

May 12 2026

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY Court of Common Pleas Daniel Coble, Circuit Court
Judge

Ubong Christopher Ubokudom, Appellant,

v.

University of South Carolina, Respondent.

Case No.: 2026-CP-40-00645

NOTICE OF APPEAL

For the Appellant (Pro Se): Ubong Christopher Ubokudom P.O. Box 1594 Columbia, SC 29202 Telephone: 248-952-7833

For the Respondent (University of South Carolina): Jacob A. Biltoft, Esq. The McKay Firm, P.A. 3700 Forest Dr., suite 404, Columbia, SC 29204 Telephone: [\(803\) 256-4645](tel:8032564645)

Appellant Ubong Christopher Ubokudom hereby gives notice of his appeal to the South Carolina Court of Appeals from the Order of the Honorable Daniel Coble, dated May 8, 2026, and entered in the office of the Clerk of Court for Richland County on May 8, 2026. Appellant received notice of entry of this order on May 8, 2026.

The Order (attached as **Exhibit A**) denied Appellant's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction and Motions to Compel Discovery. Furthermore, the Order failed to rule upon or address Appellant's the motion to determine sufficiency, the motion for leave to amend and supplement the second amended complaint as well as the motion for an amended schedule and expedited trial, effectively denying the procedural relief necessary to prevent irreparable harm.

I. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT This appeal is taken pursuant to **S.C. Code Ann. § 14-3-330(2)**, as the Order is an intermediate order affecting a substantial right. The denial of injunctive relief and the failure to enforce conclusive judicial admissions effectively deprives Appellant of a meaningful remedy and causes immediate, irreparable harm to the professional career of the Appellant and the legal rights of his minor child. This Notice is filed in conjunction with a Petition for Supersedeas pursuant to **Rule 241, SCACR**.

II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

Pursuant to **S.C. Code Ann. § 14-3-330(2)**, Appellant identifies the following issues which affect a substantial right and warrant immediate appellate review:

1. **Denial of Injunctive Relief as to Unique Educational Interests:** Whether the trial court erred in denying a Preliminary Injunction where Appellant demonstrated that Respondent's "No Record" reporting creates an immediate, irreparable blockade to law school matriculation—a unique educational opportunity that cannot be remedied by monetary damages after the June 15, 2026, ABA deadline.
2. **Failure to Enforce Conclusive Judicial Admissions:** Whether the trial court committed an error of law by failing to acknowledge and enforce conclusive judicial admissions established under **Rule 36, SCRPC**, regarding Appellant's enrollment and his **\$961.00** payment for the release of records.
3. **Abuse of Discretion regarding Discovery Verifications:** Whether the trial court erred in finding Respondent "complied with discovery" when Respondent failed to provide a unified corporate verification under **Rule 33, SCRPC**, as required by **Tupper v. Dorchester County**, 326 S.C. 318 (1997).
4. **Failure to Rule on Essential Procedural Motions:** Whether the trial court's failure to rule on Appellant's **Motion for Leave to Amend and Supplement** and not granting his second amended and supplemented complaint and **Motion for an Expedited Trial** effectively deprives Appellant of a meaningful path to final judgment, thereby affecting a substantial right.
5. **Protection of Minor's Legal Interests:** Whether the trial court erred in failing to exercise its inherent authority as *parens patriae* to grant emergency relief when Respondent's conduct prevents Appellant from fulfilling his professional requirements to serve as legal counsel for his minor child. Absent an immediate stay and mandatory injunction, Appellant will be permanently barred from completing the legal education necessary to serve as counsel for his minor daughter in future litigation regarding defective products. This loss of a unique legal right—**the right to be represented by a specific advocate with a vested interest in the minor's welfare**—cannot be remedied by monetary damages.

III. NATURE OF THE CASE AND ERRORS TO BE REVIEWED The underlying action involves a breach of implied contract, defamation per se, negligence, Breach of implied contract, Promissory estoppel, Breach of duty under the SC APA, Break of contract accompanied by fraudulent act, Declaratory judgement, Gross negligence and reckless disregard, and Intentional infliction of emotional distress claims regarding the Respondent's failure to accurately

report Appellant's enrollment history. Appellant will seek review of the following errors, among others, on appeal:

1. Whether the trial court erred in finding no "likelihood of success on the merits" when the Respondent's own Requests for Admission conclusively admit Appellant registered for and attended classes (RFA #4).
2. Whether the trial court erred in finding no "irreparable harm" despite the documented impact on Appellant's court-ordered duty to provide legal advocacy for his minor child.
3. Whether the trial court erred in determining that unverified, unsworn discovery responses signed only by counsel were sufficient under Rule 36, SCRCP.
4. Whether the trial court erred in finding no "likelihood of success on the merits" when the Respondent's own Requests for Admission conclusively admit In **RFA # 4**, the Respondent admits that "Appellant registered for courses at USC and attended classes."
5. Whether the trial court erred in finding no "likelihood of success on the merits" when the Respondent's own Requests for Admission conclusively admit in **RFA #16,17**, the Respondent admits it communicated to the Appellant that a payment of \$961.00 was required to resolve an "administrative hold" on his account.
6. Whether the trial court erred in finding no "likelihood of success on the merits" when the Respondent's own Requests for Admission conclusively admit and evidence submitted at the May 4th hearing includes an email from University staff directing the Appellant to "re-enroll." As a matter of logic, one cannot "re-enroll" in an institution they never attended.
7. Whether the trial court erred in finding no "irreparable harm" despite the documented LSAC evidence requiring all law school candidate submit official transcript from previous Universities that they have attended even if they have withdrawn grades; the Respondent cannot simultaneously admit that the Appellant 'registered for courses and attended classes' (RFA #4) while reporting to third parties that the Appellant has 'no enrollment history.' This is not a matter of legal interpretation, but a documented factual falsehood that the Court's Order failed to address.
 - A. Despite these admissions, the Respondent continues to report to the LSAC that the Appellant has "no record of academic work" and "no enrollment history." The Respondent 's own discovery responses prove that their reporting to third parties is factually false. These admissions constitute a *prima facie* case for the underlying litigation, satisfying the "likelihood of success" requirement.

IV. ERRORS OF LAW AND MANDATORY RELIEF ARISING FROM JUDICIAL ADMISSIONS

The trial court committed a manifest error of law by failing to recognize the conclusive effect of judicial admissions created by operation of law under Rule 36, SCRCP. This foundational error led to the subsequent erroneous denial of several dependent motions. Appellant seeks review of these denials, as the following relief is a mechanical necessity for a fair resolution:

1. **Failure to Compel Proper Discovery Verification (Rule 33):** The court erred in permitting unverified, attorney-only signatures and fragmented departmental verifications. Appellant seeks an order requiring Respondent to designate a single

Corporate Representative and Custodian of Records with the authority to verify the totality of Respondent's discovery responses, as required by Rule 33, SCRCF.

2. **Not addressing the motion for Leave to Amend and Supplement:** The court erred in not addressing the motion to leave to align the pleadings with the facts now conclusively admitted by the Respondent. Justice requires that Appellant be permitted to amend the Second Amended and supplemented Complaint to reflect the current evidentiary record.
3. **Not addressing the necessity to Expedite Trial and Scheduling to prevent irreparable harm to the Appellant and his minor child:** Given that core issues of registration and attendance are now admitted, the factual scope of the case has narrowed significantly. The court erred in refusing to issue an **Amended Scheduling Order** and an **Expedited Trial Date**, causing ongoing irreparable harm to Appellant's professional matriculation and his duty to advocate for his minor child.

V. ERROR REGARDING CONCLUSIVE ADMISSIONS BY OPERATION OF LAW (RULE 36, SCRCF) The trial court committed a reversible error of law by failing to recognize that the core facts of this dispute—specifically Appellant's registration and attendance—have been **conclusively established** by operation of law. Pursuant to Rule 36(a), SCRCF, Respondent failed to serve timely, verified, and sufficient responses to Appellant's Requests for Admission. Under Rule 36(b), SCRCF, these matters are not merely evidence but are judicial admissions that cannot be contradicted. The trial court's order denying injunctive relief directly contradicts these established facts, constituting an abuse of discretion and an error of law.

VI. TRANSCRIPT RECORD Pursuant to Rule 207, SCACR, Appellant has contemporaneously placed an electronic email written request to order a transcript of the hearing held on May 4, 2026. A copy of the written request is being served upon the Court Reporter/ERO, the Office of Court Administration, and the Respondent.

VII. NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE PETITION FOR SUPERSEDEAS

Appellant hereby gives notice that, pursuant to **Rule 241, SCACR**, a Petition for Supersedeas and Emergency Temporary Stay is being filed contemporaneously with this Notice of Appeal to prevent the imminent forfeiture of Appellant's law school enrollment and to protect the legal interests of Appellant's minor child.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Ubong Christopher Ubokudom, hereby certify that I have this day, May 11, 2026, served a copy of the foregoing **Notice of Appeal** (including Exhibit A) upon all parties to this matter by the following means:

To Counsel for Respondent: Jacob A. Biltoft, Esq. The McKay Firm, P.A. 3700 Forest Dr. Suite 404, Columbia, SC 29204 *Via Electronic Mail* jbiltoft@mckayfirm.com, *on May 10, 2026 and hand delivery on May 11, 2026.*

To the Trial Court Clerk: Clerk of Court for Richland County 1701 Main Street Columbia, SC 29201 *Via Hand-Delivery/Filing on May 11, 2026.*

To the Office of Court Administration: transcripts@sccourts.org *Via Electronic Mail (Rule 207 Notice) on May 11, 2026.*

Respectfully,




/s/ Ubong Christopher Ubokudom
Ubong Christopher Ubokudom
P.O. Box 1594 Columbia, SC 29202
Plaintiff Pro Se
Dated: May 11, 2026

RECEIVED

May 12 2026

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Ubong Christopher Ubokudom, *Appellant*,

v.

University of South Carolina, *Respondent*.

Appeal From Richland County Court of Common Pleas Case No.: 2026-CP-40-00645

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, **Ubong Christopher Ubokudom**, acting *Pro Se*, do hereby certify that on this day, **May 11, 2026**, I have served the following documents upon Respondent's counsel of record, **Jacob Biltoft**, via electronic mail and/or hand-delivery:

1. **Notice of Appeal (Form 1)**;
2. **Petition for Supersedeas and Emergency Temporary Stay**;
3. **[Proposed] Order Granting Supersedeas and Emergency Injunctive Relief**;
4. **SCCA Form 800 (Transcript Request) and the associated cover email to Court Administration**; and
5. **All Exhibits and supporting documents** attached to the Petition that were not previously served upon the Respondent or were not originally generated by the Respondent.

Note on Limited Service: Pursuant to the interests of judicial economy and as the Respondent is already in possession of discovery responses and pleadings previously generated by or served upon their office, this service specifically excludes redundant copies of such existing records, unless specifically incorporated as new evidence within the context of the Emergency Petition.

Service was directed to: Jacob Biltoft, Esq. 3700 Forest Dr. Columbia, SC 29204 Email: jbiltoft@mckayfirm.com

Respectfully,



/s/ Ubong Christopher Ubokudom

Ubong Christopher Ubokudom

P.O. Box 1594 Columbia, SC 29202

Appellant Pro Se

Dated: May 11, 2026

RECEIVED

May 12 2026

SC Court of Appeals

Letter to the Appellate Court Clerk

Ubong Christopher Ubokudom P.O. Box 1594 Columbia, SC 29202 (248) 952-7833

May 11, 2026

Clerk of Court South Carolina Court of Appeals 1220 Senate Street Columbia, SC 29201

RE: Filing of Notice of Appeal Case Name: *Ubong Christopher Ubokudom v. University of South Carolina* Lower Court Case No.: 2026-CP-40-00645

Dear SC court of Appeals Clerk :

Enclosed for filing is the Notice of Appeal in the above-referenced case, which was filed with the Clerk of Court for Richland County on May 11, 2026.

Also enclosed are the following:

1. **Proof of Service** of the Notice of Appeal upon the Respondent, the Court Reporter, and the Office of Court Administration;
2. **A copy of the Order** of the Honorable Daniel Coble, dated May 8, 2026, which is being challenged on appeal;
3. **The filing fee of \$250.00**; and
4. **Appellant's Petition for Supersedeas and Emergency Temporary Stay** (submitted for emergency review pursuant to Rule 241, SCACR).

Please clock-stamp the enclosed extra copies of these documents and return them to me for my records.

Respectfully,



/s/ Ubong Christopher Ubokudom
Ubong Christopher Ubokudom
P.O. Box 1594 Columbia, SC 29202
Appellant Pro Se
Dated: May 11, 2026