THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In The Court of Appeal

Appellate Case No. 2025-001480

The Supreme Court of South Carolina ("SCSC")

Appellate Case No.2026-001113

Greenville, SC Court of Common Pleas Case No.: 2023-CP-2302780

Case No.: 2023-CP-2302780

RECEIVED
JUN 18 2026
SC Court of Appeals

Armando Despaigne Zulveta, Appellant

v.

Augusta Lawn Care of Greenville, LLC, Respondent

MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA.

I, Armando Despaigne Zulveta, Appellant, Pro Se, acting In Forma Pauperis, certify that the creation of "SCSC" Appellate Case No.2026-001113, was because South Carolina Court of Appeals ("SCCA") denied his Appeal to proceed In Forma Pauperis.

Afterwards, "SCCA", forwarded Appellant a letter stating: "We are in receipt of the SC Supreme Court's ("SCSC")'s Order." On same letter, "SCCA" invited Appellant to reinstate Motion if he wishes to continue appeal. See "SCCA" Exhibit "A", dated May 14, 2026. He filed Motion to Reinstate which he did only to have a Court's Order that takes us retroactively to the original

point we were before Appellant's Appeal to "SCSC" was effectuated. Appellant requests the Court to reuse Motion and Affidavit to proceed In Forma Pauperis filed with Initial Appeal with Brief of Appellant on January 17, 2026, because his financial situation has not changed significantly since his last filing, and the affidavit still accur. Moreover, his Case still under the same court and jurisdiction that is this Court, the SC Court of Appeals, and a new affidavit would not add any tailoring to that court's form and requirements.

Right now, Appellant cannot even afford to pay for his every day meal and as result significantly loss weight against his health and wellbeing. In this current situation, much less he has money to pay for legal fees unconstitutionally imposed by Greenville Court of Common Pleas, and SC Court of Appeals' officials in detriment of Appellant's SC's and United States' Fifth Amendment Constitutional Right while hindering Greenville Court of Common Pleas, SC Court of Appeals, and SC Supreme Court from fulfilling its constitutional rights.

To understand Appellant's vegetarian-disabled financially position is necessary to read all his following Cases filed in Greenville Federal Court, Greenville Court of Common Pleas, and Greenville Criminal Municipal Court containing allegations supported by Court's record, Court's Citations, SC Rules of Civil Procedure, and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure:

a) Zulveta v. T-Mobile, USA, Inc.; CA No.: 6:26CV729-JDA-KFM.

b) Zulveta v. Spinx Automated Fueling Services Inc.; CA No.: 6:26CV731-JDA-KFM.

c) Zulveta v. Greenville Transit Authority, CA No.: 6:26CV733-JDA-KFM.

d) Zulveta v. Spill the Beans, CA No.: No.: 6:26CV737-JDA-KFM.

e) Zulveta v. Old Europe Greenville, LLC, CA No.: 6:26CV738-JDA-KFML.

f) Zulveta v. Flying Fox LLC, CA No.: 6:26CV739-JDA-KFM.

g) Zulveta v. Coffee Underground, CA No.: 6:26CV773-JDA-KFM.

h) Zulveta v. Greenville City Of, CA No: 6:26-CV-773-JDA-KFM.

Plus, i) Carmella's Café and Desert Bar; j) Lewis Barbeque of Greenville, LLC; k) Mountain Goat, LLC; l) Mc Donald's Corporation; m) Marriott International Inc., n) Golden Corral Corporation; o) Starbucks Corporation; p) Publix Super Markets Inc.; and q) Canal Insurance Company.

Plus, the following but not limited unconstitutional arrests and convictions, Cases expunged, and pending Criminal charges Cases:

WARRANTS NO.: a) 2023A2320600514; b) 20231090135618, c) 20231090135191; d) 20241090354232, e) 20241090353973; f) 20241090355359; g) 20231090349316; h) 20231090349333; and i) 20241090356035; and j) 20241090351019, in which supported by Courts' record Appellant categorically alleges and asserts and reasserts that businesses above,

along with Greenville City Of, and its employees Circuits Judge Perry H. Gravely; Judge Jessica Ann Salvini, Municipal Judges Mathew R, Haley, Stinson Woodward Ferguson; Elaina Calderon J., who is not a judge but on February 28, 2023, tried, convicted, and sentenced Appellant to Two consecutives 30 days in jail that he served; Greenville City Prosecutor Betsy C. Storm; Greenville County Sheriff Office, and Greenville City Police Department for financial gain, businesses Monopoly benefiting them, Discrimination, Retaliation, unlawful arrets and convictions, unlawful businesses Notice of Trespass, etc., they have brought Appellant into an obscure Era of Apartheid, Jim Crow, causing extraordinary damages to Appellant to the point that he has lost his job, lost his vehicle taken and concealed by Greenville City Police Department while he was incarcerated unabling him to pay towing-storage charges before retrieval.

His reputation has been so damaged that he could not find a job and he has become dependable on others out of not his fault but governmental officials mentioning above forcing the Courts to issue unconstitutional Orders designed to switch Civil matters into Criminal's while making a criminal out of Appellant, while profiting for exercising Monopoly and Discrimination among businesses defined as of public accommodations

under SC Code Section 45-9-10: States that every person is entitled to full enjoyment of described services and accommodations without discrimination on account of race, color, national origin..., but designed to hold 99.99%-100% in attendance Caucasians and by the City allowed to be ran as they were under SC Code Section 45-9-20: That exempts private clubs and other establishments not open to the general public and they can be choose who can pass through their doors as private clubs or residence. That is where Appellant squarely falls in place among Greenville City and its businesses that rather Monopolize businesses by the chosen as consumers-customers of Caucasians preferential Race with a healthier wallet versus Appellant who is Black and that is where he is being taking to an Era of Apartheid and Jim Crow composed by unlawful arrests, convictions, trespass from businesses, excessive use of force by Greenville's Sheriff Office and Police Department against Appellant who does not appreciate SC Court of Appeals be part of the scheme by blocking Appellant fundamental right access to Court over financial matters that shall be paid to Court by all govern mental officials mentioned above for their disservice to South Carolina Judicial System, fellow citizens, and constituents.

In addition, the "SCSC" in EX PARTE MARTIN v. THE STATE 321 S.C. 533, 471 S.E. 2d 134 (1995) has well established that: "the clerk of court must submit the motion to a judge for a ruling as to whether the complaint does fit within one of the statutory exceptions **"or"** whether the cause of action concerns a fundamental right that requires waiver of the filing fee." Which in this Case does.

Appellant is holding South Carolina ("SC")'s Law's protection that is given for any and future Cases in which he cannot afford Courts' costs and fees. Appellant support for his "IFP" is based on the (1) American Rule principle well established: "In cases involving fundamental rights, the court's decision to impose fees should not exceed the right being protected." (2) for any and future Cases in which he cannot afford Courts' costs and fees Plaintiff supporting his "IFP" relies on and invokes South Carolina Supreme Court ruling in EX PARTE MARTIN v. THE STATE 321 S.C. 533, 471 S.E. 2d 134 (1995). Plus, Appellant supporting his "IFP" stance invokes: Gonzalez v. United States (No. 06-11612) 483 F. 3d 390, The Supreme Court of The United States ("SCOTUS") ruled: "Our opinions have sometimes said in passing that, under the Constitution, certain "fundamental" or "basic" rights cannot be waived unless a defendant

personally participates in the waiver. See, e.g., Taylor v. Illinois 484 U.S. 400, 417–418 (1988); United States v. Olano 507 U.S. 725, 733 (1993); Moreover, since Augusta Lawn Care of Greenville, LLC, is in Default, there should not be any problem Respondent be Ordered to pay Court's costs and fees in this Case.

Appellant if seeking from this Court to take into consideration also the Amended Complaint he introduced in Common Pleas and this Court has on record.

WHEREFORE, for reasons stated above, Appellant is seeking this Court to allow him retroactively to proceed In Forma Pauperis.

On this day the 15th of June, 2026.

Armando Despaigne Zulveta 06/15/2026

606 Pendleton St., Greenville, SC 29601

Phone No.: (864) 371-0573

FORM 7

PROOF OF SERVICE OF A NOTICE OF APPEAL

RECEIVED
JUN 18 2026
SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In The Court of Appeal

Appellate Case No. 2025-001480

The Supreme Court of South Carolina ("SCSC")

Appellate Case No.2026-001113

Greenville, SC Court of Common Pleas Case No.: 2023-CP-2302780

Case No.: 2023-CP-2302780

Armando Despaigne Zulveta, Appellant

v.

Augusta Lawn Care of Greenville, LLC, Respondent

I, Armando Despaigne Zulveta, Appellant, Pro Se, acting In Forma Pauperis, certify that I have served a copy of Notice of Appeal's Motion to Reinstate on Augusta Lawn Care of Greenville, LLC, Registered Agent James Richards at 1312 Rutherford Rd., Greenville, South Carolina 29609, by depositing it in a prepaid-addressed stamped envelope.

On this day the 15th of June, 2026.

06/15/2026

Armando Despaigne Zulveta

606 Pendleton St., Greenville, SC 29601 Phone No.: (864) 371-0573

Armando Despaigne Zuneta
606 Pendleton St.,
Greenville, SC
29201

RECEIVED
JUN 18 2026
SC Court of Appeals

South Carolina Court of Appeals
1220 Senate St.,
Columbia, SC
29201