

Professional Financial Services
PLAINTIFF(S)

Tremaine Golson 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:

In response to this Court's May 7, 2025 Order Granting the Defendants' Motion to Stay Execution of Judgement upon the condition that Defendants post bonds, the Defendants filed a Motion Pursuant to Rule 60(a), SCRPC (Motion) seeking to correct a clerical error. In pertinent part, the Defendants' motion asserts:

1. The Court's Final Order incorrectly identifies the parties by reversing the designations of Plaintiff and Defendants.
2. This constitutes a clerical error affecting the clarity and legal integrity of the order. The incorrect designation may create confusion in enforcement, appeal, and the calculation of related obligations such as bond.

4. Correcting this error will not prejudice any party, and no substantive changes are being requested. (emphasis added)

Defendants' Motion is DENIED. The Court has found no clerical error in its May 7, 2025 Order and the Defendants' Motion does not specifically identify any such error.

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 06/05/2025 .

Tremaine D Golson for Tremaine D Golson
Brittney L Golson for Brittney L Golson
Brittney L Golson for Brittney L Golson
Tremaine D Golson for Tremaine D Golson
Brittney L Greene
Tremaine Golson

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.

Further, the Defendants have acknowledged that they are “requesting no substantive changes” in the Order, a statement which undermines their earlier assertion that the alleged error “may create confusion...”

Moreover, assuming arguendo, that some clerical error does exist, Defendants’ obligations in the May 7, 2025 Order were nevertheless clear:

[T]o stay the execution of Plaintiff’s judgment and to avoid the repossession and sale of their vehicle, the Defendants must post two bonds, each in the amount of \$37,028.00, with the Plaintiff, Professional Financial Services, named as the beneficiary of each bond. Said bonds must remain in effect during the pendency of Defendants’ appeal to pay Plaintiff’s judgment, along with interest, costs and damages, by reason of the appeal. After obtaining the bonds, the Defendants must provide the bond documents to Plaintiff’s counsel at 240 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 400, Columbia, S.C. 29210, who will notify the Court in the event the bonds are not in proper form.

The May 7, 2025 Order further gave the Defendants’ ten (10) days to post the necessary bonds. The Defendants have not yet posted the required bonds.

Accordingly, the Court DENIES Defendants’ Motion. Further, the Defendants must comply in full with the bond requirements of the Court’s May 7, 2025 Order Granting the Defendants’ Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment within three (3) days of the date of this Order. Defendants are reminded that no stay of the May 7, 2025 becomes effective without the required bond. If the proper bond has not been provided to Plaintiff’s counsel by the deadline, Plaintiff may enforcement its judgment upon the filing of an affidavit of non-compliance with this Court.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



Richland Common Pleas

Case Caption: Professional Financial Services vs Tremaine Golson , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2024CP4003931

Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Milton G. Kimpson 2783