

Ann Peets
PLAINTIFF(S)

South Carolina State Ethics Commission et al
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:

The plaintiff filed a motion to alter or amend and to reconsider the order issued on May 29, 2025. The motion is respectfully denied. Please 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 09/10/2025 .

RECEIVED

Oct 07 2025

SC Court of Appeals

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.

The motion is decided upon written submissions, and the court has had the benefit of extremely detailed briefs by talented advocates. While it has generally been the practice of this court to issue more specific orders on Rule 59 motions, careful consideration has been given to the extensive arguments raised. It has been determined that the original order is sufficient in that it contains no error of law or failure to rule upon any issue necessary to decide the dispute. Nor does this court find any inappropriate statements of fact or improper factual rulings. This case deals with the tension that exists in statutory interpretation related to matters that are of extreme importance to citizens. These statutes are at the core of protecting confidence in governmental activities. The court refers to the Response filed by the defendants. The issues presented in this case are at times technical and others may come to different conclusions than this court. Nonetheless, even in the context of the drastic nature of summary judgment, this court finds that the decision to determine that the defendants did not violate FOIA in the unique circumstances presented here and that the plaintiff should be required to exhaust administrative remedies is justified. Having fully reconsidered the prior ruling and the issues raised in the pending motion, with the utmost respect to those who disagree with the analysis and conclusions reached by this court, the motion to alter or amend is denied.



Lexington Common Pleas

Case Caption: Ann Peets VS South Carolina State Ethics Commission , defendant,
et al
Case Number: 2025CP3200440
Type: Order/Amend

Circuit Judge (Code #2050)

s/ William P. Keesley