

RECEIVED

Sep 10 2025

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM NEWBERRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Eugene C. Griffith, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2024-CP-36-00087
Appellate Case No. 2024-001360

Abdellah El Farissi..... Appellant,

v.

Newberry College..... Respondent.

Sheila M. Abron, Esquire
1320 Main Street, Suite 750
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 740-7676

**Respondent’s Reply in Support of Respondent’s Motion to Strike Appellant’s Motion
Reply Brief**

Respondent Newberry College (“Respondent”), by and through its undersigned counsel, respectfully submits this reply in support of its Motion to Strike Appellant’s Motion Reply Brief. For the reasons stated herein and in Respondent’s Motion to Strike, the court should grant Respondent’s motion and strike Appellant’s Motion Reply Brief.

In his Response in Opposition to Respondent’s Motion to Strike, Appellant Abdellah El Farissi’s (“Appellant”) argues that the court should exercise its discretion under Rule 240(b) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules to accept his Motion Reply Brief as a limited supplemental brief addressing issues newly emphasized in Respondent’s Final Brief. Appellant Resp. in Opp’n. Appellant’s argument fails for two obvious reasons. First, Appellant incorrectly states Rule 240(b). Rule 240(b) addresses the Court’s discretion to stay the time limits imposed by the Rules upon the

filing of a motion or petition not supplementation of a brief. Rule 240(b), SCACR. Clearly the plain language of Rule 240(b) does not address acceptance of Appellant's Motion Reply Brief, which was filed nearly six months past the deadline provided by Rule 208(a)(3), as a limited supplemental brief. Such an acceptance not only violates the rules, is untimely, and unfairly prejudices Respondent.

However, even if Rule 240(b) allowed for this type of supplementation, which it does not, Appellant's argument would still fail because Respondent's Initial Brief and Final Brief are identical, as required under Rule 211(b). Therefore, contrary to Appellant's assertions, there are no "newly emphasized" issues or arguments included in Respondent's Final Brief that necessitate filing a supplemental reply brief.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated herein and in Respondent's Motion to Strike, Respondent respectfully requests the court strike Appellant's Motion Reply Brief.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: s/ Sheila M. Abron

Sheila M. Abron (S.C. Bar No. 100005)

sabron@fisherphillips.com

FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP

1320 Main Street, Suite 750

Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Telephone: (803) 255-0000

Attorneys for Respondent Newberry College

Columbia, South Carolina
September 10, 2025

RECEIVED

Sep 10 2025

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM NEWBERRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Eugene C. Griffith, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2024-CP-36-00087
Appellate Case No. 2024-001360

Abdellah El Farissi..... Appellant,

v.

Newberry College..... Respondent.

Sheila M. Abron, Esquire
1320 Main Street, Suite 750
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 740-7676

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that the foregoing **Respondent’s Reply in Support of Respondent’s Motion to Strike Appellant’s Motion Reply Brief** in the above-captioned case has been served upon *pro se* Appellant, via electronic mail and First Class U.S. Mail, postage

prepaid, as follows:

Abdellah El Farissi

135 Doverside Dr.

Columbia, South Carolina 29212

1tennis.key@gmail.com

s/ Joel Edward Miller

Joel Edward Miller

Paralegal

Dated this 10th day of September, 2025.