

RECEIVED

Oct 27 2025

SC Court of Appeals

EXHIBIT 2

OCTOBER 23, 2025

**ORDER ON APPELLANT'S MOTION TO
RECONSIDER**

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)
)
Corel Lenhardt,)
)
Appellant,)
)
v.)
)
Charleston County School District,)
)
Respondent.)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Case No.: 2025CP100921

**ORDER ON APPELLANT’S
MOTION TO RECONSIDER**

Presiding Judge: Hon. Deadra L. Jefferson
Appellant’s Attorney: Emmanuel Ferguson, Esq.
Respondent’s Attorney: Rene S. Dukes, Esq.
Date of Hearing: N/A
Court Reporter: N/A

This matter comes before the Court on Appellant’s Motion to Reconsider, Alter, or Amend filed on July 22, 2025. The Court received Appellant’s Motion to Reconsider on July 22, 2025. The Appellant did not file a Memorandum in Support, but the Motion is in the nature of a Memorandum. Respondent filed a Responsive memorandum on July 30, 2025. The Appellant is represented by Emmanuel Ferguson, Esq. The Respondent is represented by Rene S. Dukes, Esq. This matter previously came before the Court on April 10, 2025, for a hearing on Appellant’s Appeal filed on February 2, 2025. The Court issued its Order on July 15, 2025, denying Appellant’s appeal. After consideration of the record, as well as the various interests balanced by the Court at the time of the ruling, the Plaintiff’s Motion to Reconsider is heard and Denied.¹

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

“The purpose of Rule 59(e), SCRPC, to alter or amend the judgment is to request the trial judge to ‘reconsider matters properly encompassed in a decision on the merits.’” *Arnold v. State*,

¹ This Motion is disposed of without the necessity of a hearing and decided on the record and briefs. Rule 59(f), SCRPC; *Pollard v. City of Florence*, 314 S.C. 397, 401–402, 444 S.E.2d 534, 536 (Ct. App. 1994).

309 S.C. 157, 172, 420 S.E.2d 834, 842 (1992). “A party may wish to file such a motion when she believes the court has misunderstood, failed to fully consider, or perhaps failed to rule on an argument or issue, and the party wishes for the court to reconsider or rule on it. A party *must* file such a motion when an issue or argument has been raised, but not ruled on, in order to preserve it for appellate review.” *Elam v. South Carolina Dept. of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 24, 602 S.E.2d 772, 780 (2004) (emphasis in original). “A party cannot use a motion to reconsider to present an issue he could have raised prior to judgment but did not.” *Anderson Memorial Hosp., Inc. v. Hagen*, 313 S.C. 497, 498, 443 S.E. 2d 399, 400 (Ct. App. 1994) (citing *C.A.H. v. L.H.*, 315 S.C. 389, 434 S.E. 2d 268 (1993)); *See also Arnold* 309 S.C. 157 at 172–73, 420 S.E.2d 834 at 842.

Appellant asks this Court to reconsider, alter, or amend the Court’s Order entered July 15, 2025, which affirmed the Charleston County School District Board of Trustees’ decision to terminate Appellant’s employment as an assistant principal. However, after fully considering the Appellant’s Motion, the Court finds that the Appellant presents no novel facts, arguments, or theories in support of its position. The Appellant has not highlighted any portions of the record this Court may have misunderstood, failed to fully consider, or perhaps failed to rule on. Accordingly, the Motion to Reconsider is heard and respectfully Denied.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

Hon. Deadra L. Jefferson
Presiding Judge
Ninth Judicial Circuit

Charleston, South Carolina
October 23, 2025



Charleston Common Pleas

Case Caption: Corel Lenhardt VS School District Charleston County

Case Number: 2025CP1000921

Type: Order/Other

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/D.L. Jefferson Ninth Judicial Circuit Judge 2128