

FORM 4

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

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2026CP4204208

Renee S. Beach et al
PLAINTIFF(S)

Gregory M. Parker 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 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 10/13/2026 .

Vicky Ward-Dismissed
Mandy Matney

RECEIVED
Oct 14 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.

THIS MATTER came on for review before the Honorable R. Keith Kelly upon Non-Party Mandy Matney's Motion to Reconsider the Court's Contempt Order and Confidentiality Order entered on July 13, 2026. The Motion was filed on August 2, 2026, pursuant to Rule 59(e) of the SCRCP. In lieu of oral argument, the Court exercises its discretion under Rule 59(f), SCRCP, to resolve the Motion on the parties' written submissions. See also Pollard v. County of Florence, 314 S.C. 397, 401-02, 444 S.E.2d 534, 536 (Ct. App. 1994).

After careful consideration of the Motion, the written submissions, the record, and applicable law, the Court finds that no material fact or controlling principle of law was overlooked in its prior rulings and that no error of fact or law warrants altering, amending, or vacating either challenged order.

NOW, THEREFORE, and based upon the foregoing, it is ORDERED that Non-Party Mandy Matney's Motion to Reconsider filed on August 2, 2026, is hereby DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Spartanburg Common Pleas

Case Caption: Renee S. Beach , plaintiff, et al VS Gregory M. Parker , defendant, et al
Case Number: 2026CP4204208
Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

It is so Ordered.

s/ R. Keith Kelly - 2165
