

Rhett D. Ricard, Esq.  
Direct: 843.720.1707  
Fax: 843.414.8232  
E-mail: rricard@maynardnexsen.com



**RECEIVED**

**Dec 04 2024**

**SC Court of Appeals**

December 4, 2024

**VIA E-MAIL DELIVERY**

Court of Appeals  
Catherine Harrison, Deputy Clerk  
1220 Senate Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
[ctappfilings@sccourts.org](mailto:ctappfilings@sccourts.org)

Re: *City of North Myrtle Beach, Appellant v. Sun TRS Ocean Club, LLC, Sun TRS Carolina Pines LLC, and Sun Carolina Pines RV, LLC, Respondents*  
Appellate Case No. 2024-000144  
Case No. 2021-CP-26-07489

Ms. Harrison:

We are in receipt of your correspondence dated November 27, 2024 regarding deficiencies in the First Amended Record on Appeal submitted in the above-referenced matter.

On November 20, 2024, our office received a call from someone named Shelby at the Court of Appeals informing us of the possibility that the Excel spreadsheets submitted in their native format would not be accepted by the Court. Our office explained that this was how the native files were submitted when the original Record on Appeal was submitted on September 30, 2024. We were informed that additional information would be gathered and we would be notified of any further instructions.

On November 27, 2024, we received a deficiency letter stating that the Court could not accept the attachments labeled as “native format.”

On December 3, 2024, our office spoke with Khee’ Asia Evans-Pryor, Appeals Specialist I, seeking clarification on the November 27 deficiency letter. Ms. Evans-Pryor instructed counsel to submit a letter with more information on the “native files” and requesting clarification on the submission of “native files.”

The “native files” in question are voluminous and lengthy spreadsheets that are unable to be printed in a readable or legible format. For example, Appellant’s Exhibit 83, listed at Page 1908 in Volume IV of the Index, is a spreadsheet containing Respondents’ nationwide data. This spreadsheet alone contains 39 separate tabs within the spreadsheet, each containing different data. Additionally, Respondents’ Exhibit 5, listed at Page 2616 in Volume VI of the Index, is a spreadsheet that when printed would be a total of 1,086 pages in a very small font, which would be difficult to read.

December 4, 2024

Page 2

Please accept this correspondence as a request for clarification on whether the Court would like for the native files originally submitted to be printed in a possibly illegible format as requested by the Court, or, in the alternative, instructions on how to otherwise submit these native files.

Unless otherwise instructed, we will standby on correcting the other identified deficiency in the November 27 letter related to submitting all volumes in a double-sided format until we receive further clarification regarding the submissions of the “native files.”

Respectfully,

*/s/ Rhett D. Ricard*

Rhett D. Ricard

cc: Cheryl D. Shoun, Esq. – [cshoun@maynardnexsen.com](mailto:cshoun@maynardnexsen.com)  
Richard Willis, Esq. – [rwillis@williamsmullen.com](mailto:rwillis@williamsmullen.com)  
John Tamasitis, Esq. – [jtamasitis@williamsmullen.com](mailto:jtamasitis@williamsmullen.com)

