RECEIVED
Jul 13 2026
S.C. SUPREME COURT

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
[In The Supreme Court]

APPEAL FROM LEXINGTON COUNTY
Master-In-Equity
Case No. 2022-CP-3200784
James O. Spence, Master in Equity Judge
Walton J. McLeod, Circuit Court Judge

Op. No. Pending
[Court of Appeal Case No. 2026-001149]

US Bank National Association, Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union, Joint Municipal Water and Sewer Commission, Lexington County Assessor's Office, Sunrun, Incorporated, Worldwide Enterprises 803LLC, Nayeli Gomez, Corey Short, Emily Short, John/Jane Doe, Respondents

v.

Tracie L. Green, Cardinal Pines Homeowners' Association, Inc, Defendants
Of which Tracie L. Green (aka Tracie L. Mitchem-Green) is the Appellant.

Appellant-Petitioner Tracie L. Green
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTORARI

Tracie Mitchem-Green
608 SE Defender Drive
Lake City, Florida 32025
(803) 361-0602
ProSe-Informa Pauperis Appellant-Petitioner

John Kay Sanford
john.kay@hutchenslawfirm.com
Sarah Oliver Leonard
sarah.leonard@thefoundationlegalgroup.com
Ashley Zarrett Stanley
ashley.stanley@thefoundationlegalgroup.com
Kenneth Gregory Wooten III (Alan Stewart), Attorneys for US Bank National Association
greg.wooten@thefoundationlegalgroup.com

S. Nelson Weston Jr., Attorney for Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union
nweston@richardsonplowden.com
James Davis Randall, Attorney for Joint Municipal Water and Sewer Commission
randy@oldcourthouse.com

South Carolina Attorney General Alan Wilson
1000 Assembly Street, Room 519,
Columbia, SC 29201 (Attorney for Lexington County Assessor's Office), (803) 734-3970

Sunrun, Incorporated,1800 Ashton Boulevard, Lehi, UT 84043, (855) 557-8020

Worldwide Enterprises 803LLC (Nayeli Gomez) 2903 Sandalwood Drive, West Columbia, SC 29170

Corey and Emily Short/Corey Short/Emily Short, 123 Cardinal Pines Drive, Lexington, SC 29073

INDEX[1]

Page

Certificate of Counsel …………………………………………………………………3

Questions Presented…………………………………………………………………3

Statement of the Case………………………………………………………………..4

Arguments……………………………………………………………………………..12

1. The Court of Appeals erred in misapplying Rule 207, SCACR to avoid transmitting Appellant's Motion to Certify to this Court.

2. The Court of Appeals erred in this case by violating uniformity, producing discrimination; and conflicting with its prior actions in timely transmitting the Motion to Certify to the Supreme Court of South Carolina in Appellate Case Numbers 2024—000576, and in correcting clerical errors in case No. 2020-001135.

3. The Court of Appeals erred in several points being overlooked, misapprehended, or disregarded.

4. The final judgement order (which also encompasses preceding orders) should be overturned due to unparallelled tampering (perjury; and interfering with the docket, attorneys, and other parties) by state official(s)—specifically the Clerks of Court at Lexington County Courthouse—as well as for evidence of colluded activity with other parties to secure a favored verdict due to it not being possible to have a fair trial when court officials promote advancement of other parties; commit perjury, and tampering.

5. It is presumptively prejudicial for state officials to secretly promote the advancement of certain parties during a civil trial—through acts of perjury and tampering aforementioned —ultimately skewing justice for the unfavored party.

Conclusion……………………………………………………………………………….25

[1] An Appendix is being filed simultaneously with this Petition for Writ of Certiorari, pursuant Rule 242, SCACR.

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

Appellant-Petitioner Tracie L. Green (aka Tracie Mitchem-Green) certifies that the Petition for Rehearing En banc were made June 22, 2026 and finally ruled on by the South Carolina Court of Appeals on a date unknown due to appellate Court becoming unresponsive (status update last requested on July 2, 2026).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Should the Appellant's Motion to Certify been transmitted to this Superior Court, having been received prior to the Court of Appeals issuance of the June 12, 2026 Order of Dismissal?

II. In this case, did the Court of Appeals violate uniformity, producing discrimination; and conflicting with the Clerk's prior actions in timely transmitting the Motion to Certify to this Court in Appellate Case Numbers 2024—000576 (*State of South Carolina v. Richard Murdaugh*) and correcting clerical errors in case No. 2020-001135?

III. Did the Court of Appeals err in points being overlooked, misapprehended, or disregarded?

IV. Should the final judgement order (which also encompasses preceding orders) be overturned due to unparallelled tampering (perjury; and interfering with the docket, attorneys, and other parties) by state official(s)—specifically the Clerks of Court at Lexington County Courthouse—as well as evidence of colluded activity with other parties to secure a favored verdict [Is it possible to have a fair trial when court officials promote advancement of other parties; commit perjury, and tampering]?

V. Is it presumptively prejudicial for state officials to secretly promote the advancement of certain parties during a civil trial—through acts of perjury and tampering aforementioned—ultimately skewing justice for the unfavored party?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Appellant-Petitioner presents this action based on the following character of reason: The decision of the Court of Appeals is in conflict with a prior decision of the Supreme Court. The background of this case as stated in the Appellant's Initial Brief; and Motion to Certify submitted to the Court of Appeals on June 5, 2026 and June 12, 2026, respectively, is here now re-presented:

> Tracie L.Green (aka Tracie L. Mitchem-Green) ("Appellant") is an African American female who possesses a doctorate degree in nursing (DNP). Since obeying the law by reporting evidence and patient reports of abuse in 2017, the Appellant and her family has been subjected to targeting of various forms. In a federal related action, the Appellant wrote this state:
>
>> Currently, I live in a Homeless Shelter. Due to terrorism experienced since 2017, I exited Nursing (direct patient care) to keep the public safe, which severely affected my finances. Now that the government has been made aware of the terrorism, the terrorist are less likely to hurt anymore of my patients. However, the financial targeting against me is intense (i.e. high vehicle insurance, etc). The terrorism, coupled with the suspected murderous attempt on my lief [and my child if present] has taken a toll on my health and income, though I remain at functional capacity….
>
> The Appellant believes the foreclosure of her home—initiated by US Bank National Association on March 4, 2022— is an extension of the terrorism. (The Lis Pendens submitted to this Court provides details of the Appellant's home, at 123 Cardinal Pines Drive, Lexington, South Carolina 29073.) The case was officiated by the Lexington County Master-In-Equity, the Honorable James O. Spence, after an Order was entered by Deputy Clerk Mona Huggins on July 5, 2022. In summary, after multiple years of state and federal legal activity, on June 2, 2025, with a federal stay in place pending ruling with the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit since May 29, 2025, Appellant's home was sold to Worldwide Enterprises 803 LLC (Nayeli Gomez), despite parties and Court officials being provided verification of the federal stay. Then, while federal action was in progress at the Middle District of Florida, the Appellant's home was sold a second time, to Corey and Emily Short, on either October 24, 2025 or October 25, 2025,

with a timely submitted state stay and motion to reopen case pending with Lexington County Courthouse (Hon. James O. Spence) since July 26, 2025 (the case was closed on July 16, 2025). Again after federal and state related actions, including in this Court (2025-000179) and the Supreme Court of South Carolina (2025-001796), Hon. James O. Spence submitted his final order, disbursing the final surplus funds on April 30, 2026, despite multiple Appellant filings remaining unaddressed, including the July 26, 2025 Motion to reopen and stay. A Motion for Relief from Judgement was timely submitted on May 6, 2026, but remained unprocessed and could not be located on the docket, as with six other previously submitted documents. Changes were not readily apparent despite Court notification. The original notice of appeal to The Supreme Court of South Carolina was submitted to parties and the lower Court on May 7, 2026, given that this Court dismissed the case March 18, 2025 and remitted to lower Court on April 25, 2025 prior to the lower Court's final ruling issued on April 30, 2026 (Rule 203(d)1, SCACR). However, the Supreme Court transferred the case to the Court of Appeals on May 21, 2026. Additionally, given that The Supreme Court of South Carolina issued case number prior to case transfer, it is expected that the informa pauperis application was approved as filing fee is required before a case number can be issued. (The Supreme Court of South Carolina docket of this case could not be readily located.), However, Appellant continues to service respondents/defendants served since initiation of case until further instructions are received. However, newly named respondents will require Court servicing.

On July 5, 2022, Mona Huggins Deputy Clerk Common Pleas for Lisa M Comer Lexington County Clerk of Court, entered a Referred to Master or Special Referee Order without mutual consent being obtained. Despite being notified on July 6, 2022 the Order was not amended. Despite being filed on July 6, 2022, one day after the July 5, 2022, Clerk order, Referred to Master or Special Referee Order, Motion: Trial by Jury (Second Request) with Certificate of Service (which indicated this Defendants dissent to referral to Master) the error was not corrected.

As a second example of delayed filing, Notice of Home Acquisition, dated August 22, 2022, was not filed until September 1, 2022, being addressed by the trial court on addressed in part on January 29, 2025 (discussed in detail later in this filing). On February 6, 2024, Appellant submitted a Motion to Move to Inactive Roster to Clerks Lisa Cromer and/or Mona Huggins, due to active federal appeal. Even with a follow-up on February 7, 2024, inquiring when the motion would be docketed, the motion was docketed two days later (a total of three days after being submitted), on February 9th and then again on February 12, 2024. This is in stark contrast to the Respondent US Bank National Association submitting a Motion and Order for Stay Due to Foreclosure Intervention, dated September 14, 2022 with the subsequent Order/Strike Case From Active Roster being signed by Hon. Walton J. McLeod at "22:43:00" the same day, without awareness or inclusion of the Appellant…

> Despite the Court receiving a copy of the documents submitted for filing, an error occurred when a final Order was issued on April 30, 2026, with multiple pleadings being unaddressed. On May 7, 2026, seven previously submitted documents could not be located on the docket—with submission dates as far back as February 2026. A response was not received to the Appellant's inquiry regarding the missing documents. The missing documents include (in descending order):
>
> - May 6, 2026 Petitioner's Motion for Relief from Judgement (17 pages + Appendix [14 zip files])
> - April 29, 2026 Petitioner's Motion for Sanctions by Jury Trial (27 pages, includes Appendix)
> - April 27, 2026 The Supreme Court of the United States, Supplemental Brief for the Petitioner To Petitioner's Motion to Supplement Pleading for Stay Pending Appeal (50 pages)
> - April 18, 2026 Petitioner's Motion to Supplement Pleading for Relief from Judgement (To Reopen Closed Application) (With Full Member Court Requested) (35 pages, Proof of Service 1 page)
> - April 18, 2026 Petitioner's Motion to Supplement Pleading for Stay Pending Appeal (With Full Member Court or Justice Samuel Alito) (17 pages)
> - April 10, 2026 Motion for Clarification of Case Status with Certificate of Service (7 pages, includes Appendix)
> - February 27, 2026 Letter to Court (1 page)
>
> The Appellant's January 20, 2026 Emergency Motion to Correct Public Record—which notified the Court July 16, 2025 is inaccurately listed as the sale date instead of June 2, 2025 on Lexington County, South Carolina public website—was docketed the following day on January 21, 2026.

The June 12, 2026, Motion for Certification Under Rule 204(b), SCACR, discussed dense and perverse state official(s) (clerk) interference and evidence of Respondents, including but not limited to U.S. Bank National Association willful participation, which is further expounded upon in the Argument section of this pleading. As discussed in the June 22, 2026 Petition for Rehearing *En banc*, clerk interference also is evident in the June 12, 2026 dismissal of the case:

> At **416pm,** Appellant emailed Respondents (US Bank National Association (Hutchens's Law Firm and The Foundation Legal Group), Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union (Richardson Plowden & Robinson Law Firm), and Joint Municipal Water and Sewer (Frawley and Davis Law Firm)), two separate emails—the first email included a total of 16 pdf attachments inclusive of *Appellant Tracie L. Green Motion for Certification Under Rule 240(b), SCACR* ("Motion to Certify"). The second email included 9 pdf attachments, which were the remaining appendices associated with the Motion to Certify. At **423pm,**

both emails were electronically forwarded to the Court of Appeals (ctappfilings@sccourts.org) in consecutive order (first email sent; then the second email sent) for filing. At **431pm**, the Appellant received an email indicating stamped copy of the second email attachments (the remaining appendices to the Motion to Certify). At **444pm**, the Appellant received the following consecutively:

First: Court Order (signed by who appears to be Clerk of Court Jenny Kitchings):

> *Appellant has failed to order the transcript, as required by Rule 207 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules, and this Court's letter dated May 29, 2026. Accordingly, this matter is dismissed. In light of the dismissal the Court declines to consider any pending motions. The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b), SCACR.*

Second: A stamped copy of the **first** email attachments indicating stamped copy attached. The Supreme Court was notified and a *Motion to Vacate Order and Grant Access To South Carolina E-Filing System* submitted in response.

On June 26, 2026 12:26am, the Appellant involved federal and state law enforcement [specifically, the Department of Justice Criminal Division and South Carolina State Law Enforcement Division (SLED)] due to stated events in the following email communication:

> Good Evening: For filing are the following: 1. US Bank National Association's Response of Respondent U.S. Bank National Association To Appellant's Motion to Vacate Order, dated June 22, 2026 was received via U.S. Mail on June 25, 2026; a copy is attached. PLEASE EMAIL CORRESPONDENCES as has been filed in this case already and due to documented evidence of mail tampering. A response is forthcoming. 2. Please advise case status as the case cannot be located online. Here is verification: [This case, No. 2026-001149 Docket Report indicating “No records were found” on June 25, 2026 at 11:11pm.] And here is the docket 3 days ago on June 23, 2026: [This case, No. 2026-001149 Docket Report displaying in the Event Information section on June 12, 2026, first the “Motion – Certify to Supreme Court” and last the “Dispositional Decision – Order” as the last two filed documents, respectively, on June 23, 2026 at 6:08pm.] Since I feel bullied, threatened, and my safety at risk, state and federal Law Enforcement is included on this correspondence. Law Enforcement, your assistance is requested. I am attaching the Motion for Rehearing previously filed with the Court of Appeals (see the June 23, 2026 docket above for verification of the Motion to Certify as the motion for rehearing submitted on June 22, 2026 was not docketed at the time the docket was checked on June 23, 2026; see below email). Again, I feel threatened, bullied, and discriminated against in my request to reclaim stolen property as supported by factual evidence. I am requesting law enforcement assistance at this time. [Court of Appeals, please do not refile the petition for rehearing or the motion to certify as they were filed already as indicated by the docket and the email below.] SC Court of Appeals, US Bank National Association (Hutchens’s Law Firm and The Foundation Legal Group), Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union (Richardson Plowden & Robinson Law Firm), and Joint Municipal Water and Sewer (Frawley and Davis Law Firm) are included on this correspondence.

The June 27, 2026 1159pm submission of Appellant's Reply to Response of Respondent U.S. Bank National Association to Appellant's Motion to Vacate Order, Application for Default, and Default Judgement Paper: Liability of Defendants (Respondents), Preserving Statutory Right to a Jury Trial discussed the following[2]:

> Respondent U.S.Bank National Association erred in its June 22, 2026 *Response of Respondent U.S. Bank National Association to Appellant's Motion to Vacate Order* as follows:
>
> 1. Other parties not served electronically as established in this Court since May 17, 2026; instead only received via US Mail on June 25, 2026, which delays Appellant's response time. This is the second occurrence despite remainder, which is evidentiary of intent to delay. U.S. Bank National Association violated April 24, 2024 Court Rule 262, SCACR Amended Order Regarding Electronic Service and Filing.
> 2. Failed to inform this Court complete, factual information regarding Appellant's first appeal in 2025: the case was removed and under federal jurisdiction before being acknowledged by this Court. Here is an excerpt from Appellant's recently filed Petition for Rehearing dated June 22, 2026:
>
>   "This appeal is being filed with the Supreme Court given that the South Carolina Court of Appeals dismissed the case March 18, 2025 and remitted to lower Court on April 25, 2025 prior to the lower Court's final ruling issued on April 30, 2026 (Rule 203(d)1, SCACR)." The details of the 2025 case was summarized in the Motion to Certify, including in Appendix H of the said motion: "Court of Appeals, Appellant Case 2025-000179. Respondents US Bank National Association fails to mention that the 2025 Appellant case was removed to federal court on February 7, 2025, **prior** to the appellant court issuing a case number on February 18, 2025, which appears to be a clerical error. Thus, the case was removed and under federal jurisdiction after the February 7, 2025 notice of removal was submitted…
> 3. Failed to notify this Court of set standard for U.S. Bank National Association paying for Court reporter in lower Court –which does not have a staff court reporter—due to Appellant's Motion for Waiver of Fees and Costs (Appendix A). If transcript was needed for this Appeal, U.S. Bank National Association failed to order it, particularly given the standard set in the lower Court. In congruence of behavior, U.S. Bank National Association declined to order a transcript in the lower trial Court as well as in this Court. This is evidenced by U.S. Bank National Association **not** opposing Appellant's timely Notice.
> 4. Failed to acknowledge the unnecessary expense ordering the trial Court transcript would create, violating Rule 222 (c), SCACR costs for printing irrelevant matter.

[2] The Police Report is an exact replica of an earlier report rejected by another state agency; however, information regarding U.S. Bank National Association Lead Attorney John Kay required updating: Appellant-Petitioner awareness of Attorney Kay's appearance as a listed attorney in this case occurred after receipt of U.S. Mailed Motion to Dismiss and June 12, 2026 docket review; electronic or Court of Appeal notice was not received.

In summary, Appellant submitted to this Court two separate and distinct motions related to vacating clerical orders on the following dates: June 4, 2026 and June 12, 2026, respectively. The June 4, 2026 motion was submitted to this Court in objection to the clerk's May 29, 2026 order indicating dismissal if the Appellant did not order a transcript and is awaiting ruling. The Appellant has been and continues to be compliant with Court Rules and procedures as aforementioned.

Police Report.[3]

Evidence of Fraud and/or Fraud on Court (utilized authority, courthouse, taxpayer money outside the scope of practice and/or routine court business protocol):

-- Willingly displaying false information by removing defendant, Joint Municipal Water and Sewer's name from the docket.

--Docket Tampering: On May 27, 2026, The initial notice of appeal was posted as received May 18, 2026. After emergency motion to correct docket, docket only lists notice of not ordering a transcript as the only document being received on May 17, 2026 which is false. Moreover, question regarding receipt of May 14, 2025- mailed case initiation documents remain unanswered. Moreover, the Supreme Court docket cannot be located.

--Attorney Tampering: John Kay was the primary attorney of record in the lower court. Question regarding his whereabouts continue to be unanswered. Moreover, he is no longer listed on the docket, removed without a court order. Additionally, Attorney Alan Stewart was not listed in the lower court, however, he is now listed as an active attorney.

--Respondent Tampering: To remove Joint Municipal Water and Sewer without motion or a court order is unlawful.

--Hindering a case, discrimination: A case number cannot be issued unless the filing fee has been fully paid. I submitted an informa pauperis application on May 14, 2026, May 17, 2026, and a redacted informa pauperis application on May 18, 2026 indicating to parties and Court of an inability to pay Court costs and associated fees. For the case to be dismissed due to not ordering a lower court transcript would produce manifest injustice. Ordering the transcript would produce excessive cost for irrelevant matter, as the transcript would not provide as much useful information as it already available without the transcript. Hence, the Appellant's Notice of not ordering a transcript. Furthermore, all parties have been aware of the Appellant's not ordering the transcript without contesting or objection to the Notice. Furthermore, the clerks order of dismissal if transcript not ordered conflicts with Court Rule 203 as the informa pauperis application has been accepted (i.e. filing fee fully paid), hence dismissal for a payment the Appellant cannot afford (or need) would result in discrimination and manifest injustice. Rule 203, SCACR; Civil Court Rules 3.

--Document tampering, interference: On June 4, 2026, multiple documents filed before 1159pm. Specifically, the Motion to Vacate Orders, Remove Court Officials, and Grant a New Trial was the first of five emails submitted on the said date, but the only submission with June 5, 2026 court-stamping as the received date [the factual "received" date is June

[3]NOTE: State Law Enforcement (SLED) removed from additional email correspondences due to instructions obtained for additional communication regarding Appellant's concerns.

4, 2026 453p, which was the first submission (as each filing email is labelled sequentially as “Filing 1” to “Filing 5” (due to some large files).

Default Judgement Paper[4]

…In an associated federal case, on June 13, 2026 the Appellant served US Bank National Association (Hutchen’s Law Firm/The Foundation Legal Group; Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union (Richardson Plowden Law Firm); Lexington County Assessor’s Office; Sunrun, Incorporated, Worldwide Enterprises 803LLC, Nayeli Gomez, and Westgate Resorts[5] federal court documents. The eight (8) paged email stated as follows: 6/13/26 Hello: Attached are the following documents 1. 6 13 26 Defendants FINAL.pdf 2. 6 13 26 Lis Pendens FINAL.pdf 3. 6 13 26 Relief FINAL.pdf 4. 6 13 26 Stay Freeze FINAL.pdf 5. POS FINAL.pdf Next: Be advised, it has come to my attention that all named parties may not have been notified by court(s). Case 2026-001149, South Carolina Court of Appeals. https://www.sccourts.org/c-track-public-access/. BE ADVISED THE DOCKET APPEARS TO NOT DISPLAY ALL SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS. Below is a list of documents submitted…

All applicable Respondents have failed to respond as of the removal of the docket, which the Appellant became aware of on June 25, 2026. The Appellant has continued email service to Respondents US Bank National Association, Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union, and Joint Municipal Water and Sewer Commission since case initiation on May 14, 2026. However, due to Motion and Affidavit to Proceed Informa Pauperis (“Motion for Waiver of Costs and Fees”), serve is as per Court according to Court Rules, with further guidance requested by Appellant previously.

Liability of Respondents

Appellant respectfully request that the Court:

1. **Provide written order indicating current approval of Appellant’s informa pauperis status application** pursuant to Rule 3.
2. **Approve E-system filing** to permit Appellant to continue electronic filing to reduce interaction with clerical staff due to provided evidence of multilevel clerical interference and the docket being removed restricting Appellant from receiving timely case information as are afforded to Respondents.
3. **Approve rescission to Appellant of property at 123 Cardinal Pines Drive, Lexington, South Carolina 29073** due to fraudulent foreclosure of Appellant’s US Bank National Association mortgage; fraudulent sale of Appellant’s home by US Bank National Association to Worldwide Enterprises 803LLC (Nayeli Gomez); and

[4] Although Appellant-Petitioner and family did flee South Carolina due to targeting, the request to re-establish residential exemption status is due to Lexington County Assessor’s office statement it removed residential exemption status based on data obtained from the United States Postal Service, of which the Appellant-Petitioner notified the Lexington County Assessor’s office the information was fraudulent as the property was owner-occupied, with utilities maintained at the residence. The Lexington County Assessor’s Office stated an investigation would be conducted but never provided the Appellant-Petitioner with a copy of the investigative report. NOTE: The Appellant-Petitioner did not initiate disconnection of utilities at her Lexington County, South Carolina residence until June 12, 2025 due to loss of employment, which also contains evidence of targeting.

[5] Westgate Resorts is a Respondent in the associated federal case only.

fraudulent sale of Appellant's home by Worldwide Enterprises 803LLC (Nayeli Gomez) to Corey and Emily Short.

4. **Approve $3 million dollars with interest** due to fraudulent sale of Appellant's home on June 2, 2025. Ever barring payment(s) to state entities of any kind for any reason (i.e. taxes, use of public assistance, etc.) .
5. **Approve South Carolina Residency for Appellant and child effective as of June 12, 2025** due to first day of physical return to state of South Carolina with inability to stay due effects of fraudulent initiation of foreclosure on March 4, 2022 and evidence of associated targeting.
   a. **Immediate approval of South Carolina State Medicaid, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (food benefits), and housing subsidy effective as of June 12, 2025** until 30 days after rescission of property and monetary award received by Appellant (see #3 and #4 above).
6. **Approve permanent Restraining Order with a $2 million award for security measures and maintenance**, including but not limited to all legal issues to be deferred exclusively to jurisdiction of federal government for Appellant and family members to the sixth generation due to evidence of intent to harm Appellant and family members, while preserving Appellant and family' s right to waive the exclusive jurisdiction at any time and for any reason.
7. **Approve Appellant's motion to include additional defendants and additional respondents, granting a 90-day extension to submit indicated documents, forever barring Respondents from initiating legal action for delinquent bills and/or sequela related to this and associated actions** due to evidence of creation of unlawful debt, theft, and/or collusion to harm Appellant and/or family.
8. In lieu of Default Judgement pursuant to Rule 55**, order Lexington County Assessor's office to provide a copy of its investigative report to Appellant by electronically filing the report in this Court and submitting a copy to the Appellant; and returning all of Appellant's property tax assessment from year 2022 to present to** residential exemption due to targeting being the reason Appellant sought employment and out-of-state residency in New York.
9. Award Appellant all other just and equitable relief to which Appellant is entitled. Before this Court, this default judgement paper should be utilized to determine the liability of Respondents, preserving statuatory right to a jury trial in lieu of full Court ruling, where applicable.

The following day, on June 28, 2026 at 1216am, the Appellant submitted the remaining appendices to Default Judgement Paper (specifically, the May 6, 2026 Lexington County Courthouse Relief from Judgement and its appendices as indicated in the June 27, 2026 email to the Court of Appeals and Respondents); at 241pm, the amended Certificate of Service (updating the date of service for remaining appendices); and at 252pm, the federal informa pauperis application provided to the Supreme Court of the United States (Respondent's name redacted due to noted error). The federal informa pauperis application was only provided to the Court of Appeals and Law Enforcement, excluding other parties. Copies were received from the Court of Appeals being stamped June 29, 2026 as the date of receipt. The discrepancy in submission vs. court filed dates had been mentioned by the Appellant previously in several documents including but not limited to the June 12, 2026 Motion to Certify, in which a detailed table was provided on pages 12 through 17. On July 2, 2026, the Appellant submitted the following:

> Dear Court of Appeals: 1. Please provide a case status update. 2. Attached for filing are 6.27 26 reply email1.pdf (7 pages); 6 28 26 reply email 1.pdf (7 pages); and 6 28 26 email 2 (Amended COS).pdf (8 pages). Please also file this email and send a stamped copy, please. 3. Please provide a copy of the docket, as this case in still no longer listed on C-track public docket. Here is verification: [This case, No. 2026-001149 Docket Report indicating "No records were found" on July 2, 2026 at 247pm].

A response has not been received from the Court of Appeals and the docket remains obscured from public view.

ARGUMENT

I. The Court of Appeals erred in misapplying Rule 207, SCACR to avoid transmitting Appellant's Motion to Certify to this Court.

> ***Rule 207(a)(1). Ordering the Transcript.*** *In appeals from the court of common pleas, masters-in equity, special referees or the family court in domestic actions, the transcript must be ordered within ten (10) days after the date of service of the notice of appeal…. Unless the parties otherwise agree in writing, appellant must order a transcript of the entire proceedings below*.
>
> ***Rule 204(b) Certification by Supreme Court.*** *In any case which is pending before the Court of Appeals, the Supreme Court may, in its discretion, on motion of any party to the case, on request by the Court of Appeals, or on its own motion, certify the case for review by the Supreme Court before it has been determined by the Court of Appeals. Certification is normally appropriate where the case involves an issue of significant public interest or a legal principle of major importance. The effect of such certification shall be to transfer jurisdiction over the case to the Supreme Court for all purposes.*

The Court of Appeals dismissing the case for not ordering a transcript is in conflict with this Court, the Supreme Court of South Carolina. The Appellant submitted the notice of not ordering the transcript to this Supreme Court on May 17, 2026. The case was transferred to the Court of Appeals on May 21, 2026, which indicated case viability without any notice issued of pending dismissal for the appellant not ordering the transcript. How then can the Court of Appeals overrule a decision of the Supreme Court? Moreover, if the dismissal was truly related to the Appellant not ordering the transcript, then the dismissal date should have been June 8, 2026 as indicated in the May 29, 2026 letter of deficiency instead of immediately after the Appellant-Petitioner filed the Motion to Certify on June 12, 2026. As indicated in the Motion to Vacate Order and Grant Access To South Carolina E-Filing System:

> If the second email (appendix to motion to certify) was court-stamped received and returned to Appellant in 8 minutes, for what cause was the first email (motion to certify) not treated in the same manner, taking an unprecedented 21 minutes to be court-stamped and returned to the Appellant?... Evidence shows the court-stamped motion to certify this case was withheld until the Order of Dismissal was issued, and then a notice of a court-stamped copy immediately returned to the Appellant; such actions are unlawful. Furthermore, the June 5, 2026 Motion to Vacate Orders, Remove Court Officials, and Grant a New Trial pending before this court addresses the transcript as being unnecessary and excessive cost

The Court of Appeals erred in not providing rulings to Appellant's June 4, 2026 and June 12, 2026 separate and distinct motions related to vacating clerical orders. Furthermore, all respondents except U.S. Bank National Association failed to plead in this case, hence the application for default and default judgment paper submissions on June 27, 2026. In respect of Court Rules, if the transcript was indeed needed for this Appeal, U.S. Bank National Association failed to order it, given this standard set in the lower Court. As done previously in the trial Court, U.S. Bank National Association declined to order a transcript in this appellate case also as evidenced by U.S. Bank National Association failure to timely oppose Appellant's May 17, 2026 Notice of not ordering a transcript.

II. The Court of Appeals erred in this case by violating uniformity, producing discrimination; and conflicting with its prior actions in timely transmitting the Motion to Certify to the Supreme Court of South Carolina in Appellate Case Numbers 2024—000576, and in correcting clerical errors in case No. 2020-001135.

According to the public docket, in case Number 2024—000576, *The State v. Richard Alexander Murdaugh (2)*, the Motion to Certify was submitted and docketed by the Court of Appeals on the same day. The opposing party then, submitted a letter return which indicated the present case had yet another active case, arising for the same conviction, also pending before the same Court of Appeals:

> Importantly should this Court or the Supreme Court deem certification appropriate on 2024-000576, it would necessarily follow that certification and consolidation would additionally be appropriate under SCACR Rule 214 on the underlying murder appeal- *State v Murdaugh* 2023-000392. That matter is presently pending before the South Carolina Court of Appeals with the Initial Brief of Appellant due August 12, 2024 arising from the same judgment of conviction. As noted this also is subject to this Court's discretion should certification be granted or occur. For the Court's information, the State consented to the Appellant's request today to stay briefing in each of these cases pending a decision of the Appellant's motion to certify.

The Court of Appeals forwarded the Motion to Certify to this Court. Also, in case number 2020-001135, *Wendy Brawley v. Richland County*, Attorney Andrew Lindemann made the Court of Appeals aware of a clerical error in which his clients Petition for Rehearing had not been docketed:

> Ms. Kitchings: I just realized that there is a procedural glitch with this appeal that I must call to your attention to try to get corrected. On October 10, 2024, the Appellant-Respondent Richland County (my client) filed the attached Petition for Rehearing with supporting memorandum and a certificate of service. As you can see, the Court provided me with filed copies showing that these filings were received on October 10, 2024. The Respondent-Appellant Wendy Brawley also filed a Petition for Rehearing on that same date and asked for an en banc rehearing. Last week I received an Order denying a Petition for Rehearing. Originally, I assumed that that Order denied both parties' petitions for rehearing. But I have looked closer at the situation and now realize that the Order filed

> November 14, 2024 only denied Ms. Brawley's Petition for Rehearing, and presumably Richland County's petition remains pending. That struck me as odd or out of the ordinary. As a result, I looked at the on-line docket using C-Track and realized that Richland County's petition does not appear on the docket as having been filed – despite the fact that I did timely file on October 10, 2024, and as the attachments to this email reflect, the County's Petition for Rehearing was received by the Court. Can you please look into this situation for me and take whatever action is needed for the County's Petition for Rehearing to be heard and decided? If I need to file a motion or take any further action on my end, please let me know. This further complicates the filing of petitions for writ of certiorari because the parties will be operating on different time deadlines, but it presents a real problem for the County because our 30-day deadline to petition for certiorari does not begin running until the Court of Appeals acts on our Petition for Rehearing. Thank you very much for looking into this for me. Andrew

The Court of Appeals response is as follows:

> Dear Counsel: Richland County recently alerted the court to the fact that a petition for rehearing on the County's behalf was timely filed but inadvertently not docketed. The court apologizes for this oversight and appreciates counsel directing the court to this mistake. The court will consider the petition promptly. Until the court takes action on the petition, all further deadlines will be held in abeyance, including the deadline for requesting certiorari based on the denial of the previous petition for rehearing in this case. Very truly yours, Clerk [The signature appears to be Hon. Jenny Abbott Kitchings]

Why is the handling of this case in relation to the aforementioned cases not uniform as mandated by Court Rules? Although an investigation would uncover the facts, some obvious differences are as follows:

1. In comparison to both cases *The State v. Richard Alexander Murdaugh (2)* and *Wendy Brawley v. Richland County*: This Appellant-Petitioner is pro-se and informa pauperis litigant, whereas the other Appellant's were represented by legal counsel.
2. In comparison to *The State v. Richard Alexander Murdaugh (2)*: This Appellant-Petitioner is African-American female, whereas Appellant Murdaugh is a Caucasian male.

These noted differences should not have caused this appeals case to be handled differently with regards to transmission of the Motion to certify and correcting clerical errors; or did it?

Moreover, Rule 204 (b), SCACR are the same for civil and criminal cases desiring case certification; and second appeals before appellate Courts are possible. This makes U.S. Bank National Association argument of this being this case's second appeal futile, especially if this Court, the Supreme Court of South Carolina, transferred this case to the Court of Appeals having knowledge of the prior appeal that occurred in 2025. Thereby, U.S. Bank National Association appears to be on board with the Court of Appeals being in conflict with its prior actions in the aforementioned cases.

III. The Court of Appeals erred in several points being overlooked, misapprehended, or disregarded.

Judicial Rulings in this case have not been provided to the Appellate-Petitioner, including on the five points outlined in the June 22, 2026 Petition for Rehearing *en banc*:

> First Point, the case being dismissed due to an informa pauperis Appellant not ordering the transcript is unlawful. The Court Form SCCA 405CP (Revised 04/2026) ("Motion and Affidavit to Proceed Informa Pauperis") has the following inscription: "Motion for Waiver of Costs and Fees." The Appellant submitted the notarized Motion and Affidavit to Proceed Informa Pauperis as early as May 14, 2026, indicating to the Court the need for all fees and costs to be relinquished due to Appellant's inability to pay; to do otherwise creates a manifest injustice. On May 20, 2026, the Appellant provided the Court a Notice of Available Funds and has since received loan funds with specific allocation that does not change alter Appellant's inability to pay for court fees. To balance justice on income status is a manifest injustice. Additionally, the June 5, 2026 Appellant's Initial Brief was based on the interference of lower court State Officials in the case, which made attainment of the transcript an unnecessary expense. To order the transcript would violate Rule 222 (c), costs for printing irrelevant matter, even permitting parties to seek cost recovery for the transcript which would be indicated if ordered. Therefore, in objection to the clerk's May 29, 2026 order indicating dismissal if the Appellant did not order a transcript, a Motion to Vacate Orders, Remove Court Official, and Grant a New Trial was timely submitted on June 4, 2026, in which the Appellant clearly addresses reasons for not ordering the transcript [See details under "Police Report", Hndering a case, discrimination section of this petition for writ of certorari.]
>
> The following day, Appellant was required to file a Motion to Correct Filing Order on June 5, 2026 due to evidence of document tampering by state officials, specifically the Clerk's:

> *Pursuant to Rule 262, SCACR, the Appellant submits this motion to Court's assistance in correcting filing order of documents submitted on June 4, 2026. Specifically, the Motion to Vacate Orders, Remove Court Officials, and Grant a New Trial was the first of five emails submitted on the said date, but the only submission with June 5, 2026 as the received date, which is a clear error pursuant to Court rule. Submission verification is included below. Specifically, please correct the "received" date as June 4, 2026 453p, which was the first submission*

Evidence shows document tampering was already occurring before the dismissal order was issued. However, on June 16, 2026, the Motion to Vacate Orders, Remove Court Official, and Grant a New Trial was still pending ruling at the time of the dismissal (court order not docketed) and the motion to correct filing order could not be located on the docket, which appears to indicate obstruction of justice by filings not being transmitted for judicial rulings as mandated by law. It is not lawfully acceptable for motions addressed to the Court for judicial ruling (i.e. ruling by judges) to be decided by clerks and/or not docketed. Such actions are inconsistent with this Court's history and appellant Court rules and procedure…

Second Point, the following pleadings are still awaiting a judge ruling (some of which may or may not have been docketed):1. Motion and Affidavit to Proceed Informa Pauperis and Redacted Motion and Affidavit to Proceed Informa Pauperis (submitted May 17, 2026 and May 18, 2026, respectively); 2. Motion for Stay and Freezing Assets Pending Appeal (submitted May 19, 2026); 3. Motion to Include Additional Defendants (submitted May 22, 2026); 4. Emergency Motion to Correct Docket (submitted May 26, 2026); 5. Motion to Vacate Orders, Remove Court Official, and Grant a New Trial; Motion forLeave to File Second Amended Notice of Appeal; and Second Amended Notice of Appeal; and Motion for Determination of Domestic Terrorism and to Re-establish South Carolina Residency with Appendix) (all submitted June 4, 2026); 6. Motion To Correct Filing Order, Certificate of Service; and Initial Brief—Appellant (submitted June 5, 2026); 7. Motion to Certify [addressed to the Supreme Court] (submitted June 12, 2026, prior to dismissal order); 8. Motion to Vacate Order and Grant Access To South Carolina E-Filing System (submitted June 12, 2026, in response to the dismissal order).

Third Point, when state officials persist in advocating the promotion of other parties, by perjury and tampering, during an appeals proceeding—it is irrefutable evidence that presumptive prejudicial circumstances are present. On April 30, 2026 the case at Lexington County Courthouse ended. The case title was *US Bank National Association v. Tracie L. Green, defendant et al*. According to the May 5, 2026 lower court document, additional case parties and associated attorneys included Cardinal Pines Homeowner's Association (inactive); defendant Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union (S. Nelson Weston Jr); and defendant Joint Municipal Water and Sewer Commission (James Randall Davis). John Sanford Kay, Sarah Oliver Leonard, Ashley Zarrett Leonard, Kenneth Gregory Wooten III are listed as Plaintiff Attorneys for US Bank National Association.

On May 21, 2026, this case was transferred to this Court from the state Supreme Court. Although verification of the May 14, 2026 mailing of case initiation documents was provided and the Supreme Court verified May 17, 2026 electronic receipt of documents, the docket displays errors indicating the Notice of Appeal and Motion and Affidavit to Proceed Informa Pauperis were filed/received on May 18, 2026 and May 21, 2026, respectively. This violates Rule 262(a)(1) ("Delivering the document to the clerk of the appellate court. The date of filing shall be the date of delivery."). According to Court Rules, the date of case initiation for the following documents should be listed as May 14, 2026 on the docket: Notice of Appeal; Letter Notice of Appeal, Certificate of Service; Letter, Amended Notice of Appeal, Certificate of Service, Orders from Trial Court (as indicated on the Amended Appeal); Informa Pauperis Application, Clarification of Addendum and Attachment to Notarized Motion and Affidavit to Proceed Informa Pauperis (Motion for Waiver of Costs and Fees); Motion to Extend Time to File Initial Brief , and Certificate of Service. Despite filing an emergency motion to correct the date discrepancies on the docket and providing proof of correct filing dates, the docket essentially remained unchanged, except the only document listed on the docket as being received on May 17, 2026 is "Transcript Documents - Notice of Appellant Not Ordering Transcript". However, the *Motion by Pro Se, Informa Pauperis Applicant for Litigant to Participate in Electronic Filing* was also submitted by the Appellant at the same time, but is docketed as being received on June 18, 2026, which is evidentiary of tampering. These actions and/or inactions by state officials are irrefutable violations of Court Rules. Moreover, to publish false information is a violation of SC Code Section 16-13 10 and Rule 501 Canon 2 (avoiding impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all activities) of which the latter are "rules governing the Judiciary, Employees of the Judicial Branch, and Others Assisting the Judiciary," which includes Clerk's.

Fourth Point, when state officials advocate the promotion of other parties, by perjury and tampering, during an appeals proceeding— while disregarding prior notice— it is irrefutable evidence that prejudice and discrimination are present; as well as being evidentiary of the presence of prosecutorial abuse, misconduct, overreach, and abuse of authority due to the case not being conducted according to established guidelines. (Even Court Form SCCA 233 CP—form motion—indicates "Domestic Abuse or Abuse and Neglect" and "Indigent Status" are acceptable reasons for fee exemption with the Court, which are indicated by the Appellant. In the May 13, 2026, *Form 8 Letter to the Appellate Court Clerk Filing the Notice of Appeal and Amended Notice of Appeal,* the Appellant acknowledged the reason for submitting the appeals case to the Supreme Court instead of the Court of Appeals was due to the prior dismissal and remittitur of case number 2025-000179 (*U.S. Bank National Association, Respondent, v. Tracie L. Green; Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union*, of which this Appellant was also the Appellant) in 2005: "This appeal is being filed with the Supreme Court given that the South Carolina Court of Appeals dismissed the case March 18, 2025 and remitted to lower Court on April 25, 2025 prior to the lower Court's final ruling issued on April 30, 2026 (Rule 203(d)1, SCACR)."

Although additional details of the 2025 case is further summarized later in this pleading, it is important to re-state the following discussed in the Motion for Rehearing:

…both federal and state stays pending ruling were in place, including a stay with the South Carolina Court of Appeals, which did not issue the Remittitur until April 25, 2025. To not address recurrent clerk interference would produce a manifest injustice. [It is important to note that during the construction of May 6, 2026 lower court motion for relief from judgment, the Appellant became aware documents were submitted to the inadvertently submitted to the incorrect appellant court. Nonetheless, the respondent was fully aware of the stay and notice of appeal being filed, yet fraudulently proceeded with the foreclosure sale anyway.] In summary, the Clerk's office erred in 2025 by continuing to process a case that had been removed before a case number was issued and for not returning the $250 filing fee accepted on the Clerk's office February 6, 2026 despite a copy of the granted state motion to proceed informa pauperis being docketed since January 31, 2025. More importantly, how did the Court receive payment but not the printed copies mailed along with the payment of the documents electronically submitted? Only during the construction of this petition has the Appellant been made aware of the preceding fact. Specifically, the docket shows no case activity between February 1, 2025 and February 5, 2025, despite submission of both electronic and mailed copies of the February 2, 2025-submitted documents. Those documents are: Letter Filing Notice of Appeal [Second Amendment]; Notice of Appeal [Second Amendment] (which included "Staying Judgement for Sale or Delivery of Land" section); a 9-paged Appellant Letter to the Court (inclusive of chain email from January 31, 2025); and Proof of Service.)]. Moreover, evidence appears to show clerk tampering and perjury also occurred in the 2025 case and appears to be the cause of the missing February 2, 2025 court documents that were enclosed with the money order in the express mailed package with a weight of 8.70oz. Where are the documents?

The Fifth Point, clerk's changing of parties names and attorneys names without a court order is unlawful. Even the Supreme Court named the case "US Bank National Association, Respondent, v. Tracie L. Green, Cardinal Pines Homeowners' Association, Inc., Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union, Joint Municipal Water and Sewer Commission, Defendants, Of Which Tracie L. Green is the Appellant. Appellate Case No. 2026-001149" on May 21, 2026. How then can Clerks in the Court of Appeals change parties names without a docketed judicial order, especially given that the complaint lists the defendants and there a motion is before judges requesting additional defendants be added? Moreover, evidence shows the Clerk's intent to unlawfully manipulate case parties as the May 29, 2026 letter of deficiency was only sent to the Appellant and US Bank National Association counsel **before** officially notifying the Appellant of the Clerk's decision to change the case title, though the title was originally docketed as the Supreme Court had indicated in the transfer order? This is manifest injustice and discrimination pursuant to law as all of the aforementioned actions and/or inactions by the clerk's appear to violate the following laws: **SECTION 14-1-100.** Rights in court not affected by race or color... **SECTION 14-1-170.** Filing of undertakings... **SECTION 14-8-110.** Duties of Clerk of Supreme Court; appointment of clerk of Court of Appeals to aid clerk of Supreme Court... **SECTION 14-8-400.** Terms of Court; order of docketing… **SECTION 14-8-210.** Review by Supreme Court. **Rule 203(3), SCACR**, "if the notice of appeal is not timely filed or the filing fee is not paid in full, the appeal shall be dismissed, and shall not be reinstated except as provided by Rule 260".

> The Notice of Appeal was initially served on the parties and the lower court on May 7, 2026; even the trial court case title included Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union and Joint Municipal Water and Sewer Commission. According to SC Code Section 14-17-50 and 14-17-60: "The clerk before entering on the duties of his office shall, in addition to the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, take the oaths required of such officer by Section 8-3-20. Said oaths must be endorsed upon the commission, subscribed by the officer and attested by a magistrate or notary public of the county for which the clerk shall have been elected or appointed…When so qualified the deputy may do and perform any and all of the duties appertaining to the office of his principal." SC Code Section 14-17-50 and 14-17-60 violations are evident.

In the June 12, 2026 Motion to Certify, the Appellant-Petitioner addressed U.S. Bank National Association's June 5th Motion to Dismiss with prejudice:

> <u>Dismissal with Prejudice Would Produce Manifest Injustice and Harm to Public</u> Evidence shows Respondent US Bank National Association is and has been fully aware of its fraudulent pursuit. Moreover, the respondent shows not remorse for damning so much by their participation in US Bank National Association's unlawful pursuit of Petitioner's home, just merely to cause harm. Evidence shows US Bank National Association is a danger to society that needs immediate resolution. To dismiss a case of this magnitude—with issues of whether the final judgement order (which also encompasses preceding orders) should be overturned due to unparallelled tampering (perjury; and interfering with the docket, attorneys, and other parties) by state official(s), specifically the Clerks of Court at Lexington County Courthouse, as well as evidence of colluded activity with other parties to secure a favored verdict for US Bank National Association; and a legal principle of major importance as to whether it is presumptively prejudicial for state officials to secretly promote the advancement of certain parties during a civil trial, through acts of perjury and tampering aforementioned ultimately twisting justice for the unfavored party—would create an unprecedented manifest injustice and gravely harm to public. According to the facts, US Bank National Association and Clerks Lisa Cromer and/or Mona Huggins are certainly in need of accountability, not securement of additions funds to which none are entitled. For the Court of Appeals to dismiss this case in favor for US Bank National Association would counteract the appropriate decision this Superior Court made in State of South Carolina v. Richard Alexander Murdaugh, in which this Court overturned the murder verdict and remanded the case for a new trial due to clerk interference. In similitude, this civil case is due to the same.

The June 27, 2026, Appellant's Reply to Response of Respondent U.S. Bank National Association to Appellant's Motion to Vacate Order, argued that this a case presenting before a state appellate court on multiple occasions is not unheard of, as can be noted in cases *The State v.*

Richard Alexander Murdaugh, which presented before the same Appellate Court on two separate occasions in the same year (case Numbers 2024-000004 and 2024—000576):

> In review, Appellant filed this present case in the Supreme Court of South Carolina on May 14, 2026 by placing in U.S. Mail the Notice of Appeal, the Motion and Affidavit to Proceed Informa Pauperis ("Motion for Waiver of Costs and Fees.") and other case initiation documents. In response, on May 21, 2026, the superior state court transferred this case to the Court of Appeals, Rule 204 SCACR. Similarly, *The State v. Richard Alexander Murdaugh* presented before the same state Appellate Court on two separate occasions in the same year (case Numbers 2024-000004 and 2024—000576); whereas, the Appellant appeals to this Court occurred in 2025 and 2026, respectively.

IV. The final judgement order (which also encompasses preceding orders) should be overturned due to unparallelled tampering (perjury; and interfering with the docket, attorneys, and other parties) by state official(s)—specifically the Clerks of Court at Lexington County Courthouse—as well as for evidence of colluded activity with other parties to secure a favored verdict due to it not being possible to have a fair trial when court officials promote advancement of other parties; commit perjury, and tampering.

As argued in the Appellant's Initial Brief and Motion to Certify, Trial Court Clerks at Lexington County Courthouse failed to adhere to the Handbook they took an oath to follow:

> According to the Introduction of the South Carolina's Clerk of Courts Handbook, Clerk's Lisa Cromer and/or Mona Huggins are tasked with ensuring filed documents are presented to the Court; therefore, for the Order to have been signed by a substitute judge so expeditiously is evidentiary of involvement of Clerk's Lisa Cromer and/or Mona Huggins. The Motion and Order were docketed early morning the following day, September 15, 2022 at 9:39am. Additionally, Clerk's Lisa Cromer and/or Mona Huggins did not issue an Order dismissing the case due to non-compliance with Hon. Walter J. McLeod's order (nor is there any indication Clerk's Lisa Cromer and/or Mona Huggins made the Court aware of the violation):
>
> > Failure to submit Motion and Order described in (1) – (3) above within 180 days from the date of the filing of this Order shall result in the case being dismissed without prejudice for non compliance. So dismissed, the case shall not be restored, but must be refiled.
>
> Again, delayed filing and docketing of Appellant's submitted documents reoccurred unopposed by the Court. For example, after the case was closed on July 16, 2025, several motions were timely filed on July 26, 2025 including but not limited to a Motion to Reopen Case; however, according to the docket, July 26, 2025 documents were docketed on August 11, 2025.
>
> Evidence seems to indicate that the Respondents—US Bank National Association, Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union, Joint Municipal Water and Sewer

> Commission, Lexington County Assessor's Office, Sunrun, Incorporated, Worldwide Enterprises 803LLC, Nayeli Gomez, Corey Short, Emily Short, John/Jane Doe—have colluded and/or participated in the unlawful activity (including outside of court proceedings) as detailed in documents submitted to this Court. As referenced in *State v. Murdaugh*, (page 7, footnote):
>
> > …the State has objected to referring to former Colleton County Clerk of Court Rebecca Hill as a "state official." Mr. Murdaugh does not mean that her improper motives or conduct should be imputed to the prosecution or law enforcement in this case. But it is inarguable that Ms. Hill acted in this case as an official of the State of South Carolina: She held an elected office created by Section 24 of Article V of the South Carolina Constitution…
>
> The same is true for Clerk's Lisa Cromer and Mona Huggins, they acted as officials of the State of South Carolina in the lower court case. In January 29, 2025, Hon. James O. Spence wrote in is order denying Appellant's Motion to Vacate:
>
> > Allegations of Clerk of Court Fraud. Defendant argues that the Lexington County Clerk of Court has improperly filed, mislabeled or not filed certain un-specified documents, while filing all of Plaintiff's documents as submitted…. The court finds no persuasive evidence that indicates Clerk of Court fraud or any other improper activity.
>
> The lower trial Court remains silent regarding the May 6, 2026 notification of submitted documents from as far back as February 2026 not being located on the docket. The Appellant located the final Order issued on April 30, 2026 by reviewing the docket. A communication with Clerk's Lisa Cromer and/or Mona Huggins regarding not receiving the mailed copy of the final order still remains unanswered.

V. It is presumptively prejudicial for state officials to secretly promote the advancement of certain parties during a civil trial—through acts of perjury and tampering aforementioned—ultimately skewing justice for the unfavored party.

The June 12, 2026 Motion to Certify details state officials' secret promotion of other parties and those parties—including but not limited to U.S. Bank National Association—willful participation:

> During the construction of this motion, Respondent US Bank National Association's Motion to Dismiss, postmarked June 5, 2026 was received via mail after Appellant emailed a status update request on June 9, 2026 at 1232pm.The Appellant will use US Bank National Association's motion as a framework for the argument. <u>Lack of Compliance with Court Rules and Procedure</u>. Respondent US Bank National Association alleges Appellant federal cases were mere attempts to delay the foreclosure initiated by said respondent on March 4, 2022; however, none of the federal cases were dismissed due to frivolity. <u>November 14, 2024 Foreclosure Judgement in favor of US Bank National Association.</u> Respondent fails to address it's motion for summary judgment was filed on February 7, 2026 due to docket tampering by the Clerk's Office (Hon. Lisa

Cromer and/or Hon. Mona Huggins) in which Appellant's motion to Move to Inactive Roster (due to active federal appeal), being submitted February 6, 2024 was not filed by the said Clerk's until February 9, 2024 and again on February 12, 2024. The Appellant is not aware of US Bank National Association ever attempting to rectify or even declining to participate in the unlawful actions of the state official(s). Court of Appeals, Appellant Case 2025-000179. Respondents US Bank National Association fails to mention that the 2025 Appellant case was removed to federal court on February 7, 2025, **prior** to the appellant court issuing a case number on February 18, 2025, which appears to be a clerical error. Thus, the case was removed and under federal jurisdiction after the February 7, 2025 notice of removal was submitted. Here is an excerpt from February 22, 2025 communication with the Court of Appeals, Lexington County Courthouse, and parties (including Respondent US Bank National Association): **SC Court of Appeals is the February 18, 2025 directives redacted, including the pending February 28, 2025 dismissal due to this case still being under federal jurisdiction (since February 7, 2025)?** It has come to my attention that mailed documents are not reaching their destinations [emailed delivery is largely excluded from this discussion EXCEPT 2.19.25 emailed response] . In addition, mailed items (some express and/or signature required) are not being picked up. As of today, February 22, 2025, this case still active in Federal jurisdiction. Moreover, after this email, I will only communicate with the associated parties—US Bank National Association (Hutchen's Law Firm) and Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union (Richardson Plowden)—and the current court with jurisdiction (currently, US Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Additionally, US Bank National Association fails to acknowledge participating in a preliminary auction of Appellants home on February 3, 2025 despite a state level stay being submitted the day prior, on February 2, 2025, which was unlawful. (There appears to be discrepancies in some dates documents were submitted to the appellant court and the date stamped received.)

June 2, 2025 vs July 16, 2025 Sale of Property. Respondent US Bank National Association appears to cover the fact that the Appellant's property was sold on June 2, 2025 with federal stays in place (as detailed in the May 6, 2026 Relief from Judgement submitted to Lexington County Courthouse, but was not docketed by the Hon. Lisa Cromer nor Hon. Mona Huggins prior to filing the Notice of Appeal.) The initial disbursement of funds were issued on July 16, 2025 at which time the case closed. [Of note, the motion for relief from judgement was ***appended*** to the Motion for Additional Defendants submitted to the Appeals Court and not as a motion to be ruled upon as purported by US Bank National Association.) Objection and/or Appeal to Surplus Fund Orders. Respondent US Bank National Association alleges Appellant did not object to the September 15, 2025 Order to disburse surplus funds. In stark contrast, not only did the Appellant object to the Order but on September 19, 2025, the motion, *Request for Immediate Disbursement and Rescission of Property* was filed in related Writ of Mandamus action, Case No. 2025-001796, in this Court, having been initiated on August 31, 2025 due to the unlawful sale and court officials docket tampering in which the Appellant's Motion to Reopen Case and other associated documents were not docketed as per standard procedure. Here is an excerpt: *In response to Lexington County Courthouse continual case activity—despite this active state Supreme Court case to address the fraudulent foreclosure of Plaintiff's home, in which this Superior Court notified Hon. James Spence of on September 12, 2025—the Plaintiff request immediate disbursement of the full amount due as indicated below and immediate rescission of her property, located at 123 Cardinal Pines Drive,* *Lexington South Carolina, 29073 pursuant to SCRCP 60. Plaintiff declines any and all disbursements from the surplus funds as IT IS FRAUD; thereby, please cancel the check addressed to Plaintiff.* US Bank National Association was keenly aware of the Supreme Court of South Carolina case but denied it's existence to Joint Municipal Water and Sewer Commission Attorneys on November 5, 2025, though the Supreme Court stated otherwise. <u>September 15, 2025 and April 30, 2026 Surplus Orders Objected to by Appellant.</u>Respondent US Bank National proports they are identical. However, there is a major difference, in additional to the sale being fraudulent with stays in place. Here is an excerpt from the May 6, 2026 Relief from Judgement not docketed by the Lexington County Courthouse Clerk's office: *The final order was issued without resolution of lawful, timely pending motions. Several motions remain pending before this Court. Most important, pursuant to Rule 59, a motion to Reopen (New Trial) was timely submitted on July 26, 2025, exactly ten days after case closure, with a copy provided directly to the judge on the same day. Pursuant to this law, ruling is required. … Therefore, Worldwide Enterprises 803LLC sale of the property to Corey and Elizabeth Short on October 24, 2025 with the associated case pending before the South Carolina Supreme Court—inclusive of a Lis Pendens submitted August 31, 2025 via mail and then again electronically on September 4, 2025; and a stay pending ruling submitted October 4, 2025)—doubly renders the second sale between Worldwide Enterprises (Nayeli Gomez) and Corey and Emily Short unlawful as Nayeli Gomez was fully aware of the litigation in process regarding the property, before and after the second sale. … In the April 30, 2026 Final Order, $13,042.41 was disbursed to Richardson Plowden & Robinson Law Firm on behalf of Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union. However, this Court was notified on April 29, 2026 that the debt was no longer existent due to "shave off" initiated by Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union. Hence, the "shave off" voids the judgement and disbursement is not applicable. (Again, foundationally the surplus funds are not legally claimable due to June 2, 2025 sale with federal stays pending ruling in place) and the debt being resolved by Palmetto Citizens Federal Credit Union. Despite this Defendant not being in agreement with the "shave off" that was completed without this Defendant's knowledge or consent, the , $13,042.41 judgement issued by this Court is void and must be redacted. Moreover, since this Defendant, Sunrun, and Joint Municipal Water and Sewer did not comply with the Court's July 16, 2025 and amended July 23, 2025 Order to claim surplus funds, the said funds are abandoned… Of note, the Petitioner declined all surplus funds due to fraud (the June 2, 2025 sale occurred with stays in place)… Secondly, the Court issuance of the $4,248.16 check addressed to the Lexington Clerk of Court in care of this Defendant—due to several mailing and tracking concerns filed—is also void due to claim not submitted within the 45-day timeframe ordered by this Court…* <u>Docket Tampering at Trial Court Continues</u> As indicated in the May 5, 2026 obtained List of Case Parties Appended to Motion for Additional Defendants, Lexington County Courthouse added Joint Municipal Water and Sewer Commission as a defendant on September 16, 2025. However, the docket obtained by the Court of Appeals just 13 days later indicated Joint Municipal Water and Sewer Commission has now been removed, which is unlawful and against standard procedure. This is docket, attorney, and party tampering. Additionally, the May 18, 2026 Lexington County Courthouse docket clearly indicates the Appellants home was sold on June 2, 2025 in which a $9,050.00 payment was recorded. The transaction is unlawful due to federal stay in place. For this cause, the Appellants home was **stolen** by US Bank National Association, being aided by state officials, specifically by the interference of Court Clerks. South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure 60 provides the remedy: *Rule 60. RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT OR ORDER(a) Clerical Mistakes..(b) Mistakes; Inadvertence; Excusable Neglect; Newly Discovered Evidence; Fraud, etc.* Respondents analysis of the Motion for Determination of Domestic Terrorism and to Re-establish South Carolina Residency appears no more than a smoke screen to cover its fraudulent and terroristic activities since before the unlawful foreclosure proceedings were initiated on March 4, 2022. The aforementioned motion—including other submitted motions such as Motion to Vacate Orders, Remove Court Officials, and Grant a New Trial; Motion to Vacate Orders, Remove Court Officials, and Grant a New Trial; and Motion To Correct Filing Order—all outline the coordinated terroristic activity the Appellant has been subjected due, under the umbrella of "simple foreclosure." Right to Appeal South Carolina law, specifically Rule 60, clearly provides legal remedy for fraud, including clerks interference.

CONCLUSION

Clerk interference by fraud, tampering, and providing false documents continues to occur in this case: the June 27 to June 28, 2026 submissions stamped received on June 29, 2026 is a violation of Court Rule 262 "the date of filing shall be the date of delivery…" The Court of Appeals erred by combining two separate appendices despite detailed specifications being provided.

For the reasons stated, Appellant-Petitioner asks the Court to grant the petition for a writ of certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracie L. Mitchem-Green
608 SE Defender Drive
Lake City, Florida 32025
Appellant-Petitioner
(803) 361-0602

July 12, 2026