

August 24, 2022

South Carolina Administrative Law Office
Attn: Tammie Holmes, Manager
1220 Senate Street, Suite 200
Columbia, South Carolina 29485

Dear Ms. Holmes,

Below you will find the list of Challenges to the Record in the court reporter's certified transcript of the April 22, 2022 hearing that was held in the Charleston County Court of Common Pleas and presided over by Judge Bentley Price that I received from her on August 17, 2022. I compared the earlier transcript she sent me via email on August 5, 2022 because there are discrepancies between the two transcripts where Julie Cendroski has deleted, added, and changed words from the transcription she sent me on August 5, 2021 via email. I listed these changes separately at the end of this letter. Due to these discrepancies, I will request a copy of the audio from the presiding judge, The Honorable Bentley Price, who has the sole authority to grant me a copy of the audio according to the court reporter's handbook. I also provided an explanation of the challenges when needed for clarification.

RE:PET HELPERS, INC. VS. JANET FRISCO CASE #2022-CP-10-2682 & APPELLATE CASE #2022-000775

CHALLENGE TO THE RECORD on Transcript of HEARING 4/22/22 in the Court of Common Pleas, 9th Circuit Charleston County:

A) Challenges to Court Reporter's Entrees:

Page 2, Line 5 & 6:

MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGEMENT By Mr.Futeral

It should be: MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGEMENT & MOTION FOR SANCTIONS FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH DISCOVERY by Mr.Futeral

Page 2, Lines 7 & 8

REPLY TO MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGEMENT by Ms. Frisco

It should read: RETURN TO MOTION TO AMEND ANSWER & MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT by Ms. Frisco

Page 14, Line 24

...and she called it a Motion "to" Leave to Supplement Answer

It should read: ...and she called it a Motion "**for**" Leave to Supplement Answer

(That's the name of the Motion that I made that was scheduled on April 22, 2022, but I wasn't allowed to formally argue it. It wasn't supposed to be scheduled because it was a "form motion" which means you are asking for permission to file the motion and providing a pleading to the court, but they scheduled it anyway so I couldn't drop my Return to Motion to Amend Answer which was done incorrectly. It helped the Plaintiff's lawyer rack up legal fees because he could say he had to reply to it and two previous attempts to amend my answer to the complaint that I did incorrectly. I emailed Judge McCoy, the administrative judge, but she didn't reply and neither did Angela Rigney, who schedules the hearings.)

Page 18, Line 10

And then we've given you an adoption "redacted form".

I believe it should read: "**unredacted**" form

(Immediately after that verbal exchange the plaintiff's lawyer tells the judge he has an envelope. Prior to that he is talking about documents he has already provided to the court, an affidavit and a redacted adoption application.)

Page 19, Line 21

And "I" actually spoke to her when she was coming out of this training to kill dogs.

I believe I said: And "**she**" actually spoke to her when she was coming out of the training to kill dogs.

(I'm referring to my witness, Pam Lambert, who is the one who Ms. Susko told she had just returned from training to euthanize.)

Page 20, Line 1

I want to mention to him and "to" my law analysis that the ultimate burden

I believe I said: I want to mention to him "**from**" my law analysis...

(At that time, I was about to read from my law analysis "*Memorandum in Opposition of Plaintiff's Motion for a Partial Summary Judgement*". See attached document.)

Page 20, Line 6

The movant may not present only the portions of the record supporting its position while "admitting" evidence to the contrary.

It should read: ...while "**omitting**" evidence to the contrary.

(I am reading verbatim from a law analysis contained in my filed document "*Memorandum in Opposition of Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgement*" which says "omitting". The memorandum is attached. "Admitting" and "omitting" sound very similar, but there is a significant difference in meaning relevant to my appeal.)

Page 20, Line 23

...because I "believe" that they were what they claim to be.

It should read: ...because I "**believed**" that they were what they claimed to be.

(I believed Pet Helpers were what they claimed to be prior to the experience of surrendering my dog. So 'believed' would be past tense and 'believe' is present tense. I no longer believe they care about pets or their caretakers. It's all about greed for money).

Page 22, Line 14

They've lied to me ---implying that I could get the dog back which "when" I submitted an application

It should read: ...which "**is**" when I submitted an application.

Page 27, Lines 9 & 10

She goes you surrendered your legal rights.

Should read and be punctuated: She goes, "You surrendered your legal rights!"

(I'm quoting Ms. Susko exactly as she said it, and it should have been punctuated accordingly because my point is that she said it in a hateful manner when I made the request which illustrates her cruelty and indifference to my distress over losing my dog. It's important to the case since I am claiming they are cruel and their attorney is calling that libelous.)

Page 39, Line 11

"Berkeley" County

It should read: "**Charleston**" County

B). Challenges to the Changes that were made by the Court Reporter in August 15, 2021 transcript:

Page 15, Lines 14-15

She's trying to mislead this court that she didn't have an opportunity to do so. And that she never an had an opportunity to do so.

August 5th transcript reads: She's trying to mislead this court if she didn't have an opportunity to do so. And then she never asked to do so.

Page 15, Lines 25

I'll give you "more than" enough time to speak.

August 5th Transcript reads: I'll give you enough opportunity to speak.

Page 16, Line 12

She does get a jury trial on the "damages".

August 5th Transcript reads: She does get a jury trial on the "merits".

Page 16, Line 18

It delineates "various different things" she can't do.

August 5th Transcript reads: It delineates "most everything" she can't do.

Page 21, Line 21 -22

When that is not what I appealed at all.

August 5th transcript reads: When that is not what I "**just**" appealed at all.

Line 22, Line 3

And so, you know, he (Mr.Futeral) acts like I shouldn't be able to defend myself in a court of law.

August 5 transcript reads: And so, he acts like I shouldn't be allowed to defend myself in a court of law.

Page 22, Line 8

And so I really think he's distorting "very much".

August 5th Transcript reads: And so I really think he's distorting.

Page 22, Line 9

He has a nerve calling me a liar.

August 5th Transcript reads: "I will note" he has a nerve calling me a liar.

Page 23, Line 22

"Well," they had

August 5th Transcript reads: "No", they had

(The word "well" implies agreement with the Court. " No" signifies I am disagreeing with the Court and trying to explain the sanctions of \$5000 were initiated by the Plaintiff's lawyer and a form of extortion even if the Court approved them, but Judge Price kept interrupting and cutting me off when I was trying to make points and defend myself throughout the entire hearing.

Sincerely,
Janet Frisco, Pro Se

Cc: Stephan V. Futeral
Julie Cendroski

Attachment (1)