

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appellate Case No. 2025-002279

RECEIVED

Feb 18 2026

SC Court of Appeals

PRANCETON WILLIAMS,

*Appellant,*

v.

WILLIAM "BILL" RHODES, and ELIZABETH HOLCOMB,

*Respondents.*

**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO ORDER TRANSCRIPT  
OUTSIDE OF FILING DEADLINES (Rules 207 and 263, SCACR)**

COMES NOW, Appellant Pranceton Williams, appearing pro se, and respectfully moves this Court pursuant to Rules 207(a)(1) and 263(b) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR) for permission to order the transcript from the court reporter outside of the filing deadlines. In support thereof, Appellant states as follows:

**I. BACKGROUND**

1. On February 4, 2026, this Court notified Appellant by letter that the time for ordering the transcript had expired. That letter directed Appellant to, within ten (10) days, either (a) file a copy of a letter showing the transcript had been timely ordered, or (b) serve and file a motion requesting permission to order the transcript outside of the filing deadlines set by Rule 207, SCACR, along with a copy of the letter addressed to the court reporter. Appellant files this Motion in response to that directive.

2. Also on February 4, 2026, the Court issued a separate letter pursuant to Rule 206, SCACR, advising Appellant that the multiple notices of appeal filed in this matter have been consolidated for consideration by the Court, and that the times for perfecting the appeal will run from the date of service of the last notice of appeal. The case caption was updated to add a second respondent, Elizabeth Holcomb.
3. Rule 207(a)(1), SCACR, governs the ordering of transcripts in civil appeals. In appeals from the court of common pleas, masters-in-equity, special referees, or family court in domestic actions, the transcript must be ordered within ten (10) days after the date of service of the notice of appeal. Pursuant to the Court's February 4, 2026 letter, the times for perfecting this appeal run from service of the last notice of appeal.
4. Appellant is a pro se litigant without the assistance of counsel. Because multiple notices of appeal were filed and the case was subsequently restructured by the Court — with amended caption, a new respondent, and a new running deadline tied to the last notice of appeal — Appellant was not fully apprised of the applicable transcript-ordering deadline.
5. Appellant is prepared to order the transcript immediately and attaches hereto as Exhibit A a copy of the letter to the court reporter ordering the transcript.

## **II. ARGUMENT**

### ***A. This Court Has Authority to Permit Late Ordering Under Rule 263(b), SCACR***

6. Rule 263(b), SCACR, expressly grants this Court authority to extend the time for performing any act prescribed by the SCACR, other than the time for serving the notice of appeal itself. The transcript-ordering deadline in Rule 207(a)(1) is therefore subject to extension by this Court upon a showing of good cause. The Court's own February 4, 2026 transcript letter expressly invited Appellant to file exactly this motion.
7. Good cause exists here for the following reasons:
  - (a) Pro Se Status. Appellant is a pro se litigant without legal training navigating complex appellate procedural requirements. Appellant's failure to timely order the transcript was not the result of willful disregard but of unfamiliarity with the SCACR deadlines.

(b) Procedural Complexity from Consolidation. On the same date as the transcript letter, the Court notified Appellant under Rule 206, SCACR, that the multiple notices of appeal had been consolidated, a new respondent added, and that all perfection deadlines run from the last notice of appeal — a restructuring of the case that created reasonable confusion about which deadline governed the transcript obligation.

(c) No Prejudice to Respondents. The record on appeal has not yet been compiled. Respondents will suffer no cognizable prejudice from permitting the transcript to be ordered at this time.

(d) Meritorious Appeal. Dismissal of the appeal for failure to timely order the transcript would be a disproportionate sanction. Appellant's appeal raises a substantial issue — the lower court's imposition of an excessive \$113,650.00 supersedeas bond — that merits appellate consideration.

8. The failure to order the transcript was not the result of bad faith. Appellant has acted promptly upon receiving the Court's February 4, 2026 letter and submits this Motion within the ten (10) day deadline set by that letter.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

WHEREFORE, Appellant Pranceton Williams respectfully requests that this Court, pursuant to Rules 207(a)(1) and 263(b), SCACR: (1) grant this Motion and permit Appellant to order the transcript from the court reporter outside of the deadlines set by Rule 207; (2) deem the attached letter to the court reporter (Exhibit A) as timely upon the granting of this Motion; and (3) grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Pranceton Williams  
Pranceton Williams, Pro Se  
20 Alice Farr Dr.  
Greenville, SC 29617

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appellate Case No. 2025-002279

RECEIVED

Feb 18 2026

SC Court of Appeals

PRANCETON WILLIAMS,

*Appellant,*

v.

WILLIAM "BILL" RHODES, and ELIZABETH HOLCOMB,

*Respondents.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Pranceton Williams, hereby certify that on February 18, 2026, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion upon the following parties by placing same in the United States Mail, first-class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

Gregory Alan Morton, Esquire  
4 Arborland Way  
Greenville, SC 29615  
*Attorney For Respondents*

South Carolina Office of Court Administration  
1220 Senate Street, Suite 200  
Columbia, SC 29201

s/Pranceton Williams  
Pranceton Williams, Pro Se  
20 Alice Farr Dr.  
Greenville, SC 29617