

RECEIVED

Aug 18 2025

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE COMMON PLEAS COURT

Clifton B. Newman, Common Pleas Fifth Judicial Circuit Judge

Appellate Case No. 2024-001835

Common Pleas Case No. 2022-CP-40-00027

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control,
DOES 1 through X, inclusive:
and ROE Business Entities 1 through X, inclusive

Respondent

Teresa McWilliams

Appellant, *pro se*

MOTION TO REQUEST EXTENSION TO FILE APPELLANT'S AMENDED BRIEF AND
RECORD ON APPEAL (AN AMENDED BRIEF WAS FILED WITH AND STAMPED BY THE
SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS ON MARCH 21, 2025, BUT APPARENTLY WITHOUT
COURT'S PERMISSION)

Teresa McWilliams
105 Arborgate Circle
Columbia, SC 29212
(803) 530-4738
Appellant, *pro se*

Meredith Seibert, Esquire
P.O. Box 1486
Columbia, SC 29202
(803) 790-0603
Attorney for Respondent

On August 6, 2025, appellant received a letter from the SC Supreme Court of Appeals clerk informing appellant that a Proof of Service she filed with the Supreme Court dated July 14, 2025, with the green certified mail signature confirmation (the Certificate of Service declaring the amended brief had been sent to the respondent had already been filed with the SC Court of

Appeals previously when the amended brief was sent) did not match a filed amended brief. The letter said, "No amended brief has been received."

Attached is:

- An amended brief cover page with the court stamped date of March 21, 2025.
- An amended brief cover page with the court stamped date of March 7, 2025.

Appellant received a letter from the SC Supreme Court of Appeals dated on or near March 11, 2025, stating that appellant had 10 days to respond. Appellant had included proofs and documents that should not have been in the amended brief dated March 7, 2025. (Appellant believes, although due to her inexperience and lack of legal representation she is unsure, that she included proofs and documents within the amended brief dated March 7, 2025, that should have been included in a Record of Appeal instead.) The letter said that appellant had 10 days to respond. Within that 10-day period, appellant filed the amended brief dated March 21, 2025, removing those proofs and documents from the amended brief dated March 7, 2025. The March 21, 2025, amended brief was sent to the respondent, as the Proof of Service proved. Appellant did not understand that she also needed to file a Motion requesting late filing, because the letter said she had 10 days to respond. Appellant now believes she was supposed to file a Motion rather than just correcting the things stated in the letter.

Appellant respectfully requests permission for an extension to file an amended brief as directed by the Supreme Court of Appeals in the letter dated on or about March 11, 2025, along with the proper format for the Record on Appeal. (The documents that should have been in a Record on Appeal were included as a supplement to the appellant's initial brief, instead for in a separate document. Appellant also confused the Record Appeal with the Designation of Matter. All those documents were supplied in the initial brief: however, appellant mistakenly included them in the body of the initial brief as a supplement with page numbers referencing them within the body of the initial brief.)

Appellant has also attached:

- Copies of pages from the initial brief indicating documents that should have been in a Record on Appeal.

Appellant apologizes for these mistakes and hopes that the SC Supreme Court of Appeals will not dismiss her complaint based on an administrative detail. Appellant is studying the Rules, but without examples, she made a mistake in procedure.

Respectfully Submitted;

By: _____
Teresa McWilliams

August 16, 2025
Columbia, South Carolina