

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF DORCHESTER)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO. 2015-CP-18-2381

Ronald Tucker, Jr. and Kenneth W. Tucker)
a/k/a Kenneth Tucker, Individually and as)
Co-Personal Representatives of the Estate of)
Mary H. Tucker, and Michael Allen,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

**ORDER DENYING
MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

Lutricia Tucker Blakey, Gwendolyn)
Garretson, Priscilla Gray, Florie T. Hamilton,)
Jamika Tucker Jackson, Doris Tucker Jenkins,)
Alice C. Johnson, Pamela D. Tucker McKnight,)
Charlene Tucker Smalls, Abraham Tucker,)
Ashaunte Tucker, Bradley Tucker, Calvin)
Tucker, Clifford Tucker, Craig Tucker, Cynthia)
Marie Tucker, Cynthia Tucker, Dorothy Tucker,)
Dorothy Kitt Tucker, Frank T. Tucker, Gary C.)
Tucker, Hazel Tucker, Herman Tucker,)
Kenneth J. Tucker, Kenneth Tucker, Larry)
Tucker, Lillian A. Gregg Tucker, Mary Tucker,)
Maurice Tucker, Michael Anthony Tucker,)
Reubin Tucker, III, Ryan Tucker, Sadie)
Hutchinson Tucker, Shawn Tucker, Sheldon)
Tucker, Shontique Tucker, Sophronia Tucker,)
Spencer Tucker, Victor Leroy Tucker, Victoria)
Lorene Tucker, Deborah Tucker White,)
John Doe, a fictitious name used herein to)
designate the estates and unknown heirs at)
law, distributees, devisees, issue, personal)
representative, successors and/or assigns of)
Lawrence Herman Cuttino, Lula Tucker Cuttino)
Jerry Cuttino, Drayton W. Gray, Jr., Marion)
Tucker Gray, Alonza Tucker, Bernice Harrison)
Tucker, Carsedra Yvette Tucker, Charles)
Tucker, Donald Vaughn Quentin Tucker, Eliza)
Gallashaw Tucker, Emmie Richardson Tucker,)
Geraldine Tucker, Harry Tucker, Israel Tucker,)
Sr., James Tucker, Lucille Tucker, Lucius J.)
Tucker, Mary Ella Tucker, Nathaniel Tucker,)
Regimen Gerthrod Tucker, Reubin Tucker,)
Reubin Tucker, Jr., Ronald Tucker, Teselene)
Rivers Tucker, Theron Antonio Tucker, William)

RECEIVED


FEB 10 2020

SC Court of Appeals

As held by the South Carolina Supreme Court, “[a] trial court does not have the power to alter or amend a final order if more than ten days passes and no Rule 59(e) motion has been served, nor does a trial court have any power to grant the moving party an extension of time in which to file a Rule 59(e) motion.” *Overland, Inc. d/b/a Land Rover Greenville v. Lara Marie Nance et al*, 423 S.C. 253, 257, 815 S.E.2d 431 (S.C. 2018) (internal citations omitted). Accordingly, because the time period to serve the Rule 59(e) motion had expired, this Court denies the Motion as not timely.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 1/29/20
Summerville, South Carolina



Russell A. DeMott
Special Referee for Dorchester County