

James Dustin Lucas
PLAINTIFF(S)

Andre Knox
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:

See Page 2

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 06/23/2025 .

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.

This matter comes before the Court by way of the plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider the Court's decision on the Post-Trial Motions. The Trial concluded on June 12, 2025 and the motion was filed on June 20, 2025. After review of the record and consideration of the arguments presented in the plaintiff's Motion, the Court finds that no basis has been presented to Alter or Amend it's decision. Additionally, it is improper to argue a new matter in a Motion to Reconsider. *Repko v. County of Georgetown*, 424 S.C. 494 (S.C. Sup Ct 2018). Further, the Court has determined that no additional hearing or oral argument is needed to address this Motion. Therefore, Plaintiff's Motion is respectfully denied.

It Is So Ordered.



Greenville Common Pleas

Case Caption: James Dustin Lucas vs. Meghan Seely , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2020CP2302877

Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

Hon Perry H. Gravely, Chief Administrative
Judge-Civil