

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

FORM 4

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2014-CP-26-0008

Mon
 #14

Bigford Enterprises, Inc., et al.
 PLAINTIFF(S)

D C Development, Inc., et al.
 DEFENDANT(S)

Submitted by: Benjamin H. Culbertson, Presiding Judge	Attorney for : <input type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> Defendant
	or <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Represented Litigant

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. See Page 2 for additional information.
- 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
- 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.

FILED
 HORRY COUNTY
 14 APR 24 AM 11:33

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED: See attached order (formal order to follow) Statement of Judgment by the Court:

Motion to Dismiss by defendant David Cox is GRANTED. (See page 2.)

ORDER INFORMATION

This order ends does not end the case.

Additional Information for the Clerk :

INFORMATION FOR THE JUDGMENT INDEX		
Complete this section below when the judgment affects title to real or personal property or if any amount should be enrolled. If there is no judgment information, indicate "N/A" in one of the boxes below.		
Judgment in Favor of (List name(s) below)	Judgment Against (List name(s) below)	Judgment Amount To be Enrolled (List amount(s) below)
N/A	N/A	\$ N/A
If applicable, describe the property, including tax map information and address, referenced in the order:		

The judgment information above has been provided by the submitting party. Disputes concerning the amounts contained in this form may be addressed by way of motion pursuant to the SC Rules of Civil Procedure. Amounts to be computed such as interest or additional taxable costs not available at the time the form and final order are submitted to the judge may be provided to the clerk. Note: Title abstractors and researchers should refer to the official court order for judgment details.

Benjamin H. Culbertson
 Benjamin H. Culbertson, Circuit Court Judge

2148
 Judge Code

April 22, 2014
 Date

For Clerk of Court Office Use Only

This judgment was entered on the _____ day of _____, 20____ and a copy mailed first class or placed in the appropriate attorney's box on this _____ day of _____, 20____ to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

Wendell Leon Hawkins

William E. Booth, III

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S)

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)

CLERK OF COURT

Court Reporter: Susan "Mia" Perron

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING DECISION BY THE COURT AS REFERENCED ON PAGE 1.

This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.

Plaintiffs obtained foreign judgments against the corporate defendants in 2005. Plaintiffs now seek to pierce the corporate veil so that the defendant David Cox is personally liable for the 2005 judgments against the corporate defendants.

The Motion to Dismiss Complaint by the defendant David Cox is GRANTED. The sole cause of action in this lawsuit is to pierce the corporate veil so that the defendant David Cox is personally liable for the 2005 judgments against the corporate defendants. Although the plaintiffs' Complaint adequately alleges facts constituting a cause of action for piercing the corporate veil, the Summons and Complaint were not filed until 1/2/2014. The judgments were obtained by the plaintiffs in 2005. Therefore, this action is barred by the 3-year statute of limitations.
