




hearings, which led to the dismissal of her case.¹ Respondent further argues that her clerical error constitutes excusable neglect and therefore reinstatement of her case is warranted. However, the Court served a copy of the Order of Dismissal on both Respondent's attorney and Respondent at her personal email address on January 27, 2026. As such, the Court finds Respondent was given notice of the Court's dismissal. Yet, Respondent waited until May 8, 2026, over 3 months later, to file this Motion and thus, her Motion is untimely.² Rule 29(D) (**Within ten (10) days** after notice of the final decision concluding the matter before the administrative law judge, a party may move for reconsideration of the decision....") (emphasis added).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Respondent's Motion is **DENIED**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



Ralph King Anderson, III
Chief Administrative Law Judge

May 20, 2026
Columbia, South Carolina

¹ The Court notes that Respondent submitted her attorney's name to the Court and stated that he was representing her in this action. Moreover, despite receiving more than one notice from the Court, the Court was never informed by the attorney or Respondent that he was not representing her.

² Notably, the Motion was not accompanied by the requiring filing fee; as such, it was not properly filed. See Rule 7 and Rule 71, SCALCR.


RECEIVED

Jul 23 2026

SC Court of Appeals

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Stephanie Armada, hereby certify that I have this date served this Order upon all parties to this cause by depositing a copy hereof in the United States mail, postage paid, or by electronic mail, to the address provided by the party(ies) and/or their attorney(s).



Stephanie Armada
Judicial Law Clerk

May 20, 2026
Columbia, South Carolina