

RECEIVED

Dec 27 2024

S.C. SUPREME COURT

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

IN THE ORIGINAL JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT
Appellate Case No. 2024-002062

Yamilette Albertson, on her own behalf and
on behalf of her children, Y., A., and J.; and
Constantine Shulikov, on his own behalf and
on behalf of his children, A., E., P., N., and V. *Petitioners,*

v.

Ellen Weaver, in her official capacity as State
Superintendent of Education..... *Respondent,*

PROOF OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Rule 262(c)(3), SCACR, the undersigned counsel certifies that a copy of Respondent’s Return to the Motion to Intervene filed by Eidson et al. has been served on the following counsel by mail or electronic mail (see attached sent email):

Counsel for Petitioners:


Matthew P. Cavedon
matt@amagi.info
David G. Hodges
dhodges@jj.org
Michael Bindas
mbindas@jj.org

South Carolina Attorney General:

The Honorable Alan Wilson
South Carolina Attorney General
P.O. Box 11549
Columbia, SC 29211

Counsel for Putative Intervenors:

William Tinkler
williamtinkler@tinklerlaw.com
W. Allen Nickles, III
[wanickles@nickleslaw.com](mailto:wニックles@nickleslaw.com)
Jessica Levin
jlevin@edlawcenter.org
Wendy Lecker
wlecker@edlawcenter.org
Alice O'Brien
aobrien@nea.org
Kristen Hollar
khollar@nea.org
Kaye Hearn
khearn@wyche.com
Brian Critzer
bcritzer@wyche.com

By: 

Miles E. Coleman

*Counsel for Respondent Ellen Weaver in her official
capacity as State Superintendent of Education*

December 27, 2024
Greenville, South Carolina

Miles Coleman

From: Miles Coleman
Sent: Friday, December 27, 2024 3:04 PM
To: matt@amagi.info; David Hodges; mbindas@ij.org; William Tinkler; Al Nickles; jlevin@edlawcenter.org; wlecker@edlawcenter.org; aobrien@nea.org; khollar@nea.org; Kaye Hearn; Brian Critzer
Cc: Daniel Suhr
Subject: RE: Albertson et al. v. Weaver (No. 2024-002062) -- service of Respondent's Return to the Mot. to Intervene

My apologies for the inconsistency between the subject line and the text in the body of the email sent moments ago. That email and its attachment constituted service of the Respondent's Return to the Motion to Intervene, not the Return to the Petition. I trust it was clear from the attachment itself, but hopefully this clarification will minimize any confusion.

Miles

From: Miles Coleman
Sent: Friday, December 27, 2024 2:58 PM
To: matt@amagi.info; David Hodges <dhodges@ij.org>; mbindas@ij.org; William Tinkler <williamtinkler@tinklerlaw.com>; Al Nickles <wanickles@nickleslaw.com>; jlevin@edlawcenter.org; wlecker@edlawcenter.org; aobrien@nea.org; khollar@nea.org; Kaye Hearn <khearn@wyche.com>; Brian Critzer <bcritzer@wyche.com>
Cc: Daniel Suhr <dsuhr@americanrights.org>
Subject: Albertson et al. v. Weaver (No. 2024-002062) -- service of Respondent's Return to the Mot. to Intervene

Counsel, please find attached for service on you a copy of Respondent's Return to the Petition for Original Jurisdiction, which we will be filing shortly with the Supreme Court.

Regards,

Miles



MILES COLEMAN PARTNER

miles.coleman@nelsonmullins.com

GREENVILLE ONE | SUITE 400

2 W. WASHINGTON STREET | GREENVILLE, SC 29601

T 864.373.2352 F 864.373.2925

NELSONMULLINS.COM [VCARD](#) [VIEW BIO](#)