

**AMENDED MOTION FOR JUDICIAL RECONSIDERATION OF APPELLANT’S MOTION
FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO FILE AND SERVE BRIEF, FOR REINSTATEMENT,
AND TO VACATE CLERICAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals
[In The Supreme Court]

RECEIVED
May 28 2024
SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Deadra L. Jefferson, Circuit Court Judge

Case # 2022-CP-00-100-3246

Anthony M. Chayban,

Respondent,

v.

Mary A. Griffith,

Appellant.

**AMENDED MOTION FOR JUDICIAL RECONSIDERATION OF APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO FILE AND SERVE BRIEF, FOR REINSTATEMENT,
AND TO VACATE CLERICAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

While Appellant profusely apologizes for any unintended perceived disrespect to this Honorable Court resulting from the filing of an Appeal while unprepared for a gravity of its requirements as compared to Appellant’s skills and resources, and relative to the compounded legal circumstances Appellant faces, Appellant prays the Honorable Court will please hear and reconsider Appellant’s Motion to Enlarge Time to File and Serve Brief and consider reinstatement of the action in accordance with SCRCR Rules 260(a), possibly under Federal Rule 6(b), supported by and for the following causes:

1. SCRCRCP Rule 260(a), Involuntary Dismissal and Reinstatement, reads, “Whenever it appears that an appellant or a petitioner has failed to comply with the requirements of these Rules, the clerk shall issue an order of dismissal, which shall have the same force and effect as an order of the appellate court. A case shall not be reinstated except by leave of the court, upon good cause shown, after notice to all parties...”

I am requesting the Judge please hear my Amended Motion to Enlarge Time based on extenuating circumstances.

2. Respondent is an admitted enemy of the United States, based on my interpretations of Respondent’s 2021 video-recorded and other statements indicating his alignment with the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.

Respondent continually himself claims ISIS ties, including those claims and threats which were video-recorded in 2021 which included the language, “I’m a f—ing ISIS,” “(partially unintelligible to Appellant) f—ing you all up,” “Lebanese is much better than you lowlife...lowlife people” (directed at 2 Americans) and, “Yes!” in response to a victim’s shocked, video-recorded question as to whether Respondent truly intended to make the 2021 video-recorded, “Terrorist threats??”

The recording followed Respondent’s multiple 2020 braggadocio ISIS tie claims made in a calm manner to Appellant, events surrounding which Appellant agreed to submit to a polygraph months ago.

The video-recording arose just prior to the victim's written documentation of Respondent's threats to "wipe out my family," or similar, with "200 Arabs" surrounding the events in a 2021 criminal assault case filed against Respondent.

According to my understanding of United States treason laws, it is clear to me that Respondent minimally is not loyal to the United States because of his stated allegiance to our enemies. I believe the statements constitute adherence as described in treason laws:

18 U.S.C. § 2381 says, "Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or imprisoned and fined, and incapable of holding any U.S. office."

Adere, verb: to hold fast or stick by or as if by gluing, suction, grasping, or fusing.

2. : to give support or maintain loyalty.

Appellant considers Respondent's estimated 10+ documented statements and threats during the years 2020 and 2021 to Appellant and family directly admitting to or indicating (sometimes using the word "Arab" instead of "Isis" in 2021 when threatening violent physical attacks) his alliance with America's enemies to constitute a pattern of "adherence" or loyalty.

When Respondent's terrorist threats escalated throughout 2021, an observer tried asserting that Respondent was "just trying to scare" my son, me, and others. However, stating that one is in alignment with our enemies, especially stating enemy alignment that many times (evidence reveals more than is mentioned here), and especially while doing anything else intended to frighten or intimidate civilians in

order to obstruct government affairs such as court processes, I believe, is essentially the definition of “terrorism.”

Terrorists want to make us afraid so that we will back down.

Terrorism, noun: the unlawful use of violence and intimidation, especially against civilians, in the pursuit of political aims.

Political, adjective: Relating to the government or public affairs of a country.

Respondent’s 2021 video-recorded ISIS threats were made directly relative to his hopes of accomplishing illegal eviction(s), one of which was at least partially overruled months later. Respondent was attempting to evade and/or obstruct court process and influence the government by intimidating civilians. “Just trying to scare” an American citizen into not asserting his/her rights in court is “terrorism” — as is a threatened and subsequently carried-out intentional smear campaign against victims, including myself, at the lower court levels and/or elsewhere.

This case involves unmitigated terrorist attacks arising inside and outside of the courts. I believe that creates extraordinary circumstances — and certainly an inordinate amount of work for me.

I met a lady in 2022 or so who told me a friend of hers had a job in the field of counterterrorism. She stated to me that she hadn’t, until very recently, known her friend’s true profession over the course of their 10 years of acquaintance because the individual feared and/or experienced retaliation. She stated to me that her counter-terrorism friend had recently lamented the fact that they couldn’t live with their

own spouse full-time for safety reasons. The individual incidentally didn't choose to help me after the lady contacted him and asked for help for us. My point is that I am in a dangerous position.

My Muslim friend from another Middle-Eastern country told me that he was instructed approximately 100 times during his recent immigration to the United States, as I understood him, that any mere statement of extremist alignment, allegiance, or activity would jeopardize and/or eradicate his presence in our country.

If the Respondent legally belongs here, why didn't he know enough not to state enemy allegiance on video-recording? And why did he feel comfortable bragging about it to Americans in 2020? And why did he lie about his religion?

3. I believe dismissal of my claims absent a showing of my intentional refusal to prosecute in a timely manner versus the life circumstances and challenges which I've demonstrated ongoing herein endangers the just outcomes of current and/or future, legitimate criminal investigations, actions, or outcomes against Respondent, while mischaracterizing the only people, thus far, who are willing to oppose and expose him surrounding his ISIS allegiance and/or participation.

4. I believe releasing control of property to a suspected terrorist cell versus stretching a little further for its victim(s) and/or opponent(s) where legally possible is risky to everyone in cases where alternate legal or other remedies for suspected ISIS opponents' delays or mistakes are possible. I believe a dismissal in lieu of other possible sanctions potentially violates material support laws by returning real property to a person whom I believe the average person would see just cause to suspect of Muslim Extremism.

I in no way intend to accuse anyone or indicate that any clerk or other employee would intentionally do the above. I'm saying I don't want it done inadvertently, and I believe the above would be the unfortunate effect of such a release.

Respondent confirmed his disloyalty to and dislike of Americans on video in 2021. Under our treason laws, I believe he is our enemy.

Whether or not the Court currently has enough information to believe that I have a personal and/or business interest in the property described in this action, I believe releasing control of the property to the Respondent for probable liquidation (as with another of Respondent's prior properties within the state) before a full criminal investigation is conducted relative to ISIS based on what I believe is just cause for suspicion and investigation when/if more time or other solutions such as sanctions could be imposed instead, with the utmost respect to this Honorable Court, feels wrong to do.

Thank you for your benevolent consideration.

Respectfully,



Mary A. Griffith
843-922-5840
violetvirginmary@gmail.com