## THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.

## THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA In The Court of Appeals

Karen Oliver, Appellant,
v.
Amanda Lawrence and Trident United Way, Respondents.
Appellate Case No. 2013-002587
Appeal From Charleston County J. C. Nicholson, Jr., Circuit Court Judge
Unpublished Opinion No. 2016-UP-481 Submitted October 1, 2016 – Filed November 16, 2016

## APPEAL DISMISSED

Karen Oliver, of Johns Island, pro se.

Andrew F. Lindemann, of Davidson & Lindemann, PA, of Columbia; and Christina Rae Fargnoli, of Clawson & Staubes, LLC, of Charleston, for Respondents.

**PER CURIAM:** Karen Oliver appeals a circuit court order dismissing her breach of contract and defamation action against Amanda Lawrence and Trident United Way. We dismiss the appeal pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following

authorities: Rule 203(b)(1), SCACR ("A notice of appeal shall be served on all respondents within thirty (30) days after receipt of written notice of entry of the order or judgment."); *id.* ("When a timely . . . motion to alter or amend the judgment . . . has been made, the time for appeal for all parties shall be stayed and shall run from receipt of written notice of entry of the order granting or denying such motion."); *Camp v. Camp*, 386 S.C. 571, 574-75, 689 S.E.2d 634, 636 (2010) ("Service of the notice of appeal is a 'jurisdictional requirement, and [the appellate court] has no authority to extend or expand the time in which the notice of intent to appeal must be served." (quoting *Mears v. Mears*, 287 S.C. 168, 169, 337 S.E.2d 206, 207 (1985))); *Elam v. S.C. Dep't of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 20, 602 S.E.2d 772, 778 (2004) ("An appeal may be barred due to untimely service of the notice of appeal when a party—instead of serving a notice of appeal—files a successive Rule 59(e) motion, where the [circuit court's] ruling on the first Rule 59(e) motion does not result in a substantial alteration of the original judgment.").

APPEAL DISMISSED.<sup>1</sup>

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.