

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Richard Bowman, Appellant,

v.

Cosima MacLean, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2026-001128
Lower Court Case No. 2024-CP-07-01039

RECEIVED

Sep 28 2026

SC Court of Appeals

**APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT'S REPLY
REGARDING TRANSCRIPT DEFICIENCY**

Appellant Richard Bowman, proceeding pro se, respectfully submits this limited Supplemental Response to Respondent's September 21, 2026 Reply. Appellant does not seek to repeat the arguments contained in his previously filed Return. This submission is intended to clarify the chronology concerning the transcripts and to address Respondent's assertion that Appellant failed to provide documentation concerning his efforts to obtain the missing transcript.

1. Appellant Was Attempting to Resolve the Transcript Problem Before Respondent Filed the Motion to Dismiss

Respondent's Reply states that Appellant contacted the transcript office only after the Court's August 24, 2026 correspondence and emphasizes that Appellant did not provide that correspondence to the Court or Respondent. Respondent further argues that Appellant requested relief concerning the February 4 transcript only after Respondent filed the Motion to Dismiss.

These are two different issues that should not be conflated.

After receiving the Court's August 24, 2026 correspondence indicating that the transcript should have been delivered, Appellant advised the Court that he had not received the transcript. Appellant also contacted the Office of Court Administration/Transcript Office concerning the missing transcript.

At that time, Appellant was attempting to locate the transcript that he reasonably understood had already been requested while he was represented by counsel. Appellant did not yet know that former counsel's transcript request covered only the April 1, 2026 proceeding and omitted the February 4, 2026 proceeding.

Accordingly, Appellant's pre-Motion communications concerning the missing transcript demonstrate that he was attempting to determine its status before Respondent filed the Motion

to Dismiss.

2. Appellant Did Not Learn of the February 4 Omission Until Respondent's Motion Identified It

Respondent correctly observes that Appellant's request to cure the February 4 transcript deficiency followed Respondent's Motion to Dismiss. However, the reason for that sequence is material.

The transcript requests were submitted while Appellant was represented by counsel. The May 15 and May 22, 2026 requests identified April 1, 2026 as the proceeding to be transcribed. Appellant did not prepare those requests and was unaware that February 4 had been omitted.

Upon learning of the omission through Respondent's September 16, 2026 Motion, Appellant immediately contacted former counsel. Former counsel subsequently confirmed in writing: **"I only made one transcript request."**

Thus, Appellant did not wait until Respondent's Motion to address a deficiency of which he was already aware. Rather, Respondent's Motion disclosed the February 4 omission to Appellant, and Appellant promptly investigated it after learning of it.

3. The April 1 Transcript Had Already Been Requested

Respondent's Reply acknowledges that the April 1 transcript was requested but had not been delivered to Appellant.

Respondent suggests that "one possible explanation" for the lack of delivery is that Appellant never agreed in writing with the court reporter to pay for it.

Appellant respectfully notes that this is identified by Respondent as a possible explanation, not an established fact concerning what occurred between former counsel, Court Administration, and the assigned court reporter while Appellant remained represented.

The May 22 transcript notification reflects that a transcript request was submitted on Appellant's behalf for the April 1 proceeding. Appellant has consistently represented to this Court that he has never received that transcript.

Appellant is willing and prepared to make any payment arrangement required for preparation and delivery of the transcripts.

4. Appellant's Communications Regarding the Missing Transcript Can Be Provided to the Court

Respondent specifically states that Appellant had not provided the Court with the correspondence concerning his contact with the transcript office.

Appellant respectfully provides that correspondence to supplement the record and to document that he was attempting to determine the status of the missing transcript before learning that February 4 had never been included in former counsel's transcript request.

Appellant's purpose in providing this documentation is not to excuse compliance with Rule 207, SCACR, but to give the Court a complete chronology when determining whether dismissal is warranted.

5. Appellant Has Not Abandoned This Appeal

The record reflects continuing efforts by Appellant to prosecute this appeal.

After the Court's August 24 correspondence, Appellant responded in writing, advised that he had not received the transcript, and sought additional time while attempting to obtain the materials necessary to proceed. Appellant subsequently contacted the transcript office concerning the missing transcript.

After Respondent's September 16 Motion disclosed that February 4 had not been requested, Appellant contacted former counsel that same day and obtained confirmation concerning the scope of the original transcript request. Appellant then disclosed the deficiency to this Court rather than attempting to proceed on an incomplete record.

Appellant has expressly represented that he is willing and prepared to pay the required costs for both transcripts and to comply with the Court's directions concerning their preparation.

These circumstances demonstrate an effort to cure the transcript problem and continue the appeal, rather than abandonment of appellate review.

6. Respondent's September 21 Proof of Service Reflects an Incorrect/Former Email Address

Appellant also respectfully brings to the Court's attention an additional communication issue relevant to the chronology.

Respondent's September 21, 2026 Proof of Service states that its Reply was served electronically upon Appellant at **Rbfamily@protonmail.com**.

Appellant's current email address for purposes of this appeal is **Anwalthelfen@pm.me**.

Appellant respectfully requests that the Court's records reflect his current email address and that future electronic correspondence and service be directed to that address.

Appellant raises this matter solely to ensure reliable receipt of future filings and Court communications and not to attribute any improper motive to Respondent or counsel.

CONCLUSION AND REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Appellant respectfully requests that the Court consider the complete chronology surrounding the transcript issue.

The April 1 transcript was requested while Appellant was represented by counsel. Appellant subsequently attempted to determine why that transcript had not been received. Appellant did not know that the February 4 proceeding had been omitted from former counsel's request until Respondent's Motion to Dismiss disclosed the omission. Upon learning of it, Appellant immediately investigated the matter, obtained confirmation from former counsel that only one transcript request had been made, disclosed the deficiency to this Court, and expressed his willingness to obtain and pay for both transcripts.

Appellant therefore respectfully requests that the Court **deny Respondent's Motion to Dismiss** and permit Appellant a reasonable opportunity to complete the transcript requirements and proceed with this appeal on a complete record.

Appellant further requests such additional relief as the Court deems just and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard Bowman', is written over a horizontal line.

Richard Bowman

Appellant, Pro Se

620 Sea Island Rd. #172

St. Simons Island, GA 31522

Email: Anwalthelfen@pm.me

Date: September 26, 2026

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Richard Bowman, Appellant,
v.

Cosima MacLean, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2026-001128
Lower Court Case No. 2024-CP-07-01039

RECEIVED

Sep 28 2026

SC Court of Appeals

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on September 26, 2026, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Appellant's Supplemental Response to Respondent's Reply Regarding Transcript Deficiency**, together with any accompanying exhibits, upon counsel for Respondent by United States Mail, first-class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

Adam Sinclair Ruffin, Esquire

1320 Main Street, Suite 300
Columbia, SC 29201
Email: adam@ruffinappeals.com

John R.C. Bowen, Esquire

P.O. Drawer 21119
Hilton Head Island, SC 29925
Email: john@laughlinandbowen.com

Respectfully submitted,



Richard Bowman

Appellant, Pro Se
620 Sea Island Rd. #172
St. Simons Island, GA 31522
Email: Anwalthelfen@pm.me

Date: September 26, 2026