RECEIVED
Dec 18 2025
SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Court of Appeals

Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink

Appellants

v.

Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Campers and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Management, a/k/a Chris Vellanti, a/k/a Christopher Vellanti; Christopher Vellanti, as a Member and Personally; Yvonne Goldman, as a General Manager and Personally; Frank Pellegrini; Fritzie Maroto; Jennifer Burdette; Marsha Stamm; Allen Riha; Ray Grenier; Grant Ferrendelli; and Charles Carpenter

Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2025-000859

Objections to the improper style of the case that Defense and the Trail Court colluding Judges want this Court to use that is not even accurate based on laws they have not challenged.

All the motions are incorporated by reference, as is the ADA Advocate letters instructing the Courts.

Orders and a letter of clarification of the vague orders is attached as exhibits.

MOTION: P-APPELLANTS BRING FORTH A MOTION DEMANDING THE COURT ACTUALLY RULE ON THE ADA REASONABLE ACOMMODATION REPEATEDLY SUBMITTED LONG AGO THAT THEY REFUSE TO RULE UPON AND GRANT BY LAW FOR 90 DAYS/200 PAGES THAT HAS BEEN REPEATED REGULARLY AND THAT THE COURT STOP REFUSING TO RULE, NOT MAKE UP WHAT P-APPELLANTS ARE SAYING THEY KNOW IS NOT TRUE AND WRITE THE CLEAR ORDER AND THAT IT IS REFERRING TO ADA

REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION REQUEST OF 90/200, WHAT IT IS REFERRING TO, TO INCLUDE THE ADA/REASONABLE REQUESTED,

OBJECTIONS: P-APPELLANTS OBJECTS TO ALL ORDERS AND EVERYTHING THEY CLAIM AND ORDER AND THOSE THIGNS THEY DO NOT ORDER THROUGH FRAUD, AND OTHERWISE, AND TO THE CONTINUING AND MASSIVE FRAUD ON THE COURT BY ALL JUDGES INVOLVED TO PREDETERMINE THIS CASE FOR THE LMCE WITH EXAMPLES OF THE OBJECTIONS OUTLINED AS REPRESENTATIVE OF MANY MORE.

Plaintiffs remind the court that it cannot proof documents, and they are having a very difficult time seeing and typing and Dr. Fink has hip and back damage additionally all due to Court Elder Abuse and Exploitation and Disabling intentionally both P-Appellants so they are weaken and to punish them for not allowing themselves to have their award stolen, and by making the case extremely expensive to bring forth by the Court and Defense continuing to ring up the charges against them by refusing to rule and making up laws and rules on false narratives and so forth in this matter. The sleep deprivation is very difficult to fight through and Fink is experiencing Seizure symptoms that the Courts know all of this will happen by their Unconstitutional behavior and their continued Fraud on the Court by the Court to get their predetermined outcome for their LMCE.

P-APPELLANTS OBJECT TO ALL TOPICS THAT HAVE FORCED P-APPELLANTS TO AGAIN SPEND MONEY, TAKEN TIME AWAY FROM THEIR TRUE TASK AT HAND TO DEAL WITH MORE FRAUD ON THE COURT BY THE COURT SHOWING EXTREME BIAS AND FURTHERING THE CRIMES OF THE LOWER COURT RACKETEERS AND THE SUPREME COURT. ALL IS OBJECTED TO WHETHER MENTIONED AS AN OBJECTION OR NOT, AS THE WORD OBJECTION COULD BE USED ON ALL ISSUES RAISED.

COMES NOW Dr. Linda Kennedy, J.D., B.S., B.S., and Dr. Marsha Fink, J.D., B.A., (hereinafter, "Dr. Kennedy and/or Dr. Fink", P-Appellants", "we", "our", "us", and so forth), initially filing pro se in the underlying matter on March 17, 2022, then hiring an attorney on April 12, 2022, after P-Appellants filed their own Discovery Demands with the Court on that same date before hiring the lawyer, and then firing that same lawyer for RACKETEERING which was recorded on digital media and in writing, with other RACKETEER State Actors, in December 2023, and the firing entered and Unconstitutionally approved on January 11, 2024, when no approval is necessary through Constitutional rights of P-Appellants.

The P-Appellants come before this Appeals Court, after predetermined outcomes were entered in the extremely Unconstitutional underlying court case, where the Judges presided over their own guilt and liability from their underlying participation in the facts leading up to P-Appellants later filing of a suit in the 10th Cir., without knowledge of their involvement in the underlying facts, which truths are supported by some Defendant Appellees (hereinafter, "D-Appellees") and witnesses very own admissions and recorded statements and other valuable evidence not yet released to the pubic, because it is not yet time to do so. The issues are Fraud on the Court by the Court, including, but not limited to the final inappropriate and Unconstitutional Evidentiary Hearing the RACKETEERING Judges used to get rid of P-Appellants and their troubling facts and laws in their case, through predetermined outcome strategies no matter how Unconstitutional they acted, counting on the cover of this Appeals Court to never let the truth be heard, including ex parte meeting and hearings of the RACKETEERS, setting up narratives that had nothing to do with the case, to hi-jack the case and try to make the hearings about something they made up, using even Allianz as a participant, making P-Appellants defend their case, while the lawyer could pick and choose what he would argue, to try to save himself and throw the case to Defendant, collusion of all the attorneys including P-Appellants attorney to further assure the fixing of the case, the involvement of a Lawyer-legislator, Justin Bamberg, to steer a Judge Heath P. Taylor, not of the 10th Cir., onto our case to continue to try to fix it, when Bamberg's interest was regarding Murdaugh, predetermined outcomes proven by thwith Fraud on the Court by the Court, and much more. All of this demands an investigation and De Novo Review, and this Court also being part of the Legal Machine

Criminal Enterprise in SC, (LMCE) is part of covering up the crimes of the Lower Court, for shared interest in preserving the LMCE, through show trials and show appeals in P-Appellants case and the Murdaugh case.

P-Appellants demand that this Court actually RULE on the ADA REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS IN THE ORDER WITHOUT VAUGE RESPONSES OR DECEIT, that P-Appellants ADA Reasonable Accommodations that comply with the ADA Statute, the C.F.R., THE SUPREME COURT MANDATE ON THEIR OWN CITE, AND THE CONSTITUTION IN AN ACTUAL ORDER, which has never been done nor clarifications made when demanded. These reasonable accommodations are similar to what the Courts freely gave Murdaugh's case, even when they ignored it and did something more, and without having disability issues at all.

To be clear, P-APPELLANT'S DEMAND FOR REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS ARE: **90 day BLOCK OF TIME, and 200 pages,** that may need revisiting as the dates get closer to assess the individual needs of P-Appellants to give a meaningful full presentation of the Appeal, with due process. First and foremost for the Courts MUST comply with the ADA to grant Reasonable Accommodations which P-Appellants have supplied early in this Appeal but have been stonewalled by deceit and misdirection of the Appeals Court, not acting neutrally. This is not an abuse of discretion but a Fraud on the Court by the Court to try to tuck the Courts true intent not to rule and not to give P-Appellants meaningful due process, time/pages necessary to receive due process, and try to create a scenario where the Court doesn't hear Fraud on the Court by the Court, by limiting time/pages, which review is mandatory and brings forth, a De Novo review that opens the door to all the FRAUD ON THE

COURT IN THE LOWER, APPEAL AND SUPREME COURT ACTS OF DECEDPTION, AND ALSO BRINGS TO LIGHT THE MURDAUGH SHOW TRIAL AND SHOW APPEAL, as P-APPELLANTS CASE IS A MURDAUGH-STYLE INSURANCE FRAUD/INSURANCE RESERVE FRAUD CASE THAT MIRRORS THE MURDAUGH CASE PLAYED OUT IN THE 10TH CIR. THAT TRULY SHOWS THE EXTENT OF CRIMINALTIY IN THE SC LMCE, AND THE EXTENT OF ITS PARTICIPANTS COVERED BY THE COURTS DECEPTIONS AND STONEWALLING TO HIDE IT.

The Court must stop the Disability Discrimination and the Elder Abuse and Exploitation it is instituted against P-Appellants to strategically and deceptively refuse providing P-Appellants Constitutional full Appeal presentation as a part of meaningful due process in this matter.

This entire situation would have been avoided had the Courts and its LMCE settled this case as should have been done based on the true facts and law, with so much support by eye-witnesses/D-Appellees, admitting in writing and on recordings, that they were the proxies used by the Court/Judges, Allianz, State Actors and others that were tasked to create catastrophic injuries or death, upon P-Appellants for IF/IRF purposes initiated by these Judges presiding over P-Appellants case in the 10th Cir., in this Murdaugh-style scheme the Public is yet to learn. P-Appellants case is referred to as Murdaugh 2.0 and is the reason Bamberg, the lawyer of many victims of Murdaugh, needed to get P-Appellants case dismissed by many means when he should have no interest in P-Appellants case, if not for what this case will reveal about Bamberg and his much larger contingent of LMCE members/networks, all involved in these Murdaugh schemes of the LMCE.

P-Appellants didn't know any of this when they eventually filed suit in the 10th Cir., but found out that the Trial Court Judges were actually presiding over their own guilt/liability, and needed this case buried quickly and completely, as testified to by some of their proxies, also even bringing in the State of Virginia Bar to assist. These are not P-Appellants words, but those of some D-Appellants in written admissions and on recorded interviews, before the Court shut all avenues to Discovery down for 3 plus years, and the Supremes assisted by refusing to allow Subpoenas, Subpoena Duces Tecums, or witnesses in the illegal Sua Sponte alleged evidentiary hearing which could not happen at that time, and could not be used to end a case. This Unconstitutional set of acts, that continued throughout the fixing of P-Appellants case to save the LMCE from being exposed as the Enterprise SC uses to steal P-Appellants and other people's awards, inheritances and other treasures for profit in the SC alleged legal system, criminal exploitation under color of law, and for other Unconstitutional Reasons See

P-Appellants are presenting per U.S Const. amend. I, and XIV and § 1; S.C. Const. Art. I, § 3; U.S. Const. amend. X ; Canon 3(B)(8); SCARC 221(c); ADA Title II: 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131-12165 (2024), 28 C.F.R. § 35.130, § 25.149, § 25.160, § 35.164, SC Administrative Order on ADA Accommodations, and Access to Justice for Individuals with Disabilities (May 3, 2012), ADA Accessibility Information, Administrative Directive (2011), S.C. Court Administration "Policy on Nondiscrimination and Reasonable Accommodations in Courts," S.C. Ct. Admin. (2013), The ADA Advocate letters to the Courts with several medical documented reports and pictures with more upon request; Elder law/Abuse/Exploitation, The Elder Justice Act (EJA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1397j-1397m05 (2024), Elder Abuse Prevention &

Prosecution Act, 34 U.S.C. §§ 21701-21711 (2024); SC Omnibus Adult Protection Act, S.C. Code Ann. §§ 43-35-5 to 95 (2024), Financial Exploitatin of Vulnerable Adults, S.C. Code Ann. 16-3-1050 (2024); S.C. App. Ct. R 501 Canon 1 Integrity & Independence of Judiciary, Canon 2 Avoid Impropriety and Appearance of Impropriety, Canon 3 (E)(1) Impartial performance of Duties and Mandatory Recusal ; S.C. Supreme Court Administrative Order (2014).

THE COURT MUST FINALLY GIVE A CLEAR RULING ON THE SPECIFIC ADA REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS DEMANDED (90/200), WHICH THROUGH TRICKERY AND DECEIT IT HAS NEVER DONE AS IT TRIES TO DISMISS THE CASE FOR A PREDETERMINED OUTCOME USING LIES AND KNOWN FALSEHOODS INSTEAD, TO GIFT THE LMCE ITS PREDETERMINED OUTCOME.

This means the court must actually rule specifically in writing regarding the ada reasonable accommodation demand, and provide open discussions at a later date, as to the individual needs of p-appellants and grant those needs specified by mandate, not by discretion.

The court must state in writing it is ruling on ada reasonable accommodations that p-appellants are actually spelling out to the court, (see record, and see Pg 1-16 for Unconstitutional Orders and a letter with P-Appellants demanding clarity of the Orders that are refusing to rule on the Motions attached and ringing up the charges, Pg 1-16, Pg 12 for clarification of vague Order. The Court has never addressed the ADA Reasonable Accommodations demand, and has used deception to not address, refusing t or rule

because it knows that page/time will allow p-appellants a better chance of receiving a full opportunity to present a full appeal via due process (with the additional demands to expand if needed), even after clarification requests were demanded and the court continues to refuse to rule.

THIS ORDER **MUST SAY THIS IS THE COURTS RULING ON THE ADA REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS** AND MUST GRANT THEM BY LAW AND OTHER EVIDENCE PROVIDED. AND IT MUST JUSTIFY ITS RULING IF NOT GRANTED, ON ALL THE LAWS, EVIDENCE, WRITTEN LETTERS FROM THE ADA ADVOCATE EDUCATING THE COURT, THE SUPREME COURT MANDATE ON ITS OWN SITE THAT TELLS THE COURTS THEY MUST COMPLY WITH ADA LAW AND MANDATING COURT COMPLIANCE, AND SO FORTH, WHERE DENIAL IS REFUSING TO LIBERALLY CONSTRUE THE ADA LAWS IN FAVOR OF THE P-APPELLANTS, AND DO NOT ALLOW FOR DISCRETION IN THIS MATTER, THUS REFUSING TO FOLLOW THESE LAWS AND MANDATES DO NOT CONSTITUTE AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION BUT MORE RACKETEERING AND FRAUD ON THE COURT BY THE COURT TO SAVE THE LMCE AND ITS PROFIT BASE, WHICH IS A CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE.

MOTION AND OBJECTION: P-Appellants are ADA Qualifying litigants (See Motions that thoroughly and repeatedly explain the entire ADA law as applied to the Courts under Title II and its arguments.

The Motions P-Appellants made regarding the ADA 90 days time/200 page extension are clear from the Motions, but the Orders in response are purposely vague, even when clarity is DEMANDED See Ex. Pg 12, because the Courts do not want to rule on the ADA

Reasonable Accommodations, where they know they MUST grant P-APPELLANTS DEMAND FOR REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS THAT ADDRESS THEIR INDIVIDUAL NEEDS, by law and by Supreme Court Mandate on their own website and by ADA Advocate instructing the Court as a part of her job.

Further, the Court MUST grant what is actually being demanded, and not use P-Appellants illustration of a standing order that P-Appellants used to show the absurdity of the Order received by the Court that used vague language to refuse to rule on the ADA issues, ignoring the ADA/Reasonable Accommodations Demand where the Court instead is using that illustration anyway to try to say that P-Appellants are not being reasonable, when that is not the demand that P-Appellants demanded, but to illustrate the Courts own unreasonableness in their vague nonsensical ruling in response to the P-Appellants actual ADA demands (90/200), which partial quote by the Court, is P-Appellants illustration of the absurdity of the vague Court Order. This purposeful misuse of the actual statements of P-Appellants ADA Reasonable Accommodation of 90/200, is done in bad faith as more Fraud on the Court by the Court to avoid ruling on the ADA/Reasonable Accommodations Demand that must be granted. This is more clear evidence that this process is rigged from the top down, and the LMCE is protecting itself and its own profits, not litigants.

TO BE VERY CLEAR TO THE COURT AGAIN, the real accommodations Demanded are for blocks of time (90 Days) and blocks of pages (200), with the understanding that these may have to be revisited later, but are a good start to assist P-Appellants budget time with work they can do even with the Disabiilties that the Court caused and exacerbated to weaken and punish two elderly cancer survivors, through physical punishment and

deprivation of sleep that amounts to torture and the Disabilities listed, See well documented record. P-Appellants are demanding these blocks to help them overcome these individual needs, due to ADA Disability, and this may be enough to complete the task.

To be clear, the tasks can be done, and done well, but the accommodations are necessary because of the disabilities the lower court purposely and intentionally created by its abuses of two Elderly women as Exploitation and Abuse, with malice causing P-Appellants Disabilities, stated elsewhere (See well developed record), can be overcome.

The LMCE Courts cannot again force a predetermined outcome in yet another circumstance, which this Appeals Court is attempting through ignoring the law that states they must grant the Reasonable Accommodations Demanded, and they cannot refuse to rule on the ADA/Reasonable Accommodations specifically, or make up lies about what is the Reasonable Accommodation requested, or intentionally hide they are not ruling on the ADA/Reasonable Accommodations at all, or use the wrong rules to enforce illegal opinions even if it was the right rule, where the exception would then apply however, rules do not trump the Constitution or Statutes like the ADA and Elder Abuse/Exploitation either.

The Court cannot purposely use the wrong Rule, in this case, the Court cites Rule 221(c), that does not even apply to the Appeals Court or P-Appellants. But, even then, the Rule gives and exception and when P-Appellants are facing dismissal, then the case can be Reconsidered anyway.

Reconsideration Claims by the Court: **The Court uses the strategy they often use to avoid following the law, and that is the misuse of Reconsideration Claims by the Court and the Court just making up laws and rules as they go along regardless of the real law and rule:** (See Jason Boyle case that permits Judges to unlawfully imprison bystanders without a jury trial first, and without a case number, without a lawyer, and using Double jeopardy in order to hide the LMCE theft of an inheritance with the same RACKETEERS Judge Mcintosh, Maddox and Sprouse orchestrating the extreme illegality of protecting Court theft in the LMCE): The Court claimed, the non-law, non-rule "Extraodinary Circumstances" standard in the September 30, 2025 two sentence Order, and when that was challenged it went to the SCACR **Rule 221(c),** that "the appellate court will not entertain a petition for "rehearing on a motion or petition" **unless the action of the court on the motion or petition has the effect of dismissing or finally deciding** the party's appeal" when this is not even a rule to be used in Appeals Court cases, and even still supports P-Appellants demand for ADA REASONAL ACCOMMODATIONS REQUESTED WHICH ARE 90 DAYS AND 200 PAGES.

Although this rule being used by the Court is Unconstitutional on many grounds, including it is the wrong rule that applies to Trial Courts, not appeals courts or litigants of Appeals Courts, some arguments provided herein, the Court, **without ever ruling on the ADA Reasonable Accommodations through purposeful Vaguness that they refused to clear up in spite of P-Appellants demand to do so (See August 26, 2025 Court record entry**, (Ex. Pg 5-6), the Court also had strongly implied in its September 30, 2025 Order, Ex Pg 3-4), with a two sentence "opinion" that gave defense no time to respond, that it was

going to dismiss P-Appellants case in 30 days unless there were **Extraordinary Circumstances** raised to stop it on September 30, 2025, without any rule quoted. The Court was making up a law/rule on the fly and protecting Defense who without legal communication knew it did not have to wait for a reply from Defense. The Court is prosecuting its own case, like the Trial Court did.

ADA Disabilities do not have to be considered "Extraordinary" by the Court to be ADA disabilities that require reasonable accommodations, however, not being able to see or type, having seizures due the present conditions of overworking and depriving elderly P-Appellants of anything close to normal sleep, with all-nighters having to be strung in a row to try to comply with the Orders that are intentionally and maliciously inhuman and exploit abuse the elderly and disabled, to begin with, this means the Court's are attempting to permit its own discretion to override mandatory Statutes and the Constitution, so it can predetermine the outcome through creating impossibilities against P-Appellants. Please add that P-Appellants have suffered compression fractures from having to repeatedly and quickly transfer 20,000 pages of boxed documents and binders to meeting these ridiculous deadlines that defy logic unless one sees the intent of the Court to predetermine the outcome by any means, including making up laws/rules, using the wrong law, trying to change the narratives with fake claims or what P-Appellants are demanding as reasonable accommodations and so forth as described above.

The Court threat that the case would be dismissed if not for extraordinary circumstances means the case would not be continued otherwise, which means no disabilities for reasonable accommodations would EVER be addressed or EVER considered

as Extraordinary, which does not Constitute the ADA laws/Constitutional law or constitute the meaning of a "REHEARING: if it is never heard.

Under the ADA mandatory court compliance laws, Title II, **ADA Disabilities have to be heard and ruled upon without vague or other discretionary rulings and are NOT under a fake "Extraordinary Circumstances" standard.** The Courts making up their own law on the fly that they pretend overrides the Constitution and Statue, is a Constitutional violation of due process and equal protection on its face as it breaks the mandatory ADA compliance laws as indicated above and below ON ITS FACE! ADA compliance is not discretionary and does not invite a state court to rewrite it for its own financial gain and other self-interests to protect the LMCE in SC. The ADA laws must be liberally construed for the P-Appellants. This becomes a Constitutional Question and is not analyzed legally as a mere abuse of discretion. There is no Discretion in the ADA Statute permitted, and the law must be liberally construed for P-Appellants.

Further, there is no rehearing when there is no hearing. The **"Re"** prefix means something already happened and is happening again. No ruling on the ADA Reasonable Accommodation was ever made by the Courts deceptively making vague rulings and other trickery to mislead P-Appellants, overwork P-Appellants on issues where P-Appellants are clearly follow the law, and are intended to predetermine the outcome for its LMCE. . .the same strategies used in the lower court that this court is supposed to review De Novo. This is not a new trick of deceptive Courts/Judges trying to get a predetermined outcome and bury a troubling case.

P-Appellants even requested an ADA Advocate to review and write her second letter for ADA compliance by the SC courts. . .one in the underlying case, and one recently in this alleged appeal, incorporated by reference in the record in its motions, because of the Courts insistence that Disabilities would not be considered as extraordinary, since Disabilities have been presented already to an intentional refusal to follow the law in order to get a predetermined outcome.

In the December 3, 2025 Order (Ex Pg 1-2), the Courts realized that their prior Order, making up new standards that they could not do, cannot withstand any kind of real review on its face, so wrote an actual opinion this time, that had to take a partial sentence out of context to try to make it look like it is ruling on the ADA and it is ruling on a "RE" hearing aso, without ever saying so, and is instead using an illustration that P-Appellants made and meant as an absurd illustration against the Courts refusal to address the ADA Reasonable Accommodation Demands by law, that the Court must grant.

With this Courts twisting of the rule that does not apply to Appeals, the SC Rule 221(c) was preached by the Court, which is a rule that applies to Trial Courts, not Appeals Courts, thus the opinion is not supported by Constitutional law, State and Federal Statutes, the Supreme Court mandate that all SC Courts must comply with the ADA, risking losing their federal funding, or the rules of Court they created that would not trump the ADA Statute or Constitutional Fraud on the Court by denying due process and access to the court and so forth. This is becoming more of a Constitutional Crisis than just a mere Constitutional issue. Either way, Abuse of Discretion does not apply in these matters as already stated in the ADA Motions section of the record.

This Court makes fraudulent reasoning, intentional misapplications of laws/rules, and misstating laws/rules and facts, in their need to get the predetermined outcome that saves their financial cash cow and shuts down the LMCE exposure P-Appellants are bringing as a reason this case, and the Murdugh case were staged trails and appeals as opposites, where P-Appellants are the victims of the LMCE and Murdaugh is the LMCE, played by the 10th Cir/State Actors and Allianz and their agents. All this was discovered by P-Appellants because greedy LMCE members didn't want to pay what was owed to P-Appellants before P-Appellants learned of all this other illegal action determining their case so ridiculously and obviously, with some as eye witnesses quoting they were the proxies used by the State to catastrophically injure or kill P-Appellant whistleblowers against the LMCE to initiate the IF/IRF scam with Allianz mimicking the Murdaugh frauds the public does not Yet know about.

Disabilities under the ADA will never stop being disabilities without medical intervention if at all. This was explained as a part of the out of context quote the Court is using on standing orders, to deceive the readers and hearers with a hi-jack attempt by the Appeals Court. And Courts cannot consider how surgeries may help. The reading of the law is to be construed liberally for the Disabled. P-Appellants have many, but mostly report the Disabilities the Court itself intentionally created and continued to exacerbate, which the Appeals Court now **WEAPONIZES** for its attempted final nail in the coffin no matter how illegal it is to do so.

The P-Appellants supplied just some of the many medical reports supporting the ADA Disabilities and no objections were made. The Court is saying that ADA disabilities P-Appellants described in motions that need to be specifically ruled upon by the Court with clear opinions that say they accept or deny them and grant or deny the Reasonable Accommodations without taking individual needs into account, give P-Appellants more reason to call this process a LMCE. The latter rulings gives P-Appellants immediate right to have the Appeals Court overruled, and start the Fraud of the Court by the Court investigations from **outsiders**, including those who review the actions of CARRIERS as all of these illegal actions are also shedding light on Allianz frauds/participations beyond P-Appellants complaints to SIU at Alianz, that they have already been reported to Allianz and are now going to be reporting in English and German and other languages as a part of this RACKETEERING that continues now.

P-Appellants clearly qualify under the ADA but the Courts will not rule which ruling is a "gimmie." The Court uses the tricks described NOT to rule but hide they didn't rule, because they MUST grant the real demand of 90 days/200 pages otherwise.

Further, with the new and attempt to improve their vague nonOrder on ADA Accommodations demanded since early in the case, the December 3, 2025, P-Appellants inability to meet that requirement of 30 days to submit without blocks of time/pages demanded, knowing and stating their physical limitations clearly with proof, that requires the very least restriction reasonable accommodations possible to request for page blocks and greater page limits demanded, it is clear the Court is doing all it an NOT TO RULE but pretend and disguise that it did rule on these specifical 90/200 demands by all tricks

possible. Due to the Judges intentionally causing the injuries themselves (see your own videos in the Courthouse that P-Appellants demanded be preserved), and these Appeals Judges and the Supremes before them are continuing exacerbate them to weaponize these Judicial intentional and malicious disabilities and exacerbations of same against P-Appellants for their own financial and vengeful interests and to hide their LMCE, that they intend to use to lead to P-Appellants dismissal/judgment in this long awaited predetermined outcome, this is the exact reason why the Rule 221(c), SCACR, exception exists, and that it clearly applies, if the rule is going to be wrongfully used on purpose, and P-Appellants object to its usage. In addition to all the other reasons this Order of December 3, 2025, is not in any way proper, is intentionally fraudulent and , is Unconstitutional and is thus repugnant and void. Either way, the wrong rule or any rule, or made up standard does not trump the Constitution nor the ADA Statue.

Unless Disabilities are corrected by medical intervention or other measure, if possible, Disabilities do not change for the better with time. These are disabilities all the time, per ADA, and can get worse if exacerbated, and unless a surgery or other fix is available they will stay as is or get worse. Those fixes, however, like surgery, cannot be a part of any finding by the Court to make a decision on disability qualifications under the ADA, but P-Appellants merely describe the difference between Disabilities and injuries that may heal with time.

No matter what this court tries to manipulate to get its predetermined outcome, the Disability must be honored and the reasonable accommodations must be granted under the Courts own cited rule, Rule 221(c), SCACR, intentionally incorrectly applied by ignoring

its exception: ". . . **unless the action of the court on the motion or petition has the effect of dismissing or finally deciding** the party's appeal" And obviously the rule itself doesn't even apply to Appeals, but if it did, the Rule supports P-Appellants not the court. The Order regarding no continuances but for Extraordinary Circumstances, and the December 3 Order that says provide the appeal or get dismissed, has at the very least "in effect" doomed P-Appellants unlawfully and Unconstitutionally, because a default on the 30 days they cannot meet without the accommodations demanded, are not given in this latest Court rewrite of the ADA Statute. In effect they will be dismissed as predetermined outcome is the Courts goal, showing they are extremely bias and need to take self-action to recuse from the case, or properly act in all ways, where P-Appellants are giving the Court every opportunity to not go down with the rest of the RACKETEERS who will be criminally charged, and not necessarily by the State to further shame SC LMCE, coming into view for the public even without P-Appellants case, but even more so with it.

The Laws are Clear Federally and in SC: The Federal and South Carolina Law and Rules are substantively identical:

Motions must be decided: A court has no discretion to refuse to rule on the motion.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b)(1): A request for a court order must be made by motion." Once made, the court must rule. There is no rule permitting silence or indefinite delay, nor to speed up the process to not allow P-Appellants to have time to further protect their case from Fraud on the Court. .

Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a)(1): Requires the court to find facts and state conclusions of law on matters tried or decided, and not two sentence rushed opinions not based on anything but refusing to rule on the ADA Disabilities.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b): Requires adjudication of claims and issues—not selective avoidance, like the ADA and Fraud on the Court Claims.

In South Carolina: Rule 7(b)(1), SCRCP – identical to federal rule,

Rule 52(a), SCRCP – court must make findings and conclusions, including on ADA rulings,

Rule 6(d), SCRCP – motions are set for hearing and determination and cannot be bypassed.

A judge cannot accept a filing and then refuse to act. Doing so denies access to the court. This not only goes for all the motions in the underlying case that were never permitted to be heard, but in the Supreme ruling that only a RACKETEERING Judges could allow for a filing made, to be put into the record, the collusion and RACKETEERING claims and P-Appellants new suit, the Motion for Consolidation, Motion for Supplementing the complaint, and the Appeals ignoring and twisting the ADA Reasonable Accommodations and then twisting and taking out of context what P-Appellants demanded by using an aburd example that was meant to be absurd to show the Court's reasonable and refusal to rule was absurd.

JUDICIAL ETHICS (MANDATORY, NOT ASPIRATIONAL), South Carolina Code of Judicial Conduct: Canon 3(A)(5): "A judge shall dispose of all judicial matters **promptly**, efficiently, and fairly, " which means they have to read it and give it thought and research

and not prosecute for the Defense or blanketly deny without the opinion or clarity, like not ruling on the ADA claims and pretending the court did with a false and twisting of what P-Appellants actually listed as Reasonable Accommodations, that are given to Murdaugh and the AG who have no disabilities.

Failure to rule = **ethical violation**, and Fraud on the Court as the Appeals and Supremes are further engaging in RACKETEERING with the Trail Court. This is not discretion

Further, CONSTITUTIONAL LAW is where ignoring motions becomes reversible.

Objection are to all of the findings by the Court, that P-Appellants must address on these fraudulent Orders including, but not limited to the ADA failure to rule and deceive. In regard to the Deadline of 30 days from December 3, 2025 because the ADA Ruling has never been made and is now being partially/taken out of context and still not made. Due Process Clause – 14th Amendment: A litigant has a **property and liberty interest in access to courts and adjudication. Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co., 455 U.S. 422, (1982).** "The State **may not terminate a claim** through procedural inaction or refusal to adjudicate." This goes for Appeals courts attempted dismissals and not ruling on the ADA mandatory claims they must grant when they tell the truth about what P-Appellants have demanding and not use absurd examples given. Further, **Silence = deprivation.**

Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67 (1972), Due process requires "**the opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner.**" A motion never ruled on is **no hearing at all**.

Armstrong v. Manzo, 380 U.S. 545 (1965). A hearing that occurs **after the decision is effectively made** is unconstitutional. "Partial hearings" that dodge dispositive issues violate due process.

JUDGES MAY NOT AVOID RULING TO SHIELD THEMSELVES.

All of the above are a part of P-Appellants Recusal. In re Murchison, 349 U.S. 133 (1955), "No man can be a judge in his own case."

When a motion **implicates the judge's own conduct, bias, or jurisdiction,** failure to rule is **self-interested adjudication**. This goes for Appeals and Supreme Judges and those in the Trail Court.

Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927), A judge violates due process when acting under **institutional or personal incentive**.

Avoiding a ruling to prevent review is an impermissible interest. These motions force review. The Court refusing to address them is more of their manipulative fraud.

DUTY TO RULE — APPELLATE & MANDAMUS AUTHORITY: Ex parte United States, 287 U.S. 241 (1932). Courts have a **duty to exercise jurisdiction once it is invoked**. Refusal to rule = **refusal to exercise jurisdiction**.

Will v. Calvert Fire Ins. Co., 437 U.S. 655 (1978), Mandamus is appropriate where a judge **refuses to proceed or rule**.

Dietz v. Bouldin, 579 U.S. 40 (2016), Judicial discretion **cannot be used to contradict procedural rules or due process**.

SOUTH CAROLINA–SPECIFIC AUTHORITY: Jean Hoefer Toal, C.J., State v. Needs, 333 S.C. 134 (1998), South Carolina courts must: "Follow the law as written, not as preferred." This means that the court cannot determine the law based on what the litigant is going to do about it if they don't. Ignoring motions = **lawlessness**, not discretion.

S.C. Const. art. I, § 9: Guarantees **open courts** and remedy by due course of law. A court that does not rule is **not open.**

WHAT IS *NOT* PERMITTED (CLEARLY)

A judge **may NOT**: Ignore motions, **Delay rulings indefinitely like the ADA Reasonable Accommodations of this and the lower courts, and all the motions Judge Mcintosh and his RACKETEERING colleagues intentionally ignored that the Trial Scheduling Clerk would not schedule some ignored for years and then the Courts try to do a speedy evidentiary hearing, further abusing the elderly and further harming their ADA disabilities without reasonable accommodations, on why the motions paid for were not frivolous without even stating what was frivolous about them they needed to address all in 20 pages with exhibits on over 162 issues/documents and 10 days, while taking P-Appellants jury away, after ignoring them and not ruling on them for all that time.** Further, this is like this Court not hearing the fraud on the court issues and intentionally keeping the page minimums so P-Appellants cannot raise them. Hear only "safe" issues, Decide tangential matters while avoiding dispositive motions, Refuse to rule

on jurisdiction, disqualification, or constitutional motions, Use silence to prevent appellate review, like this and the underlying courts.

Each is: a **Due process violation**; an **Abuse of discretion; Structural error; Grounds for mandamus and reversal; It goes beyond an abuse of discretion when there is fraud on the Court especially by the Court, when it involves RACKETEERING and other Frauds by the Judges and their agents.**

A judge has a mandatory duty under the Rules of Civil Procedure, the Code of Judicial Conduct, and the Due Process Clause to ***timely hear and rule on all motions;*** *refusal, delay, or partial adjudication constitutes a denial of access to courts, an abuse of discretion, and structural constitutional error. When Fraud on the Court is involved by the Court, the standard is no longer error, but intentional acts to commit criminal Rico Crimes and the investigation and review will be criminal not civil, by those outside the SC LMCE, as they are being contacted in different language translations to be very clear to them that the SC Courts have created a LMCE and are exploiting and stealing public awards, inheritances and other property of the public under color of law that involves various insurance carries and others being identified.*

As to the Government refusing to allow filings against itself including but not limited to a suit against the government for RACKETEERING and so forth, and filing motions to protect their underlying case from illegal dismissal based on Fraud and a Sua Sponte Action not permitted by law. Ignoring the ADA Motions, equals denying access to the Courts.

Objecting to any narrowing or limits on filing against the Government through Judicial Pretext in these Orders to protect the LMCE. Very Rarely and under very limited, narrow circumstances can government deny litigations from filing suits and motions against government, consistent with the Constitution. Any narrowing or limits are Unconstitutional.

A core constitutional principle and fundamental right that belongs to the People, is access to courts.

Government **may not deny a litigant the right to file suit against the government** as a general matter, and P-Appellants argue they never can do so as a corrupted government will use this limitation on fundamental rights to stop its exposure, and allow it to be a LMCE without challenge.

U.S. Supreme Court: First Amendment displays there is a fundamental right "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." **Due Process Clause** (5th & 14th Amendments) *guarantees* a **meaningful opportunity to be heard. Equal Protection Clause** – bars discriminatory or arbitrary denial of court access to include ADA Disabilties caused by the Judges and their Elder Abuse and Exploitation that has caused permanent injury and less than normal abilities that need reasonable accommodations that the Court will not rule upon.

"The right of access to the courts is one of the fundamental rights protected by the Constitution." **Bounds v. Smith**, 430 U.S. 817, 821 (1977). Government may not erect

barriers that "**impede access to the courts.**" **Boddie v. Connecticut,** 401 U.S. 371, 379 (1971).

Sovereign immunity ≠ denial of filing. P-Appellants can file as their right and only a hearing after notice for meaningful due process can decide and P-Appellants can appeal or use other rights outlined in their books that are legal and nonviolent ways to demand justice through orchestrated exposure of the Frauds on the Court. Court paper rulings must comply with all laws cited, and they must be real laws, and not made up laws or twisting of irrelevant or laws/rules that do not even apply to avoid ruling according to the laws that trump rules.

Sovereign immunity does NOT authorize the government to prevent the filing of a complaint, motions that expose it, and motions that destroy its attempts to hi-jack the case into something appearing to be different than the actual case at hand, all to predetermine the outcome.

For all the ADA laws, rules and Motions and objections that were ignored by the Court in defiance of their duties to follow the law and answer all motions completely, please see herein and in all the record where P-Appellants have repeatedly demanded these reasonable accommodations 90/200 and there has been no ruling on that even now. See Appeal Record as it is full of these motion regarding ADA Accommodations and unresponsive Orders never ruling on Reasonable Accommodations. Repeating is Cumulative and unnecessary for the point to be made, documented thoroughly by the Courts own deceptions.

These Court Deceptions have repeatedly made P-Appellants continually ask for 30 day extensions and pages, that do not address their individual needs per ADA Statue, but it is the best P-Appellants can do when Courts are not going to follow the law for other agenda purpose. These bad acts by the Court have purposely cost Elderly women $50 each time, intentionally further exploiting and abusing P-Appellants and using their finite time, finite usage of disabled body parts, taking them away from the Appeal, and all is intended to wear out elderly woman with ADA Disabilities to get a predetermined outcome as part of this latest set of Fraud on the Court by the Court scam being addressed herein.

Plaintiffs–Appellants are not incapable of providing their well thought out Appeal with proper record, as their ADA Advocate has also stressed, with letters incorporated by reference from within this Court Record and already submitted; but the Court is continuing to obstruct justice, instead, and P-Appellants are being systematically blocked from receiving their REAL ADA REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION REQUEST THEY DEMANDED, WITH THE COURTS TWISTING AN ALTERNATIVE REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION P-Appellants gave the Court in response to the Court's denial and insistence that they have to reapply every 30 days with no extension of pages, that showed the absurdity of the Courts Ruling. This "Standing Order" illustration WAS MEANT TO BE ABSURD TO EXPRESS THAT THE Court's ignoring P-Appellants least restrictive opinion of REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION IS LEGALLY MANDATORY TO GIVE AND IS REASONABLE and the Courts Order saying otherwise, is not.

Further, in all these Motions including December 3, 2025 Order stating give Appeal in 30 days or default, is still defiant of the ADA TITLE II Mandate given by the Federal and

state Law with the Supreme Court Guidelines warning the Courts they MUST follow these laws. But in the Opinions, the Court is using other tricks beside partial quotes giving the statement a different meaning out of context, AND EVEN MORE, REFUSING TO ACTUALLY RULE ON THE ADA REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS BUT JUST GIVES A GENERAL RULING THAT DOES NOT ADDRESS THE ORDER WHICH IS NOT PERMISSIBLE AND IS JUST WASTING P-APPELLANTS FINITE TIME AND FINITE ENERGY ON SUCH NONSENSE AS A PART OF FURTHER ABUSING THE DISABLED AND ELDERLY AND EXPLOITING THE ELDERLY ALSO AS BOTH P-APPELLANTS ARE OVER 60 YEARS OLD.

PLAINTIFFS WROTE THE COURT REGARDING OBJECTIONS, ON AUGUST 25, 2025, WHILE GOING THROUGH A HEALTH EMERGENCY, AND DEMANDED CLARITY OF THE ORDER WHICH WAS VAGUE Ex Pg 12). THE COURT HAS CONTINUED TO REFUSE TO RULE OR TO CLARIFY EVEN IN SUBSEQUENT ORDERS, WHERE THE ORDERS CONTINUE TO BE VAGUE BECAUSE TO CORRECT THAT THE COURT WOULD HAVE TO ACTUALLY RULE ON THE ADA REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS THAT ARE DEMANDED IN THESE MOTIONS, WHICH THE COURT IS TRYING TO HIDE FROM AND NOT RULE BECAUSE THE LAW IS NOT DISCRETIONARY. THE COURT MUST RULE ON THE REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS AND THEY MUST BE GRANTED BY LAW AND THE SUPREME COURT'S OWN INTERNET FILINGS ALREADY SUPPLIED TO YOU, THAT THE ADA ADVOCATE ALSO SUPPLIED TO YOU AND INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

The Courts, continue to FRUSTRATE THE INTENTIONS OF P-APPELLANTS TO BRING FORTH A FULL AND ACCURATE PRESENATION OF THEIR APPEAL, WHICH IS THEIR RIGHT WITH REASONABLE DUE PROCESS AND THROUGH REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS SO

THEY CAN PARTICIPATE IN THEIR CASE. These Judicial Frauds are meant to predetermine this case for RACKETEERING Defense/lower level RACKETEERING JUDGES, STATE ACTORS AND ALLIANZ, and to save the SC LMCE that is ready to be exposed because the greed of the lower courts. This predetermination is being manipulated by the Appeals Court also using P-Appellants Disabilities they received by the lower Court intentionally and maliciously, and exacerbated by them and these upper Courts, to further weaken the targets, punish the P-Appellants for not giving up on their meritorious claims, and so Defense and other RACKETEERS can win the case for their fellow LMCE Trial Court RACKETEERS, for profit to all RACKETEERS involved and covering up their SC LMCE, while further exploiting P-Appellants Elderly status and perpetration of exploitation, injuries and further abuse.

These Disabilities were not present before P-Appellants had to deal with the RACKETEERS in the Courtroom, that maliciously and intentionally caused and exacerbated to weaken the target and for vengeances against P-Appellant Whistleblowers against the corruption in the legal system. This eventually led to a cover up of the entire LMCE, that P-Appellants realized was a Murdaugh 2.0 case, structured after the Murdaugh scams, but without all the limitations the LMCE produced in order to create the made for TV lies, to hide the true story of the Murdaugh Fraud case and all the criminals and full scope of those crimes which are systemic in SC LMCE.

Such conduct constitutes elder abuse and exploitation, ADA discrimination and denial of rights required to be followed by law, and the fraud on the court by the courts themselves which has led to full court corruption through continued Racketeering under

state and federal law by the Judges and the SC LMCE that all SC courts belong to, that then involve this case Murdaugh 2.0 case, but also the Murdaugh fraud cases which also leads to the Murdaugh Murders as the fraud cases/Beach timing, was the Conspiracy Theory the State used to claim the motive for the Murdaugh Murders, which obviously this all falls apart with P-Appellants illustration of what really happened in those fraud cases, with their own case, Murdaugh 2.0.

Elder Abuse and Exploitation: The P-Appellants also warn the Courts of perpetrating Elder Abuse and Exploitation against two older P-Appellants (76 in a month, and 67 in three ½ months), in this predetermination Fraud on the Court by the Court citing Elder law/Abuse/Exploitation, The Elder Justice Act (EJA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1397j-1397m05 (2024), Elder Abuse Prevention & Prosecution Act, 34 U.S.C. §§ 21701-21711 (2024); SC Omnibus Adult Protection Act, S.C. Code Ann. §§ 43-35-5 to 95 (2024), Financial Exploitatin of Vulnerable Adults, S.C. Code Ann. 16-3-1050 (2024) and other pertinent laws and the Constitution sections cited in the ADA section of past Motions. The combination of ADA/Elder Abuse and Exploitation and Unconstitutional acts are a very harmful combination of RACKETEERING Courts.

Clarity by P-Appellants is not an issue, Clarity by the Court is: The P-Appellants have made it more than very clear what the issues are that they have brought and demanding a clear ruling dictated by the LAW, and that they can perform the required duties of Appealing their predetermined trial court frauds, the brief and other requirements, but need the reasonable blocks of time and proper number of pages, 90/200, and cannot perform up to par without the reasonable accommodations, which is

why the ADA law exists for due process and equal protection reasons and the ADA letter from the Advocate who is available to help the Court comply with the ADA mandates, says likewise and the SC Supreme Court agrees with their posting of the Guidelines and helpful tips for Courts to make sure they comply so SC can get their federal funds. . .it relies on more than a web post illusion of compliance by the Supremes. . .there must be REAL compliance with the ADA and that begins with the Court specifically ruling on the ADA Demand for 90 day block of time/200 pages extensions that are the least restrictive of all P-Appellants could demand.

THIS COURT has to follow the Constitution and ADA Statues and so forth, via their own documentation on their own website supplied in a past motion for THIS COURT's convenience so that there can be NO MISUNDERSTANDING but only Fraud on the Court for ignoring this Constitution/Statute that protects P-Appellants alleged Constitutional Rights.

So to be very clear, all the tricks of the Court need to stop as it is trying to disguise its real motive for intentionally not ruling on the ADA Motion for Reasonable accommodations of 90 days block time/200 pages, with the revisiting of this if necessary based on P-Appellants individual needs per the Statute (Motions incorporated by reference). The Courts Order must grant these reasonable accommodations in writing, or deny them SPECIFICALLY WITH REASONS WHY, THAT CAN BE APPEALED ON A FRAUD ON THE COURT BY THE COURT BASIS, INVOLVING THE CONSTITUTION, STATUTE SPECIFIC LANGUAGE, AND THE RACKETEERING CONTINUATION OF THE TRIAL COURT, WHERE NONE OF YOU HAVE IMMUNITY.

The court must clearly write the opinion, and stop making up rules and misapplying other rules that even if they were true, which they are not, do not even trump the Constitution or ADA statute anyway.

The Court needs to stop trying to wear out P-Appellants, continuing making P-Appellants deal with Court frauds rather than focusing on their Appeal, and stop the predetermination of this case to save itself, RACKETEER profits, and the LMCE operation that is clearly in play here.

Where ignoring the ADA, never ruling on it, changing the narrative on what P-Appellants are demanding by misusing a partial sentence to hi-jack P-Appellants real demands, using false authority like Rule 221(c) that doesn't even apply to Appeals Courts, and still supports P-Appellants Reasonable Accommodation arguments, through its exception, making up laws like Extraordinary Circumstances are required without even reading 37 pages of law and two exhibits before writing this two sentence Order, and not evn waiting for Defense to respond because ex parte communications is allowing the Court to prosecute the case for a predetermined outcome, and not using inherent power even if there was a reconsideration when there was no hearing so their can be no Rehearing, and the Court trying to sell the Unconstitutional idea that a court rule even if applied properly, it somehow trumps the Constitution and federal and state Statutes on the ADA, and the Supreme Courts own rule that mandates ADA compliance anyway, the Court just needs to stop the Fraud on the Court by the Court.

The best thing it can do is enter the Judgments the P-Appellants already won

that the lower court would not hear or allow to be heard until Bamberg sent in a rining to try to end the case. . .who is now slapping the wrist of Becky HIERS Hill for providing her kin, Murdaugh, appealable issues and most likely will receive at some point, the Palmetto Award, like Manning, Murdaugh, III, McMasters, Varns, and so many others that are a part of the LMCE. Additionally instruct the State they need to settle for all they have done to us, and make us fully whole, and correct its conduct against the people of SC so they are not cash cows for the LMCE. That is the best P-Appellants can do to rectify what has happened without continuing to expose this, if not corrected to include public protections against this LMCE to include Justice for the REAL victims of Murdauth who P-Appellants do not represent, but can't help but to see the further exploitation of those who suffered and continue to suffer from the injustices this LMCE hid and protected and continue to hide and protect for illegal profit and Unconstitutional control.

Under its inherent powers and all other laws and rules cited, the judiciary has both the power and the duty to remedy these violations and to ensure that older and disabled litigants receive the full measure of due process guaranteed by the Constitution by RULING on the ADA REAL REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION WITH NO OTHER TRICKERY AND BY STOPPING ALL ABUSE AND EXPLOITATION.

Further, this Court MUST have neutral investigations, not a part of the LMCE/Murdaugh case, investigation the frauds on the court by the court and enter Judgement for P-Appellants on the many Default Judgments in the lower case and Motion for Judgement on the Pleadings, both filed in the Trail Court that were delayed and then

finally heard in a limited basis by a Judge Taylor (now conveniently Becky HIERS Hill's wrist slapping lawyer after she gave Murdaugh appealable issues now being heard), where RACKETEER Taylor was steered to the Case by Justin Bamberg, a Plaintiffs alleged lawyer for the victims of Murdaugh, and obviously not seriously ruled upon, as his role was to further fix the case, in spite of the evidence and laws.

WHEREFORE, the Courts MUST grant by law, the ADA REAL REQUESTS and cease and desist from any further Elder Abuse and Exploitation against P-Appellants that is including but not limited to, P-Appellants having to constantly spend more finite time and finite energy on purposely VAGUE and Twisted Orders given by this Court, that are breaking the law on their face as the ADA Disabled and Elderly cannot just meet standards that are already identified that they need Accommodations for, and the Court being vague to try to hide that they are not hearing the ADA Motions, and are trying to limit time/days for purposes of predetermining an outcome for their fellow RACKETEERS, while never trying to give P-Appellants a meaningful Appeal Presentation and De NOVO Review against meaningful Due Process which includes this reasonable time and manner defined by the ADA and not some Judge made up rule and even using the wrong rule.

Let's stop the show trial and show appeal because P-Appellants are using it as reasons to strike and vacate this trail/appeal Orders and as teaching tools for the public to become more aware of how the LMCE fakes justice through these fraudulent methods. Further, the Court MUST INVESTIGATE and even better, during that good faith Investigation, Enter Judgments against Defense, have called a non-LMCE jury for their rulings on the portions of the case where figures were not able to be calculated and enter those that are

calculated, rule on uncapped damages not monetarily listed in the amended complaint and uncapped punitive damages, and then the Investigators can turn in all RACKETEERS to be severely dealt with by the State under the watch of P-Appellants to make sure there are no more Becky HIERS Hill shenanigans to help LMCE members get off lightly or fully. These must be accomplished through anyone who is neutral, outside the SC LMCE, and then give P-Appellants their negotiations with the State to settle all the State has done to P-Appellants, and make them fully whole, and give assurances to **leave P-Appellants alone**, with these assurances.

12/18/25

12/18/25

P.O. Box 433, Townville, SC, 29689, sosofunny1959@gmail.com, 954 279 3785.

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink, Appellants,

v.

Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Campers and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Management, a/k/a Chris Vellanti, a/k/a Christopher Vellanti; Christopher Vellanti, as a Member and Personally; Yvonne Goldman, as a General Manager and Personally; Frank Pellegrini; Fritzie Maroto; Jennifer Burdette; Marsha Stamm; Allen Riha; Ray Grenier; Grant Ferrendelli; and Charles Carpenter, Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2025-000859

ORDER

On October 27, 2025, Appellants filed a motion titled "Motion for Individualized Accommodations Per Extraordinary Circumstance and Otherwise, and Other Applicable Laws to Comply with Plaintiffs'-Appellants' Rights to Meaningful Due Process and Equal Protection, and to Protect Their Rights to a Full Presentation of the Appeal, With Stay While Reviewing and Finding in Our Favor." No return was filed.

After careful consideration, the court rules as follows: To the extent this motion is a request to reconsider rulings on prior motions—including the request to exceed 50 pages—we take no action. *See* Rule 221(c), SCACR ("The appellate court will not entertain petitions for rehearing on a motion or petition unless the action of the court on the motion or petition has the effect of dismissing or finally deciding a party's appeal."). To the extent the motion seeks additional time for the serving and filing of Appellants initial brief and designation of matter, that request is granted. Appellants shall serve and file their initial brief and designation of matter within thirty days of the date of this order or the appeal will be dismissed.

J.

FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

FILED
Dec 03 2025

cc:
Linda Kennedy
Marsha Fink
Michael Jacob Neubauer, Esquire
Robert L. Mebane, Jr., Esquire
James C Cox, III, Esquire
Trevor Marc Hughey, Esquire

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink, Appellants,

v.

Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Campers and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Management, a/k/a Chris Vellanti, a/k/a Christopher Vellanti; Christopher Vellanti, as a Member and Personally; Yvonne Goldman, as a General Manager and Personally; Frank Pellegrini; Fritzie Maroto; Jennifer Burdette; Marsha Stamm; Allen Riha; Ray Grenier; Grant Ferrendelli; and Charles Carpenter, Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2025-000859

The Honorable R. Lawton McIntosh, The Honorable R. Scott Sprouse, The Honorable Heath P. Taylor, The Honorable J. Cordell Maddox, Jr.
Anderson County
Trial Court Case No. 2022CP0400592

ORDER

The time for serving and filing the initial brief of appellant and designation of matter is hereby extended until October 31, 2025. No further extensions will be granted absent extraordinary circumstances.

FOR THE COURT

BY Catherine Hannum, deputy
CLERK

FILED
Sep 30 2025

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:
Linda Kennedy
Marsha Fink
Michael Jacob Neubauer, Esquire
Robert L. Mebane, Jr., Esquire
James C Cox, III, Esquire
Trevor Marc Hughey, Esquire

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink, Appellants,

v.

Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Campers and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Management, a/k/a Chris Vellanti, a/k/a Christopher Vellanti; Christopher Vellanti, as a Member and Personally; Yvonne Goldman, as a General Manager and Personally; Frank Pellegrini; Fritzie Maroto; Jennifer Burdette; Marsha Stamm; Allen Riha; Ray Grenier; Grant Ferrendelli; and Charles Carpenter, Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2025-000859

The Honorable R. Lawton McIntosh, The Honorable R. Scott Sprouse, The Honorable Heath P. Taylor, The Honorable J. Cordell Maddox, Jr.
Anderson County
Trial Court Case No. 2022CP0400592

ORDER

The time for serving and filing the initial brief of appellant and designation of matter is hereby extended until October 1, 2025.

FOR THE COURT

BY Catherine Jannin, deputy
CLERK

FILED
Aug 26 2025

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:
Linda Kennedy
Marsha Fink
Michael Jacob Neubauer, Esquire
Robert L. Mebane, Jr., Esquire
James C Cox, III, Esquire
Trevor Marc Hughey, Esquire

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink, Appellants,

v.

Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Campers and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Management, a/k/a Chris Vellanti, a/k/a Christopher Vellanti; Christopher Vellanti, as a Member and Personally; Yvonne Goldman, as a General Manager and Personally; Frank Pellegrini; Fritzie Maroto; Jennifer Burdette; Marsha Stamm; Allen Riha; Ray Grenier; Grant Ferrendelli; and Charles Carpenter, Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2025-000859

ORDER

On May 20, 2025, Appellants filed a "Motion in Opposition to Two Letters of Deficiency." On June 9, 2025, Appellants filed a motion titled "Objections, Motion, Reminders to Court," which, among other things, included a request for an extension of time in which to file Appellants' initial brief and designation of matter. Respondents did not file a return to either motion. After careful consideration, Appellants' "Motion in Opposition to Two Letters of Deficiency" is denied; however, the parties are directed to use the above caption on all future filings.

Further, Appellants' "Objections, Motion, Reminders to Court" is granted in part and denied in part. Appellants received the transcript on May 28, 2025. Thus, the initial brief of appellant would have been due June 27, 2025. We grant Appellants an extension of time until September 1, 2025, in which to file their initial brief and designation of matter. *See* Rule 208(a)(1), SCACR ("Within thirty (30) days after receiving the transcript or, if no transcript is ordered, within thirty (30) days after serving the notice of appeal, appellant shall serve one copy of his brief on all

parties to the appeal, and file with the clerk of the appellate court one copy of the brief with proof of service."). However, to the extent Appellants argue to rehear the denial of their request for a standing order for an extension of time and pages, the court will not entertain a petition for rehearing on this ruling. *See* Rule 240(i), SCACR ("The court will not entertain petitions for rehearing on a motion or petition unless the action of the court on the motion or petition has the effect of dismissing or finally deciding a party's appeal.").

FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

FILED
Aug 14 2025

cc:
Linda Kennedy
Marsha Fink
Michael Jacob Neubauer, Esquire
Robert L. Mebane, Jr., Esquire
James C Cox, III, Esquire
Trevor Marc Hughey, Esquire

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink, Appellants,

v.

Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Campers and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Management, a/k/a Chris Vellanti, a/k/a Christopher Vellanti; Christopher Vellanti, as a Member and Personally; Yvonne Goldman, as a General Manager and Personally; Frank Pellegrini; Fritzie Maroto; Jennifer Burdette; Marsha Stamm; Allen Riha; John Doe #1, a/k/a Ray Grenier a/k/a Ray Dukes; John Doe #2, a/k/a Tow Truck Owner and Operator; and John Doe #3, a/k/a LHR VRC Maintenance Employee, Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2025-000859

ORDER

On May 1, 2025, Appellants filed their notice of appeal and a motion seeking leave to exceed the page limit by an additional 200 pages and to extend all timelines for their compliance. After careful consideration, we deny Appellants' motion to exceed the page limits and to extend the timelines. The court will consider any specific request for an extension of time as they are received.

FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

FILED
Jun 03 2025

cc:
Linda Kennedy
Marsha Fink
Michael Jacob Neubauer, Esquire
Robert L. Mebane, Jr., Esquire
James C Cox, III, Esquire
Trevor Marc Hughey, Esquire

August 25, 2025

Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk of SC Court of Appeals
PO Box 11629
Columbia, SC 29211
Attn: Emily Heid, Case Manager
Email: ctappfilings@sccourts.org

Re: Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink, Appellants v. Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Campers and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Management, a/k/a Chris Vellanti, a/k/a Christopher Vellanti; Christopher Vellanti, as a Member and Personally; Yvonne Goldman, as a General Manager and Personally; Frank Pellegrini; Fritzie Maroto; Jennifer Burdette; Marsha Stamm; Allen Riha; Ray Grenier; Grand Ferrendelli; and Charles Carpenter, Respondents

Appellate Case No. 2025-000859

NOTICE OF EMERGENCY HEALTH CRISIS NEEDING IMMEDAITE ATTENTION

NOTED SOME OF THE OBJECTIONS TO THE PRIOR ORDER

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION NEEDED TO THE PRIOR ORDER

A STAY OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND MANDATORY EXPLANTION OF TIME AND PAGES THAT IS REASONABLE AND WILL NOT CAUSE THE NEXT EMERGENCY THAT MAKES A FAIR AND HONEST APPEAL BY KENNEDY AND FINK IMPOSSIBLE, WHEN IT DOESN'T NEED TO BE WITH FAIR RULINGS

INVESTIGATION BY INDEPENDENT AUTHORITIES, PREFERRABLY FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

REMINDER THAT JUDGES MUST SUA SPONTE RECUSE IF THEY APPEAR TO NOT BE ABLE TO RULE FAIRLY AND IN GOOD FAITH

WHEN APPELLANTS ARE HEALTHIER THEY WILL PUT IN A FORMAL BRIEF, AND THIS SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED AS THEIR BRIEF, JUST AS APPELLANTS HAVE STATED PREVOIUSLY ON ANOTHER MATTER

Not proofed due to health conditions

Dear Ms. Kitchings and Ms. Heid:

This is an emergency Notice and demand and cannot be written in Motion form due to the circumstances described, but a motion will follow, once Appellants are healthier. This is also a

11

note of general Objection to all the prior Order that can be clarified later for the same reason. Additionally, we object to the latest style of the case. All other issues are within this letter and will be clarified by Motion when our physical health is better.

The Order is overly broad and vague to where we do not even understand all of it. It is also Unconstitutional on its face. This letter is also in regard to the Reasonable Accommodations requested and denied, and now causing the very health issues we were addressing that are now **NEW** aggravations of the injuries, plus a new, well documented ADA covered disease that has again reared its ugly head stopping any progress we could make.

As we indicated, we cannot work fast for physical health reasons. We cannot prepare a full motion due to our health. Kennedy has been nearly completely bed-ridden for over a week, minus a couple of attempts to try meeting this extreme deadline given by the Court even without her kidney stone(s). She is dealing with a Kidney Stone attack, which is unfortunately a regular part of her life as they are genetic and hit when they hit. She is unable to work, and I am unable to carry the load until this gets under control, as I am experiencing an extreme lack of sleep, even just doing my part of the workload, due to an impossible deadline/page limit and am now trying to do the work of both of us until Kennedy is back on her feet. We can go forward and must go forward, but we also must do so at a rate and with the tools we have requested, that are reasonable and fair, and called for under the law, especially now with the Kidney Stone situation. This is, unfortunately, normal in Kennedy's life and covered under the ADA as they are genetic. We need a real expansion of time now with the NEW health events involving the Kidney(s) event and also with the reinjuries/aggravations of limbs, eyes and seizure symptoms these unfair, but vague and arbitrary and capricious rulings have caused, and not given another 15 day notice of a due date, which put us in the same emergency mode we must avoid without the same medical problems being issues as Kennedy can't write, see screens, with me, Fink, not being far behind, and now she can barely can read 12 pt font on paper when overworked like this, and I am suffering from the warning signs of Pre-Seizure symptoms due to short dated timeframes and massive work loads plus trying to do Kennedy's part also.

Kennedy warned that she was feeling kidney stones in an earlier writing in her flanks before, and now she has one or more stuck, she thinks in the ureter, and has extremely bloody urine and in great pain. The last incident she had three kidney stones at one time. Between this and her now aggravated hands/limbs extreme pain and eyes failing under the short due date that would be nearly impossible to meet even with a poor product, and without health issues, as we have over 6,000 documents to get through and somehow summarize in the standard number of pages and now less of a timeframe, both Kennedy and I, regardless of the added emergency of the stone(s), are once again facing an impossibility of meeting an arbitrary and capricious

deadline that ignores the issues meritoriously raised for good cause shown. We are asking, not demanding, that the Judges recuse and that we receive independent reviews and investigations into this entire matter as called for by law.

Kennedy cannot type or see computer/phone screens any longer and it is hard to see regular 12 point font on paper at this point due to extreme overuse. I, Fink, have pre-seizure-like symptoms that have returned due to both of us being extremely over-worked with minimal sleep trying to meet this impossible due date. This has caused great risk to us and our case that is a troubling case for the State and Judiciary. Seizures are nothing to take lightly as they can lead to death in a fair number of victims. They are painful and dangerous. I have been put on anti-seizure medicine due to what these Judges have done, and cannot even drive until they subside, and I know it will not be until we are treated humanely and with proper Constitutional respect.

I remind this Court that both of us (other than Kennedy's genetic kidney stone problems), acquired these illnesses mentioned because of Judges Mcintosh/Sprouse purposely setting deadlines and massive work loads to be completed under extremely Unconstitutional hearings and notices *sua sponte*, to make sure we were injured, punished and unable to put forth the effort we and this case deserved for obvious predetermined outcomes, that were not hidden by these ruthless judges. We did not give up then, and will not give up now.

We did not find clear the Order/Rulings given, but there was a statement about rehearings that we Object to, as we Object to the entire Order for vague and overbroad statements that are not Constitutional. This is not a request for a rehearing but a notice of the updated condition of both of us based on trying to follow the vague and overbroad Order. We also ask for a Stay while the Court reads and reviews this correspondence.

We see the many extensions the Attorney General's office received on the Murdaugh crime case, based on them having 6,000 documents to review and organize with a huge, tax payer staff. We hired someone to review the Murdaugh criteria and briefs because of our time and limited health abilities, and she stated the Attorney General's brief was merely a conclusory series of repeated statements without much meritorious arguing to support their position. We believe this useless brief was to make sure that Murdaugh gets another bite of the apple as a Legal Machine Criminal Enterprise member. The Defense, bringing the appeal, didn't need extra time or pages to bring their appeal forward because the appeal was not complex, but direct. It was such a basic appeal on clear cut issues given to Murdaugh for appealing purposes, especially with Becky HEIR Hill assisting Murdaugh as her grandparents assisted Buster Murdaugh in 1956.

In spite of this, we are being informed that the Attorney General's office ignored page limits granted by the appeals court and filed approximately 148 pages in their reply brief to the 47 page initial brief of Murdaugh attorneys who needed no extra time to file because the issues are cut/dry, unlike everything about our case which is a story of constant Judicial/Lawyer/Allianz planning and practice by the Combine to make sure we never got to any Discovery/Depositions, Summary Judgment despite the fact they could not dismiss the case by a 12b6 motion and fixed proceedings or Jury all orchestrated by Defendant Judges without immunity who took part in the underlying case. In reply, the Attorney General's office simply ignored the rules and any granting of extensions and pages without concern for the law or Appeals Court rulings and limits that were far more favorable than what we are receiving for a much more complex Appeal. The Attorney General said very little in those pages, limited only by the will of the Attorney General's office, yet our complex case involving so many bizarre issues and multiple defendants, including your Judges and your state, which again, makes this clear what is happening in our case.

The Defense/Judges in our case exhibit a complete Unconstitutional breaking of the most basic Constitutional laws that exist, looking like a banana republic. Yet, with this Appeal court, who is more than generous to the Attorney General, we cannot get any additional pages/reasonable time for all of these issues, plus the ADA requirements for Courts to follow, causing more reaggravations of injuries at issue caused by the underlying Judges and aggravated by these present Judges? And now, once again, with a predictable kidney stone issue which is normal for Kennedy and documented for years in her medical records, and in the Court previously showing three kidney stones at once that needed emergency surgery to remove them, we continue to face the same disproportionate, unfair treatment and rulings as before in the lower court.

All of this clearly shows Unconstiutional selective prosecution and arbitrary and capricious and unfair findings that are intended to be vague and overbroad by the Legal Machine Criminal Enterprise in South Carolina protecting itself which demands more and the voluntary Recusal of the Appeals Judges and an immediate, independent investigation forthcoming that includes and involves us and our evidence and its relation to the Murdaugh crimes with its Judges and Combine and our Judges/lawyers/Allianz and Combine running an Insurance Reserve Fraud scheme under color of law in SC. This case, and its complexities, is too massive to put into 50 pages and limited timeframes limiting such necessary demands, and further physically punishing and aggravating the injuries that hinder our abilities and now with Kennedy's very painful Kidney sone(s) severely hinders our ability to submit meaningful writings.

Kennedy will probably have to drive herself to some healthcare facility out in the backwoods where we are staying for time being while we are trying to get justice. She will have to get out of bed, where she has had to stay and sleep for most of the time this last week plus, sometimes

on heavy medication when lighter medicines are no longer effective to help Kennedy, that anyone knows about if they ever suffered from stones.

What we are describing are long-term illnesses that qualify under the ADA, and with which the Court must comply. All require surgeries to try to improve...with this particular stone perhaps needing it if it does not fully pass in the next couple of days. The extremely bloody urine has been photographed, as it is a sign that this stone is presently stuck and blocking proper kidney functions that leads to hyrdronephrosis and possible loss of a kidney if not treated. Within the next couple of days, Kennedy will know if surgery is needed based on the symptoms and will have to drive herself to a location for assistance at that time, since I am not allowed to drive because of the seizures.

We have also made contact with the Politicians who are claiming they are trying to break the status quo of the LMCE, which does it wants because there is no real opposition. We have also sent a summary of the case and Constitutional Crisis issues involving the SC Judiciary and its Combine, along with calling for a full Allianz investigation along with its RACKETEERS to several agencies.

We demand our alleged rights and that nobody be allowed to proceed above the law, as if we cannot get justice here, then we will have to re-establish as the leading legal and nonviolent opposition to what is being done here in SC to innocent people whose only crime is they sought justice in the closed system of corruption in SC government because we can do nothing more than what we are doing within the system and it is geared to protecting itself at all costs. This affects us personally and we can't allow that to continue. The settlement was simple, the case was already won at the lower court, and yet here we are as appellants. This cannot continue.

Therefore, we cannot meet the September 1, 2025 deadline due to new health issues that make it impossible and need a Stay and great expansion of time that does not put us in emergency mode again but gives us a fair chance to re-win our case that we already won in the lower court but for the refusal to enter the victories. The kidney stone(s) is just an extra serious complication that is a well documented health problem for Kennedy since she was 35 and why it qualifies under the ADA. It is genetic, not dietary, and no medicine or natural remedy can change the problem, so she can't do anything that effectively controls them.

We both have a doctor's appointment next week, where Kennedy will be able to get the dreaded Prednisone to try to help her limbs work with less pain, but it won't work if we are given short dates. Furthermore, Prednisone is not recommended for people fighting cancer, except to fight cancer itself, as it increases cortisol, a cancer causing situation in itself. Her eyes, and limbs need surgery to try to fix what these Judges have done to her.

For me, I can get a seizure drug RX refill to stay on until officially taken off by my neurologist called in due to the collapses I have experienced when greatly sleep deprived. My seizures need a lot of time away when this is all over to get back to normal without such extreme orders I have to follow that continually cause seizures due to extreme lack of sleep.

Please put this before the Judges, and we can send the picture of the urine if needed, but under seal that need not be put online as it is a personal health issue involving bodily fluids as initial proof, unless Kennedy has to drive herself a long distance to get further treatment. The next couple of days will help Kennedy determine the next step.

Please Stay all matters pending, and as soon as Kennedy can express the situation better, we will give you the update. Today, she will do limited functions as she did all last week to try to force the stone out through drinking water and then taking appropriate medicine she has on hand for these attacks.

Sadly, this should be a "no brainer" for any court or even person with a modicum of understanding of what justice, fairness, due process and equal protection are, .ie the public It does not take formal medical training to understand the dangers of a blocked kidney or the effects of seizures. It also doesn't take any legal understanding that if someone's limbs and eyes aren't functioning properly to complete a task without reasonable accommodations that also adversely affects getting justice, especially when your underlying judges caused the problem and your appeals judges are perpetuating the problem which is causing new problems resulting in vicious cycle and loop from which we cannot break free without true justice being served. This systemic injustice has now created a new problem with eyes and limbs and seisures that need a new independent and unbiased decision as it a new situation.

As the victimized public trying to get justice, we should not have to "Strapp 'em up" like some football player on the government, predetermined turf just to get through the Legal Machine Criminal Enterprise bent on protecting itself at all costs regardless of the consequences to those who come into court rightfully seeking justice.



Dr. Marsha Fink, J.D., B.A.

RECEIVED
Dec 18 2025
SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Court of Appeals

Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink

Appellants

v.

Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Campers and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Management, a/k/a Chris Vellanti, a/k/a Christopher Vellanti; Christopher Vellanti, as a Member and Personally; Yvonne Goldman, as a General Manager and Personally; Frank Pellegrini; Fritzie Maroto; Jennifer Burdette; Marsha Stamm; Allen Riha; Ray Grenier; Grant Ferrendelli; and Charles Carpenter

Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2025-000859

PROOF OF SERVICE

Dr. Linda Kennedy, J.D., B.S., B.A. and Dr. Marsha Fink, J.D., B.A., *pro se*, certify that we have served copies of **P-Appellants' Motion Demanding the Court Actually Rule on the ADA Reasonable Accommodation Repeatedly Submitted Long Ago that They Refuse to Rule Upon And Grant By Law for 90 Days/200 Pages That Has Been Repeated Regularly and That The Court Stop Refusing to Rule, Not Make Up What P-Appellants are Saying They Know Is Not True and Write the Clear Order And That It Is Referring TO ADA Reasonable Accommodation Request of 90/200, What It Is Referring To, To Include the ADA/Reasonable Accommodation Requested and P-Appellants Object To The Continuing and Massive Fraud on The Court by All Judges Involved to Predetermine This Case For The LMCE With Examples of the Object Outlined As Representative and Many More** on Lake Hartwell RV Resort and Cabins, LLC, aka Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC, Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, Lake Hartwell Campers and Cabins, Lake Hartwell Management, Christopher Vellanti, Other, Christopher Vellanti, Corporately, as the Sole Member, Manager Employee and Individually, Yvonne Goldman, as General Manager, Employee and Individually, Jennifer Burdette, as Employee and Individually, Frank Pellegrini, as Employee and Individually, Fritzie Maroto (Moroto, other, Pellegrini) as Employee and Individually, Ray Grenier, as

Independent Contractor and Individually, Grant Ferrendelli, as Independent Contractor and Individually and Charles Carpenter, as Employee and Individually, who are represented by Michael Neubauer, Esquire and Robert Mebane, Esquire of McAngus, Goudelock and Courie, LLC, 201 West McBee Avenue, 2nd Floor, Greenville, SC 29601 and on Marsha Stamm, as Co-Assistant Manager and Individually, Allen Riha, as Co-Assistant Manager and Individually, who are represented by James Cox, III, and Trevor Hughey, Grier, Cox and Cranshaw, LLC, 2001 Assembly Street, Suite 204, Columbia, SC 29201 by depositing copies of it in the United States Mail, first class postage prepaid to their respective attorneys on December 18, 2025.

DATE: December 18, 2025

Dr. Linda Kennedy, J.D., B.S., B.A.
P.O. Box 433
Townville, SC 29689
954-279-3785
Pro se Appellant

Dr. Marsha Fink, J.D., B.A.
P.O. Box 433
Townville, SC 29689
954-279-3785
Pro se Appellant