

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

**RECEIVED**

Feb 25 2026

SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM Dorchester COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

R. Kirk Griffin, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2025 - CP - 18 - 01305

CERTIFIED COPY  
2026 FEB 26 AM 9:04  
Clerk of Court  
DORCHESTER COUNTY

Shantea Jones Taylor

Appellant/Respondent,

**RECEIVED**

Feb 26 2026

SC Court of Appeals

v.

Sandra Forsythe &  
Claude Forsythe

Appellant/Respondent.

MOTION

Motion to stay enforcement Pending Appeal  
Appeal of denial of Rule 60(b) Motion

Date: 2/25/2026

s/ Shantea Jones Taylor  
Name: Shantea Jones Taylor  
Address: 4201 Buck Creek Ct  
North Charleston SC  
Phone: (803) 534 - 7973  
Email: Shantea.Jones.Taylor@gmail.com  
Appellant

Other Counsel of Record:  
Name: Drew Radeker  
Address: Post office box 6903  
Columbia SC 29260  
Phone: (803) 560 - 6891  
Respondent/Attorney for Respondent

RECEIVED

Feb 26 2026

SC Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

Feb 25 2026

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
COUNTY OF DORCHESTER

Shontea Jones Taylor,  
Plaintiff/Appellant.

v. Case No. 2025-CP-18-01305

Sandra Forsythe and  
Claude Forsythe,  
Defendants/Respondents.

MOTION TO STAY ENFORCEMENT PENDING APPEAL


Plaintiff respectfully moves this Court pursuant to Rule 62(d), SCRCP, and Rule 225, SCACR, for an Order staying enforcement of the ejectment judgment pending resolution of the appeal.

In support of this Motion, Plaintiff states:

1. Plaintiff has timely filed a Notice of Appeal from the Order denying Rule 60(b) relief.
2. The appeal raises substantial questions regarding standing and jurisdiction, including whether Defendants had legal authority to maintain the ejectment action.
3. Immediate enforcement of the ejectment would cause irreparable harm to Plaintiff prior to appellate review.
4. Plaintiff has acted in good faith throughout these proceedings and stands ready to comply with any reasonable bond conditions the Court deems appropriate.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that enforcement of the ejectment judgment be stayed pending appeal.

Respectfully submitted,



Shontea Jones Taylor  
Pro Se

Date: 2/25/26

CERTIFIED COPY  
2026 FEB 26 AM 9:05  
Dorothy M. Jackson  
CLERK OF COURT  
DORCHESTER COUNTY

RECEIVED

Feb 26 2026

SC Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

Feb 25 2026

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Shontea Jones Taylor,  
Appellant,

v.

Sandra Forsythe and Claude Forsythe,  
Respondents.

EMERGENCY MOTION FOR STAY OF EJECTMENT PENDING APPEAL

Appellant, Shontea Jones Taylor, respectfully moves this Court pursuant to Rule 225, SCA for an emergency stay of enforcement of the ejectment judgment entered by the Dorchester County Court of Common Pleas.

CERTIFIED COPY  
2026 FEB 26 PM 9:05  
Dorchester County  
Clerk of Court  
DORCHESTER COUNTY

1. Procedural Posture

The trial court entered an Order on 2/25, 2026 denying Appellant's Rule 60(b) motion and denying any further stay, and directing that Appellant be ejected "forthwith."

Appellant has filed a Notice of Appeal from that Order.

Because the Order directs immediate enforcement, emergency relief is necessary to preserve the status quo pending appellate review.

2. Grounds for Emergency Relief

Appellant's appeal raises substantial issues, including:

- Whether Respondents possessed standing and legal authority to maintain the ejectment action;
- Whether the judgment is void under Rule 60(b)(4) due to jurisdictional defects;
- Whether the trial court abused its discretion in denying Rule 60(b) relief despite documented filings raising standing concerns.

These issues are not frivolous and present serious legal questions appropriate for appellate review.

3. Irreparable Harm

Enforcement of the ejectment prior to appellate review will result in:

- Immediate loss of possession of Appellant's residence;
- Displacement and removal of personal belongings;
- Irreparable harm that cannot be undone if the appeal succeeds.

Once ejected, restoration of possession would be difficult or impossible.

The harm to Appellant outweighs any temporary delay to Respondents pending resolution of this appeal.

4. Good Faith and Equity