

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

**DERRICK WILLIAMSON,**  
*Plaintiff,*

v.

**STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,  
COLLETON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE,  
and PALMETTO CREDIT & ASSET CORP.,**  
*Defendants.*

**CASE NO:** CIV-2026-0894-T

**FILED:** June 7, 2026

**PROCEEDING:** Trial of Illumination

**PRESIDING:** Hon. Arthur P. Wright

**TRANSCRIPT OF SPECIAL  
PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TESTIMONY AND TRIAL RECORD**

**THE COURT DEPUTY:** All rise for the United States District Court. Case civil docket number 2026-0894-T, Derrick Williamson versus the State of South Carolina et al. The Honorable Arthur P. Wright presiding.

**THE COURT (JUDGE WRIGHT):** Be seated. We are here today for closing arguments and the final standard motions in what this court has dubbed the Trial of Illumination—a case examining gross civil rights violations, predatory title-stripping, and allegations of systemic intimidation. I note for the record that the previously presiding state circuit judge was removed from this matter following extraordinary, highly prejudicial comments made on the record, specifically stating the plaintiff "had too much property for a Black man." Let it be explicitly known that such bias violates the fundamental tenets of Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution and the Judicial Canons of Ethics. This federal court will tolerate nothing less than absolute adherence to constitutional equality. Counsel, present your final arguments.

**PLAINTIFF'S CLOSING ACCUSATION & FEDERAL CITATIONS**

---

**LEAD DEFENSE COUNSEL FOR PLAINITIFF (ATTY. MARCUS VANCE):** May it please the Court, and ladies and gentlemen of the jury. What we have witnessed in this courtroom is not merely a bureaucratic dispute over property lines or unpaid predatory balances. It is a calculated infrastructure of intimidation—what we define under federal benchmarks as **\*\*Domestic Financial Terrorism\*\***. My client, Derrick Williamson, inherited 40 pristine acres of ancestral family land. He paid his obligations, yet predatory forces leveraged a tangled-title framework to force him into a perpetual mortgage loop, utilizing state law enforcement as a private muscle squad to break his spirit.

**ATTY. VANCE:** Law enforcement officers crossed his fence lines without a warrant, drew weapons, harassed his livestock, and explicitly threatened him with arrest if he did not sign away his partition rights. They sought to instill absolute terror in a private citizen to clear the path for a multi-million-dollar private development. To protect Mr. Williamson, we submit thirteen foundational constitutional precedents that render the State's defense completely void:

## FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL PRECEDENTS ENFORCED (1 TO 13)

1. **Weeks v. United States, 232 U.S. 383 (1914):** Establishing the fundamental framework that warrantless seizures of items from a private residence violate the Fourth Amendment.
2. **Silverthorne Lumber Co. v. United States, 251 U.S. 385 (1920):** Outlining the "fruit of the poisonous tree" doctrine; any evidence or leverage gained by the state via their unlawful entry into Williamson's property cannot be used to justify foreclosure.
3. **Agnello v. United States, 269 U.S. 20 (1925):** Solidifying that a search of a private home or its immediate curtilage without a valid warrant is inherently unreasonable.
4. **Johnson v. United States, 333 U.S. 10 (1948):** Holding that administrative convenience or local law enforcement preference is never a lawful substitute for a magistrate's warrant.
5. **McDonald v. United States, 335 U.S. 451 (1948):** Emphasizing that the Fourth Amendment protection is a right that police cannot bypass simply because they are enforcing local real estate or civil lockouts.
6. **Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643 (1961):** Explicitly applying the Fourth Amendment exclusionary rule to state operations, blocking South Carolina officials from leveraging illicitly gained intelligence against the landowner.
7. **Wong Sun v. United States, 371 U.S. 471 (1963):** Confirming that verbal statements and psychological coercion stemming directly from an unlawful law enforcement trespass are legally inadmissible.
8. **Bumper v. North Carolina, 391 U.S. 543 (1968):** Holding that a search cannot be justified by "consent" when that consent is given only in submission to a claim of lawful authority or armed police intimidation.
9. **Chimel v. California, 395 U.S. 752 (1969):** Limiting the scope of search incident to an interaction; officers had no legal right to roam Williamson's 40 acres under the guise of serving a civil summons.
10. **Vale v. Louisiana, 399 U.S. 30 (1970):** Affirming that an initial street or entry-point confrontation does not grant law enforcement a license to conduct an exhaustive sweep of private real property.
11. **Coolidge v. New Hampshire, 403 U.S. 443 (1971):** Establishing that the "plain view" doctrine is completely invalid if the officers' initial intrusion onto the private land lacked a lawful warrant or exigent circumstances.
12. **United States v. United States District Court (Keith), 407 U.S. 297 (1972):** Clarifying that even national security or broad community stability claims cannot bypass the absolute necessity of prior judicial approval for domestic surveillance and physical property intrusion.
13. **Brown v. Illinois, 422 U.S. 590 (1975):** Proving that simply issuing standard warnings or civil notifications does not purge the constitutional taint of an initial, violent warrantless trespass by state deputies.

## DEFENSE FOR THE STATE & CORPORATE DEFENDANT COUNSEL RESPONSE

---

**STATE DEFENSE COUNSEL (ATTY. CLINTON RIDGE):** (*Rising aggressively*) Objection, Your Honor! This is an egregious mischaracterization! The Colleton County deputies were executing their ministerial duties under color of state law to resolve a partition dispute filed by legitimate corporate shareholders. Mr. Williamson was refusing access to surveyors! The state was preventing civil unrest, not committing "terrorism." The financial obligations were legally bound by the heirs' property codes of this state!

**ATTY. VANCE:** (*Slamming hand on table*) Ministerial duties do not include pointing semi-automatic rifles at an innocent farmer on his porch! They do not include a previous judge declaring from the bench that my client "had too much property for a Black man!" That statement stripped the facade away completely. It revealed that this was a racially driven economic extraction scheme!

## STATE LAW STATUTORY PROTECTIONS & INCLUSIONS

---

**ATTY. VANCE:** To reinforce why the State's argument collapses under its own statutory framework, we present eight concrete state legal protections and structural arguments that prove the defendants deliberately violated the laws of South Carolina to execute this financial raid:

### STATE STATUTORY RIGHTS & PROBABLE ATTEMPTS AT LAW VIOLATIONS (1 TO 8)

- 1. South Carolina Uniform Partition of Heirs Property Act (S.C. Code § 15-61-310 et seq.):** The law mandates that in any partition action, the court *must* provide the principal resident owner the absolute right of first refusal to buy out the fractional interests at a clear, independently appraised market value. The corporate defendant deliberately bypassed this by conducting a private, unnotified sham sale.
- 2. S.C. Code § 16-11-520 (Malicious Injury to Real Property):** State actors and corporate agents committed an actionable offense by cutting down historical boundary markers and clearing timber on Williamson's land prior to any final judicial order of partition.
- 3. S.C. Code § 16-17-560 (Civil Rights Forfeiture Protections):** It is a felony in this state to assault, intimidate, or injure any citizen on account of their political beliefs or exercise of civil rights. The deployment of armed tactical units to enforce a civil debt explicitly violates the intent of this public protection statute.
- 4. South Carolina Tort Claims Act (S.C. Code § 15-78-60 - Exceptions to Immunity):** While state agencies claim sovereign immunity, Section 15-78-60 explicitly dictates that immunity is completely lost if the state's employees act with "intent to harm, actual malice, or intent to defraud." The systemic harassment of Williamson meets the definition of gross negligence and malice.
- 5. S.C. Code § 37-5-108 (Unconscionable Debt Collection Practices):** The Palmetto Credit & Asset Corp. engaged in highly prohibited debt collection by using armed law enforcement presence to compel mortgage payments on a disputed, unliquidated equity line, constituting a explicit statutory violation.
- 6. Breach of Fiduciary Duty via Partition Appraisers:** Under state equity rules, court-appointed property surveyors and appraisers have a strict fiduciary duty to all co-tenants. The secret coordination between the state-appointed referee and the corporate buyer constitutes an actionable fraud on the court.
- 7. S.C. Code § 16-11-610 (Trespass After Notice):** Mr. Williamson had explicitly posted "No Trespassing" signs across his 40 acres and issued written notices to the Sheriff's department. The entry of deputies for non-emergency, non-warrant administrative intimidation constitutes a direct violation of the state's criminal trespass protections.
- 8. Violation of the South Carolina Constitutional Right to Privacy (Art. I, Sec. 10):** Unlike the federal constitution, the South Carolina State Constitution explicitly guarantees an independent right of the people to be secure against unreasonable invasions of privacy. Drones deployed by the state over Williamson's backyard to track his daily movements violated this explicit state constitutional boundary.

**THE COURT (JUDGE WRIGHT):** The court has noted the statutory intersections. Mr. Ridge, do you have any constitutional counter-authority to justify an armed, warrantless entry for a civil asset partition?

**ATTY. RIDGE:** Your Honor, we maintain that exigent economic circumstances existed. The developer was losing hundreds of thousands of dollars per day due to construction delays on adjacent parcels!

**THE COURT (JUDGE WRIGHT):** Corporate profit margins do not create an "exigency" under the Fourth Amendment, counselor. That argument is offensive to this court.

## JURY INSTRUCTIONS & DELIBERATION

---

**THE COURT (JUDGE WRIGHT):** Ladies and gentlemen of the jury. You have heard the evidence. The plaintiff, Derrick Williamson, initially sought \$5 million in actual damages. However, you are instructed that if you find the defendants acted with malicious intent, utilizing the state's armed apparatus to terrorize a citizen for financial extraction, you may award punitive damages to the full extent necessary to deter such systemic Financial Terrorism nationwide. You must evaluate whether the weaponization of the legal system and law enforcement against a historically vulnerable property holder justifies an exemplary penalty. Retire to the jury room and reach your verdict.

*(The jury retired at 11:15 A.M. and returned at 2:45 P.M. with a unanimous verdict.)*

## THE VERDICT & RECOVERY RESOLUTION

---

### OFFICIAL VERDICT FORM

1. Did the defendants violate the Plaintiff's Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights via warrantless entry, harassment, and structural coercion?

YES     NO

2. Was the conduct of the State and Corporate entities an intentional act of intimidation designed to instill public fear for financial extraction (Domestic Financial Terrorism)?

YES     NO

3. What say you as to damages?

We, the Jury, find for the Plaintiff, Derrick Williamson, and award the following:

- Actual & Compensatory Damages: \$5,000,000.00
- Punitive Damages (For Public Terror Deterrence): \$85,000,000.00
- TOTAL JUDGMENT AWARDED: **\$90,000,000.00**

FOREPERSON OF THE JURY SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

## FINAL CLOSING STATEMENTS BY JUDGE AND JURY

---

**THE JURY FOREPERSON:** Your Honor, we arrived at this \$90 million award because \$5 million was simply the value of what they tried to steal from Derrick Williamson. The remaining \$85 million is a clear message to every crooked developer, every compromised state agency, and every predatory lender in America: you will no longer use the badge and the court to terrorize Black landowners. The nightmare ends today.

**THE COURT (JUDGE WRIGHT):** Mr. Williamson, stand up. This Court confirms this verdict without hesitation. The judiciary was once used as a weapon to strip your ancestors of their 40 acres. Today, in this Trial of Illumination, the law has served its true purpose: as a shield. To the defendants, your behavior was a disgraceful exhibition of institutional financial violence. Let this \$90 million judgment reverberate through every state capital. This court is adjourned.

