

RECEIVED

May 23 2025

SC Court of Appeals

May 20, 2025

The Supreme Court of South Carolina
OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
P. O. BOX 12159
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211

Dear Gentlemen,

Enclosed you will find complaint forms with exhibits concerning Stephan V. Futeral and G. Wells Dickson, Jr. in compliance with Rule 14 (d) SCACR.

Sincerely,

Janet L. Frisco
843-804-0875



The Supreme Court of South Carolina
OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
COMPLAINT FORM

1. Your name and address:
Janet L. Frisco, 203 Cardinal Drive, Summerville, S.C. 29485
2. Phone number(s) and email:
(843)804-0875, janetfrisco@yahoo.com
3. Name of attorney or judge
being complained against:
G. WELLS DICKSON, JR.
4. Business Address of attorney or judge being complained against:
P.O. Box 819, Kingstree, S.C. 29556-0819
5. Please provide the type of the case if applicable (i.e. divorce, criminal, etc.): Alternate Dispute Resolution
6. If you employed the attorney, please state what you employed them to do: Mediate Case No. 2021-CP-10-2682 PET HELPERS V. JANET FRISCO
7. Did you employ the attorney? If yes, please give approximate dates and the amount, if any, paid (If judge, please write N/A): \$535.00 paid June 22, 2022
8. In the space below, please provide specific information regarding any alleged misconduct upon which your complaint is based: *(if necessary, additional pages or documentation may be added)*
Mr. Dickson was referred to me by the plaintiff's attorney, Stephan V. Futeral, for Pet Helpers, Inc. v Janet Frisco Case No. 2021-CP-10-4862 to serve as a mediator. Mr. Dickson charged me \$535.00 (EXHIBIT A) for his mediation services (EXHIBIT B) and I found out recently through discovery requests (EXHIBIT C) to Mr. Futeral who I have filed a complaint against for legal malpractice that Mr. Dickson did not charge Mr. Futeral for the mediation services although he requested two rooms for the conference. I believe it is customary for both parties in a civil case to share in the cost of mediation. Mr. Dickson and Mr. Futeral knowingly conspired to charge me the full amount for mediation service so I will file a separate complaint on Mr. Futeral.

Signature: Janet L. Frisco Date: May 20, 2025



The Supreme Court of South Carolina
OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
COMPLAINT FORM

1. Your name and address:

Janet L. Frisco

2. Phone number(s) and email:

(843) 804-0875 janetfrisco@yahoo.com

3. Name of attorney being
complained against:

Stephan V. Futeral

4. Business Address of attorney or judge being complained against:

534 Johnnie Dodds Blvd., Mt.Pleasant, S.C. 29464

5. Please provide the type of the case if applicable (i.e. divorce, criminal, etc.):

Alternate Dispute Resolution Mediation (ADR)

6. Did you employ the attorney? If yes, please give approximate dates and the amount, if any, paid (If judge, please write N/A):

7. In the space below, please provide specific information regarding any alleged misconduct upon which your complaint is based:

Mr. Dickson was referred to me by the plaintiff's attorney, Stephan V. Futeral, for Pet Helpers, Inc. v Janet Frisco Case No. 2021-CP-10-4862 to serve as a mediator. Mr. Dickson charged me \$500.00 (EXHIBIT A) for his mediation services (EXHIBIT B) and I found out recently through discovery requests (EXHIBIT C) to Mr. Futeral who I have filed a complaint against for legal malpractice that Mr. Dickson did not charge Mr. Futeral for the mediation services although he requested two rooms for the conference. I believe it is customary for both parties in a civil case to share in the cost of mediation. Mr. Dickson and Mr. Futeral knowingly conspired to charge me the full amount for mediation service so I will file a separate complaint on Mr. Futeral

Note: You should retain the original document or your own copy of any documentation submitted with your complaint.

If you have retained a new attorney, please provide their name, address and telephone number:

Signature: Janet L. Frisco **Date:** May 20, 2025

Mail to: ODC PO BOX 12159, Columbia, SC 29211

EXHIBIT A

JANET L FRISCO 0001
DATE June 22, 2022 68-7497
2560
PAY TO THE ORDER OF Wells Dickson, P.A. Trust Account \$ 535.00
Five hundred thirty-five + 00/100 DOLLARS
NAVY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
www.navyfcu.org
FOR mediation Janet L. Frisco
⑆ 2560 74974⑆0001⑆ 1194800718⑆001

SECURITY FEATURES ON U.S. CURRENCY
ONE OF THESE OF THE FOLLOWING WORDS:
SERIAL NUMBER, NUMBER OF GREEN VERTICALLY
PRINTED ON THE BACK OF THE PAPER
FLUORESCENT FIBER IN THE PAPER

002220030020002 XUS89 06/24/2022

For Deposit Only
to the Trust Account of
Wells Dickson, P.A.

002220030020002 XUS89 06/24/2022
traced: 07a9e331-e37d-4471-9d29-64a36f4ca904
163782a37-0b92-400d-b0ee-3800cfcda07d

Posting Date	2022 Jun 27
Sequence Number	18028293
Amount	\$535.00
NFCU Account Number	1194800718
MICR Account Number	1194800718
Check Number	1
Serial Number	0
MICR PC Code	1
Teller ID	000000
Branch/ATM ID	0000
Bank of First Deposit	5310030

EXHIBIT B

***** IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION *****
NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING [NEF]

A filing has been submitted to the court RE: 2021CP1002682

Official File Stamp: 01-20-2022 11:53:41 AM
Court: CIRCUIT COURT
Common Pleas
Charleston
Case Caption: Pet Helpers Inc VS Janet Frisco
Document(s) Submitted: ADR/Notice of ADR ADR/Notice of ADR
Filed by or on behalf of: Angela Rigney

This notice was automatically generated by the Court's auto-notification system.

The following people were served electronically:

Jacob Shuler Barker
G. Wells Dickson, Jr.
Stephan Victor Futeral for Pet Helpers Inc et al

The following people have not been served electronically by the Court. Therefore, they must be served by traditional means:

Janet Frisco for Janet Frisco
Case Party Info Protected
Janet Frisco for Janet Frisco

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2022 Jan 20 11:54 AM - CHARLESTON - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2021CP1002682

EXHIBIT C

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

Janet L. Frisco,

Plaintiff,

v.

Futeral and Nelson, LLC,

Defendant.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

CASE NO.: 2024-CP-10-04891

**DEFENDANT FUTERAL AND NELSON,
LLC'S ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFF'S
FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

Pursuant to Rule 33 of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendant Futeral and Nelson, LLC (hereinafter "Defendant") hereby responds to Plaintiff's Interrogatories:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS AND RESERVATIONS

- a. Defendant reserves all privileges and all objections regarding the competency, relevancy, materiality and admissibility of all information and materials disclosed herein.
- b. Discovery is continuing in this case. Defendant's responses are based on information obtained thus far. Further investigation and discovery may reveal information or materials requiring Defendant to supplement or amend its responses.
- c. Defendant objects to each request to the extent it seeks information or the production of materials protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, confidentiality, or the work-product doctrine.
- d. Defendant objects to each request to the extent it seeks information or the production of documents or other tangible items prepared in anticipation of litigation by Defendant or its representatives.

e. Defendant objects to each request to the extent it seeks information or materials that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and to the extent it seeks information or materials that are not within Defendant's possession or control.

f. Defendant objects to any definitions and instructions accompanying the requests to the extent they impose greater obligations on the responding party than the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

Subject to and without waiving these General Objections and Reservations, Defendant responds as follows:

INTERROGATORIES

1. For each person known to you to be a witness concerning the facts of the case, set forth either in a summary sufficient to inform the other party of the important facts known to or observed by such witness, or provide a copy of any written or recorded statements taken from such witnesses.

ANSWER:

a. **Janet Frisco will testify regarding Pet Helpers, Inc. v. Frisco, 2021-CP-10-2682.**

b. **Stephan Futeral will testify regarding Pet Helpers, Inc. v. Frisco, 2021-CP-10-2682.**

c. **Discovery is ongoing, and Defendant reserves the right to supplement this response and to call as witnesses any and all persons or entities identified by others.**

No written statements are known to the Defendants.

2. Give the names and addresses of persons known to the parties or counsel to be witnesses concerning the facts of the case and indicate whether or not written or recorded statements have been taken from the witnesses and indicate who has possession of such statement?

ANSWER:

**Janet Frisco
203 Cardinal Drive
Summerville, South Carolina 29485
No written or recorded statements**

**Stephan Futeral, Esq.
534 Johnnie Dodds Blvd., Suite 202
Mount Pleasant, South Carolina 29464
No written or recorded statements**

No other written statements are known to the Defendants.

3. Did Ms. Susko order two of her employees to try and entice the Plaintiff to violate Ms. Susko's No Trespass Notice, take photographs on or about June 5th, 2021 and make a police report?

ANSWER: No.

4. Did Stephan V. Futeral discuss the alleged trespassing of the Plaintiff with Melissa Susko, executive director of Pet Helpers that was included on his complaint?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this request to the extent it calls for the disclosure of attorney-client communications or disclosure of the mental impressions, conclusions, opinions, or legal theories of Defendant concerning Pet Helpers, Inc. v. Frisco, 2021-CP-10-2682, which is under appeal by Plaintiff, Court of Appeals Case No. 2022-000775.

5. Did Ms. Susko tell a Pet Helpers employee, Sue Lambert, she had received training to euthanize dogs as she was returning from the training when Ms. Lambert was employed there?

ANSWER: No.

6. Did Stephan V. Futeral send the defendant a video of Toby with Melissa Susko and other employees of Pet Helpers on or about June 15, 2021 to prove he hadn't been euthanized?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this request to the extent it calls for the disclosure of attorney-client communications or disclosure of the mental impressions, conclusions, opinions, or legal theories of Defendant concerning Pet Helpers, Inc. v. Frisco, 2021-CP-10-2682, which is under appeal by Plaintiff, Court of Appeals Case No. 2022-000775.

7. Is the majority of Pet Helpers, Inc.'s income generated by public and private donations?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this request to the extent it calls for the disclosure of attorney-client communications or disclosure of the mental impressions, conclusions, opinions, or legal theories of Defendant concerning Pet Helpers, Inc. v. Frisco, 2021-CP-10-2682, which is under appeal by Plaintiff, Court of Appeals Case No. 2022-000775. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

8. Was Toby still confined at Pet Helper's shelter in the photograph titled "Happy Ending Update" posted on Pet Helpers' website in May of 2021?

ANSWER: No.

9. Did Pet Helper's employee, Blaine John, pose with Toby, in an adoption photo holding a sign which read, "I'm Going Home" on or about May 10, 2021 that was posted on Pet Helpers' website?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

10. Did Stephan V. Futeral send the Plaintiff a photograph of Blaine John posing in a side-by-side picture with an alleged adopter after John had substantial weight loss?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this request to the extent it calls for the disclosure of attorney-client communications or disclosure of the mental impressions, conclusions, opinions, or legal theories of Defendant concerning Pet Helpers, Inc. v. Frisco, 2021-CP-10-2682, which is under appeal by Plaintiff, Court of Appeals Case No. 2022-000775. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

11. Did the Plaintiff electronically submit an adoption application for Toby on the evening of May 7, 2021 that Katie Leasure in the Pet Helper's Intake Department had sent her on May 6, 2021?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Plaintiff is in the best position to answer this question.

12. Did Melissa Susko or another Pet Helper's employee leave a phone message on May 7, 2021 for the Plaintiff stating that Toby had been adopted that morning?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant has no personal knowledge regarding this request.

13. Was the redacted adoption application Stephan V. Futeral gave to the Defendant dated May 8, 2021?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory to the extent it calls for the disclosure of attorney-client communications or disclosure of the mental impressions, conclusions,

opinions, or legal theories of Defendant concerning *Pet Helpers, Inc. v. Frisco*, 2021-CP-10-2682, which is under appeal by Plaintiff, Court of Appeals Case No. 2022-000775. The Defendant refers Plaintiff to the document referenced in this interrogatory as the document speaks for itself.

14. Did Stephan V. Futeral submit an adoption contract without any verification or form of identification for Toby/Slim Jim at the hearing April 22, 2022 claiming a third-party adopted him that the Court accepted?

ANSWER: No.

15. Was Judge Bentley Price, who ruled in favor of most of the motions requested by Stephan V. Futeral, deemed unqualified and removed from the bench by the S.C. Bar?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding this objection, multiple Judges ruled against Plaintiff in *Pet Helpers, Inc. v. Frisco*, 2021-CP-10-2682 leading the action to be dismissed by summary judgment and for a permanent restraining order to be entered against Plaintiff.

16. Was it fraudulent for Pet Helpers to solicit donations on their website if Toby was not legitimately adopted?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

17. Can Pet Helpers produce verifiable proof that Toby was legitimately adopted by a third-party and his adoption was not staged by Pet Helpers' employees to prevent Plaintiff from reclaiming him?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, Pet Helpers has already done so and is part of the public record.

18. What amount, if any, has Pet Helpers paid Stephan V. Futeral for legal representation in Pet Helpers, Inc. v. Janet Frisco?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory to the extent it calls for the disclosure of attorney-client communications or disclosure of the mental impressions, conclusions, opinions, or legal theories of Defendant concerning the litigation. Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

19. What was the amount Stephan V. Futeral paid for mediation in Pet Helpers, Inc. v. Janet Frisco?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Stephan Futeral did not pay for any mediation.

20. Did Stephan V. Futeral threaten to file a second Motion to Show Cause if Plaintiff did not pay an additional \$1700.00 and then erase the email afterwards?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Plaintiff possesses all communications sent to her by Stephan Futeral.

21. What percentage of Stephan V. Futeral's cases end in partial summary judgements in ratio to cases that have proceeded to jury trial?

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory to the extent it calls for the disclosure of attorney-client communications or disclosure of the mental impressions, conclusions, opinions, or legal theories of Defendant concerning Pet Helpers, Inc. v. Frisco, 2021-CP-10-2682, which is under appeal by Plaintiff, Court of Appeals Case No. 2022-000775. Defendant objects to this interrogatory as it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

This 9th day of May 2025

Respectfully submitted,

EARHART OVERSTREET LLC

By: *s/ Elizabeth K. Garrett*

DAVID W. OVERSTREET
State Bar No.: 16965
david@earhartoverstreet.com

ELIZABETH K. GARRETT
State Bar No.: 103900
elizabeth@earhartoverstreet.com

Attorneys for Defendant

PO Box 22528
Charleston, SC 29413
843-972-9400