

RECEIVED

Jun 29 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

Jun 29 2026

SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

, Administrative Law Judge

Case No. 2026-00-0207

Jimmie's Tree Service, Inc Employer and American Interstate Insurance Company, Carrier,	Respondent,
v.	
Bernard Bluefort, Deceased and Belinda Bluefort, Claimant	Appellant.

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Purpose of Appeal: To determine why the defendant never report the accident, disclose the full hospitalization or death to OSHA and The South Carolina's Worker's Compensation Commission. To determine whether the claim is a Death Claim or Accidental Death Claim with disfigurement. To determine whether the negligence of the defendant for not reporting an accident that occurred during working hours is grounds to not bar the Statue of Limitation. To determine how did the defendant know that the claimant was at the hospital if he was not aware of the accident or hospitalization. To determine how did the defendant get the claimant's lunch bag and boots if he was not at work or had any knowledge that there was an accident that occurred. To determine why the defendant never contact the claimant's wife who is the next of kin. Who is listed as the emergency contact. I appealed this case because this is an Accidental Death Claim with disfigurement that Commissioner Beck error of law or abuse of discretion, reversible error, judicial bias, and judicial misconduct. There were many instances where the facts of the case was overlooked. Commissioner T Beck displayed several unwarranted sarcasm, personal attacks, exhibited clear bias, his tone of voice were like he was talking at me and not talking to me. He omitted vital evidence that would show just cause of the true nature of the accident. Who was the claimant that was paid? Why was the claimant that was paid did not undergo a dependency investigation before given compensation? Why the court report omit certain testimony of the transcript?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is a Death Claim that is compensable. This is a Compensable Accidental Death Claim that the defendant had knowledge of the same day that it happened. He neglect to report the accident, the hospitalization, and the fatality of the claimant to OSHA and The South Carolina Workers Compensation Commission in a timely manner. It has been over 5 years and the defendant has not notified OSHA or The South Carolina Worker's Compensation Commission. The defendant never notified the claimant's wife who is next of kin to the claimant of the accident and hospitalization of the claimant. The Claimant suffered cardiac arrest on September 29, 2020 which resulted from the injuries sustained and unfortunately passed away that same day. The testimony of Ann Veatch Noonan confirms that Jimmie Ray Feagin (the defendant Jimmie's Tree Service) knew that the claimant died the day of the accident. There are several witness that saw Jimmie Ray Feagin (the defendant Jimmie's Tree Service) standing by another gentlemen at Tideland's Georgetown Memorial Hospital the same day the accident occur and the claimant died. If the defendant did not know about the accident or that the claimant was in the hospital. Why would the defendant go to the hospital? How did he know to go to the hospital? Who called him? Was he there at the work site when the accident happened? Why the defendant did not call the claimant's wife or file an accident report with OSHA and The South Carolina Workers Compensation Commission? How did the defendant know what hospital to go to? How did the defendant know that the claimant was at the hospital? How did the defendant get the claimant's lunch bag and boots? If the claimant was not at work then how did he get

the lunch bag and boots? According to OSHA and The South Carolina Workers Compensation Commission All employers must notify OSHA within 8 hours of a workplace accident, fatality, or within 24 hours of any work-related inpatient hospitalization, amputation or loss of an eye. It has been over 5 years and there is no record of the defendant notifying the claimant's wife, OSHA, or The South Carolina's Workers Compensation Commission. How can Ann Veatch Noonan know that the claimant died the day of the accident? It is evidence that Ann Veatch Noonan's client disclose to her that the claimant died the day of the accident, the records from Georgetown Tidelands Hospital and Georgetown County EMS Reports confirms that the claimant was Asystole or asystolic before Jimmie Ray Feagin's (the defendant) was present at the hospital the day of the accident is sufficient evidence to support that Jimmie Ray Feagin was and his attorney had knowledge that an accident occurred on his job on September 29, 2020 and that the claimant died that day at the work site from injuries sustained from the accident did not report the accident nor did he notify the claimants widow who is his next of kin that the claimant was involved in a accident. Therefore making the claim compensable and should not be barred due to the negligence of the employer. the testimony of the Ann Veatch Noonan that he died the day of the accident which was September 29, 2020. The defendants denies that the Claimant's Cardiac event and unfortunate subsequent death are casually related to his employment as there were no unusual or extraordinary circumstances. It is a fact that the claimant was at work and the defendant was there when the accident happened because how did the defendant get the claimant's work boots and lunch bag. It is beyond a reasonable doubt that the claimant would be at work driving a vehicle or

working with no boots which would leave us to believe beyond a reasonable doubt that the claimant would not be driving or working without his boots. It can be argued that the cause of the accident was from the equipment that the claimant was using. The claimant had a very dangerous job. It could be argued that the tree trimmer, the grinder, he could have been electrocuted by the electrical wires, it can be argued that a tree, tree limbs or any unusual or extraordinary circumstances that happened to the claimant due to the high risk of danger that the claimant was faced with each and every day. The injuries that the claimant sustained is evidence to suggest that the accident resulted in the claimant suffering a cardiac event that unfortunately resulted in the claimants life. The defendant had to be present at the scene of the accident. Why was the claimant's boots off and how did the defendant get them off? The claimant's boots were hard to take off. How did the defendant get his boots if he was not in contact with the claimant. According to the testimony and argument of Ann Veatch Noonan this is a conflict of interest. She stated that the Claimant died on the day of the accident September 29, 2020 not he died the day after the accident September 30, 2020 which makes the integrity of her prior arguments (Ann Veatch Noonan) questionable. It is a fact that Ann Veatch Noonan has fabricated many truths throughout this case and as a result the truth has always been revealed. Ann Veatch Noonan has lied to the Honorable Judge Scott T Beck. She argued that the claimant died from a heart attack from natural causes. Then later in the case she admit to The Honorable Scott T Beck that the claimant died the day of the accident. It is beyond a reasonable doubt that the claimant's heart attack was a result of the injuries sustained from the accident that later resulted in his fatality. Initially Noonan lie and in a confident argument she argued the

truth that is the claimant died the day of the accident. The injuries sustained from that accident is what caused a heart attack which resulted in the claimant succumbing to his injuries from the accident and the medical records from the hospital, Ems, Fire Department, and The South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicle is sufficient evidence to connect the testimony of Ann Veatch Noonan to the truth. When she said that the claimant died the day of the accident which was September 29, 2020 making the EMS and hospital report accurate when they stated the claimant was asystolic. The root word is asystole which mean the complete cessation of all electrical and mechanical activity in the heart, meaning the heart has stopped beating entirely (flat line). Therefore, it can be argued that the claimant in fact died the day of the accident, the defendant had knowledge of the accident being that he had the claimants boots and lunch bag which can be related to his employment with Jimmie's Tree Service the defendant as usual and or extraordinary circumstances that contributed to the claimant being unresponsive for his boots to be removed. Therefore the claimant's cardiac event that unfortunately subsequently resulted in death. The negligence of the defendant reporting an accident and complying with the proper protocol and procedures involving an employment is reason that the Claimant's Widow should not be barred by the Statue Of Limitation. Claimant's widow asserts that her husband suffered a physical work injury from to an accident related to his employment, and that she is entitled to benefits as the Claimant's Surviving Spouse. There is evidence to suggest that another person claiming to be the claimant was compensated that was not the claimant's next of kin. Therefore, had a Good Faith Dependency Investigation was done the wrong individuals would not have received compensation. The actions of the defendants are

questionable. Why would any compensation be released without contacting the next of kin first which is the claimants widow. What's the reason for making the claimants widow do a Good Faith Dependency Investigation not once but twice after she filed the paperwork with workers compensation as the claimant's widow to be compensated. Why was compensation paid out to someone not being the next of kin. Why wasn't a good faith dependency investigation done on the person that received compensation or why wasn't legit court records obtained to verify the next of kin to the claimant. The evidence of the investigation would have been verify that the next of kin was the Claimant's Widow Belinda Bluefort, their two children, and her daughter that he raised as his own. Therefore, his grieving widow, children would not have to go through the trauma of having to deal with the stresses of getting his Worker's Compensation Claim Filed. The Claimant's Widow Mrs. Belinda Bluefort, admits that she did not file the claim for over two years prior to the expiration of the Statute of Limitation. The defendant never called to notify me or explain to me what took place the day of the accident which was September 29, 2020. Therefore, that resulted in the claimants death the claimant's widow is well within her two years of Statue Of Limitation because the defendant has not complied with the state requirements of notifying OSHA and The South Carolina's Worker's Compensation Commission. The Claimant's widow was notified by the defendant's Attorney Ann Veatch Noonan when she testified in court on April 30, 2025 the claimant died the day of the accident which would be well within two years of the Statue of Limitation. Once the defendant takes the proper steps to comply with OSHA and The South Carolina Worker's Compensation Commission after 5 years of not being in compliance then the claimant's widow will be within her Statue of

Limitation. Also that statement alone is sufficient evidence that this claim is compensable due to Code 42-15-20. Which states thatthe occurrence of an accident. Therefore this is an Accident Death Claim that is compensable. The claimant's widow Filed a Form 52 Request for Hearing on November 29, 2023, over three years after the Accidental Death of The Claimant of which the defendant was and is not in compliance with regulations of the workforce and due to the lack of cooperation and negligence of the Claimant's previous employer Jimmie's Tree Service.

II. STIPULATIONS

1. The purpose of the hearing is to determine whether the defendant hindered the claimant from being barred from the Statute Of Limitations and if so, is the claim compensable.
2. Claimant had an average weekly wage of 437.03 with a resulting compensation rate of \$291.37
3. Notice was timely and properly served upon all parties of interest; Notice was not timely and properly served upon all parties of interest. A hearing was held without the knowledge of the Claimant's Widow.
4. Venue in Richland County is proper as agreed by all parties; and
5. The South Carolina Worker's Compensation Commission has jurisdiction over the parties and issue involved. The defendant did not comply with notifying The

Worker's Compensation Commission nor did he comply with notifying OSHA of the fatality that involved his employee.

III. APA SUBMISSIONS

Under the Administrative Procedures Act, the following records were submitted into evidence at the time of the hearing inaccurately. There is several sufficient evidence that was not allowed to be added into records The motion to add all medical records was denied:

APA#1: Records of Georgetown County EMS, dated September 29, 2020, consisting of pages 1-4. (Pages 1-5 was not allowed to be added to evidence)

APA#2: Records of Tidelands Georgetown Memorial Hospital, dated September 29, 2020-September 30, 2020, consisting of pages 5-24) (Pages 1-5 was not allowed to be added to evidence that shows vital sufficient evidence to suggest that the claimant succumb to the injuries sustained from he accident)

EXHIBIT A: Records of Dependency Investigation, consisting of Pages 25-86, dated March 11, 2024. (Pages 1-24 was not allowed to be added to sufficient evidence to suggest in favor of the widow's claim)

EXHIBIT B: Records of Supplemental Dependency Investigation, consisting of pages 87-90, dated March 3, 2025. (Pages 1-86; 90-120 was not allowed to be added into evidence which has vital sufficient evidence to suggest in favor of the widow's Claim)

IV. EVIDENCE OF THE CASE

Medical Records:

On September 29, 2020, Georgetown County EMS is questionable responded to a call involving the claimant who was in his truck in the median of the road. (APA #1, pg. 1) is questionable due to the lack of all sufficient evidence being available to confirm the events that took place on that date. The denied motion to add all sufficient evidence to Suggest exactly what happened the date of the accident. EMS initially documented they though this was a Motor Vehicle Accident. However, their subsequent report indicates there was no damage to the claimant's vehicle. (APA #2, pg. 5) The accuracy of this report is questionable. It lacks sufficient evidence as to the report came from Tideland's Georgetown Memorial Hospital who was not on the scene of the accident That is also questionable. It can be argued that the claimant did not sustain injuries From an accident that involved the equipment of the defendant. How do we know that The evidence to suggest that the claimant's accident wasn't tampered with. Which will result in the many inconsistencies in what actually happened on the job worksite. The claimant was unresponsive indicates that the claimant had already succumb to his injuries. Records From EMS document that the Claimant was in cardiac arrest.(APA #1, pg. 1). EMS attempted ventilation, chest compressions, and defibrillation. (Id., pg. 2). The reason for encounters is specifically listed as "Injury." (Id). EMS transported

Claimant to Tideland's Georgetown Memorial Hospital, where EMS providers noted that he was asystolic upon arrival which is sufficient evidence to suggest that the claimant had already succumb to his injuries. (APA #2 pg.5). His EKG revealed an extensive anterior wall myocardial infarction indicating injury. He was taken to the cardiac Catheterization laboratory for an emergency procedure. (APA #2, pg. 10) Hospital providers transferred him to the ICU, where he was pronounced deceased by Dr. Victor Diaz-Gonzalez and/or Dr. Emad Grace on September 30, 2020 (Id., pg. 8). Which is questionable according to Ann Veatch Noonan testimony of which she testified before the court that and Tideland's Georgetown Memorial Hospital (APA #2, pg. (APA #2, pg. 2, Id., pg. 2). There is sufficient medical evidence to suggest there is illness or injury that contributed to the claimant's heart attack. According to Tideland's Georgetown Memorial Hospital Medical Records the cause of death is still pending (APA#2, pg 8). The Claimant's Death Certification states that the cause of death is Pending (Ex. A, pg 82).

Dependency Investigation

If the defendants conducted a Good Faith Investigation they would have not paid the The wrong initial unidentified claimant or Claimants. The claimant's that was paid are not the next of kin to the claimant. The evidence in the investigation that the claimant is married to Belinda Bluefort. Therefore, making her and her children the next of kin to the Claimant. The dependency investigation conducted by Allied Universal, as well as a supplementary Dependency Investigation was instructed by Ann Veatch Noonan conducted by Tuten Insurance Services. Marriage records of the Williamsburg County Probate Court document that the Claimant married Belinda Bluefort on November 21,

1996. (Ex. A, pg 54). The investigator did not find any prior marriage records for the Claimant from 1980-1995.(Id., pg. 26) Is evidence to suggest that the Claimant's Widow Is the next of kin. However, the Clerk noted that the Claimant's Widow filed the Employee's Estate proceedings on July 5, 2022. (Id, pg. 26 and pg. 30-35). Claimant and Belinda Bluefort had two children, Sha'Mona Nyesha Bluefort, born in 1992, and Bernard Bluefort, Jr. born in 1997. Belinda Bluefort had a daughter, Sha'Hara Sha'Lette Pressley, born in 1984, from a prior relationship. Claimant's brother, Lavern Bluefort, stated that he did not have any other children other than Sha'Mona, Bernard, and Sha'Hara(id, pg 28). Defendants next retained Tuten Insurance Services Corporation to provide supplemental dependency investigation. Claimant's widow was order by the Honorable Judge Scott T. Beck to comply. Therefore, Leaving the Claimant's widow with no choice but to participate in the investigation.(id at 38). On June 6, 2024 and September 6, 2024 the Claimant's Widow indicated that she already complied with attending a Good Faith Dependency Investigation therefore did not understand why she had to participate in another one. The Claimant's Widow indicated that she did not wish to provide any additional information for the dependency investigation conducted by Tuten. It is questionable why Tuten services was needed being that he is not a representative for American Interstate Insurance Company. Tuten also investigated Eddie Bluefort the claimant's father. Both the Claimant's brother and Father's statement is enough evidence to suggest that the claimant's next of kin is The Claimant's Widow and her children.

Testimony of Widow Belinda Bluefort:

Mrs. Belinda testified that she believes that her husband's heart attack was a result of

the injuries that he sustained in the accident. Where he later unfortunately succumb to his injuries. The motion to add the Claimant's autopsy to show the employee's sufficient evidence to suggest the injuries sustained from blunt force trauma, broken ribs, broken bones, and bleeding was denied. (Transcript, pg. 8). The Claimant's widow further stated that he sustained blunt force trauma (id). The Claimant's widow admitted that the Death Certificate listed Coronary Artery Disease as pending cause of death.(id, pg. 10). Claimant's Widow testified that the Claimant was not hurt when he went to work. Mrs. Bluefort testified that her husband "...didn't have a heart problem. He just had a little high blood. He didn't have a heart problem. That's why I'm not understanding about this. Why the employer never called me to tell me what Happened. When he left home he wasn't like this so something happened to him while he was at work. The defendant did not make the process easy for me to take care of my business. I tried calling the defendant several times after the funeral and he stopped answering my calls. The defendant did not offer any assistance to help me With the process of taking care of business like continuing my insurance for myself and my son after the claimant died. When I called to find out get insurance information and other things he did not cooperate. I have been hospitalized several times from the stress and the emotional toll this process has taken me through. I'm not understanding why do I have to go through this process. It's not my fault if they paid the wrong individuals. I know that my husband had insurance and if the defendant was in compliance with notifying the proper entities I would have never had to go through what I'm going through now.

Testimony of Sha'Hara Sha'Lette Pressley

Ms. Pressley testified that she was at the hospital the day of Claimant's Death which was September 29, 2020.(id pg. 23). Pressley stated that they were provided his boots and clothing by Jimmy Ray Feagin (Owner of Jimmie's Tree Service).(id pg. 24-25). Ms. Pressley stated that the defendant did not state what happened to the claimant. All he Said was that he was sorry.(id pg. 25). Ms. Pressley stated that the claimant had surgery and that there was nothing motioning the claimant's heart rate. Ms. Pressley asked the nurse of his brain activity and was never given a reply. Ms. Pressley testified that her mother did not file the claim within two years because "She did not know what to do and did not know at that time it was an accident on the worksite due to the negligence and lack of corporation of the defendant. When she tried to get help and inquire and to get help they would not help. The defendant was no assistance in making the claim process easy for the claimant's widow.(id pg. 27) She testified that her mother tried to reach out to file worker's compensation claim and that she assisted (id pg. 28) Specifically, Ms. Pressley testified that "She had me research what steps to take, who to call, tried sending several different emails to different entities and inquires from different agencies. We went to several local agencies trying to find out what happened and what steps to take with no help. (Id) Tidelands Memorial Hospital, Georgetown County EMS, Several Department of Motor Vehicles offered little to no help.) These different agencies held vital information and evidence from the claimant's widow until the Statue of Limitation was up. Then documentations that is being present is being released. What is normally a easy process for obtaining public records immediately became a nightmare for many years due to he negligence of various entities making the Public records hard to obtain. The Widow's wife was appointed as

Personal Representative of the estate of the claimant and still had a difficult time obtaining evidence and vital records. It is against the law to withhold information and or evidence from the claimant's next of kin.

V. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. I find that the Claimant's Widow was forced against her will to participate in a Good Faith Dependency Investigation conducted by Tuten Insurance Services. When she had already done an investigation with Allied Universal that Judge Scott T Beck refused to use. Then Allowed Attorney Ann Veatch Noonan to choose who she wanted to conduct the second Good Faith Dependency Investigation with Tuten Insurance Services.
2. I find that the claim is not barred by the Statute of Limitation due to the lack of cooperation from the Defendant, Tidelands Memorial Hospital, Georgetown County EMS, South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles and the State of South Carolina Worker's Compensation.
3. I find that the motion to deny the addition of sufficient evidence is evidence that there is an imbalance of powers that exists to deny the claimant of compensation that is rightfully and legally compensable to the Claimant's widow.

4. I find that there is sufficient evidence even with the additional evidence being denied to suggest that the claim is compensable from the testimony of Ann Veatch Noonan. The claimant died the day of the accident.
5. The testimony from Tuten services is sufficient evidence to suggest that the Claimant's widow is the only and rightful next of kin and is entitled to compensation. Even if someone else was compensated the claimant's widow is the sole and only compensable claimant.
6. I find that the accident death claim is compensable for the claimant's widow from the injuries sustained that resulted in the unfortunate death of the claimant.
7. The negligence of the defendant is reason to reconsider barring the statute of Limitation.
8. The Statute of Limitation is not barred due to Jimmy's Tree Service NEVER reporting their employee whom they knew about being hospitalized because as stated that Jimmy Ray Feagin was at the hospital. Ann Veatch Noonan's testimony confirmed that she was aware that the claimant died the day of the accident therefore it is beyond a reasonable doubt that her client informed her of that vital and sufficient evidence. Therefore, is sufficient evidence to suggest that the employer knew about the hospitalization. Therefore intentionally did not file a accident with OSHA and The South Carolina Worker's Compensation Commission. It has been over 5 years and Jimmy has not filed a claim to this day. to present the Claimant's clothing
- 9.

VI. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Accordingly, as provided in § 42-15-20 SC Code Ann. (1976), as amended, it is the determination of this Commission that:

1. § 42-15-20 Notice to employer of accident or repetitive trauma.

(A) Every injured employee or his representative immediately shall on the occurrence of an accident, or as soon thereafter as practicable, give or cause to be given to the employer a notice of the accident and the employee shall not be entitled to physician's fees nor to any compensation which may have accrued under the terms of this title prior to the giving of such notice, unless it can be shown that the employer, his agent, or representative, had knowledge of the accident or that the party required to give such notice had been prevented from doing so by reason of physical or mental incapacity or the fraud or deceit of some third person.

(B) B. According to OSHA and The South Carolina Workers Compensation Commission

All employers must notify OSHA within 8 hours of a workplace fatality or within 24 hours of any work-related inpatient hospitalization, amputation or loss of an eye.

- All employers are required to notify OSHA when an employee is killed on the job or suffers a work-related hospitalization, amputation, or loss of an eye.
- A fatality must be reported within 8 hours.

- An in-patient hospitalization, amputation, or eye loss must be reported within 24 hours.

On April 30, 2025 The defendant's lawyer Ann Veatch Noonan acknowledge that she knew that the claimant died the day of the accident. Therefore, it This is sufficient evidence that the defendant did not comply with notifying the Claimant's representative immediately. The defendant never reported the claimants death to the worker's compensation. The defendants failure to do so prevented the claimant's widow to be able to file the worker's compensation claim within 24 hours of a in-patient hospitalization and within 8 hours of a fatality.

In the case of Bernard Bluefort Deceased, and Belinda Bluefort, Claimant, Appellants, v. Jimmie's Tree Service, Inc. Employer and American Interstate Insurance Company, Carrier, Respondents. Appellant Case No. 2026-000207. In this matter I appeal the decisions of the Worker's Compensation Commission for error of law, the disregard of evidence to state the facts, omitting vital evidence that will support the claimant's proof that the claimant sustained injuries therefore making this claim compensatable. The arguments of attorney Ann V. Noonan that the claimant did not have sufficient evidence

to support the claims that the claimant died of the injuries sustained in the accident. The claimant motioned to add addition evidence prior to the hearing. The Commissioner error of law continually overlook the facts of the case. The medical records that was added into evidence was the reports that Ann V. Noonan submitted to the courts. I tried several times to request and motion that the full Hospital Report, EMS Reports, South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicle reports, The South Carolina Highway Department Reports, The 911 call report and the autopsy reports be added into evidence. All of my motions were denied. I acknowledged to the Commissioner that there was an imbalance of powers and my lack of legal knowledge that put me at a major disadvantage. The Commissioner error in law when the testimony of Ann V. Noonan suggested without a reasonable doubt that the Claimant in fact died the day of the accident. Therefore, is sufficient evidence to support my claim that the decedent's heart attack was a result of the injuries that he sustained from the accident that resulted in his death. Therefore the correct codes that he claim would fall under would be Code Ann §42-15-40, Code Ann § 41-1-160(A-C), Code Ann § 42-9-290. The full unedited Hospital, EMS, 911, SCDMV, SCHD and autopsy reports are sufficient evidence to suggest that beyond a reasonable doubt that the claimant death is a compensable accidental death claim. Which the time to the statute of limitation would fall under a different code. The negligence of Ann V. Noonan and Commissioner Beck's error of law by omitting the evidence of injuries, the evidence of an accident, failure to acknowledge the injuries sustained, failure to use the reports of the first investigation. There were many error of law, abuse of discretion, reversible error, judicial bias, and judicial misconduct on behalf of Commissioner Beck and Ann Noonan. There were

many instances where the facts of the case was overlooked by both parties and they conspired in the court pre-hearing and the court hearing. Commissioner T Beck displayed several unwarranted sarcasm, personal attacks, exhibited clear bias, his tone of voice were like he was talking at me and not talking to me. He disregarded any action in the fact that Ann Noonan stated that the deceased claimant died the day of accident. He only informed her that the claimant could use it against her. However, When I tried to motioned to have the full Hospital, EMS, E911, South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicle, The South Carolina Highway Patrol's reports. The judge denied the motions and did not give any explanation as to why. The Commissioner ordered me to do a dependency investigation even though I expressed to him that I already completed one and I did not feel the need to complete another one. Once I refused to do another one he conspired with Ann V. Noonan in front of the courts, the court reporter, myself and my daughters, to order me to do a Dependency investigation of the choice of Ann V. Noonan. Commissioner T. Scott Beck stated that the first dependency investigation "was sloppy." Then the second dependency investigation was performed by an insurance agent and not a real investigation company. I informed Commissioner Beck that I felt that he was showing favoritism towards Ann V. Noonan because of the fact that I was not represented by a lawyer and that I knew very little about the laws. I informed him that I felt at a disadvantage. He did little to nothing about it. There were meetings held in reference to my claim that I was not made aware of and the Commissioner accused me of not showing up to court hearings. Ann Noonan informed him that I was not made aware of those hearings the other claimants were there. Therefore, when I asked the court was another claimant paid the

Commissioner that there was no other claimants but Ann Noonan informed him that the other claimants was apart of the secret meetings that I was not aware of. There has been a lot of inconsistencies in this case. I would like for the court hearings and proceedings be investigated. There were several instances where I tried diligently to inquire and request for the type of claim to be changed because of the evidence of the full unedited and untampered will suggest beyond a reasonable doubt that the claimant's heart attack was the result of strenuous and unusual circumstances sustained by the claimant while at work. During the hearing I argued that the claimant did not leave home with injures to his body. It is arguable how did the claimant sustain injures? What caused the heart attack? Why did the South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles sealed the reports of the Accident that happened on September 29, 2020? Ann V. Noonan stated on April 30, 2025 that the claimant died the day of the accident? Commissioner T. Beck stated several times through various hearings the accident on September 29, 2020. Why did Ann Noonan say that the claimant died the day of the accident? Why the motions was denied to add all the hospital reports, EMS reports, E911 reports, The South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicle reports, and the South Carolina Highway Patrol reports? Why was there several pages of these reports that were omitted? Why were no explanations given as to why the motions were denied? Why was there a imbalance of power? Why did the judge use his power to order me to have a meditation done? When we was already in court therefore we was passed the meditation phase. Why did the judge order me to do another mediation why a professional meditation was already done? Why did the judge allow Ann V. Noonan to choose a insurance company that is not even relevant to the case to do the

meditation? Why were there several facts that were omitted in the second meditation that was stated in the initial meditation? Why Ann Noonan tried to interrogate us before our initial first hearing? Why were meeting held without giving me any notice of the hearing?