

RECEIVED

Feb 17 2026

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Court of Appeals

**PlanetONE Packaging, LLC,
Respondent,**

v.

**American Pharma Machinery, LLC, and Dorothy Pierce a/k/a Dorothy Wells
a/k/a Dorothy Aleweny a/k/a Queen Dorothy Amolo,
Defendants,**

Of whom Dorothy Pierce is the Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2025-000490
Case No. 2023-CP-37-00232

APPELLANT’S RETURN TO RESPONDENT’S MOTION TO STRIKE

Appellant respectfully submits this Response in opposition to Respondent’s Motion to Strike Appellant’s “Request for Court Intervention Regarding Service.”

Respondent characterizes Appellant’s Request for Court Intervention as an admission that service was not effectuated in accordance with the Rules. The text of the Request contains no such admission.

The Request states that service was made by multiple methods, including United States Mail, electronic transmission, hand delivery, and sworn affidavits of mailing. It does not concede defective service. It does not identify a missed deadline. It does not withdraw or disclaim any previously filed Certificate of Service.

The Request seeks the Court’s intervention to regulate service procedures going forward in light of recurring service disputes. It does not acknowledge noncompliance.

The record reflects that signed Certificates of Service were filed and mailing was effectuated. Under Rule 262, service by mail is complete upon mailing. Respondent filed its Motion to Strike within hours of the electronic filing of the Request — before physical mailing could reasonably have been received — and then asserted that the filing was “not properly served.” Respondent’s immediate response confirms actual notice of the filing.

Nothing in the Request constitutes an admission of procedural failure.

1. THE ISSUE BEFORE THE COURT IS WHETHER THE COURT SHOULD EXERCISE ITS SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY TO RESOLVE RECURRING SERVICE DISPUTES

The central question before this Court is not rhetoric, but compliance with Rule 262.

Appellant completed service by United States Mail and filed signed Certificates of Service for each submission. Under Rule 262, service by mail is complete upon mailing. Respondent does not deny receipt of the filings and, in fact, responded within hours of transmission.

Despite this, Respondent continues to assert “lack of proper service” without identifying a specific document not received, without identifying a structural defect in any Certificate of Service, and without alleging prejudice.

At this stage, the issue becomes whether continued generalized assertions of “non-service,” absent identification of a concrete defect, are impeding the orderly progression of the appeal.

The record reflects:

- i. Service was mailed each time a document if filed before this court.
- ii. Certificates were filed.
- iii. Addresses were taken from Respondent’s own signature block.
- iv. Respondent had actual notice.
- v. No prejudice is alleged.

The appeal has not advanced to merits briefing due to repeated service-based motions. Where service has been completed in accordance with Rule 262 and actual notice is undisputed, further litigation over unspecified “non-service” diverts the Court from addressing the substantive issues presented.

The appropriate course is to resolve any remaining service concerns under the Rule and direct the parties to proceed to merits briefing.

2. RESPONDENT’S ASSERTION OF “NON-SERVICE” REGARDING THIS MOTION IS CONTRADICTED BY THE RECORD

Respondent’s Motion to Strike rests on the assertion that Appellant’s Request for Court Intervention was “not properly served.” The record demonstrates otherwise.

The Request was mailed on February 13, 2026 through a third-party commercial mailing platform (Postal Methods), directed to Respondent’s listed P.O. Box address (P.O. Box 2048, Greenville, SC 29602). The platform generated independent confirmation reflecting: **Valid Documents: 1; Invalid Addresses: 0; Mailed: 1.** A signed Certificate of Service accompanied the filing.

Under Rule 262, service by mail is complete upon mailing. The Rule does not require proof of delivery. It requires mailing and a certificate. Both were provided.

Moreover, Respondent filed its Motion to Strike within hours of the electronic filing of the Request, well before any physical mailing could have arrived. Respondent therefore had immediate actual notice of the filing. Respondent does not deny awareness of the document. Respondent does not identify any missing pages. Respondent does not identify any defect in the Certificate of Service. Respondent does not allege prejudice.

Respondent asserts generalized “non-service” without identifying a specific procedural deficiency. Appellant filed a signed Certificate of Service reflecting mailing in accordance with Rule 262. Although Rule 262 requires only mailing and a certificate of service, not proof of delivery. Appellant has nonetheless provided independent third-party commercial mailing confirmation to demonstrate that actual mailing occurred. **(See attached Exhibit – Third-Party Commercial Mailing Confirmation.)**

Where mailing occurred, a Certificate of Service was filed, actual notice is demonstrated by Respondent’s immediate response, and no prejudice is alleged, striking the filing is unwarranted. The Rules do not authorize dismissal based on conclusory assertions unaccompanied by an identified defect.

The Request was served in accordance with Rule 262. The Motion to Strike should be denied.

3. RESPONDENT’S RELIANCE ON RHETORICAL LABELS DOES NOT ESTABLISH A RULE VIOLATION

Respondent’s Motion repeatedly characterizes Appellant’s filings as “frivolous,” “dilatory,” “erroneous,” and reflective of “willful disregard.” These descriptors are serious accusations. Yet the Motion does not identify a specific subsection of Rule 262 allegedly violated, does not identify a defect in any Certificate of Service, does not identify a missed deadline, and does not allege prejudice.

Strong language cannot substitute for rule analysis.

The issue before this Court is straightforward: whether Appellant complied with Rule 262. The record reflects that each filing was accompanied by a signed Certificate of Service and mailed to the address listed in Respondent’s own signature block. Respondent does not deny receipt of the filings and responded immediately.

When rhetoric exceeds rule-based analysis, it does not advance the inquiry. The Court’s determination should rest on the procedural record, not on characterizations.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Court:

- I. Deny Respondent’s Motion to Strike in its entirety;
- II. Adjudicate Appellant’s Request for Court Intervention Regarding Service on its merits, rather than striking it.

- III. If the Court deems clarification appropriate, provide direction regarding service procedures going forward so that the appeal may proceed in an orderly manner; and
- IV. Grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted, this February 17th 2026.

/s/Dorothy Pierce

Pro Se Appellant

750 Mourning Dove Lane

Seneca, South Carolina 29678

(864) 324-3247

dorothypierce84@gmail.com

Processed Documents

RECEIVED

Feb 17 2026

SC Court of Appeals

Advanced Search

Job Id Enter Job Id	Document Id Enter Document Id	Description Enter Description	Date Range 02/10/2026 - 02/17/2026
Environment All	Document Status All	Get Documents	

Jobs

[Refresh as Needed](#)

Job - 2907831 **\$10.31**

Source: [Portal](#)
Department: [DorothyPierce](#)
Description: [FILED-REQUEST FOR COURT INTERVENTION REGARDING SERVICE](#)

Total: **1** Invalid: **0** Mailed: **1**

Job - 2907826 **\$2.69**

Source: [Portal](#)
Department: [DorothyPierce](#)
Description: [APPELLANT SUR-REPLY TO RESPONDENT](#)

Total: **1** Invalid: **0** Mailed: **1**

Job - 2902438 **\$18.28**

Source: [Portal](#)
Department: [DorothyPierce](#)
Description: [PlanetONE v. Pierce](#)

Total: **1** Invalid: **0** Mailed: **1**

1 - 3 of 3

Items per page: **10**

Job Detail

No. of Pages	Total Documents	Valid Documents	Invalid Documents	Invalid Addresses
45	1	1	0	0

Preference: **Black & White** **Single Sided**

Submission Time: **02/13/2026 13:58**

Originals:

Destination	Address Type	Document Id	Price	Actions	Tracking Number
Christopher B. Major and J. Patrick Bradley					
<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Haynsworth Sinkler Boyd PA	Local	7170205	\$10.31	
PO Box 2048 Greenville SC 29602					

Items per page: **10** 1 - 1 of 1

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals**

**PlanetONE Packaging, LLC,
Respondent,**

v.

**American Pharma Machinery, LLC, and
Dorothy Pierce a/k/a Dorothy Wells a/k/a
Dorothy Aleweny a/k/a Queen Dorothy Amolo,
Defendants,
of whom Dorothy Pierce is the Appellant.**

Case No. 2023-CP-37-00232
Appellate Case No. 2025-000490

RECEIVED

Feb 17 2026

SC Court of Appeals

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this February 17th 2026, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **RETURN TO RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO STRIKE** was served upon counsel for Respondent by the following methods:

Service by Electronic Mail:

J. Patrick Bradley, Esq.
HAYNSWORTH SINKLER BOYD, P.A.
pbradley@hsblawfirm.com

J. Patrick Bradley (SC Bar No. 103608)
ONE North Main Street, 2nd Floor
P.O. Box 2048 (29602)
Greenville, SC 29601

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Dorothy Pierce

Pro Se Appellant
750 Mourning Dove Lane
Seneca, South Carolina 29678
(864) 324-3247
dorothypierce84@gmail.com