

*Wesley E. Smith J.J.*  
465 North Nassau Street  
Charleston, South Carolina 29403  
(804) 244-7807

October 5, 2015

CLERK  
Honorable Daniel Shearouse  
South Carolina Supreme Court  
1231 Gervais Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29401

RE: Mr. Wesley Edward Smith, III Appellant v Charleston County School District et al  
Respondents IN REF: Case Appealant Court Case Trial Number 2015-00787

Enclosed for your immediate attention, concerns my notice on appeal "Petition for Reinstatement" that was previously submitted to this Court of Appeals for reconsideration. The reinstatement was based on the perceived error of state statutory laws regarding the casual engaging in an anti biased protected activity and the adverse injurious actions resulting to mr. Wesley Edward Smith III regarding such employment practices under S C Code 15-36-10 et al, which case involves Frivolous Matters.

I disagree with the express written order of the lower court and dissent the State Court of Appeal review blindly dismissing such action, because it is impossible for the lower court to render a verdict of the State Court of Appeal in the lower Court of Common Pleas. This perceived as prejudice and error of law which violates the enclosed precedent. Relying on *Mc Dowell v S C Department of Social Service 300 S.C. (Ct App 1989)* and *Donkle v. Forster 238 S.C. 90 (1961)*

The order goes a far to tell how the Appeals Court would render its verdict. I perceived the expressly written order from the Court of Common Pleas as being outside its jurisdictional bounds of judicially descent and should be null and voided. All other actions involving Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III claims by affirmed court order respectfully reversed and reconsidered, governing this error to the law.

**RECEIVED**

OCT 07 2015

**SC SUPREME COURT**


I also dissent the Court of Common Pleas Order with the objectionable reliance of the error or law, as taking from the letter, as we know based on the law, a remittitur denotes that the State case action was legally finalized. This statement cannot be a true statement, when the parties along with this court knows a complaint and or summon validates the commencement of the court legal procedural actions. Absent this legal familiarity makes the order of the Honorable Doyet A. Early is procedurally legally untimely and should null and void for vagueness which leaves ambiguity for the application of practice on the State laws.

I am requesting that is court reconsider this action as my "Petition for Reinstatement' based on this court finding in regards to infraction that the expressly written order is without merit less, slanderous, jurisdiction premature and an error of law. The untimely written order proffered not means of allowing the non moving party any chance of contesting or judicially challenging the case, but afforded Summary Judgment to a non deserving third party legal entity acts are senseless, based on hearsay, sheer speculation and mere conjecture of a law argument.

I am exercising the use of my right afforded residents and citizens legal right that serves as protections, a shield and defensive mechanism from continually being subjective to the personal ideologies, arbitrarily target of denoted frivolous matters and torturously attacked. As denoting under the **South Carolina Code 15-36-10. Frivolous** lawsuits; signing pleadings; imposition of sanctions; notice and opportunity to respond; reporting violations.

I did/do not consent to the waiver, use of my precious time and services have anyone to use me as practice on my legal or personal rights, nor did I authorized involuntary servitude. All other rights are preserved and reserved at this time.

October 5, 2015

  
Mr. Wesley E. Smith, III  
465 N. Nassau Street  
Charleston, SC 29403  
(804) 244-7807  
Attorney Pro Se for Appellant

RECEIVED

OCT 07 2015

SC SUPREME COURT

Copy To: CLERK Honorable Jenny A. Kitchens  
CLERK Honorable Julie J. Armstrong  
Mr. Daniel Frank Blanchard, III ESQ  
FILE