

RECEIVED

Apr 16 2025

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The Honorable T. Scott Beck, Commissioner

Appellate Case No. 2024-001935

S.C. W.C.C. File No. 2118696

Serge Wandji, Claimant,.....Appellant,

v.

The Regional Medical Center, Employer,
and Antum Risk, Carrier,..... Respondents.

MOTION TO EXCLUDE DEPOSITION OF DR SAMIES

FROM THE RECORD ON APPEAL

By Order dated February 26, 2025, the Court of Appeals ruled that the transcript of the deposition of Dr. Samies, which was identified as “#9” in the Appellant’s original Designation of Matter, should be stricken from that Designation and excluded from the Record on Appeal. The Respondents requested this relief because the deposition of Dr. Samies was not properly presented to, or considered by, the Workers’ Compensation Commission, and therefore, it is not properly included in the Record on Appeal pursuant to Rule 210(c), SCACR.

On March 3, 2023, during the pendency of his workers’ compensation claim, the Appellant filed a civil action against Dr. Samies and the Regional Medical Center. In the civil

complaint -- filed more than 12 weeks before Commissioner Beck issued his Decision and Order in the workers' compensation claim on May 31, 2023 -- the Appellant alleged that the fact Dr. Samies was a member of the Regional Medical Center Board of Trustee somehow created a conflict of interest in his workers' compensation claim. (*See attached*, Exhibit 1, civil complaint). However, the Appellant did not raise this allegation to the Workers' Compensation Commission until May 15, 2023, when the Appellant wrote to Commissioner Beck arguing,

“[a]s well documented in the recorded evidence in this case, Dr. John H. Samies is a Board of Trustee member in good standing with the Regional Medical Center. Dr. Samies is also a Financial Committee Board of Trustee member, and a Management Oversight Committee Board of Trustee member among many other roles and titles at TRMC. Dr. Samies was also the Chief of Medical Staff during [Appellant's] tenure at TRMC, in 2021. Thus, as a matter of Law [sic], Dr. Samies' overwhelming financial ties and financial incentives with TRMC disqualifies him from being considered as a credible and unbiased “Expect [sic] witness” ...” (*See attached*, Exhibit 2, letter of May 16, 2023).¹

Even then, the Appellant did not request to depose Dr. Samies in his workers' compensation claim, nor did he otherwise seek to reopen the evidentiary record in his workers' compensation

¹ Despite these written statements by the Appellant to Commissioner Beck in May 2023, the Appellant now argues that “the conflict-of-interest evidence related to Dr. John H. Samies” was not known to him “during the initial proceedings” but “only came to light during Dr. Samies' deposition, taken in September 2024 in separate civil litigation.” (Reply Brief pp.5-6). This allegation is wholly untenable.

claim, which concluded following a hearing before the Commission's Appellate Panel and the issuance of a final Decision and Order on March 8, 2024, that the Appellant did not appeal.

More than six months later, the Appellant took the deposition of Dr. Samies on September 17, 2024. Obviously, the deposition of Dr. Samies was not taken for the purpose of his workers' compensation claim that had already concluded, but it was taken in furtherance of his civil claims. The undersigned attorneys of record were not given any notice of Dr. Samies's September 17, 2024, deposition and the Respondent, Antum Risk, was not even a party to the civil claim. Therefore, the Respondents respectfully contend that the deposition of Dr. Samies would not have been admissible even if it had been timely presented to the Workers' Compensation Commission. The Respondents further respectfully contend that the Commission properly denied the Appellant's October 4, 2024, Motion to Reopen his claim and properly ordered the Appellant's October 23, 2024, Reply, to which he attached a copy of Dr. Samies's deposition transcript, stricken from the record. (*See attached*, Exhibit 3, Order of December 23, 2024).

Despite these facts and despite the prior Order of this Court dated February 26, 2025, the Appellant has filed a Reply Brief that extensively references Dr. Samies's deposition (*see* Appellant's Initial Reply Brief pp.6, 11, 13, 17, 18), as well as other matters that are neither part of the record below, nor properly before the Court on appeal. According to the Appellant, because he attached the deposition of Dr. Samies as an exhibit to a Reply to the Return to his Motion to Reopen that he attempted to file² with the Workers' Compensation Commission on October 23, 2024, and because he listed this Reply in his Amended Designation of Matter, he

² The Appellant's October 23, 2024, Reply was stricken from the record by the Workers' Compensation Commission by Order dated December 23, 2024. (*See attached*, Exhibit 3, Order of December 23, 2024).

intends to include the deposition of Dr. Samies in the Record on Appeal.³ As a result, the Respondents now seek clarification from the Court of Appeals as to whether the Appellant can include the deposition of Dr. Samies in the Record on Appeal simply because it was attached as an exhibit to a pleading that was not accepted by the Workers' Compensation Commission.

Respectfully, the Court's February 26, 2025, Order appeared clear in its intent to exclude the deposition of Dr. Samies from the Record on Appeal by striking matter #9 from the Appellant's original designation of matter, as "#9" was specifically identified as the "Transcript of the Deposition of Dr. Samies." If the deposition of Dr. Samies is not properly included the Record on Appeal, then the Appellant's direct references to and arguments about Dr. Samies's alleged testimony in his Briefs are improper, and the Respondents respectfully contend that they should be stricken from the Appellant's Brief (*see* pp.13, 14, 15, 16, 18) the Appellant's Reply Brief (*see* pp.6, 11, 12, 13, 17, and 18). In the alternative, the Respondents respectfully contend that any arguments regarding the substance of Dr. Samies's testimony should not be considered by the Court. *See* Rule 210(h), SCACR (stating that "the appellate court will not consider any fact which does not appear in the Record on Appeal"), *see also Sanders v. Salley*, 283 S.C. 458, 460, 322 S.E.2d 829, 830 (Ct. App. 1984) (stating that "[t]his Court does not sit as a trial court to receive evidence on disputed issues of fact; our function is to review the judgment of the circuit court for reversible error based on the issues and evidence presented to that court").

In reliance on the Court's February 26, 2025, Order, the Respondents filed an Initial Brief that did not address the substance of Dr. Samies's deposition testimony, believing that it had been excluded from the Record on Appeal. While the Respondents believe that they should not

³ According to the Appellant, the Commission's Motion Order dated November 1, 2024, also "explicitly lists Dr. Samies' [sic] deposition excerpts." However, this is not true. The Commission's one-page Motion Order makes no reference to the deposition of Dr. Samies.

be obligated to argue the relative merits of Dr. Samies's deposition testimony for the first time on appeal, if the Court should modify its February 26, 2025, Order so as to permit the inclusion of Dr. Samies's deposition transcript in the Record on Appeal as the Appellant now argues, the Respondents respectfully request leave to file a Sur-reply addressing the testimony of Dr. Samies, as well as the other new arguments raised by the Appellant for the first time in his Reply Brief.

Respectfully submitted,

April 16, 2025



Roy A. Howell, III, S.C. Bar #11888
Kirsten Leslie Barr, SC Bar #15525
Trask & Howell, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 2167
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29465
(843) 881-4228
Attorneys for the Respondents

Exhibit 1

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

COUNTY OF ORANGEBURG)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

2023 CP 38 0033
FILED FOR RECORD
WILHIL A. B. CLARK
2023 MAR -3 AM 10:46
CLERK OF COURT
ORANGEBURG, SC

Serge R. Wandji,)

Plaintiff)

Vs)

The Regional Medical Center,
and Dr. John H. Samies,)

Defendants)

Civil Action No.

COMPLAINT
(Jury Trial Requested)

Plaintiff Serge R. Wandji brings this action against Defendants The Regional Medical Center and Dr. John H. Samies based on the allegations set forth below.

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff is a citizen and resident of Columbia, South Carolina
2. Defendant, The Regional Medical Center is a hospital located in Orangeburg South Carolina.
3. Dr. John H. Samies is a Board of Trustee and a practicing physician at The Regional Medical Center and is also a resident of Orangeburg South Carolina.

JURISDICTION

4. The Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over the claims in this lawsuit under article V section 11 of the South Carolina Constitution and South Carolina Code section 14-5-350.

5. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the defendants because they all reside and transact business in South Carolina.

VENUE

6. Venue is proper in this Circuit under South Carolina Code section 15-7-30 because the Defendants live, reside, or do business in Orangeburg, South Carolina, and the acts and omissions that are the subject of this action occurred in Charleston, South Carolina.

FACTS

7. Plaintiff started working as a full-time staff nurse at the Regional Medical Center (TRMC) in Orangeburg, South Carolina on March 8, 2021.
8. Defendant described Plaintiff's work environment in his job description as being *"Regularly exposed to infection, contagious diseases, in contact with patients under a wide variety of circumstances, exposed to injuries and illnesses"*.
9. Defendants also acknowledged that throughout the entire month of August 2021, COVID-19 outbreak was already spread throughout the entire hospital in both the patients and employees population.
10. Following widespread outbreak of COVID-19 on Plaintiff's unit, Plaintiff tested positive for COVID-19 on August 27, 2021 and was medically removed from work by his employer (TRMC).
11. Plaintiff filed an electronic workers' compensation claim with his employer TRMC followed by an incident report submitted to his employer on August 31, 2021.

12. Plaintiff's health condition deteriorated really fast following his infection and was rushed via ambulance to the hospital (TRMC) on September 6, 2021 where he was officially diagnosed with Pneumonia due to COVID-19 with acute hypoxemic Respiratory failure.
13. Following his discharge from The Regional Medical Center Hospital on September 9, 2021, Plaintiff started receiving hospital charges beyond his insurance coverage from the Defendant.
14. Three months after he initially submitted a workers' compensation claim with his employer, Plaintiff officially filed a Form 50- Employee's Notice of Claim and request for Hearing with the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission on November 29, 2021, due to the fact that TRMC has stop responding to Plaintiff's workers' compensation related emails.
15. On January 17, 2022 Plaintiff was medically cleared by his primary care provider to return to work at TRMC with some few temporary restrictions. Prior to that time Plaintiff was written out of any work by his physician.
16. Defendants refused to allow Plaintiff to resume work, and shortly after that, Defendants officially terminated Plaintiff's employment with for no disciplinary reasons what so ever.
17. During the workers' compensation legal proceedings, Plaintiff's Protected Health Information (PHI) which he had entrusted to the Defendants as both an employee and as a patient were recklessly, willfully, and repeatedly violated by the Defendants.

18. Plaintiff reached out to Defendants requesting corrective actions being taken to address the breach of Plaintiff's PHI, but Defendant refused and referred it to a lawyer.

19. Defendants also enrolled one of their Board of Trustee, Dr. John H. Samies, to write an "expect" letter in which false and misleading statements against the Plaintiff were made, and then introduced that letter as evidence in the workers' compensation proceedings.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Workers' Compensation Retaliatory Discharge : SC Code § 41-1-80 (2013))

20. To the extent they are not inconsistent with this cause of action, Plaintiff incorporates the allegations of the paragraphs above into this cause of action.

21. Plaintiff had instituted in good faith, a proceeding under the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Law (Title 42 of the 1976 Code) for a hearing on November 29, 2021

22. Shortly after Plaintiff filed for a hearing with the South Carolina workers' compensation Commission, Defendants started consulting in private with a lawyer to strategized on how to terminate Plaintiff's employment.

23. Defendants effectively terminated Plaintiff's employment on March 15, 2022 shortly after he was medically cleared to return to work, following his COVID-19 occupational disease treatment that he contracted while working as a staff nurse at the Regional Medical Center in Orangeburg.

24. Defendants' unlawful termination of Plaintiff's employment has caused substantial financial, emotional and psychological damages to Plaintiff, including credit ruin.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligence)

25. To the extent they are not inconsistent with this cause of action, Plaintiff incorporates the allegations of the paragraphs above into this cause of action.

26. Defendants, as healthcare facility in the business of providing healthcare services to the general public, own a duty to protect all patients' Protected Health Information (PHI) as well as all their employees' PHI. Plaintiff entrusted the Regional Medical Center Hospital with his PHI as both an employee and as a patient.

27. Defendants breached their duty to Plaintiff by recklessly, willfully, and repeatedly exposing Plaintiff's PHI in the open internet via multiples unencrypted emails they sent out which included Plaintiff's PHI, in direct violation of the Federal HIPAA law. Other person were copied to these emails.

28. Defendants on November 10, 2022 sent Plaintiff an unencrypted email with an attachment document containing the Plaintiff's Personal Health Information (PHI), as well as others patients and staff members of TRMC's PHI as collateral victims.

29. Defendants on November 23, 2022 at 4:05 pm, sent again another unencrypted email to Plaintiff with an attachment document which contained Plaintiff's full name, date of birth, address, medical records number, insurance information, age,

sex, current health history, past medical history, social history, family history, lab and radiology, medical tests results, doctor's medical notes.....

30. Defendants' willful and reckless neglect was not corrected promptly despite Plaintiff's repeated denunciation of Defendant's unlawful behavior.

31. Plaintiff sent an email to the Defendants' leadership including President and CEO Mr. David Southerland on February 2, 2023 to take immediate corrective action in regards to breach of Plaintiff's PHI by the Regional Medical Center. Still nothing was done to correct that breach of Plaintiff's PHI, and Plaintiff was simply ignored by the Defendants.

32. Defendants' acts and omissions as set forth above, show willful misconduct, malice, wantonness, and entire want of care, raising a presumption of the Defendants' conscious indifference to the consequences of such acts and omissions.

33. Defendants' breach of Plaintiff's PHI caused Plaintiff substantial emotional and psychological damages, as well as incalculable future damages.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Fraud)

34. To the extent they are not inconsistent with this cause of action, Plaintiff incorporates the allegations of the paragraphs above into this cause of action.

35. The Regional Medical Center (TRMC) of Orangeburg charged and directly billed Plaintiff's COVID-19 hospital care beyond his insurance coverage starting September 2021.

36. Defendants (TRMC) received 'Special COVID-19 Pandemic' Federal funding from the Coronavirus and Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act of March 2020.

37. As a recipient of the 'Special COVID-19 Pandemic' Federal funding, Defendants (TRMC) should not have charged Plaintiff beyond his insurance coverage in September of 2021.

38. Defendants furthermore used those illegal COVID-19 hospital charges as a bargaining leverage to negotiate in their advantage a settlement in the workers' compensation case opposing them to Plaintiff.

39. Defendant also reported those illegal charges to debt collectors companies who have repeatedly harassed Plaintiff.

40. Plaintiff was consequently and proximately injured by those fraudulent hospital charges, debt collection reporting, credit ruin, mental and psychological distress and loss of reputation.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Fraud/Bad Faith)

41. During the workers' compensation case proceedings against Plaintiff, The Regional Medical Center had one of their Board of Trustees member, namely Dr. John H. Samies to write an 'expect' letter which was introduced as evidence by the Defendants.

42. Defendants and Dr. Samies did not explicitly mention in their 'expect' letter that Dr. Samies is a Board of Trustees member in good standing at TRMC, thus dishonestly, concealing Dr. Samies' Conflict of Interest in the case.

43. Defendants and Dr. Samies furthermore made intentional misrepresentations of facts, false and misleading statements about Plaintiff in their 'expect' letter.

44. Plaintiff was consequently and proximately injured by Defendants' and Dr. Samies' false representations, and their non-disclosure of the self-evidenced 'Conflict of Interest', including loss of reputation, negative impact on Plaintiff's workers' compensation claim, mental and psychological distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff request that judgment be entered against the Defendants on all causes of action and that Plaintiff be awarded; (1) actual damages; (2) consequential damages; (3) Punitive damages; (4) pre-judgment interest; (5) eventual attorneys' fees and costs and (6) such other and further relief as the court and jury deem just and appropriate.

Serge R. Wandji



03/03/2023

sergewandji@gmail.com

P.O. Box 523
Columbia SC, 29202
678-612-9649

Exhibit 2

Reply to
Serge Wandji
P.O. Box 523 Columbia SC, 29202
678-612-9649
sergewandji@gmail.com

May 16, 2023

Commissioner T. Scott Beck
S.C. Workers' Compensation
1333 Main Street, Suite 500
Columbia, SC 29201-1715

Re: Serge Wandji v. The Regional Medical Center
W.C.C. File No.: 2118696
Carrier File No.: WC2021098080

Dear Commissioner Beck,

After reviewing the proposed ORDER written by Mr. Howell, Claimant does not agree that it accurately reflects the Commissioner ruling. Furthermore, the proposed ORDER written by Mr. Howell is full of false, misleading, distorted and irrelevant statements which should be removed and/or corrected.

Commissioner Beck, signing your Respectable name and authority title on this proposed ORDER as currently written by Mr. Howell would mean condoling and encouraging falsehood and prejudice.

Here are just a few examples among many of Mr. Howell false and misleading statements in the document.

- 1- On page 11 of Mr. Howell's written ORDER, he wrote "*The Claimant denies that he was symptomatic on August 16, 2021, though he was forced to concede that the report of his August 16, 2021 COVID test states "Symptomatic as defined by CDC? Yes. Date of onset (Lab)? 8/16/2021"*."

This statement is a typical example of Mr. Howell's deceptive and falsehood, which he has demonstrated throughout this workers' compensation proceeding, and getting away with it with zero consequences. Here are the facts on this issue:

Ms. Kelly Evans was one of Mr. Howell's witnesses at that hearing. She is also the Regional Medical Center's Employee Health staff who "assessed" Claimant before his COVID-19 test on August 16, 2021. When Mrs. Evans was on the stand during the Hearing, under oath, you Commissioner Beck asked her this question "*Let me stop now, because I want to get a clarification Ms. Evans..... I just need clarity on what he (Claimant) actually said to you*" (T. p.115, ll. 20-25). This was Ms. Evans' response "*Okay. All it (the report) states is that he (Claimant) was exposed but was not having symptoms*" (T. p. 116, ll. 1-2).

Commissioner Beck, since the report prepared by the Ms. Evans who actually 'assessed' Claimant before that COVID-19 test on August 16, 2021, states that

'Claimant was not having symptoms', then where and how did Mr. Howell gets his own report on Claimant's August 16, 2021 COVID-19 test, in which it is written **"Symptomatic as defined by CDC? YES"**. This is an example of falsification and/or forgery and/or manipulation perpetrated throughout this workers' compensation proceeding, to fit into the defendants' legal strategy and narrative.

- 2- Throughout this entire document, Mr. Howell repeatedly mentioned the name of Dr. Samies, referring to him as an *"infectious disease expert giving an opinion"* (p.22). Typical to his misleading style, Mr. Howell is desperately trying to present Dr. Samies as a neutral and independent outsider with no financial ties/incentives with the defendants.

As well documented in the recorded evidence in this case, Dr. John H. Samies is a Board of Trustee member in good standing with the Regional Medical Center. Dr. Samies is also a Financial Committee Board of Trustee member, and a Management Oversight Committee Board of Trustee member among many other roles and titles at TRMC. Dr. Samies was also the Chef of Medical Staff during Claimant's tenure at TRMC, in 2021. Thus, as a matter of Law, Dr. Samies' overwhelming financial ties and financial incentives with TRMC disqualifies him from being considered as a credible and unbiased *"Expert witness"* as Mr. Howell desperately calls him. Furthermore, Dr. Samies did not even have the ethical and legal decency and lawful obligation to explicitly disclose in his so-called "expert letter" his overwhelming **'Conflict of Interest'** in this case, clearly demonstrating his dishonesty and lack of candor (APA p.144). Also, Dr. Samies who was officially declared by Mr. Howell in his pre-hearing Brief to appear at the hearing as a 'witness', was a NO-SHOW with no justifications. Dr. Samies non-appearance at the hearing to avoid being cross-examined by Claimant says it all. Therefore, everything about Dr. Samies should be removed from the final version of the ORDER.

- 3- On page 12 of Mr. Howell's prepared document, he wrote " *The Claimant was apparently in the hospital for only two days*".

Again, typical to Mr. Howell falsehood and misleading tactics, he is subtly introducing false statement in his document to support his legal strategy and narrative. Claimant was hospitalized at the TRMC (The defendants) for more than two days. They have all of my hospitalization records.

- 4- On page 17, Mr. Howell introduced and commented on what he called "Exhibit", which was not, by the way, part of the Defendants' APA submitted days prior to the hearing as required by Law in order to give time to the opposing party to examine it.

The Claimant firmly contests the authenticity and the source of that document. That so-called 'exhibit' is unrelated to Commissioner Beck's findings and has nothing to do with this case. The free comments made by Mr. Howell in that entire paragraph is completely false. For the record, the Claimant was submitted to a comprehensive record and background check by TRMC which came out cleared and cleaned, before being allowed to start working there as a staff nurse. This desperate and pitiful move by Mr. Howell

clearly demonstrates that he is on a 'fishing expedition' because of his lack of legal arguments.

Furthermore, there is **no causal connection** between that unauthenticated 'exhibit' of Mr. Howell and Claimant's COVID-19 exposure and infection at TRMC. See *McLead vs. Piggy Wiggly Carolina Co.*, 280 S.C. 466, 313 S.E. 2d 38 (1984). Also see *Ferguson v. Moore Construction Co.* 298 S.C. 457, 381 S.E. 2d 496 (1989).

Thus, that entire paragraph written by Mr. Howell about his 'exhibit' should be taken out of the ORDER.

- 5- On page 22, Mr. Howell presented a distorted version of Dr. Nicholas Lind report and intentionally omitted to include Claimant's response to Dr. Lind's report as described in APA #57, p. 141-143.

Commissioner Beck, I have found seven additional false/misleading/distorted statements made by Mr. Howell in his proposed ORDER. It is about time Mr. Howell is held accountable for all his falsehood and misleading statements made in official documents introduced in a judicial proceeding. Letting Mr. Howell to get away with no consequences with all of this unethical, illegal and unlawful behavior would only encourage him to continue that behavior.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Serge Wandji', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Serge Wandji, RN

copy 1
P.O. Box 523
Columbia SC 29202

COLUMBIA SC 290
18 MAY 2023 PM 2 L



Commissioner T. Scott Beck
S.C. Workers' Compensation
1333 Main Street, Suite 500
Columbia, SC 29201

29201-326025



Exhibit 3

BEFORE THE
SOUTH CAROLINA WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

WCC FILE NO. 2118696

Serge R. Wandji,)
)
 Claimant,)
 vs.)
)
 The Regional Medical Center of)
 Orangeburg, q)
)
 Employer,) **MOTION ORDER**
)
 Palmetto Hospital Trust,)
)
 Carrier,)
)
 _____)

A Motion regarding the following request has been received by
Defendant attorney Rob A. Howell, III

Motion to Strike Claimant's Reply filed October 23, 2024.

The following disposition has been made: GRANTED Denied



T. Scott Beck, Commissioner

Order served via USPS:

Serge Wandji 579 Folly Road PO Box 12112 Charleston, SC 29422	Roy A Howell, III, Esquire Trask & Howell PO Box 2167 Mt. Pleasant, SC 29465
--	---

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that the undersigned has on this date served a copy of this order in the above entitled action upon all parties to this case by sending an electronic copy hereof by electronic mail addressed to the attorneys for said parties; or if there is an unrepresented party(ies), by depositing a copy hereof, postage paid in the United States mail, first class, addressed to the unrepresented party(ies) and to the attorney(s) for the represented party(ies).

By Shawnee Radcliff on December 23, 2024

RECEIVED

Apr 16 2025

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The Honorable T. Scott Beck, Commissioner

Appellate Case No. 2024-001935

S.C. W.C.C. File No. 2118696

Serge Wandji, Claimant,.....Appellant,

v.

The Regional Medical Center, Employer,
and Antum Risk, Carrier,..... Respondents.

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the Respondents served the above-named Appellant, Serge Wandji, with a copy of the attached Motion to Exclude Deposition of Dr. Samies from the Record on Appeal this 16th day of April 2025, by emailing and depositing a copy of the same in the United States Mail, first class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

Serge Wandji
579 Folly Road P.O. Box 12112
Charleston, SC 29422
sergewandji@gmail.com

April 16, 2025

Kirsten Leslie Barr

Roy A. Howell, III, S.C. Bar #11888
Kirsten Leslie Barr, SC Bar #15525
Trask & Howell, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 2167
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29465
(843) 881-4228
Attorneys for the Respondents

TRASK
HOWELL
WORKERS' COMPENSATION DEFENSE

RECEIVED

Apr 16 2025

SC Court of Appeals

Reply to
Roy A. Howell, III
(843) 881-2236
rhowell@trask-howell.com

April 16, 2025

Via Mail/Email-ctappfilings@sccourts.org

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk, South Carolina Court of Appeals
P. O. Box 11629
Columbia, SC 29211

Re: Serge Wandji v. The Regional Medical Center
W.C.C. File No.: 2118696
Appellate Case No.: 2024-001935
Carrier File No.: WC2021098080
Date of Accident: August 27, 2021

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed herewith for filing, please find Motion to Exclude Deposition of Dr. Samies from the Record on Appeal, with accompanying Proof of Service, in the above-referenced matter. By copy of this letter, I am serving the Appellant, Serge Wandji, with a copy of these documents via email and regular mail. If you should have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Also enclosed is our check in the amount of \$50.00 for the filing fee.

Yours very truly,



Roy A. Howell, III

RAHIII/mbm/les

Enc.

cc: Sandra Axson, Antum Risk (w/enc.) (email/upload)
Tiffany Kirby, MUSC Health-Orangeburg (w/enc.) (email only)
Serge Wandji (w/enc.) (email/mail)
Roy A. Howell, III

