

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

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2019CP4604302

U S Bank National Association Trustee et al
PLAINTIFF(S)

Aaron C Wurdemann et al
DEFENDANT(S)

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
- STAYED DUE TO BANKRUPTCY**
- DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (CHECK APPLICABLE BOX):**
 Affirmed; Reversed; Remanded;
 Other

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 DENYING MOTION TO RECONSIDER

ORDER INFORMATION

This order ends does not end the case. See Page 2 for additional information.

For Clerk of Court Office Use Only

This judgment was electronically entered by the Clerk of Court as reflected on the Electronic Time Stamp, and a copy mailed first class to any party not proceeding in the Electronic Filing System on 03/02/2023 .

Heather J Wurdemann
Aaron C Wurdemann

RECEIVED
Mar 08 2023
SC Court of Appeals

NAMES OF TRADITIONAL FILERS SERVED BY MAIL

Court Reporter:

E-Filing Note: The date of Entry of Judgment is the same date as reflected on the Electronic File Stamp and the clerk's entering of the date of judgment above is not required in those counties. The clerk will mail a copy of the judgment to parties who are not E-Filers or who are appearing pro se. See Rule 77(d), SCRCP.

This matter came before me on March 2, 2023, upon motion by Maritza Alvarado, pursuant to Rule 59(e), SCRCP, asking the Court to alter or amend its order disbursing surplus funds. Present at the hearing: Leonard Jordan on behalf of Ms. Alvarado; the Wurdemanns appeared pro se.

“[O]ur rules contemplate two basic situations in which a party should consider filing a Rule 59(e) motion. A party may wish to file such a motion when [she] believes the court has misunderstood, failed to fully consider, or perhaps failed to rule on an argument or issue, and the party wishes for the court to reconsider or rule on it. A party must file such a motion when an issue or argument has been raised, but not ruled on, in order to preserve it for appellate review.” Elam v. S.C. Dep’t of Transp., 361 S.C. 9, 24, 602 S.E.2d 772, 780 (2004).

Upon reviewing the record presented, and considering the memoranda and arguments of the parties, I find no matter presented that was not addressed expressly or by clear implication in the prior order. I further find no basis for reconsideration or amendment of the ruling rendered in the prior order.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the motion be denied.



York Common Pleas

Case Caption: U S Bank National Association Trustee , plaintiff, et al VS Aaron C Wurdemann , defendant, et al
Case Number: 2019CP4604302
Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

s/ Teasa K. Weaver 3084