

1 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA \* COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
 \*  
 2 COUNTY OF CHARLESTON \* TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD  
 \*  
 3 -----X  
 KAREN OLIVER, \*  
 \*  
 4 Appellant, \*  
 \*  
 5 vs. \* Case No. 2023-CP-10-01598  
 \*  
 6 CHARLESTON COUNTY HOUSING \*  
 7 AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, \*  
 \*  
 8 Defendant. \*  
 -----X

May 31, 2023

B E F O R E:

The Honorable Bentley Price, Presiding Judge

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Karen Oliver, Pro Se Appellant

Carlton Bowers, Esq.  
Attorney for the Defendant

Recorded by: OWL Courtroom System

Transcribed by: Bobbi Fisher, RPR  
SC Official Court Reporter III

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I N D E X

DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Proceedings	3

E X H I B I T S

(None.)

COURT REPORTER LEGEND

Dash (--)	Indicates an interruption in speech
Ellipses (...)	Indicates trailing off in speech
(ph)	Indicates phonetic word
[Verbatim]	Indicates the word is said as written
(Indiscernible)	[Transcription] Indicates word(s) is not known due to audio recording quality

## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 THE COURT: All right. I have read the return. All  
3 right. Whose appeal is this? Or who is representing  
4 which side?

5 MS. OLIVER: Judge, I made an appeal after the  
6 magistrate judge made her decision, and they  
7 (indiscernible) because of a motion because he wants to  
8 dismiss my appeal.

9 MR. BOWERS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'm  
10 actually Carlton Bowers here on behalf of Charleston  
11 County Housing and Redevelopment Authority. Ms. Gladden  
12 is with me today. It was a motion and denial of her  
13 appeal, so it was all in one. I thought we were here  
14 today to argue against her appeal.

15 THE COURT: That's correct.

16 So it's your appeal, ma'am. Be happy to hear from  
17 you.

18 MS. OLIVER: Okay. Well, he's made -- my appeal is  
19 actually -- needs to be scheduled. He just made this  
20 motion to dismiss it, so we should be talking about why  
21 we're dismissing it, from my understanding of things.  
22 Because I can tell you why it should go on with my appeal.  
23 And why it should go on with my appeal, one of the things  
24 that I'm appealing is the judge's action. The judge, she  
25 treated photographs and recordings differently.

1           The Rule 10-001 says that you are to treat those  
2 things the same. When it came to the video, when I told  
3 the judge that this video right here would prove that I  
4 did not need -- need to be here in the court, which it  
5 stated that there would be no evictions during COVID, and  
6 she refused to look at the video.

7           But what she did is she took herself and her staff  
8 out of the courtroom, allowed CCHRA to review the video.  
9 And when she came -- well, we were still reviewing --  
10 well, I was verifying, but it was actually reviewed at  
11 that point. We were verifying, and she came back into the  
12 courtroom and she wanted to know if we were completed. I  
13 said, no, I was making sure that -- showing her that this  
14 took place while the chairman of the board was actually an  
15 employee with CCHRA. She was trying to deny that it was  
16 actually, you know, a thing that he's saying.

17           Well, the video proves and spoke for itself. But  
18 the judge refused to look at the video. And when her  
19 denying looking at the video and also removing everyone  
20 from the courtroom -- her staff -- herself and her staff  
21 from the courtroom, so we came with a disagreement. I  
22 wanted it entered into evidence, and she did not want it  
23 entered into evidence, then how could the judge make a  
24 (indiscernible) an unbiased decision if she didn't see the  
25 video to say that the video was not relevant. She

1 accepted it like -- acceptance and consideration into  
2 evidence that relates to the video itself.

3 So how could she make a determination that the  
4 consideration of acceptance is not even valid or even --  
5 that the people verified if she won't look at the video  
6 that which I responded to?

7 And on the acceptance and consideration, it  
8 references the video itself. And, also, when she -- with  
9 the video, she tried to -- let's see -- require a  
10 transcript. Well, the video has its own transcript. She  
11 just didn't want to see the video because the video  
12 exonerated me in a sense, because it said no evictions  
13 during COVID -- well, no, not during COVID but during the  
14 pandemic.

15 And at that time, CCHRA was still operating under  
16 the COVID protocols. I couldn't even go in to do my  
17 annual review because they were doing things -- not  
18 letting people come in. They were doing things just  
19 through the mail. They weren't letting me come in.

20 And I had issues, and I couldn't get them to resolve  
21 it. And also on this right here, he gave cases. There's  
22 cases of State v. Brooks right there on that line that he  
23 tried to get the judge. He actually looked at the video  
24 and he -- not only did he look at the video, he looked at  
25 the other evidence so he could be make an unbiased

1 decision.

2 So if videos are not allowed in magistrate's court,  
3 then it should be put into the protocols and procedures,  
4 but there's nothing there that's saying I could not use a  
5 video. Where she asked for the transcript, the transcript  
6 was right there on the video.

7 Now, Rule 10-001 says that you treat photographs the  
8 same way you treat videos and videos the same, vice versa.  
9 So when it came later, she accepted my pictures. There  
10 was no extra put on the pictures, the photographs. So,  
11 therefore, those two should have been treated the same.

12 And then, Judge, why are you going to leave out  
13 while I'm doing this? Why are you going to get up right  
14 now, you and your staff, and leave and not hear the rest  
15 of this? Because that's basically what took place for me.  
16 I gave you the recording and the evidence that you could  
17 hear. I deserve to be heard.

18 That right there was relevant information on that  
19 video. That video -- let's go. State vs. Landfield and  
20 State vs. (Indiscernible). They said that the absence of  
21 abuse of discretion are common legal error which results  
22 in a prejudice to the defendant. And that's what I  
23 experienced. I experienced prejudice to me because she  
24 tried to treat those two evidence -- pieces of evidence  
25 differently.

1           Now, you had a transcript already, the text in the  
2 video, so then what else is there? (Indiscernible) looked  
3 at what is going on or not because state and federal law  
4 is the same there. Now, you don't see former President  
5 Trump that haven't had his access (indiscernible) with  
6 video not being there that has to have a transcript on it.  
7 George Floyd (indiscernible) and did not have to have a  
8 transcript on it. And state and federal laws are the  
9 same.

10           So, now, I have to say something else, Judge.  
11 Please --

12           THE COURT: Well, let's wrap it up.

13           MS. OLIVER: Okay. Well, let me -- let's go to the  
14 relevance. The relevance, now had she (indiscernible)  
15 saying it's not relevant. If you can't see it, how can  
16 you tell if it's relevant? Because it was connected. You  
17 have got to have logically connectedness. And to have it,  
18 the foundation was already put when she accepted the  
19 acceptance which is consideration. So how can you tell  
20 there wasn't a contract if you won't look at all the  
21 pieces? She just wanted to get rid of me out of that  
22 courtroom.

23           Okay. And then she even started to say about, "Oh,  
24 like you're just a judge, see how (indiscernible) hooked  
25 this up?" Now, you just didn't just -- when it's time for

1 lunch, to tell everybody, "Well, we're going to rush  
2 through your cases." No. You (indiscernible), and we  
3 were willing to come back. She was not willing to do  
4 that. Judge (indiscernible) was not willing to do that.  
5 And I'm not -- I'm saying that that was wrong because the  
6 video was logically relevant, digitally relevant, and it  
7 was connected.

8 And for her to accept one was totally wrong. And it  
9 had probative value and very much probative value.

10 THE COURT: All right.

11 MS. OLIVER: And, also, Judge, if I could say one  
12 more thing. He's going to say that, on that video,  
13 that -- when the chairman of the board is saying about no  
14 evictions, that that is hearsay. That is not hearsay. It  
15 is (indiscernible) of the CCHRA's business. So it's not  
16 hearsay. Hearsay would be like if he was telling  
17 something that someone else said on that video. But he  
18 was speaking for himself and he's speaking in the  
19 (indiscernible) of CCHRA video -- business.

20 And, also, they have put in their -- for the  
21 dismissal that the essential services have been done at  
22 that unit. No, it has not been completed. I have had to  
23 go through eight months of trying to get the septic and  
24 wastewater cleaned up. Now, he did get the drain line  
25 finally done. For the past six months, I have been trying

1 to get CCHRA to hear me, that it had not been done  
2 properly, that it wasn't even done to my residence. But  
3 for the past six months, Judge, it's been like I have no  
4 one to hear me. Okay?

5 Now, when this started, I tried to get my annual  
6 review. I did not see that where in their paperwork that  
7 they made the adjustments to where I put in my changes in  
8 my family household. They did not change that. Judge --

9 THE COURT: All right, all right, all right --

10 MS. OLIVER: I didn't even check that --

11 THE COURT: When I start talking, you stop.

12 MS. OLIVER: Yes, sir.

13 THE COURT: You're getting into the factual meat of  
14 the matter, which I'm not to consider. My only job is to  
15 consider any matters of law. The matters of law that you  
16 have brought up is the admissibility of evidence  
17 pertaining to the video and to any photos or any other  
18 evidentiary issues that you may have with the trial court  
19 down below, but any admissibility of evidence is left to  
20 the sole discretion of the trial court, and I, therefore,  
21 find that she did not abuse her discretion, and I will  
22 deny the appeal. All right?

23 MS. OLIVER: Thank you, sir.

24 (The above hearing concluded.)  
25

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

CASE NAME/NUMBER: Karen Oliver v. CCHRA

2023-CP-10-01598

DATE OF HEARING: 5-31-23

COURT REPORTER/MONITOR: OWL Courtroom System

\*\*\*\*\*

I, Bobbi Fisher, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the recorded proceedings; that said proceedings were transcribed to the best of my ability from the audio recording and supporting information, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case, and I have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

*Bobbi Fisher*

/s/ Bobbi Fisher

Bobbi Fisher, RPR and Certified Transcriber

Date Submitted: 1/24/24

NOTE: PURSUANT TO RULE 607(h)(1)(B), SCACR, "A COURT REPORTER SHALL RECEIVE THE FEE OF \$1.00 PER PAGE FOR FURNISHING A COPY OF A PREVIOUSLY PREPARED TRANSCRIPT." ALL REQUESTS FOR COPIES OF THE ATTACHED TRANSCRIPT (FORM 800) FROM OPPOSING PARTY OR NON-PARTIES MUST BE SENT TO THIS REPORTER AT BFISHER@SCCOURTS.ORG.