

No. 25-5593

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN RE JEFFREY LYNN CHRONISTER — PETITIONER

V

TERRI WALLACE, WARDEN — RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING TO THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR REHEARING

pro se, JEFFREY LYNN CHRONISTER, #189827

KIRKLAND CORR. INST., B-II, 51

4344 BROAD RIVER ROAD

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

29210-4010

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT

ZACHARY W. JONES, A.A.G.

SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY

GENERAL'S OFFICE

POST OFFICE BOX 11549

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA, 29211

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

(I) WAS FRAUD ON THE COURT COMMITTED BY DEFENSE COUNSEL MR. SMITH, AND DETECTIVE WHITSTINE, AND WAS THE ARREST MALICIOUSLY MADE FOR WANT OF PROBABLE CAUSE BROUGHT FORTH BY THE FRAUD?

(II) WAS FRAUD ON THE COURT MAINTAINED BY DEFENSE COUNSEL MR. SMITH, THE SOLICITOR MR. GRANT, DETECTIVE WHITSTINE, AND WAS THE DIRECTED VERDICT PRODUCED BY THE FRAUD?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

PETITIONER'S ARREST OCCURRED ON SAME MORNING OF THE TRAGEDY, FEBRUARY 14, 1992, AND INDICTED ON APRIL 6, 1992 FOR MURDER PLUS UNLAWFUL POSSESSION OF KNIFE OR FIREARM DURING THE COMMISSION OF A VIOLENT CRIME. A TRIAL BY JURY HELD ON SEPTEMBER 21-22, 1992, BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONS. RUSHING RESULTED IN GUILTY (1992-GS-46-1224). TRIAL SOUTICOR WAS LARRY F. GRANT, DEFENSE COUNSEL DURING TRIAL, AND INVESTIGATION WAS GERALD W. SMITH OF THE YORK COUNTY SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE. PETITIONER SENTENCED TO LIFE (20 YEARS) FOR MURDER PLUS 5 YEARS CONSECUTIVE FOR FIREARMS POSSESSION. PETITIONER'S HAD 7 PAROLE HEARINGS, AND MOST RECENT 2 HEARINGS ON MEDICAL PAROLE.

THE CURRENT PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS "FILED TO THIS COURT ON SEPTEMBER 10, 2025 (No. 25-5593) AROSE FROM AN "MOTION FOR AFTER NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO RULE 60 (6) OF SOUTH CAROLINA RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE," AND ITS RELATED POST CONVICTION RELIEF APPLICATION FILED IN YORK COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS ON APRIL 23, 2019 (2019-CP-46-01421). AN "TIMELY" REPLY "WAS SERVED ON THE RESPONDENTS' CONDITIONAL ORDER PROVISIONALLY DENYING AND DISMISSING THE APPLICATION AS UNTIMELY AND SUCCESSIVE" (PLEASE SEE PROCEDURAL IMPEDIMENTS AND BARS BY STATE COURTS AT PAGE 5 TO 10 OF THE HABEAS PETITION)

PETITIONER RECEIVED ON OCTOBER 16, 2025 AN NOTIFICATION DATED OCTOBER 6, 2025, BY THE HONORABLE SCOTT S. HARRIS, CLERK OF THIS COURT, STATING THAT: "THE COURT TODAY ENTERED THE FOLLOWING ORDER IN THE ABOVE ENTITLED CASE" (COPY OF NOTIFICATION ENCLOSED, PAGE 10)

"THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IS DENIED"

PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY MOVES FOR AN REHEARING ON THE OCTOBER 6TH ORDER PURSUANT TO SUPREME COURT RULE 44(2) IN SUBMITTING, WHAT PETITIONER UNDERSTANDS, ARE THE INTERVENING CIRCUMSTANCES OF SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECTS ON THE GROUNDS WHICH ARE FACTUAL AND SUPPORTED BY COPIES OF THE TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD PAGES ALSO OTHER VIABLE DOCUMENTS THAT SHOW EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF FRAUD
STATEMENT OF THE TRIAL

THE TESTIMONY BY OTIS J. WHITSTINE UNDER INITIAL DIRECT SHOWS HE WAS WITH THE YORK COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT AND INVOLVED IN AN INVESTIGATION OF THE TRAGEDY ON DATE IT OCCURRED, FEBRUARY 14, 1992, HE WAS ADDRESSED AS "OFFICER OR DETECTIVE", SHOWN AS THE "AFFIANT" OF ARREST WARRANT, SOLE WITNESS OF INDICTMENT FOR MURDER, AND ONLY LAW OFFICIAL TO TESTIFY "INTERVIEWING" OR TALKING WITH WITNESS TOMMY / THOMAS AUTEN ON MORNING OF OCCURRENCE. THE SOLICITOR ADDRESSING WITNESS AUTEN AS "THE EYEWITNESS IDENTIFICATION AND LINE-UP". THE WARRANT STATES, "PROBABLE CAUSE BASED ON WITNESS'S"

(1) WAS FRAUD ON THE COURT COMMITTED BY COUNSEL MR. SMITH, AND DETECTIVE WHITSTINE, AND WAS THE ARREST MALICIOUSLY MADE FOR WANT OF PROBABLE CAUSE BROUGHT FORTH BY THE FRAUD?

PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY CONTENTS THAT THE INTERVIEWING CIRCUMSTANCES OF SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECT WAS MISREPRESENTATION BY COUNSEL, MR. SMITH, IN SUBORNATION OF FALSE TESTIMONY THAT WAS MADE BY DETECTIVE WHITSTINE WHICH WOULD HAVE FALSELY APPEARED HE HAD

INTERVIEWED WITNESS AUTEN ON THAT MORNING, AND OBTAINED THE WARRANT WITH PROBABLE CAUSE. WHICH RAISED HIS CREDIBILITY IN WILLINGNESS TO FALSELY TESTIFY VIOLATING HIS OATH AS THE AFFIANT. FOR THE ONLY EVIDENCE OF HIS INVOLVEMENT IN THE INVESTIGATION IS PRESENTING OF AN PHOTO LINE-UP TO WITNESS AUTEN AT WITNESS'S RESIDENCE ON AFTERNOON OF THE TRAGEDY. 18 USC 1622

THE EVIDENCE THAT SUPPORTS SUBORNATION OF FALSE TESTIMONY WAS COMMITTED IS WITNESS AUTEN'S TESTIMONY OF DETECTIVE WHITSTINE HAVING TO INTRODUCE AND IDENTIFY HIMSELF UPON ARRIVAL AT THE RESIDENCE. SHOWING THIS WAS THEIR INITIAL MEETING EACH OTHER. FOR WITNESS TESTIFIED: "HE TOLD ME WHO HE WAS, IDENTIFIED HIMSELF." THE DETECTIVE TESTIFYING TWICE BEING UNCERTAIN OF INTERVIEWING OR TALKING WITH THE WITNESS BEFORE COUNSEL'S INDUCEMENT, AND HIS OPENING INITIAL ~~TESTIMONY~~ UNDER DIRECT EXAMINING WAS "MEETING WITH WITNESS AT THE RESIDENCE" ALSO THERE IS NO PHYSICAL EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT DETECTIVE WHITSTINE HAD INTERVIEWED ANY WITNESS ON THAT MORNING. THE ONLY COPY OF AN INCIDENT REPORT FROM THE YORK COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT THAT'S BEEN ENTERED INTO THE TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD SHOWS WITNESS AUTEN AS THE REPORT'S COMPLAINANT. THOUGH THE COPY ENTERED WITHOUT THE SHOWING OF THE REPORTING OFFICER'S NAME OR THE REPORT, AND THE ONLY COPY OF AN INCIDENT REPORT PROVIDED TO PETITIONER'S FAMILY MEMBER WAS OF THE SAME REPORT THAT ITS COPY WAS ENTERED INTO THE RECORD. OUTSIDE OF THIS COPY SHOWING THE LACK OF EVIDENCE DETECTIVE WHITSTINE HAD INTERVIEWED THE WITNESS ON THAT MORNING IT ALSO SUPPORTS THE LACK OF EVIDENCE ANY WITNESS OF THAT MORNING HAD BEEN LAWFULLY INTERVIEWED. FOR THE COPY SHOWS "SMITH T.B." AS THE REPORTING OFFICER, THE RECORD FAILS TO SHOW ANY

INVOLVEMENT IN THE INVESTIGATION, AND THE REPORT IS SHOWN FABRICATED BY ITS PRESENTMENTS TO THAT OF WITNESS AUTEN'S TESTIMONY. ALSO HIS LACK OF TESTIMONY USCA 16292. FURTHER MISREPRESENTATION BY COUNSEL IN SHOWING KNOWLEDGE OF THE REPORT AND ATTEMPTING TO INDUCE WITNESS AUTEN INTO CORROBORATING ITS PRESENTMENTS OF THE SUSPECT'S HEIGHT AND WEIGHT WHERE WITNESS HAD PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED OTHERWISE. THE OTHER WITNESSES OF THAT MORNING: JOEL SMITH, TESTIFIED TO HE SAW NOTHING AND HEARD NOTHING RELEASED ON FIRST DAY: DANNY WILSON TESTIFIED TO TALKING WITH AN OFFICER JIM WILLIAMS WHOSE NAME WAS CALLED ON FIRST DAY BUT NOT PRESENT / TESTIFIED DURING THE TRIAL. THE WITNESS ALSO RELEASED ON FIRST DAY, AND NO EVIDENCE OF A "SUMMARY OF THE INTERVIEW" HE HAD TESTIFIED TO: SIDNEY BALLANTR: RECORD FAILS TO SHOW ANY EVIDENCE OF BEING INTERVIEWED OR TALKING WITH AN LAW OFFICIAL ON THAT MORNING.

PHOTOGRAPHIC LINE-UP

THE INITIAL DIRECT EXAMINING OF DETECTIVE WHITSTINE SHOWS "PRIOR" TO GOING TO SEE WITNESS AUTEN HE HAD THE LIST OF NAMES OF THE SIX INDIVIDUALS IN THE LINE UP AND HAD PREPARED IT "PRIOR TO GOING TO SEE WITNESS AUTEN" ALSO THAT AN DETECTIVE JETER IN GASTON COUNTY HAD MADE THE LINE-UP'S RECORD, AND THE RECORD SHOWS THAT THE ONLY EVIDENCE OF PREPARING THE LINE UP BY DETECTIVE JETER IS PREPARING THE INDIVIDUALS' PHOTOGRAPHS. THE RECORD FAILS TO SHOW ANY EVIDENCE / TESTIMONY OF DETECTIVE JETER HAVING THE LIST OF NAMES, AND PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY CONTENTS DETECTIVE WHITSTINE'S PREPARING OF THE INDIVIDUALS' NAMES TO THE NUMBERS ~~BEHIND~~ OF THEIR PHOTOS IN THE LINE-UP WOULD HAVE RENDERED IT ~~AND~~ SUGGESTIVE. ALSO DETECTIVE WHITSTINE'S INITIAL TESTIMONY SHOW PRESENTING THE LINE UP ALONE

THE INTERVENING CIRCUMSTANCES OF SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECTS WAS FRAUD ON THE COURT BY COUNSEL'S MISREPRESENTATION IN INITIAL CROSS EXAMINING OF DETECTIVE WHITSTINE FOR FAILING TO QUESTION THE TESTIMONY OF HAVING HAD THE LIST OF NAMES, PREPARING THE LINE-UP, AND IMPROPER USE OF LEADING QUESTIONS / INDUCEMENT. WHICH WOULD HAVE FALSELY APPEARED THE DETECTIVE HAD NO KNOWLEDGE OR A ROLE IN LINE-UP'S PREPARATION. ALSO FAILING TO OBJECT TO THE LINE-UP BEING PRESENTED ALONE GIVE THAT PETITIONER HAD CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO PRESENCE OF COUNSEL.

MALICIOUS PROSECUTION ALSO MAINTAINED BY THE ACTIVE MISCONDUCT OF MR. SMITH IN PARTICIPATING IN AN IDENTIFICATION OF PETITIONER BY DETECTIVE WHITSTINE IN JURY'S PRESENCE, AND PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT BY THE SOLICITOR. FOR THE IDENTIFICATION CAME UNDER DIRECT EXAMINING WITH HIS AND MR. SMITH'S KNOWLEDGE IT WAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL / IMPERMISSIBLE BECAUSE OF THE DETECTIVE'S PRIOR TESTIMONY OF PREPARING THE LINE-UP WOULD HAVE RENDERED IT UNUSUALLY SUGGESTIVE AIDING IN MAKING IDENTIFICATION, AND PRESENTING THE LINE-UP ALONE. SOLICITOR'S ~~URGENT~~ ~~QUESTIONS~~

(Q) "WAS ANYBODY THERE BESIDES YOU AND HIM?"; (A) "NO SIR."

(Q) "AND WHO WAS THE PICTURE THAT HE PICKED OUT?"; (A) "JEFFREY

LYNN CHRODISTER No. 3 IN THE LINE-UP"; (Q) "AND DOES MR. CHRODISTER

APPEAR DIFFERENT TODAY IN COURT?"; ~~MR. SMITH~~, "OBJECT TO LEAD-

ING YOUR HONOR"; SOLICITOR, (Q) "IS THERE ANY DIFFERENCE IN MR.

CHRODISTER'S APPEARANCE TODAY IN COURT AS IN THE PICTURE LINE-UP?"

MR. SMITH, "YOUR HONOR THE SAME OBJECTION"; THE COURT: "NO SIR.

I OVERRULE YOU GO AHEAD"; (A) "HE HAS NO BEARD AT THIS TIME"

PETITIONER CONTENDS NEVER MEETING OR HAVING SEEN DETECTIVE WHITSTINE PRIOR TO THE TRIAL, AND THE RECORD FAILS TO SHOW ANY EVIDENCE / TESTIMONY THAT DETECTIVE HAD MET OR OBSERVED PETITIONER PRIOR TO TRIAL FOR KNOWLEDGE TO HAVE MADE THE IDENTIFICATION THATS SUPPORTED BY HIS ~~ANSWER~~ ~~TO~~ RECROSS OF, "AND YOU DIDNT KNOW NO. 3 FROM ADAM'S HOUSE CAT OF YOUR OWN KNOWLEDGE DID YOU SIR?", (A) "NO SIR."

THE PROSECUTION FURTHER MAINTAINED BY MISCONDUCT OF MR. SMITH ~~IN~~ ~~CROSS~~ ~~EXAMINING~~ OF DETECTIVE WHITSTINE BY AGAIN FAILING TO QUESTION HAVING HAD THE LIST OF NAME, PREPARING LINE-UP, AND IMPROPER USE OF LEADING QUESTIONS / INDUCEMENT. WHICH WOULD HAVE FALSELY IMPRESSED UPON THE JURY DETECTIVE HAD NO KNOWLEDGE OR ROLE IN PREPARATION OF THE LINE UP AND TO TURN FALSELY APPER THE IDENTIFICATION TESTIMONY WAS RELIABLE.

CONTINUATION OF THE MISCONDUCT BY MR. SMITH AND MR GRANT TO USE OF INADMISSIBLE HEARSAY. BECAUSE OF ONLY QUESTIONING DETECTIVE WHITSTINE AS TO WHICH ONE OF THE SIX NUMBERS THAT WITNESS ACTED ALLEGEDLY PICK OUT BESIDE OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S PICTURE OF THE LINE-UP, AND THEIR FAILING TO CORROBORATE THE DETECTIVE'S TESTIMONY BY QUESTIONING THE WITNESS.

(II) WAS FRAUD ON THE COURT MAINTAINED BY DEFENSE COUNSEL, MR SMITH, SOLICITOR MR. GRANT, DETECTIVE WHITSTINE, AND WAS THE DIRECTED VERDICT PRODUCED BY THE FRAUD?

MR. SMITH MOVED FOR DIRECTION OF VERDICT ON THE GROUNDS OF;

(1) "THE EVIDENCE VIEWED IN LIGHT MOST FAVORABLE TO THE STATE SHOW A KILLING, BUT THE IDENTIFICATION ISSUE, IT DOES NOT SHOW THAT MY CLIENT

DID THAT BECAUSE OF THE NATURE OF THE TESTIMONY BY THE PEOPLE AS TO IDENTITY"; (2) "I WOULD ALSO SUBMIT THAT THERE HAS BEEN NO WEAPON PRODUCED, THERE HAVE BEEN NO PROJECTILES" AND (3) "THE PRIMARY FAILURE IN THE STATE'S CASE, YOUR HONOR, IS THERE HAS NOT BEEN ANY EVIDENCE TO MAKE OUT THE NECESSARY CASE FOR MALICE, EVEN THOUGH MALICE MAY BE INFERRED FROM THE USE OF A WEAPON, THERE HAS BEEN NO WEAPON CONNECTED TO MY CLIENTS, AND I SIMPLY FEEL THAT BASED ON THE TESTIMONY THAT WE HAVE, THE STATE HAS FAILED TO SHOW THE REQUIRED MALICE"

THE WITNESSES OF THAT MORNING AS TO IDENTITY: JOEL SMITH: TESTIFIED TO HE "SAW NOTHING"; DAVID WILSON: (A) "NO SIR. MY ATTENTION WAS RIVETED ON HIS WEAPON, AND I DIDN'T LOOK AT HIS FACE THAT WELL"; SIDNEY-BILLINGER: "I GOT A GENERAL FEATURES LOOK AT THE INDIVIDUAL"

TOMMY AULET: (A) "NO SIR. WHAT I'M TELLING YOU IS THE PERSON I IDENTIFIED IN THE LINE-UP WAS THE PERSON I SAW IN THE PARKING LOT," AND "IF THIS MAN IS THE MAN THAT I IDENTIFIED ON THE PHOTOGRAPH THEN HE IS THE SAME PERSON"

THE DIRECTED VERDICT

THE COURT: "THE TESTIMONY IN THE CASE IS THAT THE DEFENDANT WAS IDENTIFIED AS BEING THE PERSON AT THE SCENE THAT HE WAS IN POSSESSION OF A WEAPON THAT GUNSHOTS WERE HEARD AND SHORTLY IN SECONDS THEREAFTER THE VICTIM'S BODY WAS FOUND SHE WAS DEAD, OF COURSE THE STATEMENTS MADE BY THE OFFICER-- ALL OF THOSE AND THE USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON YOU DON'T HAVE TO FIND THE WEAPON IF THERE'S TESTIMONY OF USE OF A WEAPON." "USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON IS SUFFICIENT FOR AN INFERENCE OF MALICE TO SUPPORT A CONVICTION OF MURDER, MALICE AFORETHOUGHT"

FOR THOSE REASONS THE MOTION FOR DIRECTED VERDICT AT THIS STAGE IS DENIED."

COUNSEL'S SUBSEQUENT REVEAL OF THE MOTION ON HIS SAME GROUNDS WAS DENIED BY THE JUDGE ON THE SAME REASONS IN DENYING INITIAL MOTION.

GIVEN THE LACK OF COMPETENT WITNESS IDENTIFICATION TESTIMONY THE INTERVENING CIRCUMSTANCES OF A SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECT WAS THE COURT'S DECISION TO DENY THE MOTION BASED ON UNREASONABLE DETERMINATION OF THE FACTS 2254 (4)(2) BEING THE DETECTIVE / OFFICER WHITSTONE'S ~~FRAUDULENT~~ TESTIMONY, AND WHICH IS SUPPORTED BY THE COURT STATING "THE DEFENDANT WAS IDENTIFIED" AND "THE STATEMENTS MADE BY THE OFFICER--"

PETITIONER WAS ENTITLED TO THE VERDICT IN HIS FAVOR FOR REASON OF THE STATE'S FAILURE TO PRESENT COMPETENT WITNESS IDENTIFICATION EVIDENCE TENDING TO PROVE THE CHARGE IN THE INDICTMENT CITING SOUTH CAROLINA B. CRIM. P. RULE 19 (4) DIRECTED VERDICT THAT STATES ITS LANGUAGE IS TAKEN FROM RULE 19 (4) FED. R. CRIM. P. AND COMMON LAW. THE STATE'S FAILURE ALSO APPLYING TO THE VERDICT'S "POSSESSION OF A WEAPON" AND PROOF OF "MALICE AFORETHOUGHT" BEYOND AN REASONABLE DOUBT.

DIRECT APPEAL

CONTINUATION OF MISREPRESENTATION BY COUNSEL AND OR INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF APPELLATE COURT ATTORNEY BY FAILURE TO BRIEF THE MERITORIOUS CLAIM OF DENIAL OF THE MOTION FOR DIRECTED VERDICT ON APPEAL

PETITIONER HAD NO PRIOR ARREST / CRIMINAL RECORD FOR KNOWLEDGE OF FIRST APPEAL AS OF RIGHT, TAKEN ITS PROCEDURE, AND SOLICITOR HAD STATED TO CAMERA AT TRIAL, "YOUR HONOR, MY UNDERSTANDING HE HAS NO RECORD OF CRIMES OF MORAL TURPITUDE"

MR. SMITH STATED AT END OF THE TRIAL, "YOUR HONOR, I WILL FILE THE APPEAL"

FOR HIM AUTOMATICALLY, AND AT NO TIME PRIOR TO, DURING, OR AFTER THE TRIAL DID MR. SMITH CONFER WITH PETITIONER ABOUT APPEAL RIGHTS NOR THE MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL THAT HE MOVED FOR ON THE GROUNDS OF "THE VERDICT IS NOT SUPPORTED BY THE EVIDENCE THAT HAS BEEN PRESENTED GIVE THE LACK OF IDENTIFICATION, THE LACK OF WEAPON, AND THE GROUNDS THAT I HAVE STATED BEFORE", THIS MOTION ALSO DENIED BY THE COURT.

PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY CONTENTS MR. SMITH'S BREACH OF DUTY AS AN ADVOCATE WAS CONTROLLED BY ACTIVE MISREPRESENTATION TO FAILURE TO BRIEF THE MERITORIOUS CLAIM OF MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL AND OR THE DIRECTED VERDICT ~~FOR~~ APPEAL DENYING ASSISTANCE OF APPELLATE ATTORNEY REVIEW" ADVOCATE: SOUTH CAROLINA APPELLATE COURT RULE RULE 3.1, MERITORIOUS CLAIMS "WHICH PETITIONER WOULD HAVE HAD A REASONABLE CHANCE OF SUCCESS ON APPEAL BUT FOR COUNSEL'S BREACH OF DUTY. FOR THE COURT OF APPEALS WILL **REVERSE** THE TRIAL COURT'S RULING ON A DIRECT VERDICT MOTION ONLY IF NO EVIDENCE EXISTS TO SUPPORT THE RULING OR IF THE DECISION WAS CONTROLLED BY ERROR OF LAW" CITING WRIGHT V CRAPT 372 S.C. 1, 19, 640 S.E.2d 486 (Ct. App. 2006)

PETITIONER PREVENTED FROM PRESENTING ALL OF HIS CASE BY REASON OF THE FRAUD, MISREPRESENTATION, AND STATED IN CLOSE OF THE TRIAL, "I LOVED MY WIFE, THAT WASN'T ME DOWN THERE, I WANT TO FILE AN APPEAL" AND "I DON'T FEEL LIKE I WAS PROPERLY REPRESENTED AT LEAST CERTAIN THINGS THAT WAS MISSING THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN BROUGHT UP." THESE STATEMENTS EXPLAINED IN THE HABEAS PETITION.

EXECUTED ON THIS 26 DAY OF
OCTOBER, 2025

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:
Jeffrey Lynn Chronister
JEFFREY LYNN CHRONISTER, 189827

No 25-5593

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In Re JEFFREY LYNN CHRONISTER — PETITIONER

v

TERRI WALLACE, WARDEN — RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING TO
THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CERTIFICATION OF PETITIONER

I, JEFFREY LYNN CHRONISTER, BEING THE PETITIONER DO CERTIFY THAT THE
PETITION FOR REHEARING ON THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
ORDER, DATED OCTOBER 6, 2015, DENYING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
IS RESTRICTED TO THE GROUNDS SPECIFIED IN RULE 44(c) PARAGRAPH, PRESENTED
IN GOOD FAITH, AND NOT FOR DELAY

THIS 26th DAY OF OCTOBER, 2015

Jeffrey Lynn Chronister
JEFFREY LYNN CHRONISTER #189827

No. 25-5593

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In Re: JEFFREY LYNN CHRONISTER — PETITIONER

v


TERRI WALLACE, WARDEN — RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING TO
THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, JEFFREY LYNN CHRONISTER, DO DECLARE ON THIS 30TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2025, SERVED THE PETITION FOR REHEARING, MOTION FOR LEAVE IN FORM A PAUPERIS, AND ITS DECLARATION ON THE HONORABLE SCOTT S. HARRIS, CLERK OF THE COURT, AND TRUE COPIES OF SAME ON ATTORNEY FOR THE RESPONDENT, ZACHARY W. JONES, AAG., C/O SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE, P.O. BOX 11549 COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA, 29211 BY DEPOSITING IN THE UNITED STATES MAIL WITH FIRST CLASS POSTAGE PREPAID.

ALL PARTIES REQUIRED TO BE SERVED HAVE BEEN SERVED BY PETITIONER.



Jeffrey Lynn Chronister
JEFFREY LYNN CHRONISTER, 189827

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**