

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM APPELLATE PANEL OF THE S.C. WORKER'S COMPENSATION
COMMISSION

T. Scott Beck, Commissioner

Melody L. James, Commissioner

Gene McCaskill, Commissioner

WCC File No. 1303465

Appellate Case No. 2016-000790

RECEIVED
APR 12 2017
SC Court of Appeals

Ann Stevenson

Claimant/Appellant

vs.

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Employer
AND
New Hampshire Insurance Co.

Carrier,
Defendants. Respondents

**APPELLANT'S REPLY TO RESPONDENTS' RETURN TO MOTION TO
ALLOW EVIDENCE THAT WAS PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED TO OR BY THE
TRIAL COURT AND PLACED INTO EVIDENCE ORALLY OR MATERIALLY
ALONG WHAT WAS LEGALLY SUPPOSED TO BE ATTACHED IN THE
EVIDENCE CHAIN TO BE PLACED INTO THE RECORD OF APPEAL AND TO
MAKE A RULING ON THE VALIDITY OF THE COMMISSION ORDERS WHICH
ARE BASED UPON THE CORRUPTED EVIDENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS APA
COPY OF FCE REPORT**

In response to Respondents' Return to the above Motion, the Claimant replies and would like to explain the following points:

1. Under Mr. Baxley's #4 (p1 of his Return), Referring to the Full Commission Panel Hearing Transcript (January 11, 2016), he states "This document can be properly included in a Record on Appeal, but.....". He states it was not presented timely.

As it only existed as a recording having not been transcribed until January 6, 2017, I included it in the Amended Designation of Matter within a week as soon as was possible. Proof of the transcript transcribing and actual acquisition exists in the email train starting with Mr. Baxley from Thursday, January 5, 2017 and going through Creel Reporting on Friday, January 6, 2017 which is included. (Exhibit A p1-4).

So Mr. Baxley knew the details of this transcribing and states "not timely" even though it was included within less than 10 days of coming into being. Other courts have required timeliness, but I consider less than 10 days as being very timely and should be included in the record as Mr. Baxley stated it should legally.

2. Under Mr. Baxley's #5, he states Commissioner Campbell's Decision, Directions and Proposed Order instructions is not an official document. THIS is a Legal, Official, Binding document which is placed into the record at the Workers' Compensation Commission, by the presiding Commissioner(s) AND delivered by email to the attorneys in the specific case.

The Commissioners do not write or draw up their own ORDER. They give directions, instructions and what their actual decision is along with what they want included in the Order in their Proposed Order Instructions, which is drawn up by the winning attorney. This attorney then sends back his version which is supposed to include that information and the Commissioner(s) use it and sign their names to it.

Without this document of instructions and statements made by the Commissioner which is official and legal and used in every case that comes through the system at the Workers' Compensation Commission there would be **NO ORDER**.

Mr. Baxley seeks to deny and minimize this official document, because it may contain damaging information that was not found when the Commissioner(s) signed his document he provided for their Order.

And we are here appealing the Commissioner(s) **ACTUAL DECISION** and their **ORDER**.

If Mr. Baxley actually believes that the Commissioners' Proposed Order Instructions are not legal binding official documents, then he should be telling them that, not the Court of Appeals, because they are using them as such.

3. Under Mr. Baxley's #6, he states more or less the same for The Full Commission Panel Order Instructions in trying to get the Court to reject it.

My answer to his statement is the same as above to number 2.

Without this document of instructions which is official and legal and ***used in every case*** that comes through the system at the Workers' Compensation Commission there would be **NO ORDER**.

We are here appealing the Commissioner(s) **ACTUAL DECISION** and their **ORDER**.

4. Under Mr. Baxley's #7, he states, that the Court of Appeals has struck the **Deposition of Claimant, Ann Stevenson and Defendants Exhibit 1** presented at the January 8, 2015 hearing and it should not be included because the Court would not allow it before.

Mr. Baxley stated in print in his Exhibit A Chart under item 6, **“Yes” under objection** and goes on to state the Legal Basis for Objection is:

“SCACR 210 THIS DOCUMENT WAS NOT SUMMITTED INTO EVIDENCE BEFORE THE COMMISSION”

Also take notice that he states IN his RETURN, **“PRESENTED AT THE JANUARY 8,2015 HEARING.**

So which statement is actually true? And yes it takes a transcript to prove who said what, when that who contradicts themselves in statements before the Court.

Now why would Mr. Baxley make a false or misleading statement like that to the COURT, when it was he himself who introduced it into that hearing as evidenced by the transcript (p30 line 4 through p31 line 25 and more)?

These pages were presented in this Motion we are discussing and were included in the original Motion as exhibits.

There is also another reason for including what was in the Workers' Comp File and can be found in the transcript of January 8, 2015 hearing pages 3 – 4.

Commissioner Campbell makes a Decision and Ruling to include the complete file during the hearing due to something going on with Dr. Merritt's Original Deposition, which Mr. Baxley states (line 22-23), "Because that was handed in at the first hearing. (p3 line 25 thru p4 line 1) So, it's probably in the Commission's file somewhere." The Court states, "If you handed it in, yeah." (p4 line 2)

Then Commissioner Campbell states, "Without objections the Commission's File becomes a part of the record with the exception of self-serving declarations and unstipulated medical reports." There were no objections filed.

5. Under Mr. Baxley's #8, this item was clearly represented in the Appellant's Designation of Matter and even stressed, but it was not objected to by him or the Court.

And because I sought to further clarify this document so there would be no confusion in the future with my use of it or The Court's use of it, He objects now to Appellant's use of an Original clear copy of the FCE that has not been tampered with. In his Exhibit A, he does not object to the Appellant's clear copy of the FCE and even tries to hide the information about the corruption by stating that is his APA.

This uncorrupted FCE should be used in any way possible to bring and show the tampering in the original, to show what Commissioner Campbell's instructions in preparing the Order to provide the full information of the FCE in the Proposed Order (maybe he wanted to read it) and in Mr. Baxley's statement at his hearing pertaining to the FCE (p88 line 2 -11).

Mr. Baxley states, "It kinds of speaks itself." Referring to the FCE which it could not if the Defendants had tampered with it.

The tampered with copy of the FCE report was presented to the Commission and to the Court of Appeals by Mr. Baxley, but an actual clear and untampered with copy was presented to Dr. Merritt when he made his decision on MMI and capabilities.

Yes, the two copies of the FCE reports actually do "speak". One tells the actual truth from the physical therapist that did the two day exam and the other has almost every finding of injury removed by the Defendants. Shouldn't this be enough along with other evidence mishandling and false statements be enough to send back to the Workers' Compensation Commission for their review?

Also under Mr. Baxley's #8 line 9, he states" Second, appellant made no objection either before the hearing or at the hearing to the submission of the faxed copy of the FCE. Any objections to the faxed copy or any attempt to submit the "clean version should have been made before the Commission; there were no objections made. On page 3 of the Hearing Transcript dated January 8,2015, the Commissioner asked if there were objections to APA submissions and counsel of both parties indicated that there were no objections. "

The Defendants commissioned and paid for the FCE and so they were sent the actual report. ***How could objections have been made if the copy the Claimant received was from Mr. Baxley the Defendants' lawyer that had been put into evidence as being a legitimate copy of what the Defendants received? Why would Claimant have any reason to believe someone in the Defendants' Evidence Chain of Custody would tamper with it? Isn't a hearing before the Commission supposed to be honest, accurate and impartial dispensing equitable justice? How can it be with missing and contaminated evidence accepted as "the truth"?***

The first time, the Claimant knew about the tampering was when she acquired the "clean copy" in September of 2016 and was introduced under the September Motion of abeyance and material to be considered. Now that Mr. Baxley has known since September about the "Corrupted FCE" that he has in his APAs, there has been no attempt by him to correct the corrupted evidence with the Commission as is stated in the rules of conduct for lawyers. Or at least I have not been notified as to a party in the proceeding, and when I have asked there is nothing at WCC.

"Finally, as a practical matter, the missing data from the faxed copy is immaterial. The summary of the FCE is contained on Defendants APA pages 41-42, and all of those pages are present and readable. "

"The only evidence is missing from the other faxed pages are the actual testing results which were not referenced or interpreted by the Commissioner; the Commissioner simply relied upon the summary as presented by the person who administered the test (Order of Commissioner Campbell dated October 13, 2015 page 12)."

On page 2 item 4 of Commissioner Campbell's Proposed Order Request , he states," On 10/08/13 the ATP, Dre. James Merritt of Strand Orthopaedic Consultants, placed Claimant at MMI and assigned a 2% impairment to the right upper extremity. In addition, Dr. Merritt assigned work restrictions of 20lbs lifting and referred to the FCE for full capabilities. Dr. Merritt opined Claimant would need future medical treatment in the form of possible pain management. (Defendant's p5) (Drafting party to provide details of FCE.)" This is what the Commissioner clearly stated and expected " the drafting party" to provide him with the accurate details of the FCE. But with a corrupted copy that would have been impossible.

6. Under Mr. Baxley's #9, He states the Surveillance videos (accident videos) should not be included because they were actually not presented at the hearing.

On page 63 line 1, the video is referenced and Commissioner Campbell makes a Decision and Ruling to include the complete file during the hearing due to something going on with Dr. Merritt's Original Deposition.

Then Commissioner Campbell states, "Without objections the Commission's File becomes a part of the record with the exception of self-serving declarations and unstipulated medical reports."

So these videos which are in the file is also included in the record.

7. Under Mr. Baxley's #10, the pictures attached to Dr. Merritt's Deposition which he has made many conflicting statements about what happened.

If Mr. Baxley (or office) did not open the picture evidence,

- how did he have the pictures to upload to the WCC ?
- why would he have needed to upload them if he had presented the original evidence to the Commission and/or mailed it to them?
- If they were mailed, where is the proof of that? There was no notification to the Claimant or anyone else.
- when did he upload them digitally into the file?
- If the originals were in the file there would be no reason to upload would they?
- Why did he not notify the Commission of the problems with the evidence during the hearing?
- Why has he still not notified them of any of the evidence problems?

It was Mr. Baxley's responsibility to deposit the evidence in the Defendants' custody with the Commission. So how well did he comply with the evidence chain of accountability and accuracy, not only that but the legitimacy?

EXHIBITS ENCLOSED

- A Email train starting with Mr. Baxley from Thursday, January 5, 2017 and going through Creel Reporting on Friday, January 6, 2017
- B January 8, 2015 transcript p3-4, showing the Commissioner Campbell's ruling to include the file and what Mr Baxley said happened to Dr Merritt's Original Deposition
- C January 8, 2015 transcript p88 lines 2 -11, where the FCE is brought up at the hearing.
- D Above transcript p 63 line 1, video reference.
- E Commissioner Campbell's Proposed Order dated June 10, 2017

I also request to be allowed to include reference to and an explanation of p3-4 of the January 8, 2015 transcript as to statements made about the evidence placing of Dr. Merritt's Original Deposition into my briefs before the Court of Appeals.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.
Respectfully yours,

Ann Stevenson

April 11, 2017

Ann Stevenson
2261 Greenleaf Drive
Conway, S.C. 29526
843-347-5151
Appellant / Claimant

Counsel of Record
W. Johnnie Baxley III, Esquire
Wilson, Jones, Carter, & Baxley, PA
421 Wando Park Blvd.
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
843-284-1082
Attorney for Respondents

HTC Webmail

asteven@sccoast.net

RE: WCC # 1303465 Ann Stevenson vs. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 6815476:

From : Coral Strickland
<coral@creelreporting.com>

Fri, Jan 06, 2017 11:31 AM

Subject : RE: WCC # 1303465 Ann
Stevenson vs. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.
6815476:

✉ 3 attachments

To : asteven@sccoast.net

I've attached your transcript and your paid bill.

I knew she was going to have the transcript for me today so your card was only charged the \$93.50 NOT the \$150 we discussed.

Thank you!
-Coral

From: asteven@sccoast.net [mailto:asteven@sccoast.net]**Sent:** Thursday, January 5, 2017 3:47 PM**To:** contact@creelreporting.com**Subject:** Fwd: WCC # 1303465 Ann Stevenson vs. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 6815476:

Hi again,

I forgot to mention, that if you can email me a copy my computer is older and cannot open some of the dox documents. Last time with Dr Merritt you guys sent in pdf.

Thank you so much. I really appreciate your help,
Ann

From: asteven@sccoast.net**To:** contact@creelreporting.com**Sent:** Thursday, January 5, 2017 3:18:50 PM**Subject:** Fwd: WCC # 1303465 Ann Stevenson vs. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 6815476:

Hi,

The Full Commission had a Hearing on January 11, 2016, at 2:30 PM. I need to order a

EXHIBIT A

copy of the oral arguments from that hearing. Mr Baxley has sent me a brief stating due to my lawyer abandoning some body parts at the WCC appeal, that I cannot appeal to the Court of Appeals. My Reply Brief and Amended Designation of Matter and Motion Reply are all due 10 days from the date of his Brief plus on December 28,2016. I had been told there was no transcript when I picked up my Worker Comp file copy at their office. Please help me. I am a pharmacist, not a lawyer and trying to do this appeal because other lawyers would not take it after being dropped by the one who did the WCC appeal with such short notice.

Thank you,
Ann Stevenson
asteven@sccoast.net
843-454-6186

From: "Eugenia Hollmon" <EHollmon@wcc.sc.gov>
To: "Johnnie Baxley" <jwbaxley@wjlaw.net>
Cc: "asteven@sccoast.net" <asteven@sccoast.net>
Sent: Thursday, January 5, 2017 12:43:32 PM
Subject: RE: WCC # 1303465 Ann Stevenson vs. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 6815476:

The court reporter was Jill Vickers with Creel Court Reporting. Her contact number is 803-252-3445.

Genia

Eugenia Hollmon
Judicial Docketing Director
South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission
803-737-5737
Ehollmon@wcc.sc.gov

EXHIBIT A

From: Johnnie Baxley <mailto:jwbaxley@wjlaw.net>
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 11:27 AM
To: Hollmon, Eugenia
Cc: 'asteven@sccoast.net'
Subject: WCC # 1303465 Ann Stevenson vs. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 6815476:

Genia,

A hearing was held before the Full Commission on this claim on January 11, 2016, at 2:30 PM. I need to order a transcript of the oral arguments from that hearing. I do not know who the court reporter was on that particular day. Please let me know the name of the court reporter and their email address so that I can order a transcript. Thanks.



Johnnie W. Baxley III, Attorney
jwbaxley@wjlaw.net
421 Wando Park Blvd., Suite 100
Mount Pleasant, South Carolina 29464
Phone: (843) 284-1082
Fax: (843) 284-1081
wjclaw.com

This message may be protected by the attorney/client privilege, attorney work product or other privileges. If you received this message in error, please send a reply, delete the message immediately and do not forward this message to any other person.

CONFIDENTIAL & PRIVILEGED

The preceding email message, including any attachments, may be confidential and/or protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privileges. It is intended for the sole use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this transmission is not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and destroy any copies, electronic, paper or otherwise, that you may have of this communication. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

EXHIBIT A



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

www.avast.com



Wilson Jones Carter & Baxley, P.A.

image001.png

19 KB



17-0040.pdf

119 KB



stevenson v wal mart.pdf

399 KB

EXHIBIT A

1 THE COURT: Today's date is January the 8th,
 2 2015. This is South Carolina Workers' Compensation
 3 case File Number 1303465. The Claimant is Ann
 4 Stevenson represented by Attorney Carter Anthony
 5 Martling. The Employer is Walmart Associates,
 6 Incorporated. The Carrier is Employers New Hampshire
 7 Insurance Company; both Defendants represented by
 8 Attorney Johnnie W. Baxley, III.

9 THE COURT: The date of accident is February
 10 16th, 2013.

11 There is an average weekly wage of \$2,212.05 with
 12 a corresponding compensation rate of \$743.72.

13 The APAs have been submitted. Are there any
 14 objections to APAs, jurisdiction, venue or any other
 15 items?

16 MR. MARTLING: No, Your Honor.

17 MR. BAXLEY: No, sir. The only thing that I did
 18 not hand in, Commissioner, was the deposition of Dr.
 19 Merritt and I've just realized that I don't have the
 20 original.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. BAXLEY: Because that was handed in at the
 23 first hearing.

24 THE COURT: Okay.

25 MR. BAXLEY: So, it's probably in the

EXHIBIT B
 2095 3-4

1 Commission's file somewhere. So that --

2 THE COURT: If you handed it in, yeah.

3 MR. BAXLEY: -- so that you will have it I've got
4 an extra copy of the deposition transcript of Dr.
5 Merritt.

6 THE COURT: Do you need to hang onto it?

7 MR. BAXLEY: I don't, I've got a condensed
8 version, so I'm fine.

9 THE COURT: Okay. That'll work. Without
10 objections the Commission's File becomes a part of the
11 record with the exception of self-serving declarations
12 and unstipulated medical reports.

13 We're here on a remand by the Full Commission, so
14 Mr. Martling, we're also here on your 50 and Mr.
15 Baxley on your 21, so Mr. Martling if you would please
16 state your position for the record, sir.

17 MR. MARTLING: Thank you, Commissioner.
18 Commissioner, I do appreciate your patience in
19 listening to us both pre-hearing and now. I'd like to
20 restate, for the record, a couple of things we did.
21 We're here on a -- an accepted accident. It's our
22 position that the -- the facts surrounding the
23 accident are fairly un -- undisputed. Ms. Stephenson
24 tripped on an electrical cord, she fell into a -- a
25 waste bin, she suffered various injuries to the right

EXHIBIT B
2 page 3-4

1 and it hurt.

2 Q Okay. You did a Functional Capacity
3 Evaluation in this case, correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay.

6 MR. BAXLEY: Commissioner, I'm not going to go
7 through the FCE, but it's page 41 and 42 and it lists
8 all the inconsistencies, but it's going to take me
9 forever to go through them, so --

10 THE COURT: That's fine.

11 MR. BAXLEY: -- it kind of speaks for itself.

12 Q Ma'am, I just want to make sure we've got a
13 couple of dates right here. I have written down that
14 you were completely and totally out of work from
15 April 9 of 2013 until July 2nd of 2013.

16 A There were some days that I took personal
17 leave after I had those prescription errors until the
18 doctor took me out of work, two weeks, I think.

19 Q Yes, but that wasn't my question, ma'am.

20 A I don't know what the dates are.

21 Q Okay.

22 A So I have no idea what the dates started.

23 Q If I've got written down April 9, 2013 to
24 July 2, 2013, that you were completely out of work,
25 would you agree with that if that's what my dates say?

1 A But he did refuse to look at the video.

2 Q Okay. Ma'am, you've had a good bit of
3 physical therapy, correct?

4 A Not really.

5 Q All right. Well, let me take a step back.
6 Have you had any physical therapy?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Okay. And you worked with a physical
9 therapist at Progressive Physical Therapy it looks
10 like for a period of about three and a half months?

11 A Yes, off and on.

12 Q All right.

13 MR. BAXLEY: And Commissioner, I'm going to start
14 with page 84, under the part that says assessment.

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 Q Ma'am, this report says that you declined
17 any Ther-Ex -- therapeutic exercises?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And it says, "Difficult to assess secondary
20 to locations of pain are sporadic."

21 A Yeah, the doctor had discussed sending me
22 just for pain therapy during that time.

23 Q Okay. Did the physical therapist discuss
24 with you that it was hard to determine what your
25 problems were when the pain kind of changed every

D

REQUEST FOR PROPOSED ORDER

Please note these are general Order Instructions/Directives only. This document is not an Order. It is a request for a proposed Order. The undersigned reserves the right to modify or delete any portion of this document.

WCC File Number: 1303465

Date of Hearing: 01/08/2015

Place of Hearing: Horry County

CLAIMANT: Ann Stevenson

EMPLOYER: Walmart Associates Inc.

CARRIER: New Hampshire Insurance Co

Claimant's Attorney: Carter Anthony Martling

Defendant's Attorney: Johnnie W. Baxley, III

DOI: 02/16/2013

AWW: \$2,212.05 **CR: \$743.72**

Court Reporter: Cora Bruton
131 Browning Court
Lexington, SC 29073
cocobk@windstream.net
(803) 397-0189

FINDINGS & DIRECTIVES

Mr. Baxley, please draft the Order consistent with the below findings and directives and return to this office within 30 days.

1. Claimant sustained an admitted injury to her right shoulder and right knee arising out of and in the course and scope of her employment on 02/16/2013. (Drafting party to detail injuries.)
2. Claimant alleges injuries to the neck, right shoulder, right hand, low back, right knee and right foot/ankle.

EXHIBITE 1 of 3
3 pgs

3. Claimant underwent various evaluations and treatments for her admitted work related and alleged injuries. (Drafting party to provide details of evaluations, treatments and assessments.)
4. On 10/08/2013 the ATP, Dr. James Merritt of Strand Orthopaedic Consultants, placed Claimant at MMI and assigned a 2% impairment to the right upper extremity and a 3% impairment to the right lower extremity. In addition, Dr. Merritt assigned work restrictions of 20 lbs. lifting and referred to the FCE for full capabilities. Dr. Merritt opined Claimant would need future medical treatment in the form of possible pain management. (Defendant's p. 5) (Drafting party to provide details of FCE.)
5. On 12/13/2013, in an IME for the Defendants, Dr. Robert E. Elvington, Jr. of Pee Dee Orthopaedic Associates opined Claimant's pain and her objective symptoms seem out of proportion to her examination and MRI findings. (Defendant's p. 89)
6. On 12/18/2013, in deposition testimony, Dr. Merritt testified his impairment ratings were based mostly on Claimant's subjective complaints. (Drafting party to provide details of deposition.)
7. On 04/02/2014, in an IME for the Claimant, Dr. J. Stewart Haskin, Jr. of Coastal Orthopaedics opined given her exaggerated pain response and posturing, I am doubtful any treatment is going to effect a good outcome for this patient. (Claimant's p. 131)

Therefore, based on sworn testimony and a preponderance of the evidence, I hereby find:

1. Claimant is at MMI as of 10/08/2013 for her admitted work related injuries.
2. Lacking causally related medical evidence to support Claimant's subjective complaints for additional alleged body parts, all additional body parts are hereby denied.
3. I place the greatest weight on Dr. Merritt's findings.
4. Claimant is entitled to an award of PPD.
5. Claimant has a 4% disability to the right shoulder and a 6% disability to the right leg.
6. Claimant is not entitled to future medical treatment.
7. Defendants are entitled to stop TTD.
8. Defendants are entitled to credit from the date of MMI, 10/08/2013.
9. The Claimant's testimony and subjective complaints lack credibility.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please let our office know if you have difficulty obtaining a transcript or cannot complete the order within this timeframe. Draft the Order consistent with the above substance of the preceding Findings of Fact; however you may also add additional Findings of Fact consistent with the above ruling. The Order should include biographical information regarding the Claimant's work history and previous medical history, if relevant to the case.

If you need a transcript, order it *immediately* from the court reporter listed above. Provide a copy of the proposed Order to opposing counsel or *pro se* claimant before or at the same time one is submitted to the Commission.

EXHIBITE p 2073

When submitting the proposed Order to the Commission, please email only to bcheeseboro@wcc.sc.gov The Commission no longer requires hard copies of the proposed order unless the claimant is *pro se*.

Matters to include in the Order:

1. APA Submissions (if submitted)
2. Stipulations
3. Statement of the Case (contentions of the parties – stated concisely)
4. Evidence of the Case (synopsis of the evidence – including testimony and medical reports)
5. Findings of Fact [numbered] (Do not delete any of the above findings.) The prevailing party may add to support the decision, except regarding credibility unless you have been so instructed.
6. Conclusions of Law (cite applicable statutory sections and case law)
7. Award

Do not address credibility in the Order, unless it has been addressed in the preceding Order Notes.

The Honorable R. Michael Campbell, II
Commissioner
South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission
1333 Main Street
Suite 500
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 737-5672

Order Instructions e-mailed to parties on June 10, 2015.

EXHIBITE 301?

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

MOTION TO EXTEND TIME FOR FILING APPELLANT'S BRIEFS
T. Scott Beck, Commissioner

Melody L. James, Commissioner

Gene McCaskill, Commissioner

RECEIVED

APR 12 2017

SC Court of Appeals

WCC File No. 1303465

Appellate Case No. 2016-000790

Ann Stevenson

Claimant/Appellant

vs.

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Employer
AND
New Hampshire Insurance Co.

Carrier,
Defendants. Respondents

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the **REPLY TO RESPONDENTS' RETURN TO MOTION TO ALLOW EVIDENCE THAT WAS PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED TO OR BY THE TRIAL COURT AND PLACED INTO EVIDENCE ORALLY OR MATERIALLY ALONG WHAT WAS LEGALLY SUPPOSED TO BE ATTACHED IN THE EVIDENCE CHAIN TO BE PLACED INTO THE RECORD OF APPEAL AND TO MAKE A RULING ON THE VALIDITY OF THE COMMISSION ORDERS WHICH ARE BASED UPON THE CORRUPTED EVIDENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS APA COPY OF FCE REPORT** on Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., and New Hampshire Insurance Co. by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on April 11, 2017, addressed to their attorney of record, W. Johnnie Baxley III, Esquire, 421 Wando Park Blvd., Mt. Pleasant, S.C. 29464.

April 11, 2017

Ann Stevenson

Ann Stevenson
1622 Greenleaf Drive
Conway, S.C. 29526
843-347-5151
Claimant/ Appellant

APRIL 11, 2017

RECEIVED

APR 12 2017

SC Court of Appeals

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk, South Carolina Court of Appeals
Post Office Box 11629
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

RE: Ann Stevenson, Claimant/Appellant, vs. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Employer, and New Hampshire Insurance Company, Carrier/Defendants/Respondents, Worker's Compensation File No. 1303465, Appellate Case No. 2016-000790

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed for filing is a **REPLY TO RESPONDENTS' RETURN TO MOTION TO ALLOW EVIDENCE THAT WAS PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED TO OR BY THE TRIAL COURT AND PLACED INTO EVIDENCE ORALLY OR MATERIALLY ALONG WHAT WAS LEGALLY SUPPOSED TO BE ATTACHED IN THE EVIDENCE CHAIN TO BE PLACED INTO THE RECORD OF APPEAL AND TO MAKE A RULING ON THE VALIDITY OF THE COMMISSION ORDERS WHICH ARE BASED UPON THE CORRUPTED EVIDENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS APA COPY OF FCE REPORT** in the above case. Also enclosed IS the following:

- (1) Proof of service of the above Motion on the respondents

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully Yours,

Ann Stevenson

Ann Stevenson, Claimant/Appellant
2261 Greenleaf Drive
Conway, S.C. 29526
843-347-5151

cc: W. Johnnie Baxley III, Esquire
Wilson, Jones, Carter, & Baxley, PA
421 Wando Park Blvd.
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
843-284-1082
Attorney for Respondents

April 11, 2017

W. Johnnie Baxley III, Esquire
Wilson, Jones, Carter, & Baxley, PA
421 Wando Park Blvd.
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
843-284-1082
Attorney for Respondents

RECEIVED
APR 12 2017
SC Court of Appeals

RE: Ann Stevenson, Claimant/Appellant, vs. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Employer, and New Hampshire Insurance Company, Carrier/Defendants/Respondents, Worker's Compensation File No. 1303465

Dear Mr. Baxley:

Enclosed for filing is a **REPLY TO RESPONDENTS' RETURN TO MOTION TO ALLOW EVIDENCE THAT WAS PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED TO OR BY THE TRIAL COURT AND PLACED INTO EVIDENCE ORALLY OR MATERIALLY ALONG WHAT WAS LEGALLY SUPPOSED TO BE ATTACHED IN THE EVIDENCE CHAIN TO BE PLACED INTO THE RECORD OF APPEAL AND TO MAKE A RULING ON THE VALIDITY OF THE COMMISSION ORDERS WHICH ARE BASED UPON THE CORRUPTED EVIDENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS APA COPY OF FCE REPORT** in the above case.

Sincerely,



Ann Stevenson, Claimant/Appellant
2261 Greenleaf Drive
Conway, S.C. 29526
843-347-5151

cc: Ms. Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk, S.C. Court of Appeals
P.O. Box 11629
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29211

2261 Greenleaf Dr.

Conway



U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
CONWAY, SC
29526
APR 11 17
AMOUNT
\$5.17
R2304M114973-14

1010

29211

RECEIVED

APR 12 2017

SC Court of Appeals

7015 1520 0001 3201 0516

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT
OF THE RETURN ADDRESS. FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

CERTIFIED MAIL



7015 1520 0001 3201 0516

LA
GA

*Ms. Jenny Abbott Kitching's
Clerk, SC Court of Appeals
P.O. Box 11629
Columbia, SC 29211*