

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Beaufort County

The Honorable Robert J. Bonds, Circuit Court Judge

RECEIVED
Aug 31 2026
SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

NAYQUAN UNIQUE GADSON,

APPELLANT.

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2025-002023

MOTION FOR AN ORDER TO
RECONSTRUCT THE RECORD OF APPELLANT'S
TRIAL, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR A NEW TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 240 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR), Appellant requests an order reversing his convictions and remanding his case for a new trial. In the alternative, Appellant moves to reconstruct the record of his trial. Because of numerous deficiencies in the existing transcript of Appellant's trial, this court cannot meaningfully review Appellant's convictions.

Procedural History

Appellant was indicted at the January 18, 2024, term of the Beaufort County grand jury for the offenses of murder, armed robbery, and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime. *See* Exhibit A. Appellant's case was called to trial on July 28, 2025, before the Honorable Robert J. Bonds and a jury.¹ Jeffrey Scott Stephens, of Quindlen Law Firm, P.A., represented Appellant. Assistant Solicitor Mary C. Jones, of the Fourteenth Circuit Solicitor's Office, represented the State. The jury found Appellant guilty of murder and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime, and not guilty of armed robbery. Judge Bonds sentenced Appellant to life without parole. *See* Exhibit A.

Judge Bonds presided over a September 23, 2025 hearing on Appellant's motion for a new trial, and orally denied the motion. After Appellant timely filed a notice of appeal to this Court, the Division of Appellate Defense (DAD) undertook his representation, and undersigned counsel was assigned to represent Appellant on direct appeal.

Transcript Deficiencies

Upon reviewing Appellant's file, undersigned counsel discovered significant portions of the trial are missing from the transcript. The court reporter assigned to Appellant's trial was Kymberlee Williams, and the proceedings were audio-recorded. The recordings were transcribed by Aron Feldstein and certified on August 10, 2026, and subcontractor Legal Eagle delivered the transcript on or about August 19, 2026. Legal Eagle informed DAD that both the primary and backup audio files from trial proceedings were compromised and neither could be fully

¹ As discussed below, Appellant's case was initially tried once prior to July 28, 2025, but the previous trial ended in a mistrial.

transcribed; consequently, Legal Eagle cannot further improve the transcript. *See* Exhibit B; Exhibit C.

Due to poor quality and audio failures in the recordings from proceedings on July 29, 2025, the corresponding portion of the transcript is missing the entire testimony of four State's witnesses and the partial testimony of a fifth State's witness who was similarly indicted. *See* Exhibit B; Exhibit C. Significantly, two of the four State's witnesses whose testimonies are entirely missing are not referenced elsewhere in the record; therefore, counsel is only aware of their omission because of notification from Legal Eagle.

Next, due to audio failure within recordings from proceedings on July 31, 2025, the corresponding portion of the transcript is missing partial testimony from the two known defense witnesses—including Appellant—and part of the defense's closing argument. *See* Exhibit C. Additionally, Legal Eagle notified DAD that some portions of the proceedings from August 1, 2025, may also be missing due to unclear audio file sequencing. *See* Exhibit C. Based upon consistent references in both parties' closing arguments, counsel believes the transcript is also missing the entire testimony of a third defense witness; however, the full scope of missing information remains unclear.

The 625-page transcript contains 246 instances of "indiscernible" audio that could not be transcribed. These instances occur throughout witness testimony, and counsel believes that over twenty of these instances occur during critical portions of the trial, such as objections, closing arguments, and jury instructions.

Undersigned counsel has contacted trial counsel and requested confirmation regarding the scope of all information missing from the existing transcript. Because several rulings at Appellant's trial were adopted from the previous mistrial in the case, counsel also requested dates

and information associated with the mistrial. Trial counsel has agreed to send Appellant's case file to aid in determining these facts.

Reconstruction of the Record

The trial court has the authority to set the record for appeal. *State v. Ladson*, 373 S.C. 320, 324, 644 S.E.2d 271, 273 (Ct. App. 2007). "Where a trial transcript has been lost or destroyed, a court may remand to have the record reconstructed." *Koon v. State*, 358 S.C. 359, 367, 595 S.E.2d 456, 460 (2004); accord *Whitehead v. State*, 352 S.C. 215, 221, 574 S.E.2d 200, 203 (2002). Thus, "the inability to prepare a complete verbatim transcript, in and of itself, does not necessarily present a sufficient ground for reversal." *Ladson*, 373 S.C. at 324, 644 S.E.2d at 273.

A trial record must be reconstructed in a manner that allows meaningful appellate review and complies with the constitutional guarantees of procedural due process. *Ladson*, 373 S.C. at 325, 644 S.E.2d at 273-274; see also *Adams v. H.R. Allen, Inc.*, 397 S.C. 652, 726 S.E.2d 9 (Ct. App. 2012). "A new trial is therefore appropriate if the appellant establishes that the incomplete nature of the transcript prevents the appellate court from conducting a meaningful appellate review." *Ladson*, 373 S.C. at 325, 644 S.E.2d at 274 (internal quotations omitted).

In *Ladson*, this court reversed Ladson's convictions and remanded for a new trial when a reconstructed record comprised only "a bare bones summary of the evidence (with more remaining unknown than known) from a lengthy multi-day and fact-intensive trial that resulted in a non-parolable, twenty-five-year person term." *Id.* at 322, 327, 644 S.E.2d at 271, 274. In its opinion, this court acknowledged "[i]t was clear from the outset" that reconstructing the record from Ladson's trial after a "substantial delay" of fourteen months "would be an uphill struggle." *Id.* at 321-322, 644 S.E.2d at 271-272. In turn, this court found "the reconstructed record [was] largely conclusory, with testimony, objections, and the like recalled only in summary fashion;"

and that it did not indicate “the context of the motions, the specific nature of the motions, and whether the challenged evidence was cumulative to other unchallenged evidence.” *Id.* at 323, 327, 644 S.E.2d at 272, 274. Therefore, this court determined not only that the record was insufficient for meaningful appellate review, but also that Ladson had demonstrated “clear prejudice” because the paucity of the record “would effectively foreclose any collateral challenge through post-conviction relief or otherwise.” *Id.* at 327, 644 S.E.2d at 275.


In *Deaton v. Leath*, the defendants’ convictions were set aside, and the case was retried when the court reporter’s equipment had malfunctioned at trial, leaving no transcript to form the record on appeal. 279 S.C. 82, 84, 302 S.E.2d 335, 336 (1983). Subsequently, in *State v. Serrette*, the court of appeals cited *Deaton* to indicate that a defendant is entitled to reconstruct the record when he did not cause the deficiencies that hinder meaningful review. 375 S.C. 650, 652-53, 654 S.E.2d 554, 555 (Ct. App. 2007).

In Appellant’s case, the absence of several critical portions of the trial transcript—and the resulting ambiguities throughout—preclude meaningful appellate review of the trial court’s rulings. Moreover, without a complete and accurate trial transcript, counsel is unable to determine the scope of appealable issues in Appellant’s case. It is no fault of Appellant’s that the quality of the audio recordings from trial was too poor to enable complete and accurate transcription. Further, over a year has elapsed since Appellant was tried and convicted. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that this court reverse his convictions and remand for a new trial. In the alternative, Appellant moves to reconstruct the record from his trial on July 28-August 1, 2025, to permit meaningful appellate review of his convictions.

WHEREFORE, Appellant requests reversal of his convictions and remand of his case for a new trial. In the alternative, Appellant requests that this court remand his case for reconstruction

of the trial record from July 28-August 1, 2025. While this motion is pending, Appellant respectfully asks this court to hold in abeyance the timelines for filing his initial brief and designation of matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Kersey A. Reynolds
Appellate Defender

Attorney for Appellant

This 31st day of August, 2026.

EXHIBIT A

WITNESSES

Beaufort County Sheriff's Office

T. CALHOUN

DOCKET NO. 2023GS0700081

The State of South Carolina
County of Beaufort

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

January Term 2024

I hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

THE STATE

vs.

NAYQUAN UNIQUE GADSON

Indictment For

Murder

SC Code: 16-3-10

CDR Code: 0116

Defendant

Witness:

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

2022A0710400398

ACTION OF GRAND JURY.

Melissa Ramos Plata
Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date: JAN 18 2024

VERDICT

Guilty

Chadman 8/1/25
Foreperson of Petit Jury

Date:
INDICT

#26

C.C.C. PLS. and G.S.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

COUNTY OF BEAUFORT)

INDICTMENT


2023GS0700091

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on January 18, 2024, the Grand Jurors of Beaufort County present upon their oath:

Murder

That in Beaufort County, South Carolina, on or about November 14, 2022, the Defendant, NAYQUAN UNIQUE GADSON, did, with malice aforethought, kill Breiner Puerta-Gonzalez and Breiner Puerta-Gonzalez did die as a proximate result of NAYQUAN UNIQUE GADSON's actions, all in violation of Section 16-3-10, et al. of the Codes of Law of South Carolina.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided,



Solicitor

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

SENTENCE ORDER

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

County of Beaufort

State

VS.

MAYQUAN LUNIQUE GADSON

AWA: SSM:

RACE: Black SEX: Male

DOB: 12/02/2002 12:00:00 AM

) INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2023GS0700021

) AWA#: 2022A0710400398

) Date of Offense: 11/14/2022

) S.C. Code § 16-3-10

) CDR Code #: 0116

) Range of Offense: 30 years - life

In disposition of the above indictment comes now the Defendant who was ☒ CONVICTED OF or ☐ PLEADS TO: Murder

Range of Offense Pled:

In violation of § 16-3-10 of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 0116

☐ NON-VIOLENT ☒ VIOLENT ☐ SERIOUS ☒ MOST SERIOUS ☐ Mandatory GPS ☐ § 17-25-45 (CSC winner 1st or CSC winner 3rd)The charge is: ☒ As Indicted, ☐ Lesser Included Offense, ☐

Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury.

The plea is: ☐ w/o Rec/Negotiations ☐ Negotiated☐ Recommendation

Solicitor Jerry Jones

SC Bar # 100353

Attorney for Defendant Jeffrey Stephens SC Bar # 72418

The Defendant is committed to the ☒ S.C. County Detention Center ☐ Home Incarceration Programfor a determinate term of life w/o parole ☐ YOA NTE years and/or shall pay a fineof \$; provided that upon the service of days/months/years/Time Served and or paymentof \$; plus costs and assessments as applicable; the balance is suspended with probation for months/years and subject to SCDPPPS standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.☒ The sentence shall run CONCURRENT or ☐ CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: ☒ The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by SCDC.91 day/month ☐☐ To include time spent on monitored house arrest prior to trial and sentencing.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

- ☐ PTUP
☐ No Contact with Victim ☐ Domestic Violence Intervention Program ☐ Hold for Inpatient Treatment
☐ Sex Offender Registry pursuant to S.C. Code § 23-3-430 ☐ SAC/MHC if necessary
☐ Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code § 17-25-135
☐ Other:

☐ RESTITUTION See Separate Order (20% per S.C. Code § 34-21-400 (B))Restitution \$
FINE: \$

§14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5%)

§14-1-211 (A)(1)(Conv. Surcharge)

§14-1-211 (A)(2)(DUI Surcharge)

§56-5-2905 (DUI Assessment)

§56-1-286 (DUI Breath Test)

§14-1-212 (Law Enforce. Funding)

§14-1-213 (Drug Court Surcharge)

§34-11-70(b)and(c), and 34-11-90(b)and(d) (Admin Fraud Check Court Costs)

§50-21-114 (BUI Breath Test Fee)

§56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment)

3% to County (if paid in installments)

☐ Appointed PD or appointed other counsel, Provision requires \$500 be paid to Clerk during probation and shall be collected before any other fees☐ §17-3-71(B) Unpaid Application Fee to be paid to the Public Defender Fund

Clerk of Court/Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Judge Code

Session Date

Presiding Judge

Fine/Costs and Assessments are to be paid to the

Clerk of Court within day/months

\$100	\$
\$100	\$100
\$12	\$
\$25	\$
\$25	\$25
\$150	\$
\$41	\$
\$50	\$
\$4000	\$
TBD	\$3.75
\$500	\$
TBD	\$
TOTAL	\$128.75

SCCA217B
01/27/2025

WITNESSES

Beaufort County Sheriff's Office

T. Calhoun

DOCKET NO. 2023GS0700095

The State of South Carolina

County of Beaufort

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

January Term 2024

I hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

2022A0710400400

THE STATE

vs.

NAYQUAN UNIQUE GADSON

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

FILED 2024

Indictment For

Possession of Weapon During
Violent Crime

SC Code: 16-23-490

CDR Code: 0549

Melissa Ramos Plata
Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date:

JAN 18 2024

Defendant

VERDICT

Guilty

Witness:

Conner 8/1/25
Foreperson of Petit Jury

Date:

INDICT

#260

C.C.C. PLS. and G.S.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF BEAUFORT

)
)
)

INDICTMENT


2023GS0700095

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on January 18, 2024, the Grand Jurors of Beaufort County present upon their oath:

Possession of Weapon During Violent Crime

That in Beaufort County, South Carolina, on or about November 14, 2022, the Defendant, NAYQUAN UNIQUE GADSON, did possess a firearm, visibly displayed what appeared to be a firearm, or visibly displayed a knife during the commission of a violent crime, to wit: Murder and NAYQUAN UNIQUE GADSON was convicted of committing or attempting to commit a violent crime as defined in Section 16-1-60, to wit: Murder, all in violation of Section 16-23-490, et al. of the Codes of Law of South Carolina.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.



Solicitor

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

SENTENCE ORDER

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

County of Beaufort

State

VS.

NAYOUAN UNIQUE GADSON

AKA: SSN: [REDACTED]

RACE: Black SEX: Male

DOB: [REDACTED] 2002 12 10 AM

INDICTMENT CASE#: 2023GSD00095

AW#: 2022A0710400400

Date of Offense: 11/14/2022

S.C. Code §: 16-23-490

CDR Code #: 0549

Range of Offense: [REDACTED]

In disposition of the above indictment comes now the Defendant who was ☒ CONVICTED OF or ☐ PLEADS TO: Possession of a weapon during a violent crime

Range of Offense Filed: 5 year

In violation of § 16-23-490 of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code# 0549

☒ NON-VIOLENT ☐ VIOLENT ☐ SERIOUS ☐ MOST SERIOUS ☐ Mandatory GPS ☐ § 17-25-45 (CSG within 1st or CSC within 3rd)The charge is: ☒ As indicted, ☐ Lesser Included Offense, ☐ Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury.The plea is: ☐ w/o Rec/Negotiations ☐ Negotiated ☐ RecommendationMNC [REDACTED]
Solicitor Mary Jones102353
SC Bar #[REDACTED] 72418
Attorney for Defendant Jeffrey Stephens SC Bar #The Defendant is committed to the ☒ SCDC ☐ County Detention Center ☐ Home Incarceration Programfor a determinate term of 5 years/Time Served ☐ YOA NTE years and/or shall pay a fineof \$; provided that upon the service of days/months/years/Time Served and/or paymentof \$; plus costs and assessments as applicable; the balance is suspended with probation for months/years and subject to SCPPPS standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.☒ The sentence shall run CONCURRENT or ☐ CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: ☒ The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by SCDC.

91 Days/month

☐ To include time spent on monitored house arrest prior to trial and sentencing.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

- ☐ PTUP
- ☐ No Contact with Victim ☐ Domestic Violence Intervention Program ☐ Hold for Inpatient Treatment
- ☐ Sex Offender Registry pursuant to S.C. Code § 23-3-430 ☐ SAC/MHC if necessary
- ☐ Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code § 17-25-135
- ☐ Other:

☐ RESTITUTION See Separate Order (25% per S.C. Code § 24-21-400 (b))Restitution \$
FINE: \$

§14-1-208 (Assessments: 107.5%)

§14-1-211 (A)(1)(Conv. Surcharge)

§14-1-211 (A)(2)(DUI Surcharge)

§56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment)

§56-1-286 (DUI Breath Test)

§14-1-212 (Law Enforce. Funding)

§14-1-213 (Drug Court Surcharge)

§34-11-70(b) and (c), and 34-11-80(c) and (d) (Admin Fraud Check Court Costs)

§50-21-114 (DUI Breath Test Fee)

§56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment)

3% to County (if paid in installments)

Fine/Costs and Assessments are to be paid to the
Clerk of Court within days/months

\$100	\$
\$100	\$
\$12	\$
\$25	\$
\$25	\$
\$150	\$
\$41	\$
\$50	\$
\$40/rea	\$
TBD	\$
	\$ 3.75
\$500	\$
TBD	\$
TOTAL	\$ 178.75

☐ Appointed PD or appointed other counsel. Provider requires \$500 be paid to Clerk during probation and shall be collected before any other fees☐ §17-3-30(B) Unpaid Application Fee to be paid to the Public Defender Fund

Katherine Williams

Clerk of Court/Deputy Clerk

Katherine Williams

Court Reporter

Judge Code

Sentence Date

Presiding Judge

SCCA217E
01/27/2025

EXHIBIT B

ELECTRONIC DISCOVERY

TO SCHEDULE A MEETING TO REVIEW
YOUR eDISCOVERY MATTER - [CLICK HERE](#)

From: info

Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2026 11:55 AM

To: White, Della <dwhite@sccid.sc.gov>

Cc: Transcripts <transcripts@sccourts.org>; info <info@LegalEagleInc.com>; Alexandria Garraud <agarraud@LegalEagleInc.com>; Holmes, Tammie <tholmes@sccourts.org>

Subject: RE: RE: Transcript Request - State of SC vs. Nayquan Gadson 7/28-8/1/25

Della,

We wanted to provide you with a fairly serious issue with this transcript. The primary audio provided by the court reporter was unusable. We receive the back up audio which was much better except for the July 29th testimony.

The backup audio for July 29th is also unusable. The testimony for witnesses Sean Toomey, Courtney Laudato, Jason Maltbey, and Myazah White cannot be transcribed. They were all on the 29th.

Sorry for the bad news. Please let us know if you have any questions. Thank you.



Kevin Dehlinger

Director of Operations

T: 864.467.1373 | M: 864.444.4219

E: kdehlinger@legaleagleinc.com | www.legaleagleinc.com/

107 LeGrand Blvd., Greenville, SC | 29607



EXHIBIT C

White, Della

From: Kevin Dehlinger <kdehlinger@LegalEagleInc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2026 10:24 AM
To: info; White, Della
Cc: Transcripts; Alexandria Garraud; Holmes, Tammie
Subject: [External] RE: RE: Transcript Request - State of SC vs. Nayquan Gadson 7/28-8/1/25
Attachments: State v Gadson Transcript July 28 - Aug 01 2026.pdf; SCCID Form - State v Gadson.pdf; Invoice 111581.pdf

Della,

This transcript is as complete as we can get it. It is attached with the forms. Please see out notes below concerning this transcript production. We understand a challenge may be coming but I am not sure there is not much we can do with all the missing and poor audio. If you have any questions, please let me know. Thank you.

- We had to use primary and back up audio to construct the transcript. Neither version was of good quality nor provided a complete audio record of the trial.
- There were witnesses left out of the primary audio the Court Reporter did provide. When we tried to recover their testimony from the backup, these witnesses were also unavailable because of extremely poor audio that was not transcribable.
- The audio for 7-29 was not good enough to transcribe from primary or backup. 7-29 witnesses not in document: Toomey, Laudato, and Maltbey.
 - Parenthetical comments on page 112:
 - (Court recessed from 11:05 a.m. to 11:20 a.m.)
 - (Court resumed after lunch with next available audio.)
 - (Missing audio files for three witnesses; testimony skips to Mabel Niera.)
 - Christopher Escobedo's testimony was incomplete. We are missing the cross audio. We inputted a parenthetical comment for this on page 147.
- The first half of 7-31 was poor audio on the primary and backup.
 - Audio cut out for Gadson during cross, or cross never resumed after a break. Parenthetical was entered in the transcript here.
- The 8-1 portion of the transcript was pieced together from the primary and backup. There may be small missing sections here because she didn't create clear sequence of audio files.
 - The primary audio stopped during MR. STEPHENS's closing argument.



Kevin Dehlinger

Director of Operations

T: 864.467.1373 | M: 864.444.4219

E: kdehlinger@legaleagleinc.com | www.legaleagleinc.com/

107 LeGrand Blvd., Greenville, SC | 29607



RECEIVED

Aug 31 2026

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Beaufort County

Honorable Robert J. Bonds, Circuit Court Judge

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

NAYQUAN UNIQUE GADSON,

APPELLANT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2025-002023

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Rule 262(a)(3) and Rule 262(c)(3), SCACR, the undersigned hereby certifies a true copy of the Motion for an Order to Reconstruct the Record of Appellant's Trial, Or in the Alternative, For a New Trial in the above-referenced case has been served upon Melody J. Brown, Esquire, at the primary e-mail address listed in the Attorney Information System (AIS); and on Nayquan Gadson, #398220, at Lieber Correctional Institution, PO Box 205, Ridgeville, SC 29472, this 31st day of August, 2026.



Kersey A. Reynolds
Appellate Defender

South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense
Division of Appellate Defense
PO Box 11589
Columbia, SC 29211-1589
(803) 734-1330

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

2025-002023 The State v. Nayquan Unique Gadson Motion For an Order to Reconstruct the Record of Appellant's Trial, Or in the Alternative, For a New Trial

From Walkup, Catherine <cwalkup@sccid.sc.gov>

Date Mon 8/31/2026 3:07 PM

To mbrown@scag.gov <mbrown@scag.gov>

Cc Reynolds, Kersey <kreynolds@sccid.sc.gov>; abennett@scag.gov <abennett@scag.gov>; Caudy, Lara <lcaudy@sccid.sc.gov>; Mcinnis, Sara <smcinnis@sccid.sc.gov>

 1 attachment (3 MB)

2025-002023 The State v. Nayquan Unique Gadson Motion For an Order to Reconstruct the Record of Appellant's Trial, Or in the Alternative, For a New Trial.pdf;

Good afternoon,

Attached for service in the above referenced case is the Motion For an Order to Reconstruct the Record of Appellant's Trial, Or in the Alternative, For a New Trial which will be filed today August 31st with the Court of Appeals via email filing.

Respectfully,

Catherine Walkup, Administrative Assistant

RECEIVED
Aug 31 2026
SC Court of Appeals