RECEIVED

Nov 02 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF RICHLAND

COMMON PLEAS CASE NUMBER

2026-001041

MAGISTRATE CIVIL CASE NUMBER

JASON FETZER

APPELLANT(S)

**VS.**

CIRCUIT COURT, RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL COURT, SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RESPONDENT(S)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

**NOTICE OF CIVIL APPEAL**

The **plaintiff/defendant (circle one)**, JASON FETZER hereby gives notice of appeal from the judgment of the magistrate's court in the above action, to the Circuit Court of Common Pleas, in the county of RICHLAND.

This notice of appeal is made subsequent to personal notice of the judgment which was received on the 14th day of AUGUST, 2024.

**The appellant's exceptions to the judgment of the magistrate are set forth as follows:**

1. VIOLATION OF FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS: The appellant's First Amendment rights were violated through retaliatory law enforcement conduct, professional misconduct, and unjust restrictions on speech and conduct during actions where no legal violations were present.

2. VIOLATION OF FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS: The appellant's Fourth Amendment rights were violated via wrongful detention, wrongful arrest, and malicious seizure of person without legal justification or probable cause.

3. WRONGFUL TRESPASS AND INGRESS/EGRESS INTERFERENCE (Case Num: 20240610562565 & 20240610562563): The appellant was not refusing to leave upon request, possessed a valid right to ingress and egress, and was actively attempting to depart. Law enforcement committed professional misconduct by physically preventing egress using an abusive display of authority, harassment, and intimidation (including stomping feet and inciting flight) while

simultaneously ordering departure.

4. RETALIATORY ARREST FOR PROTECTED REACTION (Case Num: 20240610553758): The appellant's subsequent disorderly conduct and anger were a direct and predictable result of the severe and ongoing violation of civil rights by retaliatory officers acting out of bias, lies, or improper influence to intentionally inflict turmoil and place the appellant in harm's way.

5. FALSIFIED SHOPLIFTING CHARGE AND SLANDER (Case Num: 20240610553754): The appellant did not engage in shoplifting and was attempting a legitimate consumer purchase. The shoplifting allegations represent absolute falsification, slander, and discriminatory exclusion designed to inflict legal negligence and harm.

Dated: _____ _____

Appellant (or his attorney)