

Petition to Reinstate
Designation of Matka (Monica)

TO: Russell Brehen
And

Re: Monica

The South Carolina
Supreme Court
of Appeals
Re: MONICA

RECEIVED

MAY 23 2013

SC Court of Appeals

For the second time
Sorry!!!

Faxed on
5/19/13

5/19/2013
5/22/13

Mail on
5/20/13
5/22/13
Ch. M. White

TO: South Carolina Supreme Court
And Russell Brehen

From: Cheryl M. De
Appellate Case #2012-210726

Mailed May 22nd, 2013
do to under De's care

CC: Russell Brehen

11. That the Respondent be made liable to pay the Appellant \$4,000 for the funeral cost of the decedent.

12. For the reasons stated, this Court should reverse the judgement of the Circuit Court.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Cheryl M. Doe
Cheryl M. Doe
301 Rosemount Drive
Florence, S.C. 29505
843-665-9299
Pro-Se

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Initial Brief and Designation, on the Respondent, to Mr. Russell P. Brehen, by depositing a copy in the United States Mail, (~~December 12, 2012~~) *May 20, 2013* as well as hand delivered, on Monday December, 17th, 2012 addressed to Mr. Russell P. Brehen, 1108 3rd Ave. Conway, S.C. 29526 *Faxed on 5/19/13*

mail on 5/20/13

CC: Mr. Russell P. Brehen
1108 3rd. Ave. Conway, S.C. 29526
843-488-3500

December, 12, 2012

May 19, 2013

Counsel for petitioner certifies that the Petition for Rehearing was made and finally ruled on by the Court of Appeals on March 5, 2012.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

48661. Did the Court of Appeals err in holding that this action is not barred by res judicata? NO
48662. Did the Court of Appeals err in holding that petitioner had failed to timely object to the trial judge's charge on the burden of proof? NO

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On September 20, 2012, Cheryl M. Doe brought this action. . . .

[1. The Appellate is a natural person and citizen and resident of Forence County, South Carolina. 2. Reponsdent Coleman Doe, Jr. is a natural person, and citizen, and resident of Horry South Carolina. 3. Respondent Colema Doe, Jr. is a Personal Representative of the Estate of Mildred Doe. 4. The decedent in this matter, Mildred Doe was declared dead on December 4, 2007, while a citizen of of an domiciled in Horry County. An A estate is currently open in Horry County County Probate Court, number 2007-ES-261726. 5. The Appellate in this matter is the daughter of the Decedent and the Respondent is the son of the Decdent. 6. During 2006 the decedent suffered uterine cancer. Decedent had surgery on December 20, 2006 to remove the cancer but her condition was so far advanced that she was referred to hospice care as there was nothing more that could be done for her condition. 7. On or about April 22, 2007, the decedent ws WAS heading for hospice. She was prescribed heavy amounts of pain killers including but not to limited to Darvocet, Morphine, Percocet, Tramadol, and Duragesic pathches On April 22, 2007, about 10 p.m. the Respondent came into the home of the decedent and led the decedent and witness present they were signing a Power for the Respondent to pay her bills. 8. On April 22, 2007, the decedent alleged signed a document known as the Last Wil and Testament of Mildred Doe. (previously filed with the Probate Court). 9. Upon information and belief, the Decedent or agents acting on his behalf went into the home of the decedent for the purpose of excutig the Last Will and Testament signed by the decedent. 10. There are three witness along with the decedent in the home at that time the Respondent was present. These witness were the decedent's son, Anthony C. Doe, decedent daughter, Janice P. Parker, and decedent's grandson, Careme Smith. 11. Two of the witnesses present signed the document without

knowing it was the decedent's Last Will and Testament and that it granted all the property only to the Respondent. These two witnesses were the children of the decedent, Anthony Doe and Janice Parker. The notary was not present at the signing of the Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe nor did the witnesses later appear before the notary to attest their signatures. 12. The document, Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe, was presented by the Respondent for probate on December 31, 2007. 13. Upon information and belief, since time that the Respondent was appointed as Personal Representative of the Estate of Mildred Doe, he has engaged in waste and dispersion of the personal property of the decedent's estate. 14. At the present, the Respondent has evicted all residents living in the home of the decedent and is acting solely on his own interest and not that of the decedent or any other heir of the decedent. 15. The document Last Will and Testament of Mildred is invalid based on the testator's lack of capacity to contract. present signed the document & this the decedent was under heavy medications was under Set forth facts relevant to the questions presented. Counsel may wish to simply give a brief history of the case at this point and set forth the facts in the argument on each question. Reference should be made to where the salient facts can be found in the Record on Appeal (i.e., R.p. 37, lines 7-8).]

The Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment of the Circuit Court. Honorable Albert C. Culbertson. Court of Common Pleas. Coleman Doe Jr., as Personal Representative of the Estate of Mildred Doe Cheryl M. Doe v. Coleman Doe, Jr. Op. No. 2011-C26-6503P (S.C. Ct. App. filed March 5, 2012). 15. The document Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe is invalid based on the testator's lack of capacity to contract. 16. Before the alleged signing of the document Last Will and Testament of Mildred on April 22, 2007, the decedent was heavily medicated and in her last stage of cancer. 17. These medications combined with the decedent's advanced age and poor health rendered the decedent with the capacity to understand the extent of her estate. 18. The decedent's lack of capacity are internally evidenced within the document Last Will Testament of Mildred Doe itself in several locations. (a) The decedent left all her estate to only one sibling with no mentioning of any other heir or disowning any other heir. 19. A representation was made by the Respondent to the decedent and those present that the document was Power of Attorney. (a) according to records Power of Attorney for the estate of Mildred was recorded in Horry County, in November, 2007. 20. This statement was false as she was not signing a

2

Power of Attorney but executing a Will leaving all her property to to the Respondent alone. 20. This misrepresentation was material in that the decedent and witnesses was not a document for the Respondent to assist in paying decedent bills but was a Will leaving all the decedent's property to the Respondent.. 21. The Respondent intended that the decedent, witnesses and other family members including the the Appellate act upon act upon the the representation that document was only for him help pay her bills. 22. The decedent, document witnesses and others present did not know that the Defendant's statements were false and relied on the truth of his statements. Those present had a right to rely on the statements of the Respondent as a son, brother and uncle and rely on the fact that he claimed to be assisting the decedent. 23. As result of the reliance on the false statements of the of the Respondent concerning what the document was, both document witnesses signed a Will giving all property to the Respondent ultimately losing any share to the property they may have received as heirs. 24. The South Carolina Code of Laws provides in 62-2-502 that every will drafted within the jurisdiction of the State of South Carolina shall be signed by at least two persons, each of whom witnesses either the signing or the testator's acknowledge of the signature or of the will. 25. Two alleged witness of the document Last Will and Testament of Mildred appear to be Anthony C. Doe and Janice D. Parker, both heirs of the decedent. Both witnesses will attest to the fact that Mildred Doe did not know what she was signing nor did they know they were witnessing her Last Will and Testament. 26. The South Carolina Code 62-2-503 requires that in order to be self-proven, a Will must be acknowledged by the testator and the affidavit of at least one witness, each made before an officer authorized to administer oaths under the laws of the state where execution occurs and evidenced by the officer's certificate. 27. There is no witness line for the witness to acknowledge that he/she saw the within named party execute her Last Will and Testament before the Notary. 28. Upon information and belief, the Notary was not present at the time the will was executed, nor were the signatures later affirmed before the Notary. 29. Upon information and belief, the decedent was without capacity to contract between December 20, 2006 through the date of her death December 4, 2007. 30. Upon information and belief, the Respondent took a major role in drafting of the document Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe, assisting the decedent in virtually every step of the process. 31. The drafting of Wills and other

testamentary documents is determined by the South Carolina Supreme Court to be the practice of law in the state of South Carolina. 32. The Respondent interest in the estate of the decedent flows directly out of his unauthorized practice of law in drafting the decedent Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe. 33. The South Carolina Code of Laws 62-3-203 determines priority in determining appointment of a personal representative. Appellate priority is considered under 62-3-203(a)(5) as being an heir of the decedent. Decedent does not have a surviving spouse or other devisee in the Will other than Respondent. The Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe named the Respondent as personal representative and Rosa L. Doe, the defedant's wife, as alternative representative. 30. Upon information and belief, since the time that the Respondent was appointed as Personal Representative of the Estate of Mildred Doe, he has engaged in waste and dispersion of the peresonal porperty of the decedent's estate and is acting soley on his own interest and not that of the decedent or any other heir of the decedent. 39. Upon information anad belief, the Respondent is not properly qualifed for the position as personal representative and Appellate seeks to be appointed a spersonal representative in Respondent place.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(A)Table of Authorities.....1

(1) Brief of Appellate.....1

(B)Statement of Issues on Appeal2

(C)Statement of the Case.....2

Facts.....2

Arguments.....3

(1)Because the Respondent could have raised fraud in drafting the will himself. A misrepresentation was made by the Respondent to the decedent and those present that the document he needed the decedent to sign was to help pay her bills and keep her affairs in order, leading to the decedent and others to believe that the document was a Power of Attorney. This statement was false as she was not signing a Power of Attorney but excuting a Will leaving all her property to the Respondont. This misrepresentation was materal in that the document for the descent and witnesses signed was not a document for the Respondont to assist in paying descents bills but a Will leaving all property to the Respondont alone. Upon information and belief, the Respondont took a major role in drafting the Will document and knew that the document he was preparing to the descents bills but a document granting all proprety to himself. The Respondont intended that the descent, witnesses and other family including Appellate act upon the respresentation that the document was only to pay here bills. The decedcent, document witnesses and others present did not that the Respondont's statement were false and relied on the truth of his statements. Those present had a right to rely on the statement of the Respondont as a son, brother and uncle and rely on fact that he claimed to be assisting the decedent. As a result of the reliance on the false statements of the Respondont concerning what the document was, both document witnesses signed a Will giving all property to the Respondont ultimately losing any share to the property they may have received as heirs. My Descent had no knowledge of this week that the Respondont, Mr. Coleman Doe, Jr. showed up to her home. On April 22, 2007 around 10:00 p.m. . The Respondont went to decedent's house alone and drafted the the Will himself. Janice Parker and Anthony Will only because the Respondont told them that it was for Power of Attorney. The Respondont then went to the descedent asking her to sign without her being aware of what she was

signing. The Respondent stated in Probate that he helped her sign the Will, but the Notary, Mrs. Cox stated that the Respondent was not present. How could this be possible? The Notary also stated Rosa Doe; now the ex-wife, went with her to the decedent's home. The Notary Mrs. Cox stated at the trial, that at the time signing her notarization Rosa Doe was in the kitchen and did not want anything to do with it. Was the Respondent there, or not? Was Mrs. Cox in the home? Or was Mrs. Rosa Doe, the Respondent ex-wife, in the home? This just doesn't add up. Mrs. Rosa, was summoned to appear in court to testify, but the day of the trial her and the Notary, left the Horry County Courthouse, without permission, claiming to have gone to the hospital. Not only was the decedent on heavy amounts of medication. Anthony C. Doe and Careme Smith, the two witnesses stated Mrs. Cox was never in the home. I feel like I was treated unfairly during the whole process of this matter. The judge was out of the office several times causing us to reschedule to court date. I received no phone call(s) and it was an inconvenience because I live in Florence, S.C. My oldest sibling traveled from Atlanta, Ga. twice only to be told that the judge was out of the office. The case has been very drawn out. I was told by Honorable Dundee W. Carter, Associate Judge of the Probate Court that she took the case due to another Judge being out of the office, the morning of the trial. On the morning of August 10, 2010 I was called off my job to report to Probate Court. An individual alleging to be one of the witnesses, called confessing that she gave a false testimony under oath. Judge W. Dundee stated that my witnesses were very consistent and that the witnesses for the Respondent were inconsistent in their testimony. I was very disappointed with Judge W. Dundee's (Probate) decision, and Judge George E. Brown, Circuit Court. The proof are in the transcripts. I honestly don't believe the transcripts were ever used in each case, in the lower courts.

Conclusion: (1) The South Carolina Code of Laws provides in §62-2-502 that every will drafted within the jurisdiction of the State of South Carolina shall be signed by at least two persons each of whom witnessed either the signing or the testator's acknowledgement of the signature or of the will.

(2) The two alleged witnesses of the Document Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe appear to be Anthony C. Doe and Janice D. Parker, both heirs of the decedent. Both witnesses will attest to the fact that Mildred Doe did not know what she was signing nor did they know they were witnessing her last Will and Testament.

(3) The South Carolina Code of Laws §62-2-503 requires that in order to be self-proven, a Will must be acknowledged by the testator and the affidavit of at least one witness, each made before an officer authorized to administer oaths under the laws of the state where execution occurs and evidenced by the officer's certificate.

(4) There is no witness line for the witness to acknowledge that he/she saw the within named party execution occurs and evidenced by the officer's certificate.

(2)

(5) Upon information and belief, the Notary was not present at the time the will was executed, nor were the signatures later affirmed before the Notary. The South Carolina Code of determines priority in determining appointment of a personal representative. Appellant priority is considered under §62-3-203(a)(5) as being an heir of the decedent. Decedent does not have a surviving spouse or other devisee in the will other than the Respondent. The Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe named the Respondent and his now ex-wife, as alternate representative. Upon information and belief, since the time that the Respondent was appointed as Personal Representative of Mildred Doe, he has engaged in waste and dispersion of the personal of the decedent's estate and is acting solely on his own interest and not that of the decedent or any other heir of the decedent. Upon information and belief, the Respondent is not properly qualified for the position as personal representative an Appellate seeks to be appointed as personal representative in Respondent's place. WHEREFORE, the Appellate prays that the court inquire into the matters alleged in the Complaint and grant her the following relief:

1. That the Court find the Respondent has the same intestate rights in the estate of the decedent as that of a third party;
2. That the decedent be found to lack the capacity to contract in allegedly signing the document Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe;
3. That the Notary or any other individual authorized to administer oaths within the jurisdiction of South Carolina was present with the witnesses when signing any portion of the document Last Will and Testament of Mildred;
4. That the Court find that the decedent died without drafting a Will; in the alternative,
5. That the Court find the Respondent be purged of his interest in the alleged Will of of the decedent to which he would have received had the decedent died intestate; the Respondent has since got married again into this matter.
6. That the Court find that the Respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law in drafting the document Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe;
7. That the Appellant be appointed as Personal Representative to the estate;
8. That the Respondent make an accounting of any and all property removed from the estate of the decedent during which time the Respondent was named Personal Representative;
9. That there be a permanent Restraining Order, prohibiting either party from threatening, harassing, bothering, or interfering with the other in any matter whatsoever; and,
10. Any further relief in law or equity that this Court may deem just and proper.

(3)

11. That the Respondent be made liable to pay the Appellant \$4,000 for the funeral cost of the decedent.

12. For the reasons stated, this Court should reverse the judgement of the Circuit Court.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Cheryl M. Doe
Cheryl M. Doe
301 Rosemount Drive
Florence, S.C. 29505
843-665-9299
Pro-Se

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Initial Brief and Designation, on the Respondent, to Mr. Russell P. Brehen, by depositing a copy in the United States Mail, (~~December, 12, 2012~~) *May 20, 2013* as well as hand delivered, on Monday December, 17th, 2012 addressed to Mr. Russell P. Brehen, 1108 3rd Ave. Conway, S.C. 29526 *Faxed on 5/19/13*

mail on 5/20/13

CC: Mr. Russell P. Brehen
1108 3rd. Ave. Conway, S.C. 29526
843-488-3500

December, 12, 2012

May 19, 2013

(5) Upon information and belief, the Notary was not present at the time the will was executed, nor were the signatures later affirmed before the Notary. The South Carolina Code of determines priority in determining appointment of a personal representative. Appellant priority is considered under § 62-3-203(a)(5) as being an heir of the decedent. Decedent does not have a surviving spouse or other devisee in the will other than the Respondent. The Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe named the Respondent and his now ex-wife, as alternate representative. Upon information and belief, since the time that the Respondent was appointed as Personal Representative of Mildred Doe, he has engaged in waste and dispersion of the personal of the decedent's estate and is acting solely on his own interest and not that of the decedent or any other heir of the decedent. Upon information and belief, the Respondent is not properly qualified for the position as personal representative an Appellate seeks to be appointed as personal representative in Respondent's place. WHEREFORE, the Appellate prays that the court inquire into the matters alleged in the Complaint and grant her the following relief:

1. That the Court find the Respondent has the same intestate rights in the estate of the decedent as that of a third party;
2. That the decedent be found to lack the capacity to contract in allegedly signing the document Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe;
3. That the Notary or any other individual authorized to administer oaths within the jurisdiction of South Carolina was present with the witnesses when signing any portion of the document Last Will and Testament of Mildred;
4. That the Court find that the decedent died without drafting a Will; in the alternative,
5. That the Court find the Respondent be purged of his interest in the alleged Will of of the decedent to which he would have received had the decedent died intestate; the Respondent has since got married again into this matter.
6. That the Court find that the Respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law in drafting the document Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe;
7. That the Appellant be appointed as Personal Representative to the estate;
8. That the Respondent make an accounting of any and all property removed from the estate of the decedent during which time the Respondent was named Personal Representative;
9. That there be a permanent Restraining Order, prohibiting either party from threatening, harassing, bothering, or interfering with the other in any matter whatsoever; and,
10. Any further relief in law or equity that this Court may deem just and proper.

(3)

signing. The Respondent stated in Probate that he helped her sign the Will, but the Notary, Mrs. Cox stated that the Respondent was not present. How could this be possible? The Notary also stated Rosa Doe; now the ex-wife, went with her to the decedent's home. The Notary Mrs. Cox stated at the trial, that at the time signing her notarization Rosa Doe was in the kitchen and did not want anything to do with it. Was the Respondent there, or not? Was Mrs. Cox in the home? Or was Mrs. Rosa Doe, the Respondent ex-wife, in the home? This just doesn't add up. Mrs. Rosa, was summoned to appear in court to testify, but the day of the trial her and the Notary, left the Horry County Courthouse, without permission, claiming to have gone to the hospital. Not only was the decedent on heavy amounts of medication. Anthony C. Doe and Careme Smith, the two witnesses stated Mrs. Cox was never in the home. I feel like I was treated unfairly during the whole process of this matter. The judge was out of the office several times causing us to reschedule to court date. I received no phone call(s) and it was an inconvenience because I live in Florence, S.C. My oldest sibling traveled from Atlanta, Ga. twice only to be told that the judge was out of the office. The case has been very drawn out. I was told by Honorable Dundee W. Carter, Associate Judge of the Probate Court that she took the case due to another Judge being out of the office, the morning of the trial. On the morning of August 10, 2010 I was called off my job to report to Probate Court. An individual alleging to be one of the witnesses, called confessing that she gave a false testimony under oath. Judge W. Dundee stated that my witnesses were very consistent and that the witnesses for the Respondent were inconsistent in their testimony. I was very disappointed with Judge W. Dundee's (Probate) decision, and Judge George E. Brown, Circuit Court. The proof are in the transcripts. I honestly don't believe the transcripts were ever used in each case, in the lower courts. .

Conclusion: (1) The South Carolina Code of Laws provides in §62-2-502 that every will drafted within the jurisdiction of the State of South Carolina shall be signed by at least two persons each of whom witnessed either the signing or the testator's acknowledgement of the signature or of the will.

(2) The two alleged witnesses of the Document Last Will and Testament of Mildred Doe appear to be Anthony C. Doe and Janice D. Parker, both heirs of the decedent. Both witnesses will attest to the fact that Mildred Doe did not know what she was signing nor did they know they were witnessing her last Will and Testament.

(3) The South Carolina Code of Laws §62-2-503 requires that in order to be self-proven, a Will must be acknowledged by the testator and the affidavit of at least one witness, each made before an officer authorized to administer oaths under the laws of the state where execution occurs and evidenced by the officer's certificate.

(4) There is no witness line for the witness to acknowledge that he/she saw the within named party execution occurs and evidenced by the officer's certificate.

(2)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(A)Table of Authorities.....1
(1) Brief of Appellate.....1
(B)Statement of Issues on Appeal2
(C)Statement of the Case.....2
Facts.....2
Arguments.....3

(1)Because the Respondent could have raised fraud in drafting the will himself. A misrepresentation was made by the Respondent to the decedent and those present that the document he needed the decedent to sign was to help pay her bills and keep her affairs in order, leading to the decedent and others to believe that the document was a Power of Attorney. This statement was false as she was not signing a Power of Attorney but excuting a Will leaving all her property to the Respondont. This misrepresentation was materal in that the document for the descent and witnesses signed was not a document for the Respondont to assist in paying descents bills but a Will leaving all property to the Respondont alone. Upon information and belief, the Respondont took a major role in drafting the Will document and knew that the document he was preparing to the descents bills but a document granting all proprety to himself. The Respondont intended that the descent, witnesses and other family including Appellate act upon the respresentation that the document was only to pay here bills. The decedcent, document witnesses and others present did not that the Respondont's statement were false and relied on the truth of his statements. Those present had a right to rely on the statement of the Respondont as a son, brother and uncle and rely on fact that he claimed to be assisting the decedent. As a result of the reliance on the false statements of the Respondont concerning what the document was, both document witnesses signed a Will giving all property to the Respondont ultimately losing any share to the property they may have received as heirs.My Descent had no knowledge of this week that the Respondont, Mr. Coleman Doe, Jr. showed up to her home. On April 22, 2007 around 10:00 p.m. . The Respondont went to decedent's house alone and drafted the the Will himself. Janice Parker and Anthony Will only because the Respondont told them that it was for Power of Attorney. The Respondont then went to the descedent asking her to sign without her being aware of what she was

BRIEF OF APPELLANT*

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals
[In The Supreme Court]

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Honorable Benjamin H. Culbertsons, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2012-210726

Coleman Doe Jr., as
individually and as Personal
Representative of the Estate of
Mildred Doe, Anthony C.
Doe, Kimberly L. Doe, Janice
Parker, Doe, Jimmie C.
Gowans, John H. Doe, Kevin
E. Doe, Barbara Morrow and
Linda Onley,

Respondent,

v.

Cheryl M. Doe,

Appellant.

[INITIAL] BRIEF OF APPELLANT

cc: Russell Brehen

Cheryl M. Doe
301 Rosemount Drive
Florence, South Carolina 29505
(843) 665-9299
Pro-Se

9/21/2012FORM 7
PROOF OF SERVICE OF A NOTICE OF PETITION TO REINSTATE

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals
[In The Supreme Court]

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Honorable Benjamin H. Culbertson

Case No. 2012-210726

Coleman Doe Jr., as Personal
Representative of the Estate of
Mildred Doe,

Respondent,

v.

Cheryl M. Doe,

Appellant.

RECEIVED

MAY 23 2013

SC Court of Appeals

PROOF OF SERVICE


I certify that I have served the Notice of Petition to Reinstate, on Coleman Doe Jr., by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on September 20, 2012, *May 20, 2013* addressed to his attorney of record, Russell P. Brehen, 1108 3rd Ave. Conway, South Carolina 29526

September 20, 2012

May 19, 2013

s/ Cheryl M. Doe

Cheryl M. Doe
301 Rosemount Drive
Florence, South Carolina 29505
(864) 843-665-9299
Pro-Se





The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN
DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1015 SUMTER STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1880
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

March 11, 2013

Cheryl M. Doe
301 Rosemount Drive
Florence SC 29505

Re: Doe, Cheryl v. Doe, Coleman
Appellate Case No. 2012-210726

Dear Counsel:

Within ten (10) days, you are requested to serve the Respondent with the Petition to Reinstate the appeal, and you must file the original proof of service with this Court showing that you have done so. Within the same time frame, you must also serve and file a designation of matter in accordance with Rule 209 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules.

Very truly yours,

V. Claire Allen, Deputy

CLERK

cc: Russell Patrick Brehn

77



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN
DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1015 SUMTER STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

November 15, 2012

Cheryl M. Doe
301 Rosemount Drive
Florence SC 29505

Re: Doe, Cheryl v. Doe, Coleman
Appellate Case No. 2012-210726

Dear Counsel:

We have received your petition to reinstate in the above case. Within thirty (30) days of the date of this letter the appellant is to serve and file the appellant's initial brief and designation of matter in compliance to Rules 208 and 209 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. This Court will act on appellant's petition to reinstate upon receipt of the appellant's initial brief and designation of matter or the expiration of thirty (30) days.

Very truly yours,

V. Claire Allen, Deputy

CLERK

cc: Russell Patrick Brehn

Cheryl M. Doe
301 Rosemount Dr.
Florence, S.C. 29505



U.S. POSTAGE
\$1.06
FCM LETTER
29501
Date of sale
05/22/13
06 2S00
08310264
APC
FC0060600 106620

The S.C. Court of Appeals
P.O. Box 11629
Columbia, S.C. 29211
1015 Sumner St.
Columbia SC 29201

Att. Monica

