

EXHIBIT A

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
 COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG)
)
 Donald C. Roth,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 vs.)
)
 The River Bend Sportsman’s Resort, Inc.,)
 Riverbend Properties, Inc., Ralph N.)
 Brendle, Paul J. Barnwell, Robert T. Estes,)
 and Paul Lehner,)
)
 Defendants.)
 _____)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
 C.A. No.: 2024-CP-42-01687

ORDER FOR JUDGMENT

RECEIVED
Sep 23 2025
SC Court of Appeals

This matter came before me on Plaintiff Donald C. Roth’s Motion for Entry of Judgment. The motion was heard on August 5, 2025. Fred W. Suggs III appeared on behalf of the Plaintiff, while the Defendants were represented by Kenneth C. Anthony, Jr. The Plaintiff’s Motion for Entry of Judgment was before me based upon the Court’s order of April 16, 2025 striking the Answer of the Defendants. The Defendants’ subsequent Motion to Reconsider was denied by order of the Court dated May 27, 2025. As the Defendants’ Answer had been stricken, the allegations of the Plaintiff’s Complaint were deemed admitted and entry of judgment must be awarded. Bank of Fort Mill v. Rollins, 217 S.C. 464, 482, 61 S.E.2d 41, 49 (1950) *citing* Powell v. Easley, 213 S.C. 574, 50 S.E.2d 21 (1948).

Based upon the record, the Complaint, the evidence presented at the hearing, and the testimony of Donald C. Roth, I find by a preponderance of the evidence and conclude as follows:

1. That this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and of the Defendants.

2. That the Answer of the Defendants was stricken by Order of this Court on April 16, 2025.
3. That the Plaintiff filed a Motion for Entry of Judgment on June 25, 2025.
4. That the allegations of the Plaintiff's Complaint, including causes of action against all of the Defendants for quantum meruit, conversion, conspiracy, and violation of the South Carolina Unfair Trade Practices Act, as well as breach of fiduciary duty as to Defendant Brendle, are deemed admitted.
5. That according to the testimony and evidence provided by the Plaintiff, he is entitled to recover, jointly and severally, the following damages against all of the Defendants, to wit:
 - a. Actual damages of \$1,127,225 pursuant to all of the causes of action; and
 - b. Treble damages plus attorney's fees of \$30,706.00 consistent with the fee affidavit submitted by Fred W. Suggs III pursuant to the South Carolina Unfair Trade Practices Act.

On the basis of the foregoing, it is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the Plaintiff have judgment against the Defendants as follows:

- (1) For the sum of Three Million Four Hundred Twelve Thousand Three Hundred Eighty-One and 0/100 (\$3,412,381.00) Dollars.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Honorable Jocelyn Newman

Spartanburg, South Carolina



Spartanburg Common Pleas

Case Caption: Donald C. Roth VS The River Bend Sportsman'S Resort, Inc. ,
defendant, et al
Case Number: 2024CP4201687
Type: Order/Other

So Ordered

Jocelyn Newman

Electronically signed on 2025-08-23 09:50:51 page 4 of 4

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
) N THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG)

Donald C. Roth,)
)
Plaintiff,)
v.) MOTION TO RECONSIDER
) Case No. 2024CP4201687
The River Bend Sportsman’s Resort, Inc.,)
Riverbend Properties, Inc., Ralph N.)
Brendle; Paul J. Barnwell; Robert T.)
Estes; and Paul Lehner,)
)
Defendants.)

Defendants hereby file this Motion to Reconsider the oral ruling of the Judge at hearing on August 5, 2025, and any Form 4 or other orders which were issued pursuant or subsequent to the Court’s ruling, on the following grounds:

1. The Court failed to consider sufficient evidence that make appropriate calculations in order to determine any possible damages alleged by the Plaintiff.
2. The Court failed to take into consideration and demand sufficient evidence to support the finding of unfair trade practices, punitive damages, and attorney’s fees.
3. There was no appropriate accounting or assessment of any damages alleged by the Plaintiff.
4. The Court failed to take into consideration any debts, liabilities and costs as the property in question.
5. The Court failed to consider that there was no consideration paid by the Plaintiff or on his behalf for his alleged interest in the property or its owner.

6. The Court failed to take into consideration any basis for prior rulings in this case.

THE ANTHONY LAW FIRM, P.A.

BY: Kenneth C. Anthony, Jr.

Attorney for Defendants

250 Magnolia St.

Spartanburg, SC 29306

864-582-2355

kanthony@anthonylaw.com

August 13, 2025