

COLUMBIA

3200 Devine Street
Columbia, SC 29205
P: 803.254.5445
F: 803.254.5007

SUMTER

126 N. Main Street
Sumter, SC 29150
P: 803.778.2471
F: 803.778.1643

CAMDEN

935 Broad Street
Camden, SC 29020
P: 803.432.1992
F: 803.432.0784

Reply To: Columbia

August 20, 2026

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk of Court
South Carolina Court of Appeals
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

RECEIVED
Aug 20 2026
SC Court of Appeals

Re: Hulsey Law Group, LLC v. Robin M. Schoepfel, Jessica Lynn Schoepfel,
and Nicolas Mark Schoepfel, et al.
Appellate Case No. 2025-000355

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Please allow this letter to serve as a response to the Court's July 31, 2026 request for a memorandum in the form of a letter with Appellants' position on the proper course for the Court to follow in light of Respondent Hulsey Law Group's failure to participate in the appeal.

Subsequent to receiving the Court's letter, Attorney Cherie Durand filed a Notice of Appearance on behalf of Respondent in the appeal. However, in the event Respondent failed or fails to have counsel in the case, Appellants would request the Court issue a limited remand to the circuit court for consideration of a motion to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction, lack of standing, and failure to prosecute.

After Appellants appealed to this Court, Hulsey Law Group proceeded in the circuit court with its third-party complaint. As in this Court, Hulsey Law Group's counsel moved to be relieved as counsel in the circuit court. The circuit court granted that motion on September 18, 2025, allowing Hulsey Law Group sixty days to obtain substitute counsel. A copy of this order is enclosed. Hulsey Law Group did not obtain substitute counsel within the timeframe allowed by this Court and has not obtained substitute counsel in accordance with the circuit court's order.¹ Prior to the email notice of appearance on August 18, 2026 in this Court, Hulsey Law Group has not had an attorney representing it in the circuit court or this Court for nearly a year. This Court and the circuit court gave Hulsey Law Group ample notice and opportunity to obtain new counsel. Hulsey Law Group cannot proceed with its case against Appellants without an attorney. *See Renaissance Enters., Inc. v. Summit Teleservices, Inc.*, 334 S.C. 649, 651, 515 S.E.2d 257, 258 (1999) ("[A] corporation may appear *pro se* only in magistrate's court."); *Medlock v. Univ. Health*

¹ Cherie Durand, an attorney with Hulsey Law Group, filed a special notice of appearance "for the limited purpose of responding to the Motion to be Relieved as Counsel and requesting a temporary stay until new counsel can be obtained" but has not generally appeared in the circuit court case.

Servs., Inc., 404 S.C. 25, 28, 743 S.E.2d 830, 831 (2013) (“A business entity may be represented by a non-attorney in civil magistrate court proceedings, but it must be represented by an attorney in the circuit and appellate courts.”); *Brown v. Coe*, 365 S.C. 137, 144, 616 S.E.2d 705, 709, *order clarified*, 365 S.C. 664, 620 S.E.2d 323 (2005) (allowing an estate appellant thirty days to obtain new counsel and indicating appeal would be dismissed if the appellant did not inform the Court of new counsel within the timeframe allowed); *Fidelity Fire & Cas. Co. v. Sifly Homes, Inc.*, No. 2014CP1000507, 2015 WL 13158356, at *2 (S.C. Com. Pl. Nov. 24, 2015) (“Further, given that CSP is no longer represented by an attorney and has not had an attorney in this case for five months, it is further appropriate to dismiss CSP's claims against Earthcore.”); *Penland Fin. Servs., Inc. v. Select Fin. Servs., LLC*, No. CA 6:08-3864-HMH-WMC, 2008 WL 5279638, at *3 (D.S.C. Dec. 18, 2008), *aff'd*, 315 F. App'x 456 (4th Cir. 2009) (“Accordingly, because Charles Penland may not litigate *pro se* the rights of the corporation, he lacks standing to bring this action; and, therefore, this court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over this action.”); *Nathan v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.*, No. CIVA 2:07-0762-PMD, 2008 WL 4441966, at *2 (D.S.C. Sept. 30, 2008) (recommending action be dismissed because corporation cannot proceed *pro se* in civil litigation).

Therefore, Appellants believe, if Respondent failed to have counsel appear, the appropriate course is for the Court to issue a limited remand to the circuit court to determine whether the case should be dismissed for lack of standing, lack of jurisdiction, and failure to prosecute.

Please let me know if anything further is needed.

Sincerely,



Shanon N. Peake

SNP/dlf
Enclosures

cc: Cherie Durand

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	)	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
	)	NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON	)	
	)	
Hulsey Law Group, LLC,	)	Civil Action No.: 2024-CP-10-04202
	)	
Plaintiff and	)	
Third-Party Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	RELIEVING COUNSEL
	)	
Robin M. Schoepfel, Jessica Lynn	)	
Schoepfel, and Nicolas Mark Schoepfel,	)	
Defendants	)	
	)	
and	)	
	)	
John T. Lay and Gallivan, White & Boyd,	)	
P.A.,	)	
Third-Party Defendants.	)	

This matter came before the Court on September 18, 2025, via WebEX, pursuant to Motion to be Relieved as Counsel for Plaintiff and Third-party Plaintiff filed by Attorney Desa Ballard. The following parties were present for the hearing: Attorney Desa Ballard, Cherie Durand; and Virginia Floyd, attorney for Third Party Defendant. All necessary parties were given notice of the hearing.

Counsel was retained as counsel for Plaintiff/ Third-Party Plaintiff, Hulsey Law Group, LLC (hereinafter "HLG") in the above-captioned matter on or about August 21, 2024. Circumstances are such that counsel cannot continue to represent Plaintiff and Third-Party Plaintiff in this matter. The Court accepts the representation of Counsel that good grounds exist for her to be relieved as counsel pursuant to Rule 1.16, Rule 407, SCACR.

The requested withdrawal as counsel at this time does not prejudice the Plaintiff and Third-Party Plaintiff in this proceeding or otherwise. Nothing contained in this Order shall be construed

to affect any existing deadline in the case. The Plaintiff and Third Party Plaintiff shall have sixty (60) days from the date of entry of this Order within which to obtain substitute counsel. In the event Plaintiff and Third Party Plaintiff do not obtain substitute counsel within the designated time period, this case shall proceed.

IT IS ORDERED that Counsel has shown sufficient grounds to be relieved in this case;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff and Third Party Plaintiff shall have sixty (60) days within which to obtain substitute counsel. Nothing shall be scheduled or heard during the sixty day period provided by this Order, however, no extension of time is being granted as to any existing deadline.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

[JUDICIAL E-SIGNATURE ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]

.



Charleston Common Pleas

Case Caption: Hulsey Law Group Llc VS Robin M Schoepfel , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2024CP1004202

Type: Order/Relieve Counsel

And It Is So Ordered!

s/Dale E. Van Slambrook S.C. Circuit Court Judge
#2781