

**RECEIVED**

**May 12 2025**

**SC Court of Appeals**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
Appellate Case No. 2024-001608**

**DeQuincey G. Simmons, Appellant**

v.

**South Carolina Department of Employment and Workforce and Bridgestone Americas  
Tire Operations, LLC, Respondents**

---

**MOTION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW BY FULL PANEL AND  
CLARIFICATION OF JUDICIAL AUTHORITY**

**TO:**

Chief Judge H. Bruce Williams  
Judge Paula H. Thomas  
Judge Aphrodite K. Konduros  
Judge John D. Geathers  
Judge Stephanie P. McDonald  
Judge Blake A. Hewitt  
Judge Jerry D. Vinson Jr.  
Judge Matthew P. Turner  
Judge Kristi F. Curtis

Appellant, DeQuincey G. Simmons, respectfully moves this Court for full judicial review and immediate clarification regarding the authority, authorship, and legality of multiple unsigned orders issued in this appeal—including the May 7, 2025 order denying relief without explanation or identification.

This motion is directed to the full judicial panel of the South Carolina Court of Appeals and challenges a clear breakdown in the integrity and transparency of this appellate proceeding.

---

**FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

Appellant filed this appeal after experiencing prolonged procedural delays and non-responsiveness from the South Carolina Administrative Law Court. While that court failed to address multiple motions, it at least issued rulings signed by identifiable judges.

However, once the matter was elevated to the Court of Appeals, the situation deteriorated into something far more serious: a sequence of unsigned, unexplained denials that have been procedurally issued under anonymous authorship or clerk initials—with no judicial attribution and no legal reasoning.

Orders dated:

- December 30, 2024
- January 28, 2025
- February 20, 2025
- March 7, 2025
- April 7, 2025
- **May 7, 2025**

have either lacked judicial signatures entirely or presented cryptic designations such as “FOR THE COURT,” without indicating who rendered the decision, or on what legal basis.

Most concerning is the May 7, 2025 denial of Appellant’s Motion to Clarify and Stay Proceedings, which appears to have been processed without judicial oversight and offers no explanation for its rejection. This order summarily dismisses a constitutional challenge—without any stated findings or reference to the claims made—further eroding confidence in the legitimacy of the appellate record.

---

## LEGAL BASIS

This motion arises under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules:

- **Rule 269, SCACR** requires judicial sanctions and rulings to be issued by the appellate court—not delegated to staff or clerical personnel.
- **Rule 501, Canon 1, SCACR** obligates judges to uphold the appearance and reality of judicial independence and impartiality.
- **Tumey v. Ohio**, 273 U.S. 510 (1927) and **In re Murchison**, 349 U.S. 133 (1955) prohibit rulings from unknown or anonymous sources.
- **Chafin v. Chafin**, 568 U.S. 165 (2013) affirms that substantive judicial review cannot be evaded through vague dismissal or informal procedure.

As a **pro se litigant**, Appellant has been given no clear instruction or confirmation regarding the legal weight of these unsigned denials. The Court’s May 7, 2025 action leaves Appellant unable to determine whether a valid ruling has occurred or how to proceed with other pending motions or appeals. The lack of explanation, judicial identity, or procedural direction has obstructed access to due process and equitable treatment under the law.

“Appellant further notes that Respondents appear to have treated the unsigned May 7, 2025 order as a legitimate ruling—despite its lack of judicial authorship, reasoning, or legal citation. This raises the troubling question: why are parties and court staff treating undocumented, unexplained directives as enforceable rulings? If no judge signed it, and no rationale was provided, it cannot carry the weight of due process.”

“Since this Court has not clarified whether judges are actually authoring the rulings in question—and given the procedural irregularities documented throughout this appeal—Appellant is now forced to question whether administrative staff are acting under judicial direction or autonomously shielding judicial actors from scrutiny. If rulings are being issued without actual judicial review, the structural integrity of this appellate process is in fundamental jeopardy.”

---

## **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

Appellant respectfully requests the following:

1. That the full judicial panel review and formally acknowledge the procedural concerns raised in this motion;
  2. That the Court identify the judicial officer(s), if any, who issued each order dated above;
  3. That the Court confirm whether any ruling—including the May 7, 2025 order—was issued without judicial review or signature;
  4. That the Court issue a written response signed by an identifiable judge addressing Appellant’s constitutional objections;
  5. That the Court provide clarification on how pro se litigants are to proceed when procedural denials are issued anonymously or without legal justification;
  6. That the Court stay further action in this matter until the above issues are resolved in writing by a properly designated judicial officer;
  7. That any order found to lack proper judicial authority be withdrawn or vacated.
- 

## **CLOSING STATEMENT**

The pattern of unsigned rulings, unexplained denials, and lack of judicial identity reflects not only a breakdown in process—but a profound failure to treat this appeal with the seriousness and constitutional care it demands.

As a pro se litigant, Appellant is left without guidance on whether the May 7, 2025 denial constitutes a lawful ruling. The absence of judicial authorship and reasoning makes it impossible to determine how to mandate future filings or seek further relief.

This Court must decide whether it will continue issuing rulings in silence—or correct the record and restore lawful process to this appeal.

---

**Respectfully submitted,**  
**DeQuincey G. Simmons**  
2503 Hiers Court

Hephzibah, GA 30815  
706-495-0738  
dequinceysimmons@gmail.com

*DeQuincey Simmons*  
5/12/2025

**Dated: May 12, 2025**

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, DeQuincey G. Simmons, hereby certify that I have served a copy of the foregoing **Motion for Judicial Review by Full Panel and Clarification of Judicial Authority** on the following parties by email and U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, on **May 12, 2025**:

**Benjamin T. Cook, Esquire**  
South Carolina Department of Employment and Workforce  
Post Office Box 8597  
Columbia, SC 29202  
BCook@dew.sc.gov

**RECEIVED**  
**May 12 2025**  
**SC Court of Appeals**

**Benjamin T. Hepner, Esquire**  
Littler Mendelson, P.C.  
110 E Court Street, Suite 201  
Greenville, SC 29601  
BHepner@littler.com

I affirm that the above statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

**DeQuincey G. Simmons**  
DeQuincey G. Simmons  
2503 Hiers Court  
Hephzibah, GA 30815  
706-495-0738  
dequinceysimmons@gmail.com

*De Quincey Simmons*  
*5/12/2025*

**Dated: May 12, 2025**