

MARCH 3, 2020

STANLEY GOLSON, 200479

386-REDEMPTION WAY

McCOMACK COMMERCIAL TRST

McCOMACK, SC 29899

RECEIVED

MAR 06 2020

S.C. SUPREME COURT

To: THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE, CLERK OF COURT

POST OFFICE BOX 11330

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211

APPELLATE CASE NO- 2020-000241

DEAR CLERK:

ENCLOSED IS A COPY OF MY RULE 243(C)  
EXPLANATION.

SINCERELY,

Stanley Golson

STANLEY GOLSON, PRO-SE

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

APPEAL FROM LEXINGTON COUNTY  
WALTON J. McLEOD IV, Circuit Court Judge

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2020-000241

STANLEY GOLSON,

Appellant.

v.

LILLIAN V. MEADOWS,

Respondent.

EXPLANATION.

RECEIVED  
MAR 06 2020  
S.C. SUPREME COURT

STANLEY GOLSON, Pro-SE  
386-REDEMPTION Way  
McORMICK GOVERNMENT INST.  
McORMICK SC 29899

LILLIAN V. MEADOWS  
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL  
Post Office Box 11549  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211-1549

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## ARGUMENTS.

1. SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, THE TRIAL COURT ACTED WITHOUT JURISDICTION.
2. FRAUD ON THE COURT BY OFFICERS OF THE COURT.
3. UN CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS, MISSING GREAT SEAL OF ACTS NOT AFFIXED TO LAWS 1993-Act No 184 1995 Act No. 7 BILL-3151;

## FACTS.

PRIOR CONVICTIONS NO'S 1-7 ON FACE OF LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE NOTICE, WHERE NOT AND STILL TO THIS DAY, ARE NOT CRIMES OF VIOLENCE, AND ARE NOT CRIMES OF SERIOUS OFFENSE'S, PURSUANT TO SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS, SECTION-17-25-45.

APPELLANT SENTENCE IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL WHEN PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS NOT CRIMES OF VIOLENCE.

STATE V. BECKI 286 SE 2d 234 (W.VA. 1981).

STATE V. MILLER, 400 SE 297 (W.VA. 1990).

STATE V. KELMER, 808 SE 2d 867 (W.VA. 2017).

RECEIVED  
MAR 06 2020  
S.C. SUPREME COURT

## ARGUMENT - #1

APPELLANT MAY CHALLENGE SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AT ANY TIME. APPELLANT [IS NOT] A THIRD OFFENDER UNDER THE RECIDIVIST STATUTE OF SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS, SECTION 17-25-45. LIFE SENTENCE FOR PERSON CONVICTED FOR CERTAIN CRIMES.

WITHOUT JURISDICTION, COURT CANNOT PROCEED AT ALL IN ANY CASE, JURISDICTION IS [POWER] TO DECLARE LAWS, AND WHEN IT CEASES TO EXIST, THE ONLY FUNCTION REMAINING TO COURT IS THAT OF ANNOUNCING THE FACT, AND RULE SUA SPONTE.

"SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION CANNOT BE CURED" AND, IF COURT DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION, IT DOES NOT HAVE POWER TO PRESIDE OVER CASE.

YALGER V. SIEMENS ENERGY / AUTOMATION, INC.  
CITE AS 820 F. Supp. 1058 (S.D. OHIO 1993).

BOTH OF APPELLANT PRIOR CONVICTIONS ARE INVALID AND VOID. THE NO'S 1-8 ON FACE OF THE LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE NOTICE. DEFECTIVE INDICTMENTS CONFERS NO JURISDICTION UPON TRIAL COURT.

"THE CONSTITUTION IS THE HIGHEST LAW OF THE LAND."

THE SUPREME COURT HAS ALSO HELD THAT IF A JUDGE WARS AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION, OR IF HE ACTS WITHOUT JURISDICTIONS, HE HAS ENGAGED IN TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION.

APPELLANT INCIDENTS FROM 1992, ARE NON-VIOLENT AND PAROLE OFFENSES, AND, PURSUANT TO S.C. CODE ~~§§~~ 44-53-375. MAY NOT BE SUSPENDED NOR PROBATION GRANTED.  
Op. Atty. Gen. No. 93-25

IN 1992, S.C. CODE ANN. § 44-53-445, THE SHERIFF OFFICE SURPOSE TO SELECT, AND STATED HE WAS DISMISSING THE SCHOOL ZONE CHARGES.

THEREFORE, THE NO'S 1-7 ON THE FACE OF THE LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE NOTICE, [SHOULD NOT] HAVE BEEN USED IN THE GUILTY PLEA OF JULY 29<sup>TH</sup> 1993, AND NO OTHER TIME AFTER THAT DATE.

SEE SENTENCE SHEETS, FROM JULY 29<sup>TH</sup> 1993 / AND 2-1-99 WHICH LEFT GUILTY PLEA COURT WITHOUT JURISDICTION TO ACCEPT THE PLEAS. SEE BODY OF DISTRIBUTION OF CRACK COCAINE INDICTMENTS. STATE V. JONES, 500 SE 2d 499, AND STATE V. JONES, 536 SE 2d 675, 4. SEARCHES AND SEIZURES - 199 SEARCHES AND SEIZURES - 114 8. SEARCHES AND SEIZURES - 112

APPELLANT HAS A RIGHT TO CHALLENGE MISSTATEMENTS.

SEE, STATE V. MISSOURI, 524 SE 2d 394 CETERA ILLINOIS V. GATES, 103 S. CT. 2317, FRANKS V. DELAWARE, 98 S. CT. 2674

APPELLANT IS ENTITLED TO AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING IF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA ARE MET. WITHOUT AS A MATTER OF THIS COURT RECORD, INDICTMENT FROM 1993, THE BODY OF THE INDICTMENTS NO'S 1-7, SEE (AGENT) IN BODY OF INDICTMENT. APPELLANT SHOULD BE GRANTED RELIEF. ALSO, SEE INDICTMENT WHICH LEFT COURT WITHOUT JURISDICTIONS, SEE - BODY OF INDICTMENT, WHEREAS 44-53-110. DEFINITION IN BODY OF INDICTMENT,

SEE MASON V. STATE, UNPUBLISHED CASE, OF SUPREME COURT.

IN THIS CASE, SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION IS LACKING AND THE ACTION (MUST) BE RULED IN APPELLANT FAVOR.

WHERE THE COURT DOES NOT HAVE SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, IT SHOULD REFRAIN FROM AND FURTHER EXERCISE OF POWER.

WHEN OPPOSING PARTY SUBMITS FABRICATED DOCUMENTS, OR LIES, AS HE IS AN OFFICER OF THE COURT THIS AMOUNTS TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND VOIDS THE WHOLE PROCEEDINGS.

"RESPONDENTS ARE WAGING AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION, AND THE COURT SEEMS TO STEERING IN THERE FAVOR, AND THEY ARE ACTING WITHOUT JURISDICTION, THEY'RE ENGAGING IN TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION."

SEE CONDITIONAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL, FILED BY STANLEY GOLSON (APPELLANT) ON JUNE 8, 2018

AND, WAS SIGNED, AND IT SO ORDERED THIS 8<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2018 SIGNED BY, THE HONORABLE

ALISON R. VEE, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT.

THIS ACT VOIDS THE WHOLE PROCEEDING, FROM THAT POINT UNTIL THIS MOMENT.

"THERE IS NO TIME LIMIT ON ATTACKING JUDGMENT AS VOID."

17. FEDERAL CIVIL PROCEDURE - 2658

NEW YORK LIFE INS. CO. V. BROOKS, CITE AS 84 F.3d 137 (5<sup>TH</sup> Cir. 1996).

Appellant Guilty Plea, was VACATED on Nov-6<sup>th</sup> 1996, AND VOID/  
AND OVERTURN, DATE 3-24-97, BY THE CLERK of COURT OFFICE.  
THE NO'S 1-7 ON FRONT of THE LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE NOTICE.

Appellant SENTENCE AND CONVICTION IS NULL AND VOID.  
RELIEF IS NOT A DISCRETIONARY MATTER; IT IS

MANDATORY.

## ARGUMENT- #2

### "FRAUD ON THE COURT BY AN OFFICER OF THE COURT"

WHEN YOUR OPPOSING LAWYER LIES OR SUBMITS FALSIFIED DOCUMENTS, AS HE IS AN OFFICER OF THE COURT THIS AMOUNTS TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND VOIDS THE WHOLE PROCEEDINGS...

PROSECUTORS SHOULDN'T HAVE TO BE TOLD TO FOLLOW THE LAW.

THE SUPREME COURT HAS ALSO HELD THAT IT IS A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS TO CONVICT A DEFENDANT BASED UPON FALSE EVIDENCE, AND THE GOVERNMENT IS ALSO RESPONSIBLE FOR FALSE TESTIMONY. EVEN IF THE PROSECUTION IS UNAWARE OF THE FALSITY.

SEE, *NAPUE V. ILLINOIS*, 360 U.S. 264, 79 S. CT. 1173, (1959);

*GIYKO V. UNITED STATES*, 405 U.S. 150, 92 S. CT. 963 (1972). AND

*MILLER V. PATE*, 386 U.S. 1, 87 S. CT. 785, 17 D. ED. 2d 690 (1967).

A FINDING THAT A JUDGEMENT HAS BEEN OBTAINED BY PERPETRATING FRAUD UPON THE COURT EMPOWERS TO COURT TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENT *SUA SPONTE*. FED. RULES. CIV. PROC. RULE 24 28 U.S.C.A.

### FEDERAL CIVIL PROCEDURE- 2654

AN ATTORNEY'S LOYALTY TO THE COURT, AS AN OFFICER THERE OF, DEMANDS INTEGRITY AND HONEST DEALING WITH THE COURT, AND, WHEN HE DEPARTS FROM THAT STANDARD, HE PERPETRATES A.

"FRAUD UPON THE COURT" WITHIN SAVING CLAUSE OF RULE 9 OVERSIGHT RELIEF FROM JUDGEMENT OR ORDER.

IN ANY CASE WHICH HAS HAD FRAUD INVOLVED CAN BE REOPENED AT ANY TIME, BECAUSE THERE IS NOT A STATUTE OF LIMITATION ON FRAUD. PEOPLE V. LATIC, 410 N.E. 2d. 626 (1980).

BULLOCK V. US., 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985). DIRECTED AT JUDICIAL MACHINERY ITSELF. IF THE JUDGE HAS NOT PERFORMED HIS JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS, THEN THAT IS WHERE THE IMPARTIAL FUNCTIONS OF THE COURT HAVE BEEN DIRECTLY CORRUPTED.

FRAUD UPON THE COURT HAS BEEN DEFINED BY THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS TO EMBRACE THAT SPECIES OF FRAUD WHICH DOES, OR ATTEMPTS TO, DEFEAT THE COURT ITSELF, OR IS A FRAUD PERPETUATED BY OFFICERS OF THE COURT, SO THAT THE JUDICIAL MACHINERY CAN NOT PERFORM IN THE USUAL MANNER ITS IMPARTIAL TASK OF A JUDICATING CASES.

KEANER V. C.I.R., 387 F.3d 689 (1968).

"A DECISION PRODUCED BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT IS NOT IN ESSENCE A DECISION AT ALL, AND NEVER BECOMES FINAL."

FRAUD UPON THE COURT MAKES VOID THE ORDERS AND JUDGEMENTS OF THAT COURT AND VITIATES THE ENTIRE PROCEEDING.

IN 1994, THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HELD THAT DISQUALIFICATION IS REQUIRED IF AN OBJECTIVE OBSERVER WOULD ENTERTAIN REASONABLE QUESTIONS ABOUT THE JUDGES IMPARTIALITY.

FRAUD ON THE COURT BY AN OFFICER OF THE COURT, DISQUALIFICATION (AND) OFFICERS OF THE COURT, STATE OR FEDERAL.

WHEN YOUR OPPOSING LAWYER LIES OR SUBMITS FALSIFIED DOCUMENTS, AS HE IS AN OFFICER OF THE COURT THIS AMOUNTS TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND VOIDS THE WHOLE PROCEEDING.

THERE ARE FOUR WAYS TO IDENTIFY IF COURT FRAUD OCCURRED IN A CASE. THE FIRST WAY IS TO DETERMINE IF THE COURT MADE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW ON THE ISSUES YOU PRESENTED. SCCV 17-27-80. AND F. R. CIV. P. 52(A).

THE SECOND WAY TO IDENTIFY COURT FRAUD IS TO DETERMINE IF THE COURT MADE FINDINGS ON ALL ISSUES PRESENTED IN YOUR CASE.

A COURT IS REQUIRED TO MAKE FINDING ON EACH AND EVERY ISSUE YOU PRESENT. FAILURE TO DO SO LEAVES THE CASE OPEN AND DOES NOT ALLOW YOU TO HAVE A VALID APPEAL. THE FEDERAL STATUTE IS F. R. CIV. P. 54(b) THIS REQUIREMENT IS JURISDICTIONAL, AS NO VALID APPEAL MAY BE HELD WITH ISSUES REMAINING OPEN IN THE LOWER COURT.

THE THIRD WAY TO IDENTIFY COURT FRAUD IN YOUR CASE IS TO LOOK AT THE TRANSCRIPTS AND DETERMINE IF THE PROCEEDINGS WERE STEERED TO THE PROSECUTION. THIS IS APPARENT WHEN THE JUDGE DENIES ALL DEFENDANT MOTIONS, REGARDLESS OF THEIR MERIT, AND GRANTS ALL PROSECUTION MOTIONS. THIS NOT ONLY MEANS THE JUDGE DID NOT READ THE PLEADINGS, IT SHOWS THAT HE HAS PRE-DETERMINED THE CASE IN ORDER TO GIVE IT TO THE PROSECUTOR.

A FOURTH WAY TO IDENTIFY COURT FRAUD IS WHEN YOUR VERIFIED PLEADINGS, DONE BY AFFIDAVIT, ARE DENIED BY THE JUDGE. THE LAW REQUIRES THAT ALL AFFIDAVITS MUST BE TAKEN AS TRUE UNLESS THE PROSECUTION CAN COUNTER THEM WITH AFFIDAVIT OR EVIDENCE. THE ATTORNEY FOR THE GOVERNMENT IS NOT SUPPOSED TO PRESENT AFFIDAVITS AS A WITNESS IN A CASE. THEREFORE, THE AFFIDAVITS OR EVIDENCE (MUST) COME FROM FACT WITNESSES INDEPENDENT OF THE PROSECUTOR. IF THE COURT IGNORES YOUR VERIFIED PLEADINGS BY AFFIDAVIT, IT NEVER INTENDED FOR YOU TO HAVE RELIEF AND IS TRYING TO STEER THE PROCEEDINGS TO THE PROSECUTION. THAT IS COURT FRAUD.

1. RETURN AND MOTION TO DISMISS.
2. CONDEMNAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL.
3. FINAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL.

## GREAT SEAL.

APPELLANT STATES HE IS BEING HELD IN CUSTODY UNLAWFULLY BECAUSE THE STATUTES UPON WHICH HIS CONVICTIONS AND INDICTMENTS OR VOED, BECAUSE THE DISTRIBUTION OF CRACK COCAINE, AND PROXIMITY OF SCHOOL, AND THE CONSPIRACY CHARGES, NEVER ~~WAS~~ BEEN AFFIXED WITH THE GREAT SEAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, RENDERING THEM UNENFORCEABLE AND HIS SENTENCES ARE UNCONSTITUTIONALLY VOED. APPELLANT IS ALLEGING THERE IS NO VISIBLE IMPRESSION OF THE GREAT SEAL ON THE FOLLOWING ACTS OF WHICH HE WAS CONVICTED: 1993 ACT NO. 184, 1995 ACT NO. 7. APPELLANT REFERS TO THE FULL FAITH AND CREDIT STATUTE, 28 U.S.C. § 1738, AND ARTICLE III, SECTION 18 OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONSTITUTION IN SUPPORT OF THIS ALLEGATION.

THE RECORDS AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF (ANY) COURT OF (ANY) SUCH STATE, TERRITORY OR POSSESSION, OR COPIES THEREOF, SHALL BE PROVED OR ADMITTED IN OTHER COURTS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES AND ITS TERRITORIES AND POSSESSION BY THE ATTESTATION OF THE CLERK AND SEAL OF THE COURT ANNEXED, IF A SEAL EXIST, TOGETHER WITH A CERTIFICATE OF A JUDGE OF THE COURT THAT THE SAID ATTESTATION IS IN PROPER FORM.  
28 U.S.C.A. 1738

APPELLANT RECEIVED HIS ORIGINAL LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 13, 2018, FROM STEVEN D. TUTTLE.

SEE, U.S. V. AMEDY, 24 U.S. 1826 1826 WL 2637

WHICH STATES, ALL THAT THE STATUTE REQUIRES, IN RESPECT TO LEGISLATIVE ACTS, IS THAT THE SEAL OF THE STATE SHOULD BE AFFIXED. AND, IS DECLARED INADMISSIBLE IN EVIDENCE UNLESS STAMPED. THE CONVICTION (MUST) BE HELD ERRONEOUS.

"NO SEAL, NO LAW"

THE COURT STATES APPELLANT'S DISCOVERY OF THE MISSING GREAT SEAL (DOES NOT) CONSTITUTE NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE. AND, THAT THE DISCOVERY DATE IS IRRELEVANT. WHERE THE INFORMATION WAS FREELY AVAILABLE TO HIM AT AN EARLIER DATE.

THIS EVIDENCE [COULD NOT] HAVE BEEN DISCOVERED BEFORE TRIAL, BY APPELLANT.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE STATES APPELLANT COULD HAVE SOUGHT TO CONFIRM THE IMPRESSION OF THE [GREAT SEAL] PROVIDING FOR THE ENACTED LEGISLATION PRIOR TO TRIAL.

THE STATE, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE IS TRYING TO SHIFT THE BURDEN ON APPELLANT. THIS COURT DESPITE THE FACT, THIS ISSUE WAS NOT ADDRESSED IN TRIAL, OR ORIGINAL POST CONVICTION REVIEW HEARING. IT CAN BE USED IN THIS EXPLANATION TO BE GRANTED RELIEF.

THIS IS A (IAC) INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE COUNSEL CLAIM, FOR FAILING TO INVESTIGATE AND PRESENT THIS ISSUE TO THE COURT IN APPELLANT TRIAL. IN THE YEAR 2007, MONTH APRIL, INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE COUNSEL CLADA, ON DIRECT APPEAL COUNSEL, AFTER CONVICTION OF APPELLANT'S TRIAL.

APPELLANT ORIGINAL FIRST PCR POST CONVICTION REVIEW HEARING, HEARING ATTORNEY CHARLES T. BROOKS III WAS ALSO INEFFECTIVE FOR NOT ADDRESSING THIS GREAT SEAL ISSUE.

APPELLANT BOLSON WAS [PREJUDICE] BY THE ACTS OF THE STATE OFFICERS AND, ALL HIS STATE APPOINTED COUNSEL'S. APPELLANT CONVICTION HAS BEEN VOID, SINCE THE DAY OF SENTENCING.

THE LAWS ARE CONSTITUTIONALLY INVALID AND VOID. BECAUSE OF THE MISSING SEAL.

NO SEAL, NO LAW.

ART. III, § 18 OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONSTITUTION (1895).

RECEIVED

MAR 08 1999  
U.S. SUPREME COURT

THE LAW IS CLEAR, THERE IS NO DOUBT, ART. 18, ARE MANDATORY AND (MUST) BE FOLLOED.

THE CONVICTION (MUST) BE HELD ERRONEOUS.

VIN CHOVN HAD ADMITTED IN 1856 THAT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT, IS NOT LAW.

THE CONSTITUTION IS A (SWORD) AND A (SHIELD) TO (PROTECT) PEOPLE.

THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. THE SECRETARY OF THIS STATE HAS (FAILED) TO AFFIX THE GREAT SEAL OF THE STATE UPON, A NUMBER OF ACTS.  
1993 ACT NO. 184 AND 1995 ACT NO. 7.

A SEPARATE PROVISION OF THE CONSETUTION, ART. 1 § 23 DEEMS (ALL) PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION TO BE MANDATORY.

IN THIS EXPLANATION, THE JUDGE DUTY IS TO DECLARE THESE ACTS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

THIS RULING SHOULD BE SUA SPONTE.

SINCERELY,

CC: FILE.

Stanley Holson

Mr Stanley Holson - PRO-SE

386 - REDEMPTION WAY  
McCORMICK CORRECTIONAL INST.  
McCORMICK - SOUTH CAROLINA 29899