

Oct 20 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mayshell Wilson, Petitioner

v.

Willie Mae Reed, Respondent

Court of Appeals Case No. 2024-001284

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
Pursuant to Rule 242, South Carolina Appellate Court Rules

TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE AND ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA:

Petitioner Mayshell Wilson, appearing pro se, respectfully petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the reviewable proceedings and rulings in her appeal, including the August 26, 2026 dismissal and the October 5, 2026 order denying recall of the remittitur. Petitioner requests review of the filing and notice history and the discrepancy between appellate remittitur records and the lower-court clerk's written response concerning receipt.

I. QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether review is warranted where Petitioner repeatedly attempted to correct filing deficiencies and sought extensions, and the Court of Appeals acknowledged receipt of a filing on August 24, 2026, before dismissing the appeal on August 26, 2026.
2. Whether the complete appellate docket and notice records should be examined to determine what deficiency notices, if any, were generated or sent between Petitioner's August 21, 2026 filing and the August 26, 2026 dismissal, and whether Petitioner had a meaningful opportunity to respond.
3. Whether review of the October 5, 2026 order denying recall of the remittitur is warranted in light of the Clarendon County Clerk of Court's October 6, 2026 written response stating that her office had no record of receiving the remittitur electronically or by paper.

II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This matter is Mayshell Wilson v. Willie Mae Reed, South Carolina Court of Appeals Case No. 2024-001284. The remittitur identifies the lower-court case as 2024CP1400306. Some earlier papers identify 2024CP1400153. Petitioner does not attempt to resolve that discrepancy and asks that the official appellate docket be consulted.

The archived correspondence reflects that on October 9, 2025, the Clerk issued deficiency letters concerning signatures, the filing fee for a motion, and the required format and separate filing of an amended designation of matter. Later court correspondence confirms that the initial brief was accepted by order dated December 9, 2025. On April 10, 2026, the Clerk issued a deficiency letter concerning the format of the final brief. On May 13, 2026, another letter identified a missing proof of service for a motion to file the Record on Appeal late.

The July 8, 2026 order granted motions for extension and late filing but struck the corrected final brief and Record on Appeal filed May 26, 2026 because of formatting issues, and directed amended filings within thirty days. On August 12, 2026, the Clerk issued a deficiency letter concerning the final brief and stated that the amended Record on Appeal had not been received.

Petitioner states that when she received deficiency notices, she made efforts to correct the identified issues or sought additional time when necessary. Petitioner would not knowingly disregard a notice from the Court. Her copy of a filing dated August 21, 2026 includes a final brief and proof of service. On August 24, 2026, the Court of Appeals emailed that it had received a filing and attached a stamped copy. The appeal was dismissed on August

26, 2026. Petitioner states that she did not receive another deficiency notice between her August 21 submission and the dismissal. She asks that the complete docket and submission records be reviewed rather than asking the Court to assume that the acknowledged filing contained every required document.

The Court of Appeals issued a remittitur dated September 16, 2026. Petitioner later moved to recall the remittitur and reinstate the appeal. On October 5, 2026, the Court of Appeals denied recall, stating that recall requires a very strong showing that the remittitur was sent down through mistake or inadvertence by the court or its officer. The order stated that no action would be taken on reinstatement because recall was denied.

On October 6, 2026, the Clarendon County Clerk of Court provided a written response stating that her office had no record of receiving the remittitur electronically or by paper. The Court of Appeals' October 15, 2026 letter to the lower-court clerk states that the remittitur had been issued on September 16 and that an additional copy was attached. A separate October 15 letter concerning Petitioner's rehearing filing states that the Court would take no action because the remittitur had already been sent and refers to the October 5 order. Petitioner states that she has not received further correspondence from the lower court concerning the remittitur or status of the lower-court case.

III. REASONS WARRANTING REVIEW UNDER RULE 242(b)

A. The documented filing history warrants examination of the official docket. Petitioner recognizes that appellate rules must be followed and does not ask the Court to disregard filing requirements. She asks that the actual history of notices, submissions, receipt acknowledgments, and rulings be examined before the dismissal is treated as final beyond further review. The record reflects repeated attempts to respond to identified deficiencies, including motions for additional time and later corrective submissions.

Petitioner's position is that she acted when she received notice and did not receive an additional deficiency notice between August 21 and August 26, 2026. She respectfully requests that the Court of Appeals' docket and mailing/email records establish whether another notice was generated, when and how it was sent, what address or email was used, and whether any proof of mailing or delivery exists.

B. The remittitur transmission and receipt records should be considered together. The October 5 order states that the remittitur was properly sent on September 16, 2026. The Clarendon County Clerk's October 6 response states that her office had no record of receiving it. Petitioner does not claim that the clerk's letter alone proves the remittitur was never transmitted. The records raise a factual question that may be clarified by examining the transmission date, method, destination, and any available delivery or electronic transmission confirmation.

C. Review is requested of procedural issues, without assuming facts not established by the record. Petitioner asks for review of the official record concerning the dismissal and subsequent recall proceedings. She respectfully submits that her documented efforts to comply, the August 24 receipt acknowledgment, the lack of any additional notice received before dismissal, and the remittitur correspondence warrant review to the extent the questions are preserved and the petition is timely under Rule 242.

IV. RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court: (1) grant a writ of certiorari to review the reviewable rulings and proceedings in Court of Appeals Case No. 2024-001284; (2) examine the official docket and submission records concerning Petitioner's corrective filing efforts and the August 26, 2026 dismissal; (3) examine the records concerning the September 16, 2026 remittitur together with the October 6, 2026 letter from the Clarendon County Clerk of Court and the October 15, 2026 correspondence; (4) if warranted by the record and applicable law, vacate or set aside the challenged procedural disposition and remand for further proceedings; and (5) grant any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,


Mayshell Wilson, Petitioner Pro Se

6411 Summerton Highway
Manning, South Carolina 29102
Telephone; 803-225-2752

Date: Oct 20, 2022