

**STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

**COUNTY OF DORCHESTER**

Gerard E. Ziegler; Brenda Barrington III;  
James Stephen Greene, Jr.; William A.  
Harbeson; David Messinger; South Carolina  
Public Interest Foundation; and Dorchester  
County Taxpayers Association, individually,  
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Dorchester County; Dorchester County  
Council; Charles D. Chinnis, George H.  
Bailey, Sr., Jay Byars, Willie R. Davis, Carroll  
S. Duncan, Larry Hargett and William R.  
Hearn, Jr., in their official capacities as  
members of Dorchester County Council,

Defendants.

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
FOR THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

C.A. No.: 2016-CP-18-1975

FILED - RECORDED  
2018 FEB - 7 PM 2:44  
CHERYL GRANHAM  
CLERK OF COURT  
DORCHESTER COUNTY

**ORDER DENYING  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER,  
ALTER OR AMEND JUDGMENT,  
AND FOR A REHEARING**

**RECEIVED**

MAR 05 2018

SC Court of Appeals

This Court issued its Order of Dismissal (the "Order"), granting the Defendants' Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings and dismissing all claims in Plaintiffs' Complaint in this lawsuit on December 8, 2017 (entered, December 11, 2017). The Order followed Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings and supporting memorandum of June 16, 2017; Plaintiffs' memorandum in opposition of August 23, 2017; a hearing before the Court on August 24, 2017, at which both sides were heard extensively; Defendants' email to the Court on August 25, 2017, providing case citations requested by the Court at the hearing; Plaintiffs' supplemental memorandum in opposition of August 29, 2017; Defendants' reply to Plaintiffs' supplemental memorandum of September 5, 2017; and Plaintiffs' email to the Court of September 8, 2017, addressing Defendants' reply to Plaintiffs' supplemental memorandum

1/208

By motion dated December 18, 2017 (the "Motion"), Plaintiffs requested reconsideration, alteration, or amendment of the Order and a second hearing. The Motion suggests that four, overlapping points deserve reconsideration, rehearing, and amendment. Defendants responded by memorandum dated January 5, 2018, addressing those points and arguing that each of them had been fully covered in the facts, law, and argument already presented to the Court and had been ruled on in the Order, and that no further consideration is warranted

After due deliberation and review of the Motion, the supporting and opposing points of counsel, case law, Constitutional and statutory provisions, and the Court's notes, the Court finds that there is nothing new warranting reconsideration, amendment, or rehearing of its Order. This Court therefore denies Plaintiffs' Motion.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

Edgar W. Dickson  
Presiding Judge, First Judicial Circuit

January 22, 2018

2/2