

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

FORM 4

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

Exhibit A

CASE NO. 2024CP4003730

Shirley Castillo et al
PLAINTIFF(S)

Lake Carolina Masters Association Inc
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 Page 2 for Order of Court.

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 08/05/2026 .

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.

Plaintiffs filed a Motion to Reconsider the Court's Order issued on May 6, 2026 granting Summary Judgment for Richland County. The Motion was heard via WebEx on July 13, 2026.

Initially, Defendant argued that the Court did not have jurisdiction because Plaintiffs failed to serve the Motion to Reconsider within the 20 days as required by Rule 59(e), SCRCP. Plaintiffs' Counsel presented an email showing that the Motion had been emailed to the Court with a copy to all Defendants' counsel on May 26, 2026. For some reason, the efilng system failed to include Defendant's counsel on the distribution of the filed Motion, but it had already been emailed which the Court finds satisfies the rule for service. Therefore, the Court finds that Defendant's counsel was timely served with the Motion.

In a Motion for Summary Judgment, the Court must determine if "any triable issues of fact exist [and] the evidence and all reasonable inferences must be viewed in the light most favorable to the non-moving party." *Simmons v. Berkeley Elec. Coop., Inc.* 419 S. C. 228 (2016). Upon further consideration of the record and arguments of counsel, the Court finds that there are genuine issues of material fact as to this Defendant and thus, summary judgment is not appropriate. Therefore, the Court rescinds its Order of May 6, 2026 and denies this Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment. It is so Ordered.



Richland Common Pleas

Case Caption: Shirley Castillo , plaintiff, et al vs Canterbury Park At Lake Carolina Association Inc , defendant, et al
Case Number: 2024CP4003730
Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

s/ Honorable Perry H. Gravely, #2755