

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM ORANGEBURG COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Diane Shafer Goodstein, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2014-001683

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Respondent,

v.

Dorothy Sistrunk, Appellant.

**CORRECTION OF A MAJOR & SIGNIFICANT
TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR IN THE APPELLANT DOES NOT OBJECT
TO WELLS FARGO'S MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO FEBRUARY 2, 2015**

January 8, 2015

Dorothy Sistrunk
423 Bayne Street
Orangeburg, South Carolina 29115
(803) 268-0716

Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, LLP

Michael Anzelmo
SC Bar No. 72933
1320 Main Street / 17th Floor
Post Office Box 11070 (29211-1070)
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 799-2000

Elizabeth Scott Moise
SC Bar No. 012945
151 Meeting Street / Sixth Floor
Post Office Box 1806 (29402-1806)
Charleston, SC 29401 -2239
(803)853-5200

RECEIVED
JAN 09 2015
SC Court of Appeals

Comes now the Appellant, Dorothy Sistrunk, to file her correction to a major and significant typographical error on page 12, paragraph (e), sentence #1, in her reasons for not objecting to Wells Fargo's Motion to Extend Time to February 2, 2015, i.e., Wells Fargo Bank, N. A., Respondent v. Dorothy Sistrunk, Appellant - Case 2014-001683.

REASONS WHY THE TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR ON PAGE 12, IN PARAGRAPH (e), IS SIGNIFICANT & MAJOR AND MUST BE CORRECTED

1. **Reason #1:** The correct words are vitally important to sentence structure and meaning. On page 12, paragraph (e) is a significant and major typographical error in the Appellant's;

THE APPELLANT DOES NOT OBJECT TO WELLS FARGO'S MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO FEBRUARY 2, 2015

2. Even though the "Brief" was proof read numerous times, the Appellant's initial proof reading only concerned itself with misspelled words, sentence structure and sentence length... and not missing words. When the brief was reviewed on January 7, 2015, four (4) errors were found, but only one (1) is significant and major.

3. **Reason #2:** The word [not] is extremely important to the truth of the statement made in a **Verified Pleading** on page 12, in paragraph (e). Janet Frotscher could not and did not witness the Appellant show any invoices to the Appraiser - Jim H. Austin, III as she states in her June 2, 2008, letter on page #1, in paragraph #4 or the last paragraph. *{See the Last Paragraph in the Attached WF00125; Also Marked as Exhibit 47}*

4. **Reason #3:** Even though the following document is a Forgery by Name Substitution, Document & Appraisal Fraud, WF00016, because the Appellant was not the property owner in October of 2007; this document and the three (3) others from Wells Fargo's files, will illustrate why the missing word [not] is vitally important to the reading, meaning and understanding of paragraph (e), on page 12, in the recently filed brief.

5. The property owner and borrower on the date and time in question is [**Jacobs**].

{See Wells Fargo's Attached Exhibits WF00016, WF00022 & WF00027}

6. The document to which she (Janet Frotscher) is referring is the Satisfaction Completion Certificate that is dated September 14, 2007. *{See WF00022}* As you can see from her (Janet Frotscher's) letter, she is making a statement that the Appellant - Dorothy Sistrunk, was the borrower showing invoices to the Appraiser - Jim H. Austin, III that is not true. The 7-59 file and internal order number identifies the **borrower as Jacobs**.

7. **Reason #4:** Janet Frotscher's statement is not only patently false, it is also a false accusation. *{Review WF00125}* The Appellant has never met Jim H. Austin, III or David Terrell - the so-called - Broker or any authorized representative from Golden Gate Mortgage and/or Golden Gate Mortgage, Inc., to whom she refers.....at no time...period.

8. **Reason #5:** Wells Fargo's mortgage loan was brokered by Thomas **Jacobs** and according to SCDC, he was not employed by Golden Gate Mortgage or Golden Gate Mortgage, Inc., as a loan originator or broker in 2007. The Appellant was no way near 423 Bayne Street and did not even know such an address existed on September 14, 2007. This is why Janet Frotscher could not, nor anyone else could have possibly witnessed the Appellant showing any invoices to the Appraiser - Jim H. Austin, III. *{Review WF00022}*

9. **Reason #6:** The Satisfaction Completion Certificate, to which she is referring, is also a Document Fraud. No repairs or work was done on any plumbing, electrical systems, seals and no building supplies were ever at 423 Bayne Street because no building permit was ever issued to Thomas **Jacobs** to do any repairs. *{WF00022}* This brings the Appellant back to page 12, paragraph (e), that currently reads as follows:

"The Appellant was not the property owner or borrower in October of 2007 and Janet Frotscher did [] witness the Appellant showing any invoices to Jim H. Austin, III on September 14, 2007. [Boldness and Italics added for emphasis]"

10. **Reason #7:** Page 12's, paragraph (e), should have been written as:

"The Appellant was not the property owner or borrower in October of 2007 and Janet Frotscher did [not] witness the Appellant showing any invoices to Jim H. Austin, III on September 14, 2007. [Boldness added for emphasis]"

By inserting the word [not], the difference and meaning in the sentence can be plainly seen. The above stated are the reasons why this particular typographical error had to be corrected immediately. The remaining errors are minor and do not change the meaning of any sentence. However, if the Court feels corrections are necessary, they will be made.

CONCLUSION & REQUEST

11. The old adage - "To err is human" - obviously was not referring to "Briefs" that must be filed in an Appellate Court where major typographical errors and/or misspelled words are not tolerated. Therefore, included with this "**Correction of a Major & Significant Typographical Error**" is page 12, with the correction already made. Please insert the corrected copy into the Appellant's "Brief" that was mailed on January 6, 2015 and is dated, January 6, 2015. Thank you for your understanding and cooperation.

12. Since allegations are stated with specificity and particularity, this notification of a major and significant typographical error will be verified.

Today's Date: January 8, 2014

Respectfully Submitted;

/s/ Dorothy Sistrunk
Dorothy Sistrunk
423 Bayne Street
Orangeburg, South Carolina 29115
(803) 268-0716

Attorney Michael Anzelmo
1320 Main Street / 17th Floor
Post Office Box 11070 (29211-1070)
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 799-2000

Elizabeth Scott Moise
151 Meeting Street / Sixth Floor
Post Office Box 1806 (29402-1806)
Charleston, SC 29401 -2239
(803)853-5200

NOTARY CERTIFICATION

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, The undersigned, being duly *SWORN*, and under the *PENALTY OF PERJURY* declares the afore stated facts are true and correct as of her own knowledge.

When it comes to matters stated therein that are based upon information and/or belief; as to those matters, she believes them to be true. Accordingly, based on the stated facts, has signed and sealed these attestations this 8 day of January in the year 2015 in City and County of Orangeburg, in the State of South Carolina.

Appellant's Signature: Dorothy Sistrunk

Notary's Signature as Witness (1): Linda Stuebe

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:


**STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF ORANGEBURG**

On Jan 8, 2015 before me appeared Dorothy Sistrunk

and proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that she executed the same in her authorized capacity, and that by her signature on this Verified Pleading (Corrections of a Major & Significant Typographical Error in the Appellant Does Not Object to Wells Fargo's Motion to Extend Time to February 2, 2015) presents this document to the Appellate Court. WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary's Signature Linda Stuebe

Commission Expires MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
APRIL 13TH, 2015



Jim H. Austin, III's \$75,000.00 property value is a Fabrication, just like the 423 Bayne Street on his Appraisals. Jim H. Austin, III, engaged in Document Fraud, Appraisal Fraud and Forgery by Name Substitution. Wells Fargo paid Thomas Jacobs \$75,000.00 for a property that does not exist.

(e) The Appellant was not the property owner or borrower in October of 2007 and Janet Frotscher did not witness the Appellant showing any invoices to Jim H. Austin, III on September 14, 2007. Janet Frotscher engaged in False Accusations and concealed facts and material facts after all the facts were known. As early as January 14, 2008, Janet Frotscher knew Thomas Jacobs brokered loan 0174072777, the appraisals were falsified, Golden Gate Mortgage did not broker any loan at any time and 423 Bayne Street was built before 1950 that necessitated compliance with 24 CFR Part 35 - Subpart A - § 35.96(a)-(f).

(f) Stephanie Hammond was not in the Appellant's presence on December 21, 2007, therefore, she could not have witnessed the Appellant execute any documents for Wells Fargo. Attorney Debra C. Galloway engaged in Document Fraud and Notary Fraud along with Stephanie Hammond.

(g) Wells Fargo's employees used an Unauthorized Credit Report and engaged in Forgery in order to approve a \$75,000.00 payoff to Thomas Jacobs based on fraudulent documents and a non-existing property. The Player Law Firm was paid \$1,750.50 for Notary Fraud and Document Fraud. It is important to remember, the Appellant went to the Player Law Firm, that was located at 1415 Broad River Road to cancel any agreement, contract or loan for \$75,000.00 and has been actively engaged in ending this **Mortgage Fraud** and exposing this **Conspiracy to Defraud** since December 22, 2007.

Uniform Residential Appraisal Report

File # 7-59

The purpose of this summary appraisal report is to provide the lender/client with an accurate, and adequately supported opinion of the market value of the subject property

Property Address: 423 Bayne Street City: Orangeburg State: SC Zip Code: 29115
 Borrower: Jacobs Owner of Public Record: Sistrunk County: Orangeburg
 Legal Description: Lot/Block 5100280302
 Assessor's Parcel #: 0173-19-006 00 Tax Year: 2006 R.E. Taxes: \$ Unknown
 Neighborhood Name: Orangeburg Map Reference: 0173-19-006.00 Census Tract: 106
 Occupant: Owner Tenant Vacant Special Assessments: \$ NA PUD HOA \$ per year per month
 Property Rights Appraised: Fee Simple Leasehold Other (describe)
 Assignment Type: Purchase Transaction Refinance Transaction Other (describe)
 Lender/Clerk: Golden Gate Mortgage Address: NA
 Is the subject property currently offered for sale or has it been offered for sale at the twelve months prior to the effective date of this appraisal? Yes No
 Report data source(s) used, offering price(s), and date(s). The subject has not been offered for sale in the previous 12 months per the CMLS. It was sold at a foreclosure sale and under contract.
 I did did not analyze the contract for sale for the subject purchase transaction. Explain the results of the analysis of the contract for sale or why the analysis was not performed. The appraiser was not provided a copy of the contract. Information pertaining the sale was obtained from the seller.
 Contract Price: \$ 75,000 Date of Contract: 10-07-07 Is the property seller the owner of public record? Yes No Data Source(s): Public Records
 Is there any financial assistance (loan charges, sale concessions, gift or downpayment assistance, etc.) to be paid by any party on behalf of the borrower? Yes No
 If Yes, report the total dollar amount and describe the terms to be paid. The subject is a foreclosed sale. The appraiser was unable to identify the sellers as the owner of public record. This is typical in foreclosed sales, as counties do not update their files on a daily basis.
 Note: Race and the racial composition of the neighborhood are not appraisal factors.
 Neighborhood Characteristics:

Location	Property Values	PRICE (\$000)	AGE (yrs)	Present Land Use %
Urban <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Suburban <input type="checkbox"/> Rural <input type="checkbox"/>	Increasing <input type="checkbox"/> Stable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Declining <input type="checkbox"/>			One-Unit 40 %
Build-Up <input type="checkbox"/> Over 75% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 25-75% <input type="checkbox"/> Under 25% <input type="checkbox"/>	Demand/Supply <input type="checkbox"/> Shortage <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In Balance <input type="checkbox"/> Over Supply <input type="checkbox"/>			2-4 Unit 5 %
Growth <input type="checkbox"/> Rapid <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stable <input type="checkbox"/> Slow <input type="checkbox"/>	Marketing Time <input type="checkbox"/> Under 3 mths <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3-6 mths <input type="checkbox"/> Over 6 mths <input type="checkbox"/>			Multi-Family %
Neighborhood Boundaries: The subject is located in Orangeburg bound by Hwy 301, Hwy 601, & Joe Jefferson Hwy		150+ High 50+ Pred.	65+ 20+	Commercial 15 % Other 40 %

 Neighborhood Description: The subject area is within reasonable proximity to employment centers, shopping, houses of worship, and schools. The subject has access to all required amenities, recreational facilities, and all public services. The area is comprised primarily of single family dwellings of varying age, size, design and quality. There are some 2-4 family units as well as commercial buildings in the subjects market area.
 Market Conditions (including support for the above conclusions): The trend for the subject market is stable with appreciation likely under normal marketing conditions. The estimated marketing time for the subject area is 3 months to one year. Supply and demand appear to be in balance, with ample funds and financing packages available. It is not uncommon for the seller to pay part or all of the buyers closing costs.
 Dimensions: 37 Acre Area: 37 Acre Shape: Mostly Rectangular View: Average
 Specific Zoning Classification: A-3 Zoning Description: General Residential District
 Zoning Compliance: Legal Legal Nonconforming (Grandfathered Use) No Zoning Illegal (describe)
 Is the highest and best use of subject property as improved (or as proposed per plans and specifications) the present use? Yes No If No, describe
 Utilities:

Electricity	Water	Off-site Improvements - Type	Public	Private
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe)	Street Asphalt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Gas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sanitary Sewer <input type="checkbox"/>	Alley None <input type="checkbox"/>		

 FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area: Yes No FEMA Flood Zone: X FEMA Map #: 4501640002 B FEMA Map Date: 7-16-80
 Are the utilities and off-site improvements typical for the market area? Yes No If No, describe
 Are there any adverse site conditions or external factors (easements, encroachments, environmental conditions, land uses, etc.)? Yes No If Yes, describe
 No apparent easements, encroachments, or other adverse conditions noted. Subject does not appear to be in a special flood zone, but the appraiser cannot certify the same.
 General Description:

Units	Foundation	Exterior Description - materials/condition	Interior - materials/condition
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One <input type="checkbox"/> One with Accessory Unit	Concrete Slab <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Crawl Space <input type="checkbox"/>	Foundation Walls: Masonry Pier/Avg	Floors: Carpet/Tile-Average
# of Stories: Two	Full Basement <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Basement <input type="checkbox"/>	Exterior Walls: Siding/Avg	Walls: Drywall-Average
Type: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Det. <input type="checkbox"/> Att. <input type="checkbox"/> S-Det./End Unit	Basement Area: NA sq.ft.	Roof Surface: Comp Shingles/Avg	Trim/Finish: Wood-Average
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed <input type="checkbox"/> Under Const.	Basement Finish: NA %	Gutters & Downspouts: None	Bath Floor: Tile-Average
Design (Style): Traditional	Outside Entry/Exit <input type="checkbox"/> Sump Pump <input type="checkbox"/>	Window Type: Insulated/Avg	Bath Wainscot: Fiberglass-Average
Year Built: 1950	Evidence of <input type="checkbox"/> Infestation: NA	Storm Sash/insulated: None	Car Storage: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None
Effective Age (Yrs): 10	Dampness <input type="checkbox"/> Settlement <input type="checkbox"/>	Screens: Yes	Driveway: # of Cars: Multiple
Attic: <input type="checkbox"/> None	Heating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FWA <input type="checkbox"/> HWBB <input type="checkbox"/> Radiant	Amenities: <input type="checkbox"/> Woodstove(s) #	Driveway Surface: Paved
<input type="checkbox"/> Drop Stair <input type="checkbox"/> Stairs	Other: <input type="checkbox"/> Fuel Gas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fireplace(s) # 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fence Chain Link <input type="checkbox"/>	Garage: # of Cars
<input type="checkbox"/> Floor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scuttle	Cooling: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Central Air Conditioning	Patio/Deck <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Porch Stoop <input type="checkbox"/>	Carport: # of Cars
<input type="checkbox"/> Finished <input type="checkbox"/> Heated	Individual <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>	Pool <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>	Att. <input type="checkbox"/> Det. <input type="checkbox"/> Built-in

 Appliances: Refrigerator Range/Oven Dishwasher Disposal Microwave Washer/Dryer Other (describe)
 Finished area above grade contains: 9 Rooms 5 Bedrooms 2/2 Bath(s) 2,882 Square Feet of Gross Living Area Above Grade
 Additional features (special energy efficient items, etc.): ceiling fans, security system, fresh paint, new floor coverings, new bathroom fixtures, and new kitchen appliances
 Describe the condition of the property (including needed repairs, deterioration, renovations, remodeling, etc.): The subject property is in overall average physical condition. No items of deferred maintenance were noted at the time of analysis. Quality of construction appears to be average, and commensurate with homes similar in size and price range in the local market.
 Are there any physical deficiencies or adverse conditions that affect the livability, soundness, or structural integrity of the property? Yes No If Yes, describe
 There were no apparent adverse conditions that affect the livability, soundness, or structural integrity of the subject property at the time of analysis. No environmental impact analysis was performed.
 Does the property generally conform to the neighborhood (functional utility, style, condition, use, construction, etc.)? Yes No If No, describe
 The subject property is similar in style, condition, quality of construction and functional utility as other houses in the general area

See Exhibit 10

See Exhibit 10

See Exhibit 10

ATTEST: TRUE COPY
Winnifia B. Clark
CLERK OF COURT
ORANGEBURG COUNTY, SC

Freddie
Mac

Satisfactory Completion Certificate

Freddie Mac loan number

On September 14 the property situated at 423 Bayne Street, Orangeburg, SC, 29115

was appraised by me or Jim H Austin III

The Appraisal report was subject to: satisfactory completion, repairs, or

I certify that I have reinspected subject property, the requirements or conditions set forth in the appraisal report have been met, and any required repairs or completion items have been done in a workmanlike manner

Itemized below are substantial changes from the data in the appraisal report, and these changes do not adversely affect any property ratings or final estimate of value in the report.

The appraiser visited the above property today to inspect what repairs have been completed. Upon inspection the appraiser noted that the materials for interior walls and floors were on site. The borrower submitted to the appraiser invoices for the plumbing, electrical, and work that had been performed on the seats. It appears that these have been updated, however the appraiser is not an engineer and can not certify same.

See Exh. b-7 9

Date
9-14-07

Inspector
Jim H Austin III

ATTEST: TRUE COPY
Winnifia B. Clark
CLERK OF COURT
ORANGEBURG COUNTY, SC



Wells Fargo Home Mortgage
 MAC X2401-06N
 1 Home Campus
 Des Moines, IA 50328

June 2, 2008

OCC Case# 785593

Dorothy Sistrunk
 423 Bayne Street
 Orangeburg, SC 29115

SCDCA Complaint #08-0237-B2

Dear Dorothy Sistrunk:

RE: Office of the Comptroller of Currency ("OCC") Case Number 785593
 Wells Fargo Home Mortgage ("WFHM"), a Division of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.
 Loan Number 708-0174072777

This letter is in response to your complaint filed with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency ("OCC") on May 19, 2008. The OCC has asked Wells Fargo Home Mortgage to research and address your issues.

This response is to address your concerns as summarized below:

1. Remove negative reporting on your Credit Report.
2. Requesting the resolution to be one of the following:
 - a. WFHM to advance \$48,175.00 to repair your home and/or deduct the cost of repairs and reduce mortgage to \$26,825.00.
 - b. WFHM to suspend mortgage payments until this matter is settled to your satisfaction.
 - c. WFHM to pay the mortgage in full and sue the seller, Thomas Jacobs, your broker, GoldenGate Mortgage, the appraiser, Jim H. Austin III, and the settlement agent, The Player Law Firm, LLC, to recover the funds.

Upon receipt of your correspondence, Wells Fargo Home Mortgage has thoroughly reviewed the circumstances of your situation. It is distressing to hear of the problems you encountered, however, we must advise you that we stand by the copies enclosed of our responses dated February 21, 2008 and April 10, 2008.

Your loan application was submitted by your broker, Golden Gate Mortgage, to be processed on December 4, 2007 for a 30 year fixed rate mortgage in the loan amount of \$75,000.00 with the interest rate of 7.125%. We relied on the information supplied by your mortgage broker in approving your loan. For example, enclosed is a copy of the Satisfactory Completion Certificate dated September 14, 2007 stating you submitted to the appraiser invoices for the plumbing, electrical and work that had been performed on the seals. The appraiser indicated the work covered by the invoices appear to have been completed. A copy of the final Appraisal ordered by your broker, Golden Gate Mortgage, and processed by Jim H. Austin III dated October 8, 2007 is enclosed, stating there were no apparent adverse conditions that affect the livability, soundness or structural integrity of the subject property at the time of analysis.

ATTEST: TRUE COPY
W. J. Clark
 CLERK OF COURT
 GREENSBORO COUNTY, SC

WF00125

Exhibit 47

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM ORANGEBURG COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Diane Shafer Goodstein, Circuit Court Judge

2014-001683

RECEIVED

JAN 09 2015

SC Court of Appeals

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.,

Respondent,

v.

Dorothy Sistrunk,

Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served a copy of page 12, to my reasons for not objecting to Wells Fargo's Motion to Extend Time to February 2, 2015 on Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., to correct a significant and major typographical error by depositing a copy of the corrected page 12, in the United States Postal Service, postage prepaid, on January 8, 2015, addressed to Wells Fargo's attorney/s of record that are listed below. My Response was mailed on January 6, 2014. The significant and major typographical error was discovered on January 7, 2015.

Today's Date: January 8, 2014

/s/ Dorothy Sistrunk
Dorothy Sistrunk
423 Bayne Street
Orangeburg, South Carolina 29115
(803) 268-0716

Attorney Michael Anzelmo
1320 Main Street / 17th Floor
Post Office Box 11070 (29211-1070)
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 799-2000

Elizabeth Scott Moise
151 Meeting Street / Sixth Floor
Post Office Box 1806 (29402-1806)
Charleston, SC 29401 -2239
(803)853-5200

January 8, 2015

**NOTIFICATION OF A SIGNIFICANT
AND MAJOR TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR**

The Honorable Jenny Abbot Kitchings and the Honorable V. Claire Allen
Clerk of Court & Deputy Clerk of Court; Respectively,
South Carolina Court of Appeals
POB 11629
Columbia, SC 29211

RECEIVED
JAN 09 2015
SC Court of Appeals

RE: Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Dorothy Sistrunk
Civil Action Case #2008-CP-38-1024
Appellate Case #2014-001683

Ms. Kitchings and/or Ms. V. Claire Allen,

I am new at this so...please advise me of errors and/or any incorrect protocol. I am notifying the Clerk of Clerk and the Deputy Clerk of Court of a significant and major typographical error in my "**Appellant Does Not Object to Wells Fargo's Motion to Extend Time to February 2, 2015**" brief that was mailed on January 6, 2015. The word **[not]** is an important word because it will change the entire meaning of a sentence.

For example: John did **[not]** steal the motorcycle. (now remove the word **[not]**).
John did [] steal the motorcycle.

The exact and same error occurred in my brief on page 12, paragraph (e), sentence #1, that currently reads as follows; "***The Appellant was not the property owner or borrower in October of 2007 and Janet Frotscher did [] witness the Appellant showing any invoices to Jim H. Austin, III on September 14, 2007.***

The sentence must read as follows; otherwise, the statement is not true. "**The Appellant was not the property owner or borrower in October of 2007 and Janet Frotscher did [not] witness the Appellant showing any invoices to Jim H. Austin, III on September 14, 2007.**"

MY SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM

In order to correct this error, and pursuant to *Rule 240(e)*, *SCACR*, my solution is this: I am enclosing an original and (6) copies to replace the page on which the major and significant error occurred. I am also serving a copy of the corrected page on all parties listed below postage prepaid with "Proof of Service".

WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION IN THE EVENT MY SOLUTION IS UNACCEPTABLE?

In the event my proposed method of correcting the typo error is unacceptable, please tell me what to do or what can be done according to the Appellate Court's Internal Operating Procedures. My husband researched the matter and came up with the following:

1. New York's Appellate Court only addresses misspelled words and accepts replacement briefs.


See: <http://www.nycourts.gov/courts/ad4/Clerk/FAQ-appeals.html#tpa8>

2. The Supreme Court of Alaska's Order No. 1597, addresses typographical errors on page 2, in paragraph (D).

See: <http://www.courts.alaska.gov/sco/sco1597.pdf>

3. *Rule 211(b)(2)*, *SCACR* states the following in pertinent parts; "The party may correct obvious typographical errors and misspellings which were contained in the initial brief. No other changes may be made." This rule only addresses the "Initial Brief".

Any guidance the Clerk of Court and/or the Deputy Clerk of Court can give relative to this matter of a significant and major typographical error will be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

/s/ 
Dorothy Sistrunk

CC:

Michael Anzelmo
SC Bar No. 72933
1320 Main Street / 17th Floor
Post Office Box 11070 (29211-1070)
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 799-2000

Elizabeth Scott Moise
SC Bar No. 012945
151 Meeting Street / Sixth Floor
Post Office Box 1806 (29402-1806)
Charleston, SC 29401-2239
(803) 853-5200

Dorothy Strunk
122 Bayne Street
Orangeburg, SC 29115



UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE



U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
DENMARK SC
29042
JAN 08, 2015
AMOUNT

\$5.75
00017286-02

1024

29201

PRIORITY MAIL


TRACKED INSURED

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

For Domestic Use Only Label 107R, July 2013



USPS TRACKING #



9114 9999 4431 3331 4927 63

LAB400R Aug 2013
7690-17-000-0669

RECEIVED

JAN 09 2015

SC COURT OF APPEALS

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk of Court
South Carolina Court of Appeals
1015 Sumter Street-5th Floor
Columbia, SC 29205