

James Dustin Lucas  
PLAINTIFF(S)

Meghan Seely 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:

Plaintiff timely filed its "Motion To Alter, Amend, And Reconsider Or, In The Alternative For A Formal Order" this Court's Order denying Plaintiff's "Motion for Rule to Show Cause and Strike the Defendant's Answer" which was issued on March 24, 2023. Plaintiff filed his Motion to Reconsider on March 28, 2023, but failed to "provide a copy of the motion to the judge within 10 days after filing the Motion" as required by Rule 52(d), SCRPC and the Court was only recently made aware of the pending Motion. After carefully reviewing Plaintiff's Motion and the record, the Court finds no basis to alter or amend its prior Order nor that a hearing is necessary to address the Motion. Further, Rule 52(a) provides that "findings of fact and conclusions of law are unnecessary on decisions of motions under Rule 12 or 56 or any other motion." Therefore, Plaintiff's Motion is DENIED.

**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 06/30/2023 .

**RECEIVED**

**Jul 13 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.

---



Greenville Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** James Dustin Lucas vs. Meghan Seely , defendant, et al

**Case Number:** 2020CP2302877

**Type:** Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

s/ Honorable Perry H. Gravely, #2755