

FORM 4

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF Pickens
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2023CP3901349

Daniel Palmer
PLAINTIFF(S)

Ken Roper 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:

Please see the attachment on page 2 below.

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 05/16/2024 .

Pickens County SC
Daniel Palmer for Daniel Palmer
Daniel Palmer for Daniel Palmer

RECEIVED
MAY 28 2024
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.

This matter is before the Court on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12 of the SCRCP filed on January 05, 2024, as well as Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12 of the SCRCP filed on January 26, 2024. Based on a review of the file, submissions of the parties, and oral argument, the Defendants' Motion filed on January 26, 2024 is hereby Granted because neither Plaintiff's Complaint, or Plaintiff's Addendum, states facts sufficient to constitute any cause of action pled by the Plaintiff. Since the Court has granted Defendants' subsequent Motion to Dismiss, the prior Motion to Dismiss is rendered moot and there is nothing left for the Court to rule upon at this time.

It is so ordered.

RECEIVED
MAY 28 2024
SC Court of Appeals

EVIDENCE TO RIGHTS VIOLATION

- 1st District (Tracy v. Freshwater): Courts are obligated to offer special solicitude to pro se litigants, recognizing their lack of formal legal training.
- 2nd District (Mala v. Crown Bay Marina, Inc.): It is the court's duty to liberally construe pro se submissions, often interpreting filings to allow the best chance of success.
- 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 10th Districts: Multiple rulings, such as Gordon v. Leeke, Andrade v. Gonzales, Anderson v. Hardin, Eldridge v. Block, and Hall v. Bellmon, emphasize that the pleadings of pro se litigants should be construed liberally. This means that courts will interpret their filings with considerable generosity to avoid any inequity that might arise from their lack of legal expertise.
- Supreme Court (Fed. Express Corp. v. Holowecki): Even at the highest level, pro se litigants are held to a lesser pleading standard compared to parties who are

RECEIVED

MAY 28 2024

SC Court of Appeals



1

