

Retha Pierce (Sturdivant)
412 32nd Avenue South
Atlantic Beach, South Carolina 29582-4716
January 27, 2016
(843) 503-8752

RECEIVED

FEB 01 2016

SC Court of Appeals

Natalie Dahl
Post Office Box 762
Conway, South Carolina 29526

Re: Response To Letter Dated January 21, 2016 On Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911 Transcript

Dear Ms. Dahl:

In response to your letter dated January 21, 2016 which I received on Monday, January 25, 2016, I was indeed immensely set back to read: "I am in receipt of your most recent letter which was undated requesting ... "original document" ... for the October 1, 2014 hearing". The content further enlightened: "I had obtained the undated letter from Court Administration as I had not personally received it." Only someone who has experienced what this Appellant has undergone with some legal and judicial entities in Horry County for nearly a decade could remotely begin to identify with the debilitating effect that such statements render.

First, this Appellant was wondering why she had not received any kind of response relative to her last correspondence to you dated November 16, 2015 wherein she not only re-asked you for a word-for-word transcript of the proceedings for Civil Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911; but, she also added '... a FOIA Request for the complete audio version of the Transcript for Civil Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911 for the October 1, 2014 proceedings. In addition, this Appellant stipulated anticipation of: '... the word-for-word Transcript and the cost of the FOIA Request for the audio version'. She was even compelled beyond her control with an urgency to relay some inconceivable events that make such a document most crucial to her general predicament and, hopefully, eventual exoneration. Pre-occupied with data relative to her upcoming January 26, 2016 Reconsideration Hearing for the wrongful Driving Under Suspension (DUS) Conviction [Civil Case No.: 2014-CP-26-5792] that evolved because of her wrongful First Offense Driving Under Influence (DUI) Conviction [Civil Case No.: 2014-26-CP-03911] timely appealed, however, the Appellant intended to follow-up with you after her Reconsideration Hearing for the wrongful DUS conviction slated on the Horry County Court Docket for Tuesday, January 26, 2016. Your letter received the day before that Hearing, of course, is Appellant's only communication from you since her letter dated November 16, 2015 was dispatched, with first class postage, to you at the same time three copies were also

mailed. One of the three copies was sent to the South Carolina Court Administration.

Secondly, you indicated in your letter that you only know about my last correspondence to you as a result of the copy of your letter that the Appellant duplicated to the South Carolina Court Administration. You also referenced the copy of your letter from Court Administration as "... undated ...". The Appellant was unable to visualize how a letter dated and addressed to you, copied to another party, returned to you undated. You also said : " ... I can be of no greater service for your request". Moreover, could you at least send me a copy of the undated letter you received from me via the South Carolina Court Administration? Please send me also any information on the procedure that the Appellant should follow in order to get her FOIA Request for the complete audio version of the transcript for Civil Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911 for October 1, 2014 honored, as requested in the previous letter, if not through you.

In nearly sixty-seven years, and most especially in Horry County for several of them, the Appellant has experienced countless inconceivables, even as recently as on Tuesday while awaiting her DUS Conviction Reconsideration Hearing in the Fifteenth Judicial Circuit, when a lawyer discussing something relative to a case said right out loud in Court to the judge that the recorder might need to be shut off because he [the judge] might want what was about to be said to be "... off the record ...". Although the judge abruptly invited the lawyers to follow him to his chambers to further discuss the issue at that moment, never recessing court, it was very apparent to the Appellant that part of the business as usual in the system actually appears to include conscious efforts by cooperating neocheaters to control what is in the court transcript for the advantage of certain individuals/entities.

In conclusion, please find two enclosures: (1) Copy of last letter mailed to you dated November 16, 2016 and (2) Copy of your letter dated January 21, 2016 to the Appellant Relative to Civil Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911 Transcript. Thank you again for your assistance, and any information that you can give on the procedure to be followed in order to get the FOIA Request filled for a copy of the audio transcript for Civil Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911 will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,



Retha Pierce (Sturdivant)

Cc: O. Terry Beverly, Esquire; South Carolina Court of Appeals; South Carolina Court Administration

RECEIVED

State of South Carolina

FEB 01 2016

SC Court of Appeals



The Circuit Court of the Fifteenth Judicial Circuit

Natalie Dahl
COURT REPORTER

POST OFFICE BOX 762
CONWAY, SOUTH CAROLINA 29528
ndahl@sccourts.org

January 21, 2016

Retha Pierce (Sturdivant)
412 32nd Avenue South
Atlantic Beach, SC 29582

In Re: Case No: 2014-CP-26-03911

Dear Ms. Pierce,

I am in receipt of your most recent letter which was undated requesting again the "original document" (transcript) for the October 1, 2014 hearing. I had obtained the undated letter from Court Administration as I had not personally received it. This transcript was prepared per Rule 607, and as I had stated in my prior letter dated November 8, 2015, you have received the full, complete, unedited original transcript verbatim. There is no "unabridged copy" of this transcript. I regret to inform you that I can be of no greater service for your request. Thank you for your understanding.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Natalie Dahl, RPR".

Natalie Dahl, RPR
Court Reporter

cc: O. Terry Beverly, Esq.,
Desiree Allen, South Carolina Court Administration
Court of Appeals

Retha Pierce (Sturdivant)
412 32nd Avenue South
Atlantic Beach, South Carolina 29582-4716
November 16, 2015
(843) 503-8752

Ms. Natalie Dahl
Post Office Box 762
Conway, South Carolina 29526

Re: Response to Request For "... Specific Page Numbers and Line Numbers of the Perceived Errors" for Civil Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911

Dear Ms. Dahl:

I have received, as of November 12, 2015, your letter dated November 8, 2015 whereby you acknowledge having received my letter dated October 26, 2015 wherein I request a completely unabridged Transcript for all court proceedings relative to Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911 and you remind the Appellant "... wherein you wish to challenge the Record in the above-referenced case". You further stipulate that: "... in order to comply with your request I will need specific page numbers and line numbers of the perceived errors."

As contained in the previous correspondence, however, the initial expectation is to get a copy of the "Original" document showing word-for-word the proceedings as thought recorded on October 1, 2014. The Appellant is, therefore, willing to pay you whatever the price is for the complete unadulterated transcription of the proceedings recorded relative to Civil Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911.

Although the Appellant does have some specific gifts from the Higher Power that still enable her to remember even certain scenarios from as far back as to before she could crawl, and that also allow her to make some predictions with 100% accuracy across a variety of themes/subjects (including having mentioned to many, long before anyone ever announced intent for the position, that only a woman would follow Mark Sanford as the governor for South Carolina), she has not been shown with any precision all the pages or lines that may contain the author's errors in the Transcript under scrutiny. It is obvious to the Appellant upon commencing to read the document, however, that the Record labeled Original is missing certain questions/comments beyond a shadow of doubt because of her personal involvement in the proceedings. Too many curt remarks, biased and prejudicial delivery(ies) and preferential treatment for the prosecution foreshadow the proceedings from October 1, 2014 that don't properly align with some of the more cleaned up version. Much of this automatically detected missing data, that traumatized and stigmatized the Appellant, is what actually propelled her

to eventually require the recusal of the very Judge Larry E. Hyman , Jr. who presided over the Appeal in Common Pleas for Civil Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911 for her wrongful First Offense DUI Conviction when it was discovered that he was slated also to preside over the Appeal for her wrongful First Offense DUS Conviction as a result of the wrongful First Offense DUI Conviction.

Moreover, the already referenced missing data is nowhere in the document like the " ... sixth time..." in court remark; nor, is found certain questions like " ... What did the other judge do wrong? ... " Instead of providing Appellant from the outset the opportunity to present her exceptions and arguments without intimidation as with the prosecutor, there was a kind of intervention by the judge with stabs and jabs of curt comments/questions and seemingly ridicule of her as a pro se litigant while providing preferential treatment for the prosecuting attorney that should be at least on Page One of the Transcript but can not be found anywhere. Frankly, the Appellant was shocked at the way, during the Appeal in the Horry County Court of Common Pleas, that she was not respected like the prosecutor; yet, in retrospect, it really complies with the level of treatment she has received for at least nearly a decade in Horry County relative to constant wrongful charges/ convictions that caused her to be jailed wrongly at least eight (8) times, to be relentlessly harassed/set up and to undergo irreversible character assassination. In addition, the Transcript is missing the threat that Judge Hyman made to the Appellant that made her cringe with anticipation of how he actually was going to complete his admonishment of her: " If you mention implied consent again ... I'll ... " Ironically, Ms. Dahl, the Appellant literally wondered at that moment, as well as others, if everything being said was being recorded and if indeed an eventually-ordered transcript would be summarized or word-for-word. In addition, another aspect of the proceedings containing instructions seemingly directed to push the Appellant to agree against one of her exceptions with prosecution relative to misrepresentations/ implied consent imposed in Magistrate Court to the jury that she refused a urine test that the Officer was going to give her after a .00% breathalyzer, which she had not refused but she only wanted part of her sample for independent testing, is also missing wherein Judge Hyman seemed to be pushing the Appellant to agree with the prosecutor's version. During that scenario, there was actually a period of silence in the Court as the Appellant stared at Judge Hyman's countenance trying desperately to maintain a respectful composure before he instructed her to answer whether she agreed with it or not. That is no where in the Record also.

As an endeavor to treat your issue relative to pages and lines, the Appellant does also note in the Transcript some ambiguities contrary to her command of standard English, suggestive fragmentations, some polished responses for the Court, and not-included items. For example, on page 14: lines 20 and 22 exhibit the first two aforementioned variables. On Page 2; Line 21, "implied of consent" was not cited that way by the Appellant, and part of what was said on the same page for Lines 20 - 21 is missing. Moreover, there is also no inclusion of the instructions Judge Hyman gave the prosecuting attorney, O. Terry Beverly, to prepare the Final Order for

Civil Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911 after he abruptly dismissed the Appeal that should be at least on the last page. This also is not there. Finally, the Appellant also maintains that the many "—" represent missing data.

Please do not misconstrue the desire for an unabridged Transcript as any form of intended disrespect or personal attack on you. This is instead just a deeply battered Appellant who literally detests mediocrity and believes it is her constitutional right as a violated citizen in the United States of America to at least be able to get an authentic copy of what the court proceedings entail. During other wrongful hearings/trials for nearly ten years, even some Horry County judges have told the Appellant that some/part of court transactions relative to her case(s) were not being recorded when she would ask directly after seeing no evidence of any attempt to provide an accurate/any account of court proceedings. In December 2013, for example, one judge even responded to this Appellant's question of if the hearing relative to a false charge against her was being recorded and revealed not only no recording for her case in the main courtroom that day but for none of the cases in that section of court for that day while adding: "I am the judge..." Again on June 17, 2015, the Appellant was refused any Transcript for the New Trial for which the Clerk of Court said all information was immediately expunged and not available to date to Appellant even with a FOIA request a few days after Appellant was not allowed to see the judge as Pro Se on June 17 as summoned to Court for her New Trial regarding her false reckless driving conviction from 2008 that stemmed from her first false criminal allegation of reckless driving on December 25, 2007. That single set-up began the series of subsequent false allegations/convictions (to include the current wrongful First Offense DUI Conviction and the wrongful First Offense DUS Conviction via of the First Offense DUI Conviction) about one month after the Appellant first defeated the over three-term mayor of the Town of Atlantic Beach (the candidate for the neocheaters) in November 2007. Appellant has been denied access to all records of any of the court proceedings of the New Trial from June 17, 2015 in addition to after being denied opportunity to appear before the judge as a pro se litigant like her subpoenaed witness and the prosecutor that finally dismissed the criminal allegation of reckless driving for which she was found guilty in 2008 and for which the Appellant had already been punished with a fine and six points off her license as a result of the wrongful reckless driving stop on December 25, 2007 as well as later falsely convicted for the resisting arrest charge that was alleged from the wrongful reckless driving stop on December 25, 2007 and for which Appellant paid steep fines as well as pulled eighteen months probation.

The Appellant realizes that on the surface it may appear that much that is shared in this letter may appear to have no bearing on our transaction. The intent, moreover, is merely an endeavor to shed more light that this is a desperate need to have a complete word-for-word Transcript for October 1, 2014.

Many who purport to protect and serve have been neocheating relative to ordinary man for

over 2000 years. Some today are able to continue to convict wrongly too many innocent victims by employing the very laws designed to render a person innocent until proven guilty because of the blindness rendered by mysticism of a trusting public that allows dishonest leaders to cheat legally due to greed, avarice, and the thirst for control and power — the seeds of corruption and evilness. The abuse and denial of justice for the Appellant has intensified for over a decade to include the works of at least four Horry County judges, certain prosecutors, some policemen, and others across entities intertwined on the local, county, state and federal level. Such dishonesty and violations of any of mankind's human rights from God the Creator has placed the galaxy in its current status and fast approaching further detriment.

In conclusion, all of the elements of this Response only endeavor to relay the importance of the Appellant to receive just an unabridged copy of the complete word-for-word Transcript as recorded. She would also now like to add a FOIA Request for the complete audio version of the Transcript for Civil Case No.: 2014-CP-26-03911, and she anticipates your stipulations regarding the cost of the word-for word Transcript and the cost of the FOIA Request for the audio version.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this endeavor.

Sincerely,



Retha Pierce (Sturdivant)
Pro Se Appellant

Cc: O. Terry Beverly, V. Claire Allen, South Carolina Court Administration

Retha Peice (Sturdwiant)
412 3rd Avenue South
Atlantic Beach, SC 29582-4716

COLUMBIA SC

30 JAN 2016 PM



V. Claire Allen, Deputy Clerk
South Carolina Court of Appeals
Post office Box 11129
Columbia, SC 29201

RECEIVED

FEB/01 2016

SC Court of Appeals

29211162929

