

Jul 16 2026

S.C. SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Dr. Linda Kennedy, J.D., B.S., B.A and Dr. Marsha Fink,
J.D., B.A, Petitioners,

v.

Judges R. Lawton McIntosh, R. Scott Sprouse, J. Cordell
Maddox, Jr. (retired), in their official capacities as judges
of the Tenth Judicial Circuit and Heath P. Taylor in his
official capacity as judge of the First Judicial Circuit,
Respondents.

In re: Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink, Plaintiffs,

v.

Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC, et al.,
Defendants.

Appellate Case No. 2025-000134
Lower Court Case No. 2022CP0400592

ORDER

Petitioners have filed a petition in the original jurisdiction of this Court seeking a writ of mandamus ordering four circuit court judges, "as well as the remaining judges in South Carolina, to recuse themselves," in a civil matter that is pending in the court of common pleas for Anderson County. Petitioners, who are plaintiffs in that civil matter, argue the judges have a mandatory, ministerial duty to recuse themselves because their impartiality might reasonably be questioned, and they contend they have no other legal remedy because the denial of a motion to recuse is not immediately appealable.

Petitioners' arguments are wholly without merit. Petitioners have provided no evidence showing any judges' impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

Exh 1

Instead, they argue various judges have erred in ruling against them or in denying petitioners' motions to recuse themselves, which petitioners may challenge on appeal. See, E.g., *Richland Cnty. v. S.C. Dep't of Revenue*, 422 S.C. 292, 307, 811 S.E.2d 758, 766 (2018) ("To obtain a writ of mandamus requiring the performance of an act, the petitioner must show: (1) a duty of respondent to perform the act; (2) the ministerial nature of the act; (3) the petitioner's specific legal right for which discharge of the duty is necessary; and (4) a lack of any other legal remedy.").

However, it has come to this Court's attention that petitioners have served two circuit judges with subpoenas in the underlying civil case. The records in that case indicate the Honorable Judge R. Lawton McIntosh issued a rule to show cause on January 6, 2025, to address whether petitioners' filings in the circuit court matter violate Rule 11, SCRCP. A hearing has been scheduled before Judge McIntosh on February 6, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. at the Anderson County Courthouse to address the rule to show cause.

On January 27, 2025, petitioners, who are proceeding *pro se* in this matter, served nearly identical subpoenas on Judge McIntosh and the Honorable J. Cordell Maddox, Jr. These witness and *duces tecum* subpoenas direct Judge McIntosh and Judge Maddox to appear and testify at the scheduled rule to show cause hearing on February 6, 2025, and to produce and permit inspection of voluminous documents.

The *duces tecum* portion of the subpoenas each include more than thirty questions, excluding subparts, along with demands for documents. Petitioners demand the production of patently irrelevant materials from the judges, including their federal and state tax returns for the last five years; various telephone, email, and text message records; along with all banking and retirement account records for the last five years.

The subpoenas also direct the judges to provide written answers to various questions, such as "Do you know what insurance reserve fraud is?"; "How many of the cases your firm represented lost in the last five years?"; and "Did you ever practice before Judge Carmen Mullen and/or Judge Sheila Odom[?]"

Other portions of the *duces tecum* subpoenas demand the judges prepare lists, including a list of the number of asbestos cases the judge has heard and the percentage of cases where a plaintiff has prevailed; the number of conservatorship, guardianship, and trusteeship cases each judge has ever been a part of, along with detailed information about each individual case; and a list of any non-judicial organizations "whose membership, practices, policies, and/or procedures are

Exh 1.1

deemed secret that you currently belong to and/or you have belonged to since being the age of legal majority. . . ."

Finally, petitioners request both judges furnish dates on which petitioners may conduct their depositions.

Judge McIntosh is scheduled to preside over the February 6 hearing at which petitioners seek his testimony. It is beyond question that a judge who is presiding at a hearing may not be subpoenaed or called to testify in that hearing. *See State v. Bagwell*, 201 S.C. 387, 23 S.E.2d 244, 247 (1942) ("Because of his duties, it is erroneous for a presiding Judge to testify as a witness in a case being tried before him.").

It does not appear from the public index that Judge Maddox has ever had any involvement in the petitioners' case, yet petitioners seek his testimony. Even if Judge Maddox had participated in any prior proceeding involving petitioners, judges are not to testify with regard to matters over which they previously presided, except in cases where "the testimony is: 1) critical; and 2) can be obtained by no other means." *In re Whetstone*, 354 S.C. 213, 216, 580 S.E.2d 447, 448 (2003).

Besides improperly seeking to have the judges testify, these subpoenas are improper on their face for a number of other reasons, including the fact they instruct the judges to prepare lists or answer questions in writing. Under Rule 45(a)(1)(C), SCRCP, a subpoena may only be used to require that a person "produce and permit inspection and copying of designated books, documents or tangible things in the possession, custody or control of that person." To the extent petitioners do request the production of existing documents, their production would unquestionably constitute an undue burden on the judges. Rule 45(c)(3)(A)(iv), SCRCP.

Furthermore, prior to serving these subpoenas on the judges, petitioners moved for a continuance of the February 6 hearing, based in part on medical issues petitioners allege will prevent them from fully participating in the hearing. Nevertheless, these subpoenas demand the judges appear and be questioned by these same petitioners.¹

¹ This motion was also filed as an exhibit to the petition for a writ of mandamus. The public index indicates Judge McIntosh denied this motion by Form 4 Order filed January 27, 2025.




Exh 1.2

Petitioners' motion for a continuance also threatens suit against various judges and seeks an order requiring deposition dates not only for Judge McIntosh and Judge Maddox, but also the other circuit court judges named as respondents in the petition for a writ of mandamus, all opposing counsel, and all law clerks of judges working for the judge or in any way involved in the case.

This Court has an interest in ensuring that the employees of the South Carolina Judicial Branch, and especially judges who are required to rule on legal issues, are not unnecessarily called away from their duties. Based on the improper nature of the subpoenas, together with the threats petitioners make with respect to future actions against other judges and court personnel, this Court finds it appropriate to order as follows:

1. The attached subpoenas served on Judge McIntosh and Judge Maddox on January 27, 2025 are hereby quashed. Neither Judge McIntosh nor Judge Maddox may be required to appear or answer any of the petitioners' questions or produce the documents sought in the subpoenas.
2. Petitioners shall not issue any further subpoenas in this matter unless they are approved in writing and signed by a circuit court judge. The Clerk of Court of Anderson County shall forward any requests for subpoenas by petitioners in this matter to the Chief Judge for Administrative purposes for review.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

	C.J.
	J.
	J.
D. Mann	J.
	J.

Columbia, South Carolina
January 30, 2025

cc:

The Honorable R. Lawton McIntosh
The Honorable J. Cordell Maddox, Jr.
The Honorable R. Scott Sprouse
The Honorable Heath P. Taylor
Anderson County Clerk of Court
Linda Kennedy
Marsha Fink
Robert L. Mebane, Jr.
Michael Jacob Neubauer
Trevor Marc Hughey
James C. Cox, III

Exh 1-4

MOTIONS FOR ADA ACCOMMODATIONS AND ORDERS FILED IN

LINDA KENNEDY AND MARSHA FINK, APPELLANTS v. LAKE HARTWELL RV RESORT AND CABINS, LLC, et al, RESPONDENTS

Supreme Court No.: 2026-001282

Appellate Case No.: 2025-000859

Trial Court Case No.: 2022-CP-04-00592

1. Motion for Expansion of Time and page filed May 1, 2025
Order - Deny Expansion of time and pages -- June 3, 2025
2. Motion Objecting to Findings of Denial of ADA Accommodations and Motion for Expansion of time filed June 9, 2025
Order – Granting an Extension of Time. Denying increased page limit - August 14, 2025
3. Motion Expansion of Time and Pages filed August 25, 2025
Order -Extension of Time to File Brief and Designation of Matter is extended signed -- August 26, 2025
4. Motion for Expansion of Time and Pages for New Situation after Medical Emergency filed September 26, 2025
Order Granting Extension of Time -- No More extensions absent “extraordinary circumstances” -- Sept 30, 2025
5. Motion for Individualized ADA Accommodations for Extraordinary Circumstances filed October 27, 2025
Order to exceed page limits – no action taken. Order granted extension to file brief for 30 days -- December 3, 2025

Exh 2

6. Motion Demanding Court Actually Rule on ADA Reasonable Accommodations filed December 18, 2025
Jasmine Smith letter returning Appellants' 12/18/25 Motion saying the court will take no action – January 20, 2026
7. Motion for Appellants' Reasonable Accommodations Demand to be Clearly Answered by Court of Appeals filed January 30, 2026
8. Motion for New Constitutional ADA Reasonable Accommodations Demands filed February 9, 2026
9. No Action Letter taken on January 30, 2026 Motion from Clerk of Court Kitchings – March 6, 2026
10. Order on Motion for New Constitutional ADA Reasonable Accommodations Demands granting 10 day extension of time to file brief and designation of matter and no action taken as to exceeding page limits. – March 12, 2026.

Exh 2.2

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink, Appellants,

v.

Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC, a/k/a Lake
Hartwell Resort and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell
Campers and Cabins, a/k/a Lake Hartwell Management,
a/k/a Chris Vellanti, a/k/a Christopher Vellanti;
Christopher Vellanti, as a Member and Personally;
Yvonne Goldman, as a General Manager and Personally;
Frank Pellegrini; Fritzie Maroto; Jennifer Burdette;
Marsha Stamm; Allen Riha; Ray Grenier; Grant
Ferrendelli; and Charles Carpenter, Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2025-000859

ORDER

This appeal arises out of an order dismissing Appellants' complaint with prejudice, due in part to Appellants' refusal to comply with strict page and time limitations set by the circuit court as sanctions pursuant to Rule 11, SCRCF. Appellants filed a motion seeking leave to exceed the page limit by an additional 200 pages and to extend all timelines for their compliance. This Court denied the motion on June 3, 2025. Since that time, Appellants have filed numerous motions continuing to seek clarification or reconsideration of the decision denying Appellants' motion to exceed the page limit. We have liberally construed Appellants' lengthy filings and permitted numerous extensions of time to file the appellants' initial brief and designation of matter since the original due date of June 27, 2025. Most recently, the Court issued an order on March 12, 2026, directing Appellants to "serve and file their initial brief and designation of matter within ten days of the date of this order or the appeal will be dismissed." To date, Appellants have not served and

Exh 3

filed their initial brief and designation of matter.¹ Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b), SCACR.

H. Bruce W. Dean, C.J.
FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

FILED
Mar 24 2026

cc:

Linda Kennedy

Marsha Fink

Michael Jacob Neubauer, Esquire

Robert L. Mebane, Jr., Esquire

James C Cox, III, Esquire

Trevor Marc Hughey, Esquire

¹ On March 23, 2026, Appellants filed a "Motion for Mandatory Recusal for Fraud on the Court Challenge" as well as a "Subject Matter Jurisdiction for Fraud on the Court Challenge." After careful consideration, these motions are denied.

Exh 3.1



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

CATHERINE S. HARRISON
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

March 6, 2026

Linda Kennedy
P. O. Box 433
Townville SC 29689

Marsha Fink
P. O. Box 433
Townville SC 29689

Re: Linda Kennedy v. Lake Hartwell Resort and Cabins, LLC
Appellate Case No. 2025-000859

Dear Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Fink:

The Court has received your motion for reasonable accommodations dated January 30, 2026, and your correspondence dated February 3, 2026. This Court will not take action on either of these filings.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jenny A. Kitchings".

CLERK

cc: Michael Jacob Neubauer, Esquire
Robert L. Mebane, Jr., Esquire

Esth 4

James C Cox, III, Esquire
Trevor Marc Hughey, Esquire

²
EXH 4r1



Jennifer (Lh), Yvonne

August 9-10



after you clock out just add up your hours for each day and then total one for me and just take a picture and send it to me and then I make deposits on Saturdays. Where do you bank at?

Jennifer (Lh)

Im going to go tomorrow and open a account at the same bank everyone else uses. So that it is all the same. An yes she showed me how. An ill send it every Friday. Thank you very much.

Yvonne

Once you get your account number Jennifer just text it to me and I'll save it on my phone and I'll just make the deposit because we bank at regions down here. Thanks for everything. I can't wait for the skunk stuff next

Jennifer (Lh)

Oh we are going to get them good with that. An even keep it around just incase its ever needed again

Yvonne

That's hilarious I'll tell you what the three of us can really get in trouble

Jennifer (Lh)



Yvonne

Sounds like jalapeño margaritas for the girls



Text message


Exh 5

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF ANDERSON)
Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink)
vs.)
Lake Hartwell RV Resort and)
Cabins, LLC, A/K/A Lake Hartwell)
Resort and Cabins, LLC, Lake)
Hartwell RV Resort et. al.)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

CASE NO: 2022-CP-04-00592

Rule to Show Cause



To: Plaintiff's: Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink; Counsel for Defendants: James C. Cox III, Esq., Trevor Hughey Esq., Robert Mebane, Esq., and Michael Neubauer, Esq.

You will please take notice that the Administrative Circuit Judge, R. Lawton McIntosh will conduct a hearing on February 6, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. at the Anderson County Courthouse on case number 2022-CP-04-00592, for plaintiff's, Linda Kennedy and Marsha Fink to show cause, if they can, why sanctions pursuant to Rule 11 SCRPC, shall not be issued against either or both of you as a result of some and/or all of the filing of the following pleadings, motions, orders or other material;

Dates	Action
12/18/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter
12/10/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter
10/1/24	• (Pro Se) Motion to Alter and/or Amend • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion Objecting, Quashing, and Striking Hearing and Racketeering
9/6/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Order of Protection – Signed by Judge McIntosh
8/29/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion Objecting and Quashing Ruling
8/13/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter – “Judge Maddox: Yesterday we filed a Motion to Quash and request for a continuance in the above-

Exh C

	referenced matter that needs an immediate ruling..." • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter – "To: Court/Judges, and Clerk of Courts for immediate attention and decisions so we do not injure ourselves further due to court/judge/clerk malfeasance..." • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Amended Summons and Complaint
8/12/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Quash • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Defendant List
8/7/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Filing of Exhibits
8/5/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Quash
7/16/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter – "Dear Mrs. Thomason: This is a follow up to two certified mailings..."
7/8/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Enlargement of Time
07/03/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter – "Dear Ms. Reena Thomason: We received on or about June 27, 2024..."
6/27/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter (email from Plaintiffs to the Clerk of Court regarding Plaintiff's continuance)
6/24/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default
6/21/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter (emails between Plaintiff and Former Docket Clerk regarding Plaintiff's request for continuance)
6/20/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Strike & Dismiss Defendants
6/11/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Continuance
6/6/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion in Opposition to Defense's Order of Protection
6/4/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Order of Continuance
5/31/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion Opposing Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and Memorandum in Support
5/28/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Consolidate • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Supplement Pleadings
5/24/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Disqualify All Defense Counsel (and their firms) and Judges with Memorandum in Support • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Recuse Judge Maddox • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Strike, Set Aside, or Vacate Judge Taylor's Orders • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Continuance • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Filing of Exhibits
4/29/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for leave to Amend • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Enlarge Time • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Compel and Memorandum • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter to Judge Taylor • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter to Representative Attorney Bamburg • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Filing of Exhibits
03/25/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion Opposing Extension of Time

Exh 6.1

	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Enlargement of Time • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Amend, Alter, or Reconsider
3/11/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter – "Dear Defense Attorneys: Plaintiffs have gathered much, but not all, documents that should have been filed by attorney Michael Dodd from April 12, 2022..." • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery Request
3/8/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter to Defense Attorneys and their Firms
2/27/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery Request • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery Request
2/26/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Filing of Exhibits
2/22/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery Request
2/21/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery Request • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery Request
2/20/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter – "Dear Ms. Thomason: Attached hereto are amended copies of SCRCF Form C against Allen Riha and Marsha Stamm..." • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Letter – "Dear Judge Taylor: This is a letter, from Plaintiffs Kennedy and Fink, in follow-up to our hearing on February 16, 2024, in Anderson County in the above referenced matter..."
2/12/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Notice of Motions 1. Motion to Honor Constitutional Rights
2/6/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Request for Clarity from Judges
2/2/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Honor Constitutional Rights • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's filing of Exhibits
1/22/24	• (Pro Se) Objections to Order
1/12/24	• Form 4- Order Relieving Counsel- Signed (Sprouse)
1/9/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Evidentiary hearing • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Fire Dodd's firing Order • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Notice of Hearing 1. For Evidentiary hearing 2. Default Judgment 3. For Dodd fire Order to be singed but to oppose Motion to be Relieved • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Notice of Hearing
1/9/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Default- All Defendant's (not uploaded)
1/5/24	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Change Venue ▪ Affidavit of Linda Kennedy ▪ Affidavit of Marsha Fink
12/29/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiffs Writ of Mandamus- Recusals • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Mandamus to Enter Default
12/19/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Objections

Exh 6-2

12/18/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Strike
12/18/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Recuse (Sprouse)
12/18/23	• Order- denying Motion for Reconsideration (McIntosh)
12/15/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery Request
12/14/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Continuance • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider Dec 11, 2023 Order
12/11/23	• Order- Denied (Plaintiff's Pro Se and unsolicited Order) (McIntosh)
12/1/23	• Form 4- All motions before Court on 11/28/23 are continued due to medical emergency (McIntosh)
11/28/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's memo in Support of 2nd Amended Complaint (2nd Amended Complaint not uploaded)
11/28/23	• (Pro Se) ▪ Ex. 1 ▪ Ex. 2 ▪ Ex. 3 ▪ Ex. 4 ▪ Ex. 5
11/28/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint 2 • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint 1
11/28/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint 3 • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint 4
11/27/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Notice of Hearing ▪ Plaintiff's Motion to Record Hearing ▪ Plaintiff's Motion for hearing by Phone ▪ Plaintiff's Motion for Recusal of RLM ▪ Others
11/27/23	• (Pro Se) Motion to Record Hearing • (Pro Se) Motion for Recusal of RLM
11/22/23	• Motion to Strike (not uploaded)
11/20/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Notice of Hearing- "a hearing has been set over Plaintiff's objections and in violation of Due Process Rights re: Order of hearing presentation Plaintiff's will have following heard: A. Motion to Continue B. Motion for Hearing by Phone C. Motion to Dismiss Defendant's Motion to Dismiss D. Motion for more definite statement re: Defendant's Motion to Dismiss
11/17/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion for Continuance
11/14/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Strike and Motion for Default Judgment
11/14/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's affidavit of default
11/14/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's affidavit of default
11/14/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's affidavit of non-military service

Exh C-3

11/14/23	• (Pro Se) Notice of Hearing (Motion to Strike Default Judgment (11/28/23 McIntosh)
11/8/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's letter- "To whom it may concerns Judge McIntosh and other Court personnel" ▪ Motion to Dismiss allegedly being herd first with opposition to Amend Pleadings ▪ "why is Court suddenly changing an order that outline that it could only her the superseding matters regarding Dodd's withdrawn motion first which is the only way the matters can be heard legally..."
10/26/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's letter to Judge's on Lanier Heating and Air - "Kennedy and Fink motions that were scheduled to be heard on Oct 12, 2023 before Judge McIntosh were continued due to ...unrelated trial going forward..."
10/9/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Notice of Hearing: 1. To oppose Dodd's Motion to be Relieved 2. Plaintiff's Motion to Stay All Actions 3. Plaintiff's Motion to Require Allianz to Interplead Full Reserve 4. Plaintiff's Motion for Court to Require Defendant's to Disclose Actual Clients etc. 5. Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions
10/9/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's filing of Exhibits ▪ Ex 4- Did not upload ▪ Ex 3- Did not upload ▪ Ex 2- Did not upload ▪ Ex 1- Did not upload
9/26/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Motion to Quash and Stay until Court Rules on: ▪ Defendant's Conflicts of Interest ▪ Plaintiff's Motion to Dodd's withdrawal motion ▪ Plaintiff's Motion to Intervene ▪ Plaintiff's Motion to Interplead ▪ Dodd's Motion to Withdraw (Plaintiff's assert Dodd and the defense are working closely against their interest, etc.)
8/24/23	• Defendant's Renewed Motion to Dismiss (Neubauer)
7/18/23	• Order of Continuance of Motion to Relieved as Counsel (Maddox)
6/15/23	• Notice of Hearing- Motion to be Relieved (7/13/23) (Maddox)
6/15/23	• Dodd's Notice of Hearing- Virtual (to be relieved) • Dodd's Notice of Hearing- Virtual (to be relieved)
6/12/23	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's oppositions to Dodd's Motion to be Relieved (written to Tammy- after Dodd and Opposing counsel contacted Tammy ..to speak to Judge re: Attorney withdraw without their knowledge and request to be heard) Plaintiff's really appreciated both Tammy and Elizabeth's kind

Exh 6-4

	demeanor Plaintiff's attorney lying to plaintiffs for a full year with long description of attorney omissions
6/8/23	• Motion to Relieved as Counsel (Dodd)
6/2/23	• Notice of Hearing (Dodd)
5/16/23	• Notice of Hearing- Motion to Amend (6/1/23) (McIntosh)
5/4/23	• Plaintiff Motion to Amend Complaint (Dodd)
4/5/23	• Consent Scheduling Order (Sprouse) ▪ All motions to Amend within 30 days of Order ▪ Mediation by January 31, 2024 ▪ Trial- After March 31, 2024
6/28/22	• Plaintiff's affidavit of Service (by Process Server) • Plaintiff's affidavit of Service (by Process Server)
6/22/22	• Consent Order for Continuance (re: Motion to Enlarge and Motion to Dismiss) (Sprouse)
6/6/22	• Amended Summons and Complaint filed (Dodd) ▪ Ex 1- Inventory of Stolen Damaged Property Verification
5/24/22	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Notes (we hired Dodd and Jones needs to act accordingly)
4/18/22	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's affidavit of Service • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's affidavit of Service
4/15/22	• Affidavit of non-service (Chris Vellanti)
4/15/22	• Plaintiff's handwritten notes filed (Michael Dodd will be hired)
4/15/22	• (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery- Lake Hartwell RV • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery- Jennifer Burdette • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery- Ray Grenier • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery- Fritzie Maroto • (Pro Se) Plaintiff's Discovery- Lake Hartwell RV
3/31/22	• Filing of Summons and Complaint
3/24/22	• (Pro Se) Letter to Judge requesting under seal- McIntosh note to put in file not under seal (3/25/22) • (Pro Se) Letter to Judge without note attached
3/17/22	• (Pro Se) Summons and Complaint • (Pro Se) Motion for TRO (Block Sale of Lake Hartwell RV) • (Pro Se) Motion to Join (Lanier Heating and Air v. Lake Hartwell RV) • (Pro Se) Motion to use Court Computer System

Ex h 6.5


Notice of this hearing is hereby given to all counsel and/or parties of record to attend and participate as allowed by the court.


Your unexcused failure to attend the hearing shall not be the basis for a continuance of the hearing.

If you assert that you cannot attend because of medical condition(s), you must submit a continuance request no later than five (5) days prior to the scheduled hearing. The request shall be accompanied with a written explanation from a licensed medical doctor from South Carolina explaining your condition and stating unequivocally that your condition prevents your attendance and participation. Upon receipt of the required document(s) from a bona fide qualified medical provider that actually treats either or both of you, that party shall be allowed to participate virtually. Based upon prior occurrences, the hearing shall not be continued except for the most exceptional and extraordinary reason(s).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

January 3, 2025
Anderson, South Carolina


R. Lawton McIntosh
Administrative Circuit Court Judge
Tenth (10th) Judicial Circuit



Exh 6-6



Exh 7



S. Elizabeth Beasley

Common Pleas Docket Clerk & ADR
Coordinator

Anderson County Clerk of Court's Office

P.O. Box 8002, Anderson, SC 29622

864-260-4298/864-260-4718(fax)

From: Tony Hill <sosofunny1959@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, November 27, 2023 10:25 AM

To: Elizabeth Beasley <sebeasley@andersoncountysc.org>

Cc: Tony Hill <sosofunny1959@gmail.com>

Subject: [External]Clarification on time of hearings

You don't often get email from sosofunny1959@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Exh 8

To: Tony Hill <sosofunny1959@gmail.com>,
michael@thedoddlawfirm.com <michael@thedoddlawfirm.com>
Cc: Trey Cox <tcx@griercoxandcranshaw.com>,
thughey@griercoxandcranshaw.com
<thughey@griercoxandcranshaw.com>, Bob Deloach
<bdeloach@griercoxandcranshaw.com>, Michael Neubauer
<michael.neubauer@mgclaw.com>, Robert Mebane
<robert.mebane@mgclaw.com>

Good morning,

**All of the pending motions are set for 11/28 for 2pm
before Judge McIntosh.** With exception to the two recently
filed Motions - 1. Motion for Continuance and 2. Motion for
Default.

These are being held in person downtown at the Historic
Courthouse. We will be on the second floor in the County
Council chambers. You will enter the Courthouse from the
side of the building across from the Anderson County
District 5 Offices. Security will be at the window as you
enter and can help direct you to the Courtroom.

The Motion to be Relieved as Counsel is set to be heard
first. Judge McIntosh will decide on whether or not the rest
of the motions are heard based upon his ruling on the
Motion to be Relieved.

Kind regards,

Exh. 8-1