RECEIVED
SEP 23 2026
SC Court of Appeals

RECEIVED
SEP 23 2026
S.C. SUPREME COURT

BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT ("S Ct") OF SOUTH CAROLINA ("SC")

Austin Woods v. *Marie-Therese Assa'ad Faltas* — **Appellate Case No. 2026-00----**
AND — **from 2026-001241**
Green Alpha Property Management v. *Marie Assa'ad Faltas,* — **Appellate Case No. 2026-00----**
(incorrectly captioned below as *Marie Faltas* v. *Green Alpha*) — **from 2026-001573**

Also Please file in Appellate Cases Nos. 2026-001241, 001246, and 001573

***TIMELY* PETITIONS FOR *CERTIORARI* TO SC's COURT OF APPEALS ("SC CoA)**
***COMBINED* with: (1) *Suggestion* for Consolidation of the two *certiorari* petitions (a) for judicial economy and (b) because (i) the landlord entity is one in both cases but after changed ownership and name and (ii) the issues overlap in both cases; and (2) *Requests* for the Court in its Administative Capacity to (a) Admonish its Office of Court Administration to Obey § 18-1-120, SC Code of Laws, and (b) Clarify the Chain of Supervision of SC's Magistrates Courts Clerks.**

SC CoA denied rehearing in both 2026-001241 and 2026-001573 on 24 August 2026. These timely *certiorari* petitions meet Rule 242(b), SCACR, considerations and should be granted on all questions fairly presented below to former or current Richland County Magistrates Coble, Stroman and Wofford-Kanwat, to Orangeburg County Magistrate Dash sitting by (erroneous) designation in Richland County, to SC's circuit court sitting in the persons of the several SC circuit judges who entered orders in 2018-CP-40-00963 and of SC Circuit Court Judge Coble, who entered rulings in 2026-CP-40-01934, and to SC CoA, as evidenced in magistrates' returns, public indices, and C-track below, all of which documents are hereby sought to be considered as appendices hereto.

This Court is also hereby asked to answer (if due process lets it judge its own acts) these questions which are clearly above the lower courts' jurisdiction and/or comity:

1 – SC's Constitution and laws treat magistrates differently from SC circuit judges in nomination-to-election versus appointment-to-confirmation, terms of office, salaries, subject-matter and territorial jurisdiction (only one county for magistrates but statewide for circuit judges). No SC Chief Justice is known to have designated a magistrate to sit in circuit court or as acting SC S Ct Justice. **Is SC's Chief Justice empowered to designate a magistrate from one county to sit in another?** Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH, *pro se,* without false humility urges the answer is NO.

2 – If **all** magistrates of a county belatedly declare themselves recused for reasons pre-dating filing of certain case(s), (a) **are all those magistrates' pre-recusal acts in affected case(s) void *ab initio*?** and (b) **should the affected case(s) be transferred to circuit court specially where the statute governing said case(s) gives the circuit court concurrent jurisdiction?** Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas urges the answers are YES and YES.

3 – If a magistrate sat on an eviction case brought by a specific landlord against a named tenant but later that magistrate gets elected to circuit court and that *very* landlord changes name and seeks to evict *same* tenant who asserts same defenses ignored by the erstwhile magistrate now-SC circuit court judge who gets the case in his/her appellate capacity, **should that circuit judge mandatorily recuse him/herself?** Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas urges the answer is YES.

4 – If in the course of reviewing a case, this Court sees clear and convincing evidence that lawyer(s) and/or law firm(s) violated the duty of candor to tribunal, **should this Court on its own initiative, notwithstanding any action/inaction by ODC, initiate its own proceedings against the deceitful lawyer(s)/law firm(s)?** Promotion of public confidence urges a YES answer.

These sought-to-be-consolidated petitions are supported by spiritual facts and worldly facts, the latter summarized below. Spiritual facts are proven by their very invocation. Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' commitment to Prevention stems from her faith that God, who sees hidden charity, also knows the evils which get prevented, and which no human ever seers or thanks, and rewards thereafter.

This Court is prayed to read Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas': (1) submission of her preventive ideas, not as control or "scorched earth," but as stewardship of her God-given talents; (2) insistence that law without natural sciences is magic-mongering, not as superiority of those who studied natural sciences over those who studied only law, but as hope that this Court is open-minded to strengthen the law with mandatory deference to natural sciences even if they replace the adversarial strife (which is a post-Constitution judicial invention in any event); and (3) courageous exposition of the true reason for this Court's 180°-turn against of her in 2008, not as recrimination, but as hope that, once seeing the devastation reeked on Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas and her innocent family by what Retired/Active SC Chief Justice Jean Toal saw as a harmless courtesy to the friend of a federal judge's second wife, this Court would want to render Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' family whole.

If this Court cannot see how it treated Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas as evil *solely because* her survival needs were contrary to a scheme devised by a husband of a friend of a federal judge's second wife, it is asked to convene a substitute supreme court to review all related matters before Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas literally dies with her ideas unheeded and her contributions unmade.

Summary of Most Relevant Worldly Facts

South Carolina's longest-serving U.S. Senator, a former state judge and governor, fathered a biracial daughter by what can only be statutory rape of an African-American teen-aged housemaid. Strom Thurmond never in his lifetime publicly acknowledged Essie-Mae or her issue but sent her "disbursements" via one of his nephews he appointed as a federal bankruptcy judge. Strom Thurmond launched his political career as a segregationist and maintained it through his invention of "constituent services," which are basically glorified nepotism/vote buying. He elevated lawyers who worked in his office and kept his secret to federal judgeships and U.S. attorneys and drilled in them the "virtue" of this approach that this is how a once-U.S.-attorney recounted it with pride and joy to SC's Judicial Merit Selection Commission reviewing Debra Chapman's candidacy:

> [18 November 2019] PUBLIC HEARINGS - Garber Reporting - info@garberreporting.com
>
> [Page 125: 19-20] CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you very much. Any questions for Ms. Chapman? Mr. Strom.
>
> [21-23] MR. STROM: Mr. Chairman, I do want to put on the record, and Ms. Chapman mentioned it, that she worked with me twenty-something years ago.
>
> [24 to page 126:1] MS. CHAPMAN: Pete, it was longer than that. I think it was probably, I hate to say this, like 29 years ago.
>
> [2-4] MR. STROM: And unfortunately since you've moved to the lake, we haven't seen each other much over the last --
>
> [5-6] MS. CHAPMAN: I haven't seen you in ten years.
>
> [7-9] MR. STROM: I do want to commend you, and I think this is worth telling. Ms. Chapman was working at the -- what grocery store?
>
> [10 – 11] MS. CHAPMAN: The Chapin Red and White Grocery Store.
>
> [12 to Page 128:24] MR. STROM: [12-17] Chapin Red and White. And Strom Thurmond came through there campaigning. You had a high school degree. And you all see her personality. And he offered her a job in Charleston. And she moved to Charleston, worked full-time and went to the College of Charleston. [18-21] Well, not only did she do that, but her sister, shortly after she moved down there, came to see Debbie and said, "Here's my infant. And I can't take care of her." [22 to page 128:4] So Debbie worked full-time, raised a baby that wasn't hers, and finished the College of Charleston. During this time she handled all the judicial elections on the -- on the federal side for Senator Thurmond. So she became friends with Judge Anderson and Wilkins, and Judge Joe McCrorey and Traxler, all the judges we know that Senator Thurmond appointed. And they decided that she needed to go to law school. [5-8] And those judges raised the money for her books. I remember somebody else bought her a computer. I got a call from Judge Joe McCrorey, and said, "We'd like for you to hire this woman as a law clerk." [9-10] I said, "Judge McCrorey, I appreciate you all considering me, but I've got more than I need." [11-14] And I hung up the phone. And three minutes later,

> Judge Joe Anderson called me. And I said, "Yes, sir. When does she need to start and how much do I need to pay her?" [15-22] And, you know, again, you've seen her personality. And she's had just a phenomenal work ethic. She's the kind of person that everybody likes. And I think you'd make just a excellent judge. I think there would be no better temperament than you. People -- everybody who knows you, loves you. There are some people in your past that were a little jealous. But you're right, it's been twenty-something years since anybody went to the Salty Nut. [23-24] I believe Representative Rutherford was probably there some of that same time.
>
> [25] MS. CHAPMAN: I think he was.

That is **not** to detract from now-SC Circuit Judge McCaslin's talents and diligence; **nor** does it suggest that Judge Anderson felt anything other than "southern" civility in getting the late U.S. Magistrate McCrorey to tell Pete Strom to jump and when the latter did not, Judge Anderson made the call himself and Pete Strom asked "how high?" It is to say that Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas now sees the world as divided between those who had a chance and those who never did. Who knows how many young women were as talented and diligent as Debra Rulova but never chanced across Strom Thurmond? **The problem with nepotism is NOT that it *could* install unqualified people; it is that equally qualified ones without connections never have a chance.**

A Coptic Christian in majority-Moslem Egypt, having had Moslem colleagues of *exactly* the same highest score on the *extremely* competitive anonymously-scored multi-subject multi-day national examination which then determined admission to Egypt's then-only-public universities and its very selective then-only-public medical schools, but on graduation from *the same medical school* seen only the Moslem graduates considered for professorship tracks, and later learning how Islamists had by then invaded government, Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas knew she never had a chance despite her talents and diligence *and* that she was expected to accept it as "the natural order" of things.

She now knows she never had a real chance in SC's judicial system. Sure, an occasional judge gets curious about a *pro se* prodigy and wants to see her "in action." Seeing no immediate advantage or threat from that *pro se* prodigy's adversary, the judge rules fairly for the *pro se* prodigy. But if even a mere proverbial feather is added on the other side, the scales not only tilt but tumble.

That proverbial feather was Sharon Bonner Koon, who in 2002 rented a mortgaged house to Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas and her mother. Koon's mortgage had a "4-1 rider" which gave the lender the rent income if the borrower defaults on mortgage payments. Koon's monthly mortgage was $700.^00^, the *exact* rent she was charging Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas and her mother. Koon decided to have her cake and eat it too: to pretend the house was her primary residence then default on the mortgage and have it paid off by the federal HMAP meant for owner-occupied residences **only**. For that, Koon needed to evict Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas and her mother but had no legal basis to do so as their lease clearly gave tenants alone the right to no-fault end their tenancy and they were otherwise rent-paying and law-abiding. Enter Susie Jones Wooten, Koon's BFF since high school, and now-Senior-U.S.-District-Judge Terry Wooten's second wife. It matters not that this relationship to then-SC-Chief-Justice Jean Toal was remote and attenuated; it was an I.O.U. Toal could collect weighed against **nothing** she could collect for Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas and/or her mother. In the judicial "mind" established by Strom Thurmond's "constituent services," Toal saw as evil anyone who unsuspectingly hindered those "services." Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas had, not only to be ruled against, but to be portrayed as unreasonable, then frivolous, then vexatious, then a figurative leper who should not even have the right to talk to public employees of the "judicial branch" during business hours about her own cases. And she should see that as the natural order of things or be held in contempt.

This is *exactly* the Islamists' conduct which preaches it is "*haram*" (sinful) for Moslems to talk to Copts or congratulate them on Christmas or Easter *and Copts should accept that as "the natural order" because they are "Kafir" (infidels).* But the only "natural order" Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas accepts derives from natural sciences including behavioral sciences which conclude that, when you devalue others' lives, you *eventually* come to devalue your own and your

children grow to devalue theirs. Notice how Islamists evolved suicide bombers after setting at naught the lives of those they brand as kafirs? Similarly, the suicide rate among lawyers is high because they set at naught the lives of non-lawyers, specially those who want to speak for themselves rather than hire lawyers, and more specially the non-lawyers who expose lawyers' failures.

Of the lawyers imposed on Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas and the false witnesses against her, a majority had disciplinary or criminal issues, or they or their children suicided or were convicted of other crimes *after* they had harmed Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas as listed below in approximate chronology of contacts.

Of Larry Wayne Mason's only two biological sons, Richard Wayne Mason reportedly committed suicide and Christopher James Mason reportedly died of sepsis from drug injections.

Charlene Crouch was convicted of public drunkenness and sexual touching of a vulnerable adult. Her only daughter had drug convictions and has a pending charge of assault.

Teresa Ingram was arrested for shoplifting and solicitation for prostitution in Florence and later pled to marijuana possession in Columbia; she and her brother, Rodney, were evicted ten times.

Former CPD "Investigator" Amanda Star Blanton was arrested for disorderly conduct.

Mark Schnee, who had pretended Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas wanted him to ignore "ethics," got disbarred.

April Sampson's barely-adult daughter was arrested for attempted murder with a firearm, pled to aggravated breach of peace, and is now accused of drug possession.

Charles Cushman, who falsely accused Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas of paranoia when assigned to resolve her fee dispute with David Farrell, was arrested for what amounts to taking bribes to dismiss cases in Cushman's capacity as Camden City Attorney and later pled to misconduct in office.

Former SC Chief Justice Pleicones' grandson committed suicide. Former SC Circuit Judge D Craig Brown, who had solicited assignment to Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' cases then plotted to have her held in contempt of court some way, resigned abruptly, claiming he accepted another offer he "could not ignore or refuse" for his "family." His resignation letter is MAFIA-evoking and his dealings with Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas are not unlike an inmate who seeks a deal by claiming a cellmate confessed.

Andy Fiffick, IV, who dismissed Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' SC JMSC complaint against Jurist Kittredge's candidacy for SC Chief Justice, committed suicide.

No vengeful god and no superstition, only the natural order in behavioral sciences.

In affirming Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas simple assault on Dinah Steele, Justice Kittredge wrote "relentless harassment" of Steele by Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas. **Where did *that* come from?** Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas had long been functionally *acquitted* of harassing Steele. Either SC's Chief Justice flips "innocent until and unless proven guilty" into "guilty even after proven innocent" or he heard *and believed ex parte* gossip from that ever-helpful Susie Jones Wooten, Steele's neighbor in Elgin, SC, or both.

If tangled web it is, posterity shall untangle it. If this Court cannot leave for posterity a *concrete* act of which Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas was duly convicted to justify loss of her right to advocate for herself and to even speak to public employees in public offices about her public business during business hours, it should render Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas whole from **all the sequalae** of "what happened in 2009." *Certiorari* should be granted and all consequences of her false 2009 arrests re-examined.

Sincerely submitted on 23 September 2026 and served the same day by postage-prepaid first-class U.S. mail properly-addressed to each of Jason Hunter and Austin Woods Kenyon Office and by hand-delivery to SC CoA.

RECEIVED
SEP 23 2026
SC Court of Appeals

Marie-Thérèse Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH, Defendant/Appellant-Petitioner, all *pro se*
P.O. Box 9115, Columbia, SC 29290 Phone: (803) 783-4536
e-mail: Marie_Faltas@hotmail.com Cell: (330) 232-4164

State of South Carolina
The Circuit Court of the Twelfth Judicial Circuit

D. Craig Brown
Judge

181 North Irby Street
Suite 3605
Florence, SC 29501
Phone: (843) 679-7156
Fax: (843) 679-7157
cbrownj@sccourts.org

May 19, 2023

RECEIVED
SEP 23 2026
SC Court of Appeals

Chief Justice Donald W. Beatty
South Carolina Supreme Court
1231 Gervais St.
Columbia, SC 29201

Dear Chief Justice Beatty:

It has been an honor and privilege to serve you and the citizens of this State as a South Carolina Circuit Court Judge for more than thirteen years. After much prayer and consideration, I believe that the time has come for me to make a change in my career. I have been presented with an opportunity that is in my family's best interest and one that I do not believe that I can ignore or refuse. Therefore, I have decided to retire as a South Carolina Circuit Court Judge with my effective date of retirement being July 1, 2023, so that I can return to the private practice of law.

Thank you again for everything that you have done for me and for your continued service to the State of South Carolina.

Sincerely,

D. Craig Brown

Cc: Erin Crawford
Tiffany Raines

RECEIVED
SEP 23 2026
S.C. SUPREME COURT
RECEIVED
SEP 23 2026
SC Court of Appeals

[Minutes 0:11 – 0:27] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: I have such knee pain that when I try to stand, I may moan and groan. Please do not take that as contempt of court.*

[Minute 0:28] **Ms. Redenburg:** Okay.

[Minute 0:29] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: [presently indiscernible]*

[Minutes 0:30 – 0:49] **Ms. Redenburg:** Thank you, Dr. Faltas. All right, Judge. For the record, today is March 17, 2026. The time is 1:15 pm. On the docket this afternoon, we have Green Alpha Property with Attorney Jason Hunter versus Marie Faltas. The case is 2025CV4010601370. Your Honor, all parties are present.

[Minutes 0:50 – 1:09] **The Court:** Thank you so much; and you are welcome to court this afternoon. Again, I am Judge Dash; and I will be presiding over this hearing today for the matter pending. **We are due for mediation is what we're actually doing; so, I guess my first thing is I need to swear you in is what I need to do.** If I can get you --- You can't hear me?

[Minutes 1:10 – 1:21] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Yes, I cannot hear you. And I could not hear Ms. Redenburg either. I assumed she was calling the case; but I couldn't hear ---*

[Minutes 1:21 – 1:23] **The Court (interposing):** Is this better now? Can you hear me now?

[Minutes 1:24 – 1:28] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Yes, it's, it's a little bit better. Am I too loud?*

[Minutes 1:29 – 1:33] **Ms. Redenburg:** [presently indiscernible]

[Minutes 1:34 – 1:40] **The Court:** Okay. So, it's turned up as loud as it can. I can hear you perfectly; but I want to make sure you are able to hear me. Okay. Can you hear me?

[Minute 1:41] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Yes sir.*

[Minutes 1:42 – 2:01] **The Court:** All right, but before we get, I need to, um, well, I don't need to swear you in. We need to go ahead and see what we are actually doing in the um; **and the mediation is what we actually are going to be doing today.** But I guess first of all we need to entertain any motion that we have. I think you have several motions that you want. Counsel, anything from you before we actually begin?

[Minute 2:02] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Well, actually ---*

[Minutes 2:02 – 2:06] **The Court (interposing):** Hold on, Dr. Faltas. Yes, Counsel.

[Minutes 2:06 – 2:12] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** This is Jason Hunter. Thank you, Your Honor. I have a motion for summary judgment for the Court.

[Minutes 2:12 – 2:13] **The Court:** All right. Well, let's entertain that motion first.

[Minutes 2:14 – 3:16] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Judge, please do not consider it facetious; but I need to make my record. First, I have a motion to strike his summary judgment motion; I have a motion to dismiss predating his motion; and I also have motion to recuse Your Honor. So, all of this should go as a threshold.* ***Of course, you will do what you'll decide to do; but I need to be on the record as having stated my objections.*** *But I think you should very strongly consider my motion to strike his summary judgment motion because his summary judgment motion includes a forged document ---*

[Minutes 3:17 – 3:53] **The Court (interposing):** So, Doctor; and I am going to interrupt you at this point. So, I am going to deny that motion that I'll not hear, you know, his summary judgment. You can, you know, refute it in your objection after the fact. Okay? So, I'm denying your motion and I'm going to hear what his summary ejectment is and I'll rule on that as I hear it. And you'll get an opportunity to respond to whatever his motion is. So, I will hear his motion and you'll get an opportunity to respond. So, it's noted on the record that I'm denying your motion and that you've already objected to me, objected to me hearing that motion. Okay? Counsel, back to you.

[Minutes 3:54 – 3:55] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, if I can approach.

[Minute 3:56] **The Court:** Yes.

[Minutes 3:57 – 4:12] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** Your Honor, this is just, these are authorities. Your Honor, for the record this is a summary judgment filed by the plaintiff. This is an action for ejectment; the ejectment is proceeding ---

[Minutes 4:12 – 4:20] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH (interposing): And I have one more objection. This is not what I previously, what I was previously served with.*

[Minute 4:21 – 4:22] **The Court:** So, that's why he's giving you a copy of it now.

[Minutes 4:23 – 4:32] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Right; but that's not the motion that was pending by him that you chose to ---*

[Minutes 4:32 – 4:37] The Court (interposing): Counsel, is this the original, um, summary ejectment that you filed that she's aware of?

[Minutes 4:38 – 4:40] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** It's not, Your Honor. These are authorities.

[Minute 4:41] The Court (interposing): Okay.

[Minutes 4:41 – 4:50] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** Um, I do have a copy that I can, I'll be happy to hand again to Dr. Faltas. Um, I find that usual, these are just authorities, case law and statues, Your Honor, that's all.

[Minutes 4:51–4:57] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: So, my objection was well-taken because he had not handed ---*

[Minutes 4:57 – 5:27] The Court (interposing): So again, I am denying the objection, Dr. Faltas. And, and so you understand, again, you have rights; and I'm not to going to deny you those rights; but you cannot once I've made my ruling, you can object to it but you previously have done but that means I've ruled on the objection; and we're going to proceed with it as necessary, okay? And we'll, you'll get an opportunity to respond to it. Then at that point I'll make my final ruling on it. Counsel, thank you.

[Minutes 5:28 – 5:35] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** You're welcome, Your Honor. I was saying this is a motion for summary judgment filed by the plaintiff, the landlord in an action for ejectment that is proceeding because the terms of tenancy for this tenant has expired ---

[Minutes 5:35 – 5:39] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH (interposing): I, I cannot hear him. I cannot hear him. If he can either ---*

[Minutes 5:40 – 5:42] The Court (interposing and scolding): He's standing, he's standing next to you. So, Counsel, if you can speak a little louder if possible.

[Minutes 5:42 – 5:56] **Ms. Redenburg:** [presently indiscernible]

[Minutes 5:57 – 5:59] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: I am not being facetious, Your Honor. I really cannot hear him.*

[Minutes 6:01 – 6:02] **Ms. Redenburg:** If you could just try to speak into the microphone.

[Minutes 6:03 – 6:05] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Because he's speaking fast, too.*

[Minutes 6:06 – 6:49] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** All right, first off, Your Honor, this is a motion for summary judgment filed by the plaintiff, who is the landlord in this matter. This matter is proceeding because the term of tenancy for this tenant has expired, um, the tenant has refused to leave the premises despite having had notice, **and the tenant refused to also execute a subsequent lease.**

Your Honor, the lease agreement between the parties has a term of tenancy, that the last lease agreement, I understand there were some before that, **the last one has a term of tenancy that began in August of 2023 and ended on August 31, 2023.** Um. Your Honor, notice was provided; and I'll go into that further; but that ---

[Minutes 6:50 – 7:02] The Court (interposing): Excuse me, Counsel. What were those dates again? It seems like they are the same thing. What were the dates again, it began and it ended?

[Minutes 7:03 – 7:09] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** I believe, Your Honor, **it began on 8-1-2023 and ended 8-31-24.**

[Minute 7:10] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Objection.*

[Minutes 7:11 – 10:00] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** Your Honor, the leased premises is on Garners Ferry Road. The stated rent in the lease is seven-hundred dollars. But the lease term, of the final lease that's ended, that's really the end of the analysis. Um. If you look at the first document I handed up to you, SC Code Section 27-37-10, if you indulge me, it says in relevant part the tenant may be ejected upon application of the landlord or its agent when "or (2) the term of tenancy or occupancy has ended." Your Honor, that's clearly what has happened here.

Your Honor, the courts, the courts cannot rewrite contracts, as you know, they cannot extend contracts. And backing that up the red tab document I handed up to you, the 2007 Court of Appeals case entitled *Lowcountry Open Land Trust* versus *Charleston Southern University*. I've highlighted where that tab is; but it says there: "courts only have the authority to specifically enforce contracts that the parties themselves have made. They do not have the authority to alter contracts, or to make new contracts for the parties." Reinforcing that, Your Honor, that orange tab document, that supreme court case, 1988, still good law. It's entitled *C.A.N. Enterprises* versus *SC Health & Human Services Finance Committee*. It says, Your Honor, which is instructive for this case, "when a contract is unambiguous, clear and explicit, it must be construed according to the terms the parties have used, to be taken and understood in their plain, ordinary, and popular sense."

And, Your Honor, unambiguous in the lease agreement between the parties, it's unambiguous, clear and

explicit, that the lease ended on August 31, 2024. Dr. Faltas has been a month-to-month tenant since that time. Your Honor, notice was provided under the requirement of the statute on July 2nd of last year, notice was issued to Dr. Faltas, advising that she was a month-to-month tenant, **and asking that she vacate the premises, um, 30 days hence**. That notice was not heeded. And on or about August 4th of last year, the defendant again said I don't know anything about that, I didn't receive that notice despite my client having emailed the notice to her, gotten an email back confirmation that it's an opened email, she came into the office and feigned ignorance to the notice. At that time, ---

[Minute 10:01] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH (interposing):* *Objection to the word "feigned."*

[Minutes 10:02 – 10:06] The Court: Dr. Faltas, he's presenting it, you get to respond to it, okay? Not to object to it.

[Minutes 10:07 – 10:11] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH:* *I'm objecting to the word "feigned." That's, that's an offensive word ---*

[Minutes 10:12 – 10:18] The Court: Dr. Faltas, hold that for your response to it, okay?

[Minutes 10:21 – 15:35] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** Are you ready? The, Your Honor, we've included in our affidavit, a note made by an employee of the plaintiff contemporaneous with that meeting. He said that the, the July notice was printed out and handed to Dr. Faltas at that time and that he, **he made a further note that the defendant refused to sign a renewed lease due to the quote "new pricing for a 3-bedroom unit."** The, if you want to call it a renewed notice, but the notice that was provided to her, handed to her on August 4th, also went unheeded. So, on September 4th, Dr. Faltas presumably went to pay the rent. My client said we're not accepting the rent. We told you to leave. Please leave. Why didn't you leave? So, on September 4th, Dr. Faltas, um, after my client refused to take those further seven-hundred dollars, she called the cops, called Richland County Sheriff's Department. A deputy presumably had to come down. A police report is included in our affidavit by the deputy who witnessed the situation. Your Honor, in her, um, responsive pleading, and I'm talking specifically about the Rule to Vacate hearing request, Dr. Faltas says, quote, "this eviction application is retaliatory because I complained of threats to health and safety at Colonial Pointe." Your Honor, retaliatory evictions are, of course, covered by SC Code section 27-40-910. Now, Your Honor, there's been no allegation, and just a quick review of the statute. It, um, prohibits landlords from engaging in retaliatory conduct in response to protected conduct by a tenant. Um, protected conduct would be a complaint to the landlord about a risk to health and safety throughout the apartment or the rest of the premises or a complaint to some other supervising authority, you know, public housing or something like that. Um. And it goes into, it says, if you look at the Code also, if you look at the Code, they can't raise the rent. There has been no allegation that my client tried to raise the rent beyond the fair market value in this case. They cannot deny essential services. There has been no allegation in this case, no evidence that my client engaged in a willing diminution of essential services. So, the applicable part of the statute would be g, paragraph g. If you'd indulge me for a second. It says, "if the landlord retatiate, retaliates against a tenant for engaging in conduct protected under Section a, that's what I spoke about earlier, by refusing to renew the lease, and if the tenant is not, is not in default of the payment of rent," Dr. Faltas is not, "the landlord may not recover possession of the dwelling unit for 75 days." So, the landlord can still recover possession of the unit, Your Honor, but regardless of that, it just forestalls that for another 75 days. Your Honor, I'd submit to the Court it's been quite some time since August and September of last year, quite longer than 75 days. The statute goes on to say, "provided the tenant proves the landlord violated this chapter and the landlord has, had such notice, had notice of such complaints prior to the expiration of the lease." So, we'd be talking about communications from Dr. Faltas to the landlord that preceded August 31st of 2024. And there's no evidence of that. There's no evidence of any retaliatory conduct whatsoever, Your Honor. And in fact, Dr. Faltas has failed to file a counter-affidavit. I've not seen a counter affidavit from her despite being copied on emails from her for a while. Now, Your Honor, Dr. Faltas is a *pro se* litigant but she's not any *pro se* litigant. And I would ask this Court to adhere to the civil court rules. Rule 56, part c, of course says the adverse party, which Dr. Faltas is in this case, may serve opposing affidavit not later than two days before the hearing. That has not happened here. There is no evidence before the Court that refutes anything that I've said to you today, Your Honor. It says part e of Rule 56, goes on to say when a motion for summary judgment is made and supported as provided for in this rule," and the plaintiff has done this "an adverse party may not rest on the mere allegations or denials in his pleadings." That's what happened here, Your Honor. Dr. Faltas cannot simply say something is retaliatory. There is no evidence before the Court. And certainly, no affidavit was filed two days prior to hearing, Your Honor. And I want to ask, just reinforcement of the fact that Dr. Faltas is very familiar with the court system. Um. Your Honor, I searched her name yesterday in the Richland County Public Index, the green tab, Your Honor, we have three pages ---

[Minute 15 :31] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH:* *Objections.*

[Minutes 15:32 – 15:45] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** Three pages with her name on it, Your Honor. And Your Honor, I've also included *The City of Columbia* versus Assa'ad-Faltas ---

[Minute 15 :46] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH:* *Objection.*

[Minutes 15:47 – 15:55] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** The defendant in that case ---

[Minutes 15:52 – 16:07] The Court: Dr. Faltas, hold on, Counsel. Again, I will hear your response to Attorney Hunter's pleading that he's making for the Court. **There's nothing for you to object to at this particular point.** You can respond to it. Again, I don't have to admonish you again. **I'll hold you in contempt.**

[Minutes 16:31 – 17:41] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** Thank you, Your Honor. Um, the aqua, the green aqua tab document, *The City of Columbia* v. *Assa'ad-Faltas*, that is Dr. Faltas here before you today, Your Honor. It says in relevant part "for many years the defendant has engaged in a pattern of frivolous filings toward the court." Now, Your Honor, the last document in the appendix is a supreme court order specific toward Dr. Faltas. All that to present to you, Your Honor, that Dr. Faltas is very, very familiar with the court system. She's not filed an affidavit, and nonetheless, Your Honor, I believe this motion for summary judgment was filed last October. Dr. Faltas has had every opportunity in the world to submit evidence to the Court. There is, the record is what it is, Your Honor. A trial would do nothing, here. There is some extraneous lease that allows her to remain on the property. There is no document that presented that she has some right to remain on the property. This is not a credibility question, Your Honor. It's a question of law. That's exactly what summary judgment is used for. For those facts, Your Honor, for the foregoing reasons, we ask the Court to grant the judgment and save my client the expense of having to endure a jury trial in this case. Your Honor, that's my presentation unless the Court has any questions for me.

[Minutes 17:42 – 17:47] The Court: I don't. Dr. Faltas, Any response to Attorney Hunter's?

[Minute 17:48] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: A lot of responses.*

[Minutes 17:52 – 17:55] The Court: I am here. I am listening to you.

[Minutes 17:56 – 18:50] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: First of all: there is no contract that he was referring to starting in, that his Exhibit A is not signed by me. In fact, his affidavit or the affidavit he filed with it says, um, um, that she could not locate a contract signed by me. So, all his Blah, Blah, Blah, about cases saying that the courts cannot re-write contracts for the parties is out because this is a blank thing that's not signed by me. And if you pull his Exhibit A, you'll see that it is not signed by me.*

[Minutes 18:50 – 18:51] The Court: Are you presenting them to the Court?

[Minute 18:52] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Didn't he give you a copy?*

[Minutes 18:52 – 18:56] The Court: Are you presenting anything to the Court today, Dr. Faltas?

[Minutes 18:56 - 19:11] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Yes. I filed a motion with the Court to strike his summary judgment motion because it contains forgery. You don't have my file?*

[Minutes 19:12 – 19:16] The Court: Are you presenting anything new or different than what I currently have?

[Minute 19:19] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Yes!*

[Minutes 19:20 – 19:22] The Court: So you, you're responding to his motion, to the summary, for me to grant this summary ejectment.

[Minutes 19:23 - 19:45] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: He's said that I haven't filed anything in opposition. I'm saying I filed something in opposition long ago. And that something in opposition was that the motion should be struck because it contains a forged document.*

[Minutes 19:46 – 19:59] The Court: So, can you produce that document to the Court today? I'm not, I am in receipt of all your, all of the stuff you've given to the Court. Whatever you're presenting to me today, are you in possession of that to, to actually show me what you're talking about?

[Minutes 20:00 – 20:01] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: What I filed, the motion to strike ---*

[Minute 20:01 – 20:06] The Court (interposing): Yeah, you should have a copy of it.

[Minutes 20:05 – 20:10] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Sir, I can go to my car and get it. I can barely walk and carry things ---*

[Minutes 20:10 – 20:15] The Court (interposing): So, everything that you're asking me to consider, you do not have in your possession.

[Minutes 20:20 – 20:21] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: No sir. No sir, that's not true. I do have it in my ---*

[Minutes 20:22 – 20:25] The Court (interposing): I'm asking you. I wasn't telling you. I'm asking you.

[Minutes 20:26 – 20:32] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Sir, I'm asking you: that motion that he handed ---*

[Minute 20:33] **The Court (interposing):** Uh-huh (yes).

[Minutes 20:34 – 20:50] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH (resuming): has exhibit A that he said is a contract between his client and me, it has no signature of mine. None. And the affidavit of plaintiff, she says that she doesn't have a contract signed by me ---*

[Minutes 20:51 – 20:58] **The Court (interposing):** So, that's what I'm asking you. So, you're saying that your signature is not on that contract. Correct?

[Minutes 21:00 – 21:11] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: And I've said that in the motion to strike ---*

[Minutes 21:11 – 21:08] **The Court (interposing):** So, I'm asking you: are you in possession of that contract that does not have your signature on it?

[Minutes 21:09 – 21:10] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Yes, here it is ---*

[Minutes 21:11 – 21:13] **The Court (interposing):** Well, that's all I'm asking you. Could you please present it please?

[Minutes 21:13 – 21:16] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: You have it, too ---*

[Minutes 21:16 – 21:18] **The Court (interposing):** I'm asking you, Dr. Faltas, to present that to me.

[Minutes 21:20 – 21:26] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: You can see it has no signature of mine; and then this is the affidavit of Denice Williams: she says she has no contract signed by me.*

[Minutes 21:27 – 21:28] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** Yes, this is the plaintiff's affidavit, Your Honor.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit A and Ms. Williams' 21 October 2025 affidavit handed up to the Court.)

[Minutes 21:38 – 21:44] **The Court:** Thank you. Okay, you can continue. You can continue.

[Minutes 21:45–27:14] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Yes sir. So, residential units in South Carolina are controlled by the South Carolina Residential Landlord Tenant Act which is, which is based on the Uniform Landlord Tenant Act, which in turn is based on the Uniform Commercial Code,* ***which in turn requires good faith. There has been no good faith at all.***

What, what has been done is basically racketeering. ***This is a company from North Carolina that comes in and buys properties and tries to double the rent; and one way of doubling the rent is not accepting the rent when it's timely tendered and then filing an eviction. Now, the actual eviction application is not based on the termination of the contract, the actual eviction, and that should be in your file, too;*** *but if you want me to go get it, I'll get it for you. It's based on the rent not being paid.* ***But that is a violation of the good faith dealing because when I went to timely tender the rent, they refused to accept it. That is why I had to have a sheriff witness it.*** *And then, yes, there is plenty I have, I have sheriff's case numbers which are also on file. You all keep telling me that I shouldn't file things in the Lykesland magistrate's office but I had filed those when they were in the Lykesland magistrate's office and they said they transferred the whole file to you. So, there is evidence of my complaining to the landlord and to authorities; there is evidence of intentional diminution of services; there is evidence of failure of repair. All of that is already in the file in a timely manner, not just two days before the hearing. But my threshold motion is that the eviction which was signed by Magistrate Judge Wofford-Kanwat, she had no authority to sign it because she is recused.*

And I make the analogy of a ruling from a judge here in South Carolina, a federal judge, Judge Cameron Currry. She was sitting by designation because all the district judges in Virginia were recused. But she ruled that the attorney, the U.S. Attorney who presented the indictments against New York Attorney General Letitia James and former FBI Director James Comey has, was not legally appointed; so, the indictment is void.

Because the honorable chief magistrate of Richland County has ruled that all Richland County magistrates are recused; and she gave reasons which predate the filing of this eviction. And the landlord files an application; and it's the magistrate who issues the rule to show cause. So, the issuance of the Rule to Show Cause was void ab initio, *void from the beginning, because --- I am sorry Your Honor, I go out of breath. If I may take my breath?*

[Minute 27:14] **The Court:** Yes.

[Minutes 27:21 – 27:38] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Okay. And I may take, I need to put a nitroglycerine pill under my tongue; so that may take a few minutes for it to be absorbed. Would the Court indulge that, please?*

[Minutes 27:41 – 27:42] **The Court:** How long is that going to take?

[Minutes 27:44 – 27:51] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Three, four minutes; but this is a life, a lifesaving thing.*

[Minutes 27:53 – 27:56] **The Court:** And how often would you have to do that?

[Minutes 27:57 – 27:58] Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: *I have to do it right now.*

[Minutes 27:59 – 28:06] **The Court:** Yeah, I'm saying how often would you have to do that nitroglycerine pill? If you do it now, then when will you have to do it again?

[Minutes 28:07 – 28:16] Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: *By the grace of God, I hope it works and I don't to have to do it again in this hearing.*

[Minutes 28:18 – 28:20] **The Court:** All right, over any objection Counsel, I'm gonna do a five-minute recess. Okay?

[Minute 28:21] **Ms. Redenburg:** All rise.

[Minutes 28:35 – 28:36] **The Court:** All right, Dr. Faltas, I'm yielding back to you, Counsel, I'm yielding back to you.

[Minute 28:37] Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: *I'm sorry?*

[Minutes 28:38 – 28:39] **The Court:** I'm yielding back to you. You can continue.

[Minutes 28:40 – 28:48] Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: *Yes sir. And I assume I am relieved from the requirement to have to stand ---*

[Minute 28:51 – 28:53] **The Court (interposing):** You are. You are.

[Minutes 28:53 – 29:21] Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: *Thank you. In fact, in England instead of "Court in session, all rise," they say, "All rise, if you are able." So now, in the England which is the source of the Anglo-American jurisprudence, they recognize the inability of some people to rise; and I appreciate ---*

[Minutes 29:21 – 29:23] **The Court (interposing):** Thank you ma'am. You can continue for us.

[Minutes 29:24 – 40:42] Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: *Okay. So, as a matter of the Court enforcing its own moral authority, it should strike what he stood and presented as a contract between his client and me when there is no such contract and he tries; I'm sorry for the, for the term; to pull the wool over Your Honor's eyes.*

And the more his motion should be stricken for that reason alone and sanctions be imposed on him because he stood and went on and on and on about a contract between the parties when there is no contract.

What there is is a prior contract under different terms from the prior owner of the property; and it has very specific terms. This is the contract that is controlling and that allows me to stay as long as I do not violate that other contract, which he did not see fit to present. So, I think this is a very serious issue of lack of candor to the tribunal. And out of the Court's self-respect, it should question him about that.

So again, there has been very many proofs on the file, including pictures. And they have been continuing. Things like no light in the parking lot; and I was the one who had to call the electric company and keep calling. Things like gang graffiti; and that's also in my filings which way predates two days before this hearing.

And in every response I say "including the exhibits, the previous record of the case, and all matters available for judicial notice." So, anything signed by Magistrate Judge Kan, Wofford-Kanwat is void ab initio.

I'm not saying they cannot, if they have grounds, file a new rule to show cause. They can; but it has to be before a judge who is not recused prior to the filing. And if you see Judge Stroman, she cites reasons, the recusal for reasons happening before, before that application for ejectment was filed. So, she had no authority and it's void ab initio.

The second thing is that any act that is part of a crime, tort or fraud, is also void.

He acknowledged that this was a game. They said, no, we won't take your seven-hundred-dollar rent; we want you to sign a new lease essentially for, for, for double that amount. And if you don't sign it, leave. These are MAFIA tactics. These are, ***this is extortion; and when it's done across state lines, it's a federal issue as well.***

So, they say, the value of property doesn't always rise. There is something like a diminution of the value of property. For example, when fire happens, when there is something next-door moves in and reduces the value. And I also have prior, way long prior to this hearing, that's why I said my motion should take precedence, attached the new company. They said they paid thirty-seven-thousand dollars for each apartment on the average. But in the flood of 2015, these apartments were affected; and for them to get permission to repair them, there is something called the 50% rule. The damage cannot be greater than 50% or they have to rebuild it on elevated since it was on flood zone.

So, what did they do? They submitted an appraisal that the apartment was worth a hundred-thousand dollars in 2015. I attached from the new owner, the attestation; and it's also. It's not something that's just, you know, internet or AI or fake news. This is something they have to file with the Securities and Exchange Commission. And they do. It's thirty-seven thousand dollars per apartment. So, the value has gone down from a hundred thousand when they were charging me, the previous owner were charging me seven-hundred to thirty-seven thousand; and therefore the rent should be diminished accordingly. But what; and that is to say nothing of the miserable condition of the apartment that is left unrepaired. Since the flood, Your Honor. I don't have carpet in the living room. I don't have

any floor covering in the living room. It's concrete. And it's even not sealed concrete. And in the hallway, there were layers of vinyl that had mold under them. They did not remove them until December of 2023.

There is a whole lot that, but, but objective is what they filed in 2015, saying the market value, the sale value, the building value of the unit is a hundred thousand and what they filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and what they advertise is thirty-seven thousand. So, there has been diminution. But instead, they have this racket to monopolize apartments and instead of doing the fair market value, they try to double it and triple it by these games, which is also torts, fraud and crime. And that makes all their action having to be thrown out of court and sanctions imposed on them. I go and tender the rent timely. And they say, no, we're not going to take it; then they turn around and say we want to evict her because she didn't pay the rent on time.

He said that I feigned ignorance. I did not feign ignorance. There is established principle in law. It says the more recent takes, supersedes the older; and the specific supersedes the general. So, after they sent me that thing that says leave in July, they sent me another email saying pay the July rent. So, once they invited me to pay the July rent at that time I, they, they opened, they reopened the portal. So, I paid the July rent on the portal.

Then came August, ***and they, they maliciously turned the portal off; and the hearing we had before Your Honor, it was back on December 30th, and I, 19, I'm sorry, 2025;*** *and I asked Ms. Redenburg to provide me with a recording of it. It was like pulling teeth; but Ms. Williams admitted that it would take two seconds to open the portal ---*

[Minutes 40:42 – 41:02] **The Court (interposing):** Dr. Faltas, I hate to interject or interrupt but everything I hear you telling me is something that probably needs to be heard in a trial; but what I am determining at this particular point is whether or not we're gonna go to trial. So, I need your response into the motion that's before the Court for the summary ejectment.

[Minutes 41:03 – 41:21] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Well, I already gave you my response that there is no contract between them and me that they can rely on. The contract that's controlling is with the previous owner that protects me from being evicted at will.*

[Minute 41:21] **The Court:** Okay.

[Minutes 41:25 – 41:57] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: And there is, and the Rule to Show Cause was improperly issued because the judge who issued it is recused and was recused before she issued it. She just didn't give effect to the fact that she's recused. And the conduct was retaliatory and that does need to be determined in a trial because that's when the jury decides ---*

[Minutes 41:59 – 42:01] **The Court (interposing):** That's an issue of law. The jury does not determine the law. That's for me to decide.

[Minutes 42:02 – 41:32] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: The facts are that I complained because he stood here and pretended that I did not complain to the landlord and to authorities. And on file and also in the hearing that you heard, you heard evidence that I complained to the landlord on one thing; but on file, there are several other things that I complained to the landlord and to authorities. So, these are issues of fact. I don't see how you can say that's an issue of law when I put before you facts of complaints of health and safety issues that predate ---*

[Minutes 41:59 – 42:57] **The Court (interposing):** So you do understand that this hearing is to determine whether or not, because you understand that the law precedes anything else.

[Minutes 42:59 – 43:01] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: But this is not the law that you look at things ---*

[Minute 43:01] **The Court (interposing):** Dr. Faltas ---

[Minutes 43:01] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Okay.*

[Minutes 43:01 – 43:07] The Court (resuming): So, my job right on this particular point is to rule on the motion that's before the Court because that means that if I rule on this motion that means that this issue is halted at this point because I rule on what the law said.

[Minutes 43:08 – 43:18] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: But the law cannot say that ---*

[Minutes 43:19 – 43:20] **The Court (interposing):** I can't tell you what the law says because I did not write the law.

[Minutes 43:21 – 43:22] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: But you're not, you're misrepresenting the law. The law does not ---*

[Minutes 43:23 – 43:24] **The Court (interposing):** Well. Thank you for telling me that.

[Minutes 43:24 – 43:39] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Yes. I am sorry I have to say it to preserve my position. You're saying that it's an issue of law for your decision when there are facts on the file that I complained ---*

[Minutes 43:39 – 43:40] **The Court (interposing):** Dr. Faltas ---

[Minutes 43:40 – 43:43] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: And then you're telling me it's an issue of law that summary judgment ---*

[Minutes 43:43 – 43:46] **The Court (interposing):** And that's what I'm gonna rule on today, just the issue of law and nothing else.

[Minute 43:47] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: But that's not---*

[Minutes 43:47 – 44:01] **The Court (interposing):** The testimony that you, **because you obviously were beginning to testify to some things, that has to be cross-examined. And I am not here for trial today.** I am here today to determine whether or not we will need to have a trial based on that.

[Minute 44:02] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: I'm telling you ---*

[Minutes 44:03 – 44:21] **The Court (interposing):** Dr. Faltas, please don't do that. So, my job today is to determine whether or not what's presented to me is enough for me to rule on whether a trial needs to be had or not. This is what I am to determine at this particular point.

[Minutes 44:22 – 44:26] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: But you're saying you're going to ignore everything that was presented ---*

[Minutes 44:26 – 44:31] **The Court (interposing):** That's not what I said. So, thank you for putting words in my mouth but that's not what I said.

[Minute 44:32] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: That's the implication, Your Honor. You're saying ---*

[Minutes 44:32 – 44:36] **The Court (interposing):** Well, that's a matter of interpretation from your point, not mine.

[Minutes 44:36 - 44:48] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: All right. And I'm saying Let me state my position clearly: when in the file, which you must take judicial notice of ---*

[Minutes 44:49 – 44:51] **The Court (interposing):** Which I have.

[Minutes 44:51 – 46:36] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH (resuming): there is evidence of complaints to authorities and there is allegations that the eviction was retaliatory because it was filed after the complaints to the landlord and to the authorities, you're trying to say that it's an issue of law. And I'm saying, no, that's not an issue of law. And to the extent that you're saying that it is an issue of law, you are either misapprehending or misrepresenting the law because you want to rule against me. And that is why I asked for your recusal at the threshold. But if you agree that there are facts on file that give prima facie, prima facie evidence of retaliatory conduct, then that is an issue of the jury because even in that October 13th before Judge, Magistrate Judge Wofford, she said yes, I do have your allegations as prima facie of retaliatory conduct; but I'm here to just set the bond;* ***and the retaliatory conduct, whether it was or was not, is an issue of the jury. Now you're trying to change that and stand things on their head and say that it's an issue of law. It's not an issue of law.***

[Minutes 46:37 – 46:40] **The Court:** First, Dr. Faltas, realize that I have nothing to do with whatever conversation which you may or may not have had with a previous judge.

[Minutes 46:41 – 46:42] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH:* It wasn't a conversation, it was a hearing.

[Minutes 46:43 – 47:07] **The Court:** Well, then, I had nothing to do with that previous hearing. I've read all of the documents that have been submitted to the Court today I'm ruling on what's before me at this particular point of whether or not to grant or not grant the summary ejectment. **I don't need anything for you to tell me about the trial; I need you to respond to the law.** That's what I'm asking you today. **Nothing else.**

[Minutes 47:08 – 47:12] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH:* And the law is a document that is not signed by two parties is not a contract. Do we have a difference on that?

[Minutes 47:13 – 47:17] **The Court (angrily):** Yes, of course there is. Counsel. Okay, thank you ma'am. Counsel, anything else?

[Minutes 47:18 – 48:17] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** Yes, Your Honor, thank you. If I could very briefly respond, um, Your Honor, if I could draw the Court's attention to the proffered Landlord-Tenant Act, um, SC Code 27-40-320 is entitled "Effect of unsigned or undelivered rental agreement." In part b it says *verbatim* "If the tenant does not sign and deliver a written rental agreement which has been signed and delivered to the tenant, acceptance of possession and payment without, of rent without reservation gives the rental agreement the same effect as if it had been signed and delivered by the tenant." Sir, if you recall, we've been very upfront about the fact that we do not have a rental agreement signed by Dr. Faltas. That's clear in our affidavit, um, so, I would just, I just want to point out that to the Court that I don't think that line of argument has been unfairly worked around. Um ---

[Minute 48:18] The Court: Thank you.

[Minutes 48:19 – 48:43] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** Also our official pleading, um, it did check those blocks of both causes of action, a cause of action for non-payment, **I withdrew that because clearly my client was trying to kick Dr. Faltas out of the apartment and stopped accepting rent;** but we withdrew that and proceeded under the other cause of action, the termination of the lease. That's all, Your Honor.

[Minute 48:44] The Court: Thank you.

[Minutes 48:45 – 54:32] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Well, Your Honor, there was, it's not this that I've given to you. First, it was never tendered to me.* ***And again, what controls is the prior contract that continues and that protects me and that has completely different terms from this.*** *And then their effort to have me sign this, if indeed there was even an effort to do so, was an act of racketeering which should not be indulged or encouraged or rewarded by the Court.*

And I also, you're stopping me from saying that I objected when he said I was feigning ignorance. I am a very honest person. And then he tried to say that I'm litigious. All those cases are because people tried to bring false criminal charges against me and I defended myself without a lawyer in a jury trial in the court of none other than Judge Clifton Newman and I, thank God, I was able to do for myself what the entire team of Alex Murdaugh was unable to do for him, which is prevent a jury from returning a wrongful conviction. I was, initially the jury completely deadlocked; and Judge Clifton Newman declared a mistrial. And it took me two and a half years; and it was remanded to the City of Columbia Court; and thank God, again without a lawyer, I got it dismissed with prejudice.

So, when he stands there and, and tries to blame the victim, I think it is obscene.

It is obscene because ever since, I have not just said it's my word against them, against their word, I presented objective evidence that they obtained probable cause by perjured and forgered, and forged documents. They continued to prosecute me on forged documents and perjured testimony. I presented it to the Judicial Merit Selection Commission when, when John Meadors was running for judge. Thank God he didn't get elected.

But when now-Justice James was a, a, a circuit court judge and he was running for re-election, I also appeared before the Judicial Merit Selection Commission and gave that testimony. And now-Justice James, at the time a circuit judge, he said I agree with Dr. Faltas that judges should not honor or use or accept testimony that is perjured.

And then I also testified in the, the, um, Chief Judgeship of Justice Pleicones; and I also presented it.

So, the system is failing me. And I'm asking you: Don't fail me, too. Don't let him stand there obscenely saying Dr. Faltas is, is litigious when if we look at all the cases, I only had filed four civil cases, all of which I won; and I had filed one eviction appeal. And the Honorable Judge Lee ruled in my favor; and it was against the huge law firm of Nelson Mullins. And I attached Her Honor's rulings previously to the submissions here. So, all four civil cases that I had filed, I had won. One civil appeal that I had filed, I had won. All the others are derived from the false criminal charges they brought against me and the continued punishment of me when I kept demanding, after the jury deadlocked before Judge Clifton Newman, I continued demanding speedy retrial or dismissal. And I didn't just do it by, by being loud and I documented all the evidence of the perjury; but no one cared.

No one cares. And that is why I, I, I want you to uphold the honor of the court, to uphold your self-respect, to not stand the law on its head; and to deny his summary judgment motion.

[Minute 54:33 – 55-20] The Court: Thank you, Dr. Faltas. So, I appreciate your candor; and I appreciate your response to it. So, and I am hoping in my twenty-nine years of sitting on the bench that I've upheld the integrity of this institution that I so proudly honor. So, I'm making a ruling on, on the summary ejectment because that's what I set as the first motion, the first thing that's before the Court. And it either continues the case or it discontinues the case. You understand that. The next thing that you need to understand is that any ruling that's made in this Court are appealable. That's why they make these appellate courts. But for one thing is not going to be debatable; so you do understand that you have the right to appeal any decision that in this court to the next higher court. So, understand that.

[Minutes 55:22 – 55:30] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: Before I have the right to appeal it, I need to ask you to reconsider it.*

[Minute 55:30 – 55:33] The Court: Well, you can't, I can't reconsider something I haven't considered yet. You haven't heard my consideration on it yet.

[Minutes 55:34 – 55:40] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: I know, I know. I'm just saying if you rule adversely to me, for me to have the right to appeal it I have to ask you to reconsider it.*

[Minute 55:40 – 55:44] The Court: Well, again, Dr. Faltas, again, then you need to allow me the opportunity to, you need to listen to this. *[presently indiscernible conversation between the Court and Ms. Redenburg]* **[Minute 55:45 – 56:54]** The Court (continuing): So again, I don't reconsider, I'm not, I won't reconsider any ruling that I make today; you know you have the opportunity to appeal any decision that I made, that I am going to make today. Again, Dr. Faltas, again, we're done. Okay? So, I do feel, **because I am ruling at this particular point on the preponderance of the evidence,** which

weighs or outweighs the other, **I do feel that whatever motion that Attorney Hunter has presented to the Court does outweigh your objections that you've made on it**. And with that in mind, with that in mind, I'm gonna rule in his favor of granting this summary ejectment and we'll continue with the eviction at this particular point. Any other thing you want at this particular point, you know obviously what you need to do; but we won't have a debate with it on today, you understand.

[Minutes 56:54 – 57:00] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: I'm telling you that for the appeal to be accepted, I have to first file a motion to reconsider.*

[Minute 57:00 – 57:04] **The Court:** That's fine.

[Minutes 57:04 – 57:10] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: And I filed, I expected no different; and that is why I asked for your recusal. And thank you. May I leave now?*

[Minute 57:12 – 57:14] **The Court:** Thank you. Anything, Counsel, for clarity? (Laughs.)

[Minutes 57:18 – 57:20] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** I have nothing to add, Your Honor. Would you, would you need an order from me?

[Minute 57:22] **The Court:** Yes.

[Minutes 57:23 – 57:34] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** I'll draft an order for Your Honor; and while everyone is still in the courtroom, you do not have to file a motion to reconsider before the appeal.

[Minutes 57:34 - 57:43] **The Court:** Unless she wants me to, I mean I, I'll entertain it; but I don't see where I need to. But I can't stop her from filing anything she wants to file.

[Minutes 57:44 – 58:00] *Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH: For one thing, you just said what he presented outweighs what I presented. **That's weighing their evidence which is for the jury, not for you. And that's an error or law**; but I do want a recording of this hearing and of the prior hearing on December 30th.*

[Minute 58:01] **The Court:** Yes ma'am.

[Minutes 58:02 – 58:03] **Attorney Jason Hunter:** Your Honor, I'll be seeing you soon.

[Minute 58:04] **The Court:** Thank you very much. We're adjourned.

[Minute 58:05] **Ms. Redenburg:** [....] All rise.