

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

John Doe #53, John Doe 66, John Doe 66A, John Doe 67, Jane Doe 1 and Jane Doe 2 and Rachel Roe, individually and as representative of a class of people similarly situated, Plaintiffs,

Of whom class members Julie McDonald and Richard McDonald are the Appellants,

v.

The Bishop of Charleston, a Corporation Sole, and The Bishop of the Diocese of Charleston, in his official capacity, Respondents,

And

David K. Haller, Lawrence E. Richter, Jr., and Richter & Haller, LLC, Intervenors.


Appellate Case No. 2023-000720

ORDER

Intervenors' motion to dismiss this appeal is denied. However, within thirty days of the date of this order, Appellants shall serve—via an approved method of service pursuant to Rule 262(c), SCACR, and the supreme court's order regarding electronic service¹—and file an amended record on appeal that includes all items designated by the parties and is consecutively paginated. *See* Rule 210(c), SCACR ("The Record on Appeal shall include all matter designated to be included by any party under Rule 209 and shall comply with the requirements of Rule 267."); Rule 210(c), SCACR ("Each page of the Record on Appeal shall be numbered

¹ *Methods of Electronic Filing and Service Under Rule 262 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules*, S.C. Sup. Ct. Order (as amended April 24, 2024).

consecutively beginning with the index." Failure to comply with this order will result in dismissal of this appeal.



FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Richard S. Dukes, Jr., Esquire
Gregg E. Meyers, Esquire
Carmelo Barone Sammataro, Esquire
Benjamin C. Bruner, Esquire
Chelsea Jaqueline Clark, Esquire
John Edward Cuttino, Esquire

FILED
Aug 23 2024