

Aug 28 2024

SC Court of Appeals

3. **The Court of Appeals properly determined that Holmes' cross-appeals had been abandoned.**

Holmes' argues that the Court failed to properly consider her cross appeals, and failed to review prior orders that had been appealed and dismissed. However, the Court of Appeals properly made reference to its prior order issued on February 4, 2021, dismissing Holmes cross-appeal in part. The only two orders that remained on appeal were two orders from June 2020, neither of which Holmes addressed in her brief or her petition for rehearing. Holmes merely cited to her prior brief, without any explanation as to how the Court misapprehended or otherwise overlooked the law or facts relevant to the Holmes' cross-appeals. In her Petition, Holmes also makes references to a number of other orders, none of which are the subject of this Appeal, or have any bearing on whether this Court should grant discretionary review.

CONCLUSION

For all of these reasons, the petition does not raise any question for this Court's review under Rule 242, SCACR, and the petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Mary M. Caskey

Mary M. Caskey

HAYNSWORTH SINKLER BOYD, P.A.

1201 Main Street, Suite 2200

Post Office Drawer 11889 (29211-1889)

Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Telephone: (803) 779-3080

mcaskey@hsblawfirm.com

Attorneys for Appellant/Respondent

August 28, 2024

Columbia, South Carolina