

RECEIVED

Mar 01 2023

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT  
Certiorari to Aiken County  
Honorable Jennifer B. McCoy, Circuit Court Judge

WILLIE A. SEAWRIGHT;

PETITIONER

RECEIVED

MAR 01 2023

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA;

RESPONDENT

SC SUPREME COURT

APPELLATE CASE NO 2021-001087

PETITIONER'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR  
A VACATION OF SENTENCE PURSUANT TO RULE 60(b)  
(3)(4)(5) SOUTH CAROLINA RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURES

TO: RESPONDENT; NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE UNDERSIGNED PETITIONER  
WILL MOVE BEFORE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT  
JUDGE PRESIDING OVER THIS CASE; FOR A JUDGMENT-ORDER VACATING THE  
PETITIONER'S SENTENCE PURSUANT TO RULE 60(b)(3)(4)(5) S.C.R.C.P. BY  
THIS HONORABLE COURT, AT SUCH TIME AND PLACE AS SET BY THE COURT  
OF WHICH YOU THE RESPONDENT WILL BE NOTIFIED; UNLESS, OTHERWISE  
SPECIFIED.

PETITIONER SUPPORTS THIS MOTION WITH HIS MEMORANDUM OF LAW AND  
EXHIBITS ATTACHED...

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED  
S/ Willie Seawright

MR WILLIE A. SEAWRIGHT # 377348

EVANS-CORR-INST

\* 610 HWY \* 9 WEST

BENNETTSVILLE, SC # 29513

DATE: 2 : 28<sup>th</sup> : 2023, AD

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES . . . . .	ii
MEMORANDUM OF LAW . . . . .	1
PROCEDURAL HISTORY . . . . .	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE . . . . .	2
STANDARD OF REVIEW . . . . .	2
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS . . . . .	2
ARGUMENT	
The Trial Court Lacked Subject Matter Jurisdiction And personal jurisdiction to accept the petitioner's Guilty plea; Based on an unlawful void indictment; Invalid proceedings; - and fraud upon the court By the state . . . . .	3
CONCLUSION . . . . .	9
RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT . . . . .	9

**RECEIVED**

MAR 01 2023

SC SUPREME COURT

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

**CASES**

ANDERSON V. STATE, 338 S.C. 629; 527 S.E.2d 398 (Ct. App 2000) . . . . . 4

BELL HALL PLANTATION HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION INC. . . . . .

V. MURRAY, 419 S.C. 605; 617 S.E.2d 310; 316 (Ct. App 2017) . . . . . 7

BODMAN V. STATE, 403 S.C. 60; 792 S.E.2d 363 (2013) . . . . . 6

CALHOUN V. CALHOUN, 399 S.C. 96; 529 S.E.2d 14 (2000) . . . . . 5

COLLINS V. DOE, 352 S.C. 462; 574 S.E.2d 739 (2002) . . . . . 6

DOVE V. GOLDKIST INC, 314 S.C. 235; 442 S.E.2d 598 (S.C. 1994) . . . . . 5

GIGLIO V. U.S., 405 U.S. 150; 153; 92 S.Ct. 763; 31 L.Ed.2d 164 (1972) . . . . . 7

HAMILTON V. MEOTTER, 772 F.2d 171; 283 (5<sup>TH</sup> Cir. 1985) . . . . . 9

HAZEL-ATLAS GLASS CO. V. HARTFORD EMPIRE CO., 640 Ct. 997-1001 (1994) . . . . . 8

INNOVATIVE WASTE MGMT INC. V. CAEST ENERGY PARTNERS GP LLC  
423 S.C. 611; 615; 815 S.E.2d 780-782 (Ct. App 2018) . . . . . 5

JOHNSTON V. S. CAROLINA DEPT. OF LABOR, LICENSING AND REGULATION  
S. CAROLINA REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS Bd., 365 S.C. 293; 617 S.E.2d 363 (2005) . . . . . 5

KATZBURG V. KATZBURG, 410 S.C. 184; 764 S.E.2d 3 (Ct. App 2014) . . . . . 4

KOSCIUSKO V. PARHAM, 428 S.C. 481; 836 S.E.2d 362 (2017) . . . . . 5

RIDDLE V. OZMINT, 369 S.C. 39; 47; 48; 631 S.E.2d 70 (2006) . . . . . 7

SANDERS V. SMITH, 431 S.C. 605; 848 S.E.2d 604 (2020) . . . . . 7

S. CAROLINA DEPT. OF SOCIAL SERVICES V. TRAN, 428 S.C. 308;  
792 S.E.2d 254 (S.Ct. App. 2016) . . . . . 5

STATE V. COTTINGHAM, 234 S.C. 181; 77 S.E.2d 877 (S.C. 1953) . . . . . 6

<u>STATE V. GENTRY</u> , 363 S.C. 93; 610 S.E.2d 494 (2005) . . . . .	2
<u>STATE V. MOORE</u> ; 255 S.E.2d 496 (1979) . . . . .	6
<u>STATE V. RAYFIELD</u> ; 369 S.C. 106-631 S.E.2d 244 (2006) . . . . .	9
<u>STATE V. GRIM</u> ; 341 S.C. 63; 533 S.E.2d 329 (S.C.2000) . . . . .	4
<u>UNIVERSAL BENEFITS INC V. MCKINNEY</u> ; 349 S.C. 179, 183, 561 S.E.2d 654; 661 (Ct. App 2002) . . . . .	7
<u>WARE V. WARE</u> ; 404 S.C. 1-17-743 S.E.2d 827; 822 (2013) . . . . .	5
<u>WASHINGTON V. STATE</u> 374 S.C. 232; 478 S.E.2d 853 (1996) . . . . .	7
<u>WEAVER V RECREATION DISTRICT</u> ; 431 S.C. 357; 848 S.E.2d 760 (2020) . . . . .	6

**RULES**

RULE 60(b)(3)(4)(5) S.C.R.C.Rimp . . . . .	1;7
RULE 3(c) S.C.R.C.Rimp . . . . .	7
RULE 37 S.C.R.C.Rimp . . . . .	8

**STATUTES**

S.C. CODE § 14-5-630 . . . . .	a; 3, 4, 6
S.C. CODE § 14-9-210 . . . . .	a; 3, 4, 6
S.C. CODE § 16-9-10(A)(2) . . . . .	8

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

CERTIORARI TO Aiken County  
Honorable Jennifer B. McCoy, Circuit Court Judge

WILLIE A. SEAWRIGHT,

PETITIONER Appellate Case No. 2021-003087

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA;

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

RESPONDENT

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The petitioner is presently confined in the South Carolina Dept. of Corrections pursuant to orders of commitment from the Aiken Co. Clerk of Court on June 11, 2018. An Aiken Co. Grand Jury indicted petitioner for failure to stop for a blue light resulting in death (2018-GS-001273), and possession of stolen vehicle (2018-GS-001434) on August 20, 2018. Petitioner pled guilty to failure to stop for a blue light resulting in death, and possession of a stolen vehicle before the Honorable William P. Keesley, App. 1 Victor Li represented petitioner and Sam Grimes, Assistant Solicitor, represented the State. App. 1 Judge Keesley sentenced petitioner to concurrent terms of twenty-five years for failure to stop for blue light resulting in death and thirty days for possession of a stolen vehicle. App. 1.

RECEIVED

MAR 01 2023

SC SUPREME COURT

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The petitioner's conviction is not based upon a lawfully and sworn to indictment which is tantamount to aggravated kidnapping and is a bar to all prosecution in accordance to the South Carolina Constitution - U.S. Constitution; South Carolina Code of Laws; and South Carolina Rules of Court.

## STANDARD OF REVIEW

The matter presented below for review is not a challenge to the court's general grant of authority to hear and determine cases. That authority is rightfully granted by our Constitution STATE V. GENTRY, 363 S.C. 93, 620 S.E.2d 494 (2005); and will not be at issue here. Instead the petitioner contends that the Court of General Sessions for Aiken County failed to comply with statutory law jurisdictional in nature; specifying the manner and means for lawful return of true-billed indictments.

## STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

The statutory provisions at issue here are contained in Section's § 14-9-210; and § 14-5-630, and provides in pertinent part that: The County solicitor shall prepare and through the presiding judge of the Court of General Sessions submit to the Grand Jury while

In attendance upon the Court of General Sessions Bills of Indictment in all cases pending in the County Court in which the punishment may exceed a fine of one hundred dollars or imprisonment for thirty days; when such cases have not been previously acted on by the Grand Jury. The Grand Jury shall act thereon, and shall report its action to the presiding judge of the Court of General Sessions; and said judge shall direct the Court of General Sessions to report the same to the presiding judge of the County during its next ensuing term...

Section § 14-9-210

§ 14-5-630 (1) Aiken County. The Court of General Sessions for Aiken County shall be held at Aiken on the second Monday in January for two weeks; the first Monday in May for three weeks; and the first Monday in October for two weeks...

### ARGUMENT

The Trial Court Lacked subject Matter jurisdiction and personal jurisdiction to accept the petitioner's Guilty plea; Based on an unlawful - void Indictment; Invalid proceedings; and fraud upon the Court by the State.

The petitioner's evidence establishes that the State unlawfully impaneled its Grand Jury outside the jurisdiction of the Court of General Sessions for Aiken County; and then willfully printed and published false information in its Indictment to keep secret its violation of Statutory Law.

In this case Indictments for Failure to Stop for Blue Light Resulting in Death (2018-GS-0201223), possession of Stolen Vehicle (2018-GS-020-1434) True-Billed Indictment prints that: At a Court of General Sessions, Convened on June 11, 2018. The Grand Jurors of Aiken County present upon their oath; however; the date of True-Bill is June 7, 2018<sup>1</sup>  
SEE: Exhibit-A. Attached

The petitioner's evidence clearly establishes that there was no term of Court for the Aiken County Court of General Sessions on June 7, 2018; or June 11, 2018; for any Grand Jury to convene on.  
SEE: Exhibit-B- (2018 Terms of Gen. Court Calendar) Attached

Therefore, because of the fact, the petitioner was indicted outside the terms of Court of General Sessions for Aiken County strictly against mandatory law under sections: § 14-9-210 and § 14-5-630 (a) the trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction to accept the petitioner's guilty plea, and its judgment is void.  
SEE: KATZBURG V. KATZBURG, 410 S.C. 184, 764 S.E.2d 3 (Ct. App. 2017)

("A judgment of a court without subject matter jurisdiction is void and constitutes grounds for the court to vacate the judgment.")

("A void judgment is one that from its inception is a complete nullity and is without legal effect.")

STATE V. GRIM, 341 S.C. 63, 533 S.E.2d 329 (S.C. 2000) ("The circuit court does not have subject matter jurisdiction to hear a guilty plea unless the defendant has been indicted by a grand jury")

1. This creates an issue warranting a hearing on the matter of subject matter jurisdiction. SEE: ANDERSON V. STATE, 338 S.C. 629, 527 S.E.2d 398 (Ct. App. 2000)  
("Remand was required for hearing to determine whether court that tried defendant for murder was vested with subject matter jurisdiction.")

INNOVATIVE WASTE MGMT INC v. CREST ENERGY PARTNERS Cpllc,  
423 S.C. 621, 625; 825 S.E.2d 780-782 (Ct. App 2018) ("A Court Has No Jurisdiction  
To perpetuate A Void Judgment.")

WARE v. WARE, 404 S.C. 1-17; 793 S.E.2d 817; 822 (2013) ("A Judgment Is  
Void If A Court Acts Without Jurisdiction.")

KOSCIUSKO v. PARHAM, 428 S.C. 481; 836 S.E.2d 362 (2019) ("A Judgment of  
A Court Without Subject Matter Jurisdiction Is Void.")

S.C. DEPT. OF SOCIAL SERVICES v. TRAN, 428 S.C. 308; 792 S.E.2d 254 (S.Ct. App  
2016) ("A Judgment of A Court Without Subject Matter Jurisdiction  
Is Void.")

DOVE v. GOLDKIST INC, 314 S.C. 235-442 S.E.2d 598 (S.C. 1994) ("Court  
Lacking Subject Matter Jurisdiction Has No Authority To Act Regardless  
Of Geographical Location or Consent of Litigants.")

### PENAL CODES (STATUTES §)

Criminal Statutes Must Be Strictly Construed Against The State. STATE v. MIDDLETON, 367 S.C. 529, 626 S.E.2d 174 (App 2006). The Term "Shall" In A Statute Means That The Action Is Mandatory. SEE: JOHNSTON v. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF LABOR, LICENSING AND REGULATION, SOUTH CAROLINA REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS BD, 365 S.C. 243; 617 S.E.2d 363 (2005). CALHOUN v. CALHOUN, 399 S.C. 76, 529 S.E.2d 14 (2000) ("The Use of The Word 'Shall' In A Statutory Provision Indicates The Provision Is Mandatory."); and where a Statute's Language Is plain and unambiguous and conveys a clear and definite meaning; there is no occasion for employing rules of statutory interpretation and the Court has no right to look for or impose another meaning.

Collins v. Doe, 352 S.C. 462, 574 S.E.2d 739 (2002). And a judgment by a court in a criminal case must conform strictly to the statute, and any variation from its provisions renders the judgment void. SEE: STATE v. MOORE, 255 S.E.2d 448 (S.C. 1979). And w/ Local Rule of Court, Administrative order, policy or other procedure can take precedent over statutory law, which is always controlling. SEE: STATE v. COTTINGHAM, 224 S.C. 181, 77 S.E.2d 899 (S.C. 1953)

Accordingly, sections § 14-9-210 - § 14-5-630 requires strict compliance with its provisions; and mandates that the grand jury must be impaneled under the jurisdiction of the court of general sessions before lawful return of a true-billed indictment can take place.

### CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

All statutes are presumed constitutional and will if possible be construed so to render them valid. Weaver v. Recreation District, 431 S.C. 357, 848 S.E.2d 760 (2020) and the Supreme Court is reluctant to declare a statute unconstitutional; hence it will make every presumption in favor of finding the statute constitutional. Bodman v. State, 403 S.C. 60, 792 S.E.2d 363 (2013)

### FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY THE PROSECUTION (PERJURY)

Fraud upon the court is a narrow and invidious species of fraud that subverts the integrity of the court itself, or is a fraud perpetrated by officers of the court so that the judicial machinery cannot perform in the usual manner its impartial task of adjudging cases that are presented for adjudication. Sanders v. Smith, 431 S.C. 605, 848 S.E.2d 604 (2020)

AS OUR SUPREME COURT CITED IN RIDDLE V. OZMENT, 369 S.C. 39, 77, 78, 632 S.E.2d 70 (2006)

" A PROSECUTOR'S DELIBERATE DECEPTION OF A COURT AND JURORS BY THE PRESENTATION OF KNOWN FALSE EVIDENCE IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH RUDIMENTARY DEMANDS OF JUSTICE."

CITING SIGLER V. U.S., 705 U.S. 250, 253, 72 S.Ct. 763, 31 L.Ed.2d 164 (1972)

AND THE FAILURE TO CORRECT FALSE EVIDENCE IS AS REPREHENSIBLE AS ITS PRESENTATION. WASHINGTON V. STATE, 324 S.C. 232, 478 S.E.2d 833 (1976)

RULE 60(b)(4) S.C.R.C.V.P. PROVIDES THE COURT MAY RELIEVE A PARTY ... FROM A FINAL JUDGMENT, ORDER OR PROCEEDING IF SUCH JUDGMENT "IS VOID" THE DEFINITION OF VOID UNDER THE RULE ONLY ENCOMPASSES JUDGMENTS FROM COURTS WHICH FAILED TO PROVIDE PROPER DUE PROCESS; OR JUDGMENTS FROM COURTS WHICH LACKED SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OR PERSONAL JURISDICTION. SANDERS V. SMITH, 431 S.C. 605, 848 S.E.2d 604 (2020); SEE ALSO: BELL HALL PLANTATION HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION INC. V. MURRAY, 419 S.C. 605, 617, 799 S.E.2d 310, 316 (Ct.App 2017) (QUOTING UNIVERSAL BENEFITS INC. V. MCKINNEY, 349 S.C. 179, 183, 561 S.E.2d 659,

661 (Ct.App 2008). AND THIS RULE DOES NOT LIMIT THE POWER OF A COURT TO ENTERTAIN AN INDEPENDENT ACTION TO RELIEVE A PARTY FROM A JUDGMENT, ORDER, OR PROCEEDING; OR TO SET ASIDE A JUDGMENT FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT. RULE 60(b)(3)(5) S.C.R.C.V.P.

RULE 3(C) S.C.R.C.R.P. REQUIRES SOLICITORS TO FILE INDICTMENTS WITH THE CLERK OF COURT, YET AS EVIDENT HERE THE RECORD IS DEVOID OF INDICTMENT NOS (2018-GS-0201493); FAILURE TO STOP FOR BLUE LIGHT RESULTING IN DEATH, (2018-GS-0201434); POSSESSION OF STOLEN VEHICLE EVER BEING ON

RECORD Filings with THE Aiken County CLERK of COURT. RULE 37 S.C.R.  
CrimP Mandates; THESE RULES shall apply TO EVERY TRIAL COURT of  
CRIMINAL JURISDICTION WITHIN THIS STATE (ADOPTED EFFECTIVE SEPTE-  
MBER 1, 1988) S. CAROLINA COURT RULES 37 @ pp 256-2010 edition.

SEE: Exhibit: E (October 23, 2002 ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA RE: FILING INDICTMENTS WITH THE CLERK OF COURT) ATTACHED

## IN CLOSING

Tampering with THE ADMINISTRATION of JUSTICE IN THE MANNER  
UNDISPUTEDLY SHOWN HERE INVOLVES FAR MORE THAN INJURY TO THE  
PETITIONER (WILLIE A. SEAWRIGHT JR.) IT IS A WRONG AGAINST THE  
INSTITUTION SET UP TO PROTECT AND SAFEGUARD THE PUBLIC INSTITU-  
TION IN WHICH FRAUD CANNOT COMPLACENTLY BE TOLERATED CONSISTENTLY  
WITH THE GOOD ORDER OF SOCIETY. SURELY IT CANNOT BE THAT PRESERVATION  
OF THE INTEGRITY OF THE JUDICIAL PROCESS MUST ALWAYS WAIT UPON THE  
DILIGENCE OF LITIGANTS; THE PUBLIC WELFARE DEMANDS THAT THE AGENCIES  
OF PUBLIC JUSTICE BE NOT SO IMPOTENT THAT THEY MUST ALWAYS BE MUTE  
AND HELPLESS VICTIMS OF DECEPTION AND FRAUD. HAZEL-ATLAS GLASS CO. V  
HARTFORD EMPIRE CO, 69 S. CT. 997; 1001 (1994).

ACCORDINGLY FRAUD ON THE COURT IS MISCONDUCT BY AN OFFICER OF THE COURT  
THAT IS DIRECTED AT THE JUDICIAL MACHINERY ITSELF. SEE: SECTION  
§ 16-9-10 (A)(2)

"IT IS UNLAWFUL FOR A PERSON TO WILLFULLY  
GIVE FALSE MISLEADING; OR INCOMPLETE IN-  
FORMATION ON A DOCUMENT; RECORD, REPORT; OR  
FORM REQUIRED BY THE LAWS OF THIS STATE."  
S. CAR. CODE OF LAW § 16-9-10 (A)(2) PERJURY AND SUBORDINATION OF PERJURY

RECEIVED

MAR 01 2023

SEE: THE PETITIONER'S TRUE-BILLED INDICTMENTS ATTACHED TO EXHIBIT A  
THUS, FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY THE PROSECUTION/RESPONDENT IS CLEARLY EVIDENT HERE:

CONCLUSION

BECAUSE THE PETITIONER WILLIE A. SEAWRIGHT GUILTY PLEA, SENTENCE WAS NOT BASED ON A LAWFULLY AND SWORN TO INDICTMENT, HIS INCARCERATION IS ILLEGAL AND IS TANTAMOUNT TO AGGRAVATED KIDNAPPING AND IS A BAR TO ALL PROSECUTION IN ACCORDANCE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF OUR UNITED STATES! HAMILTON V. MCCOTTER, 772 F.2d 173, 183 (5TH Cir. 1985)

RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT

THAT THE PETITIONER'S SENTENCE BE VACATED, WARRANTING HIS IMMEDIATE RELEASE FROM HIS ILLEGAL INCARCERATION WITHIN THE RESPONDENT'S CORRECTIONAL-PENAL INSTITUTION... RESPECTIVELY...

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED  
WILLIE SEAWRIGHT

I SWEAR UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE-ACCURATE & CORRECT & THAT EACH EXHIBIT ATTACHED HERETO THIS MOTION IS GENUINE-AUTHENTIC!  
SWORN TO BEFORE ME ON THIS 22 DAY OF February 2023, AD.  
NOTARY PUBLIC FOR SOUTH CAROLINA: Sascha Outlaw  
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 2/17/24

2. SEE: STATE V. RAYFIELD; 369 S.C. 106; 631 S.E.2d 244 (2006) ("IT IS THE SOLICITOR'S DUTY TO SEE THAT JUSTICE IS DONE; HE MUST SEE THAT NO CONVICTION TAKES PLACE EXCEPT IN STRICT CONFORMITY WITH THE LAW; AND THAT THE ACCUSED IS NOT DEPRIVED OF ANY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OR PRIVILEGES") @ 109 ("A SOLICITOR IS AN OFFICER OF THE COURT; WHO REPRESENTS ALL THE PEOPLE, INCLUDING THE ACCUSED.")

*Exhibit A*

**WITNESSES**

**DOCKET NO. 2018GS0201273**

Salley Police Department

**The State of South Carolina**

J E Goldman

**County of Aiken**

Law Enforcement Case #: 17-0051

SBG

**COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS**

**ARREST WARRANT NUMBER**

**JUNE TERM 2018**

2017A0211100021

FILED June 7 2018

*Robert J. White*  
C.C.P. & G.S.

**THE STATE**

**vs.**

*Ann Sanders*  
Deputy Clerk

**WILLIE ALBERT SEAWRIGHT JR**

**ACTION OF GRAND JURY**

*True B:11*

*[Signature]*

Foreperson of Grand Jury  
Date: June 7, 2018

**CDR #: 2398**

**Indictment for**

**FAILURE TO STOP FOR BLUE LIGHT  
RESULTING IN DEATH**

§ 56-05-0750(C)(2)

**J. STROM THURMOND, SOLICITOR**

**VERDICT**

Foreperson of Petit Jury  
Date:

RECEIVED  
MAR 01 2023  
SC SUPREME COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF AIKEN )  
 )

INDICTMENT FOR  
FAILURE TO STOP FOR BLUE LIGHT  
RESULTING IN DEATH

§ 56-05-0750(C)(2)

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on June 11, 2018, the Grand Jurors of Aiken County present upon their oath:

That **WILLIE ALBERT SEAWRIGHT JR**, did in Aiken County, on or about January 13, 2017, in the absence of mitigating circumstances, wilfully and unlawfully fail to stop while driving a motor vehicle on a road, street or highway of the state for a law enforcement vehicle after being signaled to do so by means of a flashing light and/or siren, and the road conditions were such that a reasonable driver could hear and/or see the signals, and did cause the death of one Ny'zarria Kitchings as a result of said failure to stop, all in violation of Section 56-5-750(C)(2), *Code of Laws of South Carolina*, (1976) as amended.

RECEIVED

MAR 01 2023

SC SUPREME COURT

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

  
J. STROM THURMOND, SOLICITOR

**WITNESSES**

Salley Police Department

J E Goldman

Law Enforcement Case #: 17-0051

**DOCKET NO. 2018GS0201434**

**The State of South Carolina**

**County of Aiken**

SBG

**COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS**

**ARREST WARRANT NUMBER**

**JUNE TERM 2018**

**2017A0211100020**

FILED June 7 2018

*Robert J. White*  
C.C.P. & G.S.

*Ann Sanders*  
Deputy Clerk *ad*

**THE STATE**

**vs.**

**WILLIE ALBERT SEAWRIGHT JR**

**ACTION OF GRAND JURY**

*True Bill*

**CDR #: 3466**

**Indictment for**

**POSSESSION OF STOLEN VEHICLE**

**§ 16-21-80**

**J. STROM THURMOND, SOLICITOR**

*[Signature]*  
Foreperson of Grand Jury  
Date: June 7, 2018

**VERDICT**

Foreperson of Petit Jury  
Date:

SC SUPREME COURT

MAR 01 2023

RECEIVED

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF AIKEN )  
 )

INDICTMENT FOR  
POSSESSION OF STOLEN VEHICLE  
§ 16-21-80

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on June 11, 2018, the Grand Jurors of Aiken County present upon their oath:

That **WILLIE ALBERT SEAWRIGHT JR** did in Aiken County on or about January 13, 2017, knowingly and unlawfully have in his possession a stolen vehicle which he was not entitled to possess, to wit: 1999 Toyota Camry Solara valued at less than Two Thousand Dollars and belonging to Tiffany Johnson. All in violation of §16-21-80 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina (1976), as amended.

RECEIVED  
MAR 01 2023  
SC SUPREME COURT

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. STROM THURMOND, SOLICITOR

*Exhibit B*

Terms of Circuit and Family Court  
June 2018

SC SUPREME COURT

Circuit Number	6/4/2018	6/11/2018	6/18/2018	6/25/2018
<u>2</u>	Common Pleas/Common Pleas Nonjury Aiken Early, Doyet  SIGWALD 4, 5 NO CR NEEDED 6, 7, 8  Common Pleas/Common Pleas Nonjury Barnwell Keesley, William  KELLY 4, 5 NO CR NEEDED 6, 7, 8	Common Pleas Non-Jury Early, Doyet  SIGWALD 11 NO CR NEEDED 12 SIGWALD 13, 14 NO CR NEEDED 15  General Sessions Aiken Keesley, William  NEVERS  General Sessions Non-Jury 13 Early, Doyet  SIGWALD 13	General Sessions Bamberg Early, Doyet  SIGWALD 18, 19, 20 NORTON 21 NO CR NEEDED 22  Common Pleas/Common Pleas Nonjury Aiken Dickson, Edgar  NO CR NEEDED 18 MOFFITT 19 NO CR NEEDED 20 NEVERS 21	General Sessions Aiken Early, Doyet  SIGWALD  Common Pleas/Common Pleas Nonjury Bamberg Curtis, Kristi  NO CR NEEDED  Common Pleas Non-Jury 26, 27, 28 Early, Doyet  SIGWALD 26, 27, 28
	Family Court Aiken Ballenger, Karen F.  HAYES 4, 5, 6, 7 NEVERS 8	Family Court Bamberg / Barnwell Gable, Dale Moore  HAYES 11, 12, 13, 14 NO CR NEEDED 15  Family Court Aiken Snelgrove, Vicki J.  JOHNSON	Family Court Aiken Gable, Dale Moore  HAYES  Family Court Aiken Snelgrove, Vicki J.  JOHNSON	Administrative Week Gable, Dale Moore  Family Court Barnwell Pogue, Timothy H.  HAYES  Family Court Aiken Snelgrove, Vicki J.  CENDROSKI 25 JOHNSON 26, 27, 28, 29 am

*Exhibit E*

# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

RE. Filing Indictments With the Clerk of Court

ORDER

Rule 3(c), SCRCmP, requires solicitors to file indictments with the Clerk of Court. In some counties, solicitors are retaining the original indictments which have been returned by the grand jury until the proceedings are concluded. This local practice leads to problems and confusion in some cases. Accordingly, effective the date of this order, all original indictments which have been returned by the grand jury shall immediately be filed with the Clerk of Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED

Jean Hofer Toal  
Jean Hofer Toal, Chief Justice

Columbia, South Carolina  
October 23, 2002

**RECEIVED**

**MAR 01 2023**

**SC SUPREME COURT**

<http://www.sccourts.org/court/Orders/disorder/interim/orderNo2002102301>

*Not on record w/out clerk*

*1-11-11 amend. due process - state*


*Field use of process*

MR WILLIE A. SEAWORTH #377348

E Vans - CORR INST. F#3B-#143;

# 610 Hwy #9 WEST

BEWLETTSVILLE SC #29512



SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

CLERKS OFFICE

#1231 GEVAIS ST


Box #11330,

COLUMBIA, S.C. #29211,

RECEIVED

MAR 01 2023

SC SUPREME COURT



RECEIVED

MAR 01 2023

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

SC SUPREME COURT

IN THE SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

CERTIORARI TO Aiken County

Mar 01 2023

Honorable JENNIFER B. MCCOY, Circuit Court Judge

SC Court of Appeals

WILLIE A. SEAWRIGHT,

PETITIONER.

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2021-001007

✓

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RESPONDENT

NOTARIZED CERTIFICATE OF PROOF OF SERVICE

THE PETITIONER WILLIE A. SEAWRIGHT, #377348, HEREBY CERTIFY A TRUE COPY OF THE PETITIONER'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR A VACATION OF SENTENCE PURSUANT TO RULE 60(b)(3)(4)(5), AND MEMORANDUM OF LAW, AND SUPPORTING EXHIBITS - A - B - E - IN THE ABOVE REFERENCED CASE HAVE BEEN SERVED UPON MICHAEL J. NEUBAUER, ESQUIRE AT P.O. BOX #11544-COL2, SC# 29211, -#1544, THIS 24 DAY OF Feb 2023, BY VIA UNITED STATES MAIL  
S/Willie Seawright

SWORN TO BEFORE ME ON THIS

24 DAY OF Feb 2023, AD.

NOTARY PUBLIC FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Susan [Signature]

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES:

2/17/24

From:

MR WILLIE A. SEAWRIGHT; #377348;  
EVANS - CORR-INST  
# 610 HWY #9 WEST,  
BENNETTSVILLE; S.C #29512,

RECEIVED

Mar 01 2023

SC Court of Appeals

FEBRUARY 22<sup>nd</sup> 2023, AD

TO: HONORABLE ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~, CLERK OF COURT  
SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT,  
# 1331 GEVAIS ST.,  
BOX # 11330.  
COLUMBIA, S.C #29211;

RE: SEAWRIGHT v. STATE, APPELLATE CASE NO. 2021-001007

Dear ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ CLERK OF COURT

- PLEASE find Enclosed a copy of the petitioner WILLIE A SEAWRIGHT JR.
- 1: NOTICE of Motion; and Motion for a Vacation of SENTENCE  
Pursuant to Rule 60(b)(3)(4)(5) S.C.R. CIV/P;
  - 2: MEMORANDUM of LAW;
  - 3: Supporting exhibits A-B-E;
  - 4: ~~NOTARIZED~~ CERTIFICATE of PROOF of SERVICE,  
Submitted to this Court by the petitioner, for the Courts Consideration  
of his appeal in this case

Thank you.

RECEIVED

MAR 01 2023

SC SUPREME COURT

Sincerely

WILLIE A. SEAWRIGHT JR