

CONTENT OF THE NUMERICAL DESCRIPTION

-1-

1) NOTICE OF APPEAL-(01/14/2025)

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED - Feb 14 2:54 PM - RICHLAND - COMMON PLEAS -
CASE#2024CP4005272**

SYSTEMATIC DESCRIPTION

- 1) There is no specification by the court whether the case is dismissed with prejudice or without prejudice**
- 2) Therefore, RES JUDICATA DOCTRINE adjudicates, decrees and orders against the Defendant's/Respondent's.**
- 3) Defendant's/Respondent's losing the case under the Doctrine Res Judicata**

MAR 17, 2025

RECEIVED

MAR 17 2025

SC Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

MAR 17 2025

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF RICHLAND

SC Court of Appeals

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
Civil Action No.: 2024CP4005272

The Honorable McGee, Thomas Williams III

Federico Castro _____ Appellant

Vs.

Driver Records Manager of Scdmv _____ Respondent.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

THE PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT, Federico Castro, hereby gives notice of his appeal, in the above action of December 5, 2024 until January 7, 2025 are set forth as follows: There is no specification by the court whether the case is dismissed with prejudice or without prejudice. Therefore, RES JUDICATA DOCTRINE it adjudicates, decrees and orders against the respondents. Respondents losing the case under the Doctrine res judicata, the Court erred by failing and/or refusing to recognize the controlling authority of the Doctrine and by failing and/or to recognize its ruling as reflected law. The court has therefore erred and abused its discretion and dishonored its own reason for being by failing to comply with its own decisions in an order issued and filed on January 7, 2025 without any legal basis expressed, described or specified and totally void. Respondents, driver records manager, do not appear in any document and the undersigned representatives have nothing to do with this matter.

Federico Castro

(01/14/2025)



FC-1

RECEIVED CONTENT OF THE NUMERICAL DESCRIPTION

MAR 17 2025

SC Court of Appeals

-2-

2) APPEAL / BRIEF

SYSTEMATIC DESCRIPTION

1) whether or not res judicata applies if the case is Dismissed Without prejudice?

2) Yes, Your Honor , You know it . it - - I mean , I agree

MAR 17, 2025

RECEIVED

MAR 17 2025

SG Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF RICHLAND

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

Civil Action No.: 2024CP4005272

The Honorable McGee, Thomas William III

Federico Castro-----Appellant

Vs.

Driver Records Manager of Scdmv-----Respondent.

APPEAL / BRIEF

APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF: presents the following legal arguments before this Honorable Court of Appeals for review. Based on the descriptions found in the procedure report and which have been certified by the transcriber Tom Marcman and which in his time and space establishes the date February 26, 2025 it consists of the following:

(12/5/2024) On p. 14 #-22-23-24 it is faithfully cited and p. 15 #-6-7

| | |
|----|---|
| 22 | THE COURT: -- what do you have to say about the -- about whether or no res judicata applies if the case is dismissed Without prejudice ? |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6 | MR HUTCHINSON: Yes, Your Honor . You know . it -- I mean , I agree |
| 7 | |

FC-2

RECEIVED CONTENT OF THE NUMERICAL DESCRIPTION

MAR 17 2025

SC Court of Appeals

-3-

3) PLAINTIFF / APPELLANT ARGUMENT

SYSTEMATIC DESCRIPTION

- 1) And while I understand it was dismissed without prejudice .
- 2) So res judicata doesn't apply on merit .
- 3) Instead Judge Manning denied the motion with prejudice ,
- 4) Defendant's/Respondent's arguing the same matter.
- 5) Defendant's/Respondent' barred with res judicata doctrine .
- 6) Defendant's/Respondent' LOST the opportunity .
- 7) Defendant's/Respondent' never answer the complaint .

MAR 17, 2025

PLAINTIFF / APPELLANT ARGUMENTS

“The defendants/respondents face the application of RES JUDICATA against them”

The following reasonable bases and literally quoting the February 26, 2025 report of proceeding it is presented as follows:

(12/5/2024) On p. 8 # -2-3-4-5-6-

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 | MR . HUTCHINSON : Yes , Your Honor . And that brings me to my next |
| 3 | reason for this motion to dismiss is res judicata |
| 4 | Your Honor , this is the exact same matter that he |
| 5 | brought a few years ago . And while I understand it was dismissed |
| 6 | without prejudice , |

“The Defendant’s have lost the case under RES JUDICATA DOCTRINE”

The plaintiff/appellant, under a deductive argument, is raised as follows:

(12/5/2024) p. 13 # -6-7-8-9-10-11

| | |
|----|--|
| 6 | MR . CASTRO : - - so res judicata don’t apply with a medical - - |
| 7 | with - - of the - - the judgment of Judge Manning . Instead Judge |
| 8 | Manning denied the motion to dismiss with prejudice , and this is |
| 9 | the same thing where they are arguing this morning . And it is |
| 10 | barred with res judicata doctrine and they already lost the |
| 11 | opportunity because they never, never answered the complaint . |

RECEIVED CONTENT OF THE NUMERICAL DESCRIPTION

MAR 17 2025

SC Court of Appeals

-4-

4) RES JUDICATA DOES NOT APPLY TO THE PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT

SYSTEMATIC DESCRIPTION

- 1) The origin case was DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE .**
- 2) The initial action does not involve a DECISION BASED ON THE MERIT .**
- 3) Lack of SUBJECT MATTER Plaintiff/Appellant .**
- 4) Barred Respondent's MOTION WITH PREJUDICE**
- 5) Defendant's/Respondent's THE SUBJECT MATTER
"MOTION WITH PREJUDICE"**
- 6) NOTICE OF ACTION RES JUDICATA REVERSE & EXHIBIT**
- 7) Defendant's/Respondent's have lost the case under Res
Judicata Doctrine and Statute of Limitation prohibits them from
bringing back.**

MAR 17, 2025

RES JUDICATA DOES NOT APPLY TO THE PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT

- 1) The origin case was **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**
- 2) The initial action does not involve a **DECISION BASED ON THE MERIT**
- 3) Lack of **SUBJECT MATTER**

RES JUDICATA APPLIES TO THE DEFENDANTS'/RESPONDENT

- 1) **Barred the Defendants'/Respondent MOTION WITH PREJUDICE**
- 2) **THE SUBJECT MATTER, "DISMISS WITH PREJUDICE"**
- 3) The defendants'/Respondent issue immediately trigger **"MATTER JUDGE"**

ATTACHED REFERENCE:

**NOTICE OF ACTION RES JUDICATA
REVERSE & EXHIBIT**

EXHIBIT "F" - (12/05/2024.A)

**RICHLAND COUNTY
FILED
2024 DEC - 3 PM 2:58
JEANETTE W. McBRIDE**

**RICHLAND COUNTY
FILED
2025 FEB 14 - PM 2:54**

**THEREFORE DEFENDANTS/RESPONDENTS HAVE LOST THE CASE UNDER
RES JUDICATA DOCTRINE AND STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS PROHIBIT
THEM FROM BRINGING THE CASE AGAIN.**

The Plaintiff/Appellant, using a logical and deductive argument, takes the following references found in the procedural report and which have been certified on February 26, 2025, thus stating:

(12/2/2024) On p. -10-#-22-23-24-25- / p. 11-#-1-2-3-4-5-6

| | |
|----|---|
| 22 | MR . CASTRO : Number three , it is what I put in my opposition in reply , it is -- there's impossible , absolutely out of this earth any argument from New Jersey or South Carolina because I never been pulled over . I never had any issue when they try to put it |
| 26 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | out , this is a fraud . A -- |
| 2 | THE COURT : No , I -- get all that . But -- but this motion |
| 3 | focuses on -- on the pleading , itself . I' m not here to decide |
| 4 | who's right and who's wrong on the issue today . |
| 5 | What I' ve got to determinate is whether or not your claim |
| 6 | is barred |

ATTACHED REFERENCE: *(Civil Action No.: 2024CP4005272)*

| | |
|--|--|
| OPPOSITION TO NOTICE MOTION BY THE DEFENDANT | REPLY TO MOTION |
| <hr/> RICHLAND COUNTY FILED 2024 SEP 26 AM 8:39 JEANETTE W. McBRIDE <hr/> | <hr/> RICHLAND COUNTY FILED 2024 SEP 26 AM 8:39 JEANETTE W. McBRIDE <hr/> |
| (p.6-<u>FITH/#3-4-5</u>) cannot be challenged | FRAUD |

CONTENT OF THE NUMERICAL DESCRIPTION

-5-

5) PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT SUBMIT FORM 4 FOR REVIEW

SYSTEMATIC DESCRIPTION

- 1) "Other evidence properly before the court" .
- 2) under advisement .
- 3) Defense counsel has 10 days in which to file a proposed order .

MAR 17, 2025

RECEIVED

MAR 17 2025

SC Court of Appeals

“PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT SUBMITS FORMS 4 FOR REVIEW”

Statement of Judgement 2024 Dec 05 12:24 PM 2024CP4005272

Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss was heard on 12/5/24. After hearing from counsel of record and reviewing all filing and other evidence properly before the Court. Defendant’s Motion was taken under advisement by Judge McGee.

State of Judgement 2025 Jan 07 12:10 PM 2024CP4005272

Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss was heard on 12/5/24. After hearing from counsel of Record and reviewing all filling and other evidence properly before the Court. Defendant’s Motion is granted. Defense counsel has 10 days in which to file a proposed order.

Brief Summary of the Facts and chronology of the procedure

1) On “other evidence properly before the Court.”, Appellant has requested:

a. Request for “other evidence”
submitted on December 5, 2024

JUDGE MCGEE, THOMAS WILLIAM III

b. CERTIFICATE OF EVIDENCE

February 26, 2025

CONTENT OF THE NUMERICAL DESCRIPTION

-6-

6) APPELLANT / BRIEF DESCRIPTION ON (12/5/2024) - (01-07-2025)

SYSTEMATIC DESCRIPTION

- 1) look at some of the - - some of the cases**
- 2) next few days .**
- 3) Res Judicata Doctrine against Defendant's/Respondent's motion with prejudice of main basis of the subject matter .**

MAR 17, 2025

RECEIVED

MAR 17 2025

SC Court of Appeals

“APPELLANT / BRIEF DESCRIPTION ON (12/5/2024) - (01/7/2025)”

(12/5/2024), - - [Defendant’s Motion was taken under advisement]

| | |
|----|--|
| 10 | THE COURT : Yes , sir . I appreciate that , Mr . Castro , and I’m |
| 11 | going to <u>look at some</u> of the - - <u>some of the cases</u> and some of the |
| 12 | arguments that you’ve presented here . I need to - - I don’t want |
| 13 | to make a decision without looking into those and, also, the |
| 14 | matters that Mr . Hutchinson has - - has raised, as well . |
| 15 | So I will look at some of those matters that y’all have |
| 16 | discussed and I will both of you know what my ruling is |
| 17 | within the <u>next few days</u> . |

(01/7/2025), - - [Defendant’s Motion is granted. Defense counsel has 10 days in which to file a proposed order]

PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT POINTS OUT

- a. **“Defendant’s Motion is granted”**, against Defendant’s rectifying the RES JUDICATA DOCTRINE where the case is previously decided, adjudicated and ordered. The doctrine previously grants the motion with prejudice against defendant’s , as this is the main basis of the subject matter.
- b. RES JUDICATA DOCTRINE, will make any other Order impossible.

NOTE: None of the above has to do with justice because the Defendant’s have no legal basis; on the contrary, it refers to defrauding the plaintiff by testing him using low techniques such as misrepresentation, misinterpretation, defamation, manipulation, etc. as established in legal procedures to commit fraud. Recently, on 12/5/2024, you will find evidence of events that never occurred because they were fraudulent. In addition, I consider it a malicious meeting with bad faith that discovers a series of inconsistencies that reveal fraud, a characterization summarized in a few words "EGO", the worst evil of every human being, did not allow a simple solution.