

EXHIBIT H

**LAW OFFICES OF
DARRELL THOMAS JOHNSON, JR., LLC
300 MAIN STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 1125
HARDEEVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA 29927**

DARRELL THOMAS JOHNSON, JR. *
MILLS L. MORRISON, JR. **
WARREN P. JOHNSON
JOSHUA R. FESTER

843-784-2142
FAX 843-784-5770
tdjohnson1@johnsonslawoffice.com

* Certified Mediator
** Also Licensed in Georgia

May 4, 2026

Via email to ctappfilings@sccourts.org

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk of Court
South Carolina Court of Appeals
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

RECEIVED

Jun 02 2026

SC Court of Appeals

RE: Amanda Leah Schlender, Personal Representative of the Estate of Lois Neel, Decedent v.
Virginia Moryadas
Case No: 2021ES0700504
Our File No: 13-750-08-200-23

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Please find attached for filing, Notice of Appeal of the Order Denying Respondent's Rule 59 Motion and the underlying order of Decemeber 22, 2025 in the above-referenced matter.

Also attached, please find the following:

1. Proof of Service of the Notice of Appeal on Respondent;
2. Order being appealed;
3. Correspondence to the Beaufort County Probate Court notifying of the appeal;

A check in the amount of \$250.00 for the filing fee, will be placed in the mail.

Please file the documents and return a stamped copy to us.

Thanking you in advance for your assistance,

Very truly yours,

Darrell T. Johnson, Jr.

Darrell T. Johnson, Jr

Enclosures

cc: Beaufort County Probate Court – via email and Hand Delivery
Denise L. Savage, Esquire
Marilyn Koscica via email only

**LAW OFFICES OF
DARRELL THOMAS JOHNSON, JR., LLC
300 MAIN STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 1125
HARDEEVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA 29927**

DARRELL THOMAS JOHNSON, JR. *
MILLS L. MORRISON, JR. **
WARREN P. JOHNSON
JOSHUA R. FESTER

843-784-2142
FAX 843-784-5770
tdjohnson1@johnsonslawoffice.com

* Certified Mediator
** Also Licensed in Georgia

May 4, 2026

Beaufort County Probate Court
Lindsay A. Sutcliffe, Associate Probate Judge
P.O. Box 1083
Beaufort, South Carolina 29901-1083

RE: Amanda Leah Schlender, Personal Representative of the Estate of Lois Neel, Decedent v.
Virginia Moryadas
Case No: 2021ES0700504
Our File No: 13-750-08-200-23

Dear Judge Sutcliffe:

Attached for filing, please find Notice of Appeal of the Order Denying Respondent's Rule 59 Motion and the underlying Order of December 22, 2025 in the above-referenced matter.

Thanking you in advance for your assistance,

LAW OFFICE OF
DARRELL THOMAS JOHNSON, JR., LLC

s/Darrell T. Johnson, Jr.
Darrell T. Johnson, Jr.

Enclosures
cc: Denise L. Savage, Esquire
Marilyn Koscica via email only

**LAW OFFICES OF
DARRELL THOMAS JOHNSON, JR., LLC
300 MAIN STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 1125
HARDEEVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA 29927**

DARRELL THOMAS JOHNSON, JR. *
MILLS L. MORRISON, JR. **
WARREN P. JOHNSON
JOSHUA R. FESTER

843-784-2142
FAX 843-784-5770
tdjohnson1@johnsonslawoffice.com

* Certified Mediator
** Also Licensed in Georgia

May 4, 2026

Jerri Ann Roseneau
Beaufort County Clerk of Court
P.O. Drawer 1128
Beaufort, South Carolina 29901
jroseneau@bcgov.net

RE: Amanda Leah Schlender, Personal Representative of the Estate of Lois Neel, Decedent v.
Virginia Moryadas
Case No: 2021ES0700504
Our File No: 13-750-08-200-23

Dear Jerri:

It's surprising that I still encounter situations for the first time in 51 years. Enclosed is a Notice of Appeal in a Probate case now pending in your Court along with everything that I am filing in both courts, to be safe.

With kind regards,

LAW OFFICE OF
DARRELL THOMAS JOHNSON, JR., LLC

s/Darrell T. Johnson, Jr.
Darrell T. Johnson, Jr.

Enclosures

cc: Beaufort County Probate Court – via email and Hand Delivery
Denise L. Savage, Esquire
Marilyn Koscica via email only

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM BEAUFORT COUNTY PROBATE COURT
Lindsay A. Sutcliffe, Associate Probate Court Judge

Virginia Moryadas.....Appellant,

v.

Amanda Leah Schlender, Personal Representative of the Estate of Lois Neel,
Decedent,.....Respondents.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Virginia Moryadas does hereby appeal the Order Denying Respondent's Rule 59 Motion filed April 6, 2026 and the underlying Order dated December 22, 2025. Appellants received written notice of entry of this Order on April 6, 2026.

LAW OFFICE OF
DARRELL THOMAS JOHNSON, JR., LLC

By: s/Darrell T. Johnson, Jr.
Darrell T. Johnson, Jr.
S.C. Bar No: 3010
Mills L. Morrison, Jr.
S.C. Bar No: 68546
Larry J. Cohen
Admitted Pro Hac Vice
300 Main Street
P.O. Box 1125
Hardeeville, South Carolina 29927
(843) 784-2142 Phone
(843) 784-5770 Fax
tdjohnson1@johnsonslawoffice.com
millsmorrison@yahoo.com
ljc@ljcohen.com

Attorneys for Appellant

May 4, 2026

Other Counsel of Record:

Denise L. Savage, Esquire
S.C. Bar No: 102567
Coppage Law Firm
P.O. Box 2473
1010 Carteret Street
Beaufort, SC 29902
Office: (843) 379-9601
dsavage@coppagelawfirm.com

Attorney for Respondent

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF BEAUFORT

IN THE PROBATE COURT
PROBATE COURT CASE NO.:
2021ES0700504

IN THE MATTER OF:
THE ESTATE OF LOIS ANN NEEL
(Decedent)

Order Denying
Respondent's Rule 59 Motion

Amanda Leah Schlender, Personal
Representative of the Estate of Lois Neel,
Decedent,

Petitioner,

v.

Virginia Moryadas,

Respondent.

This matter came before the Court on Respondent's Rule 59 Motion, filed with this Court on January 12, 2026 (the "Motion"). The court instructed the parties that this Motion would be determined on written briefs, without oral argument. Petitioner filed Petitioner's (I) Objection to Respondent's Motion Pursuant to SCRPC 59 for Reconsideration of Court's December 22, 2025 Order and (II) Request for Sanctions Pursuant to SCRPC 37 and 45 with this Court on January 27, 2026 ("Petitioner's Objection"). Respondent filed Respondent's Reply Brief in Furtherance of Motion for Reconsideration with this Court on February 13, 2026 ("Respondent's Reply"). The Court has fully reviewed and considered all arguments, pleadings, materials, exhibits, and the applicable law.

Having carefully considered the foregoing, makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. All statutory requirements for jurisdiction, venue, and notice have been satisfied.
2. The Court agrees with Petitioner's argument that Respondent's Motion was untimely filed.




3. Furthermore, Rule 5(d) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure states that all papers required to be served upon a party "shall be filed with the court within five (5) days after service thereof."
4. This Court does not accept pleadings via email.
5. As such, while Respondent's Motion appears to have been served on Petitioner's counsel on January 2, 2026, the Motion was not considered filed with this Court until January 21, 2026, well after the five (5) day requirement.
6. The Court declines Petitioner's request for further sanctions and award of attorneys fees, costs, and expenses.

NOW, IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that:

- A. Respondent's Motion is deemed untimely and thus DENIED; and it is further
- B. ORDERED that Respondent and LCT shall comply with the directives of this Court's December 22, 2025 Order within thirty (30) days of this Order.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.


Lindsay A. Sutcliffe, Associate Judge
Beaufort County Probate Court

Beaufort, South Carolina
April 6, 2026

FILED

2026 APR -6 PM 2:45

PROBATE COURT
BEAUFORT COUNTY, SC

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF BEAUFORT

IN THE PROBATE COURT
CIVIL CASE NO.: 2021ES0700504

IN THE MATTER OF:
**THE ESTATE OF LOIS ANN NEEL
(Decedent)**

Amanda Leah Schlender, Personal
Representative of the Estate of Lois Neel,
Decedent,

Petitioner,

v.

Virginia Moryadas,

Respondent.

**Order on Petitioner's Motion (I)
Pursuant to SCRPC 37 and SCRPC 45,
to Compel Respondent's Compliance
with Demands for Interrogatories and
Document Production; and (II) for an
Order Finding Respondent and LCT in
Contempt of Court Order Dated and
Entered April 8, 2024, August 29, 2024,
and November 21, 2024**

This matter came before the Court on Petitioner's Motion (I) Pursuant to SCRPC 37 and SCRPC 45, to Compel Respondent's Compliance with Demands for Interrogatories and Document Production; and (II) for an Order Finding Respondent and LCT in Contempt of Court Order Dated and Entered April 8, 2024, August 29, 2024, and November 21, 2024, filed with the Court on March 17, 2025 ("Motion"). The court held a hearing on the Motion on September 17, 2025, which was attended by counsel to the Petitioner and Personal Representative, Amanda Leah Schlender ("PR"), also in attendance, and counsel to Virginia Moryadas ("Respondent"), also in attendance.

At the hearing, Petitioner's and Respondent's respective attorneys presented arguments regarding the issues raised in the Motion. The Court has fully reviewed and considered all arguments, pleadings, materials, exhibits, and the applicable law.

Having carefully considered the foregoing, makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. All statutory requirements for jurisdiction, venue, and notice have been satisfied.

2. Petitioner filed the present motion seeking entry of an order from the Court, pursuant to South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure (“SCRCP”) Rules 37 and 45, against Respondent and her previous company, Low Country Taxes, LLC, (“LCT”), arising from their respective failure to comply with and respond to demands for Production of Documents and Interrogatories and a SCRCP 45 subpoena, and for entry of an order against Respondent for failing to comply with this Court’s previous orders entered April 8, 2024; August 29, 2024; and November 21, 2024.
3. Respondent argues that the accounting sought has already been produced, and paid for, and that now Petitioner is seeking to encompass discovery disputes into their contempt motions.
4. Respondent also argues that Respondent, and those assisting her, made their best efforts in producing the documents that have been asked for by Petitioner, and that they should not be punished for the impossible.
5. In that regard, this Court allowed Respondent the opportunity to file affidavits, or declarations, on Respondent’s behalf.
6. One Declaration of Anita Moryadas Theisen was filed on October 14, 2025. Aside from the fact that it was untimely filed, this Court agrees with Petitioner’s arguments and finds that a declaration such as this is ultimately irrelevant to whether the Respondent herself must be found in contempt.
7. Additionally, while the Court understands Respondent’s arguments, it does not negate the fact that Respondent has not produced all of the tax returns requested, which Respondent herself prepared and was responsible for, and that Respondent has not produced all her own bank statements that have been requested, again which



she is responsible for and has control over, and only just prior to the hearing produced LCT bank statements, and that now, years after the commencement of this action, Respondent discloses that she also has a business computer where much of the tax return information is likely stored.

8. Due to this failure, Petitioner has had to bring these motions and, while the Court appreciates that additional items requested have been produced since the filing of Petitioner's latest motion, it does not negate the fact that a hearing still had to be held and expenses and fees were incurred and that items that Respondent should be able to produce are still outstanding.
9. Furthermore, this Court has not received any notice of a Rule 35 examination on behalf of Respondent, which Respondent's counsel initially said would be prepared.
10. In re Estate of Combis v. Combis, the South Carolina Court of Appeals ruled that:

"The power to punish for contempt is inherent in all courts. Its existence is essential to the preservation of order in judicial proceedings, and to the enforcement of the judgments, orders and writs of the courts, and consequently to the due administration of justice." *Curlee v. Howle*, 277 S.C. 377, 382, 287 S.E.2d 915, 917 (1982). "Civil contempt must be proven by clear and convincing evidence." *Poston v. Poston*, 331 S.C. 106, 113, 502 S.E.2d 86, 89 (1998). "Contempt results from the willful disobedience of a court order and before a person may be held in contempt, the record must be clear and specific as to acts or conduct upon which the contempt is based." *Ex parte Kent*, 379 S.C. at 637, 666 S.E.2d at 923. "A willful act is one which is 'done voluntarily and intentionally with the specific intent to do something the law forbids, or with the specific intent to fail to do something the law requires to be done; that is to say, with bad purpose either to disobey or disregard the law.'" *Miller v. Miller*, 375 S.C. 443, 454, 652 S.E.2d 754, 759-60 (Ct. App. 2007) (quoting *Widman v. Widman*, 348 S.C. 97, 119, 557 S.E.2d 693, 705 (Ct. App. 2001)).

11. SCRCP Rule 45(e) states in relevant part:



Failure by any person without adequate excuse to obey a subpoena served upon that person may be deemed a contempt of the court from which the subpoena issued. An adequate cause for failure to obey exists when a subpoena purports to require a non-party to attend a deposition, permit an inspection, or produce at a place not within the limits provided by clause (ii) of subparagraph (c)(3)(A); or if served without an adequate time to respond; or if service is made upon an individual under Rule 4(d)(1) and the individual did not receive or acknowledge the subpoena.

12. On December 5, 2025, Petitioner provided a proposal to hire a Forensic Computer Analyst company named ArcherHall, which appears to be a competent company to perform a forensic analysis and extraction of documents on the newly disclosed computer relevant to the pending litigation and the current parties¹ thereto.
13. While Respondent informed the Court that a response to Petitioner's proposal would be provided by December 15, 2025, this Court has not yet received such a response.
14. Based on the facts stated above, this Court finds that Respondent and LCT have voluntarily and willfully failed to adequately comply with this Court's previous Orders and have failed to provide complete relevant production of documents that were or should have been accessible to Respondent.

NOW, IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that:


- A. Petitioner's Motion is GRANTED as set forth below; and it is further
- B. ORDERED that Respondent and LCT are found in contempt; and it is further

¹ While this Court understands that Petitioner is seeking to amend her petition to include additional respondents, the Court is limiting the forensic analysis to Decedent, Decedent's spouse, Virginia Moryadas personally and any business returns of LCT at this time.



- C. ORDERED that Respondent and LCT are ordered to pay Petitioner's attorneys fees, costs, and expenses incurred in connection with the failure to adequately comply with the Production Demands and Subpoena, including the filing of Petitioner's Motion, as outlined in the Affidavit of Denise Lynn Savage in Support of Application for Compensation Related to and Arising from Orders of Contempt Dated and Entered April 8, 2024, August 29, 2024 and November 21, 2024 ("Savage Affidavit"); and it is further
- D. ORDERED that Respondent and LCT are ordered to reimburse Petitioner for the payment of the accountant, Hobbs CPA, fees as outlined in the Savage Affidavit; and it is further
- E. ORDERED that Respondent and LCT turn over all applicable computers and any other applicable electronic devices and data to ArcherHall for a complete forensic analysis limited to the current parties and any business returns of LCT; and it is further
- F. ORDERED that Respondent and LCT shall be obligated to pay any reasonable fees, costs, and expenses of ArcherHall upon Petitioner's submission of the relevant invoices; and it is further
- G. ORDERED that Respondent shall comply with the directives of this Order as outlined in Sections C through E within twenty (20) days of this Order.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.


Lindsay A. Sutcliffe, Associate Judge
Beaufort County Probate Court

Beaufort, South Carolina
December 22, 2025

2025 DEC 22 AM 9:59
PROBATE COURT
BEAUFORT COUNTY, SC

FILED