

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
The Honorable Dale Van Slambrook, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2024-001734

Olga Teslenko, Appellant,
v.
Joe Kocsis,
Carpet King & Flooring, Respondents.

**APPELLANT’S EMERGENCY MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD ON APPEAL,
AND REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION**

NOW COMES Appellant, acting pro se, and respectfully moves this Honorable Court, pursuant to Rules 210 and 212, SCACR, for leave to supplement the Record on Appeal with critical materials necessary for briefing and appellate review. Appellant asserts that these materials were excluded below from the record through violations of Appellant’s right to due process. The denial of this motion would be **dispositional in nature**, effectively depriving Appellant of a meaningful appeal.

This motion invokes the Court's inherent power to control its docket and fulfill its duty under S.C. Code Ann. § 18-7-130, which mandates that appellate courts hear appeals based on all essential exhibits. Appellant seeks **Panel Review** and **Immediate Consideration** in light of the February 12, 2026, briefing deadline and the pending motion for extension filed January 28, 2026.

In support of this Motion, Appellant states the following:

1. **Official Transcript of Trial Audio (Exhibit 2):**

- **Procedural History:** This Court granted transmission of trial exhibits on November 26, 2025. These exhibits (filed Dec. 1, 2025) were transmitted as a raw flash drive, consistent with the form admitted at trial.

- **Need for Supplement:** Proper appellate review and briefing necessitate an official transcript of the audio recording on said drive. This transcript is essential to establish the factual basis, central to the appeal, which was rendered inaccessible through procedural irregularities in the lower court.

2. **Evidence of Docket Tampering (Exhibit 3):**

- **Procedural History:** On September 20, 2024, Appellant filed a Motion for Reconsideration citing constitutional violations and including Screenprints E2 and E4 as newly discovered evidence of docket tampering. Through clerical obstruction, this motion was denied judicial review, and Appellant was denied the opportunity to lay a proper foundation for this evidence.
- **Need for Supplement:** To ensure this Court can review the evidence of tampering embedded in these screenprints, Appellant seeks to supplement the record with the necessary legal foundations and hyperlink analysis that were timely filed but suppressed below.

3. **Evidence of Improper Captioning (Exhibit 4):**

- **Procedural History:** Appellant's Motion for Reconsideration, timely filed below, was improperly re-captioned as a 'Domestic Violence' motion and placed on an incorrect roster, effectively excluding it from judicial review.
- **Need for Supplement:** Appellant seeks to supplement the record with a screenprint of the circuit court docket showing this re-captioning, which will directly demonstrate the obstruction that prevented a fair hearing.

4. **Extraordinary Circumstances:**

Appellant suffers from a documented progressive neurological disability and acute illness, which have significantly hindered her ability to address these complex record deficiencies. Supplementing the record now is the only way to ensure the Amended Initial Brief is built upon a truthful and complete trial record.

5. **Dispositional Nature of Motion:**

- Denial of this motion would be dispositional, effectively dismissing the appeal by excluding critical trial evidence barred below via due process violations.

- A delay in adjudication would constitute a *de facto* denial, as the current February 12 deadline approaches while the January 28 motion for extension remains unruled.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Court grant leave to supplement the Record on Appeal with the aforementioned materials (Exhibits 2, 3, and 4) to ensure a just and constitutional review of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Olga Teslenko

Olga Teslenko, Appellant, Pro Se

100 Fountain Pointe Ln, Unit 103

Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29579

Email: osenochen@gmail.com

Tel: (510) 388-2780

Dated: February 3, 2026.

Enclosed:

Exhibit 1 – Appellant’s affidavit;

Exhibit 2 – Official Transcript of Joe Kocsis’ November 16, 2023 inspection;

Exhibit 3 – Legal Foundation and Hyperlink Analysis (Screenprints E2 and E4), Appellant’s sworn testimony;

Exhibit 4 – Screenprint “Motion Miscalcaptioned ‘DV’.pdf”.

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1

Appellant's Notarized Affidavit for
Emergency Motion to Supplement,
filed February 3, 2026

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
The Honorable Dale Van Slambrook, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2024-001734

Olga Teslenko, Appellant,
v.
Joe Kocsis,
Carpet King & Flooring, Respondents.

AFFIDAVIT
OF APPELLANT OLGA TESLENKO

I, Olga Teslenko, having been duly sworn, hereby depose and state as follows:

1. I am the Appellant in the Appellate Case No. 2024-001734 and I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein.
2. **Trial Audio Recording and Transcript:** I personally made the audio recording of Respondent's inspection using my iPhone X. This recording was admitted into evidence at the March 29, 2024 trial, located in 'Folder 4' on the Appellant's flash drive. I personally provided this audio recording to court recorder Kevin Dehlinger of Legal Eagle. Attached as **Exhibit 2** is the official transcript produced by said recorder. I declare this transcript to be a true and accurate written representation of the audio evidence admitted at trial.
3. **Docket Screenprints E2 and E4 and Legal Foundations:** I personally captured the screenprints labeled E2 and E4 directly from the Horry County Fifteenth Judicial Circuit official Public Index on July 16, 2024, and August 25, 2024. These screenprints are true and accurate representations of the case electronic docket as it existed on those dates. I submitted them to the circuit court in my September 20, 2024 motion for reconsideration as newly discovered evidence of docket tampering. The legal foundations and hyperlink analysis, attached as **Exhibit 3**, constitute my sworn

testimony and analysis of this evidence, which I was denied the opportunity to present below due to clerical obstruction.

4. **Evidence of Re-Branding:** I personally captured the screenprint "Motion Miscalcaptioned 'DV'.pdf" directly from the Horry County Fifteenth Judicial Circuit official Public Index on September 30, 2024. This screenprint is a true and accurate representation of the electronic docket as it existed on that date. I submit this screenprint, attached as **Exhibit 4**, as newly discovered evidence of my Motion for Reconsideration being improperly re-captioned as a "Domestic Violence" motion.
5. **Authenticity:** All exhibits attached to my Motion to Supplement are authentic copies of the records I personally recorded, observed, and captured.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.

Olga Teslenko



SWORN to and subscribed before me

this 3 day of February, 2026.

 (L.S.)
Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission Expires: 11-08-2035



Exhibit 2

Official Transcript of Joe Kocsis'
November 16, 2023 inspection.

NOVEMBER 16, 2023

INSPECTION

LEGAL EAGLE

Post Office Box

Greenville, South Carolina 29606

(864) 467-1373 -- depos@legaleagleinc.com

1 OLA TESLENKO:

2 (Inaudible).

3 JOE KOCSIS:

4 I'm doing all right, just (inaudible) around trying
5 to take care of my baby. Woah, did you pull all
6 these up?

7 OLA TESLENKO:

8 Only with the (inaudible).

9 JOE KOCSIS:

10 Okay, I mean, the good news is it's -- it's okay.
11 Like this is an easy fix.

12 OLA TESLENKO:

13 I'm not sure.

14 JOE KOCSIS:

15 It's just -- well, it's the adhesive is what it is.

16 OLA TESLENKO:

17 But it's everywhere. There's no (inaudible).

18 JOE KOCSIS:

19 (Inaudible).

20 OLA TESLENKO:

21 Oh, (inaudible) like (inaudible) and then
22 (inaudible).

23 JOE KOCSIS:

24 So do me a favor, if you see them like this, don't
25 pull them all the way up because it is a pressure

1 sensitive adhesive. So, even though like it's still
2 walkable, like when it's done, it does need time to
3 tack up.

4 OLA TESLENKO:

5 It (inaudible). I took videos. It (inaudible) like
6 this.

7 JOE KOCSIS:

8 Okay. That's okay, but just don't take them up.
9 Like, we could still identify the pieces --

10 OLA TESLENKO:

11 (Inaudible).

12 JOE KOCSIS:

13 No, no, no. It's -- it's the adhesive is what -- is
14 what the problem is.

15 OLA TESLENKO:

16 But Joey (inaudible).

17 JOE KOCSIS:

18 No, there's adhesive on the floor. You had carpet
19 down here.

20 OLA TESLENKO:

21 The old installation had at least one-eighth of an
22 inch of glue.

23 JOE KOCSIS:

24 No, no, no. This was the carpet glue right here.
25 There -- they just -- they just put a little

1 (inaudible) on the concrete.

2 OLA TESLENKO:

3 I can -- I can show you (inaudible).

4 JOE KOCSIS:

5 It's (inaudible) the (inaudible) is glued down all
6 the way. I would have to scrape the floor
7 (inaudible).

8 OLA TESLENKO:

9 Joey, (inaudible). This -- this adhesive here is at
10 least one-eighth --

11 JOE KOCSIS:

12 That's because that's --

13 OLA TESLENKO:

14 -- thick.

15 JOE KOCSIS:

16 -- that's because that's the edge of it. It's --
17 it's pushed out on the edge.

18 OLA TESLENKO:

19 It's on --

20 JOE KOCSIS:

21 Like if you --

22 OLA TESLENKO:

23 -- thick (inaudible).

24 JOE KOCSIS:

25 No, I understand.

1 OLA TESLENKO:

2 Not one of the pieces here (inaudible) pulled up.

3 JOE KOCSIS:

4 Okay, I know.

5 OLA TESLENKO:

6 Even -- even though they have gaps --

7 JOE KOCSIS:

8 I understand. Hear me out though real quick, okay.

9 Hear me out. These pieces that we had to pull up,
10 so remember you had a -- a cut here?

11 OLA TESLENKO:

12 Yeah.

13 JOE KOCSIS:

14 Okay, so we had to take pieces up so you would have
15 no transition. Okay, if that were the case, this
16 would be a different height, but they're perfectly
17 even. Okay, this is glued straight down to the
18 floor.

19 OLA TESLENKO:

20 I don't (inaudible).

21 JOE KOCSIS:

22 You don't --

23 OLA TESLENKO:

24 (Inaudible). So, what I found is after I had my
25 (inaudible) with that almost every plank was

1 buckling and peeling up. And so, I started looking
2 (inaudible) and it turns out (inaudible).

3 JOE KOCSIS:

4 Okay, well do me a favor, I don't want you to freak
5 out over this, okay, because it is a glued down LVP.

6 OLA TESLENKO:

7 Uh-huh (affirmative).

8 JOE KOCSIS:

9 So this is an easy fix, okay. But you see how the
10 back is here; you don't see these (inaudible).

11 OLA TESLENKO:

12 (Inaudible).

13 JOE KOCSIS:

14 Well, that's what I'm saying; it simply just didn't
15 tack up. So what we're going to have to do is we
16 might have to bring in a weight roller, and you have
17 to do that sometimes with concrete, sometimes you
18 don't have to, but sometimes you do because it's not
19 tacking up to the back of the application it's not
20 tacking to the back of the product. So, this is an
21 easy fix, so I don't want you to freak out about it,
22 okay? So, let me -- let me walk around. I've seen
23 this before and it's --

24 OLA TESLENKO:

25 I'm thinking that (inaudible) right now, but the

1 rest of the floor is in -- is in exactly the same
2 condition (inaudible) here.

3 JOE KOCSIS:

4 Okay, well let me -- let me take a look, okay?

5 OLA TESLENKO:

6 (Inaudible) are you thinking to just glue those
7 pieces back down?

8 JOE KOCSIS:

9 Yeah, you have to. Yeah.

10 OLA TESLENKO:

11 Don't you think the rest of the floor needs to be
12 re-glued?

13 JOE KOCSIS:

14 No, no, no, no, because --

15 OLA TESLENKO:

16 Or (inaudible).

17 JOE KOCSIS:

18 Well, it's -- here, okay, when -- when I get the
19 glue, the glue that we use that's recommended for
20 this product, I'll -- okay, I'll show you the back
21 of the (inaudible).

22 OLA TESLENKO:

23 (Inaudible) used.

24 JOE KOCSIS:

25 Okay. That's how they sell it.

1 OLA TESLENKO:

2 Yeah, it's supposed to -- you're supposed to -- you
3 have -- supposed to have used 4.3 gallons on this
4 square footage.

5 JOE KOCSIS:

6 This spread right on here --

7 OLA TESLENKO:

8 Uh-huh (affirmative) .

9 JOE KOCSIS:

10 -- is 800 square feet.

11 OLA TESLENKO:

12 Do you have -- have you had any other buckets of
13 glue?

14 JOE KOCSIS:

15 Like diff -- like different stuff?

16 OLA TESLENKO:

17 Yeah. Have you only used that (inaudible).

18 JOE KOCSIS:

19 That's, yeah, that's what we (inaudible).

20 OLA TESLENKO:

21 Well, you only used half of the amount you were
22 supposed to use. With that, I insist on the whole
23 floor, lifting up and being glued. Not -- not one
24 place in this floor has been glued correctly.

25 There's half a bucket there, so only two gallons of

1 glue have been used.

2 JOE KOCSIS:

3 Okay, let me -- let me show you (inaudible).

4 OLA TESLENKO:

5 (Inaudible) it's my (inaudible).

6 JOE KOCSIS:

7 I'm not going to do (inaudible).

8 OLA TESLENKO:

9 That's fine.

10 JOE KOCSIS:

11 I just wanted to show you --

12 OLA TESLENKO:

13 (Inaudible). Do you remember saying you were going
14 to take care of all the subfloor problems?

15 JOE KOCSIS:

16 Yes.

17 OLA TESLENKO:

18 Have you?

19 JOE KOCSIS:

20 Oh, this is an adhesion issue is what it is.

21 OLA TESLENKO:

22 Well (inaudible) second problem. The second problem
23 is this. There's a dip here that's more than a
24 quarter inch. I will not be able to apply any
25 baseboards with this floor. You can -- you can

1 (inaudible).

2 JOE KOCSIS:

3 Okay, so you -- when we talked and I talked about
4 your subfloor.

5 OLA TESLENKO:

6 Uh-huh (affirmative).

7 JOE KOCSIS:

8 And I told you, like once the carpet comes up, like,
9 I don't know what's going on underneath.

10 OLA TESLENKO:

11 Uh-huh (affirmative).

12 JOE KOCSIS:

13 And you wanted to just go back with a baseboard.
14 Now, if you want to make your floor completely
15 level, yes (inaudible) but I won't know that until
16 the carpet comes up. There's no way --

17 OLA TESLENKO:

18 (Inaudible).

19 JOE KOCSIS:

20 -- of me (inaudible).

21 OLA TESLENKO:

22 -- conversation (inaudible).

23 JOE KOCSIS:

24 Uh-huh (affirmative).

25 OLA TESLENKO:

1 You told me that you (inaudible) done once you
2 ripped up the carpet. I pressed you to tell me how
3 much it would cost and that's why, and the final
4 conclusion that the amount would not be higher than
5 \$500.

6 JOE KOCSIS:

7 I said I would not know. I would -- I told you I
8 would not know.

9 OLA TESLENKO:

10 You said that most likely would not be higher than
11 -- more than \$500.

12 JOE KOCSIS:

13 Okay, so -- okay, so this is what I'll do.

14 OLA TESLENKO:

15 So, one thing to level the floor, because I told
16 you, yes we agreed under \$500, let's go ahead and do
17 everything (inaudible).

18 JOE KOCSIS:

19 If you want your floor to be completely level, we'll
20 have to self-level the whole floor, and there's no
21 way that it'll just be \$500. I told you we take
22 care of, like, subfloor imperfections.

23 OLA TESLENKO:

24 Well, that -- okay, so in the beginning, you knew
25 that I was going to try avoid quarter round.

1 JOE KOCSIS:

2 Uh-huh (affirmative).

3 OLA TESLENKO:

4 I needed to replace the baseboards with (inaudible)
5 quarter round (inaudible).

6 JOE KOCSIS:

7 Okay that --

8 OLA TESLENKO:

9 (Inaudible) all I needed was for you to tell me
10 what's the maximum amount for it. You said there's
11 no way it's gonna be more than \$500.

12 JOE KOCSIS:

13 There's no way for me to know, and for subfloor like
14 to get to spots like this (inaudible).

15 OLA TESLENKO:

16 Right, but you (inaudible).

17 JOE KOCSIS:

18 Okay, this is what I can do for you, okay. If you
19 want for all this to come up and for all the spots
20 to be level, like we can do that.

21 OLA TESLENKO:

22 (Inaudible).

23 JOE KOCSIS:

24 I think -- I think maybe (inaudible).

25 OLA TESLENKO:

1 (Inaudible).

2 JOE KOCSIS:

3 So, do you know when your original baseboard was
4 down and -- and that's when you said you didn't want
5 to use quarter round, right? And your original
6 baseboard was down and I told you that, you know, if
7 you don't use quarter round you'll see imperfections
8 because the entire floor like there's no such thing
9 as a perfect flat floor, and that's why everybody
10 uses quarter round to hide those imperfections.
11 Now, if you want to like skim coat certain areas and
12 bring them up, so you -- 'cause it's not going to be
13 perfectly lying flat. That's almost impossible
14 unless you self-level the whole place, and that's
15 what I was telling you before the carpet came up,
16 that that's what would happen.

17 OLA TESLENKO:

18 First of all, the first time we met you said you
19 would take care of all the subflooring issues. Then
20 I get your quote, and there's no specifically
21 mentioning of leveling of any dips --

22 JOE KOCSIS:

23 Because I -- because I don't know.

24 OLA TESLENKO:

25 Correct. I called you and we had that conversation.

1 JOE KOCSIS:

2 Uh-huh (affirmative).

3 OLA TESLENKO:

4 All I needed for you is to tell me the maximum
5 amount. Tell me 500, I'll go with that. Tell me
6 more, you know, I'll think about it.

7 JOE KOCSIS:

8 But I -- I can't --

9 OLA TESLENKO:

10 At that time --

11 JOE KOCSIS:

12 I want you --

13 OLA TESLENKO:

14 I had the chance to refuse your quote and go with
15 someone else --

16 JOE KOCSIS:

17 But we had --

18 OLA TESLENKO:

19 -- who had given me guarantee.

20 JOE KOCSIS:

21 Respectfully, Ola, respectfully, I -- nobody will
22 know until the carpet comes up.

23 OLA TESLENKO:

24 Correct. Why didn't you level up the dips when the
25 carpet came up?

1 JOE KOCSIS:

2 Okay, well, when you're going back to the baseboard,
3 I didn't see anything significant --

4 OLA TESLENKO:

5 Well --

6 JOE KOCSIS:

7 -- when this came up. This point being --

8 OLA TESLENKO:

9 More than a quarter inch dip is significant. It's
10 going to -- I can't put the baseboards on.

11 JOE KOCSIS:

12 Okay, so -- all right, so -- okay, so let's do this
13 then, okay. If you want all this to be fixed, okay,
14 what we're going to have to do is this piece that
15 you're using here, when we take this stuff up, what
16 we're going to have to do is set a level on the wall
17 and see where there's any dips.

18 OLA TESLENKO:

19 Normally, a carpenter has big levels.

20 JOE KOCSIS:

21 Yes, but when you're doing LVP, LVP is supposed to
22 go over imperfect floorings, that's what they're
23 for. And if you're not using quarter round to hide
24 imperfections, that's what it's for. But if this is
25 the way -- the way you want to do it, I guess I had

1 a different --

2 OLA TESLENKO:

3 Joey, on Tuesday I had the chance to go with someone
4 else who had guaranteed they would do everything
5 correctly so I can actually avoid quarter round.
6 Now, there are two problems that I'm describing
7 right now. One problem is your installers have used
8 insufficient amount of glue. Some places are not
9 even glued. They've brushed it, painted it.

10 JOE KOCSIS:

11 (Inaudible).

12 OLA TESLENKO:

13 I have evidence, objective evidence, half a bucket
14 of that glue, four gallon bucket, half of it is
15 still there. So, 600 square feet had only been
16 covered with two gallons of glue. According to the
17 label printed on that bucket, it's twice as little
18 as necessary for the minimum coverage. Therefore,
19 I'm telling you, the rest of this floor is probably
20 in the same condition as these planks. Therefore,
21 patching is not good for me at all. I do not agree
22 to that. Secondly, I was willing to pay the maximum
23 amount that you would tell me. I knew it's not
24 going to be more than \$500 in materials.

25 JOE KOCSIS:

1 Okay. So, well -- all right -- well, since -- okay.
2 What I'm saying, and I'm not trying to, you know,
3 justify anything, but what I'm asking is that since
4 I know exactly how you want it, being super level
5 with the baseboard, even though I did bring that up,
6 I just -- will you just give me an opportunity to
7 fix it?

8 OLA TESLENKO:

9 Well, what you were talking about was hair width of
10 discrepancy.

11 JOE KOCSIS:

12 Uh-huh (affirmative).

13 OLA TESLENKO:

14 Hair width of discrepancy can indeed be caulked.

15 JOE KOCSIS:

16 Yeah.

17 OLA TESLENKO:

18 But more than a quarter inch of discrepancy, that's
19 a huge dip. I couldn't -- I couldn't put a
20 baseboard in a way to hide it.

21 JOE KOCSIS:

22 Okay.

23 OLA TESLENKO:

24 Joey, I don't need to cause hurt. I need -- see,
25 the thing is that the money I paid you is the only

1 money I have. Now, I could go with someone else who
2 guaranteed a tiny bit bigger price, but guaranteed
3 everything is fine, would be done correctly. I
4 have -- I don't know how to let you -- if I were to
5 let you remedy it, what would you do?

6 JOE KOCSIS:

7 Well, we'd have to take it up.

8 OLA TESLENKO:

9 And do what?

10 JOE KOCSIS:

11 And we'd have to put -- level down on all the bases,
12 and any of -- and all the planks that aren't
13 adhered, you'd have to pull them up and put them
14 back down.

15 OLA TESLENKO:

16 Any planks that aren't adhered. And what I'm saying
17 is, two gallons of glue could not be spread on 600 -
18 -

19 JOE KOCSIS:

20 There (inaudible).

21 OLA TESLENKO:

22 -- square feet to -- to the planks.

23 JOE KOCSIS:

24 Well actually -- it -- well -- it actually is 800
25 square feet, so we used -- we used three quarters of

1 what we were supposed to use. So, if we use half
2 the bucket, that's two -- 400 square feet worth of
3 glue, depending on what trowel -- size trowel you
4 use.

5 OLA TESLENKO:

6 Joey, there's a label on that bucket.

7 JOE KOCSIS:

8 Uh-huh (affirmative).

9 OLA TESLENKO:

10 On the back of that bucket.

11 JOE KOCSIS:

12 Uh-huh (affirmative).

13 OLA TESLENKO:

14 The smallest minimum covers 140 square feet per
15 gallon.

16 JOE KOCSIS:

17 Per gallon, yeah.

18 OLA TESLENKO:

19 Right.

20 JOE KOCSIS:

21 Yes.

22 OLA TESLENKO:

23 And there are 600 square feet here.

24 JOE KOCSIS:

25 Yes, so we used two, so -- like, okay, so I guess

1 Justin went light on there, so. Will you allow me
2 to fix it?

3 OLA TESLENKO:

4 You have no workers; you have no expertise. Who's
5 going to do it? Justin again? I don't want it. I
6 don't want him back. I -- how could you -- look,
7 those are not -- they're patches, they're not even
8 covered in glue. How can you possibly do it?

9 JOE KOCSIS:

10 We can fix it, if you just give me an opportunity to
11 fix it. You won't have to pay anything.

12 OLA TESLENKO:

13 No, I know, I -- but -- but Joey, I have to actually
14 go and ask you for the money back. I have to. I
15 cannot risk. Please understand. Please understand.

16 JOE KOCSIS:

17 Okay.

18 OLA TESLENKO:

19 If I -- if you want to, when I save up more money,
20 I'll use the tiling job if you want to. Give me a
21 good quote, I'll pay extra. I don't care to pay a
22 little bit extra, but I need to get it back.

23 JOE KOCSIS:

24 Okay.

25 OLA TESLENKO:

1 I need to get -- you know, this is the only money I
2 have. The way I save it up is I cut on all of my
3 possible expenses, food included, which has been so
4 far good for me, and it's been working for me, you
5 know. But I'm just afraid, Joey, I'm honestly,
6 sincerely afraid, 'cause you only have Justin and
7 Roger. Roger is --

8 JOE KOCSIS:

9 I have more than Justin and Roger, but, I mean, they
10 do good work. I really wish you'd give me an
11 opportunity to fix it.

12 OLA TESLENKO:

13 The whole floor needs to be come -- pulled up. I
14 don't trust the installation with this little glue.
15 You know, it's just -- it's just unpredictable.
16 It's going to look awful. So, just think about it.
17 The whole floor coming up, then you're going to lose
18 the pieces, which piece goes where. Then you're
19 going to have your guys complain about -- complain
20 about doing extra work.

21 JOE KOCSIS:

22 They won't complain.

23 OLA TESLENKO:

24 Yeah.

25 JOE KOCSIS:

1 No, they understand. Justin's a really nice guy.
2 He won't complain.

3 OLA TESLENKO:
4 How could he spread this little glue?

5 JOE KOCSIS:
6 I --

7 OLA TESLENKO:
8 I mean --

9 JOE KOCSIS:
10 I thought he was going off the spread rate, to be
11 honest with you. Would you please give me an
12 opportunity to fix it?

13 OLA TESLENKO:
14 Joey, I can't, really, I can't. I'm sorry.

15 JOE KOCSIS:
16 Alright, well, I'll --

17 OLA TESLENKO:
18 I really can't. Think about how you can -- I'll
19 give you business when I'm ready and have money to
20 do that. It's a 10 by 10 patio; tile it in any kind
21 of tile you want. I'll pay you extra.

22 JOE KOCSIS:
23 Okay.

24 OLA TESLENKO:
25 I'm sorry. I've -- I've been -- I've been doing

1 things for people in the past and look where it led
2 me. I have no money. I don't know how to handle
3 this. I would like the money back. What I'm going
4 to do is I'm going to hire one of the quotes that I
5 had. He's going to charge me more for ripping up
6 all of these. Although, to be honest with you, only
7 within two hours I've -- and not all of that time
8 picking up the pieces. At first I was poking my
9 finger in them and filming them. And then I was
10 like, well, how far will that lift? And is it
11 supposed to lift? Compared with all of the
12 installation, it's not supposed to lift.

13 JOE KOCSIS:

14 Okay. Alright, so I'll go get your money. I'll
15 return it tomorrow for you, okay?

16 OLA TESLENKO:

17 Yeah.

18 JOE KOCSIS:

19 Sorry about this.

20 OLA TESLENKO:

21 No, I'm sorry -- you can --

22 (End of tape)

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, Jessica Antonucci, a court-approved transcriber, do hereby certify that I transcribed the electronic recording and that said transcript is true and correct, all to the best of my knowledge and ability.

I further certify that I am not related to nor the employe of any of the parties or witnesses hereto, nor related to or employed by any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor interested in the outcome of this action.

January 29, 2026

Jessica Antonucci

Jessica N. Antonucci

Transcriber

Exhibit 3

Legal Foundation and Hyperlink
Analysis of Screenprints E2 and E4,
Appellant's sworn testimony.

**LEGAL FOUNDATION AND HYPERLINK ANALYSIS FOR SCREENPRINTS E2 AND E4,
TIMELY FILED BELOW
APPELLANT'S OLGA TESLENKO
SWORN TESTIMONY**

Appellate Case No. 2024-001734

EXHIBITS E2 AND E4: FOUNDATION.....	1
1. Authenticity.....	1
2. Relevance.....	3
EXHIBIT E2: PDF DETAIL.....	5
1. Rightmost return document: 24 pages.....	6
2. Leftmost return document: 55 pages.....	7
➤ DIRECT PROOF OF CLERK'S FRAUD.....	8
EXHIBIT E4: PDF DETAIL.....	10
1. Rightmost return document: 24 pages.....	11
2. Middle return document: 55 pages.....	12
3. New, leftmost return document: 30 pages.....	13
HOW THIRD DOCUMENT WAS BACK FILED AFTER HEARING.....	15
FURTHER MANIPULATION OF THE COURT FILING SYSTEM.....	17

EXHIBITS E2 AND E4: FOUNDATION.

1. Authenticity.

Exhibits E2 and E4 are screenprints of the official public index case management website, made by the standard instrument of the CTRL+P shortcut, common to all operating systems and available on all United States computers. Simultaneously pressing CTRL and P saves the image of the current website onto the user's hard drive, in PDF format, in full, from the top of the page to the bottom. Thus, by entering Appellant's case number into the public index case management website for Horry County, and then choosing the option which allows to view all case filings on one page, the user can capture and save the screenprint of all case filings in Appellant's case by simultaneously pressing CTRL and P. Exhibits E2 and E4 were thus made by Appellant at home using Appellant's computer before and after Appellant's hearing. The public index case management website is the official State government website, and therefore its screenprints are

self-authenticating¹.

If any additional authentication were to be required, exhibits E2 and E4 can be authenticated using the prima facie website authentication procedure of authentication standards for website evidence: by searching for the link for 'Horry County Public Index', then clicking on the word 'Accept', and entering Appellant's circuit court case number '2024CP2602983' into the corresponding field on the following page, which will open the Horry County Fifteenth Judicial Circuit public index website for Appellant's case. Both exhibits E2 and E4 bear the same insignia, labeling, and formatting, as the official public index website, and the contents in both exhibits are the same as the contents on the official public index website. In other words, both exhibits meet the necessary requirements for indicia of reliability: (1) bear the same distinctive design as the official public index website; (2) contain the same information in the same format as the content of the official public index website; and in particular (3) contain the same circuit court filings for Appellant's case from its inception as the content of the official public index website for Appellant's case. This can be verified any time by comparing exhibits E2 and E4 with the official public index website. Therefore, exhibits E2 and E4 do indeed accurately reflect the contents of the official public index case management website for Appellant's case and cannot be attributed to any other website or any other source. Appellant is still in possession of the original PDF screenprints, and will have them forensically analyzed if necessary.

Even though exhibit E2 doesn't show the internet address and the date stamp of where and when it was made, its appearance, distinctive design, and content matches those of exhibit E4 which does show the internet address of where it was made, as well as matches the appearance, distinctive design, and content of the official public index case management website for Appellant's case and its internet address, which, in turn, matches the internet address stamped on exhibit E4. It is therefore indisputable that exhibit E2 is a true screenprint of the official Horry County public index case management website for Appellant's case. The date stamp of exhibit E2 is only important in relative terms: that is, in terms of whether or not it was certainly made before Appellant's hearing on August 21, 2024. Reviewing exhibit E2, it becomes indisputable that it was certainly made before Appellant's hearing in August and after the

¹ Under Rule 902(5) (Official Publications), "[a] book, pamphlet, or other publication purporting to be issued by a public authority" is self-authenticating. Rule 101(b)(6) provides that "a reference to any kind of written material or any other medium includes electronically stored information." Hence, data on governmental websites are self-authenticating. See *Williams v. Long*, 585 F. Supp.2d 679, 686-88 & n. 4 (D. Md. 2008).

magistrate's return was filed in May. Additionally, both the date and the authenticity of exhibit E2 are corroborated by the Honorable Judge Dale Van Slambrook who, at Appellant's hearing, verbalized on record the exact wording of the caption for the magistrate's return entry as 'Appeal/Appeal Return Received', and the number of documents filed in this entry as exactly two documents (T1). See page 17 of this motion above. Accordingly, exhibit E2 shows that the entry captioned "Appeal / Appeal Return Received", created on May 29, 2024, contains exactly two documents.

Exhibit E4 bares the date stamp, and its internet address stamp matches the internet address of the official public index case management website for Appellant's case. It is therefore indisputable that exhibit E4 is an accurate representation of that website on the date stamped on it. Thus, the contents of both exhibits E2 and E4 are verifiably authentic¹, and can be independently verified by viewing the official public index case management website for Appellant's case. The above analysis provides sufficient proof that a reasonable juror would find in favor of their authenticity, and therefore exhibits E2 and E4 should be admitted into evidence under Rule 104(a)².

2. Relevance.

The relevance of exhibits E2 and E4 stems from the fact of the fraud committed by the circuit court clerk who hid the third document of the magistrate's return prior to Appellant's hearing and covertly back filed it into the entry for magistrate's return after Appellant's hearing³, because it contained the magistrate's summary of fact finding which the fraudulent clerk needed to conceal from Appellant. Exhibits E2 and E4 are direct proof of this fraud. The evidence they contain is corroborated by the official transcript of Appellant's hearing (T1), as well as through a comparative analysis of the documents filed in the magistrate's return and the actual exhibits filed by Appellant (M1). The fact of this fraud was first demonstrated in Appellant's motion for

¹ *Foreword Magazine, Inc. v. OverDrive Inc.*, No. 1:10-cv-1144, 2011 WL 5169384, at *4 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 31, 2011) (admitting screenshots from websites, accompanied only by the sworn affidavit of an attorney, given "other indicia of reliability (such as the Internet domain address and the date of printout)"); accord *Lebewohl v. Heart Attack Grill, LLC*, 890 F. Supp. 2d 278 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).

² Fed. R. Evid. 104(a) provides: "The court must decide any preliminary question about whether a witness is qualified, a privilege exists, or evidence is admissible. In so deciding, the court is not bound by evidence rules, except those on privilege."

³ Fed. R. Evid. 104(b) provides: "When the relevance of evidence depends on whether a fact exists, proof must be introduced sufficient to support a finding that the fact does exist. The court may admit the proposed evidence on the condition that the proof be introduced later."

reconsideration (M2), where Appellant explicitly objected to this fraud and requested a new trial. The circuit court order affirming the fraudulent magistrate's judgment (E9), proves this fraud by asserting that "no errors of . . . fact" were found, - when in reality, even without Appellant's evidence, the magistrate's return contains no evidence to support the judgment, which is an error of fact¹. If Appellant's case had been reviewed by an impartial judiciary, this glaring error would have necessarily been acknowledged. In other words, even without Appellant's evidence, the magistrate's judgment is not supported by any evidence. Whereas, with Appellant's evidence included in review, the magistrate's judgment proves to be fraudulent². Hence the clerk's need to exclude Appellant's exhibits from review and to conceal the magistrate's summary from Appellant before the hearing. For if Appellant was given an opportunity to see the magistrate's summary before the hearing, Appellant would have immediately seen that the findings of fact were fabricated, and would have raised this issue at the hearing and requested that her actual filed exhibits be reviewed, - the same way Appellant did in her motion for reconsideration. The only way the fraudulent clerk could cause the desired circuit court decision was by excluding Appellant's exhibits from review and by hiding the magistrate's summary from Appellant so as to keep Appellant completely unaware of its fraudulent content.

The fact of the clerk's fraud is also corroborated by her changing the awkwardly worded caption of the original magistrate's return entry from 'Appeal/Appeal Return Received' to 'Return from Magistrate Court' (E2), (E4). Exhibits E2 and E4 show the ample fluency with which the public index case management system is being manipulated by the fraudulent clerks: in back filing, in August, a new, third document into the old, May, entry for magistrate's return, the clerk not only uploaded a new document into the old entry but also re-uploaded the previous two documents and changed the captioning (A16). Yet the date and time stamp of the entry remained blissfully unperturbed. It is possible that correcting the captioning on an old filing entry is a standard process allowed to court clerks, and that the fraudulent clerk used it as a pretext to back file a new, third document into the old magistrate's return entry. Unfortunately, the fact of the new, third document having been back filed into the old entry for magistrate's return after Appellant's hearing is indisputable.

¹ S.C. Code § 18-9-280(3): The appellate court will verify whether or not "the order [in question] is supported by such quantum of evidence as prescribed by the statute or law under which judicial review is permitted".

² S.C. Code § 18-9-280(1): The appellate court will verify whether or not "the judgment [in question] is based on findings of fact which are clearly erroneous".

The following sections provide more specific evidence on how this back filing was performed and how the South Carolina courts case management system is being manipulated by the fraudulent clerks.

EXHIBIT E2: PDF DETAIL

Exhibit E2 is the screenprint 'Return Two documents' created before Appellant's hearing. Exhibit E2 shows that the entry for magistrate's return, dated May 29, 2024, is captioned 'Appeal/Appeal Return Received' and contains two documents:



Horry County Fifteenth Judicial Circuit Public Index



[Horry County Home Page](#) [South Carolina Judicial Department Home Page](#) [SC.GOV Home Page](#)

Olga Teslenko VS Carpet King & Flooring , defendant, et al							
Case Number:	2024CP2602983	Court Agency:	Common Pleas	Filed Date:	04/29/2024		
Case Type:	Appeal	Case Sub Type:	Magistrate Civil 910	File Type:	Non-Jury		
Status:	Appeal	Assigned Judge:	Clerk Of Court C P, G S, And Family Court	Disposition Date:		Disposition Judge:	
Disposition:		Disposition Date:		Disposition Judge:			
Original Source Doc:		Original Case #:					
Judgment Number:		Court Roster:					

Case Parties							
Click the icon to show associated parties.							
Name	Address	Race	Sex	Year Of Birth	Party Type	Party Status	Last Updated
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carpet King & Flooring	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent		05/02/2024
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carpet King & Flooring	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent Pro Se		05/02/2024
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kocsis, Joe	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent Pro Se		05/02/2024
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kocsis, Joe	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent		05/02/2024
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Teslenko, Olga	100 Fountain Pointe Lane Unit 103 Myrtle Beach SC 29579				Appellant Pro Se		05/02/2024
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Teslenko, Olga	100 Fountain Pointe Lane Unit 103 Myrtle Beach SC 29579				Appellant		05/02/2024

Actions						
Name	Description	Type	Motion Roster	Begin Date	Completion Date	Documents
Teslenko, Olga	Service/Affidavit Of Service on MB Magistrate Court	Filing		07/05/2024-16:17		
Teslenko, Olga	Appeal/Appeal Returned Received	Action		05/29/2024-13:32		
Teslenko, Olga	Appeal/Notice of Civil Appeal (Workflow)	Action		05/09/2024-15:27	05/25/2024-15:27	

The date of creation of this screenprint is obtained by observing that this screenprint had to be saved some time after the last filing, which is dated July 5, but before the hearing which was later scheduled for August 21.

At Appellant's hearing on August 21, 2024, the presiding circuit court judge, the Honorable Dale Van Slambrook observed exactly the same content in the case management system as is shown in exhibit E2. See section FACTUAL / PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND of this petition. Thus, exhibit E2 is the accurate representation of the contents of the public index case managements system for Appellant's case prior to, and on the date of Appellant's hearing.

Exhibit E2 is a PDF screenprint possessing the features of all PDF screenprints, one of which is that, for each image of a document on it, it contains the universal referencing location (URL or internet address) of the point where this document is stored on the court server. This URL can be viewed by hovering the cursor over the image of the document:

1. Rightmost return document: 24 pages.

Case Parties							
Click the  icon to show associated parties.							
Name	Address	Race	Sex	Year Of Birth	Party Type	Party Status	Last Updated
 Carpet King & Flooring	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent		05/02/2024
 Carpet King & Flooring	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent Pro Se		05/02/2024
 Kocsis, Joe	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent Pro Se		05/02/2024
 Kocsis, Joe	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent		05/02/2024
 Teslenko, Olga	100 Fountain Pointe Lane Unit 103 Myrtle Beach SC 29579				Appellant Pro Se		05/02/2024
 Teslenko, Olga	100 Fountain Pointe Lane Unit 103 Myrtle Beach SC 29579				Appellant		05/02/2024


Actions						
Name	Description	Type	Motion Roster	Begin Date	Completion Date	Doc
Teslenko, Olga	Service/Affidavit Of Service on MB Magistrate Court	Filing		07/05/2024-16:17		
Teslenko, Olga	Appeal/Appeal Returned Received	Action		05/29/2024-13:32		
Teslenko, Olga	Answer/Notice of Civil	Action		05/09/2024-15:27	05/25/2024-15:27	

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1726012&HKey=103894978821151191091139711882110104991211074970731209779744310243741071091001161148683707590871087081119>

The URL for the rightmost return document is stored in the screenprint file:

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1726012&HKey=103894978821151191091139711882110104991211074970731209779744310243741071091001161148683707590871087081119>

Clicking on the image of a document on the PDF screenprint opens the document's URL in the user's browser and returns a copy of the actual document stored on the court server at that location. Up until January 6, 2025, clicking on the image of the rightmost return document on exhibit E2 opened the above URL and returned a copy of the actual document, stored on the court server at that location, which consisted of **24 pages** with the words '**Carpet King and Flooring**' and '**Number 1111**' printed in large bold letters at the top of the first page:



2. Leftmost return document: 55 pages.

Case Parties							
Name	Address	Race	Sex	Year Of Birth	Party Type	Party Status	Last Updated
Carpet King & Flooring	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent		05/02/2024
Carpet King & Flooring	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent Pro Se		05/02/2024
Kocsis, Joe	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent Pro Se		05/02/2024
Kocsis, Joe	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent		05/02/2024
Teslenko, Olga	100 Fountain Pointe Lane Unit 103 Myrtle Beach SC 29579				Appellant Pro Se		05/02/2024
Teslenko, Olga	100 Fountain Pointe Lane Unit 103 Myrtle Beach SC 29579				Appellant		05/02/2024

Actions						
Name	Description	Type	Motion Roster	Begin Date	Completion Date	
Teslenko, Olga	Service/Affidavit Of Service on MB Magistrate Court	Filing		07/05/2024-16:17		
Teslenko, Olga	Appeal/Appeal Returned Received	Action		05/29/2024-13:32		
Teslenko, Olga	Appeal/Notice of Civil Appeal (Workflow)	Action		05/09/2024-15:27	05/25/2024-15:27	

The URL for the leftmost return document is stored in the screenprint file:

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1726009&HKey=981015072122811115710210611310012010879817768514810984113738290118100435211285677810253551077381104122115>

Clicking on the image of a document on the PDF screenprint opens the document's URL in the user's browser and returns a copy of the actual document stored on the court server at that location. Up until January 6, 2025, clicking on the image of the leftmost return document on exhibit E2 indeed opened the above URL and returned a copy of the actual document, stored on the court server at that location, which consisted of **55 pages**, with the first page showing a large full-page badly scanned photograph:



➤ **DIRECT PROOF OF CLERK'S PERJURY.**

Exhibit E2 is direct proof of perjury by acting clerk Ms. Keeling, who, under oath and on the record, instructed the Presiding Judge that: (1) the entry for the magistrate's return does contain a document with the magistrate's summary; (2) the summary occupies the first two pages of this document, which is 30-page long; (3) the summary is "from Judge Arakas" and is signed by the magistrate:

THE COURT: [...] Ms. Keeling maybe you can help me out on this one as well. Is there a return that's filed from the magistrate on this? ***I see an appeal return received on the end, and that looks like just the appeal documents. Is there a [summary portion] in this that I'm overlooking?***

THE CLERK: Let me look. The appeal returned received is the return, ***if you look there are 30 pages.***

THE COURT: ***Is that just the documents or is there an actual summary with an outline of information signed by the magistrate? I'm not sure if I -- because I scrolled through it, I'm just not --***

THE CLERK: ***Yes, it's from Judge Arakas.***

THE COURT: Where is that at?

THE CLERK: *The [summary portion] is the first two pages and then the rest is documents.*

THE COURT: All right. *And are you saying that that's under the caption where it says appeal/appeal return received?*

THE CLERK: *Yes, sir.*

THE COURT: *And is it the first or second document identified?*

THE CLERK: *I believe it's the first.*

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm trying to get this thing pulled up.

(DOM 7, 4:9-5-11).

Exhibit E2 shows that, prior to the hearing, the return entry was captioned 'Appeal/Appeal Return Received' and contained exactly two documents. The same was confirmed by the Presiding Judge at the hearing (DOM 7). Up through January 6, 2025, these documents could be accessed by clicking them on the screenprint, which returned a 24-page document with the words 'Carpet King and Flooring' invoice 'Number 1111' printed in large bold letters at the top of the first page, and a 55-page document whose first page showed a large full-page illegibly scanned black photograph (DOM 8, 9). The magistrate's return docket entry prior to and through the hearing, therefore, did not contain a 30-page document whose first two pages were occupied by the summary. The Presiding Judge confirmed it when he repeatedly scrolled through the two available documents throughout the hearing yet had been unable to see the summary:

THE COURT: Okay. **And I don't have the benefit of the [summary]. I see the documents that were filed but I still don't see the RETURN. [...] I need the opportunity to [...] find the summary portion** of it as well to see if there is a sufficient legal explanation for that reduction.

(DOM 7, p. 9: 14-16, 10: 11-13).

This is also confirmed by Appellant's objection:

MS. TESLENKO: **...as of this morning, the magistrate's return contained no summary.** Okay? Or the magistrate's judgment contains no

summary. I have copies of everything that was filed by the magistrate in their return.

THE COURT: All right. And that's what I'm saying.

(DOM 7, p. 11:3-11).

Had the magistrate’s summary been filed on the docket, the Presiding Judge couldn’t have failed to notice its distinct title **MAGISTRATE RETURN ON APPEAL** printed in capital bold letters on top of the first page and the magistrate’s signature on the second page.

Exhibit E4, captured after the August 21st hearing, shows that a new 30-page document was back-filed into the May 29th return entry after the hearing and contained the magistrate’s summary and the items Appellant specifically identified at the hearing as omitted from the return (DOM 7)

EXHIBIT E4: PDF DETAIL

Exhibit E4 is the screenprint ‘Return Three documents’ made after Appellant’s hearing. Exhibit E4 shows that the entry for magistrate’s return, dated May 29, 2024, is now captioned ‘Return from Magistrate Court’, and contains three documents:

Teslenko, Olga	Data Entry/Request to Correct Data Entry Error	Filing		08/14/2024-14:47		
Kocsis, Joe	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		08/09/2024-15:26		
Teslenko, Olga	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		08/09/2024-15:26		
Carpet King & Flooring	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		08/09/2024-15:26		
Teslenko, Olga	Letter Submitting Exhibits Omitted in Lower Court's Return	Filing		07/22/2024-14:16		
Teslenko, Olga	Letter to Clerk of Court About Appellants Disability	Filing		07/22/2024-14:12		
Carpet King & Flooring	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:17		
Kocsis, Joe	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:16		
Teslenko, Olga	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:16		
Kocsis, Joe	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Carpet King & Flooring	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Teslenko, Olga	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Teslenko, Olga	Service/Affidavit Of Service on MB Magistrate Court	Filing		07/05/2024-16:17		
Teslenko, Olga	Return from Magistrate Court	Action		05/29/2024-13:32		
Teslenko, Olga	Appeal/Notice of Civil Appeal (Workflow)	Action		05/09/2024-15:27	05/25/2024-15:27	
Teslenko, Olga	Email Confirmation of Appeal Received	Filing		05/03/2024-09:34		

The date of the creation of this screenprint is obtained from its date stamp which shows it to be September 8, 2024, and is only significant for being a date after Appellant’s hearing on

August 21.

At Appellant’s hearing, the presiding circuit court judge, the Honorable Dale Van Slambrook observed (E2) that the entry for magistrate’s return was captioned ‘Appeal/Appeal Return Received’ – while the case management system after Appellant’s hearing showed this captioning to have changed to ‘Return from Magistrate Court’, even though the date and time value of this entry had not changed at all (E4).

At Appellant’s hearing, the presiding circuit court judge, the Honorable Dale Van Slambrook observed (E2) that the entry for magistrate’s return contained exactly two filed documents – while the case management system after Appellant’s hearing showed that there were now three documents filed in this entry, even though the date and time value of this entry had not changed at all (E4).

It is clear, therefore, that a new, third document was back filed into the old May 29th entry for magistrate’s return after Appellant’s hearing in August. To establish what document was back filed, recall that exhibit E4 is a PDF screenprint and, as such, for each document on it, it saves the URL of the point on the court server where this document is stored. This URL can be viewed by hovering the cursor over the image of the document:

1. Rightmost return document: 24 pages.

Carpet King & Flooring	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:17		
Kocsis, Joe	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:16		
Teslenko, Olga	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:16		
Kocsis, Joe	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Carpet King & Flooring	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Teslenko, Olga	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Teslenko, Olga	Service/Affidavit Of Service on MB Magistrate Court	Filing		07/05/2024-16:17		
Teslenko, Olga	Return from Magistrate Court	Action		05/29/2024-13:32		
Teslenko, Olga	Appeal/Notice of Civil Appeal (Workflow)	Action		05/09/2024-15:27	05/25/2024-15:27	
Teslenko, Olga	Email Confirmation of Appeal	Filing		05/03/2024-09:34		

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1728091&HKey=12110181774874706911210987113122891028078561131121117985478810573749810674114119112811177083108551145377>

This URL for the rightmost return document is stored in the screenprint file:

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1728091&HKey=12110181774874706911210987113122891028078561131121117985478810573749810674114119112811177083108551145377>

Clicking on the image of the rightmost return document on exhibit E4 opens the above URL and returns a copy of the actual document, stored on the court server at that location, which consists of **24 pages**, with the words **'Carpet King and Flooring'** and **'Number 1111'** printed in large bold letters on the top of the first page:



2. Middle return document: 55 pages.


Carpet King & Flooring	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:17		
Kocsis, Joe	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:16		
Teslenko, Olga	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:16		
Kocsis, Joe	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Carpet King & Flooring	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Teslenko, Olga	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Teslenko, Olga	Service/Affidavit Of Service on MB Magistrate Court	Filing		07/05/2024-16:17		
Teslenko, Olga	Return from Magistrate Court	Action		05/29/2024-13:32		
Teslenko, Olga	Appeal/Notice of Civil Appeal (Workflow)	Action		05/09/2024-15:27	05/25/2024-15:27	
Teslenko, Olga	Email Confirmation of Appeal	Filing		05/03/2024-09:34		

The URL for the middle return document is stored in the screenprint file:

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1728090&HKey=83511214366109122877443738811997103788311478534811755121498879655770777948487751121116113841145085>

Clicking on the image of the middle return document on exhibit E4 opens the above URL and returns a copy of the actual document, stored on the court server at that location, which

consists of **55 pages**, with a large full-page badly scanned photograph on the first page:




3. New, leftmost return document: 30 pages.

Carpet King & Flooring	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:17		
Kocsis, Joe	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:16		
Teslenko, Olga	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:16		
Kocsis, Joe	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Carpet King & Flooring	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Teslenko, Olga	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44		
Teslenko, Olga	Service/Affidavit Of Service on MB Magistrate Court	Filing		07/05/2024-16:17		
Teslenko, Olga	Return from Magistrate Court	Action		05/29/2024-13:32		
Teslenko, Olga	Appeal/Notice of Civil Appeal (Workflow)	Action		05/09/2024-15:27	05/25/2024-15:27	
Teslenko, Olga	Email Confirmation of Appeal Received	Filing		05/03/2024-09:34		


The URL for the new, leftmost return document is stored in the screenprint file:

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1728089&HKey=431159965875771122122112121111545411948768211755106816511749113108571099077978010850848311648765210085>

Clicking on the image of the new return document on exhibit E4 opens this URL and returns a copy of the actual new document, stored on the court server at that location, which consists of **30 pages** with the words **MAGISTRATE RETURN ON APPEAL** printed in capital bold letters on top of the first page:



And the magistrate's signature on the bottom of the second page:



HOW THIRD DOCUMENT WAS BACK FILED AFTER HEARING

Comparing the URLs, stored in exhibit E2 and E4, exposes the mechanism by which the new, third document was back filed into the magistrate's return entry after the hearing. This comparison shows that the May 29th entry was accessed after the August 21st hearing for the purpose of editing its caption. At the same time, its contents: the two initially filed return documents (24 and 55 pages long), were deleted and then re-uploaded together with a new return document (30 pages long). The time required for the deletion and re-uploading of the documents can easily be attributed to the time necessary to correct the caption. When the first two documents were re-uploaded, they were assigned new locations on the court servers:

1. The URL of the right-most return document embedded in Exhibit E2:

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1726012&HKey=103894978821151191091139711882110104991211074970731209779744310243741071091001161148683707590871087081119>

The URL of the right-most return document embedded in Exhibit E4:

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1728091&HKey=12110181774874706911210987113122891028078561131121117985478810573749810674114119112811177083108551145377>

The embedded hyperlinks in exhibit E2 and E4 show that, while the 24-page return document occupies the same rightmost position on both exhibits, its server location on exhibit E4 is different from its server location on exhibit E2. The different location on exhibit E4 means that this is not the same document as was captured in Exhibit E2. Since clicking on this document on Exhibit E4 led, up through January 6, 2025, to the same 24-page document as on Exhibit E2, the only plausible explanation for the new location is that the initial document was deleted from the entry and a new copy was re-uploaded into the entry, which assigned it a new URL address. The exact date of this operation may be obtained from the court server and is certainly after the August 21st hearing (DOM 7).

2. The URL of the left-most return document embedded in Exhibit E2:

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1726009&HKey=98101507212281115710210611310012010879817768514810984113738290118100435211285677810253551077381104122115>

The URL of the middle return document embedded in Exhibit E4:

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1728090&HKey=83511214366109122877443738811997103788311478534811755121498879655770777948487751121116113841145085>

The embedded URLs in Exhibits E2 and E4 show that the second return document is located at a different URL on Exhibit E4 than on Exhibit E2. The document itself is readily confirmed as the same by clicking on the left-most document on Exhibit E2 and middle document on Exhibit E4, which, up through January 6, 2025, brought up the same 55-page return document. The only possible explanation for its location being different on Exhibit E4 than on Exhibit E2 is that this is not the same document as was captured in Exhibit E2. The initial 55-page return document was deleted from the entry and a new copy was re-uploaded into the entry, which assigned it a new URL address. The exact date of this operation may be obtained from the court server and is certainly after the August 21st hearing (DOM 7).

3. The URL of the third return document embedded in Exhibit E2:

Exhibit E2 does not contain a third document in the May 29th Return entry.

The URL of the third return document embedded in Exhibit E4:

<https://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PIImageDisplay.aspx?ctagency=26002&doctype=C&docid=1728089&HKey=431159965875771122122112121111545411948768211755106816511749113108571099077978010850848311648765210085>

The 30-page return document is a new document that appears in the docket entry for the magistrate's return only on Exhibit E4, which Appellant saved after her hearing, and which is fully confirmed by the Presiding Judge at the hearing (DOM 7). By clicking on it, a 30-page document is returned, containing the items Appellant identified at the hearing as omitted from the return, and, specifically, the magistrate's summary (DOM 7). The magistrate's summary occupies the first two pages of this new return document, starts with the words **MAGISTRATE RETURN ON APPEAL** in large bold capital letters on the top of the first page, and ends with the magistrate's signature on the bottom of the second page.

The only possible explanation for the appearance of a new document in the return docket entry after the hearing is that it was uploaded there after the hearing, which assigned it a unique URL address. The exact date and time of this operation may be obtained from the court server, whose audit log would confirm that its location has been assigned at approximately the same time as the URLs for the newly re-uploaded 24-page and 55-page documents.

The above analysis shows that sometime after Appellant's hearing on August 21, 2024,

the May 29th return entry was accessed and its initial caption was corrected. At the same time, the two documents it contained were deleted and then re-uploaded together with a new, third document.

FURTHER MANIPULATION OF THE COURT FILING SYSTEM

Up through January 6, 2025, the URLs for the two return documents on Exhibit E2 still returned copies of the actual 24-page and 55-page files stored at their original locations on the court server. Sometime after Jan 6, these documents were deleted from their original locations, and the URLs stopped returning them. When Appellant checked these URLs on January 30, they were already unable to return the documents.

It is possible that this occurred in the process of a regular server maintenance. Alternatively, it is possible that this was done deliberately. Given Appellant's records of the original URLs as provided above, this question may be ascertained via forensic analysis of the court server.

Exhibit 4

Screenprint “Motion Miscalcaptioned
‘DV’.



Horry County Fifteenth Judicial Circuit Public Index



[Horry County Home Page](#) [South Carolina Judicial Department Home Page](#) [SC.GOV Home Page](#)

Switch View

Olga Teslenko VS Carpet King & Flooring , defendant, et al




Case Number:	2024CP2602983	Court Agency:	Common Pleas	Filed Date:	04/29/2024
Case Type:	Appeal	Case Sub Type:	Magistrate Civil 910	File Type:	Non-Jury
Status:	Dismissed	Assigned Judge:	Clerk Of Court C P, G S, And Family Court		
Disposition:	Other / Circuit Civil	Disposition Date:	09/09/2024	Disposition Judge:	Van Slambrook, Dale E.
Original Source Doc:		Original Case #:			
Judgment Number:		Court Roster:			

Case Parties

Click the  icon to show associated parties.

Name	Address	Race	Sex	Year Of Birth	Party Type	Party Status	Last Updated
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carpet King & Flooring	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent Pro Se		05/02/2024
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carpet King & Flooring	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent		05/02/2024
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kocsis, Joe	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent Pro Se		05/02/2024
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kocsis, Joe	532 Broadway St Myrtle Beach SC 29577				Respondent		05/02/2024
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Teslenko, Olga	100 Fountain Pointe Lane Unit 103 Myrtle Beach SC 29579				Appellant Pro Se		05/02/2024
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Teslenko, Olga	100 Fountain Pointe Lane Unit 103 Myrtle Beach SC 29579				Appellant		09/20/2024

Actions

Name	Description	Type	Motion Roster	Begin Date	Completion Date	Documents
Teslenko, Olga	Motion/Reconsider (DV)	Motion		09/20/2024-15:55		
Teslenko, Olga	Certificate/COC Mailing Copies of Court Orders	Action		09/09/2024-16:51		
Teslenko, Olga	Order/Magistrate Decision is Affirmed	Order		09/09/2024-16:51		
Teslenko, Olga	Certificate/COC Mailing Copies of Court Orders	Action		09/09/2024-16:08	09/09/2024-16:08	
Teslenko, Olga	Order/Electronic Form 4 - Case Dismissal	Order		09/09/2024-15:55	09/09/2024-15:55	

Teslenko, Olga	Certificate/COC Mailing Copies of Court Orders - Form 4	Action		08/27/2024-11:33	09/09/2024-11:33	
Teslenko, Olga	Order/Electronic Form 4-Motion for Appeal is Under	Order		08/27/2024-09:11	09/09/2024-09:11	
Teslenko, Olga	Data Entry/Response to Correct Data Entry Error	Filing		08/16/2024-10:51	09/09/2024-10:51	
Teslenko, Olga	Data Entry/Request to Correct Data Entry Error	Filing		08/14/2024-14:47	09/09/2024-10:51	
Carpet King & Flooring	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/ Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		08/09/2024-15:26	09/09/2024-15:26	
Kocsis, Joe	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/ Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		08/09/2024-15:26	09/09/2024-15:26	
Teslenko, Olga	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/ Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		08/09/2024-15:26	09/09/2024-15:26	
Teslenko, Olga	Letter Submitting Exhibits Omitted in Lower Court's Return	Filing		07/22/2024-14:16	09/09/2024-09:34	
Teslenko, Olga	Letter to Clerk of Court About Appellants Disability	Filing		07/22/2024-14:12	09/09/2024-09:53	
Carpet King & Flooring	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:17	09/09/2024-11:17	
Kocsis, Joe	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:16	09/09/2024-11:16	
Teslenko, Olga	Notice/Notice of Hearing and Service	Filing		07/17/2024-11:16	09/09/2024-11:16	
Kocsis, Joe	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/ Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44	09/09/2024-09:44	
Carpet King & Flooring	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/ Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44	09/09/2024-09:44	
Teslenko, Olga	8/19/2024_MOTION_Roster/ Notice of Motions Roster Publication	Action		07/17/2024-09:44	09/09/2024-09:44	
Teslenko, Olga	Service/Affidavit Of Service on MB Magistrate Court	Filing		07/05/2024-16:17	09/09/2024-09:13	
Teslenko, Olga	Return from Magistrate Court	Action		05/29/2024-13:32	09/09/2024-13:32	  
Teslenko, Olga	Appeal/Notice of Civil Appeal (Workflow)	Action		05/09/2024-15:27	05/25/2024-15:27	
Teslenko, Olga	Email Confirmation of Appeal Received	Filing		05/03/2024-09:34	09/09/2024-11:41	
Teslenko, Olga	Motion/Appeal	Motion		04/29/2024-15:27	08/21/2024-15:27	
Teslenko, Olga	Appeal/Notice of Civil Appeal	Filing		04/29/2024-15:26	09/09/2024-15:26	

Financials**Summary**

Fine/Costs:	\$175.00	Total Paid for fine/ costs:	\$175.00	Balance Due:	\$0.00
--------------------	-----------------	--	-----------------	---------------------	---------------

Costs

Description	Cost Code	Amount	Charge Action	Disbursed Amount
Civil Filing Fee State 56%	CVFFST	\$56.00		\$56.00
Civil Filing Fee County 44%/100%	CVFFCN	\$44.00		\$44.00
SCJD Filing Fee Proviso \$50 / \$25	SCJDPV	\$50.00		\$50.00
Motion/Order Filing Fee \$25	MOTION	\$25.00		\$25.00

Payments

Payment Date	Receipt Number	Entered By	Transaction Type Code	Payment Amount
09/20/2024	1113448	c26hbellam	PY	\$25.00
04/29/2024	1104524	c26hbellam	PY	\$150.00

RECEIVED

Feb 09 2026

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

The Honorable Dale Van Slambrook, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2024-001734

Olga Teslenko, Appellant,
v.
Joe Kocsis,
Carpet King & Flooring, Respondents.

PROOF OF SERVICE OF APPELLANT'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD

Appellant hereby certifies that she has served her Emergency Motion to Supplement the Record, with Exhibits, upon Respondent, Mr. Joe Kocsis, who at all relevant times represented himself the owner of Carpet King & Flooring. Service was made by depositing a true copy thereof with Federal Express, postage prepaid, on **February 3, 2026**, addressed to: Mr. Joe Kocsis, Carpet King & Flooring, 532 Broadway Street, Myrtle Beach, SC 29577.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Olga Teslenko

Olga Teslenko, Appellant, Pro Se
100 Fountain Pointe Ln, Unit 103
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29579
Email: osenochen@gmail.com
Tel: (510) 388-2780

Dated: February 3, 2026