

February 3, 2021

South Carolina Court of Appeals
Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Clerk
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Reference: Appellate Case No. 2018-001842
ORDER dated Feb 01 2021

TO: The Honorable Judges of the South Carolina Court of Appeals,
and Ms. Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Clerk

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

I received this day, February 3, 2021; the ORDER to deny my Motions dated October 28, 2020 that were as follows:

1. Request to correct the error the Court had made concerning why Appellant had filed her case; not according to the court records or as the attorneys indicated. Even though Appellant had pointed this out in many documents the Court never corrected.
2. Motion to add an addition to the Supplemental Records regarding the implementation of the Medtronic Infuse BMP device. (Even after the FDA in 2008 had notified the medical field not to use the Medtronic BMP Infuse Device in the cervical spine, seven years later (2015) this was ignored and the device was implanted into my cervical spine. Again, Proof Positive of the illegal actions of the doctor and hospital. (See attachment)

Appellant does not understand why this supplemental record was not added. Previously she had been advised by the Clerk of Courts office that she could send supplemental records until a decision had been made by the Judges.

These motions, if not accepted, give the attorneys for the Respondents a license to win the case. This cannot be legal. The most critical part of this case, and I had not heard that the Court had made any kind of decision. Here again following the rules, Appellant did not add anything new to the case except the FDA notification date the Respondents were informed not to implant the Infuse BMP device.

Also the Motion for the court to correct their mistake regarding why Appellant filed her case was illegal and should have been corrected in the lower Court or corrected when she filed with the Appellant Court. The Court made a mistake in filing my case under the lawyer's reason and not the Appellants. Please explain how a Court error so large can be denied?

*Ms. Allen ✓
Sorry, this was
returned to me.
It was mailed on
Feb. 3rd, arrived
Col. Feb 4th, and
was returned back to
me on
Feb. 20th.
S. Gavick*

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2021

SC Court of Appeals


Appellant Pro Se does not feel that she has been fairly advised of the Court's actions. (Appellant not hearing from the Court, partly due to the Corona Virus, had a friend check her computer to see if there was any information about the case. She learned that documents had been forwarded to a panel for consideration.) Appellant contacted the Clerk of Court's office in October and requested a copy of the documents because from the list it was almost impossible to know what had been submitted. One of the documents had been submitted for the attorneys without Appellant's rebuttal. Therefore, she needed to know exactly what had been given for consideration. (Even though she forwarded funds for the documents she still has not received them.)

Appellant would like the name of the individual who signed the order for the Court; denying my motions to be added as part of my Supplemental Records, the name was illegible, with no title. Also the Appellant would like to know if anyone from the Court has discussed this case with the attorneys without her being present? Therefore, Appellant wishes to Appeal the decision of the Court Order dated February 1, 2021. Is a Motion required?

Appellant is very sorry the Honorable Judges did not get to see these documents because they were a summation of all documents, making it easy to see all issues of the case.

Appellant would also state she feels she has not been fairly updated on the issues of the case. Therefore, Appellant requests a meeting concerning the Order to Deny her motions with the Honorable Judges and lawyers for the Respondents so that all parties may be updated on exactly what is going on with this case. I look forward to your response and thank you in advance for your consideration.

Yours truly,



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

/tg

Separate Copy is being mailed to the Honorable Judges.

Cc: ✓ Ms. V. Claire Allen, Chief Deputy Clerk
Attorneys for Young Clement Rivers LLP
Mr. Stephen L. Brown
Mr. Joseph J. Tierney, Jr.
Mr. Russell G. Hines,

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

COLUMBIA SC 290

23 FEB 2021 PM 2 L



RECEIVED
FEB 25 2021
SC COURT of Appeals

Ms. V. Claire Allen, Deputy Clerk
The S.C. Court of Appeals
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, S.C. 29201

29201-376999

