

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

Catherine Harrison Clerk of Court

Case 2026-000852

The State of South Carolina To join all others under rule 19, 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, Antony J. Blinken, Burger King, Inc.dba Carolina Franchise Holdings LLC, George W. Bush, Jr. Hilary Clinton, William Jefferson Clinton, James E. Clyburn, Commissioner of Social Security, Charlie Condon, Cummins Engine, Joseph Dawson III, Department of Labor, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Anthony S. Faucci, Wendell Gillyard, Lindsey Graham, Low Country Grocery Financiers, Kevin McCarthy, Mitch McConnell, Henry McMaster, Military Magnet Academy, Barack Hussein Obama, Nancy Pelosi, Marvin Pendarvis, Pepsi Bottling Group, Incorporated, Piggly Wiggly, Incorporated, Remax Professional Realty, Joseph P. Riley Jr., South Carolina, Superintendent CCSD Charleston County Schools, Donald J. Trump, Alan Wilson, Kristi Curtis, V Claire Allan, Julie J Armstrong, Catherine Harrison Leah Dupree (but not the exhausted required listings of persons, et al) Respondent(s)

v

Wesley Edward Smith III

Petitioner \

Wesley Edward Smith III
Post Office Box 294
Moncks Corner, S C 29461
email: wsmittdy4@gmail.com Appellant

South Carolina Court of Appeal
(Attn: Honorable Catherine Harrison)
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, S C 29201
Respondent(s)

RECEIVED

SEP 04 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

1. PETITIONER WESLEY EDWARD SMITH III GRIEVES FOR A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI PURSUANT RULE 242 BASED ERROR OF LAW BY COURT OF APPEALS AND NOTICE TO APPEAL COURT JUDGMENTS TO COURT ON WRIT OF MANDEMUS (SUPERCEDEAS) AS PETITIONER RELIED ON AFORMATIVE DEFENSES UNDER REVIEW AS DENIED FROM LOWER COURT TO ASSERT IN CASES FOR RLIEF UNDER RULE 60(b)(1) AS INEXCUSABLE NEGLECT/ ADVOIDANCE AS OFFICERS AND OFFICIAL MISTAKE IN LAW ENFORCMENT JUDGMENTS AND OR RULE 60(b)(3) FRAUD UPON THE ADMINISTRATIVE COURT BY OFFICERS AND OFFICIAL FOR THE COURTS WAS RESPONSIBLE AS THIS WRIT IS UBMITTED FOR RELIEF UNDER RULE 242 OR IN THE ALTERNATE ORDER GRANTING TRANSFER IN ACCORDANCE WITH 28 USC 1443 REGARDING UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CITIZENS DISPUTES, AS ALLEGED

1. I Wesley Edward Smith III being indigenous to the land of the United States of America born after 1776 (herein and hereafter a 1964 of the baby boomer generation of WWII returning Veterans product), as a Naturally born American Citizen who is not ashamed of the United State of America nor place of birth claims as alleged that as petitioner 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 fourteenth (14th) Amendment as a United States of American Naturally Born Citizen (proof available if needed)

2. Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III is here on the matter based on the fact that at my name, image and personal property likes has been used again, now by this state government clerk who is a United States of America American civilian of which any claims she or he originally filed is in the federal court regarding United State of America American disputes or constitutional indifferences of which the federal court had original jurisdiction, unless these clerks can show cause for this State government to continue the legal and procedural process as I, Wesley Edward Smith III adversely affected her or him in the performance of contracted job duties for which I, Wesley Edward Smith III am being held (inferred as a politic hostage without such showing as material proofs war like crimes identifies by government official as such AKA Draft Dodgers resentments pf outcome of WWI and WWII as attempting cold war sneak and destroy attempt) for which I, Wesley Edward Smith III am obligated to appear based on the resolved criminal laws, to resolve the written orders and personal judgment that has been made without meeting the elements of reasonable doubt

3. Wesley Edward Smith III declare these are acts of retaliation (in violation of federal law under civil rights act of 1964 (title VII) ESRIA Right Act of 1974, 42 U S C 2000 discrimination by employee in Employment under the color of law (inter alia), for this was an issue about a debt that by law is still owed to me Wesley Edward Smith III based on RESOLVED State law of South Carolina Law S C Code 41 10 10 of which State And Local Government officials and law enforcing officers have made false allegations and seized properties for which they un each case fails to establish meeting the elements of reasonable doubt who only intervned for personal gains and covert and take property that belongs to this person Wesley Edward Smith III without probable causes for each cases and every procedural and legal action, for which the state

declared me, Wesley Edward Smith III as its personal defendant without being served a notice to appeal any secret tribunal hearings and a local government copied such routine uses of my name, images and likeness to render Wesley Edward Smith III as their guilty stand alone subject law practice dummy, awhile alleged state and local government officers and officials have committed acts defined and escribed as fraudulent and abusive acts of powers which exceeds the bounds of human decency

4. The state and local government officials and law enforcing officers as prosecution had the uncanny ability to seek award judgments and seize properties without a challenge or contesting on the grounds if reasonable doubt or act which meets the resolved laws under rule 11 and by general assembly code if laws S C Code 15 36 10 respectfully of the laws, acts a ridiculously frivolous as done in bad faith, as alleged show cause proof needed as demanded by State and local resolved law and statutes.

5. As understood by this civilian in layman's term who is not a lawyer was a malicious prosecution under faulty premises and as such in these case whereas order were written, this is a legal case which "lacks merit," meaning the Clerks claim has no valid foundation in the law or the facts to win this case order as presented as evidence in this court.

II. GROUNDS GOVENING REVIEW AND REVESAL OF WRONGS ACCORDING TO RULE 242 CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS

(a) Authority of the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, or any two (2) justices thereof, may in its discretion, **on motion of any party to the case or on its own motion, issue a writ of certiorari to review a final decision of the Court of Appeals.**

(b) Considerations Governing Review. A writ of certiorari is not a matter of right [as herein contesting and challenging a wrongful (a matter or resolved law wrongly applied act) conviction as illegally and unlawfully applied against this person a guilty verdict of a magistrate bench trial judgment], but of sound judicial discretion, and will be granted only where there are special and important reasons. The following, while neither controlling nor fully measuring the Supreme Court's discretion or power to grant review in general, indicate the character of reasons which will be considered:

(1) Where there are novel questions of law.

(2) Where there is a dissent in the decision of the Court of Appeals.

(3) Where the decision of the Court of Appeals is in conflict with a prior decision of the Supreme Court.

(4) Where substantial constitutional issues are directly involved.

(5) Where a federal question is included and the decision of the Court of Appeals conflicts with a decision of the United States Supreme Court.

(c) Time for Petitioning and Filing Fee. A decision of the Court of Appeals is not final for the purpose of review by the Supreme Court until the petition for rehearing or reinstatement has been acted on by the Court of Appeals. A petition for writ of certiorari shall be served on opposing counsel and filed with proof of service with the Clerk of the Court of Appeals and the Clerk of the Supreme Court within thirty (30) days after the petition for rehearing or reinstatement is finally decided by the Court of Appeals. The petition filed with the Supreme Court shall be accompanied by the filing fee set by order of the Supreme Court.¹ No filing fee shall be required in criminal cases or petitions filed by the State of South Carolina or its agencies or departments.

As following these rules aforesaid

(1) Where there are novel questions of law.

QUESTION PRESENTED

1. What did the state and local government prosecutors prove for enforcing the laws and executing judgement against this person as a United States of America American Citizen civilian? And how was jurisdiction determined if not state statute or these listed person constitutional rights were violated without establishing reusable doubt?

RESPONSE:

2. How has this court of appeal determined having original subject matter jurisdiction over these United States of America American civilians being Wesley Edward Smith III, Catherine Harrison, Krista Curtis, Julie J Armstrong, Leah Dupree (et al)? Proof Needed)

RESPONSE :

3. What has this circuit court or court of appeal Clerks and Judges previously provided to support the private person Judgment, the Court written Orders supporting the private person Judgment and this appellant court Order which authenticates lower court private judgments and written Orders as the rendering of a “validate as true Guilty verdict” as using a sound judicial discretion under its liberal reviews in construing such cases, as located in United States South Carolina, or which may have been received from the included list surrounding State, County and or City, for which the contempt of court charges were assessed, without no sufficiency showings of being provided 1) No legal gat 2) nor Substantive material evidences, 3) Court orders with no complaint or organizational victims civil rights claims, 4) No administrative agency notices of right to sue and charge attachments and 5) No claims stated for which such sanctions should have been administered upon Wesley Edward Smith III as granted in the first place, as a conflict of personnel involvement is being inferred to exist with direct involvements which causes and effects

RESPONSE:

4. What Statute or Constitutional law did Clerk Catherine Harrison (et al) has been provided that this person violated her or his constitutional due process rights which was authenticated prior to order 20 November 2007 case 2003-CP-10-4751 and case 2025A0810200346 dated 27 May 2025 judicial hearings bench trials which verifies concurring such an order?

II. RESPONSE TO ITEMS here 242 (2)-(5) are related as followed to relief being sought
(2) Where there is a dissent in the decision of the Court of Appeals.

(3) Where the decision of the Court of Appeals is in conflict with a prior decision of the Supreme Court.

(4) Where substantial constitutional issues are directly involved.

(5) Where a federal question is included and the decision of the Court of Appeals conflicts with a decision of the United States Supreme Court.

IN REPONSE OR REPLY PETITIONER AFFIRMATIVELY ASSERTS DEFENSE
under the United States Constitution 14th amendment as stated in relevant parts:

“Section 1 All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

As on review seeks more information as denied by these court clerks who intervenes by order submission, is for contesting and challenging the guilty verdict from the magistrates judges bench trial Orders as herein petitioned for clearer certainty to be informed and apprised (writ of certiorari as used by foreign entities) as here the Clerk and this person Wesley Edward Smith III are United States of America American Citizen resolving a dispute here in the United States of America which in the American English language means to show probable causes that legal and procedural constitutional due process right have not been abridged by the concurring order dated 31 July 2026 which continues in violation of constitutional due process 14th Amendment still without explanation or legal data still does not establish reasonable doubt, as concurring on the merit that sanctions and criminal guilty charges are reflecting to interfere with due process rights both legally and procedurally by these people of which the clerks intervenes without allowing seeing their complaint, Original EEOC civil rights deprivation of rights chares or notice to sue Wesley Edward Smith III letter, or discovery disclosure from these court which supports the person and companies as listed above, guilty verdicts without required impartial grand jury, without legal data and without sufficiency showing of substantive material evidence

RESOLVED: The 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, ratified on July 9, 1868, guarantees U.S. citizenship, due process, and equal protection under the law. Such provisions are

- a. Citizenship Clause which** Grants citizenship to all persons born or naturalized in the United States.
- b. Due Process Clause which** prohibits states from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.
- c. Equal Protection Clause** requires states to provide equal protection of the laws to everyone within their jurisdiction and the
- d. Privileges or Immunities Clause that** protects fundamental rights of citizens from being abridged by state laws.

6. Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III petitions court to reverse order found procedurally and legally in violation of the 14th Amendment, rescind and or dismiss guilty verdict charges and criminal contempt of court charges (as handled via a Rule to Show Cause) case 2003 CP 10 4751 dated 20 November 2007 and court cases up to 2024 and 2025 (2024OR0810400027, 2024-CP-081004985 2025A0810200346) join by order of the court of appeal concluding case issue as resolved under 2026-000852 and case 2026001066.

7. According to Motion to show causes in South Carolina, common legal grounds include proving a lack of jurisdiction, lack of legal data, lack of substantive material evidence, lack of willfulness, and the absolute inability to comply with the rule of law and constitutional requirement of United States of America Citizen being unlawfully and unlawfully detained by this court and person of the local and state governments Common Grounds to Defend or Rescind Contempt of State of South Carolina Clerks and employees (as persons) Donald Trump and Henry McMasters (et al) orders for failures to timely prosecute and Inability to Comply Showing Wesley Edward Smith III did not have the financial means or physical capability to obey the order, meaning the violation was not "willful", and due to the lack of discovery and stage of South Carolina Lack of Notice or Due Process which provides the underlying order was invalid, unclear, or that proper notice procedures (such as precise hearing dates and times under South Carolina Court Rules) were not met as clerk and other employees non compliance nor allowances cure any unknown deficiencies prior to the deceptive waivers, default judgments or satisfied the terms of any orders prior to this final rulings of cases in Berkeley County South Carolina 2024OR0810400027, 2024-CP-081004985 2025A0810200346 guilt verdicts as alleged retaliatory, as important information is being kept secret by the clerk, of which there has been no mutual agreement or joint motion as opposing parties who agreed to drop or dismiss the charges and legal action with the use of Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III name as was denied any and all administrative required steps to defend the clerks submitted claims and constitutional due process rights under the 14th amendment.

8. As State of South Carolina clerk orders serves as the "displacement of person final purging of cases" of Order dated 31 July 2026 appear to cover up the criminal sanction and guilty verdict inserted by foreign intervenors who placed upon this person on 20 November 2007 in case 2003-CP10-4751, of which justice fair and equal judgments under this Contempt Order was found in contempt, and did not comply with specific purge conditions (such as paying a designated portion of an arrearage) set by the judge to avoid active sanctions.

9. Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III is here on the matter based on the fact that at my name, image and personal property likeness, which has been used and as the petitioner is obligated to appear to protect from further defamatory statements per orders, damages to reputation protect name and legacies, and to resolve the written orders based on a person personal judgments.

10. This was an issue about a defiance debt, that by law is still owed to me under resolved South Carolina Law S C Code 41 10 10 of which State And Local Government officials and law enforcing officers have made false allegations and seized properties for which they ("Politic groups a career We the People") each case fails to establish meeting the elements of reasonable doubt.

11. The state and local government officials and law enforcing officers as prosecution had the uncanny ability to seek award judgments and seize properties without a challenge or contesting on the grounds if reasonable doubt or act which meets the resolved laws under rule 11 and by general assembly code if laws S C Code 15 36 10 respectfully of the state foreign law rights

12. As understood by this civilian in layman's term who is not a lawyer was a malicious prosecution under faulty premises and as such in these case whereas order were written, this is a legal case which "lacks merit," meaning the Clerks claim has no valid foundation in the law or the facts to win in court

III. CONCERNS OF ETHIC VIOLATIONS AS THIS IN THE ALTERNATE SERVES A COMPLAINT BASED ON ACT RESEMBLING FRAUD, ABUSE, AND MISUES OF JUSTICE OF LAW WHILE PERSONS ACTING UNDER THE COLOR LAW AND ETHICAL MALPRACTICE WHILE DEPRIVING THIS PERSON OF CIVIL AND CONSTITUTIONAL RUGHTS IN VIOLATION OF ETHIC CODES 3.3-3. 8 RESPECTIVELY

13. Based information and belief this Supreme Court entertains rehearing complaint for officers, officials and legal entities legal and procedural misconduct on government assignment duties who has a duty to the protect the public as a body of elected by the citizens of this State and voted such person into offices, and whose sole duty was to keep the Public informed by performing

14 Employees had a duty of candor (which was to address the issues correcting lies and misstatements of facts) based on a thorough investigation and as such, corrections were made on the spot before allowing another personal judgment about the hearsay version of truth, as sworn an constitution oath to protect. The Constitution and citizen due process is without having to compromise or becoming to compromise oneself or beliefs systems to be subjected to double jeopardy in hope of self-incrimination.

15. This is the shift blaming process involving ethical concern which lawyers violates Code of ethics (as herein complained of) was used to throw others unsuspected third party to willingly give hearsay testimony from administrative person by telling to other state administrators what was heard, as rumors were as spoken truth, as other administrators went back and forth constitutionally inappropriate, which this South Carolina Supremes Court can intervene to handle judicial ethics complaints through a secretive internal process where the state Supreme Court ethical primary review is based on the sanctions applied which adversely affects the rights

United States of America American naturally born citizen, who bay law as RESOLVED is a protected species from cruel treatment and judicially unusual and unfair as applied mistreatments and unreasonable punishment for inquiring about he cause why the State and Local circuit court of the Ninith Judicial Circuit Court personnel without my consent use my name, images and likeness for keeping my monies and taking of properties without having justify any causes for disrupting my private life, liberty and freedoms as others absent this ridiculously mischief act (children and its rumors have a lasting negative affect on a governed society) that believes in the resolve laws and others constitutional due process rights.

16. As this clerk nor have the prior state and local government prosecutors have not shown proofs for enforcing the laws and executing personal and official government Orders of judgement against this person as a United States of America American Citizen civilian and as this court of appeal order which have not determined having original subject matter jurisdiction over these United States of America American civilians, the request for removal of guardianship of this person and my property rights be rescinded and as this serves as notice to transfer these person under 28 U S C 1443. As Resolved in Chapter 28 USC Under SECTION 1443 allows defendants (this petitioner) to remove certain civil or criminal actions from state courts to federal courts, as this provision is applicable in cases involving civil rights or discrimination under federal law that enables defendants (petitioner) to seek a federal forum when rights under federal law would not be adequately protected in state courts based on the parties both being United States of America Citizen civilians and as such in each case before this court the State of South Carolina prosecution procedural and legal action is based on a law that is inconsistent with federal civil rights laws and above all else meritless and ridiculous frivolous and on legal context if continued the State government officers and official that enforced the state laws and subjected this United States of America American Citizens procedures may continue to infringe upon such federally protected rights according to the resolved United States of America Constitutional due process rights under the 5 and 14th amendments which are as of now, not being respected.

17. I, Wesley Edward Smith III rely on this case law as follows for comply continuing with rule 242 (2)-(5) for reliefs as this writ of certiorari is submitted with the South Carolina Supreme Court that based on beliefs usually reverses decisions from the South Carolina Court of Appeals or lower circuit courts when it finds legal, constitutional, or procedural errors as such reversals span various areas of law, including criminal convictions, property disputes, and state regulations. Of which such notable and recent reversed cases includes (submitted as Memorandum Brief law argument as asserted here in relevant part with this writ of certiorari on review):

a. Criminal Law (*The State v. Samir Kevin Shank, 2026*): The Supreme Court reversed a Court of Appeals decision, reinstating a conviction for Assault and Battery of a High and Aggravated Nature against a defendant who backed a stolen car into an officer's door.

b. Constitutional Rights (*State v. Thomas Jones, 2024*): The Court overturned a Greenville County man's convictions for interfering with an officer and resisting arrest, ruling that his actions were protected under the First Amendment because he was merely questioning deputies on his own property.

c. Criminal Evidence (*State v. Gracely and State v. Pulley*): The Court has previously

overturned drug-related and trafficking convictions based on broken chains of custody regarding evidence and Confrontation Clause violations.

d. Land & Property (SCDOT v. Powell): The Court reversed the Court of Appeals to allow a property owner to present evidence on how the closure of a nearby intersection diminished the value of his remaining land.

IV. RELIEF AS REQUIRED BASED ON THE LAW AND MEMORANDUM OF LAW ARGUMENT AS TO GRANT RELIEFS BASED ON THE LAW

WHEREFORE AS CLERKS ACTS ALSO DENOTED AS SUSPECTED IN VIOLATION OF 6TH AMENDMENT CONFRONTATION CLAUSE FOR WHICH THIS PETITIONER HAS NOT MET HIM OR HER **as afforded by he resolved** Confrontation Clause, is part of the Sixth Amendment, and as RESOLVED guarantees a criminal defendant the right to face and cross-examine witnesses against them in court, preventing conviction based on out-of-court statements like affidavits or depositions, which Supreme Court cases like Crawford v. Washington and Davis v. Washington established that this right applies to "testimonial" statements (made to police to gather evidence for trial) but not "nontestimonial" statements made during an ongoing emergency, allowing for exceptions like dying declarations of the hearsay rule, which by these RESLOVED rights are **right to face this accusers (the United States of America American citizen being the Clerk of which this person Wesley Edward Smith III) did not** have the prior to order writing given the opportunity to see and hear this witnesses testifying against me to test this witness's truthfulness and credibility of this written order dated 31 July 2026, through cross-examination, ensuring the jury can assess their demeanor.

WHEREAS this case lack merit this reviewing adjudicator can decide (if having proper jurisdiction) this case lacks merit for several reasons such as 1) Orders establishes no legal violation which Wesley Edward Smith III did not break any laws, 2) as such orders is missing evidence of which the clerks still continues to refuse disclosures of evidence to allow reviewing of discoverable (alleged cover up or protecting another by being work place bullied also by another employee (seniors) who threatens job securities and family member) by withholding evidential information and 3) as this clerk(s) submits routinely wrong application of a law for which the legal argument implicates the use of the wrong statute thus misinterpreting how the law is applied and supposed to work for both (all) parties involved

WHEREAS the clerks refuse to disclose or checking the prior judges history and appointments as a judge 2) the Clerks refuse to allow discovery to check to see if any judicial misconducts have been filled against officers officials and state prosecutors who have enforce the laws without the grand jury that asserted a guilty verdict against this person Wesley Edward Smith III

WHEREAS Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III files for a motion to dismiss all charges and Motion to file motion for recusal or disqualification as a conflict of interest and law exist with persons of the court of appeals who could sway or influence other person to continue in a pattern of prejudice behavior (threatening jobs and livelihood or making other threats) by allowing sanction and trespasser charges become concurrent as orders are within by the clerks, which

own written order of displacement by defaults, release the lower court circuit Court and magistrate legal and procedural errors as overlooked and as evidence is being excluded (Petition offer this Order as written evidence to be included into the records as substantive material hearsay)

WHEREAS there was no grand jury deliberation rendering a guilty verdict, nor as court master was not present as a professional knowledgeable expert witness for the family, probate or private case determination as an eye witness who could have offered evidence or testimony was contrary to that court professional prosecutor on the subject matters before being allowed in the open court of public beliefs and ideas to assert its stereotyping against white black, Indian, Hispanic Asian and the others race (of which we all are part of the Human race unless these anti American (persons who do not believe in fair and equal sharing of respect as administered) can prove the blood color is not Red as white collar informants and operatives as dressed for success would spark a new legal argument) as looking down upon person as "low life blue collar workers" as the options are all hearsay that has been allowed since on or before 1982 by Henry McMasters and many others, declaring this person Wesley Edward Smith III guilty on all state assorted charges and enforcement of state resolved law without establishing reasonable doubt or having probable cause to even disturb this private person life and rights if which lack of magistrates competence to rescue or disqualify him and herself, failed to address this by order form or as the clerk fails to mention within the personally of her or his written orders, but instead the clerk of the court of appeals concurs as though being on the scene at the time of this procedural incident and this repeated legal accident as agreeing with state and local government official and offers as loyalty as a fellow employee to write and order based on a faulty premises and hearsay which is a common fallacy (A LIE/ UNTRUTHS) this writ should be respectfully granted and reliefs afforded as aforesaid and charges dismissed of the allowance of transfer to federal court for having lack of jurisdiction over these person as United State of America American Citizens and private residents here in the United States of America where you the people are conducting your business of sorts and using such person as your practice tool at your legal playground.

WHEREAS this person contend that the subject matters were unjustified and unlawful, and that petitioner believes (assured based on the resolved laws) as provided under 42 U S C 1982 have just as much right to privacy to occupy and own (buy) property as is afforded these judgmental white persons, who keeps me held against my rights as described by the district attorney ADaniel Frank Blanch III in 2007 as part of a collection of individuals who acts as a government entity that are vest wearing body corporates, legal entity politic group which filed legal meritless sanctions and award Wesley Edward Smith III as guilty verdict trespassing resident on his deceased Mother (Ms. Florence Bland Smith Bennett Property), who comes now continues to be held as the part of the State sub politic group personal hostage (being enslave in violation of the U S Constitution thirteenth (13th)) amendment as alleged) without the State of South Carolina written orders establishing reasonable doubt or showing provided probable causes for such detainment and seizing of my personal properties without any complaints or administrative charging letters that filed by these clerks, which claims were thoroughly investigated both party claims, cross claims and counter claims based on the resolved constitutional due process laws under the fourteenth (14th) amendment.

AND THEREFORE

b) Addressing of issues regarding S C Code 15-36-10 (et seg) Frivolous proceeding Acts, by the governing authority of South Carolina, S C CODE ANN 15-36-10(A)(4) of the South Carolina Frivolous Civil Proceedings Acts, as also stated in relevant parts:

(A)(4) An Attorney or pro se litigant participating in a civil or administrative actions or defense may be sanctioned for:

(a) filing a frivolous pleading, motion, or document if:

(i v) A reasonable attorney presented with the same circumstances would believe the pleading, motion, or documents is frivolous, interposed merely for delay, or merely brought for any purposes other than securing proper discovery, joinder of parties, or adjudication of the claims or defense upon which the proceedings are based.....

(v) South Carolina, S C CODE ANN 15-36-10(B) & (G) further states as in relevant part

(B)(1) If a document . . . does not otherwise comply with this section, it must be stricken unless it is . . . amended to comply with this section after the omission is called (holla) to the attention of the attorney or the party. . . AND

(G) Sanctions may include

(1) an order for the party represented by an attorney or pro se litigant to pay reasonable costs and attorney fees of the prevailing party under a motion pursuant to this section. Cost shall include, but not limited to, the following: the time required of the prevailing party, Five three (53+) plus years of being unlawfully terminated by illegal documents restraints, as continually being the only person negatively impacted person, discriminated in some form prohibited under S C Code 1-13-80 et seg) a racial animus form, by third public officials and its designated enforcer under the disguises as citizens under the naturalist uses of American laws, as here established for American citizens and certified documented resident and student, here in the United States South Carolinas territories and surrounding boundaries) by the frivolous proceedings, and travel (per diem,) expenses, millage, parking, cost of reports, and additional reasonable consequential expense (high cost of living wages supplemental) of the prevailing party resulting from the frivolous

V. PERSONAL AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH

Wesley Edward Smith III pursuant to rule 11/S C Code 1536-10 this a personal affidavit as truth, that this petition, motion or writ is not intended to waste the court time but being done in good faith as issues have not been contested or challenged or hears on such grounds under rule 242

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I. Wesley Edward Smith III certify on 29 August 2026, 2026 served a copy of FORM 18

And Order from the Court Of Appeal dated 31 July 2026 and personal affidavit contesting the sanctions and trespasser guilty verdicts on Writ of Certiorari on all parties addressed as shown below sent via United States Post Office First class mail to: SC SUPREME COURT 1231 Gervais Street Columbia S C 2920 and S C Court of Appeals 1220 Senate Street Colombia S C 29201

Berkeley County Courthouse Attn: Clerk of Court Leah Dupree) 300 B California Avenue Moncks Corner, South Carolina 29461	South Carolina Court of Appeals (Attn: Catherine Harrison) 1220 Senate Street Columbia S C 29201
--	---

Charleston County Courthouse
(attn Honorable Julie J Armstrong)
100 Broad Street Suite 106
Charleston, S C 29401

South Carolina Court of Appeals
(Attn: V Claire Allan)
1220 Senate Street
Columbia S C 29201

South Carolina Court of Appeals
(Attn Honorable Krisi Curtis)
1220 Senate Street
Columbia S C 29201

August 29, 2026


Wesley Edward Smith III
P O Box 294
Moncks Corner, S C 29461
email: wsmittyd4@gmail.com

Wesley Edward Smith III
Post Office Box 294
Moncks Corner, S C 29

SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT
ATTN: Honorable Patricia Howard / Clerk
1231 GERRARD STREET
COLUMBIA SC 29201

\$1.36⁹
US POSTAGE
FIRST-CLASS IMI
063S13194546
29461
000035606



RECEIVED

SEP 04 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

29201\$3206 CO20

