



GREENFIELD LAW FIRM, LLC.

-----A Voice for the Voiceless-----

RECEIVED

Jul 22 2022

SC Court of Appeals

July 22, 2022

VIA: FIRST-CLASS MAIL and ELECTRONIC MAIL

Hon. Jenny Abbott Kitchings
P. O. Box 11629
Columbia, SC 29211
ctappfilings@sccourts.org

RE: MOTION FOR EXPEDITED RELIEF
Gregory D. Hopkins and Amy N. Hopkins v. Jaime Hood-Hopkins
Appellate Case No. 2022-000577

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed please find the Motion for Expedited Relief. The filing fee will be placed in the mail to you separately. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact my office.

Sincerely,


Shanise A. B. Greenfield, Esq.

Enclosures:

cc: Tamika D. Cannon (*via electronic mail*)
Amy Hopkins (*via electronic mail and U.S. Mail*)
Gregory Hopkins (*via electronic mail and U.S. Mail*)

Shanise A. B. Greenfield, Esq.
Owner
Greenfieldlawoffice@gmail.com
Greenfieldlawsc.com

655 H. Fairview Rd. PMB # 358
Simpsonville, SC 29680
Tel. No.: (864) 660-9656
Fax No.: (864) 688-2443

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM LAURENS COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Eugene C. Griffith, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2022-000577

Gregory Hopkins and Amy Hopkins,

Respondents,

v.

Jaime Hood-Hopkins,

Appellant,

MOTION FOR EXPEDITED RELIEF

Shanise Greenfield
Greenfield Law Firm, LLC
655 H. Fairview Rd., PMB# 358
Simpsonville, SC 29680
(864)660-9656
(864) 688-2448- facsimile
Attorney for Appellant

Tamika D. Cannon
S.C. Victim Assistance Network
P.O. Box 170364
Spartanburg, SC 29301
(864) 312-6455
Attorney for Appellant

Counsel for Appellant hereby requests the following expedited relief to be granted by the Court:

1. For a restraining order to be granted to restrain and enjoin the Respondents from engaging in any harassing conduct toward the South Carolina Victim Assistance Network (“SCVAN”), its board members, and employees, as well as the Greenfield Law Firm LLC and its employee(s).
2. For an expedited decision to be made on Appellant’s Petition for Supersedeas, which was filed with this Court on July 8, 2022. This motion is based upon the following:

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Appellant is asking for expedited relief on Appellant’s Petition for Supersedeas based on ongoing harassment by Respondents. (See attached Facebook Posts and Text Messages).

On or about July 16, 2022, Respondent Amy Hopkins placed multiple inappropriate comments related to this pending appeal under SCVAN’s Facebook page, for no legitimate purpose other than to harass and antagonize SCVAN employees. Appellant is informed and believes that Respondents’ conduct in discussing this information in a public forum is inappropriate given that the subject of this action is a minor child and Respondents made derogatory and harmful statements about Appellant, the mother of the child. Said negative portrayals of Appellant by Respondent were, in part, an impetus for Appellant seeking the restraining order against Respondents for herself and the minor child. Respondents’ conduct constitutes harassment of SCVAN and its counsel, and has a likelihood of causing irreparable damage to not only the parties to this action, but is an attempt to harm the reputations of counsel involved in this appeal.

During July 2022, Respondent Amy Hopkins contacted the SCVAN administration for the non-profit organization that employs Appellant's counsel, Tamika Cannon, multiple times to intimidate SCVAN employees involved either directly or indirectly with this appeal. Respondent, after making no progress with her complaints to the Executive Director of South Carolina Victims Assistance Network, began to repeatedly contact the Board President of the non-profit organization, Mary Ann Stroup, by texting messages about the case to the President's personal cell phone. Respondent made false accusations regarding the involvement of Appellant's counsel, Tamika Cannon, in this matter. While Respondent is not an attorney, this behavior would be unethical for a South Carolina licensed attorney, and should not be tolerated. As officers of the Court, counsel involved in this litigation should not be subjected to Respondents' harassing conduct, which is a futile attempt to force counsel to stop providing legal representation to Appellant in this appeal. As such, Appellant is requesting this Court to expedite its decision regarding the Petition for Supersedeas in order to protect the minor child and to help avoid any further conflict, to issue a restraining order enjoining and prohibiting Respondents from publicly discussing this case on social media, any media outlets, or through any other public means, and prohibiting Respondent from contacting SCVAN employees and the Greenfield Law Firm employees, excepting Appellant's counsel for legitimate case-related matters, regarding the involvement of counsel in this matter or for any other reason involving this case..

Alternatively, if the Court denies the Motion for Expedited Relief, Appellants would ask the Court to place a restraining order on Respondents' conduct as it relates to publicly sharing any information about the appeal and also against contacting SCVAN employees and the Greenfield Law Firm employees.

Appellant now comes before the court seeking to expedite the petition for supersedeas and for restraining orders to be placed on Respondent's harassing conduct and public discussion of this appeal.

Respectfully submitted:

Date: July 22, 2022

s/ Shanise Greenfield
Shanise Greenfield, Bar# 103948
Greenfield Law Firm, LLC
655 H. Fairview Rd., PMB# 358
Simpsonville, SC 29680
(864) 660-9656
Attorney for Appellant

s/ Tamika D. Cannon
Tamika D. Cannon, Bar #72834
South Carolina Victim Assistance Network
P.O. Box 170364
Spartanburg, SC 29301
(864) 301-6455
Attorney for Appellant

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM LAURENS COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Eugene C. Griffith, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2022-000577

Gregory D. Hopkins and Amy N. Hopkins, Respondents,

v.

Jaime Hood-Hopkins, Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Appellant's Motion for Expedited Relief and supporting exhibits, to the Clerk of Court at ctappfilings@sccourts.org on July 22, 2022, and to Respondents Gregory Hopkins at gdhop1@yahoo.com and Amy Hopkins at amynhop@netscape.net, and by U. S. Mail to the Respondent's address at: 108 Fairway Drive, Laurens, SC 29360

s/ Shanise Greenfield
Shanise Greenfield, Bar#
Greenfield Law Firm, LLC
655 H. Fairview Rd., PMB# 358
Simpsonville, SC 29680
(864) 660-9656
Attorney for Appellant

EXHIBITS

1. TEXT MESSAGES SENT FROM AMY HOPKINS TO SCVAN
BOARD PRESIDENT
2. FACEBOOK POSTS SENT FROM AMY HOPKINS TO SCVAN
PROFESSIONAL FACEBOOK PAGE

From: Tamika Cannon
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2022 8:28 AM
To: Shanise Greenfield
Subject: Fwd: Nix continues

Here are the messages to our Board President. I am confirming that they were texted to her personal phone.

Tamika D. Cannon
Senior Staff Attorney
South Carolina Victim Assistance Network
P.O. Box 170364
Spartanburg, SC 29301
(864) 312-6455

NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY: This email, and any attachments thereto, is intended for use only by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain confidential information, legally privileged information, and attorney-client work product. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender by email, telephone or fax, and permanently delete the original and any of any email and printout thereof.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Sarah Ford <sarah@scvan.org>
Date: Wed, Jul 20, 2022 at 9:21 AM
Subject: Nix continues
To: <tamika@scvan.org>

Sent to Mary Ann Stroup:

Mrs. Stroop- This is Amy Hopkins. My friend Heidi Hoogstraal, reached out to you and I attempted to call you.

We am dealing with a very SERIOUS matter. My husband and and I are good Christian people. My son and his ex wife had a child their Sr year in high school. They were young and immature and both were opiate addicts. My husband and I raised our Granddaughter,Riley, for the first almost 8 years of her life. Riley turned 12 in May. We were parents not grandparents. We were so close to her. We did everything for her and provided everything financially. We were very close to our ex daughter in law. We loved her. She loved us.

She and our son divorced in 2017 and she opened a DSS case against out son in Feb 2019 and removed Riley from our life and her father's life. Riley was briefly reunited with our family in September of 2020 and the mother removed her from father and entire paternal family for a second time in May 2021. It is

child abuse. She was in contempt of court. While she was removed a second time...my husband and I sent nice emails begging to see her. We have emailed and begged for 3 years. We have been devastated over Riley being gone. We were SO CLOSE TO HER. We sent nice emails begging to see her and road by their home in Gray court a couple of tones trying to get a glimpse of our precious Riley. They have built a wall around her with this alienation.

Like I said we sent emails begging to see her and in November 2021 Laurens county served us with harassment and stalking papers with our ex daughter in law seeking a restraining order against us and she wanted to include the minor child , our Granddaughter. We thought it was absurd. We had done nothing wrong but beg to see our granddaughter through emails. No calls or texts for years because we have been blocked from ex daughter in laws phone. I spoke to Donna at the court house and she told me Magistrate court was very informal and we didn't need an attorney. Huge mistake in going to court unrepresented!!! Our ex daughter in law was represented by Shanise Greenfield. William Wham the magistrate judge who has no law degree and is on hold over status. He granted her the restraining order and included our granddaughter because he said she was a minor and her mother had sole custody so she got to decide!!! We left court devastated and immediately appealed the ruling. A circuit court judge (Eugene Griffith) agreed that magistrate court had no justification to give us a restraining order with our Granddaughter and he reversed magistrate ruling in April of this year. Shanise Greenfield was the only attorney in magistrate court with ex daughter in law. She was the only attorney. Tamika Cannon from SCVan showed up at the circuit court hearing reversal with her buddy Shanise in April. I do not believe our ex daughter in law was ever approved by SCVan. I think Shanise recruited Tamika on the down low. It is reprehensible that your organization is on board in SC court of appeals with a lying ex drug addict trying to reinstate a restraining order against loving grandparents who have never been accused of doing anything but good by the child. I spoke to Laura Hudson on Monday July 11 and I had a 25 minute conversation with her giving her information and details. She knew nothing of the care. She seemed concerned and repeatedly kept asking me, "What is the crime???" I said there isn't one. I forwarded her all my documents and she called me back Thursday July 14 and said y'all " inherited the case" and her exact words to me were, " I believe we inherited this case and I believe your husband committed a crime against this young woman!!!!" I replied, "What"? What crime was that? "Harassment" Laura said. I then said, "Mrs. Hudson, did you look at all the information I sent you"? She sad yes. I then said, " are you a grandmother?" She paused for a couple of seconds and replied, yes. Then Ms. Hudson told me she didn't like my attitude and HUNG UP ON ME. The entire conversation wasn't a minute.

I am enraged at her treatment of me and that she told me that MY HUSBAND COMMITTED A CRIME AGAINST THIS YOUNG WOMAN. There was no crime! Grandparents begging to see a child they love! Number one... my husband and I were both ridiculously issued the harassment ruling by an incompetent magistrate judge with no law degree who had no idea what he was doing. Had we been represented in court...it would have all been dismissed. Rhett Burney told me it should have been dismissed. So Laura Hudson went from being seemingly concerned on Monday to covering for her employee, Tamika Cannon on Thursday. I'm not sure Mrs. Hudson even realizes what SCVan is on board trying to do. The circuit court judge revered the restraining order between us and our grandchild. Said magistrate court HAD NO JURISDICTION. The restraining order between us and our ex daughter in law (for begging to see a child we raised and love who the mother heartlessly has alienated from entire paternal family for 3 plus years) was remanded back to Magistrate court. So it's not in place either. But that's not even on the table. Your group, who I'm sure has done a lot of good helping innocent victims who can't afford legal service is on board trying to put a restraining order back in place between loving grandparents who raised the child for years. That's all that is in theSC court of appeals. SCVan is trying to

get a restraining order reinstated with loving grandparents and grandchild. Trying to make it where OUR OWN SON CANT BRING RILEY TO SEE US WHEN HE HAS VISITATION. Not a good look for you all. The order is temporary anyway and the whole thing goes away in November of this year even though it's gone now because Judge reversed it.

We are the victims here. We are nice people. I would appreciate some answers. I would like to speak with you/ your Board. I hope you will make this right. Laura Hudson's representation for SCVan was shameful and she should be accountable. Please call me. I will call the attorney general and the newspaper if I have to. I'm calling Hite and Stone tomorrow. I can prove everything I said. I will be happy to send you proof. My husband are pro se in this ridiculous appeal because our attorney, Troup Partridge, who represented us in the appeal does not do appellate court appeals and attorney he recommended wanted 20 grand. We don't have it. So our ex daughter in law and your group are abusing the system and she has free legal help while we have spent 100 plus hours defending ourselves against this absurdity pro se. Thank you.

Pro se

On your Instagram. Very ironic. We need a lot of sunshine because we have suffered so much corruption in the last 3 years.

Mrs. Stroop- you cannot fathom what we have endured. Is begging to see a granddaughter who we love and raised a crime? That's all we did. How is Jaime Hood Hopkins receiving free legal services from you? We are the victims here. I pray to God you will have a conversation with me. We have endured so much injustice.

Are you just going to ignore me, Mrs. Stroop? We are the victims here.
How do I make an appointment to be at your next board meeting? With all my court Documents?

☰ Notifications



New



Amy Nix Hopkins commented on SCVAN Legal Services Program's photo.



4m · "SCVan gets on board with child ali..."



Amy Nix Hopkins commented on SCVAN Legal Services Program's link.



9m · "SCVan gets on board with child ali..."



Amy Nix Hopkins commented on SCVAN Legal Services Program's photo.



9m · "SCVan gets on board with child ali..."



Amy Nix Hopkins commented on SCVAN Legal Services Program's link.



9m · "SCVan gets on board with child ali..."



Amy Nix Hopkins commented on SCVAN Legal Services Program's photo.



8m · "SCVan gets on board with child ali..."



There are new posts to see in Orangeburg / Calhoun Counties - FREE, SELL or TRADE and oth...



31m



Dan Norfleet commented on a link that you're tagged in.



51m · "The AG is wasting taxpayer mone..."



Home



Watch



Groups



Feeds



Notifications



Menu



Most relevant ▾

**Amy Nix Hopkins**

SCVan gets on board with child alienation cases where a mother got a ridiculous restraining order between a grandchild and grandparent from a magistrate judge with no law degree where grandparents foolishly went to court unrepresented. FOR GRANDPARENTS SENDING EMAILS BEGGING TO SEE THEIR GRANDCHILD! Magistrate thought father had no rights to see his daughter and said mother had sole custody and although he said he didn't agree with the order...mother had sole custody and since child was a minor... mother got to decide.

Circuit court judge reversed magistrate ruling saying magistrate court had no jurisdiction to give the restraining order. SCVan was not a party to the magistrate court hearing. The reversal for the restraining order was immediately appealed and SCVan jumps on board in the appeal of the reversal. So....SCVan is fighting loving grandparents who practically raised the child for the first 8 years of her life trying to get a restraining order reinstated that was overturned by a circuit court judge. Case is in SC court of

Write a comment...



Home



Watch



Groups



Feeds



Notifications



Menu



SCVAN Legal Services Program's post



restraining order between a grandchild and grandparent from a magistrate judge with no law degree where grandparents foolishly went to court unrepresented. FOR GRANDPARENTS SENDING EMAILS BEGGING TO SEE THEIR GRANDCHILD! Magistrate thought father had no rights to see his daughter and said mother had sole custody and although he said he didn't agree with the order...mother had sole custody and since child was a minor... mother got to decide.

Circuit court judge reversed magistrate ruling saying magistrate court had no jurisdiction to give the restraining order. SCVan was not a party to the magistrate court hearing. The reversal for the restraining order was immediately appealed and SCVan jumps on board in the appeal of the reversal. So....SCVan is fighting loving grandparents who practically raised the child for the first 8 years of her life trying to get a restraining order reinstated that was overturned by a circuit court judge. Case is in SC court of appeals now. SHAMEFUL AND A DISGRACE. If anyone sees this and can help me...please reach out.

3m Like Reply Message Hide

Write a reply

Write a comment...



Home



Watch



Groups



Feeds



Notifications



Menu