

2

RECEIVED

JAMES EARL LOVORN, III

Feb 13 2026

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE  
ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

SC Court of Appeals

PLAINTIFF(S)

DEFENDANT(S)

Submitted by: COURT	Attorney for : <input type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> Defendant
	or <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Represented Litigant

**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.  See Page 2 for additional information.
- 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 Appeal Dismissed

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 attached)  Statement of Judgment by the Court:

This matter came before the Court on January 8, 2026 as Plaintiff's motion to reconsider the Court's order filed December 30, 2025. Having fully reconsidered the matter, the Court declines to alter or amend the prior order.

The Court acknowledges that use of the term "Hardship Waiver" was a scrivener's error meant to be "Season of Competition Waiver." However, such an error, even if made substantively, does not change the Court's analysis or conclusion. The "30% Rule" applies to both the Hardship and Season of Competition Waivers. The Court reviewed applicable NCAA bylaws for both waivers and found neither would aid the Plaintiff in his claim.

Further, the Court's decision not to address Plaintiff's arbitrary misrepresentation argument was purposeful because the Court finds it simply is not meritorious. As the Defendant points out in their response dated January 20, 2026, such review process outlined in bylaw 12.8.6 would be moot since Plaintiff never appealed the NCAA's decision.

Lastly, the case law is clear that the Court did not err in its consideration of the Doctrine of Laches when determining the Plaintiff's merits of success. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion to reconsider is denied.

And it is so ORDERED.





Newberry Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** James Earl Lovorn III VS National Collegiate Athletic Association

**Case Number:** 2025CP3600757

**Type:** Order/Form 4

So Ordered

S/ Frank R. Addy, Jr.

Electronically signed on 2026-01-20 14:49:10 page 3 of 3