

Wesley-E. Smith III

465 North Nassau Street
Charleston, South Carolina [29403]
email: wsmittyd4@gmail.com

April 29, 2019

MEMORANDUM TO THE RECORDS

CLERK

The Court of Common Pleas
100 Broad Street
Charleston, S. C. 29401

RE: Wesley-Edward: Smith III Petitioner/Appellant against Charleston County School District et al Appellant Case 2019-000616 Reference Trial Civil Case No.2003-CP-10-4751 /Ticket/OCR/Warrant Number2001043879Agency Id Incident Report UNKNOWN.

Dear Honorable Julie J Armstrong;

Enclosed is Wesley Edward Smith III objectionable Memorandum of Law Argument to support petition of review, reinstatement, rehearing, redress, lawful relief and for unlawful acts relief and legal remedies reversal and dismissal of the false accusations without state prosecutor or CCSD companied to the expressly written rules or adhering to the requirement of the Criminal laws adherence to comply before during and after the South Carolina Supreme Court Order dated 15 April 2019 for petition of review to transfer action pursuant 204(a) in its entirety of case referenced above. Based on information and belief, random arbitrariness is not acceptable due process when a person life, liberty and right to personal property was on the main line, absent such substantive and procedural due process for inferred violation occurred according to the Declaration of South Carolina State Constitution. Article 3..

Please stamp and return the applied case information with instructions to me in the self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed. Thanking you advance.

Sincerely,



Wesley-Edward: Smith, III

RECEIVED
MAY 02 2019
S.C. SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED
MAY 02 2019
SC Court of Appeals

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Wesley Edward Smith III, Appellant

v

Charleston County School District Respondent

Appellant Case No. 2019-000616

The Honorable Roger M. Young Sr.
Charleston County
Trial Case No 2003-CP-10-4751

ADDENDUM OF SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONABLE PLEADINGS WITH CONSTITUTIONAL MEMORANDUM OF LAW ARGUMENT TO SUPPORT OR AMNED FOR INFORMAL BRIEF

QUESTION PRESENTED

2 Individually or collectively were the respondents by its procedural due process application of a Administration Internal Review Investigation and Board of Trustees Hearing Committees action Constitutionally warranted, as in compliance and authorized?

3. Individually or collectively with substantive due process (factual evidence required as herein demanded) were the respondents, by application of its Administration Internal Review Investigations and Board of Trustees and Committee hearing action in compliance with the criminal proceeding that conformed with the constitutional protection of the citizen, the employee contained within the existence of the contractual immunities protection legal shield? Proof and evidence demanded)

3 How can I, Wesley Edward Smith III or anyone else believe that the possibility of a fair, equitable and equal hearing would have been conducted (as related here, nineteen (19) years later on trial for resolve where the inferences and objectionable questions still remains absent facts to support the respondent accusations for the firing on his employment) that under the guidelines of the State Constitutional law, regardless of any person color, race, age. disability impairments as maybe identified a physical, mental or physiological incapacitated condition of state of being, expect for CCSD, MMMS, State Prosecutors, Defense Teams, agency official, friend of the business or the other legal entitles, who individually or collectively intervene and took part of the first illegal and unlawful firing of Wesley Edward Smith III at anytime be expected, while conducting its second accusing, firing, refusal to pay money owed,

playing the victim, the judge and be the jury not be construed as retaliation, discrimination or constitutionally prejudicial to Wesley Edward Smith III?

4. Where found in the prior judicial action of case 2003-CP-10-4751 that explain relief to be granted as to the cause for action which relief results, was totally based upon the Ex Communicated, by said Convict, or Ex Parte Pro Se Defendant that a complaints, summons and or search warrants was filled and served to all parties (that were unequivocally in compliance with the laws) from anyone of the personnel or witnesses involved with CCSD, MMMS, State Prosecutors, Defense Teams, agency official reports, police investigation, friend of the business or the other legal entities, that individually or collectively intervene or took part, emphatically identified this Wesley Edward Smith III as the person identified in the line up of person, the individual that had legally harmed or personally injured and such acts stated a claim for relief that was expressly written comprehensibly and declared true and accurate by the adjudicator? Proof Demanded.

II. PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS CRIMINAL IMPLICATIONS BACKGROUND OBJECTIONS DUE TO NON SERVICE OF PROCESS AND INVALID OR IMPROPER COMMENCEMENT

Whereas, the lack of regard for constitutional performances and contractual obligation not adhered to, objections are raised herein and hereafter, I Wesley Edward Smith III as an Ex party defendant Pro Se accused of a crime and fired regarding such accusation, by assignment of case 2003-CP-10-4751 actions, which have not originated or initiated by this court alleged dealings, then as employees, citizens, deed holders, students, policy holder, shareholder, stockholder (etc etc) and the similarly situated are arbitrarily targeted (for a plethora of reasons) issues are usually the result of others acting out which stems from their unexplained subjection reasons. For whatever reasons, the expectation of the courts to ensure mandated compliance to the laws and strict compliance to the expressly written rules should be the number one (1). This would not be perceived as a conspiracy to contractual protected constitutional rights (the State preamble states in relevant " a protected and immunity while under sovereignty"), such a deprivation of rights, or a premeditated act attempted to conjoin similar matters by enjoining others in an effort to allow

interchanging of personnel in office spaces of extreme importance, allowing spoliation of evidence, contamination of the crime scene, break the Chain of Command, and allow obstructing justice by unveiling the State courts very limited integrity fabrics

Therefore Courts, while under your watchful eyes, I also ask regarding any alleged unrelated issues as being attacked as a former employee to this date, blacklisted dislocated worker, who is still being arbitrarily targeted under this State practice, which has also placed me well below the state impoverished status, homeless as a War Veteran. I believe that I have been subjected to "collateral attacks and collaterally damaged long enough reasonable minds to this date. I have attempted to quietly internalize and mitigate any damages or have investigated with (but not limited to) with others by association such as Ex Governor Nikki Haley, Ex Governor Mark Sanford, State Governor Henry McMaster's, South Carolina State Attorney General Office Allan Wilson South Carolina State Department of Treasury, State of South Carolina Attorney General Office, Chalmers Johnson Law Firm, LLP ESQ's South Carolina Department of Education, Jackson and Lewis Law Firm LLP ESQ's, For the State Senator Lyndsy Graham, For the State Senator Ernest Fritz Hollings, For the State Congressman James Clyburn Samuel Waters ESQ, LLC, Rosen, Rosen and Haygood Law Firm LLP ESQ's Inc. State of South Carolina Supreme Court and State.

As such, if anyone else had, has or have a complaint or a problem with Wesley Edward Smith III making use of the limited known resource to exercise rights that were made advisable (from legal advice) to the citizen, employee and all others of this State, by way use of the courts inquisitorial process, regarding the alleged adverse treatment and being arbitrarily target

by a business who institutionalizes by taking former employee and family civilian member legally hostage. The format in which the business uses the organization (other than the intended design use) as a umbrella to practice by having subjected employee being robbed, even by those we have been trained a long time to come to, to respect and trust. As person are perceived (this based on my very limited or no interactions with those said to be "State Government Official contacted or its delegated official legal entity (issue herein for I am to a handworker, and do not believe that just any person can come into my place of employment, as I take pride in my job) not to allow anyone to create or portray mischief, mayhem or use past behavioral study habits of such hate and buffoonery) in its office spaces. The exploiting of a citizen or employee is a crime under the laws. The similarly taking of another citizen and family is likewise is unacceptable and disrespectful. So at ts point, your Honor or Excellence, seek equal justice under the law, based upon your professional guidance and direction from the constitutional authority of law, may they complaints speak now and forevermore hold their piece as affirmed decreed, declared circumcised from further harassments shielded and protected by Orders. Yes, I've Sinned and sought and have been forgiven from those that I believed I had wronged. . .

III. OBJECTION AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEFENSIVE STANCES

1. I Wesley Edward Smith III, as a Pro se objects to defendant to CCSD accusations and production of a thirty-one (31) page firing letter by the school district on the business letterhead, collectively intervened with the State Prosecutors and introduced such criminal violations to the State courts as a plausible actions. Up til last month, the courtsl had me confused in the proceedings as reported to other State Government Officials, as assignment was under case number 2003-CP-10-4751 (action believe to be legitimate by skimming), was fired from the

Military Magnet School located at 2950 Carner Avenue Charleston, S C 29407 where I worked, for a "just cause" as asserted by the Charleston County School District located at 75 Calhoun Street Charleston S .C. 29403.

2. I Wesley Edward Smith III, as interjectorily used as a Pro se defendant Wesley Edward Smith III objects if CCSD refuse to provide the court the necessities that commences and the properly later convene the final determination of the case (without inferences or reasonable doubt remaining, to CCSD accusations and production of a thirty-one (31) page firing letter of the school district letterhead I object because I believe this was retaliation because CCSD owed my money from the fir termination and had to rehire me as a result.

3 I Wesley Edward Smith III objetc if CCSD refuse to provide the court the necessities that commences and the properly later convene the final determination of the case (without inferences or reasonable doubt remaining, granted a equitable and equal hearing was adjudicated over fairly and just) , as alleged, from CCSD turning over State evidence and took firing form employment action against Wesley Edward Smith III as though CCSD was constitutional robbed by Wesley Edward Smith III a served a complaint for which a understandable stated claim for relief was granted and the proper service a summons and a notice of my right to appeal its action, as believe that I, Wesley Edward Smith III was the person of interest, that had " personally" violated CCSD rights under S C Code 16-3-655 for CCSD that its childlike acts were interjectorily confused as CSC w/minors while its official duties as an official capacity but acted outside its role of duty boundaries (Proof of a facts, complaint and summon Needed as required by

RECEIVED

MAY 02 2019

SC Court of Appeals

4. CCSD turned over State evidence, sought protections and retained the service of the State prosecutors. Either the State prosecutors under contract CCSD refuses to provide Wesley Edward Smith who was Ex Communicated and a Ex parte due to the lack of service of a valid complaint, summon, search warrant, a probable cause hearing of that provided substantive fact of tangible evidences that is absent or not shown that Wesley Edward Smith III action were proven beyond a reasonable doubt, motion to dismiss any and all accusations and objects with the support of this memorandum of law argument as my defense shield;

III. OBJECTIONS SUPPORTING CONSTITUTIONAL LAW ARGUMENT

I OBJECTIONS this as taken in accordance with the written expression for State many platforms for assemblages, the Preamble CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA We, the people of the State of South Carolina, in Convention assembled, grateful to God for our liberties, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the preservation and perpetuation of the same, interjectorily I state, with this being identified as most favorable staring point to conduct business, litigate, mitigate or subrogate of such matters, involving fairness and equity and of which we all agree, and upon which grounds as employees, citizens and even residents cas hole heartedly rely, are the ones for which liberties life and pursuit of happiness are preserve and retained from any such inklings of deprival's or abridgements as alleged not to be inferred or in contradiction to Article I Declaration of Rights

As stated in relevant parts Article I Declaration of Rights **SECTION 3.** Privileges and immunities; due process; equal protection of laws, the privileges and immunities of citizens of this State and of the United States under this Constitution shall not be abridged, nor shall any person be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor shall any person be denied the equal protection of the laws. (1970 (56) 2684; 1971 (57) 315.)

WHEREAS each Citizens, subjection of family member loss of the financial provider firing, students and employee are at the mercy of all courts. Therefore, I respectfully demand that the actual judge in this State Supreme Court, who with constitutional adjudicating authority, be

totally neutral, unbiased and non discriminatory with its expressly written remarks, free rom any ambiguity and a understandable to thie citizen as possible. This action is based on the respondents providing any evedice to suppot the firing of Wesley Edward SmithIII from employment for a criminal violation under the S C Code 16-3-655 CSC w/ minor tangible evidence as previously relied upon, as in comparison to the assertion of a cross defense constitutional objectionable stances, that the aforementioned constitutional immunities and protections under the state sovereignty were complied with. Based on the CCSD et al actors act and actions demand to prove my guilt, parole, release from state bonds that tend to bind unintentionally, sentencing served and or innocence were not cruel or unusual or based on my constitutional cross claims for deprivation of Constitutional due process rights .

April 29, 2019

Respectfully Submitted



Welsye Edward Smith III

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Wesley Edward Smith III, Appellant

v

Charleston County School District Respondent

Appellant Case No. 2019-000616

The Honorable Roger M. Young Sr.
Charleston County
Trial Case No 2003-CP-10-4751

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (SERVICE)

I, Wesley Edward Smith III certify that on April 29, 2019 sent Objectionable Informal Brief in support petition of review, reinstatement, rehearing, redress, lawful relief and for unlawful acts relief and legal remedies of objectionable stance for review by he South Carolina Supreme Court Honorable Young Order dated 18 March 2019 by 1st Class postage:

TO: CLERK

Supreme Court of South Carolina
1231 Gervais Street
Columbia, S. C. 29201

Person with Subrogation Interest :
Honorable Henry McMaster State House
1100 Gervais Street Columbia,
South Carolina 29201

Mr. Daniel F. Blanchard, III
151 Meeting Street
Charleston. S C 29403

Wesley Edward: Smith III
465 N Nassau Street
Charleston, SC [29403]

April 29, 2019

Respectfully Submitted



Wesley Edward: Smith III
465 N Nassau Street
Charleston, SC [29403]

RECEIVED

MAY 02 2019

SC Court of Appeals