

RECEIVED

Jun 26 2025

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

The Honorable Bentley D. Price

Court of Appeals Case No. 2022-000775
Circuit Court Case No. 2021-CP-10-2682

Pet Helpers, Inc. Respondent,

v.

Janet L. Frisco Appellant,

v.

Melissa Susko Third Party Respondent.

RETURN TO PETITION FOR REHEARING

I. THIS COURT SHOULD DENY APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR REHEARING BECAUSE APPELLANT FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THIS COURT OVERLOOKED OR MISAPPREHENDED APPELLANT’S ARGUMENTS.

This Court should deny Appellant’s motion because Appellant has not demonstrated that this Court overlooked or misapprehended Appellant’s arguments on appeal. “In order to prevail on a petition for rehearing, appellants must demonstrate the Court overlooked or misapprehended their argument.” Kennedy v. Retirement System, 349 S.C. 531, 533, 564 S.E.2d 322, __ (2001) (citing Rule 221(a), SCACR). “The purpose of a petition for rehearing is not to present points which lawyers for the losing parties have overlooked or misapprehended, nor is it the purpose of

Here, Appellant does not present each point of law or fact that Appellant believes this Court overlooked or misapprehended. Rather, Appellant's arguments are diffuse, difficult to follow, and lack a coherent legal analysis. Overall, Appellant makes the same arguments as in her appeal, raises arguments that she failed to present to the lower court, lodges ad hominem attacks against Respondent's counsel, raises matters immaterial to this appeal, such as the lawsuit Appellant filed against Respondent's counsel, and claims that this Court is "guilty of malicious abuse of civil process and abuse of discretion." Ultimately, none of Appellant's arguments support her petition to rehear this matter.

CONCLUSION

Because Appellant cannot point to any instance where this Court overlooked or misapprehended her arguments on appeal, this Court should deny Appellant's motion.

Respectfully submitted,

FUTERAL & NELSON, LLC

Stephan V. Futeral, Esquire
S.C. Bar ID 66427
534 Johnnie Dodds Blvd., Suite 202
Mt. Pleasant, South Carolina 29464
Telephone (843) 284-5500
Facsimile (843) 284-5501
email to: sfuteral@charlestonlaw.net

Dated: 6/26/28

Attorney for Respondents

RECEIVED

Jun 26 2025

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

The Honorable Bentley D. Price

Court of Appeals Case No. 2022-000775
Common Pleas Court Case No. 2021-CP-10-2682

Pet Helpers, Inc. Respondent,

v.

Janet L. Frisco Appellant,

v.


Melissa Susko Third Party Respondent.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the *Respondent's Return to Petition for Rehearing* by delivering the same via email and United States Regular Mail, postage prepaid, on June 26, 2025, addressed to the Appellant as follows:

Janet Frisco
203 Cardinal Drive
Summerville, SC 29485
Janetfrisco@yahoo.com

FUTERAL AND NELSON, LLC



Tabitha T. Cloninger
Paralegal to Stephan V. Futeral, Esq.

Dated: June 26, 2025