

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
)	
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)	
)	
RestoPros of the Midlands, LLC,)	Civil Action No. 2025-CP-40-00939
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER GRANTING SUMMARY
)	JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFF
Elaine Wilson,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

On January 14, 2026, the Court held a hearing on Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment. Plaintiff appeared at the hearing through counsel and presented argument in support of its Motion. Defendant Elaine Wilson appeared pro se and participated in the hearing.

The Court has reviewed and considered: the pleadings and filings of record, including Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment; the accompanying Affidavit of Jeffrey Sturgis, Owner of Plaintiff; and the arguments presented. Based upon this review, the Court finds there are no genuine issues of material fact requiring resolution by a factfinder.

The undisputed evidence establishes the existence of a valid and enforceable contract, Defendant’s breach, and resulting damages, and Defendant has failed—both procedurally and substantively—to present admissible evidence creating a genuine issue of material fact under Rule 56, SCRPC. See Rule 56(e), SCRPC; see also *Lord v. D & J Enterprises, Inc.*, 407 S.C. 544, 553, 757 S.E.2d 695, 699 (2014) (“The initial responsibility may be discharged by pointing out to the trial court that there is an absence of evidence to support the non-moving party’s case. . . . Once the moving party carries its initial burden, the opposing party must do more than rest upon the mere allegations or

denials of [the opposing party's] pleadings . . ."); *Kitchen Planners, LLC v. Friedman*, 440 S.C. 456, 460, 463-65, 892 S.E.2d 297, 300, 301 (2023) (rejecting “mere scintilla” standard for Rule 56(c), SCRCP, summary judgment motions and reiterating that “it is not sufficient for a party to create an inference that is not reasonable or issue of fact that is not genuine” (quotation omitted)).

Accordingly, the Court finds that Plaintiff has met its burden under Rule 56, SCRCP, and that Plaintiff is entitled to summary judgment as a matter of law.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Judgment is entered in favor of Plaintiff RestoPros of the Midlands, LLC, and against Defendant Elaine Wilson in the total liquidated amount of \$9,943.48, comprised of: (i) an unpaid invoice balance of \$6,691.38, and (ii) contractual interest, at the rate of two (2.0%) percent, in the amount of \$3,251.80.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

[JUDGE'S ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

The judgment information above has been provided by the submitting party. Disputes concerning the amounts contained in this form may be addressed by way of motion pursuant to the SC Rules of Civil Procedure. Amounts to be computed such as interest or additional taxable costs not available at the time the form and final order are submitted to the judge may be provided to the clerk. **Note: Title abstractors and researchers should refer to the official court order for judgment details.**

Circuit Court Judge

Judge Code

Date

For Clerk of Court Office Use Only

This judgment was entered on the ____ day of __, 20__ and a copy mailed first class or placed in the appropriate attorney's box on this ____ day of __, 20__ to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S)
Benjamin P. Carlton
Morgan L. McCrary

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)
CLERK OF COURT

Court Reporter:



Richland Common Pleas

Case Caption: Restopros Of The Midlands Llc vs Elaine Wilson

Case Number: 2025CP4000939

Type: Order/Summary Judgment

So Ordered

s/Christopher D. Taylor (#2795)