

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


November 12, 2015

CLERK  
Honorable Jenny A. Kitchens  
South Carolina Court of Appeals  
1015 Sumter Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

RE: Mr. Wesley Edward Smith, III, v, Charleston County School District et al Respondents  
State Appeal Case 2015-000787 C/O 20150002061

This notice serve as a 20 day inquisitional follow-up to the petition for reinstatement and reconsideration due to the act and Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III which finalized act are were legal unfamiliar. The petition seek to have the suspension order overturned based on the lack of support law memorandum (the court order is the result that seems to stem the reliance of the infringing third party hearsay, with an allowed fair hearing objection, should have stricken as not admissible) and the allege violation of the petitioner Appellate Civil Rights according to rule 203.

If no response is received from this inquisition of Court process within ten (10) days from this follow-up request, this action will be forwarded to the State Supreme Court for a resolution.

  
Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III

**RECEIVED**

NOV 18 2015

**SC SUPREME COURT**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeal  
ON APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY  
Doyet A Early, Administrative Law Judge  
Order 20 November 2007

State Appeal Case 2015-000787 C/O 2015-002061

Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III, .....Appellant.

v.

Charleston County School District, et al.....Respondent,  
Wesley E. Smith, Pro Se  
465 N, Nassau Street  
Charleston, SC 29403  
(804)244-7807  
Attorney for Appellant  
Daniel Francis Blanchard, III, Esquire  
151 Meeting Street 4th Floor  
Charleston, SC 29403  
(843) 737-6550  
Attorney for Respondent

**INQUISTIONAL FOLLOW-UP ON MR. WESLEY EDWARD SMITH III  
PETITION FOR REHEARING AND REINSTATEMENT**

Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III, submits this request as the subsequent follow-up, inquiring the process of a submission that was sent on 22 October 2015. This issues were to have the Court review the order of the Honorable Doyet A. Early dated 20 November 2007 to have suspension overturned due to an error of law and the reason given that are quite possible violation to citizens Civil Rights. The overturn is based on genuine issue of material fact that remains in violation appellate Civil Rights under rule 203 denying due process, lack of showing plausible preponderance of evidence and lacks legal facility as required for civil rights in the lower court civil trial. It is only fair and an equal with the respondents having the audacity to turn over Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III and evidence to the State in an employment termination, for some deal or another reciprocated favors for its decision making process, but has failed to provide or disclose any evidence for cross examining to all opposing parties concerning one sided rulings. In Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III summation as previously affirmed, that my allowance

**RECEIVED**  
NOV 18 2015  
SC SUPREME COURT

follow up action to a violation of my Civil Rights (under rule 203 is the genuine issue of material fact remains in error of law, but overlooked) according to any person subjected to the law must have all rights and opportunities afforded to appeal a decision based on his or her Appellant Civil Rights. Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III has/is claims I been violated. The alleged violation occurred while the respondents and others are acting working as a business practice under the State of South Carolina Rules, but has violated Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III recognizable Appellate Civil Right according to Civil Appeal rule 203. Proof beyond any reasonable doubt is required disprove the objectionable reasonable inferences and question that exist based on the adverse party violation of Civil Rights.

The Court, Court order nor other third party who have encroached upon my Civil Rights, as the alleged State under the organization entity, never once discussed how Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III did not perform his job or that Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III inabilities to perform his job on duty is supported with memorandum. Also with such memorandum shown would have expressly given authorization for any third parties to act, instead of an prejudgment, which gives the appearances and reasons to believe bullying, harassment and consistent intimidation to any and all citizen, for one's own personal fulfilling leisure, and as an acceptable past time for doing business was authorized. Reasons are given that the Court actors are reenacting events to duplicate past processes as interwoven with clashing fascist's this current date. Intent beyond any reasonable belief is being shown, by misuse of the judicial process and mistreatment of the citizens should not still exist, related to any Appellate Civil Rights, as herein on challenge due to the one sided judgment(s) stemming for the overlooked just cause termination of employment. Also overlooked was the challenge to contest what legal standing such State appointed had reason to meddle or intervene in such unrelated business employment termination process, while

at the same time, an unwarranted intermingling in Mr. Wesley Edward Smith personal private and financial affairs while wrongfully extorting valuable time, service and reliable resources are being com[romises and continually jeopardized.

I believe collective or individual respondents actions may have occurred in such mannerism of things due to long tem complacent acts of overzealousness by respondents acting in human error, carelessness, inadvertent coercion or collusion, duress, chemical altering substance imbalances', neglect or inadvertent excusable. I believe my appellate rights were adversely affected and being denied based on the Court order which suspended Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III without timely serving Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III a notice to appeal the decision which make the finalization of any Court impossible to believe to be legal without the supporting memorandum of law argument and not based on the initiator(s) own hearsay, speculation and conjecture of law argument, process legally unfamiliar. Anyone that acts<sup>1</sup> in such mannerism, knows or should have reasonably known that injuries would occur or result.

*The expressly written order of Honorable Doyet A. Early dated 20 November 2007 gives reason a cause in error of Civil Rights (Only served to Segregate citizen of race/color from having the same due process to equal access in Courts, Discriminated based on my color Black and race American, and a Retaliation tool because I, Mr. Wesley Edward Smith opposes to personnel rendition of organized sham or Ponzi scheme while employed persons choose to act g under the State rules. Such conduct has not been tolerated and should not. Unauthorized and illegal business deals, partnerships or associations have subjected Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III to a subjectively written order which only purpose seems to serve, protect, shield, immune and comfort all third party legal entities who has bold fully chosen act out and violate the citizen due process right without allowing the revolving door to incur due process in recourse, while noticeably infringing upon the citizen civil right. (Order offered as implied direct evidence).*

November 12, 2015

Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III

3

---

<sup>1</sup> A genuine issue of material fact remains based on the self-infliction injuries that causes harm to another. A self-serving biases may be a reason while other persons seek applying an barrier that serve as immunity (until proper authorities convene) while acting under the State law rule are crying out for help are but afraid. Mental Competency test and protections from mistreatment are in order forms of individual inflictions may be in order for these persons who are later identified also subjected to personnel belief and later rescue any others from the presumed unwarranted and shady business practice(s).

# ATTACHMENT (1)

State Appeal Case 2015-000787 C/O 2015-002061

Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III, .....Appellant.

v.

Charleston County School District, et al.....Respondent,

# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Wesley Edward Smith, III, Petitioner,

v.

Charleston County School District, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2015-002061

Lower Court Case No.<sup>o</sup> 2003CP1004751

---

## ORDER

---

By order dated June 25, 2015, the South Carolina Court of Appeals dismissed the appeal in this matter. The Court of Appeals sent the remittitur on July 15, 2015.<sup>1</sup>

Petitioner has now filed documents asking this Court to review the decision of the Court of Appeals. Since review of a decision of the Court of Appeals is sought by serving and filing a petition for a writ of certiorari under Rule 242 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR), the documents have been construed as a petition for a writ of certiorari.

This Court will only review a final decision of the Court of Appeals, and a decision is not final for the purposes of review until a petition for rehearing or reinstatement has been acted on by the Court of Appeals. Rule 242(c), SCACR. Since no petition for rehearing or reinstatement has been ruled on by the Court of Appeals in this matter, there is no final decision for this Court to review.

Further, when no petition for rehearing or reinstatement was received by the Court of Appeals within the time permitted by Rule 221, SCACR, the Court of Appeals properly sent the remittitur. Rule 221, SCACR. The sending of the remittitur ended appellate jurisdiction over this case, and no further motions or petitions can be considered in this case by either appellate court. *Wise v. S.C. Dept. of Corr.*, 372 S.C. 173, 642 S.E.2d 551 (2007).

---

<sup>1</sup> Before the Court of Appeals, the Appellate Case Number was 2015-000787.

Accordingly, the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed.

  
C.J.  
FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina  
October 15, 2015

cc: Daniel Francis Blanchard, III, Esquire  
Mr. Wesley Edward Smith, III  
The Honorable Julie J. Armstrong  
The Honorable Jenny Kitchings

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE, CLERK OF COURT

POST OFFICE BOX 11330  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211


Hasler

FIRST-CLASS MAIL

10/15/2015

US POSTAGE


\$00.48<sup>5</sup>



ZIP 29201  
011012602628

WESLEY EDWARD SMITH, III  
465 N. NASSAU STREET  
CHARLESTON SC 29403

2940338830 0031



JULIE J. ARMSTRONG

CLERK OF COURT, C.P. & G.S.  
100 BRUCE STREET, SUITE 106  
CHARLESTON, SC 29401-2258

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED



clerkofcourt.charlestoncounty.org

61



WESLEY SMITH  
PRO SE  
465 N NASSAU ST  
CHARLESTON SC 29403-3830

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT/ORDER PURSUANT TO RULE 77 SCRPC**

**Order/fr Supreme Crt-sending tof the remittitur ended**

**CASE NO: 2003CP1004751**

**Wesley Smith VS Charleston County School Dist Etal, defendant, et al**

This judgment was entered on the 21st day of October, 2015, and notice mailed first class on Monday, October 26, 2015, to all counsel of record and/or all parties entitled to receive notice.


You may view and download this document at <http://clerkofcourt.charlestoncounty.org> or obtain a copy in person at the Clerk of Court's Office during regular Charleston County business hours.

*Julie J. Armstrong*

Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III  
465 N. Nassau Street  
Charleston, South Carolina 29403

CHARLESTON SC 294

16 NOV 2015 PM 1 L



Clerk of Court  
**Daniel E. Shearouse**  
Supreme Court Building  
1231 Gervais Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

29201+3236

