

Eric Robert Wright
PLAINTIFF(S)

South Carolina State of
DEFENDANT(S)

DISPOSITION TYPE (CHECK ONE)

- JURY VERDICT.** This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.
- DECISION BY THE COURT.** This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.
- ACTION DISMISSED (CHECK REASON):** Rule 12(b), SCRPC; Rule 41(a), SCRPC (Vol. Nonsuit); Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled);
 Other
- ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON):** Rule 40(j), SCRPC; Bankruptcy;
 Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award;
 Other
- STAYED DUE TO BANKRUPTCY**
- DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (CHECK APPLICABLE BOX):**
 Affirmed; Reversed; Remanded;
 Other

NOTE: ATTORNEYS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING LOWER COURT, TRIBUNAL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT RULING IN THIS APPEAL.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED: See attached order (formal order to follow) Statement of Judgment by the Court:

This matter was before the Court on March 27, 2025 on Appellant's Motion to Appeal, filed September 18, 2024. Eric Robert Wright, the Appellant appears Pro Se. Representing the State is Ira Allen Grossman, Esq. At the call of the case, Appellant refused the Court's repeated instructions to come to the Appellant table and stand in front of the microphone to adequately present the grounds for his appeal. The Appellant engaged in sovereign citizen verbiage and refused to engage in the Appeal process. This trial on Appellant's tickets of speeding and operating without a SCDL were heard on June 6, 2024 in the Magistrate's Court by Judge Thomas H. Hesse.

ORDER INFORMATION

This order ends does not end the case. See Page 2 for additional information.

For Clerk of Court Office Use Only

This judgment was electronically entered by the Clerk of Court as reflected on the Electronic Time Stamp, and a copy mailed first class to any party not proceeding in the Electronic Filing System on 03/27/2025 .

Case Party Info Protected
Eric Robert Wright for Eric Robert Wright
Eric Robert Wright for Eric Robert Wright

RECEIVED
MAY 01 2025
SC Court of Appeals

NAMES OF TRADITIONAL FILERS SERVED BY MAIL

Court Reporter:

E-Filing Note: The date of Entry of Judgment is the same date as reflected on the Electronic File Stamp and the clerk's entering of the date of judgment above is not required in those counties. The clerk will mail a copy of the judgment to parties who are not E-Filers or who are appearing pro se. See Rule 77(d), SCRPC.

The Return was filed on September 18, 2024. The Return set forth a complete record of the proceedings.

“Section 18-7-170 of the South Carolina Code (1985) articulates the standard of review to be applied by the Circuit Court in an appeal of a magistrate’s judgment: Upon hearing the appeal, the appellate court shall give judgment according to the justice of the case, without regard to technical errors and defects which do not affect the merits. In giving judgment, the court may affirm or reverse the judgment of the court below, in whole or in part, as to any or all the parties and for errors of law or fact.” *Bowers v. Thomas*, 373 S.C. 240, 244, 644 S.E.2d 751, 753 (Ct. App. 2007). In criminal appeals from magistrate’s or municipal court, the circuit court does not conduct a “de novo” review, but instead reviews for preserved errors raised to it by appropriate exception. In reviewing criminal cases, the court may review errors of law only. *City of Aiken v David Michael Koontz*, 368 SC 542, 629 SE2d 686 (Ct. App. 2006). The Court, having found ample evidentiary support in the record, no error of law, and finding no abuse of discretion, **AFFIRMS** the decision of the lower court.