

RECEIVED

Dec 27 2024

SC Court of Appeals

**REPLY INITIAL BRIEF OF
APPELLANT***

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

APPEAL FROM CALHOUN COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas ,

Circuit Court Judge, Heath Taylor

Case No. 2023-CP-09-00171
Appellant Case No. 2024-000195

The State of South Carolina,

Respondent,

v.

Shaneeeka Stroman,

Appellant.

REPLY [INITIAL] BRIEF OF
APPELLANT. TO RESPONDENTS
ST.MATHEWS POLICE DEPARTMENT
AND TOWN OF ST.MATTHEWS
DESIGNATION OF MATTERS TO BE
INCLUDED IN THE RECORD ON
APPEAL

SHANEEKA STROMAN
335 HORSES NECK RD
SWANSEA, South Carolina
29160(803) 596-5784
Appellant/SHANEEKA STROMAN

* Under Rule 267(e), SCACR, the cover of the final briefs should be the following colors: brief of appellant - blue; brief of respondent - red; reply brief - gray; and amicus curiae or intervenor -

green.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities ii

Statement of Issues on Appeal.....1

Statement of the Case.....1

Standard of Review1

Facts1

Arguments

1. RESPONDENTS BRIEF TRIES BUT FAILS TO MENTION THAT THE OFFICER, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY USED THREATS OF FORCE BY IMPROPERLY REMOVING THE POSSESSOR IF SHE RETURNED TO HER RECOVERED PROPERTY WHILE OFFICER WAS ARMED DURING THE THREAT. THUS VIOLATED THE PEACE PEACEBLY2

2. RESPONDENTS FAIL TO RECOGNIZE THE FORCED REMOVAL BY POLICE WHICH INTERRUPTED THE SQUATTERS PEACE PEACEBLY WHICH IN THE APPELLANTS COLOR OF TITLE EXERCISES ITS RIGHT TO PEACE RESULTINGLY ENDING IN SUIT IF ILLEGALLY INTERRUPTED.....2

Conclusion2

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES*

CASES

State v. Bates,2

Cates v. Doon, 234 S.C. 567, 90 S.E. 123 (1902).....2

State v. Ebert, 456 S.C. 789, 123 S.E.2d 456 (1963).....2

STATUTES

S.C. Code Ann. § 15-67-410.....2

S.C. Code Ann. §2
S.C. Code Ann. § 33-44-500 (Supp. 2000).....2

OTHER AUTHORITIES

RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF CONTRACTS Section 100 (1981).....2
RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF PROPERTY Section 200 (1981).....2
RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS Section 300 (1981).....2

*The authorities cited are fictitious and intended to show the form of citation only.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

1. DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR IN FAILING TO MENTION APPELLANTS ISSUES RAISED IN ITS ORDER,RESULTINGLY CAUSING BIAS?
2. DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR IN FAILING TO ALLOW POSSESSOR BACK POSSESSION OF THE PROPERTY ?
- 3.DID TRIAL COURT ERR ON ANY OR ALL THINGS RELATED TO THIS PARTICULAR CASE ON ALL OR ANY COUNTS?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On 4/1/2024,Appellant appealed a decision made by the circuit court judge ,dismissing a forced entry and detainer claim with prejudice. Appellant appealed the dismissal and Here now Comes Stroman. Stroman adversely possessed 307 Church St. in St. Matthews Sc. Stroman possessed a color of title which South Carolina honors and Stroman had an electric bill.However,the Town of St. Matthews refused Stroman water as well as threatened to lock her up if she comes back in the Town Hall. Stroman was also denied public records by The Town of St. Matthews Department and told that she had to go through Attorney Felder to collect any information on that property.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

St. Matthews Police Department failed to realize that they were improperly removing the possessed of the land by making a threatening statement mentioning that “You going to see Orangeburg today if you come back here”. After appellant reached out with strong arms, the St. Matthews police department refused to acknowledge the law after Stroman explained that she could show him the law and he said that he didn’t want to see the law.The case was tried by CIRCUIT court judge Heath Taylor which continued the case, however, dismissed APPELLANTS claims altogether with prejudice.
\$10,000.00 daily in damages from the date of improper removal.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

FACTS

All the while there was an “Action at law” and the Appellant was open, in actual, Notorious, Exclusive, and hostile adversely possessing acquired title to a piece of property and the owner’s ownership was barred by the doctrine of laches. Under claim 15-67-210(Supp.2008). SC Code Ann 15-67-230.

ARGUMENTS

- I. BECAUSE RESPONDENT ADMITTED TO USING EXCESSIVE FORCE BY IMPROPERLY REMOVING APPELLANT, AND BECAUSE APPELLANT REACHED OUT WITH STRONG ARM FOR THE ST.MATTHEWS POLICE DEPARTMENT TO REMOVE TRESSPASS NOTICE AND BECAUSE OF REFUSAL TO DO SO , AND EVEN HAVE THE AUDACITY TO DISREGARD THE STATUE BY DENYING TO VIEW THE STATUE IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY, UNDERMINES THE POLICE DEPARTMENTS MOTTO TO SERVE AND PROTECT BY ADMITTING THAT “HE IS WORKING FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA” “AND YOU WILL SEE ORANGEBURG COUNTY TODAY IF YOU COME BACK” AS IF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT WAS ACTING AS THE APPARENT OWNER OF THE PROPERTY.THEREFORE, THE ENCOUNTER REST WITH EXCESSIVE FORCE,FORCED ENTRY AND DETAINER,IMPROPER REMOVAL, VIOLATION OF PEACE WHILE APPELLANT REACHED ALL ELEMENTS OF ADVERSLY possessing 307 Church St. St. Matthews South Carolina (Open,Notorious,Exclusive,actual,and Hostile)AND SINCE THE 14TH AMENDMENT IS MENTION,THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA HAS DEPRIVED A CITIZEN OF ITS RIGHT TO PROPERTY .Causing non economical damages towards the Plaintiff and treble once estimated.

[Set out discussion and citations of authority.]

- II. BECAUSE A CASE MUST BE TRIED ON ALL ISSUES RAISED WHETHER FROM THE DEFENDANT OR THE PLAINTIFF, AND MUST BE JUST AND PROPER ,THAT THE CIRCUIT COURT FAILED TO RAISE PLAINTIFF’S ISSUES,THE STATE LACKS PROBABLE CAUSE AND UNDER FRAUDULENT OR MERITLESS CLAIMS,APPELLANTS AMENDMENT WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN FUTILE BECAUSE OF THE FRAUDLANT INTENT TO IGNORE AND HINDER PLAINTIFFS’ ARGUMENT BY NOT MENTIONING ANYTHING ABOUT IT IN THE CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE’S ORDER.

[Appellant had statutory rights that have not only been abridged by the police department, but by the State of South Carolina as well, See Doe v. Oconer Mem. Hospital where the circuit court erred in dismissing the PLAINTIFFS forced entry and detainer under article 5 of the charge without allowing amendment of the complaint immediately following a defendan’t’s motion to dismiss during the dismissal]

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, this Court should reverse the judgment of the circuit court.

December 26,202.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Shaneeka Stroman
Shaneeka Stroman
335 Horses Neck
Rd. Swansea SC,
29160
(803)596-5784
Shaneekastroman8@gmail.com