

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
 COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)
)
 M. Edward Wilson Jr.,)
)
)
)
 Plaintiffs,)
)
 v)
)
 Marquee Limo Co., LLC,)
)
)
 Defendant.)
 _____)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FOR THE 9th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

CASE NO.: 2022-CP-10-02743

ORDER

RECEIVED

Jul 01 2025

SC Court of Appeals

Presiding Judge:	Hon. Deadra L. Jefferson
Plaintiff’s Attorney:	Ellis I. Kahn, Esq. Wes B. Allison, Esq.
Defendant’s Attorney:	Jeffrey M. Crudup, Esq. Renate Hohman, Esq.
Date of Hearing:	March 17-19, 2025
Court Reporter:	Maria-Emanuel Klein

This Personal Injury case came before the Court for a jury trial on March 17-March 19, 2025. Representing the Plaintiff was Ellis I. Kahn, Esq. and Wes B. Allison, Esq. Representing the Defendants was Jeffrey M. Crudup, Esq. and Renate Hohman, Esq. All issues have been tried and a verdict rendered in favor of the Plaintiff in the amount of Three Million Three Hundred Fifty and 00/100 (\$3,350,000.00) Dollars in Actual Damages. The Defendant is entitled to a setoff of One Million Five Hundred and 00/100 (\$1,500,000.00) Dollars. Judgment is entered in favor of the Plaintiff against the Defendant Marquee Limo Co., LLC¹ in the amount of One Million Eight Hundred Fifty and 00/100 (\$1,850,000) Dollars.²

The Court required post-trial motions. The Defendant made a motion pursuant to Rule 50(b), SCRCP for JNOV.

The South Carolina Supreme Court has ruled, “[i]n deciding motions for a directed verdict or judgment notwithstanding the verdict, the trial judge must consider the evidence in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. If only one reasonable inference can

¹ The Defendant Paul Brown was dismissed as a party by stipulation.

² The Plaintiff withdrew his request for punitive damages at the close of his case.

be drawn from the evidence, the motion must be granted.” Brady Dev. Co, Inc. v. Town of Hilton Head Island, S.C. 73 (1993). See Sorin Equipment v. The Firm, 323 S.C. 359 474 S.E.2d 819 (Ct. App. 1996). "The jury’s verdict must be upheld if there is any evidence to sustain the factual findings implicit in the verdict.” see also Garrison v. Target, 429 S.C. 324 838 S.E.2d 18 (Ct. App. 2020). “A Motion for JNOV may be granted only if no reasonable jury could have reached the challenged verdict.” The Winthrop Univ. Trustees for the State v. Pickens Roofing & Sheet Metals, Inc., 418 S.C. 142, 161, 791 S.E.2d 152, 162 (Ct. App. 2016), reh’g denied (Oct. 21, 2016).

The Court finds that the evidence presented, in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party was susceptible of more than one inference and the grant JNOV is not supported by the record. Moreover, there is more than ample evidence to sustain the factual findings implicit within the jury’s verdict. The Court further finds that there is no support that no reasonable jury could have reached the challenged verdict. Moreover, the Court finds that the verdict was not actuated by passion, caprice or prejudice. The jury gave careful deliberation to the issues before it and deliberated for three (3) hours. The Motion was heard and the Court also made contemporaneous findings of fact and conclusions of law for the record which are incorporated in this Order as if stated verbatim.

Based on the foregoing; Defendant's Motion for Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict is heard and respectfully DENIED.

Hon. Deadra L. Jefferson
Presiding Judge
Ninth Circuit Court

_____, 2025
Charleston, South Carolina



Charleston Common Pleas

Case Caption: M Edward Wilson Jr VS Paul Brown , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2022CP1002743

Type: Order/Judgment and Form 4

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/D.L. Jefferson Ninth Judicial Circuit Judge 2128