

FORM 4

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

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2022CP1900308

Johnnette Latasha Jallim
PLAINTIFF(S)

Country Boy Grassing, Llc 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:

Following a jury verdict for the defendants, the plaintiff filed a post-trial motion seeking a new trial under the Thirteenth Juror Doctrine. The motion is respectfully denied. Please see Page 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 05/27/2026 .

Case Party Info Protected
Case Party Info Protected

RECEIVED
JUN 26 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.

The motion was argued in McCormick County on May 27, 2026, with John C. Bell, Jr. and Cheslyne Shea Brighthop present for the plaintiff. Mary E. Watkins and Sonja R. Tate appeared for the defendants. The Court Reporter was Tara Scott.

Briefs were filed, exhibits were cited from the trial, and a copy of the trial transcript was provided to the court. There is evidence in this record that this action arises from a motor vehicle collision where the plaintiff was a passenger in a Honda automobile that was traveling into blinding sunlight, that the driver (who was not sued in this case) continued to drive slightly above the speed limit and struck a flatbed truck that was pulled over on the side of the roadway, facing the same direction, with a portion of the left rear of the truck extending over or onto the paved section of the roadway. The court allowed evidence that the driver of the truck had consumed cocaine shortly before the wreck and that he had pleaded guilty to driving under the influence. The jury was permitted to view the evidence as to the violation of a statute prohibiting stopping on a highway and to consider that the intoxication of the truck driver led to his not pulling the vehicle entirely onto the shoulder. The truck was not moving at the time of the collision. While the court acknowledges that the jury could have determined fault on the part of the defendants, the issue of proximate cause is almost exclusively for the jury. The jury was charged concerning the sole negligence of a third party (the non-party driver), without objection. There was conflicting evidence from many of the witnesses which the jury had to resolve. There was testimony that the driver of the Honda knew that she could only see a few feet ahead for a period of about 30 seconds before impact due to the blinding light, yet she failed to reduce speed and drove without braking until slightly over a second before impact. There was evidence that the truck, with its brake lights on, could have been seen with a proper lookout. The jury was charged on various statutes and the common law rules of the road. While the result is harsh for the passenger who was seriously injured, the jury acted within its province in determining that the sole proximate cause of the collision and resulting injury was the driver of the Honda in proceeding into a blinding sun and disregarding her duty to maintain a proper lookout and to keep her vehicle under proper control so as to avoid colliding with an obstruction in the roadway, among other duties. There was clearly strong evidence that she was driving too fast for conditions. There was evidence that the truck driver was not acting within the course and scope of his employment at the relevant time. Due deference must be accorded to the difficult task of the jury in deciding this case, and the court declines to exercise its power to grant a new trial under the Thirteenth Juror Doctrine.



Edgefield Common Pleas

Case Caption: Johnnette Latasha Jallim VS Country Boy Grassing, Llc , defendant,
et al
Case Number: 2022CP1900308
Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

Circuit Judge (Code #2050)

s/ William P. Keesley