

Nov 24 2025

SC Court of Appeals

**From:** [Jasonboyle03 me](#)  
**To:** [Court Of Appeals Filings](#)  
**Cc:** [Mark Farthing](#); [Andrew Powell](#); [awilson@scag.gov](#); [Susan Spencer](#); [Grace Sommer](#); [Caroline Collins](#); [Danny Kirkland](#); [Jim Logan](#); [Kim Manley](#); [McIntosh, Lawton Law Clerk \(Carson Neeves\)](#); [McIntosh, Lawton Secretary \(Tammy Jennings\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please help  
**Date:** Sunday, November 23, 2025 12:16:55 PM

---

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

### To the Honorable Judges of the South Carolina Court of Appeals:

I write to respectfully request expedited action on the pending matters in *Boyle v. Oconee County Probate Court*, Case No. 2024-001241. This case has now been before the Court of Appeals for nearly a year, and despite substantial filings, no final briefs have been submitted. The delay is the direct result of repeated procedural objections and tactics that have prevented this case from ever being heard on its merits.

At its core, this case arose from a severe violation of my constitutional rights. Oconee County Probate Judge Danny Singleton initiated contempt proceedings in retaliation for my exercise of First Amendment protected activity. The record shows repeated departures from required constitutional safeguards, including the denial of criminal-process protections despite the imposition of criminal penalties. When I raised these issues, the 10th Circuit Court affirmed the ruling despite overwhelming evidence of judicial error.

Throughout the probate and circuit proceedings, both the Probate Court and the 10th Circuit Solicitor consistently maintained that the matter was *civil*. My documented complaints to the local solicitor stating that this was, in substance, a criminal case were disregarded. I was denied the right to counsel, denied the right against self-incrimination, and denied every procedural protection associated with criminal adjudication.

Only at the appellate stage did the Attorney General's Office—first through Assistant Attorney General Andrew Powell and now through Mark Farthing—assert that the appeal must be dismissed because the Attorney General was not served at the notice-of-appeal stage. Yet that argument directly contradicts the State's own position throughout the proceedings, and it relies on filings made *after* the final ruling. As the Court is well aware, an appeal is confined to the record that was before the lower court at the time the ruling was issued. Materials such as notices of appeal, which are created afterward, are not part of the record on appeal and cannot be used to retroactively invalidate the appeal itself.

This Court has already considered and rejected the Attorney General's argument once, in denying the initial motion to dismiss. In the order denying the motion to dismiss, the Court expressly allowed the AG to raise the issue again in the final brief, but doing so does not change the underlying legal principle: post-judgment filings are not part of the record on appeal, and the question of service cannot be used as a tool to prevent review of substantial constitutional claims. To allow a second dismissal attempt on the same grounds—especially based on filings outside the record—would undermine longstanding appellate standards and reward procedural gamesmanship.

Additionally, the continued involvement of Judge Singleton's private attorney demonstrates that the State itself continues to treat this matter, at least in part, as civil. Yet simultaneously, the Attorney General's Office maintains a position that the appeal is criminal solely for the purpose of dismissal. This inconsistency has prolonged the case and delayed justice.

I respectfully submit that these arguments have now run their course. The record on appeal must be finalized, the briefing schedule restored, and the case allowed to proceed. Justice delayed is, indeed, justice denied. Every additional month of delay prolongs the constitutional injuries I have already suffered, including incarceration, loss of income, and the ongoing impact of orders issued under a fundamentally flawed process.

My ultimate goal is for this case to be resolved so that the federal courts may address the broader constitutional issues surrounding the administrative order that enabled these events. I do not seek special treatment—only the application of the Court's rules consistently and fairly, so that this matter can finally be evaluated on its merits.

If a formal motion is required to expedite these proceedings, I am prepared to file one immediately. However, I hope the Court will consider this letter as a good-faith request for timely action so that this case may move forward without further unnecessary delay.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I appreciate the Court's consideration and remain hopeful that timely resolution will help restore confidence in the judicial process.

Respectfully submitted,  
**Jason M. Boyle, Ph.D.**