

FORM 4

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

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2025CP1003716

Colonial Savings Fa et al
PLAINTIFF(S)

Elizabeth M Dimler 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:

See below

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 05/06/2026 .

Elizabeth M Dimler for Elizabeth M Dimler
Elizabeth M Dimler for Elizabeth M Dimler

RECEIVED
Jun 02 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), SCRCP.

On January 30, 2026, the below-signed issued an order which among other things found Defendant Dimler has filed repeated frivolous motions and as sanctions ordered that no further filings would be accepted from Defendant Dimler without a bond or signature of licensed attorney. Subsequently, on March 27, 2026, the Hon. Judge Vanslambrook issued an order granting Plaintiff's Motion to Substitute a Party. It appears that the Defendant attempted to file a motion pursuant to Rule 59(e), regarding Judge Vanslambrook's order, but that pursuant to the January 30, Order the Clerk of Court properly declined to accept any filings without the bond required by that Order. The below-signed is in receipt of correspondence sent by Defendant Dimler in this matter. This correspondence was accompanied by many pages of exhibits, and by the face of the correspondence these exhibits purport to include the following: (1) Defendant's Motion pursuant to Rule 59(e), SCRCP, concerning an order issued by the Hon. Judge Vanslambrook on March 27, 2026; (2) Emergency Motion to Clarify Bond Order which bears a file stamp date of filed April 3, 2026; (3) Protective Notice of Appeal Filed April 9, 2026, and (4) Petition for Writ of Mandamus Filed with the Supreme Court of South Carolina seeking to order the Clerk to Accept Defendant's Rule 59 motion.

To the extent Defendant's correspondence seeking to clarify the bond order concerns the Order entered on January 30, 2026, by the below-signed, the Court has delivered to the Clerk of Court the correspondence with all enclosed exhibits/materials, received from Defendant; and the Court hereby directs the Clerk of Court to file the same in the record of this case as a Rule 59 motion—without assessing any filing fee—and with said filing to be deemed effective as of the post-mark date of April 11, 2026. Except as explained herein, the January 30, 2026, Order remains in full force and effect. This Order makes no finding that the aforementioned Rule 59 motion is timely, proper, or otherwise has any merit, which shall be left to be determined by the appropriate circuit court judge who issued the order to which the motion is directed.

END OF ORDER



Charleston Common Pleas

Case Caption: Colonial Savings Fa VS Elizabeth M Dimler , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2025CP1003716

Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

s/ T.J. Rode (#2792)