

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals**

Shedrick A. Savage, Petitioner,

v.

State of South Carolina, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2021-001556

Appeal From Spartanburg County
H. Steven DeBerry, IV, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2024-UP-050
Submitted January 1, 2024 – Filed February 7, 2024

APPEAL DISMISSED

Appellate Defender Lara Mary Caudy, of Columbia, for
Petitioner.

Senior Assistant Attorney General Mark Reynolds
Farthing and Assistant Attorney General Suzanne J.
Shaw, both of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Petitioner seeks a writ of certiorari from an order of the circuit court denying his application for post-conviction relief (PCR) but finding he was

entitled to a belated review of his direct appeal issue pursuant to *White v. State*, 263 S.C. 110, 208 S.E.2d 35 (1974).

Because there is sufficient evidence to support the PCR court's finding that Petitioner did not voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waive his right to a direct appeal, we grant certiorari on Petitioner's Question 1 and proceed with a review of the direct appeal issue pursuant to *Davis v. State*, 288 S.C. 290, 342 S.E.2d 60 (1986). We deny certiorari on Petitioner's remaining Question.¹

After careful review of Petitioner's brief and the record pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), we dismiss Petitioner's direct appeal. Counsel's motion to be relieved is granted.

APPEAL DISMISSED.²

WILLIAMS, C.J., and HEWITT and VERDIN, JJ., concur.

¹ Petitioner's pro se *Anders* brief also raised an additional PCR issue. While we have carefully reviewed the *Anders* issue Petitioner raised concerning his direct appeal, we have not considered his arguments regarding the PCR question. *See Miller v. State*, 388 S.C. 347, 347, 697 S.E.2d 527, 527 (2010) ("Since there is no right to 'hybrid representation' that is partially *pro se* and partially by counsel, substantive documents, with the exception of motions to relieve counsel, filed *pro se* by a person represented by counsel are not to be accepted unless submitted by counsel.").

² We decide this case without argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.