

Michael J Osten et al  
PLAINTIFF(S)

Sandra Malikowski  
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:

This matter is before the Court on Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration pursuant to Rule 59(e) SCRPC ("the Motion"), which was timely filed on September 29, 2025. The Motion asks this Court to alter, amend, or reconsider its Order denying Defendant's motion to vacate or set aside default, entered September 19, 2025. After reviewing the applicable law and considering arguments raised in the Motion, the court is unable to discover any material fact or principle of law that has either been overlooked or disregarded and further finds no error of law or fact not appropriately considered. Therefore, the Motion to Alter, Amend, or Reconsider is DENIED. 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 10/03/2025 .

<p><b>RECEIVED</b> <b>Oct 31 2025</b> SC Court of Appeals</p>
<p><b>NAMES OF TRADITIONAL FILERS SERVED BY MAIL</b></p>

**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.

---

Pursuant to the discretion afforded by Rule 59 and Pollard v. County of Florence, concludes that a hearing is not necessary to rule on Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration. See Rule 59(f), SCRCP; see also Pollard, 314 S.C. 397, 401–02, 444 S.E.2d 534, 536 (Ct. App. 1994).



Union Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** Michael J Osten , plaintiff, et al VS Sandra Malikowski

**Case Number:** 2024CP4400097

**Type:** Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

s/ Daniel Coble, 2774