

From: [Cedric Browne](#)
To: [Court Of Appeals Filings](#)
Subject: Fwd: Shaftesbury Green POA v. Browne, Appeal No. 2026-001570 - Second Supplemental Notice Regarding Form 4 and Sua Sponte Denial Without Adversarial Process
Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 9:00:34 PM

*** **EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside the organization. Please exercise caution before clicking any links or opening attachments. ***

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Cedric Browne** <plainjane9955@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Sep 8, 2026 at 4:52 PM
Subject: Shaftesbury Green POA v. Browne, Appeal No. 2026-001570 - Second Supplemental Notice Regarding Form 4 and Sua Sponte Denial Without Adversarial Process
To: <ctappfilings@sccourts.org>, Mark Nappier <MNappier@inletlaw.com>, Cedric Browne <plainjane9955@gmail.com>

RECEIVED
Sep 08 2026
SC Court of Appeals

Dear Clerk of the South Carolina Court of Appeals:

I write again to bring an additional matter to this Court's attention arising from the Form 4 filed by Master Clemmons this morning, which I referenced in my prior supplemental email.

Upon further review, I respectfully submit that the Form 4 presents a procedural irregularity that bears directly on this Court's consideration of the pending Renewed Emergency Petition.

My Objection to Proposed Sections A and H of the Draft Order was directed to Master Clemmons and served on Respondent's counsel, Mr. Mark A. Nappier. It was filed before any Order regarding the Motion for Writ of Supersedeas was entered, a fact Master Clemmons himself confirmed in the Form 4, stating: "To date, no Order regarding the Motion for Writ of Supersedeas has been entered."

Respondent Nappier filed no response or objection to my filing. No briefing was requested. No hearing was scheduled. Acting entirely on his own initiative, Master Clemmons recharacterized my Objection as a premature Motion for Reconsideration and denied it, without engaging the substance of the objection and without affording me any opportunity to respond to his characterization of it.

The result is that Respondent's counsel was relieved of the obligation to oppose my filing at all, while my objection to the draft order's terms was disposed of through a procedural label rather than on its merits, and before the order those terms appear in was ever signed or entered.

This Court is respectfully asked to consider this sequence as further grounds for the relief requested in the pending Renewed Emergency Petition. The process at the trial court level has not afforded Appellant a meaningful opportunity to be heard on the terms of the proposed order, and no entered order yet exists from which the time to post security has formally begun to run. There was a typo listed using the name Mitchel as in reference to Mr. Mark A. Nappier. This is to correct that.

Respectfully submitted,

Cedric Javus Browne, Appellant Pro Se
633 Notting Hill Court
Conway, SC 29526
(843) 796-8386
plainjane9955@gmail.com