

RECEIVED

Jan 12 2024

SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit 2

(Order Denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration,
filed December 15, 2023)

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
 COUNTY OF RICHLAND)
)
 South Carolina Public Interest)
 Foundation and John Crangle,)
 individually and on behalf of all others)
 similarly situated,)
)
 Plaintiffs,)
)
 vs.)
)
 Alan Wilson, Attorney General for the)
 State of South Carolina, Willoughby &)
 Hoefer, P.A., and Davidson, Wren &)
 DeMasters, P.A.,)
)
 Defendants.)
)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
 FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

CASE NO.: 2020-CP-40-04603

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION
 FOR RECONSIDERATION PURSUANT TO
 RULE 59(e), SCRPC**

RECEIVED
Jan 12 2024
 SC Court of Appeals

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiffs’ Motion for Reconsideration Pursuant to Rule 59(e), SCRPC (“the Motion”). The Motion asks this Court to alter, amend, or reconsider its Order entered October 20, 2023, granting the Defendants’ motion for summary judgment.

After reviewing the applicable law and considering the arguments raised in the Motion, the Court is unable to discover any material fact or principle of law that has either been overlooked or disregarded and further finds no error of law or fact not appropriately considered.

Accordingly, the Court concludes that altering, amending, or reconsidering its prior Order is unwarranted, and the issues raised in the Motion do not change the Court’s reasoning or conclusions. As such, Plaintiffs’ Motion for Reconsideration is hereby **DENIED**, and the Court, pursuant to the discretion afforded by Rule 59 and *Pollard v. County of Florence*, concludes that a hearing is not necessary to rule on Plaintiffs’ Motion for Reconsideration. *See* Rule 59(f), SCRPC (stating a Rule 59(e) motion “may in the discretion of the court be determined on the briefs filed by the parties without oral argument”); *see also Pollard*, 314 S.C. 397, 401–02, 444 S.E.2d 534, 536 (Ct.

App. 1994) (holding there was “no merit in Pollard's assertion that the circuit court committed reversible error in denying her motion to alter or amend the judgment under Rule 59(e) SCRPC, without first conducting a hearing or allowing [the parties] ‘to fully brief’ the issues raised in [the] motion”).

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

[JUDICIAL E-SIGNATURE PAGE TO FOLLOW]



Richland Common Pleas

Case Caption: South Carolina Public Interest Foundation , plaintiff, et al vs Alan Wilson , defendant, et al
Case Number: 2020CP4004603
Type: Order/Other

So Ordered

s/ Daniel Coble, 2774