

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001

RECEIVED

October 11, 2019

NOV 07 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

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

RE: Smith v. ?

Dear Mr. Smith, III:

In reply to your letter or submission, received October 2, 2019, I regret to inform you that the Court is unable to assist you in the matter you present.

Under Article III of the Constitution, the jurisdiction of this Court extends only to the consideration of cases or controversies properly brought before it from lower courts in accordance with federal law and filed pursuant to the Rules of this Court. The Court does not give advice or assistance or answer legal questions on the basis of correspondence.

Your papers are herewith returned.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By:


Michael Duggan
(202) 479-3025

RECEIVED

NOV 07 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Enclosures



The Supreme Court of South Carolina

DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE
CLERK OF COURT

BRENDA F. SHEALY
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11330
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA
29211
1231 GERVAIS STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1080
FAX: (803) 734-1499
www.sccourts.org

September 18, 2019

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

Re: Wesley Edward Smith, III v. Charleston County School District
Appellate Case No. 2019-001315

Dear Mr. Smith:

This responds to your correspondence dated September 13, 2019. For the same reasons given in my letter of September 15, 2019, no action will be taken by this Court on this correspondence.

Very truly yours,

CLERK

cc: Daniel Francis Blanchard, III, Esquire

RECEIVED

NOV 07 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

The United States Supreme Court

Wesley Edward Smith III A.K.A
Wesley Smith
Petitioner/Appellant

Ticket/OCR/Warrant State id Number UNKNOWN

versus

Charle et al

Respondent(s)

Appellate Case No 2019-001315 (As Lower court Cases were consolidated)

REF: Appellate Case No. 2019-000616 (Lower Court Case No 2003-CP-10-4751
(Charleston County School District et al vs Smith W E III
Appellate Case No 2019-000616 (Lower Court Case No 2019-CP-10-0281
(Social Security Commission Agency et al vs. Smith W E III
Appellate Case No. 2015-001271 (Lower Court Case No 2113-CP-10-0417
(Pepsi Bottling Group, INC LLC et al vs Smith W E. III
Appellate Case No 2010-174266 (Lower Court Case No 2008-CP-10-0646
(Washington Mutual Bank Home Loans merger with Centex Home Loans LLC et al
vs. Smith, W. E. III

Cases taken as Objective Responses to **Cause of Action Case 2003-CP-10-4751**

Last Officiated by: Honorable Roger Young
Order Dated 18 Mar 2019

CORRECTED CAPTIONING OF PARTIES PURSUANT ARTICLE III OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

1. I, Wesley Edward Smith III, invoke all my rights as a United States citizens, regarding all procedural, substantive due process rights, the due process clause, equal protection clause whose rights governs immunity, protections, prohibited Acts and fundamental legal and lawful rights, and as such also seek to comply pursuant Article III of the United States Constitution, move to correct caption of complaint. During this time, I am being abused, tortured, having to result to sexual favors to eat and for basic necessities not normally practiced, while sexual prostitutes are being left in despair, denied its social security benefits and parents in custody providing the child support needs, the State guardians and State assigned parent South Carolina refuse child support for this incarcerated and in desperateness for survival, unnecessarily. To narrowly tailor the complication of the said matters, as we as Ex party to the entire State event (hypothetical guesses should not be an option anymore) a state witness who testified, state evidence icne that was

collected, allegedly from the person herein listed complaint, summons and proof that a notice of Appeal right with comprehensible understanding was served to the assailant or assailants

2. Regarding this action as the Ex parte in the State Lower Court Case 2003-CP-10-4751, allegedly absent the requirement of providing discovery affords finding out the matters of such complaints stating a claim for relief, the supported summon and a legal conclusion of law argument fo facts, If I Wesley Edward Smith III legally injured or personally harm any person herein listed from a past event (why we are hear), while I was employed with the Pepsi Bottling Group, INC Charleston County School District et al and its elected Government Officials or howevr reclassified, labeled and or defined, while I was in the performance of my Job work duties, but was negligent and fail to provide you a service and or a constitutional right, with the above listed respondent, the request for the Writ of Certiorari and or the from the criminal element overlooked regarding person accused of crimes while being held (a prisoners) in confined ment of the state practices and the corporate private holding cells from various locations in custody, should and will provide all we need for an answer from those persons who are listed and actually what need to be collected from the court judgment.

3. I, Wesley Edward Smith III, without information as the Ex Parte, that do to the close association with the listed corporations and personnel within and outside the court, are able to be deficient without providing proper services of appeal notices complaint, summon, state evidence turned over, no state witness present to testify to the accusation and no valid legal conclusion of law argument to actually contest. These orders, I hand to YOU, from my possession, were orders acquired after the hearings of the case in question with legal ramification and recognizable constitutional violation .

4. I, Wesley Edward Smith III, through diligent search, on related sites, regarding the parties being awarded Summary Judgment in cases, have not found nowhere Summary Judgment was awarded to any party that was absent. Such absents were, I Wesley Edward Smith III, the listed accuser complaint, a state witness, state evidence, a legal conclusion of law argument or the admissible statement of facts from the victim, without first allowing the discovery into a subject matter regarding the lawfulness and legality of the complaint, summons, and actual occurrences of facts , to a potentially complicated process, without allowing any citizen of ist constitutional protection of equal justice under the same set of laws, as applied against me and my family, or even to cross examine the State credible or non credible witnesses first before making such legally destructive ruling form the Courts official or actors of actual law suits. (without proof there will continue to be speculations, mere conjecture of law argument and baseless motions, therefore such answers are truthfully to the best of my limited knowledge¹

¹ Answers as submitted defensively, relying on law argument based on the enacted State Statutes, Court Rules governing Crim and Civ actions to initiate proceeding, State Agencies Administrative review Final determinations and Prior State Precedents or as closely related to actions

5. Yes, even I Wesley Edward Smith III is not ashamed to admit that I've sinned, but seemingly there are those that have not. As such, speculations continue without a complaint stating grounds for relief but past and current action speak volumes. As herein listed, are those persons that have been involved individually or collectively while acting in concert, held an investigation into criminal activity while an employee for the listed corporation, decided to overturn the State investigative North Charleston Police Department findings and legal conclusion of law. Respondent listed herein and as captioned respondents of CCSD, PBG and WMB, allegedly decided to disobey the District polices for compliance in in employment, by continuing to throw unlimited amounts of boulders (bigger rock) in form of legal jargon, and lawful proportion, which unresolved and timely results can cause irreparable harms and as that viable means in which cause the judicial confusion and internal self destructions. The prevented means in this matter is to have the complaint, before docketing the case and assigning an business action code, a complaint is the first step in getting a dispute heard in court. The persons filing a suit is called a plaintiff and the person against whom the lawsuit is filed is known as a defendant. The parties must have legal capacity to sue or to be sued. If a party does not have legal capacity to file lawsuits, the suit may be dismissed, This was an action over pay being owed to Wesley Edward Smith III, from the respondents, who action allegedly was human error of law argument and mistake of law²

6. I, Wesley Edward Smith III believe a human error occurred from the lack of direct supervision of its internal employees. Because as humans, we are born to err, but to be forgiving by another is divine. Respondents did not provide proper services of a Notice of Appeal after the accusation into criminal matter involving theft, conspiracy to defraud customers, stealing form shareholder, making false report written and or oral and the breast touching in my classroom of a eleven or twelve (11 or 12) year old student who was in the 8th grade at the time of such accusations with impending investigation. I, Wesley Edward Smith III, while suspended from both employment jobs were to be paid on leave while the witness, admissible facts and until the legal conclusion of law facts which validates its internal actions.

7. In good faith I have attempted to reach the parties and the courts, but Respondents refuses to acknowledge any faults and denies Wesley Edward Smith III request to file a grievances and restoration from non eye witnesses listed on event, not relevant, while human errors, mistake of law and someone's abuse of discretion while in command, unproven basis for the false claims misidentify me as the subject or the person of interest. The state court doesn't have my name corrected to date. As such, accordingly and continently, the State of South Carolina affords relief

² Although the caption of the alleged original complaint of the respondents and as listed individual (by removing the Corporate Veil) hold all responsible accountable and liable would satisfy the indecisions made in the lower court. by not producing as requested, never service a complaint or summons to Wesley-Edward: Smith, III or Notice to Document were requested to respond to the procedural default and notification consequences for not timely responding and waiving such rights to objectionably answer or respond to Appeal any action claimed. FULL DISCLOSURE w/Proof required.

and legal remedies but personnel in the Courts refuses to comply with the requirement under the State Constitution. As follow I object to the Lower Court Spreme Court Action on the fact that I, Wesley Edward Smith III and family have constitutional protection and immunity rights as follows:

As alleged, the recognition of my right afforded by State of South Carolina constitution was violated bt the respondents while in position as employess and consultants as follows

SECTION 12. (5th Amend) Double jeopardy; self-incrimination.

No person shall be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or liberty, nor shall any person be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.

SECTION 14. (6th Amend) Trial by jury; witnesses; defense.

The right of trial by jury shall be preserved inviolate. Any person charged with an offense shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury; to be fully informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to be fully heard in his defense by himself or by his counsel or by both

SECTION 15. (8 Amend) Right of bail; excessive bail; cruel or unusual or corporal punishment; detention of witnesses. All persons shall be, before conviction,ailable by sufficient sureties, but bail may be denied to persons charged with capital offenses or offenses punishable by life imprisonment, or with violent offenses defined by the General Assembly, giving due weight to the evidence and to the nature and circumstances of the event. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor shall excessive fines be imposed, nor shall cruel, nor corporal, nor unusual punishment be inflicted, nor shall witnesses be unreasonably detained.

Also the unexplained Orders without legal conclusion of law argument is anyone's scholarly or professional position, but without such legal concussion of law argument and actually witnessing and or having person citing a specific injury or harm is meaningless and still a guess, as alleged by the unjustified order(s). The unsupported collective State Court order, at this time continually legally binds and prevents others for being restrained permanently or temporarily, enjoined and is denying all others in this mimicked and mocked process proceedings, filed under S. C. R. Civ. Pro.11(a) and or S. C. Code Ann. §§ 15-36-10 et seg is not support by facts and or law, but purely speculative and based on mere conjecture of law from the twisting of prior hearsay rumors. As follows are the percieev issues with discrimination and retaliations for oppsing unlawful bsuiness practice and this is believed to be the get back.

A. But upon a closer review, the respondents refusal to pay the amounts of money owed upon suspension/norw a second termination was without substantive evidence or supported facts to prostitute, State Requirement upon suspension, according to Pay and Wages afforded under S. C Code 41-10-10 et seg. Issues before the courts, as stated in relevant parts on overlooked issues is:

SECTION 41-10-50. Payment of wages due discharged employees. When an employer separates an employee from the payroll for any reason, the employer shall pay all wages due to the employee within forty-eight hours of the time of separation or the next regular payday which may not exceed thirty days"

B. The State Statutory Employment Contract regarding my Right To Work were to be without intimidation nor otherwise interfered with existed under S C Code as codified 41-7-10 et seg. As stated in relevant parts:

" SECTION 41-7-70. Interference with right to work, It shall be unlawful for any person, acting alone or in concert with one or more persons: (1) By force, intimidation, violence or threats thereof, or violent or insulting language, directed against the person or property, or any member of the family of any person (a) to interfere, or attempt to interfere, with such person in the exercise of his right to work, to pursue or engage in, any lawful vocation or business activity, to enter or leave any place of his employment.

IN CLOSING WITH THIS COMPLIANCE TO ARTCLE III

I, Wesley Edward Smith III, believes that I was living my dream life and felt that I had come to a place in my and family lives, that we collectively accomplished the necessities for which me and my family enjoyed without deprivations. We were satisfied without the results with the home, employment, the children's progress and our newly formed community. Based on information and belief, from the years of my time loss from employment, my family divorce(s) and being denied all constitutional protections and immunities under the laws has been wasted. I Wesley Edward Smith III and Family cannot get this time back, but by being restored relief and equitable remedies by correct justice, can and will compensate for such losses, waste of time. and debt incurred while being held by the State legal process at the hands of persons acting as mongrels, while performing its version of street justice without any provocations for a legal recourse.

If the person listed beleow were harmed or injured in the Lower court case proof of service will be required, as these same person took part of an internal employment decision to terminate my contract and fire me from employment on a subjective torture of other in employment, must provide that my duties were wrong in the performance of work. Without a complaint, summon, notice of appeal, their only legal rendition for intervening, as to what happens would be a speculation, mere conjecture of law argument and continued frivolity as person herein listed as follows:

I, Wesley Edward Smith, III have personally contacted by certified mail with no replies nor response to these acts while these persons were in the performance of their Sate duties as official (or as offices changes) as delegated duties, the following: State of South Carolina, Governor Henry McMasters, for the estate of South Carolina, Ms Nikki Haley (Gov RET);, Lt. Governors Glen McConnell Attorney General Alan Wilson; Mr. Mark Sanford; Senator David Sheehan, Senator Robert Ford, Senator Floyd Breeland Senator David Wilson, Senator Tim Scott, State legislators, Councilman Wendell Gillard, Mayor Joe Riley on the personal and business , Account affairs of City of Charleston Mayor Rimbort E. Wrenn on the personal and business account affairs of City of Bonneau, Mayor Mary Brown on the personal and business account affairs of Monks Corner, Mayor Billy Keyserling on the personal, business and Account affairs of City of Beaufort Mayor Keith Sumney on the personal, business and on Account Affair for

the City of North Charleston,; Mayor Minnie Blackwell for the personal, business and Account
Affair for the City of Hanahan State prosecutors Mr. Ashley B Able, Ms. Jody Smitherman,
Mr. Scott Katrosh Mr. Daniel Blanchard, Ms. Alice Paylor;, Committee of Citizen 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, ROSEN ROSEN
AND HAYGOOD Law Firm LLP Mr. Joseph Dawson Sr, Mr. Joseph Dawson Jr, Mr Barbra
D. Dilligard, Mr. Anderson W. Townsend, Dr. Ronald McWhirt. Dr. Maria Godloe-Johnson,
Dr. Nancy McGinley. Mr. saiah 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. John Didit, ESQ, Ms Jane Duet, ESQ, and the
committee of private Citizens AKA Washington Mutual Bank and Home loans by merger, with
Fleet Home loans, successor to Centex Homes and Loans state prosecutors of Ms. Cynthia, D.
Blair, Mr. Michelle Rowe. Mr. William Everett, SR, Mrs Cheryl Fischer, Mr. Samuel C.
Waters, Mr. Dennis Brosnan, Mr. Reginald P. Corley, Mrs Rebecca Anne Roberts, Mrs. Andrea
St K Armand, Mr. Thomas C. Hidlebrand, Mr. Robert P. Woods, Mrs. Jenny C Honeycutt,
Mrs, Jenney A Cox, Jessica Freedman (cadet), Mr. John Didit, ESQ, Ms Jane Duet, ESQ, but not
an exhausting listing as the investigating a complaining party as Respondents³.

If they can provide the resources to support the accusation of harm of legal injury which created
the case order 2003-CP-10-4751, what the issue retaining this Wesley Edward Smith III without
waiver of right or by volunteering service without affording him pay while currently confined
without affording due process protection and equall right. Delacartory for Equal, procedural and
Substantive judgments are request on the pleading as requested, upon response from respondents.

PROOF OF MAILING (SERVICE)

I, Wesley Edward Smith III certify that on November 4, 2019, response to comply with Article
construed as Writ of Habeas Corpus, Writ of Certiorari, Post Conviction Relief, and Notice to
Appeal on 11 October 19 by 1st Class postage:

6

³ I, Wesley Edward Smith III, believes without proof by Notice of Appeal regarding Criminal accusation of wihe the
cause and effect wa the firing from emplyment while I was in the perofmrnce of my duties, and unsupported firings
form employment(s) and home taking by third parties, without being provided any statement from the listed
personnel as respondents above, statements made in response to their acts, have been considered frivolous, a moot
issue and totally baseless to entertain, Such denial to turnover such witness and supporting evidence support m y
theory but supported according to the enacted laws, would be continually construed as procedurally unfair,
substantively incorrect (as alleged) and a miscarriage to the Judicial system, the Justices for Justice and the
legislators, just to allow any third parties who is no an actual eye witness to an event, state an actual or particular
claim to support third party hearsay and lies, be automatically granted or awarded Summery Judgment.

Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street, NE
Washington D. C 20502
~~September 15, 2019,~~

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

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

CC; Mr Cynthia D. Blair
CC; Mr, Asheley B Abel

4 November 2019

Respectfully Submitted



Wesley Edward Smith III

7

RECEIVED
NOV 07 2019
S.C. SUPREME COURT

Smith W

465 N. NASSAU ST

CHARLOTTE, S.C. 28403

\$0.50[®]

US POSTAGE

FIRST-CLASS

062510826296

29406

000005386



endicia.com endicia.com endicia.com

Supreme Court of South Carolina

1231 GERVAIS ST

COLUMBIA S.C. 29201

29201 33206 0020

