

The State of South Carolina
The Supreme Court

Docket case no 2021-001422

ARTHUR McQUILLA # 152425

Appellant

RECEIVED

JAN 24 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

vs.

State of South Carolina

Respondent

4 of 13

affidavit of facts giving
judicial notice; motions to
~~REVIEW~~ the motions to stay
until US SUPREME COURT
REVIEW; motions for and
extension of time to ~~RESET~~
until the motions to stay
has been ruled on and
motions to motions therefor

To: THE SC SUPREME COURT

ET AL.,

The appellant objects
to how the South Carolina
SUPREME COURT has misconstrued
his pleading in Acts of FRAUD
upon the court and
manipulation violating US
SUPREME COURT holdings
in ROSS v BLAKE, 136 S Ct

1850 (US 2016) to thwart fair
and proper review of his
issues. PLEASE stop the FRAUD
SC SUPREME COURT. THE APPELLANT
IS CLEARLY AWARE that the
SC SUPREME COURT HAS REFUSED
to vacate the ORDER in
question in this case. This
is NOT what the APPELLANT
IS SEEKING. THE APPELLANT
IS SEEKING that the US SUPREME

COURT WROTE THE ORDER. NOT
THE SC SUPREME COURT BY
THE APPELLANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL
DUE PROCESS RIGHT TO SEEK
REVIEW OF THE SC SUPREME
COURT DENYING THE MOTION
SEEKING 28 USC § 1407 TRANSFER.
THE APPELLANT IS SEEKING THIS
FROM THE US SUPREME COURT,
NOT THE SC SUPREME COURT.
STOP PURPOSELY IN ACTS OF FRAUD
MISCONSTRUING THE APPELLANT'S

pleading. The appellant sent
his notice seeking leave to
appeal the SC SUPREME COURT'S
ORDER denying the motion for
28 USC § 1407 transfer by
certified mail # 9510 8121
1436 2006 46459 on

JANUARY 6, 2022 for a second
time. The appellant clearly
sought and motioned to the
SC SUPREME COURT for a stay

9 of 13

of CASE 2021-001422 until that
US SUPREME COURT petition for
Writ of CERTIORARI was given
A fair opportunity to be heard
under the collateral order
doctrine pursuant to Hall v Hall
138 S Ct 1188 (US 2018); Mohawk
Industries Inc. v. Carpenter,
558 US 100, 130 S Ct 599, 175 L Ed 2d
458 (US 2009); and Microsoft
Corp v. Baker, 137 S Ct 1702, 198
L Ed 2d 132 (US 2017). The collateral

ORDER doctrine would permit
me to seek review from the
United States Supreme Court
before this case was permitted
to move forward. Rule 10
(b) and (c) of United States
Supreme Court rules permit
me to seek review from the
US Supreme Court, not the
SC Supreme Court to seek
to vacate the state
Supreme Court's order

UNDER THE COLLATERAL ORDER
DOCTRINE. STOP THE FRAUD
AND THE PURPOSELY MISCONSTRUING
MY FILING. I AM RENEWING
THE MOTION TO STAY CASE 2021-
001422 UNTIL THAT US SUPREME
COURT REVIEW OCCURS OR THAT
COURT DENY THE REVIEW. I
AM MOTIONING FOR AN EXTENSION
OF TIME TO REST AFTER THE
SC SUPREME COURT HAS RULED
ON THE MOTION TO STAY THIS

case that in FRANK you have
circumvented to allow me to
SEEK US SUPREME COURT REVIEW
and to explain why this appeal
should not be dismissed. I
thank you in advance.
still remain.

Respectfully
ARTHUR McQUILLA
Arthur McQuilla

JANUARY 18, 2022

RECEIVED
JAN 24 2022
S.C. SUPREME COURT

13 of 13