



CLERK'S OFFICE
SUPREME COURT
COURT OF APPEALS

South Carolina Appellate Case Management System

C-Track, the browser based CMS for Appellate Courts

Appellate Case No. ...

Cases

Case Search

Participant Search

Disclaimer: The information and documents available here should not be relied upon as an official record of action. Only filed documents can be viewed. Some documents received in a case may not be available for viewing. Some documents originating from a lower court, including records and appendices, may not be available for viewing.

Case Information: 2021-000049

Court:	Supreme Court	Classification:	Appeal - Common Pleas - Crim. Appeal from Summary Ct.
Short Title:	City of Columbia v. Marie Assa'ad Faltas View Full Title	Case Status:	Petition for Rehearing Pending
Consolidated:			
Filed Date:	01/12/2021	Oral Argument Date:	
Disposition Date:	08/31/2022	Disposition Type:	Petition for Extraordinary Writ/Relief Denied
Remittitur Date:			
Lower Court or Tribunal:	Richland (2011CP4002111)		

- Party Information

Appellate Role	Party Name	Former	Attorney(s)
Appellant	Marie Assa'ad Faltas	N	Self Represented
Respondent	City of Columbia	N	Amye Leigh Rushing

Views

Display:

Event Information

Filed Date	Event Information	Doc
10/07/2022	Motion - Extension of Time to file supplemental petition for rehearing and receive documents by email	
09/26/2022	Correspondence - Outgoing (Order Only)	
09/26/2022	Non-Dispositional Decision - Order	
09/15/2022	Rehearing - Petition for Rehearing	
08/31/2022	Correspondence - Outgoing order emailed to counsel and clerk	
08/31/2022	Correspondence - Outgoing (Order Only)	
08/31/2022	Dispositional Decision - Order Dismissing Appeal	
04/11/2022	Motion - Pro Se Motion	
02/16/2022	Motion - Motion to Withdraw Request to Appoint Counsel	
12/16/2021	Correspondence - Incoming requested case file from Richland County	
12/15/2021	Correspondence - Outgoing Letter from the Clerk	
12/13/2021	Non-Dispositional Decision - Order directing the Richland county clerk of court to deliver records	
11/23/2021	Correspondence - Incoming (Pro Se Inquiry)	
10/21/2021	Correspondence - Incoming (Pro Se Inquiry) (Exhibits Uploaded in Appellate Case No. 2021-000047)	
01/12/2021	Notice of Appeal (Criminal) - Initial	

Cassette Audio Envelope

Cassette Audio submitted by Richland county

Lower Court Filings

RECEIVED
OCT 11 2022
S.C. SUPREME COURT

EXHIBIT
No. 20

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, Petitioner,

v.

State of South Carolina, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2021-001344

Lower Court Case No. 2017CP4006831

and,

Petition of Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, Petitioner.

Appellate Case No. 2020-001424

RECEIVED
OCT 11 2022
S.C. SUPREME COURT

ORDER

Petitioner is a prolific frivolous filer. *City of Columbia v. Faltas*, 420 S.C. 28, 800 S.E.2d 782 (2017). In an attempt to control her abusive filings and actions which are disruptive to the orderly and effective administration of justice, this Court has found it necessary to impose restrictions on her ability to represent herself before the courts of this State. The restrictive orders which are currently in effect are an order dated December 23, 2009,¹ an order dated September 27, 2017,² an order dated September 20, 2019 clarifying how the September 27, 2017 applies in post-conviction relief (PCR) actions filed by petitioner,³ and an order dated June 22,

¹ This order was filed in Appellate Case Numbers 2009-147975 and 2009-148266.

² This order was filed in Appellate Case Number 2013-000862.

³ This order was filed in Appellate Case Number 2019-000036.

2022, finding petitioner in criminal contempt for multiple violations of the order of September 27, 2017.⁴

Appellate Case Number 2021-001344.

In this case, the circuit court granted petitioner post-conviction relief, and the State filed a notice of appeal. The case was assigned Appellate Case Number 2019-000708, and the case was transferred to the South Carolina Court of Appeals.

After the Court of Appeals denied petitioner's motion to relieve counsel and proceed *pro se*, petitioner petitioned this Court to:

- (1) Review the Court of Appeals' denial of her motion.
- (2) Grant her a "direct hearing or appointment of counsel to argue against precedent on the issues of unappealability and City's non-sovereignty."
- (3) Allow her to speak "for herself or from an advocate on her behalf, why grants and [Courts of Appeals'] reversals of PCR denials should be unappealable"⁵ and why lawyers who formerly worked for the

⁴ This order was filed in Appellate Case Number 2021-000815.

⁵ This position is completely frivolous. South Carolina Code Ann. § 17-27-100 (2014) states: "A final judgment entered under this chapter may be reviewed by a writ of certiorari as provided by the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules." Rule 243(a) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR), states: "A final decision entered under the Post-Conviction Relief Act shall be reviewed by the Supreme Court upon petition of *either party* for a writ of certiorari, according to the procedure set forth in this Rule." (Emphasis added). Since the State of South Carolina is a party to a post-conviction relief case, it has a right to seek appellate review from a final decision in a PCR case.

Further, when the Court of Appeals reverses an order denying post-conviction relief, the State may seek review from this Court. Rule 242(a), SCACR ("The Supreme Court, or any two (2) justices thereof, may in its discretion, *on motion of any party to the case* or on its own motion, issue a writ of certiorari to review a final decision of the Court of Appeals.") (Emphasis added); *but see Ellison v. State*, 382 S.C. 189, 192, 676 S.E.2d 671, 672 (2009) (holding this Court will not

South Carolina Attorney General's Office "who worked on those very cases as adversaries should not sit as *quasi*-judges (staff counsel) to decide them."

- (4) Lift the restrictions on her ability to represent herself *pro se* in appellate cases.

By order dated December 10, 2021, the Court of Appeals denied the petition for a writ of certiorari filed by the State, and the remittitur was sent to the circuit court on December 31, 2021. Except for the request to lift the restrictions on her ability to represent herself in appellate cases, this action by the Court of Appeals renders moot all other relief sought by the petitioner, and those requests for relief are hereby dismissed as moot.

As to the request to lift the restrictions on her ability to proceed *pro se*, this request is denied for two reasons. First, this *pro se* request is improper under the order of September 17, 2017.

Second, in light of the filings made by petitioner in this case, and her long and continuing history of making frivolous and abusive filings as reflected in the contempt order of June 22, 2022, it would be inappropriate for this Court to lift any of the current restrictions.


Appellate Case Number Appellate Case No. 2020-001424.


In this case, petitioner attempted to file a petition to lift the filing restrictions imposed on her by this Court. After the Clerk of this Court refused to accept this petition for filing, petitioner filed a motion to require the Clerk to accept the petition for filing.


We find that this petition to lift the filing restrictions is a request for relief under Rule 245, SCACR, relating to the original jurisdiction of this Court. Therefore, this *pro se* petition was properly refused for filing under this Court's order dated


entertain a petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals when the Court of Appeals denies a petition for a writ of certiorari in a PCR matter).

December 23, 2009.⁶ Further, even if this petition was properly before this Court, we would deny the petition.



A.C.J.


J.


J.


J.
Beatty, C.J., not participating.

Columbia, South Carolina
August 31, 2022

cc: Jessica M Saxon, Esquire
Michael D. Davidson, Esquire
The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Marie Assa'ad-Faltas

RECEIVED
OCT 11 2022
S.C. SUPREME COURT

⁶ That order states, in relevant part, "we hereby direct the Clerk of this Court to refuse to accept further filings from petitioner in which she seeks an extraordinary writ or to invoke this Court's original jurisdiction unless they are signed and filed by an attorney."

Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' *errata* to transcript of 21 August 2017 hearing before SC Circuit Judge Clifton Newman, as transcribed by SC Official Court Reporter III Bobbi Fisher from audio only

RECEIVED
OCT 07 2022
Page 1

S.C. SUPREME COURT
SHOULD READ

Cases: 2009-CP-40-04483
2009-CP-40-03013
2010-CP-40-07063
2010-CP-40-08650
2011-CP-40-02111
2011-CP-40-03547

PAGE(s)	LINE(s)	READS	SHOULD READ
1	4-6		
1	4-6	Case: 2010-CP-40-07063 2010-CP-40-08650 2011-CP-40-00211	
1	7	Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, M.D.,	Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH
	8	Defendant	Plaintiff in 2009-CP-40-04483 ; Defendant in 2009-CP-40-08013 , 2010-CP-40-07063, 2010-CP-40-08650, 2011-CP-40-00211, and 2011-CP-40-03547
	16	Pro se Defendant	Pro se Plaintiff and Defendant
4	12	(indiscernible)	time
	20	Theresa	Teresa
	24	26	26th
5	1	(indiscernible)	partial transcript
	25	incompetent	in contempt
6	2	four	two
	9	(indiscernible)	Coptic
	17	dealing [verbatim]	delaying
3	14	a Court (indiscernible)	a court's jurisdiction, even to control
9	11	filed	FOIAed
	21	about agreement of record	about the criminal record
10	12	ending	pending
	18	When what	Well, what
11	7-8	even I had appeared.	even after I had appealed.
	19, 20	and throughout the transcript	Mangum Hannah Marion Hanna
12	9	In demand one, I had also appeared	In the meanwhile, I had also appealed
	13	right.	ripe.
	15	ending	pending
13	10	give	gave
	14	Mangum Hannah	Marion Hanna
	20	would	could
	25	(indiscernible)	Pyramids
14	15	amended	remanded
	22	(indiscernible)	Dylann Roof
	23	shots during Saints (ph),	Charleston church saints,
15	18	Neilson's (ph)	Mason's
16	2	case is	cases
	10	hybrid	horrible
17	13	here's	he reversed
13	21-22	fact, they thought it was transferred	fact, before it was transferred
19	10	Judge Hammond	Judge Hanna

25	17	THE WITNESS:	COURT REPORTER:
31	20-21	I would have done appeal.	had failed to file appeal.
32	3	Mr. (indiscernible) file	Mr. Shearouse refused to file
	4	that I (indiscernible) returned	that I tendered it but he returned
	9	give	gave
33	1	Marilyn O'neida (ph) Hanna (ph) and	Marion Oneida Hanna and
	13	(indiscernible) to	on <i>certiorari</i> to
35	1	Not all my fault.	Not at all my fault.
	17	was unconstitutional	was not unconstitutional
	20	Judge (indiscernible) who	Judge Childs, who
36	10	have gun and force me to	have gone and falsely to
	19	forth charges	false charges
38	20	oppressed.	oppressive.
	21	(indiscernible). I give	untimely. I gave
	23	(indiscernible) in PCR.	equitable tolling in PCR.
39	7	They state, for four years	They stayed for four years
	9, 11	15 years	50 years
	10	the judge has the (indiscernible)	the Judge Hayes the uncle
40	2	(indiscernible)?	to the worst serial murderer?
43	6	believe	bring
45	15	Magnum Hanna (ph),	Marion Hanna,
46	7-8	a (indiscernible) of	<i>a fortiori</i> from

BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT ("S Ct") OF SOUTH CAROLINA ("SC")

City of Columbia

Plaintiff/ Respondent,

Number 2021-000049

v.

From Richland County 2011CP4002111


Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH **Defendant/Appellant.**

DEFENDANT/APPELLANT'S *TIMELY* PROVISIONAL SUPPLEMENT TO HER PETITION TO REHEAR THE 31 AUGUST 2022 ORDER AND FOR MISCELLANEOUS *OTHER* RELIEF

The majesty of the law is not the tyranny of the robe. Kings act "of their own volition." U.S. judges may act only on cases or controversies. The "judicial power" in *the republican form of government* guaranteed to every state by the U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 4, does not extend beyond the power to decide cases or controversies between/among parties who voluntarily submitted to, or were properly brought within, a court's jurisdiction. **This Court is neither final nor infallible. And the right to speak for oneself derives from a source even higher than the Constitution.**

FOR THE ADDITIONAL REASONS in the contemporaneously filed *provisional* supplement in SC Appellate Case 2021-000047, which is fully incorporated herein by reference along with all the attachments and exhibits thereto and incorporated therein, the 31 August 2022 dismissal of this appeal should be reheard and reversed; and plenary *pro se* briefing and oral arguments should be allowed.

Sincerely submitted on 11 October 2022.



s/ Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH, Defendant/Appellant pro se
Post Office Box 9115, Columbia, South Carolina 29090
Phone (803) 783-4536; e-mail Marie_Faltas@hotmail.com

Certificate of Service Satisfying the *Substance* of Form 7 and of all Relevant Rules, SCACR

On 11 October 2022, I served Ms. Amye Rushing and Mr. Marshall James, Counsel for the City of Columbia and sole opposing counsel in this case, with a true and complete copy of this document **by personally hand-delivering a paper copy of it** to the location of the City of Columbia's Legal Department's office on Washington and Main Streets, Columbia, SC 29201, and there and then hand-delivering it to a person long known to me to be approved and entrusted to deliver it to Ms. Rushing and Mr. Marshall, all with an additional copy served by e-mail, **solely as a courtesy**, all God so willing.

s/Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH, Defendant/Appellant/Movant and here server pro se
P.O. Box 9115, Columbia, SC 29209
Phone: (803) 783-4536 Cell: (330) 232-4164
e-mail: Marie_Faltas@hotmail.com and MarieAssaadFaltas@GMail.com

RECEIVED
OCT 11 2022
S.C. SUPREME COURT