

ORIGINAL

24-7414

FILED

MAY 28 2025

**OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.**

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re Ricardo Fishburne — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

South Carolina ^{Supreme Court} ~~North Carolina~~ — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

S.C. Supreme Court / S.C. Dept. of Corr Agency
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Ricardo Fishburne
(Your Name)

Po Box 205
(Address)

Ridgerville SE 29472
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1.) Did S.C. Supreme Court deny Right to Petition for Redress?
- 2.) Did state of S.C., SCDC, Governor McMaster Fail to Protect when they Failed to recommend A time Reduction, Clemency or Commutation of Sentence to get Petitioner out of hostile environment?
- 3.) Did SCDC & State of S.C. act cruel & unusual via Failing to recommend A time Reduction?
~~Did~~ Solicitor Isaac M. Stone Violate law in Failing to file motion for time Reduction?
- 4.) Did SCDC deny Petitioner Procedural due Process in the Appendix A Agency decision Alleging SCDC cannot recommend A time Reduction And the grievance is A Legal matter outside of SCDC's control?
- 5.) Did SCDC & state of S.C. Fail to Protect & created hostile prison conditions via Approving A Law 24-3980A Law that is / has Caused Petitioners Assaults And employs inmates that did the Assaults?
- 6.) Did SCDC, District Court, State of S.C. And United States Attorney office deprive Petitioner Fourteenth Amend. Rights via Failure to charge And sanction Directors Davis And Stirling for Committing Perjury?

LIST OF PARTIES

- [] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.
- [] All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

South Carolina Dept. of Corrections
State of S.C. / Supreme Court of S.C.
Isaac M. Stone 14th Circuit Solicitor

RELATED CASES

Jared Price v. State of S.C. 44/ S.C. 23
Ex Parte Young, 209 U.S. 123
State v. Price 2023 WL 8588535 at 26

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	S.C. Supreme Court
APPENDIX B	S.C. Dept of Cor. Grievance Step-1 & 2
APPENDIX C	S.C. Dept. of Cor. Step-2 Grievance
APPENDIX D	S.C. Dept of Cor. Grievance/Complaints
APPENDIX E	Inmate classification plan 17-25-65 Code of Law
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Jarod Price v. State of S.C. 441 S.C. 923 5

Ex Parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 13

STATUTES AND RULES

24-3-980A Capt. Robert Johnson Act 8, 10, 11

17-25-65 Time Reduction 6, 14

21.04 (74) S.C.D.C. Classification Policy 7

OTHER

Amendment-1 Right to Petition for Redress p. 4, 13

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the 5.C Supreme Court court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A ____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).


☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 5-13-25.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A ____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).



CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- 1.) Amendment-1- Right to Petition Government For Redress of Grievances
- 2.) Fourteenth Amendment, Equal Protection of the Law, Due Process of Law,
No state shall make or enforce Any Law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens
- 3.) 24-3-980A Capt. Robert Johnson Act that makes it illegal for inmates to be in possession of Telecommunication devices" unless approved by the Director to do so."
- 4.) 17-25-65 or 21.04(H)SCOR Classification Plan states 17-25-65 can be invoked to give A inmate A time Reduction for assisting SCOR on the state... SCOR or state has to verify the assistance

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The S.C Supreme Court refused to Rescind A Order At Appendix A that is clearly unconstitutional. Which is A ongoing Prohibit that's depriving the Petitioner his Right to Petition for Redress in violation of Amendment-1 U.S. Const. A Right that is unassailable. The State of S.C Supreme Court does not cite Any Justification for assailing this Right. See Appendix A.

Appendix A Also states S.C Supreme Court denied A time Reduction as sanctions. Petitioner Requested A time Reduction due to S.C Supreme Courts unconstitutional order causing injury. And Petitioner requested A time Reduction due to other assistance the Petitioner provided At SCDC in regards to promoting safety within the Prison via A Communication Platform At SCDC. Now known As 24-3-980A.

Isaac M. Stone - solicitor
Petitioner has filed multiple time Reductions From Isaac M. Stone. Pur 17-25-65C the Solicitor is required to file A time Reduction motion. Stone is in violation of Statutory Law. which is cruel & unusual because Stone knows Prison Conditions are critical. Stone is

Required to file A motion to the chief Administrative Judge within 5 days of receiving A Request from A inmate At SCOT for A time Reduction. Petitioner filed A motion for time Reduction Approx 30 days ago to Gov. McMeester, Attorney General A. Wilson And Isaac M. Stone. Isaac M. Stone failed to follow the Law and is depriving Petitioner equal Protection of the Law and due Process 14th Amendment.

Isaac M. Stone has A habit of deliberately ignoring Petitioners motions since 2010. See 3:24-cv-4472-JFA U.S. Court of Appeal Number ~~25~~ 6285 within A writ of cert filed in this court for Isaac M. Stone failure to answer A 29b motion for A new trial From 2010-2025. Causing injury. Now that 29b motion is missing from court files.

Despite these injuries At 3:24-cv-4472-JFA Isaac M. Stone fail to follow the statutory law at 17-25-65C and refuses to file the time Reduction AS 17-25-65C requires Just because

he knows he has immunity for causing injuries.

According to 17-25-65 a-c: The Circuit Solicitor shall file a motion with the Clerk of Court where the conviction was held; 2.)

The Solicitor shall send a copy of the motion to the Chief Admin Judge of the Circuit within 5 days of the filing from the inmate;

3.) The Chief Admin Judge or a Judge assigned to that County has the authority to hear and resolve the motion.. S.C. Code Ann 17-25-65 c The Statute implicitly requires a hearing be held in open court.

See Appendix E inmates shall alert the Solicitor of any assistance to S.C.D.C and request a time reduction. Petitioner has filed numerous time reductions. Isaac M. Stone is violating 14th Amendment Due Process and this Court supervisory power is the only court to enjoin it. Because the Solicitor motion is the only way to ^{initiate} ~~process~~ claim for time reduction.

Petitioner Exhausted A grievance reduction. SCDC says its a legal matter not SCDC. See Appendix B-C

the Appeal Stating its A Legal matter out-
Side of SCOC control. which is not true
because SCOC Classification Policy At
Appendix E permits SCOC to recommend
or verify inmates A time Reduction. SCOC
Violated Petitioners equal Protection of Law
they offered Janod Price v. State 2023 WL 8588535 at 26
The Grievance was for verifying the assistance.
SCOC, State of S.C And Governor McMaster

Failed to protect Petitioner where they
Failed to recommend the Solicitor Isaac M.
Stone to give Petitioner A time Reduction
Or commute Petitioners sentence or clemency
to get Petitioner out of the hostile prison.
Because the forced labor is what caused
Prison to be hostile where the inmates on
Communication (cellphones/tablets) got on phones
with SCOC via Petitioner being forced to use
cellphones. See Appendixes 2-2 since 2015 the

Petitioner placed A SCDC mental health
Counselor on notice the cellphones were A
Problem. SCDC Ignored Petitioner. Continued its
Forced Labor Causing Multiple 17 stab wounds
AS Appendix B Grievance started. From 2016-2022.

SCDC AND State of S.C. was cruel
& unusual for denying to give A decision
on Appendix A grievance asking for SCDC
and its directors for A time reduction 17-2565
recommendation. Petitioner did write solicitor
but SCDC has to Verify the assistance. SCDC
totally fails to give A decision, yet, Passed
A Law that creates further injury to the
Petitioners character because it lets the
Inmates on the cellphones know that Petitioner
facilitated getting them exposed. 24-3-980A
Law admits the Directors Authorizes these
Inmates to keep Telecommunication devices.
Since 2010 SCDC Directors, wardens been authorizing inmates to

Keep Cellphones. See Appendix D-4 where SCAC
Staff admits they will resolve the matter.

Shut the Program down since 2021-2022.

They never did. S.C. Supreme Court/State of S.C. Also failed
to recommend A time Reduction to Isaac m. Stone - solicitor.
S.C./SCAC deprived Petitioner Procedure!

due Process in failing to process the grievance

Incorrectly alleging A recommendation for A
time Reduction is A legal matter out of

SCAC's control because Appendix E SCAC's

Classification Policy 21.04 (24) states A

Inmate that Assists SCAC staff can request
A time Reduction. Once Again Petitioner has

requested numerous time Reductions From SCAC;

the Solicitor Isaac m. Stone SC/SCAC HAS to

Verify the Assistance. Thus the Grievance

Requesting the verifications SC/SCAC denied due

Process of law was cruel & unusual because the

Prison is hostile where that program is causing

A vacuum from the cruel Practices state of S.C.
SCAC facilitates inmates to do. They make
People believe theres ~~just~~ problems while state of S.C.
SCAC directors Authorizes the problems
creating A toxic environment via 24-3-980A
Law causing A catastrophe. cruel usually.

When SCAC testified to S.C General Assembly
to have 24-3-980A Law passed it created
A hostile environment for Petitioner because
as mentioned inmates are exposed for having

Cellphones / tablets that directors Authorizes.
And SCAC and its directors Failed to Protect
where they had that Law passed And
Failed to offer A time Reduction to
Remove Petitioner from SCAC hostile prison
conditions because even Protective Custody
has that Program on All Telecommunication
devices cellphones, tablets, Radios, They ~~are~~ ^{voice over}

Facilitates it. Which creates a imminent
danger for Petitioner At ALL SCDC prisons.
Defendant SCDC Failed to protect And is
Failing to Protect because the threat is
ongoing. Also, when SCDC facilitated to
having 24-3-980A Law Passed they
Knew the inmates on the phones were
A threat since 2015. See Appendixes D-1, D-2
and D-3, D-4, D-5... SCDC forced Petitioner back into population
and forced Petitioner to continue to work via cellphones.
State of SC/SCDC deprived Petitioner the Fourteenth
Amendment Rights that promises equal
Protection of the Law, ³ due Process of Laws.
Because SC/SCDC, the District Court And
U.S. Attorney's office Failed to criminally
Charge Directors Davis And Stirling for
Committing Perjury under oath. See Appendix
D-3 A order Failing to criminally Charge

Or give sanctions for these Directors
lies alleging no program via cellphones
and tablets exists At SCDC. on 7-26-24
Directors B. Stirling And W. Davis
committed Perjury. Although they had
given testimony At General Assembly
of S.C. that facilitated 24-3-980A
Capt. Robert Johnson Act Bill being Approved
on 5-13-24... Two months prior to their
Perjury the Governor Approved 24-3-980A
Law that makes it illegal At SCDC for
Inmates to be in possession of Telecomm-
unication devices " unless Directors Authorizes
the inmate to do so." The state of SC;
SCDC knows these Directors committed Perjury
thereby causing Petitioner life to be endangered.
Because they know of the prison conditions

Since the 1st time Petitioner was
Stabbed by inmates working on cellphones
for SCOR... They knew since Appendixes
D-2 and D4 that the cellphones were
A threat on the inmates on cellphones/tablets
were A threat to Petitioners safety. Yet
they committed Perjury denying the existence
of Any program while knowing the 24-3-980A
Law allowed them to Authorize these
inmates to possess telecommunication
devices. They were actually making people
believe theres A Real problem with inmates
and Gangs while they are ordering inmates
to do this. via 24-3-980A Law. Its ongoing
daily as we litigate. SCOR fails to sanction
Defendants for Perjury or have Directors Davis
on Stinking criminally charged for Perjury.

Which deprives Petitioner equal Protection of the Laws. Because Appendix D-3 verifies Petitioner requested Davis And Stirling to be sanctioned or changed... SCAC knows of this request so does District Court and U.S. Attorney Pam Bondi. SCAC violated Fourteenth Amendment equal Protection of Laws. See Appendix D-3 verification the cellphones are Authorized per judges At District Court saying he will not Sanction Davis And Stirling because Petitioner Failed to ask were they Using Telecommunication devices on the 24-3-980A Capt R. Johnson Act...

See Appendix F3 for evidence how The cellphones. Insurrection invaded And injured Petitioner's, ME ~~and~~.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

S.C Supreme Courts failure to Rescind A Prohibit At Appendix A is in violation of Amendment - 1

The Reason for granting this petition is due to S.C Supreme Courts ongoing violation of Petitioners Right to Petition for Redress At Appendix-A. Which conflicts with Amendment-1 that states "Congress shall pass no Law prohibiting Citizens Right to Petition for Redress.

S.C Supreme Court Justices Prohibit At Appendix-A has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of Judicial Proceedings as to call for this Courts Supervisory power Because These Justices decided a important Federal Question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court at Ex Parte Young 209 U.S. 123 that enjoins ongoing Federal Law violations.

SANCTIONS - Time Reduction:

S.C Supreme Court denied the SANCTIONS aka Time Reduction request At Appendix A. This sanction request was due to State of S.C General Assembly

For Directors to request Legislation For 24-3980A
Law to be enacted while knowing injury At
Appendix F3 worst Ignored. Thats like Authorizing
A drug thats Supposed to cure A disease while
Knowing its making the Cancer worsen. Because
Appendix F3 happening twice is like Cancer eating
IN Petitioners MIND. Betraying my Thoughts. Which
Endangers Society And ALL INVolved.

24-3-980-A states: " Its illegal For inmates At
SCAC to be in possession of Telecommunication
devices unless authorized to do so by directors."
And Directors committed Perjury. Covering injuries
like Appendix F1- F3 up. Judicial Insurrection
to be IN Petitioner spec, ignore INSurrection, lie to
Cover it up And continue to operate this opt IN. While
I asked to be released to stop operating the program.

CONCLUSION

The Prohibit At Appendix A shall be rescinded.
A time Reduction shall be Filed to remove Petitioner
From Justice (Black-opt) prison dangerous conditions.
The writ of Cert shall be granted to stop INSurrection.
Like Appendix F3

Respectfully Submitted,

Revered Father

5-15-2025