

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

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Robert M. Young, Circuit Court Judge

Opinion No. 2013-UP-406 (S.C. Ct. App. filed Nov. 06, 2013)

James A. Stuckey, Jr., and
Alissa R. Collins, both of
Stuckey Law Offices, LLC, of
Charleston, for, Respondents,

v.

Harold Simmons, Jr., Petitioner.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Harold Simmons Jr.
1182 King Street
Charleston, South Carolina 29403
(843) 554-7414
Pro Se

Other Counsel of Record:
Stuckey Law Offices, LLC
123 Meeting Street
Charleston, South Carolina 29401
(843) 577-9323
Harold Simmons, Pro Se

RECEIVED

DEC 23 2013

SC Court of Appeals

INDEX

Certificate of Counsel3

Questions Presented3

Statement of the Case.....3

Arguments

1. THE COURT OF APPEALS SHOULD HAVE CONSIDERED THE PRO SE
NON-PROFESSIONAL IN A PORFESSIONAL SYSTEM AND THE LIMITED
LITERARY ABILITY OF APPELLANT AND THE VIOLATION OF DUE
PROCESS OF LAW6

2. PETITIONER WAS NOT PROPERLY INFORMED OF THE RULES IN A
TIMELY MANNER IN ORDER TO FILE A RULE 59(e) MOTION TO ALTER
OR AMEND THE JUDGMENT9

Conclusion10

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

The petitioner, Harold Simmons, respectfully petitions this court for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment and opinion of the South Carolina Court of Appeals, filed on November 6, 2013. The petitioner certifies that the Petition for Rehearing was made and finally ruled (denied) on by the Court of Appeals on November 22, 2013.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Did the Court of Appeals err in not considering the Pro Se non-professional in a professional system and the limited literary ability of the petitioner and the violation of due process of law?
2. Did the Court of Appeals err in not considering the fact that the petitioner was not properly informed of the rules in a timely manner in order to file a rule 59 (e) Motion to Alter and Amend Judgment?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On July 10, 2009, Harold Simmons Jr. (Petitioner) brought this action alleging false imprisonment and violations of his civil rights by the Charleston County Family Court: Judge Paul W. Garfinkel and South Carolina Department of Social Services: Attorney Pamela Brown. This action was amended on December 7, 2010, in order to include negligent infliction of emotional distress.

The respondent's moved for a Motion for Summary Judgment arguing that they were entitled to judicial immunity. On December 10, 2010, the case came before Judge Roger M. Young, who granted the respondents' Motion for Summary Judgment.

The Petitioner inquired with the court clerk that informed him of the fact the he has to wait for the court to send him information on the next step of process in the form of a pre post order and the actual court order. On February 22, 2011, the petitioner served the Notice of Appeal on

Respondent's after he had reviewed the Appeal Chart for guidance on the next step in the process since the court clerk never sent him the rules or proper papers as were stated to him

The Petitioner received correspondence from the South Carolina Court of Appeals advising him that he should submit a brief. On September 31, 2012, the petitioner certified mailed in his brief. The petitioner received a letter dated November 6, 2013, that advised him of the South Carolina Court of Appeals affirmed opinion.

On November 21, 2013, the petitioner submitted a petition for panel rehearing or rehearing en banc as pro se, to the best of his ability considering petitioner is limited and lack literary ability with a feeble intellect. Petitioner submitted the petition in a timely manner by certified mail.

Petitioner received correspondence on November 09, 2013, from the South Carolina Court of Appeals advising him that a remittitur was sent to the lower courts. On December 4, 2013, the petitioner received correspondence from the South Carolina Court of Appeals advising him that his petition for panel rehearing or rehearing en banc as pro se was submitted too late. On December 9, 2013, the petitioner submitted a motion to recall the remittitur or, in the alternative motion for new trial.

If the Due Process Law Clause applies to Pro Se litigants that have been denied the right to equal time in the court of law to present argument and the right to be given the proper rules and documents along with being limited and or lack the literary abilities and if such application is unconstitutional, rehearing should be granted to determine the proper remedy. If the Due Process Law Clause does apply than the petitioner should be granted the opportunity to properly submit Rule 59 (e) and be allowed to resubmit the appellant brief. See US Constitution Amendment Article Fourteen.

During this period of time, petitioner was taking a medication, Oxycodone, prescribed by his physician, Dr. Richardson, of the Southeastern Spine Institute. Petitioner suffers from severe back pain due to back surgery. Petitioner was taking an additional medication, cymbalta, prescribed by his physician, Dr. Richardson of the Southeastern Spine Institute. Petitioner suffers from major depression disorder due to medical condition.

Petitioner immediately telephoned the South Carolina Court of Appeals to ask for assistance in reinstating his appeal.

Petitioner, a layperson of the law, should not be penalized for being ignorant of appellate procedures. (People v. Davis (1965) 62 Cal.2d 806.) Moreover, the court must consider petitioner's state of health and the bewilderment he must have felt in attempting to provide the court with the proper filings. Petitioner sincerely believed that he had proceeded properly and that he had done his best as legal representation on appeal. (People v. Hickok (1949) 92 Cal.App.2d 539.)] Petitioner due process of law was violated and based on the defendant Garfinkel and South Carolina Department of Social Services: Attorney Pamela Brown clearly acted outside of the scope of the law and therefore immunity does not apply in this matter.

Petitioner respectfully requests this court to consider his filings in light of the standards announced in People v. Ribero (1971) 4 Cal.3d 55, 65, that the power of appellate courts to grant relief from default ". . . is to be liberally construed to protect the right to appeal."

The Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment of the circuit court. Petitioner seeks a writ of certiorari to review that decision.

ARGUMENT

1. THE COURT OF APPEALS SHOULD HAVE CONSIDERED THE PRO SE NON-PROFESSIONAL IN A PORFESSIONAL SYSTEM AND THE LIMITED LITERARY ABILITY OF APPELLANT AND THE VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS OF LAW.

Following the order and judgment entered on December 26, 2010, in Charleston County No. 2009-CP-10-4264, petitioner filed a notice of appeal on February 22, 2011.

Petitioner received correspondence from the South Carolina Court of Appeals advising him that he should submit a brief. On September 31, 2012, petitioner certified mailed in his brief. Petitioner contends that he immediately submitted the brief based on his best ability according to the issues that were raised in the lower court. Petitioner received a letter dated November 6, 2013, that advised him of the South Carolina Court of Appeals affirmed opinion.

The panel's conclusion that the losing party failed to comply with and file Rule 59(e) motion to alter or amend the judgment in order to preserve the issue for appellate review and that the petitioner raised first time issues on appeal, and that the issues were never raised and ruled upon in trial court was an accurate opinion without consideration of the fact that the Petitioner was Pro Se and therefore falls in the category of a non-professional in a professional system and could have not been made aware of the Rule and or given the next proper process step or documents, coupled with the denial to finish arguments and have limited or lack of literary ability otherwise known as being feeble intellect is a huge oversight.

Powell v. Alabama, 287 U.S. 45 (1932), involved the conception of the due process of law clause. "While the question has never been categorically determined by this court, a

consideration of the nature of the right and a review of the expressions of this and other courts, makes it clear that the right to the aid of counsel is of this fundamental character. It never has been doubted by this court, or any other, so far as we know, that notice and hearing are preliminary steps essential to the passing of an enforceable judgment, and that they, together with a legally competent tribunal having jurisdiction of the case, constitute basic elements of the constitutional requirement of due process of law. The words of Webster, so often quoted, that, by "the law of the land" is intended "a law which hears before it condemns" have been repeated in varying forms of expression in a multitude of decisions." The rule that no one shall be personally bound until he has had his day in court was as old as the law, and it meant that he must be cited to appear and afforded an opportunity to be heard. *Bute v. Illinois*, 333 U.S. 640 (1948), involved the due process of law clause "The right to be heard would be, in many cases, of little avail if it did not comprehend the right to be heard by counsel. Even the intelligent and educated layman has small and sometimes no skill in the science of law. If charged with crime, he is incapable, generally of determining for himself whether the indictment is good or bad. He is unfamiliar with the rules of evidence. Left without the aid of counsel, he may be put on trial without a proper charge, and convicted upon incompetent evidence, or evidence irrelevant to the issue or otherwise inadmissible. He lacks both the skill and knowledge adequately to prepare his defense, even though he have a perfect one. He requires the guiding hand of counsel at every step in the proceedings against him. Without it, though he be not guilty, he faces the danger of conviction because he does not know how to establish his innocence. If that be true of men of intelligence, how much more true is it of the ignorant and illiterate, or those of feeble intellect."

The Panel did not consider the Pro Se Context, federal courts overlooked the non-professional in a professional system and the limited literary ability of appellant along with the denial of a jury trial puts the decision in direct conflict with the decision of other circuits. On November 21, 2013 the petitioner submitted a petition for panel rehearing or rehearing en banc as pro se, to the best of his ability considering petitioner is limited and lack literary ability with a feeble intellect. Petitioner submitted the petition in a timely manner by certified mail.

Petitioner received correspondence on November 09, 2013 from the South Carolina Court of Appeals advising him that a remittitur was sent to the lower courts. On December 4, 2013 the petitioner received correspondence from the South Carolina Court of Appeals advising him that his petition for panel rehearing or rehearing en banc as pro se was submitted too late. The petition was submitted a day before the remittitur was sent to the lower courts.

The practical implications of the panel's decision further support granting review. By opening the door to suits against officials challenging official government actions, the panel's decision potentially creates jurisdiction in this Circuit over every human rights case in the world—an outcome that, is very needed in the legal system. Indeed, if a Pro Se litigant with limited literary abilities could be heard and obtain judicial review of virtually any official government action simply “by (the) artful pleading” of suing the responsible officer (person in their official capacity), the statute would become “optional.” And the flood of potential suits allowed by the panel decision may well include challenges to the actions of important allies of the Official persons. See *Belhas v. Ya'alon*, 515 F.3d 1279 (D.C. Cir.

2008).

If the Due Process Law Clause applies to Pro Se litigants that have been denied the right to equal time in the court of law to present argument and the right to be given the proper rules and documents along with being limited and or lack the literary abilities and if such application is unconstitutional, rehearing should be granted to determine the proper remedy. If the Due Process Law Clause does apply than the petitioner should be granted the opportunity to properly submit Rule 59 (e) and be allowed to resubmit the petitioner brief. See US Constitution Amendment Article Fourteen

2. **PETITIONER WAS NOT PROPERLY INFORMED OF THE RULES IN A TIMELY MANNER IN ORDER TO FILE A RULE 59(e) MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND THE JUDGMENT.**

On February 22, 2011 the petitioner submitted a notice of appeal as pro se, petitioner is limited and lack literary ability with a feeble intellect along with the trial court failure to give the proper rules according to South Carolina Code of Laws Section 14-17-260 (b) which clearly states that the clerk shall issue all processes and sign all judgments. The clerk shall (b) issue all rules and notices ordered in the common pleas, The Panel should be willing to consider and determine if the clerk failed to comply with the South Carolina Code of Laws. This contributed to the petitioner to be unaware of the Rule 59(e) after inquiry with the court clerk concerning the rules and next step in the process, no preorder or rules was sent to or given to the petitioner. The petitioner proceeded to file a notice of appeal on February 23, 2011 believing that the clerk direct him accurately in the process and had given him all of the


rules at that time, not realizing that the clerk did not give him the rule of 59(e). The panel did not consider that the Pro Se Petitioner did not have the proper information given to him and or that he comprehended the information.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, petitioner asks the Court to grant the petition for a writ of certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

December 16, 2013


Harold Simmons Jr
1182 King Street
Charleston, South Carolina 29403
(843) 554- 7414
Pro Se

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Roger M. Young, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2009-CP-10-4264

Harold Simmons, Jr.,

v. *petitioner,*

Charleston County Family
Court, Paul W. Garfinkel and
South Carolina Department of
Social Services, Pamela
Brown,

Respondent,

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served *WRIT OF CERTIORARI* to be included in the Record on Appeal on Charleston County Family Court, Paul W. Garfinkel and South Carolina Department of Social Services, Pamela Brown by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on *12-19-2013* addressed to his attorney of record, James A. Stuckey, 123 Meeting Street, Charleston, South Carolina 29401.

Harold Simmons, Jr.

Harold Simmons, Jr.
1182 King Street
Charleston, South Carolina 29403
(843) 554-7414
Pro se

RECEIVED
DEC 23 2013
SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
Appellate Case No. 2011-186587

HAROLD SIMMONS, JR.)
Plaintiff)

-versus-

**MOTION AND AFFIDAVIT TO
PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS**


CHARLESTON FAMILY COURT,)
PAUL W. GARFINKEL and)
SOUTH CAROLINA)
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL)
SERVICES, PAMELA BROWN)
Defendants)

I, Harold Simmons Jr., being duly sworn, state that I am the Plaintiff and that I do not have the funds available to pay the costs of filing and service in the present matter. I hereby request that the complaint be filed and service made without costs.

Sworn to and Subscribed before me)
this ___ day of _____, 2013.)

Notary Public of South Carolina)

My Commission expires _____)


Signature or Pro Se Plaintiff

ORDER

Leave is granted to proceed in forma pauperis without payment of the filing fee and service cost.

Leave is denied to proceed in forma pauperis.

Dated: _____, 20____

Judge/Clerk of Court

_____, South Carolina

RECEIVED
DEC 23 2013
SC Court of Appeals