

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

RECEIVED  
Jan 10 2022  
SC Court of Appeals

January 10, 2022

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


RE: Janet L. Frisco Appellant vs. Pet Helpers, Respondents, Case No. 2021-CP-10-2682 Pet Helpers, Inc. vs Janet Frisco

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

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 respondents.
- (2) A copy of the orders and judgements which are to be challenged on appeal.
- (3) A filing fee of \$250.00 and motion fee of \$25.00 forthcoming.
- (4) This appeal is being filed with the Appellate Court based on Rule 60(B)3

Sincerely,



Janet L. Frisco, Pro Se

cc: Stephan V. Futeral,  
Attorney for Respondent  
1004 Anna Knapp Blvd.  
Mt.Pleasant, SC 29464  
843-284-5500

RECEIVED

Jan 10 2022

SC Court of Appeals

FORM 1  
NOTICE OF APPEAL IN A CIVIL CASE

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Bentley D. Price & R. Kirk Griffin,

Circuit Court Judges

Case No. 2021-CP-10-2682

Pet Helpers, Inc.

Respondent,


V.

Janet L. Frisco

Appellant.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Janet L. Frisco appeals the orders of the Honorable Bentley D. Price dated October 12, 2021 and November 5, 2021 and Honorable R. Kirk Griffin dated July 30, 2021. Under SCRCRCP RULE 60(B)3, the deadline is one year after the notification of the order to file an appeal with the higher court.

  
Janet L. Frisco,

Cc: Stephan V. Futeral  
1004 Anna Knapp Blvd.  
Mt. Pleasant, South Carolina  
29464  
Attorney for Respondent  
(843)-284-5500

Dated: 1/10/22

FORM 7  
PROOF OF SERVICE OF A NOTICE OF APPEAL

RECEIVED

Jan 10 2022

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Bentley D. Price, R.Kirk Griffin

Circuit Court Judges

Case No. 2021-CP-10-2682


Pet Helpers, Respondent

v.

Janet L. Frisco,  
Appellant

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Notice of Appeal on Pet Helpers, Inc. by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, addressed to their attorney of record, Stephan V. Futeral, 4005 Anna Knapp Blvd., Suite 3 Mount Pleasant, South Carolina 29464 and by email to s.futeral@charlestonlaw.net.



DATED: 1-10-22

Janet L. Frisco, Pro Se  
203 Cardinal Drive  
Summerville, SC 29485  
843-804-0875  
janetfrisco@yahoo.com

**RECEIVED**

**Jan 10 2022**

**SC Court of Appeals**

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

January 10 2022,


The Honorable Julie Armstrong  
Clerk of Court for Charleston County  
100 Broad Street  
Charleston, South Carolina 29401

RE: Pet Helpers, Inc. vs. Janet Frisco\_Case No. 2021-CP-10-2682

Dear Ms. Armstrong,

Enclosed for filing is a notice of appeal with the South Carolina Appellate Court in the above case.

Sincerely,

  
Janet L. Frisco, Pro Se

cc: Stephan V. Futeral,  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
1005 Anna Knapp Blvd.  
Mt.Pleasant, SC 29464

**RECEIVED**

**Jan 10 2022**

**SC Court of Appeals**


January 10, 2022

Futeral and Nelson, LLC  
ATTN: Stephan V. Futeral  
1004 Anna Knapp Blvd., Suite 3  
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29485

Dear Mr. Futeral,

Enclosed you will find the appeal documents that were emailed and mailed U.S. Mail to the South Carolina Court of Appeals and mailed today to the Charleston County Court of Common Pleas concerning case #2021-CP-10-2682 Pet Helpers, Inc. vs. Janet Frisco. This is a corrected copy because the previously sent copies were dated January 2021 and are being resent to all parties today.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Janet L. Frisco".

Janet L. Frisco, Pro Se

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
CASE #:2021-CP-10-2682

**RECEIVED**

**Jan 10 2022**

**SC Court of Appeals**

Pet Helpers, Inc., Plaintiff

vs.

**DEFENDANT'S MOTION PERSUANT TO SCRCP  
RULE 60(B) #3 FOR RELIEF OF RESTRAINING  
ORDERS AND SANCTION**

Janet L. Frisco

Defendant.

---

**TO DEFENDANTS PET HELPERS, INC.:**

YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT AN APPEAL HAS BEEN FILED WITH THE SOUTH CAROLINA APPELLATE COURT based on new evidence that the plaintiff committed fraud by claiming that my dog Toby, that I surrendered to them on April 13, 2021, was legitimately adopted, but the adoption was actually staged by Melissa Susko, the executive director, and her employees in order to solicit donations and defraud Bissell Pet Foundation that was subsidizing adoptions during a low-cost adoption event May 7–9, 2021. Ms. Susko and several of her employees deceptively staged an adoption using an employee to pose as a legitimate adopter after I attempted to retrieve my dog. A few days later they falsely claimed on their website that my dog had been placed in a good home in order to solicit donations. Their attorney filed a complaint of slander and libel on June 9, 2021 after I began publicly exposing what they did on social media and through public protests. They were subsequently granted two restraining orders, and a \$5,434.32 sanction that I was forced to pay to be released from jail for violation of the restraining orders. Their lawyer was granted a continuance on December 17, 2021 for a Partial Summary Judgement motion and has filed affidavits asking for further payments of his court costs and legal fees.

“Pursuant to SCRCP Rule 60(B)3 When mistakes, inadvertence; excusable neglect; newly discovered evidence, fraud, etc. on motion and upon such terms are just, the court may relieve a party or his legal representative from a final judgement, order or proceeding for the following:

**(b) Mistakes; Inadvertence; Excusable Neglect; Newly Discovered Evidence; Fraud, etc.** On motion and upon such terms as are just, the court may relieve a party or his legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons:

- (1) mistake, inadvertence, s, or excusable neglect;
- (2) newly discovered evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b);
- (3) fraud, misrepresentation, or other misconduct of an adverse party;**
- (4) the judgment is void;

(5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged, or a prior judgment upon which it is based has been reversed or otherwise vacated, or it is no longer equitable that the judgment should have prospective application.

The motion shall be made within a reasonable time, and for reasons (1), (2), and (3) not more than one year after the judgment, order or proceeding was entered or taken. A motion under this subdivision (b) does not affect the finality of a judgment or suspend its operation. This rule does not limit the power of a court to entertain an independent action to relieve a party from a judgment, order, or proceeding, or to set aside a judgment for fraud upon the court. During the pendency of an appeal, leave to make the motion must be obtained from the appellate court. Writs of coram nobis, coram vobis, audita querela, and bills of review and bills in the nature of a bill of review, are abolished, and the procedure for obtaining any relief from a judgment shall be by motion as prescribed in these rules or by an independent action.

**Note:**

This Rule 60 is drawn from the Federal Rule. There are minor changes in the language of the Federal Rule. The last sentence of 60(a) was added permitting the trial judge to correct clerical errors even after departure from the circuit. Rule 60(b) deletes subsection (6) of the Federal Rule which permits relief for "any other reason justifying relief from the operation of the judgment." In the Federal Rule subsection (6) has created ambiguity about what is included.

Finally, Rule 60(b) provides, leave to make the motion need not be obtained from any appellate court except during such time as an appeal from the judgment is actually before the appellate court. This permits the motion to be made before the trial court. The United States Supreme Court approved a similar result in Standard Oil Co. v. U.S., 429 U.S. 17, 97 S.Ct. 31, 50 L.Ed.2d 21 (1976). This change will not, except in civil actions, affect S.C. Supreme Court Rule 24, Motions for New Trial upon After-discovered Evidence, which now requires leave by the Supreme Court before the motion can be made in the trial court.

Rule 60(b) is substantially the same as Code § 15-27-130. There are two differences. First, existing State law provides for relief from a "judgment taken against him through his mistake." Rule 60(b) deletes "his" and thus there may be a motion for relief from other mistakes. Second, the statute provides that the relief must be sought within one year. This Rule retains the one-year limitation for Rule 60(b)(1)-(3) for mistake, inadvertence, excusable neglect, newly-discovered evidence, and fraud; but permits relief under Rule 60(b)(4) and (5) after one year, but within a "reasonable time" when the judgment is void or the judgment has been satisfied, avoiding the necessity of bringing a new action to set aside the judgment in such cases after one year.


Editor's Note: Effective September 1, 1990, the Supreme Court Rules were repealed by the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules.

**Note to 1994 Amendment:iv**

The amendment to Rule 60(a) and (b) clarifies that leave of the appellate court is necessary to correct a clerical mistake or to make a motion to set aside an order of judgment while the appeal is pending. An appeal is pending from the time the notice of appeal is served until the issuance of the remittitur. **See** Rules 203, 204 and 221(b), SCACR.

I ask the S.C. Court of Appeals to relieve me of the two restraining orders and sanction of \$5434.32 imposed by 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court in Charleston County due to the fact that the defendants committed fraud which is reason for relief under Rule 60(B). (Exhibit A) This motion is made upon the following grounds:

- 1. The appellate court should grant my motion for relief because the defendants committed fraud when they staged the adoption of my dog Toby and received donations and subsidies based on the falsehood that he had been adopted.**
- 2. Pet Helper's lawsuit is an attempt by the defendants to cover-up that they received donations from the public and subsidies from the Bissell Pet Foundation under false pretenses.**
- 3. The two temporary restraining orders and the sanction of \$5434.32 I was forced to pay for violating the "gag order" should not have been imposed because Pet Helpers committed fraud and lied in their motions.**
- 4. The 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court in Charleston County has refused to consider or investigate my allegations concerning the fraud by Pet Helpers while continuing to impose unjust restrictions and punishments on me.**
- 5. Pet Helpers is attempting to avoid a jury trial by requesting sanctions, a Partial Summary Motion they are requesting intended to force me to concede due to financial insolvency. Their lawyer has asked for a total of \$9,903.98 in legal fees in addition to the \$5,432.34 sanction. It is a travesty that courts can jail or financially penalize an individual without a fair trial or verdict and prevent due process.**
- 6. If Pet Helpers' fraud is not exposed and stopped, they will be able to continue to defraud the public, victimize people like me who patronized their business and continue to cause suffering to animals in their care.**




Janet L. Frisco, Pro Se

Dated: 1-10-22

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The forgoing document *DEFENDANT'S MOTION PERSUANT TO SCRPC RULE 60(B)-3 FOR RELIEF OF TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDERS AND SANCTIONS* was served on the following by email and U.S. Mail with sufficient postage affixed this 10<sup>th</sup> day of January 2022:

Stephan V. Futeral,  
Attorney for Defendants  
4005 Anna Knapp Blvd. Suite 3  
Mt. Pleasant, South Carolina 29464  
sfuteral@charlestonlaw.net.

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

Janet L. Frisco, Pro Se

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON  
PET HELPERS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JANET FRISCO,

Defendant.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
CASE NO.: 2021-CP-10-2682

**INJUNCTION AND RESTRAINING  
ORDER**

**RECEIVED**

**Jan 10 2022**

**SC Court of Appeals**

This matter came before the court upon Plaintiff's *Ex Parte* application by Plaintiff for a restraining order and injunction against Defendant. After reviewing Plaintiff's pleadings, affidavits, and hearing arguments of counsel and Defendant, this court rules that the issuance of a Restraining Order and Injunction is necessary for the protection of Plaintiff's rights during the course of this litigation, that Plaintiff will suffer irreparable injury without the issuance of this order, that there is no adequate remedy at law, and that Plaintiff is likely to prevail on the merits of its action.

WHEREFORE, it is hereby

**ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** as follows:


1. Until further order of the court, Defendant is temporarily restrained and enjoined from making defamatory statements, whether orally or in writing, that:
  - a. Plaintiff and its staff were cruel to Defendant's dog;
  - b. Plaintiff and its staff euthanized Defendant's dog;
  - c. Plaintiff and its staff are cruel to animals;
  - d. Plaintiff and its staff euthanize animals;

- e. That the adoption of "Toby" was a hoax or staged; or
- f. That the adoption of any other animal was a hoax or staged.

2. Defendant shall immediately set her social media postings to her personal page and her group pages to viewable only to Defendant and non-viewable to any third parties or the public, while preserving evidence in this matter, that claim or imply that:

- a. Plaintiff and its staff were cruel to Defendant's dog;
- b. Plaintiff and its staff euthanized Defendant's dog;
- c. Plaintiff and its staff are cruel to animals;
- d. Plaintiff and its staff euthanize animals;
- e. That the adoption of "Toby" was a hoax or staged; and
- f. That the adoption of any other animal was a hoax or staged.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED!**

  
Presiding Judge, 9<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit  
Charleston County Court of Common Pleas

Dated: 6/17/21  
Charleston, South Carolina

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

PET HELPERS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JANET FRISCO,

Defendant.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
CASE NO.: 2021-CP-10-2682

**2<sup>nd</sup> ORDER FOR INJUNCTION  
AND TEMPORARY  
RESTRAINING ORDER**

**RECEIVED**

**Jan 10 2022**

**SC Court of Appeals**

<b>Hearing Date:</b>	<b>June 29 2021</b>
<b>Presiding Judge:</b>	<b>The Honorable R. Kirk Griffin</b>
<b>Plaintiff's Attorney:</b>	<b>Stephan V. Futeral</b>
<b>Defendant's Attorney:</b>	<b>Pro Se</b>
<b>Court Reporter:</b>	<b>Circuit Court DCRP</b>

THIS MATTER came before the Court on Plaintiff's 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion for Emergency/Ex Parte Restraining Order and Injunctive Relief filed on July 23, 2021. Defendant was properly served with notice of the hearing on July 26, 2021. At the time of the hearing, Defendant sent several emails to the Court and communicated with the Court regarding the virtual hearing courtroom. Both the Court and Plaintiff's counsel sent emails to Defendant providing access to the virtual courtroom. Moreover, both the Court and Plaintiff's counsel sent emails to Defendant providing her information to participate in the hearing by telephone. However, Defendant failed to appear in the virtual courtroom or participate in the hearing via telephone.

Having found that Defendant received proper notice of this hearing and that Defendant was provided with multiple ways to participate in this hearing, but failed to do so, this Court rules as follows:

**IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** as follows:

1. Defendant is temporarily restrained and enjoined from the following:
  - a. Communicating to third parties, whether orally or in writing, about this action and the matter of Janet Frisco vs. Pet Helpers, Inc. et. al. 2021-CP-10-2848 except for allowing Defendant to speak to: (1) witnesses in conjunction with the preparation and presentation of the aforementioned cases; (2) her attorney should she hire one; (3) potential expert witnesses, (4) her priests or rabbis, and (5) Defendant's physicians or mental health care professionals;
  - b. Communicating to third parties, whether orally or in writing, about Pet Helpers, Inc., Melissa Susko, Executive Director for Pet Helpers, Inc., its staff or its legal representatives except for allowing Defendant to speak to: (1) witnesses in conjunction with the preparation and presentation of the aforementioned cases; (2) her attorney should she hire one; (3) potential expert witnesses, (4) her priests or rabbis, and (5) Defendant's physicians or mental health care professionals;
  - c. Communicating to third parties, whether orally or in writing, that Defendant is the owner of the canine known as Toby/Slim Jim;
  - d. Posing as the current owner of the canine known as Toby/Slim Jim;
  - e. Attempting to register the canine through any tracking services, such as Pet Link or 24 Pet Watch; and
  - f. Attempting to track, follow, identify, or contact the current owner of the canine who wishes to remain private and who does not wish to be similarly harassed by Defendant.

The hearing upon this application for 2<sup>nd</sup> Restraining Order and Injunction shall be held in-person within ten (10) days after entry of this Order, as required by Rule 65 of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, before the presiding Judge, Court of Common Pleas for Charleston County, on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2021 at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock, \_\_\_ m. A copy of this Order in this matter, inclusive of motions, shall be served upon Defendant.

**The Defendant is hereby advised that a violation of this Order of the Court is punishable by fines and imprisonment for up to one year.**

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED!**

\_\_\_\_\_  
The Honorable R. Kirk Griffin  
Presiding Judge, 9<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit  
Charleston County Court of Common Pleas

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
Charleston, South Carolina



Charleston Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** Pet Helpers Inc VS Janet Frisco  
**Case Number:** 2021CP1002682  
**Type:** Order/Temporary Restraining Order

So Ordered

s/ R. Kirk Griffin 2768

Electronically signed on 2021-07-29 16:19:38 page 4 of 4

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON  
PET HELPERS, INC.,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
JANET FRISCO,  
Defendant.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
CASE NO.: 2021-CP-10-2682

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
TO RECONSIDER**

**RECEIVED**  
**Jan 10 2022**  
**SC Court of Appeals**

**Hearing Date: September 23, 2021**  
**Presiding Judge: The Honorable Bentley D. Price**  
**Plaintiff's Attorney: Stephan V. Futeral**  
**Defendant's Attorney: Pro Se**  
**Court Reporter: Circuit Court DCRP**

This matter came before the court upon Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider Order on Plaintiff's 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Injunctive Relief and Rule to Show Cause for Contempt filed on August 27, 2021. After reviewing the filed pleadings, supporting documents, and hearing the argument of counsel and the pro se Defendant, this court rules as follows:

**RESTRAINING ORDER AND INJUNCTION**

The issuance of a Restraining Order and Injunction is necessary pending the outcome of this case for the protection of Plaintiff's rights during the course of this litigation, that Plaintiff will suffer irreparable injury without the issuance of this order, that there is no adequate remedy at law, and that Plaintiff is likely to prevail on the merits of its action.

THEREFORE, pending the outcome of this case, Defendant is immediately restrained and enjoined from the following:

- a. Communicating to third parties, whether orally or in writing, about this action and the matter of Janet Frisco vs. Pet Helpers, Inc. et. al. 2021-CP-10-2848 except for allowing Defendant to speak to: (1) witnesses in conjunction with the preparation and presentation of the aforementioned cases to attorneys, (2) potential expert witnesses, (3) counselors, (4) priests or rabbis, and (5) Defendant's physicians or mental health care professionals;
- b. Communicating to third parties, whether orally or in writing, about Pet Helpers, Inc., Melissa Susko, Executive Director for Pet Helpers, Inc., its staff or its legal representatives except for allowing Defendant to speak to: (1) witnesses in conjunction with the preparation and presentation of the aforementioned cases to attorneys, (2) potential expert witnesses, (3) counselors, (4) priests or rabbis, and (5) Defendant's physicians or mental health care professionals;
- c. Communicating to third parties, whether orally or in writing, that Defendant is the owner of the canine known as Toby/Slim Jim;
- d. Posing as the current owner of the canine known as Toby/Slim Jim;
- e. Attempting to register the canine through any tracking services, such as Pet Link or 24 Pet Watch;
- f. Attempting to track, follow, identify, or contact the current owner of the canine who wishes to remain private and who does not wish to be similarly harassed by Defendant; and
- g. Entering onto Plaintiff's property.

Consistent with this order, Defendant shall remove all Facebook posts, the “Justice for Toby” group page, any similar pages, all social media posts, and any other posts on any websites regarding this litigation or references any of the matters listed in paragraphs a through g above.

**SANCTIONS AGAINST DEFENDANT**

During the course of this hearing, Defendant admitted that she willfully violated this court’s Injunction and Restraining Order filed on June 17, 2021, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Order for Injunction and Restraining Order filed on July 30, 2021, and this court’s oral ruling of August 16, 2021. As a consequence for her willful violations of this court’s orders, this court sanctions Defendant for Plaintiff’s attorney’s fees for the hearing on August 16, 2021 (\$2,402.50), Plaintiff’s attorney’s fees for the hearing on September 23, 2021 (\$2,555.00), and for costs related to both hearings for filing fees (\$95.22), service of process costs (\$115.00), transcript costs (\$230.00), and other fees (\$36.62) totaling \$5,434.34.

Within thirty (30) days from the date of this hearing, Defendant shall pay Plaintiff’s attorney’s fees and costs in the amount of \$5,434.34 directly to Plaintiff’s counsel.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED!**

\_\_\_\_\_  
The Honorable Bentley D. Price  
Presiding Judge, 9<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit  
Charleston County Court of Common Pleas

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
Charleston, South Carolina



Charleston Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** Pet Helpers Inc VS Janet Frisco

**Case Number:** 2021CP1002682

**Type:** Order/Other

IT IS SO ORDERED!

/s Hon. Bentley D. Price, Circuit Judge 2766

Electronically signed on 2021-10-12 11:53:59 page 4 of 4

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF Charleston  
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2021-CP-10-2682

RECEIVED

Jan 10 2022

Pet Helpers Inc

Janet Frisco

PLAINTIFF(S)

DEFENDANT(S)

SC Court of Appeals

Submitted by:	Attorney for : <input type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> Defendant
	or <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Represented Litigant

DISPOSITION TYPE (CHECK ONE)

- JURY VERDICT.** This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.
- DECISION BY THE COURT.** This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.  See Page 2 for additional information.
- ACTION DISMISSED (CHECK REASON):**  Rule 12(b), SCRPC;  Rule 41(a), SCRPC (Vol. Nonsuit);  Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled);  Other
- ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON):**  Rule 40(j), SCRPC;  Bankruptcy;  Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award;  Other
- STAYED DUE TO BANKRUPTCY**
- DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (CHECK APPLICABLE BOX):**  
 Affirmed;  Reversed;  Remanded;  Other

NOTE: ATTORNEYS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING LOWER COURT, TRIBUNAL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT RULING IN THIS APPEAL.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:  See attached order (formal order to follow)  Statement of Judgment by the Court:

Janet Frisco is held in Contempt for admitting she violated my Court Orders in excess of 80 times. She's committed to the Al Cannon Detention Center for a term of Thirty (30) days and

ORDER INFORMATION

This order  ends  does not end the case.

Additional Information for the Clerk :

INFORMATION FOR THE JUDGMENT INDEX		
Complete this section below when the judgment affects title to real or personal property or if any amount should be enrolled. If there is no judgment information, indicate "N/A" in one of the boxes below.		
Judgment in Favor of (List name(s) below)	Judgment Against (List name(s) below)	Judgment Amount To be Enrolled (List amount(s) below)
		\$
		\$

		\$
If applicable, describe the property, including tax map information and address, referenced in the order:		

The judgment information above has been provided by the submitting party. Disputes concerning the amounts contained in this form may be addressed by way of motion pursuant to the SC Rules of Civil Procedure. Amounts to be computed such as interest or additional taxable costs not available at the time the form and final order are submitted to the judge may be provided to the clerk. Note: Title abstractors and researchers should refer to the official court order for judgment details.  
 E-Filing Note: In E-Filing counties, the Court will electronically sign this form using a separate electronic signature page.

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
 Circuit Court Judge

2706  
 Judge Code

11.5.21  
 Date

**For Clerk of Court Office Use Only**

This judgment was entered on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_ and a copy mailed first class or placed in the appropriate attorney's box on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_ to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)

CLERK OF COURT

**Court Reporter:**

E-Filing Note: In E-Filing counties, the date of Entry of Judgment is the same date as reflected on the Electronic File Stamp and the clerk's entering of the date of judgment above is not required in those counties. The clerk will mail a copy of the judgement to parties who are not E-Filers or who are appearing pro se. See Rule 77(d), SCRPC.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING DECISION BY THE COURT AS REFERENCED ON PAGE 1.**

This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.

*may be released at any time upon payment of \$ 5,434.32 to opposing counsel Stephen Futerak.*

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF Charleston  
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2021-CP-10-2682

**RECEIVED**  
**Jan 10 2022**  
SC Court of Appeals

Pet Helpers Inc

Janet Frisco

PLAINTIFF(S)

DEFENDANT(S)

Submitted by:

Attorney for :  Plaintiff  Defendant  
or  
 Self-Represented Litigant

**DISPOSITION TYPE (CHECK ONE)**

- JURY VERDICT.** This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.
- DECISION BY THE COURT.** This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.  See Page 2 for additional information.
- ACTION DISMISSED (CHECK REASON):**  Rule 12(b), SCRPC;  Rule 41(a), SCRPC (Vol. Nonsuit);  Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled);  Other
- ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON):**  Rule 40(j), SCRPC;  Bankruptcy;  Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award;  Other
- STAYED DUE TO BANKRUPTCY**
- DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (CHECK APPLICABLE BOX):**  
 Affirmed;  Reversed;  Remanded;  Other

NOTE: ATTORNEYS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING LOWER COURT, TRIBUNAL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT RULING IN THIS APPEAL.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:  See attached order (formal order to follow)  Statement of Judgment by the Court:

*Janet Frisco is held in Contempt for admitting she violated my Court orders in excess of 80 times. She's committed to the Al Cannon Detention Center for a term of Thirty (30) days and*

**ORDER INFORMATION**

This order  ends  does not end the case.

Additional Information for the Clerk :

**INFORMATION FOR THE JUDGMENT INDEX**

Complete this section below when the judgment affects title to real or personal property or if any amount should be enrolled. If there is no judgment information, indicate "N/A" in one of the boxes below.

Judgment in Favor of (List name(s) below)	Judgment Against (List name(s) below)	Judgment Amount To be Enrolled (List amount(s) below)
		\$
		\$