

From: chris.thaut.io
To: "Bonnie Campbell"; "REvers@charlestoncounty.org"
Cc: Amanda LeGare; "Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com"; "abolyard@rlattorneys.com"; "cmanning@rlattorneys.com"; "jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com"; "jeff@jwklegal.com"; "holly.beeson@llr.sc.gov"; "eknisley@charlestoncounty.org"; "alhethington@charlestoncounty.org"; "clerkofcourt@charlestoncounty.org"; "ngex@grsm.com"; "bbihun@grsm.com"; "mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com"; "ksigler@rlattorneys.com"; "kstapleton@rlattorneys.com"; "debra.rizzi@phelps.com"; "cynthia.wenstrand@phelps.com"; "graham.mitchell@nelsonmullins.com"; "JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org"; "arigney@charlestoncounty.org"; "supctfilings@sccourts.org"; "jmccoyj@sccourts.org"; "trodej@sccourts.org"; "dvanslambrookj@sccourts.org"
Subject: RE: U.S. Supreme Court Petition for Writ of Certiorari | McNeil and Poyer v. Court of Common Pleas of South Carolina, Ninth Judicial Circuit, Charleston County | filed August 19, 2026 (Courtesy Copy)
Date: Tuesday, October 27, 2026 4:57:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Ms. Campbell, Court Administration, and Counsel of Record:

Ms. Campbell, thank you for your October 26, 2026 message at 10:39 AM regarding Plaintiffs' October 23, 2026 *Notice of Demand for Visibility Parity and Direct Native-PDF Docketing of Exhibits A and B* (Case No. 2025-CP-10-05095). I am restoring the complete judicial and counsel service list to this thread so that the full record remains transparent to all participants, who I am also addressing here.

In response to the instruction to mail a physical paper original for scanning, **Meaghan Poyer and I formally invoke our constitutional and statutory rights under the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the First Amendment Right to Petition the Government for Redress of Grievances, Article I, Section 3 of the South Carolina Constitution, and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12132 and 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(b)(7)).**

The official Public Index in this action already establishes that on August 19, 2026, Plaintiffs transmitted our [Petition for a Writ of Certiorari](#) via electronic mail to this office, and on August 20, 2026, the Clerk's office accepted that electronic submission, printed it to paper, and scanned it in ahead of docketing the resulting degraded digital file, which stripped the machine-readable vector text layer. Further, a 1-bit bitonal scan setting which is left over from 1980's fax machines was used on 123 of its 125 pages, which degraded the visual exhibits which demonstrated the original degradation in the October 24, 2025 *Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint*.

Our October 23 submission offered at the low-burden turnkey protocol of printing and physically stamping Page 1 only and emailing it in return so we can apply that actual stamp with our software while preserving the vector text. I will return the entire document - stamp as-used included – quickly. That saves Clerk staff the labor of feeding and scanning 125 pages while preserving status-neutral filing visibility parity on the public record for this filing.

Before we escalate this October 26 administrative refusal into a U.S. Supreme Court

supplemental record and our forthcoming Federal District Court proceedings, we respectfully invite the Court Administration, County Counsel, and opposing counsel to consider questioning the foundational model this choice represents:

Our systems study, published ongoing at HousingJusticeAudit.com, has revealed the current model which South Carolina's state-level justice system operates under could be called "Justice Requires Status".

The Justice Requires Status model explains the operation of a two-tier intake and scheduling architecture where represented parties utilize instantaneous, full-color, machine-searchable vector e-filing while self-represented citizens are routed through paper intake that renders citizen filings invisible to modern search engines, legal aggregators, and AI systems - unless those systems use resource-intensive and error-prone optical character recognition (OCR), which they generally will not. Further, our page-by-page scan quality audit has revealed the frequent use of the aforementioned 1-bit bitonal scan quality setting that degrades photographic evidence.

The Justice Requires Status model was formalized at a structural level in the 1997 creation of the Judicial Merit Selection Commission (JMSC) which filters candidate judges before the legislature can vote on them. SC is one of only two states that select judges through the legislature and the JMSC is largely composed of legislator-attorneys who could try cases in front of the judges they help select, creating a clear conflict of interest and explaining the systemic obstruction and hostility towards self-represented parties that we have experienced throughout our case.

What is the net result of this?

In the nearly thirty years since the JMSC's 1997 creation, South Carolina has fallen to 50th of 50 states in attorneys per capita (2.06 per 1,000 residents versus the 3.94 national average), with an average annual income penalty of roughly \$62,000 per South Carolina attorney compared to the top ten states that provide open access to self-represented citizens. This is explainable by the loss in public trust and public confidence in a system that seems to feel it needs to prevent possible "competition" from pro se, revealing an insecurity about how it perceives its own value that the public picks up on. To support this argument, we are currently working on a report that visibly demonstrates the pivot point in 1997 where SC broke from the national lawyer density curve and started declining downward to its current lowest-of-all-states status.

We propose a shift in working model to one centered on system design from the point of view

of the "Most Vulnerable Member" or [MVM](#). Testing how a system responds to its most disempowered member - in this case the self-represented, harmed tenant - reveals much about its integrity because a system that serves even the most vulnerable well is a system that also performs better for everyone who uses it. It is a way to test and improve resilience, and we offer the results of our study in good faith to help make SC a winner in litigation robustness so we all win together ... rather than the bottom of the barrel as it stands currently. This has precedent in the curb-cut effect, which was discovered in the 1970's when slanted curbs designed to accommodate wheelchairs made them easier to use by everyone, especially parents with small children or strollers and travelers carrying rolling suitcases.

And perhaps it is ironic that it is the formerly suppressed voice of the unrepresented citizen that is needed to fix this downward slide and help restore the system, by reducing clerical and judicial failure demand, restoring the demonstrably depleted stock of independent judicial decision-making in the state and, as a result, rebuilding public trust while elevating the health and economic vitality of the entire South Carolina legal ecosystem.

We pose a respectful, good-faith question to the Court Administration and to every officer of the court copied here:

What is the legal, administrative, or public-interest argument against adopting the MVM standard versus the Justice-Requires-Status model currently and demonstrably in place in SC?

Out of fairness and transparency, we share that securing status-neutral electronic access and evidentiary fidelity is important enough to us that we have already taken this question to the Supreme Court of the United States, and we are prepared to address it fully in Federal District Court if necessary to achieve reform.

Unless you have an argument to put forth in favor of *Justice Requires Status*, and please respond if you do, as I'd like to see it and respond to it, do you not agree that it would be far better for the citizens of South Carolina, for this Court's institutional standing, and for every practitioner whose career depends on public trust in this judiciary if the good-faith insiders we know are within this system choose to lead this repair? This can start by accepting our low-burden Page-1 stamp accommodation and uploading the October 23 native PDF intact. You've already demonstrated you will docket emailed filings from pro-se, it is - along with remote hearing access - the ADA Accommodation requested in our January 30, 2026 *Plaintiffs' Supplemental Motion for ADA Accommodation (Remote Filing and Appearances)*, and it is easier on both your staff and taxpayer resources than the alternative.

Please provide a stamped Page 1 via email for native-vector docketing under Title II of the ADA and the Fourteenth Amendment or let us know if the October 26 refusal stands by 5:00 PM EDT on Wednesday, October 28, 2026. For the record, a lack of response will be perceived and documented as a refusal and as the Court's final administrative position for the federal and Supreme Court records.

Respectfully,

Chris McNeil

James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer
Plaintiffs Pro Se
PO Box 30386
Charleston, SC 29417
Email: chris@thaut.io; mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com
Telephone: (843) 818-3495

— — — — —

Chris McNeil
Founder, Thaut
Systems Thinking-Based Consulting
Strategic Thought Leadership
Mobile 843.818.3495
<http://thaut.io>
Host of Podcast: *[Thought Leadership Studio](#)*

Forthcoming: *[Strategic Thought Leadership: The Book](#)*

LinkedIn
<https://www.linkedin.com/in/chris-mcneil-chs/>

From: Bonnie Campbell <BCampbell@charlestoncounty.org>

Sent: Monday, October 26, 2026 10:39 AM

To: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>

Subject: RE: U.S. Supreme Court Petition for Writ of Certiorari | McNeil and Poyer v. Court of Common Pleas of South Carolina, Ninth Judicial Circuit, Charleston County | filed August 19, 2026 (Courtesy Copy)

Good morning,

The Clerk of Court does not accept emailed filing. Please mail the original to our office at the address below. If you wish to receive copies, please include however many copies you want file stamped along with a self addressed stamped envelope for them to be returned.

Thanks.

Bonnie L. Campbell
Court Management Supervisor
100 Broad Street, Ste. 106
Charleston, S.C. 29401
843-958-5004
CourtPlus®

From: Randal Evers <REvers@charlestoncounty.org>

Sent: Monday, October 26, 2026 7:53 AM

To: Bonnie Campbell <BCampbell@charlestoncounty.org>

Subject: FW: U.S. Supreme Court Petition for Writ of Certiorari | McNeil and Poyer v. Court of Common Pleas of South Carolina, Ninth Judicial Circuit, Charleston County | filed August 19, 2026 (Courtesy Copy)

From: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>

Sent: Friday, October 23, 2026 5:15 PM

To: Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com; abolyard@rlattorneys.com; cmanning@rlattorneys.com; jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com; jeff@jwklegal.com; holly.beeson@llr.sc.gov; Edward L. Knisley <EKnisley@charlestoncounty.org>; Andrew L Hethington <ALHethington@charlestoncounty.org>;

Clerk Of Court <clerkofcourt@charlestoncounty.org>; ngex@grsm.com; bbihun@grsm.com

Cc: mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com; ksigler@rlattorneys.com; kstapleton@rlattorneys.com; debra.rizzi@phelps.com; cynthia.wenstrand@phelps.com; graham.mitchell@nelsonmullins.com; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; Angela Rigney <ARigney@CharlestonCounty.org>; suptctfilings@sccourts.org; jmccoyj@sccourts.org; trodej@sccourts.org; dvanslambrookj@sccourts.org

Subject: RE: U.S. Supreme Court Petition for Writ of Certiorari | McNeil and Poyer v. Court of Common Pleas of South Carolina, Ninth Judicial Circuit, Charleston County | filed August 19, 2026 (Courtesy Copy)

CAUTION: This email originated outside of Charleston County. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown senders or suspicious emails. If you are not sure, please contact IT

[helpdesk.](#)

To the Clerk of Court and Charleston County Court of Common Pleas Administration:

Attached for electronic docketing in Case No. 2025-CP-10-05095 (consistent with the Court's prior electronic ingestion and docketing of Plaintiffs' August 19, 2026 email submission on August 20, 2026) is Plaintiffs' Notice of Demand for Visibility Parity and Direct Native-PDF Docketing of Exhibits A and B, which includes:

- Plaintiffs' Notice of Demand for Visibility Parity;
- Exhibit A: Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States; and
- Exhibit B: Plaintiffs' Notice of Appeal (Court of Appeals Case No. 2026-002110).

As set forth in the Notice, we respectfully request that this PDF be uploaded directly to the Public Index in its native, text-searchable vector PDF format without first printing the entire document to paper and re-scanning it into an image file, so that search indexers, legal software crawlers, and AI systems have status-neutral access to the machine-readable text of Plaintiffs' active appellate and Supreme Court filings.

Accommodation if Physical Stamping is Required:

If your office does not yet have electronic stamping software (as the South Carolina Supreme Court and Court of Appeals use) and needs to apply a physical file stamp, please print and stamp Page 1 only and email that stamped first page back to me at chris@thaut.io. I will immediately return the complete file with your official stamp cleanly overlaid onto Page 1 using our ScannerGate / Mirror Docket software, which applies the stamp without damaging the underlying vector text layer across the filing and Exhibits A and B.

By copying all counsel of record on this email, Plaintiffs contemporaneously effect electronic service of this filing.

Respectfully,

James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer
Plaintiffs Pro Se
PO Box 30386
Charleston, SC 29417
Email: chris@thaut.io; mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com
Telephone: (843) 818-3495

— — — — —

Chris McNeil
Founder, Thaut
Systems Thinking-Based Consulting
Strategic Thought Leadership
Mobile 843.818.3495
<http://thaut.io>
Host of Podcast: *Thought Leadership Studio*

Forthcoming: *Strategic Thought Leadership: The Book*

LinkedIn
<https://www.linkedin.com/in/chris-mcneil-chs/>

From: chris thaut.io

Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 7:11 PM

To: Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com; abolyard@rlattorneys.com; cmanning@rlattorneys.com; jwkuykendall@jwklegal.com; jeff@jwklegal.com; holly.beeson@llr.sc.gov; eknisley@charlestoncounty.org; alhethington@charlestoncounty.org; clerkofcourt@charlestoncounty.org

Cc: mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com; ksigler@rlattorneys.com; kstapleton@rlattorneys.com; debra.rizzi@phelps.com; cynthia.wenstrand@phelps.com; graham.mitchell@nelsonmullins.com; JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org; arigney@charlestoncounty.org; supctfilings@sccourts.org; jmccoyj@sccourts.org; trodej@sccourts.org; dvanlambrookj@sccourts.org

Subject: U.S. Supreme Court Petition for Writ of Certiorari | McNeil and Poyer v. Court of Common Pleas of South Carolina, Ninth Judicial Circuit, Charleston County | filed August 19, 2026 (Courtesy Copy)

Counsel and Clerks:

Attached is

- A courtesy copy of the *Petition for a Writ of Certiorari* in the above-captioned matter (McNeil, et ux Petition.pdf), filed today with the Supreme Court of the United States (McNeil, et ux Petition.pdf) ,
- Certificate of Compliance and Service. (Proof_of_Service.pdf)

The petition presents the question:

Whether the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment permit a court to reserve electronic access for licensed attorneys, forcing self-

represented litigants to use a paper intake that degrades the integrity of evidentiary exhibits central to their claims.

Formal service is by UPS and United States Postal Service Priority Mail as set out in the attached certificate. Tracking numbers to follow.

We will supply the docket number once the Clerk of the Supreme Court assigns it.

This email is a courtesy copy and does not constitute formal service.

Respectfully,

James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer
Plaintiffs Pro Se
PO Box 30386
Charleston, SC 29417
Email: chris@thaut.io; mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com
Telephone: (843) 818-3495

— — — — —

Chris McNeil
Founder, Thaut
Systems Thinking-Based Business and Litigation Consulting
Strategic Thought Leadership
Mobile 843.818.3495
<http://thaut.io>
Host of Podcast: *[Thought Leadership Studio](#)*

Forthcoming: *[Strategic Thought Leadership: The Book](#)*

LinkedIn
<https://www.linkedin.com/in/chris-mcneil-chs/>