

RECEIVED

JUN 07 2015

SC Court of Appeals

PRO SE'

BRENDA G, HARMON

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY

Court of Common Pleas

DeAndrea G. Benjamin, Fifth Judicial Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2015 – 000061

Final Brief – rule # 208 / 2nd, Designation of Matter

Brenda G. Harmon

Appellant

v.

Joel E, Johnson. D.M.D.

Respondent

Brenda G. Harmon; Pro Se'

11-11-11

11-11-11

11-11-11

11-11-11

11-11-11

11-11-11

11-11-11

11-11-11

11-11-11

11-11-11

11-11-11

11-11-11

11-11-11

I, Brenda G. Harmon, received a response from the Law Firm, McKay, Cauthen, Settana & Stublely, P. A., 1303 Blanding Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201, representatives for the above named respondent. On Thursday, May 25, 2015, via U. S. Mail. It is a reply to the Initial Brief that I wrote for the basis of my appeal. In this response, on pg. # 6, it is written that I had only ten days left to file. That is a Given. That is a right provided to me by the court. The Representatives for the defendant is suggesting that you take away that right. By the same token of having equality, the Constitution Says I have the same rights as their client, to live free. I am not free from daily pains, daily swelling or headaches from the defendant's mal-practice. When this Dentist saw that other Doctors was not going to take the blame for his mistake, he tried to blame another doctor simply because he was black. Through- out these proceedings, the defendant/representative, It is A fact, not just a claim. I request to the Court of Appeals to read the transcript in its entirety, 18 pages, and read the response. This response will be used by me, the appellant at the time I am required to appear. You cannot go to a meeting of arbitration if that meeting has been canceled. When I was notified by the Courts that my hearing, which was scheduled for December, 2014, but changed to January 6, 2015, I immediately sent a letter informing Attorney Sullivan, of the new date that was given. On Pg. # 5, of the response from the Defendant's Attorneys, Their claim was that I failed to appear at the meeting for arbitration, this is a lie. I called, Mr. Tucker S. Player, (803) 772-8008, informing him that a Court date had been set before the arbitration, the hearing was canceled. Please look at the date it was scheduled. I went to Court on January 6, 2015, for which Judge Benjamin, threw out the entire case. The meeting for arbitration was scheduled for Feb. 2015. Where is the logic? Every item that required me to reply, I did. This is what I tried to get Judge Benjamin to see, but she didn't want to see nor did she show any interest in me receiving justice, in my opinion, Judge Benjamin had made her decision before the case had started, from what she was told and not what she read. Certainly, And I hope, she didn't make her decision from the information that was sent to me from The Law Firm, McKay, Cauthen, Settana & Stublely, P. A.

1. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(x) dx = 1$ (normalization)

2. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property)

3. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x) dx = f(0)$ (sifting property at zero)

4. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

5. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

6. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

7. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

8. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

9. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

10. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

11. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

12. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

13. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

14. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

15. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

16. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

17. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

18. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

19. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

20. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

21. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

22. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

23. $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x-a) dx = f(a)$ (sifting property at a)

I am still a patient of Dr. Hamid Bahadori, M.D., of Carolina Neurology Medical Center, 125 Doughty Street, Suite 460, Charleston, S. C. 29403, therefore what he diagnosed cannot be void. Tactics are used every day by Attorneys who just want to win and win by attrition, never seeing the pain that their client caused. This Doctor, Joel E. Johnson Knows that he has done irreparable damage to my body, but still to this day won't say he's sorry. He rather crawl up like a snake and use the law because to him it is un-ethical to say so to a black female. My pain is evitable, it can only be quiet with medication for the rest of my life.

Again what constitute an "affidavit?" It is a written diagnosis of a patient from a medical Doctor. The law is a set of rules guided by facts and logic. I shall not be deprive of my rights because of my race, gender or age. The Laws from cases used in my Initial Brief, Are laws that are written.

No person, has the right to willfully take away the life of another person. I ache all the time, due to medical negligence. What was sent to me, via U. S. Mail a child can depict the lies that is written. In America you cannot do bodily harm to another person as you please, especially being a licensed person. That license, is given by the state, stating you know what you are doing. I did not in any circumstance pay you money to harm my face.

This is a second designation of matter / Final Brief. It is written.

Conclusion

For reasons provided in the initial Brief and my reply to their Response, is the reason my case should continue. I ask the Appeals Court to settle this case using the law the right way, A. Settlement, B. Arbitration, or C. Court Trial- Trial by Jury

THE STATE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT

In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY

RECEIVED

JUN 01 2015

SC Court of Appeals

BRENDA G. HARMON/PRO SE'

2110 Woodfield Drive

Columbia, S. C. 29223

June 1, 2015

Law Offices

McKay, Cauthen, Settana & Stublely, P. A.

C/O Kelli Sullivan

1303 Blanding Street

Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Re: Brenda G. Harmon v. Joel E. Johnson, DMD

Appellant Case No. 2015-000061

Dear Attorney Sullivan:

1960-1961, C. 1961-1962, D. 1962-1963

1963-1964, E. 1964-1965

1965-1966, F. 1966-1967

1967-1968, G. 1968-1969

1969-1970, H. 1970-1971

1971-1972, I. 1972-1973

1973-1974

1974-1975

1975-1976, J. 1976-1977

1977-1978

1978-1979

1979-1980, K. 1980-1981

1981-1982, L. 1982-1983

1983-1984, M. 1984-1985

1985-1986, N. 1986-1987

Enclose is a copy of the Final Brief/2nd Designation of Matter, and served included in the Record of Appeal which is filed with the Courts on the above date. It is delivered to you by way of the South Carolina Sheriff Department.

Respectfully
Brenda Harmon
June 1, 2015

Deliver To:

Law Offices

McKay, Cauthen, Settana & Stublely, P. A.

C/O Kelli Sullivan

1303 Blanding Street

Columbia, S. C. 29201

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and titles, including "The Hon. Mr. Justice" and "The Hon. Mr. Justice".

2. The second part of the document is a list of names and titles, including "The Hon. Mr. Justice" and "The Hon. Mr. Justice".

3. The third part of the document is a list of names and titles, including "The Hon. Mr. Justice" and "The Hon. Mr. Justice".

4. The fourth part of the document is a list of names and titles, including "The Hon. Mr. Justice" and "The Hon. Mr. Justice".