

RECEIVED November 8, 2018
NOV 13 2018
SC Court of Appeals

Dear Meredith (Law Clerk – Judge James Lockemy)Hyman/Brenton?
SUBJECT: "We the People" or the "BAR"

As denoted by my call with you on Monday (November 5, 2018) you have deemed that due to Legislation and or Rules/Regulations that you have the Power/Authority to deprive me of my RIGHT of "LIBERTY" inclusive of: (Freedom of Choice, Freedom to Contract). Thus, you proclaiming yourself to be a Lawyer then I am quite sure that your actions are being done so with INTENT!

Therefore, you are hereby given notice that you have and are engaged in:

§ 241 - Conspiracy against rights
§ 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law

Both of which are FELONIES for which I am sure you are aware.

Now as my case on appeal is in regards to violations of rights by that of a judge, and you yourself have engaged yourself of the same actions I will feel free in listing you as an accomplice in the action before court; in that of extortion and theft via fraud, coupled with Deprivation of Rights!

Thus, find attached a set of Interrogatives for the proceedings.

The answering of these Interrogatives will expose the TRUTH to everyone. Your, denial to respond to the interrogatives with an answer for which references LAW, will be deemed that you yourself is complicit with the criminal action of EXTORTION, Deprivation of Rights, and Deprivation of Rights under Color of Law that is being perpetrated by your Clerk and Deputy-Clerk under the supervision of Judge James E. Lockemy, and as it involves numerous players of the bank, and court, it falls as well in that of the legal definition of RACKETEERING!

It now comes a moment of TRUTH in which one must decide to uphold the God-Given Rights of the People as you are sworn to do as a "SERVANT" of "We the People" or be criminally and civilly charged when found to be engaged in Denial of RIGHTS bestowed upon man-kind by GOD!

As to confirm that you and the BAR Association has NO POWER or AUTHORITY to strip me, or any other American Citizen of ANY of MY God-Given RIGHTS, I provide the following cases as STANDING of the TRUTH:

"The State cannot diminish rights of the people."

Hertado v. California, 110 U.S. 516 (1884).

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them."

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966).

"The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime."

Miller v. U.S., 230 F 2d 486, 489 (1956).

"The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen." "His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution."

Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43, 74 (1905).

"It is manifest it was not left to the legislative power to exact any process which might be devised. The [due process] article is a restraint on the legislative as well as on the executive and judicial powers of government, and cannot be so construed as to leave congress free to make any process 'due process of law,' by its mere will."

Murray's Lessee v. Hoboken Imp. Co., 18 How. (59 U.S.) 272, 276 (1855);

French v. Barber Asphalt, 181 U.S. 324, 330 (1900).

"An act of the legislature is not necessarily the 'law of the land.' A state cannot make anything 'due process of law' which, by its own legislation, it declares to be such."

Burdick v. People, 36 N.E. 948, 949, 149 Ill. 600 (1894).

"'The law of the land,' as used in the constitution, has long had an interpretation, which is well understood and practically adhered to. It does not mean an Act of the Legislature; if such was the true interpretation, this branch of the government could at any time take away life, liberty, property and privilege, without a trial by jury."

Saco v. Wentworth, 37 Maine 165, 171 (1852).

"[T]he provision [due process clause] is designed to exclude oppression and arbitrary power from every branch of government."

Dupuy v. Tedora, 15 So.2d 886, 890, 204 La. 560 (1943).

TRUTH STATED BY THE FOUNDING FATHERS OF AMERICA

"The Legislative has no right to absolute, arbitrary power over the lives and fortunes of the people.

The Legislative cannot justly assume to itself a power to rule by extempore arbitrary decrees..."

Samuel Adams, The Rights of the Colonists (1772).

"It is not unfrequent to hear men declaim loudly upon liberty, who, if we may judge by the whole tenor of their actions, mean nothing else by it but their own liberty, to oppress without control or the restraint of laws all who are poorer or weaker than themselves."

Samuel Adams

"Liberty must at all hazards be supported. We have a right to it, derived from our Maker. But if we had not, our fathers have earned and bought it for us, at the expense of their ease, their estates, their pleasure, and their blood."

John Adams, 1765

"Without liberty, law loses its nature and its name, and becomes oppression. Without law, liberty also loses its nature and its name, and becomes licentiousness."

James Wilson, Of the Study of the Law in the United States, 1790

"The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

James Madison, Federalist 47, 1788

ARTICLE VI – UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION FOR AMERICA

"This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof;..shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding".

"The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution;" - ART. 6 U.S. CONST.

Please see the attached Interrogatives

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Bank of America)	Case No: 2018-001768
Respondent)	
)	
v.)	RULE 26
)	RULE 33
)	
Catherine Bishop)	
Appellant,)	Interrogative

APPELLANT SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO LAW CLERK MEREDITH V. HYMAN

COMES NOW Catherine Bishop, In Pro Propria Personam (hereinafter “Appellant”) who forthwith propounds the attached Interrogatories in regards to Court Process and engagement in Deprivation of Rights, pursuant to:

- FRCP Rule 26. Duty to Disclose; General Provisions Governing Discovery
- FRCP Rule 33. Interrogatories to Parties (inclusive to Court)

Enclosed is Interrogative denoted as Document EBTCADOR-2:
Page 05-05: INTERROGATIVES

INTERROGATIVES

1. Do you dispute that ALL American Citizens are entitled to Fair and Honest Hearings/Trials as a matter of RIGHT?
2. Do you dispute that God-Given RIGHTS cannot be stripped from any American Citizen unless through Due-Process which has incarcerated them?
3. Do you dispute that "NO" RIGHTS can be fined, fee'd, or taxed? (if so please state any law that you believe bestowed upon YOU, The BAR Association, or even the Government that allows for the RIGHTS to be stripped away from that of "We the People")
4. Is LIBERTY (Freedom of Choice, Freedom of Thought, Freedom to Contract) a God-Given RIGHT?
5. Is your oath and loyalty to that of upholding and protecting the God-Given Rights of "We the People" or is your loyalty and oath to the "BAR" Association?
6. If your Rules and or laws are contradictive to the United States Constitution for America then do you uphold them, or do you uphold the God-Given RIGHTS of "We the People"?
7. As the BAR Association, and therefore its Members have declared "We the People" to be too stupid, too incompetent, too ignorant in choosing who we wish to represent us; therefore allowing the BAR to be a MONOPOLY then one must ask how the same Members of the BAR have deemed us more than COMPETENT enough to represent ourselves in Court?
8. As ALL "BAR" members have declared that legislation and or laws/rules was implemented (Illegally and Unconstitutionally) that stripped away a God-Given RIGHT under the FRAUDULENT EXCUSE of protecting us then one must ask "If I have no knowledge of Rules, Processes, or Law, much less research skills yet I have a friend who does have knowledge of the Rules, Processes, Law, and research skills" then how am I being hurt if that individual represents me in court, as I have already acknowledged that this is the issue with my friend of the family, Mr. Watters? (Please state how I would not be hurt more by myself representing myself, than my friend!)
9. Do you believe that I am a child or that of a slave for which you have the Authority and or Power to decide what is best for me against my will? (We the People are SOVEREIGN and our Guaranteed Government is a REPUBLIC, not the BAR Association!)
10. Do you believe that following unconstitutional/illegal laws or rules gives you immunity when you are well aware that your said action being engaged in violates MY RIGHTS; just as it does to all "We the People?"
11. Do you believe that using the Nuremburg Defense of "I was just following orders" gives you immunity from prosecution?
12. Please provide proof within the United States Constitution "Enumerated Powers" that you believe gives you the Power and or Authority to strip away one's RIGHTS bestowed upon them by GOD!

I, Cathy Bishop, (Appellant), do hereby certify that on this 8th day of the month of November, 2018, a true copy of a 4-page letter and an attached Request for Interrogatories was furnished via Certified US Mail to:

South Carolina Court of Appeals
Attn: Meredith V. Hyman (Law Clerk of James E. Lockemy)
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201

And Faxed to (843)-774-0788
And E-Mailed mhyman@sccourts.org

Submitted by: *Catherine L. Bishop*
Cathy Bishop
cathy_bishop2002@yahoo.com
(803) 341-4278
306 Coral Way
Belvedere, SC29841

November 8, 2018

RECEIVED

NOV 15 2018

SC Court of Appeals

Dear Judge James E. Lockemy
SUBJECT: You Stand In-Error

As denoted by the letter that I received on Saturday the 3rd of November 2018 it is clear that you have misconstrued myself having you address EXTORTION by those for which you are their supervisor as being that of a Motion. I was not doing a Motion! I was bringing the issue of a criminal action being perpetrated by those under your supervision!

To ensure that you no longer feign Incompetence or Ignorance as to the facts at issue I am attaching an Interrogative so that NOTHING can be MISCONSTRUED!

Likewise, let us take notice of:

party in an appeal to receive costs from the losing party.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Why do I need to order transcripts?

The transcript shows what evidence and arguments were put before the lower court. This information is required for the Court's review of the appeal. In some cases, a transcript is not required, because all necessary information appears in court papers.

Rule 207 requires the appellant to order the lower court transcript from the court reporter when a transcript is required for the appeal. Generally, this must be done within ten days of serving the notice of appeal in civil cases and within 30 days of serving the notice in criminal cases. Refer to Rule 207 for exact details.

The transcript referred to in this rule is the circuit court transcript, not the transcript from proceedings before a magistrate, municipal judge, probate judge, or the like.

This transcript must be ordered from the circuit court reporter. Do not attempt to order it from the Court of Appeals, from the Supreme Court, from the lower court judge, from the Circuit Court Clerk, or from the Office of Court Administration. If you do not know the name of the court reporter, you may contact the Office of Court Administration to learn the name. However, you must still order the transcript within the time limits established in the Rule.

If a transcript is not required for the appeal, you need not order it.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

This will be referenced as "SCREENSHOT" in the Interrogatives attached; for which mirrors many of the questions that were already submitted to you but for which you acted like they did not exist when responding to the issue brought before you of Deprivation of Rights and EXTORTION, both of which are CRIMINAL FELONIES!

Thus, the answering of the Interrogatives will expose the TRUTH to everyone. Your, denial to respond to the interrogatives with an answer for which references LAW, will be deemed that you yourself is complicit with the criminal action of EXTORTION, Deprivation of Rights, and Deprivation of Rights under Color of Law that is being perpetrated by your Clerk and Deputy-Clerk under your supervision!

Likewise, it will denote that the TRUTH is that NO ONE is REQUIRED to order Court Transcripts in order to file an Appeal if all the necessary information for their Appeal appears within the court papers; and therefore the Court Clerk and Deputy Clerk under your supervision are engaging in EXTORTION, Deprivation of Rights, and Deprivation of Rights under Color of Law. Likewise, it is also denoted that since challenging the action being engaged by the court, those under your supervision have had the FAQ Section removed from being reviewed by the Public! Thereby, this action confirms both acknowledgement of the TRUTH that I have put before you, but also shows that your cohorts have tried to hide their actions (now when it was challenged)!

It now comes a moment of TRUTH in which one must decide to uphold the God-Given Rights of the People as you are sworn to do as a "SERVANT" of "We the People" or be criminally and civilly charged when found to be engaged in Denial of RIGHTS bestowed upon man-kind by GOD! As denoted one cannot be forced to buy a product in order to engage in a RIGHT!

As to confirm that you and the BAR Association has NO POWER or AUTHORITY to strip me of ANY of MY God-Given RIGHTS I provide the following cases as STANDING of the TRUTH:

"The State cannot diminish rights of the people."

Hertado v. California, 110 U.S. 516 (1884).

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them."

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966).

"The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime."

Miller v. U.S., 230 F 2d 486, 489 (1956).

"The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen." "His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution."

Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43, 74 (1905).

"It is manifest it was not left to the legislative power to exact any process which might be devised. The [due process] article is a restraint on the legislative as well as on the executive and judicial powers of government, and cannot be so construed as to leave congress free to make any process 'due process of law,' by its mere will."

Murray's Lessee v. Hoboken Imp. Co., 18 How. (59 U.S.) 272, 276 (1855);

French v. Barber Asphalt, 181 U.S. 324, 330 (1900).

"An act of the legislature is not necessarily the 'law of the land.' A state cannot make anything 'due process of law' which, by its own legislation, it declares to be such."

Burdick v. People, 36 N.E. 948, 949, 149 Ill. 600 (1894).

"'The law of the land,' as used in the constitution, has long had an interpretation, which is well understood and practically adhered to. It does not mean an Act of the Legislature; if such was the true interpretation, this branch of the government could at any time take away life, liberty, property and privilege, without a trial by jury."

Saco v. Wentworth, 37 Maine 165, 171 (1852).

"[T]he provision [due process clause] is designed to exclude oppression and arbitrary power from every branch of government."

Dupuy v. Tedora, 15 So.2d 886, 890, 204 La. 560 (1943).

TRUTH STATED BY THE FOUNDING FATHERS OF AMERICA

"The Legislative has no right to absolute, arbitrary power over the lives and fortunes of the people. The Legislative cannot justly assume to itself a power to rule by extempore arbitrary decrees..."

Samuel Adams, The Rights of the Colonists (1772).

"It is not unfrequent to hear men declaim loudly upon liberty, who, if we may judge by the whole tenor of their actions, mean nothing else by it but their own liberty, to oppress without control or the restraint of laws all who are poorer or weaker than themselves."

Samuel Adams

"Liberty must at all hazards be supported. We have a right to it, derived from our Maker. But if we had not, our fathers have earned and bought it for us, at the expense of their ease, their estates, their pleasure, and their blood."

John Adams, 1765

"Without liberty, law loses its nature and its name, and becomes oppression. Without law, liberty also loses its nature and its name, and becomes licentiousness."

James Wilson, Of the Study of the Law in the United States, 1790

"The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

James Madison, Federalist 47, 1788

ARTICLE VI – UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION FOR AMERICA

"This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof;..shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding".

"The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution;" - ART. 6 U.S. CONST.

Therefore, I now await you to intercede and bring this criminal activity within the court to a halt! This is not a motion but a notice of CRIMINAL ACTIVITY by that of the Court for you to correct!! Likewise, ALL previous cases handled by the Clerk off Court Ms. Jenny Abbott Kitchings, and Deputy Clerk of Court Ms. Claire Allen need to be reviewed for DENIAL of Due Process if any cases were dismissed for non-payment of transcripts for which like me were not necessary for other Appeals Cases!

Please see that my case is not and will not be dismissed for refusing to buy something that I do not want, nor need for me to proceed with my Appeals Case. Likewise, I also request, as you have taken up two weeks of my time for preparing an Initial Appeal that was brought to a halt by corruption within the courts, that I be provided these two weeks back to finish my Initial Appeal!

As you have proclaimed that "WE" in your RESPONSE LETTER, I request that you apprise me of who this whole "WE" includes that decided instead of answering the questions and addressing the issue, feigned that you all were construing my intention to being that of a motion, when to anyone with common sense and a fifth grade education could and can comprehend that for which was stated!

Therefore one must ask if you are feigning at being incompetent of the English Language, Ignorant of the English Language, or are engaged in corruption and are doing your best to hide-the fact by even having the existence of the FAQ Section removed from public viewing. If you proclaim that none of this applies to you, then one must ask "Are you Smarter than a Fifth-Grader?" Don't mean to question your action, but your response to the issue, and letter that was faxed to you, clearly indicates that you fall within one of these descriptions as were put forth!

Please see the attached Interrogatives

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Bank of America)	Case No: 2018-001768
Respondent)	
)	
v.)	RULE 26
)	RULE 33
)	
Catherine Bishop)	
Appellant,)	Interrogative

APPELLANT SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO JUDGE JAMES E. LOCKEMY

COMES NOW Catherine Bishop, In Pro Propria Personam (hereinafter “Appellant”) who forthwith propounds the attached Interrogatories in regards to Court Process under Judge James E. Lockemy, pursuant to:

FRCP Rule 26. Duty to Disclose; General Provisions Governing Discovery
FRCP Rule 33. Interrogatories to Parties (inclusive to Court)

Enclosed is Interrogative denoted as Document EBTCADOR-1:
Page 06-08: INTERROGATIVES
Page 06-06: SC Court of Appeals - FAQ Screenshot

INTERROGATIVES

1. Were you not made aware in the First Paragraph on the First Page of the Letter faxed to you, dated 28 October, that I was seeking for you to intercede on my behalf and that your contact information was being withheld from me by those under your supervision?
2. Were you not made aware in the Second Paragraph on the First Page of the Letter faxed to you, dated 28 October, that I demanded that you read the letter in its ENTIRETY so that you would understand the issue that was being placed at your feet?
3. Were you not made aware in the Second Paragraph on the First Page of the Letter faxed to you, dated 28 October, that Clerk Jenny Abbott Kitchings and Deputy Clerk Claire Allen were engaged in: EXTORTION, EXTORTION via the mail system, Deprivation of Rights, and Deprivation of Rights under Color of Law?
4. Were you not made aware on the third sentence up from the bottom of the First Page of the letter faxed to you, dated 28 October, and even provided a link to the SCCOURTS CONTENT (FAQ SECTION) under that of Court of Appeals?
5. Were you not made aware on the last sentence on the bottom of the First Page of the letter faxed to you, dated 28 October, that I was even providing you a screen shot on the SECTION for which was addressing the issue of transcripts?
6. At the TOP of the Second Page of the letter faxed to you, dated 28 October, not show a screen shot of the SECTION addressing the issue of transcripts?

To refresh your memory I happily provide you another screenshot of this same said SECTION:

party in an appeal to receive costs from the losing party.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Why do I need to order transcripts?

The transcript shows what evidence and arguments were put before the lower court. This information is required for the Court's review of the appeal. In some cases, a transcript is not required, because all necessary information appears in court papers.

Rule 207 requires the appellant to order the lower court transcript from the court reporter when a transcript is required for the appeal. Generally, this must be done within ten days of serving the notice of appeal in civil cases and within 30 days of serving the notice in criminal cases. Refer to Rule 207 for exact details.

The transcript referred to in this rule is the circuit court transcript, not the transcript from proceedings before a magistrate, municipal judge, probate judge, or the like.

This transcript must be ordered from the circuit court reporter. Do not attempt to order it from the Court of Appeals, from the Supreme Court, from the lower court judge, from the Circuit Court Clerk, or from the Office of Court Administration. If you do not know the name of the court reporter, you may contact the Office of Court Administration to learn the name. However, you must still order the transcript within the time limits established in the Rule.

If a transcript is not required for the appeal, you need not order it.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

7. Within Point 1 on the Second Page of the letter faxed to you, dated 28 October, did I not provide you with the following three questions, for which in your response you neither addressed nor answered?

Question 1: "So, as denoted the first sentence states "The **TRANSCRIPT** shows what evidence and arguments were put before the lower court." Do you dispute that it states this?"

Question 2: "The second sentence states, and I quote "This information is required for the Court's review of the appeal." Now do I not proclaim that this information is not required for a proper appeal! Can you not understand that "MY" Appeals Case has all this information "REQUIRED" within the Court Papers, Documents, Exhibits, and Evidence?"

Question 3: "The third sentence states" and I quote "**In some cases, a transcript is not required, because all necessary information appears in court papers.**" Do you dispute that it states this?"

8. I now once again ask that you refer to the screenshot, as seen after question 6 in this set of Interrogatives, and answer: The third sentence states" and I quote "**In some cases, a transcript is not required, because all necessary information appears in court papers.**" Do you dispute that it states this?
9. Within Point 2 on the Second Page of the letter faxed to you, dated 28 October, did I not state: "The first sentence of the second paragraph states "Rule 207 requires the appellant to order the lower court transcript from the court reporter when a transcript is required for the appeal." Now do you dispute that it states this?" (for which you refused to address or answer in your response dated October 31st, 2018)
10. I now once again ask that you refer to the screenshot, as seen after question 6 in this set of Interrogatives, and answer: The first sentence of the second paragraph states "Rule 207 requires the appellant to order the lower court transcript from the court reporter when a transcript is required for the appeal." Now do you dispute that it states this?
11. Do you dispute that the statement/wording "when a transcript is required for the appeal" does not imply, if not outright infer, that a transcript is not always required for an appeal?
12. Do you dispute that on page three of the letter faxed to you, dated 28 October, (in reference to the screenshot as shown again after question 6 in this set of Affidavits) did I not state in Point 3 "This brings us to the last sentence in the section denoted as "**Why do I need to order transcripts?**" which states, and I quote "**If a transcript is not required for the appeal, you need not order it.**" Do you dispute that this is stated?"
13. Do you dispute that on page three of the letter faxed to you, dated 28 October, (in reference to the screenshot as shown again after question 6 in this set of Affidavits) did I not state in Point 3, the second paragraph "Again, let me reiterate "MY" Appeals Case has all the information "REQUIRED" within the Court Papers, Documents, Exhibits, Evidence, and Rulings." Therefore a transcript is not REQUIRED; and as stated "if a transcript is not required then for the appeal, you need not order it."?

14. Do you dispute that after you were notified of these criminal actions that you or someone from within the Clerk of Court had the FAQ Section removed from sight of the Public; on that of the noted links under that of Court of Appeals?
15. Do you dispute that Rule 207 does not apply to everyone; as it only applies to those who do not have sufficient claims as already substantiated with court Papers, Exhibits, Motions, Rulings, and Evidence?
16. If you feign ignorance and proclaim that Rule 207 is applicable to all then provide proof; i.e. the original legislation which brought that rule into existence for which we can see the INTENT of the Rule!
17. Do you dispute that ALL American Citizens are entitled to Fair and Honest Hearings/Trials as a matter of RIGHT?
18. Do you dispute that God-Given RIGHTS cannot be stripped from any American Citizen unless through Due-Process which has incarcerated them?
19. Do you dispute that no RIGHTS can be fined, fee'd, or taxed? (if so please state any law that you believe bestowed upon YOU, The BAR Association, or even the Government that allows for the RIGHTS to be stripped away from that of "We the People")
20. Is LIBERTY (Freedom of Choice, Freedom of Thought, Freedom to Contract) a God-Given RIGHT?
21. Is your oath and loyalty to that of upholding and protecting the God-Given Rights of "We the People" or is your loyalty and oath to the "BAR" Association?
22. If your Rules and or laws are contradictive to the United States Constitution for America then do you uphold them, or do you uphold the God-Given RIGHTS of "We the People"?
23. As the Judges and the BAR Members have declared "We the People" to be too stupid, too incompetent, too ignorant in choosing who we wish to represent us; therefore allowing the BAR to be a MONOPOLY then one must ask how the same Judges, and Members of the BAR have deemed us more than COMPETENT enough to represent ourselves in Court?
24. As ALL "BAR" members have declared that you all have attempted to legislate (Illegally and Unconstitutionally) away a God-Given RIGHT under the FRAUDULENT EXCUSE of protecting us then one must ask "If I have no knowledge of Rules, Processes, or Law, much less research skills yet I have a friend who does have knowledge of the Rules, Processes, Law, and research skills" then how am I being hurt if that individual represents me in court, as I have already acknowledged that this is the issue with my friend of the family, Mr. Watters? (Please state how I would not be hurt more by myself representing myself, than my friend!)
25. Do you believe that I am a child or that of a slave for which you have the Authority and or Power to decide what is best for me against my will? (We the People are SOVEREIGN and our Guaranteed Government is a REPUBLIC, not the BAR Association!)

I, Cathy Bishop, (Appellant), do hereby certify that on this 8th day of the month of November, 2018, a true copy of a 4-page letter and an attached Request for Interrogatories was furnished via Certified US Mail to:

South Carolina Court of Appeals
Attn: Judge James E. Lockemy (Supervisor of Clerk of Court)
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201

And Faxed to (843)-774-0788
And E-Mailed jlockemy@sccourts.org


Submitted by: *Catherine L. Bishop*
Cathy Bishop
cathy_bishop2002@yahoo.com
(803) 341-4278
306 Coral Way
Belvedere, SC29841





Ms. Cathy Bishop
306 Coral Way
Belvedere, SC 29841

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

CERTIFIED MAIL



7018 1830 0001 4985 1745

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FCM LG ENV
NORTH AUGUSTA, SC
29841
NOV 08, 18
AMOUNT

\$7.83
R2304M113273-11

1000 29201

* ATT: MEREDITH V. HYMAN (LAW CLERK TO J. LOCKEMY)
* ATT: JUDGE JAMES E. LOCKEMY

SC COURT OF APPEALS
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

RECEIVED
NOV 13 2018
SC Court of Appeals
29201

ATT: HYMAN
ATT: LOCKEMY
11/13/18