

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

RECEIVED
Oct 19 2026
SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA
WORKER'S COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Appellate Case No. 2026-000207

Bernard Bluefort, Deceased,
And Belinda Bluefort, Claimant,

Appellants,

v.

Jimmie's Tree Service, Inc., Employer, and
American Interstate Insurance Company, Carrier,

Respondents.

FINAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Belinda D. Bluefort
3105 Nesmith Road
Nesmith, South Carolina, 29580
(843) 401-9437
Appellant Unrepresented by Attorney

Belinda Bluefort

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	i-iii
Statement of Issues on Appeal	1
Statement of the Case	1-9
Statement of the Facts	10
Standard of Review	6-8

Arguments

1.THE COMMISSIONER T. SCOTT BECK ERRED BY FINDING THIS CLAIM BARRED BY THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON FALSE PRETENSES.

2.COMMISSIONER T. SCOTT BECK ERRED BY ABUSE OF DISCRETION THROUGHOUT THIS ENTIRE CLAIM.

3.THE COMMISSIONER ERRED BY LEGAL DISCRETION, PROCEDURAL ERROR, REVERSIBLE ERROR/PREJUDICIAL ERROR, OMITTING AND TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE, STATEMENTS, TESTIMONIES, REPORTS, FACTS, FAILING TO ACKNOWLEDGE, AND DISCLOSE THAT EDDIE BLUEFORT HAS ALREADY BEEN COMPENSATED FOR A DEATH CLAIM FOR BERNARD BLUEFORT.

4.THE COMMISSIONER T. SCOTT BECK ERRED BY DUE PROCESS VIOLATION BY REFUSING APPELLANT’S (BELINDA BLUEFORT) RIGHTS TO SUBMIT SUFFICIENT SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE TO SHOW JUST CAUSE THAT THIS IS A COMPENSABLE ACCIDENTAL WRONGFUL DEATH CLAIM WITH INJURIES AND DISFIGUREMENT(S.C. Code Ann § 42-15-20, CODE ANN. §2-15-40, S.C. Code Ann § 41-1-160, S.C. Code Ann § 42-9-290 AND S.C. CODE ANN § 42-1-54).

5.COMMISSIONER SCOTT T. BECK ERRED BY WILLFUL VIOLATION, ABUSE OF DISCRETION, PROCEDURAL ERROR, DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS, REVERSIBLE ERRORS BY REFUSING THE FIRST DEPENDENCY REPORT BY CON-SEALING FACT OF THE REPORT THAT "THE CLAIMANT (EDDIE BLUEFORT)". THEN ORDERING A SECOND DEPENDENCY INVESTIGATION ON FALSE GROUNDS, BY OMITTING "THE CLAIMANT (EDDIE BLUEFORT)" ON THE SECOND REPORT.

6.COMMISSIONER T. SCOTT BECK ERRED BY CONSPIRING WITH ANN V. NOONAN TO USE ABUSE OF POWER TO ORDER A SECOND DEPENDENCY INVESTIGATION. WHICH WAS ORDERED BY AN INSURANCE COMPANY THAT FAILED TO ADMIT THE FACT THAT EDDIE BLUEFORT WAS THE CLAIMANT THAT WAS COMPENSATED FOR A CLAIM FOR BERNARD BLUEFORT.

7.IT IS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE APPELLANTS (BELINDA BLUEFORT), CONCERNS AND UNANSWERED QUESTIONS FROM THE NEGLIGENCE OF THE DEFENDANT AND THE COMMISSIONER IS SUFFICIENT GROUNDS THAT THE APPEAL SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED. DUE TO THE RESPONDENTS FAILURE TO REPORT AN EMPLOYEE'S INJURIES,HOSPITALIZATION, DEATH; THE NEGLIGENCE OF COMMISSIONER BECK, AND THE CONFESSION OF THE RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY ANN NOONAN TESTIMONY IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE THAT SUGGESTS AN UNUSUAL EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCE OCCURRED THAT RESULTED IN THE DEATH OF AN EMPLOYEE WHILE WORKING. WHY? SO, MANY ENTITIES ARE GOING TO THE EXTENT THAT THEY ARE GOING TO CON-SEAL THE TRUTH? WHY DOES THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR

VEHICLES HAVE A SEALED REPORT THAT CANNOT BE RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC BY FIOA?

8.THE TESTIMONY OF THE RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY ANN NOONAN IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THAT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE RESPONDENT WAS IN FACT AWARE OF THE UNFORTUNATE AND EXTRAORDINARY EVENTS THAT TOOK PLACE ON SEPTEMBER 29, 2020. EVEN THEN, THE RESPONDENT WILLFULLY REFUSED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE UNFORTUNATE EVENTS BY FAILING TO REPORT THE EVENTS TO THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES, ENTITIES. WHY IS THERE SO MANY INCONSISTENCIES? WHY OMIT VITAL REPORTS? WHY OVERLOOK EVIDENCE? WHY THE EMPLOYER NEVER REPORT ANY INCIDENTS, LET ALONE ANY ACCIDENTS?

9.COMMISSIONER BECK VIOLATED THE CLAIMANT (BELINDA BLUEFORT) 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS.

10.THE COMMISSIONER AND THE RESPONDENTS' NEGLIGENCE IS GROUNDS FOR THE APPEAL TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE SUPREME COURT.

11.THE COMMISSIONER ERRED BY DENING THIS CLAIM BY THE STATUTE OF LIMITATION, STATING THAT THIS CLAIM IS NOT COMPENSABLE. WHEN HE WILLFULLY OVERLOOKING THAT ANOTHER CLAIMANT EDDIE BLUEFORT WAS ALREADY COMPENSATED, AND FAILED TO PROPERLY INFORM MRS. BLUEFORT THE CLAIMANT.

Belinda Bluefort

Conclusion	14, 15
------------------	--------

STATUTES

Discovery Rule.....	5
Estoppel.....	3
S.C. Code Ann § 15-3-530	9
S.C. Code Ann § 15-3-545	9
S.C. Code Ann § 15-51-10	9
S.C. Code Ann § 15-51-20	9
S.C. Code Ann § 41-1-160 (1976)	5
S.C. Code Ann § 42-1-540 (1962)	9
S.C. Code Ann § 42-9-10	9
S.C. Code Ann § 42-9-20(B).....	9
S.C. Code Ann § 42-9-290	9
S.C. Code Ann § 42-15-20	9
S.C. Code Ann § 42-15-40	9
STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION § 1983 AND THE USE OF STATE LAW	9

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is a denied claim that the Workers Compensation Commissioner erred by denying. This is a compensable accidental wrongful death claim with disfigurement, that has sufficient evidence that suggests injuries, and medical malpractice, that was

denied by the Workers Compensation Commissioner T. Scott Beck. Commissioner Beck erred by legal discretion and procedural error by his denial stating that the claim was not compensable. Commissioner Beck's actions suggest Procedural Error and Due Process Violation by denying the use of the first Dependency Investigation Findings stating that "...It was sloppy". Commissioner Beck's willful neglect and violation of Due Process by failing to properly inform the Appellant Belinda Bluefort that her claim was denied due to Eddie Bluefort the claimant; who was already been compensated years ago for a Worker's Compensation Death claim for Bernard Bluefort by claiming to be the next of kin to Bernard Bluefort. The first Dependency Investigation Findings suggests the facts of the case that (Eddie Bluefort) was the claimant. Commissioner Beck failed his duty to be fair by failing to address the issue of who was the rightful claimant and resolving the conflict by following the proper protocol to address and resolve the conflict. Instead Commissioner Beck disregard the facts by ordering a Second Dependency Investigation that omit the findings that suggest there was a claimant. Satisfied with the omission of the Second Dependency Investigation. Commissioner T. Scott Beck's Procedural Error by failing to acknowledge and inform Belinda Bluefort that her claim was denied on the grounds that another claimant (Eddie Bluefort) was already compensated. Instead, the Commissioner burdening her with the burden of proof. The lack of Professional Ethics can be seen by Commissioner Beck and Ann V. Noonan willful violations, Procedural Errors, Professional Ethics, Legal Ethics, Abuse of Discretions, and the abuse of the Constitutional Rights of Belinda Bluefort. Who is the ONLY and Legal wife/Widow of Bernard Bluefort. Therefore, it is beyond a reasonable doubt that she is the legal Next

Belinda Bluefort

of Kin to Bernard Bluefort. The findings and facts of the First Dependency Investigation along with the Legal Court Records is sufficient evidence to verify that Belinda Bluefort is the rightful and ONLY Claimant.

On September 29, 2020 Bernard Bluefort was at Jimmie's Tree Service in Kingstree, South Carolina, at work performing a work related duty in good health, mental or physical disabilities with no injuries. When an unusual unordinary circumstance, resulted in an accident causing him to be impacted by blunt force trauma. Which resulted in Bernard suffering a heart attack as a result by the injuries sustained. Emergency Medical Service was dispatch to aid him in his distress. The first Emergency Medical Service personnel was not fully equipped with the proper life saving equipment. Therefore, a second Emergency Medical Service vehicle was dispatched. According to Georgetown Fire Department Bernard Bluefort was transported to Tideland's Georgetown Memorial Hospital. Where he was scheduled for a surgery. The doctor allege that he had heart blockages. Therefore, he had to have a heart Catheterization where they went in through his thigh verses going through his wrist which is less invasive and is less stress on his heart which was already weak from the severe serious trauma he sustained.

The EKG from Georgetown's Tideland Memorial Hospital is sufficient evidence to suggest extensive anterior injury patterns. According to the Respondent/Defendant alleges that Bernard Bluefort deceased on September 30, 2020. However, the testimony of that same Attorney Ann V. Noonan, The Georgetown Tideland's Memorial Hospital, and The Georgetown Fire Emergency Medical Service reports is sufficient evidence to support that Bernard Bluefort died the day of the accident. Therefore, it is

beyond a reasonable doubt that the accident occurred on September 29, 2020 which is the same day of the accident and the day he died. Therefore, according to the Fire Department Report and Emergency Medical Service Reports and time stamp it can be suggested that before his Heart Catheterization he had already succumb to his injuries. However, Georgetown Fire Emergency Medical Service along with Georgetown Memorial Hospital reports documented throughout their report that Bernard Bluefort was Asystolic which comes from the root word Asystole. Which means the total absence of electrical and mechanical activity in the heart. Resulting in Flatline on an electrocardiogram (ECG/EKG) and a complete stop of blood flow. Therefore, according to the Georgetown Fire Emergency Service Report, he was deceased when they arrive on the scene that they allege was initially a motor vehicle accident. Georgetown Tideland's Memorial Hospital records that Bernard Bluefort in fact was Asystolic when he arrived to the hospital. The question becomes if Bernard was Asystolic? His lack of vitals and brain activity will support that he in fact was deceased before he was even operated on. Why they did operate on him when he was already what is called in medical term Flatlined? Was it to cover up a gun shot to his thigh? Were they trying to cover up a laceration on his thigh? Therefore, When an unusual or extraordinary circumstance, accident, or event took place, causing Bernard to suffer a heart attack resulting from the severe injuries sustained. Which he later succumb to his injuries. The respondent's willful violations and lack of cooperation made it difficult, nearly impossible for Belinda Bluefort ("Appellant") to file a claim for benefits under the South Carolina Worker's Compensation Act. The Worker's Compensation Commission denied the claim by omitting that the heart attack was a result of the injuries sustained by the

accident that was caused by unusual or extraordinary circumstances or conditions of employment per S.C. Ann 41-1-160. The negligence of the respondent is sufficient evidence that this claim is not barred and that the accident should be properly investigated. The date that the appellant found out that there was an accident and the discovery that the deceased in fact died the day of the accident is sufficient evidence not to bar the statute of limitation in order to properly investigate to rule out foul play, fraud, or a crime.

The defendants denies that the cardiac event was a result of unusual or extraordinary circumstances, or accident and further denies that Belinda Bluefort, claimant's widow, complied with the statute of limitations. The respondents should be barred from using this as a defense here on out. However, according to OSHA, Board of Labor, along with the Workers Compensation Rules and Regulations confirms that the defendant did not comply with the policies and procedures in the event of an employee is injured, accidents, incidents or death on the job report the incident in a timely manner. The negligence of the defendant is evidence to suggest that the defendant failed to cooperate with the claimant's widow is grounds to suggest as sufficient evidence as to why the widow was not able to comply in a timely manner to prevent the statute of limitations from being barred for this claim. The evidence of OSHA's letter suggests that the defendant did not comply with filling any accident, injury, employee hospitalization, illnesses, death, or incidents that happens concerning work related occurrences nor do they have any intentions to ever file any incidents or accidents then, now, or in the future.

Furthermore, are grounds for the claim statute of limitation to be not barred due to it was out of the control of the widow's wife to obtain the assistance needed to initiate the claim at an earlier time. The defendant never notified the claimant's widow that an accident, incident, death, or extraordinary circumstances occurred that resulted in the claimant to be hospitalized. The claimant's widow called Bernard to inquire about wood to give to an individual. When an alleged South Carolina Highway Patrol informed the claimant's widow that she needed to go to the hospital immediately something happened to the claimant. As of October 19, 2026 the defendant still has not filed any accident, incident, hospitalization or death of an employee for September 29, 2020 or September 30, 2020 should be grounds to considered not barring the expired statue of limitation. Which resulted in the claimant's widow filing a Form 52 Request for Hearing on November 29, 2023, over three years after the death of the claimant. However, this was not the first time she filed a Form 52 Request. She also filed a Form 51 Request. After many years of not knowing what happened, what to do, and how to proceed being that the defendant not cooperating and constantly researching the widow found enough evidence to proceed with filing a claim. Claimant's widow asserts that her husband suffered a physical work injury from a accident of unusual, extraordinary circumstances related to his employment which can be confirmed by the evidence from the hospital records suggesting that the claimant sustained injuries before his Heart Catheterization. EMS arrived to the scene and before he arrived to the hospital in the hospital discharge paper reference. (A accident happened while the claimant was at work. The injuries the claimant sustained would suggest that the claimant suffered from blunt force trauma whether it be from a grinder, tree trimmer, tree limbs, trees or

vehicle. The lack there of Neurological activity, dilated pupils, swollen, bruised tongue, absent respiration, absent breathing, absent right and left lung breathing, absent pulse left and right, and EKG showed extensive anterior injury pattern along with a list of other absent vital functions would suggest that the claimant came into direct contact with something with great force that traumatized him, along with extensive anterior injury pattern that is evidence of the condition he was in death. The claimant had to come into direct contact with something with great force to leave such a traumatic injuries in order to justify the injuries sustained. The amount of injury the claimant endured is not justifiable enough to believe without a reasonable doubt that the claimant deviated into the median. If the claimant did not have the visible injuries then it would be possible. The claimant had injuries that does not suggest that he merely deviated into the median. If he deviated Into the median. Then how did he obtain lower broken ribs and bones. CPR would be justified but the bones that were broken in the rib and Lower body would suggest that the bones were broken by something with force. The broken bones suggest that the cause of death was unusual therefore it needs to be investigated. Therefore, she is entitled to benefits as the claimant's surviving spouse only wife and dependent of the claimant.

On April 30, 2024 Commissioner T. Scott Beck use abuse of power by forcing the appellant even after she expressed her concerns to do another dependency investigation without giving a valid reason, as to why he did not use the first dependency investigation, other than it was sloppy. Commissioner Scott Beck erred by omitting and failing to inform Belinda Bluefort("Appellant") of the Claimant that who compensated. Who claimed to be the next of kin was compensated for the death

claim. Which is the reason that he denied this claim. The first dependency investigation listed another claimant's name as receiving benefits. The commissioner omitted several facts of the first dependency investigation and refusing to acknowledge to the Appellant that a claimant was already compensated. Therefore, it is reason the court find the claim not compensable instead of informing Belinda of the true nature as to why he is denying the death claim. The commissioner has knowledge of another claimant being compensated and still order Belinda Bluefort to do another Dependency Investigation with an insurance agent that Ann V. Noonan chose to do the Dependency Investigation. Therefore, ordered Belinda Bluefort who had no choice but cooperate, to do a mandatory mediation, and second dependency investigation with Tutten Insurance Company that omitted the fact that another claimant was compensated. The commissioner's Abuse of Discretion caused an already grieving widow unnecessary stress all while arguing the burden of proof. When arguing the burden of proof and presenting evidence the commissioner denied several motions submit evidence to show just case. The commissioner ignored a verified payment to another claimant, The commissioner improperly excluded matters of public and administrative record. The commissioner sealed the records from the public after denying this claim.

On April 30, 2025 the hearing was reset for a hearing with Commissioner Beck the same day that Ann V. Noonan stated that (the deceased) that he died the day of the accident. This was the first time that the Appellant/Claimant was made aware that the Claimant, that he did in fact died the day of the accident. Therefore, the statute of limitation is not barred. There have been several hearing that has been held throughout the years that Ms. Belinda Bluefort appeared at court in Hartsville, St. George and

Marion. The courts in Marion were closed. The court erred by not cooperating with the claimant. The Court erred by failing to acknowledge to the Appellant that a claimant was compensated. Instead, the court stated on numerous occasions that the claims are not compensable. The court has done a great disservice to the Appellant. According to the State of South Carolina Court of Law that when the court or judge err by in failing to inform the Appellant that a claimant was paid. It questions the integrity and character of the courts. Instead of informing the Appellant that a claimant was paid the courts stringed the Appellant along by scheduling court dates that there was no court in session in hopes that she would not show up. The court in Marion several governmental offices informed us that the Marion Court House has been closed for years since COVID-19. A government building near the Court House referred us to the Marion County Jail where the Appellant waited for hours thinking that she had court. After the Marion Sheriffs checking diligently to assist the Appellant with locating her court date. They informed her that after checking they do not have her listed on their roster and they do not hold Worker's Compensation Courts in their office. When scheduled for court in Hartsville the Appellant waited for hours to have her case her when at the last minute a Representative informed her that her court date has been rescheduled. Commissioner T. Scott Beck prolonged hearings after noticing Belinda Bluefort's persistence he finally proceeding with court dates in 2025.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

Bernard Bluefort was at work performing a work working when an unusual or extraordinary circumstance happened that resulted in an accident. As a result of the

blunt force trauma from the accident Bernard sustained injuries that resulted in him having a Heart Attack. The severe results of the injuries sustained left Bernard with visual physical injuries, unresponsive, with his employer who alleges that he was unaware of any accident or any hospitalization. The Respondent's attorney Ann V. Noonan stated in court in reference to Bernard Bluefort. On April 30, 2025 Ann V. Noonan stated that he died the day of the accident. This statement from Ann V. Noonan is sufficient evidence to suggest that the reports of Emergency Medical Service, Fire Department, and the Tidelands (Georgetown) Memorial Hospital are sufficient evidence to support that Bernard Bluefort in fact died the day of the accident.

Belinda Bluefort contacted OSHA to obtain a copy of the Freedom Of Information Act Reports and records interference to help find out what happened to her husband while he was at work. OSHA wrote a letter informing her that they have no record of any accidents or incidents for Jimmie's Tree Service. The fact stands that an Jimmie's Tree Service Employee was hospitalized that he had knowledge of but OSHA have no record of him reporting any accidents, incidents, hospitalizations, let alone any employee related deaths. The respondent was at the hospital therefore he knew that the employee was hospitalized. Jimmie's Tree Service had knowledge that allegedly Bernard Bluefort died on September 30, 2020. However, OSHA had no record of any of this information. OSHA nor the Labor Board was ever contacted by Jimmie's Tree Service.

Commissioner T. Scott Beck violated Belinda Bluefort's 14th Amendment Rights by denying her of Due Process. H

The South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicle have a sealed accident report from September 29, 2020 Case number: that has been sealed from the public. According to the initial Fire Department Report and the Emergency Medical Service Report a State Trooper was present. After thirty days after the accident. The report was not released. The accident report was sealed.

1. The actions of the Judge would suggest Denial of Due Process and abuse of discretion for using an incomplete investigation instead of using the completed thorough investigation. Therefore, his failure to do so violates the Claimant's right to a fair hearing. The Claimant's Wife was ordered by the Judge to do a Good Faith Dependency Investigation conducted by Tuten Insurance Service. Even though she expressed to the judge her hesitations and discomfort.

2. When she had already completed an investigation with Allied Universal that Judge Scott T. Beck refused to use. "He said that the report was sloppy". The judge allowed Attorney Ann Veatch Noonan to choose who she wanted to conduct the second Good Faith Dependency Investigation with Tuten Insurance Services.

3. The Estoppel actions of the respondents preventing the Claimant's wife to file the necessary claims is grounds to Barr their use of the statute of limitation for their defense. Their failure to notify the Claimant's widow to of a work related accident. The respondents neglect to cooperate with the Claimant's wife by limiting her access to information let alone insurance that she was entitled to.

4. The Claimant's wife's motions to add sufficient evidence to prove her case was denied. The Judge and the respondents argue that the Claimant's wife did not show sufficient evidence to prove that the death claim was compensable. This is a contradiction and abuse of power. How can someone prove their case without being allowed to submit sufficient evidence to prove their case. The procedural Error and imbalance of powers made it impossible for the claimant's wife to show just case.

5. The testimony of Ann Veatch Noonan on January 9, 2025 is sufficient evidence to suggest that as she stated "He died the day of the accident". Why would she state that if there wasn't an accident? The statement of Ann Veatch Noonan, along with Georgetown EMS Report, Tidelands Georgetown Memorial Hospital, 911 telephone calls, State Trooper Reports, and The South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles sealed reports are sufficient evidence to suggest that the Claimant died the day of the accident September 29, 2020.

6. The Good Faith Dependency Investigations both list the Claimant's wife as his next of kin and is proven by court documented records.

7. The negligence of the respondents is reason to not bar the statute of limitation. The death claim is compensable due to the injuries sustained that resulted in the

unfortunate death of the claimant.

8. On April 30, 2025 the judge accused the Claimant's Wife of failing to appear to court hearings. The claimant's wife informed the judge that she never missed a hearing. Ann Veatch Noonan informed the judge that "Mrs. Bluefort was never made aware of those meetings" Therefore, it is sufficient evidence of Ex Parte meeting taking place without the claimant's wife having any knowledge of a meeting.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

ARGUMENTS

- 1.THE COMMISSIONER ERRED BY FINDING THIS CLIAM BARRED BY THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.
- 2.THE COMMISSIONER T. SCOTT BECK ERRED BY FINDING THIS CLIAM BARRED BY THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON FALSE PRETENSES.
- 3.COMMISSIONER T. SCOTT BECK ERRED BY ABUSE OF DISCRETION THROUGHOUT THIS ENTIRE CLAIM.

4.THE COMMISSIONER ERRED BY LEGAL DISCRETION, PROCEDURAL ERROR, REVERSIBLE ERROR/PREJUDICIAL ERROR, OMITTING AND TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE, STATEMENTS, TESTIMONIES, REPORTS, FACTS, FAILING TO ACKNOWLEDGE, AND DISCLOSE THAT EDDIE BLUEFORT HAS ALREADY BEEN COMPENSATED FOR A DEATH CLAIM FOR BERNARD BLUEFORT.

5.THE COMMISSIONER T. SCOTT BECK ERRED BY DUE PROCESS VIOLATION BY REFUSING APPELLANT'S (BELINDA BLUEFORT) RIGHTS TO SUBMIT SUFFICIENT SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE TO SHOW JUST CAUSE THAT THIS IS A COMPENSABLE ACCIDENTAL WRONGFUL DEATH CLAIM WITH INJURIES AND DISFIGUREMENT(S.C. Code Ann § 42-15-20, CODE ANN. §2-15-40, S.C. Code Ann § 41-1-160, S.C. Code Ann § 42-9-290 AND S.C. CODE ANN § 42-1-54).

6.COMMISSIONER SCOTT T. BECK ERRED BY WILLFUL VIOLATION, ABUSE OF DISCRETION, PROCEDURAL ERROR, DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS, REVERSIBLE ERRORS BY REFUSING THE FIRST DEPENDENCY REPORT BY CON-SEALING FACT OF THE REPORT THAT "THE CLAIMANT (EDDIE BLUEFORT)". THEN ORDERING A SECOND DEPENDENCY INVESTIGATION ON FALSE GROUNDS, BY OMITT "THE CLAIMANT (EDDIE BLUEFORT)" ON THE SECOND REPORT.

7.COMMISSIONER T. SCOTT BECK ERRED BY CONSPIRING WITH ANN V. NOONAN TO USE ABUSE OF POWER TO ORDER A SECOND DEPENDENCY INVESTIGATION. WHICH WAS ORDERED BY AN INSURANCE COMPANY THAT FAILED TO ADMIT THE FACT THAT EDDIE BLUEFORT WAS THE CLAIMANT THAT WAS COMPENSATED FOR A CLAIM FOR BERNARD BLUEFORT.

8.IT IS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE APPELLANTS (BELINDA BLUEFORT), CONCERNS AND UNANSWERED QUESTIONS FROM THE NEGLIGENCE OF THE DEFENDANT AND THE COMMISSIONER IS SUFFICIENT GROUNDS THAT THE APPEAL SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED. DUE TO THE RESPONDENTS FAILURE TO REPORT AN EMPLOYEE'S INJURIES,HOSPITALIZATION, DEATH; THE NEGLIGENCE OF COMMISSIONER BECK, AND THE CONFESSION OF THE RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY ANN NOONAN TESTIMONY IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE THAT SUGGESTS AN UNUSUAL EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCE OCCURRED THAT RESULTED IN THE DEATH OF AN EMPLOYEE WHILE WORKING. WHY? SO, MANY ENTITIES ARE GOING TO THE EXTENT THAT THEY ARE GOING TO CON-SEAL THE TRUTH? WHY DOES THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES HAVE A SEALED REPORT THAT CANNOT BE RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC BY FIOA?

9.THE TESTIMONY OF THE RESPONDENT'S ATTORNEY ANN NOONAN IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THAT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE RESPONDENT WAS IN FACT AWARE OF THE UNFORTUNATE AND EXTRAORDINARY EVENTS THAT TOOK PLACE ON SEPTEMBER 29, 2020. EVEN THEN, THE RESPONDENT WILLFULLY REFUSED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE UNFORTUNATE EVENTS BY FAILING TO REPORT THE EVENTS TO THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES, ENTITIES. WHY IS THERE SO MANY INCONSISTENCIES? WHY OMIT VITAL REPORTS? WHY OVERLOOK EVIDENCE?

WHY THE EMPLOYER NEVER REPORT ANY INCIDENTS, LET ALONE ANY ACCIDENTS?

10.COMMISSIONER BECK VIOLATED THE CLAIMANT (BELINDA BLUEFORT) 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS.

11.THE COMMISSIONER AND THE RESPONDENTS' NEGLIGENCE IS GROUNDS FOR THE APPEAL TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE SUPREME COURT.

1.THE COMMISSIONER ERRED BY DENING THIS CLAIM BY THE STATUTE OF LIMITATION, STATING THAT THIS CLAIM IS NOT COMPENSABLE. WHEN HE WILLFULLY OVERLOOKING THAT ANOTHER CLAIMANT EDDIE BLUEFORT WAS ALREADY COMPENSATED, AND FAILED TO PROPERLY INFORM MRS. BLUEFORT THE CLAIMANT.

CONCLUSION

The full unedited hospital, Ems, E 911, Sheriff, South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicle, and The South Carolina Highway Patrol reports and the testimony of Ann Veatch Noonan are sufficient evidence to support the fact of the deceased claimant's injuries suggest that the unfortunate subsequent extraordinary circumstances from the accident resulted in the Cardiac event that where he later succumb to those injuries. The unfortunate subsequent death can be related to his employment due to the claimant was at work, the working hours that the claimant received compensation for on that day. The negligence of the Judge, Respondents, and the Reporting agency. For the reasons stated, this Court should reverse the judgement of the South Carolina's Workers Compensation Commission Court and not bar the statute of limitation. The

Belinda Bluefort

testimony of the respondents attorney is sufficient proof that the claimant's wife was not notified by the respondents until the attorney's confession notify her that a accident happened and that the claimant died the day of the accident. Therefore, the claimant's wife is well within the statute of limitation being that she did not find out from the respondents until January 09, 2020 when the respondents finally admit to her that there was an accident and that in fact the claimant died the day of the accident.