

EXHIBIT G

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

COUNTY OF GREENVILLE

FILED-CLERK OF COURT
GREENVILLE CO. S.C.

CASE NO: 2014CP2305776

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS PAUL B. WICKENSIMER

2015 DEC 16 PM 4:10
Greenville Pharmaceutical Research Inc vs. Parham & Smith LLC

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: _____
- 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; Statement of Judgment by the Court:

Dated at Greenville, South Carolina, this .

Court Reporter:

PRESIDING JUDGE -

This judgment was entered on the 16th day of December, 2015, and a copy mailed first class this 16th day of December, 2015, to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

Franklin Milton Mann Jr. 151 Harold Fleming Court
Spartanburg, SC 29303

T. David Rheney Gallivan, White & Boyd, P.A. P.O. Box
10589 Greenville, SC 29603
M. Dawes Cooke Jr. Barnwell Whaley Patterson & Helms,
LLC P.O. Drawer H Charleston, SC 29402-0197
Alissa D. Fleming Barnwell Whaley Patterson & Helms, LLC
P.O. Drawer H Charleston, SC 29402-0197

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S)

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)

Paul B. Wickensimer Greenville County Clerk Of Court
- Clerk of Court

FILED-CLERK OF COURT
 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA GREENVILLE CO. S. IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
 PAUL B. WICKENS MET THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
 COUNTY OF GREENVILLE) C/A No.; 2014-CP-23-05776
 2015 DEC 16 PM 4 19

Greenville Pharmaceutical Research,)
 Inc.,)

Plaintiff,)

ORDER

vs.)

Parham & Smith, LLC and Gerald H.)
 Sokol, M.D.,)

Defendants.)

This matter came before the Court on Defendant Parham & Smith, LLC's Motion for Summary Judgment. A hearing was held on Wednesday December 9, 2015 at the Greenville County Courthouse. Milton Mann, Esq. was present for the Plaintiff and Jeff Bogdan, Esq. was present for Defendant Parham & Smith, LLC.

The Plaintiff's Complaint asserts only one cause of action against Defendant Parham & Smith, LLC - - Defamation *Per Se*. Plaintiff argues that Defendant Parham & Smith defamed it by way of a June 4, 2012 letter. Parham & Smith argues that the Defamation *Per Se* cause of action, and thus the Plaintiff's entire cause against Parham & Smith, LLC, should be dismissed because it was not timely filed pursuant to the statute of limitations.

South Carolina Code Section 15-3-550 (1) provides that the Statute of Limitation for an action for a defamation action is two (2) years. In Jones v. City of Folly Beach, 326 S.C. 360 (Ct. App. 1997), the South Carolina Court of Appeals addressed Section 15-3-550 and confirmed that the Statute of Limitations for a defamation action is two (2) years. Additionally, the court held that South Carolina has not adopted the discovery rule in defamation cases and that the Statute of Limitations clock starts to run on the date of the alleged defamatory statement,

regardless of when the plaintiff discovers the same. See also Gillian v. Burns, 2013 WL 8507871 (2013) (Ct. App. 2013); Meisner v. Zymogenetics, Inc., 2014 WL 4721680 (D.S.C. 2014).

Plaintiff did not file this case until October 20, 2014. The two year statute of limitations began to run on the date of the publication of the letter, which was June 4, 2012. Therefore, it expired on June 4, 2014, prior to this case being filed. Accordingly, Plaintiff's entire case against Parham & Smith, LLC is time-barred by the two year statute of limitations. S.C. Code § 15-3-550(1); Jones, 326 S.C. 360.

Further, even if the discovery rule were applicable to the application of the statute of limitations in a defamation case, Plaintiff's case would still be time-barred. Plaintiff admitted in its discovery responses that it was aware of and even received a copy of the allegedly defamatory letter by June 14, 2012. Accordingly, the two year statute of limitations certainly would have begun to run as of this date, and it would have expired on June 14, 2014, over four months before the Plaintiff filed this case. Accordingly, Plaintiff's entire case against Parham & Smith, LLC is time-barred by the two year statute of limitations. S.C. Code § 15-3-550(1); Jones, 326 S.C. 360.

Accordingly, the Court grants the Defendant Parham & Smith, LLC's Motion for Summary Judgment and finds that Plaintiff's case against Defendant Parham & Smith is time-barred by the statute of limitations and, thus, dismissed in its entirety as to Parham & Smith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Letitia H. Verdin, Presiding Judge

12/9, 2015

