

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM BERKELEY COUNTY

Court of Common Pleas

RECEIVED

Nov 06 2023

SC Court of Appeals

Appellate Case No. 2023-001509

Case No.: 2018-CP-08-02131

Bank of America, NA, Respondent,

v.

The Estate of Mary Westbrooks a/k/a Mary Y. Westbrooks, and John Doe and Richard Roe, as Representatives of all heirs and devisees of Mary Westbrooks a/k/a Mary Y. Westbrooks, deceased, and all persons entitled to claim under or through them; also, all other persons, corporations or entities unknown claiming any right, title interest in or lien upon the subject real estate described herein, any unknown adults, whose true names are unknown, being a class designated as John Doe, and any unknown infants, persons under disability, or person in the Military Service of the United States of America whose true names are unknown, being a class designated as Richard Roe, Aubrey Schultz, Kadeem Gaddist, The United States of America acting by and through its agent the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles, CIT Group Consumer Finance, N/K/A CIT Loan Corporation, Defendants,

Of Whom Audrey Schultz and Kadeem Gaddist are the Appellants.

Appelleants are still asking the courts for extension of time due to the fact of no transcripts. Mrs Schultz put in for a copy of a past rule to show cause hearing due to the fact in the respondents return motion, He stated that the Appelleants were denied and rejected by the circuit court when in fact since Janjuary 30, 2020 the Appelleants stated they were bonafied tenants and were never denied. Mrs. Schultz only orded a transcript of another court date dealing with this matter to prove that the judge stated that it was in Bank Of Americas

best interest to handle this matter outside of court after the Appelleants stated their rights as tenants. There are still no records filed to the judgement of 30 day writ that was made against appellants on September 14, 2023 due to the fact of the plaintiff did not hire a court reporter as they were suppose to do so for the court heiring. The Appelleants kindly are still asking for a motion of extension of initial time due to no transcript of judgement Also attatched are the emails where the responder never argued any of the arguments that are being brought

up now stating that the Appelleants are not bonafied tenants. The respondants only ever stated that they would not honor

our lease stating its not valid because the Appelleants were only entitled to a year from the date of the deed that was recorded.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

aubrey Schultz kadeem gaddist

Teatea9125@gmail.com