

STRITZINGER v BANK OF AMERICA IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

2020-000122

**NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF RECORD AND INTENT TO FILE COPIES OF US COURT OF
APPEALS APPELLATE BRIEFS WHICH WERE NEVER REVIEWED
NOTICE OF DEFAULT BY BANK OF AMERICA IN TRIAL COURT AND REQUEST FOR
DEFAULT JUDGEMENT AGAINST BANK OF AMERICA**

RECEIVED
FEB 03 2020
SC Court of Appeals

- APPELLANT NOTIFIES THE COURT THAT HE HAS RECEIVED A COPY OF THE COURTS TRANSCRIPT IN THIS CASE WHICH INCLUDES OPENING ARGUMENTS ONLY OF A TRIAL WHICH NEVER COMMENCED AND WAS TERMINATED BY THE CHIEF JUDGES ORDER OF THE FIFTH CIRCUIT (NEWMAN).
- FURTHERMORE, APPELLANT HAS A COPY OF A VERBAL DEPOSITION OF HIMSELF AND NOTICES OF FAILURE TO APPEAL IN DEPOSITIONS BY BANK OF AMERICA COUNSEL AND THEIR CLIENTS - TAKEN WHICH DISCUSSES ISSUES WHICH HAVE ARISEN SINCE **THE FILING** AND NOT THE JUDGMENT OF THE PREVIOUS FINAL ORDER OF NORTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT IN 2014 AS APPELLANT RECEIVED ANOTHER CONTRACT FROM BANK OF AMERICA IN AUGUST OF 2014. (SEE STRITZINGER v BANK OF AMERICA – 2014 - 766 S.E.2d 669 (2014))
- APPELLANT NOTIFIES THAT THE COURT, THAT BANK OF AMERICA FILED AN APPEARANCE IN THE LOWER COURT BUT DID NOT FILE A RESPONSIVE ANSWER AND IS IN DEFAULT. BANK OF AMERICA FILED A MOTION TO DISMISS WHICH DID NOT INCLUDE A RESPONSE TO ANY OF THE ISSUES PLEAD.
- APPELLANT BELIEVES A DEFAULT JUDGEMENT IS RELEVANT AND NECESSARY INCLUDING **DOUBLE AND PUNITIVE DAMAGES** ASSESSED FOR ASTON DEVELOPMENT SHAREHOLDERS WHO LOST MORE THAN 16M DOLLARS DUE TO ACTIONS TAKEN BY OFFICERS WRIGHT, SMITH, HOLLIDAY, MASSEY, MOYNIHAN, MONTAG, DARNELL, PRICE, LEWIS AND FREEH IN THE TRIAL COURT.
- PETITIONER NOTIFIES THE SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA ALREADY FOUND HIM A RESIDENT OF THE STATE OF VIRGINIA AS SEEN BELOW (EXHIBIT A) WHICH IS SOMETHING THIS COURT AND LOWER TRIAL COURTS CANNOT DISPUTE BUT IS IN DIRECT CONFLICT WITH ORDERS BY PROBATE JUDGES BELTON, AND SMILEY TO JUSTIFY THEIR OWN IRRATIONAL ACTIONS WHICH IMPACT NOT JUST HIM, BUT EVERY MEDICAL PATIENT IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA SERVED UNDER SIMILAR CIRCUMSTANCES, WITHOUT COUNSEL, WITHOUT ANY INVESTIGATION, AND WITHOUT MIRANDA BEING ADMINISTERED WHICH IS VERY IMPORTANT WHEN ONE ARRIVES AT A LOCAL HOSPITAL FOR TRIAGE WHICH IS WHY THE STATE OF VIRGINIA OFFERS NOTHING BUT NUTRITION AND GENERAL HEALTH CARE FOR 10 DAYS IN MOST CASES. (AS DOES DELAWARE AND FLORIDA).

JOHN S. STRITZINGER
2156 CRESTHILL RD
COLUMBIA, SC 29223

STRITZINGER v. BANK OF AMERICA

No. 424P14-1.

[Email](#) | [Print](#) | [Comments \(0\)](#)

View Case

[766 S.E.2d 669 \(2014\)](#)

STRITZINGER v. BANK OF AMERICA, et al.

Supreme Court of North Carolina.

December 18, 2014.

Attorney(s) appearing for the Case

J.S. Stritzinger, Virginia Beach, for Stritzinger, J.S.

The following order has been entered on the motion filed on the 20th of November 2014, by Plaintiff-Appellant for Petition for

[766 S.E.2d 670]

Extraordinary Relief and Certified Questions:

█ Motion Dismissed by order of the Court in conference, this the 18th of December 2014.