

Exhibit A

Orders on Appeal

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

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2018-CP-42-04297 (Consolidated)

Cindy Coxie, as Special Administrator for the
Estate of Johnny Coxie
PLAINTIFF(S)

Academy, Ltd., d/b/a Academy Sports and
Outdoors, et al.
DEFENDANT(S)


Submitted by: Robert M. Cross	Attorney for : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Defendant or <input type="checkbox"/> 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. See Page 2 for additional information.
- 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 INFORMATION

This order ends does not end the case.
Additional Information for the Clerk :

The Court, having reviewed and considered Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel filed on March 29, 2023, Defendant Academy, Ltd.’s (“Academy’s”) responsive filings dated June 22 and June 23, 2023 and oral argument by the parties on June 26, 2023, hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel and ORDERS the parties to meet and confer as to potential compromises related to Academy’s burden objections prior to returning to this Court for a status conference on July 6, 2023 at 10 A.M. Academy’s objections to disclosure founded on relevance and the Tiahrt Appropriations Rider are hereby OVERRULED. This ruling is based on the following findings:

1. The information sought by Plaintiffs meets the definition of relevance under South Carolina law at the discovery stage.
2. The Tiahrt Appropriations Rider does not create a privilege for Defendant Academy, Ltd. applicable in this case. The Court notes several points in support of this conclusion. First, Plaintiffs are not seeking information from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (“ATF”). Second, privileges applicable in civil litigation are to be narrowly construed. Third, the Court believes that Congress did not intend the Tiahrt Appropriations Rider to apply in these circumstances.
3. The parties have negotiated an extensive Amended Confidentiality Order to address concerns regarding confidentiality. However, to the extent necessary to protect

especially sensitive materials, the parties and the Court may consider additional protective protocols.

4. The Court does not believe that there have been sufficient discussions as to what compromises may be agreeable to alleviate Academy’s burden concerns. The parties, pursuant to S.C.R.P. Rule 11, are directed to negotiate on this point outside of the Court’s presence, prior to a July 6, 2023 status conference to be held by the Court at 10 A.M.

INFORMATION FOR THE JUDGMENT 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 (List amount(s) below)
N/A	N/A	N/A
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.

E-Filing Note: In E-Filing counties, the Court will electronically sign this form using a separate electronic signature page.

[Court’s electronic signature page to follow.]

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 _____ day of _____, 20____ to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S)

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)

CLERK OF COURT

Court Reporter:

E-Filing Note: In E-Filing counties, 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 judgement to parties who are not E-Filers or who are appearing pro se. See Rule 77(d), SCRPC.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING DECISION BY THE COURT AS REFERENCED ON PAGE 1.

This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.



Spartanburg Common Pleas

Case Caption: Cindy Coxie , plaintiff, et al VS Academy, Ltd. , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2018CP4204297

Type: Order/Form 4

IT IS SO ORDERED

s/ J. Mark Hayes, II #2132



***** IMPORTANT NOTICE - READ THIS INFORMATION *****
NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING [NEF]

A filing has been submitted to the court RE: 2018CP4204297

Official File Stamp: 07-03-2023 01:56:11 PM
Court: CIRCUIT COURT
Common Pleas
Spartanburg
Case Caption: Cindy Coxie , plaintiff, et al VS Academy, Ltd. , defendant, et al
Document(s) Submitted: Order/Form 4 Order/Form 4
Filed by or on behalf of: J. Mark Hayes, II

This notice was automatically generated by the Court's auto-notification system.

The following people were served electronically:

D. Lawrence Kristinik, III for Academy, Ltd.
Matthew A. Abee for Academy, Ltd.
Robert Mills Ariail, Jr. for Cindy Coxie
J. David Standeffer for Cindy Coxie
Mary Schiavo for Cindy Coxie
Samuel W. Outten for Academy, Ltd.

The following people have not been served electronically by the Court. Therefore, they must be served by traditional means:

Dustan Lawson for Dustan Lawson
Todd Christopher Kohlhepp #372454 for Todd Christopher Kohlhepp #372454
Dustan Lawson
Academy, Ltd. D/B/A Academy Sports +Outdoors
Scott Charles Allan
John F Renzulli
Christopher Renzulli
Erin Davis
Dustan Lawson for Dustan Lawson
Dustan Lawson for Dustan Lawson, Dustan Lawson
Todd Christopher Kohlhepp #372454 for Todd Christopher Kohlhepp #372454
Jenna M. Tersteegen
Robert M. Cross