

From: [Alicia Ruffin](#)
To: [Court Of Appeals Filings](#); mary.littlejohn@eeoc.gov; amanda.neely@mgclaw.com; markatelittlejohn@gmail.com; amandaelizabethpittman@gmail.com; abracy@wcc.sc.gov; [Keith Roberts](#); [Burns, LaToyla](#); tburgin@wjcbllaw.com
Subject: [Possible Scam Fraud]Case Number: 2022-001394/ (WC 555-E13688) Alicia Ruffin vs. Builders Firstsource, Inc. ; SC Court of Appeals: South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission
Date: Friday, October 7, 2022 6:25:06 PM

***** EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside the organization. Please exercise caution before clicking any links or opening attachments. *******

WARNING: Your email security system has determined the message below may be a potential threat.

The sender may trick victims into passing bad checks on their behalf.

If you do not know the sender or cannot verify the integrity of the message, please do not respond or click on links in the message. Depending on the security settings, clickable URLs may have been modified to provide additional security.

RECEIVED

Oct 07 2022

Dear Court of Appeals:

SC Court of Appeals

I am writing in concern for a copy of the Deficiency Letter. I received notification that Opposing counsel received communication from your office on 10/07/2022. But I have yet to receive a copy; with the exception of the email from Atty. South Lewis addressed Mrs. Burns. Please forward that information and all others to either the enclosed email or mailing address:

Drive
29334

563 Duncan Station
Duncan, South Carolina

Additionally, the full extent of my injuries has not been adjudicated. Commissioner Beck did not render a decision concerning the Appellant's neck and the Major Depressive Disorder and PTSD. And no court has adjudicated a decision on the evidence tampering by Atty. Amanda Neely and Atty. Mary-Kate Littlejohn. Atty. Lewis withheld the fact that Atty. Amanda Neely perjured herself before your court (Court of Appeals) July 14, 2021. She withheld a settlement check addressed to Atty. Mary-Kate Littlejohn and the Appellant. She held the check past its expiration; after the Court of Appeals rendered their decision to deny the Appellant's re-hearing. This would have proven that the proper Attorney was properly served and she perjured herself before your court. If an one attorney has been notified and then it's deemed that the firm has been properly served; since they are of the same law firm.

The FULL details of the Appellant's case has yet to be heard before any court. The Appellant was informed by Commissioner McGaskill and Wilkerson that she was within her rights to appeal their decisions of the Commission. If the Appellant would have waited too long to file; the Appellant's case would have been lost again based on a technicality. Laws have even been violated to protect the previous Opposing Counselors from facing prosecution

on how they have conducted this case and Atty. South Lewis fears that upon further review these violations and others, will come to light. Please assist the Appellant in hopes of resolving these issues.

Respectfully I Submit this statement,

Alicia Ruffin, Appellant