

**RECEIVED**

**Apr 06 2026**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Hon. Thomas W. McGee III, Circuit Court Judge

---

Appellate Case No. 2025-002585  
Case No. 2022-CP-40-01390

---

Ex Parte: Mandy Matney,	Appellant,
David Voros and Alexandra Stasko,	Plaintiffs, Respondents
v.	
Allison Dunavant,	Defendant.

---

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO REINSTATE APPEAL**

---

Respondent’s Opposition to Appellant’s motion to reinstate her appeal (the “Motion”) implicitly concedes the most important fact underlying the Motion: Respondent was timely served with Appellant’s Notice of Appeal (and Amended Notice of Appeal). Accordingly, Respondent has not—and does not claim to have—suffered any prejudice whatsoever from the purported rule violations Respondent’s Opposition identifies. That concession should guide the Court’s resolution of the Motion. Ms. Matney’s appeal should be reinstated.

**1. Respondent Claims No Prejudice from any Rule Violation**

Respondent’s Opposition does not devote a single word to the issue that resulted in the dismissal of Ms. Matney’s appeal: the perception that Respondent was

not timely served. That is because, as thoroughly documented in Appellant's Motion papers, Respondent was timely served with Appellant's Notice of Appeal on three separate occasions.

Instead, Respondent's Opposition focuses on two other purported Rule violations that were not the basis for the Court's dismissal of the appeal. Namely, Respondent contends that Appellant failed to file timely a Notice of Appeal with the Court of Appeals and failed to order a transcript of the proceedings below within ten days of the date of service of the Notice of Appeal.<sup>1</sup> *See generally* Opp. However, as with the only issue relevant to this Motion (the inaccurate perception that Respondent was not timely served), Respondent cannot and does not claim any prejudice. Given the lack of any prejudice whatsoever to Respondent, this Court should reinstate Appellant's appeal.

## **2. Appellant Timely Filed the Notice of Appeal**

Appellant appeals a September 4, 2025 order denying her Motion to Quash a third-party subpoena and a November 13, 2025 order denying her Motion to Reconsider.<sup>2</sup> Under the applicable Rules, Appellant's Notice of Appeal was due thirty days from the date of the Motion to Reconsider: here, December 13, 2025. Given that the order on the Motion to Reconsider required compliance with the subpoena within fourteen days, however, Appellant filed her initial Notice of Appeal with the circuit

---

<sup>1</sup> As Respondent concedes, when Appellant filed the Amended Notice of Appeal, Appellant notified Respondent and the Court of Appeals that there was no transcript from the circuit court to be ordered.

<sup>2</sup> Respondent contends that there is no indication that the circuit court judge was served with Appellant's Motion to Reconsider. Opp. at 1 n.1. That statement is inaccurate. Appellant timely filed the Motion to Reconsider through the Circuit Court's e-filing service. When alerted by Judge McGee's clerk that the e-filing service does not also serve the circuit court judge, Appellant served the circuit court judge via email the same day.

court (and thereby serving Respondent as well) eleven days later, on November 24, 2025. By operation of Rule 208(a), SCACR, Appellant's initial brief and designation of matter were due within thirty (30) days after serving the notice of appeal, or on or before December 29, 2025. On December 29, 2025, Appellant filed her Notice of Appeal with this Court and an initial Motion for Extension of Time. Accordingly, though Appellant did not file the Notice of Appeal with the Court of Appeals until January 2026, Appellant did file the Notice of Appeal with the circuit court within the proscribed time limit, did timely serve that Notice of Appeal, and did timely file and serve its appeal documents before this Court.

Accordingly, in the absence of any prejudice to any party and for good cause established by the fact that service was timely made and the Notice of Appeal was timely filed with the circuit court, Appellant requests that the Court reinstate her appeal.

April 6, 2026.

s/ Rebecca K. Lindahl  
Rebecca K. Lindahl  
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP  
615 South College Street Suite 1700  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202  
(704) 344-3141  
Attorney for Appellant

Other Counsel of Record:  
Meredith Bannon  
10 Westbury Parkway, Suite A  
Bluffton, South Carolina 29910  
(843) 815-4505

**RECEIVED**

**Apr 06 2026**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Hon. Thomas W. McGee III, Circuit Court Judge

---

Appellate Case No. 2025-002585  
Case No. 2022-CP-40-01390

---

Ex Parte: Mandy Matney,

Appellant,

David Voros and Alexandra Stasko,

Plaintiffs, Respondents

v.

Allison Dunavant,

Defendant.

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

---

I certify that I have served the foregoing Reply in Support of Motion to Reinstate Appeal and Memorandum in Support on April 6, 2026 via email in accordance with Rule 262(c)(3) of the South Carolina Rules of Appellate Procedure and the order dated April 24, 2024, by the Supreme Court of South Carolina providing for service by email on David Voros and Alexandra Stasko through their attorneys of record William R. Padget and Christina M. Brown, and on Allison Dunavant through her attorney of record Samantha Albrecht.

April 6, 2026.

s/ Rebecca K. Lindahl  
Rebecca K. Lindahl

Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP  
615 South College Street Suite 1700  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202  
(704) 344-3141  
Attorney for Appellant

Other Counsel of Record:  
Meredith Bannon  
10 Westbury Parkway, Suite A  
Bluffton, South Carolina 29910  
(843) 815-4505