

**To: South Carolina Court of Appeals
1015 Sumter Street
Columbia, SC 29201**

6-24-15

**From: Howard W. Charpia
1450 Jahnz Ave.
Summerville, SC 29485**

RECEIVED

JUN 26 2015

SC Court of Appeals

**Re: 2013-002311
McMasters v. Charpia , et al**

Court,

**I mailed the 14 copies of the Supplemental Record on
June 19 , 2015 , as requested.**

**Letter dated June 11, 2015 from the Court accepted my one unbound
copy of the Supplemental record and required me to mail the remaining 14
copies ; Court citing 210(b). Rule 210 (b) entails the Record on Appeal ,
not the Supplemental Record (Rule 212).**

**Letter dated October 28 , 2014 from the Court *accepts* my Final Brief
and Record on Appeal , and states that this matter will be considered *without*
the Respondent's Brief.**

**The respondent's Motion to the Court dated February 17 , 2015 asks for
8 items to be included . I numbered these items (Supplemental Record) as
requested by the Respondent's Attorney (page 2 of 2 , of Motion).**

Number 1 was the Complaint , etc ; Number 2 was the Motion for

Compulsory order , etc.

I know that this Court and the Courts I have journeyed thru are bias and prejudicial against the Pro Se litigant , time and time again the Courts have allowed the respondent's Attorney to side step its rules.


I feel that at one time the Judicial system was just and fair in their dealings , but that has long past.

I spent approx. \$ 70.00 on the Supplemental Record and have no more fiancial resoures to better the Supplemental Record .

I again plead with the Court to accept my Supplemental Record as sent. the Court has bent over backwards on numerous ocassions to satisfy the Respondent's Attorney , Frank Cisa.

The Courts should provide wide latitude when construing their pleadings and papers . (S.E.C. v Elliott , 953 F. 2d 1950 11th Circuit)

With kind regards,


Howard W. Charpia , et al
Appellant (s)

MAILED

6-24-15
Jue

Appeal is attached as Exhibit "B".

The Appellants failed to include the following items that were designated by the Respondent:

- ✓ 1. Complaint filed August 10, 2009
- ✓ 2. Motion for Compulsory order of Reference filed September 24, 2009.
- ✓ 3. Order of Recusal of Judge Maite' Murphy dated April 10, 2012.
- ✓ 6. Order of Foreclosure and Sale dated October 29, 2012.
- ✓ 7. Motion to Void and Vacate Order filed October 19, 2012.
- ✓ 8. Motion to Reconsider filed December 3, 2012.
- ✓ 10. Order of Judge Dickson Denying Motion to Reconsider dated June 26, 2012
- ✓ 11. Order of Judge Dickson Denying Motion to Void Order

In addition, the matters contained in the Record on Appeal are not arranged in the proper order in accordance with Rule 210 (c) SCARC.

The Respondent also requests that the Respondent be granted twenty (20) days after service of the correct Record on Appeal, to serve and file her Final Brief.

CISA & DODDS, LLP



Frank M. Cisa
858 Lowcountry Blvd., Suite 101
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
Phone: (843) 881-6530
Fax: (843) 881-5433
E-mail: frank@cisadodds.com

Attorneys for the Respondent,
Renee McMasters Ronaghan

This 17th day of February, 2015

PRO SE LITIGANTS;

(Here is a great tool for you Pro se pioneers. The courts both on the state and federal level can not dismiss your case just because you didn't articulate yourself well enough or failure to cite proper legal authority. The link is at the bottom to the 15-page article. Here is just some of the info.)
Connecticut DCF Watch

Pro se litigants' court submissions are to be construed liberally and held to less stringent standards than submissions of lawyers. If the court can reasonably read the submissions, it should do so despite failure to cite proper legal authority, confusion of legal theories, poor syntax and sentence construction, or litigant's unfamiliarity with rule requirements. *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 102 S.Ct. 700, 70 L.Ed.2d 551 (1982); *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106, 97 S.Ct. 285, 50 L.Ed.2d 251 (1976)(quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80 (1957)); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 92 S.Ct. 594, 30 L.Ed.2d 652 (1972); *McDowell v. Delaware State Police*, 88 F.3d 188, 189 (3rd Cir. 1996); *United States v. Day*, 969 F.2d 39, 42 (3rd Cir. 1992)(holding pro se petition cannot be held to same standard as pleadings drafted by attorneys); *Then v. I.N.S.*, 58 F.Supp.2d 422, 429 (D.N.J. 1999).

The courts provide pro se parties wide latitude when construing their pleadings and papers. When interpreting pro se papers, the Court should use common sense to determine what relief the party desires. *S.E.C. v. Elliott*, 953 F.2d 1560, 1582 (11th Cir. 1992). See also, *United States v. Miller*, 197 F.3d 644, 648 (3rd Cir. 1999)

(Court has special obligation to construe pro se litigants' pleadings liberally); *Poling v. K.Hovnanian Enterprises*, 99 F.Supp.2d 502, 506-07 (D.N.J. 2000).

Defendant has the right to submit pro se briefs on appeal, even though they may be inartfully drawn but the court can reasonably read and understand them. See, *Vega v. Johnson*, 149 F.3d 354 (5th Cir. 1998). Courts will go to particular pains to protect pro se litigants against consequences of technical errors if injustice would otherwise result. *U.S. v. Sanchez*, 88 F.3d 1243 (D.C.Cir. 1996).

<http://www.zorza.net/JudicalTech.JJWi03.pdf>

B. Chappin
1450 JAHWZ Ave.
Spartanburg, SC
29485


RECEIVED

JUN 26 2015

SC Court of Appeals

CHARLESTON SC 294

24 JUN 2015 PM 2 T



Att: =

2013 002311

Court of Appeals
1015 Sumter Street
Columbia, SC 29201

29201+3749

