

THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Appellate Case No. 2012-213119

TherL Taylor, Pro Se

Appellant

RECEIVED

MAY 13 2013

COURT of Appeals

vs.

SCDC/Employees

Respondents.

AFFIDAVIT & PETITION FOR REHEARING

Affiant named above do hereby depose the below explanation is accurate and true to the best of his Knowledge and ability and shows this Honorable Court as follows:

[AFFIANT WAS VERY LIMITED & RESTRICTED PREPARING THIS WORK. AFFIANT APOLOGIZES FOR ANY IMPERFECTIONS.]

1) On April 26, 2013, Affiant received two (2) documents from this Court, an April 23rd [A] Correspondence and an [B] Order, also dated April 23rd regarding the above case.

Affiant understood this specific case was pending in light of the documentation previously presented.

Affiant strongly believes that a full factual explanation is necessary in order to avoid any appearance of ambiguity or misunderstanding.

Enclosed are Attachments 1-10 respecting the surrounding circumstances leading up to this particular matter.

2) Squarely, on September 26, 2012, the Certificate of Service [Proof of Service] remaining in question was timely mailed to the Court of Appeals.

Affiant served all three entities depicted on Attachment 1.

Attachment 1.1 was hand produced for this Court.

Attachment 2 is Affiant's "October 1st, 2012", date stamped document to the Court of Appeals.

Attachment 3, is Affidavit of Service showing additional effort.

Attachment 4, [a] Administrative Law Court response, after two previous correspondences that were ignored until Affiant contacted the Court Administration.

LEGAL MAIL

Attachment 5, is a detailed factual account by Affiant. The referenced Attachments named within Attachment 5 were denied photocopies by SCDC.

Attachment 6, page 1 of 2 of February 6, 2012 document to this Court previously supplied with Attachments A & B. Again, Affiant was deprived copies to show this Court. Page 2 was allegedly misplaced by 3rd party. Unusual.

Back on September 26, 2012, Affiant hand delivered Attachment 1 to former mail room employee, Helen Freeman "Freeman" to notarize.

Freeman refused and advised Affiant, "It is not necessary." Affiant kindly insisted. She became up set, further stating "it's not an affidavit". Affiant stepped away from a raised voice to the back of the line, under pressure and stress to date and write what is depicted now as LOCATION 1.

Affiant returned seeking a notary after adding the statement in LOCATION 1 with arrow. Freeman denied Affiant again a notary and threatened to "lock up" Affiant in segregation.

Additionally, during the last encounter with Freeman Affiant wrote what is now boxed in "LOCATION 2" @ bottom of Attachment 1.

Subsequently, Affiant took extra effort to further establish fact he in deed executed Proof of Service properly. See Attachments 4, 5 & 6.

3) Affiant initially handed over Attachment 1 with locations 1 & 2 markings for a photocopy. Affiant was again denied and advised, "It has to be notarized or a staff disposition before it be copied." Affiant repeated the person's response and explained copies were essential supporting documents in order to show the Court.

Affiant was specifically advised in order to have a copy produced was to have it notarized.

Affiant was re-denied a photocopy. Some inmates became agitated and impatient. Consequently, Affiant stepped to the side and wrote what is reflected in LOCATION 3.

While Affiant was under significant stress mistakingly wrote "notary" (circled). Affiant's true intent was to write "copy" and finish his statement .... must be notarized. Next, Affiant stepped 3 foot to left in front of window 2 where another lady stood. Affiant obtained a notary then returned to window 1 for a copy. Affiant returned to window 2 for postage and mailing.

Affiant did not re-sign or otherwise provide an additional signature to the original. See LOCATION 4. Such is the original signature created on September 26th, 2012.

[P]lease do not misconstrue Attachment 1, as a February 15th Service as that of the original September 26, 2012, service. The truth.

Affiant believes he did the best possible under the unusual circumstances and enormous amount of potential threat, harm, anxiety & stress. Simply in exercising constitutional & other [Legal] provisions.

4) Some Allendale staff likewise returned Affiant's kindness and professionalism and was very helpful in striving to [do] the RIGHT THING.

5) Attachment 7 & 7.1 are other unusual occurrences regarding a recently hand delivered lawsuit linked to Affiant's ongoing struggle to obtain some relief in his criminal wrongful conviction. Also, before this Honorable Court. Extraordinarily, Affiant's lawsuit did not arrive at it's intended destination. Affiant lost original (Exhibits). Consequently, after hand producing the entire lawsuit, seeks to be heard [civilly] in another Court of Common Pleas whereas the Defendant, Charles Brooks is located jurisdictionally,

Common Pleas Court are improperly and unconstitutionally blocking Affiant's fil[ing].

Affiant experiences great difficulty simply having civil torts fil[ed] in Common Pleas Court as an Indigent Pro Se Person, which always warrants an appeal. Had torts been properly litigated, more than a probability exist an appeal would not be necessary.

Specifically, the caption within Attachment 1 displays TherL Taylor (Appellant) vs SCDC/Employees (Respondents). Because "SCDC/Employees" was discovered by others .... and namely Freeman, Affiant was ... and is continually mistreated and abused.

Furthermore, Affiant exercises civil [r]ights he is targeted by certain staff.

Historically, Affiant was and is conspired against by SCDC and [some] employees to further cause him serious harm or worse.

Respecting LOCATION 3. On February 15, 2013, in further effort to demonstrate (See Attachments 6 & 6.1 in part) "why" this case should not be unjustly dismissed. ... why an authoritative court should now Order SCDC to vacate the wrongful Institutional decision against Affiant that severely harmed and continues to injure him.

Attachment 8 & 8.1, as documents- one a formal Judgment as similiar, @ the center of the essence of this particular matter before the Court.

Affiant was wrongfully Institutionally convicted as once previously. See Attachment 8 & 8.1. Affiant was compelled to continue to seek legal recourse until a Court of Law declared a favorable Judgment. Affiant was set-up by gang members back on October 31st, 2006.

The driving force behind Affiant in TherL Taylor vs SCDC/Employee is because , again... for a second time was wrongfully Institutionally convicted.

LEGAL MAIL

As with the improper higher degree [Case # 2010-159968], 2nd wrongful conviction jury trial, as here, Affiant is not guilty as charged criminally nor Institutionally. Affiant continually will true fairness.

For further explanation, please see December 15th, 2011, 2 page Affidavit marked as Attachment 10.

Attachment 9.3 specifies results from Affiant's litigation to correct this matter and to declare Informa Pauperis status. The South Carolina Supreme Court recalls this Court has not clearly ruled on Affiant's Poverty which prevents the High Court from making a ruling.

Affiant request permission to file IFP and to clarify.

If Affiant is further denied and/or delayed [his] Pro Se Indigent photocopies, notary and most important [FILINGS] within Courts of Common Pleas.

How else may this Affiant be heard and present [e]vidence in the Courts.

6) Unfortunately, once again Affiant does not have \$100 Appeal Fee. Had Affiant been heard in the lower court this appeal would not occur.

Affiant has been officially declared Indigent status for well over a year, per SCDC or otherwise their Agents/Associates, Affiant is extremely limited and hindered to gain adequate Access to the Courts.

Specifically, Affiant can only have \$6.42 or under in his Cooper Trust Account @ one time. Affiant has no known brothers or sisters- relatively. Affiant's poor widowed mother resides within the bounds of an Assisant living facility, Fairfield Health Care Center in Ridgeway, South Carolina.

Affiant can not even gain a simple phone call through SCDC's system, the Chaplain or otherwise to speak with his mom. Mom does not write well after the stroke ... and Affiant is now perplexed, crying and hurting.....

Affiant disgresses.

WHEREFORE based on previously submitted documentation coupled with this presentation Affiant seeks the following Relief:

1) Declare specific rights to effectively and adequately challenge improper conditions of confinement and punishment. To permit Affiant to Proceed Inform Pauper's , most important in Common Pleas Court level to avoid ~~seeking~~ in good faith to seek "Appeal" waive poverty.

Honor the truth Affiant timely filed & served appropriate documentation.

2) Compel and [s]eriously carefully review relevant Step 1 & 2 Grievances ( KI-0002-12 & ) and supporting documents that are the underlying cause KI-2154-11. "why" this appeal continues for lack of Justice. Exercise Power to rectify.

3) Order SCDC to vacate the wrongful Institution conviction for 806, and correct relevant records.

4) Upon Information & belief, the Administrative Law Court's two criteria A) Property Interest and B) Liberty Interest under Al-Shabazz may not squarely fit. Therefore, clear the way or otherwise open the door for Affiant to [file] in the Court of Common Pleas within next few months to meet the Statute of Limitations requirement to be heard in appropriate Jurisdiction for proper adjudication. Clarify SC Code 24-27-100 & 150 applicable to Affiant.

5) Admonish SCDC/Employees to Respect, Aid & Assist Affiant's sincere efforts to exercise Basic Rights and uphold Department (scdc) Policy.

Any other just and fair remedies this Honorable Court may deem necessary.

With Integrity,



May 8, 2013

Affirmed to and subscribed before me  
on this 9 day of May

Virginia Grubb  
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 12-12-22

26.2

File

Attachment 1  
Attachment A

TherL Taylor,

Appellant,

vs.

SCCC/Employees.

Respondent.

Location 1

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Added: Affidavit of Service 9/26/12

I, TherL Taylor, presently incarcerated at ALLENDALE Institution, do hereby affirm that MY NOTICE OF APPEAL

RESPECTING ALC DOCKET NUMBERS: 12-ALC-04-501 & 502

was delivered into the hands of prison officials with the first class postage duly affixed and a return address clearly indicated on the envelope, for deposit in the United States Mail, addressed to the following person(s):

1) ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT  
1205 Pendeton Street, Suite  
Columbia, SC 29201

2) OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL  
Ms. Shanika Jonnson, Attorney  
PO Box 21787  
Columbia, SC 29221

3) The Court of Appeals  
PO Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211

Respectfully submitted,

Location 4 → Helen Freeman

Affirm to and subscribed before me on this 5<sup>th</sup> day of February 2012 3

Location 2 →

ON 9/26/12 Ms. Helen Freeman in Mail from clearly denied a ① Notary & ② photocopy & date stamp.

Virginia H. Hines  
Notary Public for South Carolina  
My Commission Expires: 12-12-22

Location 3 →

on 2/15/13 was advised only way to get copy is to have Notary must

11.1

Attachment 1.1

MR. Therr Taylor  
A.I. Character Housing Unit [C.H.U.]  
P.O. Box 1151  
Fairfax, S.C. 29827

**RECEIVED**  
MAY 16 2013  
**SC Court of Appeals**

The Court of Appeals  
P. O. Box 11629  
Columbia, S.C. 29211

RE: ALC, Docket Numbers 12-ALC-04-501 & 502

September 26, 2012

Dear Clerk's Office:

Enclosed for filing are the original and one handwritten duplicate of my Pro Se NOTICE OF APPEAL and CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.

Please return clocked-in copies of both documents within the pre-paid SASE Courtesly Provided.

Despite the ability to pay and pending Court deadlines, Appellant was denied a photocopy of the ACL's dismissal decision subject of Appeal for this Honorable Court's Consideration.

Proper Notice, a Hearing, adequate Judicial Review and Due Process WAS not Honored.

Appellant pleads the Court of Appeal Compel Respondents to justly Provide the transcript of the kershaw Institutional hearing pursuant to Rule 33, 71, ALJDRP and other applicable Civil Rules of Procedure specifically respecting basic discovery.

I am grateful for any time and serious efforts the Court may allot in this important matter.

Within Kind Regards,  
I am Sincerely,  
*Therr*

CC: File

INMATE TRUST FUND ACCOUNT REPORT  
for SOUTH CAROLINA COURT FILING FEES

Attachment A / Allendale

RECEIVED

X2

INSTRUCTIONS TO INMATE: Complete top portion then give to your mailroom. When returned from Accounting, you must mail this form with any payment to the Court.

NOV 13 2012

MAIL ROOM

By signing my name below, I am asking the Financial Accounting Office of the South Carolina Department of Corrections to complete this report. In accordance with SC Code of Laws §24-27-100 and 150, I authorize payment of the full filing fee. If I have insufficient funds in my account at this time to pay the court's full filing fee, I authorize SCDC to deduct the initial and subsequent payments until payment is completed.

INMATE NAME (print): Mr. Therl Taylor

SCDC # 260,961 INMATE SIGNATURE: Therl Taylor

I plan to file this action in the SC County of Richland or other

The section below is for SCDC - Financial Accounting Branch's use ONLY.

- (1) Total deposits to inmate's account for preceding six months' period\* ..... \$ 36.78
- (2) Twenty percent (20%) of line 1 ..... \$ 7.36
- (3) Account balance - current date ..... \$ 15.46
- (4) PAYMENT AMOUNT \*\*  
(lesser of line 2 or line 3)  
Enclosed check # \_\_\_\_\_ \$ 0

*\$15 to Greeng*

\*\*NOTE to COURT: If payment is for partial fee, Court must notify SCDC once case is accepted and filed. Send notice with case # and balance owed to address below. SCDC will NOT process any additional payments until notification is received from Court.

South Carolina Department of Corrections  
Financial Accounting - Room 234  
PO Box 21787  
Columbia, SC 29221-1787

\*Admission date is noted here if inmate incarcerated less than six months     /    /    

Prepared by [Signature] Financial Accounting Branch - SCDC

Date 11/16/12 cfile/scanust/prepared 797

*Received Nov. 26th, 2012, by MR. Herdon @ 8:15 PM.*

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals  
Appeal From Administrative Law Court  
S.C. Code § 1-23-610 (B)

Docket Numbers: 12-ALC-04-502 & 12-ALC-04-501-AP

S.C. Code § 1-23-390

TherL Taylor

v.

SCDC/Employees

RECEIVED  
OCT 01 2012  
Appellate  
SCDC Court of Appeals

Respondent.

NOTICE OF Appeal

Aggrieved Appellant (Hereinafter "Appl.") hereby Appeals the Administrative Law Court [ALC's] premature "dismissal" through Judge Carolyn Matthews, received on September 21st, 2012, based upon the following Basic grounds:

A. Three (3) request directly to Respondents through General Counsel (GC) for [e]ssential discovery material - i.e. - Transcript of [WRONGFUL] Institutional Hearing, inter Alia, were in fact denied. Furthermore, ALL the aforementioned three (3) request to GC were willfully ignored. Absolutely no response nor slight cooperation provided.

B. Consequently, regarding "A's" omission [5], Appl. presented supportive evidence to the ALC July (RTS), August 10th, 23rd + September 14th, 2012, for assistance with Basic-Relevant discovery documents. Appellant notified the Court of Respondents deliberate discovery violations, pursuant to ACL Rule 56 and 61. Noteworthy, ALC also deprived Appl. of repeated request to [R]eturn recorded "date" stamped" copies of his Pro Se work from the ALC in this matter, and also failed to acknowledge Appellant.

C. In light of "A+B" above, the Court Administration was contacted September 14, 2012, seeking simple compliance or otherwise compulsion of Respondent with applicable Rules of Law. Appel. did not seek sanctions against Respondents.

Appl. was denied Justice at All levels while acting in Good Faith efforts to fairly [R]esolve this particular matter. Appl. was stymied or otherwise intentionally stone walled by Respondents.

Appl. asserts [C]onstitutional violations pursuant to Martin v. SCDC - [2001], therefore any filing fee due to Appl's Indigent Status should be waived.

Upon Knowledge, Information & Belief Respondents ARE willfully withholding exculpatory evidence. A cover up is worse than an Alleged crime.

Respect fully with Integrity,

(TherL Taylor)

Monday, September 24th, 2012

The Courts of Appeals  
P.O. Box 11629  
Columbia, S.C. 29211

Attachment 2.1

COLUMBIA SC 290  
10 OCT 2012 PM 1 L

RECEIVED

OCT 16 2012

MAILROOM  
ACI

RECEIVED

OCT 12 2012



MAILROOM  
ACI

Received

10/17/12  
by Ms. Gault  
Sec'd by  
10/17/12

Mr. Thera Taylor F4-B#43  
Allendale Institution  
P.O. Box 1151 (260,961)  
Fairfax, S.C. 29827

29827115151



© USPS 2009

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



THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

Attachment 3 <sup>x3</sup>  
Attachment B

Carolyn Matthews, Administrative Law Judge

Appellate Case No. 2012-213119

TherL Taylor

Appellant,

vs.

SCDC, et al

Respondents

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

I Certify that I have served both documents dated October 19th & 22nd, 2012, to the Court of Appeals by personally hand delivering to Prison officials for deposit in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on October addressed to General Counsel PO BOX 21787, Columbia, SC 29221. 25<sup>th</sup> 2012



TherL Taylor F-4-B-43  
Allendale Institution  
PO BOX 1151  
Fairfax, SC 29827

Affirm to and Subscribed before me  
on this 25 day of Oct, 2012

Cynthia A Sanders  
Notary Public for South Carolina  
My Commission Expires: 3/9/21

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

# Administrative Law Court

**Carolyn C. Matthews**  
*Administrative Law Judge*



PHONE: (803) 734-0550  
FAX: (803) 734-6400  
WEB: WWW.SCALC.NET

November 14, 2012

Therl Taylor, #260961  
Allendale Correctional Institution  
PO Box 1151  
Fairfax, SC 29827

Re: 12-ALJ-04-0501-AP & 12-ALJ-04-0502-AP

Mr. Taylor,

I've received your correspondence to Court Administration dated September 14, 2012. Your appeals, referenced above, were dismissed on September 10, 2012 for your failure to file a Brief. I am unclear what action you would like from the Court. Please contact me should need anything further.

Sincerely,

Page P. Snyder, Esquire  
Law Clerk to The Hon. Carolyn C. Matthews

Cc: Christopher Florian, Esq.  
Shanika Johnson, Esq.  
Court Administration

[30]  
TherL Taylor, C. H. U.  
Allendale Institution  
Po Box 1151  
Fairfax, SC 29827

Attachment 5

The South Carolina Court Administration  
The SC Supreme Court  
Court Services Section  
1015 Sumter Street, Suite 200  
Columbia, SC 29201

RE: TherL Taylor vs. SCDC, Catherine Amason, et al  
Docket Numbers: 12-ALJ-09-501 & 502-AP  
Unjust Institutional Judgment  
Dear Court Services:

December 19<sup>th</sup> 2012

Petitioner [Hereinafter "Pet"] received the [f]irst response from Page Snyder, dated November 14, 2012, on November 19, 2012, to Pet.'s SEPT-EMBER 14, 2012, formal legal document referenced therein. Pet is Grateful for an ultimate response, whereas Pet has acted completely in Good Faith to resolve this matter with General Counsel "GC" and the ALC. This writing is a brief factual Summary to better assist understand historical facts.

First for Clarification what specific evidence or other documents that were or actually are considered by the Court? Please fairly understand our intent is to be very clear for avoidable future Action. Great concern has arose to squarely establish a BASIC [T]ruthful Record. For example, Pet.'s submitted formal documents for filing with the ALJ were not properly returned date stamped. For further clarity, please see ATTACHMENT ONE, "Petitioner's ["Pet"] Designated Attachments A-Q Annexed hereto thated are logged from Pet.'s position.

Furthermore, from experienced encounters the ALJ office routinely fails to even acknowledge or otherwise [r]espond to Pet.'s/Apellant's formally submitted documents that were intended for [f]iling as part of the official Record. The ALC fails to return clocked-in copies or Proof of ANY of Pet.'s formal submitted documentation, despite several request therefor.

Upon Knowledge, Information and Strong Belief, from the outset, as well as leading up to the written allegation against Pet, the handling of this case before and after the filing of the Notice of Appeal indicates provable improprieties and corruption exist.

It is doubtful that those involved directly (or desire to protect such dispicable acts & omissions) or indirectly, honestly wishes the minimal just herein Published elsewhere. In fact, Pet is strongly convinced, based upon the true evidence related to or otherwise connected with this case can

be substantially established by more than a preponderance of the true factual evidence.

A cover up is worse than a crime.

Once again for clarity opposing counsel[s]- GC ignored ALL direct Correspondences for BASIC Material Evidence for Fundamental Discovery during the time prior to the Agency (SCDC) decision. Particularly subsequent to docketing within the ALC. See ATTACHMENT ONE.

Respondent's deprive Pet access to a photocopy machine regardless of ability or inability to pay cost. This Policy, SCDC GA 1.03, is unconstitutional.

Significantly, the same lawyer that Pet is legally Pro Se arguing against is also the attorney in case number #502 in question strikingly mentioned in the Incident Report. See ATTACHMENT D

This Incident is one of the most Outrageous chain of facts and unusual set of circumstances that has ever occurred. Case #502 deals with improper omissions and actions with intent to cause serious bodily, mentally and Spiritual harm to Pet. To Institutionally convict at all cost with reckless and deliberate disregard for the truth, the Law or SCDC Policy is dispicable. Tax Payers should not further endure cost when this Incident can be resolved at this point. Pet should not be compelled to published publically.

Relief Wise, Pet respectfully request assistance: 1) GC/SCDC/Respondents should be required to [t]imly respond to Pet.'s reasonable request for information and provide an acknowledgment to Pet.'s simple questions. 2) GC should be compelled to first provide Pet BASIC discovery request i.e, Written Statement by Mr. Florian and an accurate Transcript of the hearing. 3) An opportunity to file a Brief. 4) That the ALC also timely- specifically acknowledge or respond to Pet.'s Motions and Correspondences and return such date stamped. 5) ALC Exhaustive Satisfaction. 6) The false allegation of 806 should be vacated.

Other people should not be compelled to spend their valuable time, money & resources to fix something that someone else should have already corrected that originated by Catherine Amason.

As with any reasonable, undiscriminated against [p]erson would clearly understand beyond ALL doubt, in order to fairly Defend and be fully [h]eard by a Brief before the ALJ or other Jurisprudence, the Transcript and a duplicate of the Statements that were allegedly recorded, read & used against Pet at the hearing should be forth coming to the aggrieved party.

Interestingly, [m]inutes before stepping on the Retaliatory Transfer (disal thearpy) Bus, from the unsanitary holding tank, Mr. D. Seward (SCDC Major) escorted Pet to [p]artially listen to the cassette hearing tape. Despite Pet.'s adamant request, paper & pen was denied so Pet was denied an opportunity to transcribe or take any notes.

Further Pet was harshly deprived to stop the tape at any point. Pet was refused to re-listen to any part of the rushed encounter.

More importantly, as a competent Pro Se Soul, under Poverty, should be provided a relevant Transcript of the Institutional double recorded hearing to adequately prepare [a Factual & Legal Brief].

Technically, again GC should have been sanctioned for withholding or otherwise concealing pertinent evidence from Pet to present [For The Fact Finder's] unbaised, impartial decision.

The aforementioned are violations of ALC V. SPECIAL RULES 56 & 61 and SCCivPro, Rule 26. GC did not have the decency to provide ANY answer.

Due to the multiple failures to respond to Pet.'s basic request and the ALC's improper dismissal, Pet timely appealed Judge Matthews opinion [Appellate Case #2012-21319, TherL Taylor vs SCDC] to the S.C. Court of Appeals.

Additionally, as a result of totally being ignored to all Pet.'s kindly request to GC [SEE ATTACHMENTS G, H, I & K], coupled with the ALC's failure to acknowledge any correspondences/motions [SEE ATTACHMENTS J & L.

Consequently, other legal entities were Notified.

Now, to reiterate for further clarity regarding responding to the adverse surprised decision to "dismiss" this particular case without being [f]ully heard by the Honorable Carolyn Matthews is a grave Injustice.

The "Record" may appear square at first glance. However, a close examination between the lines would reveal a gross indifference. Pet digresses.

Why ... because is may expose inappropriate beahvior by certain Kershaw persoinnel, SCDC or those [it] represents? Why, because when legal rights are exercised or expressed by a Pro Se Petitioner Constitutionally or Legally otherwise? Is it because of Pet.'s Poverty Status again? Is it another attempt to delay or thwart [t]rue Justice from a dignified incarcerated human being with Integrity?

Squarely, Pet tells you what it is Not: It is not because of the alleged violation of SCDC Policy, 22.14, 806 in fact, occurred. Pet did not violate Institutional Rule 806.

To add to Pet's credibility and for INFORMATIONAL purposes. In comparison, Pet did not violate the last accusation back on October 31, 2006. ultimately an Official Judgement was rendered. SEE ATTACHMENTS P 9 Q.

As a courtesy, a degree of (unclear) loyalties, respect and fear, decided not to pursue SCDC or other employees in their official and individual capacities for that particular Injustice.

If appropriate, please forward copies hereof to interested parties, namely both attorneys cited within Page Snyder's November 14, 2012, Correspondence as well as to Ms. Snyder in response.

The Court Administration general October 1, 2012, format Correspondence omits to specify which case or equally important the dated Correspondence it is referencing.

Pro Se Petitioner also notes same to the Court Administration's (CA) December 6, 2012, Correspondence regarding Case: Therl Taylor vs Charles Brooks, et al.

To avoid any appearance of ambiguity, please simply Chronologically specify for future reference which document (by date) the CA is responding to for the third party to "review and assist" Petitioner.

This Pro Se Petitioner would be grateful for a meaningful (F)air Solution at this Point with these particular prioritized matters stated herein. Have a Wonderful Holiday and Happy New Year!

With Integrity in Truth,

CC: File

(PAGE 4 of 4)

PETITIONER'S ["PET"] DESIGNATED ACKNOWLEDGED INDEX DOCUMENTS/ATTACHMENTS A - Q

A. A TRANSCRIPT of the double audio recorded Wrongful Institutional infraction for an alleged violation of SCDC Policy 22.14, section 806. To date [December 14, 2012] despite Pet.'s kindly request from different angles General Counsel ["GC"] has not provided, nor as been enforced by ALC. In fact, absolutely zero acknowledgment on this particular subject. This elemental document is necessary for an adequate DEFENSE.

B. The Written Statement with improper Opinion by Christopher "Florian". First introduced to Pet [d]uring the hearing, [p]artially read by Kershaw's Institutional Disciplinary Hearing Person ["IDHP"]. Florian was not qualified as an expert witness according to SCRE, Rule 702. Pet was afforded to Florian any questions nor engage. Additionally, Pet was deprived an opportunity to objectively counter or even respond to said statement.

Moreover, Pet was denied writing material during the hearing.

SEE ATTACHMENT ["ATTIC."] "E" for Relevant Detailed Facts.

C. Fifteen (15) Prepared Questions, Titled, "THE REPORT BY Catherine Amason "CA", partially read on Record through common "Counsel Substitute" "CS", Mr. Armstrong. Pet was not afforded an opportunity to: i) ask ANY Questions nor ii) read or iii) present a written statement during the botched hearing. IDHP initially said at the outset of the hearing, "he will represent himself", as requested- Pro Se. However, in truth Pet was forced to "go through" Mr. Armstrong.

Pet believes "ATT C" is included as part of the Official Record before the Administrative Law Court, however no been verified.

Please see ATTACHMENTS D.1 & E for clearer understanding.

D. Falsified Incident Report dated December 6, 2011.

D.1 December 15, 2011, 2 Page Sworn Affidavit. Duplicate enclosed.

E. January 2, 2012, Step One, 2 page factual detailed Complaint.

F. February 17, 2012, Step Two Complaint, Agency decision May 7, 2012.

G. July 5, 2012, Correspondence ["Corr"] to GC for BASIC Discovery- Unresponsive

- H. July 25, 2012, Corr to GC- UNRESPONSIVE
- I. August 8, 2012, GC- UNRESPONSIVE
- J. August 23, 2012, Corr ALJ regarding incomplete clarification of record  
Also, UNRESPONSIVE
- K. September 14, 2012, Corr to GC- UNACKNOWLEDGED
- ~~L. September 14, 2012, Corr to ALC, acknowledged only through the Court  
Administration~~
- M. 2 Motions to dismiss with Certificate of Service dated  
September 14, 2012
- N. October 1, 2012 Clocked-in Notice of Appeal & Certificate of Service  
to the South Carolina Court of Appeals
- O. September 14, 2012, Corr to Court Administration
- P. Pet.'s favorable Court Ordered Ruling[s]
- Q. CIVIL JUDGMENT

Note: The above Alphabetical Attachments C, D, E, F, L, M, N & O  
are belived Respondent's Stipulated tangible "Record."

Mr. Thert Taylor  
Allendale Character Housing Unit  
P.O. Box 1151  
Fairfax, S.C. 29827

Attachment 6

The South Carolina Court of Appeals  
The Honorable Jenny Kitchen, Clerk  
P.O. Box 11629  
Columbia, S.C. 29211

Re: Thert Taylor vs. SCDC, et al.  
Appellant Case: 2012-213119

February 8<sup>th</sup>, 2013

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Suprisingly, last week I received an ORDER signed by Deputy Clerk Clarie Allen dismissing the above Appellant Case. I have no power over SCDC/Employees. I am at their mercy. With Honor! No reasonable opportunity was available to correct the sudden deficiency regarding Respondent's failure to provide a Notary Public. I mailed two (2) Proof of Services.

Please understand that during the month of September 2012, now again @ issue, Mail Room SCDC Director, Ms. Helen Freeman persistently refused to notarize my Proof of Service, "because it don't need it". I mailed it with my signature. A patiently added "Affidavit of Service" underneath Certificate of Service and kindly requested Ms. Freeman to please notarize my Pro Se Proof of Service. Ms. Freeman lost self control and began making threats to have me locked up in segregation. See ATTACHMENT A.

A duplicate of the Certificate of Service that I had no authority to compel Ms. Freeman to perform this BASIC important duty - Notarize my Proof of Service.

I informally requested the significant issue with superior staff and subsequently contacted this Honorable Court explaining my plight and the fact that I took every effort to make things right. The original Proof of Service was signed by me. I understood the circumstances warranted acceptance to proceed. My intent does not involve the Civil Courts or cost tax payers or even SCDC when the matter should be responsibly resolved. We believed things were all right respecting hearing this case within this vein.

Since then Ms. Freeman no longer is employed @ Allendale. The other lady assigned to the mail room first officially became a legal Notary December 22, 2012.

A dedicated <sup>employee</sup> has been notarizing on occasion. See ATTACHMENT B Presently the situation has improved respecting accessibility to a Notary.

I diligently took all the effort any reasonable person would to satisfy securing a notary.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Ther L Taylor, Appellant,

vs.

SCDC, et al

Appellate Case No. 2012-213119

The Honorable Carolyn Matthews

ALC 2012AL0400501 & 2012AL0400502

**RECEIVED**

MAY 16 2013

**SC COURT OF APPEALS**

---

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

---

1. I am the Pro Se Appellant named above.
2. Regular Communication by mail exists throughout the state of South Carolina and that this is a proper circumstance and method of Service by mail.
3. I have this day served a copy of Reconsideration and clarity document in response to Deputy Claire Allen's ORDER in the above specific case on Attorney Shanika Johnson, PO BOX 21787, Columbia, S.C. 29221-1787, by depositing same in the United States mail, postage prepaid.

With Integrity,

Ther L Taylor

Affirmed to on this 15<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2013

Virginia Smith  
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 12-12-22



# SUMTER COUNTY CLERK OF COURT

JAMES C. CAMPBELL

Sumter County Courthouse ■ 141 North Main Street ■ Sumter, South Carolina 29150

Clerk's Office  
(803)436-2227  
Fax (803)436-2223

Family Court  
(803)436-2366  
Fax (803)436-2396

Common Pleas  
(803)436-2228  
(803)436-2231

Jury Information  
(803)436-2233

Fines & Restitution  
(803)436-2230

General Sessions  
(803)436-2264  
(803)436-2265

March 18, 2013

Dear Mr. Taylor,


We received a letter from you concerning a lawsuit. We never received pleadings of any type from you. We check in General Sessions and Common Pleas to try and locate these filings. As of this date, they have not been located. If we can help you further, let us know.

Sincerely,

*Barbara Sharper*  
Barbara Sharper  
Deputy Clerk of Court

JAMES C. CAMPBELL  
CLERK OF COURT  
COURTHOUSE, ROOM 308  
SUMTER, SOUTH CAROLINA 29150

F1 B29



UNITED STATES POSTAGE  
\$ 00.46<sup>0</sup>  
02 1R  
0006558368 MAR 19 2013  
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 29150

Therl Taylor #260961  
Allendale Correctional Inst/F-1-B #29  
P O Box 1151  
Fairfax, SC 29827

RECEIVED

MAR 21 2013  
MAILROOM  
ACI

Received  
March 22nd  
2013

181

2982731151 6007



Attachment 7.1

to 22

Attachment 8  
Attachment A 4/1  
x3

Form 4

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

COUNTY OF RICHLAND

CASE NO: 2007CP4002367

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

Therl Taylor

vs.

Christopher Arrowood

Plaintiff

Defendant

CHECK ONE:

- JURY VERDICT. This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.
- DECISION BY THE COURT. This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.
- ACTION DISMISSED (CHECK REASON):
  - Rule 12(b), SCRPC;
  - Rule 41(a);
  - SCRPC (Vol. Nonsuit);
  - Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled);
  - Other:
- ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON):
  - Rule 40(j) SCRPC;
  - Bankruptcy;
  - Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award;
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:

See attached order;

Statement of Judgment by the Court:

1) THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR DEFAULT WAS WITHDRAWN. (2) THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO RESERVE DOCUMENTATION AND EVIDENCE IS GRANTED SO THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS (DOC) IS DIRECTED TO PRESERVE ALL NOTES, FILES, TAPES, EVIDENCE, SHANK, AND ANYTHING ELSE RELATED TO THE DISCIPLINARY ACTION TAKEN AGAINST THE PLAINTIFF AND ANYTHING RELATED TO IT CONNECTED TO THE DEFENDANT. HOWEVER, THE PLAINTIFF IS RESPONSIBLE FOR HAVING A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT SERVED DATED AT COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA, THIS 14<sup>th</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2008.

THE DOC, WHICH MAY FILE AN OBJECTION OR OTHER MOTION CONCERNING THIS MATTER;

William P. Mearns  
PRESIDING JUDGE

THE CLERK OF COURT IS DIRECTED TO SIGN THE SUBPOENA THAT HAS BEEN SUBMITTED BY THE PLAINTIFF AND SEND IT TO HIM.

This judgment was entered on the 28 day of March, 2008, and a copy mailed first class this 28 day of March, 2008, to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

Therl 00260961 Taylor  
Therl Taylor  
Therl 00260961 Taylor

Christopher 283202 Arrowood  
Christopher 283202 Arrowood

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S)

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)

s/BARBARA A. SCOTT

Clerk of Court

SCRPC APP-24/FORM 4

- 1) THE MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF IS DENIED AS INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE COURT TO ISSUE.
- 2) THE MOTION TO ALLOW THE PLAINTIFF TO AMEND HIS COMPLAINT TO ALLEGE A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR ASSAULT AND BATTERY IS GRANTED. HE HAS 30 DAYS TO FILE AND SERVE THE AMENDED SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT.
- 3) THE MOTION TO APPOINT A GUARDIAN AD LITEM IS DENIED.



266

Mr. TherL Taylor, Legal Assistant  
KI, HA, #258

4848 Goldmine Hwy.  
Kershaw, S.C. 29067

Attachment 9  
Exhibit C.1

THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE, CLERK OF COURT  
Post Office Box 11330  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

**RECEIVED**

DEC 18 2011

RE: TherL Taylor vs, SCDC  
Case #2011-200-387  
2011-AC-40-0000G

**S.C. SUPREME COURT**

December 12, 2011

Dear Court:

I received the High Courts December 1st Order regarding the above referenced case. Thank you.

In square truth, please understand that [p]rior to the South Carolina Court of Appeals (SCCA) October 25th 2011 dismissal. Petitioner submitted and served his Motion to proceed INFORMA PAUPERS and AFFIDAVIT. In fact, Petitioner's Certificate of Service and said Motion was dated, notorized and mailed on **October 17, 2011**. However, Respondents and their employees refuse to provide Petitioner's Photocopies despite his ability to pay for such.

Petitioner has one Notorized copy on hand.

Petitioner believes the Supreme Court has admonished Respondents, specifically respecting the totally deprival of copies. This inaction is prejudicial toward this greatly disadvantage Petitioner.

Importantly, certain Mail Room Staff continue to further hinder and deprive Petitioner timely, and fully in utilizing a notary, pay necessary postage, and perform other essential duties specifically regarding Prtitioner's buss-ness legal matters. This adverse omission & action is also prejudicial.

Perhaps the Court would contact Kershaw Institutional Administrative Staff, Classification or current responsible alleged Law Librbrian and Photocopier, Ricky Gist 1.

Furthermore, to date the SCCA remains not to rule upon the Motion in question, nor have Respondent acknowledged or otherwise responded by any fashion whatsoever.

In light of the aforementioned unusual circumstances, Petitioner respect-fully request, in all fairness, notify all interested parties hereof.

Enclosed is a pre-paid SESE. Please return a clocked in copy of this formal document as well as the immediate prior documents for Certiorari & Certificate of Service

Petitioner further sayest not!

Very truly,



cc: Family  
File

Foot Note 1: To Prtitioner's knowledge and upon information and belief,  
after about a year of improper action & omission, Mr. Gist  
is currently relocating jobs.

266.1



Attachment 9.1  
Exhibit C.2

## The Supreme Court of South Carolina

DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE  
CLERK OF COURT

BRENDA F. SHEALY  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11330  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211

(803) 734-1080

FAX (803) 734-1499

December 13, 2011

Mr. Therl Taylor  
Kershaw Correctional Institution, HA #258  
4848 Goldmine Hwy  
Kershaw, SC 29067

Re: Taylor, Therl v. SCDC

Dear Mr. Taylor:

This responds to your letter dated December 12, 2011. Please be advised that the South Carolina Court of Appeals sent the remittitur regarding the above appeal on December 13, 2011. The sending of the remittitur ended appellate jurisdiction over this case. Wise v. South Carolina Dept. of Corrections, 372 S.C. 173, 642 S.E.2d 551 (2007) (discussing the effect of the sending of the remittitur and the limited circumstances when a remittitur may be recalled).

I am forwarding a copy of your letter to the Court of Appeals so that they will be aware of your concern that no action was taken on your motion to proceed in forma pauperis.

Very truly yours,

CLERK

cc: Christopher D. Florian, Esquire  
The Honorable Jana E. Shealy  
The Honorable Tanya Gee

262

Attachment <sup>NO COPY</sup> 9.3  
Exhibit D.1

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Therl Taylor,

Petitioner,

v.

SCDC,

Respondent.

---

ORDER

---

On October 25, 2011, the South Carolina Court of Appeals dismissed this appeal for failing to pay the filing fee required by Rule 203, SCACR. In response, petitioner filed a motion to proceed without paying the filing fee. Apparently, no ruling has been made on that motion by the Court of Appeals.

Petitioner has now filed a document requesting a writ of certiorari to review this matter. This request is denied since this Court will only review a final decision of the Court of Appeals, and the Court of Appeals has not issued a final decision in this matter. Rule 242(a), SCACR (a final decision of the Court of Appeals may be reviewed) and Rule 242(c), SCACR ("A decision of the Court of Appeals is not final for the purpose of review by the

Supreme Court until the petition for rehearing or reinstatement has been acted on by the Court of Appeals.").

IT IS SO ORDERED.



C.J.  
FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

December 1, 2011

cc: Mr. Therl Taylor  
Christopher D. Florian, Esquire

\*\*\*\*\* AFFIDAVIT OF THERL TAYLOR \*\*\*\*\*

I, TherL Taylor Hereinafter "Affiant" do hereby aver the following statements of fact in response to Mail Room Attendant, Cathrine Amason's (CA) malicious arbitrary and misleading accusations regarding efforts to cause the sever harm by alleging and conspiring to convict of Institutional infraction of 806.

1) Affiant is not guilty of offense 806. On several ocasions Affiant has reviewed the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC) video & been trained respecting the standard and principles expected by an incarcerated individual assisting others. Affiant has and always will, strictly adhere to SCDC policy and procedure, and follow superiors/supervisor directives.

2) Affiant has completed advanced Legal Training through Blackstone Paralegal School and other Learning Institutions. Affiant achieved a Certificate and is currently enrolled in Emmaus Bible College working toward earning a Degree.

It is Affiant's passion to help those that help themselves. Affiant never takes up anothers legal cause or position. Affiant encourages and points to relevant legal material so the person may better understand [t]heir legal issue(s).

Affiant only "aids and assist" others from a Legal Assistant trained & experienced Law Librarian Clerk & volunteer position .

When no attorney is available, Affiant opens the Blacks Law Legal Dictionary so the person understands what the term Pro Se means. Affiant

is very careful to make sure each person represents [their self]. Affiant always makes clear that he is not an attorney and can not represent the person in any Court unless approved by an Order. Affiant clarifies and repeats that he can only aid and assist. Affiant directs individuals to pertinent SCDC Policy & Procedure and promotes accountability, common sense and reason.

On most ocasions the person can not afford an attorney, is uneducated illiterate or does not speak or understand the english langauge.

3) Affiant always immediately makes clear to individuals to contact an attorney. Affiant directs persons to legal books that relate or is connected in some fashion with [t]heir legal issue. Afiant intentionally limits himself not to get emersed in anybodys own legal matters.

Affiant never approaches individuals. They always approach Affiant by referral by inmate and staff.

Affiant is not always to provide assistance or time to every person. Affiant refers the inmate to appropriate staff for Disposition.

4) Most recently namely Law Librarian Ricky Gist, an SCDC employee provided a private room with a bi-lingual english/spanish speaking individual to aid and assist the referred person to help himself.

5) In circumstances where an individual [a]dmits or infers guilt of serious offenses or criminal activity, Affiant as a duty to report such information to the proper trustworthy authorities.

5.1) Affiant is proactive in exercising to protect SCDC interest. Affiant must also protect his best interest. When Affiant is in doubt, such information is channeled to certain SCDC Staff, and once said information is relayed Affiant is done with that particular event unless further assistance is needed or specifically requested by the authorities.

6) Affiant is an Individual Representative Committee (IRC). Approximately two (2) weeks prior to this Affidavit being affirmed, Amason was summoned to the Warden's monthly Meeting by the IRC Chairman Richard Moss. Among inmate representatives were about ten (10) of us, including Affiant. Over five (5) Administrative Staff were also present.

Amason was questioned about numerous complaints received by prisoners of impropriety by Amason, and other primarily Mail Room Staff.

Substantial evidence exist CA is retaliating ~~against~~ and have made personal target attacks against Affiant. See Supporting Exhibits A,B,C,C.1,C.2,D,D.1.

Furthermore, because Affiant expressing himself professionally and exercises [his] legal rights is injured & danged by CA.

7) CA has also been observed on several occasions to loose control of her composure, act irratic, irrational, berating & unreasonable, unjustifiably.

CA generally demonstrates hate toward SCDC prisoners, particularly Affiant. Upon information and belief by Staff and prisoners, Amason as a bad attitude, consistently unprofessional and demonstrates bad behavior & misconduct.

8) Affiant has good reason to believe that CA and "John/Jane Doe" has repeatedly opened Affiant's incoming and out going confidential legal mail

CA has made improper and untrue remarks about Affiant and the person Affiant knows as his "dad".

Upon information and belief affiant was informed that CA unlawfully opened other individuals outgoing and incoming legal material.

9) For clarification, Affiant avers the following description scheduling Attachments/Exhibits in support of his Affidavit in Defense regarding Cathrine Amason's retaliatory, false and respecting Institutional 806 infraction: Exhibit (Ex.) A, 12/2/11, letter to IRS X 2, Ex. B, 12/5/11, letter to Sheriff, Ex. C, 12/12/11, letter to S.C. Supreme Court (SCSC), Ex. C.1, date stamped, Ex. C.2, 12/13/11, letter from SCSC, Ex. D, 12/17/11, letter from SCSC, Ex. D.1, Order from SCSC, Ex. E, 12/14/11, RIS, Ex. F, 12/15/11, RIS, Ex. G, Holmes case law, Ex. H, Report, Ex. I, two (2) page Affidavit.

10) On or about December 6th, 2011, Affiant hand delivered private confidential legal mail to mail room attendant, Michelle Michelle ("MM") unopened as insisted. The envelope was not sealed. Affiant requested MM to "please secure the item." MM agreed. MM questioned the other two (2) sealed envelopes addressed to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) allegedly because they were previously issued legal envelopes. See Exhibit A, for duplicate of IRS address.

The following statement was also on the outgoing legal envelopes (as common done by Affiant on all Legal Mail): "Priority Confidential Legal Mail. Please deliver promptly and do not open. I have took every effort to secure this item, as required by SCDC regulations and the Law."

Affiant advised MM is she had issue with the IRS envelopes to please open now, call a supervisor or have contraband get involved. MM placed the items out of Affiant's sight. No mention about the now questionable brown envelope until two (2) weeks afterwards. Before walking away affiant made eye contact with MM, thanked her & returned to Prison Industries.

Obviously CA read the contents and was offended by the phrase "certain mail room employees". And other recent legal mail. As a result CA further retaliated and conspired to cause Affiant more injury.

MM asked for affiant's identification card to deduct for postage. Affiant observed MM look in, pull out papers, weigh (now questionable item) then activate ID immediately withdrawing roughly \$3.00 total postage.

11) Affiant was first notified of the alleged December 6th accusations through 2nd Shift @ 10:15PM. Prior to pick up the following morning, Affiant submitted one (1) Request To Staff (RTS) created and dated December 13th. The remaining RTS were all dated December 14th to the Hearing Officer, Counsel Substitute, & the Recorder requesting witnesses and specific request in preparation of the arbitrary allegations. Additionally, a Dec. 14, RTS to Law Librarian, Mr. Adams for Photcopies and urgent Law Library Time.

12) Subsequently, Affiant received a formal legal response & Order from the S.C. Supreme Court dated Dec. 1st, 2011, on Dec. 5th. This material was related to unlawful mail room actions & omissions. CA obviously opened and read this document also. See Exhibit

Interestingly, opposing counsel listed on Exhibit C.2,D & D.1 was also depicted as the same attorney, Christopher Florian referenced within the allegations by CA.

To Affiant's knowledge and upon information and belief, Amason further hinders, retaliates, conspires, inter alia, against Affiant, particularly knowing Affiant took and takes issue with SDC.

- 12.1) Attached Exhibit B, is a historical case history of pending civil litigating cases to the Sheriff, including a favorable Judgment.
- 12.3) Attached Exhibit C, is a December 12th, 2011, formal document addressed to the Supreme Court, referencing Amason's inappropriateness.
- 13) Exhibit G, is a case law history of another person mailed to Affiant. ↑

13.1) Exhibit H, is the Report against Affiant.  
 13.2) Exhibit I, is a previous Affidavit.  
 13.3) It is believed the "pages" questioned by Amason are the same pages mailed to 151 West Park Blvd., Columbia, SC 29210.  
 13.4) Convicted of 806 would be a grave injustice, that would literally subject Affiant to serious hostile hearing if not place him in a deathly environment.  
 14) Despite the aforementioned limited information, produced under much stress, Affiant harbors no hatred and otherwise is not otherwise limited feelings against A. Amason.

Affirmed and subscribed to this 15 day of December 2011

Cathrine A Amason

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Ther L Taylor, Pro Se

Appellate Case No. 2012-213119

Appellant,

VS.

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

SCDC/Employees

Respondents.

RECEIVED

MAY 16 2013

SC Court of Appeals

I, Ther L Taylor Pro Se, do hereby affirm that my Affidavit and Petition for Rehearing in the above captioned case

was directly into the hands of prison official within the Institutional Mail Room, class postage duly affixed and a return address clearly depicted on the envelope, for deposit in the United States Mail, addressed to the following person(s):

1) The Court of Appeals  
Claire Allen, Deputy  
PO Box 11629  
Columbia, S.C.

<sup>A.L.C. (in)</sup>  
2) The Court Administration  
1205 Pendleton St., suite 224  
Columbia, S.C. 29201

3) General Counsel  
Shanika Johnson, Attorney  
PO Box 21787  
Columbia, SC 29221

\*\*\* I asked for 4 copies on May 9th of the entire document, was told I would get only the 5th page only of my 5 page Affidavit & Petition for Rehearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Ther L Taylor

\*also got inmates waiting in Mail Room (Grubs) for Mail services - Mothers Day etc.

Affirm to and subscribed before me on this 9 day of May, 2013

Virginia Drulis

Notary Public for South Carolina  
My Commission Expires: \_\_\_\_\_

refused this section.

on May 9th Jones decided to deny the remaining 4 pages of my Affidavit and Petition for Rehearing.

I am mailing the originals to the Court of Appeals and gave the prepared envelopes without Service as depicted above herein this document solely because Mr. Jones refused to copy the above complete document as I created it.