


7

No. 24-7170 ORIGINAL



\_\_\_\_\_  
IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
\_\_\_\_\_

In Re Jerome Cury — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Jerome Cury  
(Your Name)

4460 Broad river rd / Broad river com Inst / complex #128  
(Address)

Columbia, SC 29201  
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A  
(Phone Number)

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1.) IS The PCR Court, Court Chief Administrative Judge of The Ninth Judicial Circuit For Charleston County, as well as The South Carolina Supreme Court In error for refusing to provide the petitioner with PCR hearing transcripts of 6/27/23, 3/13/23, 12/19/24, 4/19/23, 9/10/23, along with preliminary hearing transcript all pro se filings in connection with PCR Cases# 2022-CP-10-2017, 2020-CP-10-05357 Is this not due Process violation equal protection violation, denial of fairness, as well as fraud upon the Court to willingly denied this or these documents to petitioner to be able to present his case on PCR how is this not prejudice and bias?
- 2.) Does not the petitioner has a right further entitled to have these documents how can under these circumstances this be not impossible for the petitioner to present his case by denying him of this?
- 3.) Does the law, Statutes, Supreme Court rulings, and judgments state that if a petitioner is indigent not able to pay cost or fees for such documents that he is not entitled to have these documents which is needed and use as proof showing of wrongful judgments, false arrest, false imprisonment, malicious prosecution, fraud upon the Court, perjury, and conspiracy to deprive civil right, fairness, due process, equal protection of the Law,?

## LIST OF PARTIES

- [ ] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.
- [ ] All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

## RELATED CASES

 0:24-cv-01674-JDA, No. 7044 United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, United States District Court case # 0:24-cv-01674-JDA, 2025-CR-10-0160 North Judicial Circuit Court of Common Pleas Charleston County.

In Re Jerome Curry, Petitioner No. 24-6359 Supreme Court of the United States, Civil Rights 1993 Federal District Court case in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit case # 24-1795-(22 cr 03255-JDA)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                        |   |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---|
| OPINIONS BELOW .....                                   | 1 |
| JURISDICTION .....                                     |   |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED ..... |   |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....                            |   |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....                    |   |
| CONCLUSION .....                                       |   |

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

|            |                                                                                                                                                            |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| APPENDIX A | <u>All documents judgments Destroyed By SCDC officials</u><br><u>[REDACTED]</u> See Attached to petition<br>All other documents destroyed<br>by staff SCDC |
| APPENDIX B | <u>All documents judgments Destroyed By SCDC officials</u>                                                                                                 |
| APPENDIX C | <u>All documents judgments Destroyed By SCDC officials</u>                                                                                                 |
| APPENDIX D | <u>All documents judgments Destroyed By SCDC officials</u>                                                                                                 |
| APPENDIX E | <u>All documents judgments Destroyed By SCDC officials</u>                                                                                                 |
| APPENDIX F | <u>All documents judgments Destroyed By SCDC officials</u>                                                                                                 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

## CASES

## PAGE NUMBER

USCA Const Art III Clause 2, Supreme Court, Original and Appellate  
 Jurisdiction, original jurisdiction of Supreme Court 28 USCA  
 Section 1251, Montell v. Dept of Social Services of City of New  
 York 436 US 658, Wolff v. McDonnell, Dean v. Jones 984 F.3d  
 285, Shireed v. Harding, [REDACTED] 802 Fed Appx 765,  
 Parker v. Stevenson 625 Fed Appx 196, Williams v. Benjamin  
 72 F.3d 756, Miller v. Leathers 913 F.2d 1085, Estelle v.  
 Gamble 429 US 597, Richardson v. Davis, Clinton v.  
 County of York 893 F.Supp. 59, Cooper v. Dyke 814 F.2d 941  
 Russell v. Encler 496 F.Supp. 320, Ewell v. Murray 11 F.3d 482

## STATUTES AND RULES

O'Bar v. Pinion 953 F.2d 74, Blakes v. Cunningham 409 F.2d  
 220, Skipper v. South Carolina Dept of Cor. [REDACTED] 370 SC 267  
 712 v. South Carolina Dept of Cor. 2005-CP-40-2925  
 Bowling v. Director Virginia Dept of Cor., Lovelace v. Lee  
 472 F.3d 176 USCA Const Amend 1, Cruz v. Beto 405 US 319,  
 Barnes v. Smith 430 US 817, Whitten v. [REDACTED] Gunter 757 Fed Appx 235  
 Norman v. Taylor 25 F.3d 1259, US Const Amend 8th, 14th, 5th,  
 Riddick v. Barber 109 F.4th 639, Iho v. Shreve 535 F.3d 255

## OTHER

Clarke 37 F.4th 936, Porter v. Clarke 923 F.3d 348,  
 Jehovah v. Clarke 788 F.2d 161, Williams v. Benjamin 77  
 F.3d 756, Hill v. Crum [REDACTED], Pearson v. Callahan  
 555 US 223,

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of mandamus issue.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix N/A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at N/A; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix N/A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at N/A; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix    to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at non published order; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the South Carolina Supreme Court <sup>destroyed by SCSC officials</sup> court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at N/A non published order; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☐ is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

[ ] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was N/A.

[ ] No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: N/A, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix N/A.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including N/A (date) on N/A (date) in Application No. A N/A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

[ ] For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was The year of 2024 Court.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_. *recall due to being incompetent mentally ill staff destroyed all legal documents*

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. A \_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

# CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

United States Constitution Due Process fairness equal protection 14th

Amendment, 5th Amendments, NC, VI Pittt or Pittt V. NC,

State V. Evans right to transcripts and court records to

indigent parties, Constitutional right under due process equal

protection to right to free copies of records transcripts and

pro se filings not able to present many cases due to

being denied access to Law Library Law tablet denied

since Feb 13, 2023 still being denied as well as being

incompetent mentally i'll since 2020 based upon judgment of PCR

Case # 2022-CP-10-2017 § 2020-CP-10-05357 Honorable PCR Judge MS. J. Newman  
Entered Dec 19, 2024.

Cannot Provide Due To being Denied Access To Law Library

§ Law Tablet By Staff 1st Amendment US Const Violation

Access To Courts / violation of (SCDC) Policy Access To

Courts Due Process fairness equal protection violations

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I petitioner hereby comes before this Honorable Court herein stating under penalty of perjury that all statements stated herein are true and correct so help me God being prepared in good faith, clean hands doctrine, to ensure justice within a matter where justice is being denied & prevented. The petitioner states that he filed PCR Case # 2022-CP-10-2017 May of 2022, May 2, 2022 he has already be afforded (6) PCR hearings with the delay of entering judgment therein within the Charleston County Court of Common Pleas for the Ninth Judicial Circuit due to and based upon fraud upon court, conspiracy to deprive Constitutional & civil rights within state PCR proceedings to fairness equal protection of the laws and due process, being done in bad faith, unclean hands doctrine, with also the destruction of exhibits evidence in support of case pending (PCR cases) that proves wrongful arrest, wrongful conviction, malicious prosecution, false imprisonment, fraud, conspiracy, abuse of process, abuse of power, abuse of use of governmental use of office. Petitioner legal documents have been destroyed over (3) different times by government officials and staff then refusing to replace or provide certain documentation proving not guilty and wrongful convictions etc. The petitioner has put in many pro se motions for the productions of documents records all PCR hearing transcripts for PCR cases # 2022-CP-10-2017, 2020-CP-10-05357, as well as requested all pro se filings exhibits, Brady materials under BRADY v Maryland, South Carolina Rules of Criminal Procedure Rule 5 Disclosure Full & All disclosure of evidence had PCR hearings (6) times without judgment entered or documents allowed to be given to the petitioner due to Atty. Gen. Office Danelle Difen stating such documents would be no help to the petitioners case he does not need them and that he is incompetent mentally ill

16  
STATEMENT OF FACTS

And court therefore should not provide the petitioner with such documents  
in which Judges allow. Further in last PCR hearing held Dec 19, 2024

Judge J. Newman stating and ruling that since the petitioner is incompetent  
and mentally ill since (2020) the court thereof should not provide the  
petitioner with these documents the SC Supreme Court also refuses  
to provide the petitioner with any documents filed prose in mandamus  
with their courts either along with supporting exhibits evidence filed in  
connection with case also without payments or costs thereof knowing  
that the petitioner is indigent not working and not able to pay  
any costs thereof therefore denied. Petitioner states that he did  
not know that Justice came with a price tag and that guilty  
and rich petitioners and defendants can pay to get themselves  
out of prison and jail as long as they have the money to do so

STATEMENT OF FACTS

And petitioners/defendants that cannot afford or have any money  
to pay they way out even [redacted] though they are not guilty  
must stay in prison being wrongfully convicted and should have  
no way to petition courts to get out of such wrongful  
conviction. The judicial system and State of South Carolina  
has made a legal way to enslave people that are not  
guilty of a crime as a slave if they can not  
afford to show otherwise and if they try to petition  
the court for redress to wrongful conviction they will  
be [redacted] targeted as a trouble maker and a law breaker  
Subject to inhumane treatments living conditions assaults denial  
of daily needs food, clothing, educational programs safety from  
assaults from staff and gangs connected and in bed with staff  
hired as staff hitman to assault prisoners fighting against  
unlawful conviction bias racism and perjury judicial and  
Justice systems.

### REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Reason for granting this petition is so that the petitioner as well as the lower courts and South Carolina Supreme Court and future petitioners/defendants, would know the correct procedure in obtaining documents that are needed in order to get wrongful convictions overturn and new trial granted if they are indigent and not able to pay any of the costs thereof or if they are incompetent mentally ill or not such persons still should not be denied documents that will help show and provide the court with information to show conviction is wrongful and unconstitutional.

### REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The petitioner states that he is entitled to the documents requested and that it will be impossible to present case without being presented with such documents and the courts knowing this further being done in bad faith, unclean hands doctrine to pervert and deny justice in the petitioner's case this court has already ruled in the past that indigent petitioners, defendants, and Applicants are entitled to the documents that the petitioner is requesting herein. The courts should not be allowed under any circumstances to deny any persons of such right how is this not due process, fairness and equal protection of the laws violations? Court needs to explain and rule upon this case to compel all documents to be turn over to pro se petitioner to ensure justice and due process otherwise it would be impossible for the petitioner to present case. The Respondents are entitled to such why so is the petitioner being denied equal rights.

### Exceptional Circumstances

The petitioner states that exceptional circumstances are that the petitioner is being peroxide receiving bias racist treatments denial of fairness equal protection of the laws as well as denial of due process. All Judges within South Carolina from the South Carolina Supreme Court to the [REDACTED] Lower Courts of Common Pleas these Judges refuses to grant the petitioner request for the production of recuss transcripts Brady material pro se filing's evidence, exhibits to prove wrongful conviction false arrest, false imprisonment, malicious prosecution, etc. How so is this not due process fairness equal protection violation. The petitioner has no other remedy in which he may try to get the relief and documents requested. Therefore he moves before this court herein with this petition.

### Exceptional Circumstances

The petitioner states that he is entitled to these documents as a matter of law, fact, and justice as [REDACTED] well as due process and fairness as stated before it would be impossible for the petitioner to be able to present his case before the courts without these requested documents in which the court are refusing to provide the plaintiff/petitioner with denying him of the right to present his case before the courts rightfully and with evidence exhibits documents and supporting documents to prove claims/allegations raised by the petitioner before the lower courts how can Respondent be allowed such documents yet deny same documents to Petitioner pro se petitioner and proceedings before the court still be fair and constitutional? Please Explain? how is that equal rights or due process or fairness Explain? Due to all these stated facts stated herein The petitioner feels court should take this into full consideration in making judgment in this case being presented herein pro se Petitioner has no other remedy that he may seek that would help assist him in the production of these requested documents stated herein.

## CONCLUSION

Based upon all statements stated herein the petitioner states that he is entitled to the relief stated herein this petition and the production of all requested documents in order to be able as prove or not prove to present his case before the Courts as pursuant to the US Constitution due process fairness equal protection of the laws. To do otherwise would be a total denial of Law and Justice making it impossible for the petitioner to present his case before the Courts without requested documents further rendering proceedings decided in favor and support of the Respondent all them access to documents evidence exhibits yet denying the petitioner of some thing how so not constitutional violation due process equal protection I do move to grant petition as a matter of Law and Justice

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of mandamus should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

  
April 23, 2025.

Date: 