

SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Sheena Paige, Appellant

v.

Annette Lane c/o Stanley Williams, Respondent

Court of Appeals No. 2026-000694

Circuit Court No. 2018-CP-36-00403

Magistrate Court No. 2018-CV-36-10100392

**RECEIVED**

**Oct 23 2026**

**SC Court of Appeals**

**PROPOSED APPELLANT'S INITIAL BRIEF**

**Statement of Issues on Appeal**

- I. Whether the magistrate court had subject-matter jurisdiction to enter an eviction judgment when Appellant asserted an undivided ownership interest and disputed the nature of the possessory claim.
- II. Whether the magistrate court erred by declining to receive material evidence offered concerning Appellant's ownership claim.
- III. Whether the circuit court erred in failing to resolve the jurisdictional challenge presented on appeal.

**Statement of the Case**

This matter arose from a Newberry County magistrate eviction proceeding, no. 2018-CV-36-10100392. The magistrate entered judgment July 16, 2018 ordering Appellant to vacate. Appellant reports that an attorney subsequently submitted a deed in support of reconsideration and that the judgment was maintained in August 2018. Circuit-court proceedings followed under no. 2018-CP-36-00403.

**Standard of Review**

Subject-matter jurisdiction is a legal question reviewed without deference as to the legal issue. Factual determinations and evidentiary rulings may be governed by different standards depending on the nature of the underlying action.

**Argument I — Jurisdiction and Title**

The April 2, 2018 deed appears to convey Danette Williams's undivided right, title, and interest to Appellant. It predates the July 16, 2018 eviction judgment. An undivided interest may create cotenancy rather than exclusive ownership; the deed therefore requires examination alongside the pleadings and other title documents. Appellant contends that the eviction proceeding presented a genuine ownership dispute, rather than a straightforward landlord-tenant relationship. She asks the appellate court to determine whether deciding possession necessarily required the magistrate to determine disputed title beyond the court's statutory jurisdiction. Appellant does not claim that every

assertion of title automatically deprives a magistrate of jurisdiction.

### Argument II — Opportunity to Present Evidence

Appellant recalls informing the magistrate that she possessed supporting documentation and attempting to offer it at the July 16, 2018 hearing. She reports that the magistrate directed her to keep the documentation. She further recalls statements by the magistrate about advice from the county attorney and possible probate or circuit-court proceedings. Appellant asserts that the deed was provided through counsel the following day in connection with reconsideration. Whether exclusion of evidence was preserved, prejudicial, or subsequently cured must be determined from the hearing record, motion, and order.

### Argument III — Circuit Court Review

Appellant contends that she presented the jurisdictional question on appeal and that the circuit court did not substantively resolve it. If the issue was preserved and unresolved, Appellant requests remand for an express determination.

### Conclusion

If the appeal is reinstated, Appellant requests reversal or vacatur of the challenged judgment, or remand for consideration of the magistrate's jurisdiction and material ownership evidence, as supported by the complete record.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Sheena Paige

Sheena Laquel Paige, Pro Se

2008 Charles Street

Newberry, SC 29108

Phone: (803) 269-3037

Fax: (803) 274-5656

Email: peopleplanetandpeace@gmail.com

Date: October 23, 2026

*Paige Sheen*  
10/23/2026

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on Oct. 23. 2026, I served a copy of this document upon the respondent, Annette Lane c/o Stanley Williams, by US postal mail, addressed as follows:

*Delivery Confirmation*

Annette Lane c/o Stanley Williams

11753 U.S. Highway 176

Pomaria, SC 29126

/s/ Sheena Paige Date: Oct. 23. 2026

*Paige Sheen*  
10/23/26

**RECEIVED**

**Oct 23 2026**

**SC Court of Appeals**