

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
IN THE SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

Nov 06 2025

SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM BERKELEY COUNTY
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
W.T. GEDDINGS, SPECIAL REFEREE
Case No: 2023-CP-08-00547

Appellate Case No: 2025-001547

U.S. Bank Trust National
Association, Not in its
Individual Capacity but Solely
as Owner Trustee for VRMTG
Asset Trust,

Respondent,

v.

Betty J. Moultrie aka Betty J.
Shine, In-dividually and as
Personal Representative of the
Estate of Bradford Moultrie aka
Bradford Willie Moultrie, et al;

Appellant.

**REPLY TO RESPONDENT'S INITIAL
BRIEF**

s/Eduardo K. Curry, Esq

Eduardo K. Curry, Esq

Post Office Box 42270

North Charleston, South Carolina 29423

(843) 767-5284

(843) 767-5286 (Fax)

Attorney for Appellant

Firstly, it is important for the Court to note that the trial court failed to preserve the record by audio, visual, online, written or otherwise. Pursuant to *Rule 29(d)*, Appellant is deprived of her due process by these blatant and deliberate actions or omissions of the lower court

Secondarily, pursuant to *Rule 803(5)(6)(7)* this failure leads the petitioners to attempt to create record without being able to ascertain the veracity or truthfulness that is the standard required by our court system, to sustain such facts in perpetuity. The lower court threw its malfeasance in failure to preserve the record, gives the appellant/petitioner a substantive argument, that supports and provides appellant proper to reverse against the lower court's ruling.

ARGUMENT

I. The Rule 59(e) Motion Was Timely Filed

The Appellant respectfully submits that the Respondent's contention regarding the untimeliness of the Rule 59(e) motion is unfounded. Under Rule 59(e), SCRCF, a motion to alter or amend must be filed within ten days after receipt of written notice of entry of judgment. *Rule 77(d)*, SCRCF, requires that notice of entry be properly served on all parties. The record does not reflect that Appellant received proper notice of the entry of judgment within the meaning of the Rule. Consequently, the addition of time embarked upon actual notice, rendering Appellant's motion timely. South Carolina appellate courts have consistently held that a Rule 59(e) motion is timely if filed within ten days of proper service of notice of entry of judgment. See the case *Pelican Bldg. Ctrs. v. Dutton*, 311 S.C. 56, 427 S.E.2d 673 (1993). In the absence of evidence of proper notice, a motion to reconsider should not be deemed untimely. The lower court therefore erred in finding that Appellant's motion was untimely and in declining to address its substantive merits.

II. Issues Were Properly Preserved for Appellate Review

The Respondent's argument that Appellant failed to preserve issues for appellate review is likewise without distinction. Appellant properly raised and argued each issue in her Rule 59(e) motion, thereby affording the trial court an opportunity to correct any alleged errors. See *Coward Hund Constr. Co. v. Ballard*, 336 S.C. 1, 518 S.E.2d 56 (Ct. App. 1999). The court's failure to address those arguments does not constitute waiver on Appellant's part, but rather error on the part of the tribunal in failing to make findings of fact and conclusions of law. See Rule 52(a), SCRCF.

III. The Master-in-Equity Erred by Failing to Make Findings or Conduct a Hearing

The Master-in-Equity summarily denied Appellant's post-trial motion without a hearing or written order containing specific findings, contrary to the mandates of Rule 52(a) and 59(e), SCRCF. This omission deprived Appellant of meaningful judicial review and violated due process. See *Elam v. S.C. Dep't of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 602 S.E.2d 772 (2004). The failure to make findings of fact and conclusions of law constitutes reversible error when it prevents the appellate court from

determining the factual and legal basis for the decision below.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court reverse the Order of the Master-in-Equity and demand the matter for further proceedings consistent with South Carolina law.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

s/Eduardo K. Curry

Eduardo K. Curry, Esq

Post Office Box 42270

North Charleston, South Carolina 29423

(843) 767-5284

(843) 767-5286 (Fax)

Attorney for Appellant

PROOF OF SERVICE OF A NOTICE OF APPEAL

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
IN THE SUPREME COURT

APPEAL FROM BERKELEY COUNTY
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
W.T. GEDDINGS, SPECIAL REFEREE

RECEIVED
Nov 06 2025
SC Court of Appeals

Case No: 2025-0015

US Bank Trust National Association, Not in Its Individual Capacity but Solely
as Owner Trustee for VRMTG Asset Trust,

Respondent,

v.

Betty J. Moultrie aka Betty J. Shine, Individually and as Personal Representative of the Estate of Bradford Moultrie aka Bradford Willie Moultrie; The Personal Representative, if any, whose name is unknown, of the Estate of Corinth Moultrie; Bradford Moultrie aka Bradford Moultrie, II; and any other Heirs-at-Law or Devisees of Bradford Moultrie aka Bradford Willie Moultrie, Deceased, and Corinth Moultrie, Deceased, their heirs, Personal Representatives, Administrators, Successors and Assigns, and all other persons entitled to claim through them; all unknown persons with any right, title or interest in the real estate described herein; also, any persons who may be in the military service of the United States of America, being a class designated as John Doe; and any unknown minors or persons under a disability being a class designated as Richard Roe, South Carolina Federal Credit Union, and Berkeley Electric Cooperative, Inc., Defendants, of which Betty J. Moultrie is the Appellant.

Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

The Appellants certify that the **REPLY TO RESPONDENT'S INITIAL BRIEF** was served on the Respondents by emailing a .pdf copy of the same to their counsels of record on November 06, 2025

Heidi B. Carey

hearey@rplfirm.com
Attorney for Respondent

M. McMullen Taylor
mtaylor@rplfirm.com
Attorney for Respondent

Cynthia J. Lowery
cynthialowery@mvalaw.com
Attorney for Respondent

Kelley Yarborough Woody
kwoody@kelleywoody.com
Attorney for Respondent

Lucas S. Fautua
lfautua@smithdebnamlaw.com
Attorney for Respondent

David Shelton Kershaw
davidkershawlaw@gmail.com
Attorney for Respondent

Damon Christian Wlodarczyk
damonw@hnblaw.com
Attorney for Respondent

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
THE CURRY LAW FIRM, LLC**

s/Eduardo K. Curry
Eduardo K. Curry, Esq
Post Office Box 42270
North Charleston, South Carolina 29423
(843) 767-5284
(843) 767-5286 (Fax)
Attorney for Appellant

Dated: November 6, 2025