

**From:** [Yodda Pierce](#)  
**To:** [Court Of Appeals Filings](#); [John S. Kay](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Return for DOCS cae  
**Date:** Saturday, October 4, 2025 11:20:29 AM

---

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

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** Yodda Pierce <ntsl532@yahoo.com>  
**To:** yodda Smith <ntsl532@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 4, 2025 at 08:09:44 AM EDT  
**Subject:** Return for DOCS cae

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM OCONEE COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas  
Judge Caracker, Common Pleas  
Case No. 2024-CP-37-00195

**RECEIVED**  
**Oct 06 2025**  
**SC Court of Appeals**

Foxwood Hills Property Owners Association  
Respondent,  
v.  
Christopher A. Pierce Appellant.

---

RETURN TO RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR LATE FILING

---

Appellant Christopher Pierce ("Pierce") responds to Respondant's Motion for late filing. Respondent filed a Return to Appellant's Motion to Reinstate Case which was filed untimely 3 days late having been filed on the September 24, 2025 when Pierce filed his motion on September 11, 2025.

Respondent claims in his motion that he received the motion late on September 18, 2025, but Pierce deposited the motion in US mail at the proper date as indicated on the Certificate of Service. Pierce assumes no responsibility for delivery of US mail. Pierce did not email the Respondent as he was told only to send a paper copy to Respondent by The South Carolina Appeals Court personnel. Furthermore, the South Carolina Appeals Court normally emails any copies received by them to both Respondent and Appellant. As such, Respondent is responsible for following deadlines provided in Appeals Court Rules whether or not the mail is physically delivered a copy. Also, as an experienced attorney, he could easily access the tracking information C-Track on the South Carolina Appeals Court website to verify filing

deadlines as Pierce does frequently as new motions are filed. He failed to do so and as a result do his due diligence and should accept the results of his lack of follow up.. Additionally Pierce has never actually filed a Final Brief with the South Carolina Appeals Court but has been timely with his motions. Certainly an experienced attorney should meet the same standard or better than a self represented party. Additionally Appellant did not understand the Order to pay the filing fee as he thought since Informa pauperis was being challenged in his other case it would apply to this one. That was a mistake by Appellant but nevertheless that was what happened,

Based on this flagrant disregard for court rules Pierce agrees with the South Carolina Court of Appeals that Respondent's Return should be disregarded as being untimely filed and not in compliance with Appeals Court Rules and not heard by the South Carolina Appeals Court.

---

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

---

Christopher Pierce has deposited in first class mail a copy of RETURN TO RESPONDNET"S MOTION FOR LATE FILING, CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE to: John Kay- Hutchens Law Firm, P.O. Box 8237, Columbia, SC 29201 on October 4, 2025.

\_\_\_\_\_/s  
Christopher A. Pierce  
605 White Owl Ln  
Seneca, SC 29678  
864-557-1258  
Self Represented

October 4, 2025

**RECEIVED**  
**Oct 06 2025**  
**SC Court of Appeals**