

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

Case No: 2014-002029

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Judge Doyet A. Early, III, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2008-CP-40-6656

John R. Rakowsky, Respondent

v.

Irene Santacroce, Appellant
Estate of Doris Holt, Appellant
Rodney Lail, Appellant

and

James B. Spencer, Appellant, *Pro Se*

**AMENDED RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION
TO DISMISS THE APPEAL FILED ON
FEBRUARY 2, 2015**

Michael G. Sribnick, M.D., J.D., LLC
3 Kenilworth Avenue
Charleston, S.C. 29403
Phone: (843) 789-3504
Fax: (843) 720-8907
Email: michael.g.sribnickmdjdllc@gmail.com

James B. Spencer, *Pro Se*
Box 183
7001 Saint Andrews Rd.
Columbia, SC 29212
(803) 414-0889

RECEIVED
FEB 24 2015
SC Court of Appeals

INTRODUCTION

NOW COMES THE APPELLANTS, Irene Santacroce, Rodney Lail, and the Estate of Doris Holt through the undersigned counsel and James Spencer *Pro Se* who will first submit pertinent facts in opposition to Ms. Ballard's Motion to Dismiss the appeal filed on February 2, 2015 date stamped February 3, 2015, she filed with this Court on February 12, 2015. The appeal is in regards to the Final Order issued by Judge Early on December 23, 2014.

The Factual Background, the General Overview and Discussion of this action is set forth in Appellants Amended Response in Opposition to the Appellees Motion to Dismiss the September 19, 2014, appeal filed contemporaneously with this Amended Motion in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss the February 3, 2015 Appeal.

ARGUMENT AND LEGAL BASIS

Ms. Ballard's motion to dismiss the February 3, 2015 appeal was filed on February 12, 2015 staying the deadline issued to resolve any deficiencies as set forth in the February 10, 2015 correspondence from the Clerk of Court to perfect the appeal. Subsequently, the Orders being appealed by both the represented Appellants and the *Pro Se* Appellant have been filed with the Clerk of Court on February 20, 2015 and served on all parties on that same date. Further, on February 10, 2015, the Clerk of Court notified all parties the multiple notices of Appeal of this case will be

consolidated for consideration. With the consolidation of all Appeal, the fees already submitted cover the filing fee requested of \$100.00. However, in an abundance of caution, the Appellants are submitting simultaneously with this return, another \$100.00. The represented Appellants and *Pro Se* Appellant request that any overages of filing fees be applied to motion fees that may be incurred by the Appellants in the Future.

Response regarding “Sribnick’s Failure to Serve Notice of Appeal”

First, Ms. Ballard raises the issue of her not being served. Her own exhibit H shows she was served a motion for appeal that applied to both the represented and *pro se* party. Furthermore, she has again been served on February 20, 2015, in accordance with the Clerk of Court’s letter of February 10, 2015. Therefore, this issue is moot.

Response regarding “Sribnick’s Failure File with the Circuit Court”

Ms. Ballard raises once again raises an issue of service. In an abundance of caution on February 20, 2015, service was again made to the Circuit Court. This is the second time service has been made. In either event, this basis for dismissal is also moot, as it has now been perfected in any regard.

False Statement in Notice of Appeal

The represented Appellants and the *Pro Se* Appellant all stand by this statement and will present evidence to the court in the formal brief. It is

inappropriate to argue at this point of time, as notice of appeal does not warrant argument in that regard of the issues that will be raised in the appeal.


CONCLUSION

The Court has merged the appeals filed on September 19, 2014 and February 3, 2015. Subsequently, any defect has been addressed in a timely manner.

THEREFORE, since the Appeal filed, September 19, 2014, which was interlocutory was merged by the Court into the Appeal of the Final Order filed on February 3, 2015, any disputes in procedural matters have been perfected and for other reasons stated herein, this Motion to Dismiss, taken in the best light is moot and furthermore is baseless. The Appellants, pray the Appellee's Motion to Dismiss be dismissed forthwith for the reasons stated herein.


This February 24, 2015,

By:



Michael G. Sribnick, M.D., J.D., LLC
3 Kenilworth Avenue
Charleston, S.C. 29403
Phone: (843) 789-3504
Fax: (843) 720-8907
michael.g.sribnickmdjdlc@gmail.com

By:



James B. Spencer, *Pro Se*

Box 183

7001 Saint Andrews Road

Columbia, SC 29212

(803) 414-0889

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on February 24, 2015, the document described below, was(were) served on all parties of record in this case by mailing a copy, by US mail or by courier.

Documents Served: **AMENDED RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS THE APPEAL FILED ON FEBRUARY 2, 2015**

Parties Served:

Desa Ballard, Esquire
Ballard and Watson, Attorneys at Law
PO Box 6338
West Columbia, SC 29171

RECEIVED

FEB 24 2015

SC Court of Appeals

Bruner, Powel, Wall & Mullins, LLC
1735 St. Julian Place, Suite 200
Post Office Box 61110
Columbia, South Carolina 29260-1110

Andrew Lindemann, Esquire
Davidson and Lindemann, PA
PO Box 8568
Columbia, SC 29202



Michael G. Sribnick, M.D., J.D., LLC
3 Kenilworth Avenue
Charleston, SC 29403
Phone: (843) 789-3504
Fax: (843) 720-8907
Michael.g.sribnickmdjllc@gmail.com