RECEIVED

Oct 04 2021

S.C. SUPREME COURT

703 Creekview Drive
Greenville SC 29607
October 4, 2021

The Honorable Patricia A. Howard, Clerk
PO Box 11330
Columbia, SC 29211

cc: The Honorable Paul B. Wickensimer, Clerk
305 E. North Street
Greenville, SC 29601

Re: Wedlake, *et al.* v. Acord, *et al.* … Appellate Case No. 2021-000665

Dear Honorable Ms. Howard:

Thank you for your letter of September 28, 2021. I object very strongly to violations by the Clerk's Office of Rule 221, SCACR. As excerpted (emphasis added), Rule 221 clearly states:

> RULE 221 REHEARING AND REMITTITUR
> (b) Remittitur. The remittitur ... **shall not be sent** to the lower court or administrative tribunal **until fifteen (15) days have elapsed** (the day of filing being excluded) since the **filing** of the opinion, **order**, judgment, or decree of the court finally disposing of the appeal. ... If a petition for **writ of certiorari is filed**, the Court of Appeals **shall not send** the remittitur until notified that the **petition has been denied**. …

Your letter confirms the remittitur was sent the **SAME DAY** (09/21/21) as the filing of the Order. Further, it is a matter of Court Record that I filed a "Writ of Certiorari" on 07/22/21. The Supreme Court to date did not deny my Writ.

Your letter plainly **admits to violations** of Rule 221, SCACR, by showing:

> ... this Court's order denying your motion to reinstate was issued on September 21, 2021, and the Court of Appeals issued the remittitur the same day, thereby ending appellate jurisdiction over this case. *Stogsdill v. S.C. Dep't of Health & Human Servs.*, 415 S.C. 568, 784 S.E.2d 669 (2016); *Wise v. S.C. Dept. of Corr.*, 372 S.C. 173, 642 S.E.2d 551 (2007). ...

If actions in violation of Rule 221 by the Clerk's Office were inadvertent, then I hope corrective action will be forthcoming. As I understand *"Stogsdill"* and *"Wise"*, I find nothing in either of these Orders that supports actions by the Clerk's Office that violated Rule 221. No Clerk, nor Clerk's-Office-support personnel, should be willfully and knowingly violating Court Rules.

Sincerely,

Raymond A. Wedlake

Raymond A. Wedlake

cc: Ely Owen Grote, Esquire (via e-mail)