

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

RECEIVED

February 5, 2016

FEB 08 2016

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Office of the Clerk
Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543

RE: Mr. Wesley Edward Smith, III Petitioner v Charleston County School District INC et al
Respondents Case No. 2015-002061


Dear Honorable Clerk Connors;

Enclosed for your immediate action, is another copy of Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III request and service to appeal the lower court state decision.

The State highest Court (See Order Attached) is claiming not to having jurisdiction over the State Court subject matter after the assertion of the Remittitur.

Question: Upon this courts further review by this Court of this delicate matter, as is being inferred and construed by Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III, is this intent for deprivation of a constitutional due process right violation considered a crime? No barrier can be asserted by a person or by the state to deprive a citizen of his or her due process rights.

Thanking you in advance


Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III

NO. _____

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

Mr. Wesley Edward Smith IIIPetitioner

VS

Charleston County School District et al,Respondent(s)

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III, do swear that by certified mailing that on this date, served the enclosed MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS and PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI on each party to the above proceeding or that part's counsel, and on every other person require to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first call postage prepaid, or by third-party commercial carrier by delivery within three (3) calendar days .


The names and address of those served are as follows:

Daniel F. Blanchard, III, Esquire	CLERK OF COURT
151 Meeting Street 4th Floor	Honorable Julie J. Armstrong
Charleston S. C. 29403	100 Broad Street Rm 106
	Charleston, S. C 29403

Honorable Jenny A. Kitchens	Honorable Daniel Shearouse
South Carolina Court of Appeals	South Carolina Supreme Court
1220 Senate Street	1231 Gervais Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201	Columbia, S. C. 29201

I declare that under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my ability.

Executed on February 5, 2016


Mr. Wesley E. Smith, III
465 N. Nassau Street
Charleston, SC 29403

NO. _____

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATE**

Mr. Wesley Edward Smith IIIPetitioner/

VS

Charleston County School District et al,Respondent(s)

MOTION FOR NOTICE OF APPEAL FOR WRIT FOR CERTIORARI
and REQUEST TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS WITHOUT PREPAYMENT OF
FILING FEES OR OTHER INCURRED COST

I. INTRODUCTION

I, Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III moves before this honorable court, exercising my fundamental Constitutional rights of which I am aggrieved and complaining that my constitutional due process civil rights have been deprived before the Charleston County School District and other (et al) allowed such takings. Adversely affected was the taking of my employment rights, employment pay and wages, employment benefits and the safeguards, protection and promises that affords me as a citizen of the State, the right to such liberty, the pursuit of happiness and freedoms was allowed. This violation of my constitutional right have been violated by Charleston County School District while operation in the performance of its duties under constitutional law. As such related civil proceeding, I am now having to petition this court, dissent the State Supreme Court provisional authority to RECONSIDER, REVERSE and allow REINSTAEMENT for this matters complained as identified and subsequently found in

error of law pursuant the provision under South Carolina Appellant Rules 242 for which I have reason to believe that the court issuance order of the State doctrine Remittitur is unripe for the adjudication process, as perceived in error of constitutional law and its quite possible, a unconstitutionally written order which is left to be unchallenged in the State Supreme Court by its delegated officials for this important case on review.

I was led to believe that the major concern of importance of the State Supreme Court were if the lower court has allowed used my (any persons) name Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III, my place of employment Charleston County School District , my business partners, my money, my time and my involuntary services in which to conduct its promotions of frivolous matters into, what one would perceive as a plausible lawful business affairs without me being present (rule of law required such proof of service be presented upon request, as herein and after needed).

This is regardless of whether or not the hearing was closed or secretly done. I believe that I have a right according to the rule of law (via rules of law SCRCF rule 3 requires a Complaint and under rule of law SCRCF 4 requires a service of a Summons) with notices of the time and date of specified hearing, so that I, Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III (American Citizen currently being held in bondage without bail (children collaterally attacked as well) in the State of South Carolina justice system against my free will) and be informed about out specifics of the personal harms that I personally cause Charleston County School District INC and not the tagalong (injunctions requested as well) third party hearsay rumors or generalizations of a moot issue

A potential problem I see in this oversight, is that with so many personal within the ranks of this legal field being promotion (I am self?), delegated and the interchangeability of the State court actors and officials, questions presented; Can anyone honestly rely on the State Highest Court supposing to allow the submission of the "Remittitur (which has been a problematic longstanding issue for members of a delegated Congress Committee and the State delegated legislators who are one in the same persons who debate keeping this dangerous foreign law in circulation, business) " from becoming asserted prematurely, by an unidentified actors, acting presumably for the State Court of Appeal, who has resorted to cause internal problems within the State practices by calling to challenged and undermined the very limited integral fabric of the previous soiled, and mimicked rendition of a presented case, of the which the State Supreme Court and that Courts have been instructed to rule based on the expressly written authority to preside over such delicate legal matter of a genuine issue of material fact that may remain. Such acts whereas issues raises a national conflicts on the application of the rule of law where inferences remains, where a questionably arguable and objectionable discrimination and prejudice controversies exist (See attached order) and the safeguards that Constitution due process rule of law which as mandated requires, that " before a persons life, liberty or property could be taken violation (deprivation already occurred). How could this action on the face, not be considered that the State is under seized by perpetrating State actors who is using the business arena for its own compelling personal reasons, by asserting the "Remittitur" only to serve as that barrier, even to the silence the State Supreme Court who by order has also relinquish its only authority to serve and protect the citizen not be considered a genuine issue remaining that is of national importance?

When the rule of law requires strict compliance of the mandated written rules without deviation(s), or that the Respondent mistakes of law may have been due to human error, carelessness, contributory neglect, strict negligence, overzealousness, wanton or even if malfeasance is found to be involved, the issue remains that a failure to provide such duty to provide a proof of service of summons accompanied with complaint which stated in an understandably written in the English (Americas) Language, that Charleston County School District is a citizen, as identified in the complaint and is that person who was personally injured and harmed by Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III while Mr. Wesley Edward Smith II was employed prior to being terminated. With such with a stated claim authorizing relief, attached would be with supporting memorandum of law argument, or even the law enforcement agency review of the claims for state violations. How can anyone presume, who claim to be reasonably mentally competent and or prudentially intelligent, even formulate the intervening third party' mere conjecture, pure speculations and rumored belief hearsay, as a final court action before the action officially commenced (began in the State lower Court) within the State Judicial Departments?

By law, I am a protected class species that is immune from being bullied, arbitrarily targeted, and used as an amusement while on display for any and a subject while at work or in my private life, but other person decided to run with this and make me a part of an unlawful business practice that Charleston County School District support, promote and condones and believes based on its actions, CCSD doesn't have to adhere or comply with to the State prohibition theory and prohibited practice as a business entity.

If the lower court reviewed the retrieved papers from the State employed official who operates under State law, the offices as official place of business to sign forms on the letter head while conducting a business which were done by prominent men and women that expressly wrote this view while officiating on the bench (presumed), then yes. I Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III have reason to believe based on the Constitutional rule of due process as conferred by the Constitution rule of law, that the State Supreme Court did retain the rights to review this adjudicated matter on the defamation, Civil Rights and pain and suffering subject matter. This is on the ground holding that the judgment was the made as result of the State lower court officially rendering its verdict in the State Lower Courts (SLC) by the State delegates employed citizens of the State who collects paychecks and acquire much property, attachment used for assessment in collateral damage.

My perspective is that based on the State delegated officials and appointing of personally designed as employed Executive managers lack of supervision for the requirement of a declared re duty. it is believe that such related to this action, by designed (intent is off the charts) as imitated and administered by friends acting a the supporting cast for the intervening business like entrepreneurs third party's, who by this one-sided court action design has strategically managed to manipulate the gadgets of the fine machine performance for operating in the mannerism in which is its intended, structurally, but the insiders of the corporate third party business (also sits on the reviewing board, also as the Board of Directors) have managed this takeover to take palce and happen in the State of South Carolina. From the results of this action, the hardworking and employed resident citizen of this State who are the hardworking and underpaid law abiding

citizen and their children, family and afflictions (like myself) are being used as their enslaved, legally unfairly and mistreated as the third party scapegoat while many other continue to fall prey to the deceptive and deceitful procedural process without being afforded due process or protection by the immunity clause with prevent this type of prohibited acts based on a governing factors, such a age, race, color, gender, disabilities, religion preference, or any other form of prior means for acquiring personal servitude, extorting other money, business, service and time by deceitful means unimaginable to men or women. An investigation into thus "urgent matter" is needed. as being reported by citizens on patrol. I am told to uphold, while supporting defending the State Constitution against all enemies, foreign (Remitter) and or domestic, that by reporting all perceived violation, even as I, Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III have committed such acts (State Supreme Court will not hear or allow me this Freedom of Expression even to report a perceived violation) by fallen prey to operating guise of the Sate practice process just by being affiliated with this CCSD Group as and employee, operating within a ring of lies, conversion, deceit and mistrust.

Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III again request the appeals packet necessary to proceed without paying of fees as I proceed In forma Pauperis and to appeal the State Supreme Court decision in error of the Constitution requirements and in error violation of the Rule of law. I Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III submit this request by service of "certified mailing" to this Court and other persons of interest as identified. addresses.

IN CLOSING

When I was employed, I worked in the performance and requirements of my assigned duties, So why would anyone fathom or reasonably think that members [the State Legislators [or

Congressional Committee] would put any covenants (any form of controlling or governing legislation) in the mainstream of our America governed society, only to have public believed that the consumer protection are being jeopardized and scrutinize that not to be adhered to according to the posted law, and that any citizen or consumer would not be injured as a result of false and misleading information produced by unrelated third parties. It is hard to also believe that contrary to the populist theory papers that such acts would create conflicts with the rule of law, causes controversies y between the State and the citizen, citizens and the courts and the consumers product reliability, that the creation such impeding legislation should encroached upon Federal Due process Clause. Citizen have thus, in such process has become unhappy, mistreated, unfairly accused of crimes due to the existence of such injustice, unfair legal controlling practices or reasons to believe that prejudicial administration related to full administration of justice is being controlled for some other State compelling reason other what the mechanism was designed and intend to provide. Legislators have already produce doctrine with full affect of law that governed the Federal rule of law and civil proceeding. The State Supreme Court upon to a review, could have notice that the case presided over in the lower court lacked substance and legal unfamiliar to be considered ripe for adjudication. As relying on the *Goodson v America Bankers Ins Co* 295 S.C. 400., 368 S.E.2d 687 (1988)

QUESTION PRESENTED

Prior to terminating the contract of Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III form his employment from CCSD, did CCSD go to the State legislators [or Congressional committee] to get its blessing or authorization to terminate the Employment rights of a U. S. citizen by subjecting him to such an astringent practice without such showing of such force, as needed by production of law argument made available ? Proof of such authorization required disclosure .

I affirm and or will declare that by this written submission that under the penalties of perjury, the foregoing this action has not been heard and the information is true and correct.

February 5, 2016

Respectfully Submitted


Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III

ENCLOSURE

(1)

SUPPORTING ARGUMENT FOR ACCEPTANCE

ON APPEAL FROM COURT OF APPEAL
CN: 2015-002061

Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III,.....Petitioner/Plaintiff
v
Charleston County School District et al,Respondent(s)/Defendants(s)

8443015

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH - DIVISION OF VITAL RECORDS

CERTIFICATE OF LIVE BIRTH

STATE FILE NUMBER: 145-64-025704

NAME OF REGISTRANT: WESLEY EDWARD SMITH III

DATE OF BIRTH: APRIL 23, 1964 SEX: MALE

PLACE OF BIRTH: RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MAIDEN NAME OF MOTHER: FLORENCE LOUISE BLAND

AGE OF MOTHER: 27

MOTHER'S PLACE OF BIRTH: SOUTH CAROLINA


NAME OF FATHER: WESLEY EDWARD SMITH JR

AGE OF FATHER: 35

FATHER'S PLACE OF BIRTH: VIRGINIA

DATE RECORD FILED: APRIL 29, 1964

VOID WITHOUT WATERMARK OR IF ALTERED OR ERASED



This is to certify that this is a true and correct reproduction or extract of the official record filed with the Virginia Department of Health, Planning and Finance

DATE ISSUED March 10, 2008

Janet M. Rainey
Janet M. Rainey, State Registrar

Do not accept unless on security paper with the seal of Virginia Department of Health, Vital Statistics in the lower left hand corner. Section 32-1-272, Code of Virginia as amended.

VOID WITHOUT WATERMARK OR IF ALTERED OR ERASED

EXH "A"



PO Box 8066
Wausau, WI 54402-8066
1.800.841.5748



JANUARY 2016
EASTBAY PRICES SUBJECT TO
CHANGE WITHOUT NOTICE
©2016 BY EASTBAY INC., WAUSAU, WISCONSIN.

PRSR STD
US Postage
PAID
EASTBAY

TEAM SALES

Catalog Number


1075930733

Customer Number

0

Source Code

TSS57H01




*****ECLLOT 02860**C-031

WESLEY EDWARD SMITH
465 N NASSAU ST
CHARLESTON SC 29403-3830

7563
P410
305
383


PERFECT PERFORMANCE REQUIRES PERFECT GEAR



SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES
DRIVER LICENSE
SMITH, WESLEY EDWARD III DL# 008459016
465 N NASSAU ST Expires: 04-23-2019
CHARLESTON SC 294033830

Class: D Hgt: 6-01 Wgt: 198
Sex: M DOB: 04-23-1964
Issued: 09-29-2009 10060 R 2

Restrictions: None
Endorsements: None



ANY BRAND. ANY SPORT. ANY BUDGET.

CALL FOR TEAM PRICING 1.800.841.5748

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. 2003CP1004751

ORDER

By order dated October 15, 2015, the petition for a writ of certiorari to review the decision of the South Carolina Court of Appeals in this case was dismissed.¹ This order found that the Court of Appeals had properly sent the remittitur after petitioner failed to timely seek rehearing or reinstatement following the dismissal of the appeal. No timely petition for rehearing was filed regarding the October 15, 2015, order. See Rule 221 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR) (specifying that any petition for rehearing has to actually be received by the appellate court within fifteen days).


Petitioner subsequently filed a second petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of the decision of the Court of Appeals. This petition was stricken and dismissed by order of this Court dated December 8, 2015.

Petitioner has filed documents entitled "Notice of Appeal" and "Petition for Court to Writ to Admit or Amend Per Writ of Mandamus of Which State Court Affords Relief From Governing State Administrative Agencies." These documents, which were received by this Court on December 15, 2015, seek some further review from this Court in this case.

Appellate jurisdiction over this case ended when the remittitur was properly sent on July 15, 2015, and no further motions or petitions can be considered by either appellate court after that date. *Wise v. S.C. Dept. of Corr.*, 372 S.C. 173, 642

¹ Before the Court of Appeals, the Appellate Case Number was 2015-000787.

S.E.2d 551 (2007). Accordingly, the documents received on December 15, 2015, are hereby stricken and dismissed.



C.J.

FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina
January 5, 2016

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

Mr. Wesley E. Smith, III
465 N. Nassau Street
Charleston, SC 29403

CHARLOTTE NC 282

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT
OF THE RETURN ADDRESS, FOLDED AT DOTTED LINE

CERTIFIED MAIL 05 FEB 2015 PM 4 1



UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE

1000

29201

7015 3010 0001 8631 1661

Honorable Daniel Shearouse
South Carolina Supreme Court
1231 Gervais Street
Columbia, S. C. 29201

U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
CHARLOTTE, NC
28217
FEB 06, 16
AMOUNT
\$5.78
00101040-09

29201323699

