

**FORM 18
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
SUPREME COURT**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court

From South Carolina
Court of Appeal

Kristi Curtis Court Judge Law Clerk

Case 2026-001066

RECEIVED

JUN 11 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

The State of South Carolina, Henry McMaster, Deputy Hannah Reed, Berkeley County Administration, Dewayne Lewis (15 + named not disclosed as involved per discovery requests), Cynthia Forte, Felicia Walters, Sydney Pratt as Personal Representative of the Estate of Ms. Florence Bland Smith Bennett (deceased) Bank of America, respondent(s), Joe Biden, Daniel Frank Blanchard, Burger King, Inc.dba Carolina Franchise Holdings LLC, James E. Clyburn, Commissioner of Social Security, Charlie Condon, Cummins Engine, Joseph Dawson III, Department of Labor, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Wendell Gillyard, Lindsey Graham, Low Country Grocery Financiers, Henry McMaster, Military Magnet Academy, Barack Hussein Obama, Marvin Pendarvis, Pepsi Bottling Group, Incorporated, Piggly Wiggly, Incorporated, Remax Professional Realty, Joseph P. Riley Jr., South Carolina, Superintendent CCSD Charleston County Schools Alan Wilson, Respondent(s)

v

Wesley Edward Smith III

Appellant

**PETITIONER WESLEY EDWARD SMITH III REQUEST FOR ISSUANCE OF
SUBPEAONA OR COMPEL ORDER DIRECTING PRODUCTION AND ADDRESSES
ON MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDING PENDING GRIEVANCES PETITIONING FOR
A WRIT OF CERTIORARI PURSUANT RULE 243 BASED ERROR OF LAW BY
COURT OF APPEALS TO JOIN UNDER RULE 19 AND NOTICE TO APPEAL
LOWER COURTS JUDGMENTS COURT ON WRIT OF MANDEMUS
(SUPERCEDEAS**

Wesley Edward Smith III

Post Office Box 294

Moncks Corner, S C 29461

email: wsmittdy4@gmail.com Appellant

Office of the Attorney General

Alan Wilson

P. O Box 11549

Columbia S C 29211

Respondent(s)

1. I Wesley Edward Smith III claims as alleged that I, Wesley Edward Smith III have been alienated, ostracized and segregated as excommunicated from protected activities regarding due process equal rights secured under the State of South Carolina Constitution Section 1 Article 3 as a resident and citizens, as state operated within the frame workings of the United States Constitution fifth (5) and fourteenth (14th) Amendments respectively we are persons of the United States of American as Naturally Born Citizen (proof available if needed) residing within the state territory of South Carolina jurisdictional borders as actions of persons be joined under rule 19,

2. I Wesley Edward Smith III claims as alleged that I, Wesley Edward Smith III have been alienated, ostracized and segregated as excommunicated from protected activities regarding equal rights secured under the United States Constitution and Landmark Supreme Court case in Brown V Board of education of 1954 declared racial segregation in public schools unconstitutional. As such actions overturned the "separate but equal" doctrine established by Plessy v. Ferguson (1896), while addressing the psychological impact of segregation on United States of America as a verified resident of South Carolina (our rights to live here. I Wesley Edward Smith III have been verified as a United States South Carolina resident, tenant and taxpayer, as verified by the same person who failing to understand the "importance of a leader in a leadership position while on or off duties, as a Governmental entity, whose overlooking his one (1) major responsibly and that is to care for each and every person boy, girl, Woman and Men, under his watch, regardless of their color, age group, demographics, ethics, sexual preference, religious fellowship of choice, marital relationship and national origin, He (Henry McManmatters) has failed not only this great State of South Carolina as alleged) the speaking "true face" of the state characterization of all the people he represents, but has failed me, Wesley Edward Smith III and His constitutional duties of ensuring fairness and equal rights under the due process equal protection clauses (Well he's allowed and is allowing others to arbitrary persons to intervene without a notice to sue or letter stating a confirmed legal cause to do so from a credible administrative agency which can confirm as truth) while he (Oh Henry McmanMasters) is seated (as positioned on the Front of this ole Ship) in highest regarded position, of greatest responsibilities, accountabilities and liabilities, as he is overlooking his duties as the Elected chief of administrative leadership for South Carolina. As being denoted Henry McMaster regarding employee/employer relationships, fair and equal rights to housing as White counterparts to private employers healthcare rights, as afforded by Congress (U S) under ESRIA Act of 1974, is not showing any duty to care for this person Wesley Edward Smith III as family members and children are being adversely affected.

3. Landmark Supreme Court case in Brown V Board of Education of 1954 (1955) asserted as a defense from being segregated by Henry McmanMaster (et al) which is the "set precedent" for the civil rights movement and future desegregation efforts required of schools issuing higher learning, who has a greater potentials of receiving a higher education than blacks from such prominent White schoolings, as these persons herein are directly or indirectly employed or

serves as legal consults for the Ninth Judicial Circuit Courts Systems located in downtown Charleston South Carolina 100 Broad street behind the canopy covering Sandwich shop and book store as so conveniently place) of which ALL OF THESE CASE Originated since 1982 with the same Oh Henry McMamMasters was the UNITED STATES Attorney General wuth then appointed President in 1982 Ronald Reagan [Now tooled under Donald Trump], then Oh Joe Riley (Downtown “Chucktown” Charleston South Carolina was Mayor for over forty (40 Years UNCONTESTED IN HIS SEAT as Mayor for a City of unfavorable change for all Blacks) and Oh Charlie Condom (Charleston County Judicial Circuit Court OWN Solicitor in 1982, NOW IN 2026 in Pravite Practice in Mt Pleasant S C doing his own things with Son being tooled) as strategically placing themselves in State, Local and Federal Government positions affecting business and citizens rights, and as still to THIS DAY somewhere master mixing their alter ego ulterior motives (too Constitutional oath takes and pledge to the Flag keepers) while inextricably interweaving to disturb (allow disruptions) of other to disregard the State enacted CONSinstitution, which ultimately allowed such unresolved, uncontested and unchallenged case which by use of my name in their “public databases (makes these entities entire life a “Sail” of a job to have come across, to target and racially job profile and that “predatory housing lending” its to easy) as interferences occurred at this time, with my mane, my life, my liberties, my FAMILIES HOME, properties as Heirs, and my freedoms (against Well this is the way is appears to me on the face of these documents without Court meeting the required legal documentations standards, (i e ensuring the plaintiff provided a complaint and the complaint was properly filed and served to all defendants, the court ensured that the court clerks properly approved the issuance of the alleged summons as was issued without incidents, service of hearings and notices to appear were in order and proper for the courts and the notice to appeal and object to the court rendering of his or her reports and recommendation that were made upon completion of that state and local or federal trials were adhered to without reason to infer “no other logical assumptions exist (as herein and hereafter being stated) or and No disputes remained about the person listed in the Orders, listed as the State of South Carolina (P) and (d) defendant Wesley Edward Smith III as being declared the guilty one, which the court grand jury trial transcripts remains on file, in the state and local and Federal databases without redactions of verdict rendering guilt recorded of the State carefully selected Grand Jurors of impartial (unbiased) and reasonable person) NOT to infer this, that he and his listed colleagues activities were and are NOT discriminatory of harassing to stalemate this frivolous claims (defense asserted under S C Code 15-36-10 of the South Carolina Frivolous Act (et seg) action without establishing probable cause against me, Wesley Edward Smith III a United States of America American citizen of a color not chosen too, as reasons to doubt credibility’s and accomplishments in careers, being undermined, mocked and mimicked as being laughed upon

4. South Carolina requires “showing of causes: that is not the basis upon his actions were positioned and strategically to take all this which were in my and “families” possession for his and hers personal gains above all else, as obtained (as alleged as strict proof is demanded to see accolades_ and certifications of accomplishments as a person and profession of governmental

duties) is such a schooling organized institution which as of this date subjects Wesley Edward Smith III but fails to integrate "with all deliberate attempts to circumvent speed of case by case processing for over forty four (44 +) plus years by arbitrarily taking this person Wesley Edward Smith III properties of false employment claims (ie TITTY touching a girl as State prosecutors claimed CDC with a minor child cadet in 2001) which lead to the termination from employment and collateral attacks (called seizures of civil assets by default (forfeitures) (process whereas in 2001 Henry McMaster was the State chief attorney general that failed to prosecute or present a credible eye witness to be disposed or testify before such grand jury with filled complaints, recordings of the depositions or open court testimonies) though implementations were used in varied means to stifle the administrative adjudication process for liberating justice to Wesley Edward Smith III of his rights and freedoms

5. As the petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III seeks PCR reliefs and inquiries into subject matters, and based on the "only being perceived not accusing" to violation my rights secure under the fifth (5th) and fourteenth (14th) amendments of protected contractual rights as guaranteed and secured for a United States of America, American citizen and those person as legal resident in possession of green card carriers, as legal residents and Citizen (as herein and hereafter invoking all constitutional rights as my defense) under the United States Constitution and failure for Henry McMaster (et al) as State Co-defendants (made a deal for lesser or no charges) who were/is to ensure proper legal and procedural fairness and equal rights under law wee properly administered, as alleged in violation of the equal protection and due process clause and violation of Landmark Supreme Court case in Brown V Board of education of 1954

6. I, Wesley Edward Smith III am seeking afforded judicial relief for the voiding, reversal and vacating of personal judgments by defaults and of deceptive waivers, as state and lower courts of appeals affirming the lower court action as confirmed and validated but without court sufficiency of details and proof and the required substantive material evidences from any respondent in which to refute or assert such defenses under the fruit of the poisonous Tree Doctrine (asserted as a defense) .

5. I, Wesley Edward Smith III believes that based on the law under rule 203 herein as asserted as my defense against the State of South Carolina and other actions that these persons committed or caused to be permitted such errors as were overlooked and omitted from the submission of the court of appeals case number 2026-001066 document for which the petitioner is petitioning this court by such request to grant stay this proceeding by written orders, of state and persons previously involved with the usage of this person Wesley Edward Smith III name, images and property likeness in which to enforce laws, or in the later preparation issue subpoenas approval or Order compelling of all document used in the decision making process, thus highlighting the role of the judiciaries and ethics commission stated roles for assuring harmony, liberty, peace and tranquility for promoting social change and equality for all United States of America American citizens, residents and green card carriers, accordingly

II PETITION REGARDING PCR RELIEF NOT AFFORDED BY LOWER COURT CONFIRMED AFFIRMED JUDGMENT DETERMINATION WHICH LACKS DETAILS

6. I, Wesley Edward Smith III seeks to join State of South Carolina companies, person and entities regarding being denied the notice of rights to appeal according to rule 203 (defense asserted) or timely respond to any lower courts reports and recommendations post-conviction relief, Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III wishes court consider on this types of issues while on stay or request in the alternate by declaratory judgment for the State of South Carolina and the listed person lack of details and lack of sufficiency of evidences to establish probable cause to injure this person Wesley Edward Smith III for reinstatement and recon derations under rule 60(b)(3) a fraud is peculation (in the alternated seeking relief from orders and judgments under this rule by court declaratory affirmed judgment absent state (et al) showing had probable cause or established no legal grounds for disturbing private rights and constitutional due processes
- a. Motion for a New Trial - Argue that new evidence or legal errors warrant a retrial.
 - b. Habeas Corpus Petition - Challenge the legality of detention based on constitutional violations.
 - c. Post-Conviction DNA Testing - Request testing of evidence to prove innocence.
 - d On Appeal for Reconsideration requesting this higher court to review the original decision for errors.
 - e. to submit claim on Newly Discovered Evidence as presented evidence which was not available during the original lower court trials.
 - f. Allow reliefs on Motion to Vacate or reversal of judgment and order under rule 60(b)(3) as fraud is speculated of lower courts and person Judgments, by seeking juridical review and grant judicial reliefs that allows this court to nullify the conviction based on violations of legal grounds and constitutional procedural rights
 - e. Claim of Grand Juror Misconduct upon which the absent jurors, state was able to commit prosecutorial misconduct with malicious intent to damage this person reputation and tenure as a career work contracted assignments disruptions based on State of South Carolina Failure to protect and warn and ensure service of all processing in each case, and these person unwarranted advancement of racial animus behavior which affected the trial's fairness.

QUESTION AS PRESENTED

1. What type of evidence did the or does the Court of Appeal provide to show the state having proved probable cause to reasonable suspect acts against this Person Wesley Edward Smith III and allow officials to affirm and declare action of indictments by showing reusable doubt was satisfied based on the law that no genuine issues of material facts remain which may contradict the legal proceeding with civil court trial and testimonies in complete details without inferences remaining) Proof required of sufficiency of evidence and sufficiency procedural details)

2. Where is the complaint and all services of right to appeal any actions made and to whom were invited at the hearings that was provided by the State and all another confirming a validated administrative claims and not just legal malarkey regarding continued acts of a frivolous and shameful sham act based on piss poor leadership(s) and the passing to his selected administrator and managers mentalities of Jim Crowwish and Willie Lynchist (workplace bullying of employees) type of bechavoisr, by his selected (Henry McMaster) uncontested officers and court official that protect these types of person that he served as a co defendant and turned state evidence to another legal entity, but has accused Wesley Edward Smith III since 1982 as allegedly involved with a smuggling ring in his operation Jack Pot (it appears that the hennery McMaster and Ronald Reagan had a plan forming against the United State and the United States Citizens) not as this person has been allegedly demoted to the State of South Carolina as a governor and the key witness in oversights and controls over he (Henry McMaster chooses to accuse without having to testify or answer to justice herself) ? (Proof demanded this as required by law)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I Wesley Edward Smith III certify that on June 4, 2026 submitted in case 2026-001066 on **PETITIONER WESLEY EDWARD SMITH III REQUEST FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPEAONA OR COMPEL ORDER DIRECTING PRODUCTION AND ADDRESSES ON MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDING PENDING GRIEVANCES PETITIONING FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI PURSUANT RULE 243 BASED ERROR OF LAW BY COURT OF APPEALS TO JOIN UNDER URLE 19 AND NOTICE TO APPEAL LOWER COURTS JUDGMENTS TO COURT ON WRIT OF MANDEMUS (SUPERCEDEAS AND PETIONING FOR DISCOVERY BY ISSUANCES OF COURT DIRECTED SUBPEONAS** were sent via U S Mailed First class Mail Services to:

Office of the Governor
(Attn: Governor Henry D McMaster)
1100 Gervais Street
Columbia S C 29201

Office of the Attorney General
(Attn: Attorney general Alan Wilson)
P O Box 11549
Columbia S C 29211

EMAILED TO

1. Governor Henry McMaster at govenormcmaster@governor.sc.gov and chief counsel
- 2 Attorney General Alan Wilson at email: awilson@scag.gov
- 3 Justice Jean A Toal at email: jtoal@sccourts.org
- 4 Justice Donald Beatty at email: dbeatty@sccourts.org
5. Mr Daniel F Blanchard III at email Dblanchard@rosenhaygood.com
- 6 Ms Alice F. Paylor at email apaylor@rosenhaygood.co and at email: afp@saxtonstump.com
7. for remax relaty/centex acts Ms Jenny Honeycutt at email jenny@costahoneycutt.com
- 8 Representative Wendell Gaillard at email: Wendellgailliard@schouse.gov
9. Representative Marvin Pendarvis ESQ at email marvinpendarvis@schouse.gov
- 10 Honorable Charlie Condon at email charlie@charliecondon.com
11. Mr Joseph P Riley at email jriley5@citadel.edu

12. Judge Rembert Dennis at email mdennisj@sccourts.org
- 13 Master in Equity Patrick Watts at email: jwatts@wattslawfirm.com
- 14 Ms Bonnie Hunt at email: bthunt@huntlawllc.com
- 15 Ashley B Able at email: abela@jacksonlewis.com FOR PBG
- 16 Mr Scott Katraosh at email: scott.katrosh@canal-ins.com FOR PBG
- 17 Robert Sneed at email: Robert.sneed@usdoj.gov
- 18 Ms Jody Smitherman at email: jody.smitherman@srs.gov FOR PBG
19. Mr Charlmers Johnson at email: charlmersjohnson@gmail.com FOR CCSD
- 20 Master in Equity Logan Lewis at email: logan.lewis@nelsonmullins.com FOR B OA
- 21 Jackson and Lewis P/C at email: lewiss@jacksonlewis.com FOR PBG
22. Master for Charleston County at email: master@chalestoncounty.org FOR CCSD
23. District Court Judge Rodger S. Carr at email; rcarr@charlestolaw.edu
- 24 District Court Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin at email: Jacquelyn_austin@scd.uscourts.gov
- 25 District Judge David C Norton at email: Norton_efc@scd.uscourts.gov
- 26 Jeffrey Brendan Kelley at brendan-kelley-2660@ecf.pacerpro.com
27. brendan.kelley@jacksonlewis.com
28. greenvilledocketing@jacksonlewis.com,
29. paula.davis@jacksonlewis.com
30. Andreas Neal Satterfield, Jr andreas-satterfield-6454@ecf.pacerpro.com
- 31 andy.satterfield@jacksonlewis.com
- 32 greenvilledocketing@jacksonlewis.com
- 33 laura.slatter@jacksonlewis.com
- 34 marie.wilson@jacksonlewis.com
- 35 sandy.borden@jacksonlewis.com

**WESLEY EDWARD SMITH III CERTIFICATE IN
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 11**

In supported response to the following, I, Wesley Edward Smith III as the undersigned submits this response, pursuant to South Carolina Code 15-36-10 and Rule 11 hereby affirms as Pro Se Petitioner that consultations and settlement terms with the listed third parties and its legal entities with opposing counsel were made, but the parties are unable to resolve (irreconcilable differences) on the matter herein contained in these motion(s) (petitions) thus intervention and settlement determination must be remedied by the courts and made just as are deemed reasonable and just by law, accordingly

June 4, 2026

Respectfully Submitted



Wesley Edward Smith III

P O Box 294

Moncks Corner S C 29461

Email: wsmittyd4@gmail.com

FORM 18
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
SURPREME COURT

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court

From South Carolina
Supreme Court

Patricia A Howard

Case 2026-001066

The State of South Carolina, Henry McMaster, Deputy Hannah Reed, Berkeley County Administration, Dewayne Lewis (15 + named not disclosed as involved per discovery requests), Cynthia Forte, Felicia Walters, Sydney Pratt as Personal Representative of the Estate of Ms. Florence Bland Smith Bennett (deceased) Bank of America, respondent(s), Joe Biden, Daniel Frank Blanchard, Burger King, Inc.dba Carolina Franchise Holdings LLC, James E. Clyburn, Commissioner of Social Security, Charlie Condon, Cummins Engine, Joseph Dawson III, Department of Labor, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Wendell Gillyard, Lindsey Graham, Low Country Grocery Financiers, Henry McMaster, Military Magnet Academy, Barack Hussein Obama, Marvin Pendarvis, Pepsi Bottling Group, Incorporated, Piggly Wiggly, Incorporated, Remax Professional Realty, Joseph P. Riley Jr., South Carolina, Superintendent CCSD Charleston County Schools Alan Wilson, Respondent(s)

v

Wesley Edward Smith III

Appellant

PETITIONER WESLEY EDWARD SMITH III REQUEST FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPEAONA OR COMPEL ORDER DIRECTING PRODUCTION AND ADDRESSES ON MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDING PENDING GRIEVANCES PETITIONING FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI PURSUANT RULE 243 BASED ERROR OF LAW BY COURT OF APPEALS TO JOIN UNDER RULE 19 AND NOTICE TO APPEAL LOWER COURTS JUDGMENTS COURT ON WRIT OF MANDEMUS (SUPERCEDEAS

Wesley Edward Smith III

Post Office Box 294

Moncks Corner, S C 29461

email: wsmitty4@gmail.com Appellant

Office of the Attorney General

Alan Wilson

P. O Box 11549

Columbia S C 29211

Respondent(s)

WESLEY EDWARD SMITH III SEEKING ISSUANCES OF SUBPEONAS IN THIS ACTION SERVES NOTICES TO RESPONDENTS AND RESPONDENTS PLAINTIFF LEGAL COUNSEL

Petitioner as Wesley Edward Smith III as herein listed, on this hearing for reconsideration and reinstatement for rights pursuant S C R Civ Pro rule requirement for rule 26 and rule 34, (as applicable to local rule 5), hereby request that the defendants provides for the production, for inspections and for copying within twenty (20) days or as Ordered by the court hearing officer as follows:

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING as required under rule 34 as hereby requested that the [defendants] as listed above were the PLAINTIFF in prior actions against Ms. Florence S Bennett and Wesley Edward Smith III legal or personal actions subsequently involved here son, this person Wesley Edward Smith III) the detailed recorded events, transaction and routines of such business involvements and personal concerns over Wesley Edward Smith III private life (privacy) of which information is stored by YOU people and should be readily available without procedural delays, to be disclosed at address of Wesley Edward Smith III P O Box 294 Moncks Corner, S C 29461 and to permit Wesley Edward Smith III and or his appointed legal representatives to inspect, copy, or photograph the following documents or other substantive material evidential things which may be in the possession, custody or control of the DEFENDANTS as herein listed above or as public official entities as third party body politic, corporate, or entity as foreign or as acting attorney's

A. All documents identifying Plaintiff Wesley Edward Smith III [Florence S Bennett] in responses to any and all Defendants request for interrogatories, Notice of appeal, Notices of dismissal and Right to Sue Florence S Bennett and her Son Wesley Edward Smith III administration charging agencies, the officially sealed investigation of the underacted paperwork's of hearing, investigations of the investigators that were actively involved in the submissions, as reports and recommendations of a local, state of federal administration agency as were reviewed previously by the appointed magistrate and a judgment who rendered judgment, by such Judge Order or from the Grand Jury verdicts, or the local tribunal hearing enforcement administration agencies case suggestions, rule of law that applied with his or her forwarded recommending based on law and factual tangible evidence reviewed by the board or review committee of impartial peered jurors in each case since 1972 until this present date

B. All photographs, Motion picture, videotapes, audio cassettes, drawings, plats , sketches Diagrams, reports, statement, affidavits, records, forms, writings, noted, memoranda's, written messages, contracts, or other documents or substantive material evidences as tangible things in possession, custody or control of the Plaintiff(s) As Charleston County, Dorchester County, State of South Carolina Ninth Judicial Circuit Court involvement with administrative department with Berkeley County Sheriff Department Sheriff Dewayne Lewis and Deputy Hannah Reed and other Officers in reconsiderations to REF case **COMPEL TO PRODUCE AND PROVIDE ANY AND ALL EVIDENTIAL MATERIAL AS DOCUMENTS PREVIOUSLY USED AT THE ADMINISTRAIVE OR COURT HEARINGS REGARDING THESE PERSON AND COMPANIES**

A: State of South Carolina et al (P) versus Wesley Edward Smith III (D) whereas Charleston County School District d/b/a Military Magnet Middle (Academy High) School et al et al third party hearsay claims of being victimized by Wesley Edward Smith III case number 2003-CP-10-4751 et al as factually unresolved and legally uncontested absent a Federal, State and local witness administrative charge, complaint and or legal injury claims

B. State of South Carolina et al (P) versus Wesley Edward Smith III (D) whereas (d/b/a) Social Security Commissioners et al case 2019-CP-10-0281 et al et al third party hearsay claims of being Organizationally victimized by Wesley Edward Smith III (D) as factually unresolved and legally uncontested absent a Federal, State and local witness administrative charge or complaint and legal injury claims

C. State of South Carolina et al (P) versus Wesley Edward Smith III (D) whereas d/b/a Pepsi Bottling Group INC case against Wesley Edward Smith III (D) 2113-CP-10-0417 (et al) introduced by third party hearsay claims of being victimized by Wesley Edward Smith III as factually unresolved and legally uncontested absent a Federal, State and local witness administrative charge or complaint and legal injury claims

D. State of South Carolina et al (P) versus Wesley Edward Smith III (D) whereas Centex Home loans LLC by merger with Washington Mutual Home loans (et al) case against Wesley Edward Smith III (D) 2002-CP-10-0646, introduced by third party hearsay claims of being victimized by Wesley Edward Smith III as factually unresolved and legally uncontested absent a Federal, State and local witness administrative charge or complaint and legal injury claims

E. State of South Carolina et al (P) versus Wesley Edward Smith III (D) whereas e) Lowcounty Financiers d/b/a Piggly Wiggly INC, conjoined with GREENVILLE Pro Se and intervening Moncks Corner Police Department Officer (1-6) case against Wesley Edward Smith III (D) 2023-CP-08-01932 (et al), introduced by third party hearsay claims of being victimized by Wesley Edward Smith III as factually unresolved and legally uncontested absent a Federal, State and local witness administrative charge or complaint and legal injury claims

F. State of South Carolina et al (P) versus Wesley Edward Smith III (D) whereas f) Carolina Franchise Holdings LLC d/b/a Burger King INC d/b/a Moncks Corner Police Department Officer (1-7) case against Wesley Edward Smith III (D) 2022-CP-08-02502 as case was as serpent surprise interwoven as believed conjoined with case 2022-CP-08-02597 (case captioned above for reconsidering conjoin such case under this assignment documented number) introduced by third party hearsay claims of being victimized by Wesley Edward Smith III as factually unresolved and legally uncontested absent a Federal, State and local witness administrative charge or complaint and legal injury claims

G. State of South Carolina et al (P) versus Wesley Edward Smith III (D) whereas Absent case

termination written hearing and order as request for transcripts has been requested as related to termination from (P), Cummins Turbo Engines LLC (P) and Wackenhut Security Service LLC (P) as (D) a Certified law enforcing Official for the State of South Carolina as well (alleged wrongful terminations, as cases were btwn 1995-1998 against Wesley Edward Smith III (D). introduced by third party hearsay claims of being victimized by Wesley Edward Smith III as factually unresolved and legally uncontested absent a Federal, State and local witness administrative charge or complaint and legal injury claims

H. State of South Carolina et al (P) versus Wesley Edward Smith III (D) whereas Bank of America DE NA (et al) v Heirs Property involving deprivation of hearing rights Wesley Edward Smith III case 2022-CP-10-02468, resulting in unconstitutional seizing Florence B S Bennet properties and breaching upon the Son, Wesley Edward Smith III rights as heirs to said properties and deed title rights, as this case involves, being construed by similar third party who intervened without notices, by filing or presenting a “Deceptive Waiver” as a means to deprive Wesley Edward Smith III of Constitutional due process rights (acts are perceived unconstitutional as abuse of process, conversion and fraud upon the administration court process by means of deception ill-advised of legal entity, under the alleged authority for Charleston South Carolina that such information was introduced by third party hearsay claims of being victimized by Wesley Edward Smith III as factually unresolved and legally uncontested absent a Federal, State and local witness administrative charge or complaint and legal injury claim

I. State of South Carolina et al (P) versus Wesley Edward Smith III (D) whereas Sydney H Pratt Vs Florence S Bennett (herein Wesley Edward Smith III adversely affected and negatively impacted due to legal harms) as contesting most recent State of South Carolina et al case **2024-CV-08-10400985/0368 that such information was introduced by third party hearsay claims of being victimized by Wesley Edward Smith III as factually unresolved and legally uncontested absent a Federal, State and local witness administrative indictment charge are pending and whereas failing to provide the original filing of any complaint and or legal injury claim**

J. State of South Carolina et al (P) versus Wesley Edward Smith III (D) whereas Charleston County School District d/b/a Military Magnet Middle (Academy High) School et al et al claimed to be victimize v Wesley Edward Smith III case number 2003-CP-10-4751 factually unresolved and legally uncontested administratively according to the eye witness from any Federal, State and local entity, as eye witnesses testified and filed a complaint and legal injury claim

YOU as the people have other YOU as the people can contend offerings the same mannerism of issues regarding Ms Florence S Bennett and her son Wesley Edward Smith III the son of Wesley Edward Smith Jr Whose dad was Wesley Edward Smith SR. and the legacy of Son Wesley Edward Smith IV, for full disclosure would also be appreciated for disclosure for hearings reconsideration, Given such facts, as listed above or his or her agents, employees, employers, or managers that related directly to ALL the local State and Federal terminations from careers as an employee from employment, foreclosures, guardianship, conservatorships, heir properties, personal properties, land, contracts, tax notices and or other tangible assets related to sale or seizing of properties as related to Wesley Edward Smith III or on behalf of

Mother Florence S Bennett (DECEASED) as involved son Wesley Edward Smith III as a trespasser on said property manager and land Owner private premises appeal

C. All Contract with regard to personal policies, lease agreements, policies violated ins lease handbooks, manuals, rules or regulations which Defendant as listed (et al) gave to the Plaintiff Wesley Edward Smith III (or on behalf of Mother Florence S Bennett (DECEASED) as involved in these actions)

D. All Contract, deeds, trust funds, Insurance claims and insurance payouts, tax submission of corresponding documents in YOUR people possession regarding sales, contract and other land ownership and property issues, the promises of royalties, titles of property and or of employment) Plaintiff Wesley Edward Smith II was previous SERVED AND ADMINSITARTIVE NOTIFIED (on behalf of Mother Florence S Bennett (DECEASED) as involved in these actions) which the Plaintiff contends were applicable to my employment, sale and foreclosing actions with the defendants of said case regarding the aforesaid issue regarding property seizures and employment terminations.

E. Copies of the SPECIFIC portions or provisions, of the State of South Carolina policy on handbooks and lis pendens and foreclosure actions that this person Wesley Edward Smith III (or on behalf of Mother Florence S Bennett (DECEASED) as involved in these actions) YOU were negligent to provide a public and or private service for South Carolina and YOU

THEREFORE based on the rule of law under F R C P rule 12(b)(6) for failing to stat any claim even as a intervening third party public or private legal entity as describes an America business Corporation seeks dismissal of you complete actions as involved with criminal implication and Summry Judgment of Civil Action, Wesley Edward Smith III demand immediate release of name images and likeness use by the listed third party and other, fro allege violation of F R C P rule 11 be sanctioned, restitution be admonished, expulsion for government duty assignments and return of all Wesley Edward Smith III personal properties and legal riggths as person, parent and professional be restored as absent the judgment and written order had not appeared in violation due to not following F R C P rule 12(b)

Wesley Edward Smith III seek recovery and relief afforded by award for punitive damages, Compensatory Damage irreparable harms cause to reputation as both a person and care as professionals, and attorney fees and substantive financial compensation for prosecutorial malicious intent as demanded in the JS 44 to complaint or that deemed reasonable and just by the adjudication in the remembrance that Wesley Edward Smith III cannot get the time back for incurring losses from loss from life, livelihood or enjoyed companionship happiness.

As parties are to be held accountable as jointly or severally liable under the alw of torts as each in the capacity as a person (resident of South Carolina or undetermined Sate of South Carolina professional (seeking corporate veils of protections be removed from immunity or privileges) forethought of malicious intent were activated by third party to commit such legal miscarriage to justice process to legally harm and personally injure with atrocity against ed upon Wesley

Edward Smith III even without allowing the A D R process a maturation act to remedy the personal injuries and constitutional legal harms as as was required by the aforementioned Case law and precedent) , Failed South Carolina legal process along with Wesley Edward Smith III constitutional right a afforded under Aemendment1, 4, 5, 14. 15 for the lack of showing proper services to ALL parties YOU had a particular interest in and failed to provide substantive material facts under rule 56 (c) as this genuine question where such material facts are alleged due to the lack of proper services under F R C P rule 12(b)(4) Insufficiency of Process, (5) Insufficient service of Process (5) inefficient service of Process (6)failure state a claim upon which relief can be granted and (7) failure to join a party under rule 19 (for which a NEW TRAIL is warranted and rendering as void the judgments on such under rule 59 (Wesley Edward Smith III amended complaint for judgment actions on breaches, defamation and loss wages claims for declaratory judgment seeks reliefs based on prosecutorial judicial misconduct and malicious intent and bad faith acts which equated under rule 11 as frivolousness) to raise such defensive objections, due to the lack of services of the administration reports and recommendations of said alleged violation that was affirmed committed by Wesley Edward Smith III, as eye witness testimony, and administrative investigated agency reports and finding provided probable causes (more than just reasonable suspicion on the basis of color, age group, or national origin to subject Wesley Edward Smith III to be illegally or wrongfully tormented) to any action disrupting privacy rights issue remains unseen, by not showing this information prior, proving shown probable causes prior to the termination Judgment(s) or failed to provide showing such proof beyond reasons to doubt a genuine issue question (this as absent the reasonable impartial grand jury) unbiased assessment verdicts NOT HEARSAY to prior action of by the Court Judgment of Law Execution by Written Orders, that without the two (2) of the aforesaid, as believing in “unauthorized legal gatherings of open court opinionated sufficiency of speeches” by third parties listed, who appeared to legally bully only to abridge right, as an intervening outside disruptive illegal interest group, whose only interest in Wesley Edward Smith III was only for securing personal properties for personal gains of monies and properties on rumored hearsay ‘testing-of-lies” (not confused with an first hand eye-witness testimonies) concurs with the harassing mannerisms, the discriminatory act collectively acting by YOU the other people against Wesley Edward Smith III having compelled to the courts by use of name on the court of law documents, service order of evictions, termination, convictions, arrest, foreclosures and other ending contractual arrangements, by invoking the divine intervening rule of laws, that YOU people previously submitted alleged of the diversity of citizenship(s) claims or a Civil Rights (title VII) of other Civil Rights Claims unknown, As claim absent are/were involved for disavowing the progressiveness or not allowing performances to mature with Wesley Edward Smith III as a contracted employer/employee in business corporates for America Structured relationship existed, according to such issued handbook, lease agreement and foreclosures actions that was violated or not followed YOUR breached of the protections, immunity, sovereignty and privileges of the constitutional covenant (due process denial) and Breach of contracts as referenced in the Plaintiff Complaints. All photographs, Motion picture, videotapes, audio cassettes, drawings, plats , sketches, Diagrams, reports, statement, affidavits, records, forms, writings, noted, memoranda’s, written messages, contracts, or other documents or substantive material evidences as tangible things in possession, custody or control of the [Berkeley County Sheriff Department] Chief Sheriff Dewayne Lewis and fifteen (15) local

sheriff that broke in, vandalized. Threatened and bombarded said premises belonging to Florence S Bennett of said properties without rhyme nor reasons, and all the administrative civil rights South Carolina Constitutional due process deprivation) claims which paperwork's were filed and YOU as people were given copies as Plaintiff to serve as the

PLAINTIFF, as were provided to you on behalf of the Equal employment Opportunity Commission (herein refer to as E E O C) [South Carolina Human Affairs Commissioner (Herein referring to as S C H A C of 1972] absent exhausting of completed sealed investigation paperwork's involving Mother and right to Heirs properties of hers et al) Case under review on challenge that involves the Ninth Judicial Court Administration Chiefs and Magistrates Orders, adversely affecting as here acting on behalf as her Naturally born in 1964 son, Wesley Edward Smith III.

F) Allegedly a crime or civil action was committed by either listed person as a party YOU the American People have claimed brought a prior against in negligent manner for which as alleged malicious, frivolous and bad faith actions) as REF case under on appeal 2024-CV-0810400985 AND 8102P0665792 and 2025A0810200346 as listed above or his or her agents, employees, employers, or managers that related directly to ALL the local State and Federal terminations from careers as an employee from employment, foreclosures, guardianship, conservatorships, heir properties, personal properties, land, contracts, tax notices and or other tangible assets related to sale or seizing of properties of Ms Florence Bland Bennett and as properties related to heirs rights of Wesley Edward Smith III et al)

G). AND All recording devise pictures and videos, hearing attachments, statements from the depositions of State informants, State employed or terminated interns a witnesses, or other State Witnesses that the defendants relies upon in "All" employment polices and procedures, all lease agreements, or deeds, titled, transfer of leases, transfer of land and deeds tiles, IRS reported taxes all tax debts dues, ALL emails transmission with other legal entities having a compelling or vested interest a a individual of group of person associated as the American Business Corporate Groups (herein refer to as "A B C and G" INC or LLC) for all people of selected persons, interns, foreign exchange student complaints with the attached on all recordings by private PRO photographer private but publicly taken photographs, Motion picture, videotapes, audio cassettes, drawings, plats , sketches Diagrams, reports, statement, affidavits, records, forms, writings, noted, memoranda's, written messages, contracts, or other documents or substantive material evidences as tangible things in possession, custody or control of Berkeley County Sheriff Department Sheriff Dewayne as listed above or his or her agents, employees, employers, or managers that related directly to ALL the local State and Federal terminations from careers as an employee from employment, foreclosures, guardianship, conservatorships, heir properties, personal properties, land, contracts, tax notices and or other tangible assets related to sale or seizing of properties as related to Wesley Edward Smith III against Wesley Edward Smith III (or a the party with direct financial, guardianship, and heir rights on behalf of Mother Florence S Bennett (DECEASED) as involved in these actions

FURTHERMORE for Plaintiff failures to comply as supported any previously provided Unite State district Court claims seek court to dismiss the case order for reliefs (as NOWHERE mentioned in attached Orders and judgments) that relief may be granted and based upon this alleged actions as being perceive deceptive and fraudulent acts seeks reliefs for such "frivolous and malicious" acts of judicial equitable reliefs and remedy, under 28 U S C 3611 et seg) for

prosecutorial misconduct, and monetary substantive financial compensations against defendants who insist on believing to be immune from such reliefs (this after knowingly exercising applying and exercising its Constitutional due process rights against this person Wesley Edward Smith III, as unconsented and without prior authorizations to use my Name (name sake legacy) Images or any Likenesses (corporate or business) or as conservator, guardian, or as having such rights CONTESTED (as perpetrating heirs likenesses) under Local Rule 73.02 (b)(2) and 28 U S C 636(b)(2) (inter alia)

I declare that under the penalty of perjury that the following is true and correct

Signed this _____ day of _____ 20_____.

Signature of party responding

6[✓]7



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

CATHERINE S. HARRISON
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

May 21, 2026

The Honorable Leah Guerry Dupree
PO Box 219
Moncks Corner SC 29461

REMITTITUR


Re: Wesley E. Smith, III v. Sidney H. Pratt
Lower Court Case No. 2024CP0803362
Appellate Case No. 2026-000852

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court is enclosed.

Very truly yours,


CLERK



Enclosure

cc: Wesley Edward Smith, III
Sidney H. Pratt

\$ MONEY ORDER 6989
EW

(1)

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Wesley Edward Smith, III, Appellant,


v.

Sidney H. Pratt, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2026-000852

ORDER

This appeal appears to be from an order of the circuit court reversing and remanding this matter to the magistrate's court. Appellant indicates he received written notice of entry of the January 6, 2025 order on May 29, 2025. Appellant shows proof of service on April 6, 2026. The appeal is dismissed for the failure to timely serve the notice of appeal. *See* Rule 203(b)(1), SCACR (noting a notice of appeal shall be served on all respondents within 30 days after receipt of written notice); *Elam v. S.C. Dep't of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 14-15, 602 S.E.2d 772, 775 (2004) ("The requirement of service of the notice of appeal is jurisdictional, *i.e.*, if a party misses the deadline, the appellate court lacks jurisdiction to consider the appeal. . . ."). The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b), SCACR.



FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:
Wesley Edward Smith, III
Sidney H. Pratt

FILED
Apr 20 2026

(2)

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Wesley Edward Smith, III, Petitioner,


v.

Sidney H. Pratt, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2026-001066

ORDER

Petitioner has filed a notice of appeal, which we construe as a petition for a writ of certiorari under Rule 242 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. Because the Court of Appeals' order of dismissal is not final for the purpose of review by this Court, the petition is stricken and this matter is dismissed without prejudice. *See* Rule 242(c), SCACR (providing a decision is not final for the purposes of review until a petition for rehearing or reinstatement has been acted on by the Court of Appeals).

 C.J.
FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina
May 4, 2026

cc: Wesley Edward Smith, III
Sidney H. Pratt
The Honorable Jenny A. Kitchings

(3)

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Wesley Edward Smith, III, Appellant,


v.

Sidney H. Pratt, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2026-000852

ORDER

This appeal appears to be from an order of the circuit court reversing and remanding this matter to the magistrate's court. Appellant indicates he received written notice of entry of the January 6, 2025 order on May 29, 2025. Appellant shows proof of service on April 6, 2026. The appeal is dismissed for the failure to timely serve the notice of appeal. *See* Rule 203(b)(1), SCACR (noting a notice of appeal shall be served on all respondents within 30 days after receipt of written notice); *Elam v. S.C. Dep't of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 14-15, 602 S.E.2d 772, 775 (2004) ("The requirement of service of the notice of appeal is jurisdictional, *i.e.*, if a party misses the deadline, the appellate court lacks jurisdiction to consider the appeal. . . ."). The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b), SCACR.



FOR THE COURT


Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Wesley Edward Smith, III
Sidney H. Pratt

FILED
Apr 20 2026

(4)



The Supreme Court of South Carolina

PATRICIA A. HOWARD
CLERK OF COURT

BRENDA F. SHEALY
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

BLAIRE CANN
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11330
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA
29211
1231 GERVAIS STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1080
FAX: (803) 734-1499
www.sccourts.org

May 21, 2026

Wesley Edward Smith, III
PO Box 294
Moncks Corner, SC 29461

Re: Wesley E. Smith, III v. Sidney H. Pratt
Appellate Case No. 2026-001066

Dear Mr. Smith:

This responds to your filing received May 18, 2026. As set forth in the Court's May 4, 2026, order, the order of dismissal issued by the Court of Appeals is not final for the purpose of review by this Court (because no petition for rehearing or reinstate has been filed). Accordingly, no action will be taken on your filing at this time and your money order (55164066989) for \$50.00 is being returned to you.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Howard

CLERK

cc: Sidney H. Pratt
The Honorable Jenny A. Kitchings

(E)

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF BERKELEY

RE: STATE VS. Wesley Edward Smith III

Case # 2025A0810200346/ Trespassing / Entering premises after warning or refusing to leave on request

This is to certify that on May 27, 2025 Case Number 2025A0810200346/ Trespassing / Entering premises after warning or refusing to leave on request was called for trial in the Central Criminal/Traffic. Presiding was the Honorable Whilden V. Baggett (Magistrate). The records of the Central Criminal/Traffic reflect a disposition of Guilty Bench Trial Credit Time Served.

This certification is being provided to you in lieu of a copy of the charging document in order that the expungement process might be expedited. If your office requires any further documentation please contact the Central Criminal/Traffic.


Sincerely,




Central Criminal/Traffic

Central Criminal/Traffic
223 N. Live Oak Drive
P.O. Box 6122
Moncks Corner, SC 29461
Phone: (843) 719-4050
(843) 719-4534

17-11 (4)



Certified True Records
In The Summary Court of Berkeley County
Moncks Corner, SC
Clerk Name/Initials: 
Date: _____

Wesley Edward Smith III
Post Office Box 294
Moncks Corner, S C 29461

RECEIVED

JUN 11 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Retail



29201

RDC 99

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FCM LG ENV
MONCK'S CORNER, SC 29461
JUN 06, 2026

\$2.44

S2324D502947-5

Supreme Court of SC + H (Med) re
(Att, Clerk of Court
~~1700 Senate St~~ 1231 GEORGE ST
COLUMBIA SC 29201

