

# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Danny Rose, Respondent,

v.

Robert Rose, Gloria Rose-Ruch, Mary Margaret Doll  
Rose, and John Does 1-99, Defendants,

Of whom Robert Rose, Gloria Rose-Ruch, and Mary  
Margaret Doll Rose are the Appellants.


Appellate Case No. 2023-001740


---

## ORDER

---

On December 28, 2023, this court dismissed this appeal as interlocutory. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 14-3-330 (1976 & Supp. 2012) (providing this court has appellate jurisdiction to review interlocutory orders (1) involving the merits or (2) affecting a substantial right when the order "in effect determines the action and prevents a judgment from which an appeal might be taken or discontinues the action."); *Ex parte Wilson*, 367 S.C. 7, 12, 625 S.E.2d 205, 208 (2005) ("Any judgment or decree, leaving some further act to be done by the court before the rights of the parties are determined, is interlocutory and not final."); *Grosshuesch v. Cramer*, 377 S.C. 12, 30, 659 S.E.2d 112, 122 (2008) (explaining "discovery orders, in general, are interlocutory and are not immediately appealable"). Appellants subsequently filed a petition for rehearing. After careful consideration, the court is unable to discover that any material fact or principle of law has been either overlooked or disregarded, and hence, there is no basis for granting a rehearing. Accordingly, the petition for rehearing is denied.

  
\_\_\_\_\_ C.J.

  
\_\_\_\_\_ J.

*James E. Lockery*

A.J.

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

John Martin Foster, Esquire

T. Hunt Reid, Esquire

William Thomas Young, III, Esquire

**FILED**  
**Feb 16 2024**