

12/23/2021

To whom this may concern;

Yes, my name is Touris Watts to inform the Court that I'm indigent and request that the Court appoint the Office of Appellate Defense to represent me in this matter.

Thank you,

Touris Watts

#324820

**RECEIVED**

**JAN 24 2022**

**S.C. SUPREME COURT**

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
COUNTY OF RICHLAND )  
Taurus Watts, #324820 )  
Applicant )  
v. )  
State of South Carolina, )  
Respondent. )

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
FOR THE FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

2019-CP-40-6500

**FINAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

COMMON PLEAS COURT  
 2021 NOV 16 PM 2:58  
 RICHLAND COUNTY  
 FILED

This matter comes before the Court pursuant to an application for post-conviction relief filed by Applicant Taurus Watts on November 18, 2019. Respondent made its Return and Motion to Dismiss on September 30, 2021, requesting the application be summarily dismissed because it was untimely, successive to Applicant’s prior PCR actions, and failed to make a *prima facie* showing of newly discovered evidence.

Pursuant to this request, and after reviewing the pleadings in this matter and all of the records attached thereto, this Court issued a Conditional Order of Dismissal filed October 6, 2021, provisionally denying and dismissing this action, while giving Applicant twenty days from the date of service of said Order in which to show why the dismissal should not become final. Attached to this Final Order and incorporated herein by reference is an Affidavit of Service dated October 12, 2021, serving the above-mentioned Conditional Order of Dismissal on the Applicant through his retained counsel.

Applicant submitted a response filed on October 18, 2021, titled “Applicant’s Response to Conditional Order of Dismissal” wherein Applicant argues it is the fact that his co-defendant is now willing to testify which constitutes the new evidence in this matter. Applicant states neither he nor his co-defendant Wray testified at trial, and even if Applicant could have called Wray as a

**RECEIVED**

JAN 24 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

witness, Wray was not willing to provide the testimony he allegedly is now willing to provide. An applicant requesting a new trial based on after-discovered evidence following a conviction must show that the evidence:

- (1) Is such as would probably change the result if a new trial was had;
- (2) Has been discovered since the trial;
- (3) Could not by the exercise of due diligence have been discovered before the trial;
- (4) Is material to the issue of guilt or innocence; and,
- (5) Is not merely cumulative or impeaching.

*Hayden v. State*, 278 S.C. 610, 611, 299 S.E.2d 854, 855 (1983) (citing *State v. Caskey*, 273 S.C. 325, 256 S.E.2d 737 (1979)).

The willingness of an individual to testify does not constitute newly discovered evidence. An individual's choice to do, or not do, something is not a material fact relevant to the underlying conviction. Rather, it is the information that would be provided via testimony which constitutes the relevant evidence in this matter. Ultimately, the version of facts and information Wray would allegedly testify to is not newly discovered evidence as it was known (or should have been known) by both parties prior to trial, and would easily have been discoverable by exercising due diligence. Evidence was presented at trial that Wray was the driver of the Suburban the evening of the shooting, and was known to drive that type of vehicle and Applicant was the passenger. SLED analysis on the vehicle found gunshot residue consistent with a weapon being fired from the driver's side, the side Wray was on. Applicant's trial counsel presented argument that no one had established Applicant as the fatal shooter during this incident. Moreover, Applicant himself admitted during the hearing for his first post-conviction relief action that most of the evidence in this case when it came to the weapon and gunshot residue concerned his co-defendant. (PCR Tr.

8). Applicant additionally admitted during that hearing he was aware of his right to testify, and ultimately made the decision not to. (PCR Tr. 22).

Applicant and his co-defendant knew their version of the events prior to trial. This Court is not compelled by the assertion that these facts existed in a void inaccessible to Applicant until such time as this PCR action was filed. Both co-defendants had the opportunity to testify as to their version of the incident. Applicant cannot now claim this allegedly exculpatory testimony his role that evening constitutes “newly” discovered evidence when Applicant knew that alleged version facts at the time of his trial. Before the Court will hold an evidentiary hearing, Applicant must make a *prima facie* showing he is entitled to relief. *Welch v. MacDougall*, 246 S.C. 258, 143 S.E.2d 455 (1965); *Blandshaw v. State*, 245 S.C. 385, 140 S.E.2d 784 (1965).

Applicant has failed to make such showing he is entitled to relief based on the information set forth above; therefore, he is not entitled to an evidentiary hearing in the matter. This Court has reviewed Applicant’s response to the Conditional Order of Dismissal in its entirety, in conjunction with the original pleadings, and finds a sufficient reason has not been shown why the Conditional Order of Dismissal should not become final.


**RECEIVED**

**JAN 24 2022**

**S.C. SUPREME COURT**

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that, for the reasons set forth in this Court's Conditional Order of Dismissal, the application for post-conviction relief is hereby denied and dismissed with prejudice. This Court hereby advises Applicant he must file and serve a Notice of Appeal within thirty days of the service of this Order to secure appellate review. *See* Rule 203, SCACR. Applicant's attention is directed to Rule 243, SCACR, for the procedures following the filing and service of the notice of appeal.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED this 5 day of November, 2021.

  
L. CASEY MANNING  
Chief Administrative Judge  
Fifth Judicial Circuit

Columbia, South Carolina

Taurus S. Watts #324820  
Palmetto 32A  
K.C.I  
4848 Goldmine Hwy  
Kershaw, SC 29067

COLUMBIA, SC 290

11 JAN 2022 PM 3 L




JAN 11 2022

Patricia A. Howard  
Clerk of Court, S.C. Supreme Court  
P.O. Box 11330  
Columbia, S.C. 29211



11 JAN 2022 PM 4 L

COLUMBIA SC 290 03061-11260



THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS HAS NEITHER  
OWNED NOR INSPECTED THIS ITEM. THEREFORE  
THE DEPARTMENT DOES NOT ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY  
FOR ITS CONTENTS.

VERMONT  
VERMONT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION  
S.C. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS



THIS ENVELOPE IS RECYCLABLE AND MADE WITH 30% POST CONSUMER CONTENT 

© USPS 2019