

**To:** C&M McNeil; Alicia Bolyard  
**Cc:** Van Slambrook, Dale E. Secretary (Elizabeth Atkins); Kevin O'Brien; Joy Johnson; Justine Tate; Debra Rizzi; Chris Manning; Kelsi Sigler; Kaylie Stapleton; jeff@jwklegal.com; Jeffrey Kuykendall; Van Slambrook, Dale E. Law Clerk (David Crump); McCoy, Jennifer B. Law Clerk (Eliza Lay)  
**Subject:** RE: 2025CP1005095 - James C Mcneil , plaintiff, et al VS SAC 181 Llc , defendant, et al - Request for Emergency Status Conference

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

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

### **The Brief Followed the Court's Published Instructions**

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

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

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

This characterization fails on three independent grounds:

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

### **Why This Is Dangerous and Not Just Procedurally Wrong**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Blocking this Brief from Judge McCoy does not protect Defendants.**

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

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

**This filtering does not serve the Altmans' interests.**

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

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

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

We now understand that the pattern of selective administrative gatekeeping - welcoming defense communications while blocking plaintiff safety filings - may explain why multiple motions documenting

Defense harassment, misrepresentation, and resulting Plaintiff harm sat without judicial review for months, enabling the harm to escalate to the point of a documented nervous breakdown.

### **What Happens Next**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

Chris McNeil

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

Chris McNeil

Founder, Thaut  
Strategic Thought Leadership Coaching & Consulting  
Thought Leadership Marketing  
Mobile 843.818.3495  
<http://thaut.io>  
Host of Podcast: [Thought Leadership Studio](#)

Author of (upcoming): [Strategic Thought Leadership: The Book](#)

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your help.

Meaghan Poyer  
Co-Plaintiff Pro Se  
James C. McNeil & Meaghan Poyer  
PO Box 30386

Charleston, SC 29417  
(843) 818-3495  
[mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com](mailto:mcneilandpoyer@gmail.com)

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

Good afternoon Mrs. Atkins,

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

Kindest regards,

*Alicia N. Bolyard*

**Resnick & Louis, P.C.**

**Partner- Admitted in WV and SC**

146 Fairchild St., Suite 130

Charleston, SC 29492

[abolyard@rlattorneys.com](mailto:abolyard@rlattorneys.com)

Phone (843) 410-2534



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

[www.rlattorneys.com](http://www.rlattorneys.com)

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

---

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

Your communications are ex parte and not allowed.

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

**Beth Atkins, Administrative Assistant to**

**The Honorable Dale E. Van Slambrook**

**300-B California Avenue**

**Moncks Corner, SC 29461**

**Phone 843.719.4435**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Given the escalating risk, I reiterate our concrete requests:

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

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

Sincerely,

Chris McNeil

Founder, Thaut