

RECEIVED

MAY 05 2026

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SUPREME COURT

S.C. SUPREME COURT

APPEAL FROM S.C. STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

MEGHAN WALKER RAYSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

S.C. STATE ETHICS COMMISSION CASE NO. _____

APPELLATE CASE NO: _____

ROBERT WAZNEY, PETITIONER,

v.

S.C. STATE ETHICS COMMISSION, RESPONDENT,

v.

SUMNER COUNTY CLERK OR COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,

CO-RESPONDENT,

MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

April 27, 2026

ROBERT WAZNEY

610 HWY. 9 WEST

BENNETTSVILLE, SC 29512

803-896-4958

PETITIONER, APPLICANT, PRO-SE

BY ORDER DATED MARCH 12, 2025, THIS COURT GRANTED CERTIORARI. ON SEPTEMBER 18, 2025, PETITIONER APPLIED IN THE COURT BELOW FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS, ATTACHED HERETO AS PAGE 7-OF-7, BUT THE COURT OF APPEALS, BY ORDER DATED JANUARY 16, 2026, DID NOT ADDRESS PETITIONER'S "SEPTEMBER 26, 2025" APPLICATION FOR IN FORMA PAUPERIS MOTION. PETITIONER FILED THE PETITION FOR CERTIORARI ON HIS OWN BEHALF, AND HE DOES NOT HAVE COUNSEL REPRESENTING HIM IN THIS COURT. ACCORDINGLY, PETITIONER REQUESTS THE COURT APPOINT COUNSEL TO REPRESENT HIM.

PETITIONER IS NOT A LAWYER, WAS NEVER TRAINED IN THE LAW, AND WENT TO SCHOOL ONLY THROUGH THE TWELFTH GRADE. HE IS FIFTY FIVE YEARS OLD. IN PREPARING THIS MOTION HE HAS BEEN HELPED BY A FELLOW PRISONER WHO ALSO WAS NEVER TRAINED IN THE LAW.

MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT
OF COUNSEL

The PETITIONER, ROBERT WARNEY,
PURSUANT TO RULE 608(F), SCAR,
MOVES THE COURT FOR APPOINTMENT
OF COUNSEL TO REPRESENT THE
PETITIONER. IN SUPPORT OF THE
MOTION, THE PETITIONER SHOWS
THE FOLLOWING TO THE COURT:

1. PETITIONER IS A PRISONER
OF THE STATE AND IS A POOR
PERSON AND IS UNABLE TO
SECURE A LAWYER ON HIS
OWN; AND
2. THIS CASE INVOLVES MISCONDUCT
COMMITTED BY A PUBLIC OFFICIAL
DURING LITIGATION AND FOR WHICH
THE DEFENDANT IS DISREGARDING
LEGAL PROCEEDINGS AND ACTING
IN BAD FAITH, MAKING THIS
AN "EXCEPTIONAL CASE".

3. There is no public Agency charged with the responsibility of representing indigents which is in a position to provide representation.

4. No private lawyers have been willing to supply counsel as a pro bono service to the petitioner and the court. See ATTACHED pp. N/A THRU N/A.

5. Pro bono services should be AVAILABLE throughout all members of the State BAR.

THIS COURT HAS THE INHERENT POWER TO DO ALL THINGS REASONABLY NECESSARY TO INSURE THAT JUST RESULTS ARE REACHED TO THE FULLEST EXTENT POSSIBLE, WHICH INCLUDES THE POWER TO APPOINT LAWYERS TO SERVE WITHOUT COMPENSATION WHERE IT APPEARS REASONABLY NECESSARY FOR THE COURT TO DO JUSTICE. EX PARTE DZIBBLE, 279 SC 592, 310 SERR 440 (1983).

IN AN EFFORT TO BALANCE ALL
INJECTIONS, THE COURT MUST
CONSIDER SEVERAL FACTORS IN
DECIDING WHETHER TO APPOINT COUNSEL
IN CIVIL CASES. THE CASE MUST
BE EXTRAORDINARY IN THE SENSE THAT
IT APPEARS APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
IS NECESSARY TO RENDER JUSTICE, THE
PETITIONER IS NOT REASONABLY ABLE
TO SECURE A LAWYER ON HIS OWN,
NO PUBLIC AGENCY IS CHARGED WITH
THE RESPONSIBILITY OF REPRESENTING
INDIGENTS WHICH IS IN A POSITION
TO PROVIDE REPRESENTATION, NO PRIVATE
LAWYERS HAVE BEEN WILLING TO SUPPLY
COUNSEL AS A PRO-BONO SERVICE TO
THE LITIGANT AND THE COURT, AND PRO
BONO SERVICES SHOULD BE AVAILABLE
THROUGHOUT ALL MEMBERS OF THE STATE
BAR. EX PARTE DIBBLE, 279 SC 592,
310 S.E2d 440 (1983).

PREMISES CONSIDERED, BECAUSE THIS CASE IS EXTRAORDINARY AND THE PETITIONER IS NOT REASONABLY ABLE TO SECURE A LAWYER ON HIS OWN OR BY OTHER MEANS, THERE IS GOOD CAUSE SHOWN FOR THE COURT TO APPOINT COUNSEL TO REPRESENT THE PETITIONER.

PRAYER

THE PETITIONER REQUESTS:

1. THE COURT AWARD THE PETITIONER APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL;
2. SUCH OTHER AND FURTHER RELIEF WHICH THE COURT DEEMS JUST AND PROPER.

April 27, 2026

~~ROBERT WAZOBY
610 HWY 9 WEST
BRANDT SUITE, SE 29512
803-896-4958~~

~~PETITIONER, APPLICANT, PRO SE~~

~~6-00-7~~