

Kathryn Corbett Hallman et al
PLAINTIFF(S)

7 Eleven Inc 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:

See Page 2 for Order of Court.

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 02/15/2025 .

RECEIVED

Oct 24 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.

This matter came before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Discovery from Defendant 7-Eleven, Inc. and was heard on February 14, 2025. Counsel advised that only 3 interrogatory responses were in issue: 5,10 and 17.

- 1) As to Interrogatory #5, the Court finds the referenced response was prepared by General Counsel for this Defendant and thus any additional information would be protected by the work product doctrine as set forth in the Defendant's supplemental answer.
- 2) As to Interrogatory #10 regarding names of individuals involved with providing the discovery responses, the Court finds that this information is also protected work product doctrine and attorney-client privilege and that this defendant's supplement response is sufficient.
- 3) As to Interrogatory #17, the Court finds that the Interrogatory as propounded is too broad and should be limited to the training of the individuals involved in the transactions and/or a more reasonable time period relating to the transactions in question. Further, this Defendant represented that it was continuing to search for additional information regarding trainers and would provide a supplemental response to this interrogatory when additional information becomes available. Otherwise, the Court finds that this Defendant's response and supplemental response is sufficient.

Therefore, the Court denies Plaintiff's Motion to Compel except as otherwise stated above.

It is so Ordered.



Greenville Common Pleas

Case Caption: Kathryn Corbett Hallman , plaintiff, et al vs. 7 Eleven Inc , defendant,
et al
Case Number: 2024CP2304370
Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

s/ Honorable Perry H. Gravely, #2755