

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF FLORENCE )

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
CASE NO.: 2025-CP-21-01885

Reverend Gloria Darrell, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
 )  
-vs- )  
 )  
Daisy H. Walden, )  
 )  
Defendant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**ORDER DENYING  
MOTION TO RECONSIDER**

**RECEIVED**

**Dec 08 2025**

**SC Court of Appeals**

Defendant’s Motion to Reconsider came for hearing before me on November 13, 2025, attended by movant’s counsel, Charles B. Holbrooks, III, and Plaintiff’s counsel, Leonard R. Jordan, Jr.

Defendant, Daisy H. Walden, on November 4, 2025, filed a Motion to Reconsider, pursuant to Rules 59(e) and 60(b), requesting the Court to alter, amend, and reconsider the Master’s Order and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale, dated October 27, 2025, which directed the foreclosure sale of Defendant’s real property to pay the judgment debt owed by Defendant to Plaintiff, Reverend Gloria Darrell, as represented by the Confession of Judgment, which is the subject of this litigation.

Defendant’s Motion was accompanied by a formal discussion of the requirements of S.C. Code §15-35-360, and included the citation and thorough discussion of numerous cases interpreting the predecessor to said statute. Plaintiff responded with a Return to Motion to Reconsider, filed herein on November 11, 2025, which provided a discussion of the cases cited by Defendant along with a thorough discussion of the applicability of Rule 60(b) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure. I read and considered both before the motion hearing.

Defendant also submitted Defendant’s Response to Plaintiff’s Return to Motion to Reconsider, which was filed the evening before the hearing. While this Response was not read by

me before the hearing, the counsel for the litigants were encouraged to cover thoroughly all of their points in oral arguments.

Before both counsel made their arguments, I informed them that I had reviewed the Clerk of Court's file on the 2015 suit (2015-CP-21-03174), which suit resulted in the filing of the subject Confession of Judgment, and that I had found an Order in that case, which neither side had raised. That was an Order issued by Judge Thomas A. Russo on April 13, 2016. Said Order was issued expressly "to avoid future uncertainty with regard to the validity and enforceability of the Confession of Judgment," and it "ORDERED that . . . the Confession of Judgment shall remain fully enforceable until paid in full." I indicated that I found this Order to be compelling with regard to the issues previously presented.

After that discussion, Mr. Holbrooks presented his arguments, which primarily focused on the cases cited in his memoranda, and Mr. Jordan presented his arguments, which primarily focused on Rule 60(b) and the tardiness of Defendant's attempt to be relieved of her Confession of Judgment. Mr. Holbrooks also argued that Defendant "was not afforded due process."

After a thorough, back-and-forth discussion, I announced my decision that Defendant's Motion was DENIED. I fully believe that Plaintiff is entitled to have the opportunity to collect her debt before the Confession of Judgment expires, that Defendant, who has had many years to attack the Confession of Judgment but has made no apparent effort to do so prior to this suit being filed, and that the Guardian ad Litem for the Defendant, who attended a prior hearing, produced no evidence adverse to the Confession of Judgment.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



Florence Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** Gloria Darrell VS Daisy H Walden

**Case Number:** 2025CP2101885

**Type:** Master/Order/Other

So Ordered

s/Haigh Porter, 3082