

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM NEWBERRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Hon. Donald B. Hocker, Circuit Court Judge

C.A. No.: 2020-CP-36-00093
Appellate Case No. 2020-001348

RECEIVED

Apr 01 2022

SC Court of Appeals

Jefferson Davis, Jr.Appellant,

v.

Chad Connelly, Tom Persons & South Carolina Educational Credit for Exceptional Needs
Children FundRespondents.

FINAL REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Jefferson Davis, Jr.
403 McCarter Avenue
Greenville, SC 29615
843-901-8036 (cell)
jeff@apogetax.com

Appellant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Argument1

Public Policy1

Perjury2

Conclusion2

ARGUMENT

PUBLIC POLICY. This legal question is new to South Carolina jurisprudence, but it is simple in its broad ranging effect if allowed to stand as is. A government run non-profit board is required by South Carolina state law to do X with donor's funds (in this case provide scholarships to K-12 children with special needs) ... yet the non-profit board violates the state law and their own public promises / inducements to donate (in this case paying the funds to its executive director instead of the children as required by law to the tune of \$275,406).

The legislatively appointed non-profit board has standing, but they refuse to do anything about it. If they did, they would be admitting they violated the law and "stole" money directed by law for k-12 children with special needs and paid it to their buddy, the executive director.

The only other party eligible under current law in South Carolina to pursue the matter is the SC Attorney General. The only problem there is the SC Attorney General is personal friends with the executive director who absconded with the \$275,406. It is a sticky situation and even if the AG and the executive director were not friends, the AG has a busy job and doesn't have time to track down every little matter like this.

But donors do have the time to track down these matters. Donors who contributed funds to a government run non-profit that was required by law to use 98% of the donations for k-12 children with special needs ... that advertised on its non-profit website that they would use 98% of the donations for k-12 children with special needs ... but instead only used approximately 84% for the children, and used the rest to pay the executive director buddy.

As is the case in other states where this matter has reached the appellate courts, public policy demands a finding of a constructive trust, public importance, and/or constitutional

standing. If not, there will be a major gap in the law which will allow all sorts of malfeasance to occur. We are better than that in South Carolina.

PERJURY. When is it ever proper for our courts to allow perjured sworn testimony? We are not talking simple mistakes of recollection or belief ... but outright manipulative lies, mathematical and undeniable lies, specifically calculated to bully over and “fool” the trial court and the public about embezzlement of \$275,406? Never!

The perjury matter is clear and undeniable. Again, with the pesky “public policy”, but if it is OK to provide perjured sworn testimony to a court, where does it end?

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Appellant asks this Honorable Court to reverse the judgment of the trial court order dismissing (due only to its novel nature in SC) this case for lack of standing and direct the court to address Plaintiffs Motion for Perjury, Contempt & Sanctions for False Affidavit (or address it here in the South Carolina Court of Appeals) with a finding commensurate of the incontrovertible guilt of Respondent Chad Connelly.

Respectfully submitted,



Jefferson Davis, Jr., Esq.
403 McCarter Avenue
Greenville, SC 29615
843-901-8036 (cell)
jeff@apogeetax.com

Appellant

Date: April 1, 2022