

IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS
Appellate Case No.: 2025-001299
(Lower Court Case No.: 2024-CP-18-01459)

Attia Elbadawy and Lynne Chatlos,
Appellants,

RECEIVED

Dec 30 2025

SC Court of Appeals

v.

D.R. Horton, Inc.,
Respondent.

NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO SUPERSEDEAS REVIEW
AND REPORT
DATED DECEMBER 17, 2025

COMES NOW the Appellants, Attia Elbadawy and Lynne Chatlos, appearing pro se, and submit this Notice to the South Carolina Court of Appeals for record-preservation and notice purposes only.

1. On December 17, 2025, the Honorable Judge Mattie Murphy issued a review and report concerning the writ of supersedeas.

2. Appellants did not receive this document until December 23, 2025, when it was delivered by U.S. Mail.

3. Upon review, Appellants identified numerous material errors, inaccuracies, and misstatements affecting record accuracy and procedural posture.

4. Appellants formally object to the December 17, 2025 supersedeas review and report and state that it should not be transmitted, filed, relied upon, or accepted as an accurate reflection of the record on appeal.

5. On December 29, 2025, Appellants filed the following motions in the Dorchester County Court of Common Pleas:


- Motion to Correct the Record and Amend Erroneous Supersedeas Order
- Motion to Alter and Amend Supersedeas Order Limited to Record Accuracy
- Motion to Stay Transmission of the Record on Appeal

6. These filings were made pursuant to Rule 205 and Rule 241, South Carolina Appellate Court Rules, to preserve record integrity before transmission of the record on appeal.

This Notice is submitted without requesting relief, without briefing the merits, and without waiving any objections related to jurisdiction, record accuracy, or procedural regularity.

Respectfully submitted,

Attia Elbadawy, Pro Se Appellant
Lynne Chatlos, Pro Se Appellant

Two handwritten signatures in blue ink. The top signature is for Attia Elbadawy and the bottom signature is for Lynne Chatlos.

DEC 30, 2025

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF DORCHESTER)
ATTIA ELBADAWY and LYNNE CHATLOS)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
1) Dorchester County)
2) D R Horton, Inc)
Defendant.)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2024 -CP- 1801459

DECEMBER 29 11:18 AM
DORCHESTER COUNTY
COURT CLERK OF COMMON PLEAS

Plaintiff's Attorney: PRO SE, Bar No.
Address: 493 WISE ROAD, SUMMERVILLE, SC 29483
Phone: 843-641-8556
E-mail: ala_international@yahoo.com
Defendant's Attorney: KENISON, DUDLEY & CRAWFORD
Address: 1) 201 Johnston Street, St. George SC 29477
2) 325 W McBee Avenue, Suite #301, Greenville, SC 29601
Phone: 1) 843-563-0103
E-mail: 2) 864-242-4899

MOTION HEARING REQUESTED (attach written motion and complete SECTIONS I and III)
FORM MOTION, NO HEARING REQUESTED (complete SECTIONS II and III)
PROPOSED ORDER/CONSENT ORDER (complete SECTIONS II and III)

SECTION I: Hearing Information
Nature of Motion: MOTION TO CORRECT THE RECORD AND AMEND ERRONEOUS SUPERSEDEAS ORDER
Estimated Time Needed: 15 MINUTES
Court Reporter Needed: YES/NO

SECTION II: Motion/Order Type
Written motion attached
Form Motion/Order
I hereby move for relief or action by the court as set forth in the attached proposed order.
Signature of Attorney for Plaintiff/Defendant
Date submitted: DECEMBER 29, 2025

SECTION III: Motion Fee
PAID - AMOUNT: \$ 25.00
EXEMPT: Rule to Show Cause in Child or Spousal Support
Domestic Abuse or Abuse and Neglect
Indigent Status
Sexually Violent Predator Act
Post-Conviction Relief
Motion for Stay in Bankruptcy
Motion for Publication
Motion for Execution (Rule 69, SCRCP)
Proposed order submitted at request of the court; or, reduced to writing from motion made in open court per judge's instructions
Name of Court Reporter:
Other:

JUDGE'S SECTION
Motion Fee to be paid upon filing of the attached order.
Other:
JUDGE CODE
Date: , 20

CLERK'S VERIFICATION
Collected by:
Date Filed: , 20
MOTION FEE COLLECTED: \$
CONTESTED - AMOUNT DUE: \$

**SOUTH CAROLINA
DORCHESTER COUNTY**

**COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
CASE No: 2024-CP-1801459**

Attia Elbadawy and Lynne Chatlos
Plaintiffs,

V

D. R. Horton Inc
Defendants

**MOTION TO CORRECT THE
RECORD AND AMEND
ERRONEOUS SUPERSEDEAS ORDER**

D R Horton, Inc
Third Party Plaintiffs

V

Dorchester County
Third Party Defendants

D R Horton, Inc
Mark Bible
325 W McBee Avenue
Suite#301
Greenville, SC 29601

2025 DEC 29 PM 11:48
GENERAL COPY
Clerk of Court
DORCHESTER COUNTY

Dorchester County
Attorneys Office Bradley Mitchell
201 Johnston Street
St. George, SC 29477

Attia Elbadawy *attia elbadawy*

Lynne Chatlos *Lynne Chatlos*

493 Wise Road (mailing)
493 Wise Lane (911/physical)
Summerville, SC 29483
843-641-6556
ala_international@yahoo.com
December 29, 2025

29,

MOTION TO CORRECT THE RECORD AND AMEND ERRONEOUS SUPERSEDEAS ORDER

COMES NOW the Appellants, appearing pro se, and respectfully move this Honorable Court for an Order correcting the record and amending material inaccuracies contained in the Supersedeas Order entered in this matter. This Motion is brought solely to ensure that the written record accurately reflects the procedural history and filings before the Court, prior to transmission of the Record on Appeal.

This matter is presently in an appellate posture. Under South Carolina law, the accuracy of the trial court record is essential because the appellate court is entitled to rely upon the record as transmitted. See Rule 210, SCACR.

The Supersedeas Order, as entered and docketed, contains factual and procedural statements that do not accurately reflect the filings, posture, and status of Supersedeas in this case. These inaccuracies are material and, if left uncorrected, would misstate the record presented to the Court of Appeals.

Until the Record on Appeal is transmitted, this Court retains authority and responsibility to ensure that the record is accurate and complete. See Rule 210(c), SCACR. Appellants bring this Motion promptly upon review of the Order to preserve the integrity of the appellate record.

This Motion is not a request for reconsideration of the merits, nor is it an attempt to relitigate any issue. It is narrowly and respectfully limited to correction of the written record so that it accurately reflects what occurred in this Court.

WHEREFORE, Appellants respectfully request that this Court correct and amend the Supersedeas Order to accurately reflect the procedural record and grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

CERTIFIED COPY
2025 DEC 29 11:48
Clerk of Court
OFFICE: LESTER COUNTY

On July 18, 2025, the appellants filed a motion to stay appeal or a motion for petition of writ of supersedeas . Pursuant to Rule 241 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules, requesting a temporary injunction, respondents did not file a return. After careful consideration, the Court of Appeals imposed a temporary injunction and ordered respondents to file within (10) days of the date of this order, which was July 30, 2025.

The respondents, D.R. Horton, filed a return on August 7, 2025, but with a new lawyer, Carl Mueller, that was never approved, and that is a violation because Carl Mueller had never been on the case before, and the previous lawyer, Mark Bible, never gave a reason why he was leaving the case, which is a violation of South Carolina law and procedure.

So, the Court of Appeals gave the appellants five (5) days to file a return on August 12, 2025. The appellants filed a return on August 13, 2025. After careful consideration, the Court of

Appeals continued the temporary injunction and remanded to the circuit court to allow the circuit court to expedite review of the petition for the writ of supersedeas and return and reply, and determine whether the exhibits provided in those filings were part of the record before the court at the January 21, 2025 virtual hearing with Hon Judge Murphy.

On November 2, 2025, the appellant received an email from the circuit court, a court clerk named Cheyenne, stating that Judge Murphy never saw the appellant's Exhibit #4 which was filed on December 30, 2024, and Exhibit #5, which was filed on January 10, 2025.

They were on the record and they are on the court docket, but she never saw them, and Judge Murphy never mentioned anything about Exhibit #5, which was filed by the appellants on January 17, 2025. And Exhibit#5 was not on the court docket. After many days of searching on the court docket,

nothing was found, and that is the most important exhibit for the motion for injunction.

Exhibit #5 includes the following documents.

- 1) Emails between the appellants and Dorchester County attorney, Bradley Mitchell, that prove that Wise Lane is a private road.
- 2) Emails between the appellant's neighbor, Amanda Wise, and the county attorney, Bradley Mitchell, proving that Wise Lane is a private road.
- 3) Emails, between the appellant and Clayton Homes manager, Klye Smith, to prove that the black metal gate was there. The emails go back from November 2022 to February 2023. This also proves that Wise Lane was always blocked by a semi-tractor trailer and the gate were there with "No Trespassing" signs hanging from it, to prove that the public never used Wise Lane and to prove that Wise Lane is not a county road.

4) The chain of text messages from the appellant's neighbor, Amanda Wise, to D.R. Horton lawyers, where they were trying to buy an easement from her and tried to get access to D.R. Horton's property, DV Timber Subdivision.

5) Over half a dozen similar cases citing dedication and acceptance, South Carolina common law of dedication, and South Carolina Supreme Court rules on dedication and acceptance, and the rule of prescriptive easement, and a lot of other evidence to prove that Wise Lane is a private road and to prove that the easement between the appellant's Lot #5 and Lot #6 ceased to exist due to the Doctrine of Merger that is registered with the Register of Deeds in Dorchester County, St. George, South Carolina. Because the appellant is the same owner of Lot #5 and Lot #6, and many other rules and evidence were included in Exhibit #5 filed on January 17, 2025

So, the appellant went to the circuit court to ask the Clerk of Court, what happened to Exhibit #5, why it was not on the court docket, and why Judge Murphy could not find it. After a half-hour search, the clerk at the court found Exhibit Five, but it was not the whole complete Exhibit#5. It was hiding behind a certificate of service on the court's computer docket. The appellants are not computer experts, but this seems very suspicious. How can you hide 150 pages?, which is how much Exhibit#5 had in it, behind one page on a computer system? What the court told the appellants is that they were able to find only 8 pages, not 150 pages. Only 8 pages were found.

The appellants did file a motion to investigate and find out what happened to the rest of those exhibits. So, on November 2, 2025, Judge Murphy asked Respondent D.R. Horton to write the writ of supersedeas to the Court of Appeals, which is a

violation of the court's direction regarding the writ of supersedeas. The appellants did file an objection with the lower court and the Court of Appeals.

On December 17, 2025, the Honorable Judge Murphy signed Respondent D.R. Horton's review of the appellant's exhibits, and the appellants received a copy of Judge Murphy's order by mail on December 23, 2025. After the appellants' careful review of the exhibits, the appellants found out the following: over ninety percent (90%) of the appellant's exhibits were not mentioned in her order. The review of the exhibits was inaccurately missing, biased toward Respondent D.R. Horton, and she picked and choose and wrote comments about exhibits that, in her view, would benefit only Respondent D.R. Horton, but did not make the same comments on other exhibits that would benefit the appellants. It is very obvious she is biased toward Respondent D.R. Horton.

The center of the lawsuit is the motion for injunction, and the core of the motion for injunction is the ownership of the appellant's driveway, Wise Lane. So, all evidence is related to the motion for injunction. Every document, email, and statement is part of the motion for injunction as a whole. The whole record from A to Z cannot be skipped through and picked and chosen as to which items she would like to use.

For example, when the appellants submitted affidavits from landowners who live on Wise Lane and Wise Road, and if we read the landowners' affidavits on Wise Road, you will see the county never owned Wise Lane, never maintained Wise Lane or Wise Road, and the public never used Wise Lane. That proves the ownership is private, not public, not county, and the appellant is the legal owner of Wise Lane by adverse possession, by tacking, and also the appellant is the only

dominant easement holder left. Respondent D.R. Horton does not have any business on Wise Lane. That is what the motion for injunction is all about.

The appellants complained about trespassing and threatening conduct in the motion for injunction to stop the respondent D R Horton from trespassing and threatening the appellants, all under CASE No: 2024-CP-1801459.

(1) The appellant's summons and complaint and the motion for injunction were filed on 09/05/2024. 1)The appellants filed a copy of his deed. (2) A Twin Lakes Subdivision map. (3) Emails from Tiffany Huerber dated 11-19-2021, stating the following: "I have forwarded your emails to Jim Simpson and Casey Byrd with Public Works and asked them to send you verification of ownership and maintenance for Wise Road," time 1:53 p.m. dated 11-19-2021. (4) Email from Casey Byrd to the appellant (Lynne Chatlos) dated 11-19-2021, time 1:59 p.m.

stating Wise Lane is a private road and is not maintained by
Dorchester County. (5) Email from the appellant (Lynne Chatlos)
to Casey Byrd dated 11-19-2021, time 2:08 p.m.

“Hi, thank you for the statement on a private road,
One more question,. In the future, can the county
change the road from private to public?” (6) Email from
Casey Byrd to the appellant dated 11-19-2021, time 2:14 p.m.
stating the petition would have to be sent to the county and
there would need to be proof the road was built up to
county standards. Once petitioned, the Public Works
Department would take the petition before County Council
and they would vote whether to accept the road into
maintenance or not. “I hope this helps. Let me know if you
have any further questions.”

The appellant (Lynne Chatlos) emailed Casey Byrd back
on 11-19-2021 at 2:35pm stating "Hi, thank you so much
for the information

Now we know the process and we will be following the above guidelines in the future if needed.

Thank you again for all your help.”

Those emails were submitted with the motion for injunction, and those emails should have been enough to end the case right there.

7), Dorchester County map shows the appellant’s driveway,

Wise Lane in gray color line meaning: does not own or maintain the road, which lines up with what Casey Byrd emails states.

Reviewing Hon Judge Murphy review and her report on the Appellants Exhibit#4. Page #2, item clause number two, where Judge Murphy claiming that Wise Lane AKA Wise Road

Where did she get that from?

The appellant’s deed states Wise Lane.

The appellant’s title search, First American Title Insurance Co. states Wise Lane.

Dorchester County Planning and Zoning verification of the address Wise Lane and Wise Road just for 9-1-1 purposes because

Wise Lane is a private driveway. A letter from Planning and Zoning to the appellant's neighbor, Marcia Wise, in 1987 names the small dirt road Wise Lane. A letter from Dorchester County Planning Department to Marcia Wise dated July 1990 Dorchester County address notification: Wise Lane, a private road off Weir Road located in the Twin Lakes Subdivision. So Wise Lane is not aka Wise Road.

In page #3, In clause number 3, the Honorable Judge Murphy stating the appellant's reply to D R Hortons counterclaim answer to By Exhibit #4. That is false and it misleads the Court of Appeals because the appellants answered the respondent's counterclaim on November 12, 2024, with three exhibits: Exhibit #1, Exhibit# 2, and Exhibit #3. Honorable Judge Murphy skipped those 3 exhibits all at one time. The appellants filled Exhibit#4 on December 30, 2024. Exhibit #5 filed on January 10,2025 and filed another exhibit#5 on January 17,2025.

After careful review, the appellants found the following errors and respectfully asked Judge Murphy to review the following and to write her report on the following exhibits.

- 1) exhibits #1 filed on 11/12/2024
- 2) exhibits #2 filed on 11/12/2024
- 3) exhibits #3 filed on 11/12/2024
- 4) exhibits #4 filed on 12/30/2025
- 5) exhibits #5 filed on 01/10/2025
- 6) exhibits #5 filed on 01/17/2025

The appellants after carefully reviewing the Hon Judge Murphy report, the appellants exhibit#4 has the following errors/mistakes.

1), The first 5 pages, in exhibit#4, which are the supporting exhibits, start from the first page with November 14, 2024. We, the plaintiffs, met in person with Mr. Bradley Mitchell and Melissa Bates, his paralegal, in the Dorchester County building in Summerville, South Carolina, all the way to page number #5 Hon Judge Murphy never wrote her review/report on the first 5 pages in exhibit#4 filed on 12/30/2024

2) In Exhibit #4,

communication between Mr. Landon Brock and Dorchester County employees, Derek McCoy, all in Exhibit 4-3 and

Exhibit 4-4 and only in 4-3 and 4-4 .

But in 4-5 and Exhibit 4-6 are different.

Please write your review and report on E4-5 and E4-6.

3) Review Exhibit #4 - 5, which is an email from Mike and Jason to Anna Marie. They all are Dorchester County employees asking, "Can you have someone from Public Works remove this gate? If you do not, can we have a recommendation on the path forward? I'm not an attorney, but if the county owns the ROW, I would think they would have the authority to move the gate." All the way to E4-6.

In Exhibit 4-11, email from attorney Mr. Christen Wall. The appellants were trying to get him to represent the appellants in the case. In the answer, the judge, Honorable Murphy, reviewed and reported about his email to the appellants. If Mr. Wall, was honest and up front with the appellants in the first place, He should have given his legal advice to the appellants, telling us that the county never accepted the

dedication on the plat map, and the burden of proof is on the respondent, D.R. Horton, to prove that the county accepted the dedication. But instead, he chose to scare the appellants. The email E4-11.

In Exhibit 4-12, Honorable Judge Murphy commented about the email from Landon Brock to the appellants' former lawyer in E4-12. Mr. Landon Brock was not giving any legal advice or legal opinions. Mr. Brock was telling the appellants that the respondent, D.R. Horton's lawyer, told Landon Brock they would only use the appellant's driveway, Wise Lane, for water and sewer pipes, and the homeowners in D.R. Horton's subdivision would never use Wise Lane for traffic or traveling. They would use Helms Drive and Pruitt Street.

In the answer, the appellants asked Mr. Brock, if that is the case, then why doesn't D.R. Horton use Helms Drive and Pruitt Street for water and sewer pipes? They have the permit. They have no permit to use Wise Lane.

Later on, the respondents, D R Hortons lawyer Mr. Mark Bible, said this never happened and that D.R. Horton's lawyer, Tom Harper, never emailed Mr. Brock telling him that D.R. Horton would only use Wise Lane for water and sewer. There are emails proving it happened. The appellants submitted a copy of Mr. Thomas Harpers email to the court to prove that Mark Bible was again caught in a lie. And Mr. Bible wanted to leave the case and bring on another lawyer.

The Dorchester County ordinances in E4-14 to E4-25 on the Dorchester County website state how to apply for a permit, what the punishment is if someone works on a county road without a permit, how to renew an encroachment permit, and what the application form looks like. An example in E4-14, Ordinance 38-21, stating the county only issues encroachment permits on roads controlled by the county and shall be granted

Only for a public purpose. In E4-26, South Carolina Code 56-5-450. That is Wise Lane, a private driveway, according to South Carolina Code 56-5-540.

In Exhibit 4-27, South Carolina Code 6-29-1170. It is very surprising that the respondent or Honorable Judge Murphy didn't comment on that law. South Carolina Code 6-29-1170 is the whole argument in this case about the specify law and the respondent, D.R. Horton, and Judge Murphy run over the S.C. Code 6-29-1170 at seventy-five miles per hour and did not even make one comment about what that code means and how important that code is. 6-29-1170. If Honorable Judge Murphy applied that South Carolina Code to the lawsuit, it would have solved things since day one. But Judge Murphy chose to violate South Carolina Code 6-29-1170.

That code is about dedication and acceptance on the plat map and Dorchester County's own ordinances E4-28 to E4-30.

It is on Dorchester County's website. According to that ordinance, a plaintiff's driveway could never be a county road unless the county broke its own law, Ordinance 38-225. In clause number ten, dirt road maintenance, the county shall not accept maintenance on any dirt road, whether new or existing.

This is why Casey Byrd, in her email, stated that in order to change Wise Lane from a private road to a public road, a petition had to be filed, and the road would have to be built to county standards first because of this ordinance, Dorchester County Ordinance 38-225.

So, according to South Carolina Law 56-5-450 (2021), Exhibit 4-26, every way or place in private ownership and used for vehicle travel by the owner and those having express or implied permission from the owner, but not any other person, is a private road or driveway. That describes Wise Lane.

So, Wise Lane is a driveway, and county never accepted it.

Honorable Judge Murphy violated another South Carolina law. Exhibit 4-31, Honorable Judge Murphy saying that the picture of the gate with the "No Trespassing" signs on it is undated photography. It is the same photo for the same road on the same driveway taken by D.R. Horton, and the respondent, D.R. Horton, submitted the same photo on the same road to the court. So why is the respondent, D.R. Horton, photo dated and the appellant's photo undated? Where is her bias showing through again? Clearly, because the appellant's photography of the gate shows very clearly "No Trespassing" signs on the gate

And when the respondent, D.R. Horton, trespassed on the appellant's property on July 26, 2024, they entered from the west side of the appellants property, by building an illegal wooden bridge which crossed over the appellant's ditch,

The dead end of the appellant's driveway of Wise Lane.

D.R. Horton trespassed on the appellant's property, then went to his driveway, Wise Lane, damaged the driveway, tore down trees, ripped up the road, and harassed the appellant's wife.

And you have to ask yourself, why did D.R. Horton take the photo from outside the gate? If the road is a public road, why not come down and take the picture from the other side of that gate? Because they know it's a private road and they know how to read "No Trespassing." And they would be arrested if they came back for trespassing.

Honorable Judge Murphy talks about an updated photo and updated comments, but she never mentioned anything about the 1967 Twin Lakes Subdivision plat map. It is way out of date and it is a very old map. This is not matching what is reality on the ground, what is happening now. It does not even match with Dorchester County's GIS map. Fifty percent of the lots on the 1967 plat map, it is not there anymore.

Honorable Judge Murphy in her report talked about the police report dated 9-5-2025 from the Dorchester County Sheriff's Department, but she failed to mention what was in the police report.

About the photo of the prescription medication bottle in Exhibit 4-41, it is major antidepressant medicine the appellant is on, due to the wrongful acts caused by the respondent, D R Horton trying to steal the appellant's property.

In Exhibit 4-42, Exhibit 4-43, Honorable Judge Murphy reported saying that the photography showed heavy equipment and handwritten notes. First of all, there was no heavy equipment in Exhibit 4-43. And about the handwritten notes,

What are those notes are saying the appellants respectfully asked Hon Judge Murphy to Review her report and to rewrite her report on the appellants exhibit#4.

Judge to rewrite her review with some kind of accuracy
and actually apply the laws and rules of the state of SC

What also needs to be taking note of:

What kind of incident and how many police reports?

On exhibit#4-24 and exhibit#4-43, Hon Judge Murphy

reported the photos show heavy equipment and hand

written notes, first of all there is not even any heavy

equipment in exhibit E#4-43 and the handwritten notes

are just an explanations from the appellants so there

would be no confusion of what the photos were about.

The appellants are respectively asking Hon Judge Murphy

to rereview and rewrite with more truthful accuracy.

APPELLANTS REVIEW EXHIBIT#5 FILED ON 01/10/2025

Exhibit#5

After carefully reviewing the Hon Judge Murphy of her Review and report. The appellants found the following errors Exhibit#5-1 email from appellants Attia Elbadawy and Lynne Chatlos date April 29,2019 to Dorchester County Public works employee Mr. Jason Carraher, asking Dorchester County to fix the road for the appellants, the road condition was unbelievable the mud at least 3 to 4 feet deep and we the appellants were getting fed up with fixing the road and putting money and hard labor into the road, we needed help from Dorchester County. We are taxpayers, but the County never helped the appellants to fix Wise Lane. Spending over \$75,000.00 between labor,money,time and materials, that email proves that Wise Lane is a private road and never was used by the public and it is not suitable (unsafe) to be used by the public. It took the appellants 4 years to build Wise Lane. So, what where does Derek Mccoy or the Respondents, D R Horton even thinking? because that email alone should have stop the case right there.

Hon Judge Murphy does not have any comments on this email not even one word about this very important email.

Exhibit 5-2, email from Public Works Jim Simpson to prove that Wise Lane is a private road and not a county road or maintained by the county.

The appellate's paid tax on the road, Wise Lane, so the road is a private ownership.

Honorable Judge Murphy had no comment on this email. What is wrong with that?

The county is clearly saying that the road is not a county road. It is not a public road. It is not maintained by the county.

3) Exhibit 5-3, email from Public Works

employee Casey Byrd to the appellant (Lynne Chatlos)

stated on November 19, 2021 that Wise Road is a private road.

Those three emails are solid evidence that proves that Wise Lane is a private road.

It was never accepted by the county or the public or never maintained by the county.

Those three emails in Exhibit 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3, they should be enough.

There's enough evidence there to end the case and it shouldn't have gotten this far.

Exhibit # 5-4, South Carolina Code 56-5-450

proves that Wise Lane is a private road driveway.

Honorable Judge Murphy violated South Carolina Law 56-5-450.

Exhibit # 5-5, email from Dorchester County saying there are no sewer lines on Wise Lane.

So, the appellant needed to build an above ground septic system.

More proof that it is not a county or public road.

Exhibit # 5-6, the chain of emails between the appellant Lynne Chatlos and Dorchester County Public Works Casey Byrd on November 19, 2021.

Honorable Judge Murphy went through that email by a speed of 75 miles an hour and didn't stop. Didn't slow down, no words, no comments.

What is wrong with that?

Let's us analyze the chain of emails between the appellant Lynne Chatlos and Dorchester County employee Casey Byrd.

First off, the appellant tried to build, building the road and why the county does not want to help the appellants to build Wise Lane. The appellants are so tired of spending money, time, and hard labor.

Why is the county not building the road for the appellants and then sending the bill to the subdivision owner to pay the bill? According to the subdivision act.

So, the appellants emailed the county asking about Wise Lane ownership.

The county emailed the appellant Lynne Chatlos back stating that Wise Road is a private ownership, meaning the county does not own the road or the public.

That means that the road belongs to the landowner, which is the appellant.

Email, Casey Byrd.

Also, Dorchester County does not maintain Wise Road.

That means the county never accepted the road and never maintained the road.

The appellant Lynne Chatlos, to Dorchester County, employee Casey Byrd.

One more question to Casey Byrd, the employee.

After we, the appellants, spend all the time and money and labor to fix and build Wise Lane and we the appellants

already spent a lot of money and time and labor

but the condition of the road is still horrible.

Mud three to four feet deep

So, question is, in the future, can the county change the road from private to public road?

Explanation from Casey Byrd to the appellant Lynne Chatlos.

Once a petition for the Dorchester County public works

No, the road is a private road. This is before the county

It belongs to the appellant and the county does not maintain the road.

Obviously, the county is not going to spend \$250,000 to fix the road, but the question, after we, the appellants, spent all that money, can the county change the road from private to a public road was asked.

Casey Byrd Dorchester County employee replied back to the appellant Lynne Chatlos

No, the county cannot change the road from private to public.

You, the appellants, would have to file a petition.

You would have to send it to the county.

There would need to be proof that the road was built to county standards.

Once a petition, the Dorchester County public works department would take the petition before the county council and they would vote on whether to accept the road into its county maintenance or not.

I hope this helps you.

Let me know if there's anything further or any other questions you have.

The appellant Lynne Chatlos replied back to Dorchester County employee Casey Byrd.

Hi, thank you so much for the information.

Now we know what the process will be going forward.

We will follow the above guidelines in the future if needed

Thanks again for all your help, Lynne.

Exhibit #5-8.

As we can see in the letter from Stantec Consulting Services, Inc., they're talking on behalf of the respondent, D.R. Horton, as the new owner of the DV Timber subdivision. Date: October 10, 2023

And the major change and modification in the original plan was to use Helms Drive and Pruitt Street and the sanitary sewer pump station to pump the sewer system against the gravity.

So, in the new plan, the respondent, D.R. Horton, removed the sanitary sewerage pump station to save some money.

And the respondent, D.R. Horton, thought why not use the appellant's driveway, Wise Lane, so they can save some money by using a gravity sewer system.

The date is 10-10-2023.

That also proves that when the respondent, D.R. Horton, obtained the encroachment permit by email by way of assignment using the previous owner's encroachment permit application form, that was illegal because the respondent, D.R. Horton, are the new owners of the DV Timber subdivision since August 2023, according to D.R. Horton Assistant Secretary Michael Condon's affidavit. And the encroachment permit page 1 under the previous owner BRD Land Investments LLC, were to use Helms Drive, Pruitt Street and Trinity Drive, approved by employee Mike Goldston, dated February 16, 2023.

Which is the same date the appellants got the residential use address 911 from employee Tiffany Hueber from

Dorchester County, which is 493 Wise Road, the mailing address.

So, the encroachment permit is good for 12 months.

Then you have to fill out a new one, a new encroachment permit application.

So, the permit is under the previous owner, BRD Land and Investments, expired on February 16, 2024.

By that time, the respondent, D.R. Horton, is the new owner.

So, the new encroachment permit application form should be under the respondent's name, D.R. Horton.

But in April 25, 2024, an email permit the respondent, D.R. Horton, still using the previous owner's application form for an encroachment permit.

And still the first page of the encroachment permit is showing Helms Drive and Pruitt Street as the location for the encroachment permit.

Exhibit 5-10, South Carolina rule of expanding and an easement, similar cases, South Carolina Electric and Gas vs Berkeley Electric.

Exhibit# 5-11, email from South Carolina to the appellant Lynne Chatlos, proof that Wise Lane is a private road.

Exhibit #5-12, Stantec Engineering Design.

As we can see, two of D.R. Horton's lawyers went to the appellant's neighbor Amanda Wise trying to buy a 40-foot utility easement from her for water and sewer.

See Amanda Wise affidavit in Exhibit #6.

Exhibit #5-13, Dorchester County's rule of encroachment permits.

Good for six months, then an extension for another six months.

So, it's good for a whole year.

Then after that required a reapplication for the new permit.

Exhibit# 5-14, letter from Dorchester County Planning and Zoning -Residential Use to prove that the appellant's physical address is 493 Wise Lane and Wise Road is 911 and that is proof that Wise Lane is a private driveway to the appellant.

Exhibit #5-15, DHEC permit to construct on-site water waste system showing the physical address Wise Lane and also showing the water supply private.

So, when Derrick McCoy said there is existing water pipes on Wise Lane, that was a flat-out lie. He had no proof

Note: The county did fire Derek McCoy because he was working outside the scope of Dorchester County

The permit date of January 10th, 2023.

That also proves that Wise Lane is a private road.

Exhibit #5-16, the appellants tried to clear some of the respondent, D.R. Horton's confusion about the difference

between a right-of-way and a public right-of-way.

The respondent's lawyer was trying to mislead the court with some terminology such as a public easement is the same as easement as the boundary line and adjacent line.

The appellants did clear up all of that confusion they tried to invent.

Exhibit# 5-17, the desperation of respondents D.R. Horton in that exhibit about how two lawyers from the respondent, D.R Horton, went to the appellant's neighbor Amanda Wise work unannounced to try to buy a 40-foot utility easement.

How they were begging her to sell them a 40-foot utility easement to respondent D.R. Horton.

So that is more proof that respondent D.R. Horton does not have a legal permit to work on the appellant's driveway, Wise Lane.

It also proves that Wise Lane is a private road, otherwise why would they try to buy a utility easement from the neighbor, Amanda Wise?

Exhibit #5-18 proves that Wise Lane always was a private road and private land since 1857 and in the previous owner's deed, no public or dedication to the road.

The road was always private, never public.

Exhibit #5-18 about the rules of the easement and the ROW, the rule of extending an easement.

The county does not have the right to extend an easement without the consent of the easement holder.

And also about Dorchester County never accepting the dedication so Wise Lane is a private road.

And the private easement and the appellant, he is the only dominant easement holder left on Wise Lane.

That is why Wise Lane is a private driveway to reach his two lots. #5 and #6.

Exhibit# 5-19, Dorchester County GIS map shows the easement location on Wise Lane and how the road ends at the appellant's lot # 5.

That means the easement between the appellant's lot #5 and lot #6 is relinquished, meaning that it is non-existent anymore and it is ceased to exist due to the doctrine of merger that is registered with the Dorchester Register of Deeds in St George, SC

Because lot #5 and lot #6 are under unity of one ownership, both lots are owned by one owner which is the appellant.

South Carolina Supreme Court rules that you cannot have an easement on your own property and with the Doctrine of Merger, it should end the case right there.

Exhibit #5-20, a plat map for Twin Lakes subdivision clearly shows the boundary lines between the appellant's property and the respondent's property.

Also showing the easement location and where the easement ends and which lot owner has the right to use the easement.

And the 1967 plat map shows the boundary line for the Twin Lakes subdivision and Darlington Veneer Company which 1,500 acres of wood forest.

In 2023, the respondent's D.R. Horton became the owner of Darlington Veneer Company.

It was a tree farm for logs.

The Veneer Company never used any of the Twin Lakes subdivision roads ever.

The Appellants' Review and Report.

On Honorable Judge Murphy's Review and Report, on the Respondent's, D R Horton January 17, 2025, filing.

The Appellants object to Honorable Judge Murphy's Review and Report on the Respondent's January 17, 2025 filing.

In the Court of Appeals Order and Directions, the Court did not give direction to the Honorable Judge Murphy to write her review and report on the Respondent's exhibits.

So the Appellants object to Honorable Judge Murphy's report, but the Appellants would like to give some notes on Judge Murphy's report.

Notes, number one, about the Respondent's January 17, 2025, filing.

The Respondents, D R Horton never served the Appellants with the January 17, 2025, filing

And the Appellants never signed for the Respondent's D R Horton's FedEx package.

And that is a violation of South Carolina Civil Procedure.

And the Appellants asked Judge Murphy in many motions to strike and to remove the Respondent's D R Horton January 17, 2025, filing off the record.

Note number two, if the Respondents D R Horton have a legal permit, why did the Respondents D R Horton never call the County to enforce the permit?

And why didn't they serve the Appellants according to the Civil Procedure?

And why did the Respondents DR Horton wait to surprise the Appellants with comments and fake permits so the Appellants would be surprised during the virtual hearing on January 21, 2025?

And that is another violation of South Carolina Civil Procedure.

No surprises, and any judgment should be void.

If you break one rule of the Civil Procedure, the judgment would be void, and the Respondent, DR Horton, broke all of them.

In Honorable Judge Murphy's report on page 6A, Exhibit#1A, May 30, 2024, through June 3, 2024, email communications between Stantec Consulting and County employees of Dorchester County regarding removal of Appellants' gate, blocking access to the road.

So, what happened after that story ended?

That's it?

What does that mean?

So that is proof that Wise Lane is a private ownership and the County does not have jurisdiction over Wise Lane

The Appellants did strike the Respondent DR Horton's January 17, 2025, filing due to inaccurate statements,

falsely and misleading the Court, and all the Respondent's D R Horton statements were not under oath and not under penalty of perjury. and cannot be proven by any County resolution or acceptance of Wise Lane into the County Maintenance system.

And the County never accepted the road and the County never maintained Wise Lane.

And that should be enough to end the case right there.

The burden of proof is on the Respondent, DR Horton.

And the Respondent, DR Horton, failed to prove that the

County accepted Wise Lane into the County

Maintenance System and that the public ever

used the road.

On January 17, 2025, at 9:30am, the Respondent,

D R Horton, entered January 17, 2025, exhibits into

evidence which were never served upon the Appellants.

It is a violation of due process and surprised the Appellants that the Respondents D R Horton lack of honor And it is a violation of South Carolina Civil Procedure. And the Appellants never got the chance to talk, even for two minutes. And the appellant Lynne Chatlos never even got a chance to speak.

Honorable Judge Murphy stopped the Appellant, Attia And when she tried to talk about how the Respondent, DR Horton's contractors trespassed on the Appellants' property and how the Respondent's contractors sexually harassed her, the Honorable Judge Murphy immediately stopped her, why do this to a victim that has suffered enough And asked the Respondent's lawyer, Mark Bible, to speak And the Appellant, Attia Elbadawy, asked Honorable Judge Murphy, "But Your Honor, I didn't even have a chance to talk for two minutes."

Mr. Mark Bible

On January 21, 2025, a virtual hearing was held on two different cases.

The first one was case number 2024-CP-1801458 against Dorchester County.

And the second case was 2024-CP-1801459 against the Respondent, DR Horton.

Honorable Judge Murphy stopped the Appellant, Attia Elbadawy, from talking.

Honorable Judge Murphy said she would review the record and that was how she left it that day.

The Appellant, Attia Elbadawy, kept telling Judge Murphy that there was a lot of evidence in the following

Exhibits:#5, Exhibit#5, Exhibit#4 ,Exhibit#3

Exhibit#2 and Exhibit#1.

But Honorable Judge Murphy kept stopping the Appellant from talking and moved onto the Respondent's lawyer,

Mr. Mark Bible.

He talked for over fifteen minutes that day during the virtual hearing.

The Appellants realized what was going on must have been planned ahead of time.

And this is why it was virtual hearings, so they could control the transcript later on.

Two transcripts have already been severely altered.

And on March 14, 2025, the Appellants filed a motion to present new evidence to the lower court.

The title of the motion was Plaintiffs' Motion to Present New Evidence.

The word "motion" had been whited out.

That motion to present new evidence was for the motion for injunction.

It was 120 pages of solid evidence.

But the Court never scheduled a motion hearing.

After January 21, 2025, until June 23, 2025, which is the date Honorable Judge Murphy denied the Appellants' motion for reconsider and the motion for injunction.

The Appellants filed more than 19 filings related to the motion for injunction.

Between filing motions to produce new evidence for the motion for injunction, adding new evidence, and motions to strike.

The Respondent's D R Horton Memorandum in Opposition to the Plaintiffs' Motion for Injunction. And the Motion to strike Chris Hill and Kelsey Harper affidavits.

Also, the motion to strike Dorchester County Attorney Bradley Mitchell's testimony from January 21, 2025, the virtual hearing and the motion for injunction and the emergency motion to strike.

Those motions have never even been heard and the

Hon Judge Murphy ruled on the appellants motion to reconsider without even hearing any of the motions.

Proving once again Hon Judge Murphy bias actions

to the Respondents D R Horton.

And the motion to recuse Judge Murphy.

The filings adding new evidence and related to the motion for injunction were as follows.

1), On January 24, 2025, Plaintiffs added new evidence, over thirty pages of evidence, emails, maps, engineering designs, etc., Exhibit #6.

All of this proves Wise Lane is a private ownership and a private driveway.

2), On February 6, 2025, additional evidence, Exhibit #7 Steve Meyers affidavit, over 31 pages of documents, laws, and pictures, proving Wise Lane is a private road.

On February 14, 2025, Plaintiffs' request for production to the Defendants/Respondents DR Horton, all about the ownership and the motion for injunction, 2 pages.

On February 14, 2025, interrogatory questions to the Defendant /Respondent, DR Horton, all about the

Illegal permits and the ownership of Wise Lane, 7 pages.

February 20, 2025, adding more evidence, Exhibit# 8, 32 pages, proving that Dorchester County never maintained or owned Wise Lane, including maps, pictures, documents, etc.

The affidavit of Christopher Brown proves that Wise Lane is a private road and that he has maintained the east side of Wise Road for over 17 years no public ever used the road.

On March 14, 2025, the Plaintiffs' Motion to Present New Evidence for Motion for Injunction, 120 pages of laws similar cases cited, laws of including such as easements and similar cases, dedication, acceptance, similar cases, cases and laws and rules of prescriptive easements, documents, emails, affidavits of the Plaintiffs' neighbors and their full consent to the Appellant to have sole

ownership over Wise Lane and to keep the black metal gate up on his driveway.

And also affidavits of Mark Wapshire, Clayton Homes' manager, and Exhibit # 9, and many other documents and emails to prove Wise Lane is a private road.

But the word "motion" was whited out from the top page of the motion page.

Mark Wapshire proved that Wise Lane is a private road and never maintained by the County and that the public never used the road and that the black metal gate has been there with No Trespassing signs on it.

On April 7, 2025, the Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel to the Respondent, DR Horton, Inc., to answer the Appellants' interrogatory questions.

That motion is all about the motion for injunction and to prove that Wise Lane is private and that the Respondent, DR Horton, has no legal right to be on the Appellant's driveway.

The Respondent, DR Horton, refused to answer the Appellants' 22 straight forward questions, and that Motion is 49 pages long.

In Exhibit# 10, on April 7, 2025, the Motion to Open an Internal Investigation, the Respondent, DR Horton, produced a lot of fake documents.

And the motion for injunction at the January 21, 2025, virtual hearing included a fake permit and fake documents trying to prove that the Appellant's driveway is a County road.

This motion is all about the motion for injunction and about the January 21, 2025, virtual hearing, and it is about 44 pages long.

On April 9, 2025, Plaintiffs' evidence to consolidate the two cases.

The case against Respondent DR Horton in case number 2024-CP-1801459 and the case against Defendant Dorchester County in case number 2024-CP-1801458.

This motion was all about the ownership of Wise Lane and why it was so important to consolidate the two cases together, 7 pages.

On April 15, 2025, the Motion to Compel Production of Documents, etc. 177 pages long, all about proving that the Appellant is the owner of Wise Lane and that Respondent DR Horton refused to produce the documents.

And directly linked to the motion for injunction.

On May 14, 2025, motion to reconsider Plaintiff's motion for temporary injunction and/or pulmairy injunction.

On May 14, 2025, the Plaintiffs filed a Motion to Reconsider, 159 pages.

Also included were the Appellant Attia Elbadawy's affidavit, 7 pages, and the Appellant Lynne Chatlos's affidavit, 6 pages.

A mountain of evidence from documents, emails, South Carolina Supreme Court rules of dedication and acceptance, and common law rules, neighbors' affidavits, cited laws, cited cases, photos, etc.

All prove Wise Lane is a private driveway only for the Appellant and prove that the easement between Lot #5 and Lot #6 has now ceased to exist.

Over 159 pages of solid evidence, Google maps

County surveys, and GIS maps prove the County never accepted the road and the public never used the road.

But the Honorable Judge Murphy kept denying motions of the Appellants without any given reason why or any explanation as to the reason for the denials.

She seems very biased toward the Respondent D.R. Horton.

That is why the Appellants filed a lawsuit against Dorchester County in Federal Court for due process, discrimination, Freedom of Information Act violations, property damage, property rights, obstruction of justice, abuse of authority, Fifth Amendment violations, Fourteenth Amendment violations, continued discrimination, fraud by trying to steal private land, and many other violations.

Honorable Judge Murphy destroyed the integrity of the justice system in Dorchester County and also destroyed America's image as a nation that believes in justice as a whole.

On May 16, 2025, the Appellants filed a Motion to Stay.

The Honorable Judge Murphy never heard this motion.

18–pages, Exhibit –A and Exhibit– B, including

Amanda Wise’s full consent to the Appellant to have sole ownership over Wise Lane and to keep the Black Metal Gate on top of his driveway, Wise Lane.

On June 5, 2025, the Appellants filed a Motion for Declaratory Judgment to declare that Wise Lane is a private road by adverse possession by tacking with the previous owner.

All the landowners on Wise Lane and Wise Road gave their consent to the Appellant, Attia Elbadawy, to be the only legal owner over Wise Lane and to keep the Black Metal Gate on his driveway.

Also, Wise Lane is an easement for only the dominant easement holder, Attia Elbadawy.

This motion is directly related to the motion for injunction, and Judge Murphy never heard this motion before she denied the Appellants' Motion to Reconsider.

On June 5, 2025, the Appellants filed a Motion to Extend or Reopen to the discovery deadline, eleven pages.

On June 5, 2025, the Appellants added evidence to support the Motion to Reconsider, Exhibits K/R, 66-pages.

Also on June 5, 2025, the Appellants filed a Memorandum in Support of the Plaintiffs' Motion for Declaratory Judgment, 44- pages long, and a Petition to Declare Wise Lane a Private Road, Exhibit- N.

On June 9, 2025, the Appellants filed a Memorandum in Support of the Motion to Reconsider and a Motion to Stay, 21- pages long.

On June 10, 2025, the Appellants filed a Motion for Continuance of Trial, 5- pages.

Also on June 10, 2025, the Appellants filed a Memorandum in Support of Documents for the Motion to Reconsider, 197- pages long.

On June 12, 2025, the Appellants added more evidence, 11-pages.

On June 12, 2025, the Appellants filed a Memorandum and Documents in Support of the Appellants' Motion for Internal Investigation, Motion to Produce Documents, and Motion to Compel, 96- pages.

On June 16, 2025, the Appellants filed a Memorandum in Support of the Motion to Reconsider, 12-pages.

Also on June 16, 2025, the Appellants filed a Motion to Strike Chris Hill's affidavit, Kelsey Harper's affidavit, the Respondent D.R. Horton's memorandum in opposition to the motion for injunction, and Dorchester County Attorney Bradley Mitchell's testimony from the January 21, 2025, virtual hearing.

On June 23, 2025, the Appellants filed an Emergency Motion to Strike due to missing filings and docket irregularities.

On June 27, 2025, the Appellants filed a Motion to Recuse Honorable Judge Murphy.

On June 18, 2025, the Respondent D.R. Horton filed a Memorandum in Opposition to the Motion to Compel discovery one hour before the scheduled hearing and never served the Appellants.

The June 18, 2025, hearing transcript was later found to be significantly altered.

Due to all these violations, the Appellants respectfully request that the Court of Appeals and the South Carolina Supreme Court remove case number 2024-CP-1801459 from Dorchester County Circuit Court.

The court never entered or placed the Appellants' Motion to Strike on the court docket until after the Honorable Judge Murphy denied the Appellants' Motion to Reconsider. The Appellants called and emailed the clerk, Priscilla Bolen, every day to inquire why the Appellants' Motion to Strike was not yet on the court's docket. The answer was always the same: the court was short on staff and the motion would be placed on the docket eventually.

Until June 23, 2025, at approximately 9:50 a.m., when Respondent D.R. Horton filed a Motion for Summary Judgment against the Plaintiffs. When the Appellants saw Respondent D.R. Horton's Motion for Summary Judgment appear on the court docket on June 23, 2025, at 9:50 a.m., and the Appellants' Motion to Strike was still not on the court docket, despite having been pending since June 16, 2025, the Appellants realized that the

court was again attempting to gain time so that Respondent D.R. Horton could file its Motion for Summary Judgment first.

At that time, the Appellants knew for certain that the Honorable Judge Murphy would deny the Appellants' Motion to Reconsider. Therefore, on June 23, 2025, racing against time, the Appellants rushed to the courthouse in St. George to file an Emergency Motion to Strike at approximately 12:43 p.m., consisting of 21 pages.

The Motion to Strike addressed missing filings and undocketed materials, including the Appellants' Motion to Strike, the affidavits of Chris Hill and Kelsey Harper, and Respondent D.R. Horton's memorandum, which had been filed on January 21, 2025, in connection with the Motion for Injunction hearing.

However, with extraordinary speed, the Honorable Judge Murphy denied the Appellants' Motion to Reconsider around 4pm on June 23,2025 she saved Respondent D.R. Horton for a second time.

On June 27, 2025, the Appellants filed a Motion to Recuse Judge Murphy to remove her from the case

as she had become demonstrably biased in favor of Respondent D.R. Horton.

On June 17, 2025, Defendant Dorchester County filed its answer to Defendant/Third-Party Plaintiff D.R. Horton, Inc counterclaim 8 months late, and one day before the June 18,2025 virtual hearing on the following Motions:

(1) Motion to Compel; (2) Motion to Open Internal Investigation; and (3) Motion to Produce Documents each of which supported Respondent D.R Horton at the June 18,2025 virtual hearing.

On June 18, 2025, Respondent D.R. Horton filed a memorandum in opposition to the Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Discovery at approximately 8:51 a.m., just one hour before the virtual hearing scheduled for 10:00 a.m. that same day. Respondent D.R. Horton never served the Appellants.

During the virtual hearing, the Appellants notified the Honorable Judge Murphy that Respondent D R Horton had never served them with the filing, yet she took no action and imposed no sanctions on Respondent D.R. Horton's counsel. It was treated as though nothing improper had occurred.

Later, the June 18,2025 virtual hearing transcript revealed that approximately fifty percent (50%) of the transcript had been altered to favor Respondent D.R. Horton

For these reasons, the Appellants seek intervention by the Court of Appeals and the South Carolina Supreme Court to remove the Appellants CASE No: 2024-CP-18-01459, from Dorchester County Circuit Court.

All of the evidence and documents have been submitted to the lower court before the January 21,2025 virtual hearing on the Motion for Injunction and also, before the Motion to Reconsider.

Motion for Injunction on June 23,2025

and also, all of the evidence and documents have been submitted by the appellants to the Court of Appeal order on August 13,2025

The following order from the Court of Appeal can be found on the next page. (page 18)

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Attia Elbadawy and Lynne Chatlos, Appellants,

v.


D.R. Horton, Inc., Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2025-001299

ORDER

On July 18, 2025, Appellants filed a motion to stay the circuit court's May 6, 2025 and June 23, 2025 orders, which respectively denied Appellants' motion for a temporary injunction and/or preliminary injunction and denied Appellants' motion to reconsider the circuit court's order denying Appellant's motion for temporary injunction and/or preliminary injunction. On July 30, 2025, we construed Appellants' motion as a petition for a writ of supersedeas pursuant to Rule 241 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules requesting a temporary injunction, to which no return had been filed. The order imposed a temporary injunction and ordered Respondent to file a return and Appellants to file a reply, explaining the request for a writ of supersedeas would be considered upon receipt of the requested filings, which the court has now received.

After careful consideration, we continue the temporary injunction and remand to the circuit court to allow the circuit court to expeditiously review the petition for a writ of supersedeas, return, and reply, and determine whether the exhibits provided in those filings were part of the record before the court at its January 21, 2025 hearing. Appellants shall provide this court with a copy of the circuit court's written order making this determination within ten days of receipt. Following the circuit court's written order making this ruling, this court will consider the petition for a writ of supersedeas.


FOR THE COURT

J.

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Attia Elbadawy

Lynne Chatlos

Mark Anthony Bible, Jr., Esquire

John T. Crawford, Jr., Esquire

The Honorable Maite Murphy

The Honorable Cheryl L. Graham

CONCLUSION

Review and Conclusion.

Appellants, after careful review of the Honorable Judge Murphy's review and report on the Appellants' exhibits and the writ of supersedeas, the Appellants object to Honorable Judge Murphy's review and report.

And the Appellants return the matter back to the lower court to review the errors and mistakes in Honorable Judge Murphy's review and report.

In Honorable Judge Murphy's order, the order is full of mistakes and defects.

And those mistakes, there are so many and they are serious mistakes, listing them as the following.

1) Honorable Judge Murphy did not write her report and review on the following exhibits.

Exhibit #1, filed on November 12, 2024.

Exhibit #2, filed on November 12, 2024.

Exhibit#3 filed on November 12, 2024.

Exhibit#5 filed on January 17, 2025.

About her review and report on Exhibit #4, filed on December 30, 2024.

On Exhibit#5, filed on January 10, 2025.

The report on exhibit#4 and exhibit#5 are full of defects and those defects are so many and very serious.

The Appellants have already listed them in the motion.

Also, about the review of her reports about the Appellants' filing evidence and motions after January 21, 2025, until the June 23,2025 period. Hon Judge Murphy review and report on the Appellants' evidence and motions filed after January 21,2025, is inaccurate and full of mistakes and defects and needs to be corrected. The Appellants did list all the filings and motions that have been filed by the Appellants from the time period of January 24, 2025, until June 23,2025

for the lower court to review & report with precise accuracy.

This section is part of the conclusion. The following pages and exhibits were filed by the Appellants for the January 21, 2025 virtual hearing. The total exhibits related to the Motion for Injunction consist of 6 exhibits.

Exhibit #1 was filed on November 12, 2024.

Exhibit #2 was filed on November 12, 2024.

Exhibit #3 was filed on November 12, 2024.

Exhibit #4 was filed on December 30, 2024.

Exhibit #5 was filed on January 10, 2025.

Exhibit #5 was filed on January 17, 2025.

The total number of pages submitted by the Appellants before the January 21, 2025 virtual hearing were 342 pages

The Honorable Judge Murphy reviewed and reported on only 64 pages out of the 342 pages submitted by the appellants.

The total number of pages submitted by the Appellants from January 21, 2025 until June 23, 2025, which is the date the Honorable Judge Murphy denied the Appellants' Motion to Reconsider the Motion for Injunction, is 1,307 pages.

Accordingly, the total number of pages submitted by the Appellants from September 5, 2024 until January 17, 2025, which was prior to the virtual hearing on the Motion for Injunction held on January 21, 2025, was 342 pages

The total number of pages submitted by the Appellants from January 21, 2025 until the second Motion for Injunction, which was the Motion to Reconsider denied on June 23, 2025, was 1,307 pages total.

SOUTH
100

Therefore, the grand total of pages related to the Motion for Injunction from September 5, 2024 through June 23, 2025, is 342 pages plus adding the 1,307 pages for a grand total of 1,649 pages submitted by the appellants.

Out of the 1,649 pages only a mere 64 pages were reviewed and reported on that related to the Motion for Injunction, by the Honorable Judge Murphy.

Out of the 1,649 pages the appellants submitted 495 pages to the Court of Appeals.

As a result, the Court of Appeals returned the Honorable Judge Murphy's order to the lower court for review and re-reporting on all those missing exhibits.

Accordingly, a total of 1,585 pages remain missing from the exhibit review.


+


**SOUTH CAROLINA
DORCHESTER COUNTY**

**COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
CASE No:2024-CP-1801459**

Attia Elbadawy and
Lynne Chatlos
Plaintiffs
V
D R Horton, Inc,
Defendants

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
MOTION TO CORRECT THE
RECORD AND AMEND ERRONEOUS
SUPERSEDEAS ORDER**

D R Horton, Inc
Third Party Plaintiffs,
V
Dorchester County
Third Party Defendants,

**We certified that a true copy of MOTION TO CORRECT THE RECORD
AND AMEND ERRONEOUS SUPERSEDEAS OFFER**

By depositing it in the United States Mail,
first-class postage prepaid, or by certified mail, addressed as
follows on the date indicated below:

1) D.R. Horton, Inc.,
Mark Bible
325 W. McBee Ave., Suite# 301,
Greenville, SC 29601.

2) Dorchester County
Attorney, Bradley Mitchell
201 Johnston St., St. George, SC 29477.

Attia Elbadawy

Lynne Chatlos
493 Wise Road (mailing)
493 Wise Lane (911/physical)
Summerville SC 29483
ala-international@yahoo.com
December 29, 2025
29,

David J. Stephens
CLERK OF COURT
DORCHESTER COUNTY
2025 DEC 29 11:48
CERTIFIED COPY