

1 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ) IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA CIRCUIT COURT 5

2 COUNTY OF RICHLAND ) COURT C.A NO.2023-CP-40-04408

3

4 Kamarah Reynolds-Hall )

5 Plaintiff,)

6 Versus )

7 University of South Carolina )

8 and Holder Properties )

9 Defendant.)

10

11

H E A R I N G

12

13 DATE: July 9, 2024

14

15 LOCATION: South Carolina Circuit Court 5

16

17 JUDGE: Daniel Coble

18

19 TRANSCRIBED BY: ERIN REILLY

20

21 LEGAL EAGLE

22 Post Office Box 5682

23 Greenville, South Carolina 29606

24 864-467-1373

25 depos@legaleagleinc.com

**RECEIVED**

DEC 03 2024

SC Court of Appeals

APPEARANCES:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Attorney for Plaintiff:  
Kamarah Reynolds-Hall (Pro Se)  
  
Attorney for Defendant:  
David DeMasters , Esquire  
Riley Pope & Laney, LLC  
2838 Devine Street  
Columbia, SC 29205  
  
Catherine G. Griffin, Esquire  
Baker Ravenel & Bender, LLP  
PO Box 8057,  
Columbia, SC 29202

INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Certificate of Transcriber . . . 15

EXHIBITS

(None marked)

(THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY CONTAIN QUOTED MATERIAL. SUCH IS  
REPRODUCED AS READ OR QUOTED BY THE SPEAKER.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are going to go ahead and get started with the 2:00 o'clock docket. First up, we have Kamarah Reynolds-Hall versus Jamie Robinson 2023CP404408. The first motion on this case that was filed was from the Defense, University of South Carolina. Motion to Dismiss. All right. Let's see, who do we have here for this case?

MR. DEMASTERS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Dave DeMasters, I'm here for the University of South Carolina.

THE COURT: Right. Mr. DeMaster for USC.

MS. GRIFFIN: I'm Catherine Griffin here for Holder Properties. We also have a motion.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Griffin.

MR. REYNOLDS-HALL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Judge Coble, this is Kamarah Reynolds-Hall, the Plaintiff.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Reynolds-Hall, can you turn your video on?

MR. HALL: Judge Coble?

THE COURT: This is Mr. Reynolds-Hall?

MR. REYNOLDS-HALL: Yes, sir.

MR. HALL: This is his dad, Travis Hall.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Hall.

MR. HALL: How you doing, sir?

1           THE COURT: I'm doing well. All right. Mr.  
2 Reynolds-Hall, the Defense has filed two motions to dismiss.  
3 They were filed first, so they get to argue those first. After  
4 they've made their arguments you can respond and then they'll  
5 get to have the last argument on those motions before I take it  
6 under advisement and consider it. So, I'm happy to hear from  
7 Mr. DeMasters first.

8           MR. DEMASTERS: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please  
9 the Court. Our motion is based solely on this statute of  
10 limitations in this case. As a governmental agency, USC has a  
11 two-year statute of limitations pursuant to the Tort Claims  
12 Act. It's 1578110. Based on the allegations in the complaint  
13 as well as the numerous attachments attached to it. The  
14 incident that is the subject of the complaint occurred on  
15 August 23rd, 2020.

16           Mr. Kamarah -- Mr. Reynolds-Hall was involved in  
17 altercation with several USC football players at one of the  
18 athletic dorms on August 23rd. Him and his father reported it,  
19 the assault on August 27th, 2020 to the USC Police Department.  
20 There's also another incident where Mr. Hall went into the room  
21 of another football player and was criminally charged with  
22 burglary. It was subsequently pled down to trespass and that's  
23 subject of another lawsuit where Mr. Tim Domino representing  
24 Mr. Reynolds Hall in that case.

25           That's a defamation case that's actually scheduled

1 for trial next week. But this case was brought against USC for  
2 an alleged coverup of the assault of Mr. Reynolds-Hall by the  
3 USC football players. Now, during the pendency of the criminal  
4 charges against Mr. Reynolds Hall, he received all of the  
5 video, all of the criminal discovery in March 10th of 2021.  
6 And this is all according to his pleadings that he submitted  
7 attached to his complaint. And he filed this lawsuit on August  
8 22nd, 2023.

9 Well, after the two-year statute of limitation a plot  
10 that expired for the University of South Carolina. I'm going  
11 to be short and sweet and his -- he did respond in opposition  
12 and he basically argued that COVID-19 tolled the statute of  
13 limitations for his claims. There's no basis in the case law  
14 or anything government -- Governor McMaster did to toll the  
15 statute of limitations for any civil claims.

16 And then he also argued that equal tolling applied.  
17 There's no evidence anywhere that anybody from USC had anything  
18 to do with his delay in filing this lawsuit, Your Honor.  
19 Again, he -- this incident happened on August 23rd, 2020, which  
20 I believe he had noticed of his claims then. But even at the  
21 very latest in March of 2021, he absolutely had notice of any  
22 alleged claims. He had all the videos and documentation of  
23 USCPD and yet he still filed his complaint more than two years  
24 after that date in August of 2023.

25 So, he missed it by at least five months, just using the

1 March 10th, 2021 date. If Your Honor has any questions, we'll  
2 be happy but that is the short and sweet part of our motion,  
3 Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. DeMasters. Yes, sir.  
5 Mr. Reynolds-Hall.

6 MR. HALL: Hey, sir, this is his dad. Do you mind if  
7 I speak with him?

8 THE COURT: Sure, go ahead.

9 MR. HALL: Yes, sir. The incident we've already  
10 spoken about which was August 23rd, 2020. My son, he was  
11 assaulted by six football players at the University of South  
12 Carolina. He also was lured by two basketball players on the  
13 2020 basketball team at the University of South Carolina. We  
14 got the discovery -- excuse me, let me back up. We requested  
15 foyer for over four months from the university.

16 The university never gave us anything. We finally  
17 received a letter from the university saying, "Hey, we made a  
18 mistake. We should have given you the foyer, but we made a  
19 mistake." By that time, hey, we are still trying to find out  
20 information. USC went silent, there was a wall of silence. No  
21 one would talk to us, no one would give us any information, no  
22 one would give us anything.

23 So, around March of 2021, the discovery arrives.  
24 Inside the discovery when it came, it had all the information  
25 anyone would need to do probable cause. So, as I studied

1 through all that information line by line looking at it to see  
2 who's involved, because we originally said it was 13. No, the  
3 written -- the number now is six football players and two  
4 basketball players. So, right then that was the first thing,  
5 so then I started looking at a probable cause on the  
6 statements. Each one of the statements that they have -- that  
7 they had in their possession, those young men told them in  
8 September of 2020 that they are the ones who did the assault.  
9 At that time, no one arrested the young men at all, this was  
10 September 5. Keep in mind, I'm still investigating. So, as I  
11 continued further, I got the film develop and I wanted to see  
12 what happened on each floor minute -- by second, by second,  
13 minute by minute.

14 What I saw would encourage anybody to demonstrate against  
15 law enforcement when they're not going to do their job. I'm  
16 not going to use any harsh language or anything, I just want to  
17 make sure it is known that there are so many missteps that  
18 happened, that when the university and it was -- excuse me,  
19 when it was brought to the university's attention, all they did  
20 was deny, deny, deny, and just, you know, ignored it.

21 So, by that time, I'm on Facebook now and I'm trying to  
22 gather some attention about this thing. It wasn't to ruin USC,  
23 I wanted to know what happened to my son and I wanted to know  
24 how did he miss that opportunity that he worked so hard for,  
25 for over 10 years, being a law student and being a football

1 player.

2           So, when you look back at what DeMasters not  
3 DeMasters but Mr. DeMasters said USC didn't develop any film.  
4 They didn't provide anything not through foyer, not through any  
5 unauthorized routes or anything until they got to Jack Swally's  
6 [phonetic] office is when we got that information, which was  
7 seven and a half months later that by that time nobody's been  
8 arrested, the football season is still continuing. Nobody --  
9 everybody's saying that USC it's an ongoing investigation. It  
10 was truly not an ongoing investigation. Nobody was willing to  
11 do anything at the university, nobody wanted to hear anything.  
12 And then by that time, you get other parties involved like the  
13 Fifth Circuit solicitor. He knew if USC knew and saw the  
14 statement then he knew and he saw the film as well. But nobody  
15 was willing to do anything, I kept trying to reach attention.  
16 I kept doing the things I needed to do, got a petition. I  
17 started speaking on radio shows, trying to bring some attention  
18 to this but truly -- did I lose you all? Okay.

19           THE COURT: We got you, you came back.

20           MR. HALL: Yes, sir. So, they truly dropped the ball  
21 and I can -- I feel it was on behalf of the football team and  
22 the basketball season because all that information it was  
23 concealed. If we don't get that discovery, we don't know. If  
24 we don't get that discovery by the basketball players we don't  
25 know. So, when you look at the film, the film identifies

1 everybody who had a role in the assault. That film does not  
2 lie. The film should have ruled the case. That thing should  
3 have been cut and dry. Who's involved, do the investigation,  
4 do your suspensions and everything. But what they did was  
5 Kamarah was at the University of South Carolina, he was there  
6 academically accepted first. So, the second part of him going  
7 to the University of South Carolina was for him to pursue  
8 football. His dream was taken away from him by the assault, by  
9 the individuals that covered it up. All of that.

10           Instead, the university retaliated on us and they  
11 came full force. And as I close, I ask you, Your Honor, look  
12 at all that evidence and I also did send film through the SC  
13 court email. If you take a look at all of that, I plead with  
14 you to take a look at it and say, "Hey, if Mr. Hall willing to  
15 come up here and say these wrongdoings then I'll hold him in  
16 contempt. But I know I'm telling you the factual truth that's  
17 on paper, it's on the video. Nobody can deny it. Thank you.

18           THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hall. Let me hear from  
19 Ms. Griffin. You filed a similar motion based on the statute  
20 of limitations as well?

21           MS. GRIFFIN: No, Your Honor. My motion has not  
22 reached the statute of limitations issue yet. We filed a  
23 motion to dismiss for insufficient service of process. And so,  
24 in my motion that I have filed and I filed an affidavit also of  
25 the General Counsel for Holder Properties. What we believe

1 happened although the Plaintiff has not filed anything with the  
2 Court as to how they served Holder properties, is that they  
3 actually served CMM Realty, who is now the property managing  
4 management company for the complex where Mr. Hall claims to  
5 have been assaulted. And so, since they served the wrong  
6 party, we have moved to dismiss the lawsuit and ask that, Your  
7 Honor, dismiss it because there's no proof that we have been  
8 served. They served CMM Realty and we are Holder properties  
9 and there's no relationship between the two entities.

10 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Griffin.

11 MR. HALL: Sir, Mr. Hall?

12 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

13 MR. HALL: In relation to what Holder Property is  
14 stating, I ask that everybody take a look at your stream. This  
15 car here was delivered to Holder Properties, not a property  
16 management company. It said Holder Properties. So, whatever  
17 management company sign for that, that had nothing to do with  
18 them having receipt of the delivery of it. Their home bases in  
19 Atlanta, that's true, but they do the majority of their  
20 operations here in South Carolina.

21 So, that means they had a representative here in  
22 South Carolina named Brittany Blanz. She oversees over 500,000  
23 properties. What Ms. Griffin is saying, it went to a property  
24 management company. No, we sent it straight to Holder  
25 Properties. It never said anything about property management,

1 | Holder Properties, is what's -- is where it went to. And then  
2 | the other part of that is when you're looking at it and you've  
3 | taken a look at it with a microscope, there is everything that  
4 | was done correctly with this car.

5 |           Everything was done so that everybody would know it  
6 | was filed, registered, first class, all those things. We never  
7 | sent it to a property management. We never did that. We sent  
8 | it to Holder Properties. So, whoever was the subordinate  
9 | operations person, they should have forwarded that immediately  
10 | to Atlanta instead of saying it went to a property management  
11 | person, it should have went straight to Brittany Blanz who  
12 | oversees here in Columbia and then it should have left her  
13 | office and went straight to the home office in Atlanta. So,  
14 | that's my argument for you with Ms. Griffin. It never went to  
15 | a property management company; it went to directly to Holder  
16 | Properties.

17 |           THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hall. All right. For  
18 | these -- all right. The motions to dismiss, I'm going to take  
19 | those under advisement. I'm going to review the motion  
20 | submitted, the process of service as well as the statute of  
21 | limitations to see if it was done in compliance with the law.  
22 | That's something I got to look at to make my determination. As  
23 | to Mr. Hall, he has the motion to allow Travis Hall to speak in  
24 | all hearings.

25 |           I'm going to mark that as resolved because I let him speak

1 in this hearing. I can't let -- I don't know if you can speak  
2 in other hearings. I thought these judge -- I can't -- we'll  
3 mark that one as resolved. And then Mr. Hall has an omnibus  
4 motion for integrity of the investigation. I think that's what  
5 he discussed previously in his response to Mr. DeMasters. Is  
6 that correct, Mr. Hall?

7 MR. HALL: Yes, sir. That's the exact language. I  
8 mean, the exact document we want to use to speak about the  
9 integrity of it.

10 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let me take all these  
11 motions under advisement. Consider everything I heard today,  
12 Mr. Hall and Mr. Reynolds-Hall, make sure your address is up to  
13 date with the Court. After I make my ruling, I will -- you'll  
14 get something in the mail with that decision. So, just make  
15 sure your address stays up to date with the Court.

16 MR. HALL: Can I ask the Court one question, sir?

17 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

18 MR. HALL: We've been willing to do ADR with both  
19 parties. We've been trying to speak to them. I think that if  
20 the Court rules and said the case can continue, I would like  
21 that the Court mediate each party to come up with a settlement  
22 and resolve this unfortunate incident.

23 THE COURT: All right. It's noted for the record.  
24 All right. Thank you all for being here today.

25 MR. DEMASTERS: Thank you, Your Honor.

[END OF HEARING]

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, ERIN REILLY, a court-approved transcriber, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete Transcript of Record of the proceedings had and evidence introduced in the trial of the captioned case, relative to appeal, in the South Carolina Circuit Court 5, South Carolina, on the 9th day of July, 2024.

I do further certify that I am neither of kin, counsel, nor interest to any party hereto.

November 29th, 2024

ERIN REILLY

TRANSCRIBER

