

**ATTACHMENT 1 TO WRIT OF CERT ADDMENDUM ARGUMENT
TO FORM 18 HEREON
PETITION FOR A REHEARING, REISTAMENT OR REMOVAL
TO THE SUPREME COURT**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court

From South Carolina
Court of Appeal

RECEIVED

SEP 09 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Catherine Harrison Clerk of Court
Court Order dated 31 July 2026

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: wsmitty4@gmail.com Appellant

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

1. PETITIONER WESLEY EDWARD SMITH III GRIEVED FOR A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI BUT AS UNDERSTOOD IN THE AMERICAN ENGLISH LANGUAGE RELIEFS TO AMERICAN CITIZENS INVOLVES JUDICIAL REVIEWS TO BE INFORMED FOR A BETTER UNDERSTANDING BASED ON LEGAL AND PROCEDURAL ERRORS OR VIOLATION TO CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT WHICH AS UNDERSTOOD THIS COURT AFFORDS FAIR AND EQUAL REVIEWS OF BOTH PARTIES BASED ON THE ALLEGED OVERSIGHTS, OMISSIONS AND COMMITTED WRONGS AS PETITIONER IS TO BE FULLY VETTED (RELIEVED FROM ALL WRONGDOINGS) PURSUANT RULE 242 BASED ERROR OF LAW BY COURT OF APPEALS AND NOTICE TO APPEAL COURT JUDGMENTS OR OTHERWISE PERSONS LISTED CAN SHOW CAUSE TO THIS COURT ON WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (SUPERCEDEAS) AS NONE APPLICABLE FOR REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICAN CITIZENS GOVERNED RIGHTS BY RESOLVED UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND AMENDMENTS

1. Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III AFFIRMATIVELY STATES AS ASSERTING THE PROTECTED ACTIVITY OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION PRIMARILY AS THE DEFENSE AGAINST UNITED STATES CITIZENS ACTS OF CONSTITUTIONAL WILLFUL WRONGDOINGS

Accordingly, as stated in relevant parts "The United States Constitution 14th amendment

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

2. Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III enclosed submits the required \$50.00 filing fee as denoted per South Carolina Supreme Court Clerk Patricia A Howard submitted document (as implied to infer a directing Court order), for case of 2026000852, from submission filed to the Court of Appeals, but believes that there are some continued legal and procedural discrepancies being noted, more of a deceptive mean, or motive to allow bad faith conquering's by these interchangeable persons, as the "New Style Politic Form" for conducting American Government business (as state official and local officers that enforces the law routinely are procedurally and legally applied incorrectly), as located here in the United State of America, not unless such persons can show cause as 1) not being in the United States of America, 2) not conducting official government Official duties, 3) is not a Naturally Born American citizen in the United States of America after the year of 1776, or 4) as inferred South Carolina thee State claiming the DE-union of rights as an Independent State, which are not to include the freedoms, liberty, prosperity or the exercising due process rights, as Resolved per the United States of America Constitution adoption parental ("The Parent, the protection and the guardians") process on July 4th, 1776, or of which I, Wesley Edward Smith III am too an American Naturally born American citizen with governed regulating rights here in the United States of America on American soils.

3. Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III based on the replacement of or changes for including case number 2026001066, with case 2026-000852 (See Order document dated 24 April 2026 as exb (2) to be inclusive (not excluded) as substantive material evidence of fact of reference), as this Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III (alleges continued frivolous violation under S C Code 15-36-10 and as sham shame violations under S C Code 15-75-10 A K A shady acts), as this person Wesley Edward Smith III (Clerk document makes no reference to what case of reference) as was not given notice of any changes to the cases from any persons nor this clerk.

4. Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III, claim for relief is obvious based on constitutional law and civil rights violation who since 1982 have been seeking such relief, from the long termed career politic choosing persons as a person, company and legal entity as included in this petition, that refuses acknowledgment of any faults or clerical mistakes, to have the gonads to intervene as a leader, and demand the making of such notes to the records, from the appointment board of corrections trustees. As of this date, for not being allowed the ADR (A K A Alternative Dispute Resolution to settle pay disputes, employment dismissal under false pretenses in violation to employment policies and [procedures, and dismissal of all state and local inferred reasons to declare, and court clerks or judicial clicks, that concurs by writing Order (as introduced as writing instrument which verified or verifies such charges as truth) but charges are not authenticated by not meeting the element and law standards for establishment meeting of reasonable Doubt)

5. Petitioner, Wesley Edward Smith III further alleges no meeting any of the state and local witness, student interns, operative, reliable source of A K A the government Snitches: as the government go to accusers, who have complied with S C Code 17-23-60 or the United States Confrontation clause under the Sixth (6th) amendment "which guarantees meeting these people in the court of law before impartial and reasonable set of grand jurors (not the D. A. as the sole prosecuting jury) of which I, Wesley Edward Smith III have always been denied by the "We the People politic Group" of collective individual thirst partiers (seeing these person on news broadcast, seeing them on a television channel acting or a press conference about irrelevant subjects or recorded segments that are unrelated to these subject matter claims on deprivation of legal and procedural rights legal matters is not descriptive as a qualifying event right justified) and believes that all cases as involved, shares the same persons, companies and legal entity should be liable, accountable and responsible for its actions for agreeing to share the same denial of constitutional rights and the alleged misconduct committed by these persons calling themselves (by self appointments with politic grouped others as the "entitled privileged") as such position have been long termed denoted as a prominent "title earned" of a government officials or officers of the administrative law courts of which such continued deprivations of rights and abuses of powers in this process, infers fraud has been and is being committed in violation of Rule 60(b)(3).

6. Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III suspects such persons, Companies and legal entities have and are involved with the violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, of which attempting to

debate or rebut the duplication of such orders, will be "liberally construed" as ridiculously frivolous, moot, baseless and above all else a sanctioning matter if documents are submitted to delay the court time, harass a party or a mean to delay justice process as submitted under the false pretenses, as in case not governed by the notice of case change document which supports such submission into this State of South Carolina Supreme Court.

7. Therefore Petitioner first course in this action is for clarification from the State for "duplicating the case with two (2) difference case numbers which involves the same person, companies and legal entity (whether they be foreign born or legally based American employees with right to work in the U S A) but is unknown to by this clerk who can conveniently deny such rights (legally and procedurally bound and bonded) discovery but can submit an all conclusive concurring Court Order as an authenticated action of finality" which still does not meet the reasonable doubt standard but continues to support persons, companies and legal entities who were allowed to speak in a public court, that gave hearsay testimonies, in the courts open to opinions and the assertion of ideas (a perceived and accepted cultural norm).

8. As on review 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. As the ending result, continues in violation of constitutional due process 14th Amendment as established by reasonable doubt, as concurring on the merit that sanctions and criminal guilty charges are reflecting an admission not to interfere with due process rights both legally and procedurally by these people of which the clerk(s), without providing a civil rights or constitutional law violation charge letter, nor allowing discovery disclosure from these court supports verdicts without required impartial grand jury, without legal data and without sufficiency showing of substantive material evidence which prove reasonable doubt was in fact established.

III STATES ACTS INFERS MAKING (MAKES) PREMATURE MOVES REGARDING ITS CIVIL COMPLAINTS WITHOUT SERVICES OF ANY NOTICES FOR LEGAL OR PROCEDURAL VIOLATION COMMITTED BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CITIZEN ON THE COMMISSION OF SOME ILLEGAL OR UNLAWFULLY PROVEN STATE ACTIONS WHICH REMOVEAL ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS BY LAW SHOULD BE GRANTED ON THIS PETITION

According to 28 U.S.C. § 1441 governs the **removal of civil actions**, allowing a defendant to transfer a lawsuit filed in a state court to a federal district court if the federal court has original jurisdiction. as of which both the Clerk Catherine Harrison and petitioner (state defendant) Wesley Edward Smith III are United States of America American Naturally born America citizens as civilians in an alleged unresolved legal and procedural dispute.

IV IN THIS CASE (AS HEREIN RELATED) REMOVAL REGARDING CRIMINAL ACTIONS IMPELICATION RELIEFS AND JUDICIAL REMEDY

9. The core issues regarding this code rule, as if the action governs the civil rights acts of 1964 violation on the complaint previously file by Catherine Harrison for this section as removable is required, for that act by (§ 1441(a), Any civil action brought in a state court may be removed by a defendant (herein petitioner request) to the federal district court for the district and division where the action is pending, provided the federal court has original jurisdiction (such as federal question or diversity jurisdiction), unless Congress says otherwise, regarding Diversity and Fictitious Names (§ 1441(b)(1), which is determined if a case is removable based on diversity of citizenship, the citizenship of defendants sued under fictitious names (like "John Doe or Jane Didthat") is ignored, and as such the Forum Defendant Rule Foreign States (§ 1441(d)) which involves citizen of the United States of America, involved in a Civil action brought in state court against a foreign state can be removed to federal court, where the case is tried without a jury.

10. As such, in this case which involves such federal constitutional question under 28 U.S. Code § 1441, as in this matter, such cases can be removed under 28 U S C 1331 when presenting a **Federal Questions as to court to entertain such: Would you ask when and where did this person as known by the state and local courts as the clerk, clerk Catherine Harrison present into this court as a United States of American citizen or a diversity of citizen claims whereas in its was filed by her or him as a plaintiff of which such complaint was by administrative law investigated, or of which included claims based on the U.S. Constitution or federal laws, such as civil rights violations under 42 U.S.C. § 1983) or a constitutional deprivation of rights under the fifth and fourteenth amendments or as rights are secured in housing from interferences under 28 U S C 3531?**

11. This is not to be liberally construed based on inference inferred or a person use of authority in government position oath abound, not to assert authority as a right but if similarity situated as that person, with his or hers job to judicial discern based on the law and the wrongs being alleged (not personal discretions for judicial reviews or belief system as a career politic or based on a personal idea) BUT based on the rule of engagements, when one person uses the force of law to move or hinder the rights of another person without any consent written nor oral the uses and company brand products belongs to this person Wesley Edward Smith III name, images and personal property likeness for a personal gain, by responding and showing causes to the court that reasonable doubt was in facts established, and such acts as being claimed are preposterous by this person, and thus according to the United States Constitution or the federal statutes were not violated (proof need be provided him or her) that this act of adversely affecting the constitution and this person Wesley Edward Smith III , based on person suspected of violating with willful and malicious intent to cause person and legal injuries and harms were not a violation of any constitutional and civil rights law, as resolved.

12. As American citizens under the United States of America Constitutional protected activity, prohibited from deprival, infringements or rights abridged, which qualifies for federal jurisdiction, which also governs the removal under specific federal statutes like 28 U.S.C. § 1443, defendants facing state court actions (as in the South Carolina Supreme Court) that violate

their equal civil rights can sometimes remove the case to federal court qualified the federal court as having Original Jurisdiction of which the federal court jurisdiction is based upon the aforesaid has the legal authority to hear these type of claims as being made, with the providing of proof as filings which must include supporting documents such a legal and procedural facts and a notice sent by the state court and all other parties involved thus includes the showing a Reading of charges by the appointed and anointed magistrate judge read or summarized the criminal charges filed by the state or federal prosecutor, 2) shows the submission of the Notice of rights as the state court fully explained in written form the confirmed constitutional rights, including the notices of right to appeal the orders and reports and recommendation, 3) read and signed notice right to remain silent prior to arrest and evictions 4) the right to an attorney if the defendant could not afford a lawyer, or that the judge appointed one, 5) that the Entering a plea was performed before a grand jury convened body of reasonable and impartial person that rendered the guilty verdict and 6) that the petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III as the state named defendant was allowed to respond to the prosecutions charges to the guilty verdict),

13. With this understanding that the federal court judge may on resolving before or after such **federal claims, may remand any state mixed claims** the federal judge decides the removal was improper or lacks jurisdiction based on the United States of America claims from either Catherine Harrison (et al as listed person claims may have varied) as the State Clerk or this person moving as Petitioner Wesley Edward Smith III, as both parties are not fully aware (due to secrecy) known to determine without being afforded pretrial hearings rights regarding discovery prior to judgments and written orders by the state and local court and persons to accurately determine her or him is a United States of America American citizen, private resident, private citizens and private personal generally regarding family life styles, and as such in that case the relief affording state remedy could be sent back ("remanded") to the state court.

14. Under 28 U.S. Code § 1455.AS REQUIRED IN THE PREVENTRION BASED ON IDEA ASSSERTED TO PREVENT FUTHUERANCE OF STATE COURT ARRAINMENTS and spoliation of evidence, of which the primary federal code governing the procedure for removing a criminal case from state court to federal district court which focus on the legal coded for criminal removal is based on procedure which **Procedure (§ 1455) of 28 U.S.C. § 1455** outlines the exact rules and timeline for filing a notice of removal for criminal prosecutions, which the review in this case involves **Civil Rights Cases (§ 1443) under 28 U.S.C. § 1443** that permits removal of certain state criminal prosecutions involving denials of equal civil rights. It is important to note the required rules and deadlines and time **limit which this petitioner on rehearing's, reinstatement and request for removal, as NOTICE to the State of South Carolina (et al) as listed respondents** as the notice of removal not later than **30 days** after the state court arraignment, or at any time before trial, whichever is earlier (unless the federal court grants an extension for good cause provided from the state courts of which the required contents must include in the notice this short, plain statement of the grounds for removal denial, plus copies of all processes, pleadings, and orders served from the state court upon this person Wesley Edward Smith III and the Clerk Catherine Harrison. Once filed and served to the state prosecutor, the state court cannot proceed further unless the federal court sends the case back

(remands it by showing cause).

15. This action is being requested as required with so many unknown actors intervening in the name of the State of South Carolina, while claiming to act as separate governing politic entities, and with such tribunal chief hidden agendas based on secretive ulterior motive(s), as the state and local American government that intervene and will not allow any disclosure which duty was to and is required to perform was not denying discovery or to review all of docketed cases and applied motion this a proper before this court arraignment is timely presented

16. Petitioner, Wesley Edward Smith III has not been afforded to enter a plea, (See exb 3 as offered into evidence of which my rights to plea was silenced as abridged by the sanction order of Judge Doyet A Early order dated 20 November 2007 in the prevention of filing **a not guilty verdict**) **a meritless sanction order filed should not be in any way shape or orf form misconstrued as automatically or readily assumed as a no contest of being guilty on all state charges unknown as** this early stage to allow time to review evidence (**A K A Nolo .** contendere) which in the American Language means I agreed with the charges as set forth by the state prosecutors as is without further contesting or challenging any perceived state officers and official as prosecutors bench trials based on legal or procedural wrong in violation of my United States Of America citizens rights while here in South Carolina, which is an untrue accounting, as my rights are still being invoked under the 14th Amendment as affirmative in defense against these legal an procedural wrongs, as alleged until the State of South Carolina Show proof otherwise as such productions is required disclosing any and all facts.

17 Also worth noting, the South Carolina Court of Appeals not only denied my notice of appeal by refuse the commanding (directing) Order of the South Carolina Supreme Court on 21 May 2026 failed to permit the petitioner Petition for rehearing or reinstatement for which this petition should be granted, and the relief from the judicial review showing the remedy by a detailed written order from the appointed adjudicators (panel)

18. **As when such action are related herein sets out he procedures which** involves Criminal actions for which such removal would be in accordance with 28 U S C 1446(1) is resulting action sought based on violations of civil right, as such review in the United States District Court for Charleston South Carolina is appropriate as such actions were alleged within this court jurisdiction and should entertain all such matters under and by 28 U S C 1446 Civil Rights Case which states;

"For any act under color of authority derived from any law providing for equal rights, or for refusing to do any act on the ground that it would be inconsistent with such law. or as such relief affords (1) Against any person who is denied or cannot enforce in the courts of such State a right under any law providing for the equal civil rights of citizens of the United States, or of all persons:

**V. AS DESCRIBED BY LAW AS FRAUDULENT OR DECEPTIVE PRACTICES
PROCEDURAL AND LEGALLY AWHIL PERPETRATING A FRAUD AS A SO**

CALLED NEW DEAL WORLD ORDER PROMOTED BY STATESMEN AND ASSOCIATED WOMEN VICE AS TITLES LOOKING LIKE AN OFFICIAL OFFICER AS A STATE BUT WE ARE HERE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA WHICH IDEAS AND BELEIFS AS SET ASIDE AND OFF SET

19. As understood with the street community who with shared street commonalities, sometimes differs how games are played. We differ in the aspects of respect not being shown to the United States of America Constitution nor this citizen Wesley Edward Smith III, that-believes Yes everyone and anyone on a weekend can go hide out and play in their associated dealings of the games called hide and come seek. marbles, jacks, operation of the doctor and nurse game of you operate on me and ill can operated on you, or under the games of dress ups like Marvin and now I'm Ms. Mable, or in the dungeons classics of dragons or whatever suites their imaginary mindset of fallacy, at "that" weekend event is suitable even as lions, bears, Dem panthers and roaring tigers, but when that sixth (6th) senses kicks in on Monday to Friday work grinds for 12 to 24 grind, or by however you believe the twerk work day starts, that when we all should come back to our reality of the United States of America business structure and formats as RESLOVED by our Constitutional responsibilities, obligations, accountabilities and as liable fpow wrongs committed to due process rights (you do me and Ill do your rights) as American Citizens, as We each live, work and play here in the United States of the Great North And South America

20. Based on history, you the people sought your independence to escape from authority and authoritative figures, from the so called actions from the King governing British Royalities, from the Roman Empire rule and have decided to adopt partially the care acts for all citizens and were afforded under the European concept of government duties, as here in the United States of America not being shown to all person being provided the basic necessities or Crongree supports under the ESRIA Act of 1974, which would not only be a practical concept, but more beneficial as the governing duty, of which the same (based on belief of history reporting's and new insights) had your ancestors evicted (exiled from) kicked out of such European countries for quite the similar perpetration of political frauds being like mannerism of things, as herein alleged suspected by these person, interposed companies with its legal entity of people ,who have been OUT OF TOUCH (Zzz) With our United States Of America citizens realities, the teachings, instructions , practices , and the common sense respect we if color have been for many many years shown to one or the other.

21. As such, since I, Wesley Edward Smith III am American and speaks the American English Language, that all forms of communication be in English. Unless these person can show casue or has shown to the courts that this above Petition for rehearing as attachment 1 to support the filing dated 29 August 2026, attached for addressing the correction of the Clerk Catherine Harrison procedural and legal error overlooks or omis form the Orders, of which the Clerks and court appointed (alternate motion for productions by answering to the Writ of Mandamus as show proof) can show being reasonable doubt belong to a legacy of royalty of which foreigners as intervenors us of words are being converted with the American English language rules governing a fair and equal hearing under the laws, which confuses person on and under afforded legal case reviews with merits.

VI. RELIEF AS REQUIRED BY LAW AS ALLEGED MISCONDUCT BY UNITED STATE SOUTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATORS ADMINISTRATION AGENTS AS TO OFFICIALLY GOVERN ABUSE OR MISUSE OF PROCESS BY PERSON OF THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT WHO GOVENMENTAL DUTIES OVERREACH

22 Ironically, the clerk of Court Catherine Harrison received the Ninth Judicial Circuit Court actions as committed by the Charleston County Clerk Honorable Julie J Armstrong, the Berkeley County Administrations Clerk Honorable Leah G. Dupree, and assumed the assumption of command for being that one (1) person to be held accountable, responsible and liable, but has been passed to the court of appeal clerk Catherine Harrison, as Public officials and or public officers dressed as law enforcing officers or delegated by State clerk by such personal govnement state and local agents, who have applied the attaching escaping from justice process and procedures in the attached two pronged approach to securing person and property, with the same comfort in first case hearing under review for reliefs and reversal if judgment and written orders of sending and evictions from properties, as a tenant resident protected by South Carolina Residential tenant agreement privacy rights act (State locals provided no probable cause as an outside American State government to intrude on the my protecting rights as a American Citizen, from unreasonable searches and illegal seizures as alleged, and the unwarranted disturbance with peace, liberty and freedoms involved with such persons in privacy for being denied of rights under 42 U S C 1982 as you the people enjoy without being harassed or discriminated against unreasonably by the court of law.

23. **WHEREAS** this review is based on the judgment sentences[ings] and orders affirmation by written orders without establishing showing having gas legal reasoning as a. person nor legal entity pas public official or public law enforcing officer for the state of local administrative agency who failed to show probable cause and presented a sufficiency showings of required substantive material evidence (showing of proof to detain and seize all Wesley Edward Smith III properties or terminations form employment of be involved with foreclosure action, the petition should be respectful granted as enjoining, sanctions and transfers are warranted by law.

24. A fraudulent deceptive practice is a misleading, false, or unethical business action that tricks consumers into making a purchase or decision they would not otherwise make, as in relevant part 1) Orders which **False advertises by Making untrue claims about a person o propagandas that benefits all citizens**, 2) the **Bait-and-switch by taking one 91) person and having him or her repeat rumors form the persons that actually committed the criminal act and civil violations originally**, 3 **hidden the cost owed to another and attorney fees by creating meritless and frivolous cases in order form to obtains** extra service charges, costly mailing and shipping costs to meet deadlines, 3) the recurring of cases without resolve as late in the checkout process, and 4) the **Misrepresentation of legal and procedural goods by selling the state and local government propagandas as the reliable products**, which are used, damaged, altered and out of touch with today's realities and dated brands are being refabricated as a new American legal and procedural process for conducting ALL the citizens business.

RECEIVED

SEP 09 2026

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

S.C. SUPREME COURT

I, Wesley Edward Smith III certify on 31 August 2026, served attachment 1 to coincide with the copy of FORM 18 order from the Court Of Appeal dated 31 July 2026 and personal affidavit as a NON FRIVOLOUS MATTERED (asserted again) contesting the sanctions and trespasser guilty verdicts on the petition for rehearing, Reinstatement and removal (or state persons to show cause per Writ of Mandamus) 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 29201 and S C Court of Appeals 1220 Senate Street Columbia 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: Kristi Curtis) 1220 Senate Street Columbia S C 29201
--	--

AS EMAILED TO PERSON OF INTEREST as a insurance company, legal entity, american corporations entity, public officials and officer with last known email Addresses


- 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: Wendellgaillard@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_etc@scd.uscourts.gov

Emailed to third party legal entities with intervene only with interest concern in the companies shock and shareholders business financial pictures as join to Case, as once active Participants (in parts or as a whole liable as part of this politic body responsible liable and accountable for lack of duty of candor (ethics violator) for the misrepresented facts while asserting hearsay Order in the bait and switchem routines US citizen vice Foreign persons abuse of legal process):


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

August 31th, 2026


Wesley Edward Smith III M. Ed.
P O Box 294
Moncks Corner, S C 29461
Email: wsmittidy4@gmail.com

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

Retail



29201

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FCM LG ENV
MONCK'S CORNER, SC 29461
SEP 01, 2026

\$2.85

RDC 99

S2324D502947-17

SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT
Clerk: Patricia Thomas Clerk
1231 GOWAN STREET
COLUMBIA S.C. 29201

RECEIVED

SEP 09 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT