

RECEIVED

Apr 25 2024

SC Court of Appeals

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

George M. McFadden, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Estate Case No. 2020-ES-40-00392
Circuit Court Case No. 2023-CP-40-00573
Appellate Case No. 2024-000234

In the Matter of the Estate of Adell Thompson Adams:
Constance Washington,
Appellant,

v.

Adrian E. Adams, as Personal Representative for the Estate of Adell T. Adams,
Respondent.

MOTION TO DISMISS

Dated this the 23rd day of April, 2024

THE AUTONOMY GROUP, PC

By: /s/Soraya Martial-Wright
Soraya Martial-Wright, Esq.
SC Bar #103340
452 Lakeshore Pkwy, Suite 120
Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730
P: (803) 262-0442/ F: (803) 828-7779
soraya@taglegacyplanning.com

April 23, 2024
Rock Hill, South Carolina

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Table of Authorities | 3 |
| Motion to Dismiss | 4 |
| Statement of the Case | 4 |
| I. The History of Appellant’s Claim | 4-6 |
| II. The Probate Case | 6-8 |
| Argument | 8 |
| Timeliness | 8-9 |
| Reason for Disallowance of Claim | 9-10 |
| Unsigned Document | 10 |
| No Assets to Pay Creditors’ Claims | 10-11 |
| Appellant’s Claim is Not Valid | 11-12 |
| Conclusion | 12-15 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | |
|---|-------|
| SC Code § 62-3-806(a). Allowance of Claims | 6, 9 |
| SC Code § 62-3-804(2). Manner of Presentation of Claims | 7 |
| S.C Rules of Civil Procedure 6b. Enlargement | 9 |
| SC Code § 62-3-805. Classification of Claims | 11 |
| SC Code Ann. §15-3-530. Three Years | 11 |
| SC Code Chapter 36 §15-36-10. Frivolous Lawsuits | 13-14 |
| SC Rules of Civil Procedure 3.1. Meritorious Claims and Contentions | 14 |
| SC Rules of Civil Procedure 11(a). Signing of Pleadings; Attorneys | 14 |
| SC ACR 269. Frivolous Appeals, Petitions, Motions or Returns. | 14 |
| <i>Runyon v. Wright</i> , 322 S.C. 15, 471 S.E.2d 160 | 14 |

MOTION TO DISMISS

NOW COMES Respondent, Adrian E. Adams, and makes this Motion pursuant to SC Appellate Court Rules 240, 267 and 269, and the South Carolina Frivolous Civil Proceedings Sanction Act, on the ground that the Appeal is without factual or legal merit and was filed primarily for an improper purpose to injure and harass the Respondent. This Motion will be based upon the pleadings and records on file in this action, and upon such further documents and evidence as may be presented in support of this motion, including all letters, filings, documents, Orders and other papers and pleadings referred to in this Motion.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I. The History of Appellant's Claim

May, 2009-February, 2020

Appellant Constance Washington (“Washington” or “Appellant”) filed a Complaint on October 31, 2012 in Magistrate Court in Richland County, SC against Adell Adams alleging money owed on an alleged verbal contract for “home health care” services from May to August, 2009, following a surgery Adell Adams had in May, 2009 (Richland County/Upper Township Magistrate Court Case 2012CV401070927). Multiple attempts at service by Sheriff went unserved. A private process server served Adell Adams on February 5, 2013. Adell Adams filed her Answer with the Magistrate on March 8, 2013.

A hearing on Washington’s Complaint was held on April 1, 2013. Adell Adams appeared with witnesses and gave testimony. The Magistrate Court ruled that there was no “contract or amount agreed upon” between the parties, and judged in favor of Washington in the amount of \$500.00 plus court costs of \$80.00. Adell Adams paid the judgment in full on April 30, 2013 to the Magistrate. Washington then signed for and picked up her payment of \$580.00 on May 8, 2013 at the Magistrate’s Office.

On April 30, 2013, Washington filed an Appeal from the Magistrate Court’s Order in the Richland County Court of Common Pleas (case 2013CP4002623), citing an error in the calculation of liquidated damages, stating that the liquidated damages should be \$7,500.00, because the Magistrate Court had “ruled that Defendant was in default and as a result, Defendant admitted all of the allegations in Plaintiff’s complaint.” Washington attached to her Notice of

Appeal only one page of the five page Order of the Magistrate Court Judge, the Honorable Tomothy C. Edmond, which page was entitled, "Notice of Default Judgment." Respondent believes this portion of the Order was filed by the Magistrate in error. The remainder of the Magistrate Court Order clearly states that the matter was tried on April 1, 2013, that the parties presented testimony and arguments, and that the Judge had ruled in favor of the Plaintiff in the amount of \$580.00. The basis for this appeal therefore is false and fraudulent, since Adell Adams was not in default; filed a timely Answer to Plaintiff's complaint; appeared at the hearing on the Complaint; and gave testimony with several witnesses. Furthermore, the basis for this appeal was false and fraudulent, since Adell Adams paid the judgment amount in full on April 30, 2013; and by accepting it on May 8, 2013, Washington waived her right to pursue further damages or to pursue the matter in Appeals Court.

Upon information and belief, Mrs. Adell Adams had no knowledge of the Appeals case and was not served.

The Honorable Magistrate Judge Tomothy C. Edmond filed an Answer to the Notice of Appeal on May 31, 2013 citing, "It appeared that there was no contract or amount agreed upon, and based on the testimonies of all parties involved a judgment of five hundred (500) dollars was granted in favor of the plaintiff plus the court costs of eighty (80) dollars for a total of five hundred eighty (580) dollars. The Defendant paid the \$580 in full and it was received by the plaintiff on May 8, 2013."

A hearing was held in the Circuit Court of Appeals case on March 15, 2019, nearly six years later. Adell Adams did not appear. An Order was entered on March 20, 2019, reversing the amount of the judgment and ordering Appellant be granted judgment in the amount of \$7,500.00 against Adell Adams.

An Execution was issued on November 1, 2019 and a Motion for Supplemental Proceedings on January 10, 2020, in an attempt to execute on Adell Adams' property. On January 14, 2020, a Rule to Show Cause and Order for Supplemental Proceedings was filed.

The Rule to Show Cause and Order provided that the matter be referred to Richland County Master in Equity, Joseph M. Strickland, for further proceedings and that Adell Adams appear before the said Master in Equity on February 10, 2020, at 11:30 a.m., at the Richland County Courthouse, in Columbia, South Carolina. Adell Adams was ordered to appear and answer under oath concerning her assets, and answer questions propounded to her by

Washington, to show cause why her property should not be applied toward satisfaction of the judgment and why a Receiver should not be appointed. Washington did not execute on the Circuit Court Appeals Judgment prior to Adell Adams' passing.

Adell T. Adams died on February 19, 2020.

II. The Probate Case

Respondent Adrian E. Adams was named as Personal Representative in Adell Adams' Last Will and Testament, and was duly appointed on May 11, 2020. Washington filed a Statement of Creditor's claim in decedent's estate (Richland County Probate Case 2020ES4000392) on May 20, 2020 in the amount of \$7,500.00.

Respondent, pro se at the time, filed a Notice of Allowance/Disallowance of Creditor's Claim (the "Notice of Disallowance" or "Disallowance") on November 8, 2021, disallowing the Appellant's claim in full. Respondent also filed a Proof of Delivery on November 8, 2021 stating that he had mailed a copy of the Disallowance to the attorney for the Appellant. Pursuant to 62-3-806 (a), Respondent's Disallowance contained the following required thirty day warning:

A notice of disallowance or partial disallowance of a claim must contain a **warning** that the claim will be **barred** to the extent disallowed **unless the claimant commences a proceeding for allowance of the claim in accordance with Section 62-3-804(2) within thirty days of the mailing or other service** of the notice of disallowance or partial disallowance. Emphasis supplied.

Completely disregarding the statutory thirty day warning contained in Respondent's Notice of Disallowance and more than three months later, the attorney for the Appellant sent a letter to the Personal Representative, and Respondent herein, dated February 16, 2022, acknowledging receipt of the Notice of Disallowance and Proof of Delivery. Appellant's Attorney filed his letter with the Probate Court on February 20, 2022. In his letter, the attorney for the Appellant unilaterally took the position that the Notice of Disallowance was not valid since: (a) the Personal Representative had not signed the Notice of Disallowance, (b) there was no reason given for the disallowance of the claim, and (c) the Notice of Disallowance was filed outside the maximum time allowed under South Carolina Code. Notwithstanding the statutory thirty day warning barring his client's claim, the attorney for the Appellant further took the

position that no response to the Notice of Disallowance was required and, “Ms. Washington maintains her right to be paid in full for the judgment plus all applicable interest from the estate proceeds prior to the closing of the estate.”

The attorney for the Appellant did not file a Petition for the Allowance of the claim within thirty days of receiving the Notice of Disallowance, pursuant to Section 62-3-804(2). In fact, this sub-section provides that once a claim is presented, “a claimant may **at any time thereafter** commence a legal proceeding against the personal representative by the filing of a summons and petition for allowance of claim or complaint in any court where the personal representative may be subjected to jurisdiction, seeking payment of the claim by the decedent's estate, and serving the same upon the personal representative.” Emphasis supplied. Appellant did not need to wait for the claim to be Allowed or Disallowed. She could have filed a Petition for Allowance of Claim *at any time* after her Creditor's Claim was filed but before the expiration of the thirty days after receiving the Notice of Disallowance.

The Probate Court noticed and scheduled a closing hearing for July 21, 2022.

Respondent's attorney filed a Notice of Appearance in the probate case on July 20, 2022 and requested an extension of the closing hearing date. The extension was granted with a new due date of August 22, 2022 to complete the closing documents. Respondent's attorney requested a second extension which was granted with a new due date of October 14, 2022.

Respondent's attorney filed the required closing documents to complete the estate administration on October 24, 2022, including a Notice of Right to Demand a Hearing, Accounting, Proposal for Distribution (proposing no distribution to Appellant), Application for Settlement and Proof of Delivery of mailing the closing documents to Appellant's attorney.

On November 4, 2022 Appellant's attorney filed a Demand for Hearing and a hearing was held on December 20, 2022.

Based on documents filed in the case and submitted by all parties, testimony of the parties and the arguments of Counsel, the Probate Court's Order was filed on January 10, 2023. The Probate Court denied Appellant's claim, ordering in pertinent part, but not limited to:

- a. The Respondent's Notice disallowing Appellant's claim “is not invalidated because it is not signed. Nothing in the code supports this argument.” The Notice of Disallowance filed with the Court was signed and “is the controlling document.”

b. “Nothing in the code requires a reason for the Disallowance. The form itself states this is optional. Therefore, failure to state a reason does not invalidate” the disallowance of Appellant’s claim.

c. “The time period for the Allowance or Disallowance of Claims in SC Code § 62-3-806(a), is a duty placed on the Personal Representative for the Court and the timely administration of the Estate. There is no available consequence for a creditor to claim or ask for as a result of the delay, other than a Petition for Performance or a Petition for Removal of the Personal Representative.”

d. “The Court is authorized to extend the time for Allowance or Disallowance of Claim for good cause shown as described in SC Code Ann. § 62-3-806(a)” and an extension was granted.

e. The Notice of Disallowance of Appellant’s claim, filed “outside the time period of fourteen (14) months from the death of Decedent required by SC Code § 62-3-806(a) does not invalidate the action of Disallowance of the Claim.”

f. Code § 62-3-806(a) and the Notice of Disallowance of Appellant’s claim received by Appellant’s attorney, “require the filing of a Summons and Petition for Allowance of Claim with the payment of \$150.00 within thirty (30) days of the mailing of the form.” (Emphasis in original Order).

g. Code § 62-3-806(a) and the Notice of Disallowance of Appellant’s claim received by Appellant’s attorney, “warn that if the creditor does not file a Summons and Petition for Allowance of Claim with the payment of \$150.00 within thirty (30) days of the mailing of the form, their claim will be forever barred.” (Emphasis in original Order).

h. The attorney for the Appellant “failed to timely commence a proceeding for Allowance of the Claim in accordance with Section 62-3-804(2) and therefore the claim is forever barred.”

The attorney for Appellant filed a Petition for Allowance of Claim on January 5, 2023, more than one year after receiving Respondent’s Notice of Disallowance containing the thirty day warning. The Probate Court dismissed this action in its January 10, 2023 Order.

The Appellant filed a Motion to Reconsider on January 20, 2023, which was denied by Order dated January 27, 2023.

The attorney for Appellant did not at any time file a Petition for Performance or a Petition for Removal of the Personal Representative in the probate case as a course of action for his client, the creditor, and Appellant herein, when receipt of the Respondent's Notice of Disallowance was outside the time limit of fourteen months.

The Appellant filed an Appeal in the Richland County Court of Common Pleas (case number 2023CP4000573). The Appeals Court found by Order dated February 13, 2024, "We find that the Probate Court did not err in finding that Appellant failed to file a Petition for Allowance of her creditor's claim when the Notice of Disallowance was not timely filed, and was unsigned. The Appellant's Appeal is therefore denied."

ARGUMENT

Timeliness

While the Code does not specifically address consequences available to creditors whose claims are disallowed outside of the time limits, the Code does provide a very specific mechanism, a strict timeline, and consequences to creditors when a Notice of Disallowance is served on the creditor. The Code refers to it as a "warning." In fact, Section 62-3-806(a) provides strong, even repetitive, language as follows (emphasis supplied):

A notice of disallowance or partial disallowance of a claim must contain a **warning** that the claim will be **barred** to the extent disallowed **unless the claimant commences a proceeding for allowance of the claim in accordance with Section 62-3-804(2) within thirty days of the mailing** or other service of the notice of disallowance or partial disallowance. **Every claim which is disallowed in whole or in part by the personal representative is barred so far as not allowed unless the claimant commences a proceeding for allowance of the claim in accordance with Section 62-3-804(2) not later than thirty days after the mailing** or other service of the notice of disallowance or partial disallowance by the personal representative.

Clearly, the heavier burden is on the creditor to timely file a petition for allowance, when a claim has been disallowed—regardless of whether the disallowance was outside of the time limit.

Time limits imposed by the code on personal representatives of estates are not meant to be punitive. They are given to keep the estate moving along, to provide for the timely administration of estates, and to prevent probate courts from becoming bogged down in cases lingering *ad nauseam*. Probate Courts have the discretion to give personal representatives

informal latitude and flexibility for additional time, without the requirement of formal motions for extension that need to be circulated, signed, filed and served on multiple parties. Further, the code doesn't direct the personal representative to file a motion for extension to extend the time to file a Notice of Allowance/Disallowance outside the fourteen month timeframe. The Court is authorized and has discretion to reasonably extend time for good cause shown as described in SC Rules of Civil Procedure 6(b) and SC Code Ann. § 62-3-806(a). Informal extensions were granted to the Personal Representative in this case.

Appellant provides no statute or case law supporting her contention that the untimely Disallowance she received is invalid. The Notice of Disallowance of Appellant's claim, filed outside the time period of fourteen (14) months from the death of Decedent required by SC Code § 62-3-806(a) does not invalidate the action of Disallowance of the Claim.

Reason for Disallowance of Claim

Appellant cites that no reason was given for the disallowance of her claim and that there "would have been no valid reason for the Court to have disallowed a valid judgment obtained against the Decedent during the Decedent's lifetime."¹ Respondent prepared and filed the Notice that disallowed the claim and it was up to the creditor to petition for its allowance. The Court didn't disallow the claim, except to rule in its January 10, 2023 Order that the claim was, "forever barred" by the Code. As stated on the Form 372 ES Notice of Allowance/Disallowance of Creditor's Claim, a reason for the disallowance is optional and not required to be given, and is certainly not a reason for the Disallowance to be deemed invalid.

Unsigned Document

Appellant seems to want to make an issue of the fact that the Notice of Disallowance she received was unsigned and that, therefore, makes it invalid. Appellant provides no statute or case law supporting her contention that the unsigned Disallowance she received is invalid. As the Probate Court stated in its January 10, 2023 Order, the Notice of Disallowance filed with the Probate Court **was signed and is the controlling document**. Emphasis supplied.

Throughout courts today parties are served unsigned documents on a daily basis. In fact, some get filed with the courts unsigned. The Circuit Court of Appeals March 20, 2019 Order

¹ Respondent denies that Appellant ever had a valid judgment in the amount of \$7500.00.

reversing the amount of the Magistrate's Judgement from \$580.00 to \$7,500.00 was filed unsigned by the Judge. No one would argue that this Order was invalid or of no effect simply by virtue of it being unsigned. Indeed, if we were to determine all unsigned court documents invalid and ineffective, the courts would be in chaos.

No Assets Available to Pay Creditors' Claims

Appellant alleges in her Initial Brief, "The Personal Representative is also a beneficiary of the Decedent's estate and Appellant believes that attempting to disallow a clearly valid creditor's claim such as this was a bad faith effort on his part to keep more of the estate for himself."

If a reason were required to be given for disallowance of a claim, which is denied, Respondent avers that there is no "bad faith" when there are no assets of the estate from which to pay the Appellant's claim.

Section 62-3-805 provides: "(a) If the applicable assets of the estate are insufficient to pay all claims in full, the personal representative shall make payment in the following order: (1) costs and expenses of administration, including attorney's fees, and reasonable funeral expenses."

Respondent avers that the expenses of administration, attorney fees and funeral expenses have been paid from all liquid assets of the estate, namely life insurance proceeds which are exempt from creditor's claims, and a small amount in the decedent's checking account. Actually, the expenses of the estate administration in this case have exceeded the liquid assets of the estate.

Other than a 2009 Buick Lacrosse with a blown transmission, the only asset of the estate is the decedent's residential real property. While Appellant's judgment might otherwise attach to the real property, and be required to be paid upon the sale of the property, the existing mortgage lien on the property plus the homestead exemption, if applicable to the testate heirs, total significantly more than the market value of the property and there is, therefore, no equity in the real property available to pay creditor's claims.

Appellant's Claim Is Not Valid

Contract actions in South Carolina are time-barred after three years has passed. S.C. Code Ann. § 15-3-530 provides that “an action upon contract, obligation, or liability, express or implied...” must be brought within three years of the time the cause of action accrues.

Respondent avers that Appellant’s complaint for an alleged verbal contract for “home health care” was filed more than three years *after* the alleged contract occurred and should have been barred by the Statute of Limitations. Appellant alleges to have provided “home health care” to the decedent from May to August, 2009, but didn’t bring her complaint until October 31, 2012.

If there was a contract, which is denied, it could only have been a verbal contract at best. However there couldn’t have been a valid verbal contract where the two parties did not have a “meeting of the minds” as to its terms.

Respondent concedes that, in any case, since a Magistrate Judgment was entered, the decedent paid the Judgment in full on April 30, which was accepted by the Appellant as evidenced by her Pick Up Form dated May 8, 2013.

The filing of the Appeal from the Magistrate’s Judgment was in error and barred by law, since the Judgment debt was paid. By accepting the Judgment payment of \$580.00, Appellant waived and voided her right to Appeal the amount to \$7,500.00.

The filing of the Appeal from the Magistrate’s Judgment on the basis that the liquidated damages should be \$7,500.00, because the Magistrate Court had “ruled that Defendant was in default and as a result, Defendant admitted all of the allegations in Plaintiff’s complaint” was false and fraudulent, since the Defendant Adell Adams was not in default; filed a timely Answer to Plaintiff’s Complaint, appeared at the hearing on the Complaint, and gave testimony.

Upon information and belief, decedent was not served with or properly served with notice of the first appeal in Circuit Court, and had no knowledge of the case. Upon information and belief, the Circuit Court of Appeals didn’t have accurate facts of the Magistrate Court case, since the Appeals case was based on one page of a five page Magistrate Order, which is believed to have been an error by the Magistrate Judge. The Circuit Court of Appeals case was therefore improper and should not have been brought against Adell Adams.

Appellant’s claim in Probate Court was disallowed by the personal representative. Appellant’s claim then was further barred by the failure of the Appellant herself to properly present her alleged claim in Probate Court by filing a timely Petition for Allowance. Her claim was further forever barred by the Probate Court’s January 10, 2023 Order and again by the

Probate Court's January 27, 2023 Order. Appellant's claim was again disallowed when the Richland County Circuit Court affirmed the Probate Court's January 10, 2023 Order by Order dated February 13, 2024.

CONCLUSION

The Probate Court did not err in finding that Appellant failed to file a Petition for Allowance of her creditor's claim when the Notice of Disallowance was not timely filed and was unsigned.

Appellant's claim has been barred by the failure of the Appellant herself to properly present her alleged claims in Probate Court; by the Probate Court's January 10, 2023 Order forever barring the claim; and the February 13, 2024 Circuit Court of Appeals Order Affirming the Probate Court's Order.

Appellant has been litigating this matter for nearly fifteen years.

As set forth herein, Respondent alleges Appellant and her attorney have pursued an unmeritorious claim against the decedent, her estate, and the Personal Representative and Respondent herein, which has caused the Respondent to incur unnecessary attorney fees and costs.

SC Code Chapter 36, known as the South Carolina Frivolous Civil Proceedings Sanctions Act, provides in Section 15-36-10 as follows:

A(4) An attorney or pro se litigant participating in a civil or administrative action or defense may be sanctioned for:

(a) filing a frivolous pleading, motion, or document if:

(ii) a reasonable attorney in the same circumstances would believe that under the facts, his claim or defense was clearly not warranted under existing law and that a good faith or reasonable argument did not exist for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law;

(iii) a reasonable attorney presented with the same circumstances would believe that the procurement, initiation, continuation, or defense of a civil cause was intended merely to harass or injure the other party; or

(iv) a reasonable attorney presented with the same circumstances would believe the pleading, motion, or document is frivolous, interposed for merely delay, or merely brought for any purpose other than securing proper discovery, joinder of parties, or adjudication of the claim or defense upon which the proceedings are based;

(b) making frivolous arguments a reasonable attorney would believe were not reasonably supported by the facts; or

(c) making frivolous arguments that a reasonable attorney would believe were not warranted under the existing law or if there is no good faith argument that exists for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law.

Pursuant to Section 15-36-10(B)(1) and (2), the Appeal must be stricken and the court, “upon its own motion or motion of a party, may impose upon the person in violation any sanction which the court considers just, equitable, and proper under the circumstances.”

SCRCP 3.1, provides, “A lawyer shall not bring or defend a proceeding, or assert or controvert an issue therein, unless there is a basis in law and fact for doing so that is not frivolous, which includes a good faith argument for an extension, modification or reversal of existing law.”

SCRCP 11(a), provides that a party and/or the party’s attorney may be sanctioned for filing a frivolous pleading, motion, or other paper, or for making frivolous arguments, when there is no good ground to support it; and is interposed for delay.

Also, SC ACR 269 provides, "Where an appeal, petition, motion or return is frivolous or taken solely for the purposes of delay, or is not in compliance with these Rules, the appellate court may upon its own motion or that of a party, after ten (10) days’ notice, impose upon offending attorneys or parties such sanctions as the circumstances of the case and discouragement of like conduct in the future may require."

In *Runyon v. Wright*, 322 S.C. 15, 471 S.E.2d 160 (1996), the party and/or attorney may also be sanctioned for filing a pleading, motion, or other paper in bad faith whether or not there is good ground to support it. The sanction may include an order to pay the reasonable costs and attorney fees incurred by the party or parties defending against the frivolous action or action brought in bad faith, a reasonable fine to be paid to the court, or a directive of a nonmonetary nature designed to deter the party or the party’s attorney from bringing any future frivolous

action or action in bad faith. *Id.* Further, if appropriate under the facts of the case, the court may order a party and/or the party's attorney to pay a reasonable monetary penalty to the party or parties defending against the frivolous action or action brought in bad faith. *Id.*

Respondent alleges no reasonable attorney would believe Appellant's Appeal to this Court is filed in good faith, warranted or supported by the facts or existing law. Respondent alleges the Appeal is filed in bad faith, frivolous and interposed for delay, injury and harassment.

The Appellant's Appeal should be dismissed and monetary and non-monetary sanctions taxed against the Appellant and her attorney, in this Court's discretion.

WHEREFORE, Respondent prays of the Court,

a. Pursuant to Section 15-36-10(G)(1), for an order for the Appellant to pay Respondent's reasonable costs and attorney's fees;

b. Pursuant to Section 15-36-10(G)(2), for an order for the attorney for Appellant to pay a reasonable fine to the court; or

c. Pursuant to Section 15-36-10(G)(3), for a directive of a nonmonetary nature, including injunctive relief, designed to deter a future frivolous action or an action in bad faith;

d. For such other and further relief as to this Court seems just and proper.

Dated this the 23rd day of April, 2024

THE AUTONOMY GROUP, PC

By: /s/ Soraya Martial-Wright
Soraya Martial-Wright, Esq.
SC Bar #103340
452 Lakeshore Pkwy, Suite 120
Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730
P: (803) 262-0442/ F: (803) 828-7779
soraya@taglegacyplanning.com

April 23, 2024
Rock Hill, South Carolina

RECEIVED

Apr 25 2024

SC Court of Appeals

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

George M. McFadden, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Estate Case No. 2020-ES-40-00392
Circuit Court Case No. 2023-CP-40-00573
Appellant Case No. 2024-000234

In the Matter of the Estate of Adell Thompson Adams:
Constance Washington,
Appellant,

v.

Adrian E. Adams, as Personal Representative for the Estate of Adell T. Adams,
Respondent.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify to the Court as follows:

I have this day served a copy of the Motion to Dismiss on all parties in interest via the court's NEF system or by placing the same in an envelope, first-class mail, postage prepaid, addressed to each person at his dwelling house or usual place of abode or to the place where he regularly conducts his business or profession as follows:

Via NEF and US Mail
T. Jeff Goodwin
Goodwin Law Firm
2309 Devine St.
Columbia, SC 29205

Via US Mail
Adrian Adams
170 Summer Lake Dr.
Marietta, GA 30060

THE AUTONOMY GROUP, PC

By: */s/ Soraya Martial-Wright*
Soraya Martial-Wright, Esq.
SC Bar #103340
452 Lakeshore Pkwy, Suite 120
Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730
P: (803) 262-0442/ F: (803) 828-7779
soraya@taglegacyplanning.com

April 23, 2024
Rock Hill, South Carolina