

ISAAC SMITH, JR.

DAX LEWIS, ET AL.

PLAINTIFF(S)

DEFENDANT(S)

Submitted by: COURT

Attorney for : Plaintiff Defendant
or
 Self-Represented Litigant

DISPOSITION TYPE (CHECK ONE)

- JURY VERDICT.** This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.
- DECISION BY THE COURT.** This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered. See Page 2 for additional information.
- ACTION DISMISSED (CHECK REASON):** Rule 12(b), SCRPC; Rule 41(a), SCRPC (Vol. Nonsuit); Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled); Other
- ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON):** Rule 40(j), SCRPC; Bankruptcy; Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award; Other
- STAYED DUE TO BANKRUPTCY**
- DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (CHECK APPLICABLE BOX):**
 Affirmed; Reversed; Remanded; Other Appeal Dismissed

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

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

THIS MATTER CAME BEFORE THE COURT on March 2, 2026 for a hearing. Plaintiff and Defendant Dax Lewis both appeared *pro se*. Sonja Lewis was also in attendance. Upon consideration of Defendant’s motion to dismiss, the Court grants Defendant’s motion for the following reason:

This case is one of several which have been filed concerning exactly the same issue. Essentially, in the present action, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Dax Lewis and Doren Lewis assisted their mother, Sonja Lewis, in moving Plaintiff’s mother from Lexington and otherwise assisting Sonja Lewis in misappropriating funds from their mother. Sonja Lewis and Isaac Smith are both children of Carrie Muller Smith Lewis who has now been deceased for almost five (5) years. Denial of Plaintiff’s motion for a default judgment and motion to stay were previously appealed to the Court of Appeals (Case 2025-002152), and the appeal was dismissed on November 12, 2025. Remittitur was sent on January 21, 2026.

Simply stated, this case is one of numerous cases which have been filed concerning the same subject matter, namely, the manner by which Sonja Lewis undertook to care for Carrie Lewis and the manner by which her estate was probated. In Lexington County, the following cases have been filed by Plaintiff essentially alleging the same complaints:

2019-CP-32-001270, Isaac Smith v. Sonja Lewis
2021-CP-32-02587, Isaac Smith v. Sonja Lewis
2022-LP-32-00448
2024-CP-32-00809, Probate Appeal

In Richland County, Plaintiff instituted litigation concerning the same factual background in cases:

2018-CP-40-00403, Probate Appeal
2022-CP-40-05246, Isaac Smith v. Richland County, Judge Amy McCulloch, et al.

Plaintiff has previously appealed the various courts' adverse rulings in cases 2024-CP-32-00809 (Lexington Probate Case, 2024-001668), 2019-CP-32-001270 (the initial litigation with Sonja Lewis, 2021-001434), 2018-CP-40-00403 (Richland Probate Case, 2018-002167), and the present action (2025-002152). In all cases, his appeals were dismissed. Only the present case, and cases 2021-CP-32-02587 and 2022-LP-32-00448, are listed as currently pending. The Court notes that, because cases 2018-CP-40-00403 and 2024-CP-32-00809 have now ended, the *lis pendens* in 2022-LP-32-00448 should be cancelled, and a separate order shall be issued accomplishing this task.

Defendant's motion is well-founded. Time and again, Plaintiff has lost in the trial and appellate courts of this state, yet he continues to file new actions litigating exactly the same grievances which the courts have ruled are unfounded time and time again. The present action is merely a rebranding of the above cases with Sonja Lewis' children substituted as party defendants. Furthermore, the Court was informed by Ms. Lewis that Plaintiff also brought suit in Fulton County, Georgia on the identical factual bases as the above referenced litigation.

Plaintiff is also somewhat disingenuous. In the present case, the reason given for his motion to stay is so that the litigation in Richland case, 2022-CP-40-05246, can be addressed and concluded first. His motion for a stay was dated July 1, 2025; however, Plaintiff's action in 2022-CP-40-05246 was dismissed on February 16, 2024. Although Plaintiff has subsequently filed various motions in that case which could be interpreted as motions to reconsider the dismissal, it would appear that he never forwarded those motions to the judge who issued the February 16, 2024 order within ten (10) days as required by Rules 59(g) or 60(a). Accordingly, his motions are properly subject to denial. Smith v. Fedor, 422 S.C. 118, 809 S.E. 2d 612 (S.C. App. 2017)

In conclusion, the Court agrees with Defendant – this litigation is abusive and warrants dismissal under *res judicata* and Rule 12(b)(8), the allegations in the present complaint are clearly barred by the statute of limitations, and any further relitigation of these issues is wholly in violation of the spirit of Rule 1. This case is dismissed. By separate order, an order to restrict Plaintiff's filings with regard to this subject matter will be entered for the 11th Circuit.

It is so ordered.

ORDER INFORMATION

This order ends does not end the case.

Additional Information for the Clerk :

INFORMATION FOR THE JUDGMENT INDEX		
Complete this section below when the judgment affects title to real or personal property or if any amount should be enrolled. If there is no judgment information, indicate "N/A" in one of the boxes below.		
Judgment in Favor of (List name(s) below)	Judgment Against (List name(s) below)	Judgment Amount To be Enrolled (List amount(s) below)
		\$
		\$
		\$
If applicable, describe the property, including tax map information and address, referenced in the order:		

The judgment information above has been provided by the submitting party. Disputes concerning the amounts contained in this form may be addressed by way of motion pursuant to the SC Rules of Civil Procedure. Amounts to be computed such as interest or additional taxable costs not available at the time the form and final order are submitted to the judge may be provided to the clerk.

Note: Title abstractors and researchers should refer to the official court order for judgment details.

E-Filing Note: In E-Filing counties, the Court will electronically sign this form using a separate electronic signature page.

s/ Frank R. Addy, Jr.

Circuit Court Judge

2159

Judge Code

March 3, 2026

Date

For Clerk of Court Office Use Only

This judgment was entered on the _____ day of _____, 20____ and a copy mailed first class or placed in the appropriate attorney's box on this _____ day of _____, 20____ to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE APPELLANT(S)

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE RESPONDENT(S)

CLERK OF COURT

Court Reporter: Stacy Johnson

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



Lexington Common Pleas

Case Caption: Isaac Jr Smith VS Dax Lewis

Case Number: 2025CP3201722

Type: Order/Form 4

So Ordered

S/ Frank R. Addy, Jr.