

From: [Hurd Kevin, TX-452](#)
To: [Court Of Appeals Filings](#)
Cc: [Kevin H](#)
Subject: Respondent Pro Se Filing: Evan C. Rayfield v. Kevin Hurd / No. 2026-001855
Date: Thursday, October 8, 2026 11:43:39 AM

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

Kevin Hurd

525 Neighborhood rd.
Wellford SC, 29385
kevingreenville@hotmail.com
10/8/2026

VIA EMAIL

ctappfilings@sccourts.org

RECEIVED
Oct 08 2026
SC Court of Appeals

RE: Opposition to Motion to Reinstate Appeal

Case Name: Evan C. Rayfield v. Kevin Hurd

Appellate Case No.: 2026-001855

Lower Court Case No.: 2026CV4210500596/2026CP4202464

Dear Clerk of Court and Honorable Judges of the Court of Appeals:

I am the Respondent in the above-referenced matter. I am writing to formally object to the Appellant's request to reinstate their eviction appeal, which was previously dismissed by this Court Rule.

The Court should deny the Appellant's motion to reopen this case for the following reasons:

1. **Lack of Good Cause Shown:** Under Rule 260(a) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR), a dismissed case shall not be reinstated except by leave of the court upon a showing of good cause. The Appellant has failed to present any legally sufficient or justifiable reason for their procedural default, failure to prosecute, or failure to meet this Court's strict deadlines.
2. **Severe Financial Harm and Accrued Arrears:** This is an eviction matter regarding the possession of real property. The Appellant is currently in rental arrears totaling over \$9,000. Reopening a meritless appeal forces me to absorb financial loss without any security or timeline for resolution.
3. **Ample Time to Prepare for Removal:** The Appellant has had approximately 6 months to make alternative housing arrangements and prepare for removal from

the premises. Any claim of sudden hardship or surprise is negated by the half-year window they have had during these proceedings.

4. **Prejudice to the Respondent and Judicial Efficiency:** Prolonging this dismissed matter harms my rights as the property owner. The ongoing delay prevents me from managing, utilizing, or safely re-leasing the property. Reopening this case would reward procedural neglect at my direct financial expense.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the South Carolina Court of Appeals deny the Appellant's motion to reopen or reinstate the appeal and allow the prior dismissal to stand.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Kevin Hurd

Respondent, Pro Se

CONFIDENTIAL