

*Wesley-E. Smith III*

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

July 15, 2019

RECEIVED

JUL 18 2019

CLERK

The Court of Common Pleas (Attachment hold for General Sessions Court)  
100 Broad Street  
Charleston, S. C. 29401

SC Court of Appeals

RE: State et al Movant/Plaintiffs vs Wesley-Edward: Smith III Petitioner/Appellant Related Trial Civil Case No.2003-CP-10-4751/NCPD Ticket/OCR/Warrant Number2001043879 Agency Id SC0100800 Incident Report

Dear Honorable Julie J Armstrong;

Enclosed for your immediate actions is per the State Court of Appeal Letter date 28 June 2019 to Amend Complaint. I, Wesley Edward Smith III attachment to hold or stay Criminal Court proceedings actions for POST CONVICTION RELIEF w/Defense Answers pertaining to consolidate the State parties actions under NCPD jurisdiction Ticket/OCR/Warrant Number2001043879 Agency Id SC0100800 After Action Incident Report filed by CCSD for CSC w/minor 13-10-355, along with Pepsi Bottling Group LLC Grand Larceny Case and the Washington Mutual Bank Home Loans REF Forfeiture Case

Inadvertently overlooked in the State Lower cCircuit Criminal Courts (Proof needed by disclosure of all substantive information and evidence the State relied on as factual for being awarded judgment ruling). The defendant pro Se Wesley Edward Smith III was absent the entire proceeding because someone failed to send the proper notices to the court and serve the accuser

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

- cc South Carolina State Attorney General Office
- cc. State Governor Henry McMaster's
- cc: South Carolina State Department of Treasury
- cc: State of South Carolina Attorney General Office
- cc State Internal Revenue Services
- cc Mr. Charlmers Johnson LLC Esq Inc
- cc Mr Ashely Able Esq and cc: Rosen, Rosen and Haygood LLC ESQ Inc.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON )

) IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

) Trial Court Case No

Wesley-Edward: Smith, III et al )  
(previously misidentified as defendant )  
Pro Se was ex parte to cases against me )  
Petitioner )

) Ref [Case 2003-CP-10-4751]

-against-

) Amended Cross Complaint to Hold and Stay proceeding  
) pending State appellant Court review for POST  
) CONVICTION RELIEF and Grand Jury Review  
) action to Consolidate Related Matters for  
) Count 1: Conspired acts Obstructing to Speedy Justice  
) Count 2: Conspiracy to Defraud South Carolinas  
) Count 3: Deprivation of Citizens Constitutional  
) Protections, Immunities and Privileges  
) Count 4: Abuse of Power by use of a Monoplistic  
) Business tactics on  
) Citizen by use of Fraudulent Legal Process  
) Count 5: Conspiracy to use Legal Lynch tactics on  
) Citizen by use of Fraudulent Legal Process  
) Count 6: Conspiracy to Kidnapping of citizen by use  
) of Fraudulent Legal Process  
) Count 7: Conspiracy to commit Fraud Upon The  
) Courts (Narrower Theory Fraud) Legally by  
) using Citizens and other employee for its  
) illegal Business Practice  
) Count 8: Conspiracy to Kidnapping of citizen by use  
) of Fraudulent Legal Process  
) Count 9: Grand Larceny  
) Count 10: Exploitation of Citizens, Employee and  
) Children by divulging of unrelated issues  
) Count 11: Treason  
) Count 12: Aiding and Abetting the Commission of a  
) crime by Employees who declares  
) privileged Executive Management  
) Count 13: Mutiny Committed Against Citizen of State  
) by use of Monopolistic Legal Devise not  
) reliably designed for all citizens subjected  
) to the State process  
) Count 14: Death and Murder of Citizens by use of  
) fraudulent legal injections force upon the  
) citizen by use its one-sided porcess

**RECEIVED**

JUL 18 2019

SC Court of Appeals

- ) Count 15: Fraudulent legal process other than intended design
- ) Count 16: Deprivation of Constitutional Substantive and Procedural Due Process Protections
- ) Count 17: Deprivation of a Fair hearing, fair Proceedings unbiased, and non discriminative State
- ) Count 18: Fraudulent mean to Commit Invasion of private Citizen for Court procedures
- ) Count 19: Fraudulent means to Commit Unnecessary Duress
- ) Count 20: Conspiracy to undermine Immigration Control Enforcement by displacing the Qualified State Employees and Citizen with undocumented Workers for cheaper labor
- ) Count 21: Collusion to commit fraudulent Acts while seeking immunity from State punishers
- ) Count 22: Conspiracy to take Children from parents without a evidentiary hearing, a Fair hearing and or Procedural Hearing without biases
- ) Count 23: Conspiracy to procrastinate State legal process which allows State Officials to retire and leave country without the punishment on violators with such enforcement of law
- ) Count 24: Conspiracy to Comrnial Act
- ) Count 25: Criminal Neglect of duty for not reporting Criminal Activity in a timely Manner According to Statutory and Constitutional Law and BY WAY OF COUNTER CLAIM: Legal Malpractices and or Medical Malpractice

State et al: )  
 State of South Carolina, Honorable )  
 NikkiHaley; Governor Herny McMasters )  
 Lt. Governors Glen McConnell ) Amended Complaint with Cross Complaint  
 Attorney General Alan Wilson;, )  
 Mr. Mark Sanford; Senator, )  
 State Internal Revenue Services )  
 State legislator, Councilman Wendell Gillard, )  
 South Carolina Department of Treasury )  
 South Carolina Department of Transportation, )  
 South Carolina Department of Education, )  
 South Carolina State Secretary, )  
 South Carolina Human Affairs Commission )

State Solicitors Office Ms. Scarlett A Wilson )  
 Mayor Joe Riley on the personal and business )  
 on Account affairs of City of Charleston )  
 Mayor Rembert E. Wrenn on the personal and )  
 business account affairs of City of Bonneau )  
 For the personal and business account affairs for )  
 Monks Corner Mayor William W. Peagler on )  
 the personal and business, Mayor Billy )  
 Keyserling on Account affairs of City of )  
 Beaufort, Mayor Keith Sumney on the personal, )  
 business and account Affairs for City of North )  
 Charleston, Mayor Minnie Blackwell for the )  
 City of Hanahan State prosecutors Mr. Ashley )  
 B Able, Ms. Jody Smitherman, Mr. Scott Katrosh )  
 Mr. Daniel Blanchard, Ms. Alice Paylor,, )  
 We as the People listed herein operating within )  
 the State territory of South Carolina are )  
 AKA Committee as private Citizens )  
 listed, Charleston County School District )  
 Mr. Daniel Blanchard, Ms. Alice Paylor, )  
 Mr. Joseph Dawson Sr, Mr. Joseph Dawson )  
 Jr, Mr Barbra D. Dilligard, Mr. Anderson W )  
 Townsend, Dr. Ronald McWhirt. Dr. Maria )  
 Goodloe-Johnson, Dr. Nancy McGinley. )  
 Mr Isaiah Whaley, Mr. Ronald Brown, )  
 Mr. John Didit, ESQ, Ms Jane Duet, ESQ, )  
 AKA this Committee as private Citizens are )  
 Pepsi Bottling Group A.K.A Bottling Group )  
 Inc A.K.A The Pepsi Bottling Company INC )  
 with Attorneys Mr, Ashley Able, Ms. Jody )  
 Smitherman, Mr. Scott Katrosh, Mrs. Lynn S. )  
 Holly, CEO Mr. John T. Cahill, CEO Mr. )  
 Eric Foss Mr. Steve Barberio, Mr. Joe )  
 Voderic, Mr. Bob Marshall, Mr. Richard )  
 Simmons, Mrs. Sharon Sullivan, Mr. John )  
 Berisford, Mr. Mike Correa, Mr. Russ Arnold )  
 Mrs. Paulette Alvitti, Mr. Erik Mizell, Mr. )  
 Herb Jarvis, Mr. Sean Helsel, Mr. Tim )  
 Rossetti, Mr. Jeff Stevens, Mr. Michael Fowler, )  
 Roy Miller, State witnesses with statements made )  
 are Mr. Johnnie Devine,; Mrs. Jennifer Pankake, )  
 Mr. Irvin Haynes. Mr. Jerry Abraham, Mr. Earl )  
 Robinson, Mrs. Myra Hill, Mr. Tom Mizell, Mr. )



proceedings Informa Pauperis, to all citizens that are impoverish for whatever reason with the support of the financial declaration of such finances that will be reviewed and then approved without prepayment of filing and feed in court of the common pleas or on appeal. Not to many person or selected people while in the perforce of its duties (performance issues), once a determination has been made, would right admit a fault and change its determination, beit man or women. This is why We the Citizen come to rely on the court for such misunderstandings and root cause for most alleged injustices and unfair proceeding and constitutional violations.

**RESPONSE 2. Objective Replying:** Pursuant to rule 203(d (1)(B)(I), SCACP time is still tolling which remain to be proving to this Pro se defendant. I have not receive any notices from the State prosecutors or its defense team stating specifically in plain English language that this Wesley Edward Smith III who was employed at the MMMS, had violated their right for which either of them suffered a legal harm or personal injury (Proof needed) to AMEND my complaint with admissible, substantive facts supporting the same. Other than that, issue are considered ,moot by this courts. A Non privy, non eye witness State prosecutors and state defense failing to provide the requirements of this rules (provide proof that it serve notice to all parties and of my right to appeal. Secondly, the personnel in the lower court granted and order, but by granting such order, hold me in a "legal hold" by the placement of felonious sanctioning methods which has been declared and decreed, and then twisted further by other based on hearsay from non eye witnesses. Thus pursuant to rule S C R Civ Pro 12(6) the cause of action case in the Lower Court governing rule 56 "Genuine Issue is remaining with out the proof require of the complaint and summons for the injured party. Therefore, consideration for dismissal should've been considered based on fact that any of the "We the People" has failed in the pleading of case 2003-CP-10-4751, to state sufficient facts for the cause of action case (How can one provided factual sufficient facts when not the eye witness to the alleged events or the professional material expert that has been called into testify with proof is demanded and still needed).

**RESPONSE 3. Objective Replying;** Quite honestly, the case has already been determined and declared frivolous, I believe until this can be clear up first and resolved, based on the fact that the state Prosecutors and the Defense team are a non privy entity or and eye witness. and if this court is not going to accept a request evn for the waiver (given the situation and in accordance with SCACR of fees and a waste of the court limited resources I believe that the Stat to While I was employed with MMMS, I was attacked by the State Defense and State prosecutors teams and left hear legal limbo for over eighteen (18) years, trying to understanding this legal debacle and understand how the assertion of the State At Will Law (S C CODE 4-1-110) served as defensive strategy and legal protection for judgment to non privy and non eye witness persons. The lower court prematurely awarded Summary Judgment and I am unable to pay \$250.00, for I have been force into indigent person status after being procedurally robbed and statutorily rapped in violation of State law (which a genuine issue remain uncontested). I, Wesley Edward Smith , according the forcing into below the State of South Carolina standards for impoverish, I am below this mark.

## **RELIEF REQUESTED**

Based on ruling with on view of revisable errors according to the state law and constitution, please Review issue 1-3 of I Wesley Edward Smith III (while being held in the State legal bondage under a practice or other known pseudonym), all my personal right, legal rights, employment right, loss of family, suffered a Divorce and much more, all while in the hands ability to become employed all hinges on the determination of the court review for a legal resolution of the hearsay and contradiction of the courts Finest down to the Honorable Roger Young Order dated 18 March 2019 is baseless, without merit without affording the Wesley Edward Smith III a citizen and defendant pro se legal due course to exercise my liberty, life, fair hearing and procedural fairness. I demand a fair and speedy trial and other relief as required by law for citizen adversely affected, falsely accused and illegal injury and personal harm for the alleged torturous and inhumane treatment.

**WHEREAS** based on the fining of the court. with the allowance of the Speedy trial, I, Wesley Edward Smith III demand to review the Grand Jury Indictments, a speedy trial in Criminal Court proceedings, seeking corrective actions for POST CONVICTION RELIEF w/Defense Answers pertaining to parties actions under NCPD jurisdiction Ticket/OCR/Warrant Number2001043879 Agency Id SC0100800 After Action Incident Report filed by CCSD for alleged CSC w/minor 13-10-355

By allowing the Ste Prosecutors and it State Defense team to intervening with out having a factual information or being and eye witness that could acuuraley detail the events or by legal standing, I would have long discovered the types of adverse affects of being statutorily rapped and constitutionally robbed of my right, Immunities, Protections and Privileges as a Citizes. This process continues to hold me legally hostage by its State process and continually denies Wesley Edward Smith III such as, but should not have been denied rights enumerated or limited to:

- 1 Notice of rights to appeal expressed determination
- 2 A Complaint (with at least a reasonably understood claim for relief
3. Summons (Person and Address must be identified (ser. UM285/certificate)
- 5 Affidavit of Truth/Declaration from each person claiming injury or harm
6. Notice of Appellant rights
- 7 An unbiased tribunal.
- 8 Notice of the proposed action and the grounds asserted for it.
- 9 The opportunity to present reasons for the proposed action not to be taken.
- 10 The right to present evidence, including the right to call witnesses.
- 11 The right to know the opposing evidence.
- 12 The right to cross-examine adverse witnesses.
- 13 A decision based only on the evidence presented.
- 14 Opportunity to be represented by a competent and unbiased counsel.
- 15 The tribunal to prepare a record of the evidence presented and
- 16 The tribunal to prepare written findings of fact and the reasons for its decision which a fair and reasonable equal opportunity is allow all person during discovery

**WHEREAS** Relief was sought and still demanded in the complaint, and at this juncture, seek to strike motion to dismiss the State Court orders (If not the enter order for some unknown reason, Just Strike this Wesley Edward Smith III (This defendant Pro Se was absent for the Order based on the legal argument and support of Constitutional Law) if the CCSD action cannot provide substantiated admissible evidence that is complied with any of the aforementioned, then by constitutional law o the land, that Wesley Edward Smith III is entitled to a fair hearing, a speed trial, equal justice under the law a plethora of relief, and that a prayer or demand for declaratory or Summary judgment for the relief deemed entitled. Relief in the alternative or of several different types may be demanded. Relief for a sum certain in money may be demanded.

With the State of Affairs in constant disaray and rule, laws and personnel changing without the citizens being sent individual noti in such change, the charges one though twenty (1-25 ) are still applicable in the court of law, no matter how committed changes the language for such.

As such I Wesley Edward Smith III. have not, in no form or fashion willingly volunteered to waive any legal rights in any Court of Law were rules are equally admintered under the law nor based in my absence, the allowance of the Court official to isolate and "Pro Se defendants (related here non legal protection in the courts)which only results, allegedly allows arbitrary attacks to those that are ignorant and incompetent to the law, based on the various applications of the law and rules use for regular means before, during and after all Court proceedings involving those person chosen and accused for a specified crime which has resulted in an harm or adverse action as a result.

I Wesley Edward Smith III sought counsel for speedy, fair, unbiased, non discriminative procedural hearing.

I Wesley Edward Smith III did not seek legal representation for target practice from any legal practice the works against the already enacted laws. nor any other form that would allow others in representation to add to falsified casue of action, make misstatement of the facts, tampers with the State evidencem nor contaminate the crime scene based on the specified State alleged commission of the said crime, that I, Wesley Edward Smith III committed, only to have result It in a procedural default or a forfeiture ro foreclosures action by default for which my home an other tangible personal property and legal rights were taken and deprived

I Wesley Edward Smith III believes the attack was allegedly committed by person that are dominating (bullying) to others (conflicting egos) but share the same common interest in the exfoliation of the citizen monies and possible business opportunities, based on a alleged monopolistic State business practice against the citizen and employees of the State.

This should especially be considered based on the fact that my once retained legal counsel (led to such deprival of evidentiary hearing) was rescued by the courts. Based on that fact, the prior case should be a rescue for the cause of action for both the State prosecutors and State Defense team

**THEREFORE**, in consideration with the case 2003-CP-10-4751 before. the addendum attached is a request, be it to Stay on hold or leave off court as allowed for the consolidation under the same guise as this case was premeditated and legal attacks again the employees were presented and has allegedly manifested unnecessarily. Collectively or individually person in regard of the same subject matters, the submission consolation for judicial efficiency is requested based on the fact that the case are eerily similar and done in similar fashion.

**THEREFORE** , Pursuant State of South Carolina Appeal Court letter 28 June 2019, this Amended Complaint and request to consolidate the State matters and its witness action taken up against Wesley Edward Smith III overlooked or absent form the Lower Court record as follows:

1). Petitioner/Pro Se Defendant Wesley-Edward; Smith, III, et al state id number 145-64-025704, alleges and claims that this petition is requested and without substantive proof, legal conclusion of Law a plausible argument or any admissible evidence presented, as used in for the Lower Court procedural default and forfeiture action robbing men and my familiy of our lovely home.

2) Petitioner/Pro Se Defendant Wesley-Edward; Smith, III, et al state id number 145-64-025704, alleges this request is to allow the State and all of its actors t provide evidence for the entire State and Wesley Edward Smith III be expunge, exonerated, acquitted of all unfounded or supported blame in order to return private personal properties and to be employed, and on the following grounds that the State action should be dismissed in its entirety as alleged: 1) due to prosecutorial misconduct, 2 State's failure state a claim for relief, 3) that the defense attorney did not adequately represent the petitioner during the original trial and/or direct appeal process, 4) Prosecutorial Misconduct, 5) Failure to Miranda, 6) Failure to timely Prosecute which would affords all constitutional protections, immunities and guarantees and 7) Failed to comply with the rules of the Court Constitutional authority of the State of South Carolina laws which affords the fifth (5) from self incrimination and under the Sixth (6th) which guarantees citizens right to a speedy Trial) and 8) Councils lack a level of Competency with the Law by not complying with the South Carolina Constitution law which governs such proceedings from any implied or expressed inflictions or unwarranted time delays for other than the Courts intended machinery, purpose and legal design.

### **RELIEF IN CLOSING**

The case should be consolidated in the Spirit of Judicial Efficiency and the fact that no legal conclusion nor admissible evidence was used at any hearing (I Wesley Edward Smith III as the Pro Se defendant is without proof or the Service of a complaint and or summons) and relies on the court for to have the state comply with the discovery and cross examinations of evidence and witnesses previously.

No matter how the State changes its wording or languages to vernacular (uncommon understanding) of the enacted law, the acts speaks for the violators.

I have been detained, charged, arrested, and interrogated over twenty (27+) times since name was inducted by this court, by the above. This occurred either collectively or individually by such person that choose to take part in an internal investigation, who made accusation and placed Wesley Edward Smith III in such a precarious position without allowing seeking timely resolution. The State of South Carolina and its representatives, by the person listed above and herein listed., has allowed the casting of a shadow of doubt against Pro Se Defendants (et al) and similarly situated in conjunction with case before this court, for which this case should be reviewed in the spirit of Judicial Efficiency governing constitutional right of a Speedy trial. Eighteen (18 years) on a legal hold by the State process (for whatever legal jargon reasoning or uncommon or misunderstood vernaculars) doesn't constitute a speedy trial. Without the proffering of admissible evidence which fair proceeding discovery affords all that are accused of a crime. actions that were based on a legal conclusion of law or absent a complaint with the submitting of the summons, the defendant Pro Se, denies and sayith not

Demand by order to restrain all person or foreign entities from enjoining others and or any other persons not previously involved in this action or who was not a eye witness, or material witness. Any other theories, ideologies and similar speculations are squashed and laid to rest in fact, not found in fact first, but shortly after (given each case by case basis allowed upon further discovery) should only then, be deemed a baseless and frivolous subject matter, not case This further prevents a premise accusations which leads to quick (hasty) decisions to arbitrary detain or arrest under false pretenses and likewise the legal and lawful ramification involving mass suits from arising.

I, Wesley Edward Smith III seek declaratory Judgment or direct verdict for the Judge or appointed jurors on motion notwithstanding redirects, submit this amended cross Complaint, as hear on review, was the criminal element and legal action the State prosecutors and State defense team inadvertently left out and Court overlooked in the Lower Court due to the fact that the State prosecutors and State defense team were not actual eye witnesses and non privy parties that relied solely on the children's rumors, purely speculative and mere conjecture of law argument, to please the courts and partners practice business craft. The judges relied on the State prosecutors and State defense teams action as the "legitimate truth", thus causing the printing of defaming false information, and caused such lies to be passed to other as valid and substantiated. Subsequently, as a direct result, the court issues lip lock papers, which prematurely sanctions the case but places a legal hold on everyone, including the legal process in contempt in the Lower Court.

**WHEREAS**, Pending on the outcome and verdict of this court, the submission of the Cross Complaint is based on the Conspiracy to Commit Criminal Act is the act upon which two or more i.e Judge, State Prosecutor and the State defending team, has entered into an agreement (Per Order of Case 2003-CP-10-4751 etc etc) commit a crime and an overt act (Production of an expressly written Order, as aforementioned) has been taken against Wesley Edward Smith III and family to further the crime.

**WHEREAS**, secondly upon the legal finding of this court, whereas the Corporate Criminal Liability of the business, question of whether a corporation can be held criminally responsible, liable is based on the courts have held that corporations are criminally liable for the acts of their manager, agents and employees, but cannot be put in jail, but reasonably sanctioned with fines, loss of license or franchise. By allowing removing the corporate vbeils, allows the Corporate Directors, officers and the employees are individually held liable (ma out fine and sanctions requested, to teach others acceptable behavior in a civilized society and following the prescribe job performance and business work habits) liable for crimes they personally commit, whether for personal benefits or on behalf of their corporation and under some circumstances, a Corporate Manager can be held criminally liable for the criminal activities of his or her subordinates, by failing to supervise the subordinate appropriately, and

**WHEREAS**, the question arise on the cross complaint for Criminal Neglect of duty for the supervisor not reporting Criminal Activity in a timely Manner, according to Statutory and Constitutional Law.

**THEREFORE**, based on the hearsay which is without admissible evidence, legal conclusion of law argument and a actual eye witness who would be privy and who could account and accurately identify the person and attest per submission of its own affidavit to the allege facts, that this Wesley Edward Smith III as the alleged accuser, there is no case on Wesley Edward Smith III and must be dismissed for lacking insufficient evidence and a credible eye witness to attest and account at the palce of the commission of said alleged crime which causes and effects was that Wesley Edward Smith Ili was fired prematurely from employment under a faulty premise and by falsifying reports. .

#### **QUESTON TO THE LEGAL PROFESSIONAL**

1. If CCSD, PBG and WMB or the State lower courts did not have totality of all subject matters, why are there production of order showing favor to non-privy party and upon review of this case to continually allow such matter, why after nineteen year without allowing a fair hearing?
2. Does the State At Will Law (S C Code 41-1-110) trumps (supersedes) any person right as such as a private citizen or employee right, which allows the fair hearing, court procedural fairness, allow examination and cross examination of evidence in a criminal case or the cotizen constitutional rights for a speedy trial?

July 15, 2019

Respectfully Submitted



Wesley Edward Smith III



# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS  
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN  
DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
1220 SENATE STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890  
FAX: (803) 734-1839  
www.sccourts.org

June 28, 2019

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

Re: Wesley Edward Smith, III v. Charleston County School District  
Appellate Case No. 2019-000616

Dear Mr. Smith:

Upon reviewing your correspondence filed with the South Carolina Court of Appeals, the following deficiencies have been noted under the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR), and must be corrected in their entirety within ten (10) days of the date of this letter or your correspondence will not be accepted and your appeal will be dismissed:

- The required filing fee has not been submitted for your initial notice of appeal. The correct filing fee amount is \$250.00
- Pursuant to Rule 203(d)(1)(B)(i), SCACR, a proof of service upon the respondent or respondent's counsel must be provided for your initial notice of appeal filed in April. You must serve and file a proof of service substantially in the format shown by Form 7 in Appendix C to part II of the SCACR.
- An amended notice of appeal must be filed which complies strictly with Rule 203, SCACR. Please be sure that a proof of service upon the respondent or respondent's counsel is served and filed alongside your amended notice of appeal.

A SC CASE VS YOU  
PROCEED TO COURT FOR JUSTICE  
1000 2000 1000 1000 TR

Very truly yours,

*V. Claire Allen, Deputy*

CLERK

cc: Daniel Francis Blanchard, III, Esquire

# In the South Carolina Court Of Appeals

Wesley Edward Smith III A.K A  
Wesley Smith

Ticket/OCR/Warrant State id Number UNKNOWN

Appellant

versus

Charleston county School District et al

**RECEIVED**

JUL 18 2019

Respondent

REF: Civil Case No 2003-CP-10-4751

Honorable Roger Young

Order Dated 18 Mar 2019

SC Court of Appeals

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (SERVICE)

I, Wesley Edward Smith III certify that on July 15, 2019, in the spirit of this court judicial efficiency, upon this request, to have the Staté case against Wesley Edward Smith III consolidated (per attached Addendum pages, RE Pepsi Bottling Group Inc (PBG) in Civil Case No 2013-CP-10-00417 Honorable Stephanie McDonald Order Dated 25 February 2013 and the Washington Mutual Banl ("WMB") RE: Case Trial Number 2008-CP-10-0646 to the South Carolina Court of Appeal in connection with letter dated 28 June 2019, by 1st Class postage:

TO: Mr. Daniel F, Blanchard III Esquire  
151 Meeting Street Suite 300  
Charleston S C 29401

CLERK  
South Carolina Court of Appeals  
1015 Sumter Street  
Columbia, S. C. 29201

Mr. Ashley Able  
One Liberty Square  
55 Beattie Place Suite 800  
Greenville SC 29601

Mr. Samuel Waters Sr.  
220 Executive Center Drive  
Columbia, S C 29211

July 15, 2019

Respectfully Submitted



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