

FORM 4

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

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2025CP1900353

Camelia Socite
PLAINTIFF(S)

Mandarich Law Group, LLP et al 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), SCRCP; ☐ Rule 41(a), SCRCP (Vol. Nonsuit); ☐ Rule 43(k), SCRCP (Settled);
☐ Other
- ☐ **ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON):** ☐ Rule 40(j), SCRCP; ☐ 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:

Please see page 2 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 08/07/2026

ADP, Inc.

Camelia Socite for Camelia Socite

Mandarich Law Group, LLP et al for Mandarich Law Group, LLP et al

Mandarich Law Group, LLP et al for Mandarich Law Group, LLP et al

Camelia Socite for Camelia Socite

RECEIVED

SEP 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-Fileers or who are appearing pro se. See Rule 77(d), SCRCF.

This matter came before this Court on July 20, 2026 upon Plaintiff's Motion to determine the sufficiency of Defendant's Answer. Plaintiff's Motion to compel, and Defendant's Motion to Dismiss.

Plaintiff, Camelia Socite, represented herself and Defendant appeared represented by Chad Echols.

After hearing the arguments made by the Parties and a review of the filings in this matter, the Court's decision is as follows:

- 1) Plaintiff's Motion to compel is respectfully denied. Defendant has complied with Plaintiff's discovery requests and requests for production of documents. However, the request was not made pursuant to Rule 34. Additionally, Plaintiff's RTA exceeded the allowable 20 requests pursuant to Rule 36(c).
- 2) Plaintiff's Motion to determine the sufficiency of Defendant Mandarin Law Group's Answers to requests for admission is respectfully denied because of the lack of Personal Jurisdiction.
- 3) Defendant Mandarin Law Group's Motion to Dismiss is granted. Defendant did not act directly or indirectly to avail itself the benefits and protections granted by the laws of South Carolina. There is no continuing relationship or obligations (minimum contacts) which would subject Defendant to the jurisdiction of this Court.

Mr. Echols, please prepare a formal Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Edgefield Common Pleas

Case Caption: Camelia Socite VS Mandarich Law Group, LLP et al , defendant, et al
Case Number: 2025CP1900353
Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

Vernon F. Dunbar
