

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Carol Tidik Will and Trust and Brad Tidik, Plaintiffs

v.

Karen Tidik Sorensen and Jane Doe 1, Respondents

of whom Brad Tidik is the Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2026-001189

RECEIVED

AUG 14 2026

SC Court of Appeals

MOTION AND BRIEF FOR REINSTATEMENT OF APPEAL

NOW COMES, Appellant Brad Tidik and says unto this Honorable court as follows:

1. The Clerk of this court has has issued the Appellant the 8/3/26 Order dismissing his appeal and Appellant files for Reinstatement under Rule 260 SCACR.

2. Appellant filed for appeal *In Forma Pauperis* and then received the 7/13/26 Order from the COA judge Denying his motion, exclusively and only because Appellant did not specify the Statute for his appeal by right, and with the court noting Appellants the right to appeal *In Forma Pauperis* with citation of Ex Parte Martin S.C. 533 S.E.2d 134 (1995). **Exhibit A**

3. As the only thing missing was the common citation of the statute for appeal of the trial court Dismissal of Parties and/or Modification of his complaint and Appellant filed for COA Rehearing and cited S.C. Code Ann. § 14-3-330. **Exhibit B**

4. On 7/21/26 Appellant, stunningly, received a letter from the COA Clerk where the clerk acted to stand *in stead* of the judges of the COA by stating the Rehearing would be blocked from a judicial determination of the court. The Clerk claimed NOT filing the Rehearing would not "...dismiss..." the Appeal - in violation of the clerk duties that are only to dismiss "Whenever it appears that an appellant or a petitioner has failed to comply with the requirements of these Rules." and not to substitute judicial judgment on the content. Rule 260(a) SCACR. **Exhibit C**

5. Appellant replied to the Clerk in his 7/22/26 letter that the actions of the Clerk of this court blocking a determination of the COA judges on Appellant Motion for Rehearing would unequivocally be the sole cause of dismissal for his Appeal. **Exhibit D**

6. On 8/3/26 the Clerk of this court, and no judicial order, dismissed the Appeal. **Exhibit E**

7. Appellant right to appeal with the constitutional and statutory provisions to do so are stated herein are fundamental in that no clerk can violate rules, procedure, and judicial integrity that the appeal must be Reinstated. Ex Parte Martin S.C. 533 S.E.2d 134 (1995), S.C. Code Ann. § 14-3-330, Rule 260(a) SCACR.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Appellant requests that this appeal is reinstated.

/s/Brad Tidik
Brad Tidik, Appellant

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Carol Tidik Will and Trust and Brad Tidik, Plaintiffs,

v.


Karen Tidik Sorenson and Jane Doe 1, Respondents,

of whom Brad Tidik is the Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2026-001189

ORDER

Appellant filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. No return was filed. The right to proceed *in forma pauperis* must rest upon a statute or a fundamental constitutional right. *Ex parte Martin*, 321 S.C. 533, 471 S.E.2d 134 (1995). Appellant has the burden of showing he is entitled to this relief, but he has not done so. Accordingly, after careful consideration, Appellant's motion is denied. The filing fee must be paid within fifteen (15) days of the date of this order. Failure to provide the filing fee will result in dismissal of the appeal.



FOR THE COURT

J.

Columbia, South Carolina

FILED
Jul 13 2026

cc:

Brad Tidik

Luther O. McCutchen, III, Esquire

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Carol Tidik Will and Trust and Brad Tidik, Plaintiffs

v.

Karen Tidik Sorensen and Jane Doe I, Respondents

of whom Brad Tidik is the Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2026-001189

MOTION AND BRIEF FOR REHEARING OF 7/13/26 ORDER

NOW COMES, Appellant Brad Tidik and says unto this Honorable court as follows:

1. The court has denied Appellant his Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis by stating in its 7/13/26 that appellant must state a "...statute..." for his In Forma Pauperis to be granted.
2. Appellants states the statute for his immediate appeal as relating to the striking of his complaint is S.C. Code Ann. § 14-3-330(2)(c), "strikes out..any part thereof.."

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Appellant has provided a statute as required by the court and as such In Forma Pauperis must be granted.

/s/Brad Tidik
Brad Tidik, Appellant



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

July 21, 2026

Brad Tidik
420 Eureka Road #352
Wyandotte MI 48192

Re: Brad Tidik v. Karen Sorenson
Appellate Case No. 2026-001189

Dear Mr. Tidik:

The Court received your motion and brief for rehearing of the July 13, 2026 order. Pursuant to Rule 221(c), SCACR, this Court will not entertain petitions for rehearing on a motion unless the action of the Court on the motion has the effect of dismissing or finally deciding an appeal. Therefore, no further action will be taken on your filing.

Very truly yours,

Jasmine D. Smith, Deputy
CLERK

cc: Luther O. McCutchen, III, Esquire

Brad Tidik
420 Eureka Rd. #352
Wyandotte, MI 48192

7/22/26

South Carolina Court of Appeals
J. D. Smith,
Deputy Clerk

Re: Brad Tidik v. Karen Sorensen
Appellate Case No 2026-001189

Hi,

I received your 7/21/26 letter refusing to allow my Motion and Brief for Rehearing of the 7/13/26 order denying In Forma Pauperis and it is in error as to rule and law being:

1. The 7/13/26 order required me to provide the statutory basis for my Appeal by Right.
2. I filed my Motion and Brief for Rehearing that supplies the statutory basis for my Appeal by Right.
3. My sworn In Forma Pauperis affidavit filed with the Clerk of this court is evidence that denial of In Forma Pauperis does so end this appeal, and the refusal of the Clerk to allow the filing of the Motion and Brief for Rehearing for presentation of the statutory basis for my Appeal by Right to the judge does guarantee the dismissal of the appeal in violation of SCACR Rule 221(c)
4. If the error of the Clerk of this court is not corrected in filing the Motion and Brief for Rehearing then this will force additional motions to be placed before the court to correct this issue.

Please insure that my Motion and Brief for Rehearing are promptly filed with the court.

/s/ Brad Tidik
Brad Tidik

7/22/26

email, USPS

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Carol Tidik Will and Trust and Brad Tidik, Plaintiffs,

v.

Karen Tidik Sorenson and Jane Doe 1, Respondents,


of whom Brad Tidik is the Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2026-001189

The Honorable B. Alex Hyman
Horry County
Trial Court Case No. 2024CP2601482

ORDER

Appellant has failed to pay the notice of appeal filing fee as required by Rule 203 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules, and this Court's order dated July 13, 2026. Accordingly, this matter is dismissed. The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b), SCACR.

FOR THE COURT
BY  deputy
CLERK

Columbia, South Carolina

FILED
Aug 03 2026

cc:
Brad Tidik
Luther O. McCutchen, III, Esquire

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Carol Tidik Will and Trust and Brad Tidik, Plaintiffs

v.

Karen Tidik Sorensen and Jane Doe 1, Respondents

of whom Brad Tidik is the Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2026-001189

CERTIFICATE FO SERVICE

I, Brad Tidik do hereby certify that on 8/8/26 I served the following :

MOTION AND BRIEF FOR REINSTATEMENT OF APPEAL

by sending such documents via first class mail, postage paid, to:

Luther McCutchen, 4610 Oleander Drive, Ste. 203 Myrtle Beach, SC 29577 (843) 449-3411

South Carolina Court of Appeals Clerk, P.O. Box 11629 Columbia, SC 29211

The undersigned states under the penalties of perjury that the foregoing is true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

/s/ Brad Tidik
Brad Tidik
420 Eureka Rd.
#352
Wyandotte, MI 48192

C: 734-552-1452
Deer1888@yahoo.com

