

Marka Danielle Rodgers
PLAINTIFF(S)

Cnt Foundations
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:

This matter came before the Court on September 8, 2023 as Defendant's Motion to Compel Arbitration. The Plaintiff was represented by Daniel Summa, and the Defendant was represented by Charles Krawczyk. Upon consideration of the competing Memorandums and the Arbitration Provision, Defendant's Motion is GRANTED. Moreover, the Court does not find proof that the parties did not mutually assent to the Arbitration Provision, and the Court does not find that the Provision is unenforceable. See *Mart v. Great S. Homes, Inc.*, No. 2018-001598, 2023 WL 5944268, at 7 (S.C. Ct. App. Sept. 13, 2023). The Defendant is to submit a Formal Proposed Order within 10 days.

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 10/17/2023 .

RECEIVED

Jul 30 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.



Charleston Common Pleas

Case Caption: Marka Danielle Rodgers VS Cnt Foundations

Case Number: 2022CP1005916

Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

s/Jennifer B. McCoy #2764