

Jessie J Carter
PLAINTIFF(S)

Oscar Auto Sales 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), 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
- 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:

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Jessie Carter's ("Plaintiff's") Motion to Alter/Amend the Court's order issued on November 17, 2021. Plaintiff argues that the Court erred because it failed to consider that the contract was not rescinded. The Court did consider this argument when issuing its previous order and found that the contract was properly rescinded. Notably, the Plaintiff is not asking for the car or arguing that the contract should be reinstated. Rather, Plaintiff is asking for a sum of money related to a separate dispute over loan funds. Therefore, after another reading of the relevant files in the record and relevant case law, the Court comes to the same conclusions as stated in its original order, including that Plaintiff was not the owner of a motor vehicle at the time of the alleged fraud as defined in SC Code 56-15-320 (b). Plaintiff's Motion to Alter/Amend is DENIED.

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 12/06/2021 .

Marco A Quiroga

RECEIVED
Jan 04 2022
SC Court of Appeals

NAMES OF TRADITIONAL FILERS SERVED BY MAIL

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.



Greenville Common Pleas

Case Caption: Jessie J Carter vs. Oscar Quirroga , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2019CP2307116

Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

s/Letitia H. Verdin, SC Judge 2162