

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Asbury H. Gibbes, Petitioner.

Appellate Case No. 2017-000917

ORDER

The records in the office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court show that on November 14, 1974, petitioner was admitted and enrolled as a member of the Bar of this State. Currently, petitioner is a retired of the Bar in good standing.

Petitioner has now submitted his resignation from the South Carolina Bar pursuant to Rule 409, SCACR. The resignation is accepted.

If petitioner is currently representing any South Carolina clients, petitioner shall immediately notify those clients of the resignation by certified mail, return receipt requested. Further, if petitioner is currently counsel of record before any court of this State, petitioner shall immediately move to be relieved as counsel in that matter.

Within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall:

- (1) surrender the certificate of admission to the Clerk of this Court. If petitioner cannot locate this certificate, petitioner shall provide the Clerk with an affidavit indicating this fact and indicating that the certificate will be immediately surrendered if it is subsequently located; and
- (2) provide an affidavit to the Clerk of this Court showing that petitioner has fully complied with the requirements of this order.

FOR THE COURT

BY s/ Daniel E. Shearouse
CLERK

Columbia, South Carolina

September 15, 2017

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Paaris C. Snell, Petitioner.

Appellate Case No. 2017-001752

ORDER

The records in the office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court show that on May 24, 2004, petitioner was admitted and enrolled as a member of the Bar of this State. Currently, petitioner is a regular member of the South Carolina Bar in good standing.

Petitioner has now submitted his resignation from the South Carolina Bar pursuant to Rule 409, SCACR. The resignation is accepted.

If petitioner is currently representing any South Carolina clients, petitioner shall immediately notify those clients of the resignation by certified mail, return receipt requested. Further, if petitioner is currently counsel of record before any court of this State, petitioner shall immediately move to be relieved as counsel in that matter.

Within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall:

- (1) surrender the certificate of admission to the Clerk of this Court. If petitioner cannot locate this certificate, petitioner shall provide the Clerk with an affidavit indicating this fact and indicating that the certificate will be immediately surrendered if it is subsequently located; and
- (2) provide an affidavit to the Clerk of this Court showing that petitioner has fully complied with the requirements of this order.

FOR THE COURT

BY s/ Daniel E. Shearouse
CLERK

Columbia, South Carolina

September 15, 2017



OPINIONS
OF
THE SUPREME COURT
AND
COURT OF APPEALS
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA

ADVANCE SHEET NO. 36
September 20, 2017
Daniel E. Shearouse, Clerk
Columbia, South Carolina
www.sccourts.org

CONTENTS
THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
PUBLISHED OPINIONS AND ORDERS

27739 - In the Matter of Heather Mary Boone McKeever	16
Order - Re: Expansion of Electronic Filing Pilot Program - Court of Common Pleas	23
Order - Re: Amendments to Rule 268, South Carolina Appellate Court Rules	24

UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS

None

PETITIONS - UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

27685 - Louis Michael Winkler, Jr. v. The State	Pending
27701 - Bobby Wayne Stone v. The State	Pending
27706 - The State v. Alphonso Thompson	Pending
Order - Gregory L. Campbell v. The State	Pending

**EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF
CERTIORARI IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT**

27722 - The State v. Ricky Lee Blackwell	Granted until 10/28/17
--	------------------------

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

27726 - Farid A. Mangal V. The State	Pending
27725 - James Jowers v. SCDHEC	Pending

27727 - Vance L. Boone, et al., v. Quicken Loans, Inc., et al.	Denied 9/13/2017
27728 - Jane Doe v. The State	Pending
27730 - Angela Patton v. Dr. Gregory Miller	Pending
27731 - Protestant Episcopal v. Episcopal Church	Pending
27734 - In the Matter of William Ashley Jordan	Pending

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

PUBLISHED OPINIONS

None

UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS

2017-UP-358-Jeffrey D. Allen v. S.C. Budget and Control Board

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

5496-State v. John W. Dobbins, Jr.	Pending
5497-Kan Enterprises v. S.C. Dep't of Revenue	Pending
5498-State v. Sandy Lynn Westmoreland	Pending
5500-William Huck v. Avtex Commercial	Pending
5501-State v. Lorenzo B. Young	Pending
5502-State v. Preston Ryan Oates	Pending
5504-John Doe 2 v. The Citadel	Pending
5506-State v. Marvin R. Brown	Pending
5507-The Oaks at Rivers Edge v. Daniel Island Riverside	Pending
5510-State v. Stanley L. Wrapp	Pending
5511-State v. Lance L. Miles	Pending
2017-UP-225-State v. Joseph T. Rowland	Pending
2017-UP-280-Terlizzi Home Improvement v. Michael L. Boheler	Pending
2017-UP-282-Mother Doe A. v. The Citadel	Pending
2017-UP-283-State v. Kadrin Rajun Singleton	Pending

2017-UP-289-Marion Stone v. Susan Thompson	Pending
2017-UP-293-SCDSS v. Janet Bright and Randy Bright	Pending
2017-UP-296-Rivergate Homeowners v. WW & LB	Pending
2017-UP-307-SCDSS v. Ashley Marie Cole	Pending
2017-UP-311-State v. Robert William Wazney	Pending
2017-UP-315-State v. Taquan L. Brown	Pending
2017-UP-317-Jimmy Long v. SCDPPPS	Pending
2017-UP-324-State v. Mario Valerio Gonzalez Hernandez	Pending
2017-UP-325-Tony King v. Christopher Miller	Pending
2017-UP-331-SCDSS v. Nina Ward	Pending
2017-UP-336-Clarence Winfrey v. Archway Services, Inc. (1)	Pending
2017-UP-338-Clarence Winfrey v. Archway Services, Inc. (3)	Pending
2017-UP-339-State v. John H. Dial, Jr.	Pending
2017-UP-340-Jimmy Boykin v. Zady R. Burton	Pending
2017-UP-342-State v. Bryant Christopher Gurley	Pending
2017-UP-344-Brent E. Bentrim v. Wells Fargo	Pending

PETITIONS-SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

5253-Sierra Club v. Chem-Nuclear	Pending
5382-State v. Marc A. Palmer	Pending
5387-Richard Wilson v. Laura B. Willis	Pending
5388-Vivian Atkins v. James R. Wilson, Jr.	Pending
5391-Paggy D. Conits v. Spiro E. Conits	Pending

5398-Claude W. Graham v. Town of Latta	Denied 09/08/17
5416-Allen Patterson v. Herb Witter	Pending
5417-Meredith Huffman v. Sunshine Recycling	Pending
5418-Gary G. Harris v. Tietex International, Ltd.	Denied 09/08/17
5419-Arkay, LLC v. City of Charleston	Pending
5424-Janette Buchanan v. S.C. Property and Casualty Ins.	Granted 09/08/17
5430-Wilfred Allen Woods v. Etta Catherine Woods	Pending
5431-Lori Stoney v. Richard Stoney	Pending
5432-Daniel Dorn v. Paul Cohen	Pending
5433-The Winthrop University Trustees v. Pickens Roofing	Pending
5434-The Callawassie Island v. Ronnie Dennis	Granted 09/08/17
5438-The Gates at Williams-Brice v. DDC Construction Inc.	Pending
5441-State v. David A. Land	Pending
5442-Otha Delaney v. First Financial	Pending
5443-State v. Steven Hoss Walters, Jr.	Pending
5444-Rose Electric v. Cooler Erectors of Atlanta	Pending
5447-Rent-A-Center v. SCDOR	Pending
5448-Shanna Kranchick v. State	Pending
5449-A. Marion Stone III v. Susan B. Thompson	Pending
5450-Tzvetelina Miteva v. Nicholas Robinson	Pending
5451-Pee Dee Health v. Estate of Hugh Thompson, III (3)	Pending

5452-Frank Gordon, Jr. v. Donald W. Lancaster	Pending
5453-Karen Forman v. SCDLLLR (3)	Pending
5454-Todd Olds v. City of Goose Creek	Pending
5455-William Montgomery v. Spartanburg County	Pending
5456-State v. Devin Johnson	Pending
5458-William Turner v. SAIIA Construction	Pending
5460-Frank Mead, III, v. Beaufort Cty. Assessor	Pending
5462-In the matter of the Estate of Eris Singletary Smith	Pending
5464-Anna D. Wilson v. SCDMV	Pending
5467-Belle Hall Plantation v. John Murray (David Keys)	Pending
5469-First Citizens Bank v. Park at Durbin Creek	Pending
5471-Joshua Fay v. Total Quality Logistics	Pending
5473-State v. Alexander Carmichael Huckabee, III	Pending
5475-Sara Y. Wilson v. Charleston Co. School District	Pending
5476-State v. Clyde B. Davis	Pending
5479-Mark M. Sweeny v. Irene M. Sweeney	Pending
5483-State v. Shannon Scott	Pending
5486-SC Public Interest v. John Courson	Pending
5487-State v. Toaby Alexander Trapp	Pending
2015-UP-330-Bigford Enterprises v. D. C. Development	Pending
2015-UP-466-State v. Harold Cartwright, III	Pending
2016-UP-052-Randall Green v. Wayne Bauerle	Pending

2016-UP-109-Brook Waddle v. SCDHHS	Pending
2016-UP-132-Willis Weary v. State	Denied 09/08/17
2016-UP-137-Glenda R. Couram v. Christopher Hooker	Denied 09/08/17
2016-UP-138-McGuinn Construction v. Saul Espino	Pending
2016-UP-141-Plantation Federal v. J. Charles Gray	Pending
2016-UP-261-Samuel T. Brick v. Richland Cty. Planning Comm'n	Denied 09/08/17
2016-UP-320-State v. Emmanuel M. Rodriguez	Pending
2016-UP-325-National Bank of SC v. Thaddeus F. Segars	Pending
2016-UP-330-State v. William T. Calvert	Pending
2016-UP-338-HHH Ltd. of Greenville v. Randall S. Hiller	Denied 09/08/17
2016-UP-366-In Re: Estate of Valerie D'Agostino	Denied 09/08/17
2016-UP-382-Darrell L. Goss v. State	Pending
2016-UP-392-Joshua Cramer v. SCDC (2)	Pending
2016-UP-395-Darrell Efird v. The State	Pending
2016-UP-402-Coves Darden v. Francisco Ibanez	Pending
2016-UP-404-George Glassmeyer v. City of Columbia (2)	Pending
2016-UP-408-Rebecca Jackson v. OSI Restaurant Partners	Pending
2016-UP-424-State v. Daniel Martinez Herrera	Pending
2016-UP-430-State v. Thomas James	Pending
2016-UP-431-Benjamin Henderson v. Patricia Greer	Pending
2016-UP-436-State v. Keith D. Tate	Pending

2016-UP-447-State v. Donte S. Brown	Pending
2016-UP-454-Gene Gibbs v. Jill R. Gibbs	Pending
2016-UP-461-Melvin T. Roberts v. Mark Keel	Pending
2016-UP-473-State v. James K. Bethel, Jr.	Pending
2016-UP-475-Melissa Spalt v. SCDMV	Pending
2016-UP-479-State v. Abdul Furquan	Pending
2016-UP-485-Johnson Koola v. Cambridge Two (2)	Pending
2016-UP-486-State v. Kathy Revan	Pending
2016-UP-489-State v. Johnny J. Boyd	Pending
2016-UP-515-Tommy S. Adams v. The State	Pending
2016-UP-519-Live Oak Village HOA v. Thomas Morris	Pending
2016-UP-527-Grange S. Lucas v. Karen A. Sickinger	Pending
2016-UP-528-Betty Fisher v. Bessie Huckabee and Lisa Fisher v. Betty Huckabee	Pending
2016-UP-529-Kimberly Walker v. Sunbelt	Pending
2017-UP-002-Woodruff Road v. SC Greenville Hwy. 146	Pending
2017-UP-009-In the matter of Daryl Snow	Pending
2017-UP-013-Amisub of South Carolina, Inc. v. SCDHEC	Pending
2017-UP-015-State v. Jalann Williams	Pending
2017-UP-017-State v. Quartis Hemingway	Pending
2017-UP-021-State v. Wayne Polite	Pending
2017-UP-022-Kenneth W. Signor v. Mark Keel	Pending

2017-UP-025-State v. David Glover	Pending
2017-UP-026-State v. Michael E. Williams	Pending
2017-UP-028-State v. Demetrice R. James	Pending
2017-UP-029-State v. Robert D. Hughes	Pending
2017-UP-031-FV-I, Inc. v. Bryon J. Dolan	Pending
2017-UP-037-State v. Curtis Brent Gorny	Pending
2017-UP-040-Jeffrey Kennedy v. Richland Sch. Dist. Two	Pending
2017-UP-043-Ex parte: Mickey Ray Carter, Jr. and Nila Collean Carter	Pending
2017-UP-046-Wells Fargo v. Delores Prescott	Pending
2017-UP-054-Bernard McFadden v. SCDC	Pending
2017-UP-059-Gernaris Hamilton v. Henry Scott	Pending
2017-UP-065-State v. Stephon Robinson	Pending
2017-UP-067-William McFarland v. Mansour Rashtchian	Pending
2017-UP-068-Rick Still v. SCDHEC	Pending
2017-UP-070-State v. Calvert Myers	Pending
2017-UP-071-State v. Ralph Martin	Pending
2017-UP-082-Kenneth Green v. SCDPPPS	Pending
2017-UP-096-Robert Wilkes v. Town of Pawleys Island	Pending
2017-UP-103-State v. Jajuan A. Habersham	Pending
2017-UP-108-State v. Michael Gentile	Pending
2017-UP-118-Skydive Myrtle Beach, Inc. v. Horry County	Pending

2017-UP-124-Rudy Almazan v. Henson & Associates	Pending
2017-UP-137-In the matter of Calvin J. Miller	Pending
2017-UP-139-State v. Jeffrey Lynn Chronister	Pending
2017-UP-145-Cory McMillan v. UCI Medical Affiliates	Pending
2017-UP-158-State v. Rion M. Rutledge	Pending
2017-UP-169-State v. David Lee Walker	Pending
2017-UP-192-David Johnson v. Mark Keel	Pending
2017-UP-193-John Gregory v. Mark Keel	Pending
2017-UP-194-Mansy McNeil v. Mark Keel	Pending
2017-UP-195-Edward Green v. Mark Keel	Pending
2017-UP-209-Jose Maldonado v. SCDC (2)	Pending
2017-UP-300-TD Bank v. David H. Jacobs	Pending

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court**

In the Matter of Heather Mary Boone McKeever,
Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2016-002464

Opinion No. 27739

Heard March 22, 2017 – Filed September 20, 2017

DEBARRED

Lesley M. Coggiola, Disciplinary Counsel, and Barbara Marie Seymour, Deputy Disciplinary Counsel, both of Columbia, for Office of Disciplinary Counsel.

Heather Mary Boone McKeever, of Lexington, Kentucky, *pro se*.

PER CURIAM: The numerous charges against Respondent Heather Mary Boone McKeever in this disciplinary matter include the unauthorized practice of law, improper fee arrangements, false statements before the court, and attempting to intimidate a former client. Because McKeever failed to answer the formal charges against her and failed to appear at her hearing before the Commission on Lawyer Conduct, she is in default and the charges against her are deemed admitted. The only matter before the Court is determining the appropriate sanction for McKeever's misconduct. At the hearing before this Court, McKeever offered no mitigating evidence or explanation for her conduct. Because of her pattern of abusing the judicial process, masking her misconduct, and, perhaps most troubling, attempting to intimidate a former client through meritless lawsuits, we find it appropriate to permanently debar McKeever in this state, order her to pay the costs of the

investigation and subsequent proceedings, and other sanctions as will be described herein.

FACTS

The following facts are drawn from the formal charges against McKeever, which are deemed admitted pursuant to Rule 24(a) of the Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement (RLDE) contained in Rule 413 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR).

McKeever is a licensed attorney in Kentucky who moved to Charleston with her husband, Shane Haffey, in the midst of the foreclosure of a \$1,000,000.00 loan on their Kentucky home. Upon arriving in Charleston, McKeever came into contact with Betty McMichael, who owned two properties—991 Governors Road where she resided, and 986 Governors Road which she rented out. After learning that McMichael faced foreclosure on both of these properties, McKeever offered her legal representation, despite not being licensed to practice law in South Carolina. McMichael initially declined the offer, but she ultimately agreed to the arrangement after repeated phone calls and visits from McKeever. In exchange for McKeever's legal services, McMichael allowed McKeever and her family to live in the 986 Governors Road house rent-free during the course of representation—an improper fee arrangement because McKeever did not advise McMichael on the scope of her legal representation or the basis for her fees. Moreover, McKeever obtained a possessory interest in the property that was the subject of the litigation—a conflict of interest of which McKeever did not make McMichael aware.

Upon obtaining McMichael's consent to represent her in the foreclosure actions, McKeever's subterfuge began. Sometime after McMichael accepted her legal representation, McKeever induced her to issue a quitclaim deed granting title to 986 Governors Road to Bondson Holdings, a fictitious entity owned by McKeever and Haffey. Moreover, after the judge granted permission for McKeever to appear *pro hac vice* in the 991 Governors Road foreclosure action in July 2011, she took no steps to protect McMichael's interest for the next year while living rent-free in a house owned by McMichael in exchange for her legal representation. Ultimately, a licensed South Carolina attorney was forced to make an appearance on behalf of McMichael in 2012 and the case was eventually dismissed in 2013.

While representing McMichael in connection with the first foreclosure action brought against 986 Governors Road, McKeever again sought *pro hac vice* admission with a licensed South Carolina attorney serving as local counsel. Without consulting local counsel or McMichael, McKeever filed a document entitled "Answer Class Action Complaint" under local counsel's name. In the document, she asserted thirty-nine affirmative defenses, apparently in an effort to remove the encumbrances on the property and secure clear title, which McKeever and Haffey held after receiving the deed from McMichael.¹ Additionally, in an attempt to delay and hinder the foreclosure proceedings, McKeever falsely claimed that McMichael resided at the property, levied allegations against opposing counsel, and filed notices of depositions for numerous named and unnamed individuals. When local counsel discovered McKeever filed the answer under her name and without her knowledge, she moved to be relieved as counsel. Eventually the mortgage holder voluntarily dismissed its action against McMichael, and in November 2011 McKeever filed the quitclaim deed to 986 Governors Road.² McKeever took no further legal action on McMichael's behalf; however, she retained the benefit of living at 986 Governors Road rent-free and holding title to the property.

In late 2012, Bank of America acquired the entity which held the note on 986 Governors Road and reinstated foreclosure proceedings on the property. Prior to filing, Bank of America's attorneys conducted a title search and discovered the quitclaim deed granting title to Bondson Holdings. Bank of America then filed its action naming both McMichael and Bondson Holdings in its summons and complaint. McKeever contacted South Carolina attorney Parker Barnes, Jr. and requested he serve as local counsel for McMichael, falsely representing that she was eligible to appear *pro hac vice*. McKeever filed no answer, responsive pleadings, or any other motions on behalf of McMichael aside from a motion for an extension of time to file a response and objection to a transfer to the Master in Equity. This Court issued a letter to the Charleston County Clerk of Court advising that McKeever was not licensed to practice law in South Carolina, nor had she filed an application for

¹ McKeever did not disclose this fact to local counsel or to any other parties to the action.

² It appears McKeever delayed filing the deed until after the foreclosure action was dismissed to avoid any discovery of her interest in the property and resulting conflicts of interest.

pro hac vice admission in the matter.³ Nevertheless, McKeever continued to file pleadings and motions on behalf of Bondson Holdings and Haffey. In these various motions and pleadings, McKeever asserted frivolous or meritless legal positions, made false statements, and threatened civil action and criminal prosecution against Barnes, opposing counsel, the presiding judge, and the clerk of court.

After McKeever's repeated efforts to stall the foreclosure process on 986 Governors Road failed, she attempted to perpetuate the scheme to defraud McMichael and Bank of America by filing two lawsuits against McMichael in Kentucky. Despite Kentucky's lack of jurisdiction over McMichael, McKeever filed suit on behalf of Bondson Holdings seeking \$327,500.00 in damages, alleging conversion and disparagement of title based on false accusations that McMichael encumbered 986 Governors Road with the mortgage now held by Bank of America and two other debts incurred after deeding the property to Bondson Holdings. In the second Kentucky action, McKeever brought suit on behalf of her purported law firm, McKeever Law Offices, LLC, claiming \$256,200.00 in damages for McMichael's failure to pay attorney's fees. McMichael was forced to hire local counsel in Kentucky to defend against these actions, and Bondson Holdings' claim was eventually dismissed with prejudice for lack of personal jurisdiction.⁴ The presiding judge further ordered Bondson Holdings to pay McMichael \$1,500.00 in attorney's fees, but McMichael agreed to forego payment of the award in response to threats of an appeal by McKeever. McKeever's actions in filing suit against McMichael were intentionally designed to intimidate and coerce her, and to perpetuate the scheme to defraud her and obtain title to 986 Governors Road free of any encumbrances.

In yet another attempt to delay the foreclosure proceedings brought against 986 Governors Road, McKeever assisted Haffey with the filing of a bankruptcy petition in Kentucky for an entity he owned called Sandlin Farms, falsely claiming the entity owned an interest in 986 Governors Road. The bankruptcy court dismissed

³ Although Barnes had earlier motioned to be relieved as local counsel for McMichael, he resumed his representation to protect her legal interests after learning of McKeever's misrepresentations.

⁴ The final disposition of the claim filed by McKeever Law Offices, LLC is not clear from the record.

the petition, finding Haffey engaged in "an ongoing pattern of delay" and abused the bankruptcy process.⁵

McKeever also engaged in the unauthorized practice of law in two other instances when she appeared on behalf of another homeowner facing foreclosure in Beaufort County in 2012 and then appeared on behalf of her own adult daughter in January 2015 after the daughter was charged with speeding.⁶ Despite the arresting officer repeatedly advising McKeever that she was engaging in the unauthorized practice of law, she filed a motion to dismiss and made multiple appearances on behalf of her daughter without applying for *pro hac vice* admission.

In summary, since arriving in South Carolina in 2010, McKeever has engaged in the unauthorized practice of law and violated the rules of *pro hac vice* admission. She actively solicited McMichael's consent to represent her in foreclosure proceedings despite not being licensed to practice in South Carolina; prepared and filed a quit claim deed to 986 Governors Road; and represented Bondson Holdings and Haffey's interest in the 986 Governors Road foreclosure action without seeking *pro hac vice* admission. Likewise, throughout these various proceedings, McKeever was not eligible to appear *pro hac vice* because she resided in South Carolina,⁷ was regularly engaged in the practice of law in the state, and was regularly engaged in substantial business activities in South Carolina. McKeever then used her confidential relationship with McMichael to obtain title to McMichael's property and resided in the premises rent-free for years, all the while failing to provide any meaningful representation or protect McMichael's legal interests. When the Office

⁵ McKeever signed and filed an appeal of this dismissal on behalf of Haffey. That appeal is pending, with an order holding it in abeyance pending the outcome of various appeals McKeever filed in litigation related to the foreclosure on the \$1,000,000.00 loan on the Kentucky property.

⁶ While appearing on behalf of her daughter, McKeever also made numerous false statements to the court, including asserting dismissal was warranted because the State failed to appear at two earlier hearings and representing that her daughter was entitled to the appointment of a guardian ad litem, despite knowing her daughter had already reached the age of majority.

⁷ At the time of McKeever's infractions, the Appellate Court Rules prohibited persons residing in South Carolina from obtaining *pro hac vice* admission. That rule has since been amended to allow *pro hac vice* admission to South Carolina residents. Rule 404, SCACR.

of Disciplinary Counsel initiated its investigation of McKeever's alleged misconduct by serving her with a notice of investigation in May 2013, she failed to submit a written response as required by Rule 19(b), RLDE, failed to appear to answer questions under oath, failed to produce subpoenaed documents, and made numerous false statements to mislead disciplinary counsel.

ANALYSIS

The authority to discipline attorneys and the manner in which the discipline is administered rests entirely with this Court. *In re Tullis*, 375 S.C. 190, 191, 652 S.E.2d 395, 395 (2007). We have repeatedly held that an attorney's failure to participate in a disciplinary proceeding is indicative of a disinterest in the law and will be given substantial weight in determining the appropriate sanction. *In re Murph*, 350 S.C. 1, 4, 564 S.E.2d 673, 675 (2002). An attorney who fails to answer charges or appear to defend or explain her alleged misconduct is subject to the harshest sanctions because the disciplinary process is designed largely to protect the public from indifferent or unscrupulous lawyers. *Id.*

As a result of her actions, we find McKeever violated Rule 404(a)–(c), SCACR, and the following Rules of Professional Conduct: 1.1; 1.2; 1.3; 1.4; 1.5; 1.7; 1.8; 1.16; 3.1; 3.2; 3.3; 3.4; 4.1; 5.5; and 8.4. Rule 407, SCACR.

In light of McKeever's blatant disregard for this state's regulation of the legal profession, her abuse of the judicial system, threatening and coercive behavior directed at McMichael, and her lack of candor with various courts, we impose the following sanctions and declare McKeever be: (1) permanently debarred, prohibiting her from seeking any form of admission to practice law (including *pro hac vice* admission) in South Carolina, and prohibiting her from advertising or soliciting legal services in the state; (2) ordered to pay McMichael \$1,500.00 for attorney's fees related to the actions filed in Kentucky; and (3) ordered to pay the costs of the disciplinary investigation and formal proceedings. Moreover, pending the outcome of the bankruptcy proceeding in which Haffey has subjected the 986 Governors Road property, we reserve the right to void any deed through which McKeever wrongfully granted title to herself and Haffey in violation of our Rules of Professional Conduct.

Within fifteen (15) days of the date of this opinion, McKeever shall file an affidavit with the Clerk of Court showing that she has complied with Rule 30 of Rule 413, SCACR.

DEBARRED.

BEATTY, C.J., KITTREDGE, HEARN, FEW and JAMES, JJ., concur.

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Re: Expansion of Electronic Filing Pilot Program - Court of
Common Pleas

Appellate Case No. 2015-002439

ORDER

Pursuant to the provisions of Article V, Section 4 of the South Carolina Constitution,

IT IS ORDERED that the Pilot Program for the Electronic Filing (E-Filing) of documents in the Court of Common Pleas, which was established by Order dated December 1, 2015, is expanded to include Saluda County. Effective September 26, 2017, all filings in all common pleas cases commenced or pending in Saluda County must be E-Filed if the party is represented by an attorney, unless the type of case or the type of filing is excluded from the Pilot Program. The counties currently designated for mandatory E-Filing are as follows:

Aiken	Allendale	Anderson	Bamberg
Barnwell	Beaufort	Cherokee	Clarendon
Colleton	Georgetown	Greenville	Hampton
Horry	Jasper	Lee	Oconee
Pickens	Spartanburg	Sumter	Williamsburg
Lexington	Saluda—Effective September 26, 2017		

Attorneys should refer to the South Carolina Electronic Filing Policies and Guidelines, which were adopted by the Supreme Court on October 28, 2015, and the training materials available on the E-Filing Portal page at <http://www.sccourts.org/efiling/> to determine whether any specific filings are exempted from the requirement that they be E-Filed. Attorneys who have cases pending in Pilot Counties are strongly encouraged to review, and to instruct their staff to review, the training materials available on the E-Filing Portal page.

s/Donald W. Beatty

Donald W. Beatty
Chief Justice of South Carolina

Columbia, South Carolina
September 14, 2017

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Re: Amendments to Rule 268, South Carolina Appellate
Court Rules

Appellate Case No. 2017-001166

ORDER

Pursuant to the provisions of Article V, Section 4 of the South Carolina Constitution, Rule 268(b)(3), SCACR, is amended to alter the method of citing to the South Carolina Code of Regulations. Furthermore, we amend paragraph (c) of the rule by adding paragraphs (8) and (9) to include guidance for citing to the South Carolina Court-Annexed Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules and the Rules of Procedure for the Administrative Law Court.

These amendments, which are set forth in the attachment to this Order, are effective immediately.

s/ Donald W. Beatty C.J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn J.

s/ John Cannon Few J.

s/ George C. James, Jr. J.

Columbia, South Carolina
September 20, 2017

Rule 268(b)(3) is amended to provide:

(3) Regulations which appear in the Code of Regulations of South Carolina should be cited in the following manner: S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 19-501 (2011). Regulations which appear in the supplement to the Code of Regulations of South Carolina should be cited in the following manner: S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 61-4.102 (Supp. 2016). The date used in the citation shall be the latest copyright date of the volume or supplement.

Rule 268(c) is amended to add paragraphs (8) and (9), which provide:

(8) South Carolina Court-Annexed Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules: Rule ____, SCADR.

(9) Rules of Procedure for the Administrative Law Court: SCALC Rule ____.