

BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT ("S Ct") OF SOUTH CAROLINA ("SC")

Appellate Case No. 2022-00----

AND STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF RICHLAND

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
On Application for Post-Conviction Relief (PCR) No. 2019-CP-40-00112

Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH

Applicant/Appellant's MEMORANDUM in Support of  
Interlocutory Appeal with Leave AND in Support of  
Equal Protection Rights and of Human Right to Self-Advocacy.

v.

State of South Carolina, and City of Columbia, SC

SC Circuit Judge Brown's 31 January 2022 ORDER denying leave for Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH ("Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas" or "Dr. Faltas") to proceed *pro se* but granting her leave for interlocutory appeal is *in effect* a final order as it *finally* disposed of her right to *pro se* advocacy *in that case* and **disposed of the entire case after she had asserted:** (1) in the 27 January 2022 hearing in this matter, **"I cannot, as a matter of conscience, participate in a system so discriminatory[;]"** (2) to SC Circuit Judge Brown on 20 February 2020, at Tr. p 17, lines 10-14, and p 18, lines 17-21, **"If they say, no, [...] she has to have counsel or withdraw her PCRs or something, then it will be my choice. And at that point, I would still have preserved my issues. \*\*\* [I]f you have to put me between losing without a lawyer and without other adverse consequences and losing with a lawyer with added adverse consequences, any rational person would choose losing without a lawyer[;]"** and (3 and 4) to *another* PCR Court and to SC S Ct her desire **"to be heard for herself or not heard at all."** *Vide* 20 November 2019 SC S Ct ORDER denying rehearing of, and thus treating as issue of finality, denial of Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' motion to **respond *pro se* to SC Appellate Case 2019-000708**, available <https://ctrack.sccourts.org/public/caseView.do?csIID=69765>. ***Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' inference*** that forced counsel means **"losing with a lawyer with added adverse consequences"** was **fully vindicated** when, after forced counsel Griffith sent cruel e-mails pretending to want to help Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas (Exhibit 1 hereto), Griffith finally revealed what he *really* wants for Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas:

I will work for – time served on ALL charges, *dismissal of any pending charges including contempt*, in exchange for your dropping all pursuits related to the matters, in all courts of South Carolina, so long as the state agrees to expungement of all the charges clearing your criminal record. Tell me to proceed. [\* \* \*] **Clearly expungement means accepting the convictions.** You spoke out if both sides of your mouth. Yes expunge - no no expunge. Well - to your health.  
[s/]Timothy L Griffith, Attorney at Law

If Dr. Faltas could "accept" her false and unconstitutional "convictions," she would *never* have filed her PCRs *ab initio*. **And Griffith's refusal to subpoena necessary witnesses for the 27 January 2022 PCR evidentiary hearing assured both the loss of that PCR AND non-preservation of issues for appeal and/or later federal habeas. Unless allowed to prosecute 2019-CP-40-00112 *pro se*, Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas withdraws it alone but NOT "freely [or] voluntarily."** Any withdrawal would be under *extreme duress* of (1) disloyal and ineffective forced counsel and (2) new contempt charges *clearly brought against her to extort her into* "dropping all pursuits related to the matters, in all courts of South Carolina[.]" ***But Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas should be allowed to prosecute 2019-CP-40-00112 pro se as SC S Ct never had jurisdiction to prospectively restrict her pro se advocacy.***

**I. FINALITY OF AN ORDER IS JUDGED BY ITS EFFECT, NOT ITS NAME.**

If not adjudicated now, Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' right to *pro se* advocacy in 2019-CP-40-00112 will *never* be adjudicated. If PCR were, despite Griffith's ineffectiveness, granted, a prevailing Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas would have no right to appeal. If PCR were denied, there will be no proof that Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas would have won *this PCR* had she prosecuted it *pro se*. *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541 (1951).

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

541, 546-47 (1949), reads in relevant part [with emphasis added]:

This decision appears to fall in that small class which finally determine [...] rights asserted in the action, **too important to be denied review [...] until the whole case is adjudicated.** The Court has long given this provision of the statute **this practical rather than a technical construction.** *Bank of Columbia v. Sweeny*, 1 Pet. 567, 569; *United States v. River Rouge Co.*, 269 U.S. 411, 414; *Cobbledick v. United States*, 309 U.S. 323, 328. [¶] *We hold this order appealable* because it is a final disposition of a *claimed right which is not an ingredient* 547-547 of the cause of action and does not require consideration with it.

The right to speak for oneself is a basic human right, higher than a constitutional right. Even brief deprivations of constitutional rights are deemed irreparable injuries as a matter of law. So, the right to *pro se* advocacy is "too important to be denied review until the whole case is adjudicated."

## II. ONLY PUBLISHED APPELLATE DECISIONS OF SC S Ct ARE BINDING, AND ONLY ON SC's Court of Appeals ("CoA") ACCORDING TO SC's Constitution, ARTICLE V.

Section 1 of Article V, SC Constitution's vesting "the judicial power" in "a unified judicial system," is a recognition that judicial power is *limited* to the power to resolve real cases or controversies. Section 5 limits SC S Ct's *appellate* jurisdiction thus [with emphasis added]:

**The Court shall have appellate jurisdiction *only* in cases of equity, and in such appeals they shall review the findings of fact as well as the law, except in cases where the facts are settled by a jury and the verdict not set aside. The Supreme Court shall constitute a court for the correction of errors at law under such regulations as the General Assembly may prescribe. (1972 (57) 3176; 1973 (58) 161; 1985 Act No. 9.)**

SC's General Assembly never prescribed for SC S Ct *appellate* power to make *judicial decisions* in circuit court cases *before the cases even commence*. That *judicial* power is limited to corrections of errors of law *after they occur in circuit or inferior courts*. And Section 4 sets *the totality* of what administrative power SC S Ct and/or SC's Chief Justice have thus [with emphasis added]:

**SECTION 4.** Powers of Chief Justice; rules; admission to practice of law and discipline of persons admitted.

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court shall be the administrative head of the unified judicial system. He shall appoint an administrator of the courts and such assistants as he deems necessary to aid in the administration of the courts of the State. The Chief Justice shall set the terms of any court and shall have the power to assign any judge to sit in any court within the unified judicial system. Provided, each county shall be entitled to four weeks of court each year and such terms therefor shall be provided for by the General Assembly. Provided, further, that the Chief Justice shall set a term of at least one week in any court of original jurisdiction in any county within sixty days after receipt by him of a resolution of the county bar requesting it. **The Supreme Court shall make rules governing the administration of all the courts of the State. Subject to the statutory law, the Supreme Court shall make rules governing the practice and procedure in all such courts.** The Supreme Court shall have jurisdiction over the admission to the practice of law and the discipline of persons admitted. (1972 (57) 3176; 1973 (58) 161; 1985 Act No. 9.)

**SECTION 4.A.** Submission of Supreme Court rules to judiciary committees; disapproval by General Assembly.

**All rules and amendments to rules governing practice and procedure in all courts of this State promulgated by the Supreme Court must be submitted by the Supreme Court to the Judiciary Committee of each House of the General Assembly during a regular**

session, but not later than the first day of February during each session. Such rules or amendments shall become effective ninety calendar days after submission unless disapproved by concurrent resolution of the General Assembly, with the concurrence of three-fifths of the members of each House present and voting. (1985 Act No. 8.)

SC's Chief Justice's *administrative* powers are **limited** to budgeting, hiring, and scheduling. Since Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas was never an SC Judicial Department judge or employee, SC's Chief Justice and SC S Ct *never had administrative power* over Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' conduct *in SC's courts or outside them*.

Rule-making by SC S Ct is limited by "the statutory law" and by the requirement of submission to SC's Legislature's "judicial committees." SC S Ct **never submitted to the judiciary committees** any rules or amendments to the effect that Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas, alone out of all SC's inhabitants, may not file papers *pro se* and may not contact SC Judicial Department employees by phone, fax or e-mail.

Contracts contrary to public policy are void; and so are administrative rules contrary to public policy.

Even if Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas *arguendo* became frivolous *overnight* after SC S Ct on 7 April 2011 "**appreciate[d] Dr. Faltas' good faith attempt to opine on a legal matter pending before the Court,**" and *arguendo* sprouted vex and frivolity only 14 months after then-presiding SC Circuit Judge Clifton Newman complimented Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' conduct and advocacy as "**most pleasant and gracious [but] not frivolous at all,**" SC Code of Laws **does not exclude frivolous people** from these sections:

**SECTION 14-1-100. Rights in court shall not be affected by race or color.** Whenever authority has heretofore been conferred by law upon any free white person or persons to institute any suit or proceedings or to prefer any information or complaint in any matter, civil, penal or criminal, the same rights shall be enjoyed by and the same remedies shall be applicable to all persons whatsoever, regardless of race or color, **subject to the same conditions and none other.**

Any *frivolous* white person may plead his own case in SC's Courts:

**SECTION 40-5-80. Citizen may prosecute or defend own cause.** This chapter may not be construed so as to prevent a citizen from prosecuting or defending his own cause, if he so desires.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 56-102; 1952 Code Section 56-102; 1942 Code Section 326; 1932 Code Section 326; Civ. P. '22 Section 282; Civ. C. '12 Section 3922; Civ. C. '02 Section 2819; G. S. 2167; R. S. 2295; 1721 (7) 173; 1868 (14) 97; 2002 Act No. 307, Section 2

**The only approved tools against vex/frivolity are Rule 11, SCRCP, and § 15-36-10, SC code.**

No SC state *trial* or appellate court used either tool against Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas before 8 April 2011, and she had by then won all closed civil cases she had brought there *pro se* and had won an appeal she orally argued *pro se* before SC CoA and preserved her win against her opponent's *certiorari* petition.

Article V, Section 9's reference to "decisions" clearly means *judicial*, not administrative, decisions:

**SECTION 9.** Jurisdiction of Court of Appeals; binding effect of Supreme Court decisions.

The Court of Appeals shall have such jurisdiction as the General Assembly shall prescribe by general law. The decisions of the Supreme Court shall bind the Court of Appeals as precedents. (1985 Act No. 9.)

**No jurisdiction ever vested in SC S Ct to deny Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' *pro se* advocacy rights, or to force that denial "right or wrong" on the lower trial courts by citing *State v. Cheeks*, 400 S.C. 329, 733 S.E.2d 611 (Ct. App. 2012), which followed a published judicial decision, not a secret discriminatory administrative order motivated solely by an improper desire to promote lawyer employment.**

**III. SC Case Law and Consistent Practices are to Allow *pro se* Prosecution of PCR cases.**

*Richardson v. State of South Carolina*, 377 S.C. 103, 659 S.E.2d 493 (2008), No. 26464, is clear that "state law provides that counsel must be appointed **or a knowing, intelligent waiver of the right**

**to counsel must be obtained.** S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-60 (2003); Rule 71.1(d), SCRCP [citations]" and **"an applicant may have the right to reject or discharge court-appointed counsel and proceed pro se** or retain his own counsel." The only prohibition is against baseless change of counsel.

Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas conscientiously and painstakingly canvassed currently-pending PCR *certiorari* petitions in SC's appellate courts and most *published* decisions on previous applications **but found no case other than her own where a PCR applicant was a priori forced to have PCR counsel.**

#### IV. **Objective Observations Prove that Forced Counsel Harm Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas.**

The *only* PCR Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas filed *pro se* before 2011 became moot after she got the challenged conviction vacated due to after-discovered evidence of actual innocence. 2007-UP-193 - City of Columbia v. Faltas But she won *the only* PCR (2017-CP-40-06831) she was later allowed to prosecute *pro se*, and therein created a record so strong the PCR grant withstood SCAG's *certiorari* petition *although appellate counsel was forced on Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas as Respondent.* SC Appellate case 2019-000708, *supra*. By contrast, though 2016-CP-40-01444 was won by forced PCR counsel at trial, failure of forced trial and appellate counsel to preserve and argue *all* sustaining grounds caused reversal of the PCR grant. 2020-MO-004 - Faltas v. State Another forced counsel, Dan Addison, just lost 2019-40-CP-01374, an after-discovered-evidence case, and is playing dumb about his duty to timely seek reconsideration and file an appeal if reconsideration were denied. Exhibit 2 hereto is the e-mail chain between Attorney Addison and Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas. And as seen above, Attorney Griffith wants Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas to be in a worse position than before bringing her PCRs.

#### V. **Courts Should Not Strive to Force Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas or Others to Hire Lawyers.**

The legal profession becomes a MAFIA when, as here, people are threatened with *criminal* contempt of court and six-month imprisonments if they do for themselves what lawyers want to be hired to do. Then-Candidate, now-SC-Circuit-Judge, Holt *boasted* to SC's Judicial Merit Selection Commission ("SC JMSC") on 13 November 2018, at Public Hearing Transcript pp 109, lines 7-4 [with emphasis added]:

I wasn't sure how that was going to work, and **I didn't want to take work away from lawyers.** They'd know and ask me, though, about mediation and what my thoughts were on it. But I would have to say that there's been a benefit to it, **because lawyers are mediators.** So if they're not handling the case, **a lawyer's there mediating the case.**

The misery-magnifying 8 April 2011 ORDER is nakedly tailored for the narcissistic but failed Orin Briggs, who wanted to maximize: (1) payments for himself in return for *no* benefit to his client and (2) his chances to talk about himself *ad nauseum* by carrying papers for approval by SC S Ct. The proof is that, **also on 8 April 2011, SC S Ct DENIED** Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' motion for appointment of counsel. SC S Ct did not want Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas to *benefit* from a lawyer, only to *hire* one. The scheme failed as Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas and her family had no money for Briggs but had too much sense to hire him who puts his clients in worse position than before hiring him; *e.g.*, Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas asked Briggs to get her released on bond pending appeal; instead, Briggs consented to retro-active *increase* of Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas' sentence; she got released, with horrendous bond conditions, two days **later** than if she had served her **original** sentence. *Vide* SC Appellate Case 2019-000708, *supra*. The weird paper-pre-approval idea was quietly ignored; **but too vain to admit its real motive**, SC S Ct kept fabricating stories of increasing horror about Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas.

**NOTHING in SC S Ct's list of grievances against Dr. Assa'ad-Faltas, even if *arguendo* true, is curable by imposing a lawyer on her for PCRs or to file civil complaints.** If she stood and interrupted oral arguments (videos *factually* disprove that), the cure would have been to ban her from oral arguments, not to impose a lawyer on her. With live streaming and WebEx, she can follow arguments remotely anyway.

Any "placard" she "may have carried" "to show her displeasure" should have just been confiscated at the door.

What she *ever* carried to any SC courthouse were: (1 - 2) case files and exhibits; (3) a replica of a Coptic icon of Mary and Jesus to show to jurists and opponents for their cultural enrichment; and (4) an 8.5x11 page with **large bold type**, “I respectfully rest on my written pleadings on file[,]” on 16 September 2011 to then-SC Circuit Judge Barber’s court. Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas then feared contempt of court *if she even literally opened her mouth*. That one page is scanned in the files of the cases Judge Barber heard that day. When Judge Barber asked Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas questions, she dared respond only by nodding or shaking her head until the judge promised no contempt if Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas spoke in response to the judge’s questions. **This is how far SC S Ct unjustifiably and callously terrorized Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas and made ghouls of otherwise-nice lower court judges mistakenly misled to obey SC S Ct “right or wrong.”**

Nor will forcing a lawyer on Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas’ PCR cases stop her from applying to positions for which she thinks herself qualified and to which she may contribute her intellect, education, and originality. **And lawyers can never stop Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas from acclaiming the Holy Coptic Orthodox Church.**

#### VI. CONCLUSION

To honor its representation of “tailor[ing] to target *only*” whatever SC S Ct “consider[s] abusive and harassing,” this Court should admit that Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas had never previously abused the right to PCR. Thus, Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas should be allowed to prosecute her pending PCRs fully *pro se*. That will save resources and further litigation, state and federal, about what she is or is not allowed to do *pro se* and about effectiveness of her current *forced* PCR counsel. And as her *Faretta* rights were restored, there should, God willing, be no further need for any new PCRs as Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas, thank God, exonerated herself *pro se* from the two new charge brought against her after November 2013. Prosecutors’ very knowledge that Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas’ *Faretta* rights have been restored likely deterred new false criminal charges against her.

The restoration, not the denial, of Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas’ rights to *pro se* advocacy saves judicial resources.

**But, if SC S Ct remains idiosyncratically averse to Dr. Assa’ad-Faltas’ *pro se* advocacy, it should allow her to withdraw her PCRs with a statement that she had exhausted all the state remedies she was allowed to exhaust. It is now up to SC S Ct to decide whether a coerced withdrawal of PCR will be accepted.**

#### Certificate of Submission AND Certificate of Service AND of Copies

Submitted by hand delivery to SC S Ct and by e-mail to Richland County’s Clerk of Court (as she is NOT an employee of SC’s Unified Judicial System but of Richland County, SC, and has established filing by e-mail under SC S Ct’s ORDERS which post-date, and thus supersede, SC S Ct’s 27 September 2017 and 20 September 2019 ORDERS, which latter are invalid anyway as contrary to SC Code of Laws §§ **14-1-100** {“Rights in court shall not be affected by race or color”} and **40-5-80** {“Citizen may prosecute or defend own cause”} *inter alia*) and served the same day by **both** hand-delivery and e-mail to SCAG at [yasmeenklein@scag.gov](mailto:yasmeenklein@scag.gov), and **copied** by e-mail to: (1) Timothy Griffith at [tlgriffith@tlgriffith.com](mailto:tlgriffith@tlgriffith.com), (2) Jessica Saxon at [jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov](mailto:jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov), and (3) Robert Dudek at [rdudek@sccid.sc.gov](mailto:rdudek@sccid.sc.gov), **all on 10 February 2022**, and all God so willing.



S/Marie-Thérèse Assa’ad-Faltas, MD, MPH, Applicant/Appellant *pro se*  
P.O. Box 9115, Columbia, SC 29290  
e-mail: [Marie\\_Faltas@hotmail.com](mailto:Marie_Faltas@hotmail.com)

Phone: (803) 783-4536  
Cell: (330) 232-4164

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Re: The order

Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>

Tue 2022-02-08 6:59 PM

To: timothy Griffith <tgriffith@tgriffith.com>

Cc: 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>; Saxon, Jessica <jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov>; Robert Michael Dudek <rdudek@sccid.sc.gov>

Who is "the person"? Does (s)he have a name or is another one of your lies?

---

**From:** timothy Griffith <tgriffith@tgriffith.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 8, 2022 4:26 PM

**To:** Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>

**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>; Saxon, Jessica <jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov>

**Subject:** Re: The order

I told the person I wanted a copy and they said they would send to AG and AG could copy it.  
Haven't see them yet

Timothy L Griffith, Attorney at Law

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

On Tuesday, February 8, 2022, 3:42 PM, Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com> wrote:

What about the transcript? Did you confirm with the court reporter that it was ordered by the State? What are you doing to secure me a copy?

---

**From:** Timothy L. Griffith <tgriffith@tgriffith.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 8, 2022 3:37 PM

**To:** 'Marie Faltas' <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>

**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>

**Subject:** The order

Marie,

I received the Order and here is a scanned copy

Timothy L. Griffith, Esquire  
Attorney at Law  
803 499-2012

---

**From:** Marie Faltas [mailto:marie\_faltas@hotmail.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, February 5, 2022 10:22 PM

**To:** timothy Griffith <tgriffith@tgriffith.com>

**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>; Robert Michael Dudek <rdudek@sccid.sc.gov>; Saxon, Jessica <jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov>

**Subject:** Re: expunged

All you have offered me are lies. Since you say you have no case on which you represent me, there is no reason for you to traumatize me further with your sadistic e-mails.

I do no longer need you to follow up because you won't do it anyway. If the transcript shows up, arrange for a copy to be sent to me without imposing your treasonous e-mail on me.

**That is ALL.**

---

**From:** timothy Griffith <tgriffith@tgriffith.com>

**Sent:** Saturday, February 5, 2022 10:09 PM

**To:** Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>

**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>

**Subject:** Re: expunged

Maria.

I have offered you an option to spare your stress and health.

Timothy L Griffith, Attorney at Law

On Saturday, February 5, 2022, 9:26 PM, Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com> wrote:

At least have the decency of typing and signing on the case caption a statement to the effect that you do not think that 2019-CP-40-00112 is your case and therefore will not file the notice of appeal in it.

You are again setting me up for more contempt.

Without a **separate** statement from you, I'll have to attach this entire e-mail chain as proof that you it is not hybrid representation because you do not think it is your case.

Not only will that force me to forfeit the attorney-client privilege, it will also show how unethical you are. I was trying, despite all you did to me, to be a Christian and not expose you.

You are persistently exhausting what little time, health and energy I have left.

FU.

---

**From:** timothy Griffith <tgriffith@tgriffith.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 5, 2022 9:10 PM  
**To:** Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>  
**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: expunged

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

Oh. No. Not my case. You'll have to try that Pro se or hire a lawyer or ask CID appeals

Timothy L Griffith, Attorney at Law

S.C. SUPREME COURT

On Saturday, February 5, 2022, 8:31 PM, Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com> wrote:

What on earth does that mean? Are you filing the appeal or not?

---

**From:** timothy Griffith <tgriffith@tgriffith.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 5, 2022 8:28 PM  
**To:** Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>  
**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>; Robert Michael Dudek <rdudek@sccid.sc.gov>; Saxon, Jessica <jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: expunged

Bless your heart Maria. Have a good evening

Timothy L Griffith, Attorney at Law

On Saturday, February 5, 2022, 7:42 PM, Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com> wrote:

**Bad faith on MY part?!?!?** I am not the one who brought false criminal charges against others then brought *more* false charges against them to make them stop seeking redress of the first charges from which they had, thank God, exonerated themselves *pro se*.

**The real bad faith is YOUR insistence that you want to, and can, help me with my PCRs when ALL ALONG you wanted me to abandon the PCRs altogether and verbally and emotionally abuse me in the process.**

So what advantage do you bring? If I wanted to "accept the [false] convictions" I would not have filed my PCRs *ab initio*.

And I told you *from the beginning* that I will NEVER admit or accept guilt for that of which I know myself to be innocent. **You misled me into believing you had some magical solution which clears my record *without false direct or constructive admission of guilt.*** I said, Okay, let me see it.

What you have shown me is your treason and **your cruelty** in verbally abusing me to beat me into the result you wanted all along.

And now I see clearly that your refusal to file the notice of appeal is to push me into another corner. **You obviously have never seen integrity and strength of character before** because you did not recognize them when you saw them in me.

**You will file the notice of appeal from Judge Brown's 31 January 2022 ORDER by 10 February 2022 OR you will be added to a legal malpractice lawsuit already pending.**  
FU.

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

---

**From:** timothy Griffith <tlgriffith@tlgriffith.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 5, 2022 7:24 PM  
**To:** Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>  
**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: expunged

Maria.

I said I would work out a deal for you after you suggested you would like one. But obviously now you have changed your mind again. I won't work on. Deal you say you will not accept. If you say - I will accept such a deal - and it is a deal for you - then I would bring you a written offer.  
But I won't even try if you are acting in bad faith

Timothy L Griffith, Attorney at Law

On Saturday, February 5, 2022, 2:16 PM, Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com> wrote:

And what, may I ask, is Yasmeen Klein's authority to drop contempt charges brought by SC's Supreme Court?  
I asked you to bring me a written deal to look at. **I never ever told you that I would plead guilty to that of which I am innocent.**  
You are a sadistic unethical liar.  
FU Judas.

---

**From:** timothy Griffith <tlgriffith@tlgriffith.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 5, 2022 1:02 PM  
**To:** Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>  
**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: expunged

Clearly expungement means accepting the convictions. You spoke out if both sides of your mouth. Yes expunge - no no expunge. Well - to your health.

Timothy L Griffith, Attorney at Law

On Saturday, February 5, 2022, 12:43 PM, Marie Faltas <[marie\\_faltas@hotmail.com](mailto:marie_faltas@hotmail.com)> wrote:

Here you go already. Time served means pled guilty. Play another one.  
This has been the purpose all along, hasn't it; and I relinquish my right to compensation too?  
FU, Judas.

---

**From:** Timothy L. Griffith <[tgriffith@tgriffith.com](mailto:tgriffith@tgriffith.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 5, 2022 11:32 AM  
**To:** 'Marie Faltas' <[marie\\_faltas@hotmail.com](mailto:marie_faltas@hotmail.com)>  
**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <[marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com](mailto:marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** expunged

That challenge is accepted. If you are serious, I will work for - time served on ALL charges, dismissal of any pending charges including contempt, in exchange for your dropping all pursuits related to the matters, in all courts of South Carolina, so long as the state agrees to expungement of all the charges clearing your criminal record.  
Tell me to proceed.

---

**From:** Marie Faltas [[mailto:marie\\_faltas@hotmail.com](mailto:marie_faltas@hotmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 5, 2022 10:26 AM  
**To:** Timothy L. Griffith <[tgriffith@tgriffith.com](mailto:tgriffith@tgriffith.com)>  
**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <[marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com](mailto:marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com)>; Saxon, Jessica <[jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov](mailto:jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov)>; Robert Michael Dudek <[rdudek@sccid.sc.gov](mailto:rdudek@sccid.sc.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Filing the appeal per your phone call

**YOU are the one who *consistently* misrepresents things to me. YOU previously told me that the State is NOT interested in an expungement deal.**

**In fact, YOUR OWN FILED  
OPPOSITION TO WEISS'  
MOTION TO QUASH faults the  
State for refusing to consent to  
PCR.**

If the State refuses to consent to PCR, which is a matter of right, why would they consent to expungement, *which is purely discretionary?*

**Additionally, my understanding is that expungement can occur only after service of the sentence. I will NOT go to jail for 20 days, during which I am likely to dies, simply because you are too lazy, too stupid,**

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

and/or too cowardly to win my PCR for me.

**But, to call your bluff, bring me a *WRITTEN* expungement from the State and I shall, God willing, look at it.** That is how deals are handled.

Meanwhile, FOLLOW UP on the transcript. *That is still your job and spare me your ignorant and false psychoanalysis of me.* Practicing Medicine without a license is a crime. Again, bring me a *written* deal and my copy of the transcript. FU.

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

---

**From:** Timothy L. Griffith <tgriffith@tgriffith.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 5, 2022 8:43 AM  
**To:** 'Marie Faltas' <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>  
**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** RE: Filing the appeal per your phone call

Dear Dr Faltas,

Unfortunately, you have misrepresented to me, your reasons for pursuit of the PCRs on multiple occasions.

First, you represented to me, that you were afraid that the charges and convictions would be an impediment toward obtaining citizenship. That turned out to be not the case when you refused to simply have the cases expunged and clear your record.

Then, your reasoning for not accepting the suggestion of expungement was represented to me as being, that you wanted to defend your rights to a fair trial which you were denied. A commendable pursuit - but after 12 years; it has become fruitless and vain.

Then, you told the Court this last hearing; that you wanted to prevail, and continue, to stand up for all persons engaged in PCR, to protect their right to represent themselves.

And now, you represent to me that expungement would be admitting guilt and you refuse to do so - also a good stance but at this point fruitless and vain in my opinion.

However - after 12 years of engagement, you continue to tell me of the stress the whole process brings upon you and health issues aggravated by the process, and yet, you are not

willing to expunge your record and be done with it and live in peace with a clear record and having fought a good and hard fight.

You could easily- in my opinion- strike a deal with the state, to simply drop all the PCRs and have your record expunged, and THAT is a case I would gladly facilitate for you.

Obviously, the true reason for your pursuit is that you enjoy the process. You enjoy the challenge. You enjoy the deep research and knowledge you have gained - and that is admirable. However, you fail to see the peace and better health you could have by simplifying your life in this area. You, of course, would retain the knowledge gained and perhaps could - at your leisure, use that knowledge to help others either by volunteering to do research or write proposals. Or, you could pursue your medical consulting or many other endeavors. You are an intelligent person, but you have allowed your vanity in these cases to cloud your mind of the possibilities and of the way to win - yes to win, by clearing your record and going on with life as a content and happy person.

This is just **advice** as a person who is **truly interested** in helping you to achieve your stated goal. Clearing your record should be your only goal. Just advice. My "job" is to **advise** you and aid in the process and to do as you would like with your PCR, at the same time, I am to "handle" the case as I determine is best to achieve the goals you tell me that you want to achieve, not to just parrot your words to the Court.

You in Court initiated an ill-advised and most likely fruitless pursuit by asking to appeal the denial of the Court to relieve me as counsel. That one is on you, a separate action, and not a part of my representation in your PCR case, and if you wish to pursue that, you must follow the orders of the court and obtain counsel to do so.

If you are denied your PCR, THEN I will most definitely file an appeal when I receive such an order, and under the rules, the appeals division of the CID would take up that appeal.

Timothy L. Griffith, Esquire  
Attorney at Law  
803 499-2012

---

**From:** Marie Faltas [mailto:marie\_faltas@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 5, 2022 8:02 AM  
**To:** timothy Griffith <tgriffith@tgriffith.com>  
**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>; Robert Michael Dudek <rdudek@sccid.sc.gov>; Saxon, Jessica <jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Filing the appeal per your phone call

**What you FAIL TO, or PRETEND TO NOT, understand is that federal court requires exhaustion of state remedies even if they seem futile.**

Also, SC state case law requires you to file an appeal in criminal and PCR cases *even if you think the appeal is frivolous.*

**RECEIVED**  
**FEB 10 2022**  
**S.C. SUPREME COURT**

You pretended to respect my conscience: I could not participate in a system so discriminatory **especially after I have seen how many DISBARRED lawyers and other criminals are allowed to proceed *pro se***.

There is nothing to lose by filing that appeal: if it is rejected immediately, then the requirement of exhaustion of state remedies would have been met.

If it were, God willing, by a miracle granted, then that is the end of my problems.

It is clear to me that you would rather have me lose with you as my lawyer than have me win without you.

Also, just so you know, **SC COID appellate section is now automatically and rudely hanging up on me**. It happened *twice* yesterday and once the day before.

FU.

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

---

**From:** timothy Griffith <[tgriffith@tgriffith.com](mailto:tgriffith@tgriffith.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 5, 2022 7:40 AM  
**To:** Marie Faltas <[marie\\_faltas@hotmail.com](mailto:marie_faltas@hotmail.com)>  
**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <[marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com](mailto:marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Filing the appeal per your phone call

Dr Faltas,

No. It is not only not my duty, but I would be stuck into another case were it to not be rejected immediately- which it will be.

You - as an indignant- should have applied with the CID appeals division.

First - it was foolish of you to appeal that decision at the hearing. Just more delays and frivolous fluttering about, knowing full well that appealing that decision would not produce a positive result, but May in fact further frustrate the Court.

Second - Judge Brown should have processed with the hearing and let you appeal as desired after the conclusion of the hearing.

Let's move positively toward resolving the PCRs. Stop trying to go back in time to undo an order of the supreme Ct- it's not going to happen here - perhaps in the Fed courts it will work out.

Timothy L Griffith, Attorney at Law

On Friday, January 28, 2022, 1:11 PM, Marie Faltas <[marie\\_faltas@hotmail.com](mailto:marie_faltas@hotmail.com)> wrote:

Who drafted this ORDEER?

First, there is a typo: it says "the Ms. Klein."

Second, the 27 September 2017 ORDER allows me to make the initial appeal *pro se*.

*I attach it.*

***Please object to that part ordering me to find counsel.***

This is insanely tyrannical.

God will judge you if you do not object to the last part.

Thanks and God bless./Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH

---

**From:** Timothy L. Griffith  
 <[tgriffith@tgriffith.com](mailto:tgriffith@tgriffith.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 28, 2022 12:55 PM  
**To:** 'Marie Faltas' <[marie\\_faltas@hotmail.com](mailto:marie_faltas@hotmail.com)>

Cc: 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas'  
<marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>  
Subject: The Order not yet signed but sent.

The order:

Timothy L. Griffith, Esquire  
Attorney at Law  
803 499-2012

RECEIVED  
FEB 10 2022  
S.C. SUPREME COURT

From: Marie Faltas  
[mailto:marie\_faltas@hotmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2022 12:10 PM  
To: Timothy L. Griffith <tgriffith@tgriffith.com>  
Cc: 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas'  
<marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>  
Subject: Re: One more request or suggestion

Thank you; but as I had explained to you when you were first appointed to me and made this suggestion, expungement involves admitting the crime and professing regret.  
**I told you then, and am repeating again, I did NOT assault that woman; and I am NOT sorry I told Marion Oneida Hanna she has no civil jurisdiction when, in fact, she had no civil jurisdiction as Judge Gravely ultimately held and as the State's certiorari petition was denied.**

I cannot lie. Plus, these people never leave me alone even after I win; how much worse will it be if I falsely admit to crimes I did not commit?

Exactly 24 days after the remittitur issued, thank God, sealing my *pro se* victory in 2017-CP-40-06831, I get hit with a Rule to Show Cause from SC's Supreme Court itself.

You are NOT representing me in that, *nor am I asking you to do so. It was Mr. Zelenka's idea to copy you; and as you can see from his e-mail, he did so in response to my phone call seeking to resolve this new matter.*

These people do not want to resolve anything; they want to make me suffer.  
**Yes, I want to be an expert witness for the wrongly-accused/wrongly-convicted; and I have offered myself several times to Ms. Fullwood in Michael Elders' case; but Ms. Fullwood NEVER returned my calls.**

Additionally, unless and until I get fully vindicated, any time I get put on the stand as an expert witness, the Prosecution in that particular case will bring up that history.  
I have no choice but to fully vindicate myself; **and I have faith that God will vindicate me at the time of His choosing**

If you really need my expertise in specific cases and think you can fend off the Prosecution's or the State's *ad hominem* attacks on me, get a funding order in your other concerned client's case(s).  
Thank God, I have been able to do wonders when used as a medical expert witness before. **I cannot afford to do so as a courtesy now.** I barely have enough to live on and barely have time to take care of myself. But, if you desire to get a funding order, my *reduced* expert witness fees are \$300.00 for

out of court research and \$600.00 for in-court presence plus travel if applicable.

Thanks and God bless./Marie

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

**From:** Timothy L. Griffith <[tgriffith@tgriffith.com](mailto:tgriffith@tgriffith.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 28, 2022 11:39 AM  
**To:** 'Marie Faltas' <[marie\\_faltas@hotmail.com](mailto:marie_faltas@hotmail.com)>  
**Cc:** 'Marie Assa'ad-Faltas' <[marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com](mailto:marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** One more request or suggestion

Dr. Faltas,

Perhaps you have reached a point in your life when you don't really need all of the stress associated with these cases BUT you, of course, would like to have a clear record.

Please consider again, just having all of the cases expunged from your record. That leaves you with a clear and untarnished criminal record, saves you from further stress (which you have expressed to me is a lot) and ends your struggle. I would be glad to help you work these out if you would like though you are perfectly capable, I am sure, of doing that work – but I would help in any way I can, including negotiations to have these charges removed.

YOU REALLY DON'T HAVE ANYTHING TO PROVE – In that you have made an excellent showing for yourself and your abilities.

This could actually open up opportunities for you to help others in the PCR arena as a consultant or otherwise. I know that I for one, would appreciate your input as a zealous advocate and researcher.

Give this some consideration in regard to your own stress level and health.

Timothy L. Griffith, Esquire  
Attorney at Law  
803 499-2012

**From:** Marie Faltas  
[mailto:[marie\\_faltas@hotmail.com](mailto:marie_faltas@hotmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 27, 2022 11:08 PM  
**To:** timothy Griffith <[tgriffith@tgriffith.com](mailto:tgriffith@tgriffith.com)>  
**Cc:** Marie Assa'ad-Faltas <[marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com](mailto:marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: URGENT. Should there be a written order on SC Circuit Judge Brown's granting me leave to appeal interlocutorily?

Thank you so much. For some reason, this e-mail from you did not show up on my end until now. I have been having some of my worst respiratory wheezes since the hearing and later this evening, which is preventing me from falling asleep. PLEASE give me a humanitarian/well-check/wake up call tomorrow, God willing, any time before 9:30 am but preferably circa 7:30 am. Thanks again and God bless./Marie

**From:** timothy Griffith <[tgriffith@tgriffith.com](mailto:tgriffith@tgriffith.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 27, 2022 8:07 PM  
**To:** Marie Faltas <[Marie\\_Faltas@hotmail.com](mailto:Marie_Faltas@hotmail.com)>;

2/9/22, 3:47 PM

Mail - Marie Faltas - Outlook

Yasmeen Klein <yasmeenklein@scag.gov>  
**Cc:** Marie Assa'ad-Faltas  
<marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: URGENT. Should there be a written  
order on SC Circuit Judge Brown's granting me  
leave to appeal interlocutorily?

Marie,  
I have inquired about a written order OR a form 4  
as to which the Court will issue or ask for.

I think we did quite well today - we prevailed in  
every motion against your case (other than the  
request to have me relieved- I respect your  
position on that). But all in all, a good showing.

Timothy L Griffith, Attorney at Law

On Thursday, January 27, 2022, 11:41 AM, Marie  
Faltas <Marie\_Faltas@hotmail.com> wrote:

If so, who of you will prepare it.  
I also need a copy of today's transcript  
for the appeal. Would you please  
request it.  
Thanks and God bless./Marie

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Re: Attached Image. Mr. Addison's duties are NOT over yet; he needs to file for reconsideration, obtain the transcript, AND file the notice of appeal if reconsideration is denied.

Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>

Wed 2022-02-09 3:24 PM

To: Dan Addison <DAddison@hallboothsmith.com>; Marie Assa'ad-Faltas <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>

Cc: Timothy L. Griffith <tlgriffith@tlgriffith.com>; Saxon, Jessica <jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov>; Robert Michael Dudek <rdudek@sccid.sc.gov>

**I NEVER ever asked for you to be "my personal attorney."** Indeed, I never wanted *you* in this case. **You should have raised the "travel to Columbia is difficult" issue before now.** Indeed, *for the very 28 January 2022 hearing, you were offered remote participation by WebEx* but you chose to travel. **ODC, to my knowledge, does NOT issue advisory opinions.**

*By contrast, the rules of criminal procedure are clear: it is trial counsel's duty to timely file the notice of appeal then seek relief from representation after the appeal.*

---

**From:** Dan Addison <DAddison@hallboothsmith.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 3:16 PM

**To:** Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>; Marie Assa'ad-Faltas <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>

**Cc:** Timothy L. Griffith <tlgriffith@tlgriffith.com>; Saxon, Jessica <jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov>; Robert Michael Dudek <rdudek@sccid.sc.gov>

**Subject:** RE: Attached Image. Mr. Addison's duties are NOT over yet; he needs to file for reconsideration, obtain the transcript, AND file the notice of appeal if reconsideration is denied.

Dr. Faltas – I frankly no clear answer as to what my continued duties are in this matter. The court appointed me to handle the civil appeal of your Pro Se filed action from Magistrate level to Circuit Court level. This doesn't mean I have been hired as your personal attorney to do your bidding. Given that I am no longer a member of the Richland County Bar nor the district for Pro Bono appointments, I am not positive what my responsibilities are going forward. I have reached out to the court for further guidance, and also to the ODC office personnel. If necessary, I may file a motion to be removed per my relocation, as traveling to Columbia is difficult.

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

**Dan Addison**

Attorney at Law | Hall Booth Smith, P.C.



O: 843.720.3460

D: 843.720.3485

111 Coleman Boulevard, Suite 301

Mount Pleasant, SC 29464

hallboothsmith.com



ALABAMA | ARKANSAS | COLORADO | FLORIDA | GEORGIA  
MONTANA | NEW JERSEY | NEW YORK | OKLAHOMA  
NORTH CAROLINA | SOUTH CAROLINA | TENNESSEE

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy the original message and any copies.

**From:** Marie Faltas <marie\_faltas@hotmail.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 3:02 PM

**To:** Dan Addison <DAddison@hallboothsmith.com>; Marie Assa'ad-Faltas <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>

**Cc:** Timothy L. Griffith <tgriffith@tlgriffith.com>; Saxon, Jessica <jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov>; Robert Michael Dudek <rdudek@sccid.sc.gov>

**Subject:** Re: Attached Image. Mr. Addison's duties are NOT over yet; he needs to file for reconsideration, obtain the transcript, AND file the notice of appeal if reconsideration is denied.

Repeating the subject line: **Re: Attached Image. Mr. Addison's duties are NOT over yet; he needs to file for reconsideration, obtain the transcript, AND file the notice of appeal if reconsideration is denied.**

The points SC Circuit Judge Brown did NOT address **include** (1) my request to make supplemental arguments under *Anders v. California* and *State v Williams* which implemented *Anders* in South Carolina **if Mr. Addison had not been relieved**; (2) the stripping-naked issue was admitted by the magistrate; and (3) the Magistrate's ruling that the right to compulsory process does not apply in Rule 29(b) proceedings. SC Circuit Judge Brown also erred **as a matter of fact** in stating that witnesses were "subpoenaed." **The magistrate refused to issue subpoenas at all for the 4 February 2019 hearing.** What were issued were *summons*. **It is therefore technically correct to say that White was not subpoenaed; but he omitted that White had been "summoned" but did not appear.**

My questioning of Steele was **about the period related to the claimed assault and** other periods to show that her medication, if any, was not related to the alleged assault. **That is a factual misstatement which should be addressed on reconsideration.**

There are other factual errors and omissions **which would be lost if not addressed in a motion to reconsider. So, unless he makes a motion to be relieved,** Mr. Addison is under obligation to file the reconsideration motion **OR to seek leave for me to move for reconsideration under *Anders* and *Williams, supra.*** **Additionally, SC Circuit Judge Brown used an antiquated and overruled standard for recusal.** The controlling last word is *Caperton v. Massey*, 556 U.S. 868 (2009).

Again, unless relieved, Mr. Addison's duty is to file the notice of appeal, not to merely tell me about when it is due. If I were to file it myself, it would be rejected as hybrid representation.

**Additionally, whether he intends to move to be relieved or not, Mr. Addison has a duty to secure the transcript before the time to seek reconsideration**

***and move to supplement the motion for reconsideration after receipt of the transcript.***

It was always clear to me that the forced lawyers' purpose was to lose my cases on purposes and set me up for contempt in addition. **The recent orders prove me correct.**

---

**From:** Dan Addison <[DAddison@hallboothsmith.com](mailto:DAddison@hallboothsmith.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 2:18 PM  
**To:** Marie Faltas <[marie\\_faltas@hotmail.com](mailto:marie_faltas@hotmail.com)>; Marie Assa'ad-Faltas <[marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com](mailto:marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com)>  
**Cc:** Timothy L. Griffith <[tgriffith@tgriffith.com](mailto:tgriffith@tgriffith.com)>  
**Subject:** FW: Attached Image

Dr. Faltas, please find attached the Judge's ruling from the hearing on January 28. Judge Brown has affirmed the lower court ruling, in its entirety.

I have included Mr. Griffith on this email as I am not certain but that this case had some possible import to his matter(s) that he is handling for you.

Any Notice of Intent to Appeal of this case will need to be filed with the SC Court of Appeals within 30 days of the order date of Judge Brown's signature (2/9/2022), which by my calculations would be on or before March 10, 2022

**Dan Addison**

Attorney at Law | Hall Booth Smith, P.C.



O: [843.720.3460](tel:843.720.3460)

111 Coleman Boulevard, Suite 301

D: [843.720.3485](tel:843.720.3485)

Mount Pleasant, SC 29464

[hallboothsmith.com](http://hallboothsmith.com)

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT



ALABAMA | ARKANSAS | COLORADO | FLORIDA | GEORGIA  
 MONTANA | NEW JERSEY | NEW YORK | OKLAHOMA  
 NORTH CAROLINA | SOUTH CAROLINA | TENNESSEE

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy the original message and any copies.

---

**From:** [copier@hallboothsmith.com](mailto:copier@hallboothsmith.com) <[copier@hallboothsmith.com](mailto:copier@hallboothsmith.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 1:52 PM  
**To:** Dan Addison <[DAddison@hallboothsmith.com](mailto:DAddison@hallboothsmith.com)>  
**Subject:** Attached Image

**Re: Your voice messages - Timothy Griffith****RECEIVED**

Marie Faltas &lt;marie\_faltas@hotmail.com&gt;

**FEB 10 2022**

Wed 2022-02-09 10:24 AM

To: Dudek, Robert <RDudek@sccid.sc.gov>; Timothy L. Griffith <tgriffith@tlgriffith.com>  
Cc: Marie Assa'ad-Faltas <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>; Saxon, Jessica <jsaxon@sccid.sc.gov>

The problem is Timothy Griffith is refusing to file the appeal for me (see attached e-mail chains) and the order gave me 10 days **and might be used for more contempt against me.**

When will you people be satisfied with the sufferings you caused me already?  
God bless nonetheless./Marie

---

**From:** Dudek, Robert <RDudek@sccid.sc.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 10:18 AM  
**To:** Marie Faltas <Marie\_Faltas@hotmail.com>  
**Cc:** Marie Assa'ad-Faltas <marieassaadfaltas@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Your voice messages - Timothy Griffith

Dr. Faltas: I cannot give you legal advice or assist you while you are represented by counsel. I know you stated that you wanted to relieve Mr. Griffith but he is still your attorney. Further, the Appellate Division does not become involved in lower court proceedings to file a notice of intent to appeal unless we are counsel of record in that lower court proceeding. We are an appellate office and we would not handle an appeal unless the Appellate Court ruled the appeal would go forward, and the prospective client was screened for indigency and found indigent.

Robert Dudek

Robert M. Dudek  
Chief Appellate Defender  
South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense  
Appellate Division  
1330 Lady Street, Suite 401  
PO Box 11589  
Columbia, SC 29201-1589  
(803) 734-1330 – Telephone  
(803) 734-1397 - Fax

---

**This communication and any attachment thereto is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein, and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, utilization, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the Commission on Indigent Defense immediately and permanently delete the original and any copy of any e-mail and any printout thereof. SCCID may be reached by using the email address of the sender, or at 803-734-1343.**