



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

CATHERINE S. HARRISON
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

December 02, 2025

Jason Michael Boyle
750 Mourning Dove Ln.
Seneca SC 29678

Re: In the Matter of Jason Michael Boyle
Appellate Case No. 2024-001241

Dear Mr. Boyle:

Enclosed is this Court's decision on your motion to strike and motion to permit electronic service. This appeal is no longer held in abeyance. The record on appeal must be filed and all briefs must be served and filed within twenty (20) days of the date of this letter. Furthermore, we are in receipt of your email correspondence dated November 24, 2025. If you wish to request relief from this Court, you must do so in the form of a motion pursuant to Rule 240 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. No further action will be taken on your correspondence.

Very truly yours,

Jasmine D. Smith, Deputy

CLERK

cc: James W. Logan, Jr., Esquire
Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

In the Matter of Jason Michael Boyle, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2024-001241

ORDER

On September 30, 2025, Appellant moved to strike Respondent's designation of the February 14, 2025 notice of appeal and proof of service. Appellant argued the notice of appeal and proof of service were not presented to the circuit court, and therefore, were not proper for inclusion in the record on appeal. *See* Rule 210(c), SCACR ("The [r]ecord shall not . . . include matter which was not presented to the lower court or tribunal."). On October 1, 2025, Appellant amended his motion to strike.¹ On October 3, 2025, Respondent filed a return, opposing Appellant's motion. Respondent noted Appellant filed his notice of appeal with the circuit court as required by Rule 203 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules and, as a result, designation of the notice of appeal and proof of service was proper. On October 3, 2025, Appellant filed a reply, arguing that although the notice of appeal was filed with the circuit court, it was not presented to the circuit court, which is what Rule 210 requires. Additionally, Appellant moved this court to sanction Respondent for "designating filings expressly barred by Rule 210[c], and by doubling down in its [r]eturn with misleading interpretations of Rules 210 and 203." After careful consideration, we deny Appellant's motion to strike. On August 25, 2025, this court denied Respondent's motion to dismiss the appeal from the February 7, 2025 order, and allowed Respondent to present its argument, which concerns the service of the notice of appeal from the February 7, 2025 order—the February 14, 2025 notice of appeal—in its brief. Thus, consideration of the February 14, 2025 notice of appeal and proof of service will be before this court. Although this court would be able to review the notice of appeal and proof of service in its own records, this court determines it will be easier during the briefing process if the February 14, 2025 notice of appeal and proof of service are included

¹ Initially, Appellant moved to strike his designation of a July 25, 2024 notice of appeal, but he withdrew this request when he filed his amended motion to strike on October 1, 2025.

in the record on appeal. Further, we deny Appellant's motion for sanctions. *See* Rule 269, SCACR ("Where an appeal, petition, motion[,], or return is frivolous or taken solely for purposes of delay, or is not in compliance with these Rules, the appellate court may upon its own motion or that of a party, after ten (10) days['] notice, impose upon offending attorneys or parties such sanctions as the circumstances of the case and discouragement of like conduct in the future may require."

On September 30, 2025, Appellant filed a motion to "permit[] all service in this appeal to occur exclusively by electronic mail" because "[b]eginning October 5, 2025, Appellant will be residing abroad in Uganda for an indefinite period of time." Appellant argues that because of his move to Uganda, he "will not be able to receive documents promptly or reliably" and "will face significant delays and expenses . . . for filings that opposing counsel [could] readily receive electronically." On October 3, 2025, Respondent submitted a letter in lieu of a formal return. Respondent took "no position" on the request; however, Respondent noted the "appellate court rules currently only permit service 'by electronic means in a manner provided by order of the Supreme Court of South Carolina'" and the relevant order only permits lawyers to serve other lawyers electronically. On October 3, 2025, Appellant submitted a letter, arguing Rule 263 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules authorizes this court to direct service by electronic means when appropriate. On October 6, 2025, Appellant submitted a second letter, stating his citation to Rule 263 was in error and he "intended to invoke th[is] court's authority under Rule 262(c)(3)" of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules and the Supreme Court's April 24, 2024 order. After careful consideration, we deny Appellant's motion to permit all service to occur exclusively by electronic mail. *See* Rule 262(c)(3), SCACR ("Service upon the attorney or upon a party shall be made by . . . [s]erving a copy on the person by electronic means in a manner provided by order of the Supreme Court of South Carolina."); *RE: Methods of Electronic Filing and Service Under Rule 262 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (As Amended April 24, 2024)*, No. 2020-000447 (S.C. Sup. Ct. Order dated April 24, 2024) (Howard Adv. Sh. No. 15) (describing when electronic service is allowed).



FOR THE COURT J.

Columbia, South Carolina

FILED
Dec 02 2025

cc:

Jason Michael Boyle

James W. Logan, Jr., Esquire Mark

Reynolds Farthing, Esquire