

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
No. 1:25-cv-417



Charity Mainville,)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
Eugene H. Soar, David)
M. Yopp, Margaret P. Eagles,)
Christine M. Walczyk, Vartan A.)
Davidian III, Anna C. De Santis,)
Karlene S. Turrentine,)
John Does 1-3)
Defendants)

**SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION TO RENEWED EX
PARTE EMERGENCY TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER**

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Charity Mainville respectfully submits this Supplemental Motion to her Renewed Ex Parte Emergency Temporary Restraining Order pursuant to Rule 65(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This filing supplements the pending request for emergency injunctive relief (Docs. 3, 9, 10, and 16), in light of ongoing constitutional violations, procedural misconduct, and new developments and evidence that threaten to render any eventual judgment ineffectual.

Specifically, Plaintiff now seeks an order declaring void or vacating multiple anonymous orders entered by the North Carolina Court of Appeals in appellate case number 25-521, including: (1) the July 1, 2025 order dismissing the appeal and imposing costs; (2) the July 2, 2025 order dismissing Plaintiff's motion to disqualify Clerk Eugene H. Soar and Attorney David M. Yopp; and (3) the July 21, 2025 order denying Plaintiff's motion for

supervisory relief (Exhibit A). Each was issued without judicial identification, legal basis, or citation to governing rules, in direct violation of due process. Because this relief was not explicitly requested in Plaintiff's initial TRO filing, and the Court has not yet ruled on the original or renewed motions, this clarification is necessary to preserve the Court's authority to grant complete and effective relief.

Plaintiff does not seek appellate review of those rulings but instead seeks to vacate them under 42 U.S.C. §1983 as void orders issued in violation of constitutional guarantees of due process, judicial transparency, and access to the courts.

This motion is submitted ex parte pursuant to Rule 65(b)(1), consistent with the original TRO filing, with certification provided below. Continued delay in resolution is causing irreparable harm and undermining the purpose of emergency relief. Defendants have already received access to the docket, filed Rule 12(b) motions, and had ample opportunity to respond. They have failed to provide any factual evidence, legal reasoning, or authority that would preclude the relief requested herein.

SUPPLEMENTAL FACTUAL BASIS FOR RELIEF

1. Legislative Acknowledgment of Unlawful Clerk-Issued Orders

On July 17, 2025, Plaintiff spoke by phone with Joe Coletti, North Carolina House Majority Oversight Staff Director, and Wes Jones, Counsel for the North Carolina House Oversight & Government Operations Committee. During this call, Mr. Jones confirmed that it is widely known among attorneys in North Carolina that clerks of the court routinely issue orders—including case dismissals—under the authority or in the name of judicial panels. When

Plaintiff requested the legal basis for this practice, she was told it stemmed from an internal policy, not a statute or rule. Plaintiff objected that no law permits such delegation and that issuing orders under the authority of a judge without judicial review constitutes fraud.

Plaintiff was told further legal research would be conducted, but as of this filing she has received no follow-up. After the call, she sent an email documenting the conversation to the full Oversight Committee (Exhibit B). That email has not been disputed, and a screenshot confirms it has been opened repeatedly (Exhibit C).

Furthermore, Plaintiff sent a follow-up email to the Oversight Committee on July 23, 2025 (Exhibit D), reiterating her concerns and providing legal analysis, data, and constitutional context. As of this filing, no response has been received. This silence, even after direct legislative engagement and a clear warning of the federal implications, further demonstrates institutional acquiescence.

This admission, combined with the Court's refusal to identify the issuing judicial officer, demonstrates that Plaintiff is not facing isolated misconduct but a broader scheme tolerated—if not actively supported—by state officials. Despite being formally notified of the fraudulent practice, the North Carolina General Assembly's Oversight Committee has neither corrected the record nor taken steps to investigate. Their silence in the face of documented procedural fraud indicates institutional awareness and acquiescence, which further threatens Plaintiff's right to a neutral and accountable adjudicator.

When elected officials, legal advisors, and court administrators are all made aware of constitutional violations and do nothing, the burden necessarily falls on the federal judiciary to intervene.

By declining to correct or even acknowledge the deception, this Court facilitates an ongoing constitutional violation and shields fraudulent conduct from accountability.

2. Data on Appellate Practices and Judicial Concealment

In response to the legislative acknowledgment of clerk-issued orders, Plaintiff undertook a comprehensive review of North Carolina Court of Appeals civil appellate dismissals from 2023 through mid-2025. Her findings reveal an entrenched pattern of judicial concealment, disproportionate pro se harm, and manipulated language designed to obscure actual judicial oversight. The data (Exhibit E), summarized below and supported by Exhibit C, establishes systemic procedural misconduct:

1. In 2023, 30% of dismissals favored the opposing party, with 50% of those involving pro se litigants. Approximately 7% of those dismissal orders referenced judicial authority by name, reflecting a degree of transparency.
2. In 2024, 40% of dismissals favored the opposing party, 56% of which were against pro se litigants. Nearly half (48%) of these orders adopted new language stating "By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel," a phrase that became uniformly used after November 2024.
3. In the first six months of 2025, every dismissal order included the phrase, "By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel...". The Court also began using the term "referred"—as in "referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal"—in 50% of cases, issuing rulings without formally allowing or denying the motion.

These statistical and linguistic shifts, combined with contradictory statements from state officials and defense counsel, expose a coordinated

effort to obscure the absence of judicial participation in dispositive orders—supporting Plaintiff’s claim of a continuing constitutional violation warranting immediate federal relief.

A. Contradictions Undermining the Claimed Judicial Anonymity Policy

Defense counsel Curran O’Brien asserted in her Memorandum of Law (Doc. 20) that the North Carolina Court of Appeals has no obligation to disclose judicial panel identities due to an internal policy adopted in August 2022. The confluence of statistical harm to pro se litigants, sudden language shifts, and failure to disclose judicial identities demonstrates not just procedural irregularities, but entrenched obstruction. These findings amplify Plaintiff’s claim that federal intervention is both necessary and urgent.

Similarly, in Exhibit 21 to Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint, Defendant Soar—through an official Court of Appeals email—directed Plaintiff to a press release and stated: “The names of judges ruling on motions are not released.” (Doc. 28, Ex. 21). The message was sent on May 7, 2025, from the official appellate court address, and linked to a public announcement justifying delayed or absent judicial disclosure.

This defense is contradicted by the record. At least four appellate dismissal orders issued in 2023¹ and one in 2024² expressly identified the panel members at the time of entry. These examples—occurring after the policy’s alleged adoption—demonstrate that

¹ See Exhibit E at 2 Case No. 23-112, at 3 No. 23-531, at 4 No. 23-891, at 5 No. 23-1046

² See Exhibit E at 6 Case No. 24-176

disclosure has not only remained possible, but has been selectively applied.

Such inconsistency exposes the policy as pretextual. The selective concealment of judicial identities in Plaintiff's case appears not to be a routine administrative practice but a targeted act intended to shield fraudulent conduct from scrutiny. This bolsters Plaintiff's claim that the denial of judicial identification is not merely irregular—it is a calculated obstruction of due process and judicial transparency.

3. Conflict of Interest in Writ of Prohibition Panel

On July 16, 2025, for the first time, the North Carolina Court of Appeals identified the panel of judges that denied Plaintiff's Petition for Writ of Prohibition filed in appellate case 25-521. This panel included Judge Carolyn Flood. The writ was denied in favor of Defendant David Yopp, who serves as opposing counsel in the state proceeding, under circumstances detailed in Claim 18 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

Judge Flood's presence on that panel raises serious due process concerns. Prior to her 2023 election, Judge Flood served at the North Carolina Court of Appeals as a judicial law clerk from approximately 2009 to 2022—overlapping directly with Defendant Yopp's tenure at the same court. Public records confirm she drafted judicial opinions for multiple appellate judges, assisted with transitional case backlogs, and held longstanding institutional relationships within the appellate system.

The denial of Plaintiff's writ of prohibition occurred mere hours after Plaintiff filed an objection challenging judicial conduct in federal court, following a two-month delay in the state appellate docket. This sequence strongly supports the inference of coordinated retaliatory action. Judge

Flood's adjudication of a case involving a former colleague—one whom Plaintiff has directly accused of constitutional misconduct—creates, at minimum, an appearance of impropriety and undermines Plaintiff's right to a neutral tribunal.

This new information heightens the urgency of the requested federal relief and further justifies Plaintiff's demand for disclosure of judicial identities, recusal where appropriate, and immediate injunctive intervention.

JUDICIAL CONCEALMENT PREVENTS PROPER PLEADING AND OBSTRUCTS ACCESS TO RELIEF

Plaintiff's Amended Complaint names multiple *John Doe* defendants due to the Court of Appeals' ongoing refusal to disclose the judicial actors responsible for issuing key rulings—including those challenged in this motion. This concealment is not a procedural inconvenience; it is a constitutional obstruction. Without identification of those actors, Plaintiff cannot fully name necessary parties or enforce her right to redress under 42 U.S.C. §1983.

Under federal pleading standards, Plaintiff is permitted to name *Doe* defendants when the identities are unknown at the time of filing. She does not need leave to amend to substitute actual names once known. However, the refusal to disclose judicial identities—despite multiple pending motions and the introduction of compelling legislative evidence—effectively blocks Plaintiff from finalizing her claims. This impedes her First Amendment right to petition and violates due process under the Fifth Amendment.

Critically, Defendants have filed motions to dismiss. But until the Court addresses Plaintiff's unresolved request for judicial identification—raised in the original TRO and preserved in her Rule 59(e) motion—it cannot

properly grant on any motions to dismiss. The amended complaint remains incomplete due solely to information controlled by the state. It would be premature—and unconstitutional—to grant dismissal while simultaneously denying Plaintiff the information to identify those who violated her rights.

Moreover, based on the newly released writ of prohibition and legislative admissions, Plaintiff can now identify at least one judge involved and may soon be required to name additional state actors, including officials from the legislature or entire judicial panels. The burden of that process—especially for a pro se litigant—is unnecessary and avoidable.

If the state continues to assert that these orders were issued by judicial panels, the Court should require the state to certify under oath the identity of the issuing judges—or admit that no such judicial authorization occurred. Absent such certification, Plaintiff is entitled to presume the orders were unauthorized and fraudulent, particularly as each states they were issued by “the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel,” without judicial names or signatures and legislative officials have confirmed that such orders are routinely issued by clerks without judicial review. This presumption is especially warranted given that Plaintiff’s Motion for Protective Supervisory Relief and to Vacate Void Order (Doc 28, Ex. 33) was summarily denied on July 21, 2025, without explanation or judicial identification. This further supports Plaintiff’s position that such denials are procedurally void and constitutionally defective.

Failure to act not only burdens Plaintiff with unnecessary procedural hurdles, but also risks multiplying litigation against additional parties who might otherwise be excluded with timely disclosure.

LEGAL BASIS FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF

Plaintiff incorporates by reference the legal arguments and authorities set forth in her original and renewed motions for emergency injunctive relief (Docs. 3, 9, 10, 16). As before, this supplemental motion is brought under Rule 65(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which permits issuance of a temporary restraining order without notice where immediate and irreparable injury will result before the adverse party can be heard.

Plaintiff warned this Court—through her prior filings—that failure to rule promptly on her emergency TRO would allow state actors to enter constitutionally defective orders. That harm has now materialized: her appeal was dismissed in precisely the manner forewarned, through an anonymous order that lacks judicial identification and violates due process. The Court's delay, whether intentional or not, enabled that unconstitutional outcome. Plaintiff respectfully urges that further inaction now risks compounding that injury and undermining the integrity of this proceeding.

EXPANDING PUBLIC INTEREST

Granting relief is in the public interest, as it safeguards core constitutional principles of transparency, judicial accountability, and equal access to justice. Plaintiff has taken steps to raise public awareness of the judicial misconduct described herein, including launching an online petition on July 26, 2025, urging the North Carolina General Assembly to investigate the Court of Appeals, and expanding public outreach through a social channels. The practice of issuing anonymous orders—now confirmed by legislative officials to be clerk-authored—threatens public confidence in the

judiciary and invites unchecked procedural abuse. An injunction would restore integrity and deter further institutional harm to all litigants, not just Plaintiff.

Plaintiff has also informed legislative officials of her intent to notify similarly affected pro se litigants—identified through public records analysis—of their potential civil rights claims arising from anonymous clerk-issued dismissals. While Plaintiff will act within the boundaries of legal information, the systemic nature of these dismissals raises the possibility of coordinated litigation or even class-based claims. If left unaddressed, the state judiciary and its federal counterparts may soon face parallel constitutional challenges from other litigants, reinforcing the urgent need for this Court to intervene and restore lawful process. Proactive judicial relief here would mitigate escalating institutional exposure and affirm this Court's commitment to protecting constitutional rights before further structural damage occurs.

LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS ON THE MERITS

Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, supported by more than 80 pages of verified exhibits, sets forth multiple plausible claims that survive Rule 12(b)(6) and are grounded in documentary evidence, sworn filings, and official records. These include distinct violations of constitutional rights by state officials and private actors acting under color of law. The pattern of misconduct, now corroborated by legislative admissions and statistical review, presents a strong factual foundation.

To the extent the Court previously relied on *Winter* to deny emergency relief, that conclusion is no longer tenable given the expanded record,

specific identification of harm, and the federal interest in curbing institutional violations. At this stage, Plaintiff need not prove every claim, only demonstrate that at least one has a likelihood of prevailing. Given the strength of the verified allegations and the evidence already submitted, Plaintiff meets this standard. Moreover, the Court's refusal to compel judicial identification has obstructed Plaintiff's ability to fully amend her complaint, placing the question of "merits" beyond Plaintiff's control and undermining the adversarial process.

CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO RULE 65(B) (1) (B)

Plaintiff certifies that Defendants have been served with both the original and amended complaints and have access to the original TRO and subsequent filings via the Court's docket. However, due to the emergency nature of this supplemental filing and the irreparable harm resulting from ongoing procedural misconduct—including anonymous orders and the refusal to disclose judicial identities—Plaintiff respectfully submits this motion ex parte. Further delay would frustrate the very purpose of emergency relief and enable continued constitutional violations. Defendants will be served with this motion upon filing.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court:


1. GRANT this Supplemental Motion in support of Plaintiff's pending Motion to Amend and Motion to Compel (Docs. 9, 10, 16), pursuant to Rule 65(b), and consider this submission in conjunction with those filings);

2. ISSUE an order temporarily restraining and enjoining Defendants and their agents from relying on or enforcing the anonymous dismissal entered by the North Carolina Court of Appeals in appellate case number 25-521, or any related orders lacking judicial identification;
3. DECLARE that the challenged dismissal is void or without legal effect due to its issuance without judicial identification, legal authority, or compliance with constitutional due process;
4. ORDER the State of North Carolina or its agents to submit, under oath, the names of the judicial officers who authorized the dismissal orders at issue, or require the Court of Appeals to certify that no such judicial authorization occurred;
5. PRESERVE Plaintiff's right to amend the complaint to substitute properly identified parties for John Does, without further leave, upon disclosure or identification of relevant judicial actors;
6. EXPEDITE consideration of this motion, given the ongoing irreparable harm and constitutional injury Plaintiff continues to suffer;

DECLARATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July 30th, 2025



Charity Mainville
Plaintiff, Pro Se






Exhibit A

North Carolina Court of Appeals

Phone: (919) 831-3600
Web: <https://www.nccourts.gov>

EUGENE H. SOAR, Clerk
Court of Appeals Building
One West Morgan Street
Raleigh, NC 27601

Mailing Address:
P. O. Box 2779
Raleigh, NC 27602

From Wake
(24CV022933-910)

No. 25-521

CHARITY MAINVILLE,
Plaintiff,

v.

ANNE DE SANTIS &
DE SANTIS RENTALS, LLC,
Defendants.

ORDER

The following order was entered:

The motion filed in this cause on the 3rd of July 2025 and designated 'Motion for Protective Supervisory Relief and to Vacate Void Order Pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. 7A-32(c)' is denied.

By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 21st of July 2025.

WITNESS my hand and official seal this the 21st day of July 2025.

Eugene H. Soar
Clerk, North Carolina Court of Appeals

Copy to:
Ms. Charity A. Mainville, For Mainville, Charity - (By Email)
Mr. David M. Yopp, Attorney at Law, For De Santis, Anne, et al - (By Email)
The Honorable Clerk of District Court, Wake County

Exhibit B

Follow Up on Today's Call

1 message

Charity Mainville

Thu, Jul 17, 2025 at 1:08 PM

To: "Joe Coletti (Gov Ops Staff - House Majority)" <Joe.Coletti@ncleg.gov>, "Wes Jones (Gov Ops Staff - House Majority)" <Wes.Jones@ncleg.gov>
Cc: "Abigail.McKinney@ncleg.gov" <Abigail.McKinney@ncleg.gov>, "Allison.Gilbert@ncleg.gov" <Allison.Gilbert@ncleg.gov>, "Andrew.Stiffel@ncleg.gov" <Andrew.Stiffel@ncleg.gov>, "Austin.Dunlow@ncleg.gov" <Austin.Dunlow@ncleg.gov>, "Casey.Glymph@ncleg.gov" <Casey.Glymph@ncleg.gov>, "Cristy.Yates@ncleg.gov" <Cristy.Yates@ncleg.gov>, "Cynthia.Echevarria@ncleg.gov" <Cynthia.Echevarria@ncleg.gov>, "Houston.Jones@ncleg.gov" <Houston.Jones@ncleg.gov>, "Jasmine.Miller@ncleg.gov" <Jasmine.Miller@ncleg.gov>, "Johnna.Smith@ncleg.gov" <Johnna.Smith@ncleg.gov>, "Justin.Lucas@ncleg.gov" <Justin.Lucas@ncleg.gov>, "Karleigh.Ndiaye@ncleg.gov" <Karleigh.Ndiaye@ncleg.gov>, "Lana.Witt (Rep. Mike Schietzelt)" <Lana.Witt@ncleg.gov>, "Lezonia.Jones@ncleg.gov" <Lezonia.Jones@ncleg.gov>, "Mason.Powell@ncleg.gov" <Mason.Powell@ncleg.gov>, "Megan.Klutz@ncleg.gov" <Megan.Klutz@ncleg.gov>, "Rachel.Ager@ncleg.gov" <Rachel.Ager@ncleg.gov>, "Sean.Harrington@ncleg.gov" <Sean.Harrington@ncleg.gov>, "Susan.Burleson@ncleg.gov" <Susan.Burleson@ncleg.gov>, "Tammy.Ross@ncleg.gov" <Tammy.Ross@ncleg.gov>, "Allen.Chesser@ncleg.gov" <Allen.Chesser@ncleg.gov>, "Allison.Dahle@ncleg.gov" <Allison.Dahle@ncleg.gov>, "Amber.Baker@ncleg.gov" <Amber.Baker@ncleg.gov>, "Amos.Quick@ncleg.gov" <Amos.Quick@ncleg.gov>, "Ben.Moss@ncleg.gov" <Ben.Moss@ncleg.gov>, "Brenden.Jones@ncleg.gov" <Brenden.Jones@ncleg.gov>, "Brian.Echevarria@ncleg.gov" <Brian.Echevarria@ncleg.gov>, "Carla.Cunningham@ncleg.gov" <Carla.Cunningham@ncleg.gov>, "Eric.Ager@ncleg.gov" <Eric.Ager@ncleg.gov>, "Grant.Campbell@ncleg.gov" <Grant.Campbell@ncleg.gov>, "Harry.Warren@ncleg.gov" <Harry.Warren@ncleg.gov>, "Jake.Johnson@ncleg.gov" <Jake.Johnson@ncleg.gov>, "Jeffrey.McNeely@ncleg.gov" <Jeffrey.McNeely@ncleg.gov>, "John.Blust@ncleg.gov" <John.Blust@ncleg.gov>, "Maria.Cervania@ncleg.gov" <Maria.Cervania@ncleg.gov>, "Rep. Mike Schietzelt" <Mike.Schietzelt@ncleg.gov>, "Shelly.Willingham@ncleg.gov" <Shelly.Willingham@ncleg.gov>, "Stephen.Ross@ncleg.gov" <Stephen.Ross@ncleg.gov>, "Timothy.Reeder@ncleg.gov" <Timothy.Reeder@ncleg.gov>, "Zack.Hawkins@ncleg.gov" <Zack.Hawkins@ncleg.gov>

Dear Joe,

This email is to formally document the substance of a phone call we had today, July 17, 2025, at 10:03 AM, which included Wes Jones, legislative attorney, regarding judicial misconduct and administrative overreach at the North Carolina Court of Appeals.

You stated the Oversight Committee is unable to do anything or investigate my concerns, to which Mr. Jones stated that clerks at the NC Court of Appeals are allowed to issue orders, including dismissals of a case. When I clarified that was not true and that the orders specifically state they were issued by a three-judge panel, I also explained that if a clerk is issuing orders under that pretense, that constitutes fraud. Mr. Jones made it clear that the legislature and "attorneys" are aware this is going on.

Then, when I stated they are required by law to release the names of the judges associated with those orders so I can name them in my § 1983 claim—under Section 18 of the North Carolina Constitution, North Carolina Public Access Law, and the 14th and 1st Amendments of the United States Constitution—Mr. Jones tried to claim there was an internal policy. When I stated an internal policy doesn't trump the law, he then tried to imply that I don't understand the law because attorneys haven't complained about this.

I proceeded to immediately interrupt him by asking him to stop insulting my intelligence and made it clear that being pro se doesn't mean I don't understand the law. I also stated that it makes sense an attorney wouldn't say anything because they have their careers to worry about and aren't going to challenge a court they conduct business in. I am not in that position. I am someone who does understand the law, but it is not my career.

I do appreciate you, Mr. Coletti, stepping in and shutting down Mr. Jones to clarify what it is that I am asking for. As you mentioned, you will speak with the committee to find the laws that allegedly allow them to withhold the names, the clerk to charge fees without authorization, and the clerk to enter orders.

I will be posting to the public today about our conversation, letting those who have had a case in the Court of Appeals know that they should request it to be reopened. I will also be reaching out to Governor Stein to see if he too was aware of the fraudulent misconduct.

Exhibit B

I included my background in my first email to this committee so I could avoid the gaslighting and be taken seriously. That must have been missed, so allow me to save some time and teach the attorneys on the committee about the law:

Regarding the Clerk and the Release of Judicial Names:

- Article I, Section 18 of the North Carolina Constitution guarantees access to open court
- N.C. Gen. Stat. § 132-1 provides that people may obtain copies of their public records and public information unless otherwise specifically provided by law
- NC App Rule 32 mandates how orders are issued and does not confer judicial authority on the clerk whatsoever
- NC App Rule 39 defines the duties of appellate clerks stating it should always be open and have clear record keeping. Nowhere does this rule authorize the clerk to issue judicial orders.

Orders issued without judicial authority are void ab initio. Any clerk who impersonates a judicial panel not only violates state law but renders the resulting orders legally void.

Regarding Court Fees:

- Appendix F of the North Carolina Rules of Appellate Procedure, governed by N.C. Gen. Stat. § 7A-20 provides that there is no fee for filing a motion in a cause.
- NC App Rule 12(c) provides that the printing of the record on appeal is done by the clerk per direction of the court. In my case, no such order was issued. The fees were imposed unilaterally and appear retaliatory, as outlined in my filings. No rule authorizes the clerk to impose costs without judicial directive.

Your Obligation to Investigate:

- Article I, Section 6 of the North Carolina Constitution mandates that all branches of government remain accountable to the people.
- N.C. Gen. Stat. § 120-19.1 empowers legislative oversight committees to compel testimony, subpoena records, and investigate any state agency or employee—including judicial actors in their administrative roles, such as the Clerk of Court or the Administrative Office of the Courts.

If judges of the North Carolina Court of Appeals—including the Chief Judge or the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court—are aware that a clerk is issuing judicial orders, that constitutes misconduct and fraud at which:

Article IV, Section 17(2) of the North Carolina Constitution provides that the General Assembly shall prescribe a procedure for the removal of a justice or judge for willful misconduct in office, willful and persistent failure to perform their duties, or conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice that brings the judicial office into disrepute.

Unless you can cite the specific law that overrides these provisions, you have an obligation to investigate. Do not cite "internal policy" or offer vague explanations. I also know these are not protected as personnel records, so do not pursue that claim either.

To be clear, I am not asking the legislature to interfere with my case or alter any rulings. I am demanding transparency and an investigation into administrative misconduct that has constitutional consequences.

- I want the unlawful \$340 they took from me returned immediately.
- I want the names of the judges who issued the orders.
- Since you have now acknowledged that Clerk Eugene Soar most likely issued those orders, I expect you to subpoena him and question him directly so I may use that information in my federal case and receive the justice I deserve.

In addition, you must report this to the Administrative Office of the Courts so he may be removed from his position. Every day he remains at the North Carolina Court of Appeals increases the number of cases that may need to be reopened.

If the North Carolina General Assembly continues to ignore these facts, it will no longer be negligence—it will be complicity in systemic fraud. It is shameful and deeply disappointing that you have already remained silent and appear to have forgotten your oath to the people, the Constitution, and the rule of law.

Thank you,

Charity Mainville

c: 608.215.6654

2

Exhibit C

Follow Up on Today's Call

Legal Desktop/De Series Portable X


Thu, Jul 17, 1:08 PM (12 days ago)



Viewed 12h ago

1 link opened latest 6d ago

26 views of last msg



Charity Mainville

to Joe, Wes, Abigail.McKinney@ncleg.gov, Allison.Gilbert@ncleg.gov, Andrew.Stifel@ncleg.gov, Austin.Dunlow@ncleg.gov, Casey.Glymph@ncleg.gov, Cristy.

Dear Joe,

This email is to formally document the substance of a phone call we had today, July 17, 2025, at 10:03 AM, which included Wes Jones, legislative attorney, regarding judicial misconduct and administrative overreach at the North Carolina Court of Appeals.

You stated the Oversight Committee is unable to do anything or investigate my concerns, to which Mr. Jones stated that clerks at the NC Court of Appeals are allowed to issue orders, including dismissals of a case. When I clarified that was not true and that the orders specifically state they were issued by a three-judge panel, I also explained that if a clerk is issuing orders under that pretense, that constitutes fraud. Mr. Jones made it clear that the legislature and "attorneys" are aware this is going on.

Then, when I stated they are required by law to release the names of the judges associated with those orders so I can name them in my § 1983 claim—under Section 18 of the North Carolina Constitution, North Carolina Public Access Law, and the 14th and 1st Amendments of the United States Constitution—Mr. Jones tried to claim there was an internal policy. When I stated an internal policy doesn't trump the law, he then tried to imply that I don't understand the law because attorneys haven't complained about this.

I proceeded to immediately interrupt him by asking him to stop insulting my intelligence and made it clear that being pro se doesn't mean I don't understand the law. I also stated that it makes sense an attorney wouldn't say anything because they have their careers to worry about and aren't going to challenge a court they conduct business in. I am not in that position. I am someone who does understand the law, but it is not my career.

I do appreciate you, Mr. Coletti, stepping in and shutting down Mr. Jones to clarify what it is that I am asking for. As you mentioned, you will speak with the committee to find the laws that allegedly allow them to withhold the names, the clerk to charge fees without authorization, and the clerk to enter orders.

I will be posting to the public today about our conversation, letting those who have had a case in the Court of Appeals know that they should request it to be reopened. I will also be reaching out to Governor Stein to see if he too was aware of the fraudulent misconduct.

I included my background in my first email to this committee so I could avoid the gaslighting and be taken seriously. That must have been missed, so allow me to save some time and teach the attorneys on the committee about the law:

Regarding the Clerk and the Release of Judicial Names:

- Article I, Section 18 of the North Carolina Constitution guarantees access to open court
- N.C. Gen. Stat. § 132-1 provides that people may obtain copies of their public records and public information unless otherwise specifically provided by law
- NC App Rule 32 mandates how orders are issued and does not confer judicial authority on the clerk whatsoever
- NC App Rule 39 defines the duties of appellate clerks stating it should always be open and have clear record keeping. Nowhere does this rule authorize the clerk to issue judicial orders.

Tracking

79 total views · 1 total click

Learn more

☐ Raleigh, NC	Jul 28
☐ WI	Jul 28
☐ New Hartford, CT	Jul 27
☐ Raleigh, NC	Jul 25
☐ Statesville, NC	Jul 25
☐ Statesville, NC	Jul 24
☐ Raleigh, NC	Jul 24
☐ Edneyville, NC	Jul 24
☐ Edneyville, NC	Jul 24
☐ Charlotte, NC	Jul 24
☐ Charlotte, NC	Jul 24
☐ Booneville, NY	Jul 24
☐ Raleigh, NC	Jul 24
☐ Philadelphia, PA	Jul 24
☐ Raleigh, NC	Jul 24
☐ Raleigh, NC	Jul 23
☐ MI	Jul 23
☐ Selma, NC	Jul 23
☐ GA	Jul 23
☐ Charlotte, NC	Jul 23
☐ Clinton, NC	Jul 23
☐ Archer Lodge, NC	Jul 23
☐ Charlotte, NC	Jul 23

Follow Up on Today's Call

Exhibit D

Charity Mainville

Wed, Jul 23, 2025 at 4:47 PM

To: "Joe Coletti (Gov Ops Staff - House Majority)" <Joe.Coletti@ncleg.gov>, "Wes Jones (Gov Ops Staff - House Majority)" <Wes.Jones@ncleg.gov>
Cc: "Abigail.McKinney@ncleg.gov" <Abigail.McKinney@ncleg.gov>, "Allison.Gilbert@ncleg.gov" <Allison.Gilbert@ncleg.gov>, "Andrew.Stiffel@ncleg.gov" <Andrew.Stiffel@ncleg.gov>, "Austin.Dunlow@ncleg.gov" <Austin.Dunlow@ncleg.gov>, "Casey.Glymph@ncleg.gov" <Casey.Glymph@ncleg.gov>, "Cristy.Yates@ncleg.gov" <Cristy.Yates@ncleg.gov>, "Cynthia.Echevarria@ncleg.gov" <Cynthia.Echevarria@ncleg.gov>, "Houston.Jones@ncleg.gov" <Houston.Jones@ncleg.gov>, "Jasmine.Miller@ncleg.gov" <Jasmine.Miller@ncleg.gov>, "Johnna.Smith@ncleg.gov" <Johnna.Smith@ncleg.gov>, "Justin.Lucas@ncleg.gov" <Justin.Lucas@ncleg.gov>, "Karleigh.Ndiaye@ncleg.gov" <Karleigh.Ndiaye@ncleg.gov>, "Lana.Witt (Rep. Mike Schietzelt)" <Lana.Witt@ncleg.gov>, "Lezonia.Jones@ncleg.gov" <Lezonia.Jones@ncleg.gov>, "Mason.Powell@ncleg.gov" <Mason.Powell@ncleg.gov>, "Megan.Klutz@ncleg.gov" <Megan.Klutz@ncleg.gov>, "Rachel.Ager@ncleg.gov" <Rachel.Ager@ncleg.gov>, "Sean.Harrington@ncleg.gov" <Sean.Harrington@ncleg.gov>, "Susanh.Burleson@ncleg.gov" <Susanh.Burleson@ncleg.gov>, "Tammy.Ross@ncleg.gov" <Tammy.Ross@ncleg.gov>, "Allen.Chesser@ncleg.gov" <Allen.Chesser@ncleg.gov>, "Allison.Dahle@ncleg.gov" <Allison.Dahle@ncleg.gov>, "Amber.Baker@ncleg.gov" <Amber.Baker@ncleg.gov>, "Amos.Quick@ncleg.gov" <Amos.Quick@ncleg.gov>, "Ben.Moss@ncleg.gov" <Ben.Moss@ncleg.gov>, "Brenden.Jones@ncleg.gov" <Brenden.Jones@ncleg.gov>, "Brian.Echevarria@ncleg.gov" <Brian.Echevarria@ncleg.gov>, "Carla.Cunningham@ncleg.gov" <Carla.Cunningham@ncleg.gov>, "Eric.Ager@ncleg.gov" <Eric.Ager@ncleg.gov>, "Grant.Campbell@ncleg.gov" <Grant.Campbell@ncleg.gov>, "Harry.Warren@ncleg.gov" <Harry.Warren@ncleg.gov>, "Jake.Johnson@ncleg.gov" <Jake.Johnson@ncleg.gov>, "Jeffrey.McNeely@ncleg.gov" <Jeffrey.McNeely@ncleg.gov>, "John.Blust@ncleg.gov" <John.Blust@ncleg.gov>, "Maria.Cervania@ncleg.gov" <Maria.Cervania@ncleg.gov>, "Rep. Mike Schietzelt" <Mike.Schietzelt@ncleg.gov>, "Shelly.Willingham@ncleg.gov" <Shelly.Willingham@ncleg.gov>, "Stephen.Ross@ncleg.gov" <Stephen.Ross@ncleg.gov>, "Timothy.Reeder@ncleg.gov" <Timothy.Reeder@ncleg.gov>, "Zack.Hawkins@ncleg.gov" <Zack.Hawkins@ncleg.gov>

Dear Joe and members of the House Oversight Committee,

I am following up on the email I sent Thursday, July 17, as I have not received any response regarding applicable laws that authorize clerks to issue dispositive orders—particularly in the North Carolina Court of Appeals—refuse to disclose judicial names on such orders, or impose unauthorized filing fees.

Please be advised that I will no longer engage in telephone communications regarding this matter unless scheduled and recorded, due to the lack of good faith and transparency during our previous call. All future communications should be in writing. I am particularly concerned that Mr. Wes Jones—the attorney representing the oversight body—acknowledged it is “well known among attorneys” that clerks issue dispositive appellate orders, including dismissals. That acknowledgment, coupled with the Committee’s inaction, raises serious constitutional concerns.

As an act of good faith, I am providing each member of the oversight committee—particularly Representative Blust and Representative Schietzelt, both licensed attorneys—the opportunity to clarify their position. Silence in this context will be treated as conscious omission and potential ratification of constitutional violations.

Absent a written citation to legal authority justifying the nondisclosure of judicial identities in dispositive orders and unauthorized fees, I will proceed with submitting this correspondence and supporting evidence to the United States District Court in my ongoing civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. I also reserve the right to name additional parties in that litigation.

I understand that the State of North Carolina cannot be named as a defendant under § 1983 due to sovereign immunity, and that legislators enjoy absolute immunity only for monetary damages stemming from legislative acts. However, I am seeking declaratory or injunctive relief and accountability for non-legislative conduct, which is not shielded by absolute immunity.

Legislators take an oath to uphold both state and federal constitutions. If members of this oversight committee are actively obstructing the disclosure of judicial fraud or are complicit in unconstitutional practices for political or institutional purposes, they may be operating beyond the scope of protected legislative activity and acting under color of law. Continued inaction will be cited in the record as evidence of deliberate indifference by state legislative officials to systemic constitutional violations occurring within the North Carolina judiciary.

Additionally, I have conducted an extensive review of the North Carolina Court of Appeals’ practices. Contrary to Mr. Soar’s assertion of a longstanding policy since July 2022, I found that in 2023 alone, approximately 7% of dispositive orders in public civil appellate cases did identify judicial panel members. I also located at least one such order in 2024. Notably, prior to the last election, most orders stated, “By order of the Court,” whereas coinciding with the Griffith

Exhibit D

and Riggs dispute, the language changed to "By order of the Court sitting as a three-judge panel." If such orders were in fact issued by clerks, then the use of judicial language is not merely civil misconduct- it constitutes a misrepresentation of judicial authority, which may rise to the level of criminal fraud.

Further, more than 50% of civil appellate dismissals in 2023 and 2024 involved pro se litigants. Based on this trend, 2025 appears to be following suit. I plan to contact each affected pro se litigant—approximately 30 cases thus far—to inform them of their potential civil rights claims within the applicable statutory limitations. I understand the boundary between legal advice and legal information and will act accordingly.

I have organized all of this research—including a spreadsheet of case data and examples—into a public folder available [here](#).

This, along with documentation of unauthorized fee practices, will be shared with members of the media, the public, and legal reform advocates. I will continue to raise awareness of this issue. Suppressing or disliking my efforts only motivates me further.

It sets a dangerous precedent when legislators manipulate the judiciary to serve political or institutional interests. This not only undermines the foundational principles of democracy but also erodes public trust and leaves future generations to deal with the consequences. I would hope a reminder is unnecessary, but history compels us to remember: North Carolina once sanctioned the forced sterilization of over 7,400 citizens based on radical ideology and pseudoscience—including girls as young as 12.

While the state later offered financial compensation, no amount—certainly not \$20,000—can restore the fundamental right to bear children. Let us learn from these past injustices, not repeat them under a different guise.

Thank you,

Charity Mainville

2

2023 Cases

Exhibit E

Case No	Case Title	Dismissal Outcome	Filed By	Outcome Against Pro Se	Order by Court	Order by Judge	Notes
23-1	Kaplan v. Kaplan	Denied	Defendant-Appellee	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 15th of March 2023 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is denied. By order of the Court this the 1st of August 2023. (For the Pro se)
23-5	Walker v. Vandermolten	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 22nd of February 2023 and designated 'Appellant's Motion for an Order Allowing the Withdrawal of Pending Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs.
23-13	Chance v. Clark	Allowed (withdrawal)	Joint	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 25th of May 2023 and designated 'Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs.
23-16	E.D. v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellee	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 15th of March 2023 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Waive Printing and Processing Costs' is allowed. Plaintiff-Appellee's printing and processing costs shall be waived. By order of the Court this the 20th of March 2023.
23-18	Foust v. N.C. Dept of Emvtl. Quality	Other	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 20th of April 2023 and designated 'Appellee Carolina Sumrock LLC's Motion to Dismiss Appeal for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction and for Sanctions' is dismissed per opinion for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Appellee's motion for sanctions under Rule 34, N.C. Rules of Appellate Procedure is denied.
23-54	Roberts v. Roberts	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 20th of February 2023 and designated 'Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal or, in the Alternative, to Stay' is allowed in part, per opinion. By order of the Court this the 5th of September 2023.
23-83	In re: Hamilton Mktg. Grp., LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 7th of July 2023 and designated 'Motion for Dismissal of the Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs.
23-86	Arter v. Orange City.	Denied	Defendant-Appellee		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 3rd of March 2023 and designated 'Respondents'-Appellees' Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is denied. By order of the Court this the 6th of March 2023.
23-88	Barnes Hauling Co., LLC v. Credence Trucking Co., LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 11th of April 2023 and designated 'Defendant-Appellant's Motion for Withdrawal of Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs.
23-94	Cardenas v. Griffin Bros Enters., Inc.	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 8th of May 2023 and designated 'Motion Defendants-Appellees Griffin Bros Enterprises, Inc., Griffin Bros. Leasing Inc., Griffin Bros. Tire Sales, Inc., Griffin Brothers Auto Centers, LLC, CNC Marketing Services, Inc., Griffin Development #1 LLC, Griffin Family Investments, LLC, MLG Association Limited Partnership, PLLC, LLC, Z4 Investments LLC, Z5 Investments LLC, Z8 Investments, LLC, Z9 Investments, LLC Zoomup Investments, LLC, and Griffin Brothers Companies' Motion for Sanctions Pursuant to Rule 34 of the North Carolina Rules of Appellate Procedure' is allowed as follows: Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay cost.
23-103	Guthrie v. Maddox	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 8th of March 2023 and designated 'Defendant-Appellant's Motion for Withdrawal of Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs.
23-104	City of Gastonia v. McDaniel	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X	On 10 September 2024, Plaintiff and Defendants filed a 'Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal and Consent Motion Requesting Withdrawal of [our] 3 October 2023 Opinion, "wherein mandate we stayed by order entered 23 October 2023. Having retained jurisdiction and considered the parties' joint requests, we determine it proper to grant the motion. IT IS NOW ORDERED as follows: The Consent Motion to Withdraw this Court's 3 October 2023 Opinion for the COA23-104 appeal is granted. Further, the Joint Motion to Dismiss the Appeal pursuant to the parties' joint request is granted. Parties will each bear their own costs, if any; By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 9th of October 2024.
23-108	Foy v. Alviria	Allowed	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 27th of March 2023 and designated 'Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs.
23-109	Khan v. Cresta Holdings, LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 24th of May 2023 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs.
23-112	Melvin v. Melvin	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes		X	This cause is before the Court upon appeal by Plaintiff Lynette Melvin from final judgment entered 17 May 2022 in Cumberland County Superior Court. This Court, having reviewed "Defendants/Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal" and Plaintiff's responses thereto, determines Defendant's motion is granted. Plaintiff's appeal is hereby dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. Judges MURPHY, HAMPSON, and GRIFFIN. By order of the Court this the 5th of October 2023.
23-116	Lowrie v. The Est. of Leslie George Csanyi	Denied	Defendant-Appellee		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 2nd of June 2023 and designated 'Defendant Overcas's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Interlocutory Appeal' is denied per opinion. By order of the Court this the 3rd of October 2023.
23-123	L.B.A. Haynes Strand, PLLC v. Lalone	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 17th of May 2023 and designated 'Joint Motion of Plaintiff/Appellants and Defendant/Appellant to Withdraw All Appeals Pursuant to N.C.R. App. P. 37(e)(2)' is allowed. Appeals dismissed. Each party to pay its own costs.
23-134	Coates v. Durham City.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 26th of April 2023 and designated 'Petitioners-Appellants' Motion to Withdraw and Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs.
23-135	Sarvis v. Durham City.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 26th of April 2023 and designated 'Petitioners-Appellants' Motion to Withdraw and Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 27th of April 2023.

Exhibit E

23-145	Dotter v. Allgood	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 21st of March 2023 and designated Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal and Motion to Impose Rules 25 and Rule 34 Sanctions is allowed. Appeal dismissed. All costs associated with this appeal shall be taxed to Brookie M. Crump for violating N.C.R. App. P. 34. The motion for sanctions pursuant to N.C.R. App. P. 31 Allow 3 This matter is remanded to the trial court for a hearing to determine reasonable attorney fees.
23-147	McLester v. McLester	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 5th of April 2023 and designated Defendant-Appellant's Consent Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 5th of April 2023.
23-151	Williams v. Gaston City, Govt	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 30th of May 2023 and designated Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 30th of May 2023.
23-194	King v. Golden Carpet Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 4th of April 2023 and designated Consent Motion to Dismiss Appeal as moot is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 5th of April 2023.
23-196	Fonville v. WBRP, LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 18th of May 2023 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs.
23-227	Kelley v. City of Durham	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 28th of September 2023 and designated Consent Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 28th of September 2023.
23-232	Fuller v. Sovereign Healthcare & PMA Cos.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 23rd of June 2023 and designated Defendant-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 28th of September 2023.
23-244	Carden v. LB&B Assocs., Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 11th of September 2023 and designated Defendant-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 11th of September 2023.
23-261	Wyatt v. The Golden Mint, Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 24th of April 2023 and designated Joint Motion to Remove From the Court of Appeals Docket is allowed. Appeals dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 25th of April 2023.
23-263	Scott v. Scott	Denied	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 7th of June 2023 and designated Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is denied. By order of the Court this the 7th of May 2024.
23-274	Universal Life Ins. Co. v. Lindberg	Denied	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 15th of September 2023 and designated Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is denied. By order of the Court this the 5th of December 2023.
23-294	Craig Jenkins Lipfert & Walker LLP v. Woods	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	Yes		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 16th of August 2023 and designated Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion That Appeal be Dismissed is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay cost. By order of the Court this the 5th of September 2023.
23-326	U.S. Bank T. v. Rogers	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	Yes		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 8th of May 2023 and designated Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Defendant-Appellant's Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 22nd of September 2023.
23-328	Linker v. Linker	Allowed	Intervenor-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 12th of July 2023 and designated Motion to Dismiss Appeal is granted per opinion. By order of the Court this the 21st of November 2023.
23-332	Wilmington Sav. Fund Soc'y, FSB v. Hamilton	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 14th of February 2024 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant, Wilmington Savings Fund Society, FSB, D/B/A Christiana Trust as Trustee for PNPMS is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 15th of February 2024.
23-342	Cross Creek Mall SPE, LP v. Ngo	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 2nd of May 2024 and designated Motion to Voluntarily Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 10th of May 2024.
23-350	Watkins v. Crossroads Auto. Grp., Inc.	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 16th of June 2023 and designated Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 26th of October 2023.
23-368	Bunce v. Univ. of N.C. Health Care Sys.	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 8th of May 2023 and designated Motion to Dismiss Appeal by University of North Carolina Health Care System is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 16th of May 2023.
23-376	Chafv. Njoku	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 17th of November 2023 and designated Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 17th of November 2023.
23-382	Complete Mktg. Solutions, LLC v. Lake Creek Corp.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 5th of January 2024 and designated Consent Motion to Dismiss is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 5th of January 2024.

EX. E

23-388	Mangal v. Hanson	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 28th of July 2023 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 10th of August 2023.
23-392	Brostrom v. Brostrom	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 28th of November 2023 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 29th of November 2023.
23-396	Brayman Const. Corp. v. Flairton Constructors, Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	3rd Party-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 2nd of October 2023 and designated 'Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 3rd of October 2023.
23-397	Flairton Constructors, Inc. - Blythe Dev. Co. v. City of Charlotte	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 2nd of October 2023 and designated 'Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 2nd of October 2023.
23-403	Ross v. Gage	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 15th of December 2023 and designated 'Appellant's Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 15th of December 2023.
23-432	Envl. Serv. Sys., LLC v. CE Off., LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 21st of September 2023 and designated 'Voluntary Dismissal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 22nd of September 2023.
23-433	Envl. Serv. Sys., LLC v. BP Quorum, LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 6th of September 2023 and designated 'Voluntary Dismissal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 22nd of September 2023.
23-438	Balsden v. Allen	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 28th of November 2023 and designated 'Notice of Dismissal of Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 29th of November 2023.
23-444	Grannis v. Danner	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		Here, the trial court reversed the decision of the Charlotte Civil Service Board and remanded the matter to the Civil Service Board for a new hearing. As the order being appealed from is interlocutory and no substantial right would be affected absent immediate appeal, Petitioner-Appellee Nantz's motion to dismiss is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 11th of January 2024.
23-466	Nantz v. City of Charlotte	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	No	X		Defendant, however, has also filed a PWC in this matter seeking appellate review on the merits. By order of the Court this the 22nd of January 2024. By unanimous vote of a panel consisting of Judges WOOD, FLOOD, and STADLING.
23-531	The Lofts, LLC v. Landlease (US) Const., Inc.	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 4th of January 2024 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 5th of January 2024.
23-533	Huggins v. Martin Gen. Hosp.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 28th of August 2023 and designated 'Defendant-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 28th of August 2023.
23-578	Mazareigo-Gonzalez v. Hernandez	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 21st of September 2023 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellant's Consent Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 21st of September 2023.
23-590	Littlejohn v. Integon Indem. Corp.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 26th of October 2023 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss' is denied. By order of the Court this the 9th of November 2023.
23-605	Baxter v. N.C. State Highway Patrol Troop F Dist. V	Denied			X		The motion filed in this cause on the 28th of July 2023 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is decided as follows: The record on appeal is stricken, and Respondent-Appellant shall serve a revised proposed record on appeal upon Plaintiff-Appellee on or before 16 August 2023. The substitute record on appeal shall then be settled and filed in accordance with N.C.R. App. P. 11 and 12 under docket number COA23-616. By order of the Court this the 9th of August 2023.
23-616	Guarascio v. Guarascio	Other	Plaintiff-Appellee		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 13th of September 2023 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal for Violations of Appellate Rules' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs.
23-646	Bank of Am., N.A. v. Arigbe	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 30th of November 2023 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Dismiss Appeal as Moor' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 11th of August 2023.
23-659	Miller v. Shawber	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 22nd of January 2024 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is denied. By order of the Court this the 8th of April 2024.
23-669	Newell v. Newell	Denied	Defendant-Appellant		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 26th of September 2023 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss Appeal Rendered Moor' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 26th of September 2023.
23-694	Legacy at Firetower, LLC v. Outlaw	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		

Ex. E

23-686	Granville Cnty. Bd. of Educ. v. Ret. Sys. Div., Dept. of State Treasurer	Allowed (withdrawal)	Joint		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 26th of February 2024 and designated Joint Motion for Dismissal of Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 26th of February 2024.
23-739	Binswanger S. (n.c.), Inc. v. Camping World Holdings, Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 24th of January 2024 and designated Motion by Plaintiff-Appellant to Voluntarily Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 25th of January 2024.
23-754	Counter v. Keating	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 11th of September 2023 and designated Defendants-Appellants Motion for Withdrawal of Appeal is allowed. Defendants-Appellants Appeal is dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 13th of September 2023.
23-770	Marcus v. Forward Air Final Mile, LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 5th of February 2024 and designated Defendant-Appellant Forward Air Final Mile's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 6th of February 2024.
23-771	Palle Irrevocable Bus. Tr. v. Watlington	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 29th of September 2023 and designated Motion to Strike Record/Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 18th of October 2023.
23-786	Jenkins v. Jenkins	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 8th of November 2023 and designated Defendant-Appellant's Motion for Leave to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 5th of November 2023.
23-793	Seifte v. Franklin Baking Co. of Goldsboro	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 20th of December 2023 and designated Defendant-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 21st of December 2023.
23-794	Odindo v. Kanyl	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 26th of September 2023 and designated Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff-Appellant's Appeal Pursuant to N.C.R. App P. 25, 34, 37 is allowed. By order of the Court this the 6th of February 2024.
23-806	Midtown-FCA, LLC v. Balfour Beatty Constr., LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	3rd Party-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 31st of October 2023 and designated Joint Motion to Dismiss the Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 2nd of November 2023.
23-808	Engfert v. Williams	Allowed (withdrawal)	Joint	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 3rd of January 2024 and designated Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 4th of January 2024.
23-810	Lowell & Co., Inc. v. Danish	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 20th of December 2023 and designated Motion to Voluntarily Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 21st of December 2023.
23-944	Brantley v. Dynasty Holdings, LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 26th of March 2024 and designated Defendant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 26th of March 2024.
23-879	K.H. v. Southmountain Children & Fam. Servs., Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	3rd Party-Appellant	No	X		Defendants motion to dismiss Plaintiff's interlocutory appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. Panel consisting of: Chief Judge Dillon, Judges Tyson and Griffin. By order of the Court this the 18th of April 2024.
23-881	Gohin v. City of Charlotte	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 21st of February 2024 and designated Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is denied per opinion. By order of the Court this the 18th of June 2024.
23-882	Lawrence v. Lawrence	Denied	Defendant-Appellee	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 11th of October 2023 and designated Verified Motion to Dismiss is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 13th of November 2023.
23-920	All in Fed. Credit Union v. Ackerman	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 2nd of August 2024 and designated Joint Motion of Plaintiff-Appellee and Defendant-Appellant to Dismiss Appeal as moot is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 17th of January 2024.
23-942	Griffith v. Griffith	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 14th of December 2023 and designated Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Appeal and Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Record on Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Printing and processing fee for record on appeal is waived. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 3rd of January 2024.
23-946	Waters v. State N.C. Judd Standards Comm'n	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 12th of July 2024 and designated Intervenor CBIG Holdings, LLC's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 12th of July 2024.
23-961	Cauley v. Southland Nat'l Ins. Corp.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Intervenor-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 29th of November 2023 and designated Defendant-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 30th of November 2023.
23-986	Saar v. Bartell Morrison Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		

4

Ex. E

23-1002	Wells Fargo Bank, NA v. George	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 21st of November 2023 and designated 'Motion for Sanctions' is dismissed without prejudice to refile when a properly settled record on appeal is filed with this Court pursuant to this Court's 8 November 2023 order.
23-1026	Berry v. Ellis	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		By order of the Court this the 5th of December 2023. The motion filed in this cause on the 20th of December 2023 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion for Withdrawal of Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 21st of December 2023.
23-1029	Kocias v. Fla. Health Care Profs.	Denied			X		The motion filed in this cause on the 21st of February 2024 and designated 'Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss and/or Strike Plaintiff-Appellant's Appeal Pursuant to N.C.R. App. P. 34 for Violations of N.C.R. App. P. 28' is denied per opinion. By order of the Court this the 17th of September 2024. (for pro se)
23-1030	Summit SolutionsZ, Inc. v. Cooper Elec. Constr. Co.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellee	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 28th of November 2023 and designated 'Defendant-Appellee Trust Bank's Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is granted. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 10th of July 2024.
23-1041	Arnold v. Tradewind Flight Servs., Inc.	Denied	Plaintiff-Appellee		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 22nd of November 2023 and designated 'Plaintiffs-Appellees' Motion to Dismiss Appeal and Request for Sanctions' is denied. By order of the Court this the 18th of June 2024
23-1046	Doe v. Transylvania Cnty. Bd. of Educ.	Allowed	Respondent-Appellee	No		X	By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 13th of November 2024, Panel consisting of Judges Tyson, Murphy, and Carpenter, WITNESS my hand and the official seal of the North Carolina Court of Appeals, this the 13th day of November 2024.
23-1089	Harris v. Harris	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 18th of January 2024 and designated 'Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 18th of January 2024.
23-1096	Adunni v. Osulund	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 7th of June 2024 and designated 'Defendant-Appellant's Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 7th of June 2024.
23-1116	Pub. Serv. Co. of N. Carolina, Inc. v. SEN-Ashville 1, LLC	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 7th of February 2024 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellee Public Service Company of North Carolina, Inc. D/B/B Dominion Energy North Carolina's Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is granted. By order of the Court this the 6th of August 2024.
23-1120	Cameron v. Newman	Denied				X	The motion filed in this cause on the 4th of January 2024 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is denied. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 5th of February 2025.
23-1122	Jones v. Alay	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	No	X		After careful review of the record and briefs in this matter heard in the Court of Appeals 14 August 2024, defendants have failed to comply with Rules 11 and 18 of the North Carolina Rules of Appellate Procedure... Therefore, we allow plaintiffs' motion to dismiss appeal and deny third-party defendants' motion to dismiss appeal. By order of the Court this the 27th of August 2024.
23-1165	Pisla v. Neil Dellinger Masonry, Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 27th of February 2024 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 28th of February 2024.
23-1168	Cashion v. Cashion	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 4th of March 2024 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 5th of March 2024.

STATS

% Dismissed in favor of opposing party	30%
% Within dismissed in favor of opposing party being pro se	50%
Either outcome being against a pro se	13%
Order with a judge or panel reference	7%

2023 Appeal Cases 1172
Dismissal Allowed 79 Cases
Dismissal Allowed (Withdrawn Voluntarily) 55 Cases
Dismissed By Request of Opposing Party 24 Cases

2024 Cases

Ex. E

Case No	Case Title	Dismissal Outcome	Filed By	Outcome Against Pro Se	Order by Court	Order by Judge	Notes
24-20	Cowper v. Daimler Trucks	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		Dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, costs assessed; By order of the Court this the 8th of February 2024.
24-35	Honacher v. Unihorn	Denied	Plaintiff-Appellee (Pro Se)	Yes		X	By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 18th of February 2025.
24-38	Niend v. Niend	Allowed in part	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		Dismissed w/o prejudice; sanctions denied; costs for assessment only; By order of the Court this the 27th of June 2024.
24-55	Bailey v. S. Lithoplate	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Defendant-Appellant's Appeal Pursuant to Rule 13(C) of the N.C. Rules of Appellate Procedure; By order of the Court this the 20th of August 2024.
24-59	Hubbard v. Wells Fargo	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		Appeal withdrawn; By order of the Court this the 21st of March 2024.
24-62	Strevy v. The Auto Depot	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff-Appellant's Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 25th of September 2024.
24-88	Rake v. SDC K-L LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		Consent Motion to Withdraw or Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 6th of September 2024.
24-95	Bentfield v. Conti Tire The Arms.	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	No	X		Motion to Dismiss Appeal filed by Defendant-Appellee Continental Tires the Americas is hereby ALLOWED. Appeal dismissed; By order of the Court this the 23rd of February 2024.
24-103	Lopez v. Arnulfo-Plata	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	No		X	Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff-Appellant's Appeal is allowed per opinion. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 3rd of December 2024.
24-114	Giulotti v. Rorer	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	No	X		The dismissal was against the appellant (Defendant Rorer). The Court found "gross violation" of the NC Rules of Appellate Procedure by Rorer, including untimely service of the transcript, failure to file the transcript documentation form, and repeated delays in serving or filing key documents without seeking extensions. By order of the Court this the 29th of August 2024.
24-121	POC Land Acquisition, LLC v. The Town of Mooreville	Allowed	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 8th of March 2024 and designated Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 11th of March 2024.
24-124	Culbertson v. S&B Real Est. Invs., LLC	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 8th of March 2024 and designated Motion to Dismiss Appeal for Lack of Jurisdiction is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs; By order of the Court this the 1st of April 2024.
24-176	Altabe v. Autohouse of Asheville, Inc.	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes		X	The Court found the appeal frivolous and in violation of NC Rules of Appellate Procedure, including improper formatting of the record, failure to properly settle the record, and unsubstantiated legal claims. The dismissal was based on Rule 25(p) and Rule 34, allowing sanctions for appeals not grounded in fact or law and for gross violations of appellate rules. Panel Consisting of: Judges Murphy, Arrowood, and Griffin
24-181	Mitchell v. Rice	Denied	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion was against the appellant (Warren D. Mitchell), but the Court rejected it and proceeded to issue a full opinion on December 3, 2024—vacating and remanding the trial court decision. By order of the court
24-224	Sloan-Quaden v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	No	X		Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; By order of the court
24-235	Brinson v. Unemployment Off.	Allowed	Defendant-Respondent	Yes	X		Tommence, Did stion of came on the Securis Motion to Dismiss is died. Appaa dises a. Applant to pay costs; by order of the court
24-246	Durham Green Flea Mkt. v. City of Durham	Denied		No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 14th of October 2024 and designated Respondent's Motion for Leave to File Reply Brief in Support of Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction is denied per opinion. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 3rd of December 2024.
24-266	Berry v. Ellis	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 20th of November 2024 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay cost; By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 21st of November 2024.
24-271	Bunce v. Rex Healthcare, Inc.	Denied				X	The motion filed in this cause on the 30th of April 2024 and designated Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal denied. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 5th of November 2024.
24-278	Morrow v. Morrow	Allowed	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 2nd of May 2024 and designated Appellant Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; by order of the court
24-285	Acres v. Paul	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiffs-Appellant	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 3rd of September 2024 and designated Plaintiffs-Appellants' Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs; by order of the court

Ex. E

24-286	In re: Cottle	Allowed (withdrawal)	Respondent-Appellant	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 3rd of March 2025 and designated Respondent-Appellants' and Petitioners' Appellees' Joint Motion for Dismissal of the Appeal' is allowed. Appeals dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 4th of March 2025.
24-302	Cedarwood Apartments, L.P. v. Locklear	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 15th of November 2024 and designated Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal and Cross-Appeal by Defendant-Appellant, Cross-Appellee, and Plaintiff-Appellee, Cross-Appellant is allowed. Appeals dismissed. Appellants to bear their own costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 18th of November 2024.
24-306	Peter v. Brookdale Senior Living	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 12th of July 2024 and designated Defendant-Appellants' Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the court.
24-382	Chaisson v. Chaisson	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 18th of July 2024 and designated 'Joint Motion Pursuant to Rule 37 (e)(2) to Dismiss Appeal by Consent' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the court.
24-398	Gibson v. Garratt	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X	'Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 4th of December 2024.
24-406	Cooper v. Berger Belcher v. Gary, Williams, Parenti, Watson Gary & Gillespie, PLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 20th of December 2024 and designated Defendant-Appellants' Motion to Dismiss or Otherwise Allow Withdrawal of their Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 23rd of December 2024.
24-419	PLC	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		Dismiss' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; by order of the court.
24-426	Cobb v. Blue Ridge Realty & Invs., LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 23rd of July 2024 and designated 'Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. By order of the court.
24-433	Guarascio v. Pureza	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellee	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 6th of August 2024 and designated Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed; by order of the court.
24-452	The Church of God in Christ Jesus New Deal, Inc. v. Roxboro Church of God in Christ Jesus	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 22nd of August 2024 and designated Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. By order of the court.
24-463	Redman v. Redman	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 19th of November 2024 and designated Defendant-Appellants' Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; by a panel judge.
24-480	IRA Club FBO Melissa Danquist IRA 2000487 v. Dancy	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 6th of January 2025 and designated Joint Motion to Partially Dismiss Plaintiff-Appellants' Appeal' is allowed. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 21st of May 2025.
24-489	Burton v. Griffin	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	No	X		Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Defendant's Appeal for Failure to Timely File Appellant Brief' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs; by order of the court.
24-491	Das v. State of N.C.	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 16th of August 2024 and designated Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. By order of the court.
24-516	Collins v. Holley	Denied				X	The motion filed in this cause on the 16th of September 2024 and designated Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is denied. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 3rd of December 2024.
24-525	Dept of Transp. v. Wonder Day P'ship	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 28th of August 2024 and designated Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is granted per opinion. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 18th of June 2025.
24-527	Mark E. Shelley, P.C. v. Lisenby	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 15th of October 2024 and designated Joint Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Plaintiff-appellant to pay costs; by order of the court.
24-546	The Homestead At Mills River Prop. Owners Ass'n, Inc. v. Shamrock Carolina Land Co., LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X		The motion filed in this cause on the 15th of October 2024 and designated Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss' is denied. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 18th of June 2025.
24-573	Bryant v. Fields	Denied	Defendant-Appellee	Yes		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 7th of January 2025 and designated Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs; By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 10th of January 2025. (assessment charged)
24-598	Prajo v. Choice Health Mgmt. Servs., LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X	

Exh. b, t E

24-605	Sipe v. Matt Baldwin Homes, LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No				The motion filed in this cause on the 9th of September 2024 and designated Consent Motion to Dismiss Appeal Rule 37(E)(2) NCRAAP is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the court
24-647	Taylor v. Dollar Tree Store, Inc.	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X			The motion filed in this cause on the 9th of August 2024 and designated Motion to Dismiss is allowed. Appeal dismissed. By order of the court
24-667	Starling v. Starling	Denied		No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 30th of December 2024 and designated Motion to Dismiss is denied. Defendant's purported appeal is granted. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 4th of June 2025.
24-668	Martinez-Estrada v. Century State Co.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No			X	The motion filed in this cause on the 23rd of October 2024 and designated Motion to Dismiss or Withdraw Appeals is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Defendant-Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 24th of October 2024.
24-691	Justice v. Fred's Towing & Recovery, Inc.	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X			The motion filed in this cause on the 17th of September 2024 and designated Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. By order of the court Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. And it is considered and adjudged further, that Kinardo Ragland, do pay the costs of the appeal in this Court incurred, to wit, the sum of Nine and 00/100 Dollars (\$9.00), and execution issue therefor. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 11th of the motion filed in this cause on the 3rd of September 2024 and designated Motion to Remove is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court this the 4th of September 2024.
24-692	Ragland v. N.C. Dept of Com. Div. of Empt Sec.	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 30th of September 2024 and designated Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Perfect Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 17th of October 2024.
24-703	Jones v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X			The motion filed in this cause on the 13th of January 2025 and designated Defendant-Appellant Wake County's Motion to Dismiss or Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 16th of January 2025.
24-714	Mid Am. Apartments LP vs. Reid	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	Yes		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 24th of October 2024 and designated Notice of Dismissal of Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 30th of October 2024.
24-755	Harrell v. Wake Cnty.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		Motion to Dismiss is denied. By order of the Court this the 16th of September 2024.
24-756	Bartosak v. Bartosak	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	Yes				The motion filed in this cause on the 24th of January 2025 and designated Joint Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 27th of January 2025.
24-759	MacDonald v. MacDonald	Denied	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X			Appellees Motion to Dismiss Appellants Appeal or in the Alternative, for Sanctions is denied. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 30th of December 2024.
24-786	AMPSA, LLC v. Thomason	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 10th of February 2025 and designated Defendant-Appellants and Plaintiff-Appellees Joint Motion to Withdraw or Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 11th of February 2025.
24-802	Hilliard v. Gilliam	Denied	Plaintiff-Appellee			X		Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 13th of January 2025.
24-824	Holly Forest Ass'n v. Sapphire Sanctuary Inns, LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 5th of December 2024 and designated Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 9th of December 2024.
24-829	Abdullaeva v. The Presbyterian Hosp.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 26th of November 2024 and designated Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 2nd of December 2024.
24-866	Creel v. Zimovis	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 30th of September 2024 and designated Defendant-Appellee Saritha Akurath's Motion to Dismiss Appeal and Motion for Sanctions is denied. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 18th of June 2025. Plaintiff is a Pro Se
24-904	Graham v. Taylor	Denied				X		The motion filed in this cause on the 23rd of January 2025 and designated Defendant-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 23rd of January 2025.
24-913	Ferreira v. Ferreira	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 6th of November 2024 and designated Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Defendant-Appellant's Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 13th of November 2024.
24-925	Wilson v. Verren	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	Yes		X		

Ex. E

24-934	Sampson v. N.C. Farm Bureau Mut. Ins. Co., Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 16th of April 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 17th of April 2025.
24-943	Dawson v. Annalio	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 19th of March 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Notice of Voluntary Dismissal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 20th of March 2025.
24-947	Jones v. Thomas	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 3rd of February 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 6th of February 2025.
24-1002	Lipp v. Mahanty	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 12th of February 2025 and designated Defendant-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw/Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 13th of February 2025. (Plaintiff was Pro se)
24-1008	Cunningham v. Bravo 4 Autoworks LLC	Denied			X	The motion filed in this cause on the 7th of February 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is denied. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 28th of February 2025. (Appellant was a Pro Se - only case that seem to fair with a pro se)
24-1018	Hedgspeth v. Aspen Dental Mgmt., Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 17th of January 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 21st of January 2025.
24-1025	Hors v. Robinson	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	No	X	Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Interlocutory Appeal is allowed per opinion. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 4th of June 2025.
24-1046	Comeau v. The River Golf Club	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 11th of June 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 12th of June 2025.
24-1047	The Cincinnati Specialty Underwriters Ins. Co. v. Mathis	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 13th of March 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 17th of March 2025.
24-1050	Comeau v. Lake Royale P.O.A.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 11th of June 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 12th of June 2025.
24-1059	Giles v. Hudson Co. of Tenn., Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 5th of February 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeals dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 6th of February 2025.
24-1076	Davis v. Noel	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 28th of January 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's and Defendant-Cross Appellant's Motion for Dismissal of Appeals is allowed. Appeals dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 30th of January 2025.
24-1086	Ferreira v. Ferreira	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 23rd of January 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 23rd of January 2025.
24-1114	Quintana v. State of N.C.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 9th of January 2025 and designated Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 9th of January 2025.

STATS

% Dismissed in favor of opposing party	40%
% Withdrawn dismissed in favor of opposing party being pro se	55%
Either outcome being against a pro se	26%
By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel	48% (Constant after 11/2024)

2024 Appeal Cases 1132
Dismissal Allowed (Withdrawn Voluntarily) 40 Cases
Dismissed By Request of Opposing Party 24 Cases

2025 Cases

Ex. E

Case No	Case Title	Dismissal Outcome	Filed By	Outcome Against Pro Se	Order by Court	Order by Judge	Notes
25-3	Republican Natl Comm. v. N.C. State Bd. of Elections	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 9th of January 2025 and designated 'Consent Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Plaintiff-Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 9th of January 2025.
25-8	Byrd v. Aerolina, Inc.	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 7th of January 2025 and designated 'Plaintiffs-Appellees' Motion to Dismiss Appeal and Refer to Motions Panel' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 24th of February 2025.
25-19	In re: The Richmond City Jail Facilities	Referred	Other-Appellee	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 3rd of April 2025 and designated 'Appellees' Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 23rd of April 2025.
25-49	Cuevas v. Cuevas	Referred	Defendant-Appellees			X	The motion filed in this cause on the 15th of May 2025 and designated 'Defendant-Appellees' Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 12th of June 2025.
25-51	Carolina Place LLC v. Bright Star Tech LLC	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 23rd of January 2025 and designated 'Withdrawal of Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeal of North Carolina' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay cost. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 27th of January 2025.
25-56	Maine Fed. Credit Union v. Braswell	Referred	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 3rd of June 2025 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion for Sanctions Pursuant to Rule 54 of the North Carolina Rules of Appellate Procedure' is referred to the panel assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 23rd of June 2025.
25-75	Pettaway v. Lee	Allowed (withdrawal)	Plaintiff-Appellant	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 9th of June 2025 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 11th of June 2025.
25-101	Est. of Staley v. Randolph Hosp., Inc.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 7th of May 2025 and designated 'Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal and Cross-Appeal' is allowed. Appeal and Cross-Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 8th of May 2025.
25-110	Singh v. Univ. of N.C. at Chapel Hill	Referred	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 29th of April 2025 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellees' Motion to Dismiss Defendants' Appeal and Petition for a Writ of Certiorari' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 23rd of May 2025.
25-114	Okmus, Inc. v. Teasley	Referred	Plaintiff-Appellees	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 31st of March 2025 and designated 'Okmus, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 15th of April 2025.
25-123	OH Tacoma 1 Subd. a Series of OH Tacoma 1 Tr. v. Newsome	Referred	Defendant-Appellee	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 12th of February 2025 and designated 'Defendants-Appellees' Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 28th of February 2025.
25-129	Lee v. Lee	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellees	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 9th of June 2025 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellee Richard M. Lee, Jr.'s Motion to Dismiss Defendant-Appellant's Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 26th of June 2025.
25-157	Lei v. GEICO Gen. Ins. Co.	Referred	Defendant-Appellee	No		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 30th of May 2025 and designated 'Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 12th of June 2025.
25-162	Lei v. Progressive Corp.	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 11th of March 2025 and designated 'Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 25th of March 2025.
25-169	Taylor v. Myers	Denied	Defendant-Appellee	Yes		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 24th of April 2025 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is denied. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 1st of May 2025.

EX. E

25-170	Ceasar v. Sayeveya	Denied	Plaintiff-Appellee	Yes			X	The motion filed in this cause on the 21st of March 2025 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is decided as follows: Defendant-Appellant's response is deemed timely filed on 9 April 2025. Plaintiff-Appellee's motion to dismiss appeal is denied. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 10th of April 2025.
25-187	Meister v. McDaniel	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	Yes		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 21st of March 2025 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellee Emily Jeffords Meister's Second Amended Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 24th of March 2025.
25-192	Capitol City Homes, LLC v. Starlight Homes N.C., LLC.	Referred				X		The motion filed in this cause on the 30th of May 2025 and designated 'Capitol City Homes' Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 19th of June 2025.
25-217	Nelson v. Lyndon Steel Co.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 25th of March 2025 and designated 'Defendant-Appellants' Motion to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellants to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 27th of March 2025.
25-230	Timmons v. Herring	Referred	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 3rd of July 2025 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellees' Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 14th of July 2025.
25-253	Watson v. Shaheen	Referred	Defendant-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 23rd of May 2025 and designated 'Defendants-Appellees' Joint Motion to Dismiss Pro Se Plaintiff-Appellants' Appeal of the 17 July 2024 Order and to Refer to Motions Panel' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 7th of July 2025.
25-257	Topping v. Meyers	Referred	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 25th of March 2025 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Defendants-Appellants' Appeal' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 16th of April 2025.
25-264	Integon Indem. Corp. v. Eagles	Referred	Defendant-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 4th of April 2025 and designated 'Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject-Matter Jurisdiction' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 24th of April 2025.
25-266	Rocky Mount Fam. YMCA, Inc. v. United States Fire Ins. Co.	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 30th of May 2025 and designated 'Joint Motion for Withdrawal of Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 2nd of June 2025.
25-282	Erie Ins. Exch. v. Kobitsky	Referred	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 17th of June 2025 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 1st of July 2025.
25-285	Byrd v. Byrd	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 22nd of April 2025 and designated 'Appellant Defendant's Motion for Leave to Withdraw Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 24th of April 2025.
25-314	SFRX XII Charlotte Owner, L.P. Park Ave. Props. v. Brice	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 11th of April 2025 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellee SFR XII Charlotte Owner, L.P.'s Motion to Dismiss Appeal and Response in Opposition to Motion for Extension of Time or to Deem Record Timely Filed' is decided as follows: Plaintiff-Appellee SFR XII Charlotte Owner, L.P.'s motion to dismiss appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 29th of May 2025.
25-325	Welbourne v. Barbee	Referred	Defendant-Appellee	No		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 1st of May 2025 and designated 'Defendant-Appellees' Motion to Dismiss Appeal' is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 15th of May 2025.
25-347	Kany v. Odindo	Allowed	Plaintiff-Appellee	Yes		X		The motion filed in this cause on the 17th of April 2025 and designated 'Plaintiff-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Defendant-Appellant's Appeal' is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 2nd of May 2025.

Ex. E

25-362	Lane v. Chen	Referred	Defendant-Appellee		X	The motion filed in this cause on the 12th of June 2025 and designated Defendant-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Perfect Appeal is referred to the panel that will be assigned not hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 25th of June 2025.
25-387	Universal Life Ins. Co. v. Lindberg	Referred	Plaintiff-Appellee	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 12th of May 2025 and designated Universal Life Insurance Company's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 29th of May 2025.
25-417	Shehan v. Shehan	Allowed (withdrawal)	Defendant-Appellant	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 15th of July 2025 and designated Defendant's Unopposed Motion to Withdraw Appeal is allowed. Appeal dismissed. Appellant to pay costs. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 17th of July 2025.
25-424	Valentine v. Town of Chapel Hill	Allowed	Respondent-Appellee	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 8th of May 2025 and designated Respondent-Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal as Interlocutory is allowed without prejudice to any right Petitioners may have, if any, to raise constitutional arguments in the superior court in this matter, see, e.g., Askew v. City of Kingston, 386 N.C. 286, 290-91 (2024), or to file a separate action as suggested by the federal court. Appeal dismissed. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 28th of May 2025.
25-521	Mainville v. De Santis	Allowed	Defendant-Appellee	Yes	X	Appellees' Motion for Sanctions is allowed as follows: Appeal dismissed. The motion is otherwise denied. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 1st of July 2025.
25-542	Kale v. Gupta	Referred	Defendant-Appellee	No	X	The motion filed in this cause on the 6th of June 2025 and designated Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is referred to the panel that will be assigned to hear the appeal. By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel, this the 10th of July 2025.

STATS

% Dismissed in favor of opposing party	50%
% Within dismissed in favor of opposing party being pro se	50%
Either outcome being against a pro se	38%
By order of the Court, sitting as a three-judge panel	100%

2025 Appeal Cases pending
Dismissal Allowed (Withdrawn Voluntarily) 16 Cases
Dismissed By Request of Opposing Party 8 Cases
Cases Referred 17 Cases