

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

RECEIVED
Nov 07 2025
SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM GREENVILLE COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Jessica A. Salvini, Circuit Court Judge
Civil Action No. 2024-CP-23-02744

Appellate Case No: 2025-001550

Bruce Wilson,, Appellant

v.

Pranceton Rodrigues Williams and Ennis M. Fant., Defendants,

Of Whom Ennis M. Fant....., Respondent.

**SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE
CLERK'S DEFICIENCY LETTER DATED OCTOBER 29, 2025**

TO: THE HONORABLE COURT OF APPEALS OF SOUTH CAROLINA

NOW COMES the Appellant, Bruce Wilson, pro se, and files this Supplement to his Motion for Reconsideration of the Clerk's Deficiency Letter dated October 29, 2025. Appellant submits this supplement to present *newly considered, material* evidence that directly refutes the basis for the Deficiency Letter.

The Clerk's Deficiency Letter, dated October 29, 2025, asserts that Appellant's Proof of Service is non-compliant because it "does not show service to respondent's counsel at the correct address," specifically directing Appellant to use "1315 Blanding Street, Columbia, SC 29201."

Contrary to the implication of the Deficiency Letter, a review of the official records of the South Carolina Court of Appeals confirms that P.O. Box 1452, Columbia, SC 29202 is in fact an address actively and officially used by the Rutherford Law Firm for litigation in this Court.

In the concurrently pending appeal of Leslie E. Jennings-Maldonado v. Demetrius Flemming (Appellate Case No. 2025-001424), the attorneys for the Appellant, J. Todd Rutherford and Austin D. Nichols, are listed as the counsel of record. In that capacity, they have filed multiple documents listing the Rutherford Law Firm's address as:

RUTHERFORD LAW FIRM
1315 Blanding Street (29201)
P.O. Box 1452
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

(See "Notice of Appeal" filed July 16, 2025; "Motion for Extension of Time" filed August 4, 2025); notwithstanding, the Blanding Street does not denote "*Columbia SC*"

The "Proof of Service" in that case, signed by J. Todd Rutherford, also includes P.O. Box 1452. This establishes that the firm itself, and the specific attorneys involved in this matter, represent this P.O. Box as a proper address for service and official correspondence.

In support of this Supplement, Appellant will contemporaneously file as **Exhibit A** relevant filings from the Court of Appeals in *Case No. 2025-001424*, and as **Exhibit B** filings from the lower court action underlying the present appeal, which show Mr. Austin D. Nichols of the Rutherford Law Firm utilizing the same P.O. Box 1452 address in his representation concerning Appellant Wilson's civil suit(s).

Furthermore, Appellant utilized a second, well-established method of service accepted by this Court: electronic service via the Court's filing system to the email address *austin@rutherford.law*. Respondent's counsel has acknowledged this as his valid email address. This method of service is routinely accepted by this Court and provides immediate, verifiable delivery.

Therefore, Appellant effectuated service through two channels: (1) U.S. Mail to the P.O. Box address his firm uses in its own appellate and lower court practice, and (2) the Court's e-filing system to his acknowledged email address. The method used for the Initial Brief was identical to the service method for the Motion to Stay, which this Court previously accepted and acted upon without issue.

It is fundamentally inconsistent and prejudicial to deem a pro se Appellant's service deficient for utilizing an address that the Respondent's law firm concurrently and officially employs in its own filings, especially when coupled with proper electronic service. The Deficiency Letter, based on an incomplete record, penalizes Appellant for reasonably relying on the Respondent's own documented practices and using a court-approved electronic service method.

WHEREFORE, Appellant Bruce Wilson respectfully reiterates the prayers for relief in his original Motion and further prays that this Honorable Court:

1. Take judicial notice of the use of P.O. Box 1452 by the Rutherford Law Firm, and attorneys J. Todd Rutherford and Austin D. Nichols, in the official filings for Jennings-Maldonado v. Flemming (2025-001424) and in the lower court proceedings of the instant matter.
2. Find that the Appellant's service upon Respondent's counsel both via U.S. Mail to P.O. Box 1452 and electronically to austin@rutherford.law was proper, compliant with the SCACR, and undertaken in good-faith reliance on the Respondent's own listed addresses and the Court's accepted practices.
3. Grant the Motion for Reconsideration, vacate the Deficiency Letter, and deem the Appellant's Initial Brief and Designation of Matter as timely and properly filed.

Respectfully submitted

By: /s/ Bruce Wilson
Bruce Wilson
14 Freestone St.
Greenville, SC 29605
brucewilson23@gmail.com
Pro Se Appellant

RECEIVED
Nov 07 2025
SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM GREENVILLE COUNTY

Court of Common Pleas

Jessica A. Salvini, Circuit Court Judge

Civil Action No. 2024-CP-23-02744

Appellate Case No: 2025-001550

Bruce Wilson, , Appellant

v.

Princeton Rodrigues Williams and Ennis M. Fant., Defendants,

Of Whom Ennis M. Fant....., Respondent.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Bruce Wilson, hereby certify that on this 7th day of November, 2025, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Supplemental To The Motion for Reconsideration upon Respondent's counsel, Austin D. Nichols, Esq., via the Court's e-filing system and email to: austin@rutherford.law

By: /s/ Bruce Wilson
Bruce Wilson
14 Freestone St.
Greenville, SC 29605
brucewilson23@gmail.com
Pro Se Appellant

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT A

RECEIVED

Aug 04 2025

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

J. Kristi F. Curtis, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2025-001424

Leslie E Jennings Maldonado, Respondent,

v.

Demetrius Fleming, Appellant.

MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO REQUEST TRANSCRIPT

NOW COMES the Appellant, Demetrius Fleming (“Appellant”), pursuant to Rule 207(b)(1) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR), and respectfully moves this Court for an extension of time within which to serve and file the request for transcript(s) in the above-captioned matter. In support of this motion, Appellant states the following:

1. Appellant timely filed the Notice of Appeal in this matter on July 16, 2025.
2. Under Rule 207(b)(1), SCACR, Appellant is required to serve and file the request for transcript(s) within ten (10) days of filing the Notice of Appeal.
3. Due to a good faith mistake in identifying the appropriate transcript and delay in obtaining necessary court reporter information, Appellant is unable to meet the original deadline.
4. This request is made in good faith and not for purposes of delay.
5. Appellant respectfully requests an extension of **30 days** from the current deadline, up to and including August 15, 2025, within which to serve and file the transcript request(s).
6. No party will be prejudiced by the granting of this motion.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Court enter an Order granting an extension of time to serve and file the transcript request(s).

Respectfully submitted,

This 4th day of August, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ J. Todd Rutherford
J. Todd Rutherford, Esq.
Austin D. Nichols, Esq.
RUTHERFORD LAW FIRM
1315 Blanding Street (29201)
P.O. Box 1452
Columbia, South Carolina 29202
Phone No.: (803) 256-3003
Fax No.: (803) 256-9698
todd@rutherford.law
austin@rutherford.law
Attorneys for Appellant

Other Counsel of Record:
Leonard R. Jordan, Jr., Esq.
211 Veterans Road, Suite D
Columbia SC 29209
(803) 726-1950
Attorney for Respondent

RECEIVED

Aug 04 2025

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

J. Kristi F. Curtis, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2025-001424

Leslie E Jennings Maldonado, Respondent,

v.

Demetrius Fleming, Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Notice of Appeal on Leonard R. Jordan, Jr, Esq. by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on July 16, 2025, addressed to 211 Veterans Road, Suite D Columbia SC 29209.

This the 4th day of August 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ J. Todd Rutherford

J. Todd Rutherford, Esq.

Austin D. Nichols, Esq.

RUTHERFORD LAW FIRM

1315 Blanding Street (29201)

P.O. Box 1452

Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Phone No.: (803) 256-3003

Fax No.: (803) 256-9698

todd@rutherford.law

austin@rutherford.law

Attorneys for Appellant

EXHIBIT A

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

J. Kristi F. Curtis, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2021CP4002079

Leslie E Jennings Maldonado, Respondent,

v.

Demetrius Fleming, Appellant.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Demetrius Fleming (“Appellant”) appeals the Judgment and decision in the above-referenced case. On November 5, 2021, the Circuit Court issued an Order entering Default Judgment against Appellant in the amount of \$49,133.98. The Judgment was imposed by the Honorable L. Casey Manning. Appellant timely filed an Answer to Plaintiffs Summons and Complaint on October 15, 2021. Appellant filed a Motion to Set Aside on September 25, 2023. The Circuit Court denied Appellant’s Motion on July 9, 2024. Appellant timely filed a Motion to Reconsider on July 22, 2024. This appeal is taken from the Order of the Honorable Kristi F. Curtis, dated June 18, 2025, which denied Appellant’s Motion to Reconsider. Appellant received written notice of entry of this order on June 18, 2025.

This the 16th day of July 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ J. Todd Rutherford

J. Todd Rutherford, Esq.

Austin D. Nichols, Esq.

RUTHERFORD LAW FIRM

1315 Blanding Street (29201)

P.O. Box 1452

Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Phone No.: (803) 256-3003

Fax No.: (803) 256-9698

RECEIVED
JUL 16 2025
SC Court of Appeals

todd@rutherford.law
austin@rutherford.law
Attorneys for Appellant

Other Counsel of Record:
Leonard R. Jordan, Jr., Esq.
211 Veterans Road, Suite D
Columbia SC 29209
(803) 726-1950
Attorney for Respondent

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

J. Kristi F. Curtis, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2021CP4002079

Leslie E Jennings Maldonado, Respondent,

v.

Demetrius Fleming, Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Notice of Appeal on Leonard R. Jordan, Jr, Esq. by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on July 16, 2025, addressed to 211 Veterans Road, Suite D Columbia SC 29209.

This the 16th day of July 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ J. Todd Rutherford
J. Todd Rutherford, Esq.
Austin D. Nichols, Esq.
RUTHERFORD LAW FIRM
1315 Blanding Street (29201)
P.O. Box 1452
Columbia, South Carolina 29202
Phone No.: (803) 256-3003
Fax No.: (803) 256-9698
todd@rutherford.law
austin@rutherford.law
Attorneys for Appellant

RECEIVED

JUL 16 2025

SC Court of Appeals

Cases

Case Search

Participant Search

Disclaimer: The information and documents available here should not be relied upon as an official record of action. Only filed documents can be viewed. Some documents received in a case may not be available for viewing. Some documents originating from a lower court, including records and appendices, may not be available for viewing.

Case Information: 2025-001424

Court:	Court of Appeals	Classification:	Appeal - Common Pleas - Other
Short Title:	Leslie E. Jennings-Maldonado v. Demetrius Flemming View Full Title	Case Status:	Awaiting Transcript
Consolidated:			
Filed Date:	07/16/2025	Oral Argument Date:	
Disposition Date:		Disposition Type:	
Remittitur Date:			
Lower Court or Tribunal:	Richland (2021CP4002079)		

- Party Information

Appellate Role	Party Name	Former	Attorney(s)
Appellant	Demetrius Flemming	N	Austin Drake Nichols James Todd Rutherford
Respondent	Leslie E. Jennings-Maldonado	N	Leonard R. Jordan, Jr.

Views

Display:

Event Information

Filed Date	Event Information	Doc
09/10/2025	Transcript Documents - Other Correspondence - Cancellation	
09/10/2025	Transcript Documents - Transcript Ordered - Second Transcript Request	
08/22/2025	Transcript Documents - Other Correspondence - From Court Reporter	
08/14/2025	Transcript Documents - Transcript Ordered	
08/05/2025	Non-Dispositional Decision - Extension Granted - Request Transcript	
08/04/2025	Motion - Extension of Time (1st) - Request Transcript	
08/04/2025	Correspondence - Outgoing (Transcript to be Ordered Letter)	
08/04/2025	Transcript Documents - Transcript Ordered	
07/21/2025	Correspondence - Outgoing (Initial Letter)	
07/16/2025	Notice of Appeal (Civil) - Initial	

EXHIBIT B

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
COUNTY OF GREENVILLE

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF
THE THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Bruce Wilson,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.)
)
Princeton Rodrigues Williams, and)
Ennis M. Fant)
)
Defendants.)

CASE NO.: 2024-CP-23-02744

**MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO
RECONSIDER**

NOW COMES Defendant, Ennis M. Fant (“Fant”) by and through counsel, and submits this Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion to Reconsider. Fant submits the follow in support of his memorandum:

ARGUMENT

Plaintiff’s Motion to Reconsider is merely a restatement of his written and oral arguments to the Court. Under SCRCP Rule 59(f), a Rule 59(e) motion may in the discretion of the court be determined on the briefs filed by the parties without oral argument. Motions to Reconsider are limited in scope and are not to be used to repeat the same arguments previously presented. *Dockins v. Benchmark Commc’n*, 180 F.R.D. 294, 295 (D.S.C. 1998). A Motion to Reconsider cannot be granted where the moving party simply seeks to have the Court rethink its decision. *Id.*

Our Supreme Court has stated that, “our rules contemplate two basic situations in which a party should consider filing a Rule 59(e) motion.” *Elam v. South Carolina Dep’t of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 24 (2004). A party may wish to file such a motion when she believes the court has misunderstood, failed to fully consider, or perhaps failed to rule on an argument or issue, and the party wishes for the court to reconsider or rule on it. *Elam*, 361 S.C. at 24. A party must file such a motion when an issue or argument has been raised, but not ruled on, in order to preserve it for appellate review. *Id.* Additionally, “[a] party **cannot** use a motion to reconsider to present an

issue he could have raised prior to judgment but did not.” *Anderson Mem'l Hosp., Inc. v. Hagen*, 313 S.C. 497, 498 (Ct. App. 1994) (citation omitted) (emphasis added).

In this matter Plaintiff simply reasserts the same arguments considered and determined by this Court, and Plaintiff seeks to assert the misplaced argument that Pranceton Williams’ procedural default status can be used to support his lack of factual pleading. This Court has considered all the facts and argument presented, and in doing so, issued its order on the merits. Procedurally, Plaintiff’s initial Complaint was dismissed for failure to state a claim and now Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint has been dismissed for the same.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above reasons, Plaintiff’s Motion to Reconsider should be dismissed and this Court’s Order granting Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss should be upheld.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Austin D. Nichols
Austin D. Nichols, Esq.
J. Todd Rutherford, Esq.
RUTHERFORD LAW FIRM
1315 Blanding Street (29201)
P.O. Box 1452
Columbia, South Carolina 29202
Phone No.: (803) 256-3003
Fax No.: (803) 256-9698
Attorneys for Defendant
austin@rutherford.law
todd@rutherford.law

This the 9th day of May 2025.