

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Wesley Edward Smith III A.K A
Wesley Smith

Ticket/OCR/Warrant State id Number UNKNOWN

Petitioner/Appellant

versus

Charleston County School District et al

Respondent

REF: Appellate Case No. 2019-000616
Appellate Case No. 2019-001315
Appellate Case No/ 2010-174266
Taken From : Civil Case No 2003-CP-10-4751
Honorable Roger Young
Order Dated 18 Mar 2019

RECEIVED

AUG 22 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

While pass behaviors of the Charleston County School District and State interveners from proven actions, as alleged, appears as respondents were acting as full fledged Monopolistic Society who studied patterns of a Dictators Oppressive Behavior for Operating(s) or ways for entangles Doing Business, this is purely speculative from Wesley Edward Smith III. This statement is based on the facts that I am without being provided admissible facts or substnative evidence for which this action above all requires. So as being construed in my as express for the inhumane, abusive, neglected, and torturously treated while being arbitrarily accosted for another for my absents. This

While under this State Court Appeal Judicial Judiciary Review, the Addendum page sent on August 15, 2019 serves to both a reply to the Supreme Court and a response to Appeals Court Case Numbers 2019-000616 and 2019-001315, which complies with the Supreme Court Order. Admissible evidence as requested will allow denoting clear errors of law and the role discretion made upon closer reviewing to the enclosed record. Based on the appellate courts discovered facts, this court has sufficient time to rehearse the review of the admissible court documents retrieved from the Lower Court to reconsider to either dismiss, mistrial, remand, reverse, reconsider, relief and remedy equity and squash all the prior or present state, actors actions that not in compliance with the rules or affords equal protections, the privileges ad immunities of the Constitutions mandates strict compliance(s).

While under the Appeals Court Judicial review for case Number 2019-000616, Wesley Edward Smith, III seeks to review the disposition of the Appellate Court Order No. 2010-174266 and a possible rehearing governing based on how and from whom the legal conclusion were obtained, is demanded respectfully. This also serves as to proceed without prepayment of fees because you and yours allows the "State Prosecutor and Partner State Defense Team", just to practice with not only the laws, but has injured and has allowed me to become attacked while at work, and robbed of all my personal property even my home was taken under flase pretenses. I Wesley Edward Smith III have been and still being exploited and taken for every dime I had without due process of law nor for knowing my accuser(s) claim that stated as relief that should have been granted. Therefore a waiver of fees is requested in these narrowly tailored and quite rare instances.

August 20, 2019

Respectfully Submitted



Wesley Edward Smith III

RECEIVED

AUG 22 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Wesley Edward Smith III A.K.A
Wesley Smith

Ticket/OCR/Warrant State id Number UNKNOWN

Petitioner/Appellant

versus

Charleston County School District et al

Appellate Case No 2019-000616

Respondent

REF: Civil Case No 2003-CP-10-4751
Honorable Roger Young
Order Dated 18 Mar 2019

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (SERVICE)


I, Wesley Edward Smith III certify that on August 20, 2019, submits to the Court of Appeal and addendum with reports that State Agencies issued reports and the possible procedural violations and abuse of discretion overlooked. This also serves that request to consloiated similar iss in Case No 2016-00002/2002-CP-18-01016 and Case no. 2014-000995/2013-CP-10-0417 in connection to the Lower Court Cases, the Appeals Courts Reviews and matter related to Appeals Court letter dated 1 August 2019, and Supreme Court Letter dated 9 Aug 2019 in the spiritit of Judicial Efficiency by 1st Class postage:

TO: Mr. Daniel F, Blanchard III Esquire
P. O Box 893
Charleston S C 29401

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

August 20, 2019

Respectfully Submitted


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

RECEIVED
AUG 22 2019
S.C. SUPREME COURT



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN
DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1015 SUMTER STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

September 05, 2014

The Honorable Julie J. Armstrong
100 Broad St Ste 106
Charleston SC 29401-2210

REMITTITUR

Re: Wesley Smith v. Pepsi Bottling Group
Lower Court Case No. 2013CP1000417
Appellate Case No. 2014-000995

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jy. A. Kitchings".

CLERK

Enclosure

cc: Wesley Edward Smith, III
Ashley Bryan Abel, Esquire

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Wesley Edward Smith III, aka Wesley Smith Appellant,

v.

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

Appellate Case No. 2019-001315

ORDER

By order dated July 17, 2019, the South Carolina Court of Appeals dismissed the appeal in this matter.¹ Petitioner has now filed documents seeking review of the decision of the Court of Appeals.² 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), these documents have been construed as a petition for a writ of certiorari.

Under Rule 242(a), SCACR, 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, there is no final decision for this Court to review.


Accordingly, the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed without prejudice to petitioner's ability to timely serve and file a petition for a writ of certiorari and appendix if a petition for rehearing or reinstatement is ruled on by the Court of Appeals. If such a petition and appendix is filed, petitioner is warned that the

¹ Before the Court of Appeals, the Appellate Case Number is 2019-000616.

² These documents also seek a rehearing of the order of the Court of Appeals. Since this request is more appropriately considered by the Court of Appeals, this Court will take no action on this request.

petition and appendix will need to fully comply with the requirements of Rule 242, SCACR, including the filing fee required by that rule.

Finally, to the extent that petitioner may be asking this Court to issue a writ of habeas corpus, that request is stricken and dismissed since petitioner has failed to provide the affidavit and motion filing fee required by this Court's order dated November 17, 2010.³


FOR THE COURT

C.J.

Columbia, South Carolina
August 9, 2019

cc: Daniel Francis Blanchard, III, Esquire
Wesley Edward Smith, III, Esquire
The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings

³ This order was issued in Appellate Court Case Number 2010-174266. While that order referenced the fact that the motion filing fee was then \$25, the motion filing fee under Rule 240, is now \$50. Order of the Supreme Court dated October 9, 2018 (available at www.sccourts.org/whatsnew/displaywhatsnew.cfm?indexID=2335).

In the South Carolina Court Of Appeals

Wesley Edward Smith III A.K A
Wesley Smith

Ticket/OCR/Warrant State id Number UNKNOWN

Petitioner/Appellant

versus

Charleston County School District et al

Respondent

REF: Appellate Case No. 2019-000616
Appellate Case No. 2019-001315
Appellate Case No/ 2010-174266
Taken From : Civil Case No 2003-CP-10-4751
Honorable Roger Young
Order Dated 18 Mar 2019

While pass behaviors of the Charleston County School District and State interveners from proven actions, as alleged, appears as respondents were acting as full fledged Monopolistic Society who studied patterns of a Dictators Oppressive Behavior for Operating(s) or ways for entangles Doing Business, this is purely speculative from Wesley Edward Smith III. This statement is based on the facts that I am without being provided admissible facts or substnative evidence for which this action above all requires. So as being construed in my as express for the inhumane, abusive, neglected, and torturously treated while being arbitrarily accosted for another for my absents. This

While under this State Court Appeal Judicial Judiciary Review, the Addendum page sent on August 15, 2019 serves to both a reply to the Supreme Court and a response to Appeals Court Case Numbers 2019-000616 and 2019-001315, which complies with the Supreme Court Order. Admissible evidence as requested will allow denoting clear errors of law and the role discretion made upon closer reviewing to the enclosed record. Based on the appellate courts discovered facts, this court has sufficient time to rehearse the review of the admissible court documents retrieved from the Lower Court to reconsider to either dismiss, mistrial, remand, reverse, reconsider, relief and remedy equity and squash all the prior or present state, actors actions that not in compliance with the rules or affords equal protections, the privileges ad immunities of the Constitutions mandates strict compliance(s).

While under the Appeals Court Judicial review for case Number 2019-000616, Wesley Edward Smith, III seeks to review the disposition of the Appellate Court Order No. 2010-174266 and a possible rehearing governing based on how and from whom the legal conclusion were obtained, is demanded respectfully. This also serves as to proceed without prepayment of fees because you and yours allows the "State Prosecutor and Partner State Defense Team", just to practice with not only the laws, but has injured and has allowed me to become attacked while at work, and robbed of all my personal property even my home was taken under flase pretenses. I Wesley Edward Smith III have been and still being exploited and taken for every dime I had without due process of law nor for knowing my accuser(s) claim that stated as relief that should have been granted. Therefore a waiver of fees is requested in these narrowly tailored and quite rare instances.

August 20, 2019

Respectfully Submitted



Wesley Edward Smith III

In the South Carolina Court Of Appeals

Wesley Edward Smith III A.K A
Wesley Smith

Ticket/OCR/Warrant State id Number UNKNOWN

Petitioner/Appellant

versus

Charleston County School District et al

Appellate Case No 2019-000616

Respondent

REF: Civil Case No 2003-CP-10-4751
Honorable Roger Young
Order Dated 18 Mar 2019

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (SERVICE)


I, Wesley Edward Smith III certify that on August 20, 2019, submits to the Court of Appeal and addendum with reports that State Agencies issued reports and the possible procedural violations and abuse of discretion overlooked. This also serves that request to consloiated similar iss in Case No 2016-00002/2002-CP-18-01016 and Case no. 2014-000995/2013-CP-10-0417 in connection to the Lower Court Cases, the Appeals Courts Reviews and matter related to Appeals Court letter dated 1 August 2019, and Supreme Court Letter dated 9 Aug 2019 in the spiritit of Judicial Efficiency by 1st Class postage:

TO: Mr. Daniel F, Blanchard III Esquire
P. O Box 893
Charleston S C 29401

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

August 20, 2019

Respectfully Submitted


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

RECEIVED

AUG 22 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Wesley Edward Smith, III, Petitioner,

v.

Washington Mutual Bank, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2016-000002

Lower Court Case No. 2002CP1801016

ORDER

By order dated August 6, 2015, the South Carolina Court of Appeals dismissed the appeal in this matter. When no petition for rehearing or reinstatement was received, the Court of Appeals sent the remittitur on December 22, 2015.


Petitioner has now filed a petition and notice of appeal seeking further review in this case. Since a decision of the South Carolina Court of Appeals is reviewed by a petition for a writ of certiorari under Rule 242 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR), these documents have been construed as a petition for a writ of certiorari under Rule 242.

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, the Court of Appeals properly sent the remittitur. Rule 221, SCACR. The sending of the remittitur ended appellate jurisdiction over this case. *Wise v.*

S.C. Dept. of Corr., 372 S.C. 173, 642 S.E.2d 551 (2007).

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



C.J.

FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

January 5, 2016

cc: Samuel Calvin Waters, Esquire
Robert P. Wood, Esquire
Mr. Wesley Edward Smith, III
The Honorable Cheryl L. Graham
The Honorable Jenny Kitchings


RECEIVED

AUG 22 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Smith, W
465 N. MASSAU ST
Charleston, S.C. 29403

CPU



U.S. POSTAGE
\$0.85
FCML 0000
Orig: 29406
08/20/19
11082313
06 2S

R2305H127274

CLERK of Court
Supreme Court of South Carolina
1231 GERVAIS ST
COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201

29201-320631

