

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
)	
COUNTY OF LEXINGTON)	Civil Action No. 2022-CP-32-03934
)	
Crescent Roofing & Remodeling LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY TO
)	DEFENDANT ERIC RAGSDALE
v.)	
)	
Eric Ragsdale,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

TO: PLAINTIFF CRESCENT ROOFING & REMOLDELING

DEFENDANT'S PRO'SE RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS

RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendant Eric Ragsdale ("Defendant") hereby responds to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories to Defendant Eric Ragsdale, answered by number of each question in discovery document, identically numerically, and :

- a. The information supplied in these Answers is not based solely on the complete knowledge of the executing party, but attempt to comply to request, with limited skill and as a layman.
- b. The word usage and sentence structure are that of a pro se litigant, without an attorney and does not purport to be the exact language of the executing party.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS AND RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

- 1. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent they deviate from

or purport to impose requirements other than or in addition to those required by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

2. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent they seek information or documents outside the scope of discovery permissible under the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

3. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent that they seek information or documents protected by future Attorney-Client Privilege, the litigant or Attorney Work Product Doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity. None of these responses is intended as, or should be construed as a waiver or relinquishment of any part of the protections afforded by the Attorney-Client Privilege, the Attorney Work Product Doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity.

4. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent that they seek information or documents that are beyond his custody, possession, or control and/or seek information that is equally available to Plaintiffs.

5. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent they seek information or documents for any period of time beyond any applicable statute of limitations.

6. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests because they contain undefined terms which make them vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive.

7. Defendant expressly limits its responses to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the information or documents that can be located after a reasonable and diligent search, within the short period allowed, of its records believed most likely to contain the responsive information.

8. Defendant's investigation into the facts alleged in Plaintiffs' Complaint and Defendants counterclaim is ongoing, and he continues to search for information or documents responsive to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests. As additional information or documents become available, Defendant reserves the right to amend, modify, clarify and/or supplement its responses and objections as appropriate.

9. Defendant's decision to provide information or documents notwithstanding the objectionable nature of Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests is not to be construed as an admission that the information or document is relevant, as a waiver of the general or specific objections, or as an agreement that future requests for similar discovery will be treated in a similar manner.

10. These General Objections and Limitations apply to each of Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests as though restated in full in response thereto. To the extent Defendant asserts objections to individual requests, those objections shall apply equally to any subparts of the request.

11. I object to each interrogatory to the extent that it calls for the disclosure of information outside the scope of the time, place, subject matter, and circumstances of the occurrences mentioned or complained of in the Complaint or Counterclaim.

WITHOUT WAIVING THESE DEFENSES, I RESPOND AS FOLLOWS:

RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT

1. Defendant objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, oppressive, unduly burdensome, and calls for speculation. Without waiving the objections, Defendant responds that he is unaware of the identity of any persons, other than the Plaintiffs, who may have knowledge of the facts alleged in the Complaint.

2. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent that they seek information or documents that are beyond his custody, possession, or control and/or seek information that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff.

3. Defendant objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, oppressive, unduly burdensome, and calls for speculation. Without waiving the objections, Defendant responds that he is unaware of the identity of any persons, other than the Plaintiffs, who may have knowledge of the facts alleged in the Complaint other than the Plaintiff of the communication and inspection of the workmanship notice.

4. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent they seek information or documents outside the scope of discovery permissible under the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

5. Defendant objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, oppressive, unduly burdensome, expensive, and calls for speculation. Plaintiff was provided damage assumptions by text communication, pictures and his own personal witnesses of claim, and claim is subject to compensatory evaluation by expert or restoration to the undamaged state and is unavailable at this time. Damage claims, in whole or part, for jury determination assessment of punitive request at trial.

6. Defendant objects and reserve the right to explore for trial, any expert witnesses, but no decision has been made and request is outside the scope of the South Carolina Rules Of Civil Procedure.

7. Defendant objects Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent that they seek information or documents that are is equally available and provided to Plaintiff. All communication was verbal and written between Plaintiff, Defendant and State Farm adjuster, which Plaintiff has knowledge and possession of this information.

8. Defendant objects.

9. Defendant objects, that the factual or legal theory is subject to trial preparation or stage and any documents or photos applicable is determinable by Plaintiffs financial demand in complaint of Defendants denial in counterclaim dispute of defective workmanship and Plaintiff's electronic communication agreement to restore property damage. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent that they seek information or documents that are t is equally available and privy to Plaintiff's electronic device.

10. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent they deviate from or purport to impose requirements other than or in addition to those required by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

11. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's discovery request as the facts would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff.

12. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's discovery request as the facts is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative and would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff.

13. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent they deviate from or purport to impose requirements other than or in addition to those required by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

14. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's discovery request as the facts would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent they deviate from or purport to impose requirements other than or in addition to those required by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

15. Defendant objects, in part, but for clarity, this statement was a clerical error should read "failures in removing shingles for replacement damaged...." Defendant objects to the remaining of Plaintiff's discovery request as the facts is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative and would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff.

16. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's discovery request as the facts is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative and would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff.

17. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent that they seek information or documents that are beyond his custody, possession, or control and/or seek information that is equally available to Plaintiffs.

18. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's discovery request as the facts is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative and would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff.

19. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's discovery request as the facts is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative and would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff.

20. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent that they seek information or documents that are beyond his custody, possession, or control and/or seek information that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff. Shingles being removed from structure fall intentionally to ground, negligently of failure to protect areas, surfaces, or premises, broke off Wi-Fi antenna for remote monitoring.

21. Defendant objects to Plaintiff' discovery requests to the extent Plaintiff has equal knowledge of damage to premises and property, from removal of old shingles to ground.

22. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's discovery request as the facts are unreasonably cumulative or duplicative and would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff. Defendant had the repairs performed and or corrected in the seasonal operation requirements of components. Discovery request seeks information or documents that are beyond his custody, possession, or control of Defendant at this time.

23. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's discovery request as the facts is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative and would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that was made and is equally available and provided to Plaintiff.

24. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's discovery request as the facts would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent they deviate from or purport to impose requirements other than or in addition to those required by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

25. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's discovery request as the facts are unreasonably cumulative or duplicative and would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that are not available at this time, but damages were, equally available and known to, and viewed by Plaintiff. Defendant has not resolved the "exterior damage."

26. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests to the extent they deviate from or purport to impose requirements other than or in addition to those required by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure. Such a request requires expertise and to perform a legal analysis and request a legal opinion.

27. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' discovery requests to the extent they are overbroad and deviate from or purport to impose requirements other than or in addition to those required by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure. Further, the extent of the request, would further injure the Defendant, that Plaintiff originally intended to impose a wrongful act purposely and willingly, for the Defendant to suffer for advantage of acts, to collect a debt, subjecting the Defendant to annoyance, embarrassment, and unwarranted oppression. Defendant reserves the right to sever claim in the counterclaim into a tort action.

28. 29. 30. Defendant objects to paragraphs 28, 29, 30, of Plaintiffs discovery requests, as the facts is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative, and any documents substantiating exact value of replacement is equally available to Plaintiff, that original documents are beyond his custody, possession, or control and would be determinable by trial and the extent that they seek information or documents that are speculation, that is equally available and was provided to Plaintiff.

DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO PRODUCE

1. 2.3.4.5.6.7.8.10.11. Defendant incorporates all previous objections and objects to the request of production in its entirety as follows:

1. Plaintiff was provided text, pictures and Plaintiff personally assessed the damage. This request seeks information or documents that is equally available and provided to Plaintiff.

2. Plaintiff seeks information of work that has been lost, discarded, or not available to Defendant at this time. Defendant seeks restoration to damage of property known to Plaintiff, to its original condition, before work was performed, in consideration that value may be economically valued higher to correct in today's environment.

3.Plaintiff's request is burdensome and requires speculation that Plaintiff may refute and can only be determined by trial, in compensatory characterization by experts. Plaintiff was provided opportunity to determine.

4.Plaintiff's request continuing in nature would be Requests to the extent they deviate from or purport to impose requirements other than or in addition to those required by the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

5.Plaintiff's request is overbroad for identity of persons or all persons and or all communication, materials, correspondence related to the damage of property, defective workmanship, threats, collections, in this case with limited witnesses and reliance solely on text messages, pictures and witnessed by Plaintiff, in and between direct communication of Defendant and Plaintiff.

6.Defendant objects to any intrusive request outside of trial production or mediation. Any documents or tangible things shall set forth the items to be inspected either by individual item or by category and describe each item and category with reasonable particularity. The attached is not limited to, but also available to Plaintiff, the availability or availability not currently in custody of Defendant.

Eric Ragsdale, Defendant Pro'se
121 Shumpert Rd
West Columbia, S.C. 29172
shredswu@gmail.com
803 309-0539

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
)	
COUNTY OF LEXINGTON)	Civil Action No. 2022-CP-32-03934
)	
Crescent Roofing & Remodeling LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY TO
v.)	DEFENDANT ERIC RAGSDALE
)	
Eric Ragsdale,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

----->

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The Defendant Eric Ragsdale in the above-captioned matter, certifies that the copy of the document requested, Plaintiff's request for Discovery, was sent by electronic transmission to sam@phillipsfirm.net on or before September 27th 2023, to Plaintiff's attorney of record Robert B. Phillips, ESQ, by permission in former email correspondence dated, August 28th, 2023.

Eric Ragsdale, Pro'se Defendant

Columbia, South Carolina

PLAINTIFF ATTORNEY
sam@phillipsfirm.net