

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Diane Shafer Goodstein, Presiding Judge
First Judicial Court Judge, Ninth Judicial Circuit
Charleston County
Charleston, South Carolina

Case No. 2018-CP-10-1163

RECEIVED

OCT 12 2018

SC Court of Appeals

Young Clement Rivers, LLP Law Firm
Joseph J. Tierney, Jr. Esquire and
Ms. Christine Kent Toporek, Esquire
Counsels for defendants Dr. George H.
Khoury and Bon Secous St. Francis,
West Ashley, 843-577-4000
P. O. Box 993, Charleston, S. C. 29402

Respondent

vs

Thelma R. Garrick, Pro Se Attorney

Appellant

(INITIAL) BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Thelma R. Garrick
195 Crescent Oaks Ct.
Orangeburg, S. C. 29115
803-534-9912
Pro Se attorney for Appellant

Page -2-

Notice of Appeal

Case No. 2018-CP-10-1163

Joseph J. Tierney, Jr..... Respondent

For Dr. George H. Khoury and Bon

Secours St. Francis, W. Ashley

Vs

Thelma R. Garrick, Pro Se atty..... Appellant

I, Thelma R. Garrick, party aggrieved by a judgment to dismiss case #2018-CP-10-1163, prepared (but not dated) by the Counsel for the Respondents and signed off on July 25, 2018 by Judge Diane S. Goodstein, Judicial Court Judge for Charleston County South Carolina without the appearance or hearing from the Appellant.

Appellant, after learning more news regarding her health requested an extension to the court date of July 12, 2018. This request for an extension was made in a timely manner as directed but the Clerk of Court's office never acknowledged this document. Nor has it been to this date even with proof of delivery to all parties. It is understood that as Appellant awaited notification of an approval of extension or new hearing date the Respondent's Counsel met with Judge Goodstein (ex parte communication?) This was unprecedented, as both had received copies of the request for an extension.

Also, Appellant learned of the hearing from the Clerk of Court's office in a telephone call requesting why she had not heard back from the Court. Appellant requested the verification of the date of hearing but was told that Judge Goodstein was not on the docket on July 12th but was on July 23rd? The correct date was needed for the request of a copy of the transcript. I am awaiting a call for the charges, as I did not know how many pages were in the transcript. It is difficult when you are not on any electronic devices or Internet. Upon receipt of this information funds will be sent post haste.

My petition for an appeal is based also on the following miscarriages of Justice and as outlined in the Motion to Dismiss:

1. Dismissal of Case.
2. False allegations by Respondents' counsel:
 - a.) Medical Neglect
 - b.) Negligence by staff and nurses
 - c.) Expert Witness
3. Disrespect and contempt toward Appellant for Pro Se status.
 - a.) Continual battery to dismiss
 - b.) Settlement offer disregarded, would not discuss (No longer on table)
 - c.) Underlying and subtle hints that Appellant not harmed in any way
4. Dr. George H. Khoury's deliberate lies and subterfuge as to my knowledge and permission to agree to the massive experimental surgery.
 - a.) Drugged immediately

a.) Drugged immediately

Page -3-

Continuation of Appeal

Case No. 2018-CP-10-1163


5. Experimental Surgery for monetary gain.
6. The two witnesses taking Appellant to operating room drugged would not witness her signature; another employee who was not even there witnessed.
7. Appellant not a candidate for surgery.
8. Damage done to spine, lifestyle because of permanent pain and trouble sitting, or standing for length of time.
9. Doctor's statement on the surgery needed.
10. Case not based on neglect or about if the surgery was done correctly.
11. Judge
12. MRIs', CT scans, X-rays


This appeal is being filed for Justice of illegal personal actions and falsehoods taken on behalf of the Respondents that were motivated by greed without the knowledge or permission of the patient, Appellant. No excuse can be given for this massive surgery. The preparation needed in and out of the operating room (according to my research) would have taken considerable time to set things up and get the Robotic Arm (Medtronic Navigation System) in place for their two representatives to operate and teach Dr. Khoury, his staff, and God knows who else who observed this surgery. I have requested the video; there is no way they did not do one because it was a teaching process.

The surgery performed on the Appellant was premeditated with intent to harm. This is not an idle accusation but a common sense knowledge that in order to test this Medtronic Pain Distribution Port Appellant had to be kept in pain to see if it would help the pain. Not tested approved or FDA approval Dr. Khoury agreed to test their implants for monetary gain. Again, without her knowledge or permission! He knew she was not a candidate because of her allergies but chanced her demise by giving her medicines he knew she was allergic to according to the hospital records.

I thank the Appellant Court for giving me the chance to present this case honestly and without prejudice.

Also I ask the Court of Appeals to change the presentation of this case from a Judge to a jury trial. Thank you.



 South Carolina
Dated: 10-5-18

STATEMENTS OF CASE NO, 2018-CP-10-1163

On March 5, 2018 Thelma R. Garrick, Appellant, filed a Summons and Complaint against Dr. George H. Khoury, neurosurgeon, and Bon Secours St. Frances, West Ashley hospital in the County of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina in the Court of Common Pleas; alleging an illegal experimental surgery had been performed in lieu of the fusion to relieve pressure on the left sciatic nerve that had been discussed before surgery. The experimental surgery was performed premeditatedly with intent to harm in order to test a Medtronic Pain Distribution Port (name given by Dr. Khoury's office staff) without Appellant's knowledge of the change of procedure or without her permission.

DISMISSAL OF THE CASE

The Respondent's Counsel met with the assigned Judge on July 12, 2018 even though they knew an extension had been requested by the Appellant who was waiting to hear from the Court. Therefore, only one side of the case was discussed on Counsel's scenario or their version of why the case was filed. This case was not filed on neglect or negligence on Doctor's part, hospital or staff and nurses as alleged by Counsel for Respondents. Nowhere can this be found in Appellant's Summons and Complaint or any document thereafter.

My statement in the Summons and Complaint, "Doctor performed major back surgery using medical devices for experimentation and benefit. Doctor premeditatedly, willingly, knowingly implanted experimental devices and medication known for its permanent, debilitating injuries without Plaintiff's knowledge or permission."

As stated in the Brief of Appellant this case was dismissed upon written Motion by the Counsel for the Respondents due to Counsel's lack of understanding on what grounds the case was filed. This motion was actually signed off by the Judge on July 25, 2018 after Counsel for the Respondents and the Judge met on the Court date July 12, 2018. Again, without Appellant's presence as she waited to hear from the Court on her request for a continuance that was forwarded by US Mail, filed and received by the Court within the timeframe given by the Court.

Appellant's contact according to "Notice of Motion Scheduling" dated June 13, 2018 was Ms. Caroline Leonard. Numerous telephone messages were left on her telephone because of her busy schedule in Court. However, I spoke to her personally on two occasions where she promised to get back to Appellant regarding her request for an extension. Ms. Leonard never contacted the Appellant before the hearing or after.

Appellant does not have Internet to e-mail and this I conveyed to all parties of contact.

EXPERT WITNESS

Appellant has all MRI's, CT scans, X-rays from January 15, 2015 through June 27, 2018. They tell a story and this is what will be presented to the jury. A commoner can see the evidence with the naked eye from the full back MRI before surgery to immediately after surgery, and damage to the spine through June 27, 2018.

Anyone looking at these films will understand the pain and suffering I am also in, just as I understood why I have so much pain as I looked at them. It is not necessary to pay an expert witness to testify and say what you want him to say. I would be more than happy to question the expert witness of the Respondents.

COVER UP

The first knowledge the Appellant had of the experimental surgery was six months after the surgery on August 20, 2015. My health was deteriorating rapidly when Dr. Khoury showed me on March 7, 2016 the lower lumbar MRI I had done on March 3rd, and explained to me that my "body was rejecting what he had put in me". He discussed the MRI in detail and explained also the Distribution port and how it worked. Because of his meticulous detail that day I have been able to understand what is happening to my body. He indicated that the port should be removed. (At this point you could not see how the weight of the port had altered my spine.) And, at this time Dr. Khoury had not told me the rest of the experimentation to my spine.

My next appointment was for April 18, 2016. He again took Appellant to the computer screen and showed her a full scan of the entire spine. I immediately told him that was not the one he showed me on March 7th. He shrugged and said that this was all he had. We argued for almost an hour with him denying everything he had shown me and told me on March 7th. A complete cover-up! He tried to use psychology saying my mind was bad and I did not remember. He said I should give him a date to operate but got angry with me because I did not answer him immediately. He left the room saying "Let me know within twenty-four hours the date you want the surgery". (I have proof of this.)

Needless to say I never went back but went for a second opinion. The second opinion neurosurgeon exclaimed when he saw me that he thought I would be in a wheel chair because I had been cut in half, split open and my entire spine was altered. There was nothing he could do for me. From this doctor's statement I learned from Medicare that my spine had been severed and grafted back together but nothing else.

From my third opinion neurosurgeon who would not see me but after looking at films had his nurse call me to tell Appellant that he could not help me.

From my fourth opinion from Duke, North Carolina I learned that I had a cage around the severed spine area. But did not learn of the "Infuse" insertion into my spine until the first part of 2018 (Also in last hospital records I received.) I had suspected it but did not learn officially or had it confirmed until January 4, 2018 by a Medtronic Calm Department. This Orthopedic doctor said I had four choices (had witness): 1.) Go back to Dr. Khoury; 2.) Let him give me the shot to test the port; 3.) Get me an attorney and sort it out or 4.) Go home and learn to live with the pain.

Before I filed my lawsuit Dr. Khoury called my house twice. The first was a message that proves I knew nothing of the change in surgery. The second was he trying to get me to come in and see him and discuss my surgery with him. He tried psychology again saying that what happened really did not happen that I just could not remember. No further contact.

DISRESPECT AND CONTEMPT BY RESPONDENTS COUNSEL

It was evident from the beginning his contempt of filing Pro Se. In fact, I filed my Summons and Complaint on March 5, 2018 and Counsel for the Respondents filed a Motion to Dismiss on March 20, 2018. (So far Appellant has been able to block dismissals with Motion to Dismiss and Rebuttals. I have never heard anything from the court until I received the Motion to Schedule hearing.)

Appellant learned that before the hearing arbitration was necessary. Appellant did not hear from Respondents Counsel. A Settlement offer was forward to their counsel. Never received an acknowledgement. The Settlement Offer is an embarrassment because it was so low but at the time I only wanted to prove to the Respondents that they could not do anything they wanted with a patient in the operating room whether old or young.

Please be advised that the Settlement is no longer on the table!

DELIBERATE LIES AND SUBTERFUSE

Drugged immediately upon arrival at hospital. The Circulator for the surgery tried to hide the hypodermic needle when she put it into the IV port. Appellant was asked to sign Release for surgery while under sedation and on the way to operating room. Witness to Appellant's signature did not witness signature. Dr. Khoury tested the port immediately after surgery while patient in inhumane pain.

EXPERIMENTAL SURGERY FOR MONETARY GAIN

Dr. Khoury had four-year contract with Medtronic 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016. Also received monetary compensation. This can be reviewed under a public portal. (Information obtained from two staff writers of the Star Tribune.)

APPELLANT NOT A CANDIDATE FOR SURGERY

Highly allergic to Steroids and many others.

DOCTOR'S SIGNED REPORT OF JUNE 27, 2018

Appellant tried to seek relief from pain for the fifth time. Now accepts advice not to have surgery from three other surgeons until the implants become life threatening.

Neurosurgeon's signed statement on how he could help me with the surgery needed.

"His Assessment:

"Complex patient with advanced degenerative changes and instrumentation (distribution port defective and the rod holding it secure is broken at the spine) with pseudoarthrosis.

I have reviewed in detail risks, benefits and alternatives. I have informed the patient and family of the fact that not all medical procedures and techniques have been studied for "FDA" approval, and by necessity some procedures and devices may be used in a manner that has been studied (considered "off label"), I have specifically discussed with the patient and family the risks of worsening neurologic function, even death, infections, significant bleeding including injury to surrounding structures. These injuries may lead to the need for additions human, or inanimate origin may be used. I have instructed them that the devices that may be used are subject to mechanical failure and may need to be replaced or revised. I have fully described the expected procedure and some possible deviations that may occur by necessity." The operation, he said, would be 6 to 7 hours with no guarantees."

Appellant would never agree to this surgery any more than she would agree to the experimental surgery Dr. Khoury performed.

Both doctors work with Medtronic and both admitted to using the Infuse medicine all of the time. My research has led me to learn that over 8,000 people have been permanently disabled with this drug. So far there has been five states with big litigation suits. My last MRI indicates that I too have abnormal bone growth.

MEDICAL BATTERY

Dr. Khoury informed me on the telephone that he had only put one rod and two screws in my spine. To what or to whom did he turn my body over too? I am a very private person so who all looked at my body during the operation with no clothes on?

Appellant learned, from the hospital records, that two Medtronic Representatives were in the operating room training the medical team on their new Navigation System (Robotic Arm). Again, without my knowledge. So what went on in that operating room? I know with an experimental operation of this magnitude a video would have been made but upon my request I was told by medical records that there was not one or they did not know of one.

I can understand why the Respondents Counsel does not want this case to go to court, and with my inexperience it may very well not because of disrespect of Appellant as a Pro Se Attorney. It is extremely difficult because the State does not have an outline like the Divorce and Family Court cases.

JUDGE

Years ago, a case involving false allegations by a State Attorney was filed against my brother. Judge Diane S. Goodstein was the Judge who believed this attorney and arrested him charging him with stalking. The State took her word and he spent five years in prison in the worst facility you have in South Carolina. This man's career was in the military, policy officer in both North and South Carolina; and later to make more money for his family went into Finance advancing rapidly until he opened his own Mortgage Broker Company. It was as if I spent those five years with him as I supported, encouraged, and visited every visiting day because I knew he was innocent.

I believe it would be best if she were recused from this case.

Thank you for understanding.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, I ask this Court to reverse the judgment on Case No. 2018-CP-10-1163 entered on the 25th of July 2018 by the Circuit Court of Common Pleas of Charleston County, Charleston, South Carolina, ninth circuit court.

Respectfully submitted,



Thelma R. Garrick
195 Crescent Oaks Court
Orangeburg, South Carolina 29115
803-534-9912
Attorney Pro Se

October 4, 2018

Copies to:

The Honorable Julie J. Armstrong
Court of Common Pleas
Charleston County Judicial Center
100 Broad Street, Suite 106
Charleston, S. C. 20401-940

and

Mr. Joseph J. Tierney, Jr. Esquire
Ms. Christine K. Toporek, Esquire
Young Clement Rivers, LLP
Calhoun Street, Suite 400
P. O. Box 993
Charleston, S. C, 29402
843-577-4000

PROOF OF SERVICE OF NOTICE OF APPEAL

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Diane S. Goodstein, Circuit Court Judge

RECEIVED
OCT 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

Case No. 2018-CP-10-1163

Young Clement Rivers, LLP
Law Firm, Joseph J. Tierney, Jr.
And Ms. Christine Kent Toporek
Counsels for defendants Dr. George
H. Khoury and Bon Secours St.
Francis, West Ashley

Respondent

vs.

Thelma R. Garrick

Appellant

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served Notice of Appeal on the Honorable Julie J. Armstrong, Clerk of Court, C.P. & G.S., 100 Broad Street, Suite 106, Charleston, S. C. 29401-2258; with copies to Joseph J. Tierney, Jr. Esquire, Counsel for the Defendants, to P. O. Box 993, Charleston, South Carolina 29402, telephone No. 843-577-4000, and the Honorable Diane S. Goodstein, Judge First Judicial Circuit, State of South Carolina, P. O. Box 234, St. George, S. C. 29477 by depositing a copy to each in the United States Mail, certified, prepaid on September 6 (Copy enclosed).

October 3, 2018

October 5, 2018

South Carolina Court of Appeals
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

RECEIVED

OCT 12 2018

SC Court of Appeals

88078

Dear Sir or Madam:

Reference: Case No. 2018-CP-10-1163
Court of Common Pleas
Charleston County
Charleston, South Carolina

Defendants, Dr. George H. Khoury and Bon Secours
St. Francis, West Ashley vs Plaintiff, Thelma R. Garrick

Enclosed you will find request to appeal the judgment of dismissal dated July 25, 2018 by Judge Diane S. Goodstein. Documents enclosed are:

Proof of Service – Letter to Defendants Counsel
(Initial) Brief of Appellant
Filing fee – Check in the amount of \$100.00

Thank you in advance for your perception of the case and approval.

Yours truly,


Thelma R. Garrick

/tg

Enclosures

LETTER TO CLERK OF LOWER COURT
NOTICE OF APPEAL

In The Court of Common Pleas
Charleston, South Carolina

CASE No. 2018-CP-10-1163

Diane S. Goodstein, Presiding Judge,
Ninth Judicial Circuit
First Judicial Court Judge

September 6, 2018

RECEIVED
OCT 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

RE: Thelma R. Garrick Appellant-Respondent

vs

Joseph J. Tierney, Jr., Young Clement Respondent-Appellant
Rivers LLP, Counsel for the Defendants
Dr. George H. Khoury and
Bon Secours Roper St. Francis,
West Ashley

The Honorable Julie J. Armstrong
Clerk of Court, C.P. & G.S.
100 Broad Street, Suite 106
Charleston, South Carolina 29401-2258

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

I received the Judgment to Dismiss the above case from the Court on August 9, 2018. I immediately forward a letter to the Clerk of Court of Common Pleas who had totally dismissed my request for an extension that was filed in a timely manner.

This letter will serve as my notice of appeal in the above case. (Please excuse any errors because it is very difficult to type with a broken arm.)


The following judgments are to be appealed through the Appellate Court of South Carolina.

1. Request for continuance of the Notice of Motion Scheduling sent to the Clerk of Court totally ignored. To this date still have not had it acknowledged by the Court, Attorneys for Defendants or Judge presiding prior to the court date of July 12, 2018.
2. Prove the false allegations by attorneys for the Defendants regarding reason

- for filing Case.
3. Prove that an "Expert Witness" is not needed through a video from X-rays, Cat scans, MRIs, and Hospital records.
 4. Prove that Dr. Khoury broke his Hippocratic Oath when he promised to harm no one.
 5. Prove that Dr. Khoury did not do the entire surgery but had two Medtronic representatives in the operating room training and taking over my body using their Navigation System (Robotic Arm) without my knowledge or permission.
 6. Prove Dr. Khoury did not have my permission to change my operation from a fusion to relieve pressure on left sciatic nerve to an Experimental Surgery that altered my entire spine.
 7. Prove that Dr. Khoury and Hospital gained monetarily from this operation, and that he had a four-year contract to use their devices, etc.
 8. Prove that Plaintiff was not a candidate for the surgery because of allergies.
 9. Prove surgery is not an option to correct damage done to spine, lifestyle, or permanent pain. (Plaintiff learned on June 29, 2018 that Pain Port is broken into at the spine, and there is abnormal bone growth where spine was severed in order to test the Medtronic "Infuse" that through research over 8,000 people have been permanently disabled. No one will show Plaintiff whether or not cage is secure.)
 10. Prove that Defendants attorneys showed only contempt toward Pro Se attorney.

A more full and complete order is to follow. All Respondents have been notified by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested via Postal Service this date, September 6, 2018.

Sincerely,


Thelma R. Garrick PRO SE
195 Crescent Oaks Ct.
Orangeburg, S, C, 19115
803-534-9912

cc: Mr. Joseph J. Tierney, Jr.
Ms. Christine K. Toporek
Young Clement Rivers LLP
Attorneys at Law
P. O. Box 993
Charleston, S.C. 29402
843-720-5406

Honorable Diane S. Goodstein, Judge
First Judicial Circuit
State of South Carolina
P. O. Box 234
St. George, S. C. 29477

RECEIVED

OCT 12 2018

ORANGEBURG
1550 MIDDLETON ST
ORANGEBURG
SC

SC Court of Appeals

29115-9998
4565400115

09/06/2018 (800)275-8777 2:12 PM

Product Description	Sale Qty	Final Price
First-Class Mail	1	\$0.50

2
9
6924 TREE 0000 0900 9T02

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee	\$3.45
Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)	\$2.75
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt (hardcopy)	\$2.75
<input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt (electronic)	\$0.00
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified Mail Restricted Delivery	\$0.00
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Required	\$0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Restricted Delivery	\$0.00
Postage	\$0.71
Total Postage and Fees	\$6.91

0115
26

Postmark
Here

09/06/2018

Sent To
The Honorable Julie J. Livingston, Clerk Court
Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No. *of Common Pleas*
101 Broad St. Suite 106
City, State, ZIP+4® *Charleston, D.C. 29401-2258*

U.S. Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9000 See Reverse for Instructions

ORANGEBURG, SC 29401
(Weight: 0 Lb 1.20 Oz)
(Estimated Delivery Date)
(Saturday 09/08/2018)

Certified 1 \$3.45
(@@USPS Certified Mail #)
(70180360000033914289)

Return 1 \$2.75
Receipt
(@@USPS Return Receipt #)
(9590940240538079731243)

Total \$20.31

RECEIVED
 OCT 12 2018
 SC Court of Appeals

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-8053

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)
 7018 0360 0000 3391 4289

9590 9402 4053 8079 7312 43

The Honorable Justice D. D. Lindsey
 Clerk of Court of Common Pleas
 100 Broad St. Suite 106
 Charleston, S.C. 29401-2258

1. Article Addressed to:
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
 Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
 Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

3. Service Type
 Adult Signature
 Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
 Certified Mail®
 Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
 Collect on Delivery
 Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
 Insured Mail (over \$500)
 Registered Mail™
 Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
 Return Receipt for Merchandise
 Signature Confirmation™
 Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery
 Priority Mail Express®
 Registered Mail™
 Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
 Return Receipt for Merchandise
 Signature Confirmation™
 Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature
 [Signature]

B. Received by (Printed Name)
 [Signature]

C. Date of Delivery
 9-10-18

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes
 If YES, enter delivery address below: No

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-8053

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

1. Article Addressed to:
 Honorable Diane S. Dordstein
 First Judicial Circuit of S.C.
 P.O. Box 234
 St. George, S.C. 29477

9590 9402 4053 8079 7312 50

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)
 7018 0360 0000 3391 4296

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-8053

Domestic Return Receipt

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature
 [Signature]

B. Received by (Printed Name)
 Karen M Parker

C. Date of Delivery
 9-10-18

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes
 If YES, enter delivery address below: No

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-8053

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

1. Article Addressed to:
 Joseph J. Terry, Jr., Esquire
 Young Clement Rivers, LLP
 P.O. Box 993
 Charleston, S.C. 29402

9590 9402 4053 8079 7312 36

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-8053

Domestic Return Receipt

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature
 [Signature]

B. Received by (Printed Name)
 MARY S. HOFFMAN

C. Date of Delivery
 9-10-18


D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes
 If YES, enter delivery address below: No

3. Service Type
 Adult Signature
 Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
 Certified Mail®
 Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
 Collect on Delivery
 Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
 Insured Mail (over \$500)
 Priority Mail Express®
 Registered Mail™
 Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
 Return Receipt for Merchandise
 Signature Confirmation™
 Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

Helma R. Garrick
195 Crescent Oaks Ct
Orangeburg, S. C. 29115


CERTIFIED MAIL



7018 0360 0000 3391 4319



1000



29201

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FCM LG ENV
ORANGEBURG, SC
29115
OCT 06, 18
AMOUNT

\$5.29

R2304M115448-10

RECEIVED
OCT 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

South Carolina Court of Appeals
1220 Penate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201