

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Judge L. Casey Manning, Fifth Judicial Circuit

Case No:2016-CP-001239

Biafra Monique Curtis,

Appellant

V.

South Carolina Department of Public Safety,
Warren Ganjehsani, Mike Oliver, Leroy Smith,
Kenneth Phelps, Anthony Grice, William Taylor,
Nicklous King, Willie McCauley, Jr., Ada Schmidt,
Aaron Canzater and Cherie Young, individually
and in their official capacities, et al., **Respondent(s)**

RECEIVED

MAR 17 2017

SC Court of Appeals

**RESPONSE AND OBJECTION TO MOTION TO REFORM THE RECORD ON APPEAL AND FOR
EXXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE FINAL BRIEFS UNTIL THE RECORD ON APPEAL CAN BE
REFORMED**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, APPELLANT, hereby responds and objects to the above referenced Motion To reform the record on appeal and for extension of time to file final briefs until the record on appeal can be reformed. The Appellant is in agreement with this motion based on the fact that there are several moving parts to this case which should be addressed as well as the "crossing of documents" in the mail and the court regarding an additional Order which came from the court after the Appellant had already submitted documents and the several Motions filed by the respondents.

The Appellant, again, takes this very seriously and is making every attempt to abide by the rules of the court, the orders from the court while attempting to evaluate and balance these motions by the respondents. Please remember, I am a Pro Se Litigant who is trying her very best to cooperate to the best of my ability with all of the above referenced concerns.

REGARDING THE RECORD ON APPEAL

When the Appellate looked at rule 210(c), the first sentence states that the record on appeal shall include all matter designated to be included by any party under rule 209 and shall comply with the requirements of rule 267. When the appellant looked at Rule 209, the first line states that at the time a party serves his briefs under rule 208, to include a reply brief, he shall also serve on all parties to the appeal a designation of matter to be included in the record on appeal, so, since the January 26th order did not make specific requests regarding the designation of matter, the appellant followed the fourth line of the order which says specifically, the record should include all matters designated by **both** parties for inclusion in the record on appeal, so this is why the appellant amended her designation of matter, in the attempt to conform to the order, and removed matters not presented to the lower court and not designated in the record on appeal.

In following the instructions of the March 2nd 2017 order clarifying that the exhibits that were stricken were the "Exhibits to Support Final Brief", when the only documents submitted to the court with that title are displayed in the court index on January 6, 2017. **THE APPELLANT REMOVED ALL OF THESE EXHIBITS** from all documents submitted to the court.

Regarding the record on Appeal, the matter included in the record was previously listed on the appellant designation of matter and the respondents designation of matter. Per the January 6th order, fourth sentence of the first paragraph specifically.

It is conceivable that any lay person could be misconstrued by this and confused by this especially since the January 26th Order did not specifically this, which why the March 2, 2017 order was issued to clarify.

The statement that the appellant did not submit mental health and medical records in the lower court or to counsel prior to the delivery of the proposed record on appeal is false. These documents were sent directly to the respondents on October 20th 2015 and are recorded in the Richland County Court of Common Pleas on this date. They were also submitted to the Respondents previously (See Transcript PG 6, Lines 1-25, PG 12 Lines 13-25. In the above references to the transcript, which the Respondent's requested the entire transcript in their initial designation of matter, and this issue was raised in the trial court, the respondent's attorney acknowledges the serious injuries sustained by the appellant and the respondents attorney also acknowledges the substantial damages and loss incurred by the appellant. Her statements are based on the medical records and medical history that they received prior to the hearing. Any additional records are simply to provide the continuation of care information.

The records from the Richland County Public index was extrinsic evidence presented upon first discovery when the respondents attorney stated that the final order signed and dated May 16th 2016 was a scrivener's error. These public index records indicate that the final order signed and dated May 16th 2016 was also entered into the Richland County Court of Common Pleas public index on May 16th 2016, which supports the very essence of this case, that the final judgement was signed and entered into the Richland County Public Index two days prior to the

actual hearing date. The attachments to the record on appeal as exhibits 1,2 and 3 were in the original designation of matter. The other exhibit is simply a letter from Richland County chief Deputy Clerk, Virginia Belcher, to acknowledge that the documents which the respondents claim to have not received were, in fact, received by the court and included in the case file as well.

Regarding the records, the respondents failed to reference exhibit 5 which is relevant because

1. The respondents designation of matter included the entire transcript from the trial with no exclusions and
2. These issues were brought up in the trial hearing see transcript PG. 8, lines 10-11, PG 9 Lines 24-25, PG 10 Lines 1-5 which confirm that notice of the claim was mailed to South Carolina Attorney General Alan Wilson, Governor Nikki Haley, Director Leroy Smith and Colonel Mike Oliver on September 27th 2014 within the two-year verify claim requirement referenced by the Judge in the transcript.

With regard to the statement that the summons complaint and answer have been jumbled together in the record on appeal, the appellant has never seen the respondents answer and would like to hereby request a copy of it.

Again, the respondents designation of matter included the transcript of the trial hearing in its entirety without any pages being excluded. The respondents initials brief should be included.

Pertaining to the jury charges, the pro se appellant, being a late person, and in the earnest attempt to abide by the Court's Order, downloaded a form from the court website and has removed these jury charges in her amended documents which were submitted on March 13th 2017.

Per the January 26th order specifically, the appellant did submit an amended record on appeal by the February 27th 2017 deadline. However, it was after this information was already submitted that the appellant received the March 2, 2017 order. So in an effort to abide by both

orders, the appellant submitted an amended proposed record on appeal on March 13th 2017. The first paragraph second sentence States all records on appeal are stricken and the second sentence states that the appellant show serve record on compelled at complies with roof tent 210. The first sentence of rule 210 states that the record on a pill shell include a designation of matter per rule 209. Route 209 and B states that the designation must clearly identify what the party desires to have included in the record on appeal and the designation may only propose to include portions of the transcripts pleadings orders exhibits and other materials which may be properly included in the record on appeal per rule 210 C. Then rule 210 C states that when a portion of an order judgement decision or pleading is to be included in the record on appeal, the entire order judgment decision or pleading shall be included in the record.


The final brief is reflective of both orders of the court, the rules of the court and the respondent's allegations of wrongful presentation of information. The appellant did submit amended documents to the court documents on February 27, 2017 in response to the January 26th 2017 order and after receiving the March 2nd 2017 order, however, after reviewing the last order, the appellant amended her previously submitted documents and resubmitted them on February 13th 2017, therefore correcting the titles of the documents and also in an attempt to adhere to all of the rules of the Court within the bodies of the documents. The difference in the number of pages is the amended proposed final reply brief does meet the requirements of Rule 211(b), which states that the final brief shall be identical to the briefs previously submitted under rule 208, except for the following: 211 (b)(1) the references in the initial brief shall be revised to indicate where the material appears in the record on appeal. These revised references may be in place of or in addition to the initial references. The inclusion of additional references in the table

of authorities falls under this rule. The appellant has resubmitted and amended proposed final reply brief that is signed and the front cover of the brief is blue paper per Rule 267 (e).

Please note that the appellant is NOT attempting to enlarge the complexities of the case, but rather, make certain to reference ALL issues raised in trial court hearing and issues contained in BOTH the appellants AND the respondents designations of matter which INCLUDE THE ENTIRE TRANSCRIPT as it was designated, without exclusions. The Relief sought to dismiss this case is premature, which, I believe, is the reason that the respondents filed in this motion to reform as well, but removing pertinent, relevant information is NOT warranted.

With that said, the appellant agrees to the part of the motion regarding reforming the documents and further requests that the motion be granted or that this case should either be moved for oral argument or remanded back to the trial court to be heard by jury trial.

March 13, 2017



Biafra Monique Curtis, Pro Se
PO BOX 21294
Hilton Head Island, SC 29925

**PROOF OF SERVICE OF RESPONSE AND OBJECTION TO MOTION TO REFORM THE RECORD ON
APPEAL AND FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE FINAL BRIEFS UNTIL THE RECORD ON
APPEAL CAN BE REFORMED**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Judge L. Casey Manning, Fifth Judicial Circuit

Appellate Case No: 2016-001239

Biafra Monique Curtis, Appellant

V.

South Carolina Department of Public Safety,
Warren Ganjehsani, Mike Oliver, Leroy Smith,
Kenneth Phelps, Anthony Grice, William Taylor,
Nicklous King, Willie McCauley, Jr., Ada Schmidt,
Aaron Canzater and Cherie Young, individually
and in their official capacities, et al., Respondent(s)

PROOF OF SERVICE


RECEIVED

MAR 17 2017

SC Court of Appeals

I Certify That I Have Served The Response And Objection To Motion To Reform The Record On Appeal And For Extension Of Time To File Final Briefs Until The Record On Appeal Can Be Reformed to The Respondent(S) By Depositing A Copy Of It In The United States Mail, Postage Prepaid, on March 13, 2017, Addressed To Norma Jett, Esquire And Allison D. Hood, Esquire Post Office Drawer 909 Bamberg, SC 29003, to Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Clerk South Carolina Court of Appeals PO BOX 11629 Columbia, SC 29211 and to Jeanette McBride Clerk of Court Richland County Court of Common Pleas Post Office Box 2766 Columbia, South Carolina 29202

March 13, 2017


Biafra Monique Curtis, Pro Se
PO BOX 21294
Hilton Head Island, SC 29925
843-684-3118

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL

PRIORITY MAIL
POSTAGE REQUIRED

**PRIOR
★ MA**

P



U.S. POSTAGE
\$10.00
PM 2-DAY
31419 0006
Date of sale
03/13/17
06 2500
08282179 SSK

PRIORITY MAIL 2-DAY™

- DATE OF DEL
- USPS TRACK
- INSURANCE
- PICKUP AVA

* Domestic only

WHEN USED INTERNA
A CUSTOMS DECL
LABEL MAY BE REQ

EXPECTED DELIVERY 03/15/2017

SHIP TO: **JENNY ABBOTT KITCHENS** 0006
CLERK OF COURT
SC COURT OF APPEALS
RECEIVED

PO BOX 11629
COLUMBIA SC 29211-629

MAR 17 2017

USPS CERTIFIED MAIL



9502 6000 1739 7072 0002 35

**PRIORITY
★ MAIL ★**

**UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE®**

VISIT US AT USPS.COM®
ORDER FREE SUPPLIES ONLINE

FROM: **BIAFKA CURTIS**
PO BOX 21299
HILTON HEAD, SC
29925

TO: **JENNY ABBOTT KITCHENS**
CLERK OF COURT
SC COURT OF APPEALS
PO BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SC 29211

Label 228, March 2016

FOR DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL USE



8000001000014

EP14F July 2013
00125005

VISIT US AT USPS.COM®
ORDER FREE SUPPLIES ONLINE

**UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE®**

This packaging is the property of the U.S. Postal Service® and is provided solely for use in sending Priority Mail® shipments. Misuse may be a violation of federal law. This packaging is not for resale. EP14F © U.S. Postal Service, July 2013. All rights reserved.