

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF WILLIAMSBURG)
)
Quincy Jones and Sandy Jones,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
vs.)
)
Kowsalya and Bharathi Sethumadhavan,)
)
Defendants.)
_____)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
THE THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

CASE NO.: 2023-CP-45-00208

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS’
MOTION TO RECONSIDER**

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiffs’ Motion for Reconsideration pursuant to Rule 59(e), SCRPC. The Motion asks this Court to alter, amend, or reconsider its order granting in part Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss.

The purpose of Rule 59(e), SCRPC, to alter or amend the judgment is to request the trial judge to “reconsider matters properly encompassed in a decision on the merits.” *Arnold v. State*, 309 S.C. 157, 172, 420 S.E.2d 834, 842 (1992). Consequently, a party usually is allowed to ask the court to reconsider its decision even if it means rehashing all or part of an argument previously presented. *See Elam v. S.C. Dep’t of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 22, 602 S.E.2d 772, 779 (2004). A party may wish to file such a motion when he believes the court misunderstood, failed to fully consider, or failed to rule on an argument or issue, and the party wishes for the court to reconsider or rule on it. *Elam*, 361 S.C. at 24, 602 S.E.2d at 779.

After reviewing the applicable law and considering the arguments raised in the Motion and in Defendants’ Memo in Opposition, the Court is unable to discover any material fact or principle of law that has either been overlooked or disregarded. The Court further finds no error of law nor fact not appropriately considered.

Accordingly, the Court concludes that altering, amending, or reconsidering its prior Order is unwarranted, and that the issues raised in the Motion do not change the Court's reasoning or conclusions. As such, Plaintiff's Rule 59(e) Motion is denied. The Plaintiffs' claims are dismissed and the Defendants' counterclaims are remanded to the Magistrate's Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

April 10, 2024
Kingstree, South Carolina.

The Honorable Kristi F. Curtis



Williamsburg Common Pleas

Case Caption: Quincy Jones VS Bharathi Sethumadhavan

Case Number: 2023CP4500208

Type: Order/Other

So Ordered

s/ Kristi F. Curtis, Circuit Court Judge, No. 2762