PETION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE ACTION OF

Timothy Meyers, Appellant,

v.

Affordable Concrete and Masonry, Respondent.

Re: In the South Carolina Supreme Court Case of Timothy Meyers v. Affordable Concrete and Masonry Appellate Case No. 2024-000657 and Lower Court Case No. 2024CP2600231 The PRO SE Petitioner Timothy Meyers asks this Honorable Court to grant a Writ Of Certiorari in this matter.

INTRODUCTION

Before you comes a case of shoddy work performed by AFFORDABLE CONCRETE AND MASONRY at the residence of TIMOTHY MEYERS residing at 7712 Hunting Swamp Rd, Conway SC 29527. After work was performed, and deficiencies in that work were exposed, Mr Meyers asked a local Magistrate Court to hear the case, and since then, this case has gone to the South Carolina Appeals Court, and The South Carolina Supreme Court.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

THIS CASE WAS INITIALLY HEARD AT A MAGISTRATE IN HORRY COUNTY IN WHICH INITIALLY, A COURT CASE THAT WAS TO BE HEARD AT 10AM EST, WAS NOT HEARD TILL 10:50AM EST DUE TO THE FACT AFFORDABLE CONCRETE AND MASONRY REPRESENTATIVES WERE NOWHERE TO BE FOUND. ONCE THE CASE PROCEEDED, MULTIPLE EX-PARTE CONVERSATIONS WERE MADE BETWEEN THE MAGISTRATE AND THE AFFORDABLE CONCRETE AND MASONRY AND WERE MADE DUE TO THE FACT THAT TIMOTHY MEYERS HAS MASSIVE PHYSICAL CONSTRAINTS.

AFTER THE MAGISTRATE'S DECISION WAS APPEALED, NO PROOF OF SERVICE OF COMMON PLEAS HEARING DATE WAS OFFERED, NOR WAS A DECLARATION OF NON-SERVICE PRESENTED. HENCE, MR MEYERS WAS NOTIFIED OF THE COMMON PLEAS CASE THAT HE APPEALED TO, AND THE CASE WAS DISMISSED FOR NON-ATTENDANCE.

CASE WAS THEN APPEALED TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS, WHERE THE COURTS NEVER CONCLUDED OR AFFIRMED ANY OF THE PREVIOUS QUESTIONS, AND DENIED/DISMISSED THE APPELLANTS FILING.

THE CASE WAS THEN APPEALED TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT, WHO DENIED THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. ON THE DATE OF THE INITIAL MAGISTRATE HEARING THAT HAD A REASSIGNED MAGISTRATE, THE APPELLANT IN THIS CASE MR MEYERS WAS AT THE COURTHOUSE READY FOR TRIAL AND CHECKED IN SOME 30 MINUTES PRIOR TO THE SCHEDULEDHEARING TIME OF 10AM.
2. ON THIS SAME DAY, AND AS TIME WAS PASSING, MR MEYERS AT 10:16AM NOTICED THAT THE NOW RESPONDENT "AFFORDABLE CONCRETE" HAD NOT YET CHECKED IN FOR THE HEARING, AND FACTUALLY WASN'T IN THE BUILDING.
3. AT 10:18AM, APPELLANT MR MEYERS INQUIRED WITH THE MAGISTRATE'S MAIN OFFICE AND THE SECRETARIES OFFICE AS TO THE TIME THAT HAD ELAPSED AND THE FACT THAT THE TRAIL SHOULD BE NOW DEEMED IN FAVOR FOR THE APPELLANT AS THE OTHER PARTY WAS A NO-SHOW.
4. THE SECRETARY IN MAGISTRATE MAYES OFFICE TOLD ME THAT TYPICALLY THERE IS ONLY A 15 MINUTE WAIT PERIOD ALLOWED AFTER THE HEARINGS TIMEFRAME AND VERDICT SHOULD BE THEN HAD.
5. AFTER RE-CHECKING WITH THE OFFICE CLERK, THE APPELLANT WAS TOLD TO AGAIN WAIT.
6. THE APPELLANT WENT TO THE LOWER FLOOR REAR ENTRANCE TO GET SOME AIR WHEN HE NOTICED WHAT HE THOUGHT WAS POTENTIALLY THE STAND-IN MAGISTRATE JUST ENTERING THE BUILDING.
7. AT 10:37AM, THE APPELLANT AND THE REPLACEMENT MAGISTRATE RODE THE ELEVATOR TOGETHER TO THE SECOND FLOOR.
8. UPON ARRIVING ON THE SECOND FLOOR, THE NOW RESPONDENT WAS STILL NOWHERE IN SITE AND HAD NOT CHECKED IN AT EITHER THE MAGISTRATE OFFICE OR THE CLERKS OFFICE FOR THAT DAY'S HEARING.

9. AFTER WAITING AN APPROX. ANOTHER 22 MINUTES, THE RESPONDENT "AFFORDABLE CONCRETE" IN THAT OF THE WIFE OF THE BUSINESS SHOWS UP, AND WE ARE LED INTO THE MAIN COURTROOM TO PROCEED.
10. THE WIFE THAT WAS NOW PRESENT HAD ZERO KNOWLEDGE OF THE ACTUAL WORK THAT HAD BEEN PERFORMED, OR THE LOCATION OF THE PROPERTY IN WHICH WORK WAS PERFORMED "OTHER THAN THE ADDRESS" AND KNEW NOTHING OF BEFORE OR AFTER CONDITIONS OF WHERE THE WORK WAS PERFORMED AND TESTIFIED TO THAT IN COURT WHEN QUESTIONED.
11. AT APPROX. 23 MINUTES INTO THE PROCEEDINGS, THE HUSBAND OF AFFORDABLE CONCRETE WALKED INTO THE PROCEEDINGS DURING TESTIMONY.
12. ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS THE REPONDENTS TESTIMONY WAS FILLED WITH LIES AND FABRICATIONS, AND WHEN I SHOWED PICTURE EVIDENCE AS A STATEMENT OF FACT, THE MAGISTRATE SEEMED LESS THAN OPEN TO THE FACT THAT PEOPLE WERE PERJURING THEMSELVES REAL TIME IN COURT.
13. AFTER SHOWING PICTURES OF THE WORK INVOLVED AND OFFERING STATEMENTS FROM QUALIFIED CONTRACTORS IN THE SAME FIELD OF WORK, THE MAGISTRATE CAME TO THE DETERMINATION THAT WE SHOULD ALL DRIVE TO THE SITE WHERE THE WORK WAS PERFORMED.
14. AFTER SEEING THE ACTUAL WORK, AND ACTUALLY THE MAGISTRATE SPENDING ALMOST THE ENTIRE TIME WALKING WITH THE RESPONDENT FROM AFFORDABLE CONCRETE, I KNEW DUE TO THE POLITICS OF THE RELATIONSHIP, THE APPELLANT HAD A ZERO CHANCE OF A FAIR DECISION.
15. A DECISION CAME DOWN FROM THE MAGISTRATE OFFICE FINDING FOR THE RESPONDENT, AND THERE WAS NO CONSIDERATION OF FACT IN THE CASE THAT CLEARLY CONTRADICTED THE SPEW OF MISTRUTHS BY THE RESPONDENT.
16. AFTER THE APPELLANT RECEIVED THE DECISION, HE IMMEDIATELY APPEALED THE DECISION TO THE COMMON PLEAS COURT OF HORRY COUNTY.
17. AFTER THE APPEAL WAS FILED AND STAMPED THE APPELLANT NEVER WAS SERVED WITH A TIMEFRAME AS TO A NEW TRIAL IN THIS MATTER.
18. COURT RECORDS SHOW THAT THE COURTS HAVE NO RECORD OF PROCESS/SERVICE ON THE APPELLANT.
19. IMMEDIATELY UPON FINDING OUT THERE HAD BEEN A HEARING AND A DECISION IN THIS MATTER, THE APPELLANT FILED AN APPEAL WITH THE SC APPELLATE COURTS.
20. THE PLAINTIFF HAS FULFILLED HIS REQUIREMENT FOR FILING ALL THE NECESSARY PAPERWORK AND HAS TOLD THE TRUTH IN ALL MATTERS.
21. THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN HARRASSED, STALKED, BERATED, FILMED AND FOLLOWED VIA VEHICLE BY THE REPONDENT ON NUMEROUS OCCASIONS. IN THE LATEST INCIDENT, THE APPELLANT PULLED INTO A RIGHT HAND LANE OF A BANK DRIVE THRU AND THE RESPONDENT WAS IN THE LEFT HAND LANE AND ROLLED HIS PASSENGER WINDOW DOWN IN AN EFFORT TO TALK DOWN TO THE APPELLANT. WHEN LEAVING THE DRIVE THRU BEFORE THE RESPONDENT, APPROX. 1.5 MILES AWAY, I NOTICED THE REPONDENT WITHIN 2 FOOT OF MY BUMPER IN HIS TRUCK WHILE TRAVELING AT APPROX. 35-40 MILES AN HOUR.

22. THE RESPONDENT WENT ON TO TURN AT EVERY TURN THE PLAINTIFF WAS MAKING, AND ACTUALLY THEN FOLLOWED THE PLAINTIFF INTO AN EMPTY LOT WHERE THE APPELLANT HAD TURNED INTO, JUST TO ULTIMATELY VERIFY THE RESPONDENT WAS FOLLOWING HIM.
23. IT IS BELIEVED THAT THE RESPONDENT HAD A WEAPON IN HIS TRUCK, AND AS I WAS ABOUT TO CALL THE POLICE IN THIS MATTER AND WHEN THE RESPONDENT SAW ME READYING A PHONE CALL, HE QUICKLY DIVERTED. MOST OF THIS EVENT WAS RECORDED.
24. MR MEYERS THEN RECEIVED NOTICE THAT THE SOUTH CAROLINA APPELLATE COURT REFUSED TO RETURN THE CASE TO THE LOWER COURTS.
25. MR MEYERS THEN APPEALED THE APPELLATE COURTS DECISION TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT, WHERE THAT COURT DENIED THE REQUEST FOR CERTIORARI.

LEGAL ARGUMENTS AND PRIOR PROCEEDINGS

1. IT IS WIDELY KNOWN OF THE MAGISTRATE COURTS THROUGHOUT THE US THAT MAGISTRATE COURTS WERE DEVELOPED TO BE CLOSER TO THE PEOPLE....MEANING THAT THESE COURTS ARE TO BE EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO THE COMMON MAN TO BE ABLE TO AIR HIS GRIEVANCES. AND EVEN THOUGH ITS AT TIMES CONSIDERED TO BE A MORE LOOSELY HELD AND CONSTRUED METHOD OF JUDGING LAW, THERE ARE STILL RULES THAT GOVERN PROCEDURES. IN ANY COURT ESPECIALLY MAGISTRATE COURT, THERE IS A KNOWN "TIME LIMIT" OF 15 MINUTES FROM THE SET TRIAL TIME THAT INDIVIDUALS THAT ARE PART OF THAT HEARING ARE TO BE PRESENT IN COURT. IN THIS INSTANCE, ONLY ONE PARTY WAS PRESENT AT THE TIME OF THE HEARING. CLEARLY IF THERE WAS NO TIME LIMITS AT ALL, THERE WOULD NEVER BE A NEED FOR ANY JUDGEMENT, OR A NEED FOR ANYONE TO EVER SHOW UP IN COURT. THIS COURT THROUGH WHAT I FEEL WAS A PRIOR PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE COURT, LOOKED THE OTHER WAY IN THIS INSTANCE TO A KNOWN STANDARD, AND ALLOWED THIS ATROCITY TO HAPPEN.
2. IN SEVERAL INSTANCES IN THE MAGISTARATE HEARING, REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REPONDENT PERJURED THMSELVES "UNDER OATH" AND NOTHING WAS EVER DONE. AFTER MULTIPLE OBJECTIONS TO TESTIMONY WERE MADE, AND FACTUAL EVIDENCE WAS SHOWN TO THE PRESIDING JUDGE, NO CONSIDERATION OF FACT WAS EVER MADE, NOR WAS THERE EVER A WARNING GIVEN FROM THE JUDGE TO THE PARTIES CONSTRUING LIES UNDER OATH. IF ANYONE WILLFULLY PROVIDES FALSE OR MISLEADING TESTIMONY WHILE UNDER OATH, IT IS A FELONY, AND PENALTIES CAN RANGE FROM THE

JUDES DISCRETION UP TO 5 YEARS IN JAIL. FOR LYING ABOUT A DOCUMENT, THE MINIMUM FINE IS 100 DOLLARS AND 6 MONTHS IN JAIL. CLEARLY IN THIS HEARING, THERE WERE MULTIPLE INSTANCES WHERE PROOF WAS PRESENTED OF THE WILLFUL LIES IN WHICH THE RESPONDENT CREATED IN REAL TIME, AND NOTHING WAS DONE.

3. WHEN THE MAGISTRATE IN CHARGE OF THIS HEARING CHOSE TO GO INTO THE FIELD AND LEAVE THE ACTUAL COURTROOM AND GO TO A PRIVATE PROPERTY TO IN ESSENCE MOVE THE COURTROOM 10 TO 12 MILES AWAY FROM THE PROPER VENUE, AND WHEN ARRIVING AT SAID PROPERTY, ALL DECORUM WAS OUT THE WINDOW. THE MAGISTRATE ASKED US ALL TO DRIVE OUR OWN VEHICLES TO SAID PROPERTY, HE TOOK HIS PERSONAL VEHICLE AND TOOK THE COURT CLERK WITH HIM, AND ASKED US TO MEET HIM AT THAT LOCATION TO CONTINUE THE HEARING. SEVERAL THINGS IMMEDIATELY CAME TO MIND. GOD FORBID ANYONE WAS IN AN ACCIDENT ON THE WAY TO OR FROM THE PROPERTY, AS WHO WOULD THE LIABILITY OF THE INCIDENT HAVE FALLEN ON. ADDITIONALLY, THE RESPONDENT WALKED WITH AND STAYED AT THE SIDE OF THE JUDGE THE ENTIRE TIME....HE PRACTICALLY NEVER LEFT HIS SIDE. THE JUDGE NEVER MANDATED ANY COURT RULES WHILE IN THE FIELD, THERE WAS NO FORMAL QUESTIONING, NO FORMAL RECORD OF ANY TYPE, NO COURT PROCEDURES AT ALL. IT WAS A FREE FOR ALL. THE FACT THAT THE THEN APPELLANT WAS AFFIRMED TO BE A PHYSICAL HANDICAP, THERE WERE LIMITING FACTORS IN WHAT THE APPELLANT COULD DO WHEN TRAVERSING TERRAIN, AND WAS NOT PART OF CONVERSTAIONS THAT WERE BEING HAD BETWEEN MULTIPLE PARTIES, CONVERSATIONS THAT HAD THEY BEEN IN A CONTROLLED SETTING, WOULD HAVE NOT LED TO EX PARTE CONVERSATIONS. AN EX-PARTE CONVERSATION BEING HELD BY A JUDGE WITH A PARTY TO THE CASE, WHILE DISALLOWING ALL PARTIES TO BE INVOLVED SHOULD BE GROUNDS FOR DISMISSAL OF THE JUDGE AND A MISTRIAL. THERE ARE SEVERAL GLARING INSTANCES OF LAW BEING BROKEN IN REGARD TO EX-PARTE COMMUNICATIONS, ONE OF WHICH WAS AS SOON AS THE JUDGE OPENED THE DOOR TO LEAVING THE CONTROLLED ENVIRONMENT OF COURTROOM. FIRST, THE JUDGE LOST ALL SEMBLANCE OF THE SANCTITY AND SAFETY OF THE COURTROOM THE MOMENT WE WERE TOLD TO GO TO THE SIGHT. CONVERSATIONS THAT WERE THEN HAD BETWEEN THE JUDGE AND HIS CLERK THAT ALL PARTIES SHOULD HAVE BEEN PRIVY TO, TO THE CONVERSATIONS HAD BETWEEN THE JUDGE AND THE REPONDENT. THE RESPONDENT WAS ALLOWED TO RE-GROUP SO TO SPEAK AND COLLABORATE PROCEDURALLY. NOBODY TOOK INTO CONSIDERATION THE SAFETY FACTOR OF LEAVING THE COURT. ANYTHING COULD HAVE HAPPENED IN THAT MOMENT, FROM A CAR ACCIDENT TO STEPPING IN A HOLE AT THE LOCATION. NO SAFETY OF ALL PARTIES WAS EVER CONSIDERED. ADDITIONALLY, ANY VIABLE EVIDENCE WAS PRESENTED AT TRIAL IN THE FORM OF PICTURES AND VIDEO, AND FINDING OF FACT COULD HAVE BEEN DERIVED FROM THOSE PICTURES INSTEAD OF GOING TO THE SIGHT. EVIDENCE

PRESENTED IN THE COURTROOM WAS A BETTER REPRESENTATION OF TIME AND PLACE OF THE REPONDENTS SHODDY WORK. ITS UNPRECEDENTED FOR A COURTROOM TO BE MOVED OUTSIDE UNLESS IN A RARE INCIDENT OF OVERCROWDING. WHICH IN THIS INSTANCE WASN'T THE ISSUE. ADDITIONALLY, THE EX-PARTE CONVERSATIONS ARE ONLY ALLOWED IF IT PERTAINS TO SOMETHING AS SIMPLE AS SCHEDULING, IN WHICH ALL PARTIES DON'T NEED TO BE PRESENT. THE CANONS OF ETHICS PROHIBITS THIS TYPE OF ACTIONS ON THE PART OF A JUDGE, AND RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURES OF SOUTH CAROLINA STATE THAT IF THERE WAS AN EX-PARTE CONVERSATION IN THE PRESENCE OF ALL OTHER PARTIES, THE JUDGE MUST FULLY INFORM ALL PARTIES OF THAT CONVERSATION AND GIVE ALL PARTIES A CHANCE TO RESPOND TO THESE NOW NEW MATTERS. CLEARLY THIS JUDGE TOOK THE LIBERTIES TO ALLOW WHAT CAN BE EASILY PERCEIVED AS HIS PERSONAL ALLIANCE WITH THE RESPONDENT, TO PUT THEM AHEAD OF THE RULE OF LAW. FROM A DISTANCE I COULD HEAR PARTS OF A CONVERSATION WHEN WE FIRST ENTERED THE PRIVATE PROPERTY OF WHAT THE JUDGE AND THE RESPONDENT REMEMBERED THIS AREA OF THE WORLD TO BE AS KIDS. THE FACT THAT DECORUM, PROCEDURE, AND RULE OF LAW WENT OUT THE WINDOW ONCE WE LEFT THE COURTHOUSE, SOLIDIFIES THE FACT THAT THE MAGISTRATE RULING SHOULD HAVE BEEN THROWN OUT, AND THAT THESE FACTS SHOULD HAVE BEEN ABLE TO BE PRESENTED AT THE COMMON PLEAS LEVEL, AND A DETERMINATION FROM AN UNBIASED JUDGE BEEN MADE.

4. PLEASE UNDERSTAND, I RECEIVED THE MAGISTATE FIINDING "IN THE MAIL" AND IMMEDIATELY SCHEDULED AN APPEAL HEARING TO BE MADE AT THE COMMON PLEAS LEVEL. POINT IS, I GOT THAT NOTICE WITHOUT BEING SERVED.
5. I NEVER RECEIVED A NOTICE OF A COURT HEARING, OR A COURT HEARING DATE FROM THE COURTS IN REGARD TO A NEW HEARING DATE. AND ALTHOUGH THE COURTS HAVE RULED THAT A MAILMAN DOESN'T NEED TO ACTUALLY COME TO THE DOOR AND MAKE MULTIPLE ATTEMPTS TO RAM IN DOWN MY THROAT, THIS NEVER HAPPENED. FACTUALLY, ALL MEANS BY THE COURT WERE NOT MADE TO GUARANTEE DELIVERY OF SAID NOTICE. SERVICE COULD HAVE BEEN MADE BY THE SHERIFF OR CONSTABLE, POSTING THE DATE PUBLICLY WAS NEVER MADE, NOR AS MUCH AS A SIMPLE PHONE CALL OR EMAIL WAS MADE. THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS HAS NO RECORD OF ME BEING SERVED WITH A COURT DATE BASED ON APPEAL "I FILED" TO IMAGINE SOMEONE WOULD INTENTIONALLY WANT TO GO THROUGH THE RIGORS OF THE WORK OF APPEALS IN THIS MATTER, INSTEAD OF THE HEARING OF FACT AT A COMMON PLEASE LEVEL IS RIDICULOUS.
6. THE APPELLANT HAS MADE EVERY EFFORT TO COMPLY TO COURT RULE AND STANDARDS SET BY THE RULE OF LAW TO COMPLY WITH THE COURTS IN THIS MATTER. ON THE CONTRARY, FROM THE OUTSET, THE REPONDENT CHOSE NOT TO BE ON TIME FOR THEIR OWN HEARING THAT THEY SET, AND ADDITIONALLY, THE COURTS CHOSE TO ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN.

7. AFTER RECEIVING THE DECISION OF THE LOWER COURTS – COMMON PLEAS LEVEL – THE APPELLANT THEN PAID FOR AND APPEALED THIS CASE TO THE APPELLANT COURT OF SC. THE APPELLANT COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA RULED THAT MY DESIGNATION OF MATTER WAS INAPPROPRIATE, AND IN RE-LOOKING AT IT, THE APPELLANT FOUND NO ISSUES WITH IT WHATSOEVER.
8. APPELLANT THEN APPEALED THE APPELLATE COURTS DECISION TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT, WHERE THEY DENIED THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI.
9. THE LAW IS CLEAR CONCERNING BEING ON TIME FOR COURT. IN THE INITIAL MAGISTRATE HEARING SCHEDULED FOR 10AM, THE RESPONDENT WAS 40 MINUTES LATE TO THE PROCEEDING AND THE CASE SHOULD HAVE BEEN DISMISSED AT THE 15 MINUTE LATE RULE, AND A DECISION FOR THE APPELLANT BEEN HAD.
10. ONCE THE MAGISTRATE HEARING TOOK PLACE AND WAS MOVED OFF-SITE AND MULTIPLE EX-PARTE CONVERSATIONS WERE HAD BETWWEN THE JUDGE AND MULTIPLE PARTIES WITHOUT THE APPELLANT PRESEND, SC RULE 3.5: SHOULD HAVE APPLIED AND NO CONVERSTAIONS LIKE THIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN ALLOWED, OR THE PROCEEDINGS SHOULD HAVE STOPPED AND A DECISION IN FAVOR OF THE APPELLANT SHOULD HAVE BEEN HAD.
11. WHEN THIS CASE WAS APPEALED TO THE LOWER COURT, THERE WAS NO PROOF OF SERVICE OF THE DATE TIME OR PLACE OF THAT HEARING MADE UPON THE APPELLANT " A CASE THE APPELLANT PAID FOR AND FILED " AND A DECISION WAS MADE WITHOUT THE APPELLANT PRESENT. SC RULE 4 IS CLEAR THAT THERE MUST BE PROOF OF SERVICE OR A DENIAL OF PROOF OF SERVICE BE HAD. IN THIS CASE WHEN THE APPELLANT ASKED FOR EITHER, HE RECEIVED NO RESPONSE FROM THE LOWER COURTS.
12. APPELLANT THEN FILED AN APPEAL WITH THE SC APPELLATE COURTS WITH A PROPER DESIGNATION OF MATTER PER SC RULE 209. THE APPELLANT CLEARLY STATED ALL MATTERS TO BE RAISED ON APPEAL, INCLUDED ALL MATTERS RELEVANT TO THIS CASE AND IDENTIFIED ALL TRANSCRIPTS, PLEADINGS, ORDERS, AND EXHIBITS TO BE HEARD OR SHOWN AT TRIAL, AND THE APPELLATE COURT CHOSE TO DISREGARD THE VALIDITY OF THIS SAME DESIGNATION OF MATTER.
13. THIS CASE WAS THEN APPEALED TO THE SC SUPREME COURT, AND THE APPELLANTS MOTION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS DENIED.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. At the heart of this case is the most basic of all things that was abused was the initial hearing that was had in front of the Magistrate in Conway SC. Court hearing was scheduled for 10am, and it wasn't a situation where 15 ppl were scheduled for court that day, it was our case only. I arrived at approx. 9:40am, checked in with the office secretary, and at 10am when nobody from Affordable Concrete and Masonry

was in sight, I asked if this hearing was still going to be heard. I was told to wait. Customarily there is a 15-minute window for anyone to show up at any Magistrates office I have ever been in, and then the case is awarded in favor of the person that showed up within that window. This should have been the very same here, as the 15-minute stipulation exists in SC.

2. At approx. 1030am I walked outside to get some fresh air, and saw a stand-in judge coming in then, who eventually would hear this case....1030 NOW....and we rode up in the elevator together to the second floor. People from Affordable Concrete and Masonry were still not present, and not until I believe the courts called them to remind them to come to court, did the wife of the owner of Affordable Concrete arrive – a person that knew nothing about the work that had been performed.
3. The Courts started this hearing at almost 11am, ONE FULL HOUR PAST the previously set court time for the hearing.
4. It wasn't until 1128am that the owner that had familiarity with the work performed arrives to court.
5. I objected as soon as court proceedings began as to a time issue with the defendant not showing up for court on time. The judge dismissed my objection, and I believe did so as I would find out later that this judge and this man's family were long time friends.
6. During the hearing, the judge said that we were leaving the courthouse and going onsite to see the work....At that point I objected as to how would we ever contain the ex-parte conversations that could happen, and who would be liable if there was an accident to or from the courthouse.
7. At the site, and due to physical limitations of myself, the judge and the defendant enjoined over 20 minutes of ex-parte conversations about the case, and on the way to the setting, the judge spoke freely to his staffer that was in tow with the judge to the site in addition to this 20 mins.
8. I objected to the ex-parte conversations, and the judge made no ruling on this, and just ignored my request.
9. After this ruling in favor of the defendant, I appealed the case to the Common Pleas Court. A hearing was scheduled; I was never given notice of the hearing. The courts have no record of service on me, and they have nothing saying there was an attempt or denial of service.
10. The hearing was dismissed by the Common Pleas, with no notice and no phone calls to me alerting me there was a hearing.
11. I appealed this then to the Appellate Court, and eventually to the SC Supreme Court.
12. The case should have been found in favor of me at the Magistrate level when the defendant was late.
13. The ex-parte conversations, and the trip to the location shouldn't have been allowed.
14. My objections to the ex-parte conversations should have been addressed and those conversations concluded.

15. The Common Pleas Court should have affirmed delivery to me of date, time, place of the appeal hearing held in their court.
16. I legally should have had an opportunity to present my case to the courts.

CONCLUSION

This appeal touches the very basics of issues which are a cornerstone in our Judicial System. First issue....One party didn't show up in time for court, and after 1 hour of being late to the set known time to be in court, was allowed to present a case for the first 40 minutes from someone that had no knowledge and no experience of the work that had been done. The next issue is EX-PARTE CONVERSATIONS between the Judge and the Defendant. The Judge allowed EX-PARTE conversations to be had even after objection to this matter. Lastly, the issue of NON-SERVICE of hearing times from the County. South Carolina's Supreme Court has ruled multiple times on verifying the service of documents and the service of notices, multiple times in which Service in ANY FORM must be credible and must be proved to have happened. In this case, none of that exists. Regarding EX-PARTE conversations, the Supreme Court of South Carolina, as well as the US Supreme Court prohibit all ex-parte conversations between a judge and one party without the other party present. EX-PARTE conversations can compromise the integrity of the court by potentially influencing the judge's decision making without the other person's knowledge or ability to respond. In this matter, over 30 minutes of EX-PARTE conversations were had, and when objected to, weren't even considered by the judge to be inappropriate.

Based on the aforementioned issues that have happened in the lower courts, I am asking that you Grant the Writ of Certiorari.

Sincerely,

7-22-2025

Tim Meyers
PRO SE APPLICANT

APPEAL TO THE US SUPREME COURT
WRIT OF CERTIORARI
PROOF OF SERVICE

Timothy Meyers
The Pest Professionals
PLAINTIFF

v.

AFFORDABLE CONCRETE & MASONRY
DEFENDANT/S

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Timothy Meyers, Appellant, certify that I have served this action on AFFORDABLE CONCRETE & MASONRY and also made service on Honorable Renee Elvis Horry Couty Clerk of Courts and also made service on the South Carolina Court of Appeals. Plaintiff Meyers received a copy of the decision from the South Carolina Court Supreme Court via the Court of Appeals on 7-16-2025, and a copy of that notification is attached. Service was made by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, Hand Delivered, Delivered via email on 7-23-2025, and sent to the address of AFFORDABLE CONCRETE AND MASONRY AT 6491 HWY 701 N. CONWAY SC 29526, RENEE ELVIS AT 1301 2ND Ave, CONWAY SC, 29526, AND THE SC CORT OF APPEALS AT 1220 SENATE STREET, COLUMBIA SC 29201

TIMOTHY MEYERS - PLAINTIFF
7712 HUNTING SWAMP RD
CONWAY SC 29527

7-23-25
DATE

PRIORITY MAIL
FLAT RATE ENVELOPE
POSTAGE REQUIRED

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL

PAPER POUCH how2recycle.info

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE.

Retail

P

US POSTAGE PAID
$11.00
Origin: 29579
08/06/25
4561640579-04

PRIORITY MAIL®

0 Lb 3.10 Oz
RDC 03

EXPECTED DELIVERY DAY: 08/08/25

C076

SHIP TO: 1220 SENATE ST
COLUMBIA SC 29201-3769

USPS TRACKING® #

9505 5109 9892 5218 7968 93

ONE RATE ■ ANY WEIGHT

TRACKED ■ INSURED

USPS.COM/PICKUP

PS00001000014

EP14F October 2023
OD: 12 1/2 x 9 1/2

PAPER POUCH how2recycle.info

FROM:

Tim Meyer
7112 Huntingdon Dr
Conway SC 29527

RECEIVED
AUG 08 2025
SC Court of Appeals

TO:

SC Court of Appeals
1220 Senate St
Columbia SC 29201

ATTN: Ms Kitchings

This packaging is the property of the U.S. Postal Service® and is provided solely for use in sending Priority Mail® and Priority Mail International® shipments. Misuses may be a violation of federal law. This package is not for resale. EP14F © U.S. Postal Service; October 2023; All rights reserved.

This package is made from post-consumer waste. Please recycle - again.