

July 19, 2016

Via Electronic & Regular Mail

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk of Court
South Carolina Court of Appeals
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Re: Alexander Guice v. US Foodservice, Inc., et al
Appellate Case No. 2015-001821

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Please be advised that the undersigned Appellant submits this correspondence requesting customer service assistance.

Specifically, upon review of Case Summary regarding the above-entitled action on "C-Track", it would appear that the assigned Case Manager or appropriate Clerk inaccurately designated the June 29, 2016 Correspondence submitted to your office by the undersigned as a "Motion - Extension of Time (1st) for Appellant's initial reply brief".

However, a review of the aforementioned June 29, 2016 correspondence confirms that this one page document was not a motion for an extension of time to file the initial reply brief based on several factors. First, the June 29, 2016 document was not filed with the Court seeking a Court Order granting or denying an extension Motion; the June 29 correspondence was not filed in accordance with Rule 240, SCACR; and the document did not include the required \$25.00 motion filing fee. June 29, 2016 Correspondence from Appellant, previously filed.

Second, as advanced by Respondents' Counsel's June 29, 2016 response correspondence, "If Appellant seeks an extension of time in which to file his Initial Reply Brief, he needs to file a motion requesting the same, along with the appropriate filing fee". Respondents' Correspondence dated June 29, 2016, previously filed. The undersigned did not file a Motion for Extension of Time to file his Initial Reply Brief, which can be confirmed upon a review of the record.

Finally, the undersigned timely filed a "Motion for Correction and/or Clarification of Respondents' Designation of Matter", on July 3, 2016, to include requesting "that the deadline for filing his [Appellant's] Initial Reply Brief be suspended until this Court rules on this Motion and Respondents' Designation of Matter has been corrected and/or clarified", which was filed within the ten day time limit imposed to file a responsive


pleading subsequent the June 24, 2016 Court Order issued on Appellant's Motion to Strike. Motion for Correction/Clarification of Respondents' Designation of Matter, previously filed.

Based on foregoing, I respectfully request that your office correct the inaccurate designation of the June 29, 2016 correspondence submitted to your office by the undersigned Appellant from "Motion - Extension of Time (1st) for Appellant's initial reply brief", to "Correspondence" or "Letter" or other accurate suitable representation of the June 29 communication submitted your office.

By copy of this correspondence, Erin L. Hantske, Esq., the Respondents' Counsel of record, has been provided a copy of the same via electronic mail and regular mail.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Please respond to this correspondence at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,



Alexander Guice
U.S. African American Citizen
Honorable Disabled Veteran
Appellant, *pro se*

cc: Erin L. Hantske, Esquire