

**RECEIVED**

**Sep 05 2023**

**S.C. SUPREME COURT**

EXHIBIT   /

**Barry Baker**

---

**From:** Transcripts <transcripts@sccourts.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 24, 2022 12:02 PM  
**To:** Barry Baker  
**Cc:** Raines, Tiffany  
**Subject:** James Kevin Holmes v. Cynthia Elaine Collie n/k/a Cynthia Elaine Holmes

Mr. Baker:

It is with sincere regret that we must inform you that the hearing held on April 20, 2022 in Charleston County via WebEx cannot be transcribed as no audio recording can be located. Please let me know if you think this could have been heard on a different date.

Sincerely,

Court Reporter Section

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE This message is intended only for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not read, copy, retain, or disseminate this message or any attachment. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete all copies of the message and any attachments.



**South Carolina Court Administration**  
South Carolina Supreme Court  
Columbia, South Carolina

1220 SENATE STREET, SUITE 200  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201

December 12, 2022

C. Holmes  
PO Box 187  
Sullivan's Island, SC 29482

RE: Holmes v. Holmes  
Case number: 2021-DR-10-5478  
Date of Hearing: 4/20/2022

Ms. Holmes:

It is with sincere regret that we must inform you that the hearing held on April 20, 2022 via WebEx in Charleston County cannot be transcribed as no audio recording can be located.

Sincerely,

Court Reporter Section

---

EXHIBIT 2

Case No. 2021-CP-10-5478

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON )

AFFIDAVIT

2022 JUL 22 AM 10:27  
JULIE J. AMMONS  
CLERK OF COURT

FILED

Personally came and appeared before me, Notary Public, C. Holmes, who upon being duly sworn did depose and say the following:

1. I am the defendant, of legal age, and competent to state the matters herein. This affidavit is based on personal knowledge and on information and belief. It is submitted in support of the attached motion for recusal/disqualification of the Presiding Judge R. Markley Dennis, Jr., in Case Number 2021-CP-10-5478.
2. As a threshold matter, jurisdiction can be raised at any time and it is respectfully submitted that jurisdiction is lacking due to, including but not limited to, the currently pending prior matter in the exclusive jurisdiction of the Charleston County Family Court for the same and similar claims.
3. Moreover, there is precedent as Judge Dennis granted the undersigned's request for recusal due to the same or similar circumstances in Case Number 2019-CP-10-03131.
4. The record reflects a pattern and practice of violations, including but not limited to, the South Carolina Constitution and its mandate that, "All courts shall be public." Article 1, section 9 of the South Carolina Constitution. Specifically, all orders herein have been entered based on impermissible ex parte contacts. In this case, the so-called hearing was ex parte, without legal notice of the hearing, without exigent or other circumstances warranting ex parte hearing, and without a court reporter or audio recording for transcript as per the South Carolina Court Administration. The case of *Burgess v. Stern* controls and provides that all orders rendered after the impermissible ex parte contacts herein should be vacated. *Burgess v. Stern*, 428 S.E.2d 880, 311 S.C. 326 (S.C., 1992).

should be vacated. *Burgess v. Stern*, 428 S.E.2d 880, 311 S.C. 326 (S.C., 1992).

5. Further, "(t)his Court advised the Bench and the Bar that not only do such orders deprive the reviewing Court of adequate records on appeal, but also deny to the deprived party an opportunity to be heard in matters which affect them." *Herring v. Retail Credit Co.*, 266 S.C. 455, 224 S.E.2d 663 (1976).

6. Despite objections, the record reflects a pattern and practice in other cases as in this case with unfair/unauthorized rulings adverse to the undersigned by the Presiding Judge who fails to ensure a court reporter or audio recording for transcript, thereby denying due process and adequate record for meaningful review on appeal.

7. The undersigned is prejudiced thereby and but for denial of due process including notice and meaningful opportunity to be heard, the outcome herein should and would be different in the undersigned's favor.

8. On information and belief, goat(s) and untrustworthy attorneys, so-called officers of the court, conspired to game the judicial system and perpetrate fraud upon this Honorable Court in the presence of the Court in order to, including but not limited to, evade the jurisdiction and process of the currently pending prior matter in the exclusive jurisdiction of the Charleston County Family Court for the same and similar claims.

9. Moreover, the record reflects the other side's pattern and practice of ambush litigation, dishonorable failure to copy the other side with documents filed with this Honorable Court, filing false affidavit(s) for the Court's reliance without copying the other side to the other party's extreme prejudice, unprofessional breach of confidentiality, and impermissible direct or indirect ex parte contacts with the Presiding Judge.

10. In addition, the attached copy of Notice is dated April 06, 2022, but was not mailed on that date. Specifically, we received the attached copy of notice from the clerk via USPS on or about April 15, 2022, regarding remote hearing and immediately and timely responded to the court with the attached copy of correspondence as we have no equipment, access, or means to participate remotely. Significantly and materially, the attached copy of notice provides no alternative to remote hearing, no Courtroom for the hearing, and no indication on whether Judge Dennis was remotely located in Berkeley County. Further, the clerk's office is required to reschedule when the party has no ability to participate remotely as in this case. To the extent there is any ambiguity, the rule of lenity supports the undersigned's position and supports recusal. Rules 6 and 7, SCRCP.

11. Moreover, the South Carolina Supreme Court directs that dispositive motions as in this case, the Motion to Dismiss, should be scheduled for in-person hearing as requested by the moving party who also requested a court reporter for audio recording for transcription.

12. A judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned when his or her factual findings are not supported by the record. *Ellis v. Procter & Gamble Dist. Co.*, 315 S.C. 283, 285, 433 S.E.2d 856, 857 (1993). Specifically, in this case the Presiding Judge's factual findings regarding, including but not limited to, notice are not supported by the record thereby reasonably raising questions regarding impartiality.

13. Further, a judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned when his or her factual findings are not supported by the record. *Ellis v. Procter & Gamble Dist. Co.*, 315 S.C. 283, 285, 433 S.E.2d 856, 857 (1993). With respect to Rule 39(a)(1), SCRCP, the record reflects there is no "consent to trial by the court sitting without a jury." Specifically, the record reflects timely request for Rule 38, SCRCP, jury trial and compliance with Rule 39(a), SCRCP, which states:

"When trial by jury has been demanded as provided in Rule 38 (*as in this case*), the action **shall** be designated upon the calendar and the clerk's filebook as a jury action." Rule 39(a), SCRCP (emphasis supplied).

With respect to Rule 39(a)(2), SCRCF, the record reflects there has been no finding that a “right of trial by jury ... does not exist.” The record reflects the undersigned’s timely request for Rule 38, SCRCF, jury trial. Rule 38(a), SCRCF, and the South Carolina Constitution provide that the right of trial by jury **shall be preserved inviolate** and expressly states as follows:

“Issues of fact in an action for the recovery of money only or of specific real or personal property **must be tried by a jury**, unless a jury trial be waived.” Rule 38(a), SCRCF (emphasis supplied).

The record reflects the undersigned expressly reserves, preserves, and does not waive trial by jury. In this case, the Presiding Judge’s failure to preserve inviolate the undersigned’s substantial right to a particular mode of trial reasonably raises questions regarding impartiality. Where a party had a right to jury trial because litigation concerned a land title dispute, an order of reference to master of equity (MOE) is reversible as a matter of law. *Creed v. Stokes*, 285 S.C. 542, 331 S.E.2d 351 (1985).

14. Reasonable men/women might question the impartiality of the Presiding Judge under the following circumstances. Specifically, in Case No. 2005-CP-10-5113, the Presiding Judge ruled a represented party, i.e., the undersigned, violated the revised South Carolina Code Section 15-36-10 (hereafter the revised FPA) without finding a violation by counsel of record, who signed, filed, and certified the claim was meritorious. See *In re Ruffin*, 363 S. C. 347, 610 S. E. 2d 803 (2005) (Court found lawyer did not violate Rule 3.1 in filing a meritless complaint because there was no clear and convincing evidence of the misconduct; the lawyer relied on the advice of his attorney). See Exhibit A.

15. The Presiding Judge herein is the same Presiding Judge in Case No. 2005-CP-10-5113. The attached excerpt of transcript from Case No. 2005-CP-10-5113 reveals unconstitutional retroactive application of the revised FPA over the undersigned’s timely objection in violation of the Legislature’s intended and expressly stated effective date. *Southeastern Site Prep v. Atlantic Coastal Builders and Contractors, LLC*, 394 S.C. 97, 107, 713 S.E.2d 650, 655 (S.C. App. 2011). The record, statutory law, and case law reflect that the revised FPA was not in effect, it was not applicable, and there is no

violation of the applicable FPA.

16. An objective observer should and would reasonably conclude that the record in Circuit Court Case Number 2005-CP-10-5113 reflects abundant error of material fact and law, not founded on the evidence. A reasonable man or woman should and would conclude that the record reflects the decision-maker was "influenced by partiality, prejudice, passion, caprice," or other unconstitutional reason not supported by the record. *See Peagler v. Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company*, 234 S.C. 140, 107 S.E. 2d 15, 84 A.L.R. (2d) 794 (1963). The record including, but not limited to, that referenced below, reflects the Presiding Judge's "partiality, prejudice, passion, caprice," and/or other unconstitutional basis, indicating recusal herein.

17. Further, the Presiding Judge failed to provide transcription of pertinent proceedings at summary judgment in Circuit Court Case Number 2005-CP-10-5113, thereby preventing full and fair transcript and record for meaningful judicial review and depriving the undersigned of due process, equal protection, and full and fair appeal. See Exhibit C, attached copy of Form 4 Order granting summary judgment based on a **phone conference which was not transcribed or recorded.**

18. Moreover, the record reflects the Presiding Judge granted summary judgment in that case based on the improper, less burdensome Federal legal standard. Accordingly, that summary judgment is reversible as a matter of law and, therefore, insufficient grounds for violation of South Carolina Code Section 15-36-10. *See Hancock v. Mid-South Management Co., Inc.*, 381 S.C. 326, 673 S.E.2d 801 (S.C. 2009). That summary judgment order is reversible as a matter of law because it recites and relies on the improper legal standard, stating, "the existence of a mere scintilla of evidence in support of the non-moving party's position is NOT sufficient to overcome a motion for summary judgment." Order filed May 23, 2007, in Case No. 2005-CP-10-5113 found at SUMMARY JUDGMENT STANDARD

(emphasis supplied). This standard is not the proper standard because a mere scintilla of evidence IS sufficient to overcome a motion for summary judgment in South Carolina (when not based on Federal claims, etc.). *Hancock v. Mid-South Management Co., Inc.*, 381 S.C. 326, 673 S.E.2d 801 (S.C. 2009). South Carolina jurists should and would know the South Carolina legal standard for summary judgment. Reasonable men/women should and would reasonably question impartiality.

19. Further, the Presiding Judge denied the undersigned's reasonable request for Counsel at that hearing after Counsel of Record, who re-located out-of-state but still practiced in South Carolina, was unable to attend on insufficient notice.

20. Pursuant to controlling precedent, in Case No. 2005-CP-10-5113 the undersigned was entitled to rely on Counsel of Record who signed the pleadings and complaint which precludes a violation of the revised FPA by the undersigned. In manifest error and blatant bias, the Presiding Judge Dennis did not find the person who signed and certified the complaint, i.e., Counsel of Record, in violation of the revised FPA.

21. The attached copy of transcript excerpt from that case establishes that the Petitioner timely raised the issue of inapplicability of the revised FPA. Despite knowing that novel issues of great public importance and novel issues of new legislation were raised in that pending appeal, the Presiding Judge Dennis failed to follow the rule of law requiring stay pending that appeal. The "decision of whether to award sanctions is a collateral issue and does not constitute a ruling upon the merits of the case.... See *Cooter & Gell v. Hartmarx Corp.*, 496 U.S. 394, 396, 110 S.Ct. 2447, 110 L.Ed.2d 359 (1990)." *Pee Dee Health Care, P.A., v. Estate of Thompson*, 418 S.C. 557, 795 S.E.2d 40 (S.C.App. 2016). See also *Cooter & Gell v. Hartmarx Corp.*, 496 U.S. 384, 402, 110 S.Ct. 2447, 110 L.Ed.2d 359, 58 USLW 4763 (1990)(the lack of any legal requirement other than the talismanic recitation of "'frivolous' will

foreclose meaningful review of sanctions”) (emphasis supplied).

22. Despite the pending appeal with novel issues of exceptional public importance, the Presiding Judge prejudiced the appeal by violating controlling precedent and by violating the South Carolina Rules of Court regarding stay pending appeal. The inapplicable revised FPA includes a provision for reporting to the appellate courts and to ODC, thereby thwarting and/or denying objective and meaningful appellate review. The revised FPA is unconstitutional on its face and/or as applied. *Cooter & Gell v. Hartmarx Corp.*, 496 U.S. 384, 402, 110 S.Ct. 2447, 110 L.Ed.2d 359, 58 USLW 4763 (1990)(the lack of any legal requirement other than the talismanic recitation of “‘frivolous’ will foreclose meaningful review of sanctions”) (emphasis supplied). “Procedural due process imposes constraints on governmental decisions which deprive individuals of liberty or property interests within the meaning of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.” *Kurschner v. City of Camden Planning Comm’n*, 376 S.C. 165, 171, 656 S.E.2d 346, 350 (2008). “The fundamental requirements of due process include notice, an opportunity to be heard in a meaningful way, and judicial review.” *Id.* “Due process is flexible and calls for such procedural protections as the particular situation demands.” *S.C. Dep’t of Soc. Servs. v. Wilson*, 352 S.C. 445, 452, 574 S.E.2d 730, 733 (2002) (quoting *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 481, 92 S.Ct. 2593, 33 L.Ed.2d 484 (1972)). *Bundy v. Shirley*, 412 S.C. 292, 772 S.E.2d 163 (S.C. 2015). “The touchstone of due process is protection of the individual against arbitrary action of government,” *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 558 (1974), or denial of fundamental procedural fairness, see, e.g., *Fuentes v. Shevin*, 407 U.S. 67, 82 (1972) (the procedural due process guarantee protects against “arbitrary takings”). *County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833, 118 S.Ct. 1708, 140 L.Ed.2d 1043 (1998). See *Moore v. Moore*, 376 S.C. 467, 657 S.E.2d 743 (2008) (procedural due process requires (1) adequate notice; (2) adequate opportunity for a hearing; (3) the right to introduce evidence; and (4) the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses). See S.C. Const. art. I, sec. 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 14; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 4; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 5;

U.S. Const., Article I, sec. 9 and 10; U.S. Const. amend. I, IV, V, VII, and XIV. See *Hicks v. Feiock*, 108 S.Ct. 1423, 485 U.S. 624, 99 L.Ed. 721, 56 U.S.L.W. 4347 (1988). Accordingly, the motion should be granted.

23. The attached copy of transcript excerpt also evidences the Presiding Judge's impermissible ex parte communication with and meddling by ODC (Office of Disciplinary Counsel) in that pending litigation, Case No. 2005-CP-10-5113. Significantly and materially, there was no pending grievance and no notice of any grievance with ODC or the Commission. While the Presiding Judge had no personal knowledge of that fact, ODC's wrongdoing and misrepresentations to the Presiding Judge were designed to and did in fact wrongfully and unduly influence the outcome in that pending case, Circuit Court Case Number 2005-CP-10-5113. The then Disciplinary Counsel (DC), now replaced, violated the letter and spirit of the Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 407, SCACR, and engaged in impermissible and unprofessional conduct and ex parte contact by meddling in pending litigation to gain collateral advantage for private parties, thereby tipping the scales of justice. It is disturbing to consider what some unethical attorneys will do and have done to directly or indirectly ex parte a presiding judge in order to pocket an amount greater than the annual salary of that government official, over \$350,000.00.

24. That unconstitutional retroactive application of the revised FPA was then used to pile on more unreasonable, if not unethical, attorneys fees to copy and paste duplicate prior pleadings, propound no discovery, and conduct no depositions on a case dismissed, not on summary judgment, but for lack of subject matter jurisdiction in another case signed filed and certified meritorious by counsel of record who was not sanctioned.

25. At the revised FPA hearing in that case, Circuit Court Case Number 2005-CP-10-5113, the moving party put forth no evidence to dispute that undersigned reasonably believed that the claims were valid

or that the party's reliance on advice of counsel was not made in good faith. *Sapphire Devt. v. Span USA Inc.*, 120 Fed. Appendix. 466, 2005 WL 226032 (C.A.4 (SC) 2005). Further, on information and belief, the moving party in that case took no depositions, yet requested attorneys fees in an amount more than the Presiding Judge's salary for the entire year. Despite ruling that the attorneys fee affidavit contained unreasonable fees and charges, the Presiding Judge herein awarded almost \$100,000.00 in unreasonable attorneys fees. The moving party failed its burden of proof, and the record contains no facts or record supporting the ruling. A discerning review finds that motion under the revised FPA did not even allege a violation of the revised FPA, much less prove it. Moreover, that unconstitutional retroactive application of the revised FPA was then wrongfully used, while stayed pending appeal, as grounds for a second and third unconstitutional retroactive application of the revised FPA.

26. Is it any wonder attorneys are at each others throats over the revised FPA? The revised FPA does not authorize sanctions on a Motion to Dismiss, it does not authorize sanctions against a represented party who is entitled to rely on the attorney, and it does not authorize attorneys fees against counsel of record, instead authorizing a reasonable fine to the court.

27. Reasonable men/women should and would question the impartiality of the Presiding Judge under these circumstances. Petitioner is informed and believes that the Presiding Judge Dennis is not a neutral decision-maker in this and other matters and his impartiality is reasonably questioned by reasonable men/women, thereby undercutting appearance of a disinterested court. The undersigned and the Court are prejudiced thereby and recusal/disqualification is respectfully requested. This motion is in no way a reflection on my esteemed law school classmate, Ned Dennis, on Nancy Jane, or on other members of the remarkable Dennis family.

*[Handwritten Signature]*

C. Holmes  
PO Box 187  
Sullivans Isd., SC 29482-0187


SWORN to before me this

22 day of July, 2022

*[Handwritten Signature: Sonya A. Glass]*

Notary Public for South Carolina

Comm. Expires: 1 June 2026



Common Pleas  
Charleston County Judicial Center  
100 Broad Street - Suite 106  
Charleston, SC 29401-9401

STATE OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA

A



Cynthia Elaine Collie  
Po Box 187

Sullivans Island, SC 29482

**NOTICE OF MOTION SCHEDULING**

April 06, 2022

**Motion "MDISMS - Motion to Dismiss & Proof of Service" for Case: 2021CP1005478 - James Kevin Holmes VS Cynthia Elaine Collie , defendant, et al has been added to the following Motions Roster:**

**529 - Judge Dennis Motions Week of April 18, 2022**

**This hearing of this motion has been scheduled for 4/20/2022 at 10:30 AM.**

Motion(s) for the herein referenced case will be heard by the Honorable R. Markley Dennis on the above specified date and time. The hearing will be held via the WebEx Virtual Courtroom.

To access the virtual courtroom go to the South Carolina Judicial website at [SCCOURTS.ORG](http://SCCOURTS.ORG). Click "Calendar", then "Monthly View", then "Circuit" on the day your hearing is scheduled. Scroll until you find Judge R. Markley Dennis, Jr. then click the Virtual Courtroom link. Enter your name and email to join.

Please submit memos and briefs 72 hours prior to hearing.

If you have any questions please contact Joy Johnson at (843) 958-5049 or [jsjohnson@charlestoncounty.org](mailto:jsjohnson@charlestoncounty.org)

Mail Notice To:
<p>Cynthia Elaine Collie Po Box 187  Sullivans Island, SC 29482</p>

Court Info:
<p>Common Pleas Charleston County Judicial Center 100 Broad Street - Suite 106 Charleston, SC 29401-9401</p>

**If you have any questions regarding the scheduling of this motion, please contact the courts at:**

**(843) 958-5000**

Respectfully,

Julie Armstrong  
Clerk of Court

CE Holmes  
PO. Box 187  
Sullivans Island, SC 29482  
843.883.3010

---

B

15 April 2022

*Ms. Caroline Leonard or Current  
Clerk's Office  
100 Broad St. #106  
Charleston, SC 29401*

Re: Holmes v Holmes  
2021-CP-10-5478

Dear Caroline:

Happy Easter almost and we hope you and your kind staff are well! We just received notice of webex hearing in the above-referenced matter. We apologize for any inconvenience, but we do not have means or access to webex and we are not able to participate.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions. By copy of this letter, opposing counsel is notified. Stay safe all. Best wishes and with warm personal regards, I remain

Yours very truly,

CE Holmes  
PO. Box 187  
Sullivans Island, SC 29482  
843.883.3010

---

C

7 April 2022

**FILED**

APR 15 2022

JULIE J. ARMSTRONG  
CLERK, C.P. & G.S.

Ms. Caroline Leonard  
Clerk's Office  
100 Broad St. #106  
Charleston, SC 29401

Re: DRB  
21-CP-10-2888

Dear Caroline:

Happy Easter almost and we hope you and your kind staff are well! We just received notice of webex hearing in the above-referenced matter. We apologize for any inconvenience, but we do not have means or access to webex and we are not able to participate.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions. By copy of this letter, opposing counsel is notified. Stay safe all. Best wishes and with warm personal regards, I remain

Yours very truly,



Thank you!



STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF Charleston

Dr. Cynthia Holmes, M.D.

Plaintiff(s)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

CIVIL ACTION COVERSHEET

05-CP-10-5113

East Cooper Regional Medical Center,
East Coast Regional Medical Center,
Paul Gantz, MD

Defendant(s)

(Please Print)

Submitted By: Charlotte C. Johnson
Address: Charlotte Johnson Law Firm, LLC
102 East Bay St. Ste. 303
Charleston SC 29401
597 722-8248

SC Bar #: 11547

Telephone #: 843 725-8248

Fax #: 843 725-8248

Other:

E-mail: Charlotte.Johnson@jcmlaw.com

NOTE: The cover sheet and information contained herein neither register nor supersedees the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of docketing. It must be filed and returned, signed and dated. A copy of this coversheet must be served on the defendant along with the Summons and Complaint.

DOCKETING INFORMATION (Check one box below)

- JURY TRIAL demanded is complete.
This case is subject to ARBITRATION pursuant to the Circuit Court Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules.
This case is subject to MEDIATION pursuant to the Circuit Court Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules.
This case is exempt from ADR (certificates attached).

NATURE OF ACTION (Check One Box Below)

Grid of categories for Nature of Action including: Consumer, Real Estate, Personal Injury, Professional Malpractice, etc.

\*\* Check only if Complaint & Answer is filed in 20 days

Submitting Party Signature: [Signature]

Date: 12-16-05

Note: Frivolous civil proceedings may be subject to sanctions pursuant to SCSLCP, Rule 11, and the South Carolina Frivolous Civil Proceedings Statute, A.C. Code Ann. §15-95-10 et. seq.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON  
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
Dr Cynthia Holmes, M.D.

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

Case No. 2005-CP-10-5113

versus

East Cooper Community  
Hospital, Inc., Tenet  
HealthSystem Medical, Inc;  
John Grady, M.D.; Paul Yantis,  
MD

E

Plaintiff

Defendant

**CHECK ONE:**


- JURY VERDICT** This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the verdict has been rendered
- DECISION BY COURT.** This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered
- ACTION DISMISSED (CHECK REASON):**  Rule 12(b), SCRPC;  Rule 41(a), SCRPC (Vol. nonsuit)  
 Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled),  Other -
- ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON):**  Rule 40(j), SCRPC,  Bankruptcy,  Binding Arbitration.  
Subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award,  Other

**IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:**  See attached order,  Statement of Judgment by Court

This matter initially came before the Court on April 23, 2007. Pursuant to a phone conference on May 3, 2007. Defendants' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED!** Formal order to follow. And it is so **ORDERED!**

Dated at Charleston, South Carolina,

Date May 3, 2007

Judge:   
R. Markley Dennis, Jr.

This judgment was entered on the \_\_\_\_\_ Day of \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy mailed first class this \_\_\_\_\_ Day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro-se) as follows:

Attorney(s) for Plaintiff(s)

Attorney(s) for Defendant(s)

SCRCP Form 4 (Rev. 2/96)

FILED  
2007 MAY 3 PM 2:33  
Clerk of Court  
JULIA M. CLARK  
COURT

F

PAGE

Cynthia Holmes, M.D. v East Cooper Community Hospital et al  
Case No. 05-CP-10-5113  
Hearing of September 18, 2009  
Before The Honorable R. Markley Dennis, Jr.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	}	
	}	
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON	}	COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
	}	
Cynthia Holmes, M.D.	}	
	}	
Plaintiff,	}	
	}	
vs.	}	Case No. 05-CP-10-5113
	}	
East Cooper Community Hospital,	}	
Int., Tenet HealthSystems Medical,	}	
Inc., John Grady, M.D., and Paul	}	
Yantis,	}	
	}	
Defendants.	}	

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

The within Hearing in the above-captioned case was heard on September 18, 2009, before The Honorable R. Markley Dennis, Jr. in Courtroom 4C of the Charleston County Courthouse, 100 Broad Street, Charleston, South Carolina; attended by Counsel, as follows:

APPEARANCES:

Cynthia Collier, Esq.  
P O Box 187  
Sullivan's Island, SC 29483-0187  
Appearing Pro Se

Lindsey Smith-Yunzzy, Esq.  
PRATT THOMAS EPTING & WALKER  
P O Drawer 22247

PAGE

Cynthia Holmes, M.D. v East Cooper Community Hospital et al  
Case No. 03-CF-10-5113  
Hearing of September 16, 2009  
Before The Honorable R. Markley Dennis, Jr.

the record, preserved, and good luck in Columbia.  
Thank you.

MS. COLLIE: And your position is that  
the amended Act is applicable?

THE COURT: My position is that the  
Order is binding and final in this matter today.  
It will be -- you may serve your notice of appeal  
and you are aware -- and I'll place this on the  
record because we were advised of this at our  
meeting by Ms. Coggiola with the Office of  
Disciplinary Counsel, I am required to report  
this to her, which I will do today. I will send  
a letter and a copy -- and a certified copy of  
the Order. I also am required to, apparently,  
report it to the Supreme Court, which I will  
report it -- I will send a copy of that letter to  
Mr. Shearone who is the clerk. So, thank you.

MS. COLLIE: Your Honor, this matter  
is pending appeal and I ---

THE COURT: That's fine. That will  
be up to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, but


6


STATE OF WASHINGTON )  
 ) AFFIDAVIT OF CHALMERS JOHNSON  
 COUNTY OF PIERCE )

The Affiant, after being duly sworn, did make the following statements:

1. I was representing Dr. Holmes in Case # 05-CP-10-5113, in 2005.
2. On December 3, 2008, the Court issued an Order from the bench, withdrawing me as counsel for the Plaintiff. The appeal, in this case, was dismissed in July of 2008. At this time, I am not representing Dr. Cynthia Holmes in any action currently filed in any Court.
3. Shortly after the service of the Summons and Complaint, in this case, I received a request for me to meet with Mr. Pratt-Thomas and Ms. Smith-Yancey, who were attorneys for the Defendants.
4. We met at my offices in Charleston, SC, on East Bay Street.
5. At the meeting, I explained to the attorneys my theory of the case. The explanation I gave was, in content, the same one that I gave in responses to their subsequent motion to dismiss, motion for summary judgment, and in the appellate brief that I wrote for this case.
6. I specifically explained that I believed that the Hospital's decision not to consider Dr. Holmes' application for privileges (rather than considering it and making a decision one way or the other, which would have given her appeal rights), was a breach of the contractual rights set forth in the Hospital bylaws because Dr. Holmes' application did comply with the prerequisites for consideration.
7. Mr. Pratt-Thomas told me that he was the one who had told the Defendant to reject the application without actually denying it. He acknowledged that this course of action would keep Dr. Holmes application from being "denied" and would therefore not allow her to be able to appeal, as there would be no "decision" to appeal.
8. It is my understanding from the discussion, that Mr. Pratt-Thomas was not taking the position that the application was not complete, but that the refusal to consider it was being done for the sole purpose of avoiding having to issue any decision whatsoever on Dr. Holmes' application.

THE AFFIANT SAITH NO MORE.

  
 Chalmers C. Johnson

*Sworn to before me this*  
*13th Day of December 2008*  
  
 Notary Public for Washington  
 My Comm. Exp. 12/13/2012




EXHIBIT 3



## The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS  
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
1220 SENATE STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890  
FAX: (803) 734-1839  
www.sccourts.org

April 25, 2023

Cynthia Holmes  
PO Box 187  
Sullivan's Island SC 29482

Re: James Holmes v. Cynthia Collie  
Appellate Case No. 2022-001146

Dear Ms. Holmes:

The Court is in receipt of your petition for rehearing en banc that was filed on April 21, 2023. Your previous petition for rehearing was denied on April 11, 2023 and the Court will not take any action on this subsequent filing. Your check number 3232 in the amount of \$50.00 is being returned to you. You may file a petition for writ of certiorari in the South Carolina Supreme Court pursuant to Rule 242, SCACR.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Catherine Harrison, deputy".

CLERK

cc: Barry I. Baker, Esquire  
Kyle T Varner, Esquire

EXHIBIT 7

C. Holmes, Esq.  
P.O. Box 187  
Sullivan's Island, SC 29482  
843.883.3010

RECEIVED

MAY 11 2023

SC Court of Appeals


4 May 2023

Fax: 803.734.1839

The Honorable Catherine Harrison  
Clerk, SCCOA  
1220 Senate St.  
Columbia, SC 29201

Re: COA Case No. 22-001146

Dear Ms. Harrison:



Thank you for your most recent correspondence. We hope this letter finds you and your kind staff well. Without being disagreeable, there is disagreement. We are writing to correct a misunderstanding regarding the pending motion to reconstruct the record and motion for reconsideration. See *Clements v. Young*, 310 S.C. 73, 425 S.E.2d 63 (Ct. App. 1992) (appellant moved for reconstruction of the record on remand to the lower court where the hearing was unrecorded). See Rule 240, SCACR. "There is no limit to the type of motion that could be filed in the appellate courts," including but not limited to, timely motion for reconsideration. *Toal et al., Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 379. Another action is pending in the Family Court between the same parties for the same claim including retirement and marital property. The Family Court attorney defendant herein filed this duplicitous and duplicative action in the circuit court to make an end run around the jurisdiction of the Family Court. The Family Court attorney defendant has unclean hands. Family Court confidentiality and privacy is hereby requested. Under the facts, the Family Court is the

proper forum to provide clear title for real estate or other transactions. Matters of great public importance are raised, including but not limited to, denial of substantial rights such as confidentiality and privacy rights regarding Family Court matters herein, including retirement and marital property, which are capable of repetition, capable of evading judicial review, and incapable of vindication after-the-fact and which must be raised or waived. *Hagood v. Sommerville*, 362 S.C. 191, 607 S.E.2d 707 (2005); *Shah v. Richland Mem. Hosp.*, 350 S.C. 139, 564 S.E.2d 681 (Ct. App. 2002); Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 144-145.

The question of jurisdiction is a question of law. Jurisdiction can be raised at any time as in the pending motion. Jurisdiction cannot be waived. *Knight v. Kelly*, 289 S.C. 318, 345 S.E.2d 490 (1986); *Martin v. Skinner*, 286 S.C. 527, 335 S.E.2d 252 (Ct. App. 1985). When deciding a jurisdictional question based on facts, a reviewing court has the **power and duty to review the entire record including the reconstructed record from the trial court**, find the jurisdictional facts within the record, and decide the jurisdictional question in accord with the preponderance of the evidence. *Canady v. Chas. Cnty. Sch. Dist.*, 265 S.C. 21, 216 S.E.2d 755 (1975); Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 276 (emphasis supplied). It is respectfully submitted dismissal is premature pending reconstruction of the record in the trial court.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the most recent correspondence overlooks, misconstrues, or misapprehends applicable law. Specifically, pursuant to Rule 240, SCACR, Former Chief Justice Toal's appellate practice book expressly states, "There is no limit to the type of motion that could be filed in the appellate courts," including but not limited to, timely motion for reconsideration herein; otherwise, censorship would prevail. Former Chief Justice Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 379. In particular, the proper forum with exclusive original jurisdiction is the Family Court for the intertwined issues herein of equitable division including but not limited to, retirement and marital property reserved and preserved in the attached copy of the certified Divorce Decree. S.C. Code § § 63-3-510 to 530. This matter involves the Decree of Divorce, after almost 30

years and three children of the marriage, to which Family Court attorney defendant, with decades of experience, agreed on the record, into which that agreement was incorporated, from which defendant never appealed, and which is now the law of the case. See Rule 16, SCRFC. "The family court has jurisdiction of the parties and control of all subsequent proceedings from the time of service of the summons and complaint..." *Wazney v. Wazney* (S.C. App. 2019). The meritorious motions are timely served and filed, therefore, the pending petition for rehearing en banc is properly addressed to the new ruling and new issues regarding the appellant's right to reconstruct the record in the trial court for the impermissible ex parte hearing adversely affecting the appellant's individual and property rights without notice and where, without explanation, the SCCA's audio for transcripts has a critical gap in the recording for this hearing despite finding recordings for essentially all other hearings on that day. The South Carolina Constitution in article 1, section 9 provides that "[a]ll courts shall be public." The United States Supreme Court has interpreted the guarantees of freedom of speech found in the First Amendment to the United States Constitution to include a guarantee of open and public courts. *Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v. Virginia*, 448 U.S. 555, 580 (1980). It is respectfully submitted that State and federal statutory and constitutional rights are implicated and the adversely affected litigant has a State and federal statutory and constitutional right to reconstruct the record in the trial court below which is hereby requested. Further, it is respectfully submitted reconstruction of the record below is a prerequisite to meaningful appellate review of the Court of Appeals decision as well as factual support for disposition herein. Former Chief Justice Toal in her appellate practice book confirms that the April 11, 2023, decision raises new issues which are subject to a new petition for rehearing. Former Chief Justice Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 295-297. Further, reversal of the decision on motion to reconstruct, and the record reflects it should be reversed, renders void/voidable the decision herein thereby complying with Rule 221, SCACR. See *Tench v. S.C. Dept. of Educ.*, 347 S.C. 117, 553 S.E.2d 451 (2001) (holding that the failure to petition the Court of Appeals for rehearing on an issue effectively resulted in the abandonment of a party's right

to be heard on that issue); Former Chief Justice Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 391. It is respectfully submitted dismissal is premature pending reconstruction of the record in the trial court. To the extent there is ambiguity, the rule of lenity supports the appellant's position. Accordingly, the appellant respectfully submits meritorious petition and motion.

Moreover, the South Carolina Clerk of Court Manual and the *Miller* case provide as follows:

The Clerk of Court's duty is not discretionary. The Clerk of Court should not construe a *filing*.... it is not within the Clerk of Court's authority to refuse to perform her duty based on her opinion that a filing lacks legal merit or is untimely. 21 C.J.S. Courts § 338 (2006) ("[A] clerk of court cannot ordinarily determine questions of law [or] render judgments."). *Miller v. State*, 659 S.E.2d 492, 377 S.C. 99 (S.C. 2008) (emphasis supplied).

In this case, refusal to file effectively determines questions of law and/or impermissibly renders judgment by denying meaningful opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time for full and fair record on appeal (ROA), thereby arbitrarily and capriciously denying substantial rights and meaningful appellate review. To the extent there is wrongful direct or indirect *ex parte* consolidation of a 2022 appeal with a 2020 appeal, and the record reflects there is, Rule 214, SCACR, provides, "A party may move to consolidate two or more appeals..." Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, 3rd Ed. (2016), p. 370. The Family Court attorney defendant herein failed and refused his professional responsibility to move for consolidation by filing a motion, paying the filing fee every other attorney must pay, serving the other side, and providing the other side a meaningful opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time. Appellant is prejudiced thereby and objects. Accordingly, the lower appellate court order herein is reversible as a matter of law. "The touchstone of due process is protection of the individual against arbitrary action of government," *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 558 (1974), or denial of fundamental procedural fairness, see, e.g., *Fuentes v. Shevin*, 407 U.S. 67, 82 (1972) (the procedural due process guarantee protects against "arbitrary takings"). *County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833, 118 S.Ct. 1708, 140 L.Ed.2d 1043 (1998). See *Moore v. Moore*, 376 S.C. 467, 657 S.E.2d 743 (2008) (procedural due process requires (1) adequate notice; (2) adequate opportunity for a

hearing; (3) the right to introduce evidence; and (4) the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses). See S.C. Const. art. I, sec. 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 14; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 4; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 5; U.S. Const., Article I, sec. 9 and 10; U.S. Const. amend. I, IV, V, VII, and XIV. See *Hicks v. Feiock*, 108 S.Ct. 1423, 485 U.S. 624, 99 L.Ed. 721, 56 U.S.L.W. 4347 (1988).

Under the facts, the record reflects there is no statutory notice for the impermissible ex parte hearing in the trial court adversely affecting the appellant's individual and property rights where, without explanation, the SCCA's recording for transcripts has a critical gap in the recording for this hearing despite finding recordings for essentially all other hearings on that day. "[C]ourts shall be public." S.C. Const. art. 1, sec. 9. Our objection is timely raised. Because the April 11, 2023, order raises new matter and new issues including but not limited to, denial of motion to reconstruct the record, petition for rehearing en banc is properly entered herein regarding new matter and new issues. Further, motion for reconsideration of denial of petition for rehearing en banc is timely served and filed. Accordingly, we respectfully request that the filing be forwarded to the Court. Please find enclosed a check for the filing fee (though we have not yet received the returned check). At your earliest convenience, please confirm receipt of the enclosed check # 3088 for the filing fee at 843.883.3010 or at the back-up number 843.883.9030. If you do not receive the check shortly, we are happy to promptly forward a duplicate.

Thanking you in advance for your kind consideration and with best personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be a stylized 'S' or similar character, located below the closing text.

EXHIBIT 5

C. Holmes, Esq.  
P.O. Box 187  
Sullivan's Island, SC 29482  
843.883.3010

14 May 2023

Fax: 803.734.1839

Clerk, SCCOA  
1220 Senate St.  
Columbia, SC 29201

**RECEIVED**  
**May 15 2023**  
**SC Court of Appeals**

Re: COA Case No. 22-001146

Dear Madam:


We hope this letter finds you and your kind staff well. Thank you for your May 11, 2023, correspondence. Without being disagreeable, there is disagreement. We are incorporating in full by reference the attached copy of correspondence dated May 4, 2023. Specifically, we are writing to request that our timely motion to reconstruct the record be forwarded to the court for disposition. See *Clements v. Young*, 310 S.C. 73, 425 S.E.2d 63 (Ct. App. 1992) (appellant moved for reconstruction of the record on remand to the lower court where the hearing was unrecorded); *Toal et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 379. Moreover, we are writing to request that our timely motion for reconsideration be forwarded to the court for disposition. See Rule 240, SCACR; *Toal et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 379 ("There is no limit to the type of motion that could be filed in the appellate courts," including but not limited to, timely motion for reconsideration.). Further, we are writing to correct a misunderstanding wherein your correspondence overlooks or misapprehends these motions. The record reflects neither is successive.

It is respectfully submitted that the petition for rehearing is subsequent, not successive. Former Chief Justice Toal in her appellate practice book provides that new issues in the April 11, 2023, decision are subject to the attached subsequent petition for rehearing. *Coward Hund Const. Co., v. Ball Corp.*, 336 S.C. 1, 518 S.E.2d 56 (Ct. App. 1999); Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 295-297. In addition, determination of whether it is subsequent is a matter of interpretation of law for the Court. To the extent there is any ambiguity, the rule of lenity supports appellant's position. Accordingly, we are requesting forwarding to the Court for disposition.

Please find enclosed check #3231 for the filing fee (though we have not received any returned check). At your earliest convenience, please confirm receipt of the previous check # 3088 for the filing fee and the enclosed check # 3231 at 843.883.3010, at the back-up number 843.883.9030, or at the contact information listed above. If you do not receive the check shortly, we are happy to promptly forward a duplicate.

Again, thank you and with kind regards, I remain

Yours very truly,



cc

Cc

*BIBaker*  
*PO Box 31265*  
*West Ashley, SC 29417*

C. Holmes, Esq.  
P.O. Box 187  
Sullivan's Island, SC 29482  
843.883.3010

RECEIVED

MAY 11 2023

SC Court of Appeals


4 May 2023

Fax: 803.734.1839

The Honorable Catherine Harrison  
Clerk, SCCOA  
1220 Senate St.  
Columbia, SC 29201

Re: COA Case No. 22-001146

Dear Ms. Harrison:



Thank you for your most recent correspondence. We hope this letter finds you and your kind staff well. Without being disagreeable, there is disagreement. We are writing to correct a misunderstanding regarding the pending motion to reconstruct the record and motion for reconsideration. See *Clements v. Young*, 310 S.C. 73, 425 S.E.2d 63 (Ct. App. 1992) (appellant moved for reconstruction of the record on remand to the lower court where the hearing was unrecorded). See Rule 240, SCACR. "There is no limit to the type of motion that could be filed in the appellate courts," including but not limited to, timely motion for reconsideration. *Toal et al., Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 379. Another action is pending in the Family Court between the same parties for the same claim including retirement and marital property. The Family Court attorney defendant herein filed this duplicitous and duplicative action in the circuit court to make an end run around the jurisdiction of the Family Court. The Family Court attorney defendant has unclean hands. Family Court confidentiality and privacy is hereby requested. Under the facts, the Family Court is the

proper forum to provide clear title for real estate or other transactions. Matters of great public importance are raised, including but not limited to, denial of substantial rights such as confidentiality and privacy rights regarding Family Court matters herein, including retirement and marital property, which are capable of repetition, capable of evading judicial review, and incapable of vindication after-the-fact and which must be raised or waived. *Hagood v. Sommerville*, 362 S.C. 191, 607 S.E.2d 707 (2005); *Shah v. Richland Mem. Hosp.*, 350 S.C. 139, 564 S.E.2d 681 (Ct. App. 2002); Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 144-145.

The question of jurisdiction is a question of law. Jurisdiction can be raised at any time as in the pending motion. Jurisdiction cannot be waived. *Knight v. Kelly*, 289 S.C. 318, 345 S.E.2d 490 (1986); *Martin v. Skinner*, 286 S.C. 527, 335 S.E.2d 252 (Ct. App. 1985). When deciding a jurisdictional question based on facts, a reviewing court has the **power and duty to review the entire record including the reconstructed record from the trial court**, find the jurisdictional facts within the record, and decide the jurisdictional question in accord with the preponderance of the evidence. *Canady v. Chas. Cnty. Sch. Dist.*, 265 S.C. 21, 216 S.E.2d 755 (1975); Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 276 (emphasis supplied). It is respectfully submitted dismissal is premature pending reconstruction of the record in the trial court.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the most recent correspondence overlooks, misconstrues, or misapprehends applicable law. Specifically, pursuant to Rule 240, SCACR, Former Chief Justice Toal's appellate practice book expressly states, "There is no limit to the type of motion that could be filed in the appellate courts," including but not limited to, timely motion for reconsideration herein; otherwise, censorship would prevail. Former Chief Justice Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 379. In particular, the proper forum with exclusive original jurisdiction is the Family Court for the intertwined issues herein of equitable division including but not limited to, retirement and marital property reserved and preserved in the attached copy of the certified Divorce Decree. S.C. Code § § 63-3-510 to 530. This matter involves the Decree of Divorce, after almost 30

years and three children of the marriage, to which Family Court attorney defendant, with decades of experience, agreed on the record, into which that agreement was incorporated, from which defendant never appealed, and which is now the law of the case. See Rule 16, SCRFC. "The family court has jurisdiction of the parties and control of all subsequent proceedings from the time of service of the summons and complaint...." *Wazney v. Wazney* (S.C. App. 2019). The meritorious motions are timely served and filed, therefore, the pending petition for rehearing en banc is properly addressed to the new ruling and new issues regarding the appellant's right to reconstruct the record in the trial court for the impermissible ex parte hearing adversely affecting the appellant's individual and property rights without notice and where, without explanation, the SCCA's audio for transcripts has a critical gap in the recording for this hearing despite finding recordings for essentially all other hearings on that day. The South Carolina Constitution in article I, section 9 provides that "[a]ll courts shall be public." The United States Supreme Court has interpreted the guarantees of freedom of speech found in the First Amendment to the United States Constitution to include a guarantee of open and public courts. *Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v. Virginia*, 448 U.S. 555, 580 (1980). It is respectfully submitted that State and federal statutory and constitutional rights are implicated and the adversely affected litigant has a State and federal statutory and constitutional right to reconstruct the record in the trial court below which is hereby requested. Further, it is respectfully submitted reconstruction of the record below is a prerequisite to meaningful appellate review of the Court of Appeals decision as well as factual support for disposition herein. Former Chief Justice Toal in her appellate practice book confirms that the April 11, 2023, decision raises new issues which are subject to a new petition for rehearing. Former Chief Justice Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 295-297. Further, reversal of the decision on motion to reconstruct, and the record reflects it should be reversed, renders void/voidable the decision herein thereby complying with Rule 221, SCACR. See *Tench v. S.C. Dept. of Educ.*, 347 S.C. 117, 553 S.E.2d 451 (2001) (holding that the failure to petition the Court of Appeals for rehearing on an issue effectively resulted in the abandonment of a party's right

to be heard on that issue); Former Chief Justice Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, Third Ed. (2016), p. 391. It is respectfully submitted dismissal is premature pending reconstruction of the record in the trial court. To the extent there is ambiguity, the rule of lenity supports the appellant's position. Accordingly, the appellant respectfully submits meritorious petition and motion.

Moreover, the South Carolina Clerk of Court Manual and the *Miller* case provide as follows:

The Clerk of Court's duty is not discretionary. The Clerk of Court should not construe a *filing*. . . it is not within the Clerk of Court's authority to refuse to perform her duty based on her opinion that a filing lacks legal merit or is untimely. 21 C.J.S. Courts § 338 (2006) ("[A] clerk of court cannot ordinarily determine questions of law [or] render judgments."). *Miller v. State*, 659 S.E.2d 492, 377 S.C. 99 (S.C. 2008) (emphasis supplied).

In this case, refusal to file effectively determines questions of law and/or impermissibly renders judgment by denying meaningful opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time for full and fair record on appeal (ROA), thereby arbitrarily and capriciously denying substantial rights and meaningful appellate review. To the extent there is wrongful direct or indirect *ex parte* consolidation of a 2022 appeal with a 2020 appeal, and the record reflects there is, Rule 214, SCACR, provides, "A party may move to consolidate two or more appeals. . ." Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, 3rd Ed. (2016), p. 370. The Family Court attorney defendant herein failed and refused his professional responsibility to move for consolidation by filing a motion, paying the filing fee every other attorney must pay, serving the other side, and providing the other side a meaningful opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time. Appellant is prejudiced thereby and objects. Accordingly, the lower appellate court order herein is reversible as a matter of law. "The touchstone of due process is protection of the individual against arbitrary action of government," *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 558 (1974), or denial of fundamental procedural fairness, see, e.g., *Fuentes v. Shevin*, 407 U.S. 67, 82 (1972) (the procedural due process guarantee protects against "arbitrary takings"). *County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833, 118 S.Ct. 1708, 140 L.Ed.2d 1043 (1998). See *Moore v. Moore*, 376 S.C. 467, 657 S.E.2d 743 (2008) (procedural due process requires (1) adequate notice; (2) adequate opportunity for a

hearing; (3) the right to introduce evidence; and (4) the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses). See S.C. Const. art. I, sec. 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 14; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 4; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 5; U.S. Const., Article I, sec. 9 and 10; U.S. Const. amend. I, IV, V, VII, and XIV. See *Hicks v. Feiock*, 108 S.Ct. 1423, 485 U.S. 624, 99 L.Ed. 721, 56 U.S.L.W. 4347 (1988).

Under the facts, the record reflects there is no statutory notice for the impermissible ex parte hearing in the trial court adversely affecting the appellant's individual and property rights where, without explanation, the SCCA's recording for transcripts has a critical gap in the recording for this hearing despite finding recordings for essentially all other hearings on that day. "[C]ourts shall be public." S.C. Const. art. 1, sec. 9. Our objection is timely raised. Because the April 11, 2023, order raises new matter and new issues including but not limited to, denial of motion to reconstruct the record, petition for rehearing en banc is properly entered herein regarding new matter and new issues. Further, motion for reconsideration of denial of petition for rehearing en banc is timely served and filed. Accordingly, we respectfully request that the filing be forwarded to the Court. Please find enclosed a check for the filing fee (though we have not yet received the returned check). At your earliest convenience, please confirm receipt of the enclosed check # 3088 for the filing fee at 843.883.3010 or at the back-up number 843.883.9030. If you do not receive the check shortly, we are happy to promptly forward a duplicate.

Thanking you in advance for your kind consideration and with best personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be a stylized name or set of initials, located below the closing text.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Ninth Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2021-CP-10-5478  
App. Case No. 2022-1146

J. K. Holmes,

Respondent,

v.

C.E. Holmes,

Appellant.

PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC ON  
MOTION TO RECONSTRUCT THE RECORD IN THE LOWER COURT ON REMAND WHERE,  
WITHOUT EXPLANATION, NO RECORDING FOR THE HEARING CAN BE LOCATED AND  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The appellant respectfully submits petition for rehearing en banc and motion for reconsideration. The April 11, 2023, decision is reversible based on prejudicial error of material fact and law and is internally inconsistent. In addition, without adequate record, i.e., without reconstructing the lower court record, there can be no factual determination, and therefore, no factual support for decision. Without factual support or Record on Appeal jointly filed by the parties, the April 11, 2023, decision is reversible abuse of discretion. The record reflects there is no lawful notice of the hearing below. Under these facts, there is no authorization/jurisdiction for impermissible ex parte hearings, and without any record, there is inadequate record for meaningful review requiring reconstruction of the record in the lower court. This Honorable Court as well as adversely affected litigants have a right to an adequate record of the impermissible ex parte proceedings below. The intended beneficiaries of the requirement for a record of the proceedings below are adversely affected litigants including the appellant. But for wrongful lack of a recording of the impermissible ex parte hearing for transcription by the court reporter, the outcome should and would be in appellant's favor. To the extent there is ambiguity, the rule of lenity supports appellant's position. Accordingly, appellant requests reconstruction of the lower court record on remand for adequate record for determination herein as well as adequate record for meaningful appellate review. See *Clements v. Young*, 310 S.C. 73, 425 S.E.2d 63 (Ct. App. 1992) (appellant moved for reconstruction of the record on remand to the lower court where the hearing was unrecorded); Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, 3rd Ed. (2016), p. 378. "The touchstone of due process is protection of the individual against arbitrary action of government," *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 558 (1974), or denial of fundamental procedural fairness, see, e.g., *Fuentes v. Shevin*, 407 U.S. 67, 82 (1972) (the procedural due process guarantee protects against "arbitrary takings"). *County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833, 118 S.Ct. 1708, 140 L.Ed.2d 1043 (1998). See *Moore v. Moore*, 376 S.C. 467, 657 S.E.2d 743 (2008) (procedural due process requires (1) adequate notice; (2) adequate opportunity for a hearing; (3) the right to introduce evidence; and (4)

the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses). See S.C. Const. art. I, sec. 2, 3, 4, 10, and 14; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 4; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 5; U.S. Const., Article I, sec. 9 and 10; U.S. Const. amend. I, IV, V, VII, and XIV. *Hicks v. Feiock*, 108 S.Ct. 1423, 485 U.S. 624, 99 L.Ed. 721, 56 U.S.L.W. 4347 (1988).

## INTRODUCTION

The Great Statesman, Rep. Elijah Cummings, may he rest in peace, observed, "When we're dancing with the angels, the question will be asked, in 2023, what did we do to make sure we kept our democracy intact?" *Emphasis supplied.* Along with Rep. John Lewis, may God rest his soul, it is fitting to remember these lifetimes of steadfast bravery and unremitting courage. It is fitting, as well, to remember the beginnings of that democracy. The framers of our State and Federal Constitutions risked life, limb, and liberty to escape abuses by the British government.

Both State and Federal Constitutions were deliberately crafted to foreclose those abuses here. The framers did not need computers, smart phones, or tablets to discern the basic tenets of fundamental fairness and due process. An impartial decision-maker was seen as a non-negotiable requirement for preventing such abuses. The letter and spirit of our cherished Constitution categorically prohibit deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor shall any person be denied equal protection of the laws. The right of trial by jury shall be preserved inviolate. As a corollary, another requirement, deemed mandatory and prohibitory, is that no single individual, whether British monarch or government official shall have absolute authority over a citizen's life, liberty, or property without being subject to the right of appeal with meaningful judicial review.

In the instant case, appellant timely reserves, preserves, does not waive, and expressly requests fundamental fairness and substantial rights including but not limited to, meaningful opportunity to be

heard at a meaningful time and full and fair trial by jury. There are examples of unrepresented parties and/or traditional filers subjected to a separate second-class system of so-called justice, where the South Carolina Rules of Court are gleefully and cavalierly used as a trap for the unwary. Significantly and materially, there is an abundant body of law decisively declaring separate is never equal. Systemic institutional biases are acknowledged, including but not limited to, prejudice against minorities along with favoritism under Alex Murdaugh's "rules of law." Unequal treatment and the like threaten our democracy and feed the appearance of the proverbial "rigged" system. This issue is of exceptional importance as it is capable of repetition, capable of evading judicial review, and incapable of adequate remedy on appeal. The following inscription is found at the Four Corners of Law in Charleston, SC: Where the rule of law ends, tyranny begins. The Judge J. Waties Waring Judicial Center is named for the renowned crafter of divine dissents lying in repose in Charleston, who must be turning over in his grave at the historically persistent lawlessness at the Four Corners of Law. As set forth more fully below, it is respectfully submitted our democracy depends on the basic tenets of fundamental fairness and due process just as much, if not more so, in this age of smart phones, tablets, computers, and extraordinary and unprecedented public health and affiliated economic emergencies ongoing and still unfolding.

## DISCUSSION

Without being disagreeable, there is disagreement. Pursuant to Rule 219, another action is pending in the Family Court between the same parties for the same claim which should be considered en banc and which implicates jurisdiction and lack thereof. The family court has exclusive original jurisdiction over domestic matters pursuant to S.C. Code § § 63-3-510 to 530, including but not limited

to, marital property and retirement issues. Jurisdiction can be raised at any time and jurisdiction cannot be waived. The Family Court is the proper forum which has exclusive original jurisdiction over domestic matters herein. The Family Court attorney defendant herein filed this duplicitous and duplicative action in another court to make an end run around the jurisdiction of the Family Court. Defendant has unclean hands. The Family Court matter is subject to Family Court confidentiality and privacy which is hereby requested. This matter involves the attached copy of the Decree of Divorce, after almost 30 years and three children of the marriage, to which attorney defendant, with decades of experience, agreed on the record, into which that agreement was incorporated, from which defendant never appealed, and which is now the law of the case. See Rule 16, SCRFC ("The family court has jurisdiction of the parties and control of all subsequent proceedings from the time of service of the summons and complaint...") Wazney v. Wazney (S.C. App. 2019). The appellant respectfully requests reconsideration and petition for rehearing en banc for the April 11, 2023, decision which is based on error of material fact and law as well as internal inconsistencies. The appellant also requests reconstruction of the record on remand where, without explanation, the SCCA's recording for transcripts has a critical gap in the recording for this hearing despite finding recordings for essentially all other hearings on that day, one of many unexplained irregularities in this matter. Assuming the SCCA's statement regarding the missing gap in the recording is true, why was there unexplained delay with SCCA's explanation being sent only after dismissal despite petitioner's more than three timely transcript requests? Why did SCCA's unreasonable delay lead to wrongful sua sponte dismissal by a single government employee at the same SCCA address? The record reflects untrustworthy insider attorney defendant gaming the system. That lower court hearing was wrongfully held ex parte without the required notice to the adversely affected party, who on appeal is told that the South Carolina judicial system has a critical gap in the recording of that hearing which cannot be located and which cannot be transcribed. Remand is respectfully requested to reconstruct the record. Without the reconstructed record, there is no authorized determination of the facts, no lawful decision without the

reconstructed record, and any purported ruling is based on arbitrary and capricious speculation with inadequate basis or explanation for meaningful appellate review. Accordingly, the April 11, 2023, order is reversible based on error of material fact and law. See, e.g., *Fidrych v. Marriott Int'l, Inc.*, 952 F.3d 124, 146 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2020) (remanded for lack of adequate explanation for meaningful review: "(T)he court disposed of the substance of the issue in a single sentence. See J.A. 252. We need more explanation to conduct meaningful appellate review of the court's disposition of the motion.").

Pursuant to Rule 219, SCACR, this matter should be heard en banc because the inapplicable less burdensome legal standard was wrongfully applied. Pursuant to S.C. Code § 14-8-220, *de novo* review is the standard of review at Rule 240(j), SCACR, appeal herein, which is different than the less burdensome standard of review for Rule 221, SCACR, rehearing. The proper more burdensome *de novo* standard of review was not applied and the April 11, 2023, order is reversible as a matter of law because a less burdensome legal standard was wrongfully applied. Ambiguity regarding the proper legal standard pursuant to Rule 240(j), SCACR, appeal is a denial of substantial rights, including but not limited to, due process. Rule 240(j), SCACR, appeal is a S.C. Code § 14-8-220 appeal of an order by an individual judge and the proper legal standard is *de novo*. S.C. Code § 14-8-220. To the extent there is ambiguity, the rule of lenity supports appellant's position. It is well established that the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure (FRAP), upon which the SCACR are based, have long been interpreted to provide for review of decisions by a single judge. See Rule 27(c), FRAP. Pursuant to S.C. Code § 14-8-220 and Rule 240(j), SCACR, the case stands before the appellate court as if it had never been decided. See *Griffin v. State*, 763 N.E.2d 450 (Ind.2002) (citing 5 Arch N. Bobbitt & Frederic C. Sipe, *Bobbitt's Revision, Works' Indiana Practice* § 111.3 (5th ed.1979)). See *Ex parte Northern Pacific Railway Co.*, 280 U.S. 142, 144, 50 S.Ct. 70, 74 L.Ed. 233; *Stratton v. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co.*, 282 U.S. 10, 15, 51 S.Ct. 8, 75 L.Ed. 135 (The District Judge recognized the rule that if the court was warranted in taking jurisdiction and the case fell within section 266 of the Judicial Code (28 USCA § 380), a single judge was not authorized to dismiss the complaint on the merits, whatever his opinion of the

merits might be). "The prior denial of the transfer motion was the order of a single judge. Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(c) provides that 'an action of a single judge may be reviewed by the court.' That order is thus not binding on us as law of the case." *Thompson v. Merit Sys. Protection Bd.*, 772 F.2d 879, 882 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Accordingly, the April 11, 2023, opinion is reversible as a matter of law because the more burdensome legal standard of review under these circumstances for Rule 240(j), SCACR, appeal was not applied.

Pursuant to Rules 219 and 203, SCACR, the opinion is internally inconsistent because it relies on the pending lower court Rule 59(e), SCRCP, motion but overlooks or misapprehends the fact that the pending Rule 59(e), SCRCP, motion voids jurisdiction for the July 14, 2022, entry of judgment herein. Jurisdiction can be raised at any time and jurisdiction cannot be waived. *See* Rule 59(e), SCRCP ("the trial judge shall retain jurisdiction"). Unlawfully entering a judgment after a timely filed post-trial motion as in this case is appealable because there is no jurisdiction for such unauthorized entry and because appellant is denied substantial rights including but not limited to, mode of trial as well as substantial rights akin to mode of trial which must be appealed immediately. Appealability of wrongful July 14, 2022, entry of judgment by a clerk is at issue where a single government employee in the lower court wrongfully acted pursuant to direct or indirect impermissible ex parte contacts. Instead, the record reflects Rule 38, SCRCP, notice requiring the clerk's office to transfer the matter to the jury trial roster which is hereby requested. Rule 39, SCRCP. Accordingly, the wrongful July 14, 2022, entry is void for lack of jurisdiction and should be vacated and/or reversed.

Moreover, pursuant to SCACR, including Rule 219, SCACR, this matter should be heard en banc because dismissal of this appeal is not properly before the court. Moreover, jurisdiction can be raised at any time and jurisdiction cannot be waived. Due process requires including but not limited to, notice and meaningful opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time. These are matters of great public importance. Sua sponte dismissal of appeal at the behest of untrustworthy Family Court attorney defendant, so called "officer of the court," who is currently respondent in the pending Family Court

matter, cannot pass constitutional muster. Sua sponte dismissal herein cannot pass constitutional muster at the behest of untrustworthy Family Court attorney defendant, so called "officer of the court," and current Family Court respondent, without filing a motion to dismiss and paying the filing fee which denies the other side meaningful opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time and provides inadequate explanation and provides no factual support or jointly filed ROA for meaningful appellate review. Further, the State and Federal Constitutions provide, including but not limited to, Constitutional guarantees, protections, and substantial rights under the circumstances. Appellant is prejudiced thereby. But for untrustworthy Family Court attorney defendant failing to file and pay the filing fee for a motion to dismiss which every other litigant must pay, the outcome should and would be in appellant's favor. Accordingly, the April 11, 2023, opinion should be reversed. See *Moore v. Moore*, 376 S.C. 467, 657 S.E.2d 743 (2008) (procedural due process requires (1) adequate notice; (2) adequate opportunity for a hearing; (3) the right to introduce evidence; and (4) the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses). See S.C. Const. art. I, sec. 2, 3, 4, 10, and 14; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 4; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 5; U.S. Const., Article I, sec. 9 and 10; U.S. Const. amend. I, IV, V, VII, and XIV. *Hicks v. Feiock*, 108 S.Ct. 1423, 485 U.S. 624, 99 L.Ed. 721, 56 U.S.L.W. 4347 (1988). See also Adam A. Milani & Michael R. Smith, *Playing God: A Critical Look at Sua Sponte Decisions by Appellate Courts*, 69 TENN. L. REV. 245, 251 n.16 (2002).

Further, pursuant to Rule 219, SCACR, en banc consideration is indicated where a single government employee researched outside a jointly filed ROA, which was not yet due, and failed to provide the adversely affected party with the information/documentation he relied upon. There are multiple apparent inaccuracies/irregularities below. Reliance on a public index with inaccuracies/errors without notice and opportunity to respond is challenged and the appellant, as a traditional filer, respectfully requests a printed copy of the purported "record" and information researched outside the record, cited, and relied upon due to apparent multiple inaccuracies/irregularities below. Furthermore, the propriety of failing to copy traditional filers with hard copy of electronic research outside the record

which the court relied on herein is challenged as well as failing to provide hard copy of, for example, emails to and from litigants who are not traditional filers because neither can pass constitutional muster. As just one example of the misrepresentations and/or irregularities in the lower court herein, there was no required notice to the adversely affected party, the undersigned, of that hearing and no recording of that hearing for transcription can be located. Pursuant to Rule 207, SCACR, appellant timely requested the transcript from SCCA multiple times, however, there was no timely response from SCCA. On or about October 17, 2022, appellant timely made another request for transcript, again without response from SCCA. Only after filing a motion for a response herein and paying \$50.00 filing fees did the SCCA respond stating SCCA was unable to locate a recording of any hearing in the case below. In contrast, the SCCA's ex parte email response to the ex-husband attorney defendant shows SCCA's immediate response when untrustworthy Family Court attorney defendant requested the transcript without timely copying the other side. Despite locating recordings for essentially all other hearings in other cases that day, there is a critical gap in the recording for this matter without explanation. The appellant respectfully submits substantial rights including mode of trial and those akin to mode of trial are timely raised and requested and require reconstruction of the record in the lower court of that impermissible ex parte hearing. The record reflects unequal treatment and irregularities in this matter supporting review. Appellant is prejudiced thereby. But for SCCA's unexplained gap in the recording for the transcript of hearing, the outcome would and should be in appellant's favor. Decades-long insider Family Court attorney defendant, so-called officer of the court, has unclean hands. See *Moore v. Moore*, 376 S.C. 467, 657 S.E.2d 743 (2008) (procedural due process requires (1) adequate notice; (2) adequate opportunity for a hearing; (3) the right to introduce evidence; and (4) the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses). See S.C. Const. art. I, sec. 2, 3, 4, 10, and 14; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 4; S.C. Const. art. V, sec. 5; U.S. Const., Article I, sec. 9 and 10; U.S. Const. amend. I, IV, V, VII, and XIV. *Hicks v. Feiock*, 108 S.Ct. 1423, 485 U.S. 624, 99 L.Ed. 721, 56 U.S.L.W. 4347 (1988).

The record reflects further unequal treatment for the proverbial decades-long insider Family Court attorney defendant who engaged in direct or indirect impermissible ex parte contacts with the court and the SCCA while breaching professional responsibilities to, including but not limited to, copy the appellant. Respondent is hereby requested to timely copy the undersigned on all contacts herein whether electronic, written, email, text, oral, or other and to provide those copies from the date the case was filed, up to and including the present, and going forward. It is respectfully requested that this Honorable Court issue its order for compliance with the SCACR and the professional responsibility to copy the other side.

In addition, the record reflects unequal treatment regarding request for transcript. Despite three or more timely requests for transcript by the appellant, there was no response UNTIL AFTER DISMISSAL. At the same time, with lack of transparency and while being hidden from the undersigned, the decades-long insider untrustworthy attorneys failed to copy the undersigned on their transcript request which received immediate response BEFORE DISMISSAL.

Moreover, appellant had to file a motion and pay a filing fee just to get a delayed response to three or more timely transcript requests while SCCA's unexplained delays led to wrongful dismissal. The record reflects direct or indirect impermissible ex parte contacts with the court by untrustworthy attorneys without filing the required motion to dismiss and without paying the filing fees required of other attorneys thereby denying the appellant, including but not limited to, notice and meaningful opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time.

Further, pursuant to Rule 219, SCACR, and in violation of the SCACR Rules, dismissal is not properly before the court: The SCACR Rules do not allow dismissal based on issues that have not been raised by the parties which should be heard en banc. The SCACR do not allow judges to act as counsel of record for the ex-husband Family Court attorney defendant in the pending Family Court matter and for sua sponte dismissal based on pure speculation regarding questions that have yet to be presented. There is no jointly filed ROA, affidavit, or factual basis in support of the opinion herein which requires

reconstruction of the record. Without factual support, the order is reversible abuse of discretion.

Accordingly, the April 11, 2023, order is reversible as a matter of law, judicial overreach, and/or abuse of discretion.

The April 11, 2023, opinion overlooks or misconstrues the prior sua sponte order by a single government employee which apparently relies word-for-word on Chief Justice Toal's Second Edition of *Appellate Practice in South Carolina* which is now updated in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition with new precedent. Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, 2d Ed. (2002), p. 94. The first case cited in the opinion is inapposite because it applies to mortgage foreclosures. *No. Carolina Fed. S. & L. Ass'n. v. Twin States Dev. Corp.*, 289 S.C. 480, 347 S.E.2d 97 (1986). Mortgages include agreement to mortgage foreclosure and there is no mortgage foreclosure in the instant case. Referral can also be entered on consent. There is no consent in this case and in fact, there is timely Rule 38, SCRCF, notice requiring the clerk to transfer the matter to the jury docket. Rule 39, SCRCF. The second case cited supports appellant's position because appellant appeals deprivation of a party's right to trial by jury which must be immediately appealed. *Williford v. Downs*, 265 S.C. 319, 218 S.E.2d 242 (1975). Deprivation of the party's right to trial by jury must be immediately appealed. *Creed v. Stokes*, 285 S.C. 542, 331 S.E.2d 351 (1985).

Former Chief Justice Toal's Third Edition provides updated controlling precedent. Toal *et al.*, *Appellate Practice in South Carolina*, 3rd Ed. (2016), p. 155-157. At issue is denial of the appellant's right to trial by jury in a law case. *Salmonsens v. CGD, Inc.*, 377 S.C. 442, 661 S.E. 2d 81 (2008). "[S]ome minimal inquiry will always be necessary on the part of the appellate court considering the appealability of an order which is alleged to have deprived a party of a mode of trial." *Flagstar Corp. v. Royal Surplus Lines*, 341 S.C. 68, 533 S.E.2d 331 (2000). **"These cases not only permit, but indeed require, immediate appeal."** *Id.*(emphasis supplied). This updated precedent mandates "some minimal inquiry" is necessary and must be immediately appealed. *Id.* It is respectfully submitted governing case law requires reconstruction of the record below to satisfy the mandate for

“some minimal inquiry.” *Id.* The matter herein includes counterclaims with jury demand. It is respectfully submitted that reconstruction of the lower court record is required in order to comply with new precedent and governing case law. Accordingly, the April 11, 2023, and December 9, 2022, opinions should be reversed pending reconstruction of the lower court record which is hereby requested.

Significantly and materially, pursuant to Rule 219, SCACR, the order entered December 9, 2022, is a violation of Legislative intent that a panel of judges, not a single individual, finally determine an appeal (see, e.g., Rule 240(j), SCACR) as well as a violation of the party presentation rule which should be considered en banc. S.C. Code § 14-8-220. The American judicial system is an adversary system, not based on inquisitors: **In order to ensure the integrity of the judicial system,** the norms of that adversarial system prohibit ex parte communications and outside factual research which undercut the appearance of a disinterested court. In both civil and criminal cases, in the first instance and on appeal, the principle of party presentation is followed: The parties frame the issues for decision and the courts have the role of **neutral arbiter** of matters the parties present. *Greenlaw v. United States*, 554 U.S. 237, 243 (2008) (emphasis supplied). In this case, the record reflects a single government employee authored a wrongful sua sponte opinion based on outside-the-record factual research while functioning as the ex-husband Family Court attorney defendant’s counsel of record, not a neutral arbiter. As such, the record reflects the wrongful sua sponte order of a single individual is reversible abuse of discretion. The ex-husband Family Court attorney defendant’s standard-operating-procedure (SOP) parallels Alex Murdaugh’s “the rules don’t apply to me” SOP which was used to entice the judiciary to rubber-stamp his wrongdoing. Similarly, untrustworthy officers of the court herein entice sua sponte wrongdoing thereby denying the other party an opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time. Sua sponte disposition requires, at a minimum, briefing prior to dispositional decision and the orders herein are reversible error for this reason alone. Accordingly, the April 11, 2023, and December 9, 2022, opinions should be reversed and reconstruction of the record below is

needed both as factual support for any decision herein and for adequate record for meaningful appellate review hereafter. *See Clements v. Young*, 310 S.C. 73, 425 S.E.2d 63 (Ct. App. 1992) (appellant moved for reconstruction of the record on remand to the lower court where the hearing was unrecorded).

In addition, pursuant to Rule 219, SCACR, and S.C. Code § 14-8-220, the appellant respectfully submits Rule 240(j), SCACR, petition for rehearing herein is *de novo* review which does not include the individual judge who signed the order that is the subject of the Rule 240(j), SCACR, review which should be considered en banc without the participation of the single individual who signed the wrongful, unsupported sua sponte dismissal without notice or briefing. Appellant filed the appeal pursuant to Rule 240(j), SCACR, for appeal of a single judge's order. S.C. Code § 14-8-220 provides statutory authority for Rule 240(j), SCACR, and provides for **appeal** of the order of a single judge. S.C. Code § 14-8-220. Meaningful review requires that a judge not directly or indirectly participate in appeal of his or her own order. Occasionally, a recently appointed Appellate Court Judge or recent Supreme Court Justice will find him or herself in the position of potentially reviewing an Order that he or she authored. In these cases, the Judge or Justice will recuse him or herself from the position of potentially reviewing an order that he or she authored. A judge "shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned." *Rule 3(E)(1), CJC, Rule 501, SCACR*. Disqualification is required if a reasonable factual basis exists for doubting the judge's impartiality. *Rice v. McKenzie*, 581 F.2d 1114, 1116 (4th Cir. 1978) (emphasis supplied). Appellant reasonably questions impartiality. In the *Rice* case, then Chief Judge Haynsworth further ruled that, "For many years a federal judge has been prohibited from sitting to hear or determine an appeal in a case or issue tried by him. 28 U.S.C.A. § 47. To say the least, it would be unbecoming for a judge to sit in a United States Court of Appeals to participate in the determination of the correctness, propriety and appropriateness of what he did in the trial of the case. After rendering decisions, some judges remain open minded, and some are unreluctant to confess previous error, but **a reasonable person has a reasonable basis to question the impartiality** of a judge who sits in a United States Court of Appeals

to review his own decision as a trial judge." *Id.* At 1117 (emphasis supplied). The inquiry is whether a reasonable person would have a reasonable basis for questioning the judge's impartiality, not whether the judge is in fact impartial. *Id.* at 1116. Granted, this is a Fourth Circuit case, but the principle from this oft-cited case is well-stated, sound, and universally accepted as logical and fair. "There is another way to look at the case, however: as one in which the losing litigant appeals from a ruling by Judge X to an appellate panel that includes Judge X; and it is considered improper—indeed it is an express ground for recusal, see 28 U.S.C. Sec. 47—in modern American law for a judge to sit on the appeal from his own case. On this ground the Fourth Circuit held in *Rice* that section 455(a) required the district judge to recuse himself. [*Rice v. McKenzie*, 581 F.2d 1114, 1116 (4th Cir. 1978).] We agree with this result." *Russell v. Lane*, 890 F.2d 947 (7th Cir. 1989) (emphasis supplied). Similarly, in this case, "(t)o say the least, it would be unbecoming for a judge" to sit on the Rule 240(j), SCACR, appeal of his own decision. *Rice v. McKenzie*, 581 F.2d 1114, 1117 (4th Cir. 1978). Moreover, under these facts and in consideration of Legislative intent and the overarching principles incorporated in the State and Federal Constitutions by the framers, due process requires that the appellate court judge who individually signed the sua sponte dismissal order after outside-the-record factual research not participate, directly or indirectly, on appeal of the decision which is the subject of the Rule 240(j), SCACR, *de novo* appeal. Ambiguity regarding the requirement of non-participation on Rule 240(j), SCACR, appeal is a denial of due process. To the extent there is ambiguity, the rule of lenity supports appellant's position. Accordingly, Rule 240(j), SCACR, *de novo* appeal and due process require non-participation by the individual judge who signed the wrongful sua sponte dismissal based on outside-the-record factual research.

Former Justice Sandra Day O'Connor warned the public about the importance of judicial independence. She wrote "... many Americans today do not see the need for independent judges. Many prefer a judiciary that acts merely as a reflex of popular will." *Judicial Independence and 21st Century Challenges*, Sandra Day O'Connor, The Bench, July/August 2012. As she explained, "The reason

why judicial independence is so important is because **there has to be a safe place** where being right is more important than being popular; where fairness triumphs strength. That place, in our country, is the courtroom. It can only survive so long as we keep out political influences." *Id.* (emphasis supplied).

Public policy, legislative intent, statutory authority, governing case law, State and Federal Constitutional law, the Rules of Court, the SCACR, and fundamental fairness support Rule 219, SCACR, en banc consideration of Rule 240(j), SCACR, appeal and application of the *de novo* legal standard herein.


In sum, the order dated April 11, 2023, misapprehends, overlooks, and/or misconstrues material fact and law. Appellant respectfully objects. This matter is of great public importance. This matter involves the attached copy of the Decree of Divorce to which the Family Court attorney defendant, with decades of experience, agreed on the record, into which that agreement was incorporated, from which defendant never appealed, and which is now the law of the case. See Rule 16, SCRFC ("The family court has jurisdiction of the parties and control of all subsequent proceedings from the time of service of the summons and complaint.'..." *Wazney v. Wazney* (S.C. App. 2019). The family court has exclusive original jurisdiction over the domestic matters herein including marital property and retirement pursuant to S.C. Code § § 63-3-510 to 530. This matter is currently pending in the Family Court subject to confidentiality and privacy which is hereby requested. It is undisputed that the family court can order child support to continue beyond eighteen years. *SCDSS Child Support v. Mangle*, 633 S.E.2d 903 (S.C. App. 2006). See S.C. Code § 20-7-420(A)(17). Defendant's tax returns confirm support payments made by him pursuant to written agreement and subject to S.C. Code § § 63-3-510 to 530. Legislative intent, exclusive original jurisdiction pursuant to S.C. Code § § 63-3-510 to 530, and the plain language of the Decree (copy attached) to which the ex-husband attorney defendant agreed and which is now the law of the case all provide exclusive jurisdiction over marital property and retirement issues without prejudice in the Family Court. To the extent there is ambiguity, the rule of lenity supports the undersigned's position. Accordingly, the April 11, 2023, order is reversible as a

matter of law based on error of material fact and law.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and for substantial justice affecting substantial rights, the undersigned respectfully requests this Court grant this petition for rehearing en banc and motion for reconsideration with abeyance pending resolution. The appellant also makes motion with abeyance for reconstruction of the record on remand where, without explanation, the SCCA's recording for transcripts has a critical gap in the recording for the hearing below despite finding recordings for essentially all other hearings on that day, one of many unexplained irregularities in this matter. As the adversely affected party appealing the wrongful ex parte hearing, appellant respectfully requests reconstruction of the record in matters adversely affecting the appellant and respectfully submits dismissal is premature pending reconstruction of the record below. Accordingly, the April 11, 2023, order should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

  
C. Holmes  
POB 187  
S.I., SC 29482-0187  
843.883.3010



of this action.

**SECOND:** The Plaintiff and Defendant last resided together as husband and wife in the County of Charleston, State of South Carolina.

**THIRD:** The Plaintiff and Defendant were lawfully married on September 4, 1978, in the State of Georgia and of this marriage three (3) children have been born:

**FOURTH:** The Defendant has committed adultery.

**FIFTH:** There is no fraud or collusion between the parties in the bringing of this action.

Based upon the foregoing findings of fact, the Court concludes:

**FIRST:** This Court has jurisdiction of the parties and subject matter of this action.

**SECOND:** More than 90 days have elapsed since the filing of the Complaint.

**THIRD:** The Plaintiff is entitled to a divorce on the statutory grounds of adultery.


**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Plaintiff is hereby granted a divorce, a *vinculo matrimonii*, on the statutory grounds of adultery, and

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that all other issues including, but not limited to, temporary and permanent custody, child support, alimony, and the equitable division of marital property and retirement accounts are reserved and preserved pending discovery, mediation, and further Court hearings, if necessary; and

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the parties may engage in discovery under the Rules of Civil Procedure including interrogatories, requests for production, requests for

admissions, depositions and subpoenas.


AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



E. F. Sejaris Andrews, Presiding Judge  
Family Court of the Ninth Judicial Circuit

Charleston, South Carolina

30 day of January, 2004.



PLEASE AFFIX COPY  
JULY ADMISSIIONG (SEAL)  
DEPUTY CLERK S. & FC  
DEPUTY CLERK

EXHIBIT 5



## The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS  
CLERK

CATHERINE S. HARRISON  
DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
1220 SENATE STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1880  
FAX: (803) 734-1839  
[www.sccourts.org](http://www.sccourts.org)

May 11, 2023

Cynthia Holmes  
PO Box 187  
Sullivan's Island SC 29482

Re: James Holmes v. Cynthia Collie  
Appellate Case No. 2022-001146

Dear Ms. Holmes:

The Court received your filing dated May 4, 2023. Our records reflect the Court has already issued a ruling on your petition for rehearing and suggestion for rehearing en banc. We construe your recent filings received April 21 and May 4, 2023, as successive petitions for rehearing. Pursuant to Rule 221(c), SCACR, the Court declines to take further action on your filings.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jenny A. Kitchings".

CLERK

cc: Barry I. Baker, Esquire  
Kyle T Varner, Esquire

EXHIBIT 6



## The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS  
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
1220 SENATE STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890  
FAX: (803) 734-1839  
[www.sccourts.org](http://www.sccourts.org)

November 30, 2022

Saverne Haynes  
211 S. Poplar Street  
Seneca SC 29678

Re: Michel D. Haynes v. Saverne Haynes  
Appellate Case No. 2022-000699

Dear Ms. Haynes:

Our records show that our office has not received a proof of service for the motion to allow late filing of the respondent's initial brief and designation of matter. Therefore, the motion will not be acted upon and the respondent's initial brief and designation of matter will not be accepted for filing. The filing fee received for the motion will be refunded.

Very truly yours,

Handwritten signature of V. Claire Allen in cursive.

CLERK

cc: Caroline Elizabeth Waldrep, Esquire  
Robert L. Waldrep, Jr., Esquire

EXHIBIT 7



## The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS  
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
1220 SENATE STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890  
FAX: (803) 734-1839  
www.sccourts.org

November 30, 2022

Paul Magargle  
Division of Finance and Personnel  
1220 Senate St., Suite 101  
Columbia, S.C. 29201

Re: Michel D. Haynes v. Saverne Haynes  
Appellate Case No. 2022-000699

Dear Mr. Magargle:

We received a motion for extension in the above titled appeal. The respondent provided this office with a fifty dollar (\$50.00) filing fee in the form of a check numbered 10341 which was deposited on October 28, 2022. This motion is being returned to Respondent.

Please refund the \$50.00 filing fee to Saverne Haynes at the following mailing address:

Saverne Haynes  
211 S. Poplar Street  
Seneca SC 29678

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "V. Claire Allen".

CLERK

cc: Caroline Elizabeth Waldrep, Esquire  
Robert L. Waldrep, Jr., Esquire  
Saverne Haynes