



Community Address

Brookdale Anderson

311 Simpson Road
Anderson SC 29621
(864) 261-3875

Facsimile

Date: 12/29/20

From: Taronika D. Webb

To: Shelby

Fax No.: 1-803-734-1839

Subject: Page 2

Number of Pages (including Cover): 2

Message:

This is the page that was missing from Public Index. Case # 2019-000754.

RECEIVED

Dec 30 2020

SC Court of Appeals

*Thanks,
Taronika Webb*

Note: This facsimile contains PRIVILEGED and CONFIDENTIAL information intended only for the use of the specific individual or entity named above. If you or your employer is not the intended recipient of this facsimile or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized dissemination or copying of this facsimile or the information contained in it is strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify the person named above at once by telephone and return the original facsimile to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

Assisted Living Fax 864 260*6370

RECEIVED

Dec 30 2020

SC Court of Appeals

Bias Judge-Abuse by discretion

Because the judge was only going to make a decision on this one invasion of privacy. If the defendants want to be prejudiced they should have asked in court or when submitting the proposed order causing an ex-parte Communication. See Book Cellar Inc. Vs. City of phoenix 678 p.2d 512(Ariz. Ct.App.1984)

Abuse by discretion by ordering the defendant to move peeping tom. Trial judge was out of his jurisdiction by ordering the defendant to move me back on property, not giving me a say in the move after breach of contract/negligence was granted. Trial judge should have enforced this and made sure they carried out this order. After the plaintiff asked to be moved off the property.

Conflict of interest/bias- Trial judge went with the defendant in the ten day advisement by moving me back on the property after asked to be moved. Judge stated that he would be in favor of the defendant he would rule with the defendant regardless causing manifested injustice. Mallet vs mallet 473 S.E. 2d 804(1996)

Invasion Of Privacy - After a ten day advisement issued by Judge Cordell Maddox on April 4,2019. The respondent in this case did not move the appellant. In an invasion of privacy case the court set out four elements which must be alleged in order to state a cause of action: (1). An unauthorized intrusion or prying into the plaintiff seclusion; (2). An intrusion which is offensive or objectionable to a reasonable man; Snakeburg 385 S.E. 2d at 6 Here the plaintiff proves all the required.