request a hearing before a judge on the issue in an ex parte setting and allow Stokes to express his desires to the court. PCR 44. Bloom stated that in his next telephone contact with Sims that he learned that Sims had not followed through with Bloom's suggestions. PCR 46. He stated that because of this he had to sever his professional relationship with him. PCR 46.

As stated above, counsel Sims did not recall any discussion with Bloom concerning any potential conflict of interest issue. This Court has determined that Mr. Sims testimony is credible.

affirmed the state's lower appellate court on the conflict issue concluding that defense counsel prior prosecution of the defendant did not require removal as a conflict of interest. The Court held:

Childers asked the trial judge to relieve defense counsel based on defense counsel's prior prosecution of him and his perceived lack of defense counsel's trial preparation. Defense counsel told the trial judge he was ready and prepared to go to trial and he had no independent recollection of prosecuting Childers. Childers failed to show his counsel had any divided loyalties or an actual conflict of interest. *See Gregory*, 364 S.C. [150] at 152, 612 S.E.2d [449] at 450 [2005] ("An actual conflict of interest occurs where an attorney owes a duty to a party whose interests are adverse to the defendant's."); *See also People v. Abar*, 290 A.D.2d 592, 736 N.Y.S.2d 155 (N.Y.App.Div. 2002)(finding there was no conflict of interest where defendant's public defender had previously prosecuted him on unrelated charges when she was employed as an assistant district attorney); *State v. Cobbs*, 221 Wis.2d 101, 584 N.W.2d 709 (1998)(concluding there was no actual or serious potential conflict where defendant's counsel had previously prosecuted defendant while working in the district attorney's office). The Court of Appeals correctly found the trial judge did not abuse his discretion by denying Childers' request to relieve counsel.

State v. Childers, 645 S.E.2d 233, 235 (S.C. 2007).

Given there was no evidence of conflict, or even serious potential conflict under the particular facts of this case, there could be no Sixth or Fourteenth Amendment error. *See Mickens v. Taylor*, 535 U.S. 162, 171(2002)("we think 'an actual conflict of interest' meant precisely a conflict that affected counsel's performance-as opposed to a mere theoretical division of loyalties")(emphasis in original). The record clearly shows counsel did not claim an actual conflict, or move to be relieved based on his perception of a conflict. *Compare Holloway v. Arkansas*, 435 U.S. 475 (1978)(trial counsel advised the court of an actual conflict of interest and requested different counsel be appointed for co-defendants). Moreover, the record shows Petitioner relied upon counsel, and expressed no complaint of counsel, prior to the trial. In short, neither case law nor fact support Petitioner's position.

This Court distinguishes any reliance upon *United States v. Gonzalez-Lopez*, 126 S.Ct. 2557 (2006), provides that Petitioner was not required to show prejudice where his right to choice of counsel was violated. This Court does not disagree with that reading of the case; however, this is not a choice of counsel matter, and *Gonzalez-Lopez* is neither relevant or dispositive to the issue here. Stokes was represented by an appointed counsel and did not request the services of another whom he could retain or who would waive compensation. The particular right of counsel of choice evaluated in *Gonzalez-Lopez* was not invoked in the instant case involving court appointment. “[T]he right to counsel of choice does not extend to defendants who require counsel to be appointed for them.” *Gonzalez-Lopez*, 126 S.Ct. at 2561. Clearly, the resolution of the issue in *Gonzalez-Lopez* is not applicable to the present case with its differing factual underpinning. In fact, in regard to the factual basis posed by Petitioner, this Court finds that two of Petitioner’s critical factual assertions lack support in the record.

The record is void of any attempt by the Applicant to have counsel Sims removed with the uncontradicted record that Stokes was aware of the prior prosecution by Sims. The record does not show Petitioner was “vehemently” opposed to counsel’s representation because of Sims’ former role as a prosecutor, nor does the record show an actual conflict of interest. The state supreme court in Childers adopted the logic of other jurisdictions that hold such a situation does not show “competing interests” or “divided loyalties” that could form a basis for finding an actual conflict in representation. *Childers*, 645 S.E.2d at 235. In support of its decision, the state court cited with favor *People v. Abar*, 290 A.D.2d 592 (N.Y. App. Div. 2002), *affirmed* 786 N.E.2d 1255 (N.Y. 2003), and *State v. Cobbs*, 584 N.W.2d 709 (Wis.App.1998), *review denied* 222 589 N.W.2d 629 (Wis. 1998), both of which fully support the state court’s findings. The court in *Abar* noted that

“[a]lthough the transfer of a defense attorney to a District Attorney’s office might well create a conflict of interest constituting a disqualification of the District Attorney’s staff from prosecuting the defendant previously represented by the former defense attorney” the converse situation does not provide the same opportunity for “abuse of confidence” or the appearance of conflict. 290 A.D.2d at 593. Similarly, in *Cobbs*, a former prosecutor had also been appointed defense counsel. While a prosecutor, counsel had represented the state against Cobbs. The court found that the former representation had absolutely nothing to do with the present representation, and that counsel had broken ties with the office more than five years before the instant charge. The court concluded there was no conflict of interest. Such sound logic is persuasive in evaluating when confidences are placed in counsel, and when abuse may occur.

In this case, with at least a six (6) year lapse between Sims being a prosecutor, any divided loyalties argument must fail. Additionally, there was no connection between the former offense and the instant case. The only matter was the existence of the conviction - a proven fact - as evidence in aggravation and the fact that Audrey Smith testified in the penalty phase about the circumstances of the conviction. There is no showing that the prior prosecution adversely affected his representation of Stokes based upon this state witness (Audrey Smith) - a person whom he never represented. There were no divided loyalties in the matter.

The simple fact of the former prosecution did not provide proof of a conflict of interest. Given the lack of an actual conflict, the Petitioner otherwise must show adverse effect to be entitled to relief. *Id.* This precisely follows the United States Supreme Court’s well-defined precedent:

...the possibility of conflict is insufficient to impugn a criminal conviction. In order to demonstrate a violation of his Sixth

Amendment rights, a defendant must establish that an actual conflict of interest adversely affected his lawyer's performance.

Cuyler v. Sullivan, 446 U.S. 335, 350 (1980). See also, *State v. Wareham*, 143 P. 3d 302 (Utah App. 2006) (attorney's prosecution of individual present no general bar to attorney's subsequent representation in a criminal defense capacity); *Hendricks v. State*, 128 P.3d 1017 (Mont. 2006) (per se ineffective assistance of counsel as a conflict of interest does not result when appointed counsel previously prosecuted defendant on another matter).

This Court alternately finds that there was a knowing waiver of a conflict of interest. SCACR, Rule 407, Rule 1.7(b)(1-2), wherein it essentially states that a lawyer should not represent a client if the representation of that client may be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client unless:

- 1.) the lawyer reasonably believes the representation will not be adversely affected; and
- 2.) the client consents after consultation.

However, the comments to Rule 1.7 recognize that a client may consent to representation notwithstanding the conflict. However, it notes: "when a disinterested lawyer would conclude that the client should not agree to representation under the circumstances, the lawyer involved cannot properly ask for such agreement or provide representation on the basis of the client's consent." Further, the comments noted that "there may be circumstances where it is impossible to make the disclosure necessary to obtain consent."

In *United Sewerage Agency v. Jelco Inc.*, 646 F.2d 1339 (9th Cir. 1991), the court set out factors which may be used in

- 1.) the nature of the litigation;
- 2.) the type of information the lawyer may have access;
- 3.) whether the client is in a position to protect his interests or know whether he will be vulnerable to disadvantage as a result of the representation; and
- 4.) the issues in dispute.

See generally, Jarvis and Tellum, When Waiver Should Not Be Good Enough: An Analysis of Current Client Conflict. 33 *Willamette L. Rev.* 14t (1997).

In A.B.A. Formal Ethics Opinion, 92-367 (Oct. 16, 1992), the committee opined that cross-examination of an adverse witness who is a client creates a disqualifying conflict, in the absence of appropriate client consent, depending upon the nature and degree of the conflict. As stated above, in most cases when a defendant is faced with a situation in which his attorney has an actual or potential conflict of interest, it is possible for him to waive his right to conflict-free counsel in order to retain the attorney of his choice. U.S. v. Schwarz, supra., citing U.S. v. Kliti, 156 F.3d 150, at 153 (2d Cir. 1998) and U.S. v. Blau, 159 F.3d 68 at 7 (2d Cir. 1998). Where an actual or potential conflict has been validly waived, the waiver cannot be defeated simply because the conflict subsequently affects counsel's performance; such a result would eviscerate the very purpose of obtaining the waiver.

As stated above, in most cases when a defendant is faced with a situation in which his attorney has an actual or potential conflict of interest, it is possible for him to waive his right to conflict-free counsel in order to retain the attorney of his choice. U.S. v. Schwarz, supra., citing U.S. v. Kliti, 156 F.3d 150, at 153 (2d Cir. 1998) and U.S. v. Blau, 159 F.3d 68 at 7 (2d Cir. 1998). Where an actual or potential conflict has been validly waived, the waiver cannot be defeated simply because

the conflict subsequently affects counsel's performance; such a result would eviscerate the very purpose of obtaining the waiver.

Not all conflicts may be waived, however. An actual or potential conflict cannot be waived if, in the circumstances of the case, the conflict is of such a serious nature that no rational defendant would knowingly and intelligently desire that attorney's representation. See Kliti, 156 F.3d at 153; Levy, 25 F.3d at 153. Under such circumstances, the attorney must be disqualified, regardless of whether the defendant is willing to waive his right to conflict-free counsel. See Levy, 25 F.3d at 153.

In Schwarz, the Second Circuit described the distinction between waivable and unwaivable conflicts citing United States v. Fulton, 5 F.3d 605 (2d Cir.1993). Fulton involved the representation of a defendant by an attorney who had been accused of participating in criminal activity related to the crimes for which the defendant was on trial. See *id.* at 607-10. The district court had advised the defendant of the conflict and had obtained a waiver. See *id.* at 608. On appeal, the defendant argued that the waiver was ineffective. See *id.* at 612.

The Second Circuit agreed and noted that, "[i]n such cases, we must assume that counsel's fear of, and desire to avoid, criminal charges, or even the reputational damage from an unfounded but ostensibly plausible accusation, will affect virtually every aspect of his or her representation of the defendant." *Id.* at 613. The Court distinguished between conflicts that implicate the attorney's self-interest and those that implicate the attorney's ethical obligation to someone other than the defendant, noting that the former are "of a different character" than the latter. *Id.* The Court concluded that because the conflict at issue there resulted in counsel's "[a]dvice as well as advocacy [being] permeated by counsel's self interest, and [because] no rational defendant would knowingly

and intelligently be represented by a lawyer whose conduct was guided largely by a desire for self-preservation," the conflict was not waivable. *Id.* (Emphasis added).

Although the particular conflict at issue in Fulton belonged to that narrow category of conflicts that courts have deemed to be *per se* violations of the Sixth Amendment right to counsel, see *id.* at 611-12; Solina v. United States, 709 F.2d 160, 168-69 (2d Cir.1983), Fulton's rationale with respect to when an *attorney's self-interest* renders a conflict unwaivable is equally applicable to the unusual facts of Schwarz. The lawyers's representation of Schwarz was in conflict not only with his ethical obligation to the PBA as his client, but also with his own substantial self-interest in the two-year, \$10 million retainer agreement his newly formed firm had entered into with the PBA. Like the conflict in Fulton, Worth's conflict "so permeate[ed] the defense that no meaningful waiver could be obtained." Fulton, 5 F.3d at 613. The Court held that: "[w]e must assume that, under such circumstances, the distinct possibility existed that, at each point the conflict was felt, Worth would sacrifice Schwarz's interests for those of the PBA. Indeed, we think it likely that these very concerns motivated the government to argue to the district court at the *Curcio* hearing that the conflict created by the PBA retainer could not be waived. Thus, we conclude that the conflict between Worth's representation of Schwarz, on the one hand, and his ethical obligation to the PBA as his client and his self interest in the PBA retainer, on the other, was so severe that no rational defendant in Schwarz's position would have knowingly and intelligently desired Worth's representation. Cf. *id.* ("[N]o rational defendant would knowingly and intelligently be represented by a lawyer whose conduct was guided largely by a desire for self-preservation."); cf. also United States v. Arrington, 867 F.2d 122, 129 (2d Cir.1989) (upholding district court's disqualification of attorney "saddled" with serious conflict where allowing waiver would have required defendant to "forego[] the

presentation of ... evidence that would [have been] of great assistance")." The Schwarz court found that the conflict was unwaivable.

Schwarz is distinguishable from the present case. In Schwarz, the government charged the defendant, a police officer, with assaulting a victim in a bathroom at a police precinct. Id. at 79-80. There, the law firm of defendant's trial counsel had a \$10,000,000 retainer agreement with the police officers' union, the Patrolman's Benevolent Association (the "PBA"). Id. at 91. During the criminal proceedings, the victim filed a civil lawsuit against the PBA alleging that the PBA through its agents and its president conspired to injure him and then covered it up. Id. The Second Circuit found an actual conflict existed between trial counsel's personal interest and professional obligation to the PBA and his representation of the defendant. Id. at 91-92. In particular, the defendant's interest in making a defense that would implicate another police officer in the assault--a strong, obvious interest--diverged with trial counsel's interest in refraining from any conduct that could harm the PBA, for example--making an argument that supported the conspiracy theory in the victim's civil lawsuit. Id. at 91-92.

In Schwarz, trial counsel had a personal interest and professional obligation to another client that differed from his criminal client. Also, trial counsel refrained from making a particular defense in the criminal case because it ran counter to another client's interest.

In the instant case, Sims's earlier prosecution arose from an independent action and was unrelated to the present prosecution of Stokes. It was already a matter of record concerning the earlier conviction for the Audrey Smith incident. As such, Schwarz does not support the defendant's position. See U.S. v. Peterson, 233 F.Supp. 2d 45 (E.D.N.Y. 2002).

In clarifying the narrow approach of the unwaivable conflict issue and application of Schwarz, the Second Circuit recently stated:

As we made plain in Fulton, however, *lesser conflicts*, such as an attorney's representation of two or more defendants *or his prior representation of a trial witness, are generally waivable*. See United States v. Fulton, 5 F.3d at 613. *Although such a conflict might require a defendant to abandon a particular defense or line of questioning, he can be advised as to what he must forgo; he "can then seek the legal advice of independent counsel and make an informed judgment that balances the alteration in the trial strategy against the perceived effect of having to get a new and perhaps less effective defense counsel."* United States v. Fulton, 5 F.3d at 613. In the multiple representation situation, the defendant "can be advised by independent counsel of the dangers" of such matters as "one defendant's cooperating with the government," and make a knowing and intelligent decision that he wishes to continue to be represented by his attorney despite the attorney's representation of another accused. *Id.* Where the defendant can rationally opt to retain counsel of his choice despite a conflict, the court conducts a Curcio hearing to determine whether the defendant knowingly and intelligently waives his right to conflict-free representation. See, e.g., United States v. Leslie, 103 F.3d 1093, 1098 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 520 U.S. 1220, 117 S.Ct. 1713, 137 L.Ed.2d 837 (1997); United States v. Levy, 25 F.3d at 153.

U.S. v. Perez, 325 F.3d 115 (2d Cir. April 4, 2003) (attorney's status as potential witness at defendant's trial was conflict of interest that was waivable).

This case is similar distinguishable from cases where conflicts have been determined when a lawyer jointly represents a witness where an immunity agreement had been made to testify against his client. See Hoffman v. Leeke, *supra*. In Perillo v Johnson, 79 F3d 441 (5th Cir .1996), an attorney's concurrent representation of capital murder defendant and witness who had been granted transactional immunity in murder of which defendant had been convicted necessitated evidentiary hearing to determine if conflict of interest entitled defendant to habeas corpus relief. But see, Cowell v Duckworth, 512 F Supp 371 (ND Ind 1981) where in action brought by state prisoner seeking writ of habeas corpus, writ would be granted on ground of ineffectiveness of counsel retained by


prisoner's wife to represent him where record established that defense counsel had actual conflict of interest between representation of defendant and two prosecution witnesses.

Here, Stokes was aware that Sims had prosecuted him in 1990-1991. He was aware - based upon the credible testimony of Virgin Johnson that he could have somebody else represent him and he stated no. This Court finds that the Applicant waived his right to have counsel other than Thomas Sims represent him. The claims otherwise must be dismissed. ¹¹

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, the entire Application for Post-Conviction Relief must be denied and dismissed. This Court finds that the Applicant has failed in his burden of proof in this proceeding. Therefore, this Court is constrained to deny the application for post-conviction relief in its entirety.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED this 21 day of October, 2010.


L. CASEY MANNING
Presiding Judge

¹¹ This Court again notes that the Applicant - subsequent to the hearing and the closing of the evidentiary record - proffered an affidavit from Sammie Stokes which attempts to contradict the testimony of both Sims and Johnson. This was not newly discovered evidence. Stokes was present at the hearing, heard the testimony of counsel and could have testified before the evidentiary record was closed. The Court set aside the term solely for this hearing and the hearing was completed with the record not being left open for further evidentiary matters. The Court concludes the belated presentation of the affidavit should be struck as the record was closed. At the hearing the Applicant was presented with the opportunity to testify and be subject to cross-examination and impeachment before and after counsel testified before the evidentiary record closed. He waived his opportunity to do so at that time by his inaction with the timely opportunity to present evidence. The Applicant failed in his burden of proof at the time of the hearing by seeking to contradict the testimony of counsel Sims and Johnson.

Orangboug Coult/ South Carolina

THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
1701 Main Street, Richland County Judicial Center
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

L. Casey Manning
Resident Judge
(803) 576-1773
(803) 576-1744 Fax

Reply to :
P.O. Box 192
Columbia, S.C. 29202



February 13, 2013

Winnifa B. Clark
Orangeburg County Clerk of Court
PO Box 9000
Orangeburg, SC 29116

FILED
FEB 19 PM 10:49
CLERK OF COURT
ORANGEBURG COUNTY, SC

Re: Filing

Dear Clerk:

Please find enclosed an Order signed by Judge Manning. Please file this Order Denying Rule 59 Motion.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Adam Ribock in cursive.

Adam Ribock
Law Clerk
Judge L. Casey Manning


ATTEST: TRUE COPY
Winnifa B. Clark
CLERK OF COURT
ORANGEBURG COUNTY, SC


STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
 COUNTY OF ORANGEBURG)
)
SAMMIE LOUIS STOKES, #5069)
 Plaintiff,)
 vs.)
)
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
 Defendant.)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
 FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
 CASE NO.: 2001-CP-38-1240

**MOTION AND ORDER INFORMATION
 FORM AND COVERSHEET**

2012 APR 19 11:09 AM
 CLERK OF COURT
 ORANGEBURG COUNTY, SC

Plaintiff's Attorney: Robert E. Lominick, Bar No. 68802 Address: PO Box 5508 Columbia, S.C. 29250 Phone: 803-771-7271 Fax 803-937-1707 E-mail: robert@lominacklaw.com Other: _____	Defendant's Attorney: Donald J. Zelenka, Bar No. 5758 Address: PO Box 11549 Columbia, S.C. 29211 Phone: 803-734-3601 Fax 803-734-4035 E-mail: agdzelenka@scag.gov Other: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> MOTION HEARING REQUESTED (attach written motion and complete SECTIONS I and III) <input type="checkbox"/> FORM MOTION, NO HEARING REQUESTED (complete SECTIONS II and III) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PROPOSED ORDER/CONSENT ORDER (complete SECTIONS II and III)	
SECTION I: Hearing Information	
Nature of Motion: _____ Estimated Time Needed: _____ Court Reporter Needed: <input type="checkbox"/> YES / <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
SECTION II: Motion/Order Type	
<input type="checkbox"/> Written motion attached <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Form Motion/Order I hereby move for relief or action by the court as set forth in the attached proposed order.	
 Signature of Attorney for <input type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff / <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant	April 19, 2012 Date submitted
SECTION III: Motion Fee	
<input type="checkbox"/> PAID - AMOUNT: \$ _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EXEMPT: (check reason)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Rule to Show Cause in Child or Spousal Support <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Abuse or Abuse and Neglect <input type="checkbox"/> Indigent Status <input type="checkbox"/> State Agency v. Indigent Party <input type="checkbox"/> Sexually Violent Predator Act <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Post-Conviction Relief <input type="checkbox"/> Motion for Stay in Bankruptcy <input type="checkbox"/> Motion for Publication <input type="checkbox"/> Motion for Execution (Rule 69, SCRPC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proposed order submitted at request of the court; or, reduced to writing from motion made in open court per judge's instructions Name of Court Reporter: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	
JUDGE'S SECTION <input type="checkbox"/> Motion Fee to be paid upon filing of the attached order. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	JUDGE CODE _____ Date: _____
CLERK'S VERIFICATION	
Collected by: _____ Date Filed: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> MOTION FEE COLLECTED: \$ _____ <input type="checkbox"/> CONTESTED - AMOUNT DUE: \$ _____	

ATTEST: TRUE COPY

 CLERK OF COURT
 ORANGEBURG COUNTY, SC

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF ORANGEBURG)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

SAMMIE LOUIS STOKES, #5069)
)
Applicant,)
)
vs.)
)
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,)
)
Respondent.)
_____)

C/A No. 01-CP-38-1240

ORDER DENYING
RULE 59 MOTION AND DENYING
MOTION TO APPOINT NEW COUNSEL

FILED
NOV 12 2011
CLERK OF COURT
ORANGEBURG COUNTY, SC

This matter comes before this Court pursuant to a November 15, 2010 Motion to Affirm or Amend filed by Applicant. This Rule 59 motion arises from the Order of Dismissal dated October 21, 2010 and filed October 22, 2010. The Respondent made a "Respondent's Response in Opposition to Rule 59 Motion" on November 29, 2011. A hearing on the motion was held in Richland County on December 8, 2011. At the December 8, 2011 hearing, the Applicant was not present and his attendance had been waived by his counsel. Appearing on behalf of Applicant Stokes were court-appointed counsel Keir Weyble and Robert Lominack. The Respondent was represented by Assistant Deputy Attorney General Donald J. Zelenka and Assistant Attorney General Melody J. Brown. No testimony was taken at the hearing. The Court gave both counsel until January 27, 2012 to prepare a post-Rule 59 hearing memorandum, after counsel for Applicant rejected a revised request to provide either a proposed or corrected Order. The memorandums were timely submitted by both parties.

After thoroughly reviewing the memorandum and pleadings submitted by both parties, on

ATTEST: TRUE COPY
Wingie B. Clark
CLERK OF COURT
ORANGEBURG COUNTY, SC

February 28, 2012, this Court held a brief status conference in chambers with Applicant's counsel Robert Lominack and Respondent's counsel Donald J. Zelenka. During the conference, this Court noted that he had concerns about the fact that the Applicant had not been called at the PCR hearing as a witness and then after the hearing an attempt was made to submit the Applicant's affidavit after the evidentiary record was complete. This Court stated that he intended to deny the consideration of the submitted affidavit when Stokes could have been called as a witness. At the status conference, Respondent's counsel was asked by the Court to provide the Court and opposing counsel with a proposed order denying the Rule 59 motion. The Court allowed opposing counsel 10 days to provide objections to the proposed order. Respondent's counsel provided this Court and opposing counsel an initial proposed order denying the Rule 59 motion on March 27, 2012.

On March 30, 2012, Applicant's counsel expressed by an email a concern whether the proposed order was responsive to the Court's intent from the chambers conference. On April 9, 2012, this Court, in an email through his law clerk, advised counsel of his intent to sign the March 28, 2012 proposed order and gave counsel further opportunity to place objections in the record.

On April 12, 2012, counsel for the Applicant filed objections to the adoption of the proposed order and an additional request to appoint counsel due to the recent decision in Martinez v. Ryan, _ U.S. __, 2012 Westlaw 912950 (March 20, 2012) in a pleading dated April 10, 2012. In the April 12, 2012 objections, the Applicant incorporates his earlier assertions in the November 15, 2010 pleading. In addition, he contends that appointment of new counsel is necessary because current PCR counsel erred in failing to call Applicant Stokes at the time of the

evidentiary hearing and belatedly attempting to supplement the record with an affidavit which the Court rejected. He contends that an intervening decision in the U.S. Supreme Court, Martinez v. Ryan, _ U.S __, 2012 Westlaw 912950 (March 20, 2012), should allow for the replacement of current counsel at this stage to investigate and formulate whether current PCR counsel was ineffective in their unsuccessful strategic decision in failing to call Stokes as a witness.

After reviewing the recent pleadings, including the April 10, 2012 objections to the adoption of the proposed order, this Court then requested the counsel for the Respondent to submit a revised proposed order supplementing it with the additional case history and a denial of the objections and motion to appoint new counsel. On April 19, 2012, the Respondent submitted a revised proposed order. This Order follows and denies the Rule 59 motion in its entirety and the motion to appoint new PCR counsel.

I.

ORDER PREPARATION.

In his Rule 59 motion and argument before this Court, Stokes initially claims that the Court erred in signing a proposed order provided by Respondent's counsel consistent with the Respondent's post-hearing memorandum of law that had not been specifically requested by the Court. The Supreme Court of South Carolina initially gave this Court a deadline of September 1, 2010 to enter a final order in this matter. On August 29, 2010, Respondent's counsel - who was going to be unavailable during the remainder of the period - provided this Court (and opposing counsel) with a proposed order of dismissal by email.¹ The basis for the State providing the

¹In the August 29, 2010 email to this court, counsel for Respondent stated:
"To: Honorable L Casey Manning
CC: Robert Lominack, Keir Weyble

unsolicited proposed order was explained to the Court and opposing counsel in the email that date. The Court subsequently requested opposing counsel on Applicant's behalf to also provide a proposed order to the Court which was done on October 1, 2010. The Court signed an Order of Dismissal generally consistent with the Respondent's submission on October 21, 2010.

The Applicant's initial broad complaint against the order is unclear other than the fact the court relied extensively on a proposed order supplied by Respondent and ruled against their position. Applicant relies upon Hall v. Catoe, 360 S.C. 353, 601 S.E.2d 335 (2004). However, in Hall, the Court the Supreme Court did not preclude a PCR hearing court's from requesting proposed orders from counsel and confirming them after review, but stated:

Although we strongly encourage PCR judges to draft their own findings of fact and conclusions of law in death penalty cases, we also acknowledge that in all

Re: Respondent's Proposed Order - Order Deadline - September 1, 2010

Dear Judge Manning:

I am aware of the September 1, 2010 Order deadline entered by the South Carolina Supreme Court in this matter. As of this date, I have not received any specific request from you or direction concerning this matter concerning the preparation of a proposed order. I am similarly not aware of any request made of the opposing party. Out of an abundance of caution, I have prepared the following proposed Order of Dismissal consistent with the positions the Respondent made in its post-hearing memorandum on February 16, 2010. I will be out of town this week at a conference and was concerned that if you wished to have the State prepare an order consistent with our earlier position, I would have been unable to provide it to you by the Wednesday deadline currently set by the Supreme Court.

Of course, if this is not consistent with your wishes an/or a continuance from the Supreme Court deadline order is sought, please ignore the attached proposals.

By copy of this email with attachments in pdf and Word and Wordperfect, I am advising opposing counsel of this communication. "

other cases, it is common practice for judges to ask a party to draft a proposed order for the sake of efficiency. In the present case, the evidence sufficiently indicates that the PCR judge spent an adequate amount of time reviewing the order before adopting it. . . .

Hall v. Catoe, 360 S.C. 353, 365, 601 S.E.2d 335, 341 (S.C.2004).

Stokes contends that the apparent adoption of the state's unsolicited proposed order was error because it rejected his position concerning the existence of a conflict of interest and a waiver of the conflict of interest arising from defense counsel Thomas Sims prosecution in 1991 and representation in 1999. He also suggests this error in the adoption of the portions of the proposed order arises from the failure on the part of the order to specifically cite federal constitutional cases concerning knowing and voluntary waivers, such as Boykin v. Alabama, 395 U.S. 238 (1969), Glasser v. U.S., 315 U.S. 60 (1942) and Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458 (1938). *Motion to Alter*, p. 5-6.

However, Stokes ignores the conclusions by this Court that implicitly acknowledges this constitutional waiver standard in the following findings and conclusions:

This Court finds as a fact, based upon the credible testimony of both Virgin Johnson and Thomas Sims, that **Stokes knowing[ly] and voluntarily waived a conflict of interest and with full knowledge of the conflict and ability to have a different lawyer desired to have Thomas Sims continue to represent him in the trial.** Applicant failed in their burden of proof at the PCR hearing and failed to timely call the Applicant to contradict the testimony of either Mr. Johnson or Mr. Sims. The belated presentation of a statement of Applicant after the hearing is insufficient to satisfy their burden of proof under these discrete circumstances.

Order, p. 25. (emphasis added).

This Court concludes as a matter of law that Thomas Sims's prior prosecution of Stokes does not create an actual conflict of interest and/or require a new trial. First, this Court finds as a fact based upon credible evidence presented at the hearing that counsel Sims and counsel Johnson had discussions with the Applicant about his right to have new counsel other than Sims because of the

earlier prosecution and Stokes advised them then and since that he desired to have Mr. Sims represent him in the matter. Further, this Court finds credible evidence that Stokes, aware of the prior involvement of Sims in the Smith prosecution wanted to have Sims continue to represent him in this matter.

Order, p. 30-31. (emphasis added). “This Court alternately finds that there was a knowing waiver of a conflict of interest.” Order , p. 39.

This Court further relied upon SCACR Rule 407, Rule 1.7 (b). The hearing court specifically found: “[H]ere, Stokes was aware that Sims had prosecuted him in 1990-1991. He was aware - based upon the credible testimony of Virgin Johnson that he could have somebody else represent him and he stated no. This Court finds that the Applicant waived his right to have counsel other than Thomas Sims represent him. The claims otherwise must be dismissed.” Order, p. 45.

The Applicant’s objection is one of form, not of substance. It is evident that this Court was specifically addressing the issues of a knowing and intelligent waiver of a Sixth Amendment right, even though the court did not expressly cite bedrock law of Boykin or Zerbst in the written analysis of the issue. As to this claim, the motion to alter and amend should be denied.

Further, it is clear that this Court performed acceptable procedures in preparation of the order under Hall v Catoe (“In the present case, the evidence sufficiently indicates that the PCR judge spent an adequate amount of time reviewing the order before adopting it.”). The post-hearing memorandums were received by the Court by February 2010. Both parties provided the Court with proposed orders consistent with their positions in the post-hearing briefing. Respondent provided a proposed order consistent with the Respondent memorandum on August 29, 2010 - albeit unsolicited due to the imposed order deadline by the South Carolina Supreme

Court. The Applicant provided its proposed order - solicited upon information and belief from opposing counsel - on October 1, 2010. The Order dismissing the case was signed October 21, 2010 - almost two months after receipt of the respondent's proposed order, nearly one month after receipt of Applicants order, and more than seven months after posthearing briefing had been completed. The motion to alter which suggests an entirely new order should be entered must be denied.

II.

THE REJECTION OF THE AFFIDAVIT FROM SAMMIE STOKES

In the second portion of the motion to alter, Stokes complains that his post-hearing personal affidavit was not included in consideration. *Motion to Alter*, p. 6-8. The Applicant submitted the affidavit on August 18, 2009 from Applicant Sammie Stokes after the evidentiary hearing was closed on August 5, 2009. At that hearing, testimony was taken from various witnesses and the Applicant was present throughout the hearing. However, the Applicant's counsel failed to call the Applicant in support of his claims either during the Applicant's case or in reply after state witnesses testified. PCR Tr.p. 48, l. 5-7. At the close of the state's case, the Applicant's counsel advised the court that there would be no further witnesses. PCR Tr.p. 107, l. 22. No request was made to leave the record open for any further evidence - particularly when the Applicant was present at the entire hearing, heard the evidence presented and could have testified and been subjected to cross-examination. The only matters remaining were the briefing and the decision of the Court.

The Applicant acknowledges that the affidavit was submitted two weeks after the hearing

concluded along with a Memorandum Clarifying Ground 9(d). The Applicant attempts in his motion to take the State to task during the intervening months prior to the entry of the October 21, 2010 order for failing to seek procedures to cross-examine the Applicant concerning the averments made in the belated affidavit. The Applicant admits that the State voiced objections to the affidavit in a November 12, 2009 email and in the February 16, 2010 Post-Hearing Memorandum, p. 44. In his August 18, 2009 Memorandum Clarifying Ground 9(d), the Applicant stated that the submission was made because "immediately after the hearing, respondent's counsel Don Zelenka, remarked that he was surprised Stokes had not been called to testify. Undersigned counsel interpret Mr. Zelenka's remark as an indication that respondent's arguments from this point forward - most immediately the arguments likely to appear in its post-hearing briefing - will feature the absence of testimony from Stokes as a basis for denying post-conviction relief . . ." Applicant's Memorandum Clarifying Ground 9(d), p. 1. (August 18, 2009). Respondent's counsel confirmed in an earlier pleading that the Applicant correctly stated that Respondent's counsel's response when asked what he thought the Judge was going to do, and pointed out that they had not contradicted any of the testimony of either Mr. Sims or Mr. Johnson by Applicant's failure to testify at the hearing. This Court had found that it was evident at that time that the Applicant had not presented any evidence to contradict the representations made by either counsel or in the original trial record concerning the discussions and desire to have Mr. Sims represent him in this trial, as well as the subsequent trials. The burden of proof in the collateral proceeding was upon the Applicant.

This Court finds that the Applicant's affidavit submitted on August 18, 2009, which he now purports to merely corroborate what his trial counsel had already acknowledged was

properly rejected under S.C. Code § 17-27-80 within the original *Order of Dismissal* at p. 45, ft. 11. Under § 17-27-80, the Act states that “the court *may* receive proof by affidavits . . . and may order that applicant brought before it for hearing.” *Id.* It does not require this Court or any court to automatically admit any affidavit (at any time prior to decision) as Applicant now suggests. Importantly, the Applicant was present at the August 5, 2009 hearing and there was certainly time available on that date. At the conclusion of the Applicant’s case in chief, counsel Lominack stated: “that concludes our testimony portion of the case.” Tr.p. 49, l. 5-6. After Mr. Sims and Mr. Johnson had testified in the Respondent’s case in chief and the Respondent had rested its case, what is most important, this Court offered the opportunity to have the Applicant called at that hearing when he asked counsel if they wanted “anything further” and the response by the counsel was “nothing further.” PCR Tr.p. 107, l. 18-22. At that point, the Court inquired about making arguments then, in addition to a proffer for a submission of proposed orders. Plainly, it was strategic decision by the Applicant to not present the testimony of Sammie Stokes at that time - when the Court and opposing counsel were present and prepared to receive proof.

The Applicant suggests that the affidavit does not present new information and merely corroborates the testimony of Mr. Sims and Mr. Johnson. However, that is not an accurate characterization of the affidavit. In the affidavit at paragraph six, Stokes states: “[I]f I had known that Mr. Sims handled my whole trial for the prosecution in 1991, that the 1991 conviction would be used against me at the 1999 trial, and that Audrey Smith would testify and be cross-examined by Mr. Sims, I would have asked to have a different lawyer.” Affidavit, Sammie Stokes, p. 2, ¶ 6 (August 17, 2009). To the contrary, the broadly worded affidavit does attempt to contradict the testimony of Virgin Johnson and Thomas Sims concerning the substance of the discussions and

his decision and Stokes' desire to be continually represented by Mr. Sims, even after the entire trial. At the PCR hearing, former counsel Sims stated that they had discussed with Stokes his role, who he was, "and what my role had been in the previous matter with him." PCR Tr.p. 55, l. 15-19. In complete contradiction of Stokes belated affidavit, counsel Sims testified at the hearing that after the trial, after all the information had come out, that Stokes called him and wanted him to continue to be his lawyer in the second case. PCR Tr.p. 56, l. 23-p. 57, l. 9. This testimony repudiates the substance of Stokes' later averments.

This Court finds that this one-sided and limited affidavit presentation did more than Stokes has suggested - it prevented the State from cross-examining Stokes in an already closed record about the discussions that both trial counsel had with him - matters that were uncontradicted at the time of the hearing, including whether his prior convictions could be used against him at trial and his knowledge about whom the prosecutor was at his initial trial. The belated affidavit presentation also did not include any information about the fact that after the trial Stokes sought and did have Sims continue to represent him in his subsequent potential capital trial after he was aware of the prior prosecution and the cross-examination by Sims of Audrey Smith - evidence that again wholly contradicts the affidavit of Stokes. Further, counsel Sims testified that he and Stokes talked about evidence of the Audrey Smith incident and that Sims knew it would come in. PCR Tr.p. 60, l. 2-18. Also, PCR Tr.p. 87, l. 9-17; Tr.p. 88, l. 15-p. 89, l. 2; p. 98, l. 1-17. Contrary to the Stokes affidavit, counsel Johnson also testified about the fact that after the trial, Stokes continued to be desirous of having Thomas Sims represent him the second capital trial and he asked if the trial was overturned and we had to try it again that he wanted Thomas Sims to represent him again. Tr.p. 102, l. 1-24. ("I know he wanted Thomas

back.”). Counsel Johnson also testified that they had discussions that the evidence of the prior conviction could be presented at the trial and that Stokes did not request then for Sims to be removed. PCR Tr.p. 103, l. 15-24.

In asserting in the belated affidavit that he was not aware that Sims had prosecuted him previously, it also varies from the testimony of Sims and Johnson. It does not corroborate their testimony or confirm it - it disputes it. Further, while the affidavit does state that “he was not in the courtroom during the trial,” the record of the March 12, 1991 trial reveals that although the Applicant refused to come into the courtroom during the testimony, he did enter the courtroom at the outset of the trial proceedings and was present when then Solicitor Sims provided the judge with the indictment while Stokes made a personal plea for a continuance. March 12, 1991 Tr.p. 6-14.

This Court is constrained to conclude that the post-hearing submission of the affidavit was a blatant attempt to avoid the pitfalls of cross-examination and subjecting the Applicant to the adversarial process. This Court had made available the hearing process by securing a reasonable length of time for the evidentiary hearing and provided the opportunity for each side to fully present their case at the hearing.

Simply put the credibility of the Applicant, as well as the completeness of his affidavit to the claims before the court, were plainly at issue. In the State’s post-hearing memorandum, the State urged this Court to strike the affidavit from consideration as it was not newly discovered evidence, but was evidence sought to be shielded from the adversarial process where the Applicant would have opened himself up to impeachment and further testimony concerning the

issues. *Respondent's Post-Hearing Memorandum*, p. 44, n. 11.² This Court must agree with that assessment.

In the Order of Dismissal, this Court addressed the belated submission after the record was closed with appropriate rejection by acknowledging that the Applicant did not testify at the post-conviction hearing. Order of Dismissal, p. 2. In rejecting the affidavit's belated submission, this Court stated:

This Court again notes that the Applicant - subsequent to the hearing and the closing of the evidentiary record - proffered an affidavit from Sammie Stokes which attempts to contradict the testimony of both Sims and Johnson. This was not newly discovered evidence. Stokes was present at the hearing, heard the testimony of counsel and could have testified before the evidentiary record was closed. The Court set aside the term solely for this hearing and the hearing was completed with the record not being left open for further evidentiary matters. The Court concludes the belated presentation of the affidavit should be struck as the record was closed. At the hearing the Applicant was presented with the opportunity to testify and be subject to cross-examination and impeachment before and after counsel testified before the evidentiary record closed. He waived his opportunity to do so at that time by his inaction with the timely opportunity to present evidence. The Applicant failed in his burden of proof at the time of the hearing by seeking to contradict the testimony of counsel Sims and Johnson.

Order of Dismissal, p. 45, n. 11.

There is no basis to alter or amend this conclusion which struck the one-sided affidavit from the record. The record was closed after the Applicant was given the opportunity to testify in

²In the State's Posthearing memorandum, the Respondent asserted:

"Respondents note that the Applicant - subsequent to the hearing - proffered an affidavit from Sammie Stokes which attempts to contradict the testimony of both Sims and Johnson. The Respondent submit that the belated presentation should be struck as the record was closed. Further, the Applicant failed in his burden of proof at the time of the hearing by seeking to contradict the testimony of counsel Sims and Johnson."

their case in chief and on reply. Contrary to the assertions and characterization of counsel, he does seek to contradict the combined testimony of Mr. Sims and Mr. Johnson about their discussions with Stokes, the knowledge of Stokes concerning Sims prior prosecution and Stokes's desire with the knowledge of the prior involvement to have Sims continue as defense counsel.

Why Stokes was not called to testify in the normal course of the hearing is subject to speculation, but it is clear it was an attempt to avoid contemporaneous cross-examination at the hearing. The fact that this Court reasonably decided to reject the post-hearing gamesmanship of belatedly inserting an affidavit which states some matters inconsistent with testimony presented - testimony which had been subjected to adversarial testing before the fact-finder - was a proper rejection. The full opportunity to have Applicant testify at the hearing was made before the evidentiary record was closed.

The motion to alter concerning the exclusion of Stokes August 17, 2009 affidavit must be denied.

III.

THE FINDING OF CREDIBILITY OF THOMAS SIMS.

In the final assertion of his motion to alter or amend, the Applicant asserts that this Court mischaracterized the testimony of Jeffrey Bloom. There was a contested issue of fact concerning the existence of alleged conversations between Mr. Bloom and counsel Thomas Sims concerning the prior prosecution of Stokes and particular steps to take, as well as the basis of Mr. Bloom's further non-involvement in the case. Mr. Bloom testified that certain matters happened and

specific subjects were discussed and Mr. Sims - who had been sequestered upon the Applicant's motion during Mr. Bloom's testimony - testified that he had no recollection of the alleged discussions and directions about conflict of interest ever occurring. Compare Tr.p. 43-48 (Bloom testimony) with Tr.p. 57-58, 84-85 (Sims testimony). The Court concluded in the Order of Dismissal that Mr. Sims was credible in his testimony that he had no recollection of any discussion with Bloom about a conflict of interest issue. *Order of Dismissal*, p. 35, footnote 10. See also *Order of Dismissal*, p. 32, footnote 8. These differences in the testimony of each witness were significant on the critical points.

While Mr. Sims was sequestered upon Applicant's request by the Court [PCR Tr.p. 19], Mr. Bloom testified that he had a face to face meeting with Mr. Sims in Orangeburg to discuss potential involvement in creating a juror profile, he stated that during the meeting a second issue came up about a potential conflict of interest that Bloom was very concerned about because Sims had previously prosecuted Mr. Stokes. PCR Tr.p. 43, l. 12-15. Mr. Bloom testified that he thought it was a "substantial and serious issue" and was trying to impress upon Mr. Sims that if he had prosecuted him it would be an issue in a capital sentencing proceeding. "I don't think he fully understood how or why that would be. But I kept emphasizing that conviction is going to become in play at the capital sentencing proceeding, and he did not seem as concerned about the conflict issue." PCR Tr.p. 43, l. 19 - p. 44, l. 1. Bloom testified that he stressed to Sims from his own capital experience that Sims had to have an ex parte hearing in front of a judge requested in writing so that the solicitor would not be present because it was an attorney client issue. However, Bloom reported that Sims kept saying don't worry about it and that Stokes had already waived it. Bloom testified that he stated that the hearing was necessary because of the other

consequences and that “it may even be that you absent yourself from the hearing so that Mr. Stokes is free to tell the judge about the prior prosecutor/defendant relationship. PCR Tr.p. 44, l. 2-19. Bloom stated he “very much so” related this information to Sims, although he contended that meeting was under an hour and that it was that he could not help him with the jury profiling request and his concern over the conflict issue. Bloom testified that Sims did not seem to appreciate the nature of the conflict issue. PCR tr.p. 44-45. Bloom reported that he followed-up about his demand for a motion hearing to Mr. Sims at a later time during a telephone call that also involved jury profiling. Bloom stated :

I again asked him, have you filed any kind of written motion on this potential conflict of interest issue we discussed or had a hearing and he indicated no. And he still didn't seem concerned about it. And I told him that really needed to be something that was settled on the record long before trial . . . I concluded by telling him , well there's really not much I can do for you, one because he continued to want jury profiling, which I didn't do and two he didn't seem at all top appreciate the gravity of the conflict of interest issue. *And I concluded that I just needed to sever any professional relationship to the case because –and I don't mean this rudely, but I didn't want to work with an attorney who failed to appreciate the gravity of the issue.*

PCR Tr.p. 45, l. 15- p. 46, l. 12 (*emphasis added*). On cross-examination, Mr. Bloom thought the discussion had occurred after April 15 and could have been either in May or June and the telephone call happened within 30 days from the meeting. PCR Tr. P. 47, l. 1-9.

This Court was faced with making a credibility determination concerning the existence of a discussion between counsel Sims and Mr. Bloom about a conflict hearing and waiver issue which was seen as one of substance - not one of memory. The Court recognized this factual dispute during the PCR hearing when the Court specifically questioned Mr. Bloom concerning the specifics about the two communications he had with Mr. Sims:

Q. Did you specifically indicate to Mr. Sims there was a case or rule that he was in direct conflict with in representing Mr. Stokes?

A. I—

Q. I really understand your concern.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you offered him an opinion. Did you offer him an opinion or a case or a rule?

A. I didn't provide a case. I know I discussed the conflict of interest rules generally. I *may* have cited a specific rule at the time. I *probably would not* have cited a rule in our meeting. I *may* have in the phone conversation because I learned of the conflict through Mr. Johns, I believe on the ride up here or right before our meetings. So after that I had an opportunity to go back and look at the rules. So *probably* in the phone call I *may* have told him my main concern was the rule whatsoever, at the time.

PCR Tr.p. 47, l. 22- p. 48, l. 7 (*emphasis added*). Subsequent to the presentation of testimony, the Court inquired of Applicant's counsel about whether Mr. Bloom ever wrote Sims a letter telling him that there was a conflict - which applicant's counsel conceded that there was no letter and that it was just verbal, a question that this Court had intended to ask Mr. Bloom. Tr.p. 108, l. 3-8.

Thomas Sims recollections concerning his conversations with Mr. Bloom was different in a number of significant aspects. Sims testified that in the early stages of his representation that he had a discussion with Mr. Bloom about doing jury work for the defense and that Mr. Bloom provided him with some rudimentary information. Sims testified that his understanding was that he did not assist him at trial because Mr. Bloom was involved in a major trial in Aiken. PCR Tr.p. 57, l. 12-25. Counsel Sims testified:

Q. Do you recall having a discussion with Mr. Bloom specifically about the conflict

of interest based upon your prior prosecution?

A. I don't.

Q. You don't have any recollection?

A. I don't have any recollection of that.

Q. Do you have any recollection of Mr. Bloom calling you and asking you if you'd yet had an ex parte hearing with the judge about the conflict issue?

A. I - -I - - This has been over ten years ago, and I can't say as I recall that. No, I don't recall that.

PCR Tr.p. 58, l. 1-11. The Applicant emphasizes the portion of cross-examination where the following occurs:

Q. . . . Mr. Zelenka asked you about a meeting with Jeff Bloom, and you said you didn't remember meeting with him or talking about a perceived conflict of interest. You're not saying that didn't happen, you just don't recall it 10 years later, right?

A. Yes, That's what I'm saying.

PCR Tr.p. 84, l. 18-22.

The stark difference in the testimony between Mr. Bloom and Mr. Sims required resolution by the Court. In doing so, this Court was able to assess the particular credibility of the witnesses, including the fact that Mr. Sims was sequestered during Mr. Bloom's testimony and had no apparent knowledge of its substance prior to his own testimony, and Mr. Sims credible demeanor on the witness stand when he claimed he had no recollection of any conversation with Bloom concerning the conflict issue. The Court had to make a call as to what occurred [and what

did not occur] between two lawyers. In making the assessment, the Court concluded:

In the PCR hearing, the Applicant called Richland County attorney Jeff Bloom to testify. Mr. Bloom described being asked to assist in the case preparation concerning jury matters. PCR 41-43. However, unlike Sims testimony, Mr. Bloom suggested that he recalled a discussion about a potential conflict of interest which Bloom was concerned about based upon the prior prosecution. PCR 43. Bloom stated that he tried to emphasize this to Mr. Sims who Bloom contended did not fully understand why it would be a problem. Bloom contended that he told Sims that at a minimum he must request a hearing before a judge on the issue in an ex parte setting and allow Stokes to express his desires to the court. PCR 44. Bloom stated that in his next telephone contact with Sims that he learned that Sims had not followed through with Bloom's suggestions. PCR 46. He stated that because of this he had to sever his professional relationship with him. PCR 46.

As stated above, counsel Sims did not recall any discussion with Bloom concerning any potential conflict of interest issue. **This Court has determined that Mr. Sims testimony is credible.**

Order of Dismissal, p. 35, n.10. (Emphasis added). See also, *Order*, p.32, n. 8.

This Court had a basis in the record to support the credibility determination made by the PCR court concerning the alleged conversations between Mr. Bloom and Mr. Sims related to the conflict of interest issue. The motion to alter should be denied.

IV.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND WAIVER

During the Rule 59 motion hearing, counsel for Stokes additionally argued that the fact that counsel Sims had researched an argument to exclude the admission of evidence of the prior bad acts, including the conviction involving the Audrey Smith incident supported their showing that Sims did not appreciate and therefore did not fully discuss with Stokes the possibility that the Smith matter would be introduced by the State at the trial. While it is true that counsel Sims stated that he knew the evidence of the prior bad acts was going to come in. PCR Tr.p. 60, l. 18.

Further, the record did reflect that counsel conducted research on the admissibility of prior bad acts in the penalty phase of the trial. PCR Tr.p. 69 -70. [The trial transcript of the October 25, 1999 trial shows counsel Sims argued at the outset of the penalty phase that the evidence of the prior acts should be excluded in the penalty phase pursuant to State v. Lyle 125 S.C. 406, 118 S.E. 803 (1923) and S.C.R.E. Rule 404(b). The Solicitor correctly argued that the very recent decision in State v. Hughes (Mar-Reece), 336 S.C. 585, 521 S.E.2d 500 (Oct. 4, 1999), which rejected a similar theory, defeated Sims's argument and the trial court agreed. ROA Tr.p. 1088-1090].³ Sims's argument at trial was essentially whether crimes over 10 years old were too remote to be considered, whether the prior crimes were felonies versus misdemeanors which was crafted from Evidence Rule 609 concerning impeachment use of convictions. PCR Tr.p. 77-78. Although this argument was inadequate under Hughes, supra., its lack of a sound basis in the law at the time of the trial had no effect on the conflict issue because Sims' actual expectation was that the evidence would be admitted, albeit over his objection.

At the PCR hearing, counsel Sims testified that he was aware of the state's intent to use the Audrey Smith indictment and conviction in the penalty phase. PCR Tr.p. 89-90. He stated that he had researched the matter and felt that they could probably try to keep it out, mainly because it was beyond the 10 year limit. However, he stated that he did not think that the

³At the October 14, 1999 pre-trial motion hearing, counsel Sims made a similar argument. The Solicitor had indicated his intent to present prior bad acts not limited to convictions into the penalty phase. ROA 1606. The judge deferred the ruling until the penalty phase. ROA 1607-08. Further, at the same motion hearing, counsel Sims indicated a concern about his name appearing on the ABHAN indictment involving his wife. Counsel Sims again brought up a concern about whether the crimes were misdemeanors at the time of conviction and its use depending on certain provisions of the evidence code under Lyle or Rule 609. Counsel Sims stated that he wanted to do more research on that matter. ROA 1637-1638.

evidence would be kept out, but he wanted it kept out. PCR Tr.p. 93, l. 4-9. Mr. Sims denied that he would have told Stokes that the evidence would not be admitted. To the contrary, he said he probably would have told him that most judges would not make the call to keep it out. PCR Tr.p. 93-94. To clarify, Sims stated that he fought to keep the evidence out, but agreed that he anticipated that the judge would let the evidence in. PCR Tr.p. 98, l. 3-12.

The Applicant's present argument to alter and amend suggests that counsel Sims did not perceive a potential conflict of interest because he believed that the evidence of the Audrey Smith incident and conviction could never be admitted. This is a misreading of the record. Counsel Sims clarified that he thought he had a viable argument to keep the evidence out, but that he expected the judge to still admit the evidence. Further, Sims was cognizant at least two weeks before the trial that his own name was on the prior indictments and wanted to have his name removed before the indictments would be introduced. Contrary to the claim suggested by Applicant, Sims was not ignoring the potential admissibility of the evidence or the potential of Audrey Smith testifying about the incident and the letters that Stokes had sent to her in his assessment of his ability to represent Stokes. He had notice and anticipated the introduction of the evidence.

The Court in its order concluded that:

This Court finds as a fact, based upon the credible testimony of both Virgin Johnson and Thomas Sims, that Stokes knowing and voluntarily waived a conflict of interest and with full knowledge of the conflict and ability to have a different lawyer desired to have Thomas Sims continue to represent him in the trial. Applicant failed in their burden of proof at the PCR hearing and failed to timely call the Applicant to contradict the testimony of either Mr. Johnson or Mr. Sims. The belated presentation of a statement of Applicant after the hearing is insufficient to satisfy their burden of proof under these discrete circumstances.

Order of Dismissal, p. 25. The Court further found “as a fact based upon credible evidence presented at the hearing that counsel Sims and counsel Johnson had discussions with the Applicant about his right to have new counsel other than Sims because of the earlier prosecution and Stokes advised them then and since that he desired to have Mr. Sims represent him in the matter.” *Order of Dismissal*, p. 30-31.

There is evidence at the PCR hearing to support this finding. PCR Tr.p. 55-57, 88-90, 101-103. Counsel Virgin Johnson recalled that Stokes was told prior to trial that evidence of the prior conviction that Sims had prosecuted could possibly be presented. PCR Tr.p. 102. In its order, the Court found the evidence that Stokes, aware of the prior involvement of Sims in the Smith prosecution wanted to have Sims continue to represent him in this matter and never requested to have Sims removed was credible. *Order of Dismissal*, p. 31. Evidence supported this conclusion. PCR Tr.p. 55-57, 59-60, 88-90, 102-105. See also State v. Abernathy, 289 Ga. 603, 715 S.E.2d 48 (2011) (defense attorney’s previous employment as a prosecutor where he handled citations against the defendant did not create a conflict of interest where he no involvement in the homicide case).

The motion to alter and amend should be denied.

DENIAL OF MOTION TO APPOINT NEW PCR COUNSEL.

In his April 10, 2012 pleading, current appointed PCR counsel Keir Weyle and Robert Lominack seek an order relieving their appointment at this time and allow for appointment of new counsel. Current PCR counsel contend that the recent decision in Martinez v. Ryan, _ U.S. _, 2012 Westlaw 912950 (March 20, 2012) supports them being relieved as counsel in this setting

to allow for newly appointed counsel to investigate whether current PCR counsel was ineffective, particularly related to their decision to not call Stokes to testify at the PCR hearing. This Court has considered whether Martinez requires this new appointment within a state PCR action brought pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §17-27-10, 160. Stokes current counsel seem to assert that the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in Martinez, creates a new and independent cause of action for ineffective assistance of collateral counsel in our state courts PCR system. While the decision in Martinez does contain expansive language, a proper analysis reveals that the Supreme Court specifically declined to address the issue of whether a constitutional right to effective assistance of collateral counsel exists:

While petitioner frames the question in this case as a constitutional one, a more narrow, but still dispositive, formulation is whether a federal habeas court may excuse a procedural default of an ineffective-assistance [trial] claim when the claim was not properly presented in state court due to an attorney's errors in an initial-review collateral proceeding.

Id. at *3. Even Justice Scalia in his dissent acknowledged that the majority chose to evade this issue. See id. at *16 (Scalia, J., dissenting) (noting that the reframing of the issue “avoid[ed] the Court's need to confront the established rule that there is no right to counsel in collateral proceedings”). It appears that Martinez is only directed toward federal habeas proceedings brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and is designed and intended to address issues that arise in that context. Further, it does not overrule the precedent of the South Carolina Supreme Court in Aice v. State, 305 S.C. 448, 451, 409 S.E.2d 392, 394 (1991) (holding that an allegation that prior PCR counsel was ineffective is not per se a sufficient reason allowing for a successive PCR application). See e.g., Austin v. State, 305 S.C. 453, 409 S.E.2d 395 (1991) (recognizing that the

constitutional right to counsel does not extend to discretionary appeals on collateral attack, but allowing a PCR applicant to receive a belated appeal from the denial of his initial PCR application where first PCR counsel failed to file a notice of appeal); Washington v. State, 324 S.C. 232, 478 S.E.2d 833 (1996) (granting PCR where the defendant alleged ineffective assistance of PCR counsel due to so many procedural irregularities).


More importantly, Martinez does not require any state to hold a collateral PCR action within a PCR action with a double appointment of PCR counsel. This Court, under the discrete circumstances presented after the initial judgment was already entered, denies this extraordinary request to relieve current appointed PCR counsel and appoint new counsel.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, it is ORDERED

1. The Rule 59 motion to alter and/or amend is denied in its entirety.
2. The Motion to Relieve Current PCR counsel is DENIED.
3. The Motion to Appoint New PCR counsel is denied.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED this 13 day of February 2012.


L. CASEY MANNING
Presiding Judge

Columbia, South Carolina.