

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

JUN 01 2026

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY

SC Court of Appeals

Court of Common Pleas, Honorable David P. Caraker

Appellate Case No. 2026-000049

Horry County Case Number

Case No. 2020-CP-26-05267

108300

25th Avenue, LLC,

Respondent,

v.

Carol Ann Honeycutt,

Appellant.

**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
TO FILE INITIAL BRIEF**


Pursuant to SCACR Rule 240(a), Carol Ann Honeycutt (hereinafter "Appellant") respectfully requests an enlargement of time within which to file Appellant's Initial Brief. Included with this Motion for an Enlargement of Time is Proof of Service and the \$50.00 filing fee. The Appellant is requesting an extension of time through June 30, 2026.

On April 27, 2026, Deputy Clerk Jasmine D. Smith wrote a letter notifying the Appellant that the initial brief was due thirty day later, which calculated to May 26, 2026. Then on April 28, 2026, Deputy Clerk Smith wrote a letter requiring Appellant, "Within ten (10) days [to] . . . serve and file a memorandum explaining to this Court how the case is not moot . . ." No time was given for mailing time. Appellant completed this assignment and served it on the Court and the

Respondent. This assignment required time that was supposed to be dedicated to writing the Initial Brief. Now, the Appellant, having been delayed by this additional assignment, requests that this honorable Court allow the Appellant to June 30, 2026, to complete, serve, and file the Initial Brief.

WHEREFORE, having set before this honorable Court the grounds for this Motion, the Appellant moves for an Order granting an enlargement of time through June 30, 2026, for filing Appellant's Initial Brief.

Respectfully submitted,



Carol Ann Honeycutt
Appellant, Pro Se
P. O. Box 8574
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29578
843-254-5951
email: auso2@southcarolina.usa.com

Myrtle Beach, South Carolina

May 26, 2026

FORM 7

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

RECEIVED
JUN 01 2026
SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM Horry COUNTY

Court of Common Pleas, Honorable David P. Caraker

Appellate Case No. 2026-000049

Horry County Case Number

Case No. 2020-CP-26-05267

25th Avenue, LLC,

Respondent,

v.

Carol Ann Honeycutt,


Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the
**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
TO FILE INITIAL BRIEF**

of the above captioned and numbered case on Respondent by depositing a copy of it in the United States Postal Mail, postage prepaid, on May 26, 2026, addressed to Respondent, 25th Avenue Llc., Agent of Record, Richard F. Williams, 309 North Highland Way, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29572.

May 26, 2026


Carol Ann Honeycutt
Appellant Pro Se
Post Office Box 8574
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29578
843-254-5951
email: auso2@southcarolina.usa.com

RECEIVED

JUN 01 2026

SC Court of Appeals

May 26, 2026
USPS MAIL

Re: Appellate Case No. 2026-000049
25th Avenue LLC, Respondent v.
Carol Ann Honeycutt, Appellant
Ms. Jasmine D. Smith, Deputy Clerk
Court Administration
The South Carolina Court of Appeals
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Horry County Case No 2020-CP-2605267

Letter Content:

1. Letter of Transmittal of Motion to Enlarge Time
2. Request for a Response from Ms. Smith to Appellant.'s Letter of May 8, 2026

Dear Deputy Clerk Smith,

Enclosed with this letter is Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time to file Appellant's Initial Brief, the Proof of Service, and the fifty dollar (\$50) filing fee. Additionally, this is a second request for you to respond to the questions which were in my email and letter of May 8, 2026.

REPETITION OF QUESTIONS IN APPELLANT'S EMAIL AND LETTER OF MAY 8, 2026:

1. Appellant did not receive a response to the request copied below. Therefore, Appellant had to file the enclosed motion and pay the fifty dollar filing fee.

In view of the additional assignment to write a memorandum proving the case is not moot, Appellant is requesting that you advance the due date approximately by two weeks to June 15, 2026, without requiring the appellant to write a motion to extend the time and without requiring the appellant to pay the fifty dollar (\$50) filing fee for such a motion.

2. Please respond to this conundrum. Please indicate the solution to this conundrum. Will you be providing a new due date for the Initial Brief based on the following considerations? If so, the enlargement of time is automatic. This would indicate that you should return the fifty dollar filing fee to the Appellant.

There is an additional, more disruptive, conflict inserted here by the demand for the memorandum. If you submit Appellant's Memorandum to the Court to be decided on before the appellant submits the brief, then the due date for Appellant's Brief should be set after the Court determines that the case is not moot (which it will certainly do.) However, it is obvious that the determination of mootness cannot be made without the entire brief which asserts all the laws, facts, arguments, and precedents of the case.

Whereas, you, the clerk, cannot review the Memorandum on Mootness, nor can you make a dispositional decision. The Memorandum will have to be submitted to a panel of Appellate Court Judges. The Appellate Court judges cannot make a decision on mootness until they receive the entire appeal, read it, and determine the outcome based on the briefs and all follow-up briefs. So, your demand that the

memorandum be submitted in ten days will not be effective because the memorandum will be insufficient information until the appeal documents have been submitted to the Court. Obviously, you have inserted a useless step that will delay this appeal.

3. What prompted you to write a letter one day after you set the date for the Initial Brief that required the Appellant to prove her appeal is not moot? What influence prompted you, Deputy Smith, to write the letter demanding that Appellant "serve and file a memorandum explaining to the Court how this case is not moot." Please write a letter explaining who or what prompted you to make this demand.

The timing of this demand was very curious. It is curious that on April 27, 2026, you wrote a letter setting the appellant's brief due date as thirty (30) days from the date of that letter, and, a day later, you challenged the appeal by instructing me to write and file a memorandum with the court proving that the case is not moot.

The Respondent, 25th Avenue Llc., is in default and did not submit a Motion to the Court to declare the appeal moot.


It appears there is an outside interference, an invisible respondent/(s), to this case who are officer(s) of the court who are not party to this case but who would be damaged by information which will come out if this case is not dismissed.

There is one party who will be directly damaged when this appeal is completed. That party, Judge Debra R. McCaslin, is part of a group of attorneys and judicial officers who colluded and conspired to Obstruct Justice from the Appellant/Defendant in the underlying circuit court case.

The "invisible respondents," judicial officers, non-parties, include Henrietta Golding and Taylor Voegel, the former attorneys for the respondent, and possibly other judges (Judge Kristi Curtis, now an Appellate Court judge, Judge Hyman, or retired Supreme Court Chief Justice Beatty). These officers of the court are connected to this case along with clerks of the Appellate Court who have aided those attorneys, and all of whom have colluded to obstruct justice from the defendant.

Your attention to the details of this letter are most appreciated.

Sincerely,



Carol Ann Honeycutt
Appellant, Pro Se
P. O. Box 8574
Myrtle Beach, SC 29578
auso2@southcarolina.usa.com

enc.: USPS: MOTION TO ENLARGE TIME
TO FILE THE INITIAL BRIEF
ERRATA- MEMORANDUM
DISPROVING MORTHESS

cc: by USPS
Mr. Richard F. Williams, Pro SE, Agent of Record, 25th Avenue Llc.
309 N. Highland Way, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29572

ERRATA

MEMORANDUM DISPROVING MOOTNESS

May 8, 2025

Please attach this page to the Memorandum and note the typographical error corrections with this page. Thank you.

/s/ Carol Ann Honeycutt

Carol Ann Honeycutt
Appellant, Pro Se

1. The memorandum cover letter was also labeled **Exhibit 4**. Please return it to the cover letter location.
2. The Cover Letter Exhibits, 1-3, are attached to the cover letter. They are not part of the Exhibits for the Memorandum.
3. HEADING DATE CORRECTION: MAY 8, 2026, not APRIL.
4. Page 3, C. 1. Close parenthesis after (1950).
5. Page 4, II. B. (2) correct spelling: mootness.
6. Page 5, IV, paragraph 3: If a (not an), and Issues 1-8 (not 1-7).
7. Page 6, paragraph 3, correct spelling: surreptitious.
8. Page 9, (2) c. "before he became a judge." Add "he."
9. Page 12, 3. "motions" not motion.
 - a. The motion filed February 21, 2024: MOTION TO AMEND MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY TO INCLUDE PLAINTIFF (Priority Matter). (See **Exhibit 13.**)
- ADD: This motion was never heard. The transcript of this hearing has no mention or discussion of this motion.**
10. Page 13, line 3, "unknown" not unknow.
 4. line 4. "witnesses," not witness.
 - last line: "cover-ups," not covered-ups.
11. Page 14, A. last paragraph: "an" order, not and order.

RECEIVED
JUN 01 2026
SC Court of Appeals

CA Honeycutt
P.O. Box 8574
Myrtle Beach, SC
29578

COLUMBIA SC 290

29 MAY 2026 PM 4 L

RECEIVED

JUN 01 2026

SC Court of Appeals

Ms. Jasmine D. Smith
Deputy Clerk
S.C. Appellate Court
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201



U.S. POSTAGE IMI
\$1.36
RDC 99
29577 FCM
Date of sale
05/26/26 K
02 8W0
2000392312

FOLD HERE

29201-376399

