



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN
DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

November 17, 2017

The Honorable David Hamilton
PO Box 649
York SC 29745-0649

REMITTITUR

Re: SunTrust v. Mark Ostendorff
Lower Court Case No. 2007CP4604305
Appellate Case No. 2015-000198

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court is enclosed.

Very truly yours,


CLERK

Enclosure

cc: Mark Ostendorff
Brian Steed Tatum, Esquire

RECEIVED

NOV 15 2017

The Supreme Court of South Carolina ^{SC Court of Appeals}

SunTrust Mortgage, Inc., Respondent,

v.

Mark Ostendorff, Petitioner.

Appellate Case No. 2017-001938


Lower Court Case No. 2007-CP-46-04305

ORDER

Based on the vote of the Court, the petition for a writ of certiorari to review the Court of Appeals' decision in *SunTrust Mortgage, Inc. v. Ostendorff*, Op. No. 2017-UP-234 (S.C. Ct. App. filed May 31, 2017) is denied.

FOR THE COURT

BY



CLERK

Columbia, South Carolina

November 15, 2017

cc:

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings

Brian Steed Tatum, Esquire

Mark Ostendorff

The Honorable David Hamilton

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals**

SunTrust Mortgage, Inc., Respondent,

v.

Mark Ostendorff, Appellant

Appellate Case No. 2015-000198

Appeal From York County
S. Jackson Kimball, III, Master-in-Equity

Unpublished Opinion No. 2017-UP-234
Submitted March 1, 2017 – Filed May 31, 2017

APPEAL DISMISSED

Mark Ostendorff, of Central, pro se.

Brian Steed Tatum, of Tatum Law firm, PLLC, of
Charlotte, North Carolina, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: We dismiss this appeal pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and *Shields v. Martin Marietta Corp.*, 303 S.C. 469, 470, 402 S.E.2d 482, 483 (1991) (holding an order restoring a case to the active docket is not directly appealable).

AFFIRMED.¹

LOCKEMY, C.J., and HUFF and THOMAS, JJ., concur.

¹ We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.