

Zachary Leland Moody et al  
PLAINTIFF(S)

Gabriela B Lopez 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:


See page 2

**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 09/20/2023 .

Gabriela Baltazar Lopez Gutierrez John Allen Drew Scott D Caufield Leopoldo Vera Hernandez Gabriela B Lopez	 <p><b>RECEIVED</b> <b>Sep 25 2023</b> <b>SC Court of Appeals</b></p>
<b>NAMES OF TRADITIONAL FILERS SERVED BY MAIL</b>	

**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 is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Alter or Amend pursuant to Rule 59(e) SCRCP and is directed to the Court's Order filed August 22, 2023 granting summary judgment to Defendant TCT1, LLC d/b/a Keller Williams Western Upstate and denying summary judgment to Plaintiff. A decision on a Rule 59(e) motion can be decided on any briefs on file without oral argument. Pollard v. County of Florence, 314 S.C. 397 (Ct. App. 1994). After thorough consideration of all memorandums submitted at the hearing on summary judgment and in support of this motion, oral arguments, and case law, the Court finds that the granting of summary judgment to Defendant and denial of summary judgment to Plaintiff was proper and therefore Plaintiff's Rule 59(e) motion is respectfully DENIED.

It is so Ordered.



Greenville Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** Zachary Leland Moody , plaintiff, et al vs. Gabriela B Lopez ,  
defendant, et al  
**Case Number:** 2020CP2302297  
**Type:** Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

G.D. Morgan Jr.