



Regina M. Hunter El



Notice to the Principal is Notice to the Agent; Notice to the Agent is Notice to the Principal

13 September 2022 CE, 16 Safar 1444 AH

NOTICE: RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION VIOLATED

16 August 2022 Notice of Clerk's Misapplication of Court Rules WAS NOT a Motion to Reinstate

Via 1st Class USPS Mail & Email

Ms. Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Clerk
Ms. V. Claire Allen, Deputy Clerk
The South Carolina Court of Appeals
1200 Senate Street
Columbia, S.C. 29201
Tel. (803) 734-1890, Fax: (803) 734-1839

RECEIVED
Sep 13 2022
SC Court of Appeals

Dear Ms. Kitchings, et. al.:

I believe you acted dishonorable by distorting the truth. The letter sent to you on 16 August 2022, regarding the misapplication of court rules was NOT a Motion to Reinstate. No motion fee accompanied my letter and other motion fees cannot be substituted. I find your decision to construe it as such shows a poor exercise of judicial discretion or judgment. In addition, upon your decision and thereafter, you did not inform any party that you waived the motion fee under Rule 240(d)¹.

- **Fact:** The notice was dated 16 August 2022 and was not posted to the online docket until 26 August 2022; 10 days later.
- **Fact:** No motion fee accompanied my 16 August 2022 letter and motion fees paid thereafter cannot be arbitrarily substituted.
- **Fact:** The \$50⁰⁰ USD fee paid on the 26 August 2022 was to file the *Motion to Extend the Time to file a Motion to Reinstate*, pursuant to Rule 263(b), SCACR.
- **Fact:** On the same day I paid motion fee to request an extension of time, the Clerk chose to post my letter dated 16 August 2022 to the docket as a *Motion to Reinstate* although the money paid was not for that purpose.
- **Fact:** The Clerk did not reveal her intent to construe the notice as a *Motion for Reinstate* for 10 days or until the deadline required under Rule 260(a), SCACR

¹ South Carolina Judicial Branch. Court Rules. Rule 240(d) "*In extraordinary cases, the appellate court may relieve a party from paying the filing fee.*" Retrieved on 13 September 2022 from <https://www.sccourts.org/courtReg/displayRule.cfm?ruleID=240.0&subRuleID=&ruleType=APP>

- **Fact:** The 16th August letter states that the grievance with SCCA is not resolved.
- **Fact:** No *Motion to Reinstate* was filed by the Appellant on 26 August 2022 and any and all docket entries emanating from that error are false.
- **Fact:** The Clerk has not answered the 16 August 2022 letter, nor made the corrections specified therein and Appellant awaits her reply.

Thus, you harmed me when you decided to act prematurely. You did not wait the time allotted to me to move to reinstate or to enlarge the time to do so. You did not allow for my freedom of thought, expression or conscious and obstructed the administration of justice.

The decision whether to file a motion to reinstate was mine to make, not yours. I have a right to self-determination; and the State does not have right to interfere in the free exercise of this fundamental human right except a matter of public health or emergency. You should have asked me about a decision that critical to preserving the appeal instead you sought to exercise control over my affairs and did not remain neutral. Article 1 of the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (United Nations General Assembly, 23 March 1976), to which the United States is a party and ratified in 1992, states “*all peoples have the right of self-determination*”.

I hold you intentionally confounded truth with falsehood. You deliberately held back your decision to construe the letter as a motion to reinstate instead of simply reaching out to me and asking if my letter should be deemed as such. Instead, you have concealed the truth while you know the truth, and mixed truth with falsehood. The letter was in continuity of my grievance with the SC Court Administration. My right to petition grievances to a government entity is inviolate and court rules are subject to the statutory law. The right to bring a grievance is guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States and the South Carolina Constitution¹, Art. 1,§2 and international treaty law. Your failure to act respectfully, impartially, without bias and prejudice towards a self-represented party, was an evil manner.

Respectfully,



I Am: Regina M. Hunter El

All Rights Reserved

A Natural Person, In Full Life, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris

Regina M. Hunter El

1165 Broad St. #16

Sumter, S.C. 29150

Cc:

Hon. Donald W. Beatty, Chief Justice, Administrative Head, S.C., State Court Administration
Elijah Hunter, Respondent