

**SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA**

Clara L. Brockington, Appellant,
Vs
South Carolina Department of
Workforce and BELK, Inc., Respondents.

RECEIVED
JAN 14 2025
SC Court of Appeals

Appellate Case No. 2024-001656

**APPEAL / ORDER DATED
DECEMBER 17, 2024
MOTION TO CONTINUE**

On December 17, 2024, the COURT denied previous MOTION TO CONTINUE dated, November 25, 2024. Pro Se Plaintiff does not agree that the MOTION TO CONTINUE was not filed in a timely manner for the Notice of Appeal. Pro Se Appellant has spoken with Clerks of the Court on each appeal and there was not one time in questions asked, Pro Se Appellant was told the Appeal would not be timely. Pro Se Plaintiff is not an attorney, clerk of the court or any court official. However, Pro Se Plaintiff does respond accurately and timely when documents are returned for corrections. Pro Se Plaintiff has spoken with physicians, other medical professionals, as well as some legal professionals, and Pro Se Plaintiff is requesting that the COURT reconsider your ORDER denying MOTION TO CONTINUE. Pro Se Plaintiff has been very strong in showing: 1/Some Recipients were untruthful about receiving previous documents that were packaged by the Library and United States Post Office in a timely manner with postal fees and faxed document sheets, in a timely manner. 2/Pro Se Plaintiff is surrounded by Professionals, that have Legal Backgrounds and very familiar with dates, orders, paperwork, Motions, etc., appeared to be mailed in a timely manner. 3/Pro Se Plaintiff has shared with all of my physicians (Heart Doctor, Family Doctor, Urologist, Therapist, Counselor, etc.) these legal assignments and expectations from the Court, clarifies that it appears that no consideration is given that Pro So Plaintiff is not an attorney, clerk or any court personnel. The State of South Carolina should have funding to assist others when needed. This is a very strong showing of my expertise, that the Remittitur should be recalled, due to replying to deadlines to correct errors, were submitted in a timely manner to the COURT. Pro Se Plaintiff, Medical Team and Counseling Team, request that this Motion To Continue (Recall Remittitur) is granted. Thanks!


Clara L. Brockington, Pro Se Plaintiff

Florence, South Carolina
January 6, 2025

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Clara L. Brockington, Appellant,

v.

South Carolina Department of Employment and
Workforce, and Belk, Inc., Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2024-001656

ORDER

On November 25, 2024, we dismissed this appeal because Appellant failed to provide proof of timely service of her notice of appeal as required by Rule 203 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. No timely motion to reinstate was received, and remittitur was sent properly on December 12, 2024. On December 13, 2024, Appellant filed a document in which she stated she wanted to appeal this court's November 25, 2024 order. We construe this document as a motion to recall remittitur. A remittitur cannot be recalled except upon "a very strong showing . . . that the remittitur was sent down through some mistake or inadvertence on the part of this [c]ourt or its officer." *State v. Keels*, 39 S.C. 553, 17 S.E. 802 (1893). Appellant has failed to make such a showing. Therefore, Appellant's motion is denied.



FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:


Clara Lewis Brockington
Ashtin Diane Bellamy Kilpatrick, Esquire
Benjamin Thomas Cook, Esquire
The Honorable Jana E. Shealy
The Honorable Ralph King Anderson, III

FILED
Dec 17 2024

RECEIVED
JAN 14 2025
SC Court of Appeals

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Clara L. Brockington, hereby certify that I have this date, served the MOTION TO CONTINUE (and recall the remittitur) upon all parties of this case by fax and depositing a copy in the United States mail, postage paid and to the address provided by the parties / attorneys. Pro Se Plaintiff is providing proof of NOTICE OF APPEAL, witnessed by legal, professionals, clerks, etc., that are assisting with this case, due to my medical conditions, etc. Thanks in advance!


Clara L. Brockington, Pro Se Plaintiff
P. O. Box 3232, Florence, SC 29502
Telephone: (843) 616-1317

Attorney Ashtin Kilpatrick, Esquire
S. C. Dept. of Employment & Workforce
P. O. Box 8597, Columbia, SC 29202
Telephone: (803) 737-0395

Attorney Benjamin Thomas Cook, Esquire
S. C. Dept. of Employment & Workforce
P. O. Box 8597, Columbia, SC 29201
Telephone: (803) 737-0395

Stephanie Perez, Clerk
Administrative Law Court
Edgar A. Brown Bldg., Suite 224
1205 Pendleton St., Columbia, SC 29201

Attorney Luther T. Moore
BELK, Inc.
2801 W. Tyvola Road
Charlotte, NC 28217
Telephone: (704) 357-1000

Florence, South Carolina

January 6, 2025

Greenville
P.O. Box 3232
Flo., SC 29502

COLUMBIA SC 290

11 JAN 2025 PM 2 L



FOREVER

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2025

SC Court of Appeals

S. C. Court of Appeals
attn: Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Clerk
P.O. Box 11629
Columbia, SC 29211

29211-162929

