

FORM 4

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF Georgetown
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2022CP2200650

Frank Henderson et al
PLAINTIFF(S)

Tyrhonda Priest 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:

Defendants' Motion seeking to find the plaintiffs in contempt and impose sanctions, including striking pleadings and assessing attorney's fees, was heard via the Webex Virtual Courtroom by consent on May 22, 2025. Despite the efforts of Ms. Murray-Boyles to obtain information and comply with previous orders and agreements, her clients have demonstrated an egregious failure to participate in meaningful discovery. Their repeated non-compliance clearly constitutes willful disobedience and gross indifference to the rights of the adverse parties. Recognizing that this is a drastic result and one which this court cannot recall having imposed in decades, the motion is granted, however no ruling is made on the award of attorney's fees. An affidavit of attorney's fees was just filed on the day before the hearing and there should be an opportunity for the plaintiffs to challenge any award in a subsequent hearing. Mr. Mihalic is to submit a proposed order within 20 days. See pg. 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 05/22/2025 .

RECEIVED
Feb 05 2026
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), SCRCF.

Yvonne Murray-Boyles appeared for the plaintiffs. Justin Mihalic appeared for the defendants. This case is set for a day-certain trial in December and has been pending since August of 2022. In a climate where discovery abuses are relatively common, this court has not seen the extent of non-compliance that has forced defense counsel to repeatedly seek the assistance of the court. Defense counsel appears to have been gracious in granting extensions throughout the pendency of this action. The court finds no fault with plaintiffs' counsel based on the presentation made at the hearing.



Georgetown Common Pleas

Case Caption: Frank Henderson , plaintiff, et al VS Infinity Home Care , defendant,
et al
Case Number: 2022CP2200650
Type: Order/Sanctions

Circuit Judge (Code #2050)

s/ William P. Keesley