

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

JUN 14 2021

SC Court of Appeals
APPEAL FROM ANDERSON COUNTY

Court of General Sessions

R. Lawton McIntosh, Circuit Court Judge

Case No.: 2012-GS-23-07504, 07507

Appellate Case No. 2018-000564

The State,..... Respondent

v.

George Cleveland III,.....Appellant

APPELLANT'S PETITION FOR REHEARING

George Cleveland III
400 Hunter Street
Seneca, S.C. 29678
(864) 784 7223
Pro se Appellant

South Carolina Department of Probation
Parole and Pardon Services
Mr. Matthew C. Buchanan, General Counsel
Post Office Box 50666
Columbia, S.C. 29250
(803) 734-9220

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Ex parte Hollman 79 S.C. 9, 60 S.E. 19, 14 (1908).....4
State v. Hamilton 333 S.C. 642, 511 S.E. 2d 94, (Ct. App. 1999).....3-4
State v. Lee 350 S.C. 125, 132, 564 S.E. 2d 372, 376 (Ct. App. 2002).....3-4
State v. Phillips 416 S.C. 184, 187 (S.C. 2016).....1
State v. Spare 374 S.C. 264, 268 647 S.E. 2d 706, 708 (Ct. App. 2007).....4
United States v. Cotton 535 U.S. 625, 630 (2002).....1-2,4-5

CONSTITUTION

S.C. Const. Art. I §19.....1,4-5

STATUTES

18 U.S.C.A. §2312.....1-3,5

APPELLANT'S PETITION FOR REHEARING:

Appellant George Cleveland III, *pro se*, respectfully submits this Petition for Rehearing of *State v. George Cleveland III, Op No. 21-UP-121 (S.C. Ct. App. Filed April 21, 2021* unpublished opinion which Affirmed the lower court's order sentencing Appellant Cleveland to 90-days in jail for restitution arrears pursuant to *Rule 221 (a) SCACR* because this court overlooked my argument that subject matter jurisdiction can be invoked at any time. *United States v. Cotton 535 U.S. 625, 630 (2002)*, and this Court disregarded my argument that *S.C. Const. art. I §19* barred the General Sessions Court from jailing me for restitution arrears. *State v. Phillips 416 S.C. 184, 187 (S.C. 2016)*; ("Any material fact or principle of law [that] has been overlooked or disregarded..." is cognizable for this court to Grant this Petition for Rehearing of this case.

PRINCIPLE OF LAW HAS BEEN OVERLOOKED

The principle of law has been overlooked in Appellant Cleveland's argument that the General Sessions court did not have subject matter jurisdiction to impose a 90-day jail sentence for restitution arrears because this court citation of several cases are not applicable to my case.

In my Final Brief, I explicitly argued that the General Sessions court below did not have subject matter jurisdiction to impose a 90-day jail sentence for restitution arrears because the vehicles connected to this case were reported stolen out of

Georgia, and recovered in South Carolina. Since the vehicles crossed state lines, subject matter jurisdiction belongs to the federal government, not the government of South Carolina under the 18 U.S.C.A. §2312 (“The Dyer Act”) (“**whoever transports interstate... a motor vehicle the same to have been stolen, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.**”), see appellant’s Final Brief filed in this court at pp. 2-5. This court overlooked this principle of law above because this court did not explain or cite why United States v. Cotton 535 U.S. 625, 630 (2002) did not apply to my subject matter jurisdiction. In Cotton, the Supreme Court of the United States held that “[s]ubject matter jurisdiction... **involved a court’s power to hear a case, can never be forfeited or waived**, [c]onsequently, defects in subject matter jurisdiction require correction regardless of wh[en] the error was raised...”

This court cited State v. Lee 350 S.C. 125, 132, 564 S.E. 2s 372, 376 (ct.app. 2002), and State v. Hamilton 333 S.C. 643,647, 511 S.E. 2d 94, 96 (ct. app. 1999) to support its’ reasoning that the General Sessions court below “had subject matter jurisdiction to revoke ninety days of Cleveland’s probation.” I will explain each case in turn.

In Lee he violated conditions of his parole and probation and subsequently violated by the parole board, and the General Sessions court. Lee 350 S.C. 125, 132, 564 S.E. 2d 372, 376 (ct. app. 2002) Lee argued the General Sessions court did not have subject matter jurisdiction because that court could not place him on probation and on parole at the same time, Lee, id., at 132. This court disagreed, and affirmed Lee’s appeal.

In State v. Spare¹ 374 S.C. 264, 268, 647 S.E. 2d 706, 708(ct. app. 2007); Spare violated his probation for falling behind on restitution payments. His chief argument was that he made a bona fide effort to pay his restitution. The General Sessions court disagreed, and concluded he willfully failed to pay his restitution; however, this court disagreed with the General Sessions court, and concluded Spare did not willfully fail to pay his restitution, and remanded the case for a new probation revocation hearing, Spare, id., at 270-71.

None of the above cases provide any Logic to my probation 90-day revocation case. Specifically, Lee, Spare, and Hamilton do not align with my argument because my arguments connected with subject matter jurisdiction invoking a federal case, and federal statute, it is not Lee's argument of probation, and parole jurisdiction issues, or Spare's argument of his bona fide effort to pay restitution. General Sessions courts cannot invoke power that court do not have. Not Oconee, Greenville, or Anderson, or no South Carolina county. Not in 2012-13. R.pp. 36, 41-47 when I was sentenced to prison, and probation, not in 2018 when this case was filed, and not in 2021 when this Petition for Rehearing was filed because there is no statute of limitations on subject matter jurisdiction. If a lower court has no power to impose a prison sentence, a probation sentence, a probation revocation sentence, or any punishment that power does not yield to the lower courts based on time; therefore, this court overlooked the principle of law of subject matter jurisdiction cannot be

¹ See also State v. Hamilton 333 S.C. 642, 647, 511 S.E. 2d 94, 96(ct. app. 1999). This case is similar to the Lewis & Spare.

waived or forfeited, and it can be raised at any time under United States v. Cotton 535 U.S. 625, 630 (2002).

PRINCIPLE OF LAW HAS BEEN DISREGARDED

The principle of law has been disregarded in Appellant Cleveland's argument that the General Sessions court did not have subject matter jurisdiction to impose a 90-day jail sentence for restitution arrears because this court several cases cited are not applicable to my case.

In my Final Brief, I explicitly argued that the General Sessions court below did not have subject matter jurisdiction to impose a 90-day jail sentence for restitution arrears because *S.C. Art. I §19* (See pp. 6-7 of Appellant's Final Brief) states: "**No person shall be imprisoned for debt except in cases of fraud**"... Under United States v. Cotton 535. This court disregarded the case law connected to the South Carolina Constitution. In particular, I cited Ex parte Hollman 79 S.C. 9, 60 S.E. 19, 14 (1908); which reasoned *S.C. Art. I §19* does not allow for a restitution arrears to be jailed because "[r]estitution is a [d]ebt is that which is due from one person to another..." United States v. Cotton 535 U.S. 625, 630 (2002).

This court states that "our case law permits a circuit court to revoke payments of.. restitution, and cited Spare, 268, 647 S.E. 2d at 708, and Hamilton, 333 S.C. at 649, 511 S.E. 2d at 97. But neither of these cases mentions nothing about *S.C. Art. I §19* granting South Carolina Appellate Courts the power to publish case law that conflicts with the requirements of Art. I §19, conversely, provisions of the South Carolina Constitution are "mandatory". therefore, this court overlooked the

principle of law of subject matter jurisdiction cannot be waived or forfeited, and it can be raised at any time under United States v. Cotton 535 U.S. 625, 630 (2002).

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, I respectfully request this court to Grant this Petition for Rehearing, and determine whether United States v. Cotton 535 U.S. 625, 630 (2002) can be waived, or forfeited, or have a statute of limitations on subject matter jurisdiction for interstate vehicle theft under the *Dyer Act*, and under *S.C. Const. Art. I §19* with or without further Briefing, or documents respectively.

Respectfully Submitted,

s/

George Cleveland III, *pro se*

400 Hunter Street

Seneca, S.C. 29678

(864) 784 7223

gcleveland7475@gmail.com

Dated: June 07, 2021

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

JUN 14 2021

APPEAL FROM ANDERSON COUNTY SC Court of Appeals
Court of General Sessions

R. Lawton McIntosh, Circuit Court Judge

Case No.: 2012-GS-23-07504, 07507

Appellate Case No. 2018-000564

The State,..... Respondent

v.

George Cleveland III,.....Appellant

APPELLANT'S PROOF OF SERVICE

Appellant George Cleveland III certifies that on the date below, a copy of the Petition for Rehearing has been mailed to the counsel of record for the Respondent by first class prepaid postage to the following:


S.C. Dept. of Probation, Parole & Pardon Services

Office of General Counsel

Attn: Mr. Matthew C. Buchanan

Post Office Box 50666

Columbia, S.C. 29250

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "George Cleveland III", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and cursive.

George Cleveland III, *pro se*

400 Hunter Street

Seneca, S.C. 29678

(864) 784 7223

Pro se Appellant

Dated: June 07, 2021

June 07, 2021

The South Carolina Court of Appeals
Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Clerk of Court
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, S.C. 29211

RECEIVED

JUN 14 2021


SC Court of Appeals

**Re: State v. George Cleveland III; Appellate Case No. 2018-000564;
Appellant's Petition for Rehearing**

Dear Ms. Kitchings,

Can you file the attached Petition for Rehearing, and the Proof of Service? I have attached 6 stapled copies, and 1 unstapled copy of the Petition for Rehearing.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'George Cleveland III', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and cursive.

George Cleveland III, *pro se*

400 Hunter Street

Seneca, S.C. 29678

864-784-7223

gcleland7475@gmail.com

cc: file w/enclosures

Mr. Matthew C. Buchanan, Esquire

P

US POSTAGE & FEES PAID
PRIORITY MAIL
LEGAL FLAT-RATE ENVELOPE
CornPisPrice

062S0009993639
9004544
FROM 28678



stamps
endicia
06/07/2021

PRIORITY MAIL 2-DAY™

George Cleveland III
400 Hunter Street
Seneca SC 29678-4155

0006

B012

SHIP TO: The South Carolina C of Appeals
Jenny Abbott Kitchings Clerk of Court
PO Box 11629
Columbia SC 29211-1629

USPS TRACKING #



9405 5116 9900 0239 5023 47

RECEIVED

JUN 14 2021

SC Court of Appeals