

FORM 4

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

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2023CP2800460

Melissa Branham et al
PLAINTIFF(S)

Zach Cameron 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 came before the Court on Motions for Protective Orders filed by Defendant Circle K seeking to limit discovery. Plaintiffs oppose such motions. Based on a review of the Record, the parties' submissions, to include memoranda, the challenged Requests for Production (RFP) and the Rule 30(b)(6), SCRPC deposition topics, as well as the arguments of counsel, the Court rules as follows:

1. AMENDED MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S SECOND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION.
The Court rejects Defendant's contention that Plaintiff's RFPs are not relevant (despite the absence of a law enforcement determination regarding alcohol, there appears to be some evidence that alcohol was involved). Further, Defendant has not shown that the RFPs are unduly burdensome or will cause other injury/harm. As such, Defendant's Motion is DENIED, with the qualification that:

1) Except for RFP #19, where information is sought concerning "age restricted sales", the

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 06/23/2025 .

John Doe Entity 1
John Doe Entity 2
John Doe Entity 3
John Doe Entity 4
John Doe Entity 5

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-Fileers or who are appearing pro se. See Rule 77(d), SCRCP.

Defendant's production may be limited to "age restricted alcohol sales (to include beer and wine)";

2) Except for RFP #22, production of information pertaining to "third party sales" may be limited to alcohol sales (including beer and wine).

2.MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER REGARDING 30(b)(6) NOTICE

The Defendant's Motion is DENIED. The parties earlier reached some tentative agreement pertaining to the majority of the topics for Rule 30(b)(6), SCRCP examination as shown in Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's Motion. As shown in Exhibit 2 to the Motion, the Plaintiff altered some of the agreed-upon topics; however, the Court does not find these changes to be burdensome. As shown on Exhibit 2 to the Motion, the Plaintiffs also added six topics to the agreed upon list in Exhibit 1. The Court finds that these topics are relevant to the proceedings. Further, the Defendants have not shown that these topics are unduly burdensome or will cause other injury/harm.

The limitations to the RFPs outlined above do not apply to the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition. To the extent needed, the prevailing party may submit a formal order for the Court's consideration.



Kershaw Common Pleas

Case Caption: Melissa Branham , plaintiff, et al VS Zach Cameron , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2023CP2800460

Type: Order/Electronic Form 4

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Milton G. Kimpson 2783

Electronically signed on 2025-06-23 09:09:57 page 3 of 3