1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)	IN CIRCUIT COURT
2	COUNTY OF LAWRENCE)	FOURTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
3		
4 5 6 7 8 9	DAVID SCHIED, Plaintiff, vs. DEPT OF SOCIAL SERVICES, Defendant.))))))) Motions Hearing) CIV. 22-116)))
10 11 12 13	Circuit Cour Deadwood, Sc	
14 15	APPEARANCES:	
16 17 18	P.O. Box	Law Firm, Prof. LLC
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

(WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were duly 1 2 had:) 3 This is the date and time set for a motions hearing in the matter of David Schied versus Department of Social Services. Today, appearing on behalf of the Department of Social 6 Services, having made his notice of appearance, is Mr. Bob Morris. 8 Mr. Schied has been provided an opportunity to appear 9 before this Court either in person or, upon request, 10 through telephonic appearance. Mr. Schied has not appeared 11 12 today. 13 The Court specifically address those motions that 14 would be considered regarding and relating to the appeal. 15 Number one, specifically, the request for an extension to file the appellate brief as is required under statute. 16 I'm going to allow Mr. Morris to make his record with 17 regard to the three motions that are pending, as well as 18 the failure to appear by Mr. Schied and the resulting 19 impact of Mr. Schied's nonappearance today. 20 21 Mr. Morris, you may proceed. 22 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. Mr. Schied has made a number of filings with the 23 Lawrence County Clerk of Courts, and for -- I mean, even if 24 you call it voluminous, that's probably an understatement, 25

but ultimately, the clerk of courts, on July 29, 2022, sent Mr. Schied a letter outlining what he needed to do to bring this matter before the Court.

In particular, paragraph 5 of that letter from Ms. Latuseck, she indicated, "The Court has authorized a hearing to be scheduled specifically and only for the purpose of hearing your motion for waiver of costs and motion to extend your time for filing a brief in the matter. You will be provided that date through a notice of hearing that will be mailed to you. You will need to appear in person at that hearing unless otherwise allowed by the Court to appear telephonically. You may make your request once you receive the notice of hearing." That's July 29th.

On September 19, 2022, the Court, on its own motion, signed a notice of hearing, and that notice of hearing was set on those particular issues for today's date, October 7, 2022, at 9:30 a.m. MST at the Lawrence County Courthouse.

According to the certificate of service, that was served upon Mr. David Schied, sent certified mail, as certified by the clerk, on the 19th day of September, 2022. And I do not believe -- well, I don't know if he received it.

THE COURT: Well, the Court will inquire with the Clerk of Courts right now as to the delivery and acceptance of that

piece of mail. 1 Ms. Latuseck, did he receive or do you have 2 verification that he received the notice of hearing? 3 MS. LATUSECK: Yes, Your Honor. I received the certified mail return on September 23rd. According to the post office stamp, he received it on September 21st. 6 THE COURT: Ms. Latuseck, I'm going to have you raise your right hand. 8 CAROL LATUSECK, 9 called as a witness, being first duly sworn, testified as 10 follows: 11 THE COURT: Ms. Latuseck, since the time of the delivery of 12 that notice of hearing, had, at any time, you received in 13 14 the clerk's office, or any of your deputies received any 15 form of notice or have you cleared any piece of mail that has come from Mr. Schied to the Court that would request an 16 appearance telephonically or any other accommodations under 17 the Americans with Disabilities Act? 18 19 MS. LATUSECK: No, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. 21 Mr. Morris, you may continue with your -- let's 22 address the motions, themselves, as if he were here. Ι would like to hear what your position is. 23 Sure. Thank you, Your Honor. 24 MR. MORRIS: Mr. Schied filed a notice of appeal on June 10, 2022, 25

from an Office of Administrative Hearings' order -- final order of dismissal dated May 12, 2022. So he filed the -- the case was dismissed on May 12, 2022.

Pursuant to the Chapter 1-26, he then filed his notice of appeal.

On June 30, 2022, I made a notice of appearance as a special assistant attorney general on behalf of the South Dakota Department of Social Services.

In 1-26, there is the appellate rules, administrative rules for appellate procedure under 1-26.

First of all, under 1-26-31.4, the appellant is to file a statement of issues within ten days. None has been filed.

Pursuant to 1-26-32.2, request for a transcript must be made within ten days. None was requested.

Subsequently, subsequent to the notice of appeal, the South Dakota Department of Social Services, from the hearing examiner of the record, there was a record — the record was transmitted on June 27, 2022. Pursuant to 1-26-33, the record must be transmitted to the clerk of courts in the county where the appeal is venued within 30 days, so that was complied with.

Once the record of -- is transmitted, then SDCL 1-26-33.2 sets forth the briefing schedule. The appellant's brief is due 30 days after the record is

transmitted. Just using a true 30 day, since the record was filed on June 27, 2022, July 27, 2022, would have been the date his brief was due.

Now, I know that there were pending — there are pending motions. One was a motion for waiver of fees. He has not paid the fees, so part of, you know, my argument would be he's not here today to address the waiver of fees, so the Court — the question is: Are you going to waive the fees and give the Court jurisdiction, or is the fact that he hasn't paid any fees do away the jurisdiction of the Court? I really don't know the answer to that.

Second thing is a motion to extend time for filing and the motion to — what his — the reasons for his request.

And I would point out to the Court, the irony here is that Mr. Schied asked for an extension of time to file the brief, which would normally do — be due July 27th, and I would point out to the Court, and the record would reflect this if you went through all the pages, but since July 29th, Mr. Schied has filed over 800 pages of documents in this case that, for lack of a better term, do not appear to be relevant to any of the issues because we really don't know what the issue is — that he believes are because he hasn't filed a statement of issues, but it's just a lot of repetitive information that is just clogging the clerk of court's docket in this case.

But even though he's had the ability and time to file over 800 pages of documents since July 29th, he has not filed an appellant brief, and so he has — I think the Court attempted to make accommodations for him, gave him the opportunity for a telephonic hearing. He received notice, but he's not here today, and so ultimately, naturally I would defer to the Court as the ultimate decision-maker of this, but although Mr. Schied is pro se, the pro se rules of liberally construing it go to the — say the materials, the arguments, and those sorts of things, pro se people, pro se litigants still have to follow the rules of civil procedure just like an attorney does.

And so there -- in my view, there's been a total lack of following the rules of civil procedure. The Court has given Mr. Schied every opportunity to do so, and I believe the only appropriate remedy under the circumstances is a motion to dismiss for, essentially, failing to follow through with his pending motions by his lack of appearance.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Morris.

This Court has considered this matter. When it first arose, there was an issue regarding how the clerk shall receive these documents, and the normal process is they should be filed through Odyssey, which is required for prose litigants. We do accept filings through regular mail,

and the Court was working with the clerks when they were trying to inform Mr. Schied of that.

Mr. Schied continued to request that his filings be made through e-mail, which is not a good medium to receive because of the digital process that may result in bad timings, if you will, for the receipt of those e-mails.

They may get caught up in the clerk's e-mail chain or inside of their e-mail box and not be seen for sometime.

So e-mail is not a medium or a means by which people or prose litigants normally are allowed to file their documents.

Nonetheless, having received information that he is a quadriplegic, at least based on prima facie on his representation of that, this Court then made accommodations with the clerk of courts to receive these documents, and for filing purposes, to receive them in e-mail.

As Mr. Morris correctly stated, they were voluminous.

Many documents were very difficult to tab and to place a proper heading in Odyssey. The clerks did a sufficient job, and in some aspects they did an incredible job of trying to isolate what exactly the filing was. And credit is due to the clerks attempting that.

Initially, this was being produced through our deputy clerk, who then brought in the actual Clerk of Courts, and Ms. Latuseck began taking over the entirety of the filings.

This Court, upon review of the requests that are made

inside of the preliminary filings made by Mr. Schied, did everything it could to accommodate Mr. Schied believing that he was quadriplegic.

Someone must have been filing these documents or was assisting him in filing these if he's truly quadriplegic, or he has an ability to use a computer with only his mouth and to get this paperwork into the mail system. And the Court is not sure if he had any assistance, but nonetheless, we allowed as many accommodations as possible.

And so Mr. Schied, after numerous filings, was given an opportunity by this Court, who did it sua sponte, calling this matter on for a motions hearing because Mr. Schied, even though acting pro se, had failed to comply with the basic procedures in requesting motions to be heard; namely, he had not noticed it for hearing for the Court to hear.

And under normal circumstances, I would wait until the attorney notices that motion for hearing, and that could lapse over the time frame by which that individual be requesting particular relief. And in this instance, Mr. Schied, acting as his own attorney, and still giving him deference, had failed to file a notice of hearing, and so the Court, making sure that I was trying to accommodate him as best as I could, and in some ways going over and beyond what the Court should do, filed a sua sponte notice of

hearing, which the Court believes that would have been the responsibility of Mr. Schied.

2.1

In so doing, I accommodated his claim that he was disabled by ensuring that Mr. Schied had an ability to appear in person, and if not in person, granting him access to the record by allowing him to appear telephonically if he made the request for a telephonic appearance.

No request was made, and so he has not appeared today and is not able to champion his claims.

Even with that, the Court allowed Mr. Morris to make his record regarding those motions that were pending. Specifically the motion for the waiver of filing fees and also the motion for extension to file the brief.

Mr. Morris is correct. The Court has not previously ruled on those, and Mr. Schied has not made an attempt to get this before the Court on either one of these motions. The Court called on for this hearing, and he has failed to appear today.

The Court has a limit upon which it may intercede on behalf of a pro se litigant, and the Court has met that wall. I cannot, in good faith and under the laws of our state, intercede when a clear violation of the law, specific to failing to make an appearance and champion your case, has been made. And here Mr. Schied cannot speak to the request for his waiver of filing fees; and so,

therefore, the Court will deny the request for filing fees, thereby lacking jurisdiction.

But even if at the appellate level the Supreme Court believes that I should have accommodated him, I will take into consideration the request for an extension brief.

Mr. Schied, again, has failed to appear and champion his request to have this.

The Court notes that Mr. Morris made a good record regarding the time length -- correction, the length of time that has transpired since this appeal began in June. He has had every opportunity to prepare his brief, and he has failed to do so.

But in the interim, he was able to file 800-plus pages of documents all looking as if he was trying to make some form of argument with regard to the jurisdiction of this Court, regarding appeal to the Americans with Disabilities Act, and several other arguments, but at no time has he made a direct response to the appeal inside the brief that is required under statute.

The Court finds that he has failed to, number one, file his brief in the time that is required under statute; and, number two, even with the Court accommodating this hearing sua sponte, he has failed to appear and champion the request for the extension.

There are several other motions that were found in the

first filing. Mr. Schied wanted the Court to take motion for immediate consideration. This Court was concerned that at the time it received this notice of appeal and the underlying e-mail chain that arose from that between the clerk of courts and Mr. Schied, and actually accommodated an immediate consideration of this matter, although the Court does not understand Mr. Schied's desire for the relief under a motion for immediate consideration, it should be noted the Court took this matter seriously and began moving quickly, as best as it could, to accommodate Mr. Schied.

The second motion was for declaratory statements, and these, I think, related to the clerk of court's authority to conduct its proceedings. These motions, both one and two, are denied because Mr. Schied has failed to appear today.

There was a motion for service upon one constitutes service upon many. This is the first time this Court has run into this form of motion, and, again, by failing to appear today and to champion this motion, the Court must dismiss this for lack of prosecution.

There was a fourth request, or put in the alternative to the service upon one motion, a motion for publication or posting in combination with e-mail constitutes third-party medium for verified service. This Court has considered

this as well, and not fully understanding what this motion was requesting, because it mentioned "e-mail," essentially the Court allowed Mr. Schied to present his filings through e-mail, and that's all the Court can glean from what that motion was, but nonetheless, even though the Court had accommodated him, the motion was and is still pending, has not been properly championed, he has failed to appear, and as a result, I will deny the motion for publication for lack of prosecution.

There were several issues raised inside of his initial pleadings, including the Bates stamps that are provided by Odyssey, upon which Bates stamps normally occur at the bottom of the document. Mr. Schied had made issue with that, claiming that the bottom page he currently had writing or text that the Bates stamp covered.

Number one, text normally does not appear at the very, very bottom of the page, and there usually is a one-inch margin in most of the filings. At least at the appellate level there are 1-1/2-by-1-by-1-by-1 margins that are required.

This circuit court doesn't have the same stringent requirements, but at a minimum, the Court's not going to adjust the Odyssey system and ask IT to change the position of the Bates stamps to a different location on the page, because any other location, based on the Court's review,

would have also covered up text because it appears that, on the majority of these filings, the Bates stamp would not be convenience in any one or any respect for consistency purposes.

There was also an issue with regard to the Bates stamps only appearing on the first page of the filed document. Again, this is something that is done by Odyssey, and the Court is not going to request that IT modify every — or the entire program so that it would place the Bates stamps at the discretion or at the request of a litigant.

We're off the record.

(An off-the-record discussion was held.)

THE COURT: With regard to the Bates stamp issue, also, my understanding is, is that in this particular case, the clerk of courts, in accommodating these numerous and voluminous e-mail submissions, had to take these documents and to Bates stamp them directly with their own, and so in that instance, there at least was some argument that it could have been done elsewhere, but it did not impact the subject matter of the filing; so, therefore, the Court finds that this is a nonissue.

There was a request by Mr. Schied that the clerk submit the rules of the Court to him. This Court is governed by the rules of civil procedure. Those are

readily available on the Internet. Mr. Schied has ample opportunity to review all of the rules of the Court, and the clerk is not responsible for submitting an entire section of the code to Mr. Schied.

But in this essence, technically the State of South Dakota has provided those rules in the entire code to Mr. Schied because they submit the same on and freely accessible on the Internet.

The fifth motion on his initial pleading was a motion for extension of time, and this Court has already dealt with that.

And finally, number six, there was a motion for forma pauperis, f-o-r-m-a p-a-u-p-e-r-i-s, waiver of costs, fees, and transcript fees. This Court has already addressed those.

MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, may I, I guess, make an observation --

THE COURT: You may.

MR. MORRIS: -- to you?

I agree with you that it's difficult to really label the filings, but I would refer the Court to the August 9, 2022, filing that we have labeled as "Formal Objection and Leave for Interlocutory Appeal," and I believe the Court — at first it was difficult for me to really understand what his disability was. The Court referenced him as a

quadriplegic, but Mr. Schied, throughout the documentation, referenced himself as a, quote, "totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee," unquote.

And in this particular filing on August 9, 2022, on page 22, he embedded a photograph of himself in a wheelchair, and, of course, the file -- the copy I have is in black and white, but the -- I did see a color copy somewhere, and he is -- his lower extremities are amputated at the knees, and then it does appear that in his hands perhaps some of the digits have been -- have been amputated. So he is not a quadriplegic. He is, according to his definition or representation, a totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee.

And I have no reason to believe that anyone other than Mr. Schied is the — is the originating author and creator of these documents. Perhaps he has someone to help him, but whether it be him or someone helping him, he has filed over 800 pages of documents since July 29th, so it does appear he's fully capable of setting forth and briefing the particular issues. So I never understood the necessity for the extension of time brief or the brief.

So I just wanted to address the record on that particular issue.

THE COURT: And I appreciate that, Mr. Morris. It does appear that, based on the picture that we've received, he

1	is at least has his upper arms and his lower arms.
2	There is at least one digit the Court can see, maybe two in
3	his picture. He does have thighs, but it does appear that
4	maybe the at the knee, those are amputated. So I
5	appreciate that.
6	I guess the main point is that the Court draws the
7	attention that it has done everything it can within reason
8	to accommodate Mr. Schied, and he has still failed to make
9	his appearance today.
10	As a result, the Court is going to dismiss this action
11	for failure to prosecute for the reasons that have been
12	previously set forth on the record.
13	Mr. Morris, if you'd prepare an order highlighting the
14	reasons why the dismissal has been made, incorporating this
15	Court's ruling, and also provide notice of appeal to Mr.
16	Schied if one exists, I'd appreciate it.
17	MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: We'll be in recess.
19	(Hearing recessed at 10:08 a.m.)
20	
21	9:30am began 10:08 recess = 38 minutes
22	mber must been been telleine
23	They must have been talking "off the record" for a very
24	long time!
25	

1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.)
2) SS. CERTIFICATE COUNTY OF LAWRENCE)
3	
4	I, LYNNEL R. BRUEMMER, an Official Court Reporter and
5	Notary Public in the State of South Dakota, Fourth Judicial
6	Circuit, do hereby certify that I reported in machine
7	shorthand the proceedings in the above-entitled matter and
8	that Pages 1 through 17, inclusive, are a true and correct
9	copy, to the best of my ability, of my stenotype notes of
10	said proceedings had before the HONORABLE ERIC J. STRAWN,
11	Circuit Court Judge.
12	Dated at Deadwood, South Dakota, this 7th day of
13	October, 2022.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	<u>/s/ Lynnel R. Bruemmer</u> LYNNEL R. BRUEMMER
19	My Commission Expires: 8/12/25
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	