

Exhibit B

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF ORANGEBURG)
)
OWL LABS, INC.,)
)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
)
v.)
)
ORANGEBURG COUNTY SCHOOL)
DISTRICT,)
)
)
Defendant.)
)
_____)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FOR THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Case No. 2024-CP-38-00640

RECEIVED

Aug 14 2025

SC Court of Appeals

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION OF SUMMARY
JUDGMENT ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Owl Labs, Inc.’s (“Plaintiff”) Motion for Reconsideration of Summary Judgment Order (“Motion for Reconsideration”). A hearing on Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment was heard on March 13, 2025. Both parties presented their arguments and supporting memoranda at the hearing and since. This Court entered an Order on the Motion for Summary Judgment on June 6, 2025, and Defendant timely filed their Motion for Reconsideration on June 16, 2025.

The purpose of a motion under Rule 59(e), SCRCF, to alter or amend a judgment is to request the trial judge “reconsider matters properly encompassed in a decision on the merits.” *Arnold v. State*, 309 S.C. 157, 172, 420 S.E.2d 834, 842 (1992). Consequently, a party usually is allowed to ask the court to reconsider its decision even if it means rehashing all or part of an argument previously presented. *See Elam v. S.C. Dep’t of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 22, 602 S.E.2d 772, 779 (2004). A party may choose to file such a motion when they believe the court misunderstood, failed to fully consider, or failed to rule on, an argument or issue, and the party wishes for the court to reconsider or rule on the argument or issue. *See id.* at 24, 602 S.E.2d at 779.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2025 Jul 15 4:55 PM - ORANGEBURG - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2024CP3800640

After reviewing the Motion for Reconsideration and supporting memoranda, this Court, in its discretion, declines to hold a hearing to address the motion and, as decided on the record, briefs, and applicable law, respectfully declines to alter, amend, or vacate the prior order. *See* Rule 59(f), SCRCP; *Pollard v. City of Florence*, 314 S.C. 397, 401–02, 444 S.E.2d 534, 536 (Ct. App. 1994).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Honorable Charles McCutchen

(Signature Page to Follow)



Orangeburg Common Pleas

Case Caption: Owl Labs, Inc. VS Orangeburg County School District

Case Number: 2024CP3800640

Type: Order/Other

IT IS SO ORDERED

Charles J. McCutchen