

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Cynthia Holmes, M.D., Petitioner,

v.

Haynsworth Sinkler Boyd, P.A., successor to Sinkler &
Boyd, P.A., Manton Greer and James Y. Becker,
Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2020-001096

ORDER

Petitioner seeks a twenty-day extension of time to serve and file a petition for a writ of certiorari and appendix to challenge the Court of Appeals' order dismissing her notice of appeal on the basis that it was untimely and that the orders on appeal were interlocutory and not immediately appealable.¹ She also requests the time to serve and file the petition and appendix be held in abeyance pending a decision on the motion.

By Order dated August 12, 2020, petitioner was granted a twenty-day extension of time to serve and file her petition for a writ of certiorari and appendix, which exhausted the extension permitted in matters filed under Rule 242 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR). *See RE: Extensions in Cases Seeking a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to Review a Decision of the South Carolina Court of Appeals*, S.C. Sup. Ct. Order dated June 16, 2014 (providing a party may be granted extensions totaling no more than twenty days during the proceedings before this Court under Rule 242, SCACR, unless the party provides evidence of the existence of "extraordinary circumstances such as illness or other

¹ The Appellate Case Number before the Court of Appeals was 2019-000880.

circumstances beyond the control of the movant [that] warrant the granting of the extension").²

Because petitioner has failed to show the existence of any extraordinary circumstances, the motion for an extension and the motion to hold the time limits in abeyance are both denied.



FOR THE COURT C.J.

Columbia, South Carolina
September 3, 2020

cc:

Mary M Caskey, Esquire
Mary Cothonneau Eldridge, Esquire
Chalmers Carey Johnson, Esquire

² This Order is available at:
<http://www.sccourts.org/whatsnew/displaywhatsnew.cfm?indexID=963>.