STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA **COUNTY OF CHARLESTON**	)	**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS** **NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**
James C. ("Chris") McNeil and Meaghan Poyer, **Plaintiffs,**	)	**Civil Action No. 2025-CP-10-05095**
v.	)	**PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE TO THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE CONCERNING SYSTEMIC OBSTRUCTION, ADA ACCESSIBILITY, AND URGENT SAFETY RISKS**
SAC 181, LLC, **Meridian Residential Group, LLC,** **Adam W. Bayles, individually,** **Tara Bayles, individually, and** **MRG Investing Company LLC** **Defendants.**	)	

FILED
2026 MAR 27 PM 4:47
JULIE J. ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT

I. THE "INFORMATION BLACKOUT" AND COLLAPSE RISK

Plaintiffs file this supplement to the March 20, 2026 Safety Brief to notify the Chief Administrative Judge of a critical shift in system conditions. In addition to the high-risk conditions already documented in the **Brief in Aid of Safety Risk Mitigation and Judicial Clarity** filed March 20, 2026, the defense infrastructure is experiencing a simultaneous "Information Blackout" and attorney exodus:

- **Justine M. Tate** left Phelps Dunbar on March 11, 2026, 2 weeks and one day after Plaintiffs filed the Omnibus Motion of February 24, 2026 without formal withdrawal, which means Altman principals (beneficial owners of SAC 181) may be unaware of the reduction in representation.
- **Alicia N. Bolyard** is positioning for exit via a disqualification motion against her she requested be heard, while seeking remote appearance - conduct consistent with preparing for an exit from the case.
- **Kevin O'Brien** will be exposed to potential removal via the same January 14, 2026 Opposition to Motion to Quash Subpoenas and Cross-Motion to Disqualify Counsel, as it also targets Phelps Dunbar - potentially leaving the Altman principals unrepresented at a moment of realization of catastrophic exposure.
- **The Safety Risk:** If these principals discover the impending **entire Altman portfolio-threatening verdict exposure** simultaneously with the **abandonment by their counsel**, and the **central actor** in the Narcissistic System identified in the Brief in Aid of Safety Risk Mitigation and Judicial Clarity **concurrently and unexpectedly loses the "buffer" of counsel,** the **high-risk conditions** "Narcissistic Rage/Collapse" and "Cornered Animal Syndrome" predicted in the March 20, 2026 brief dramatically increase.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE GATEKEEPING AS AN ADA BARRIER

Judge McCoy's March 26 continuance is the second granted by her in this case. The first was obtained through defense counsel's fabricated consent in November 2025, which directly enabled the three additional months of obstruction that produced Plaintiff McNeil's documented nervous breakdown.

The case now returns to the Chief Administrative Judge whose own staff member characterized Plaintiffs' safety filing as 'ex parte' 62 minutes before accommodating defense counsel's scheduling request on the same email thread. [Exhibit B staff gatekeeping; Exhibit C full thread]

Plaintiffs further bring to the Chief Administrative Judge's attention a documented pattern of **administrative gatekeeping** that functions as a barrier to ADA-mandated justice.

- While defense counsel receive near-instant "Webex" accommodations, Plaintiffs' documented 76/80 PCL-5 PTSD needs have been met with court staff labeling my safety filing 'ex parte and not allowed' at 1:37 PM; 62 minutes later, the same staff accommodated defense counsel's request for Webex access in the same thread, while Plaintiff's ADA Accommodations filing that asks for similar accommodation will be 2 months old on March 30 without being addressed.
- This structural bias mirrors the "Ask-Harm Loop" identified in the **Housing Justice Audit**, where the system's "front door" (admin staff and local law enforcement) serves to filter out the Most Vulnerable Member (MVM) while protecting the "Passive Investor" interests of the Altmans.

III. NOTICE OF POLITICAL ESCALATION (EXHIBIT 2)

Attached as **Exhibit A** is a formal **Notice of Intent to Mayor William Cogswell**. This letter documents the City's prior knowledge (since 3/10/26) of the Housing Justice Audit which documents the Commissioner's "Project 350K" valuation gap. Plaintiffs are also assessing escalating the "Captured LE" behavior of the Charleston County Sheriff's Office - which engaged in victim-blaming after the forced move - to the **SLED Public Corruption Unit**.

RELIEF REQUESTED:

That the Chief Administrative Judge, in his capacity as the administrative head of the Ninth Circuit, intervene to:

1. **Un-Stall the April 3 Hearing:** Confirm that the administrative assignment question Judge McCoy identified in her March 26, 2026 letter was resolved when the Chief Administrative Judge convened and presided over the February 9, 2026 scheduling hearing in this matter, and reschedule the hearing either April 3 or the first date that accommodates the Answer period for the Second Amended Complaint addressed in number 2. [Exhibit F Judge McCoy March 26, 2026 Letter]
2. **Grant Leave for the Second Amended Complaint, which has been on the docket since October 24, 2025 -** 154 Days as of March 27, 2026 - for a Motion that is "freely

given" but that adds Charleston law community insider Charles S Altman as an individual defendant, along with the image counts that are pivotal in this case.

3. **Amend the Answer Period for the Second Amended Complaint** to the day before the Hearing, enabling the ability to:
4. **Prioritize the Omnibus Motion of February 24, 2026** to utilize that hearing to "collapse the docket" and make many motions moot while enabling the ability to granting deemed admissions, Summary Judgements, and Partial Summary Judgements for allegations evidenced on the docket with zero acknowledgment or engagement by defense,
5. **Order Representation Status:** Force Phelps Dunbar to confirm if their clients have been informed of Attorney Tate's 3/11/26 departure and O'Brien's potential departure if the Cross-Motion to Disqualify that Bolyard requested (which O'Brien supported in writing) is heard, and force Resnick & Louis to confirm if their clients are aware their attorney is requesting to have her own disqualification motion heard, which would remove their counsel,
6. **Ensure ADA Compliance:** Provide the pro se Plaintiffs the same digital filing/appearance "courtesy" afforded to the defense firms currently seeking to exit the case as well as the e-filing requested in the January 30 ADA Motion..

Respectfully submitted this 27th day of March, 2026.

James C. ("Chris") McNeil, Pro Se
P.O. Box 30386, Charleston, SC 29417
chris@thaut.io

Meaghan Poyer, Pro Se
P.O. Box 30386, Charleston, SC 29417
mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com

EXHIBIT A

Email to Mayor Cogswell and Staff 3/27/2027

Subject: URGENT: Follow-up to 3/10/26 - Housing Justice Audit & Forthcoming National Press Release

To: Mayor William Cogswell **CC:** Elizabeth Dieck (Chief of Staff); Jennifer Cook (Clerk of Council); Julia P. Copeland (City Attorney); Ross Appel (City Council); Stephen Bowden (City Council); Deja Knight McMillan (Director of Communications), Bay Sheehan (Communications Coordinator)

Mayor Cogswell,

Following my email to your office on **March 10, 2026**, I am writing to provide a final update before the full national rollout of the **Housing Justice Audit (HJA)** and its associated press strategy.

The Audit, which is now live and "soft-launched" at https://housingjusticeaudit.com/report, identifies a systemic "Ask-Harm Loop" within Charleston's housing justice system.

This is exemplified by the ongoing litigation regarding **181 Gordon Street (Case No. 2025-CP-10-05095)**, involving your appointee, **Jonathan S. Altman**.

Current Systemic Obstructions:

1. **The Valuation Gaps:** We have documented affordable housing commission Jonathan S Altman signing off on both a 95% devaluation of the Altman family's Charles Realty Company Inc stock between 2006 and 2021 - which is not credible during those boom years in Charleston Commercial Real Estate - and a **$350k+ discrepancy** between probate filings and the commercial reality of the property at the heart of the tenant exploitation lawsuit- disparities that directly contradicts the goals of your "Project 3500."
2. **Unresolved Safety Risks:** My **March 20, 2026 Brief in Aid of Safety Risk Mitigation** remains unaddressed. A hearing scheduled for April 3 was moved to an **indefinite continuance**, leaving urgent health and safety concerns for residents in a state of administrative limbo.
3. **Law Enforcement Vacuum:** Due to a lack of investigative progress and documented victim-blaming at the local level (CCSO), I am now looking at moving to engage the **South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SLED) Public Corruption Unit** to ensure an external review of these files.

The Choice for your Administration: I am offering you this window to utilize the Audit's findings to take national leadership over this housing health crisis. You have the opportunity to move Charleston toward a **Conscious Co-Stewardship** model as a leader of the paradigm-level change that is needed to solve the housing crisis.

I am currently finalizing national press releases based on the Housing Justice Audit findings and plan to distribute them next week.

If your administration chooses to engage with the systemic issues documented here and in the Housing Justice Audit, that engagement could significantly impact the scope or framing of the press releases..

You have an opportunity to take national leadership in the housing crisis utilizing unique insights discovered by a systems audit and intervention using the Most Vulnerable Member (MVM) method, elements of the Vanguard Method from the UK that were used in the successful **Systems Thinking in Housing** Study there, and my own Strategic Thought Leadership platform the HJA serves as a demonstration of.

I hope to be sharing how Charleston's leadership is utilizing these findings to solve the housing crisis rather than Charleston serving as an example of the deep systemic problems at the root of it. Ensuring conflicts of interest are removed is necessary for credible engagement and avoiding **Project 3500 being renamed "Project 350K".**

But that is up to you.

Attachments to this communication:

- Today's court filing: Plaintiffs' Supplemental Notice to the Chief Administrative Judge Concerning Systemic Obstruction, ADA Accessibility, and Urgent Safety Risks (March 27, 2026) - in which this letter appears as Exhibit A
- Brief in Aid of Safety Risk Mitigation and Judicial Clarity (March 20, 2026) - Exhibits A1-A3 are omitted from this copy; they are filed under seal with the Court and address jury verdict exposure modeling

Transparency note: This letter is simultaneously filed as an exhibit in Case No. 2025-CP-10-05095 before the Charleston County Court of Common Pleas. All parties and counsel of record have access to this communication.

Respectfully,

Chris McNeil

Founder, Thaut
Strategic Thought Leadership
Mobile 843.818.3495
http://thaut.io
Host of Podcast: Thought Leadership Studio

Author of (upcoming): Strategic Thought Leadership: The Book
LinkedIn
https://www.linkedin.com/in/chris-mcneil-chs/

EXHIBIT B

Screenshots Demonstrating Gatekeeping by Court Staff

Email from Plaintiff McNeil to Court Staff pointing out escalation of risk:

From: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 12:24 PM
To: C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>
Cc: Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins) <dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org>; Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>; Van Slambrook, Dale E. Law Clerk (David Crump) <dvanslambrooklc@sccourts.org>; McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org>
Subject: RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

*** **EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside the organization. Please exercise caution before clicking any links or opening attachments. ***

Ms. Atkins, Ms. Johnson, and Judge McCoy's chambers –

I am following up on my co-Plaintiff and wife Meaghan Poyer's March 20 email for two reasons.

(continued as copy-paste text for legibility)

1. Since she sent that, we have become aware that two defense attorneys are now either out of the case or have asked to withdraw. These are two of the three counsel involved in the documented behaviors that led to my nervous breakdown and "severe" PTSD score of 76 out of 80 on the PCL-5. That change validates my modeling as the system enters the higher-volatility phase identified in the Brief, escalating the need for the safety conditions requested.
2. Now that The Brief in Aid of Safety Risk Mitigation and Judicial Clarity is filed, along with the accompanying Motion to file Exhibits A1-A3 under seal, I am supplying the stamped versions so chambers has exactly what is on record, with the exception that the attached version also includes Exhibits A-1, A-2, and A-3 that document the financial side of the high-risk situation. They are being shared for case-management and safety-planning purposes with the understanding that they are filed under seal and are not on the public docket.

The brief was designed as a decision tool to clarify how this case behaves as a system and which rulings before and on April 3 help reduce avoidable risk to both the proceedings and our family. It is supported in that function by the now-live Housing Justice Audit, which has just soft-launched in beta form at HousingJusticeAudit.com/report.

To clarify point 1 above: since March 20, conditions modeled in the brief have begun to appear in real time. Friday, we became aware that one defense attorney left her firm as of March 11 (which correlates to a standard two-week notice starting the day after our February 24 Omnibus filing), and another has now asked to have her own disqualification motion heard, enabling withdrawing from representation. This leaves the central controlling actor in the defense system in a less-buffered state just as the April 3 hearing is poised to convert liability from speculative to fixed.

This is the higher-volatility phase described in the Safety Risk analysis.

Given the escalating risk, I reiterate our concrete requests:

1. Grant immediate leave for the Second Amended Complaint that has been on the docket unopposed since October 24, 2025. This adds the individual-capacity ownership role and brings in the image counts that are central to this case.
2. Amend the answer period to end before April 3 to enable item 3.
3. Modify the April 3 roster in line with the recommendations in the Safety Brief, prioritizing the Omnibus filing that renders many other motions moot and materially reduces the "surface area" through which the system can keep converting our asks into new harm.

I can provide a one-page index pointing to the specific pages in the brief and Housing Justice Audit that correspond to these emerging conditions, if that would be useful.

Sincerely,

Chris McNeil
Founder, Thaut
Strategic Thought Leadership & Systems Thinking Consultant
Mobile 843.818.3495
http://thaut.io
Host of Podcast: Thought Leadership Studio

Author of (upcoming): Strategic Thought Leadership: The Book

LinkedIn
https://www.linkedin.com/in/chris-mcneil-chs/

Response from Beth Atkins, Administrative Assistant:

From: Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins) <dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 1:37 PM
To: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>; C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>
Cc: Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>; Van Slambrook, Dale E. Law Clerk (David Crump) <dvanslambrooklc@sccourts.org>; McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org>
Subject: RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

Your communications are ex parte and not allowed.

Any communication with the Court should be pursuant to a properly noticed hearing.

Beth Atkins, Administrative Assistant to

The Honorable Dale E. Van Slambrook

300-B California Avenue

Moncks Corner, SC 29461

Phone 843.719.4435

Plaintiff McNeil's response to Atkins included (readable in full in Exhibit C)

"Yesterday's "Ex Parte" Characterization by Ms. Atkins Was Wrong and Harmful
At 1:37 PM on March 23, Ms. Atkins — Administrative Assistant to Judge Van Slambrook, not Judge McCoy — responded to our all-parties courtesy copy by stating: "Your communications are ex parte and not allowed."

"This characterization fails on three independent grounds:

1. **"Not ex parte.** Every counsel of record and both judges' chambers were copied. Ex parte means contact with a judge without notice to opposing parties. This communication was the opposite of ex parte.
2. **Not Ms. Atkins' hearing.** The four April 3 motions are on Judge McCoy's roster. Ms. Atkins administers Judge Van Slambrook's chambers. She has no procedural authority over what reaches Judge McCoy.
3. **Not equally applied.** No ex parte concern was raised with defense counsel with near-identically structured emails. This selective enforcement is visible on this email thread."

Request by Defense counsel Alicia M Bolyard

On Mon, Mar 23, 2026 at 2:39 PM Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com> wrote:

Good afternoon Mrs. Atkins,

I hope this finds you well. I do have a request for the upcoming hearing scheduled for April 3, 2026 at 11:30 a.m. I would like to request to be able to attend and present any oral argument I have virtually via Webex. I have some restrictions in my schedule that week and I would greatly appreciate the Court allowing me to appear virtually if it is so inclined to do so. I appreciate the Court's time and attention to this matter.

Kindest regards,

Alicia N. Bolyard

Resnick & Louis, P.C.

Partner- Admitted in WV and SC

146 Fairchild St., Suite 130

Charleston, SC 29492

Contrasting response by Brooke S. Slade, granting the Webex access defense counsel Alicia Bolyard had asked for … the same Webex access Plaintiffs requested in the nearly 2-months old January 30 2026 ADA Motion that has yet to be ruled on.

From: McCoy, Jennifer B. Secretary (Brooke Slade) <jmccoysc@sccourts.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2026 9:41 AM
To: Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>; McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org>
Cc: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>; Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>
Subject: RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

Good morning,

Parties may attend virtually. You may access the Virtual Courtroom by clicking the following link: https://scjudicial.webex.com/scjudicial/j.php?MTID=mc495d441e0f1d8b3f9f7c9c7919edc23

Best,

Brooke S. Slade
Administrative Assistant
The Honorable Jennifer B. McCoy
100 Broad Street, Suite 348
Charleston, SC 29401
Phone: (843) 958-5066

EXHIBIT C

Full Email Thread with Court Staff

- Including O'Brien and Bolyard's DARVO mischaracterizations of Plaintiff's CCSO notification as "threats".

From:	McCoy, Jennifer B. Secretary (Brooke Slade)
To:	Alicia Bolyard; Joy Johnson; C&M McNeil; McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay); Angela Rigney
Cc:	chris thaut.io; Kevin O"Brien; Justine Tate; Debra Rizzi; Chris Manning; Kelsi Sigler; Kaylie Stapleton; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall; Van Slambrook, Dale E. Law Clerk (David Crump); Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins)
Subject:	RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference
Date:	Thursday, March 26, 2026 2:01:23 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image005.png Letter from Judge McCoy.pdf

---

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached letter from Judge McCoy.

Thank you.

Best,

Brooke S. Slade

Administrative Assistant
The Honorable Jennifer B. McCoy
100 Broad Street, Suite 348
Charleston, SC 29401
Phone: (843) 958-5066

From: Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2026 11:07 AM
To: McCoy, Jennifer B. Secretary (Brooke Slade) <jmccoysc@sccourts.org>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>; McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org>
Cc: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>
Subject: RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

***** EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside the organization. Please exercise caution before clicking any links or opening attachments. ***

Thank you, Mrs. Slade!

Alicia N. Bolyard
Resnick & Louis, P.C.
Partner- Admitted in WV and SC
146 Fairchild St., Suite 130
Charleston, SC 29492
abolyard@rlattorneys.com
Phone (843) 410-2534

ARIZONA | CALIFORNIA (7) | COLORADO | FLORIDA (6) | MISSISSIPPI | NEW MEXICO| NEW JERSEY | NEW YORK | NEVADA (2) | SOUTH CAROLINA (2) | TEXAS (5) | UTAH | LONDON, UK

www.rlattorneys.com

This message is confidential and may contain privileged information. Only the intended recipient is authorized to read or utilize the information contained in this e-mail. If you receive this message in error, please discard the message and advise the sender by reply e-mail or by phone.

From: McCoy, Jennifer B. Secretary (Brooke Slade) <jmccoysc@sccourts.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2026 9:41 AM
To: Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>; McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org>
Cc: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>; Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>
Subject: RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

Good morning,

Parties may attend virtually. You may access the Virtual Courtroom by clicking the following link: https://scjudicial.webex.com/scjudicial/j.php?

MTID=mc495d441e0f1d8b3f9f7c9c7919edc23

Best,

Brooke S. Slade
Administrative Assistant
The Honorable Jennifer B. McCoy
100 Broad Street, Suite 348
Charleston, SC 29401
Phone: (843) 958-5066

From: Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2026 4:39 PM
To: C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>; McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org>
Cc: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>; Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>; McCoy, Jennifer B. Secretary (Brooke Slade) <jmccoysc@sccourts.org>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>
Subject: Re: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

***** EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside the organization. Please exercise caution before clicking any links or opening attachments. ***

Good afternoon,

I believe that the note indicating a virtual appearance may have been inadvertently carried over from when this matter was previously scheduled. The matter is scheduled for in-person; however, Judge McCoy's office is included on this matter to further advise.

Best,

Joy S. Johnson
Common Pleas Non-Jury Coordinator
Charleston County Clerk of Court
100 Broad Street, Ste. 106
Charleston, SC 299401
843-958-5049

CourtPlus®

From: C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2026 4:27 PM
To: McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org>
Cc: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>; Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins) <dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com <jeff@jwklegal.com>; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>; Van Slambrook, Dale E. Law Clerk (David Crump) <dvanslambrooklc@sccourts.org>
Subject: Re: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

CAUTION: This email originated outside of Charleston County. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown senders or suspicious emails. If you are not sure, please contact IT helpdesk.

Dear Ms. Johnson, Ms. Lay, and Judge McCoy's chambers,

Thank you for confirming that our "Brief in Aid of Safety Risk Mitigation and Judicial Clarity" was received by your office on March 20, 2026.

I am writing to request clarification on three items before the April 3 hearing.

1. HEARING FORMAT

The hard-copy notices we received via USPS (dated March 3, 2026) all state "Judge McCoy In-Person Motion Roster April 3, 2026" and "This hearing will be held In-Person at the Charleston County Judicial Center." The official case docket confirms the same.

In reviewing the published court roster, these motions are listed as "Virtual Appearance." We have received no notification of a format change. Our pending Supplemental ADA Motion specifically requests virtual appearance as a health-based accommodation to mitigate the severe PTSD symptoms documented in our record (PCL-5 score 76/80).

The "Virtual Appearance" on our hearing does not match the "virtual hearing" designation we see on other hearings on the same roster. And defense counsel's informal request for a remote

appearance yesterday (Ms. Bolyard's email of March 23) appears to have been granted and reflected on the roster immediately, while our formal ADA request remains unaddressed.

If the hearing is now hybrid, we respectfully ask that the Court confirm the ADA accommodation for Plaintiffs as well, so that both sides have equal access.

2. DEFENSE COUNSEL STATUS CHANGE

A March 20 autoreply from SAC 181's counsel Justine Tate confirmed that she left the firm of Phelps Dunbar on March 11, 2026. She remains listed as the attorney of record on the public docket, and no Motion to Relieve Counsel has been filed or granted. Kevin O'Brien of Phelps Dunbar remains as active counsel for SAC 181.

We note this for the record and to state clearly: we oppose any defense request for a continuance of the April 3 hearing.

3. CONFIRMATION REQUEST

Could we please receive written confirmation of (a) the hearing format for Plaintiffs, and (b) whether the ADA accommodation has been granted?

We look forward to the Court's guidance. My husband and I are available by phone or email if there are any questions.

Thank you for your help.

Meaghan Poyer
Co-Plaintiff, Pro Se
James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer
PO Box 30386
Charleston, SC 29417
843-818-3495
mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com

On Tue, Mar 24, 2026 at 1:41 PM McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org> wrote:

> Good afternoon,

Your brief was received by our office on March 20, 2026. Thank you.

Best,

Eliza Lay

Law Clerk

The Honorable Jennifer B. McCoy

100 Broad St., Suite 348

Charleston, SC 29401

Phone: (843) 958-5064

From: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 12:58 PM
To: C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>; Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>
Cc: Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins) <dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>; Van Slambrook, Dale E. Law Clerk (David Crump) <dvanslambrooklc@sccourts.org>; McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org>
Subject: RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

***** EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside the organization. Please exercise caution before clicking any links or opening attachments. ***

Ms. Johnson, Ms. Lay, and Judge McCoy's chambers - with copy to Ms. Atkins:

Due to documented escalating risk conditions, we require **confirmation by 2:30 PM today, March 24, 2026, that Judge McCoy has received and been notified of the time-sensitive nature of the Brief in Aid of Safety Risk Mitigation and Judicial Clarity**, hand-filed with the Clerk of Court on March 20, 2026.

The Brief Followed the Court's Published Instructions

Every hearing notice for the four motions on Judge McCoy's April 3 roster contains this instruction: "Supporting memos and briefs are to be filed with the Clerk's Office, one week prior to your scheduled hearing." Our March 20 email provided the courtesy copy; our March 23 follow-up provided the Clerk-stamped version. Both copied every counsel of record and both included the critical exhibits A1-A3 filed under seal on the docket.

Yesterday's "Ex Parte" Characterization by Ms. Atkins Was Wrong and Harmful

At 1:37 PM on March 23, Ms. Atkins — Administrative Assistant to Judge Van Slambrook, not Judge McCoy — responded to our all-parties courtesy copy by stating: "Your communications are ex parte and not allowed."

This characterization fails on three independent grounds:

1. **Not ex parte.** Every counsel of record and both judges' chambers were copied. Ex parte means contact with a judge without notice to opposing parties. This communication was the opposite of ex parte.
2. **Not Ms. Atkins' hearing.** The four April 3 motions are on Judge McCoy's roster. Ms. Atkins administers Judge Van Slambrook's chambers. She has no procedural authority over what reaches Judge McCoy.
3. **Not equally applied.** No ex parte concern was raised with defense counsel with near-identically structured emails. This selective enforcement is visible on this email thread.

Why This Is Dangerous and Not Just Procedurally Wrong

The Safety Brief exists because our counselor has expressed repeated concern for our family's safety. It models twelve interlocking risk conditions, seven currently operating, five predicted to activate at the April 3 hearing threshold.

The Brief is designed to protect everyone in this case, including Defendants.

The sealed exhibits document that Defendants' post-hearing exposure under multiple jury-verdict models approaches or exceeds the equity in the Altman family's entire identified portfolio. The Brief identifies why through multiple scenarios.

- First, jurors reviewing the Housing Justice Audit - which they must do to assess the value of the platform defense flattened and kept flat for months - are documented to act as agents of social change.
- Second, judicial estoppel locks the Altmans to sworn probate valuations that understate their assets' market value substantially.

In the latter case, a judgment of modest size, collected at those sworn values, reaches the entire portfolio. A third scenario combining those two factors appears catastrophic.

The Brief references a settlement window - closing April 2 - designed as a rational exit before the April 3 hearing elevates liability to where the models show exposure exceeding estimated value of the full portfolio. The sealed Exhibit B models, using Prospect Theory and documented behavioral patterns, model what happens when the Altman family discovers this exposure *after* the hearing rather than *before*: *"the system shifts to extreme risk-seeking. The marginal cost of further escalation drops to zero."*

The Brief specifically identifies the mechanism now playing out in real time:

"The Altman family may be operating in Pre-Shock Latency (Condition 7) - they likely have not yet processed the full scope of their collection exposure because captured counsel has been filtering information under a false narrative ..."

Blocking this Brief from Judge McCoy does not protect Defendants.

It extends the information blackout that is setting up Defendants for the very catastrophic

outcome the Brief was filed to prevent. Every day that Judge McCoy does not have this brief is a day the settlement window shrinks, the safety conditions intensify, and the Altman family remains unaware of the exposure their own attorney has hidden from them.

Court staff participating in this filtering - whether intentionally or through misapplied procedure - is participating in the same information-control architecture that caused Plaintiff McNeil's nervous breakdown (PCL-5 score 76 out of 80) and that has produced zero judicial attention to our filings pointing to coordinated defense abuse of plaintiff McNeil for months, until Judge Van Slambrook intervened on February 9, 2026.

This filtering does not serve the Altmans' interests.

It serves only the interests of counsel who have kept their clients uninformed about the true scope of exposure and does so in a way that depends on breaking the Plaintiffs through escalation of the documented harm pattern before that information comes to light.

The Brief offers a settlement window closing April 2 specifically to give Defendants a rational exit before the April 3 hearing elevates that exposure beyond what the Altman family can absorb.

By blocking the Brief from Judge McCoy, court staff extend the conditions under which that settlement window expires unused and the Altman family may encounters their full exposure for the first time in a courtroom - the highest-risk scenario for everyone, including this Court's proceedings.

We now understand that the pattern of selective administrative gatekeeping - welcoming defense communications while blocking plaintiff safety filings - may explain why multiple motions documenting Defense harassment, misrepresentation, and resulting Plaintiff harm sat without judicial review for months, enabling the harm to escalate to the point of a documented nervous breakdown.

What Happens Next

If we receive confirmation by 2:30 PM today that Judge McCoy has the Brief, we will proceed with hearing preparation and the settlement process the Brief is designed to enable.

If we do not receive confirmation by 2:30 PM today:

- We will file a formal complaint with the South Carolina Commission on Judicial Conduct documenting the pattern of selective administrative filtering of safety-related communications by party identity, in a case involving documented clinical-severity PTSD and expressed counselor concern for family safety.
- We will file a report with the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SLED) regarding obstruction of safety-critical information in an active case where law enforcement stonewalling (Charleston County Sheriff's Office, Case No. 2026-001263) has already been documented. This may dovetail with other infractions reported to SLED at the same time.
- The complete email thread documenting the selective treatment - defense requests welcomed, plaintiff safety filings blocked, in the same thread - will be referenced on housingjusticeaudit.com and published on rocketsfight.org as part of the Housing Justice Audit's documentation of the Ask<-->Harm Loop extending into the courthouse.
- This pattern will be raised as an additional basis for relief at the April 3 hearing, and documented in the Third Amended Complaint as litigation-related conduct that compounded the harm to Plaintiffs.

However, if we *do* receive confirmation by 2:30 PM today:

- You will have done what is within your power to mitigate a high-risk situation with consequences for multiple parties.
- Judge McCoy will have a systems analysis that clarifies a complex case and a clear path to judicial action she can take as she sees fit.

We are asking for one thing: **confirmation that the judge presiding over the April 3 hearing has the brief her own court instructed us to file, with clear notice of its**

time sensitivity.

Respectfully,

Chris McNeil

James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer
Plaintiffs Pro Se
PO Box 30386
Charleston, SC 29417
Email: chris@thaut.io; mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com
Telephone: (843) 818-3495

Chris McNeil

Founder, Thaut

Strategic Thought Leadership Coaching & Consulting

Thought Leadership Marketing

Mobile 843.818.3495

http://thaut.io

Host of Podcast: Thought Leadership Studio

Author of (upcoming): Strategic Thought Leadership: The Book

LinkedIn

https://www.linkedin.com/in/chris-mcneil-chs/

From: C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 4:55 PM
To: Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>
Cc: Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins) <dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org>; chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>; Van Slambrook, Dale E. Law Clerk (David Crump) <dvanslambrooklc@sccourts.org>; McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org>
Subject: Re: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

Dear Ms. Atkins, Ms. Johnson, and chambers –

I couldn't help but notice the distinction in response to my husband's March 23 communication about our safety concerns, and I am a bit confused. His email was meant simply to reiterate my March 20 message (this time with the stamped versions attached) so that the Court had the same materials that were hand-filed, and no one raised an ex parte concern with that earlier email.

To ensure we remain in full compliance with the Court's expectations going forward, could you please clarify specifically how the March 23 email was determined to be ex parte? It copied all counsel of record and the same court staff included in prior messages on this thread, and it followed the same format defense counsel used on January 27 and 28 when they requested roster changes and a status conference.

Because my husband's counselor has repeatedly raised concerns about our family's safety, it is important to us that this information reaches the right hands through the proper channels, and that, as pro se litigants holding the fort while we work on onboarding counsel to a complex case, we are following the same procedural standards that apply to all parties in this matter. Please advise on how to accomplish this.

Thank you for your help.

Meaghan Poyer
Co-Plaintiff Pro Se
James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer
PO Box 30386
Charleston, SC 29417
(843) 818-3495
mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com

On Mon, Mar 23, 2026 at 2:39 PM Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com> wrote:

> Good afternoon Mrs. Atkins,
>
> I hope this finds you well. I do have a request for the upcoming hearing scheduled for April 3, 2026 at 11:30 a.m. I would like to request to be able to attend and present any oral argument I have virtually via Webex. I have some restrictions in my schedule that week and I would greatly appreciate the Court allowing me to appear virtually if it is so inclined to do so. I appreciate the Court's time and attention to this matter.
>
> Kindest regards,
>
> *Alicia N. Bolyard*
>
> **Resnick & Louis, P.C.**
>
> **Partner- Admitted in WV and SC**
>
> 146 Fairchild St., Suite 130
>
> Charleston, SC 29492
>
> abolyard@rlattorneys.com
>
> Phone (843) 410-2534

RESNICK & LOUIS, P.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ARIZONA | CALIFORNIA (7) | COLORADO | FLORIDA (6) | MISSISSIPPI | NEW MEXICO| NEW JERSEY | NEW YORK | NEVADA (2) | SOUTH CAROLINA (2) | TEXAS (5) | UTAH | LONDON, UK

www.rlattorneys.com

This message is confidential and may contain privileged information. Only the intended recipient is authorized to read or utilize the information contained in this e-mail. If you receive this message in error, please discard the message and advise the sender by reply e-mail or by phone.

From: Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins) <dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 1:37 PM
To: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>; C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>
Cc: Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>; Van Slambrook, Dale E. Law Clerk (David Crump) <dvanslambrooklc@sccourts.org>; McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org>
Subject: RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

Your communications are ex parte and not allowed.

Any communication with the Court should be pursuant to a properly noticed hearing.

Beth Atkins, Administrative Assistant to

The Honorable Dale E. Van Slambrook

300-B California Avenue

Moncks Corner, SC 29461

Phone 843.719.4435

From: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 12:24 PM
To: C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>
Cc: Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins) <dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org>; Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>; Van Slambrook, Dale E. Law Clerk (David Crump) <dvanslambrooklc@sccourts.org>; McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay) <jmccoylc@sccourts.org>
Subject: RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

*** **EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside the organization. Please exercise caution before clicking any links or opening attachments. ***

Ms. Atkins, Ms. Johnson, and Judge McCoy's chambers –

I am following up on my co-Plaintiff and wife Meaghan Poyer's March 20 email for two reasons.

1. Since she sent that, we have become aware that two defense attorneys are now either out of the case or have asked to withdraw. These are two of the three counsel involved in the documented behaviors that led to my nervous breakdown and "severe" PTSD score of 76 out of 80 on the PCL-5. That change validates my modeling as the system enters the higher-volatility phase identified in the Brief, escalating the need for the safety conditions requested.
2. Now that The Brief in Aid of Safety Risk Mitigation and Judicial Clarity is filed, along with the accompanying Motion to file Exhibits A1-A3 under seal, I am supplying the stamped versions so chambers has exactly what is on record, with the exception that the attached version also includes Exhibits A-1, A-2, and A-3 that document the financial side of the high-risk situation. They are being shared for case-management and safety-planning purposes with the understanding that they are filed under seal and are not on the public docket.

The brief was designed as a decision tool to clarify how this case behaves as a system and which rulings before and on April 3 help reduce avoidable risk to both the proceedings and our family. It is supported in that function by the now-live Housing Justice Audit, which has just soft-launched in beta form at HousingJusticeAudit.com/report.

To clarify point 1 above: since March 20, conditions modeled in the brief have begun to appear in real time. Friday, we became aware that one defense attorney left her firm as of March 11 (which correlates to a standard two-week notice starting the day after our February 24 Omnibus filing), and another has now asked to have her own disqualification motion heard, enabling withdrawing from representation. This leaves the central controlling actor in the defense system in a less-buffered state just as the April 3 hearing is poised to convert liability from speculative to fixed.

This is the higher-volatility phase described in the Safety Risk analysis.

Given the escalating risk, I reiterate our concrete requests:

1. Grant immediate leave for the Second Amended Complaint that has been on the docket unopposed since October 24, 2025. This adds the individual-capacity ownership role and brings in the image counts that are central to this case.
2. Amend the answer period to end before April 3 to enable item 3.
3. Modify the April 3 roster in line with the recommendations in the Safety Brief, prioritizing the Omnibus filing that renders many other motions moot and materially reduces the "surface area" through which the system can keep converting our asks into new harm.

I can provide a one-page index pointing to the specific pages in the brief and Housing Justice Audit that correspond to these emerging conditions, if that would be useful.

Sincerely,

Chris McNeil

Founder, Thaut

Strategic Thought Leadership & Systems Thinking Consultant

Mobile 843.818.3495

http://thaut.io

Host of Podcast: Thought Leadership Studio

Author of (upcoming): Strategic Thought Leadership: The Book

LinkedIn

https://www.linkedin.com/in/chris-mcneil-chs/

From: C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2026 11:10 AM
To: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>
Cc: Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins) <dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org>; Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>; dvanslambrooklc@sccourts.org; jmccoylc@sccourts.org
Subject: Re: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

Dear Ms. Atkins, Ms. Johnson, and Judge McCoy's Chambers:

I am writing as co-plaintiff in McNeil & Poyer v. SAC 181 et al., Case No. 2025-CP-10–05095, which has four motions on Judge McCoy's April 3 roster.

I am asking that the attached filing, which I am hand-filing at the Clerk of Court today, be placed in Judge McCoy's hands as soon as possible. Chris' counselor that he hired due to the breakdown has expressed concern for our family's safety on multiple occasions, and this filing explains why in detail.

Two items require the Court's attention before April 3:

Our Motion for Leave to File the Second Amended Complaint has been on the docket since October 24, 2025 - 148 days. The brief explains why granting it now, with an amended answer period ending April 2, is essential to making the April 3 hearing effective and to reducing our family's ongoing exposure to harm.

The April 3 hearing motions need to be addressed together. The brief provides Judge McCoy with a complete map of what is on the docket, which motions are rendered moot

by the relief we are requesting, and why the safety concerns modeled in the filing make consolidated resolution urgent.

The brief includes three key exhibits that will be sealed on the docket for in-camera review but are in this pdf.

I would be grateful for confirmation that this has reached Judge McCoy's desk. My husband and I are available by phone or email if the Court has any questions.

Thank you for your help.

Meaghan Poyer
Co-Plaintiff Pro Se
James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer
PO Box 30386
Charleston, SC 29417
(843) 818-3495
mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com

On Tue, Mar 3, 2026 at 4:49 PM C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Ms. Atkins, Ms. Johnson, and Judge Van Slambrook's Chambers:
>
> I am following up on my February 20, 2026 email [attached for reference] regarding the clinical evaluation referenced during the February 9 status conference to schedule our Emergency Motion for Health-Based Protective Order and Supplemental ADA Motion. Thank you again for accommodating that hearing, which advanced case management despite the challenges.
>
> Evaluation Progress Update:
> We remain committed to obtaining the formal assessment of my husband Chris McNeil's documented PTSD symptoms (PCL-5 score 76/80 severe range) and are navigating systemic access barriers transparently:
>
> MUSC Forensic Psychiatry: On March 2, Allison (MUSC Institute of Psychiatry) confirmed their policy requires an attorney (not a pro se individual or spouse) to receive/direct a forensic report due to conflict-of-interest concerns, even if the co-

plaintiff receives it on behalf of the evaluated party. This is a standard forensic protocol we respect but are working around.

Litigation Partner Path: Our rigorous due diligence process for values-aligned counsel (who can receive/direct the MUSC assessment) remains underway. We exercise appropriate care given the record, with no firm officially joining the case yet as of today.

Immediate Support Bridge: On MUSC referral (no PTSD/gaslighting specialists available for 2+ weeks), Chris has a Thriveworks intake tomorrow (March 4, 2 PM) for stabilization support. Their consent form notes they avoid litigation involvement (no forensic services, records only via subpoena/court order) - typical for outpatient providers - but this secures care now while we resolve the forensic path. We are doing everything possible within these constraints, viewing them as data points in the Housing Justice Audit's "Ask-Harm Loop".

Key Question for the Court:

To avoid inadvertent delay: Is Judge Van Slambrook awaiting completion of a formal clinical assessment before ruling on pending motions (e.g., protective orders, ADA e-filing, disqualifications, omnibus relief)? If yes, we will update post-Thriveworks and provide a revised timeline. If not, we appreciate that clarity to focus resources.

We remain available for status updates or a brief WebEx. Thank you for your continued attention to judicial efficiency and access. Sincerely,

Meaghan Poyer
Co-Plaintiff Pro Se
James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer
PO Box 30386
Charleston, SC 29417
(843) 818-3495
mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com

On Tue, Feb 24, 2026 at 3:32 PM C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Ms. Atkins, Ms. Johnson, and Judge Van Slambrook's chambers,
>
> I am writing to provide a brief update regarding the Plaintiffs' Case Clarity Brief and

Omnibus Request for Relief, which Chris provided as a courtesy copy yesterday.

I successfully hand-filed the document with the Clerk of Court today. For the Court's records, the stamped, filed version is substantially identical to yesterday's courtesy copy, though we took the time this morning to refine the language, clarify the distinctions between Charles Altman and Jonathan Altman regarding the probate valuation issues, and correct a citation format.

While at the courthouse, I encountered a procedural question. Because the document is titled as a "Brief" to supplement the record from our February 9 status conference, the Clerk’s office advised that it could not be filed with a formal Motion Coversheet (which carries a $25 fee). Consequently, I filed it as a Brief with no fee so that the Court would have our roadmap on the docket immediately.

Given that the Brief maps the unrefuted evidence directly to the pending motions and explicitly requests Summary Judgments and Deemed Admissions under the Court's inherent authority to manage the docket, could you advise if the Court would prefer us to follow up by filing formal, (perhaps one-page) Motions for Summary Judgment and Rule 36 Admissions that reference this Brief?

We want to ensure we are following the Court's preferred procedure without unnecessarily cluttering the docket with individual motions if the Omnibus Brief is sufficient for the Court's review at this stage.

Finally, regarding the clinical evaluation update I provided on Friday, we are still awaiting final confirmation from MUSC on the process for my receiving the assessment on Chris's behalf, and I will update the Court as soon as that path is secured.

Thank you for your continuing guidance and patience as we navigate these procedural steps. I have attached a scanned copy of the stamped, filed version of the Brief for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Meaghan Poyer
Co-Plaintiff

On Mon, Feb 23, 2026 at 4:54 PM chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io> wrote:

Dear Ms. Atkins, Ms. Johnson, and Judge Van Slambrook's chambers,

Please find attached a courtesy copy of Plaintiffs' Case Clarity Brief and Omnibus Request for Relief Following February 9, 2026 Status Conference. Meaghan will hand-file the original with the Clerk of Court first thing tomorrow morning, February 24, 2026.

This filing builds on the February 9, 2026 hearing brief and is offered to assist the Court in efficiently resolving the pending motions. It includes:

- A consolidated table of all counts with the strongest judicial action available on the current record and the unrefuted evidence supporting each (Section I);
- An analysis of the compounding harm architecture showing why decisive action is required now (Section II);
- The deemed-admission pathway based on 62 to 167 days of zero substantive defense response to core documented events (Section III); and
- Requested relief organized in sequence from immediate protective orders through substantive disposition and a criminal referral request (Section IV).

We respectfully ask that the Court treat this courtesy copy as notice of the filing, with the original to follow upon hand-filing tomorrow. As noted in prior correspondence, Chris's ADA accommodation request for e-filing access remains pending. Until that is resolved, hand-filing through the Clerk remains our only available method.

All counsel of record are copied on this email.

Respectfully,

Chris McNeil

James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer
Plaintiffs Pro Se

PO Box 30386
Charleston, SC 29417
Email: chris@thaut.io; mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com
Telephone: (843) 818-3495

From: C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2026 4:57 PM
To: Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins) <dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org>
Cc: Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; dvanslmbrooklc@scourts.org; Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>
Subject: Re: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

Dear Ms. Johnson and Judge Van Slambrook's Chambers:

I am writing to provide a brief status update on the clinical evaluation referenced in Plaintiffs' Hearing Brief and discussed in the February 9 scheduling hearing to schedule our two emergency motions.

Evaluation Progress:

We have been in discussions with the MUSC Forensic Psychiatry Department regarding a formal clinical evaluation of my husband, Chris McNeil's, documented PTSD-type symptoms as a result of months of coordinated defense gaslighting. MUSC has informed us that their department has a policy against providing forensic psychiatric assessments directly to the individual being evaluated, so they do not typically accept pro se parties. This presents an access barrier we are actively working to resolve through two paths.

Two paths forward are in progress:

1. Co-Plaintiff as receiving party. We have discussed with MUSC whether the assessment can proceed with me, as Co-Plaintiff, receiving the forensic report on my husband's behalf — providing the separation between the person being evaluated and the party directing and receiving the assessment. We are awaiting

their response and expect to hear back by Monday, February 23, 2026.

2. Retained counsel. We are in active discussions with potential law firms regarding representation, which would also resolve MUSC's concern by providing a licensed attorney to receive and direct the forensic assessment. We are exercising appropriate diligence given the circumstances documented in the record. We have not yet selected a firm, but this remains a parallel path.
We want to ensure we are not inadvertently causing delay. Is the Court awaiting the completion of this clinical evaluation before ruling on any of the pending motions? If so, we will prioritize accordingly and we will provide a more specific timeline once we hear from MUSC on Monday. If not, we are grateful for that clarity and will continue pursuing the evaluation at the pace that best serves my husband's health and the integrity of the assessment.

Sincerely,
Meaghan Poyer
Co-Plaintiff

On Fri, Feb 6, 2026 at 10:31 AM Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins) <dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org> wrote:

> Judge Van Slambrook will conduct a short status conference, via WebEx, on Monday February 9, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. to address the scheduling of the motions that were recently filed by Pro Se Plaintiffs.
>
> This hearing will be conducted remotely via WebEx. To reach the link for the hearing, go to the Judicial Branch website (sccourts.org). Click on the Courts link, then choose Circuit Court, then click on the Judges link. After clicking on Judges, an alphabetical list of all judges will appear. The link below the name of the judge will give access to any virtual courtroom that the judge is conducting at that time. Click on the Virtual courtroom. Once the judge opens the court session, you may join, but you will be muted. At the appropriate time, the Judge or his clerk will move you from "attendee" to "panelist" and you will be able to participate in the hearing.
>
> Beth Atkins, Administrative Assistant to
> The Honorable Dale E. Van Slambrook
> 300-B California Avenue
> Moncks Corner, SC 29461
> Phone 843.719.4435

From: Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 8:02 AM
To: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>; Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins) <dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org>; dvanslmbrooklc@scourts.org
Cc: Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>
Subject: RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

***** EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside the organization. Please exercise caution before clicking any links or opening attachments. ***

Good morning all,

I apologize for my delay in responding I was in a full day mediation yesterday. I represent the following in this matter: Defendants Meridian Residential Group, Tara Bayles, and Adam Bayles, individually. I join in the sentiments and request from Counsel for SAC 181 for a short Emergency Status Conference regarding the most recent correspondence from *pro se* Plaintiff Chris McNeil. I would ask that we set the multitude of motions for a later date as some of those are directly against me, as an attorney, and I will need time to fully brief those issues. One of those being the most recent filing by the Plaintiffs, a Motion to Disqualify me as counsel in response to a Motion to Quash I filed due to the Plaintiff sending nonparties documents purporting to be subpoenas, however said documents were not issued or signed by the Clerk. I agree with Counsel for SAC 181 and consider several of Mr. McNeil's most recent communications as threats to my clients and myself, as their attorney.

We look forward to the Court's further instructions and guidance in this regard. If Judge Van Slambrook needs or wants any other documents or information from us at this time, please let us know. We will be happy to provide. We thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Pro se Plaintiffs and counsel for all other parties are copied on this e-mail.

Kindest regards,

Alicia N. Bolyard
Resnick & Louis, P.C.
Partner- Admitted in WV and SC
146 Fairchild St., Suite 130
Charleston, SC 29492
abolyard@rlattorneys.com
Phone (843) 410-2534

ARIZONA | CALIFORNIA (7) | COLORADO | FLORIDA (6) | MISSISSIPPI | NEW MEXICO| NEW JERSEY | NEW YORK | NEVADA (2) | SOUTH CAROLINA (2) | TEXAS (5) | UTAH | LONDON, UK

www.rlattorneys.com

This message is confidential and may contain privileged information. Only the intended recipient is authorized to read or utilize the information contained in this e-mail. If you receive this message in error, please discard the message and advise the sender by reply e-mail or by phone.

From: chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 4:45 PM
To: Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>; Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org; dvanslmbrooklc@scourts.org
Cc: Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>; C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>; Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>
Subject: RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

Dear Ms. Johnson, Judge Van Slambrook's chambers, and counsel:
I write briefly to respond to Mr. O'Brien's email below and his request for an emergency status conference.

Assignment / which judge should hear this

My understanding is that the pending motions in this civil case (including those originally set for hearing on December 19, 2025) are assigned to Judge Thomas J. Rode, and that Judge McCoy granted the continuance of that roster date when defense counsel reported unavailability.

Out of respect for that prior assignment and for judicial economy, my wife and I believe any consolidated status conference and motion hearing in 2025-CP-10-05095 should remain with Judge Rode, unless the Chief Judge for Administrative Purposes orders otherwise.

We do not object to a brief status conference being set; we simply ask that it be coordinated through the existing assignment so that the judge already familiar with the record, chronology, and discovery disputes can address them holistically.

Joinder in a status conference and notice of forthcoming filing

As pro se plaintiffs, we support a status conference to address the cluster of pending motions (SAC 181's motions to dismiss, for sanctions, for a stay of discovery, and to quash non-party subpoenas, as well as our own opposition and cross-motions). Clear case-management guidance from the Court will help all parties and reduce unnecessary motion practice.

Because pro se litigants in Charleston County cannot e-file, and given my current medical vulnerability (severe PTSD symptoms so far documented on two validated self-report instruments (including a PCL-5 score of 76/80, in the severe range)), I am not able to safely reach the courthouse before closing today.

I intend to hand-file tomorrow a short written response and/or motion (likely a Rule 26(c) protective-order motion addressing counsel conduct and discovery obstruction) and will provide courtesy copies to all parties.

Clarification of the January 26 email Mr. O'Brien characterizes as "threats"

For the Court's convenience, I am attaching the January 26, 2026 email that Mr. O'Brien references, titled "Courtesy Notice – Criminal Investigation & Counsel Conflicts." I respectfully ask that the Court and staff review the actual text rather than rely solely on opposing counsel's description. In that email, I did three things:

- Gave notice that I had initiated a criminal investigation with the Charleston County Sheriff's Office (Case No. 2026-001263), with primary focus on

property manager Tara R. Bayles and evidence already described in this Court's record (allegedly falsified "postmark" document, 21‑platform image syndication, and interference with LLR Investigation #2025‑566).
- Issued evidence-preservation cautions (forensic recoverability, crime‑fraud exception, and spoliation/adverse inferences) grounded in standard litigation practice when potential criminal and Bar issues arise from the same underlying facts.
- Disclosed that I am now testing in the severe PTSD range (PCL-5 score 76/80) and experiencing extreme gaslighting‑type harm from a months‑long pattern of conduct by property managers, insurers, and defense counsel, while still inviting the Altman principals to read the filings themselves and consider a more responsible resolution path.

I should note that when I use the term "gaslighting" in this context, I am not speaking loosely or rhetorically. I mean a sustained pattern, across multiple firms and attorneys, of acting as if the core traumatic events in this case simply did not occur, despite incontrovertible record evidence. It is not that they are disputing our documented evidence. They are not even acknowledging its existence.

A specific example is repeatedly refusing even to acknowledge the undisputed publication and mass syndication of private interior images of our home, including those of plaintiffs and the indignity of their old dog in diapers, which is documented in exhibits to the Motion for Leave to File the Second Amended Complaint and related filings.

Each time defense counsel writes and argues as though these events are imaginary or legally insignificant, it compounds the harm by invalidating lived trauma, forcing me to relive it and to keep proving that what happened to us really happened. I am contemporaneously documenting these instances for the Court so that "gaslighting" here refers to a specific, evidence-tied litigation pattern, not a casual insult.

On the email Mr. O'Brien referenced:

At no point did I threaten physical harm to any lawyer or to anyone's family. The only reference to "families" was a suggestion that counsel consider speaking with their families before deciding whether to remain in a matter that may generate criminal and Bar exposure - essentially encouraging sober reflection, not issuing a threat.

To the extent criminal exposure could eventually touch any attorney, that will be the independent decision of law enforcement and prosecutors. When I met with the deputy, I initially focused the complaint on Ms. Bayles, but I was specifically asked which lawyers and firms were involved with the disputed evidence and

regulatory interference. I answered those questions and provided a summary document, and from that point part of this process has been out of my hands.

Gaslighting and need for Court oversight

From my perspective, Mr. O'Brien's framing of that courtesy notice as "threats against lawyers" because I mentioned possible criminal and Bar consequences is another example of the pattern I described: legitimate pursuit of civil, criminal, and regulatory remedies repeatedly being reframed as misconduct by the person raising them.

I am not in a psychological position where I can continue to absorb that kind of mischaracterization without serious health consequences; the PCL-5 score of 76/80 was not hypothetical, it reflects my lived reality in this case. At the same time, I remain committed to proceeding within the rules, preserving evidence, and giving the Court a clear record. That is why I am not risking a rushed in-person filing before 5:00 PM and will instead file tomorrow, rested and careful.

Next steps

I consent to and welcome a status conference at the Court's convenience, preferably before Judge Rode consistent with the existing assignment, whether in person or via Zoom.

Tomorrow I will hand-file a short written motion/response addressing (a) the pattern of mischaracterization and lawfare, and (b) appropriate protective conditions on counsel communications and motion practice going forward.

Thank you for your time and for allowing me to clarify my position without compromising my health by racing downtown this afternoon.

Respectfully,

Chris McNeil

James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer
Plaintiffs Pro Se
PO Box 30386
Charleston, SC 29417
Email: chris@thaut.io; mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com
Telephone: (843) 818-3495

From: Kevin O'Brien <Kevin.O'Brien@phelps.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 3:01 PM
To: Joy Johnson <JSJohnson@charlestoncounty.org>; dvanslambrooksc@sccourts.org; dvanslmbrooklc@scourts.org
Cc: Justine Tate <Justine.Tate@phelps.com>; Debra Rizzi <Debra.Rizzi@phelps.com>;

chris thaut.io <chris@thaut.io>; C&M McNeil <mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com>; Alicia Bolyard <abolyard@rlattorneys.com>; Chris Manning <cmanning@rlattorneys.com>; Kelsi Sigler <ksigler@rlattorneys.com>; Kaylie Stapleton <kstapleton@rlattorneys.com>; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall <JWKuykendall@jwklegal.com>
Subject: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference
Importance: High

Ms. Johnson, Ms. Atkins, and Mr. Crump:

Justine Tate and I and our law firm of Phelps Dunbar, LLP are counsel for Defendant SAC 181, LLC in the above-referenced matter.

We are writing to request an emergency status conference with Judge Van Slambrook. There are many motions pending before the Court. However, the *pro se* Plaintiffs in this case have recently been taking action and/or sending correspondence, about which we respectfully submit should be brought to the attention of Court and about which we respectfully and humbly request the Court's intervention. Last night *pro se* Plaintiff, James C. ("Chris") McNeil sent an e-mail making threats against lawyers in this case (which we understand to include Ms. Tate and myself) including that he intended to seek criminal charges and he mentioned our families in the e-mail. (We would be happy to share the e-mail with the Court upon Judge Van Slambrook's request.) Plaintiffs have also been sending to non-parties documents Plaintiffs are purporting to be subpoenas, but which documents were not issued or signed by the Clerk. We have recently filed Motions to Quash two such purported subpoenas to non-parties.

We are requesting a short emergency status conference with the Court in the near future, which we would be happy to have virtually, to seek some potential case management rules for this case, including a possible stay of further activity to maintain the status quo until the Court has time to hear many of the pending motions.

Several motions in this case had originally been set for hearing for a Motions Roster on December 19, 2025, but we needed to seek a continuance because both counsel for SAC 181 were unavailable on that date. The Motion for Continuance was granted by Judge McCoy. We are awaiting notice of the resetting of the hearings of those motions. However, there have been several other motions filed in this case subsequent to the first batch of motions originally being set for hearing.

While we expect all parties would appreciate the clarity that would be provided by obtaining rulings on all of the pending motions, a few that would really help frame what, if any claims in this case will be able to proceed, and issues on the timing and scope of any discovery would be (1) SAC 181's Motion for Sanctions (seeking dismissal), (2) SAC 181's Motion for a Protective Order Including a Stay of Discovery (requesting a stay of all

discovery until after our Motion to Dismiss is resolved and the pleadings are finally framed), and (3) the related Motion to Dismiss.

We understand that there is a possibility that many or all of the motions in this case may possibly get set for a Motions Roster the week of February 23, 2026. We would look forward to same.

However, in the interim, we would respectfully request a short emergency status conference with the Court regarding any further actions or correspondence regarding this lawsuit pending all of the other motions being heard. Naturally, if the Court would also have any time slots in the near future that opened up wherein some of the more pressing motions could be heard, we would certainly welcome the opportunity and believe that the other parties would as well.

We look forward to the Court's further instructions and guidance in this regard. If Judge Van Slambrook needs or wants us to file a formal Motion for a Status Conference, please let us know and we would be happy to do so. If Judge Van Slambrook needs or wants any other documents or information from us at this time, please let us know.

We thank all of you and Judge Van Slambrook in advance for all of your time and consideration.

Pro se Plaintiffs and counsel for all other parties are copied on this e-mail.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kevin M. O'Brien
* Admitted in NC, SC, and FL*
Phelps Dunbar LLP
4300 Edwards Mill Road
Suite 600
Raleigh, NC 27612
Direct: 919-789-5302
Fax: 919-789-5301
Email: kevin.o'brien@phelps.com

Please note our recent change of address.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message, including any attachments, is private communication sent by a law firm, Phelps Dunbar LLP, and may contain confidential, legally privileged information meant solely for the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, then delete the e-mail and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE ~~~ This message is intended only for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not read, copy, retain, or disseminate this message or any attachment. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete all copies of the message and any attachments.

EXHIBIT D

CCSO Notification Email

- Following is the full text of Mr. McNeil's January 26, 2026 email that defense counsellater described to the Court as "threats" to lawyers and their families.
- As the text reflects, the only reference to "families" appears in the context of urging counsel to consult their families before deciding whether to remain in a matter that may generate criminal and Bar exposure; there is no threat of physical harm.

From:	chris thaut.io
To:	"caltman@caltmanlaw.com"; "jaltman@derfneraltman.com"
Cc:	"Kevin O"Brien"; "Justine Tate"; "Alicia Bolyard"; "gladys.lambert@ipgclaims.com"; "C&M McNeil"
Subject:	Courtesy Notice – Criminal Investigation & Counsel Conflicts
Date:	Monday, January 26, 2026 5:56:00 PM
Importance:	High

Mr. Altman, Mr. Altman, Counsel, and Ms. Lambert,

I am sending this as a courtesy notice because I still choose to act from principles of fairness and transparency, even where your conduct toward me has not done the same. Some of you will shortly need a new property manager, and this notice may help you avoid some avoidable crises.

I understand what has been going on. I have personal experience with what is called "narcissistic systems and what you are operating in has all the usual fingerprints: a central actor cannot operate at scale without enablers and a smear campaign that mischaracterizes the target and reframes legitimate boundary-setting as the problem.

I have every reason to believe a similar dynamic is in play here: I strongly suspect you have been fed a distorted story about me and about our case posture, because malignant narcissists are skilled con artists and routinely repackage resistance to abuse as "unreasonable" or "unstable" behavior in the victim.

That said, Joathan and Charles - you are experienced lawyers with access to the full record, and you do not have to rely on anyone's narrative; you can read what is actually on the docket, see the falsified documents, the undisputed privacy violations, and the escalating lawfare for yourselves, and once you do, the evidence and harassment pattern - including in your own defense filings - are, in my view, incontrovertible.

I've long wondered why you are letting this happen on your watch. This is at criminal levels, I am suffering from it, enough is enough, and here is what I am doing about it:

Criminal investigation and coordinated campaign

Today I initiated a criminal investigation with the Charleston County Sheriff's Office, Case No. 2026-001263, with primary focus on **Tara R. Bayles (Meridian Residential Group, PMIC #30129)** and related conduct arising from the 181 Gordon Street matter. The evidence provided includes the falsified USPS "postmark" (forensic metadata showing a September 5 creation date for a document represented as August 28), 21-platform image syndication records, cross-firm coordination emails, and timing analysis of interference with LLR Investigation #2025-566.

From my perspective, the Altman family has funded and continued to rely on a litigation and insurance machine that has systematically gaslit me about traumatic events (illegal eviction, document fraud, privacy violations), turning what began as a solvable dispute into a coordinated harassment and likely smear campaign instead of a good-faith effort to resolve the case.

Counsel – if you recuse yourself from the case, I will consider not filing charges on you.

Before you let your ego make that decision for you, I suggest discussions with your families. And if you've been seeking a way to disentangle from Tara, here is your opportunity: the perfect excuse.

Clinical harm and urgency (PTSD 76/80)

I have now completed validated clinical assessments, including the DSM-5 PTSD Checklist (PCL-5), on which I scored **76/80**, well into the severe PTSD range. That score documents trauma-level, permanent changes from coordinated gaslighting, pretending the majority of traumatic events associated with this case did not happen, while simultaneously escalating the pressure and refusing to engage in good-faith settlement discussions.

A separate, research-based gaslighting framework places my experience at **79/80 (extreme range)**, reflecting coordinated psychological warfare by multiple actors: property management, defense counsel, and insurance, with all acting in concert over months. This is not abstract language; it describes the clinical reality I am now living with as a direct result of the system the Altmans have financed and have allowed to continue by willing agents of wrongdoing. You have escalated exposure for your client, the Altmans, as well.

Evidence preservation

You are hereby instructed to preserve all communications and documents relating to this matter, including but not limited to emails, texts, internal notes, and messaging with Ms. Bayles, Meridian, IPG, and co-counsel.

These are *my* **three cautions**:

1. **Forensic recoverability.** Emails, messages, and deleted files can be retrieved from cloud servers and third-party systems by forensic specialists you do not control. Attempted cleanup after this notice is rarely successful and is often obvious in the audit trail.
2. **Crime-fraud and privilege.** Use of legal process as a vehicle for harassment, obstruction, or other criminal conduct pierces the attorney–client privilege; communications furthering that conduct are not protected and may be subject to disclosure in both Bar and criminal proceedings.
3. **Spoliation and adverse inferences.** Any deletion, alteration, or concealment of relevant evidence following this notice will be treated as spoliation and addressed accordingly through adverse inferences, sanctions, and, where appropriate, additional criminal and regulatory referrals.

Charles and Jonathan,

Window for direct contact and open-letter plan

Given
(a) the documented PTSD-level harm (PCL-5 76/80),
(b) the extreme gaslighting severity, and
(c) your continuing refusal to come to the table in good faith,

I will no longer negotiate through counsel who are themselves upcoming subjects of the criminal investigation and potential Bar complaints.

I will be following up with you separately with additional information, because you are the only principals in this group with both the authority and capacity to end this conflict responsibly.

If I do not hear from you directly, or from a new, unencumbered agent acting solely in your interests (not Tara's or conflicted counsel's), by Wednesday at 12:00 PM, I will proceed to publish a **public Open Letter to the Altman Family** on RocketsFight.org.

That letter will outline the clinical findings (including the 76/80 PTSD score), the coordinated gaslighting pattern, the updated damages analysis, your role as enablers of this system, and the path you still have available if you choose to shift from unconscious enablement to conscious stewardship.

If you wish to discuss a path that combines meaningful accountability with systemic course-correction, I am willing to do that directly or through a truly independent representative who is not implicated in the conduct under review. Otherwise, I will continue on the civil, criminal, Bar, and public-accountability tracks already in motion, without further courtesy notice.

Respectfully,

Chris McNeil

James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer
Plaintiffs Pro Se
PO Box 30386
Charleston, SC 29417
Email: chris@thaut.io; mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com
Telephone: (843) 818-3495

EXHIBIT F

Judge McCoy March 26, 2026 Letter

State of South Carolina
The Circuit Court of the Ninth Judicial Circuit

Jennifer B. McCoy
Judge

100 Broad Street
Charleston, SC 29401
Phone: (843) 958-5066
Fax: (843) 958-5067
jmccoysc@sccourts.org

March 26, 2026

Re: 2025-CP-10-05095
James C McNeil, plaintiff, et al vs. SAC 181 LLC, defendant, et al

Dear Parties and Counsel:

The Court has reviewed the motions currently pending in the above-referenced matter on its docket next week. Upon review of the relief sought and the procedural posture of this case, it has come to the Court's attention that the first-filed motion by the Plaintiff raises issues regarding assignment of case to a single judge which falls solely within the administrative authority reserved to the Chief Administrative Judge pursuant to South Carolina Supreme Court Administrative Order filed July 26, 2006 (attached).

As such, this Court is unable to hear or decide the pending motions at this time. The initial motion by plaintiff to maintain assignment to a particular judge must be addressed and resolved by the Chief Administrative Judge before any subsequent motions may be properly considered by this Court.

Accordingly, the hearings currently set before this Court for April 3, 2026, are hereby continued. The parties are directed to coordinate with the office of the Chief Administrative Judge of this circuit to schedule the appropriate proceedings or conferences regarding the motion to assign.

Once the Chief Administrative Judge has ruled on the matter, the remaining motions may be heard in accordance with the decision on that motion.

Should you have any questions regarding scheduling or administrative procedures, please contact the Charleston County Clerk's Office, also copied on this correspondence.

Sincerely,

/s/*Jennifer B. McCoy*

Jennifer B. McCoy
Circuit Court Judge
9th Circuit of South Carolina

Cc: All parties of record by email; Charleston County Clerk's Office; Judge Van Slambrook, Chief Administrative Judge

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER

Pursuant to the provisions of S.C. CONST. Art. V, §4,

IT IS ORDERED that the following procedures shall be followed in the management and disposition of all complex common pleas cases now pending or hereafter filed in each circuit:

On the Chief Administrative Judge's own motion or on motion of counsel on an approved form, a copy of which is attached and made a part of this order, made after the filing of the original complaint, the Chief Administrative Judge can designate a case as complex, establish a date prior to which the case will not be called for trial and assign the case to a judge assigned to the circuit or an adjoining circuit who will be given exclusive jurisdiction to handle that case from beginning to end.

The motion may be granted on the information contained in the motion or the Chief Administrative Judge may require a hearing to determine whether the case justifies special handling.

If the motion is granted, the case will not be called for trial prior to the date designated in the order. The Chief Administrative Judge will assign the case to a judge assigned to the circuit or an adjoining circuit and all pretrial motions and other matters pertaining to that case will be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the judge assigned to the case. When appropriate, the case should be given a date certain for trial with the trial of the case also handled by the assigned judge.

If the Chief Administrative Judge believes that the case is not so complex as to require the assignment of a specific judge to handle the case from beginning to end, the Chief Administrative Judge can partially grant the motion by providing a date in his or her order before which the case cannot be called to trial. This will allow counsel adequate time to prepare the case for trial without the necessity of having to attend roster meetings and justify a continuance. Continuances beyond the date established in the scheduling order should not be requested or granted by the Chief Administrative Judge without exceptional circumstances being shown. Once the continuance has expired, the case will be handled in the same manner as all other normal cases.

If the Chief Administrative Judge does not believe that the case is complex or requires additional time for preparation, the motion will be denied and the case will be placed on the trial roster and handled in the same manner as all other normal cases.

If the motion is granted and a specific judge is assigned to handle the case from beginning to end, copies of the motion and order granting the motion will be provided by the clerk of court to counsel of record and the judge assigned to the case.

This Order shall be effective immediately and shall remain in effect until rescinded or modified by future Order of the Chief Justice. All previous Orders regarding procedures to be followed in the management and disposition of complex common pleas cases are hereby rescinded.

s/Jean Hoefer Toal
Jean Hoefer Toal
Chief Justice

July 26, 2006
Columbia, South Carolina