

FORM 4

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

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2024CP4004380

Charles Ives et al
PLAINTIFF(S)

Claude Campbell Properties 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), 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:

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration pursuant to Rule 59(e) SCRCP ("the Motion"), which was timely filed on 09/25/2026. The Motion asks this Court to alter, amend, or reconsider its ORDER, entered 09/25/2026. After reviewing the applicable law and considering arguments raised in the Motion, the court is unable to discover any material fact or principle of law that has either been overlooked or disregarded and further finds no error of law or fact not appropriately considered. Therefore, the Motion to Alter, Amend, or Reconsider is DENIED.

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 09/29/2026 .

RECEIVED
Oct 28 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.

Pursuant to the discretion afforded by Rule 59 and Pollard v. County of Florence, concludes that a hearing is not necessary to rule on Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration. See Rule 59(f), SCRCP (stating a Rule 59(e) motion "may in the discretion of the court be determined on the briefs filed by the parties without oral argument"). See also Pollard, 314 S.C. 397, 401–02, 444 S.E.2d 534, 536 (Ct. App. 1994) (holding there was "no merit in Pollard's assertion that the circuit court committed reversible error in denying her motion to alter or amend the judgment under Rule 59(e) SCRCP, without first conducting a hearing or allowing [the parties] 'to fully brief' the issues raised in [the] motion").



Richland Common Pleas

Case Caption: Charles Ives vs Claude Campbell Properties Llc , defendant, et al
Case Number: 2024CP4004380
Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

s/ Daniel Coble, 2774
