

See Tuten v. joel, 410 S.C. 104, 763 S.E.2d 54 (Ct. App. 2014)

The Court of Appeals ruled that Joel had taken no steps to end the attorney-client relationship, that Joel himself never communicated with Ms. Tuten, and Ms. Glover's letter did not effectively convey that Joel would no longer be her lawyer. The court held that, at a minimum, Joel should have communicated to his client, in advance, that he intended to withdraw. Id. at 114, 763 S.E.2d at 60; see also In re Lorenz, 408 S.C. 324, 759 S.E.2d (2014) (disbar-ring real estate lawyer for, among other things, closing office and leaving the state without notice to clients, in violation of Rule 1.16).

Motions to withdraw as counsel are also subject to the duty to consult and confer with opposing counsel prior to filing the motion under Local Civil Rule 7.02 (federal court) and Rule 11(a) (state court).

On Thu, 8/24/17, Smith, Amelia G. <asmith@sccourts.org> wrote:

Subject: David Scot Lynd v. Dawn Caldwell 2016-002024

To: "dscotlyn@yahoo.com" <dscotlyn@yahoo.com>, "sandy@sennlegal.com" <sandy@sennlegal.com>, "jordan@dmorrison-law.com" <jordan@dmorrison-law.com>, "tdomin@clawsonandstaubes.com" <tdomin@clawsonandstaubes.com>, "david@dmorrison-law.com" <david@dmorrison-law.com>, "chris@sennlegal.com" <chris@sennlegal.com>

Date: Thursday, August 24, 2017, 2:37 PM

Attached please find an order filed in this case.

~~~ CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE ~~~ This message is intended only for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not read, copy, retain, or disseminate this message or any attachment. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete all copies of the message and any attachments.

**Smith, Amelia G.**

---

**From:** scot <dscotlyn@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 28, 2017 2:37 PM  
**To:** Smith, Amelia G.; Lockemy, James E.  
**Subject:** Re: David Scot Lynd v. Dawn Caldwell 2016-002024

also be advised i have not received a copy of the record of which 3 separate request have been made,

nor have i received the file from your friend mr greenberg that you are so adamant to protect

i cant do a brief without all the filings and records, two 3 page transcripts are not adequate

so that is another due process violation, you are repeatedly trying to get grounds to dismiss the case to prtect the state from its errors and IOP from its fraud.

CONSIDER THIS A MOTION TO REMOVE THE CASE TO FEDERAL COURT SO AS TO INCLUDE THE CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

-----

On Thu, 8/24/17, Smith, Amelia G. <asmith@sccourts.org> wrote:

Subject: David Scot Lynd v. Dawn Caldwell 2016-002024  
To: "dscotlyn@yahoo.com" <dscotlyn@yahoo.com>, "sandy@sennlegal.com" <sandy@sennlegal.com>, "jordan@dmorrison-law.com" <jordan@dmorrison-law.com>, "tdomin@clawsonandstaubes.com" <tdomin@clawsonandstaubes.com>, "david@dmorrison-law.com" <david@dmorrison-law.com>, "chris@sennlegal.com" <chris@sennlegal.com>  
Date: Thursday, August 24, 2017, 2:37 PM

**RECEIVED**  
AUG 28 2017  
SC Court of Appeals

Attached please find an order filed in this case.

~~~ CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE ~~~ This message is intended only for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not read, copy, retain, or disseminate this message or any attachment. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete all copies of the message and any attachments.