EXHIBIT A

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2026 Jan 30 11:02 AM - CHARLESTON - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2025CP1003716

FORM 4

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

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2025CP1003716

Colonial Savings Fa
PLAINTIFF(S)

Elizabeth M Dimler 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:

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 01/30/2026 .

Elizabeth M Dimler for Elizabeth M Dimler
Elizabeth M Dimler for Elizabeth M Dimler

RECEIVED
May 18 2026
SC Court of Appeals

NAMES OF TRADITIONAL FILERS SERVED BY MAIL

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2026 Jan 30 11:02 AM - CHARLESTON - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2025CP1003716

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 was before the Court on January 7, 2026, on eleven motions—ten motions filed by Defendant and one by the Plaintiff seeking sanctions against Defendant for excessive and duplicative filings. Plaintiff was represented by counsel and Defendant appeared pro se.

Defendant's ten motions are as follows: (1) Defendant Dimler's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Standing, (2) Defendant's Motion for Master Counterclaim Pleading & Certificate of Service (3) Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Counsel Appearance F/Failure, (4) Defendant's Motion for Federal Jurisdiction, Notice/Equity Jurisdiction, (5) Defendant's Motion to Compel Production and Inspection, (6) Defendant's Motion to Strike Alleged Promissory Note, (7) Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Standing/ Rec of Trust Settlement, (8) Defendant's Motion to Compel Discovery & Emergency Notice+/Unauthorized, (9) Defendant's Motion to Compel Discovery, and (10) Defendant's Motion for Sanctions, Emergency Notice & Certificate of Service.
Finally, the eleventh motion before the Court is Plaintiff Colonial Life Savings's Motion for Sanctions.

Upon the arguments and memoranda of the parties the Court rules as follows and, within 20 days requests Plaintiff prepare a proposed order consistent with the instructions contained herein:

(1) Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Standing is respectfully DENIED. The factual assertions made by Defendant are unsupported and immaterial to the issue of standing. The Court directs Plaintiffs to submit a proposed order in (MS. Word format) within 15 days denying Defendant's motion for lack of standing.

(2) Defendant's Motion for Master Counterclaim Pleading & Certificate of Service does not request any relief that is different than her other motions. Therefore, this motion is respectfully DENIED.

(3) Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Counsel Appearance for failure to Register as a Foreign agent is unsupported by evidence and baseless. Therefore, this motion is DENIED.

(4) Defendant's Motion for Federal Jurisdiction, Notice/Equity Jurisdiction, does not set forth any basis for such jurisdiction or to defeat the jurisdiction of this Court. Therefore, this motion is DENIED.

(5) Defendant withdrew the Motion to Compel Production and Inspection on the record. Therefore, this motion is resolved with prejudice and need not be addressed.

(6) Defendant's Motion to Strike Alleged Promissory Note is duplicative of her other motions attacking standing which are without support. Therefore, this duplicative motion is DENIED.

(7) Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Standing/ Rec of Trust Settlement is duplicative of her other motions attacking standing which are without support. Therefore, this duplicative motion is DENIED.

(8) Defendant's Motion to Compel Discovery & Emergency Notice/Unauthorized is duplicative of the other motion to compel which was withdrawn by Defendant at the hearing. Furthermore, Defendant acknowledged at the hearing that Plaintiff has responded to the discovery requests. Because this motion is baseless and duplicative it is therefore DENIED.

(9) Defendant's Motion to Compel Discovery is duplicative of the other motion to compel which was withdrawn by Defendant at the hearing. Furthermore, Defendant acknowledged at the hearing that Plaintiff has responded to the discovery requests. Because this motion is baseless and duplicative it is therefore DENIED.

(10) Defendant's Motion for Sanctions, Emergency Notice & Certificate of Service Discovery is duplicative of the other motion to compel which was withdrawn by Defendant at the hearing. Furthermore, Defendant acknowledged at the hearing that Plaintiff has responded to the discovery requests. Because this motion is baseless and duplicative it is therefore DENIED.

(11) Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions.
Plaintiff filed their Motion for Sanctions in response to Defendant's excessive motions filed with the court. It is clear from the record of this case that Defendant has filed repetitive and frivolous motions. Pursuant to Rule 11, SCRCP, this court has the discretion and authority to issue sanctions to deter such litigation abuse and to minimize the substantial and unnecessary strain on the Court's docket and resources. See Bauknight as Tr. Of James Brown 2000 Irrevocable Trust v. Pope., 445 S.C 498 (2025). Therefore, Defendant is HEREBY ENJOINED and PROHBITED from filing any further motions in this matter, unless prior to each filing the Defendant either posts a bond of $500.00 with the Clerk Court, or the filing has been reviewed and signed by an attorney licensed to practice in South Carolina.

Within 20 days, Counsel for plaintiff shall prepare a proposed order in MS.Word format making proposed findings in support of its standing. The proposed order should also address the sanctions imposed against Defendant as described above. This Form 4 Order shall resolve all other motions and no further order will be issued except on the issues of standing and sanctions.

END OF ORDER.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2026 Jan 30 11:02 AM - CHARLESTON - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2025CP1003716

Charleston Common Pleas

Case Caption: Colonial Savings Fa VS Elizabeth M Dimler , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2025CP1003716

Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

s/ T.J. Rode (#2792)