

From: [Williams, H. Bruce](#)
To: [Kitchings, Jenny](#)
Subject: FW: Courtesy Copy – Mis-Docketed Rule 240 Motion (App. No. 2024 001734).
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 1:10:08 PM
Attachments: [Gmail - Letter filing Appellant's Rule 240 Motion and Exhibits; Appellate Case No. 2024-001734.pdf](#)
[Teslenko v. Kocsis - Motion to Compel.pdf](#)
[Screenprint 2024-001734 Case View.pdf](#)

From: O. T. <osenochen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 2:58 PM
To: Williams, H. Bruce <hwilliams@sccourts.org>; Williams, H. Bruce <hwilliams@sccourts.org>
Subject: Courtesy Copy – Mis-Docketed Rule 240 Motion (App. No. 2024 001734).

***** EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside the organization. Please exercise caution before clicking any links or opening attachments. ***

LETTER TO THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS
PROVIDING A COURTESY COPY – APPELLANT’S MIS-DOCKETED RULE 240 MOTION

August 25, 2025

The Honorable Chief Judge H. Bruce Williams
South Carolina Court of Appeals
Email: hwilliamsj@sccourts.org
Email: hwilliams@sccourts.org

RE: Teslenko v. Kocsis, Appellate Case No. 2024-001734

Dear Chief Judge Williams,

For courtesy, I am forwarding a copy of my letter to the Clerk requesting correction of the mis-docketing of my Rule 240 motion.

The filing letter accompanying my submission expressly identified it as a Rule 240 motion, and the motion itself was titled Appellant’s Renewed Motion to Compel Transmission of Original Exhibits (Rule 240, SCACR), requesting adjudication by a judge. However, the Clerk’s office docketed it instead as an “Amended Motion to Reconsider.” This mis-docketing appears calculated to stall and administratively deny the motion, rather than allow it to be presented to the Court, despite its direct bearing on the evidentiary record and underlying fraud in the lower courts.

Enclosed for clarity are:

1. Gmail printout of the Filing Letter dated August 23, 2025, identifying the motion

as filed under Rule 240;

2. Clocked copy of the Rule 240 motion as filed;
3. Screenshot of the docket entry showing the inaccurate title.

Respectfully submitted

s/ Olga Teslenko

Olga Teslenko, Pro se Appellant
100 Fountain Pointe Ln, Unit 103,
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29579
Telephone: (510) 388-2780
Email: osenochen@gmail.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **O. T.** <osenochen@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Aug 25, 2025 at 2:51 PM

Subject: Letter Requesting Correction – Appellant's RULE 240 Motion Mis-docketed;
Appellate Case No. 2024-001734.

To: Court Of Appeals Filings <ctappfilings@sccourts.org>

**LETTER TO THE APPELLATE COURT CLERK
REQUESTING CORRECTION – APPELLANT’S RULE 240 MOTION MIS-DOCKETED**

August 25, 2025

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk of Court,
South Carolina Court of Appeals
Email: ctappfilings@sccourts.org

RE: Olga Teslenko v. Joe Kocsis
Appellate Case No. 2024-001734

Dear Clerk Kitchings,

On August 23, 2025, I filed Appellant’s Renewed Motion to Compel Transmission of Original Exhibits, submitted pursuant to Rule 240, SCACR. The formal filing letter accompanying my submission expressly identified it as a Rule 240 motion and requested adjudication by a judge rather than administrative disposition by the Clerk.

Today, I observed that the docket entry for this filing inaccurately describes it as “Appellant’s Amended Motion to Reconsider”. My motion is not a reconsideration motion; it is a Rule 240 motion, properly filed and accompanied by Proof of Service and exhibits.

For clarity and accuracy of the record, I respectfully request that the docket be corrected to reflect the title and nature of the motion as filed—Appellant’s Renewed Motion to Compel Transmission of Original Exhibits (Rule 240, SCACR)—and that the motion be referred to the panel for adjudication, as it concerns Appellant’s right of access to the evidentiary record.

Enclosed for ease of reference are:

1. Gmail printout of the Filing Letter dated August 23, 2025, identifying the motion as filed under Rule 240;
2. Clocked copy of the Rule 240 motion as filed;
3. Screenshot of the current docket entry reflecting the inaccurate title.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this correction.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Olga Teslenko

Olga Teslenko, Appellant, Pro Se
100 Fountain Pointe Ln, Unit 103
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29579
Email: osenochen@gmail.com

Tel: (510) 388-2780