

**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 Supreme Court**

The State, Petitioner,

v.

Henry Haygood, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2014-001985

---

**ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS**

---

Appeal From Orangeburg County  
The Honorable Edgar W. Dickson, Circuit Court Judge

---

Memorandum Opinion No. 2015-MO-005  
Submitted February 3, 2015 – Filed February 11, 2015

---

**AFFIRMED IN PART, VACATED IN PART, AND  
REMANDED**

---

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant  
Attorney General John Croom Colvin Hunter, both of  
Columbia, for Petitioner.

Breen Richard Stevens, of Orangeburg, for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** The State seeks a writ of certiorari to review the Court of Appeals' opinion in *State v. Haygood*, 409 S.C. 420, 762 S.E.2d 69 (2014). We grant the petition, dispense with further briefing, affirm the Court of Appeals' opinion in part, vacate in part, and remand for a new trial.

The Court of Appeals found the circuit court erred in finding the testimonial statements made by the victim to the police did not violate the Confrontation Clause of the Sixth Amendment because the statements fell within the excited utterance exception to hearsay. *See Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36, 68 (2004) ("Where nontestimonial hearsay is at issue, it is wholly consistent with the Framers' design to afford the States flexibility in their development of hearsay law . . . . Where testimonial evidence is at issue, however, the Sixth Amendment demands what the common law required: unavailability and a prior opportunity for cross-examination.").

The Court of Appeals also found the admission of the victim's statement in this case violated the Confrontation Clause because the victim's statements were testimonial, there was no evidence the victim was unavailable to testify, and there was no evidence respondent had the opportunity to cross-examine the victim. We find the Court of Appeals erred in addressing whether the facts of this case demonstrated respondent's rights under the Confrontation Clause were violated because the record before the court lacked the facts necessary to make such a determination. For unexplained reasons, the recording of the proceeding before the magistrate's court was unavailable, and the only facts available to the Court of Appeals were from the magistrate's summary of the responding officer's testimony during the State's case-in-chief. We find the information contained in the magistrate's summary is insufficient to conduct a Confrontation Clause analysis, especially where the magistrate did not hold a hearing to determine whether the officer's testimony would violate the Confrontation Clause.

Therefore, we vacate the Court of Appeals' opinion to the extent it addresses whether the victim's statement violated the Confrontation Clause. We remand for a new trial in accordance with this Court's opinion.

**AFFIRMED IN PART, VACATED IN PART, AND REMANDED**

**TOAL, C.J., PLEICONES, BEATTY, KITTREDGE, and HEARN, JJ.,  
concur.**