

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

RECEIVED

Apr 14 2026

SC Court of Appeals

Teresa Hill, Petitioner,

v.

The Honorable Dale E. Van Slambrook, The Honorable
Maite Murphy, and The Honorable Sheryl M. Perry,
Respondents,

and

Hill Family 2008 Trust of Arizona and Yvonne E.
Herold, Trustee, Real Parties in Interest.

Appellate Case No. 2026-000894

ORDER

Petitioner has filed a petition for a writ of mandamus, emergency motion for stay pending disposition, and motion for referral to the Court of Common Pleas in our original jurisdiction. She asks this Court to stay the order of ejectment issued by the Honorable Dale E. Van Slambrook, which requires Petitioner to post a bond pending appeal; prohibit law enforcement from executing the writ of ejectment; require Judge Van Slambrook to vacate his order of ejectment; direct the Charleston County Court of Common Pleas to rule on Petitioner's motion to compel production of an alleged trust instrument; require the Charleston County Court of Common Pleas and the Magistrate to require the Hill Family 2008 Trust of Arizona and Yvonne Herold, Trustee, to produce the alleged trust instrument prior to any further prosecution of the ejectment action; and, alternatively, reduce the bond to a nominal amount and allow Petitioner a reasonable amount of time to remove her possessions from the premises. The Real Parties in Interest have filed a return opposing the requests.

Any request to stay enforcement of the ejectment order should be made by a petition for supersedeas to the circuit court and/or the court of appeals, where an

appeal of the order is currently pending in Appellate Case No. 2025-001651. *See* Rule 241(d), SCACR (setting forth the procedure for obtaining supersedeas); *State v. Hill*, 314 S.C. 330, 332, 444 S.E.2d 255, 256 (1994) (stating a writ of supersedeas is only available where there is an appealable order). Petitioner has not shown that she is entitled to a writ of mandamus or referral to the Court of Common Pleas for any of the actions she requests. *See Wilson v. Preston*, 378 S.C. 348, 354, 662 S.E.2d 580, 583 (2008) (providing that to obtain a writ of mandamus requiring the performance of an act, the petitioner must show: (1) a duty of the respondent to perform the act; (2) the ministerial nature of the act; (3) the petitioner's specific legal right for which discharge of the duty is necessary; and (4) the lack of any other legal remedy). Because Petitioner has not shown good reason for this Court to determine these requests in our original jurisdiction, we decline to entertain the petition for a writ of mandamus, emergency motion for stay, and motion for referral to the Court of Common Pleas. *See* Rule 245, SCACR (providing this Court will not entertain matters in its original jurisdiction when the matter can be determined in a lower court without material prejudice to the rights of the parties).

 C.J.
FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina
April 14, 2026

cc:

Teresa Zachry Hill
Daniel S. Slotchiver
Anna E. Richter
Jesse Sanchez
The Honorable Dale E. Van Slambrook
The Honorable Maite Murphy
The Honorable Sheryl M. Perry
The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings