STRITZINGER v STRITZINGER

2025-000964

AUG 07 2025
SC Court of Appeals

APPELLANT FILES

A

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

BRIEF

ON

MOTION TO STRIKE

OR PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO US DISTRICT COURT IN RESPONSE TO THE COURTS RECENT ORDERS

John S. Stritzinger

1800 Washington Street

Columbia, SC 29201

843.352.3459

Contents

STRITZINGER v STRITZINGER 1
2025-000964 1
APPELLANT FILES 1
A 1
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION 1
BRIEF 1
ON 1
MOTION TO STRIKE 1
OR PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO US DISTRICT COURT IN RESPONSE TO THE COURTS RECENT ORDERS 1
(A.2) Legal References and Case Law 4
LEGAL REFERENCES – SOUTH CAROLINA CONSTITUTION 5
LEGAL REFERENCES – SOUTH CAROLINA STATUTE 5
LEGAL REFERENCES – SOUTH CAROLINA CASE LAW 5
LEGAL REFERENCES – US CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS 5
LEGAL REFERENCES – US CODE 5
LEGAL REFERENCES – US SUPREME COURT CASE LAW 5
LEGAL REFERENCES – OTHER STATES (REPUBLICAN) 5
LEGAL REFERENCES – OTHER STATES (DEMOCRATIC) 5
(B) Statement of Issues on Appeal. 6
1. Is a Criminal Perjury Cross Claim which under South Carolina Law can only be tried in the Circuit Court a valid legal defense to a Mental Health Complaint filed in a lower court and if so doesn't the Probate Court have to transfer to a court which can resolve all the evidence, facts, and statutes legally? 6
2. Are State Statutes Higher in Precedence than State Constitutional Provisions? ... 6
3. Can an Inferior Court suspend the rights of a higher court? 6

4. Can a South Carolina resident file a mental health complaint against a resident of another state who he has spent any time with since 2014 using a stolen partial trial record from the Virginia which included one of several expert reports?....................6

5. Do South Carolina State Judges have the power to suspend the rights of a citizen of another state who hasn't committed a criminal offense in South Carolina? 6

6. Does the State of South Carolina have to follow basic criminal processes in the service of mental health complaints including the appointment of competent, and specialized counsel?....................6

7. Can the State of South Carolina via doctors contracted on his behalf, email evidence to the court directly before trial without inspection? Is this a Due Process problem?....................6

8. Do the state of South Carolinas courts represent general due process issues which cant be cured without a new trial, and competent counsel or an order of transfer to the US District Court? 6

9. Did The State of South Carolina have jurisdiction over standing to try a mental health filing by James R. Stritzinger Jr. 6

(C) Statement of the Case. 7

(D) Standard of Review....................12

(E) Argument. 12

1) Is a Criminal Perjury Cross Claim which under South Carolina Law can only be tried in the Circuit Court a valid legal defense to a Mental Health Complaint filed in a lower court and if so doesn't the Probate Court have to transfer to a court which can resolve all the evidence, facts, and statutes legally? 13

2) Are State Statutes Higher in Precedence than State Constitutional Provisions? . 13

3) Can an Inferior Court suspend the rights of a higher court? 14

4) Can a South Carolina resident file a mental health complaint against a resident of another state who he has spent any time with since 2014 using a stolen partial trial record from the Virginia which included one of several expert reports?....................15

5) Do South Carolina State Judges have the power to suspend the rights of a citizen of another state who hasn't committed a criminal offense in South Carolina? 15

6) Does the State of South Carolina have to follow basic criminal processes in the service of mental health complaints including the appointment of competent, and specialized counsel?....................15

7) Can the State of South Carolina via doctors contracted on his behalf, email evidence to the court directly before trial without inspection? Is this a Due Process problem? 16

8) Do the state of South Carolinas courts findings represent general due process issues which cant be cured without a new trial, and competent counsel or an order of transfer to the US District Court? 16

9) Did The State of South Carolina have jurisdiction over standing to try a mental health filing by James R. Stritzinger Jr. 16

(F) Conclusion. 16

APENDIX A 17

FORMAL BILL OF EXCEPTION – FILED IN THE DISTRICT COURT WITH ALL LEGAL REFERENCES 18

(A.2) Legal References and Case Law

- Legal References and Case Law is included in his bills of exception filed with the trial court.
- Appellant notes that the Virginia Supreme Court has already ruled by letter than it its opinion no State Supreme Court can review the laws or judgements of another State under Article IV except for specific provisions to review the absolute innocence of a party for a past conviction which it had the power given sufficient evidence to overturn to a party who is now a state citizen by choice.

LEGAL REFERENCES – SOUTH CAROLINA CONSTITUTION

LEGAL REFERENCES – SOUTH CAROLINA STATUTE

LEGAL REFERENCES – SOUTH CAROLINA CASE LAW

LEGAL REFERENCES – US CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

LEGAL REFERENCES – US CODE

LEGAL REFERENCES – US SUPREME COURT CASE LAW

LEGAL REFERENCES – OTHER STATES (REPUBLICAN)

LEGAL REFERENCES – OTHER STATES (DEMOCRATIC)

(B) Statement of Issues on Appeal.

1. Is a Criminal Perjury Cross Claim which under South Carolina Law can only be tried in the Circuit Court a valid legal defense to a Mental Health Complaint filed in a lower court and if so doesn't the Probate Court have to transfer to a court which can resolve all the evidence, facts, and statutes legally?
2. Are State Statutes Higher in Precedence than State Constitutional Provisions?
3. Can an Inferior Court suspend the rights of a higher court?
4. Can a South Carolina resident file a mental health complaint against a resident of another state who he has spent any time with since 2014 using a stolen partial trial record from the Virginia which included one of several expert reports?
5. Do South Carolina State Judges have the power to suspend the rights of a citizen of another state who hasn't committed a criminal offense in South Carolina?
6. Does the State of South Carolina have to follow basic criminal processes in the service of mental health complaints including the appointment of competent, and specialized counsel?
7. Can the State of South Carolina via doctors contracted on his behalf, email evidence to the court directly before trial without inspection? Is this a Due Process problem?
8. Do the state of South Carolinas courts represent general due process issues which cant be cured without a new trial, and competent counsel or an order of transfer to the US District Court?
9. Did The State of South Carolina have jurisdiction over standing to try a mental health filing by James R. Stritzinger Jr.

(C) Statement of the Case.

This court has reviewed several related cases to the Appeal in this cause. None of them were offered Oral Arguments or decisions on the merits over the South Carolina's order preserving the right for the Probate to suspend the rights of citizens of South Carolina involved in their courts. The issue is the Supreme Court of South Carolina did not review the numerous Due Process Issues, the problems with Evidence, they simply upheld that the Probate court has the right to sign orders such as that under South Carolina. We agree they do, but there would have to be evidence brought forth in trial which supported those actions. Our contention is there was no trial at all. The Trial was Dr. Jeffrey emailing two reports to the trial court, in addition to the report that James R. Stritzinger stole from the State of Virginia. 3 in total. And amazingly Jeffrey Raynor, Dr. Vyas, and Dr. Raynors resident are not psychologists, and all three referred to a Texas report written by Dr. Burroughs which was one of 5 tried in the State of Texas, and was commissioned by Katherine Wright in rebuttal. Psychiatrists can not diagnose mental health problems on the DSMIV they can only medicate them according to Dr. Raynor and only if they have their own personal observations that they are severe symptoms which cannot be resolved via therapy.

This report even according to Dr. Burroughs had expired under Texas law, and was written in 2014, and none of three doctors offering evidence in South Carolina had spoken with her, or had her notes to review. There cascading hearsay of hearsay of hearsay which happens when one expert reviews and comments on the hearsay statement of another expert in another state, none of which is not admissible in the State of South Carolina and even a Freshman in USC Law school should be able to argue that issue to at least preserve the argument. Counsel appointed by the Trial Judge did nothing at all. Seriously. Bart Bartlett cared not at all. He said I had a 5K dollar budget and that almost of that would be in his intake meeting in his office north of the city which he apparently asked the South Carolina State Police to record, and who were standing in an office adjacent to the office the whole time.

Judge Newman signed a circuit court order allowing me to appeal and retry the issue of the Probate sanctions, the issue before this court. This meant she was going to review the Due Process issues under the South Carolina Constitution, and US Constitution in her court on original jurisdiction, THEN HELD THE APPEAL FOR 7 YEARS WITHOUT A TRIAL, and then on the day of the trial this April simply told me she wasn't going to let me call witnesses, or mark documents. Furthermore, she didn't have a trial transcript from the lower court so we could review the record. She simply signed an order and then ignored her own plan. Worse, I believe she wiretapped my home, and all my electronic records ILLEGALLY for 7 years without cause including CALEA WIRETAPS IN REAL TIME FOR EACH AND EVERY CALL MADE FROM MY CELL PHONE.

This appeal only refers to whether the Probate court had Jurisdiction over James R. Stritzingers claims, even though they have already ruled that the amounts in question with the Wright, Verizon, and Bank of America cases are above their State Jurisdiction in South Carolina, and the cross-claims of John S. Stritzinger for Felony Perjury too.

Appellant believes that each and every statement read to him was a count of Perjury by James R. Stritzinger Jr, and each and every statement even if true was heresay as he had no knowledge or counter knowledge to each and every point he wrote. Furthermore, James. R. Stritzinger claims his filing was in retaliation for me being a whistle blower on his relationship with his corporate secretary which is illegal in South Carolina too.

PREVIOUS HISTORY ON OTHER RELATED CAUSES

James R. Stritzinger Jr served his brother a mental health complaint the day after arriving by train from the State of Florida on Amtrak arriving at approximately 2am on St. Patricks Day 2018 or seven years ago. He was served on February 19th with a mental health complaint by Richland County Deputies even though he was in Richland county for less than five hours, and had not been cited for any activity.

Appellant(is a VA resident) who was in Columbia South Carolina to file a labor request to order Verizon Federal to reinstate his employment(suspended for 6+years) due to complex litigation in **BOTH STATE COURTS AND FEDERAL COURTS** simultaneously. Neither case was authorized to commence to trial initially, although Judge Birch set a trial and Verizon didn't show up which should result in a default Judgement, but he refused to sign an order to the same without cause. SC Judges usually will not sign orders of non lawyers ever even if they are correctly written and in the proper form. They usually ask their own staff to draft something lesser which has no language about the trial in it. All relief denied they usually write. Judge Birch told me from the Bench that since Verizon was one of the Top 100 employers in south Carolina, that they would be given every opportunity to appear, but they acknowledged the case and choose not to appear stating I had to pay them 1500.00 a day per expert including their own counsel (BEFORE TRIAL). (See Stritzinger v Verizon Federal in this court).

Appellant served with distinction at Verizon, but was suspended over an Intellectual Property Agreement, and complex business transaction with the US Government which involved a Rental car from Dollar Rental Car and because of a complex set of mental health and criminal processes filed by various parties related to Verizon Legal, all won by Appellant in cases he tried mostly himself. Verizon lawyers used mental health as a legal dispute against owing John S. Stritzinger any money. What bid? What Money? What Job? They denied everything even his own existence, even though his own contract states Verizon has to defend him in all business transactions.

This complaint asked that he steal all of his property in Texas, and two out of state companies, terminate his license, and terminate all of his rights under the US Constitution with no basis in law or in fact. Even if James R. Stritzingers complaints were true, they didn't happen in South Carolina, and this state had no jurisdiction over the complaint.

The issue was John S. Stritzinger was working for Verizon in Charleston at the Verizon Wireless and Federal offices there, and had rented a car in Orlando simply because the flight to Orlando was 1000.00 less than flying direct to Charleston from Dulles Airport. This is a fact that most people can resolve in a few minutes from their own console via Southwest Airlines, or Delta the two largest carriers to the airport. Appellant was working in Charleston to speak to a Federal Security contract on a project which President Obama had declared not just top Secret, but Departmentally Classified to his own cabinet. This he relayed to the Verizon Federal Account Team and which was why John S. Stritzinger was selected for the project. Appellant had worked on government contracts both directly and as a subcontractor and is named on more than 50 primary documents in the possession of the General Services Administration although not always for winning contracts. In this case, Appellant was told by Mr. Obama personally that we had been selected for a Government project which he had made more sophisticated on a Classified Task Order from the original project issued by the FBI Procurement office. He extended the FBI project to his own protective staff, moving the responsibility to the Commander of Chief of the US Military which also changes the funding sources for the same making the project assured to get funding by the US Congress with their blessing. The system was going to extend a vanilla offering to the US Secret Service, and the Military Joints Chief Staff and Mr. Obama informed Verizon Federal that the Department of Justice was going to be the owner of the system after completion. Thus the parent of the FBI was going to run the system as an Internal-Affairs classified project under DOJ, but funded by the Presidents Military budget. This seemed all rational to Appellant as he designed the system of record, but he needed his manager Mr. Asiedu, and his President Ms. Zeleniak to do their usual tasks so that Verizon could design, and build and operate for some period of time, with a usual transfer process(4) sometime thereafter.

James R. Stritzinger Jr, Sr. and his family had no knowledge of this project or his employment at Verizon, nor did he attend the evidentiary hearings/trials(5) in Virginia on this subject matter, nor did either one attend an additional filing made by William R. Stritzinger his brother in Delaware(1) - The sixth filing. Worse, Mr. Asiedu effectively filed 7 criminal processes via the MD prosecutor who had filed a CI in every state his car had crossed from Florida to Pennsylvania including Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and Pennsylvania requiring 8 circuit court terminating orders as to his knowledge state police officers never cancel anything until

they get a local court order. In civil courts this is called Case Parking, but the same problem happens in criminal courts despite Article IV of the US Constitution(Full Faith and Credit).

Appellant filed a complaint with the Maryland State Supreme Court(Court of Appeals) against the MD prosecutor from Queen Annes County Ms. Lee Darrell who had lost her case, and despite losing, opened up criminal processes anyway. I asked for her to be disbarred, and the State of Maryland told me that they had in fact closed the MD Case by hard order by the Maryland Supreme Court, and later the Florida Supreme Court and 5th Circuit Court of Appeals signed similar orders.

Appellant is an admitted US Court of Appeals bar member for the 2nd Circuit, and has many years of Appellate actions and believes it would take more than a full day to walk a circuit court judge through all the issues which occurred, and how they were dispositioned, and usually this is a requirement to go to appeal. Appellate judges don't usually need that time, as they just read a very long transcript over a weekend, or have their staff outline key points of testimony. In this case, we have no trial record at all. No witnesses were called on the record, no issues preserved, no documents marked, and no opportunity to run a proper trial under the rules.

Appellant claims only that he promises that to walk through his issues with two partially disabled children in Texas the financial orders which resulted, and then to extend this to issues with Bank of America, and Verizon his two employers during the pre-pendency of this case would take at least two days to answer an interested parties questions on the same. Most judges simply don't care, its not their personal interest or their area of specialty and we are only offering this case is quite complicated in the facts. The District Court in Virginia ruled that Dr. Vyas not only didn't do a mental health evaluation, he didnt have a security clearance to even review the facts. He is a 1st generation Indian doctor working in a US Military Nuclear corridor with the primary US Navy Facility just a few miles away. It was nearly unbelievable as an American.

Dr. Jeffrey Raynor.....simply told Appellant... he cant solve any of that.... If you don't ignore it and go back to work...you are crazy he said.... He told me that every day. Ignore a 67% garnishment, Ignore 7 simultaneous Circuit Court Criminal Actions, 2 Patent Law Processes, and his own brothers filing hearsay and false statements in the same circuit courts or lower probate courts....other than Donald Trump I believe I have been sued more than anyone else in America in the past 20 years. Why? Well Katherine Wright sent disabled children who were going to private schools in Texas to schools which had no special resources(no trained teachers), then they ordered Appellant to pay for the same. That's bad enough, then Ms. Wright confesses she was having an affair with the Texas Appellate Judge who signed the mandate in the appeal in that case, and that Mandate

is in direct opposition to the US Supreme Courts Decision in Forrest Grove School District v TA.

Dr. Jeffrey Raynor is the Chief Mental Health Examiner for the State of South Carolina, and head of the USC Medical School. He personally signs the licenses of all doctors who practice psychiatry in the State of South Carolina, although he admits he has not training as a Psychologist. He explained to Appellant that his job is to resolve issues which make people unable to work and take care of themselves using their own labor for any reason. He and his staff told his patients that in general that people who cannot work are mentally disabled. Furthermore, he told Appellant personally that he used to work at ESH Hospital in Williamsburg which held the 2nd of 3 trials in this case and whose doctors are personal friends of his by his own admission. Dr. Raynor admitted that this case had been tried by Dr. Vyas who ran a trial in his own name Vyas v Stritzinger for exactly the same reason in 2015, but although won temporary orders in Williamsburg, lost on appeal at the Circuit Court in Virginia Beach County mainly because, Appellant had already sued his employer Verizon in the Circuit Court, and had explained his problem to chief Judges Woolard, and Lahne of the district court and they had already verified his employment and served his circuit court case using Virginia Deputies. In other words, the State of Virginia's defense of his cross-criminal claims against Sam Asiedu who joined the case for Mr. Asiedu simply because he filed a labor complaint first, and a criminal case first in six states. However the State of Virginia lost at trial, and their actions were dismissed across four states (MD, FL, PA, and VA)

None of that matters however because James R. Stritzinger had no standing to sue his brother in his South Carolina, and due to 28 USC 1332 this court had no jurisdiction over the matter in the first place.

The State of South Carolina via its lower courts served a heresay complaint which had attached stolen partial trial records from another state which is a violation of HIPPA statutes, which are clearly on every wall of Prisma Health Center here in South Carolina. However South Carolina never provided the statement to John Stritzinger, a deputy looked at it and told John Stritzinger a few words of what it contained. He said the document claimed Appellant was unemployed, homeless, and ranting about the CIA on the streets of Columbia, SC, when Appellant was in fact staying in hotels in Lexington County not Richland County, had taken regular Yellow Cabs from his hotel to the courthouse and downtown Columbia, and went home every night. He expected he would get an emergency trial in Federal Court, or a temporary order to go back to work after the Florida Supreme Court and Court of Appeals had ruled in his favor and terminated Mr. Asiedu's criminal action.

Appellant was appointed a lawyer who didn't send a subpoena for his employment records, his property records, and didn't even have his resume. He didn't call employment verification lines, and he didn't call any witnesses, make any legal statements or comments, he simply handed Judge Belton a bill and said he would refuse to appear on appeal, as he wasn't paid for it.

As for James R. Stritzinger Jr, he has stolen all of his property, and asked he lose his license although he wasn't even driving in South Carolina. He took the train. He and someone hired by the court as a Court Coordinator, asked the court to terminate all of his rights as a human despite not doing anything at all in South Carolina witnessed by a SC deputy which relates to anything in the complaint. Its completely baseless and brought to harass and steal all the property of Appellant.

Worse this court, and the lower courts after seven years wont allow any evidentiary hearing where Appellant can mark his resume, and employment documents. Its completely ridiculous, a massive due process problem under both the South Carolina and US Constitution in Appellants opinion.

Appellant isn't asking this court to rule on issues that haven't been heard, Appellant simply wants the court to order the US Court to have a short show cause proceeding, and make a determination if they can resolve the very complex case which he believes should include at least 5 Verizon Experts, at least 5 doctors, and at least two FBI agents who need to testify about the US Government bid the GSA issued to Verizon and by extension John S. Stritzinger. 15 Professional witnesses at least 2 hours each is more than a one week trial, and Greg Parker, Dr. Raynor, and other State Agents have given him less than 6 mins on avg per day, and recently Judge Newman gave him 1 hour of oral arguments, but wouldn't revisit the evidentiary record at all despite not having a trial record.

(D) Standard of Review.

We are seeking a review of the exact processes from origination of James R. Stritzinger Jr's lawsuit to specific basis for suspending the rights of a citizen of another state and to enter those findings explicitly before Appellant appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States under Article III as this is a dispute between South Carolina, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, North Carolina, Florida, Texas, and Virginia at this point among others.

(E) Argument.

1) Is a Criminal Perjury Cross Claim which under South Carolina Law can only be tried in the Circuit Court a valid legal defense to a Mental Health Complaint filed in a lower court and if so doesn't the Probate Court have to transfer to a court which can resolve all the evidence, facts, and statutes legally?

   Federal Law has case styles which include MC styles which include both civil and criminal claims in the same case. Usually lawyers have to explicitly due so to avoid criminal or civil sanctions for surprise when they plead criminal issues INLIMINE in civil processes, or ask for Civil Damages under Civil Statues in Criminal Courts.

   We believe as included in our Formal Bill of Exception in Exhibit A we have documented the sources of the same.

2) Are State Statutes Higher in Precedence than State Constitutional Provisions?

   Probably the most famous case in America taught in every law school in America is **Marbury v Madison** which discusses and establishes the basis for Judicial Review set by the US Supreme Court. Furthermore the Virginia Constitution clearly allows them to review on original Jurisdiction any action which claims a Constitutional Violation.

   Although we believe this court should order this case retried only because there is no trial transcript whatsoever and in a case which has legal relief in excess of criminal sanctions in the South Carolina Case, we certainly believe that African American Judges cannot make up state which is in excess of State Criminal Citations against White Citizens from another state without cause. That's clearly not powers given to Judge Newman, Belton, and Smiley who are all African America, with African America Operations Officers, and almost all African American clerks. We talk about racial balance in America while three black judges have fired all the white people who work there and are writing their own statutes and criminal penalties.

   No trial has occurred where Appellant and his counsel have been allowed to present evidence, mark documents, and cross-examine the prosecutions witnesses. Furthermore Greg Parker told Appellant he was his attorney at Palmetto Health, when in fact he was the States private MH prosecutor, who spoke to him for less than 5 minutes. He said it was common for the Doctors of Prisma Hospital to email all expert reports right to the Judges who worked onsite. They have no processes at

all. In Virginia, ESH has two sets of appointed counsel and I promise they are even more formal in presenting evidence than the Circuit Court. Delaware is just as formal, with Doctors supporting the judge on the bench who he can ask for medical opinions in real time. The State of South Carolinas processes are ridiculous.

JOHN S. STRITZINGER A RESIDENT OF VIRGINIA HAS NEVER BEEN SERVED WITH A SUBSTANTIVE PLEADING OF THEIR BASIS FOR RELIEF, OR THE ORIGINAL PETITION FILED BY JAMES R. STRITZINGER. CAN YOU REBUT SOMETHING YOU DON'T HAVE AND CANT SEE AS ITS SEALED?

PRO SE LEGAL DEFENSE IS NOT POSSIBLE WITHOUT AT A MINIMUM ACCESS TO THE DOCKET SHEET, AND ALL ITS CONTENTS. JUDGE NEWMAN HAS REFUSED TO LET HIM REVIEW ANYTHING SO PRO-SE REPRESENTATION IS NOT POSSIBLE.

3) Can an Inferior Court suspend the rights of a higher court?

We have never ever seen a States highest trial court by Statute, give up rights given to it under the State Constitution. The Probate court is an inferior court. It cannot suspend the right of the Circuit Court to try any issue. It cannot suspend the rights of a US Citizen under the Constitution without a basis in law and equity.

Nothing James R. Stritzinger has claimed has happened here in South Carolina. The probate court cannot order any other court to do anything. It could possible order a lower Magistrates court to try a case due to judicial dockets overflows, but only by agreement of counsel. Appellant has cross-claims of perjury against James R. Stritzinger Jr which he has not waived. The Probate court cannot terminate actions which it has no jurisdiction over in the first place.

Furthermore, Appellante believes The probate court cannot tell this court to not review his appeal either. As such I believe if this court cites a lower courts orders to terminate his appellate rights, I would cite that is an order not supported by the South Carolina Constitution, and is therefore invalid.

This court has to review, whether the Probate court had appropriate basis to suspend the rights of a non-citizen of South Carolina who was staying in local hotels. Was a police report written? Did James R. Stritzinger have supporting or corroborating evidence? No he simply lied. He filed a felony perjured complaint, and offered one of approximately 5 MH, and two judicial statements from virginia. He has one document of a case which was tried more than 3 times before.

4) Can a South Carolina resident file a mental health complaint against a resident of another state who he has spent any time with since 2014 using a stolen partial trial record from the Virginia which included one of several expert reports?

   No. James R. Stritzinger filing is heresay. Its not admissible. All of the facts as summarized by a Richland Deputy did not occur in South Carolina, and therefore this state has no jurisdiction over them, and Judicial officers of South Carolina are not given the powers to review the laws of other states.

5) Do South Carolina State Judges have the power to suspend the rights of a citizen of another state who hasn't committed a criminal offense in South Carolina?

   We don't believe in general any court cannot sign any order terminating the rights of anyone legally without good cause shown, and after the completion of a trial on the merits it has established it has sole and only jurisdiction over, and only after it believes that no other court has entered orders on the same subject.

6) Does the State of South Carolina have to follow basic criminal processes in the service of mental health complaints including the appointment of competent, and specialized counsel?

   Yes we believe that South Carolina is effectively running a pre-trial process as seen in many states criminal codes where a magistrate decides whether there is enough evidence to proceed. However in every state in the United States there is defense counsel present to object and discuss before the trial on the merits. You cant allow MH documents to be emailed to the court which have never been reviewed by anyone especially when they are STOLEN FROM OUT OF STATE BY SOMEONE WHO HAD NO NEED TO BE IN POSSESION OF THEM...

7) Can the State of South Carolina via doctors contracted on his behalf, email evidence to the court directly before trial without inspection? Is this a Due Process problem?

   We believe all of the evidence in this case is inadmissible in the trial court. Please see the basis in the Bill of Exception Attached.

8) Do the state of South Carolinas courts findings represent general due process issues which cant be cured without a new trial, and competent counsel or an order of transfer to the US District Court?

   We believe that no appellate court cannot review a lower courts trial proceedings without a transcript. They have to either take evidence directly, dismiss the case for want of prosecution, or order a new trial assuming court processes are followed. This is in fact in the rules of the Courts of South Carolina.

9) Did The State of South Carolina have jurisdiction over standing to try a mental health filing by James R. Stritzinger Jr.

   No appellant was not a resident of South Carolina, and had been in the state for only one day to file and appear in the US District Circuit Court on Richland Street. It was not possible to gather and establish any fact in good confidence in support of the same.

(F) Conclusion.

In summary James R. Stritzinger filed a MH complaint because he didn't believe his brother statement he was working on a Federal bid for Verizon in South Carolina. He and his father made statements that I stole a rental car, have tried to prevent him from working or earning money on facts they had no knowledge, for more than 10 years, while they stole all of his property, and tried to deny him access to his children. This is felony perjury, felony grand larceny, felony tortious interference, felony 2 counts of vexatious litigation which needs to be set in Federal Court as it has now spanned 3 courts, six state police agencies and six high state courts all of which have signed

orders on the same set of facts. That's not possible under Double Jeapordy provisions of this states Constitution, or the same states in the US Constitution.

Massive damage has been cause by Judge Newman and a very race baited staff which are nearly all African America, against Verizon Federals Top Engineer in the whole country without even calling Verizon for an employment verification, without asking an FBI agent to appear to discuss the bid they issued from their office, absolutely nothing has been done.

We believe this court should find that James. R. Stritzinger entered a felonius pro-complaint which was brought in bad faith and a duplicate to other legal processes which is a state jail complaint he is due counsel. He had no standing to request legal relief against his brother other than to steal his property. This court had no standing to review the action except the individual actions against Wright, Verizon and Bank of America which were all pending in the Circuit Court. This finding would terminate the action, and reverse.

Alternatively, We are seeking an order of Mandamus to the US District Court for a new trial as in his experience a US Court of Appeals under local Rules cannot review anything with a trial court transcript attached, and in Texas if tried there with more witnesses the same standard applies, an automatic new trial is ordered if there is no transcript.

In conclusion, The Circuit Court has full and sole jurisdiction over all the facts(Wright, Verizon, Bank of America, RE:Stritiznger), or to review facts entered by other state courts, and since more than 15 courts have been crossed this might take several weeks at this point. It cannot be done in a Webex call in 30mins as is usually scheduled in this state.

A fair result would either a default Judgement in the Verizon case as that is what in fact happened, or to order a new trial by transferring this to review in the US District Court.

PRAYER

Appellant prays the court strikes the probate courts restrictions and orders the District court to take evidence, or Alternatively to simply sign an order for the US District Court to retry this case under 28 USC 1332 amounts in question diversity of citizenship. Appellant prays the court will provide South Carolina legal references to each of his questions of law as they are important for all citizens of this state not just in this case but in every case.

Signed this 6th day of August,

2025

APENDIX A

FORMAL BILL OF EXCEPTION – FILED IN THE DISTRICT COURT WITH ALL LEGAL REFERENCES.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This was served electronically via email to James R. Stritzinger Jr.

John Stritzinger <jstritzinger33@gmail.com>

FYI

John Stritzinger <jstritzinger33@gmail.com> Fri, Jul 25, 2025 at 4:35 PM
To: Jim Stritzinger <jim@stritz.com>
Cc: "Coble, Daniel Law Clerk (Sarah Di Stefano)" <dcoblelc@sccourts.org>, "Newman, Jocelyn Secretary (Ebony Martin)" <jnewmansc@sccourts.org>

Bill of exception to be filed in my case.

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **John Stritzinger** <sfriday02@gmail.com>
Date: Friday, July 25, 2025
Subject: FYI
To: John Stritzinger <jstritzinger33@gmail.com>

--
John S. Stritzinger
843.352.3459

BILLOFEXCEPTION.pdf
1157K

STRITZINGER v STRITZINGER ET ALL

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE COURT OF APPEALS, SOUTH CAROLINA

Appeal No. 2025-000964

Trial Court Cause # 2019CP4004271

LETTER ON BILL OF EXCEPTION AND 2ND REQUEST FOR NEW TRIAL

#1 – STATE CONSTITUTIONAL PREMISES HAVE HIGHER PRECEDENCE THAN STATE STATUTE & OTHER PROCESS ISSUES:

a) Prohibitions in the Constitution of:
#1 Retrying a Case (Double Jeopardy which has already been tried three times)
#2 Twice Being Subject to the loss of all life without the Due Process of Law
#3 Being Denied Due Process Altogether by not~~e~~ being able to depose witnesses, mark documents, and have a transcript from the trial court.

b) State Statute does not give a State Judge the Power to make someone a citizen of the State against their will. Appellant does not wish to be a resident of the State of South Carolina, and never applied to be a citizen of South Carolina.

c) Literally all the evidence submitted in the trial court was either stolen from Virginia or is inadmissible due to ex-parte contact from the court to state doctors who were acting as the prosecution in this case. Expert Witnesses from out of state were not present to be deposed, and all of their medical documents had EXPIRED in their home state.

d) Requirement for competent counsel to be appointed. Bart Bartlett may be competent counsel but he hated his client, and made no effort to do anything in his clients defense. In fact he sought to prosecute rather than defend his client.

e) Probate clauses allowing the suspension of the rights of a US Citizen are dubious, and certainly of lower precedent following a review of Jurisdiction, Venue, and Standing to pursue a lawsuit. Appellant believes that James R. Stritzinger, likely has a claim against the South Carolina State police for CALEA wire intercepts of his communications while he was an employee of the University of South Carolina but the timing of that activity is questionable to appellant, as his own fiancée/paramour may have been the one who filed it when he didn't marry her as he promised.

f) Examples of Constitutional Claims in South Carolina vs Statute are included as below:

Adams v. McMaster: This case challenged the constitutionality of the Governor's allocation of federal emergency education funding for the SAFE Grants Program, which was deemed unconstitutional as it violated the state's constitutional mandate against public funding of private schools.

State v. Charles Dent: This disciplinary matter involved an attorney who accepted an agreement for discipline and was imposed a six-month definite suspension. The court accepted the agreement and imposed a public reprimand as reciprocal discipline.

Meredith Logan Whitehurst v. Town of Sullivan's Island: This direct appeal from the circuit court's affirmance involved a municipal court conviction for violation of the Town's Disorderly Conduct Ordinance. The court affirmed the conviction, finding no error in the handling of the case.

James H. "Jay" Lucas, Jr. v. The State of South Carolina: This case involved a constitutional challenge to the 2015-16 Appropriations Act, where the court held that a section not germane to the act could be excised by a court.

The Doctrine of Standing in South Carolina: This article provides a survey and critique of the doctrine of standing in South Carolina, discussing the key aspects and limitations of standing in state constitutional law.

g) Appellant believes this court has to sign orders and findings on why it believes the original petition was valid, that this court had jurisdiction, and James R. Stritzinger had standing to sue. Then the court had to decide whether its own trial court was

the proper venue considering criminal cross claims and three other related actions which included all the primary facts of the case. (Wright, Bank of America, Verizon). Judge Jocelyn Newman refused to sign an order of Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law, which is grounds for immediate appeal in Texas.

#2 A CRIMINAL CROSS CLAIM IS A VALID LEGAL DEFENSE....IN A CIVIL PROCEEDING WHEN ALL THE EVIDENCE PURPORTED IS FABRICATED AND SUBJECT TO PERJURY REVIEW AND HERESAY EXCEPTIONS

a) A Criminal Cross Claim is a General Defense allowed in Every court in the land. If the Probate court doesn't have the power or jurisdiction to here the cross-claim, the case needs to be transferred to the higher court on original jurisdiction. (IE Probate judges need to transfer cases they do not have the power to hear to their parent and highest trial courts.
b) The Probate court has already ruled it didn't have jurisdiction over Criminal Claims against James R. Stritzinger Jr, didn't have jurisdiction over the issues with Bank of America, and Verizon, and out of state corporations so it couldn't rule on any of the operative facts, other than a simple finding of why it shouldn't have proceeded with the original action.
c) See Spencer v. Krause, No. 14-35689 (9th Cir. 2017)
d) McDonough v Smith - 18-485
e) James R. Stritzinger JRs filing and initial claim was not proven. It was a hearsay complaint which included a stolen report as an Exhibit. Both the statement, and the exhibit are not admissible under South Carolina Rules of Evidence. This finding is enough to dismiss the entire complaint. Furthermore the Richland police did not validate the claim, and made no effort to take his statement before serving the claim against a citizen of another state.

#3 STANDING TO MAKE A CLAIM

a) Profressor Randazzo of the University of South Carolrina told our entire class that someone only has standing to request civil relief if that party has been harmed tangibly by the respondent in the claim. James R. Stritzinger Jr was not harmed by John S. Stritzinger and had no basis to file civil lawsuit against his brother.
b) John S. Stritzinger was in Professor Randazzo's class when he cited a case on the syllabus, and offered that the current court (Roberts Court) had ruled on this issue very recently in the Supreme Court of the United States – Constitutional Law 450 – University of South Carolina.

c) John S. Stritzinger is a citizen of Virginia, and James R. Stritzinger Jr is a citizen of South Carolina, James R. Stritzingers affidavit was inadmissible as he had no first hand knowledge of anything in his claim. He was not a party to the lawsuit in Florida over the home he was staying.

#4 JURISDICTION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

a) The State of South Carolina had no jurisdiction over Federal Causes of action involving real time surveillance(18 U.S. Code § 2511 - Interception and disclosure of wire, oral, or electronic communications prohibited), between two parties of Different States who had no business interactions together for more than 20 years(beyond the statute of limitations of the State of South Carolina), involving parties of many states(DE, PA, NY, VA, TX, SC, NC), of amounts greater than 1M dollars, and under US Statute 28 USC 1332, the probate court could not rule on this issue, nor could any other court in South Carolina except the Supreme Court of South Carolina, on an issue of actual innocence, or to review someone's criminal history in an application to become a South Carolina Resident.

b) James R. Stritzinger Jr claims that real time communications between himself and his brother John were intercepted by South Carolina State Law Enforcement, and given to his employer illegally, resulting in his bankruptcy, and loss of more than 5M dollars in assets in a complex property problem. He claims that he lost his job in 2009 due to this issue, yet he never sued SCRA launch where he wanted to return to work, and where he loved his job.

c) Imagine if James R. Stritzinger Jr filed a mental health complaint against Donald Trump (someone he doesn't know)..... except by the TV, or against Chris Uthe, a former employee of his who is an active FBI agent who lives in Delaware simply for claiming he was an FBI agent.

The absurdity of the claim and the action of the Richland Police Department is near unprecedented. The courts orders in this case, were only supported by another narcist Dr. Jeffrey Raynor of Prisma Health, who literally killed two patients in the short time Appellant was in his hospital by overmedicating people who were already catatonic. Neither Jeffrey Raynor, nor James R. Stritzinger by filing documents in the court are not sufficient to establish jurisdiction of the state. The events in question, and the facts had to occur in South Carolina as did the parties. John Stritzinger was in South Carolina a single day, when the complaint was filed.

#5 INTERFERENCE BY COURT STAFF IN THE PROCESS

a) Kim Williams court operations of the Probate court obstructed Justice in this case by claiming there was no transcript of Judge Belton or Judge Smileys court rooms, even though they had personal tape recording devices which were clearly in plain view, and which they told the parties were running. Ms. Williams committed perjury which is a felony.

b) Kim Williams has obstructed justice by setting Probate Hearings at times when Evidence cannot be marked, usually on holidays when no witnesses can be present. Appellant notes in Texas Motions are Set by the moving party, and the Duty Judges moves those settings on Motion of Defendants counsel.

c) Ms. Athena Border has obstructed justice by docketing cases on the appeals docket which were original actions so that a trial could not be had at all, (count1), and has asked the State of Texas not to serve subpoenas from her court that they already had in their possession. (count2). Both felonies under US Code 18 USC 73.

Prayer,

Appellant prays the court will sign an order acknowledging his bill of Exception and set a new trial.

John S. Stritzinger

John S. Stritzinger/S

ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS A – BILL OF EXCEPTION FILE STAMPED BY THE COURT OF APPEALS SOUTH CAROLINA

STRITZINGER v STRITZINGER ET ALL

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

AND THE COURT OF APPEALS, SOUTH CAROLINA

Appeal No. 2025-000964

Trial Court Cause # 2019CP4004271

RECEIVED
JUN 27 2025
SC Court of Appeals

FORMAL BILL OF EXCEPTION TO PROBATE COURT ACTION

APPELLANTS STATEMENT ON EVIDENCE AND WHY THIS COURT SHOULD RECONVENE TO REVIEW IT

Excluding everything else, and because there is no trial court record, Appellant/CounterPetitioner will provide a list of evidence he believes which was not marked but handed to the trial court which would constitute a record in the probate court.

A. AFFADAVIT OF JOHN S. STRITZINGER

APPELLANT OFFERS THE FOLLOWING AFFADAVIT OF HIS RECOLLECTION OF THE PROBATE ACTION

"John S. Stritzinger made a full market bid for the home he was living in Florida with the affirmation from BBT that a 200K home would be bought with improvements, and a 600K home in Texas would be sold which had a balance of roughly 200K owed to Bank of America. Appellant expected he should receive a payment in cash of roughly 150-200K after settlement as the litigation in Texas might have been more complex. BBT was going to underwrite that action.

I was sued by my brother for eviction after he told him me he would not accept a full market bid for the home he was living and despite having sufficient collateral. The Florida Circuit court signed this order prior to trial, and set the trial more than 30 miles from Appellants residence in an absolutely humungous county which is almost as large as South Carolina. The trial was set for more than 10 days thereafter, requiring a cost to stay plus transportation over 2K dollars which was irrational. The situation with this court he believed was even more difficult as he believed they took the original statement from the City of Orlando Police, or reviewed it prior to this trial.(3rd one in florida).

Appellant believes that was the case, because David A. Stritzinger was financing litigation of his father James R. Stritzinger Sr. against Katherine Wright which spanned several states and because Jim Sr. wanted to steal John S. Stritzingers house in Austin, Texas. In other words James R. Stritzinger Sr. believed his company was forced into bankruptcy as a result of the divorce process by the Wright Family, and had filed conspiracy complaints against Wright lawyers in six states. The Summary Below represents my recollection of the background and what happened before the court took the appeal in this case. I believe literally all the evidence entered into the record by the Probate court was inadmissible under the SC Rules of Evidence."

B. SUMMARY OF THE PROBATE ACTION AND PROBLEMS

INITIATION OF THE PROBATE ACTION

he probate Action was initiated by James R. Stritzinger Jr, a resident of 695 Bluff Pt Road, Columbia, SC art of the district of the Dutch Fork Magistrate, and Soutwestern Columbias border with the city of mo against his brother who was staying in Lexington County after two partial years in Florida(Sumter ounty – LadyLake).

UBSTANCE OF THE PROBATE ACTION AND VALIDATION

ames R. Stritzinger apparently filed a MH petition with some County Magistrate which was accepted nd sealed by the court. We believe judge Maurer ordered it to be served. Judge Maurer did not ask ichland county detectives to validate the complaint as they never took John S. Stritzingers statement /ho was a Virginia resident who was staying at his brothers rental property in Florida while multiple roceedings with Verizon Federal were underway primarily in Maryland, and Florida, but in the US istrict courts of three districts.

Ve assume that it was with Judge Maurer who was the Magistrate for Dutch Fork in 2018. We presume his only because this office was less than 3M from James R. Stritzingers home, and on the way to his vorkplace and the I26 Hwy. We say apparently because Appellant was never served this document. ppellant has never seen it. For the same reason Appellant could not respond to it, only Mr. Bartlett ould as Mr. Bartlett has electronic access to the MH docket in the probate court.

URISDICTION AND STANDING

ames R. Stritzinger had not spoken to John S. Stritzinger except over a dinner paid for by Appellant for aura and James Stritzinger at Carolina Ale House in the Vista on St. Patricks Day. Prior to that they had 10 contact with each other for more than 2 years. Appellant was staying at the Masters Inn in Lexington County, and took a cab to dinner. (Checker Yellow). That was a normal dinner, and nothing substantial iappened. It was the only time John S. Stritzinger was in the city except to go to the US District Courthouse. Richland county had no basis to serve a complaint against John S. Stritzinger who was living n a different county and had been in the County less than 5 hours on the night in question.

'Appellant believes that James R. Stritzinger is not a lawyer, or a MH professional and did not have the owers given to deputies of the state to initiate actions. Furthermore, he did not have first hand nowledge of anything he apparently swore to in his filing." He has no standing to request relief because ie was not physically harmed by John S. Stritzinger which is the basis the US Supreme Court has made to establish the same. The list of references are endless. James R. Stritzinger Jr's filing was MOOT.

Furthermore apparently James R. Stritzinger attached to his statement a medical report which WAS A PARTIAL COURT RECORD FROM A PREVIOUS TRIAL IN VIRGINIA OF MANY REPORTS WHICH APPELLANT NON.

ames R. Stritzingers filing represented a felony theft of medical records, violation of HIPAA compliance, berjury, double jeapordy, etc. Without the Medical documents it would not have been served. "

RICHLAND COUNTY DETECTIVE AFTER SERVICE WOULD NOT PROVIDE A COPY OF THE COMPLAINT

SECOND AFFADAVIT OF JOHN. S. STRITZINGER

"An unkown deputy said he was given a MH document from a County Magistrate. He told me that it included a medical document from Virginia, and a statement from my brother stating I was homeless, jobless, and ranting about the Central Intelligence Agency was the basis of his filing which was brief. He took me to the intake of the ER room at Prisma Hospital and said it was up to them whether it would be upheld. They had 48 hours to determine the merits of the filing according to the deputy but he did not cite South Carolina code, provide an attorney or give me a copy of the document so I could prepare my thoughts. He offered nothing else. He didn't ask me any questions. He said that was Prismas job. He said if my responses were ok then I would be released.

When I arrived at Prisma, I was made to wait until well into the evening before I could even get a sandwich. I was starving and the ER room I was staying was very very cold. Below 65 degrees and I didn't have my clothes with me which were at my hotel as I recall. I believe my hotel drove them to the Amtrak at CLB site as I had to check out over the phone and they were in Amtrak storage. All my other posessions were in my 4 bedroom home in Texas and a storage unit there."

JUDGE MAURER HAS NO SOUTH CAROLINA LAW DEGREE AND CANNOT RULE ON JURISDICTION AND STANDING WITHOUT FURTHER TRAINING OR BRIEFING BY LEGAL EXPERTS

As seen in Exhibit A – The training required to review standing and Jurisdiction are lengthy requiring at least 3CH at a public law school or University. Judge Maurers service of this claim is illegal and a violation of the South Carolina Constitution (Double Jeapordy).

ACTIONS BY VERIZON WHICH MADE EMPLOYMENT DIFFICULT

Verizon filed a civil action with the State of Virginia Employment Commission by Samuel Asiedu without contacting Verizon management. (Self Filed). Furthermore Mr. Asiedu after being denied access to a classified extension to a US Government bid, filed a criminal complaint against orders from internal counsel as well at the direction of his mom and father who are both US Immigrants who went to law schools in the United States. In other words Verizon via Samuel Asiedu had sued John S. Stritzinger both on a civil complaint, and a criminal complaint in multiple jurisdictions when he had almost no cash flow.

Furthermore the criminal complaint was served to Virginia which blocked owed paid Vacation Time, and his sales commissions which were worth approximately 30K dollars, and would have been sufficient to return to Texas. Under Virginia law, a Wage claim greater than 10K has to be served by the Circuit Court **on a Criminal Bench Warrant.** Such an order would have precluded John S. Stritzinger from EVER RETURNING TO VERIZON EVEN THOUGH MR. ASIEDU WAS DIRECTLY VIOLATING A NATIONAL SECURITY ORDER ISSUED BY PRESIDENT OBAMA.

PREVIOUS TRIALS ALREADY DETERMINED IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS STATES IN THE SAME MATTER

"I believe the States of Florida, Virginia, and Delaware had all heard related trials related to this action, and were using evidence and data from Texas. I believe Judge Smileys hearing was the 5th incident. These incidents were all related to irrational garnishments by Texas. Pennsylvania and North Carolina effectively denied trials. In other words Mr. Asiedus actions spanned PA, NJ, DE, MD, NC, SC, FL, TX. I needed 14 sets of counsel to resolve this complaint if Judge Wooten didn't order an order on the merits in US District Court. I believe that Judge Wooten acted in a criminal manner in this case, he both denied

a hearing on the merits, and then denied Bankruptcy proceedings citing Federal Benefits and low expenses."

PRELIMINARY HEARING – SMILEY

"Prior to my hearing with Judge Smiley, I met with Dr. Raynor every day for a few minutes. This went on for some 90 days. The complexity of the Verizon Action was very great, and even Mr. Bartlett took more than a week to understand. It was beyond the reach of Dr. Raynor, and his resident Ms. Noggle. Ms. Noggle is a much better than average looking female about 35 years old, and Dr. Raynor was her certifying doctor. Occasionally a third doctor appeared when Ms. Noggle was on vacation. Dr. Raynor is the hospital director, and he told me about the facility. I joined as many groups as I could to make time pass, but they essentially try to get you to recant all the facts you told them to leave. An employment action against Verizon Federal in South Carolina had zero chance of success, and he suggested I return to Virginia right away. He said he used to work there. He believed that the legal situation was so bad that it might take a decade to restoration. That was the basis of his finding.

Judge Smiley held a hearing about 10 days later. Ms. Noggle wrote a report stating that they had called the Doctor who wrote the report in Virginia, and they weren't going to do an evaluation beyond what he already did. They said it was sufficient to enter into the record. They emailed this report and their notes on the conversation to Judge Smiley, and he entered a 90 day patient stay. This stay cost the US Government more than 200K dollars, as RH charges over 2000 dollars a day. What they do is they charge you personally, then file a request with the US Government for reimbursement. My bill reached 200K at my discharge, and sometime within 60 days thereafter it was paid a long with a large lump sum of 65K dollars in January.

The issue is this is cascading hearsay because the Virginia Doctor in Question Dr. Vyas, was reviewing the FBI bid and the Verizon Action in Virginia which is quite a complicated set of issues in itself. Dr. Vyas has no national security clearance yet works in a Nuclear Military area. It was beyond amazing. Dr. Vyas said he was relying on a divorce report filed by Maureen Burroughs a Texas Professional.

So we had a SC professional reviewing a VA professional, reviewing a TX professionals documents none of which had any primary data of their own. They never saw me acting irrational in the equivalent of a hotel room at Richland Hospital with a TV, and a game room.

Judge Smiley said he was signing a 90 day order but it was only in effect in South Carolina, and I was free to leave thereafter. He asked me what I was going to do, I told him my plan was to return to Bob Evans who gave me benefits with BCBS while I tried to resolve the VZ complaint. I tried to do that in Florida, but judges who signed probable cause statements for felony criminal issues, are not inclined to hear cross-claims without some statement by third party counsel. I believe the two Senior judges in Florida were already tainted by Verizon who hoped to steal my bid work and Intellectual property which included upwards of 150 preliminary patents.

The issue in this case was emailed and stolen records. Mr. Greg Parker said he was the ad litem attached to the case, and it wasn't his job to do anything but call the state as a witness. In other words Greg Parker called Dr. Raynor and Ms. Noggle as witnesses, and they entered the Virginia Documents into the record along with the full medical documents gathered by Prisma. Nurses take notes every day so after two weeks they have 20-50 pages of documentation usually. This is usually just bio-rthym data.

The issue is the holding area at RH is a hotel room, and the longer term stay is very different with full spectrum issues. The spectrum of treatable disorders in this hospital was much larger than I have seen before as the State of Virginia has a much larger hospital, and the first trial in Delaware (yes that's right this is the third trial on the same filings) was essentially a rehab hospital for drug users. They prescribe methodone and wait two weeks effectively to see what you are like without toxins in your body.

Its my experience that most patients in the hospital are at the verge of starvation so their MH issues are related to nourishment problems. After a week in the hospital with 3 trays and lots of sleep most patients recover. Charging the US Government 200K for homeless services is ridiculous. I believe Governor McMaster does not do his job. In Columbia alone they are short about 5K beds, and I believe in Myrtle Beach about 2500 beds.

Greg Parker told me he was going to be my lawyer. I asked him to get my resume, and validate my work history and he refused. He told me the first hearing was a formality. I believe he filed one or more statements with the court on his 2 min discussion with me.

I am a previously sworn Federal Law Enforcement officer, and I believe that Mr. Parker committed Felony Perjury on our very first encounter. I filed a bar complaint against him for the same. I also believe the State of South Carolina has a process problem. In Virginia every patient gets an attorney without requesting one, and the state has a prosecutor for each and every case which is usually outside counsel with special training on medical issues."

BELTON ON THE MERITS

"Judge Belton accepted my motion for counsel and appointed Mr. Bartlett. She told us she was going to review the whole case including Judge Smileys order. Mr. Bartlett let Greg Parker who was now acting as the State Prosecutor to enter the entire record from the first hearing without objections. He did not seek to cross-examine James R. Stritzinger or review the states process for initiating the case, the amounts billed by prisma which were excessive. Mr. Bartlett did nothing at all. He request Mr. Bought night who became the 4th Prisma doctor along with Ms. Finks, Dr. Raynor, and Dr. Noggle and he offered no legal theories, offered nothing nice to say about me, and did not make any effort to send subpoenas or do some statement on previous job history. Effectively Mr. Bartlett became Greg's assistant in prosecuting his client which is a clear claim for a bar compliant in TOTAL INEFFECTIVENESS OF COUNSEL. No legal theories, No evidence, No effort to call me as a witness. No discussion of Florida, or recent travels or staying in another county. Furthermore, after doing nothing at all Mr. Bartlett served the court for a bill of 10K dollars when he did no preparation at all. He met me once in his office. After that Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Parker submitted a draft order to the court which I understand was a draft order they use in every medical case. It effectively gives all your money and property to an executor and suspends all of your rights as a US Citizen. I believe the order itself is illegal and unconstitutional. Courts only have the power to enter orders related to pleadings they have received and evidence on the record. There was no responsive pleadings representing that order, and no evidence in support of the drastic basis of it in the first place. That order however is signed by every south Carolina state Judge in every probate matter. It may take a Federal Trial to rectify the process, but that's several years longer in practice.

James R. Stritzinger took the stand and said I was incompetent and he was simply trying to save his brothers life. He testified for several minutes. The court did not allow me to cross-examine him on

process issues, and Mr. Bartlett asked him no question at all. He did nothing at all but send the court a bill.

I believe James R. Stritzinger has a narcisstic personality disorder. He was a Microsoft Vice President who lost all of his money after starting his own company, and lost his new job at SCRA a South Carolina State appointed job by the Governor for having an affair with his corporate secretary. After the affair he was fired and had no money to pay for his 3M mortgage in Hilton Head. He had put all of his own money in trust, and was living off trust payments, but he was forced into bankruptcy as a result of his own poor personal conduct.

I told the FBI when I was an executive at Bank of America in 2009, he called me to tell me he was leaving his wife of many years, and that he was in love. He asked to stay with me in Charlotte. I told him no, I liked his wife, and he wasn't separated or divorced yet. He believes that that phone call was wiretapped by Bank of America security or Katherine Wrights counsel in Texas, and they (one or both) filed an anonymous complaint with his manager in South Carolina which resulted in losses in excess of 5M dollars by my estimation. My brother was quite rich at one time with a boat on the lake.

My brothers problems had nothing to do with me. I made no errors at Verizon. I made no bad decisions, but James R. Stritzinger sr, his dad joined the criminal action with Dollar Rental Car in Florida on affidavit which has mostly destroyed my life and my kids lives. Jim Sr, also insulted a Texas judge who barred him from the court room and assessed 100K dollars in legal fees which is the primary issue in the garnishment case. In other words in a custody battle Jim Sr. who began to drink heavily insulted the court operations officer of the 345th district court on tape, after he called my ex wife an expletive in the hallway. She was standing right next to him as I recall. They then played a tape of the exchange at the last day of the trial. After that I had to evict him from my home as my kids didn't like him around. They complained he was mean."

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

1) SMILEY
    a) Reports – Initial Filing by James R. Stritzinger Jr. with Dr. Vyas Report (INADMISSABLE STOLEN EVIDENCE & HERESAY – TWO OBJECTIONS).
    b) Statement of John S. Stritzinger about the perjury of Gregory Parker – Reardon Law Firm who was the States Appointed Ad-Litem. Mr. Parker told Appellant he was his lawyer and would be defending him. Mr. Parker then took multiple statements about the Verizon case which were included in the record.
    c) Reports and Statements by Noggle, Raynor which were related to Dr. Vyas report. After 1 week they had not done their own. Appellant objects to these as neither Dr. Noggle, or Raynor were psychologists nor was Dr. Vyas, they have no training to review Dr. Burroughs report who had a Masters in Psychology, and her PHD in Psychiatry. Dr. Burroughs in my opinion is significantly more qualified to the other three doctors, but even her report was one of six filed in Texas. The State of South Carolina only review negative evidence admitted in other states not anything positive. Furthermore Dr. Noggle, and Dr. Raynor neither have any national security experience or any technology experience and could not provide comments about the Verizon FBI bid which was the basis of their report.

d) Statement by James R. Stritzinger asking for a 90 day stay who did not have standing, experience, or background to enter an expert report.
e) Statement of Greg Parker claiming he also supported a longer review of the case.
f) I don't believe that any of the experts who testified are qualified to provide comments on the Verizon Federal Bid received from the FBI, none saw John S. Stritzinger behaving irrationally, and none could support James R. Stritzinger previous perjured complaint which was admitted before the hearing even began by email.

2) BELTON
a) NOGGLE, RAYNOR filed a report after 90 days. Bartlett appears. Objections to NOGGLE AND RAYNORS appearance would have been ignored by most courts.
b) Court orders a report by Boughnight requested by Bartlett who was his friend. A 5th grade math test was rendered, and Mr. Boughtnight said I was dyslexic when he met me. Like Dr. Raynor, and Noggle he was not qualified to review the Verizon case, and was equally skeptical like most psyhologists.
c) Counsel Bartlett after temporary orders by Judge Smiley had to review the entire process, previous trials and other states, a felony crimes by the Stritzinger family in a trial on the merits. If this case is reviewed that's what needs to happen.
d) Counsel Bartlett offered no legal theories, no competing experts, no cross-examination, no documents in support, no work history, no property ownership statements in Texas. He did nothing at all.
e) Judge Belton refused to let me cross-examine witnesses as she had appointed Mr. Bartlett to do that.
f) As a result of the complete incompetence of Mr. Bartlett at trial, only the State of South Carolina proceeded. There was no defense allowed to be presented.
g) Judge Belton taped the courtroom proceedings, and entered documents into the record without marking them and stating what they are. As a result her trial is not renewable on a per document basis.
h) Judge Belton was presented a form draft order by Greg Parker which he apparently had already sent to Jim Jr, and Bart Barlett. The three parties had agreed before the trial what they were going to ask the court to order.

OTHER ISSUES – PREVIOUS TRIALS AND DOUBLE JEAPORDY

a) William R. Stritzinger(DE), Jim Sr(FR) had filed identical trials and complaints they lost.
b) Samuel Asiedu had filed an identical statement in Virginia and he lost, because the Chief Judge of Virginia Beach County(Lahne) met me on emergency orders WHILE I WAS STILL AN EMPLOYEE OF VERIZON.
c) The filing by James R. Stritzinger Jr. was not double jeapordy it was a 4th Jeapordy event all filed by the direct family of John S. Stritzinger AFTER ALL BEING FORCED INTO BANKRUPTCY BY MS. WRIGHT AND HER COUNSEL.

MAJOR COMPLAINTS ON A REVIEW/APPEAL

a) No Reporters Record by the clerks affidavit from either Smiley or Beltons Case.
b) No Service of Process of the original Action which is required in all Civil and Criminal Causes.

c) Illegal interrogation not by a Richland Detective on Tag Jurisdiction, but by Ms. Finks at between 2am-4am if I am not mistaken. Otherwise I would have been released at 7am. Her interrogation was on the CIA which James R. Stritzinger Jr. Applied to and wanted to work for but I did not.

d) Cross-Claims on Appeal not allowed to be served at the Circuit Court Level – Cross-Criminal charges against James R. Stritzinger.

e) Circuit Court denies right to correct the record, cross-examine the original witnesses.

f) Circuit Court denies to suspend Ms. Wrights garnishment, or enforce subpoenas issued by the clerk in the Circuit Court.

John S. Stritzinger /S

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This document was served electronically to James R. Stritzinger Jr. before filing by electronic methods in its entirety including exhibit A, and B.

John S. Stritzinger /S

John S. Stritzinger

1800 Washington Street

Columbia, SC 29201

RECEIVED

JUN 27 2025

SC Court of Appeals

EXHIBIT A - List of United States Supreme Court cases involving standing

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

A number of United States Supreme Court opinions have been important for their development of the doctrine of legal standing in the context of federal law in the United States. Some of those opinions include:

Case	Year decided	Holding	Voting
Dred Scott v. Sandford	1857	People of African ancestry (whether free or not) were not United States Citizens, and therefore lacked standing to sue. This ruling stood as precedent until the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.	7–2
Georgia v. Tennessee Copper Co.	1907	States, as quasi-sovereigns, have *parens patriae* standing to sue for environmental harms, in this case fumes from copper mining.[1]	9–0
Fairchild v. Hughes	1922	A New York resident (whose state had women's suffrage) lacked any particularized standing to challenge alleged state-level ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This was a landmark case; prior to this, private citizens were permitted to litigate public rights.	9–0
Frothingham v. Mellon	1923	The generalized injury of higher taxation overall is insufficient to give a taxpayer standing to challenge federal spending. This case is considered the genesis of the doctrine of standing.[2]	9–0
Poe v. Ullman	1961	The plaintiff lacked standing to challenge a law banning contraceptives as it had never been enforced, and the controversy was not yet ripe. The same law was successfully challenged four years later in *Griswold v. Connecticut*.	5–4
Baker v. Carr	1962	Voters have standing to litigate when their constitutional right to vote is infringed.	7–2

Epperson v. Arkansas	1968	In contrast to *Poe*, the court did recognize standing in a case for overturning an unenforced Arkansas state law prohibiting the teaching of evolution.[3]	9–0
Flast v. Cohen	1968	Clarified that *Frothingham* did not deny all taxpayer lawsuits; identified the *Flast* test, which gives standing to taxpayers challenging laws are based on the congressional power to tax and spend, and if the challenged law can be shown to exceed any constitutional limitations on that power.[4]	8–1
Sierra Club v. Morton	1972	An environmental group, as a corporate entity, did not by itself have standing to challenge a development permit, but such a group could sue on behalf of any of its members if those members had, themselves, a particularized interest.[5]	4–3
United States v. SCRAP	1973	SCRAP, despite alleging quite attenuated injuries to the local environment due to a proposed rail freight increase on recyclable materials, did assert a particularized harm by showing that its members made use of those areas, and thus enjoyed standing to sue under the principles enunciated in *Sierra Club*.[6]	8–0
DeFunis v. Odegaard	1974	A student who had challenged a school's racially discriminatory admissions standards, but who had been allowed to attend college while the case proceeded, lacked standing due to mootness.	5–4
Valley Forge Christian College v. Americans United for Separation of Church and State	1982	Americans United lacked standing on the grounds that the conditional gift of surplus federal property to a religious college was the result of an executive branch action under Article IV rather than a congressional action taken under the Taxing and Spending Clause, and therefore was not covered under the *Flast* test.[7]	5–4
Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman	1983	An organization may sue in its own right if it has been directly injured, for example through a "drain on the organization's resources", and that so-called "testers", individuals who sought to determine if a company was in violation of the law, may have standing in their own right.[8][*full citation needed*]	9–0[9]

City of Los Angeles v. Lyons	1983	A plaintiff had standing to sue for damages from being subjected to a chokehold that was allowed under Los Angeles Police Department policy, but did not have standing to sue for an injunction against the chokehold policy itself because the plaintiff could not show a "real and immediate threat" that he would be subjected to the same policy in the future.[10] The Court clarified that courts must find standing for different forms of relief individually.[11]	5–4
Allen v. Wright	1984	A group of African-American parent plaintiffs lacked standing to challenge what they saw as a lack of enforcement of restrictions by the Internal Revenue Service on certain private school tax exemptions, as the plaintiff parents' children had never applied, and had no plans to apply to those schools.	5–3
County of Riverside v. McLaughlin	1991		
Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife	1992	Plaintiff environmental organizations lacked standing under the Endangered Species Act; such a plaintiff must have suffered a tangible, particular harm.	7–2
Northeastern Fla. Chapter, Associated Gen. Contractors of America v. Jacksonville	1993		
Raines v. Byrd	1997	Individual members of Congress lack the particularized interest required for standing for issues affecting the entire Congress, in this case the Line Item Veto Act of 1996.	7–2
DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Cuno	2006	State taxpayers do not have standing to challenge state tax laws in federal court.	9–0
Massachusetts v. EPA	2007	States have standing to sue the EPA to enforce their views of federal law, in this case, the view that carbon dioxide was an air pollutant under the Clean Air Act. Cited *Georgia v. Tennessee Copper Co.* as precedent.	5–4

Hein v. Freedom From Religion Foundation	2007		
Bond v. United States	2011	Plaintiff had standing to argue that a federal law enforcing the Chemical Weapons Convention in this instance intruded on state police powers. (On the merits, Bond's claim was later rejected.)	9–0
Hollingsworth v. Perry	2013	Proponents of a California ballot initiative against gay marriage did not have standing to defend the law in court after the governor and attorney general refused to do so; the decision had the effect of legalizing gay marriage in California	5–4
Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins	2016	There is a distinction between the "concrete" and "particularized" requirements for the "injury in fact" element of the standing test. The case was remanded without deciding the standing question.[12]	6–2
Thole v. US Bank	2020	Statutory cause of action to sue does not satisfy Article III standing requirements; plaintiffs must have suffered concrete and particularized injury.	5–4
Carney v. Adams	2020	Plaintiff did not have Article II standing to challenge the legality of a law limiting who can apply for judicial vacancies because he failed to show that he was "able and ready" to apply for a judicial vacancy and thus did not suffer personal, concrete, and imminent injury.	8–0
Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski	2021	Nominal damages satisfy Article III's requirement of redressability.	8–1
California v. Texas	2021	States and individuals have no Article III standing to block a federal individual mandate of $0 because there is no penalty.	7–2
TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez	2021	Only plaintiffs concretely harmed by a defendant's statutory violation have Article III standing to seek damages against that private defendant in federal court.	5–4

FDA v. Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine	2024	A plaintiff's desire to make a drug less available for others does not create Article III standing.	9–0
Murthy v. Missouri	2024	States and individual social media users have no Article III standing to enjoin government agencies and officials from pressuring or encouraging social media platforms to suppress protected speech in the future.	6-3

EXHIBIT B – STATE COURTS RULING ON FEDERAL LAW

CONSTITUTION ANNOTATED
Analysis and Interpretation of the U.S. Constitution

ArtIII.S1.6.4 State Court Jurisdiction to Enforce Federal Law

Article III, Section 1:

> *The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.*

Unless the federal courts possess exclusive jurisdiction over a matter, state courts may hear cases over which federal courts would have also had jurisdiction.[1] However, it does not necessarily follow from the fact that state courts are *authorized* to hear claims arising under federal law that the state courts *must* agree to hear federal claims. In deciding multiple cases on this issue, the Supreme Court has ruled that state courts generally must hear federal law claims unless state law bars a state court from hearing a federal claim through a "neutral rule of judicial administration" that does not improperly burden claims arising under federal law.[2]

In the 1876 case *Claflin v. Houseman*, the Supreme Court held that state courts could hear cases arising under federal bankruptcy law.[3] The Court reasoned:

> The laws of the United States are laws in the several States, and just as much binding on the citizens and courts thereof as the State laws are. The United States is not a foreign sovereignty as regards the several States, but is a concurrent, and, within its jurisdiction, paramount sovereignty.[4]

The Court thus held that "the State courts have concurrent jurisdiction whenever, by their own constitution, they are competent to take it."[5] While *Claflin* concerned when state courts may exercise jurisdiction over federal claims, a number of subsequent cases have cited *Claflin* when considering when state courts may validly *decline* jurisdiction over federal claims.

In several cases, the Supreme Court has upheld state courts' refusal to hear federal claims, finding that state law provided a "valid excuse" to decline jurisdiction. For instance, in *Douglas v. New York, N.H. & H.R. Co.*, the Court upheld a state law that allowed state courts to decline jurisdiction over both state and federal law claims when neither party was a resident of the State.[6] The Supreme Court noted that there was nothing in the federal statute at issue "that purports to force a duty" to hear cases on state courts "as against an otherwise valid excuse."[7] In *Howlett v. Rose*, the Court summarized cases like *Douglas*, where states had validly declined to hear federal claims, as involving "neutral rule[s] of judicial administration."[8]

By contrast, in *Mondou v. New York, N.H. & H.R. Co.*, a Connecticut court declined to hear a case arising under federal law, in part because the state court held it was "at liberty to decline cognizance of actions to enforce rights arising under [the federal] act,

because . . . the policy manifested by it is not in accord with the policy of the state."[9] The Supreme Court rejected that proposition and held that the state court must hear the case. In so holding, the Court emphasized that the case did not involve "any attempt by Congress to enlarge or regulate the jurisdiction of state courts, or to control or affect their modes of procedure," but only a question of when state courts must hear federal claims that fall within their "ordinary jurisdiction, as prescribed by local laws."[10]

Similarly, in *Testa v. Katt*, the Rhode Island Supreme Court declined to enforce a federal statute containing a punitive damages provision, finding that the law was penal in nature and the "state need not enforce the penal laws of a government which is 'foreign in the international sense.'"[11] The U.S. Supreme Court reversed, holding that the Rhode Island court must enforce the federal statute, and that a state policy of not enforcing penal statutes of other sovereigns was not a "valid excuse" under *Douglas*.[12] Among other things, the Court explained that "[i]t cannot be assumed, the supremacy clause considered, that the responsibilities of a state to enforce the laws of a sister state are identical with its responsibilities to enforce federal laws."[13]

In the 2009 case *Haywood v. Drown*, the Supreme Court considered a state statute that divested New York state courts of jurisdiction over suits under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 seeking money damages from corrections officers, as well as similar state law claims against corrections officers.[14] The Court held that the New York law violated the Supremacy Clause. Writing for the majority, Justice John Paul Stevens explained, "we have emphasized that only a neutral

jurisdictional rule will be deemed a 'valid excuse' for departing from the default assumption" that state courts will hear federal claims.[15] Although the New York statute removed jurisdiction over both state and federal claims, the Court held, "equality of treatment" between state and federal claims "does not ensure that a state law will be deemed . . . a valid excuse for refusing to entertain a federal cause of action."[16] Rather, by distinguishing between Section 1983 claims against corrections officers and all other Section 1983 suits, New York undermined the federal policy of making relief under Section 1983 broadly available. The Court held that this was impermissible: "having made the decision to create courts of general jurisdiction that regularly sit to entertain analogous suits, New York is not at liberty to shut the courthouse door to federal claims that it considers at odds with its local policy."[17]

The question of state court enforcement of federal law is related to, but distinct from, the anti-commandeering doctrine.[18] In *Printz v. United States*, the Supreme Court distinguished between federal control over state courts and commandeering of the political branches of state government. Justice Antonin Scalia's majority opinion surveyed federal legislation from early Congresses that required state courts to take certain actions, such as recording applications for citizenship, but noted that state courts are bound by the Supremacy Clause, which expressly requires them to apply federal law. The Court thus concluded, "we do not think the early statutes imposing obligations on state courts imply a power of Congress to impress the state executive into its service."[19]

Footnotes

1. ^ *See, e.g.*, Claflin v. Houseman. 93 U.S. 130, 136 (1876); Charles Dowd Box Co. v. Courtney, 368 U.S. 502, 507 (1962); Gulf Offshore Co. v. Mobil Oil Corp., 453 U.S. 473, 477–84 (1981).
2. ^ Howlett v. Rose, 496 U.S. 356, 374 (1990).
3. ^ 93 U.S. 130 (1876). Currently, federal law grants the federal courts exclusive jurisdiction over bankruptcy cases, 28 U.S.C. § 1334, but that was not true at the time of the events at issue in Claflin.
4. ^ 93 U.S. at 136.
5. ^ *Id.*
6. ^ 279 U.S. 377 (1929). *See also* Herb v. Pitcairn, 324 U.S. 117 (1945) (upholding state court's application of state venue laws to dismiss for want of jurisdiction of an action brought under federal law because the cause of action arose outside the city court's territorial jurisdiction); Missouri *ex rel.* S. R. Co. v. Mayfield, 340 U.S. 1 (1950) (holding that a state's application of the forum non conveniens doctrine to bar adjudication of a federal claim brought by nonresidents was constitutional as long as the policy was enforced impartially); Johnson v. Fankell, 520 U.S. 911 (1997) (holding that a state rule limiting interlocutory jurisdiction did not discriminate against federal claims). A related question is whether federal procedural rules apply in state courts when they hear federal claims. The Supreme Court rejected that proposition in Minneapolis & St. Louis R. Co. v. Bombolis, in which it declined to apply the Seventh Amendment's jury trial requirement to state courts enforcing a federal statute. 241 U.S. 211. The rule that state courts must entertain federal claims, the Court explained, did not imply that "for the purpose of enforcing the right, the state court was to be treated as a Federal court." *Id.* at 222.
7. ^ 279 U.S. at 388.
8. ^ 496 U.S. 356, 374 (1990).
9. ^ 223 U.S. 1, 55 (1912).
10. ^ *Id.* at 56–57. *See also* McKnett v. St. Louis & S.F. Ry., 292 U.S. 230, 233–34 (1934) ("[T]he Federal Constitution prohibits state courts of general

jurisdiction from refusing to do so solely because the suit is brought under a federal law.").

11. ^ 330 U.S. 386, 388 (1947).
12. ^ *Id.* at 393.
13. ^ *Id.* at 389.
14. ^ 556 U.S. 729 (2009).
15. ^ *Id.* at 735.
16. ^ *Id.* at 738.
17. ^ *Id.* at 740.
18. ^ For further discussion of the anti-commandeering doctrine, see Amdt10.4.2 Anti-Commandeering Doctrine.
19. ^ 521 U.S. 898, 907 (1997).

University of South Carolina
Thomas Cooper Library
Student Printing Kiosk
Columbia
South Carolina 29208
803-777-5146

Terminal: 24TCLTechLounge
06/27/2025 14:50
Receipt #: 104267

Qty	Description	Amount
19	Letter B&W Print	2.85
	SubTotal	2.85
	Total	USD $2.85

Acct #:************5980 [C]
VISA DEBIT
Chip Read
Auth No.: 030661
Mode: Issuer
AID: A0000000031010
NO CVM
TVR: 8000008000
IAD: 0606120360A000
TSI: 6800
ARC: 00
APPROVED

Student Printing Kiosk
go.sc.edu/studentprinting

Align top of FedEx Express® shipping label here.

RECEIVED
AUG 07 2025
SC Court of Appeals

557

ORIGIN ID:USCA (843) 352-3459
JOHN STRITZINGER
[illegible]00 WASHINGTON ST
COLUMBIA, SC 29201
UNITED STATES US

SHIP DATE: 06AUG25
ACTWGT: 0.55 LB
CAD: 6570821/ROSA2650

TO SC CLERK OF COURT
COURT OF APPEALS
1220 SENATE ST

COLUMBIA SC 29201
(000) 000-0000 REF:
INV:
PO: DEPT:

FedEx Express
E

Envelope
Recycle me.

FRI – 08 AUG 5:00P
** 2DAY **

TRK# 0201 8833 7144 4205

28 COLBG

USCA 29201
SC-US CAE