



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

CATHERINE S. HARRISON
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

July 08, 2025

Mr. Justin A. Jernigan, Esquire
302 Pine Cliff Dr.
29672
Seneca SC 29672

Mr. David Leon Morrison, Esquire
PO Box 119
Columbia SC 29202

Mr. Cameron W. DeBoy, Esquire
1201 Main Street
Suite 1800
Columbia SC 29201

Mr. Andrew F. Lindemann, Esquire
PO Box 6923
Columbia SC 29260

Re: Christine Jernigan v. Kershaw County
Appellate Case No. 2024-002127

Dear Counsel:

Enclosed is the decision of the Court. The initial brief of respondent and designation of matter is due within thirty (30) days of the date of this letter.

Very truly yours,

Catherine Hamison, deputy

CLERK

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Christine Jernigan, Appellant,

v.

Kershaw County South Carolina, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2024-002127

ORDER

On June 2, 2025, Respondent filed a motion to dismiss this appeal, arguing this court lacked appellate jurisdiction because the circuit court found Appellant's motion to reconsider was not timely filed, which was not challenged in a subsequent motion to reconsider or in Appellant's initial brief and, as a result, the motion to reconsider did not toll the time for serving the notice of appeal. *See* Rule 203(b)(1), SCACR (stating that "[w]hen a timely . . . motion to alter or amend the judgment . . . has been made, the time for appeal for all parties shall be stayed and shall run from receipt of written notice of entry of the order granting or denying such motion"); *Shirley's Iron Works, Inc. v. City of Union*, 403 S.C. 560, 573, 743 S.E.2d 778, 785 (2013) ("An unappealed ruling is the law of the case and requires affirmance."). On June 12, 2025, Appellant filed a return, arguing that if this court reverses the circuit court's underlying order, then the order denying Appellant's motion to reconsider "become[s] irrelevant." Further, Appellant, relying on *Swing v. Swing*, 445 S.C. 340, 914 S.E.2d 158 (2025), argues its motion to reconsider "was indisputably 'timely'" and any "purported procedural missteps/deficiencies . . . do not affect this [c]ourt's appellate jurisdiction." On June 17, 2025, Respondent filed a reply. After careful consideration of the filings, we deny the motion to dismiss. However, this order merely allows the appeal to proceed at this time and does not finally determine whether the underlying order is subject to immediate review.


FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

FILED
Jul 08 2025

cc:

Justin A. Jernigan, Esquire

David Leon Morrison, Esquire

Cameron W. DeBoy, Esquire

Andrew F. Lindemann, Esquire