

**RECEIVED**

**Jan 24 2025**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas  
Alan D. Clemmons, Master in Equity

Appellate Case No. 2024-001119

---

Specialized Loan Servicing LLC,

Respondent,

v.

Cindy B. Hunt,

Defendants,

Of whom, Cindy B. Hunt is the Appellant.

---

RETURN TO APPELLANT'S MOTION TO HOLD IN ABEYANCE

---

Chad W. Burgess, Esq.  
(S.C. Bar No.: 72520)  
BROCK & SCOTT, PLLC  
3800 Fernandina Road, Suite 110  
Columbia, South Carolina 29210  
(803) 454-3540  
*Attorney for Respondent*

**NOW COMES** Respondent, Specialized Loan Servicing LLC. (“Specialized Loan Servicing”), by and through its undersigned attorney, and pursuant to Rule 240(e) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules, hereby submits its Return and Memorandum in Opposition to the Motion to Hold in Abeyance served by Cindy B. Hunt (“Appellant” or “Hunt”) on January 15, 2025, averring as follows:

**BRIEF PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

This matter is an action to foreclose a mortgage on real property in Horry County, South Carolina. Appellant challenges the Master in Equity’s Order and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale in favor of Respondent entered on June 26, 2024. Appellant submitted documents purporting to be her initial brief and designation of matter on September 19, 2024. On October 1, 2024, Respondent filed a motion to dismiss the appeal based upon Appellant’s filings being so deficient as to make it impossible for Respondent to issue its initial brief and designation of matter. On December 20, 2024, this Court issued an order denying Respondent’s motion to dismiss. The December 20<sup>th</sup> order struck Appellant’s initial brief and designation of matter and directed appellant to file and serve an amended initial brief and designation of matter that complies with the rules within thirty days of the order. On January 15, 2025, Appellant served a motion titled “Motion to Hold in Abeyance”. Because Appellant’s request is largely indecipherable and any motion for relief on the grounds stated by Appellant would be futile, the request should respectfully be denied.

**ARGUMENT AND CITATION OF AUTHORITY**

Read in the light most favorable to Appellant, the motion appears to request this Court hold the appeal in abeyance and grant Appellant leave to file a motion for relief from judgment pursuant

to SCRCRCP Rule 60(a) and (b), to be heard by the Master in Equity. Appellant's motion falls well short of demonstrating any coherent grounds to support a motion for relief from judgment. Put mildly, Appellant's motion is confusing and largely indecipherable and appears to be a thinly veiled attempt to further delay this matter. Appellant's motion repeatedly cites to pages numbering in the thousands where it is unclear to what document she is citing. Appellant's motion further appears to seek "correction" to filings she has made before this Court. *See* Appellant's motion, paragraph 3. The Master in Equity lacks jurisdiction to order correction to documents Appellant filed in the appellate courts and correcting her filings made in this Court would not be properly addressed by a SCRCRCP Rule 60 motion.

Further, Appellant's motion makes assertions that are patently false on their face. For example, Appellant asserts that the order that is the subject of this appeal was signed by both the undersigned and the Master in Equity. *See* Appellant's motion, paragraph 8. As the order being appealed was not a consent order, the undersigned did not sign the order. The order being appealed was electronically signed by the Master in Equity on June 26, 2024. Most problematic for Appellant is that none of the assertions made in her motion state any coherent grounds upon which to base a motion for relief from judgment.

In light of the foregoing, any SCRCRCP Rule 60 motion made on the assertions contained in Appellant's motion would be futile and Appellant's motion should be denied. Appellant's open disregard for this Court's direction should also be mentioned. Appellant has failed to submit an initial brief and designation of matter in compliance with the SCACR in direct defiance of this Court's December 20, 2024, order. As such, this appeal should be dismissed.

**CONCLUSION**

Appellant’s motion for leave to file a SCRCR Rule 60 motion for relief from judgment is confusing and largely indecipherable. The motion is futile as it does not state any coherent grounds to support a SCRCR Rule 60 motion. Therefore, Respondent respectfully requests that Appellant’s motion be denied. Further, because Appellant has failed to file an amended initial brief and designation of matter in open disregard for this Court’s direction in its December 20, 2024 order, this appeal should be dismissed and the case remanded to the Circuit Court.

Respectfully submitted,

BROCK AND SCOTT, PLLC

s/Chad W. Burgess  
S.C. Bar No.: 72520  
3800 Fernandina Road, Suite 110  
Columbia, South Carolina 29210  
(803) 454-3540  
*Attorney for Respondent Specialized Loan  
Servicing, LLC*

Dated: January 24, 2025

**RECEIVED**

**Jan 24 2025**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas  
Alan D. Clemmons, Master in Equity

Appellate Case No. 2024-001119

Specialized Loan Servicing LLC,

Respondent,

v.

Cindy B. Hunt,

Defendants,

Of whom, Cindy B. Hunt is the Appellant.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on January 24, 2025, she served a copy of Respondent's Return to Appellant's Motion to Hold in Abeyance, and Certificate of Service by Mail upon the person below by depositing the same in the U.S. Mail with proper postage affixed and addressed as follows:

Cindy B. Hunt  
195 Willow Green Dr, Unit D  
Conway, SC 29526

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lauren Browder  
BROCK & SCOTT, PLLC