

IN THE APPEALS COURT OF GEORGIA  
STATE OF GEORGIA

CHARLES E. THOMPSON PLAINTIFF,

Civil Action No:

v.  
ROBERT REICHERT, et al.,  
DEFENDANTS.

12-CV-58359

RECEIVED IN OFFICE  
2015 MAR 20 PM 3:54  
COURT CLERK'S OFFICE

cc Request for Permission to Amend  
Plaintiff's 2-13-2015 Application for  
Interlocutory Review

Plaintiff in the above case comes forward and re-  
quest for permission to amend his application for inter-  
locutory review according to O.C.G.A. 9-17-15 (g). IN  
FOMAN V. DAVIS, 371 U.S. 182 (1962) held that  
leave to amend is generally freely given by any court.  
Id.

signed: Charles E. Thompson

Date: 3-19-2015

IN THE APPEALS COURT OF GEORGIA  
STATE OF GEORGIA

CHARLES E. THOMPSON, Plaintiff,

Civil Action No:

v.

17. CV-58359

Robert Reichert, et al,  
Defendants.

cc Amendment

Plaintiff in the above case comes forward and amends his application for Interlocutory Review dated 2-13-15 because the Clerk of Court applied the wrong rule to deny Plaintiff access to this court claiming his brief was presented for filing untimely under rule 30(c), and do show the following in support:

(1) This Clerk of Court applied the wrong rule to deny Plaintiff his right to self representation in this court which right is guaranteed under Art. I, Sec. 1, para VIII of the Georgia Constitution which right this Clerk have denied Plaintiff.

cc  
In This Court's Rule Book under IX. Application For Interlocutory Appeals' hold: rule (c) which rule this Clerk used to deny Plaintiff's brief for INS DISCRETIONARY APP

(2)  
situation which act is upon actions under the 1<sup>st</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and  
14<sup>th</sup> amendments to the U.S. Constitution, and Art. I, Sec. 1, paras  
I and II of the Georgia Constitution.

Rule 30(j) holds, no pleading will be accepted on an applica-  
tion for, interlocutory appeal . . . . id. which is clear-  
ly not applicable to the fact set in this case and this  
court will never set his clerk's 1-27-15, and its 2-6-15  
orders which cited this rule as authority for denying  
Plaintiff's Application for discretionary appeal where rule  
30(j) is not applicable to application for discretionary  
appeals. Rule 30(j) is for interlocutory appeals and not for  
Plaintiff's discretionary appeal. check records and see for  
yourself. And as such it is obvious that the court must re-  
verse this court's 1-27-15 and 2-6-15 orders wherein  
this clerk used rule 30(j) to deny Plaintiff's Brief for  
his discretionary appeal which is not the controlling  
rule for a discretionary appeal but conversely, it is  
controlling only for interlocutory appeals. check records  
and see for yourself. Rule 30(j) is not in play in this case  
which the clerk used to ~~deny~~ deny Plaintiff his right to peti-  
tion this over matter regardless of previous violation of  
the 1<sup>st</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> amendments to U.S. Const.

sign: Charles Thompson

date: 3-18-2015

- Certificate of Service -

This is to certify that I have served copies of this pleading and enclosed documents on the parties listed below;

Chambers, Higgins & Richardson,  
Katz & Griggs, LLP  
P.O. Box 18086

320 Arkwright Rd. Ste. 405  
Macon, GA. 31209-8086

This the 18<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2015,

signed: Chad E. Hampton

Rose

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA  
State of Georgia

CHARLES E. THOMPSON, Plaintiff,

Civil Action No:  
12-CV-58359

v.  
ROBERT REJCHER, et al,  
Defendants.

FILED IN OFFICE  
MAR 11 2015  
COURT CLERK  
CLERK COURT OF APPEALS OF GA

CC

Request For Permission To Amend Plaintiff's  
2-13-2015 Application For Interlocutory  
Review

Plaintiff in the above style comes for word and re-  
quest for permission to amend his Application  
for Interlocutory Review under O.C.G.A. 9-11-5(a)  
and in Forman v. Davis, 37 Me. 5, 178, 182 (1962) hold that  
leave to amend a complaint should be freely given by  
the court, id.

signed: Charles E. Thompson

Date: 3-8-15

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA  
State of Georgia

Charles E. Thompson Plaintiff, Civil Action No.  
v.  
Robert Reichert et al,  
Defendants.

12-CV-58359

(C  
AMENDMENT FOR PLAINTIFF'S 2/13/2015 APPLICATION FOR INTERLOCUTOR REVIEW)

WAS proven on the face of the records the clerk of the Appellate Court of Georgia defaulted on her duty which caused an uncontrollable ripple effect in the otherwise orderly proceedings of this court in its administration of justice because she refused to file my brief even though the briefing schedule had not been issued by this court now or at the time this clerk returned Plaintiff's brief claiming it as untimely which caused Plaintiff to have to re-submit his brief in this ~~best~~ mix of great hurry because this clerk held Plaintiff's brief to a higher standard than she would for a seasoned lawyer for filing

(2)

Pleadings wherein plaintiff is an indigent pro se litigant who does not have any training in law whatsoever who has been denied plaintiff his right to petition the government for a redress of grievances which right is ~~is~~ guaranteed under the 1st & 14th amendments to the U.S. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1 and II of GA. Const. which also amounts to a denial of ~~the~~ due process of law and equal protection under the law.

IN *EMORE V. McCAMMON*, 640 F. Supp. 905 (1986) held:  
... the right to file a lawsuit pro se is one of the most important rights under the constitution and laws of the U.S. In this instant case it is clear based on the history of this case that the court of Georgia is trying to deny plaintiff his most important rights under the constitution which is his right to file a lawsuit against the government in person in pro se or as a pro se litigant.

cc Evidentiary Historical Facts ))

I first submitted my lawsuit to the superior court below in October 2011, just before the 2 year statute period expired but that court held I had not stated a cause of action. But when I appealed that

(3)

Court's decision to this Court this Court held that I indeed had stated a cause of action and this Court reversed the Court's below decision. see THOMPSON v. Reicher et al, 378 Ga. App. 23, 733 S.E.2d 342 (2012)

Plaintiff was in prison when he first submitted this ~~suit~~ lawsuit to the Georgia Courts. And most of those phrase litigants in there that worked in the law library all had great problems with the clerk of court filing their pleadings so the judges of the courts could review their complaints. And as this Court knows here recently there was a big protest march outside the U.S. Supreme Court in Washington, D.C. against the clerks of courts. Full records and see for yourself. It was on the news. Now I know what that protest was all about. This court clerk have almost stopped plaintiff's case from going forward with his case because she or he have illegally denied plaintiff his right to file his brief where his brief was perfectly in time for filing.

When this Court first reversed the court decision and the case was ordered back to that superior court plaintiff had great hardships imposed on him by that court, for example: Plaintiff resubmitted his case back to that court November 2012 and the defendant's answered 2013 January. And ~~attorneys~~ plaintiff

(4)  
made motions and other pleadings. And eventually discovery was requested and the defendants complied. Now at that late stage of this instant case the judge name Brown ordered plaintiff to rewrite all of his pleadings to that court or else face dismissal of my case. I had to rewrite all my pleadings on file which consisted of well over 400 pages of rewrites because the judge said he could not decipher and comprehend what I was alleging even though I had asked him on a number of occasions to view all my allegations as a unit as are required by the court's case laws and I cited those case laws to the court in my pleadings, prior to him writing his Meq 1 9-1-2013 decision requiring plaintiff to rewrite all his pleadings. Nobody had any problems at all understanding plaintiff's pleadings but the judge. As pointed out supra and in plaintiff's other pleadings all parties answered my case without problems deciphering and understanding my pleadings. And the defendants complied with and answered all of plaintiff's discovery requests without a grain of a problem understanding plaintiff handwriting or understanding my requests. That was unusual for a judge to do that in the late stage of the proceedings because if he did not understand plaintiff's handwriting and consequently could not comprehend plaintiff's allegations he should've made that known well before after all parties had completed discovery. Right? Why would he wait until after

The pre-trial Conference to hold that he couldn't decipher or comprehend plaintiff's pleadings? That is an abuse of that judge's discretion because it was too late in the proceedings for him to write such an order and he did it without any prior precedents for him to base his decision on. Right? He made a rash decision which definitely slowed plaintiff down and stopped all proceedings for plaintiff lawsuit until about a year later after I had finished re-writing all my pleadings. Believe me, it was like torture going before that court below a second time. I mailed a complaint against the court below to the Judicial Qualifications Commission last year in Madison GA but I have not heard word from them as of yet. The records prove the activities of judge Brown is extremely unethical to say the least and I said more about him in my response against that 9-13 order.

And above and beyond that fact is that court's 10-30-14 decision which I am now trying to get this court to do its duty by reviewing it. That decision proves beyond doubt that the court below conspired against me because I am an indigent pro se litigant without any formal training in law. That 10-30-14 decision has absolutely no basis in law or fact and that is the reason why this court clerk refused to file plaintiff's brief because plaintiff have a good meritorious lawsuit against the government.

Now in 5 appeals court clerk is doing the same thing Judge Brown did below by trying to use a technicality to try to dismiss my case because without a brief I won't have a case.

(b)  
C) The illegal decision of This Court's Clerk

## Standards of Reviews

Wilson v. The State, 173 Ga. 275, 160 S.E. 319 (1931);

O.C.G.A. 15-1-3 - TO END.

The threshold inquiry here must be based on this Court's 1-9-2015 Order.

Attached to Plaintiff's Brief for Interlocutory Review labeled as Exhibit B is a copy of this Court's 1-9-2015 Order which reads: under section: Case Status - Application Granted: . . . . The Notice of Appeal must be filed with the trial court and not with the Court of Appeals of Georgia, see OCGA 5-6-37. Once the trial court clerk has received and filed the notice of appeal the trial court clerk will prepare a copy of the records and transcripts as designated by the notice of appeal and transmit them to this court. Once the Notice of Appeal is docketed in the Court of Appeals of Georgia, a docketing notice with the briefing schedule and other important information is mailed to counsel for the parties or directly to the parties, if the parties are representing themselves. You do not need to provide this court with a copy of the Notice of Appeal you file with the superior court, i.e. under court rules of that same

1-9-15 order it also read: (7)  
of appeals of Georgia has been enclosed for your re-  
view. I, AND I the Plaintiff, submitted Plaintiff's Brief  
to this court for filing within 13 calendar days from  
the issuance of this court's 1-9-15 order because  
Plaintiff submitted his Brief for filing on 1-22-2015  
but his clerk never stamped it as filed but  
contrarywise, she mailed it back to Plaintiff claim-  
ing falsely that Plaintiff's Brief was untimely where-  
in this court had not docketed this case nor had it  
mailed out the briefing schedule as it had he it  
would do in its 1-9-15 order; therefore Plaintiff's  
Brief was submitted to this court premature  
which is obvious according to the face of these  
records which are presently before this court. There  
are no possible way in law or fact that Plaintiff's  
Brief was submitted to this court for filing in an  
untimely manner.

Plaintiff did all that was required for him to do  
which was to follow this court order which was  
mailed to him from this court 1-9-15. What else can a  
prose litigant do or what else can a seasoned law-  
yer do except to follow this honorable court's orders.  
I could do no more ~~than~~ than follow this court or-  
ders as a prose litigant because I don't have a copy  
of this court's rules until 1-9-15 which is verified

(9)  
by that 1915 order wherein it was held that this court  
had finally mailed me a copy of its rules. But prior to  
that time plaintiff had only the court orders to follow  
and as a pro se litigant like most lawyers plaintiff  
got well accustomed to following the court orders.  
That was the only thing that plaintiff followed which  
was all plaintiff had to follow because prior to 1915  
plaintiff didn't have a copy of this court's rules. And be-  
sides these facts the Georgia Supreme Court have held  
in Wilson v. The State, 173 Ga. 275, 160 S. E. 319 (1931)  
that Ga. Code ANN. sec. 6090 declares that when an order  
is taken to hear a motion for new trial in valuation, the  
brief of the evidence must be presented for appro-  
val within the time fixed by the order or else the  
motion will be dismissed. This section refers to evi-  
dence introduced upon the trial of the merits of a  
case. ~~id.~~ Wilson v. The State, 160 S. E. at 329.  
Therefore, being as such plaintiff was correct in fol-  
lowing this court's 1915 order and had a right under  
the totality of these circumstances to rely only on  
this court's orders which is all that he had to follow  
throughout these proceedings commencing from Dec-  
ember 20th to ~~1915~~ 1915, which is when I finally received  
a copy of this court's rules. As a pro se litigant no com-  
petent court could expect no more from plaintiff  
than what he did during the time he submitted his  
brief to this court for filing. And the court held ~~that~~

(9)  
expressly that 600 of the code of this state that this section refers to evidence introduced upon the trial of the merits of a case. It does not refer to such evidence as the parties may desire to introduce to sustain or rebut grounds of a motion for new trial which attack the competency of jurors to try the case; certainly not to evidence introduced by the state for the purpose of rebutting such grounds in motion for new trial. WILBEN v. THE STATE, 160 S.E. 319, which proves that this section 600 of the code of this state exclusively applies to this instant case because it refers to evidence introduced upon the trial of the merits of this instant which is plaintiff's brief of evidence without which he will have no merits of the case to introduce to the court in plaintiff's behalf and as such plaintiff's brief refers to evidence introduced upon the merits of his case. And therefore, plaintiff was bound by the court orders which is common practice of the court in administering justice. Therefore plaintiff's brief of evidence must be presented for approval within the time fixed by this court's 1-9-2015 order which he did do prematurely on 1-27-2015 within 13 calendar days from the 1-9-15 order, which plaintiff was in obedience to that 1-9-15 order and by being so I didn't think it would hurt anything if I filed my brief before the briefing schedule was notified by the clerk as held in the 1-9-15 order, so since I had been working on case

for 5 years inside and outside the prison, I was well prepared to submit my BRIEF to the COURT because all who is concerned must concede that there is great Merits in my behalf throughout the entire case. Which fact must be considered by the COURT in determining whether or not to allow me an opportunity to file Plaintiff's BRIEF.

Plaintiff submitted his BRIEF prior to the docketing of this instant case. In Horton et al. v. Western Contracting Corporation et al., 136 App. 613, 613, 149 S.E.2d 542, 543 (1966) hold: At the time the Notice of Appeal was received by the clerk of this COURT the Rule of this COURT was mandatory that the clerk give appellant notice of the docketing of the case. Since such notice was mandatory the case was not docketed until the notice was mailed by the clerk. In this case the clerk gave no notice, by mailing it or otherwise, so at the time of appellant's request for additional time the case had not been docketed because no notice was given. Under such circumstances the time for filing the brief and enumerations of errors had not expired and this COURT had jurisdiction of the case and jurisdiction and power to correct its unfortunate omission and provide time for the filing of the brief and enumeration of errors. Id. see Horton, 149 S.E.2d at 543. And in this instant case the face of his Record and Exhibits, the 1-9-15 order shows that when

(1)  
Plaintiff presented his Brief for filing this instant case had not been docketed and as such ~~the~~  
Plaintiff had time to ~~prepare~~ file his brief, I see  
Herb, supra. Contrary to this court's 2-6-15 and 2-7-  
15 orders wherein ~~that~~ this court clerk that Plaintiff's  
Brief was untimely, which cuts amounts to gross  
miscarriage of justice, especially so because plain-  
tiff is proceeding pro se and this clerk because of  
that fact is on the run against Plaintiff.

Exhibit B attached to Plaintiff's Application for In-  
terlocutory Review also held in the section headed as:  
Case Status - pending, hold. The above reference appeal  
is in your name before this court. The appeal was dock-  
eted in the \_\_\_\_\_ term and a decision must be re-  
ndered by the court by the end of \_\_\_\_\_ term  
which ends on \_\_\_\_\_, which is documented  
proof that at the time Plaintiff submitted his brief  
where there was no notification of the mandatory  
requirement that the litigants must be notified by the  
Clerk of the docketing of Plaintiff's case for damages  
on 1-15 up to this date 3-4-2015, this clerk of court  
is obviously still have not made of Plaintiff any kind  
of notification of docketing by mail or otherwise. ~~Check~~  
Check Exhibit B cited supra and see for your self  
the section cited supra, which verifies that in this case  
was ~~not~~ not docketed on 1-15 because  
that section which verifies that the case had been  
docketed is left blank and the sections are  
left blank. Read Exhibit B, which is this court's 1-9-

is order and see for yourself what's on the face of this  
Record. Although the instant case was not docketed at  
the time this Court made its 1-27-15 and 2-6-15 holding  
that Plaintiff's case was untimely. The clerk still held  
that Plaintiff's Brief was untimely which clearly violates  
case laws ~~of~~ laid down supra in Horton v. West-  
ern Contracting Corporation, 149 S. E.2d at 543, 136 App  
613, at 613; which is a miscarriage of justice under any laws or  
facts in the law of the United States of Americans held in  
Horton v. Western Contracting Corporation, as long as the  
Clerk had not docketed Plaintiff's claim for damages  
on appeal, under such circumstances the time for filing  
the Brief and enumeration of errors had not expired  
and this Court had jurisdiction of the case. See Horton,  
149 S. E.2d at 543. And that case is 100% applicable to  
this instant case because it is 100% identical to this  
instant case and therefore Horton, controls this inst-  
ant case beyond any doubt. It is a civil case for damages,  
a lawsuit, in this Court just like Plaintiff's lawsuit is  
now pending before this Court. And as such this Court  
must order this Clerk to file Plaintiff's Brief accord-  
ing to the principles of Horton. And this is why we and  
we definitely need interlocutory appellate review as are  
required by OCGA 5-6-35(b). And Plaintiff already have a copy  
of his enumerations of errors on file and must be pointed out  
the fact that Horton is a decision reached by this Court  
which case law this Clerk obviously erred because he  
did not apply Horton to this instant case and as such it is  
clear that he misapplied the law proven by Horton. EX-

(13)  
Inbit B proves that this case was not docketed when Plaintiff submitted his Brief for filing and therefore this clerk acted under all circumstances by holding Plaintiff's Brief as untimely.

In this instant case it was error for this clerk to rely on such a rule in light of the facts in this case. Horton, 149 S. E.2d at 543 hold: IN VIEW OF THE RULE EXISTING AT THE TIME, UPON WHICH THE BAR HAD THE RIGHT TO RELY, IT WOULD BE A TRAVESTY ON JUSTICE TO SAY THAT THIS COURT WAS POWERLESS TO PREVENT HARM FROM BEING DONE BY AN OMISSION OF THE COURT ITSELF. Id. 149 S. E.2d at 543. And that is what the clerk of court did in this instant case. They erroneously relied on Court Rules 300 and 310 which is not applicable to the facts of this instant case, because it would be a travesty on justice to say that this Court was powerless to prevent harm from being done by the Court itself which was the fact that this Court wrote 2 erroneous orders on 1-2-15 and on 2-6-15 claiming that Plaintiff's Brief was untimely and cite of rule 300 and 310 as their authority, and as such those rules are not applicable to this situation because in light of this Court's order's mainly it's 1-9-15 order, which Plaintiff was bound by because prior to that time Plaintiff did not have a copy of this Court's rules. And it would be a travesty on justice to say that this Court was powerless to prevent harm from being done by error of the

Court itself. It was this court that issued the 1-27-15 and 2-6-15 orders which held that Plaintiff's Brief was untimely and that is an error made by this court itself and this court have inherent authority to correct itself by vacating those 2 erroneous court orders and then proceeding on as otherwise provided by HAW and order this clerk to file Plaintiff's Brief for review in this court because without my brief I can't defend myself against my accusers which would be a travesty on justice because Plaintiff as a pro indigent defendant was bound by this court's 1-9-2015 order which ordered Plaintiff to wait on the briefing schedule which also provided by that 1-9-2015 order that this case was not docketed but yet Plaintiff during that time 13 days later after this court 1-9-15 order on 1-22-2015 Plaintiff submitted his Brief to this court for filing during the above described conditions but this clerk held that Plaintiff's Brief was untimely where this case was not even docketed in this court. The record on appeal had not been sent up by the trial court to this court nor had this court issued Plaintiff a briefing schedule like it had promised in its 1-9-15 order but at some 13 calendar days after these affairs this clerk held Plaintiff Brief as untimely which is clearly a miscarriage

(15)  
of justice under all circumstances of this one parti-  
cular case. One thing is certain is the fact that inter-  
locutory review must be had in this case, right?  
Moreover, the clerk did not follow this court's  
procedures that it set out in its case law concerning  
prose litigant's filings of premature pleadings  
which she was bound by, by this court's case law  
in footnote 1 of Mitchell v. Cancer Care Joint Inc., 685  
S.E.2d 923, n.1 (2009) wherein this court held that if a  
prose litigant submit papers or pleadings, etc. for fil-  
ing premature the clerk was order to hold the plead-  
ing in abeyance until time for filing that this clerk was  
ordered by this court to file the prose pleading on  
the first day that the period begins to run as plaintiff  
so duly briefed in his motion for interlocutory review  
said pleading. And all parties must concede that Plaintiff  
did not his Brief to this Honorable Court prematurely  
as Plaintiff have proven supra and in his motion for in-  
terlocutory review. This clerk erroneously returned  
Plaintiff's Brief holding of all things that Plaintiff's  
Brief was untimely which clearly amounts to a mis-  
carriage of justice, in light of this court's 7-9-15 or-  
der and the date Plaintiff submitted his Brief for fil-  
ing which was only 13 calendar days from this court's  
7-9-15 order.  
(DUE Diligence)

All parties and the Court must concede that Plaintiff acted and responded to this Court's 1-9-15 order with extraordinary diligence. Black's LAW DICTIONARY, 9th Ed., COPYRIGHT 2009 defines extraordinary diligence as: Extreme care that a person of unusual prudence exercises to secure rights or property. And the face of this Court's records clearly proves especially in light of Plaintiff's premature brief that Plaintiff used extreme caution in submitting his brief to this Court for filing on 1-22-15 just 13 calendar days from this Court's 1-9-15 order.

Black's LAW defines great diligence as the diligence that a very prudent person exercises in handling his or her ~~own~~ own property like that of issue and it defines necessary diligence as the diligence that a person is required to exercise to be legally protected. And Due diligence as: The diligence reasonably expected from, and ordinarily exercised by a person who seeks to satisfy a legal requirement to discharge an obligation, etc. And it is clear from the Court's records that Plaintiff did and went beyond what is required of an indigent pro se litigant, and he did not get his brief filed with the Court because as this Court knows, he have been now trying to get this case and brief filed for over 5 years. See Thompson v. Reichert, 733 F.2d 342 (2012). All circumstances of due diligence as defined by Black LAW's supra applies to Plaintiff's efforts

in getting his brief filed with this court which is proven by this Record before this court.

O.C.G.A. 15-1-3(4) hold: Every court has power to control in the furtherance of justice, the conduct of its officers and all other persons connected with a judicial proceeding before it, in every matter appertaining thereto, id. Therefore, according to law this court must order this clerk to file his brief because it is timely by law. And O.C.G.A. 15-1-3(7) hold: Every court

has power to correct its own proceedings before final judgment, id. And as pointed out supra, this court must correct this affair because it was the errors of this court in its 1-27-15 and 2-6-15 orders which held that plaintiff brief was untimely and as such the court can correct itself because it was the court itself which made these errors. IN EVANS V. STATE, 69 Ga. App. 175, 245 E.2d 86 (1943) hold: Inherent power of Courts should never be impaired or destroyed to such an extent that the court cannot exercise a power necessary to the court's proper functioning, id.

Therefore, according to this record before this court this court must order the clerk to file plaintiff brief in order to ~~ensure~~ ensure the proper functioning of the court in this instant case.

Discretion in regulating and controlling business of court is necessarily confided to judge, see SIMPKINS V. STATE, 149 Ga. App. 763, 256 S.E.2d 63 (1979). In this instant case this court greatly abused its discretion by issuing orders 1-27-15 and 2-6-15, because such actions are unjust, illegal and are forbidden by this court in BRADLEY V. PARRIS, 11 Ga. App. 167, 141

S.E. 2d 125 (1965); GROSSMAN V. Glass, 143 Ga. App. 464, 238 S.E. 2d  
 869 (1977). And it is incumbent upon the court to order Dis-  
 missal of a writ to be filed. It is fundamental that every court pos-  
 sesses inherent power to preserve and enforce order  
 and compel obedience to the court's judgments and or-  
 ders, to control the conduct of the court's officers and all  
 other persons connected with the judicial proceedings  
 before the court, and to inflict summary punishment for con-  
 tempt upon any person failing and refusing to obey any  
 lawful order. See JACKSON V. STATE, 225 Ga. 553, 170 S.E. 2d  
 281 (1969); FARMER V. HOTTEN, 146 Ga. App. 120, 245 S.E. 2d 457  
 (1976), overruled on other grounds, IN RE CRANE, 253 Ga. 667  
 324 S.E. 2d 443 (1985), cert. denied, 440 U.S. 958, 99 S.Ct. 1499,  
 59 L. Ed. 2d 771 (1979). And in this instant case this court's  
 clerk clearly violated this court's 1-9-15 order which  
 promised a writ's schedule along with the case status  
 report, and they could be held in contempt. This clerk  
 did not recognize this court's 1-9-15 order at all before  
 she made her decision by holding that Plaintiff's  
 writ was ungranted and as such the judge must order  
 the clerk to file Plaintiff's writ. Disobedience to  
 lawful court order is obstruction of justice. See GRIGGS V.  
 BRYANT, 239 Ga. 244, 236 S.E. 2d 599 (1977). Every court's  
 judges are charged with the ~~administration~~ admin-  
 istering justice and with maintaining the dignity and  
 authority of the court. See JOHNSON V. STATE, 177 Ga. 981, 171 S.  
 E. 699 (1933). This record reveals the act of this clerk was  
 unethical under the Georgia canon of ethics and as

This Court must validate of 4/10/10 to this clerk's 12715 and 2-6-15 orders and proceed on as otherwise provided by law by ordering this clerk to file Plaintiff's writ. The Court have the inherent power to adequately control, in furtherance of justice, officers, parties, jurors, witnesses, and others connected with a pending case see Cross v. Potts, 8 Ga. App. 463, ~~69~~ 69 S.E. 582 (1910).

In Miller serv. Inc. v. Miller, 77 Ga. App. 413, 485, E.2d 76 (1998) is a case where because of error by the clerk this Court was forced to recall this ~~clerk's~~ clerk's illegal act and held: "... When an execution was issued by the clerk contrary to the terms of the judgment and was paid by defendant in full and marked satisfied by the clerk. The Court had the power to have the clerk recall such an execution and order to refund the money paid to the clerk by the defendant. Miller serv. Inc. v. Miller, supra, 77 Ga. App. 413. So it is in this instant case the Court must validate those 12715 and 2-6-15 orders and order this clerk to file Plaintiff's writ.

Plaintiff have a right to self representation in this state guaranteed to him under the Georgia Constitution of 1983, Art. I, Sec. 1, para. XII; Nelson v. Georgian Manor Condominium Ass'n, 253 Ga. 440, 321 S.E.2d 330 (1984). This record can not assure this Court that Plaintiff's rights to self representation has not been abused that caused Plaintiff a great deal of irreparable harm because while he was fighting for his country in the US.

Marine Corp in the Republic of South Vietnam Plaintiff was afflicted with PTSD (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder) and he was ~~afflicted~~ afflicted with nap psychosis and other mental illnesses that have been documented and diagnosed by the Dept of Veterans Affairs Hospital.

In all cases before this Court all litigants are bound by the Court orders, prior to its final decision like in this instant case.

In every instant the litigant must follow the court orders in all cases in America or his case will get dismissed according to law and fact. In the Luke v. Luke, 158 Ga. 103, 123 S.E. 76, 719-20 (1924) the Supreme Court held: It will be noted that the language is the brief of evidence must be presented within the time fixed by order.

The order the court granted, giving the Plaintiff the final hearing of the Motion to prepare and perfect the Brief of evidence, was binding upon the parties.

And as the Court can see that Plaintiff in this instant case was bound by the court's 1-9-15 order which order concerned a future briefing schedule and the schedule and record do not concern which Plaintiff have yet to receive as of right now.

In Blackburn v. Alabama Midland Railway Co.



a brief to any court in Georgia for filing, which is undisputable because there are no case points that found that made any difference or distinctions between a brief for discretionary review ~~and~~ or any other kind of brief to this court. There are no distinctions between briefs in law and fact any kind of briefs controlled by the above mentioned authorities. In law it treats all briefs the same ~~as~~. The same laws controls the filings of all briefs here in the courts of Georgia. There are no precedents that makes a distinction concerning briefs. Any brief and all briefs ~~are~~ here in Georgia is controlled by court orders. Although ~~it~~ may be in another state it may be different but I have not found a precedent for the court concerning this subject but one thing is for sure it this instant case plain that was bound by this court's 5-9-15 order.

In Mayor and Council of Brunswick v. Davenport, 131 Ga. 465, 62 S.E. 584, 585-586 (1908) had: But where both enter into an express written agreement that the brief of evidence may be filed by the movant at the final hearing and this agreement has been approved by the court, and the movant Repinson has consented, has gone to the trouble and expense of preparing the brief, and presents it to the court pursuant to the terms of such order, the respondent will be estopped from insisting on filing as to the essence of the film of the brief of evidence, etc. IN all cases concerning briefs, it is the court order that

is preeminent and superior to all other authorities un-  
til the court order is reversed on appeal. Therefore, Plaintiff  
was right by relying on his court's orders when he  
submitted his brief for filing according to this court's  
1975 orders and this court must order this court clerk  
to file Plaintiff's brief according to laws cited supra,  
throughout this amendment because justice so requires.

Plaintiff's plea for this court to hold ~~his~~ his  
case to less stringent standards than those of  
seasoned lawyers

Plaintiff is being penalized by this clerk for exercising  
his constitutional right which is a violation of the 14th  
and 15th amendments to the US Const. It is obviously seen  
in all these records before this court that ~~Plaintiff's~~  
Plaintiff's civil rights have been violated because  
these records show that this clerk and the clerk be-  
low have greatly racially discriminated against Plaintiff  
because his skin is Black and because he is poor  
who is unskilled in law and those clerks of courts have  
took advantage of Plaintiff because he is Black and  
poor. First, Plaintiff asks the court to punish his standing as  
aunt instead of isolated incidents. It is illegal for the  
court to punish Plaintiff for exercising his constitutional  
rights. See Sherard v. Cullen, 481 F.2d 946 (1973). This court  
clerk is trying to use a trick to win the case for the de-  
fendants government which is an unfair action and racial  
discrimination against Plaintiff because his skin is Black,  
which is clearly seen by the records of this court right now

I've tried to get help but have been unsuccessful. This court clerk have taken advantage of plaintiff because he is black and poor. There is no doubt about that. The clerk had to see their own T-915 order but they did not recognize their own order. They was better to try to protect the member and other government officials which is extremely obvious according to these records. In Jenkins v. McKerthen 395 U.S. 411 (1959), the U.S. Supreme Court held: "These pleadings are to be considered without regard to technicality." Pleadings are not to be held to the same high standards of perfection as lawyers. In the District of Columbia Court of Appeals where that private individuals have a constitutional right to access to the courts, see Bourjaily v. Smith 430 U.S. 817 (1977), that is, the right to sue and defend in the courts, see Chambers v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R. 207 U.S. 142 (1907); Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 510 (1971) held: "Pleadings must be liberally construed. Further, all rules and regulations relating to pleading, practice, and procedure shall be liberally construed so as to administer justice." O.C.G.A. 15-10-44; also see Hampson v. Long 201 Ga. App. 480 (1981), 415 S.E.2d 322. But this clerk used and abused court rules because I am black to try to cause plaintiff harm and this clerk have caused me great irreparable harm and the court must order the clerk to give plaintiff what.

A Conclusion

I pray to Jefferson the great Jesus Christ for this court to order this clerk to the member to do not those obvious errors that this clerk made show above.

51311; Rev. Charles Thompson Date: 3-8-2015

Exhibit A

COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA  
DOCUMENT RETURN NOTICE FOR APPLICATIONS

February 6, 2015

To: Mr. Charles E. Thompson, 1254 Third Street, Macon, Georgia 31201  
Docket Number: A15D0166 Style: Charles E. Thompson v. Robert Reichert, et al.

Your document(s) is (are) being returned for the following reason(s).

1.  Your Application was not accompanied by the statutory filing fee, \$300.00 civil; \$80.00 criminal, or a sufficient pauper's affidavit. OCGA§5-6-4 and Rule 5 Please be advised that your pauper's affidavit should be notarized by a notary public.
2.  Portions of the record included were not tabbed and indexed. Rules 30 (e) and 31 (c).
3.  A stamped "filed" copy of the trial court's order to be appealed was not attached to your Application. Rules 30 (b) and 31 (e)
4.  A stamped "filed" copy of the Certificate of Immediate Review was not attached to your Interlocutory Application. Rule 30(b)
5.  Your document(s) was (were) not signed by counsel (No signatures with expressed permission are permitted). Rule 1 (a)
6.  There were an insufficient number of copies of your document. Rule 6
7.  No Certificate of Service accompanied your document(s). Rule 6 You should provide a copy of your filing to the District Attorney and include his/her name and address on your Certificate of Service.
8.  Your Certificate of Service did not include the complete name and /or mailing address of each opposing counsel and pro se party. Rule 1(a) and 6
9.  Your document exceeds page limits. Rules 24(f) , 30(e) and 31(c)
10.  Your request for court action must be submitted in motion form. Rule 41 (a)
11.  No extension of time for filing an interlocutory application will be granted . Rule 30 (g) . No extension of time will be granted for filing a discretionary application unless the motion for extension is filed on or before the due date of the discretionary application.
12.  The type font was smaller than 10 characters per inch; type was not double-spaced or/and type was on both sides of the paper. Rules 1(c), 24(b), 37(a) and 41(b).
13.  Your motions were submitted in an improper form (joint, compound, or alternative motions in one document). Rule 41 (b)
14.  Margins were too small or paper size was incorrect. Rules 1(c), 24(c), 30(e), 31(c) and 41(b).
15.  **We cannot process your documents because they were submitted for filing more than 30 days after the date of the order granting, denying or dismissing the application or the order granting, denying or dismissing the Motion for Reconsideration. Rules 30(j) and 31(j).**
16.  **Other:**

A15D0166. Charles Thompson v. Robert Reichert, et al. was granted on December 15, 2014.

For Additional information, please go to the Court's website at: [www.gaappeals.us](http://www.gaappeals.us)

Exhibit B



**Court of Appeals of Georgia**

January 9, 2015

TO: Mr. Charles E. Thompson, 1254 Third Street, Macon, Georgia 31201

RE: A15D0166. Charles E. Thompson v. Robert Reichert, et al.

**CHECK RETURN**

- Your check number \_\_\_\_\_ in the amount of \_\_\_\_\_ written on the account of your firm for the filing fee in \_\_\_\_\_ is enclosed. Please be advised that this Court is returning your check since the filing fee was already paid by \_\_\_\_\_

**CASE STATUS - APPLICATION GRANTED**

- Discretionary Application, A15D0166, was granted by this Court on December 15, 2014.

The Notice of Appeal must be filed with the trial court and not with the Court of Appeals of Georgia. See OCGA §5-6-37. Once the trial court clerk has received and filed the Notice of Appeal, the trial court clerk will prepare a copy of the record and transcripts as designated by the Notice of Appeal and transmit them to this Court. Once the Notice of Appeal is docketed in the Court of Appeals of Georgia, a Docketing Notice with the Briefing Schedule and other important information is mailed to counsel for the parties or directly to the parties, if the parties are representing themselves. You do not need to provide this Court with a copy of the Notice of Appeal you filed with the superior court.

**COURT RULES**

- A copy of the Rules of the Court of Appeals of Georgia has been enclosed for your review.

**CASE STATUS - PENDING**

- The above referenced appeal is in your name before this Court. The appeal was docketed in the \_\_\_\_\_ Term and a decision must be rendered by the Court by the end of the \_\_\_\_\_ Term which ends on \_\_\_\_\_

**APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO APPEAL A PROBATION REVOCATION**

- To appeal a probation revocation, you will need to file a Discretionary Application with this Court. Rule 31 of the Rules of the Court of Appeals of Georgia describes a Discretionary Application and the items you would need to include with your application.

A Discretionary Application must be filed within 30 days of the stamped filed date on the order that you are appealing and the application must be accompanied by a proper Certificate of Service and a pauper's affidavit or the \$80.00 filing fee. You must also comply with all the other applicable rules of Court regarding filing with the Court of Appeals of Georgia.

Enclosed, please find a copy of the Rules of the Court of Appeals for your review.

**COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA  
DOCUMENT RETURN NOTICE FOR APPLICATIONS**

January 27, 2015

To: Mr. Charles E. Thompson, 1254 Third Street, Macon, Georgia 31201

Docket Number: Style: Charles E. Thompson v. Robert Reichert, et al.

Your document(s) is (are) being returned for the following reason(s).

1.  Your Application was not accompanied by the statutory filing fee, \$300.00 civil; \$80.00 criminal, or a sufficient pauper's affidavit. OCGA§5-6-4 and Rule 5 Please be advised that your pauper's affidavit should be notarized by a notary public.
2.  Portions of the record included were not tabbed and indexed. Rules 30 (e) and 31 (c).
3.  A stamped "filed" copy of the trial court's order to be appealed was not attached to your Application. Rules 30 (b) and 31 (e)
4.  A stamped "filed" copy of the Certificate of Immediate Review was not attached to your Interlocutory Application. Rule 30(b)
5.  Your document(s) was (were) not signed by counsel (No signatures with expressed permission are permitted). Rule 1 (a)
6.  There were an insufficient number of copies of your document. Rule 6
7.  No Certificate of Service accompanied your document(s). Rule 6 You should provide a copy of your filing to the District Attorney and include his/her name and address on your Certificate of Service.
8.  Your Certificate of Service did not include the complete name and /or mailing address of each opposing counsel and pro se party. Rule 1(a) and 6
9.  Your document exceeds page limits. Rules 24(f) , 30(e) and 31(c)
10.  Your request for court action must be submitted in motion form. Rule 41 (a)
11.  No extension of time for filing an interlocutory application will be granted . Rule 30 (g) . No extension of time will be granted for filing a discretionary application unless the motion for extension is filed on or before the due date of the discretionary application.
12.  The type font was smaller than 10 characters per inch; type was not double-spaced or/and type was on both sides of the paper. Rules 1(c), 24(b), 37(a) and 41(b).
13.  Your motions were submitted in an improper form (joint, compound, or alternative motions in one document). Rule 41 (b)
14.  Margins were too small or paper size was incorrect. Rules 1(c), 24(c), 30(e), 31(c) and 41(b).
15.  **Your document was submitted for filing more than 30 days after the date of the order granting, denying or dismissing the application or the order granting, denying or dismissing the Motion for Reconsideration. Rules 30(j) and 31(j).**
16.  **Other:**

---

For Additional information, please go to the Court's website at: [www.gaappeals.us](http://www.gaappeals.us)

Certificate of Service -

This is to certify that I have served copies of the enclosed documents on the parties listed below;

Chambers, Higdon Richardson,  
Katz & Griggs LLP  
P.O. Box 14086  
320 PARKWAY 19TH FL. 3E. 405  
MARIETTA, GA. 30067-9086

This is the 8th day of MARCH, 2015

signed: Paul C. Thompson  
prose