

RECEIVED

Aug 25 2025

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

The Honorable Dale Van Slambrook, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2024-001734

Olga Teslenko, Appellant,

v.

Joe Kocsis and Carpet King & Flooring,
Respondents.

APPELLANT'S RENEWED MOTION TO COMPEL TRANSMISSION OF ORIGINAL EXHIBITS

Appellant, appearing pro se, respectfully moves this Court pursuant to Rule 240, SCACR, to reconsider its January 14, 2025 order denying transmission of original exhibits and to compel the Horry County Clerk of Court to transmit those exhibits (including Appellant's flash drive) filed July 22, 2024, to this Court.

BACKGROUND.

1. Trial court. At trial in the magistrate court, Appellant entered a package of exhibits, including paper exhibits and a flashdrive containing video evidence, which were reviewed, authenticated, and admitted into evidence without objection.
2. Defective return. On appeal to the circuit court, those exhibits were omitted from the magistrate's return. Pursuant to the county clerk's instruction, Appellant filed a corrective package on July 22, 2024, consisting of identical copies of the omitted exhibits, both paper and flashdrive. At the circuit court hearing, Appellant confirmed under oath that her exhibits were identical to those admitted at trial. See Exhibit A

(Transcript of Circuit Court Hearing, Aug. 21, 2024), pp. 5–10. She later provided written proof of this in her post-hearing motion for reconsideration, filed with the circuit court on September 20, 2024.

3. Clerical obstruction. The circuit court scanned the paper exhibits in a manner that rendered them illegible, and excluded the flashdrive entirely.
4. Motion for originals. On November 11, 2024, Appellant moved this Court to order transmission of the original exhibits. In response to deficiency notices, Appellant filed an itemized list of the exhibits on November 21, 2024, and served it on Respondent on December 6, 2024, thereby correcting all deficiencies. See Exhibit B (Appellant’s Motion to Transfer Originals with Correction #1).
5. Denial order. Despite Appellant’s full compliance with both deficiency notices, this Court denied the motion on January 14, 2025, citing “unnumbered exhibits.” See Exhibit C (Order Denying Motion, Jan. 14, 2025).

GROUND FOR RELIEF.

6. Erroneous denial. The denial was erroneous. Appellant corrected every deficiency identified by the Clerk and explained that her exhibits were filed below precisely as instructed. Numbering is a clerical formality, not a substantive bar to appellate review. Appellant’s admitted trial exhibits were part of the record; when they were omitted from the return, Appellant re-filed them. Appellant does not seek to supplement the record with new material, but only to compel transmission of the evidence already admitted at trial. Appellant certified under oath and demonstrated that her re-filed exhibits were identical to those admitted at trial. Barring admitted trial exhibits from review denies Appellant due process.
7. Legal issue. Rule 210(c), SCACR requires that the Record on Appeal contain “all matters material to the appeal.” Rule 10(c), SCRCP likewise requires transmission of all exhibits admitted below.
8. Legal issue. S.C. Code §18-7-130 directs that appeals “be heard upon the return of the magistrate with all papers relating to the case.” The phrase “all papers relating to the case” necessarily includes exhibits admitted at trial. Where the return is incomplete, and Appellant both objected and re-filed the admitted trial exhibits pursuant to the clerk’s instruction, those exhibits must be treated as part of the record.

9. Statutory Interpretation. To interpret §18-7-130 otherwise would allow clerical omission or deliberate suppression to deprive appellants of review of admitted evidence—a result fundamentally at odds with Rule 210(c) and basic due process.
10. Due Process denial. Fundamental fairness and due process require that this Court review the case on the same evidentiary record considered by the magistrate. To bar Appellant’s exhibits from review on the pretext that they were not numbered below would punish her for clerical conduct outside her control and effectively deny meaningful review.
11. Empty record. The record before this Court—without the original exhibits—is incomplete, devoid of Appellant’s evidence, and therefore misleading. The scanned versions are illegible, and the flashdrive evidence cannot be reduced to paper. Excluding them denies Appellant meaningful appellate review.
12. Extraordinary prejudice. The continued refusal to transmit Appellant’s original exhibits has caused extraordinary prejudice. Appellant has expended significant, unnecessary resources attempting to comply with shifting clerical instructions, only to be told that her admitted trial evidence would not be reviewed. The obstruction diverted Appellant’s limited resources from her health and family responsibilities, causing severe emotional and physical hardship. Most critically, the denial of transmission has prevented meaningful appellate review on the actual evidence admitted at trial, compounding the injustice of the lower courts’ actions, which were not mere clerical mistakes but deliberate suppression of the evidentiary record.
13. Request for judicial review. Appellant respectfully requests that this motion be adjudicated by a judge of this Court, rather than disposed of administratively by the Clerk, as it concerns Appellant’s right of access to the evidentiary record.

RELIEF REQUESTED.

Appellant respectfully requests that this motion be adjudicated by a judge of this Court, rather than disposed of administratively by the Clerk, as it concerns Appellant’s constitutional rights. Appellant has complied with every instruction of the clerks, yet continues to be denied transmission of the record necessary for judicial review. To preserve Appellant’s constitutional right of access to the courts, it is essential that this Court order transmission directly, rather than leave the matter to clerical discretion.

For the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Reconsider its January 14, 2025 Order;
- B. Compel the Clerk of Court for Horry County to transmit to this Court the original exhibits package filed July 22, 2024, including the flashdrive;
- C. In the alternative, permit Appellant to substitute her identical copies, including the flashdrive, and order that they be admitted into the record nunc pro tunc as of July 22, 2024, the date of their original filing in the circuit court;
- D. Grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper to ensure that this appeal is decided on a complete and accurate record.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 23, 2025

/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

Enclosures:

Exhibit A – Transcript of Circuit Court Hearing (Aug. 21, 2024).

Exhibit B – Motion to Transfer Originals (Nov. 11, 2024) with Correction #1 (Nov. 21, 2024).

Exhibit C – Order Denying Motion (Jan. 14, 2025).

Exhibit A

Circuit Court Hearing Transcript
(August 21, 2024)

1 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA) IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA CIRCUIT COURT 15
2 COUNTY OF HORRY) COURT C.A NO. 2024-CP-26-02983
3
4 Ogla Teslenko,)
5 Plaintiff,)
6 Versus)
7 Carpet King & Flooring, Joe Kocsis)
8 Defendant.)
9
10 H E A R I N G
11
12 DATE: August 21, 2024
13
14 LOCATION: South Carolina Circuit Court 15
15
16 JUDGE: Dale Van Slambrook
17
18 TRANSCRIBED BY: ERIN REILLY
19
20 LEGAL EAGLE
21 Post Office Box 5682
22 Greenville, South Carolina 29606
23 864-467-1373
24 depos@legaleagleinc.com
25

APPEARANCES:

Attorney for Plaintiff:

Olga Teslenko (Pro Se)

Attorney for Defendant:

Joe Kocsis (Pro Se)

INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

Certificate of Transcriber 13

EXHIBITS

(None marked)

(THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY CONTAIN QUOTED MATERIAL. SUCH IS
REPRODUCED AS READ OR QUOTED BY THE SPEAKER.)

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 THE COURT: The next matter I had was Olga Teslenko
3 versus Carpet King & Flooring. Ms. Teslenko or some
4 representative of Carpet King & Flooring present in our virtual
5 courtroom today?

6 MS. TESLENKO: Your Honor, my name is Olga Teslenko.
7 I don't represent Carpet King & Flooring and I represent only
8 myself. I'm the appellant

9 THE COURT: All right. Is there any representative
10 here from Carpet King that has joined us? All right. Let me
11 find this file as well. All right. I'm looking at the public
12 index, I see the motion that you'd filed Ms. Teslenko. All
13 right. Ms. Keeling maybe you can help me out on this one as
14 well. Is there a return that's filed from the magistrate on
15 this? I see an appeal returned E-D on the end, and that looks
16 like just the appeal documents. Is there a return in this that
17 I'm overlooking?

18 THE CLERK: Let me look. The appeal returned
19 received is the return, if you look there are 30 pages.

20 THE COURT: Is that just the documents or is there an
21 actual summary with an outline of information signed by the
22 magistrate? I'm not sure if I -- because I scrolled through it,
23 I'm just not --

24 THE CLERK: Yes, it's from Judge Arrakis.

25 THE COURT: Where is that at?

1 THE CLERK: The return is the first two pages and
2 then the rest is documents.

3 THE COURT: All right. And are you saying that
4 that's under the caption where it says appeal/appeal return
5 received?

6 THE CLERK: Yes, sir.

7 THE COURT: And is it the first or second document
8 identified?

9 THE CLERK: I believe it's the first.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm trying to get this thing
11 pulled up, Ms. Teslenko?

12 MS. TESLENKO: Yes, judge.

13 THE COURT: Tell me what you're asking for. What are
14 you appealing and why should I -- and what relief are you
15 asking for and why should I grant it?

16 MS. TESLENKO: Sir, I'm appealing the judgment by the
17 magistrate's judge that ruled in my favor and I claimed a
18 complete material breach of contract. So, the judge ruled in
19 my favor but somehow discounted the amount of money that was
20 supposed to be return -- recovered to me from the Defendant by
21 \$1,825 without any explanation. I actually felt unsafe when I
22 received that judgment because at the magistrate court hearing,
23 I have provided a flash drive that contained all of the
24 documents that support my claim as well as an immense amount of
25 video and photo evidence that this is indeed a complete

1 material breach of contract. The flooring for which I paid Mr.
2 Kocsis \$3,395 was not even pretended to be installed. The
3 flash drive also contained the independent inspection report by
4 National Foundation certified inspector, independent inspector
5 recommended by the manufacturer.

6 THE COURT: Were all of those documents submitted to
7 the magistrate?

8 MS. TESLENKO: Yes, not only did they submit the
9 flash drive at the hearing.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MS. TESLENKO: But I also printed out some distinct
12 or distinctly critical documents were also printed out and
13 submitted in a printed package. The printed package also
14 contained my Plaintiff's statement. Your Honor, one side note
15 that I must add is this is the very first time in my entire
16 life that I have to interact with the judicial system. I
17 understand the importance of having -- a functioning judicial
18 system in society.

19 A society can't function without a set of laws and a way
20 to abide by them, to enforce these laws are abided by. But my
21 own personal tendencies and also, you know, the culture of
22 where I come from, they kind of kept me away from any
23 interaction with courts. In other words, I don't even know how
24 courts interact.

25 It was my hope that in the United States courts work

1 properly and at this point. So, I didn't know that I was
2 supposed to maybe file my evidence prior to appearing in the
3 magistrates court hearing. So, when I came to the magistrates
4 court hearing, I had a flash drive which I submitted to the
5 Judge. I had a packet of printed documents, which I have also
6 submitted to the Judge.

7 And also, I had several physical of vinyl planks that
8 contained the trial marks and other evidence which were
9 physical proof of what the inspector has found and put in his
10 inspection report of the physical proof of the contractor Mr.
11 Joe Kocsis having violated all the essential requirements for
12 the installation of this product and adhesive requirements for
13 the adhesive that he used. So, that was submitted to the
14 Court. And at the court hearing, I was able to read through my
15 statement entirely.

16 And in my statement, it's explicitly stated that I am
17 aware of the South Carolina law that provides the contractor
18 with the right to cure a defect, but that this situation is not
19 a construction defect. This situation is a complete material
20 breach of contract. And at the end of my statement, I asked
21 the Court to review the evidence and order that the full amount
22 of the contract be returned or recovered to me as well as the
23 inspection fee, which was \$430.

24 So, the total amount of money that I specifically
25 asked for to be recovered to me was \$3,825. The Magistrate's

1 court somehow ruled in my favor. Well, I understand how it was
2 ruled in my favor. Let me back up for a second. At the
3 magistrate hearing at my court date, the magistrate judge has
4 actually had the flash drive reviewed and several videos were
5 reviewed in the courtroom and showed explicitly that this
6 installation was not at all actually installed.

7 The planks were simply laid over the concrete not
8 rolled, not pressed. So, my videos show me lifting off each
9 plank with one hand only hold in the telephone with camera in
10 the other hand. This is not even a mockery of installation;
11 this is zero installation. So, the judge did have to rule in
12 my favor, the amount of the judgment was what actually made me
13 deadly concerned. The judge ruled only \$2,000 to be recovered
14 to me from the Defendant was the actual amount of the contract
15 plus the inspection fee were \$3,825.

16 There was no explanation provided for why \$1,825 were
17 decided to not be recovered to me. And the reason I felt very
18 unsafe at this judgment was that it in center hide Mr. Kocsis
19 in the -- his line of operation. In other words, Mr. Kocsis
20 earned \$1,800 per day's work of salvaging half from my condo.

21 He earned money to salvage somebody else's property.
22 I have experience of being ripped off ever since I've relocated
23 into this community, three years ago because of my disability,
24 I have to retire. So, I had to find a place where life is a
25 little less expensive. I bought this condo and then an immense

1 amount of collusion started happening to where initially for
2 the longest time I thought I was just being imaginative. I
3 thought things were just something as fantastic as that
4 couldn't be true. So, I started to collect evidence and is the
5 evidence of the objective facts that I had been collecting that
6 showed me that collusion indeed happens in this community,
7 people are indeed ripping me off and so I thought - I felt very
8 unsafe.

9 THE COURT: Let me interrupt you for a minute, I want
10 to make sure I understand. The amount of the prayer, which is
11 the amount you requested was 3,825, is that right, but the
12 amount of the award was 2000?

13 MS. TESLENKO: Correct.

14 THE COURT: Okay. And I don't have the benefit of
15 the order. I see the documents that were filed but I still
16 don't see the return.

17 MS. TESLENKO: I can actually see the return.

18 THE COURT: Explaining it. So -- I'm sorry, say that
19 again for me?

20 MS. TESLENKO: It was after I reviewed the return --
21 returned by the magistrate court that I discovered that the
22 magistrate's court omitted my flash drive and preprinted
23 documents were also omitted from the printed documents package
24 that it turned in to the magistrate's court. One was my
25 statement, which outlined exactly that there was a complete

1 bridge of contract and that I was requesting or praying for
2 \$3,825. The second document -- the second category of
3 documents were all the manufacturer's instructions. And third
4 document omitted in the magistrate return was a copy of my
5 check paying the inspections fee. The judgment itself contains
6 not ---

7 THE COURT: Let me do this. Ms. Teslenko and I
8 appreciate you sharing that. I think I understood essentially
9 what was going on before you explained it, but after you
10 explained it, I understand it better. I need the opportunity
11 to review all of those documents that are in that return and,
12 and find the summary portion of it as well to see if there is a
13 sufficient legal explanation for that reduction.

14 Okay. If there is a sufficient legal explanation for that
15 reduction then the award may have to stay at the \$2,000. Okay?
16 If there's not a sufficient explanation then I'll have to sort
17 out how to handle that. It wouldn't necessarily mean that I
18 would change the award. It may very well require that the
19 matter be reconsidered or reviewed by the magistrate after
20 being remanded or returned to them. Okay?

21 MS. TESLENKO: Could I ask you a few questions, two
22 questions. I don't know how to -- can I ask you a question,
23 Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: I can't give you any legal advice but I
25 might be able to share some explanation.

1 MS. TESLENKO: No, about what you just said.

2 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

3 MS. TESLENKO: Question number 1, as of this morning,
4 the magistrate's return contained no summary. Okay. Or the
5 magistrate's judgment contain no summary. I have copies of
6 everything that was filed by the magistrate in their return.

7 THE COURT: All right. And that's what I'm saying.

8 MS. TESLENKO: Do you think there's --

9 THE COURT: I need to look at the -- I need to look
10 at that document and if it's not there then I'll consider that
11 as well. Okay.

12 MS. TESLENKO: And Question Number 2, can I ask you a
13 second question about what you just said?

14 THE COURT: Certainly.

15 MS. TESLENKO: I understand that you may have to
16 remit or return this case back to the magistrate's court.
17 However, I have evidence of the -- of that particular
18 magistrate court doing something very incomprehensible for me.
19 For instance, when I asked them about the rules to appeal, they
20 told me that I was being ungrateful. It's incomprehensible,
21 second instance when I asked them --

22 THE COURT: Whether they would handle it or not, I
23 mean, that's a -- that's something that would have to be dealt
24 with down the road. I can't answer that question today.

25 MS. TESLENKO: Okay. Could I -- at which point can I

1 ask for this case to be returned back to some other magistrate
2 court not Myrtle Beach?

3 THE COURT: I'm not sure if I can address that. If I
4 can I will in my order. If I can't you may have to deal with
5 that once it gets sent back to them. Okay?

6 MS. TESLENKO: Thank you very much. Thank you.

7 THE COURT: Okay. All right. And so, the way we're
8 gonna leave it right now Ms. Teslenko is I'm taking this matter
9 under advisement. I will prepare a written order that will be
10 filed and a copy will be sent to you. Okay?

11 MS. TESLENKO: Thank you Judge.

12 THE COURT: Okay. Yes ma'am. Good luck to you.

13 MS. TESLENKO: Thank you very much. Have a good day.

14 THE COURT: You too.

15

16 [END OF HEARING]

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25


1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

2 I, ERIN REILLY, a court-approved transcriber, do hereby certify
3 that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete Transcript
4 of Record of the proceedings had and evidence introduced in the
5 trial of the captioned case, relative to appeal, in the South
6 Carolina Circuit Court 15, South Carolina, on the 21st day of
7 August, 2024.

8
9 I do further certify that I am neither of kin, counsel, nor
10 interest to any party hereto.

11 September 4th, 2024

12 ERIN REILLY

13 Handwritten signature of Erin Reilly in cursive script on a light-colored background.

14 TRANSCRIBER
15
16
17
18

Exhibit B

**Appellant's Motion to Release and
Transfer Original Exhibits
(November 12, 2024)
with Correction #1
(November 21, 2024)**

RECEIVED

Nov 12 2024

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Dale E. Van Slambrook, S.C. Circuit Court Judge #2781

Appellate Case No. 2024-001734

Olga Teslenko, Appellant,

v.

Joe Kocsis,
Carpet King & Flooring, Respondents.

**MOTION TO REQUEST THE RELEASE AND TRANSFER OF THE ORIGINAL
EXHIBITS FILED WITH THE TRIAL COURT ON 7.22.2024 IN A LETTER
SUBMITTING EXHIBITS OMITTED IN LOWER COURT'S RETURN**

Pursuant to S.C. Code Section 18-7-130, which requires that an appeal case be heard by the appellate court based on all the essential exhibits in the case; and in compliance with Rule 210(c), SCACR, which requires that the record on appeal include only those exhibits which were presented to the lower court; as well as, lastly, in order to comply with Rule 10(c), SCRCP, which requires that copies of exhibits be attached to the brief in order to be adopted into the record on appeal, appellant Olga Teslenko ("Appellant") files this Motion to Request the Release and Transfer of the Original Exhibits Filed with Horry County court on 7.22.2024 in a Letter Submitting Exhibits Omitted in Lower Court's Return.

Appellant wishes to designate the original exhibits because: (1) they are essential to proving Appellant's case; (2) they were filed timely with the lower court; and (3) they fall into one of the two categories identified by this Honorable Court as the categories for which the scanned copies are unacceptable in the record on appeal. The package of the exhibits Appellant filed with Horry County court on 7.22.2024 in a letter submitting exhibits omitted in lower court's return, contained over 80 pages of printed documents and a flashdrive with photo and video evidence. Unfortunately, nearly all of the printed documents were scanned by Horry County court such that they became illegible. Please see the enclosed examples for illustration. In accordance with the explanation given by this Court, as well as the fundamental principles of law, copies are unacceptable if they are illegible. Yet these exhibits are essential to proving Appellant's case, and they were timely filed with the lower court. It therefore follows that the original, legible, exhibits should be included in the record on appeal instead of the scanned illegible copies. Additionally, one of the exhibits was a flashdrive containing essential evidence. Please see the enclosed copy of the filed flashdrive. Since that flashdrive is not a paper exhibit, and since the contents of that flashdrive are essential to proving Appellant's case, and since that flashdrive was timely filed with the lower court, the original of that flashdrive should be included in the record on appeal.

For these reasons, and in accordance with the explanation given by this Court, Appellant respectfully moves to request the issuance of an order directing the release and transfer of the entire package of the original exhibits filed with Horry County court on 7.22.2024 in a letter submitting exhibits omitted in lower court's return, to be included in the Record on Appeal in the above case.

RECEIVED

Nov 21 2024

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Dale E. Van Slambrook, S.C. Circuit Court Judge #2781

Appellate Case No. 2024-001734

Olga Teslenko, Appellant,

v.

Joe Kocsis,
Carpet King & Flooring, Respondents.

**LETTER TO THE HONORABLE APPELLATE COURT CLERK
CORRECTING THE DEFICIENCY IN APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
TRANSPORTATION**

November 21, 2024

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

In response to your notice of the deficiency in my motion for transportation, please find below the list of the specific exhibits admitted at trial in the magistrate court and then filed with the circuit court as exhibits omitted in lower court's return, with a short description of the exhibit:

1. South Carolina Residential Construction Standards, pp. 1 – 2, two pages total (official South Carolina Residential Construction Standards, the Seal page, and the Table of Contents page).
2. South Carolina Residential Construction Standards, Resilient Flooring Standards, pp. 36 – 40, five pages total (official South Carolina Residential Construction Standards, the full chapter on Resilient Flooring Standards).

3. Tony Jones Flooring Inspections, report, not paginated, 47 pages total (the independent inspection report as it was provided to Plaintiff, the text, 2 pages, and the report photographs, 45 pages).
4. <https://www.fcits.org/find-inspector.php>, Inspector Details, p. 1 of 1, one page total (the screenprint of Tony Jones FCITS certifications printed off of FCITS.org).
5. SHAW FLOORS, What To Expect And How To Prepare For Resilient Flooring; not paginated, one page total (the first page of Plaintiff's own summation document All Instructions.pdf which is described in Plaintiff's statement on p. 1 as combining Shaw installation instructions, adhesive specifications and material specifications, for convenience).
6. SHAW FLOORS, LVP Prime Plank 0616v Residential Resilient Direct Glue Profile; not paginated, one page total (the second page of Plaintiff's own summation document All Instructions.pdf which is described in Plaintiff's statement on p. 1 as combining Shaw installation instructions, adhesive specifications and material specifications, for convenience).
7. SHAW Customer Support (continued); not paginated, one page total (the third page of Plaintiff's own summation document All Instructions.pdf which is described in Plaintiff's statement on p. 1 as combining Shaw installation instructions, adhesive specifications and material specifications, for convenience).
8. Shaw Floors, Installation, Installation Guidelines for Residential Resilient Direct Glue, pp. 1 – 7, seven pages total (official Shaw Floors installation instructions document downloaded off shawfloors.com, Revision: 04012022).
9. Philadelphia Commercial, Specification, Shaw 200 Resilient Adhesive, pp. 1 - 5, five pages total (Official Shaw Inc. 200 Resilient Adhesive specification document, Revision: 09052023).
10. Carpet King shipping label for Shaw 200 TPS 4G, one page (photograph of the shipping label off the glue bucket used).
11. Shaw 200 Bucket Label, Back-1, one page (photograph of the manufacturer's label off the glue bucket).
12. Shaw 200 Bucket Label, Back-2, one page (photograph of the manufacturer's label off the glue bucket).
13. 11.17.2023 Carpet King warranty email and Plaintiff's reply, pp. 1 - 3, three pages total (Gmail printout of the electronic communication).
14. NFCA, Properly Prepared Concrete Slab, one page (photograph of a properly prepared concrete slab downloaded off of the National Floor Covering Association manual, the full version of which is included in the flashdrive).

15. NFCA, Inadequate Adhesive Transfer, one page (photograph of a properly prepared concrete slab downloaded off of the National Floor Covering Association manual, the full version of which is included in the flashdrive).
16. Flashdrive, (the physical flash drive, which is a copy of the original flash drive admitted by the magistrate court)

The above list enumerates the exhibits admitted by the magistrate court in exactly the same format in which they were admitted by the magistrate court, and then filed with the circuit court. Regrettably, these exhibits were not properly labeled or paginated. Please let me know if this list corrects the deficiency in my motion for transportation. Thank you very much for notifying me of this deficiency and allowing me the opportunity to correct it.

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

Exhibit C
Court of Appeals Denial Order
(January 14, 2025)

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Olga Teslenko, Appellant,

v.


Joe Kocsis and Carpet King & Flooring, Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2024-001734

ORDER

Appellant filed a motion seeking transportation of exhibits from the circuit court pursuant to Rule 210(f), SCACR. In the Court's deficiency letter dated November 21, 2024, we indicated that Appellant must provide a list of the specific exhibits admitted at trial, such as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 (flash drive). Although Appellant provided a detailed list of the items she wishes to have transported to this Court, she did not provide any specific exhibit numbers, which are required for identification by the circuit court Clerk of Court. Furthermore, items 1-15 identified in Appellant's motion appear to be documents capable of reproduction in the record on appeal. Items 1-15 should be included in Appellant's designation of matter, then later reproduced as part of the record on appeal, as contemplated by Rules 209 and 210(c), SCACR. To the extent Appellant wishes to have item 16 transported to this Court for review, she must provide the exhibit number from the circuit court. Accordingly, Appellant's motion for transportation of exhibits from the circuit court is denied.

Appellant also filed a motion seeking to hold the appeal in abeyance pending release of exhibits from the circuit court. The motion is denied. The appellant's initial brief and designation of matter are due within 30 days of the date of this order.

 C.J.
FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Olga Teslenko

Carpet King & Flooring

Joe Kocsis

FILED
Jan 14 2025

RECEIVED

Aug 25 2025

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

The Honorable Dale Van Slambrook, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2024-001734

Olga Teslenko, Appellant,

v.

Joe Kocsis and Carpet King & Flooring,
Respondents.

PROOF OF SERVICE OF RENEWED MOTION TO COMPEL

Appellant hereby certifies that she has served her Renewed Motion to Compel on Respondent, Mr. Joe Kocsis, who at all relevant times represented himself to be the owner of Carpet King & Flooring. Service was made by depositing a true copy thereof with Federal Express, postage prepaid, on August 23, 2025, addressed to: Mr. Joe Kocsis, Carpet King & Flooring, 532 Broadway Street, Myrtle Beach, SC 29577.

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

Dated: August 23, 2025