

STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

FOR COMMISSION USE ONLY:

CASE NUMBER

C 2021-024

COMPLAINT FORM

COMPLAINANT: CCEG Jeremy Clark

RESPONDENT: Wanda Stringfellow

ADDRESS: [Redacted]

ADDRESS: [Redacted]

TELEPHONE NUMBER: [Redacted]

TELEPHONE NUMBER: [Redacted]

TITLE: Chairperson

TITLE: Mayor

Set forth in detail specific facts upon which you based your complaint against above-named respondent (only detailed, clear factual allegations will be considered. If additional space is needed, attach supplemental sheets).

On 22 March 2021 Mayor Wanda Stringfellow, Chester, SC said she recused herself from an issue involving the underbid issue of two vehicles the city owns, but then stated that she would participate in the discussion and went ahead, not really recusing herself. Attached is a newspaper article in support of this issue and the agenda from the meeting. There should also be a city zoom meeting recording of that city council meeting showing exactly what happened. The recusal I've been told is because the bidder is her son Jayden Stringfellow. I'm sure you are aware that due to that conflict of interest she should not have taken part in any discussion or used any influence on the subject, and that it would have been preferable for her to turn the meeting over to the Mayor pro tem and even exit the room, but instead she blatantly disregarded the very nature of what a recusal is. See supplemental sheets attached.

All investigations, inquiries, hearings, and accompanying documents must remain confidential unless respondent waives the right to confidentiality. If there is a finding of probable cause, the following documents become public record: the complaint, the response (if any) by respondent, and the notice of hearing. If a hearing is to be held, the final order and all exhibits become public record. If no hearing is held following a finding of probable cause, the final disposition of the matter becomes public record. The willful release of confidential information is a misdemeanor, and any person releasing such confidential information, upon conviction, must be fined not more than one thousand dollars (\$1,000) or imprisoned not more than one year. Section 8-13-320(10)(g).

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF Chester

Personally appeared before me Jeremy L. Clark who, first being duly sworn, says that he/she has read and knows the contents of the above complaint and that the allegations contained therein, are true and correct to the best of his/her own knowledge, except for those matters therein based upon information and belief, and as to those he/she believes them to be true.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this
1st day of April, 2021

[Redacted Signature]

[Redacted Signature]
Complainant Signature

Notary Public for South Carolina Elizabeth B. Avery
My Commission expires 9/24/24
York County SC

SEC-7 (Revised 8/2019)

REPLY TO: 201 Executive Center Drive, Suite 150, Columbia, South Carolina 29210 (803)253-4192
FAXED COPIES WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

C102form

STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

2021 APR -5 PM 1:33

RECEIVED



Chester City Council Virtual Meeting Agenda

March 22, 2021, 6:30 pm

VIRTUAL LINK: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83177660947>

To join the meeting, click on the link above
or dial by telephone 1-301-715-8592

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. PRAYER
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- IV. CITIZENS FORUM
- V. PETITIONER
 1. Dr. Scott Allen, Volunteer, Donate Life SC, and Sharing Hope SC
- VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 22, 2021
- VII. EXECUTIVE SESSION
 1. Contractual Matter: Convergent Non-Profit Solutions, Mr. Rick Kiernan
 2. Contractual Matter: Enterprise – Police Vehicles
 3. Personnel Matter: Police Department
- VIII. DEPARTMENT REPORTS
 1. Administrative
 - a. The American Rescue Plan Act of 2021
 - b. Chester County Historical Society – Placement of 10 pounder Gun and Carriage
 - c. Approval of 2021-2022 Budget Calendar
 - d. Affected Homes in Joe Collins Drainage Project – SC Rural Infrastructure Authority Grant Update
 - e. Awarding of Bid - RFP 2021-002 Dodge Ram Vehicle (Fire Department)
 - f. Awarding of Bid – RFP 2021-003 Ford Crown Victoria Vehicle (Fire Department)
 - g. 2014 CPST Project Updates
 2. Finance
 3. Fire
 - a. Introduction of New Firefighters
 4. Human Resources
 5. Police Department
 - a. Introduction of New Police Officers
 - b. Recognition – Police Academy Graduate
 6. Public Works
 7. Parks and Recreation

The NEWS & REPORTER

Discussion of vehicle sale may have violated state code

By Travis Jenkins

Tuesday, March 30, 2021 at 7:45 pm (Updated: March 30, 7:55 pm)

Chester City Council discussed selling a pair of fire department vehicles last week and one participant in the conversation may have run afoul of state law in the process.

In her monthly report to the council, Chester City Administrator Stephanie Jackson mentioned that bidding was recently closed on the sale of a Dodge Ram and Ford Crown Victoria, both of which have aged out of usefulness to the fire department. The minimum bids set by the city were \$3,500 for the Ram and \$2,000 for the Crown Victoria. Only one bid was received for each, both submitted by Jaden Stringfellow (whose mother, Wanda, is mayor), but each was well below what the city requested.

Jackson told the council she needed a decision on whether to accept the lower-than-requested bids, to negotiate with the bidder on a sum closer to what the city wanted or to rebid the vehicles entirely.

City Attorney Latonya Dilligard Edwards said she had not researched the matter thoroughly because of time constraints, but said the council was within its rights to take any of the three options Jackson mentioned. She did note that she would not advise the city to enter negotiations with the bidder on a price, since "their bid was their bid."

"We could spin our wheels on this all night. This information was in our packet," said Mayor Wanda Stringfellow. She also noted it was 9:10 p.m. at that point and that she'd hoped the meeting would be over and she would be at home by that time.

"You just need to act on what is in the packet. It's in council's hands," she said.

At that point, Fire Chief James Jackson joined the virtual meeting. He recently put the two vehicles out front of the fire department with "for sale" signs on them, which he said had attracted more interest. Chief Jackson suggested perhaps altering the minimum bid amounts.

"How fair is that to the bidder?" Stringfellow asked. "How does that play? You suggested a lower bid amount, so what you originally asked for evidently wasn't a fair bid."

When Chief Jackson then tried to talk about possibly obtaining a new larger bid from the lone bidder, Stringfellow interjected, "That's not what you said."

Councilwoman Annie Reid asked about extending the deadline (which Jackson said early on opened on March 11), but that couldn't happen, Stringfellow noted, since the bids had already been opened.

"The bid received went through all the processes?" Stringfellow asked.

Jackson said it had, including a pre-bid conference and the opening of sealed bids. The council ultimately elected (by a unanimous vote) to rebid both cars.

It was not until just before Reid asked about extending the deadline that Stringfellow acknowledged the conflict of interest present in her discussing a matter involving a family member.

"I'm going to recuse myself from the vote, however, I am partaking in the discussion," she said.

The South Carolina Ethics Commission has long advised members that recuse themselves because of a conflict to physically leave the room (or Zoom call, in this instance) during discussions and votes. The State Ethics Act provides that "no public official may knowingly use his office to obtain an economic interest for himself, a family member of his immediate family, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated." Further, voting members with a conflict are not only not supposed to vote, they are not to even take part in discussions, as doing so could influence the vote of others. The Municipal Association of South Carolina (MASC) provides a form on its website officials should fill out and submit to a meeting parliamentarian for the record listing the topic and the justification for recusal. South Carolina code holds that "any officer or employee who willfully conceals such a substantial financial interest or willfully violates the requirements of this section shall constitute malfeasance in office and upon conviction shall forfeit his office or position."

No member of the council or Edwards pointed out the apparent missteps Stringfellow made in the course of the discussion. Jeff Shacker, field services representative for MASC, said that is actually the correct protocol.

The Association has cautioned municipal officials over the years...that they avoid pointing out in public a colleague's potential conflict of interest because it could be seen as defamation and could, as a result, possibly expose the elected or appointed official to personal liability," Shacker said.

3/31/2021

Discussion of vehicle sale may have violated state code | OnlineChester.com

A preferred approach is for fellow council members or the city attorney to approach the person in private prior to a meeting to discuss the potential conflict and offer guidance on how to handle the situation in the meeting.

“Of course, to do that, the potential conflict would need to be identified/anticipated beforehand, which may not always be possible,” Shacker said.

Jackson did not respond to an email seeking more information on the bidding process.

January 18, 2023

South Carolina Ethics Commission
201 Executive Center Drive
Suite 150
Columbia, South Carolina 29210
Attn: Kevin P. Hinson

RE: Case Number C2021-024

To whom it may concern,

Please accept this correspondence as my response to the complaint filed against me on April 5, 2021, by Jeremy Clark. I would first like to give a brief summary of the meeting in question. During our March 22, 2021 meeting, I unequivocally stated that I would not take part in any vote regarding bids for a vehicle being sold by the City of Chester Fire Department. As mayor, one of my roles on council is to oversee council meetings and ensure that the meeting progresses in an orderly fashion. As such, my initial comments regarding the vehicle bid were not intended to participate in the discussion regarding the bids, but instead it was to move the meeting along. At no point did our city attorney who is the parliamentarian, or another member of council take it upon themselves to conduct that portion of the meeting while I was recused. Additionally, my statement was not self-serving nor was it meant to aid my family member who was a bidder. My statement and question during the discussion was on behalf of all bidders in the process. I did not take part in the vote on the bid and none of the bids were accepted during this meeting. The bid was readvertised for new bids. For these reasons, I do not believe that my statements should be construed as me acting in a manner to further an economic interest for a family member.

During my tenure on city council, it was never conveyed to me that a member of council must remove themselves from the meeting in question altogether, nor has this ever been a practice of other members of city council. Instead, the practice has always been that members should state they are recusing themselves and refrain from voting on the issue at hand. As an example, during a 2021 council meeting, the council discussed a contractual bid for lawn services at our city cemetery. We received several bids including one from C&C Lawn Care who is owned by the brother of one of our council members, Councilman Carlos Williams. During discussion of the bid, another councilman made it known that C&C Lawn Care was owned by Councilman Williams' brother. Councilman Williams confirmed that C&C Lawn Care was owned by his brother and made a few additional statements. However, when it came time to vote, Councilman Williams announced that he was recusing himself from the vote. Similar to this current matter before you, no one informed council that Councilman Williams should have exited the meeting.

Additionally, our City Attorney, Latonya Edwards, was present for the March 22, 2021 meeting and she did not indicate that I was in violation by remaining in the council meeting during the discussion or vote on the proposed bids, nor did any member of council make me aware of the potential violation. Had I been aware of this requirement, I would not have hesitated to comply.

I am not above instruction or learning. I would have welcomed this insight from either our city attorney or my fellow council members. As previously stated, I believed that I was adhering to the ethic requirement by stating I was recusing myself and refraining from voting on the matter.

Finally, my comments and conduct during the March 22, 2021 meeting were not willful or done with malfeasance. I did not intend to violate any ethics law. It was a mistake that was committed without any malice or premeditation. I have long served my community in many capacities, and it is never my intent to do anything as an elected official to discredit, misrepresent or dishonor the

position in which I have been elected. I followed procedure as it has been long practiced within the City of Chester. Now, however, I know better, will do better, and will ensure that those around me do better as well. As such, I respectfully request that this complaint be dismissed.

Respectfully,

Wanda Stringfellow

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

BEFORE THE STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:)

Complaint C2021-024)

Wanda Stringfellow)
Respondent.)

Jeremy Clark)
Complainant.)

NOTICE OF HEARING

The State Ethics Commission has determined that there is probable cause pursuant to Section 8-13-320(10)(i), Code of Laws, South Carolina, 1976, as amended, to support the allegations made in the above-captioned complaint. The State Ethics Commission will, therefore, convene a formal hearing into the matters, in accordance with Section 8-13-320(10)(i) & (j), Code of Laws, South Carolina, 1976, as amended, and State Ethics Commission Regulations, S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 52-707 (1997 Cum. Supp.) on Thursday, June 15, 2023 at 9:30 a.m. at the State Ethics Commission Hearing Room located at: 201 Executive Center Drive, Suite 150, Columbia, South Carolina 29210.

The following allegations will be heard:

COUNT ONE
FAILURE TO RECUSE FROM A GOVERNMENTAL DECISION IN RESPONDENT
HAD AN ECONOMIC INTEREST
SECTION 8-13-700(B), S.C. CODE ANN., 1976, AS AMENDED

That Wanda Stringfellow, Mayor of the City of Chester, did in Richland County, attempting to influence a governmental decision in which a family member had an economic interest by participating in the discussion to award bids for a Request for Proposal (RFP) 2021-002 Dodge Ram Vehicle and RFP 2021-003 Ford Crown Victoria, in violation of Section 8-13-

700(B).

COUNT TWO
**FAILURE TO RECUSE FROM A GOVERNMENTAL DECISION IN RESPONDENT
HAD AN ECONOMIC INTEREST
SECTION 8-13-700(B), S.C. CODE ANN., 1976, AS AMENDED**

That Wanda Stringfellow, Mayor of the City of Chester, did in Richland County, fail to provide a written recusal statement regarding the bids for RFP 2021-002 Dodge Ram Vehicle and RFP 2021-003 Ford Crown Victoria, in violation of Section 8-13-700(B).

You have the right to be represented by counsel, the right to call and examine witnesses, the right to introduce exhibits, and the right to cross-examine opposing witnesses. This hearing will be open to the public as required by Section 8-13-320(10)(j), Code of Laws, South Carolina, 1976, as amended. The procedures to be followed are set forth in the Administrative Procedures Act, Section 1-23-10, et seq., Code of Laws, South Carolina, 1976 as amended the State Ethics Act, Section 8-13-100, et seq., Code of Laws, South Carolina, 1976, as amended, and State Ethics Commission Regulations S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 52-707 (1997 Cum. Supp.).

A pre-hearing conference may be scheduled prior to the hearing to allow exchange of witness lists and evidence, marking of exhibits, and disposition of motions or pleadings. In the event you fail to appear, judgment by default will be rendered against you. If there are any questions concerning the above notice or hearing times, please contact the State Ethics Commission.


Meghan L. Walker, Executive Director
State Ethics Commission

Dated this 19th day,
of January, 2023.

Certificate of Service by Certified Mail

I hereby certify that a copy of this **NOTICE OF HEARING** was duly served on Respondent Wanda Stringfellow, 103 Wanda Drive, Chester, SC 29706 by depositing said **NOTICE OF HEARING** in the United States mail, Columbia, South Carolina on this 23rd day of January 2023, by **CERTIFIED MAIL, E-RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED**, appropriate postage affixed, and a return address clearly indicated on said envelope.



Columbia, South Carolina

Rachael O'Bryan, Administrative Assistant
State Ethics Commission (803) 253-4192

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)
IN THE MATTER OF:)
COMPLAINT 2021-024)
Jeremy Clark)
Complainant.)
Wanda Stringfellow)
Respondent.)

BEFORE THE STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

DECISION AND ORDER

Pursuant to Section 8-13-320(10) of the South Carolina Ethics, Government Accountability, and Campaign Reform Act of 1991 (Ethics Act), the State Ethics Commission (Commission) reviewed the above-captioned complaint and found probable cause to charge Wanda Stringfellow (Respondent) with two (2) counts of violating Section 8-13-700(B). Present at the hearing held on June 15, 2023, were Commissioners Bryant S. Caldwell, Mary Hunter B. Tomlinson, and F. Xavier Starkes, Hearing Panel Chair. Respondent was duly notified, but did not appear for the hearing. The Commission was represented by Courtney M. Laster. The following charges were considered:

COUNT ONE
FAILURE TO RECUSE FROM A GOVERNMENTAL DECISION
SECTION 8-13-700(B), S.C. CODE ANN., 1976, AS AMENDED

That Wanda Stringfellow, Mayor of the City of Chester, did attempt to influence a governmental decision in which a family member had an economic interest by participating in the discussion to award bids for Request for Proposal (RFP) 2021-002 Dodge Ram Vehicle and RFP 2021-003 Ford Crown Victoria, in violation of Section 8-13-700(B).

COUNT TWO
FAILURE TO RECUSE FROM A GOVERNMENTAL DECISION
SECTION 8-13-700(B), S.C. CODE ANN., 1976, AS AMENDED

That Wanda Stringfellow, Mayor of the City of Chester, failed to provide a written recusal statement regarding the bids for RFP 2021-002 Dodge Ram Vehicle and RFP 2021-003 Ford Crown Victoria, in violation of Section 8-13-700(B).

FINDINGS OF FACT

Having carefully reviewed the evidence presented, the Panel finds as fact:

1. At all times relevant, Respondent served as Mayor for the City of Chester (City).
2. In early 2021, the City solicited bids for two (2) City-owned vehicles – a 2000 Dodge Ram (Dodge) and a 2000 Ford Crown Victoria (Ford). The solicitation set a minimum bid of \$3,500 for the Dodge and a minimum bid of \$2,000 for the Ford.
3. In response to the City's solicitation, Respondent's son Jai'den Stringfellow (Stringfellow) bid \$500 on each vehicle.
4. On March 22, 2021, Council convened to discuss, in part, Stringfellow's bids.
5. The City Administrator presented Council with three (3) options: (1) approve Stringfellow's bids; (2) approve additional negotiations with Stringfellow; or (3) grant approval to re-bid the vehicles.
6. During Council's discussion on these options, Respondent stated, "I'm going to recuse myself from the vote. However, I am partaking in the discussion." Respondent subsequently questioned the fairness to Stringfellow if the minimum bid amounts were changed and/or Council approved additional negotiations.
7. At the conclusion of the discussion, Council granted approval to re-bid the vehicles. Respondent verbally recused from the vote, but did not reduce her recusal to writing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based upon the Findings of Fact, the Panel concludes, as a matter of law:

1. At all times relevant, Respondent was a public official as defined by Section 8-13-100(27). Accordingly, the Commission has personal and subject matter jurisdiction.
2. Section 8-13-100(11)(a) defines "economic interest" as:

an interest distinct from that of the general public in a purchase, sale, lease, contract, option, or other transaction or arrangement involving property or services in which a public official, public member, or public employee may gain an economic benefit of

fifty dollars or more.

3. Section 8-13-100(15)(a) defines "family member" as:

the spouse, parent, brother, sister, child, mother-in-law, father-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, grandparent, or grandchild.

4. Section 8-13-700 provides, in relevant part:

(B) No [public official] may make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use his [public office] to influence a governmental decision in which he, a family member, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated has an economic interest. A [public official] who, in the discharge of his official responsibilities, is required to take an action or make a decision which affects an economic interest of himself, a family member, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated shall:

(1) prepare a written statement describing the matter requiring action or decisions and the nature of his potential conflict of interest with respect to the action or decision;

...

(4) if he is a public official, other than a member of the General Assembly, he shall furnish a copy of the statement to the presiding officer of the governing body of an agency, commission, board, or of a county, municipality, or a political subdivision thereof, on which he serves, who shall cause the statement to be printed in the minutes and require that the member be excused from any votes, deliberations, and other actions on the matter on which the potential conflict of interest exists and shall cause the disqualification and the reasons for it to be noted in the minutes.

5. Sections 8-13-130 and 8-13-320(10) allow the Panel to levy an administrative fee and to require payment of a civil penalty of up to \$2,000 for each violation of the Ethics Act.

DECISION

NOW, THEREFORE, based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Panel has determined, based on a preponderance of the evidence, that Respondent Wanda Stringfellow is in violation of two (2) counts of Section 8-13-700(B) for: (1) her participation in the March 22, 2021 Council discussion related to her son's bids on the City vehicles and (2) her failure to submit a written recusal for the vote in the same matters.

THEREFORE, pursuant to Section 8-13-320(1)(i) of the Ethics Act, the Panel hereby issues a Public Reprimand and orders Respondent to pay a civil penalty of \$4,000;

AND, pursuant to Section 8-13-130 of the Ethics Act, and in addition to the civil penalty, the Panel hereby orders Respondent to pay an administrative fee of \$650, making Respondent's total amount owed to the Commission \$4,650.

AND, pursuant to Section 8-13-320 of the Ethics Act, if the \$4,650 is not paid within ninety (90) days from Respondent's receipt of this Order, a judgment in the amount of \$4,650 shall be entered against Respondent. In the event of a failure to pay, upon the Commission's filing of said Judgment with the Clerk of Court in the County of Respondent's last known residence, the Clerk of Court shall enter this Order in the amount of \$4,650 in its Judgment Rolls, without cost to the Commission.

FINALLY, Respondent Wanda Stringfellow has ten (10) days from receipt of this Order to appeal to the full Commission.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 26th DAY OF June 2023.

STATE ETHICS COMMISSION


F. XAVIER STARKES, HEARING CHAIR

Columbia, South Carolina

January 17, 2024

Ms. Laster,

I would like to appeal the decision of the State Ethics Commission rendered in case 2021-024 in the matter of Jeremy Clark (complainant) and Wanda Stringfellow and request a reduction in the fine imposed upon me. Due to loss of income and my inability to work during most of the 2023 year, I am unable to pay such a punitive fee. This fine creates a devastating hardship on me and my family financially.

Your kind consideration and that of the imposing entity will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Wanda Stringfellow.

Wanda Stringfellow

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)
IN THE MATTER OF:)
Complaint C2021-024)
Jeremy Clark,)
APPELLATE.)
Wanda Stringfellow,)
APPELLANT.)

BEFORE THE STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

NOTICE OF APPELLATE HEARING

Wanda Stringfellow served a Motion for an Appeal on the State Ethics Commission on January 24, 2024. The State Ethics Commission will, therefore, convene a formal appellate hearing into the matter, in accordance with State Ethics Commission Regulations, 52 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 802 (2013 Cum. Supp.) on May 16, 2024 at 9:30 a.m. at the State Ethics Commission Hearing Room located at: 201 Executive Center Drive Suite 150, Columbia, South Carolina 29210.

Pursuant to 52 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 803, the Appellant shall file any additional briefs within ten (10) days of the date of service of this notice. In the event the Appellant fails to appear, he will have waived his hearing and judgment will stand.



Meghan Walker Dayson
Executive Director

Dated this 29th day,
of January 2024.

Certificate of Service by Certified Mail

I hereby certify that a copy of this **NOTICE OF APPELLATE HEARING** was duly served on the Respondent Wanda Stringfellow, 103 Wanda Drive, Chester, SC 29706 by depositing said **NOTICE OF APPELLATE HEARING** in the United States mail, Columbia, South Carolina on this 5th day of February 2024, by **CERTIFIED MAIL, E-RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED**, appropriate postage affixed, and a return address clearly indicated on said envelope.



Columbia, South Carolina

Rachael O'Bryan, Administrative Assistant
State Ethics Commission

(803) 253-4192

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)
IN THE MATTER OF:)
Complaint C2021-024)
Jeremy Clark,)
APPELLATE.)
Wanda Stringfellow,)
APPELLANT.)
_____)

BEFORE THE STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

**AMENDED
NOTICE OF APPELLATE HEARING**

Wanda Stringfellow served a Motion for an Appeal on the State Ethics Commission on January 24, 2024. The State Ethics Commission will, therefore, convene a formal appellate hearing into the matter, in accordance with State Ethics Commission Regulations, 52 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 802 (2013 Cum. Supp.) on September 19, 2024 at 9:30 a.m. at the State Ethics Commission Hearing Room located at: 201 Executive Center Drive Suite 150, Columbia, South Carolina 29210.

Pursuant to 52 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 803, the Appellant shall file any additional briefs within ten (10) days of the date of service of this notice. In the event the Appellant fails to appear, he will have waived his hearing and judgment will stand.



Meghan Walker Dayson
Executive Director

Dated this 20th day,
of May 2024.

Certificate of Service by Certified Mail

I hereby certify that a copy of this **NOTICE OF APPELLATE HEARING** was duly served on the Respondent Wanda Stringfellow, 103 Wanda Drive, Chester, SC 29706 by depositing said **NOTICE OF APPELLATE HEARING** in the United States mail, Columbia, South Carolina on this 22nd day of May 2024, by **CERTIFIED MAIL, E-RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED**, appropriate postage affixed, and a return address clearly indicated on said envelope.



Columbia, South Carolina

Rachael O'Bryan, Administrative Assistant
State Ethics Commission

(803) 253-4192

From: [Laster, Courtney](#)
To: [Brabham, Renique](#); [O'Bryan, Rachael](#)
Subject: FW: [External] Stringfellow Hearing
Date: Tuesday, September 17, 2024 5:19:50 PM

Courtney M. Laster
General Counsel
South Carolina Ethics Commission
201 Executive Center Drive, Suite 150
Columbia, SC 29210
Phone: 803-253-4192
Fax: 803-253-7539

From: Wanda Stringfellow <mayorstringfellow@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2024 5:15 PM
To: Laster, Courtney <claster@ethics.sc.gov>
Subject: [External] Stringfellow Hearing

Good afternoon Ms. Laster,

I would like to rescind my request for an appeal hearing. I have submitted via US express mail a cashiers check in the amount of 4,650 the fine assessed.

W. Stringfellow

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)