

RECEIVED

Jun 22 2026

SC Court of Appeals



Horry Common Pleas

Case Caption: Valarie Harrison , plaintiff, et al VS Holiday Inn Club Vacations ,
defendant, et al
Case Number: 2024CP2608610
Type: Order/Restore Case To Active Docket

15th Circuit Resident Judge

s/ B. Alex Hyman

Electronically signed on 2026-04-08 11:32:31 page 6 of 6

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF HORRY

VALARIE HARRISON AND
VINCENT GLORIOSO,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HOLIDAY INN CLUB VACATIONS,
NORDIS DIRECT, INC., TRANSACTIS,
INC., WILSON RESORT FINANCE, LLC,
ALLISON FARINOLA, BROOKS COLLINS,
HOWARD TEWS, SEAN MONTICELLO,
AND BLUEGREEN VACATIONS,

Defendants.

) IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

) Docket No.: 2024-CP-26-08610

RECEIVED

Jun 22 2026

SC Court of Appeals

) **ORDER**

This matter came before this Court on March 23, 2026, for a hearing on the following motions: (1) Plaintiff Valarie Harrison's Motion to Reopen Case and Notice of Failed Arbitration; (2) Defendants' Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Case and Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Prosecute; and (3) Defendants' Combined Motion for Sanctions and for Court Protection.

Plaintiff Harrison, with the Court's consent, did not appear for the hearing but requested the Court to consider her submittals as her oral argument on the motions. This Court has reviewed all briefs, memoranda, motions, exhibits, and correspondence submitted by both Plaintiff Harrison, proceeding pro se, and Defendants, through their counsel of record, William E. Lawson and Meagan E. Burns of Turner Padget Graham & Laney, P.A. The Court has further considered the oral arguments presented by Defense counsel Burns and Lawson, the submissions and emails of Plaintiff Harrison, and the entire record of this proceeding, including the JAMS arbitration correspondence and related exhibits filed herein.

Having considered the foregoing, and being fully advised in the premises, the Court hereby finds and orders as follows:

I. BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 20, 2024, Plaintiff Valarie Harrison filed a civil action in the Horry County Court of Common Pleas asserting claims of fraud, forgery, misrepresentation, and the creation of an unauthorized loan against Defendants in connection with a timeshare purchase and related financing agreements. Co-Plaintiff Vincent Glorioso was also named as a plaintiff in the action.

On January 17, 2025, Defendants filed a Motion to Compel Arbitration and Stay the Case pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*, based on the arbitration clause contained in the governing Purchase Agreements between the parties.

On June 20, 2025, this Court granted Defendants' Motion to Compel Arbitration and Stay the Case. The Court's Order expressly recognized the validity and enforceability of the arbitration provision and directed the parties to proceed with arbitration of all claims asserted by Plaintiffs against Defendants.

Plaintiff subsequently filed a Demand for Arbitration with JAMS, which was assigned Case No. 5410001292. JAMS determined that the JAMS Consumer Minimum Standards did not apply because the dispute involved real property and assessed the standard filing fee. JAMS' fee determination was reviewed at three administrative levels, each of which confirmed the real estate classification. JAMS further advised Plaintiff that she could raise the classification issue with the arbitrator upon appointment.

Rather than pay the assessed fee or avail herself of the remedy offered by JAMS, Plaintiff refused to remit the required \$1,750 balance, lodged accusations of misconduct, fraud, bribery, and collusion against JAMS employees, and filed \$4,400,000 damages demand against individual JAMS administrators. On September 19, 2025, JAMS issued a 30-day notice advising that the file would be administratively closed if payment was not received. On October 21, 2025, JAMS formally closed the file due to non-payment.

On November 19, 2025, Plaintiff filed the instant Motion to Reopen Case and Notice of Failed Arbitration.

II. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO REOPEN CASE IS DENIED

The Court finds that the arbitration proceeding administered by JAMS did not fail due to any misconduct by JAMS or Defendants. Rather, the JAMS arbitration was administratively closed

as the direct and foreseeable consequence of Plaintiff's deliberate refusal to pay the required filing fee balance, despite receiving ample notice and multiple opportunities to do so.

The Court further finds that Plaintiff's allegations of collusion, bribery, fraud, and bias against JAMS and Defendants are entirely conclusory, unsupported by any competent evidence, and legally insufficient to invalidate the arbitration agreement or excuse Plaintiff's non-compliance with JAMS' procedures.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Case and Notice of Failed Arbitration is **DENIED** in its entirety.

III. DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE IS GRANTED

Having considered Defendants' Motion to Dismiss under Rule 41(b), SCRCP, and having applied the four-factor test set forth in McComas v. Ross, 368 S.C. 59, 626 S.E.2d 902, 904 (Ct. App. 2006), the Court finds that dismissal with prejudice is warranted. Plaintiff bears full personal responsibility for the failure to advance her claims: she was ordered to arbitrate, initiated the JAMS proceeding, then willfully refused to pay the assessed filing fee and rejected JAMS' express offer to have the classification reviewed by the arbitrator upon appointment. Defendants have been substantially prejudiced, the record reveals a pattern of deliberately obstructive conduct, including inflammatory accusations against JAMS employees and a \$4,400,000 damages demand against individual JAMS administrators, and no lesser sanction would be effective, as reopening the case would reward Plaintiff's strategic non-compliance and nullify this Court's prior Order.

With respect to Co-Plaintiff Vincent Glorioso, Mr. Glorioso has not participated in this lawsuit in any capacity, has not signed or submitted any pleading in his own name, and the limited power of attorney held by Ms. Harrison expired by its own terms on December 4, 2025. His complete absence independently warrants dismissal.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that all claims asserted by Plaintiff Valarie Harrison and Co-Plaintiff Vincent Glorioso against Defendants are hereby **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** pursuant to Rule 41(b), SCRCP, for failure to prosecute and for failure to comply with this Court's June 20, 2025 Order compelling arbitration. This dismissal operates as an adjudication on the merits.

IV. DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS IS GRANTED

This Court has considered Defendants' Combined Motion for Sanctions and for Court Protection arising from the unsolicited telephone call placed by Plaintiff Harrison to Defense counsel Meagan Burns on March 10, 2026, at approximately 4:24 p.m.

This Court has reviewed the Affidavit of Attorney Adrian P. Carter, who was present in Ms. Burns' office during the entirety of the call, and the submissions of both parties regarding the substance and tenor of the call.

This Court finds that during the call, Plaintiff verbally wished bodily harm and injury upon both Ms. Burns and co-counsel Ed Lawson, maintained a hostile, rude, and demeaning tone, and repeatedly refused to allow Ms. Burns to respond. The Court further finds that Ms. Burns did not use threatening or abusive language during the call.

The fact that Plaintiff is proceeding pro se does not insulate her from the obligation to conduct herself in a manner consistent with the standards expected of all litigants before this Court.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Sanctions is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff Valarie Harrison is hereby sanctioned for her hostile and harassing conduct directed at Defense counsel during the telephone call of March 10, 2026.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Harrison is hereby **PROHIBITED** from contacting Defense counsel by telephone, in person, or by any means other than electronic written communication for all remaining matters related to this case, including any post-judgment proceedings.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Harrison is hereby **PROHIBITED** from approaching, harassing, or intimidating Ms. Burns, Mr. Lawson, or any other member of Defendants' legal team, whether at the courthouse, at counsel's offices, or at any other location.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Harrison is hereby **ADVISED AND ORDERED** that any further hostile, harassing, or intimidating conduct directed at Defense counsel or any other party or participant in this litigation may result in such further sanctions or consequences as this Court deems appropriate, which may include but are not limited to contempt of court or referral to appropriate law enforcement authorities.

V. PROTECTIVE ORDER HELD IN ABEYANCE

With respect to the entry of a formal protective order under applicable South Carolina law, the Court advises Defense counsel to review the relevant state statute governing protective orders and to inform this Court whether Defendants wish to proceed with the filing of a formal protective order. Defense counsel shall notify the Court within a reasonable time of their intention to proceed, if any, and the Court will take such further action as may be appropriate at that time.

VI. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein and on the record at the hearing conducted on this date:

1. Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Case and Notice of Failed Arbitration is **DENIED**.
2. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Prosecute is **GRANTED**, and all claims asserted by Plaintiffs Valarie Harrison and Vincent Glorioso are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.
3. Defendants' Motion for Sanctions is **GRANTED**, and the communication restrictions set forth in Section IV of this Order are effective immediately.
4. Defense counsel is directed to review the applicable South Carolina statute regarding protective orders and to advise the Court if Defendants wish to proceed with the filing of a formal protective order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

_____, 2026
Conway, South Carolina

The Honorable B. Alex Hyman