

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE CHARLESTON COUNTY JUDICIAL CENTER
COMMON PLEAS
Deadra L. Jefferson, Common Pleas Judge

RECEIVED

JAN 06 2026

SC Court of Appeals

Case No: 2024CP1004687

ERIC HOLLAND ROBERT WRIGHT

Appellant

VS.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Respondent

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Eric Holland Robert; Wright
C/of 545 West 126th Street 12-J
New York, New York near 10027
Appellant In Propria Persona

Ira Allen Grossman
100 Ann Edwards Lane,
Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, 29464
Attorney for Respondent

Table of Contents and Cases

Statement of Issues on Appeal	Page 4
Statement of the Case	Page 5
Standard of Review	Page 10
Argument	Page 14
Conclusion	Page 16
United States of America Republic Constitution	
1 st Amendment	Page 5, 7, 15
4 th Amendment	Page 9, 14
5 th Amendment substantive due process	Page 6, 7, 8, 13, 15
6 th Amendment	Page 6, 7, 11, 13
8 th Amendment	Page 8, 9, 13, 15
11 th Amendment	Page 5, 10, 13, 14
13 th Amendment	Page 5, 8, 9, 13
14 th Amendment Paragraph 3	Page 5, 10, 16
Article 3 section 2	Page 6, 7, 9, 12, 14
Article 6	Page 6, 8
Article 4 Section 4	Page 10
Article 6 Section 2	Page 10
Article 6 Section 3	Page 8, 10
South Carolina State Constitution Article 1	
Section 2	Page 7,15
Section 3	Page 6, 7, 8, 13
Section 9	Page 8
Section 10	Page11, 14

Section 14	Page 8, 15
Section 15	Page 13, 15
Section 22	Page 6, 7
27 CFR 72.11	Page 8,11
Black’s Law Dictionary 3 rd Edition	Page 10
Corfield v. Coryell, 6 Fed. Cas. 546 (1823).....	Page 4
Hale v. Henkle	Page 10, 16
Paul v. Virginia, 75 U.S. 168 (1869)	Page 4
Privileges and Immunity Clause	Page 4
Nonresident Violator Compact SECTION 56-25-30	Page 12, 14
S.C. CODE 56-05-1520	Page 11, 12
S.C. Code Section 56-5-170, 56-5-4700, 56-5-4970, 56-5-760(C)	Page 11, 14
S.C. Code Section 56-5-1538	Page 11
S.C. CODE 56-01-0020	Page 11, 12
S.C. CODE SECTION 14-25-95	Page 5, 13, 15
Separation of Powers	Page 5, 15, 16
State of South Carolina Municipal Court Handbook (2011)	Page 10
Title 5 U.S.C. §706	Page 10
Title 15 USC 4724 (e) (1) (a)(b)(c), (2)	Page 5
Title 18 USC 241, 242	Page 6, 13, 14
Title 26 USC 7701 (a) (1)	Page 4
Title 28 USC 3002 (10)	Page 4
Title 49 USC 31301	Page 10
UCC 9-307(h)	Page 5
Volume 21 of the S.C. Code of Laws	Page 10

Statement of Issues on Appeal

For the Record: The transcript is not quite accurate and I am not a sovereign citizen.

For the Record: Privileges and Immunity Clause "The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States." **Since Corfield v. Coryell, 6 Fed. Cas. 546 (1823)** freedom of movement has been captured by this clause. In **Paul v. Virginia, 75 U.S. 168 (1869)** the Court defined 'freedom of movement' as "right of free ingress into other States, and egress from them" and has consistently held that **this is a duty of the States, not the Federal government. I, Eric Holland Robert from the Wright family is making a distinction between a citizen of each state (permanent residents, 14th Amendment persons) and a Citizen in the several states (Born American natives to the United States of America Republic). I am the born alive native/Citizen in the several states.**

For the Record: On March 27, 2025, I, a non-statutory born alive native American South Carolinian State Citizen to the several union states to the United States of America Republic am Eric Holland Robert from the Wright family, sui juris, In Propria Persona made a special appearance with one common law witness Nykeba Torian from the Green family, sui juris to the Charleston County Judicial Center Common Pleas before Common Pleas Judge Deadra L. Jefferson.

In transcript page 4 line 1-4, This is the beginning of the early part of the court's error in recording for this transcript. Page 4 line 5-23 is me presenting myself and challenging the Appeals court because Judge Deadra L. Jefferson wanted me to enter the well of the court when I was trying to ask questions, she would respond by saying the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA can't hear you, she made those statement many times and it's not on the transcript. That is how the jurisdiction challenge began. I am not entering the well of a legislative administrative court of commerce when I have not entered a contract to act as a person as defined under Title 28 USC 3002 (10) and/or Title 26 USC 7701 (a) (1). Page 4 line 24 – Page 5 line 4 I am challenging the jurisdiction because Judge Jefferson was asking me to enter the bar of the court and it's not in the transcript, Page 5 line 5 – 8, I put an Affidavit of Fact and Judicial Notice and Complaint to Dismiss autographed under penalty of perjury with questions to be answered on the Charleston County Judicial Center Common Pleas Court of Record. Page 5 line 16-19, I said for the record I want to ask questions concerning the errors of the Town of Mount Pleasant Chief Municipal Judge Thomas H Hesse. Page 5 line 17 – Page 6 line 2, is me telling Judge Jefferson the violations that happened in the lower court. Page 6 line 3-12, I am telling the judge what didn't happen in the lower courts and even asked questions pertaining to an injured party corpus delicti or a contract that I may have breached. There is no answer by Judge Jefferson. Page 6 line 13, I am

asking the court to prove that I am a corporation or doing business as a person under Legislative administrative jurisdiction. Common Pleas Judge Jefferson found opportunity to make it an open and shut matter by allowing me to make my presentment ask a couple of unanswered questions and soon after starting at Page 7 line 2 Judge Jefferson asked the opposing attorney if he saw anything wrong or error from the lower court. The transcript doesn't show why I was challenging the court jurisdiction to enter the well of the court. I am an American South Carolinian with the status of honorable hardship after serving as a sworn oath public official with the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA employed by the South Carolina Army National Guard. The STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA is de facto government a society, unless the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA can provide proof that I am a resident to the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA or a United States citizen under Title 15 USC 4724 (e) (1) (a)(b)(c), (2), in the United States under UCC 9-307(h), all claims made by the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ET AL shall be before an Article 3 section 2 court of record. The common pleas and the municipal judge are not duly elected judicial officer, and the TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT is not a court of record as required in the beginning when I made my initial special appearance in the lower court. There is nowhere in the transcript did Judge Jefferson ask any questions pertaining to my issues and questions that I wanted to raise for the record.

Statement of the Case

For the Record: This matter is about State employee's doing business with the TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT MUNICIPAL COURT that are sworn oath public officials to the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA violating State Citizens Bill of Rights, 11th, 13th Amendment and separation of powers in the Constitution for the United States of America Republic and Article 1 - Declaration of Rights to the South Carolina State Constitution.

On June 6, 2025, I Eric Holland Robert from the Wright family made a special appearance In Propria Persona with my two American common law witnesses at the Town of Mount Pleasant Municipal Court before Chief Municipal Judge Thomas H. Hesse. There was an issue with me not crossing the bar of the court to stand as defendant-in-error ERIC ROBERT WRIGHT <sic> <misnomer> with no contract interest to interstate commerce. The Town of Mount Pleasant Municipal Court is an administrative court under the legislative branch of government in commerce. In the result of me not entering the well of the court, I was denied my first Amendment Right to Freedom of Speech not able to ask questions concerning the matter.

The court proceeded without my consent to a bench trial making the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA a plaintiff and judging its own case when it's required in my Affidavits that I am

required to be in Article 3 section 2 court of record in front of a duly elected judicial officer as stated in the Constitution.

The Municipal Chief Judge Thomas H. Hesse is in violation to South Carolina State Constitution Sections 3, 14 and 22 in the Declaration of Rights and to the 5th Amendment substantive due process, 6th Amendment Right to face my accuser, right to trial by jury, right to speedy trial and with no evidence on the record that I haven't seen just hearsay made by Patrolman Captain Carter. Every time I made an objection or tried to ask a question, I was threatened that I was going to be arrested for contempt of court. The Municipal Judge forced a proceeding under Color of State law without consent. Municipal Judge Thomas H. Hesse practiced law from the bench by not being neutral, fair and impartial by making a plea on my behalf with no State prosecutor involved. Judge Hesse violated separation of powers by being a Legislative Administrative Judge making judicial determination of guilt. When I went to the clerk for an appeal, I was denied an appeal unless I paid the UNIFORM TRAFFIC TICKET under S. C. CODE SECTION 14-25-95 within ten days.

FOR THE RECORD: On the 6th of June at 10:00am I, Eric Holland Robert from the Wright family, sui juris, In Pro Per made a special appearance with two American common law witnesses, who are Nykeba Torian from the Green family sui juris and Darnell Jamaal from the Eady family, sui juris before the Mount Pleasant Municipal Traffic Court before Thomas H. from the Hesse family doing business as MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE.

1. FOR THE RECORD: The Town of Mount Pleasant Police Captain who willfully by threat of arrest under the color of state law issued the Uniform Traffic Ticket has committed fraud by forcing transportation codes against me, a State Native not resident by using an account number 011179363, using an illegal name, a date of birth given under threat and duress and address I did not provide, that is not an active contract and I have not contracted to nor been in a contractual agreement with the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA since the closing of the account on February 2008.

2. FOR THE RECORD: On the 6th of June 2024, I, Eric Holland Robert from the Wright family, sui juris In Propria Persona made a special appearance with two American common law witnesses mentioned above before the Town of Mount Pleasant Municipal Traffic Court before Thomas H. From the Hesse family doing business as MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE. The MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE willfully abandon his fiduciary duty by committing official misconduct and prosecutorial misconduct by acting outside of his official capacity violating Title 18 USC 241, 242. Thomas H. from the Hesse family doing business as MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE called the legal name ERIC ROBERT WRIGHT <sic> <misnomer> Aggrieved Defendant-in-error. I, Eric Holland Robert from the

Wright family, immediately made an objection to the error of the court record and started presenting myself for the record and as I was trying to make my presentation and ask a few questions, MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE in his official capacity started interrupting me while I was on the record. MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE violated my first amendment right to freedom of speech while I'm in special appearance and reserving my rights in a public court, and even interfering with the record speaking over me and threatening me with disrupting the court proceeding if I did not enter the Bar of the traffic court to act as ERIC ROBERT WRIGHT <sic><misnomer> Aggrieved Defendant-in-error. As I was trying to successfully make my presentment, I was threatened by MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE not to speak and not say one word, or he will have me arrested while he willfully proceeded without my consent with fraud with the TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT POLICE CAPTAIN CARTER to a forced bench trial.

3. FOR THE RECORD: The TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT MUNICIPAL TRAFFIC COURT and the CLERK OF COURT and MUNICIPAL JUDGE may have in the beginning made an error and was negligent to knowing the facts going off presumptions of the alleged claim but when I made an special appearance with my **Affidavit of Fact and Rebuttal, with a Writ of error Coram Nobis under penalty of perjury with two American common law witnesses** the MOUNT PLEASANT MUNICIPAL CLERK OF COURT and MUNICIPAL JUDGE then acts not in error or negligence but now made willful acts to conspire and commit fraud and violate the 5th amendment substantive due process to the Bill of Rights to the Constitution for the United States of America Republic and Section 3, 22 in the South Carolina State Constitution.

4. FOR THE RECORD: While I was still standing on the American soil not entering the bar of the traffic court. MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE in his official capacity violated the 1st Amendment and South Carolina State Constitution Section 2 freedom of speech to not allow me to present myself before the court record and proceeded with a bench trial that violates South Carolina State Constitution Section 3, Section 22 and the 5th Amendment right to substantive due process, and 6th Amendment not giving me a fair chance to ask questions related to the nature of jurisdiction, if this was civil or criminal, a right to face my accuser or have a trial by Jury, ask question to decide if I should make a plea or even have this matter change venue to an Article 3 Judicial court. MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE ignored my 6th Amendment right to face my accuser. MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE knew I was before him at the court bar, acknowledge me by stating on the record "there's a gentleman here, but I don't know who he is" even as I try to tell him.

He acknowledged my two American common law witnesses by stating on the record that "there's two people here and I don't know what they're here for". MUNICIPAL JUDGE

THOMAS H. HESSE saw the Affidavits of facts, rebuttals, Special Appearance and Writ of Coram Nobis and denied them without explanation on the court record. When I made objections to and during the forced bench trial and asked if it was sustained or overruled, I was greatly ignored.

5. FOR THE RECORD: The MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE and MOUNT PLEASANT POLICE CAPTAIN CARTER conspired against me to gain foreign extortion fees through Uniform Traffic Tickets with fraudulent proceeding with no State prosecutor, no corpus delicti injured party with no valid Affidavit of Complaint sworn under penalty of perjury. MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE has allowed the MOUNT PLEASANT POLICE CAPTAIN CARTER to give testimony under penalty of perjury and not once show any proof of evidence to his alleged claim, which is hearsay that violates the Declaration of Rights Section 3, 9, 14 and the 5th and 6th Amendment is fraud. MOUNT PLEASANT MUNICIPAL JUDGE THOMAS H. HESSE has made a void judgement making it clear that he is the judge, prosecutor and juror and found the legal entity ERIC ROBERT WRIGHT<sic><misnomer> Aggrieved Defendant-in-error guilty and that is practicing law from the bench which violates the separation of power by not giving the judicial branch the opportunity to make the determination of guilt and that is prosecutorial misconduct, official criminal misconduct and a mistrial.

6. FOR THE RECORD: Article 3 Section 2: The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;-- to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, ;-- to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction;-- to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;-- to controversies between two or more states;-- between a state and citizens of another state;-- between citizens of different states;-- between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants of different states, and between a state, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects. This is clear to see that THE MOUNT PLEASANT MUNICIPAL CLERK OF COURT is acting outside of their official capacity under the Color of State law to force a sentencing using the account number 011179363 with the illegal entity ERIC ROBERT WRIGHT<sic><misnomer> making Eric Holland Robert from the Wright family sui juris a victim to abuse of power that the system is forcing me to cooperate to these alleged criminal or civil matters at hand violation of the 8th and the 13th Amendment, forcing me to be a resident to the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA using the TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT POLICE DEPARTMENT Police Captain to make alleged claims that falls under 27 CFR 72.11, all crimes are commercial and for a crime to exist there must be a Corpus Delicti injured party. The STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA or THE TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT or its

MUNICIPAL CLERK OF COURT does not and cannot provide any contracts with my autograph and date that I have violated to make them an injured party. If there is a valid claim the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA or THE TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT cannot use their MUNICIPAL COURT to be a plaintiff to a case and judge their own case. That is not fair and impartial. When I went to go for an appeal to challenge the proceeding and judgement, The TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT MUNICIPAL CLERK OF COURT office violated my right to make an appeal unless I pay the UNIFORM TRAFFIC TICKET fine first.

7. FOR THE RECORD: I, Eric Holland Robert from the Wright family sui juris, in Propria Persona, am here on another special appearance with three American common law witnesses for the 14th of August 2024. For any reason that the TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT MUNICIPAL TRAFFIC COURT under Article One legislative branch that governs persons in commerce through contract in an administrative court that willfully use this improper venue and uses the fraudulent illegal entity ERIC ROBERT WRIGHT <sic> <misnomer> Aggrieved Defendant-in-error to be sentenced by using an account number 011179363 that is not a valid contract on the court of record for ALLEGED SUIT NO: 20241810828106 and ALLEGED SUIT NO: 20241810829657, and not be dismissed by a Municipal pro tem judge or Assignee has violated their sworn oath to the Bill of Rights to the Constitution for the United States of America and the South Carolina State Constitution and has conspired with the Clerk of Court Laurie from the Wilson family doing business as COURT ADMINISTRATOR LAURIE WILSON to violate my Natural Unalienable Common Law Rights secured by the Bill of Rights to the Constitution for the United States of America Republic. This would be unlawful and illegal. I have a right and it is required for me to go before a duly elected Judicial Officer in an Article Three section Two court of record for any alleged criminal or civil matter. The TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT MUNICIPAL TRAFFIC COURT MUNICIPAL JUDGE HESSE or assignee is not a duly elected Judicial Officer. This would be a Human Rights violation using the Color of State law to extort fees and human trafficking and a terrorist attack to be arrested for a Victimless Crime, Bill of attainder is prohibited by the federal and state Constitution. This would be a violation of the 4th Amendment and a terrorist attack seizure to apprehend an American South Carolinian to the republic, a living man Eric Holland Robert from the Wright family, sui juris for extortion of property money. This violates the 8th & 13th Amendment cruel and unusual punishment and involuntary servitude by forcing transportation codes and State policy that has no contract to enforce by sentencing the living man as the legal entity and using a Municipal Judge who is not a duly elected judicial officer to be a judge prosecutor and juror in an administrative court for commerce.

Standard of Review

FOR THE RECORD: De novo Review of administrative agency decisions is governed by the Administrative Procedure Act, which provides at 5 U.S.C. §706 that reviewing courts should “set aside” agency “actions, findings, and conclusions” that are “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” When an agency holds a formal hearing that creates a record, the reviewing court may set aside agency decisions only when they are “unsupported by substantial evidence.”

All State Judges are bound to Article 3 Section 2, Article 4 Section 4, Article 6 Section 2, Article 6 Section 3, 11th Amendment and the 14th Amendment Paragraph 3 of the Constitution for the United States of America. **The Constitution of the United States and South Carolina provide the fundamental law of the judicial system. All other laws, regardless of their source, must not conflict with the U.S. Constitution.** All State laws, regulations and ordinances must not conflict with the state constitution. All summary court judges must strictly heed the provisions of both constitutions. The two constitutions are printed in volume 21 of the S.C. Code of Laws. See, State of South Carolina Municipal Court Handbook (2011)

1. Is it fraud, official criminal misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct and misrepresentation of policy and not law for an administrative judge to enforce a Uniform Traffic Ticket given by a patrolman using an illegal name, date of birth given under duress, and an address as identification that I did not contract to at the SCDMV forcing me to be a resident to the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA?
2. For the accused who is a State Citizen American South Carolinian and not a resident or nonresident to be a defendant to the State of South Carolina, Does the State of South Carolina as Plaintiff supposed to produce a breached contract as evidence for a victimless crime to have subject matter and personam jurisdiction for the accused to enter the well of any legislative administrative court for interstate commerce as a defendant?
3. The private automobile is not active for commerce and was not at the time of contact had any visible commercial signs as if interstate commerce is being done for the public, Hale v. Henkle. Pursuant to 49 U.S. Code § 31301 - Definitions (2) “commerce” means trade, traffic, and transportation. Black’s Law Dictionary 3rd Edition - Traffic is defined as

Commerce. Since the Uniform Traffic Ticket is an instrument used for commerce, is S.C. CODE 56-05-1520 and S.C. CODE 56-01-0020 a STATE statute offense against the revenue laws under commerce defined by 27 CFR 72.11?

4. Does an alleged defendant have the 6th Amendment right to examine any evidence to determine if there's any objections for the record? A right to a speedy trial by jury and face an accuser? Is the guilty judgement void for the record for the judge cannot be the jury in a court of law? Is that an act called practicing law from across the bench?
5. Does a police official in their official capacity violated the Fourth Amendment to the Bill of Rights and Article 1 Section 10 to the South Carolina State Constitution as defined by SC Code Section 56-5-170 and 56-5-4700, 56-5-4970 and violated 56-5-760(C) upon the land South Carolina, a constitutional state to the several union states to the united States of America Republic by seizure, using his emergency motor vehicle activating his blue lights emergency codes to force me to pull over for a non-emergency alleged incident with no injured party corpus delicti and no sworn complaint under penalty of perjury?, see, SECTION 56-5-170. Authorized emergency vehicles defined.

(A) Authorized emergency vehicles for purposes of this section include the following:

- (1) fire department vehicles;
- (2) police vehicles;

FOR THE RECORD: South Carolina law defines what is an "Operation of authorized emergency vehicles" (See Section 56-5-760) (C) The exemptions in this section granted to an authorized emergency vehicle apply only when the vehicle is making use of an audible signal meeting the requirements of Section 56-5-4970 and visual signals meeting the requirements of Section 56-5-4700 of this chapter, except that an authorized emergency vehicle operated as a police vehicle need not use an audible signal nor display a visual signal when the vehicle is being used to:

- (1) obtain evidence of a speeding violation;
- (2) respond to a suspected crime in progress when use of an audible or visual signal, or both, could reasonably result in the destruction of evidence or escape of a suspect; or
- (3) surveil another vehicle or its occupants who are suspected of involvement in a crime.

FOR THE RECORD: SECTION 56-5-1538. Emergency scene management; definitions (1) "Authorized emergency vehicle" means any ambulance, police, fire, rescue, recovery, or towing vehicle authorized by this State, county, or municipality to respond to a traffic incident.

(2) "Emergency services personnel" means fire, police, or emergency medical services personnel (EMS) responding to an emergency incident.

6. For the Nonresident Violator Compact (NRVC), There is no contract valid on the court of record for *The Nonresident Violator Compact SECTION 56-25-30* Release of nonresident licensed by compact jurisdiction. If I a State Citizen to the United States of America Republic is a Defendant where is the out of state driver's license and how can an nonexistent in state driver's license be a nonresident to this alleged matter? see, SECTION 56-25-30 (1) "Any law enforcement officer who issues to a person a uniform traffic citation may, in addition to any other action authorized by law and subject to the exceptions noted in this section, allow the person to proceed without first either having to post bond or appear before a magistrate, recorder or other judicial officer if the person accepts the citation. Such acceptance shall constitute the person's recognizance to comply with the terms of the citation."

(2) When issuing a citation for a traffic violation to a nonresident who is licensed by a compact jurisdiction, if the law enforcement officer receives the person's recognizance as above-described, the officer shall not, subject to the exceptions noted below, require the person to post bond but shall allow the person to proceed. Where is the active SCDMV contract that is signed to be contracted to the Nonresident Violator Compact?
7. Can a S.C. Driver's License be issued a Uniform Traffic Ticket as a nonresident pursuant to the Nonresident Violator Compact in the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA?
8. Is the court making it clear that I, a natural man upon the several states is automatically in the jurisdiction of the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA when I do not possess any STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA identification as a resident nor do business with the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA?
9. Does only a valid out of state driver's license give jurisdiction for a Nonresident Violator Compact to apply?
Does the two alleged citations State and Address listed qualify as a Nonresident Violator Compact?
10. Does the alleged plaintiff STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, making a claim on a State Citizen, file their alleged claim in Article 3 section 2 court of record having Original Jurisdiction? Can the State of South Carolina be a plaintiff to a civil case against a State Citizen and judge its own case in the same venue, is that a conflict of the 11th Amendment?
11. Is it neutral, fair and impartial for the Judge not to give an answer for S.C. CODE 56-05-1520, S.C. CODE 56-01-0020 for both nature and cause of action on the record for a civil or criminal matter?

12. Is it fair and impartial when any Judge disregard or deny without grounds Affidavits under penalty of perjury that are not motions?
13. Is there any evidence on the record that gives sufficient proof that a crime has been committed?
14. Do I have a right to appeal or is it a privilege? Does the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA and the TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT MUNICIPAL COURT et al violate South Carolina Constitution Section 3,15 and the 5th Amendment substantive due process, 8th amendment excessive fines clause, Title 18 USC 241-242 using S C. CODE SECTION 14-25-95 under color of state law to force appellate to pay the UNIFORM TRAFFIC TICKET within ten days and then I can have the right to make an appeal?
15. Is there a valid contract on the record as evidence to show proof that the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA or the TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT is an injured party corpus delicti?
16. Is it fair and impartial for a Municipal Chief Judge Hesse or assignee using the color of State law and violating the 11th and 13th Amendment, to force Eric Holland Robert from the Wright family, to be a victim to fraud and conspiracy, by forcing a bench trial and forced sentencing without consent using a fraudulent legal entity, no signature contract with no evidenced placed on the record that is either civil or criminal in nature?
17. I am challenging the alleged offense to the guilty judgement. Is it fair and Impartial for Municipal Chief Judge Hesse made a guilty judgement on the grounds of hearsay with no evidence placed on the court of record? Does an alleged aggrieved defendant have the 6th Amendment right to examine any evidence to determine if there's any objections for the record? A right to a speedy trial, a trial by jury and face an accuser? Is the guilty judgement void for the record for the judge cannot be prosecutor and the jury in a real court of law?

Argument

FOR THE RECORD: The Municipal Judge and the Common Pleas Judge are not duly elected judicial officers in the proper venue Article 3 section 2 court of record, to not violate the 11th Amendment as required. The two judges are conspiring in my opinion by willful negligence and error using S.C. CODE 14-25-95 against my unalienable human common law rights secured by the Bill of Rights and South Carolina State Constitution Article 1 Declaration of Rights, violating Title 18 USC 241-242.

The Town of Mount Pleasant Police Captain Carter in his official capacity violated Section 10 to the South Carolina State Constitution Declaration of Rights and the Fourth Amendment to the Bill of Rights and as defined by SC Code Section 56-5-170 and 56-5-4700, 56-5-4970 and violated 56-5-760(C) upon South Carolina a constitutional state to the several union states to the united States of America Republic by seizure, using his emergency motor vehicle activating his blue lights emergency codes to force me to pull over for a non-emergency alleged incident with no injured party corpus delicti and no sworn complaint under penalty of perjury.

The Nonresident Violator Compact (NRVC), There is no evidence to a contract valid on the court of record for The Nonresident Violator Compact SECTION 56-25-30 Release of nonresident licensed by compact jurisdiction. The Town of Mount Pleasant Captain Carter went into the SCDMV system and look up an old account that he used the numbers to falsify a legal name that I don't do business as nor have I contract with the SCDMV with that legal name to make me a resident to the address to the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA that I never was a resident to that location. Judge Hesse did check the record and still carried out the proceedings using the Nonresident Violator Compact(NRVC) as stated in the transcript using the same false illegal name ERIC ROBERT WRIGHT<sic><misnomer> as identification information.

The Common Pleas Judge Jefferson did not protect me nor the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA with her biased attitude towards me calling me a sovereign citizen and referring to me using sovereign citizen verbiage as if that gives her the right to abandon her fiduciary duties and still be in honor. A judge does not have to honor anything but the record which she didn't look at the record or ask any questions pertaining to the errors that is written in my Affidavit of Fact of Complaint and Judicial Notice to Dismiss autographed under penalty of perjury. Judge Jefferson violated substantive due process to the Bill of Rights and Section 3, 22 the Declaration of Rights and didn't check that the lower court made an error that she could have corrected the record, seeing that this is misapplication of policy. Judge Jefferson would have seen that the information in the Uniform Traffic Ticket on the record does not qualify under the Nonresident Violator Compact (NRVC).

She would have seen or asked me or the opposing attorney if the Policeman wrote up a citation off wrong information. The South Carolina DMV is responsible for holding information when residency is over, the system uses its old information to help police indicate State Citizens men and women as a person and/or resident even after expiration. These sworn oath public officials for the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, et al do not want me, the posterity, to be free from their jurisdiction as a resident and be free at peace upon this Republic. These sworn oath public officials for the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, et al doing business for the TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT MUNICIPAL COURT Judge Hesse and Clerk of Court Laurie Wilson and the help of the CHARLESTON COUNTY JUDICIAL CENTER COMMON PLEAS Judge Jefferson are conspiring against me a State Citizen to not enjoy the United States of America Republic and be free from de facto government tyranny because S.C. CODE SECTION 14-25-95, Notice of Intention to appeal is a violation of my right to make an appeal, it hinders me from being able to exercise my right to make an appeal, according to S.C. CODE 14-25-95 reads it is a right. It's a violation to the States Constitution Section 3 and Section 15 and the 5th Amendment substantive due process, 8th Amendment cruel and unusual punishment and excessive fines of \$309.38. It is cruel for S.C. CODE SECTION 14-25-95 Notice of Intention to appeal to be a part of the S.C. Code conspiring on my rights to appeal is unusual punishment to be enforced by the lower courts in hope that the excessive fine is not paid within ten days so the appeal would pass its time period and having to pay a fine before an appeal judgement has been made. \$309.38 is being paid under threat and duress and coercion and before I can have a right to a trial by jury secured by the South Carolina State Constitution Section 14 and the 6th amendment to the Bill of Rights. The Municipal Judge knows that he can act outside his official capacity because if the fine is to excessive to pay before ten days the lower court automatically wins by default helping the Town of Mount Pleasant Municipal Court and the State of South Carolina collect revenue in violation of South Carolina's Declaration of Rights and the Bill of Rights in my opinion is fraud. The Municipal Chief Judge Hesse had no problem threatening me multiple times and once to my witnesses in both hearings using armed uniformed and plain clothed policemen to fill up the courtroom to intimidate me not to speak when I was trying to present myself and reserve my rights for the record infringing on Section 2 to the State Constitution and the 1st Amendment Right to Freedom of Speech, taking testimony which is hearsay as evidence and showing no tangible evidence so I can make an objection to any errors, practicing law from the bench by being an Legislative Administrative Chief Judge making a plea on my behalf not supported by substantial evidence making a judicial determination of guilt a violation of separation of powers.

Conclusion

For the Record: In the interest of justice; It is the duty for the State of South Carolina public officials to honor their sworn oath to the Bill of Rights and to the South Carolina State Constitution Article 1 - Declaration of Rights to protect the Citizens to the several union states and all residents, knowing when to enforce public policy when a private State Citizen is not engaging in interstate commerce and to protect private rights to not violate due process and separation of powers by enforcing interstate commerce under the color of state law. The Judgement from the lower court must be overturned and returned to me in full \$309.38 for the fact that the lower court railroad me for a victimless crime during 3 forced proceedings to enforce color of state law with no contract engaging in interstate commerce that does not give jurisdiction to the STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA or the TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT. See **Hale v. Henkel 201 U.S. 43 at 89 (1906) Hale v. Henkel was decided by the United States Supreme Court in 1906.** The opinion of the court states: "The "individual" may stand upon "his Constitutional Rights" as a Citizen. He is entitled to carry on his "private" business in his own way. "His power to contract is unlimited." HE owes no duty to the State or to his neighbors to divulge his business, or to open his doors to an investigation, so far as it may tend to incriminate his life and property. "His Rights" are such as "existed" by the Law of the land (Common Law) "long antecedent" To the organization of the State" and can only be taken from him by "Due Process of the Law", and "in accordance with the Constitution." "He owes nothing" to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their Rights." The United States Supreme Court has ruled: **Undoubtedly the right of locomotion, the right to remove from one place to another according to inclination, is an attribute of personal liberty, and the right, ordinarily, of free transit from or through the territory of any state is a right secured by the Fourteenth Amendment and by other provisions of the Constitution. See: Williams v. Fears, 343 U.S. 270, 274 "Generally "public road" is road used by public as matter of right." See; Atchison Transportation & Shipping F. RY. Co. v. Acosta, (Civ. App. 1968) 435 S.W.2d 539 ref. n.r.e..**

Under penalty of perjury, under Common law, All rights reserved,

Appellant, Eric Holland Robert, Wright, Sui Juris In Pro Per

Eric Holland Robert, Wright Sui Juris In Pro Per

In care of 545 West 126th Street Apt 12-J

New York, New York near 10027

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Now comes from the Wright family, Eric Holland Robert with an Appellate Brief, to be hand delivered and be put on the **South Carolina Court of Appeals record and by Certified Mail No: 9589 0710 5270 3575 5331 78**, to Opposing Counsel and/or other parties information: **(Attorney) Ira Allen Grossman (Respondent) South Carolina State of address 100 Ann Edwards Lane, Mt. Pleasant SC 29464, on this 6th day of January in the year 2026.**

I am, Eric Holland Robert, Wright, sui juris
Eric Holland Robert from the Wright family, Sui Juris
In Care of: 545 West 126th Street Apt. 12-J
New York, New York, near 10027
United States of America Republic

RECEIVED
JAN 06 2026
SC Court of Appeals

RECEIVED BY, Court of Appeals DATE: 1-6-26