

94878
RECEIVED

OCT 19 2021

FORM 1
NOTICE OF APPEAL IN A CIVIL CASE SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals
(In The Supreme Court)

APPEAL FROM BERKELEY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
Jennifer B. McCoy #2764, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2019-CP-08-00424

Charles R. Norris, as Personal
Representative for Peggy H. Pinnell
Agency, Inc., State Farm Life
Insurance Company

Respondent,

v.

Joe Clemons

Appellant.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Joe Clemons appeals the orders (judgment) of the Honorable Jennifer B. McCoy dated September 22, 2021. Appellant received written notice of entry of this orders (judgement) on October 13, 2021.

October 18, 2021

s/Joe Clemons
Joe Clemons
2202 Addidas St., Eutawville, SC 29048
(843) 753-7007
Prose Litigant/Apologist for Appellant

FORM 7
PROOF OF SERVICE OF A NOTICE OF APPEAL

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals
(In The Supreme Court)

APPEAL FROM BERKELEY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
Jennifer B. McCoy #2764, Circuit Court Judge

RECEIVED

OCT 19 2021

SC Court of Appeals

Case No. 2019-CP-08-00424

Charles R. Norris, as Personal
Representative for Peggy H. Pinnell
Agency, Inc., State Farm Life
Insurance Company

Respondent,

v.

Joe Clemons

Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Notice of Appeal on Charles Norris by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on October 18, 2021, addressed to the attorney of record, Charles R. Norris, 151 Meeting Street/Sixth Floor, Post Office Box 1806(29402-1806, Charleston, South Carolina 29401-2239, on October 18, 2021

October 18, 2021

s/ Joe Clemons
Joe Clemons
2202 Addidas St., Eutawville, South Carolina 29048
(843)753-7007
Prose Litigant/Apologist for Appellant

October 18, 2021

This is proof that I delivered two forms to Mr. Norris office, one of the forms is Form 1 Notice of Appeal in a Civil Case and the other is Form 7 Proof of Service of a Notice of Appeal.

I Joe Clemons has delivered the forms on October 18, 2021,
it was received by Charles R. Norris.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joe Clemons". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name "Joe Clemons".

Joe Clemons

FORM 9
LETTER TO CLERK OF LOWER COURT
FILING NOTICE OF APPEAL

RECEIVED

OCT 19 2021

SC Court of Appeals

October 20, 2021

LEAH GUERRY DUPREE
CLERK OF COURT
BERKELEY COUNTY, SC

21 OCT 19 PM 4:30

FILED &

The Honorable Leah Guerry Dupree
Clerk of Court for Berkeley County
P.O. Box 219
Moncks Corner, South Carolina 29461

RE: Charles R. Norris, as Personal Representative of the Peggy Pinnell, State Farm Inc., State Farm Life Insurance Company.

Respondent, v. Joe Clemons, Appellant, Case No. 2019-CP-08-00424

Dear The Honorable Leah G. Dupree:

Enclosed for filing is a notice of appeal in the above case.

Sincerely,

s/ Joe Clemons
Joe Clemons
Joe Clemons

2202 Addidas St., Eutawville, South Carolina 29048

(843) 753-7007

Prose Litigant/Apologist for Apellant

CERTIFIED TRUE COPIES OF RECORD IN THIS COUNTY

Leah Guerry Dupree
DATE: 19 OCT 2021
CLERK OF COURT
C.P. & G.S.
BERKELEY COUNTY, SC

Joe Clemons
E-mail Clemonswelding
1@gmail.com

FORM 8
LETTER TO THE APPELLATE COURT CLERK
FILING THE NOTICE OF APPEAL

October 20, 2021

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk, South Carolina Court of Appeals
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

RECEIVED

OCT 19 2021

SC Court of Appeals

(The Honorable Patricia A. Howard
Clerk, Supreme Court of South Carolina
Post Office Box 11330
Columbia, South Carolina 29211)

RE: Charles R. Norris as Personal Representative of the Peggy Pinnell, State Farm Agency, Inc., State Farm Life Insurance Company.
Respondent. V. Joe Clemons, Appellant, Case No. 2019 CP-08-00424

Dear Ms. Kitchings (Ms. Howard):

Enclosed for filing is a notice of appeal in the above case. Also enclosed are the following:

- (1) Proof of service of the notice of appeal on the respondent (s).
- (2) A copy of the order(s) (judgement) which is (are) to be challenged on the appeal.
- (3) A filing fee of \$250.00.
- (4) This appeal is being filed with the Supreme Court because at court I was not allowed to present important evidence, I was denied the opportunity to present critical proof needed to substantiate the facts that would prove my case. In my complaint I had a list of **Cause of Action** that was pertinent information to the breach of contract by fraudulent and misrepresentation. These are some of the following things that was listed in my complaint of my **Cause of Action** in this case that I was not allowed to present and defended at trail. The complaint was filed on February 15, 2019, I will list the numbers as it appears on complaint.

- ~~#~~ 12 On July 6, 2010, outside of the Plaintiff's presence, and without his knowledge or consent, Defendant Agency signed Plaintiff's signature and submitted a new amendment of application on behalf of Plaintiff, the policy without a WPD.
- *13. That for six (6) consecutive years the Plaintiff's did not receive any information from the Defendant regarding the denial and/or change of the policy signed.
- ~~#17~~ That upon and review of the documents by Plaintiff, the documents do not reflect Plaintiff's signature.
- # 25 That Defendants have failed and refused to provide the policy as agreed and fraudulently forged new application forms on the policy all while continuing to accept payment from Plaintiff for the premiums without Plaintiff's permission or knowledge.
- # 26. The Defendants have therefore breached the contracts.
- # 27. That these breaches were fraudulent, substantial and material.
- # 28. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's breach, the Plaintiff has been damaged in the amount of and is entitled to recover damages in the amount of the insurance policies, premiums, punitive damages, attorney fees, interest, and such other incidental and consequential damages as related to the policies.
- # 30. That as an agent for State Farm, Defendant Agency accepted the fiduciary duty to sell insurance policies as an honest fair-dealing to all current and potential State Farm policyholders.
- # 45. That the Defendants had pecuniary interests in making their false representations, namely, receiving payments from Plaintiff for premiums while failure to notify Defendant that the policy with a WPD was denied and that there were options for a policy without a WPD, and in forging Plaintiff's signature without his knowledge and/or consent, all in furtherance of their business profits and careers.
- # 46. That the Defendants owed duties of care to the Plaintiff, as reasonable persons, to see that truthful information was communicated to the Plaintiff.
- # 47. That the Defendants breached those duties by failing to exercise due care with regard to Plaintiff.
- # 56. That Defendants, by and through their agents, had knowledge that their representations were false and had a reckless disregard for their truth or falsity.

In my Conclusion

The exhibits that were presented at the end of trial, I did not have an opportunity to see, review or defend those fraudulent prepared documents that was presented, as Mr. Norris has done throughout this case. Therefore presently, Mr. Norris is being investigated by ***The Supreme Court of South Carolina Office of Disciplinary Counsel, by Ms. Kelly B. Arnold***, file number 21-DE-L-0392. The best evidence and proof for accuracy of what transpired during trial would be to listen to the audio recording of the trial, because I have not yet received a copy of the transcript. Previously nine (9) out of eleven (11) transcripts were altered and the two that was accurate is because I told them that I would be recording them, so the best solution for accuracy I would strongly request you to listen to the audio recordings of the trial that happen on August 23-24, 2021.

If I was allowed to present, explain and defend these ***Cause of Action*** during trial, I believe the motion for ***Directed Verdict*** would never been presented or accepted and the judge decision on the motion would have been improper, also the way that ***Directed Verdict*** was used at trial is not in line with the purpose and the intent of ***South Carolina Rule 50***, were the ***Directed Verdict, Summary Judgement and Judgement as a Matter of Law***, where all these motions originate from.

Sincerely,

s/ Joe Clemons

Joe Clemons


2202 Addidas St., Eutawville, South Carolina 29048
(843)753-7007

Prose Litigant/Apologist for Appellant