

Honorable John Few
Honorable Jasper Cureton

Oct. 8, 2013

C/o Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Clerk
P.O. Box 11629
Columbia, S.C. 29211

RECEIVED

Blue Ridge Electrical Coop
vs.

NOV 1 2013

Kathleen J. Gresham
(and Steve)

2009-1412

SC Court of Appeals

NOV 15 2013

RECEIVED

Dear Judges Few and Cureton ~~SC Court of Appeals~~

I write this sitting beside the hospital bed of my husband, Steve Gresham, in for heart surgery that I partially contribute to, this action brought erroneously by Blue Ridge Electrical Coop against him, never a Coop member. Our neighbor brought us our mail deeming your envelope important to interrupt his recovery. This Order concerning our initial brief. Please let me emphasize that the actual brief portion is a reasonable length not much exceeding the Court's "suggested" length. It is only the actual Transcript record attached that makes it long. However, I deemed it critical you see the actual Transcript as Blue Ridge made claim that it does not exist. It not only exists but in great depth especially to establish that this initial lawsuit by Blue Ridge was brought in folly and unreasonably, thus triggering the sanctions process I duly raised. That motion is still pending before you and is one of the issues in our appeal.

As we are pro se and poor compared to Blue Ridge with its deep pockets and willingness to spend hundreds of thousands of our Coop's money to collect their alleged "debt," never owed as found by a full jury, it matters to us that you say our initial brief which cost our family over \$500. to copy and mail, is to be stricken and/or discarded. Judge Few was adamant that time was critical in this old case that we had no involvement in it being old. Our medical conditions were long ago advised and we put our lives on hold for multi years while Blue Ridge sued us unjustly for the debt that never was.

Please reconsider acceptance of our Initial Brief and see that the length is from primarily the Transcript attachments. I believed such would help the Court not distract it. The Brief should be accepted, we suggest respectfully, to serve the interests of justice especially in light of what has been set forth by Blue Ridge and to show the Court the depth and extent of the Court's Transcript. We, the parties, were instructed that this Appeal be fully concluded and briefed by Sept. 3, 2013 by the briefing directions as urged by Judge Few. I was the only one who complied and at great personal and financial expense. I still have not a Final Brief from Blue Ridge and its increasing host of add-on lawyers now some 3 months past the Court due date.

I also noted that the many extra lawyers we now battle were added on unilaterally without notice, substitution or what we understand is the correct process with the Court, which motion we also raised.

We have struggled hard to comply with your directions despite our health issues, work and the huge time and costs. We were the prevailing party on every issue after a 3-day

jury trial. The trial had been pending for about 2 years and threatened before that filing by Blue Ridge.

I also do not understand why the trial judge and trial clerk who have no jurisdiction now, are copied.

Please, reconsider striking our initial Brief and require Blue Ridge to complete their final Brief. is long ago submitted and I went the extra step and big expense to bind 6 copies of the Initial Brief as along with the Final Brief as an aid and convenience to the Court. I so advised Clerk Kitchings in correspondence.

RECEIVED
NOV 15 2013
SC COURT OF APPEALS

As my husband has leukemia and now heart surgery and this extra stress from an unjust law suit that should never have been filed, I am devastated by your Order, as is he. Can we not find you to reconsider and remove the transcript is that length is what offends you? Have you actually viewed and read our initial Brief? If so, justice and fairness would indicate its immediate acceptance for we performed in good faith, diligently followed Judge Few's directive and provided this Court actual proof that the transcript was in existence and completely proved our positions.

Please let me hear of your Revisiting this issue as no one is prejudiced or harmed by the Transcript pages added to our Initial Brief - in fact, the Brief is only clearer and the page limitation suggestive depending on the circumstances and fairness. Certainly, fairness and justice can prevail a page limitation especially in this case made more cumbersome because 1) the Court reporter did not promptly discover her or the Court's errors in record maintenance; and 2) that Blue Ridge exercised lack of reasonable judgement in even bringing the suit as there was no debt. This case can, with your exception for this good cause shown, rapidly proceed to a just conclusion.

We respectfully so request.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Jennings (Eresham)
and Steve Eresham
written from Greenville Memorial Hospital

1524 Hwy. 11
Landrum, S.C. 29356

cc: L. Brandt