

July 5, 2013

RECEIVED

JUL - 8 2013

TO: Supreme Court Clerk/attn: Debie

Ref: Appellate Case no. 2012-213516

S.C. Supreme Court

Lower Court Case no. 2011-CP-40-08913

**Please be review the attached signatures and CORRECTED DATES,
the Original documents will be hand-delivered to your office on Monday.**

Thank you.

Faxed for Appellant/Terra Freeman

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court Case No. 2012-213516

RECEIVED

JUL - 8 2013

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas Case No. 2011-CP-40-08913

S.C. Supreme Court

Joseph M. Strickland (Master of Equity) Judge
(allegedly!) Special Circuit Court Judge


Dear Clerk:

Please find the proper corrections of the attached erred dates, regarding Appellant/Plaintiffs'
Motion for Reinstatement.

July 5, 2013

Sincerely,

cc: Jody A. Berdenbaugh clo Erik T. Norton
cc: Ruth Kennedy


Terra K. Freeman, Pro se
112 Vineyards Crossing Ct, Columbia, SC 29229

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court Case no. 2012-213516

RECEIVED

JUL - 8 2013

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas - Case no. 2011-CP-40-08913

S.C. Supreme Court

Joseph M. Strickland (Master of Equity) Judge
(allegedly!) Special Circuit Court Judge

Terra K. Freeman, et alAppellants,

v.

Bank of AmericaRespondent.

CORRECTION OF DATE should read JULY 3, 2013 – FILED RECORDS ON APPEAL

Mrs. Ruth Kennedy, Pro Se Mrs. Terra K. Freeman, Pro Se
263 Blythe Creeke Drive 112 Vineyards Crossing Court
Blythewood, SC 29016 Columbia, SC 29229
Above Appellants...

Jody A. Bedenbaugh-c/o Erik T. Norton
SC Bar Numbers. 71176 & 73860
1320 Main Street/17th Floor
P.O. Box 11070 (29211-1070)
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 799-2000
Added Attorneys for Bank of America

Correction DATE: July 3rd, 2013

CORRECTED ON: July 5, 2013

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS
Appellate Case no: 2012-213516

Page 1 of 3
Attachment-5

APPEAL FROM the RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
Joseph M. Strickland (alleged Substitute) Judge
Lower Case no. 2011-CP-40-08913

Terra K. Freeman and Ruth Kennedy, Pro Ses ¹

Plaintiff/Appellants

vs.

Bank of America, c/o Missy Graham, Office of Assistant
Manager and Jane Barfell, Personal Banker,

Defendant(s)/Respondent(s)

RECEIVED

JUL - 8 2013

S.C. Supreme Court

MEMORANDUM with CITATION of AUTHORITIES
in SUPPORT of MOTION TO RESTATE

Pursuant with SCACR 204(a)(c)(d), 207, and 267(b) these above said pro se are individually/but jointly writing this said Memorandum with Citation of Authorities, regarding this Supreme Court's attached Order which appears to have again!, filed in error, its Dismissal of Appellants' Petition for Appeals, now! pursuant with "Belue v. Belue, 267 S.C. 120, 276 S.E.2d 295 (1981)", and Rule 221, SCACR, although ! this Supreme Court did not consider that both Appellants filed their Appeal involved a "...FINAL JUDGMENT INVOLVING a Challenge on STATE or Federal Grounds to the Constitutionality of a STATE LAW..." pursuant with SCACR 203(d)(1)(A)(i)²

SUPREME COURT'S OBVIOUS ERRORS in its Order June 19, 2013 do to the following:

1. Supreme court's 6/19/2013 Order admits these Appellants "appeals involves TWO ORDERS issued by the Circuit Court...which granted a motion to dismiss...dated APRIL 12, 2012." Regarding "...The TRANSCRIPT!! of the MARCH 30, 2012 HEARING!! on this Motion INDICATES that NEITHER APPELLANT was PRESENT at THAT HEARING". But yet! this Supreme Court's own! signed Letter dated "February 27, 2013" contradicts! that "...the HEARING SCHEDULED for MARCH 2012, the Court Reporter indicates that, while the Respondent Appeared through counsel, neither of you appeared. As a RESULT, NOTHING!! was apparently PUT! ON! the RECORD for THAT!! HEARING! Therefore, NO!! TRANSCRIPT!!! is! AVAILABLE!! for that! (MARCH 2012) date". Which is Untrue.

¹ HAINES v. KERNER ET AL. No. 70-5025. SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES - says Cases on Pro Se Rights that "...Allegations such as those asserted by Petitioner, However Inartfully pleaded are Sufficient..." Which states we do not hold ...Pro Se claims to the same Standards as an Attorney. "...Prisoner's pro se complaint... should not have been dismissed without affording him the opportunity to present evidence on his claims." 4 27 F.2d 71, reversed and remanded."

² 203(d)(1)(A)(i) states "...Any final judgment involving a challenge on state or federal grounds to the constitutionality of a state law or county or municipal ordinance where the principal issue is one of the constitutionality of the law or ordinance;"

1a): This said Supreme Court's ORDER of 6/19/2013, shows further! it ERRED/or Otherwise! intentionally OVERLOOKED, the fact! that this Supreme Court ADMITTED/or acknowledge! that it READ! the said lower trial court Judge Strickland's ORDER dated "APRIL 12, 2012" "...which granted a motion to dismiss", although! this said Supreme Court NEVER ACKNOWLEDGED!! that the said lower trial court's actual!! read ORDER! of "APRIL 12, 2012" always INDICATED also!! that the said Appellant/Plaintiff(s) DID!! APPEAR! at the alleged MARCH 30, 2012 lower Court Hearing;

1b): Appellant/Plaintiffs already PRODUCED Documented Evidence to this said Supreme Court (that's been OVERLOOKED/or in Error was not consider in this Supreme Court's ORDER dated 6-19-2013) which the said documented evidence showed to this said Supreme Court that the said Lower Trial Court's DOCKET/and/or Case HISTORY SHEET- NEVER showed the lower trial court Judge Strickland never! placed Appellant/Plaintiffs filed State! Court! COMPLAINT to be actually heard within ANY! OPEN COURT HEARINGS, on the date MARCH 30, 2012, nor! on the date NOVEMBER 1, 2012³...

*** (due to lower Court Judge Strickland's always known and ADMITTED to his personal biased interest and/or personal known INVOLVEMENTS/with the Defendant/BANK of AMERICA's admitted involvements with Appellant/Plaintiffs named PAYEE/CCG/and or CCG's Agents Pough, McQueen and Brunson; as well as the said lower trial court Judge Strickland's ADMITTED to been a former! HIRED EMPLOYEE-with Defendant/ BOA's hired said Attorney(s)' Nelson & Mullen's LAW FIRM- who ALSO! was known to ALWAYS been involved with Appellant/Plaintiffs' Cashiers Checks/or Money Orders named PAYEE/CCG, regarding claims filed and FIRST!! RULED! in FINAL!! JUDGMENT(s) filed ONLY!! within a STATE!! COURT!! Civil and Criminal proceedings that took place since the year 2007, SETTLED/RESOLVED/and DISMISSED, as well as GRANTED FULL RELIEF from SCAG/South Carolina ATTORNEY GENERAL Office Officials/Plaintiff(s)' prior rendered STATE!! COURT!! ORDERS - Ruled ONLY in FAVOR!! of Appellant/Plaintiffs named PAYEE/CCG and CCG's said PRO SE parties were heard/and .or/RECEIVED FINAL!! State! Court! Orders ONLY within the said RICHLAND COUNTY STATE Court, in the YEAR 2007, which involved this said Appellant/Plaintiffs' PRO SE monies.)***

**SUPREME COURTS 6-19-2013 ORDER is Unreliable/or LYOT
or ERRED -WHEN it TRUSTED/or Accepted ONLY! Lower Court's written ORDER NOV. 2, 2012
YET! SUPREME COURT Only!! RELIED UPON Lower Court's "TRANSCRIPT!!"
HEARING! DATED "MARCH 30, 2012"; But DID! NOT! RELIE upon Lower Court signed ORDERED
CLAIMS dated "APRIL 12, 2012" acknowledging APPELLANT/Plaintiffs allegedly APPEARED in
THAT said LOWER COURT HEARING allegedly on "MARCH 30, 2012"**

2. This Supreme Court's ORDER dated 6-19-2013 second paragraph, ADMITS it relies upon ONLY!! the said Lower Trial Court Judges Strickland's written ORDER dated "NOVEMBER 2, 2012", but! this same Supreme Court signed Judge's LETTER dated "February 27, 2013" on second page, and second paragraph ADMITS!


"...that the ONLY!! TRANSCRIPT!! that is AVAILABLE in this matter is the HEARING of NOVEMBER 1, 2012, and THAT! TRANSCRIPT!! has been mailed to you. Therefore, the INITIAL BRIEF... will need to be served and filed within THIRTY DAYS of the DATE of this LETTER OR within THIRTY DAYS of your RECEIPT!! of the TRANSCRIPT!! of the NOVEMBER 1, 2012, HEARING, whichever is LATER." Which CONTRADICTS! /or shows ERROR of Supreme Court Order 6-19-2013.


³ due to Appellant/Plaintiffs ALWAYS provided to this said Supreme Court showing documents of their FILED MOTION(s) for DISQUALIFICATION of the said lower trial court Judge Strickland, who NEVER!! RULED!, nor never! SIGNED No! ORDER! regarding his DISQUALIFICATION on the dates MARCH 30, 2012 nor NOVEMBER 1st, 2012, when this said Supreme Court's ORDER alleged on 6-19-2013 - ADMITS!! that Both Appellant/Plaintiffs filed their "... APPEALS INVOLVES! NEED!! OR DEBS! ISSUED! by the CIRCUIT COURT..." involving the said lower trial court ORDERS dated "APRIL 12, 2012" and "NOVEMBER 2, 2012".

2. **WHEREAS** now! this Supreme Court's ORDER dated 6-19-2013 claiming "...The First ORDER granted a motion to dismiss...dated APRIL 12, 2012. The TRANSCRIPT!! of the MARCH 30, 2012, HEARING INDICATES..." an alleged HEARING was heard without the Present of said Appellant/Plaintiffs, although!! this said Supreme Court's ADMITTED READING also of the Lower Trial Court's actual WRITTEN ORDER dated APRIL 12, 2012 signed! with the actual NAME!! of the JUDGE JOSEPH M. STRICKLAND, "...INDICATES"...the Appellant/Plaintiff(s) indeed! DID APPEAR!! at the said MARCH 30, 2012 Hearing, which also CONTRADICTS this SAME Supreme Court's own! written LETTER dated "February 27, 2013" who in ERRED and claimed "...As to the HEARING SCHEDULED!! for MARCH 2012...the RECORD for THAT HEARING...NO! TRANSCRIPT!! IS AVAILABLE!! for that DATE..."⁴ yet! this said Supreme Court ORDER dated 6/19/2013 ERRED! for the said lower trial court's REPORTER, told the interfornal UNTRUTH to! this! Supreme! which mislead this said Court to have ruled "The TRANSCRIPT of the MARCH 30, 2012..." was indeed "AVAILABLE" and or was Recorded. Therefore, shows and supports Appellant/Plaintiffs claims made in their written NOTICE OF APPEAL that the said lower trial court's ORDERS showed and ADMITTED to personal interest and biased due to the Lower trial court's written "JUDGEMENTS involves a challenge on state or federal grounds to the constitutionality of a state law ..." pursuant with SCACR 203(d)(1)(A)(ii)

WHEREFORE, pro se Appellant/Plaintiffs states that this said memorandum is proper and correct as to their believe and attempt to comply to the rules of this said Supreme court, but also state that if there are any additional corrections in which must amended, please do not hesitate to contact these said Appellant/Plaintiffs.

Contacted Date: July 3, 2013 / Correction on: July 5, 2013


 Ruth Kennedy, Pro Se
 263 Blyth Creek Dr., Baywood, SC 29016

Respectfully Submitted,

 Terra Freeman, Pro Se 112
 Vineyards Crossing Ct, Columbia, SC 29229

⁴ This said Supreme Court's ORDER of 6-19-2013, REFUSED! for Never! refiled also!! upon the said lower trial court's written ORDERED CLAIMS dated "APRIL 12, 2012" - WHICH alleged! that Appellant/Plaintiff(s) indeed! DID! APPEARED! at the alleged "MARCH 30, 2012" HEARING; Which this said Supreme Court's 6-19-2013 ORDER, and! this said Supreme Court's own! LETTER dated "February 27, 2013" showed the said lower trial courts REPORTER was UNTRUTHFUL to this said Supreme court regarding the TRANSCRIPT of MARCH 30, HEARING was indeed RECORDED, as well as this said Supreme Court on 2-27-2013 ADMITS that Appellant/Plaintiff DID!! ALWAYS WROTE! and had personal CO NTACTS with the said lower trial court REPORTER, and also ADMITTED by this said Supreme Court "...HAVE!! CONTACTED!! the COURT REPORTER, Ms. Robin Riebold, about what the TRANSCRIPT are AVAILABLE in THIS! MATTER." Therefore, shows these PRO SE Appellant/Plaintiff ALWAYS DID comply with this Supreme Court RULES 207, as to WHY! this said Supreme Court ALSO ORDERED and REINSTATED Appellant/Plaintiffs' prior also ERRED Dismissal. *(See attached Supreme Court's attached Order dated February 6, 2013)

"February 6, 2012 - in ERROR!! also! stated that "...By ORDER dated January 2, 2013, this APPEAL was DISMISSED USE TO Appellant's BENEFIT to PROVIDE the COURT with CORRESPONDENCE!! showing the TRANSCRIPT!! and REFILEd Orders! from the Court Reporter as Required by Rule 207, SCACR. APPELLANTS HAVE FILED a REPLY, which AS APPELLANTS COMPLIANCE! with Rule 207, ARE HERBY REINSTATED the APPEAL."

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court Case No. 2012-213516

RECEIVED

JUL - 8 2013

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas Case No. 2011-CP-40-08913

S.C. Supreme Court

Joseph M. Strickland (Master of Equity) Judge
(allegedly!) Special Circuit Court Judge



Terra K. Freeman, etc.alAppellants,

v.

Bank of AmericaRespondent.

PROOF of SERVICE

I, the undersigned, Pro Se Appellant/Plaintiffs, do hereby certify that I have served all counsel in this action with a copy of the document(s)/or/MOTION TO REINSTATE herein below specified by mailing, faxing or hand-delivered the same to ALL the following:

Mrs. Ruth Kennedy, Pro/Se
263 Blythe Creeke Drive
Blythewood, SC 29016
Above Appellants...

Mrs. Terra K. Freeman, Pro Se
112 Vineyards Crossing Court
Columbia, SC 29229

Jody A. Bedenbaugh-c/o Erik T. Norton
SC Bar Numbers. 71176 & 73860
1320 Main Street/17th Floor
P.O. Box 11070 (29211-1070)
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 799-2000
Added Attorneys for Bank of America

Document(s) attached served:

- Supreme Court's ORDER dated "June 19, 2013"
- Supreme Court's LETTER dated "February 27, 2013"
- Supreme Court's ORDER dated "February 6, 2013"

Total Attachments - 5

Corrected Date: July 3rd, 2013
Correction Dated: July 5, 2013