

Exhibits 7 2 pages

1 of 2

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF Richland

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2023 CP-6441

Samuel C. Brown
Plaintiff,

MOTION AND ORDER INFORMATION
FORM AND COVERSHEET

vs.
Tommy Truesdale Madry Truesdale
et/s Defendants

Plaintiff's Attorney: _____, Bar No. _____ Address: _____ Phone: _____ Fax _____ E-mail: _____ Other: _____	Defendant's Attorney: _____, Bar No. _____ Address: _____ Phone: _____ Fax _____ E-mail: _____ Other: _____
---	---

- MOTION HEARING REQUESTED (attach written motion and complete SECTIONS I and III)
- FORM MOTION, NO HEARING REQUESTED (complete SECTIONS II and III)
- PROPOSED ORDER/CONSENT ORDER (complete SECTIONS II and III)

SECTION I: Hearing Information
 Nature of Motion: _____
 Estimated Time Needed: _____ Court Reporter Needed: YES / NO

- Written motion attached
- Form Motion/Order

I hereby move for relief or action by the court as set forth in the attached proposed order

Samuel C. Brown Signature of Attorney for Plaintiff / Defendant
 Date submitted: 4/23/2024

- SECTION III: Motion Fee
- PAID - AMOUNT: \$ _____
 - EXEMPT: (check reason)
 - Rule to Show Cause in Child or Spousal Support
 - Domestic Abuse or Abuse and Neglect
 - Indigent Status State Agency v. Indigent Party
 - Sexually Violent Predator Act Post-Conviction Relief
 - Motion for Stay in Bankruptcy
 - Motion for Publication Motion for Execution (Rule 69, SCRCP)
 - Proposed order submitted at request of the court; or,
reduced to writing from motion made in open court per judge's instructions
- Name of Court Reporter: _____
 Other: _____

JUDGE'S SECTION

<input type="checkbox"/> Motion Fee to be paid upon filing of the attached order.	JUDGE CODE _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	Date: _____

CLERK'S VERIFICATION

Collected by: pm Date Filed: 4/23/24

MOTION FEE COLLECTED: \$ _____

CONTESTED - AMOUNT DUE: \$ _____

proposed order sent to
Judge 4/23/24
Nemman

RICHLAND COUNTY
 FILED
 2021 APR 23 PM 4:32
 JEANNETTE W. McBRIDE
 C.C.P., G.S., & F.P.

Exhibits

second page

202

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF RICHLAND

COURT OF COMMON PLEA

PETITIONER: SAMUEL CARLOS BROWN

Proposed
Default Judgement Order

VS.

RESPONDENTS: Tommy Truesdale/BD Maudy Truesdale

any Person with Interest or Entity claiming or any Hiers to estates of 738 Colleton St.

Entry. Now the time has come when a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend as provided by these Civil Procedure Rule 55 and that fact is made to appear by affidavit or otherwise, the clerk shall enter the party's default. The defendants describe above neglected to execute within a reasonable time thereafter published summons, complaint and Lis pendens in the Columbia star public notice a good and sufficient quit claim deed of the property described in the complaint, upon tender of such deed ready for execution, the plaintiff/petitioner Samuel Carlos Brown shall nevertheless recover his costs. It shall be ordered.

It is hereby order granted.

Sworn to and subscribed before me.

Day of _____, 2024

Judge/Clerk of Court.

Proposed

Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission expires.

Copy / proposed
order
sent to Judge
Newman

Exhibits 2

1 of 2

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2024 Dec 19 3:13 PM - RICHLAND - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2023CP4006441

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)
)
Samuel C. Brown,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.)
)
Tommy Truesdale and Maudy Truesdale,)
)
Defendants.)
)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

CASE NO.: 2023-CP-40-06441

ORDER

This matter came before Judge Coble on Plaintiff's Damages Hearing held in-person on December 10, 2024. Present at the hearing was the pro se Plaintiff, Samuel Brown, who presented his argument. Defendant did not appear and is in default. Judge Coble took the sworn testimony of Plaintiff to prove his case.

Based on Plaintiff's testimony, even though Defendant is in default, Plaintiff is still required to prove the damages sought in the Complaint regarding ownership of the property. Under South Carolina Code Section 15-67-10, Plaintiff did not present any evidence which would allow him to be entitled to the property.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

[JUDICIAL E-SIGNATURE PAGE TO FOLLOW]

Exhibit 2

2 of 2



Richland Common Pleas

Case Caption: Samuel C Brown vs Tommy Truesdale , defendant, et al
Case Number: 2023CP4006441
Type: Order/Other

So Ordered

s/ Daniel Coble, 2774

Electronically signed on 2024-12-19 11:21:25 page 2 of 2

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2024 Dec 19 3:13 PM - RICHLAND - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2023CP4006441

Exhibits

3

1 of 2

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
 COUNTY OF RICHLAND)
)
 Samuel Brown,)
) Plaintiff,)
)
 vs.)
)
 Tommy Truesdale and Maudy Truesdale,)
)
) Defendants.)
)
)
)
)
)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
 FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

CASE NO.: 2023-CP-40-06441

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
 FOR RECONSIDERATION PURSUANT TO
 RULE 59(e), SCRPC**

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2025 Jan 14 4:07 PM - RICHLAND - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2023CP4006441

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration Pursuant to Rule 59(e), SCRPC ("the Motion"). The Motion asks this Court to alter, amend, or reconsider its Order denying Plaintiff damages entered December 19, 2024.

After reviewing the applicable law and considering the arguments raised in the Motion and Defendant's Response, the Court is unable to discover any material fact or principle of law that has either been overlooked or disregarded and further finds no error of law or fact not appropriately considered.

Accordingly, the Court concludes that altering, amending, or reconsidering its prior Order is unwarranted, and the issues raised in the Motion do not change the Court's reasoning or conclusions. As such, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is hereby **DENIED**, and the Court, pursuant to the discretion afforded by Rule 59 and *Pollard v. County of Florence*, concludes that a hearing is not necessary to rule on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration. See Rule 59(f), SCRPC (stating a Rule 59(e) motion "may in the discretion of the court be determined on the briefs filed by the parties without oral argument"); see also *Pollard*, 314 S.C. 397, 401-02, 444 S.E.2d 534, 536 (Ct. App. 1994) (holding there was "no merit in Pollard's assertion that the circuit court committed reversible error in denying her motion to alter or amend the judgment under Rule 59(e) SCRPC,