

From: Carol Ann Honeycutt
To: Court Of Appeals Filings: rfarms5006@gmail.com; auso2@southcarolina.usa.com
Subject: PETITION FOR REHEARING 2026-000049 25TH Ave. LLC v. Carol Ann Honeycutt
Date: Friday, June 26, 2026 3:39:39 PM
Attachments: 2026.6.26.Petition for Rehearing Mootness.odt

*** EXTERNAL EMAIL: This email originated from outside the organization. Please exercise caution before clicking any links or opening attachments. ***

June 26, 2026
VIA USPS & EMAIL

Re: Appellate Case No. 2026-00049
25th Avenue LLC, Respondent, v.
Carol Ann Honeycutt, Appellant
Appeal on Horry County Case No. 2020-CP-2605267

Ms. Jasmine D. Smith, Deputy Clerk
Appellate Court Judges

Court Administration
The South Carolina Court of Appeals
Court Administration
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina
29201

Content of This Letter
Transmittal of PETITION FOR
REHEARING MEMORANDUM
DISPROVING MOOTNESS
Proof of Service
\$50 Fee by Money Order

RECEIVED
Jun 26 2026
SC Court of Appeals

Dear Ms. Smith and Appellate Court Judges,

Please submit this letter with the Petition to the judges who will review this.

This is the letter of transmittal sending to the above recipients the PETITION FOR REHEARING THE MEMORANDUM DISPROVING MOOTNESS. This is sent in response to the Order of June 11, 2026, which dismissed this appeal as moot. This Petition meets the requirements of SCAC Rule 221(a) by identifying and explaining "the points supposed to have been overlooked or misapprehended by the court." Appellant believes that this appeal is not moot and that the lower court rulings will be reversed by the ruling of the Appellate Court.

Furthermore, Appellant believes that the motivation for this questioning mootness was motivated by my Motions of March 18, 2026, and April 24, 2026, to Judge Debra R. McCaslin. These Motions requested that Judge McCaslin order the court reporter to provide to me as Defendant The Complete Transcript of the Motions Hearing of April 24, 2023 and the audio recording of that hearing. The court reporter produced for me what I call The Incomplete Transcript which had a significant amount of evidence removed from it by Plaintiff's attorneys.

I. The Appellant's Brief will prove the appeal is not moot.

I am restating that the Appellant's Brief will make it obvious this case is not moot, and that the Appellant/ Defendant's Constitutional rights were denied by the orders of the lower court.

III. Please answer the questions from the letter of May 8, 2026.

In my letter to you of May 8, 2026, I asked the questions which are copied below. I would very much appreciate and honest, complete, and prompt answer to these questions.

A. The timing of this demand is 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.

B. What prompted you to write a letter one day later that requires the Appellant to prove her appeal is not 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 timing of your letter of April 28, 2026, fits the timing of the delivery of a second motion to Judge McCaslin. On April 28, 2026, at 9:58 A.M. a second Motion was delivered to Judge Debra R. McCaslin at her office in the Lexington County Court House asking her to order that The Complete Transcript and the Audio Recording of the motions hearing of April 24, 2023, be delivered to the Defendant/aAppellant Carol Ann Honeycutt. The first motion was mailed to Judge McCaslin on March 18, 2026. The two motions together clearly confirm the law and the facts that Judge McCaslin is responsible to order that defendant be given The Complete Transcript and the Audio Recording of the motions hearing of April 24, 2023, held before her.

The defendant has been blocked illegally from receiving the full transcript since June 6, 2023. Is it possible that Judge McCaslin wanted the appeal to be considered moot to attempt to evade her duty to order the full transcript and audio recording?

If Judge McCaslin did not call the Appellate Court to "handle" this, perhaps, another official from the group mentioned above (who are trying to protect their own interests) may have called. The "invisible respondents," judicial officers, non-parties, include Henrietta Golding and Taylor Voegel, the former attorneys for the Plaintiff/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.

Appellate Judge Kristi Curtis could have contacted you to write the letter of April 28 2026. If so, she is acting to defend her own interests and those of this group who do not want the facts and truth of the case to be brought to day light. She was part of the Horry County case and absolutely obstructed justice from the Appellant. I will submit a Motion to Recuse her to prevent her from participating as a judge in this appeal and any that may follow.

C. Appellant requests that you provide a response to the following question:

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.

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

Sincerely,

/s/ Carol Ann Honeycutt

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

cc: by USPS & email
Mr. Richard F. Williams, Pro Se
Agent of Record, 25th Avenue LLC.
309 N. Highland Way
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29572
rfwms5006@gmail.com

enc.: USPS: PETITION EXHIBITS

MONEY ORDER SENT BY USPS

FORM 7
PROOF OF SERVICE OF PETITION FOR REHEARING
MEMORANDUM DISPROVING MOOTNESS

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

Appellate Case Number 2026-000049

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY

Court of Common Pleas

David P. Caraker, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2020-CP-2605267

25 th Avenue LLC,	v.	Respondent,
Carol Ann Honeycutt,		Appellant

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served this APPELLANT'S PETITION FOR REHEARING THE MEMORANDUM DISPROVING MOOTNESS on 25th Avenue LLC by placing a copy into the USPS mail to Respondent 25th Avenue LLC, Pro Se, Richard F. Williams, Agent of Record, at 309 North Highland Way, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29572, on June 26, 2026. The Plaintiff has no attorney upon whom to serve this Petition.

June 26, 2026

Myrtle Beach, South Carolina

/S/ Carol Ann Honeycutt

Carol Ann Honeycutt

Post Office Box 8574

Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29578

(843) 254-5951

Appellant Pro Se

auso2@southcarolina.usa.com
