

RECEIVED

Jun 23 2026

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

The Honorable Robert L. Reibold, Administrative Law Judge
Docket No. 25-ALJ-17-0156-CC

Appellate Case No. 2026-001190

Matthew DeNapoli and Lindsay DeNapoli.....Appellants,

v.

Charleston County Assessor,Respondent.

**APPELLANTS' UNIFIED REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME AND REQUEST FOR RECORD MANAGEMENT
INSTRUCTIONS.**

Tuesday, June 23, 2026

Appellants Matthew and Lindsay DeNapoli, proceeding *pro se*, respectfully submit this Unified Reply to Respondent's Response and the Administrative Law Court (ALC) Clerk's letter, both dated June 22, 2026, to correct critical factual omissions regarding the lower court record, establish independent good cause, and request specific record management instructions from this Court.

I. The Literal "Transcript" Clarification is Acknowledged

Appellants accept the ALC Clerk's June 22 clarification that the lower court held no formal hearings and left the threshold February 18, 2026 status conference unrecorded. While this eliminates the availability of verbal transcripts, it simultaneously exposes a much deeper, unresolved procedural defect regarding the physical, documentary record.

II. The Pro Se Visibility Barrier and the Missing Master Docket Sheet

Respondent asserts that because no verbal transcript exists, Appellants possess "all material necessary to prepare their initial briefs." This assertion ignores the core structural reality faced by *pro se* litigants.

As *pro se* appellants, we do not possess the same visibility or electronic access to the South Carolina Attorney Information System (AIS) or Court Management System (CMS) that licensed counsel enjoys. Consequently, Appellants do not even have a copy of the official lower court master docket sheet. Because of this visibility barrier, Appellants cannot verify whether the primary, foundational evidentiary payloads, specifically the 290-page bundle, Exhibit DNEEEE, and the March 10, 2026 Partial Summary Judgement exhibits, were ever structurally ingested into the lower court's master docket or if they are being treated as transient, informal "courtesy" email files.

This is precisely why Appellants' May 27, 2026 request explicitly invoked **Item #4** (Designation of the Entire Record), stating:

"Because Appellants are proceeding pro se and do not have access to the electronic court record, Appellants request that the ALC identify and direct the parties (and the Court of Appeals) to the precise location(s) of any audio, video, or other records within the electronic docket."

Furthermore, Appellants explicitly asked to *"be advised of the procedure and any associated costs for obtaining copies"* of the certified record. Rather than providing a certified master docket sheet, a list of associated copy costs, or directing the parties to the exact electronic locations of the designated exhibits, the ALC Clerk's response was limited entirely to confirming that no oral recordings exist. Without a certified docket index from the lower court, Appellants cannot compile a compliant Record on Appeal or draft precise Statement of Facts citations under SCACR Rule 208(b).

III. Respondent's Conditional Consent is Immaterial Under SCACR Rule 263(b)

Respondent notes it "consents" to a strict 30-day extension but attempts to dictate future limits, stating it "will not be inclined to agree to further extensions." As Appellants noted in their moving papers, under **SCACR Rule 263(b)**, extensions of time are governed strictly by the sound discretion of this Appellate Court upon a showing of good cause, they cannot be restricted, dictated, or extended by mutual agreement or conditional ultimatums of the parties.

The independent good cause remains absolute: Appellants are faced with redacting thousands of pages of highly sensitive Personal Identifying Information (PII), including unredacted tax returns, driver's licenses, vehicle registrations, and the names of minor children, which Respondent produced unredacted during discovery. This mandatory compliance Pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-2-330, The Supreme Court Order of August 13, 2007 and SCACR Rule 267 cannot be safely executed alongside an un-indexed, unverified administrative record.

IV. Request for Specific Record Management Instructions

To bridge this electronic visibility gap and prevent the appellate record from being structurally sanitized, Appellants respectfully request that this Court issue explicit record management instructions directing the ALC Clerk to:

- **Provide a Certified Master Docket Sheet:** Furnish the parties with a certified copy of the complete lower court docket index, alongside an invoice for any associated administrative costs
- **Identify Ingestion Locations:** Direct the parties to the precise location(s) of the uncompressed evidentiary payloads transmitted by Appellants within the electronic docket to ensure they are properly cited in appellate briefs.

Conclusion

Wherefore, Appellants respectfully renew their request for a 60-day extension (or, alternatively, 30 days from the date the lower court provides a certified master docket sheet and identifies the precise locations of the primary evidentiary payloads) to ensure a complete, lawful record is before this Court.

Dated: Tuesday, June 23, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

s/Matthew DeNapoli

Matthew DeNapoli, Pro Se Appellant
918 Casseque Province, Mount Pleasant, SC 29464
Matt Phone: (703) 930-6473
Email: mdenapoli@spacecomintl.com

s/Lindsay DeNapoli

Lindsay DeNapoli, Pro Se Appellant
918 Casseque Province, Mount Pleasant, SC 29464
Lindsay Phone: (703) 930-6473
Email: lindsaydenapoli@yahoo.com

Jun 23 2026

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

The Honorable Robert L. Reibold, Administrative Law Judge
Docket No. 25-ALJ-17-0156-CC

Appellate Case No. 2026-001190

Matthew DeNapoli and Lindsay DeNapoli.....Appellants,

v.

Charleston County Assessor,Respondent.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that on **June 23, 2026**, a true and correct copy of the foregoing
was served in the following manner:

- A **courtesy copy** was sent via electronic mail to the following:
Bernard E. Ferrara, Jr., Esq. (bferrara@charlestoncounty.org),
Marc G. Belle, Esq. (mbelle@charlestoncounty.org),
Kevin M. DeAntonio, Esq. (kdeantonio@charlestoncounty.org),
Andrew L. Hethington, Esq. (alhethington@charlestoncounty.org),
Jana Shealy (jshealy@scalculator.net), and
Jared Thompson (jthompson@scalculator.net).
- Formal service to be affected by depositing the same in the **United States Mail**, postage prepaid, properly addressed to:

Charleston County Attorney's Office

Bernard E. Ferrara, Jr., Esq.

Lonnie Hamilton, III Public Services Building 4045 Bridge View Drive North
Charleston, South Carolina 29405

Jana Shealy, Clerk, Administrative Law Court

Edgar A. Brown Building
1205 Pendleton Street, Suite 224
Columbia, SC 29201

Jared Thompson, Law Clerk / ALC Staff

Edgar A. Brown Building
1205 Pendleton Street, Suite 224
Columbia, SC 29201

Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

s/Matthew DeNapoli

Matthew DeNapoli, Pro Se Appellant
918 Casseque Province, Mount Pleasant, SC 29464
Matt Phone: (703) 930-6473
Email: mdenapoli@spacecomintl.com

s/Lindsay DeNapoli

Lindsay DeNapoli, Pro Se Appellant
918 Casseque Province, Mount Pleasant, SC 29464
Lindsay Phone: (703) 930-6473
Email: lindsaydenapoli@yahoo.com