

78887/78888

March 7, 2016

**RECEIVED**

MAR 09 2016

**SC Court of Appeals**

Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
**Attn: Lynn**  
Clerk of Court  
SC Court of Appeals  
1220 Senate Street  
Columbia, SC 29201

**RE:** Glenda Couram v Lula N. Davis, Shirley Rivers, Constance "Connie" Rhett, Marcia Adams, Dottie Blankenship, Tosha Autry, Steven W. Lake, in their official and individual capacities, and the South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles, Respondents.  
**Appellate Case No.: 2012-213441**

Dear Lynn:

Please find a check for \$50.00, filing fee for the two Motions filed on or about February 29, 2016 in reference to the above referenced matter. The initial check was sent to the wrong court.<sup>1</sup>


Thanking you in advance.

*continued on next page*

---

<sup>1</sup> - I wanted to inform the court that when I filed the Motion to Rehear after the COA ruling in February 4, 2015, I challenged subject matter jurisdiction – circuit court Rule 59 Motion in the circuit court. The courts seems to have violated standard practice for granting a 12(b) motion to dismiss based in which they based their ruling solely on the illegal Motion to Dismiss, filed after remand from the federal court and 3 federal orders dated October 29, 2012 filed by the defendants in violation of Rule 11 and completely inconsistent with well established, law etc., Would the recent ruling by the US Supreme Court apply to this matter V.L. v E.L., et.al., No. 15-648 decided March 7, 2016; (28 U.S.C. § 1738) FULL FAITH AND CREDIT ACT – See Dawson v. Estate of Ott, it says first, the trial court's order was an impermissible collateral attack on the judgment of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana. Second, the court lacked jurisdiction over the life insurance proceeds, which were not an asset of the decedent's estate. See also Semtek Int'L Inc. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (99-1551) 531 U.S. 497 (2001) 128 Md. App. 39, 736 A. 2d 1104, *reversed and remanded* - Justice Antonin Scalia wrote the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, reversing the decision of the Maryland courts. Scalia wrote that there was no final "judgment on the merits" in the California case and thus the Maryland trial was not precluded - Specifically, the California case was dismissed without prejudice, and a reading of the appropriate rule could be seen as still permitting other actions. Therefore, Semtek was entitled to a trial before the Maryland courts and the case was remanded with such instructions. (From Wikipedia)

Sincerely,



Grinda Couram

*pro se*

104 Macaw Lane

Lexington, SC 29073

803 358-0127

[grcouram@hotmail.com](mailto:grcouram@hotmail.com)


/grc

Encl: Check 2735

c: Eugene H. Matthews, Esq.  
Jeff Goodwyn, Esq.  
SC Court of Appeals  
SC Supreme Court

Glen Cove  
104 Macaulay  
Lexington, SC 29073

COLUMBIA  
SC 290  
07 MAR '16  
PM 2 L



B 15460202 13236



FOREVER

RECEIVED

MAR 09 2016

SC Court of Appeals

Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
Attn: Lynn Case Manager  
Clerk of Court  
SC Court of Appeals  
1220 Senate Street  
Columbia, SC 29201

29201376999

