

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