

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )

COUNTY OF RICHLAND )

Professional Financial Services, )

Plaintiff, )

vs. )

Tremaine Golson aka Tremaine D. Golson )

and Brittney L. Greene aka Brittney L. )

Golson, )

Defendants. )

IN THE COURT OF COMMON  
PLEAS

FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

CASE NO.: 2024-CP-40-03931

**ORDER**

**RECEIVED**

**Jul 22 2025**

**SC Court of Appeals**

This matter came before the Court via WebEx on July 11, 2025. The Plaintiff/Respondent (Plaintiff) was represented by John S. Kay, Esquire. The Defendants/Appellants (Defendants), Tremaine Golson and Brittany Golson, appeared, pro se. On March 17, 2025, this Court granted Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment in a collections case involving a loan secured by Defendants' vehicle. The Defendants appealed the decision to the South Carolina Court of Appeals and on May 8, 2025, this Court granted their Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment Pending Appeal and required the Defendants to post bond pursuant to *S.C. Code Ann. §18-9-130(A)(2)* (incorrectly cited in the order as §18-9-130(2)). *The Defendants, thereafter, filed a motion to stay with the Court of Appeals, seeking a stay of the March 17, 2025 judgement but a waiver of the May 8, 2025 bond in its entirety, or, in the alternative, a reduced bond amount. By order dated June 24, 2025, the Court of Appeals vacated the May 8, 2025 order and remanded the case for expedited consideration of Plaintiffs' Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment Pending Appeal "with consideration given to whether section §18-9-*

130(A)(1) of the South Carolina Code (2014) is applicable to the monetary judgement ordered by the circuit court and section §18-9-150 of the South Carolina Code (2014) for the repossession judgment.”

S.C. Code Ann. §18-9-130(A)(1) states that for money judgments, if the “presiding judge grants a stay of execution and requires a bond or other surety to guarantee the payment of the judgment pending the appeal, the amount of the bond or other surety may not exceed the amount of the judgment.” As it relates to the repossession of the vehicle, S.C. Code Ann. §18-9-150 provides, in pertinent part, that “the execution of the judgment shall not be stayed by appeal ... unless an undertaking be entered into on the part of the appellant, with at least two sureties and in such amount as the court or a judge thereof shall direct, to the effect that the appellant will obey the order of the appellate court upon the appeal.”

At the hearing, Defendants argued that the March 17, 2025 judgement should be stayed but that any bond requirement be waived. Plaintiff asserted that a bond is needed to protect it during the pendency of Defendants’ appeal and that bond could be imposed under both §18-9-130(A)(1) for its money judgment and §18-9-150 for the repossession judgment. However, Plaintiff also offered that it could adequately be protected by a bond in the amount of \$18, 514.00, the approximate amount of the value of the collateral, under §18-9-150.

*For the reasons specified in its now vacated order – that Defendants will suffer irreparable harm if their vehicle is repossessed during the pendency of the appeal because there is only one operable vehicle in their household, they have four children, three of whom are under the age of 18 and in high school, their one vehicle is their only source of transportation to travel to work and one of the Defendants must engage in frequent travel for medical appointments - the Court orders that execution of the March 17, 2025 judgement in its entirety be stayed, subject to the Defendants posting bond in the amount of \$18, 514.00, with two*

sureties, under §18-9-150. The Defendants should provide evidence of such bond to Plaintiff's counsel, at his offices located at 240 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 400, Columbia, S.C. 29210, within fifteen (15) days of the date of this Order. Given that Plaintiff offered that a bond under §18-9-150 would adequately protect its interests, the Court does not order bond under §18-9-130(A)(1).

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

---

Milton G. Kimpson  
Circuit Court Judge  
Fifth Judicial Circuit

July 15, 2025

Columbia, South Carolina

(ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE FOLLOWS)

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2025 Jul 15 11:21 AM - RICHLAND - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2024CP4003931



Richland Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** Professional Financial Services vs Tremaine Golson , defendant, et al  
**Case Number:** 2024CP4003931  
**Type:** Order/Other

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Milton G. Kimpson 2783