THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED
OCT 23 2026
SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
Case No.: 2025-001237

Victoria Joy Stevens,

Appellant,

v.

Charles Ard,

Respondent.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO PROCEED UNDER PROTEST AND EXPLICIT RESERVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS

Victoria Joy Stevens
4311 Bryant St.
Loris, SC 29569
Appellant

Charles Ard
2621 Simpson Creek Drive
Loris, SC 29569
Rspondent

TO: THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE AND ASSOCIATE JUDGES OF THE S. C. COURT OF APPEALS:

Appellant Victoria Joy Stevens, proceeding *pro se*, hereby submits this formal Notice of Intent to Proceed Under Protest and Explicit Reservation of Constitutional Due Process Rights. In support of this Notice, Appellant respectfully states as follows:

1. **Compelled Participation:** Appellant Victoria Joy Stevens formally notifies this Appellate Panel that she is proceeding with the appellate schedule strictly under compulsion due to this Court's prior orders denying her motions to compel, correct, or verify the record. Appellant's ongoing participation and compliance with the scheduling order are involuntary.
2. **Reservation of Constitutional Rights:** Appellant proceeds strictly under protest, explicitly demanding the preservation and reservation of her rights under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, guaranteeing both substantive and procedural due process.
3. **State Constitutional Violations:** Factually, Article I, Section 3 of the South Carolina Constitution guarantees due process and the equal protection of the laws, while Article I, Section 9 mandates that all state courts shall be public. Appellant explicitly reserves her right to challenge the integrity of the record under these constitutional mandates.
4. **No Waiver of Objections to the Record:** Having filed her appellate brief, Appellant emphasizes that she is not waiving her objections to what she asserts is a fraudulent transcript. Appellant maintains her standing assertions that the record provided by the South Carolina Court of Common Pleas is corrupted, structurally deficient, and inadequate for fair appellate review.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Court recognize this formal Notice and order that:

1. This appeal shall proceed on the current record as transmitted; and
2. Appellant's continued participation in this appellate process shall be deemed under protest, safely preserving all legal objections, constitutional challenges, and arguments against waiver.

Respectfully submitted under protest and with an explicit reservation of all procedural and substantive constitutional due process rights,

Dated this 20th day of October, 2026.

Victoria Joy Stevens

Victoria Joy Stevens, Pro Se Appellant
4311 Bryant Street
Loris, S.C. 29569
(843) 516-1541

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 20th day of October, 2026, a true and correct copy of the foregoing *Notice of Intent to Proceed Under Protest* was served via [specify method, e.g., First-Class U.S. Mail / Electronic Filing System] upon the Respondent and the following interested parties of record:

Charles Ard, Pro Se Respondent
2621 Simpson Creek Drive
Loris, SC 29569

RECEIVED
OCT 23 2026
SC Court of Appeals

CC: The Honorable B. Alex Hyman
1301 2nd Avenue, Suite 3A30
Conway, SC 29256
Kay H. Richardson, Court Reporter
PO Box 282
Aynor, SC 29511
Renee Elvis, Clerk of Court
1301 2nd Avenue
Conway, SC 29256
Jimmy Richardson, Solicitor
1301 2nd Avenue, Suite 1D09
Conway, SC 29256

Victoria Joy Stevens, Pro Se Appellant

Re:

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Victoria Joy Stevens, Appellant,

v.

Charles Ard, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2025-001237

ORDER

On September 9, 2026, Appellant filed a "motion to authorize inspection of audio recordings and to compel transcript correction." In her motion, Appellant moves this court to (1) compel compliance with a subpoena duces tecum signed by the clerk of court to the court reporter; (2) grant explicit written authorization for Appellant or an independent court-certified transcriber to inspect and listen to the recordings for the hearings held on June 9-10, 2025; (3) direct the court reporter to submit the raw audio files to the Chief Judge for Administrative Purposes for an in camera comparative audit against the produced written transcript; and (4) grant Appellant leave to supplement or amend her initial brief thirty days after "the final correction of the trial record." No return was filed. After careful consideration, we deny Appellant's motion. *See* Court Reporter Manual State of South Carolina, South Carolina Court Administration (Updated May 1, 2018) ("Court reporters shall not grant any request to listen to audio recordings or to read steno notes unless the requestor has received written authorization from the presiding judge or, in his/her absence, the chief judge for administrative purposes in that circuit."); *id.* (explaining that upon receipt of a challenge to the accuracy of a transcript, the court reporter will review the record and report the findings in writing to the challenger and "[f]urther review of the record may be permitted by the presiding judge upon written request with good cause shown"). Further, on July 17, 2026, the South Carolina Judicial Branch objected to the subpoena duces tecum issued to the court reporter.

_____ J.

FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

FILED
Oct 14 2026

cc:
Victoria Joy Stevens
Charles Ard

W.J. Stevens
9311 Bryant St.
Loris, SC 29569

CERTIFIED MAIL®

9589 0710 5270 2403 1063 24

COLUMBIA SC 290
COLUMBIA SC 290
21 OCT 2026PM 4 L
21 OCT 2026PM 4 L

South Carolina Court of Appeals
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, S.C.

RECEIVED
OCT 23 2026
29201 SC Court of Appeals

29201-376999