

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF RICHLAND
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NUMBER: 2012CP4007331

Phillip Morgan

Trustwave Corporation

PLAINTIFF(S)

DEFENDANT(S)

Submitted by: _____

Attorney for: Plaintiff Defendant or Self-Represented Litigant

DISPOSITION TYPE (CHECK ONE)

- JURY VERDICT. This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.
- DECISION BY THE COURT. This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.
- ACTION DISMISSED (CHECK REASON): Rule 12(b), SCRPC; Rule 41(a), SCRPC (Vol. Nonsuit); Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled); Other _____
- ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON): Rule 40(j), SCRPC; Bankruptcy; Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award; Other _____
- DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (CHECK APPLICABLE BOX): Affirmed; Reversed; Remanded; Other _____

RECEIVED
RICHLAND COUNTY
CLERK OF COURT
APR 18 2013
JANETTE W. BRIDE

NOTE: ATTORNEYS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING LOWER COURT, TRIBUNAL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT RULING IN THIS APPEAL.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED: See attached order (formal order to follow) Statement of Judgment by the Court

ORDER INFORMATION

This order ends does not end the case.

Additional Information for the Clerk: _____

INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC INDEX

Complete this section below when the judgment affects title to real or personal property or if any amount should be enrolled. If there is no judgment information, indicate "N/A" in one of the boxes below.

| Judgment in Favor of (List name(s) below) | Judgment Against (List name(s) below) | Judgment Amount To be Enrolled |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | \$ |
| | | \$ |
| | | \$ |

If applicable, describe the property, including tax map information and address, referenced in the order.

The judgment information above has been provided by the submitting party. Disputes concerning the amounts contained in this form may be addressed by way of motion pursuant to the SC Rules of Civil Procedure. Amounts to be computed such as interest or additional taxable costs not available at the time the form and final order are submitted to the judge may be provided to the clerk. Note: Title abstractors and researchers should refer to the official court order for judgment details.

Circuit Court Judge _____ Judge Code _____ Date _____

For Clerk of Court Office Use Only

This judgment was entered on the _____ day of _____, 20____ and a copy mailed first class or placed in the appropriate attorney's box on this 18 April 2013 to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

John David Hawkins

Mathew Todd Carroll

James Grant Long III

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S)

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)

Court Reporter _____

Clerk of Court

Jeanette W. Bride

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

Phillip Morgan, individually and on)
behalf of all similarly situated Plaintiffs,)

Plaintiff,)

VS.)

South Carolina Department of Revenue;)
South Carolina Division of State)
Information Technology; the Office of the)
Governor of the State of South Carolina;)
Trustwave Corporation; and Trustwave)
Holdings, Inc.,)

Defendants.)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Civil Action No.: 2012-CP-40-7331

Order Denying Plaintiff's
Motion to Reconsider

2013 APR 16 PM 1:40
JEANETTE W. MCBRIDE
C.C.P. & G.S.


RICHLAND COUNTY
FILED

This matter comes before the Court by way of Plaintiff Phillip Morgan's Motion to Reconsider pursuant to Rule 59(e) SCRPC and/or Rule 52 SCRPC. Specifically, Plaintiff asks this Court to reconsider its Order of February 27, 2013 dismissing Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice without giving Plaintiff leave to amend his Complaint in lieu of dismissal.

This Court hereby DENIES Applicant's Motion pursuant to Rule 59(e) SCRPC to reconsider this Court's Order of February 27. Pursuant to Rule 59(f), the Court is of the opinion that oral argument is not necessary.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

April 16, 2013
Columbia, South Carolina


G. Thomas Cooper, Jr.
Judge, Fifth Judicial Circuit

SCANNED