

FORM 4

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

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2019-CP-38-00550

ROBERT GEATHERS AND DEBRA
GEATHERS

APPLICANT

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE
ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

DEFENDANT

Submitted by: COURT

Attorney for : ☐ Plaintiff ☐ Defendant
or
☐ Self-Represented Litigant

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
- ☐ **DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT** (*CHECK APPLICABLE BOX*): ☐ Affirmed; ☐ Reversed; ☐ Remanded; ☐ Other

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 June 25, 2026 in Saluda County for a hearing on Defendant's post-trial motions, namely: Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict, to Enforce the Damages Cap Under the Solicitation of the Charitable Funds Act, and for a New Trial. The Defendant, National Collegiate Athletic Association, was present and represented by John E. Cuttino, Esq., C. Bradley Hutto, Esq., Lewis Schlossberg, Esq., and Andrew K. Fletcher, Esq. Plaintiffs Robert and Debra Geathers were present represented by John D. Kassel, David Langfitt, Esq., and Jordan Calloway, Esq. The Court finds as follows:

The Court denies the Defense's Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict motion. "The jury's verdict must be upheld unless no evidence reasonably supports the jury's findings." *Curcio v. Caterpillar, Inc.*, 355 S.C. 316, 320, 585 S.E.2d 272, 274 (2003); *Wedgewood Condo. Ass'n v. Centex Homes*, 447 S.C. 54, 72, 923 S.E.2d 288, 297 (Ct. App. 2025), reh'g denied (Dec. 2, 2025). In considering a JNOV, the trial judge is concerned with the existence of evidence, not its weight. *Curcio v. Caterpillar, Inc.*, 355 S.C. 316, 320, 585 S.E.2d 272, 274 (2003). This standard of review has its roots from seventeenth century England, where jurors faced criminal punishment for neglecting to follow, or willful disregard of, the evidence and the court's instructions. Cassandra Burke Robertson, *Judging Jury Verdicts*, 83 Tul. L. Rev. 157, 164

(2008). Respect for sanctity of the jury's decision is paramount for a reliable and effective justice system. Therefore, the Court denies the Defendant's JNOV motion.

The Court denies the motion to enforce the damages cap. This motion was the most challenging among the NCAA's motions for the Court's consideration, but only with respect to Mrs. Geathers' Loss of Consortium claim and the jury's award for that cause of action. Frankly, the issue of whether there can be more than one occurrence for a Loss of Consortium claim under these facts, or whether the jury's finding of 47 occurrences may be imputed with respect to Mrs. Geathers' claim, is a novel issue of law in South Carolina. The Court notes that some of our sister states have answered this question directly through legislation in similar contexts, such as medical malpractice claims and insurance coverage. *See* Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 3937.18 (West) (limiting UIM and UM coverage to "all claims resulting from or arising out of any one person's bodily injury, ... sustained by one person, and, for the purpose of such policy limit shall constitute a single claim."); N.M. Stat. Ann. § 41-5-6 (West) ("the aggregate dollar amounts ... include payment to any person for any number of loss of consortium claims or other claims per occurrence that arise solely because of the injuries or death of the patient") Because this question represents a novel issue of law, the Court declines to interfere with the decision of the jury. The Charitable Immunity Act is clear, and the jury's finding of 47 occurrences allows for the jury award for Mrs. Geathers' Loss of Consortium claim to be as high as Mr. Geathers' Negligence claim. The issue lies in whether the 47 occurrences can be similarly attributed to the Loss of Consortium Claim. Again, out of respect for the jury's dedication and careful attention to this case, the Court declines to interfere with the verdict.

Furthermore, the interest of justice and public policy warrant allowing the award for Loss of Consortium to stand. The jury found that Plaintiffs were correct in their central premise: The NCAA was created to prevent the very harm which ultimately occurred to Mr. Geathers, Defendant has been aware of these preventable dangers for decades, and on 47 occasions Defendant neglected to undertake appropriate action to reasonably mitigate or eliminate these preventable injuries. As a result, Mrs. Geathers lost the privilege of growing old in health with her husband. Therefore, the Court will not disturb this verdict.

The Court denies the motion for a new trial. "A new trial may be granted to all or any of the parties and on all or part of the issues (1) in an action in which there has been a trial by jury, for any of the reasons for which new trials have heretofore been granted in actions at law in the courts of the State;..." SCRPC 59. The NCAA states the following four reasons which warrant a new trial being granted: (1) The jury instructions on "increased risk of harm" and voluntary undertaking were inconsistent with the law; (2) The Court erroneously admitted evidence that prejudiced the NCAA; (3) The verdict was against the weight of the evidence; and (4) The damages award is excessive.

Regarding ground (1), the Court is satisfied that the jury was properly instructed on the applicable law. There is ample evidence demonstrating a series of systematic failures by the

SCRPC Form 4C (12/2011) Page 2

NCAA which increased the risk of harm to players. The instructions on increased risk of harm and voluntary undertaking were appropriate given the supporting evidence, the Restatement 2nd, and applicable case law. Regarding ground (2), the Court has a broad discretion in determining the admissibility of evidence. *City of N. Myrtle Beach v. E. Cherry Grove Realty Co., LLC*, 397 S.C. 497, 507, 725 S.E.2d 676, 681 (2012). More importantly, no evidence of subsequent remedial measures was introduced or presented to the jury. Rather, the jury heard evidence of Defendant's continuing pattern of consciously failing to undertake reasonable, or even benign, measures to educate players on, or to mitigate, the known, preventable dangers of permanent head injury. Concerning reason (3), when the Court considers a motion for a new trial based on insufficiency of the evidence, the trial court is concerned with the existence of evidence rather than its weight, as the weight of the evidence is a question for the jury. *State v. Smith*, 363 S.C. 111, 115, 609 S.E.2d 528, 530 (Ct. App. 2005). As outlined in the denial of Defendant's JNOV, ample evidence was presented which reasonably supports the jury's verdict. Reason (4) is denied for the same reasons that Defendant's Motion to Enforce the Damages Cap was denied. Furthermore, expert testimony clearly established the future expense associated with Mr. Geathers' injuries, and any damage award for the past and present aspects of his injuries was supported by other evidence presented at trial.

As a final matter, the Court would like to express its appreciation to all counsel involved in this litigation. Throughout my involvement in this litigation, counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendant have demonstrated the highest level of professionalism, made my job easier, and presented their respective cases with efficiency, skill, and diligence. That I had the privilege to preside over such a unique and challenging case with such capable counsel was a true honor, and I wish everyone the best of luck on appeal.

For the above stated reasons, the Court denies the Defendant's JNOV Motion, Motion to Enforce the Damages Cap, and Motion for a New Trial.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ORDER INFORMATION

This order ☒ ends ☐ does not end the case.

Additional Information for the Clerk : _____

INFORMATION FOR THE JUDGMENT INDEX		
Complete this section below when the judgment affects title to real or personal property or if any amount should be enrolled. If there is no judgment information, indicate "N/A" in one of the boxes below.		
Judgment in Favor of (List name(s) below)	Judgment Against (List name(s) below)	Judgment Amount To be Enrolled (List amount(s) below)

See previous verdict form		\$
		\$
		\$
If applicable, describe the property, including tax map information and address, referenced in the order:		

The judgment information above has been provided by the submitting party. Disputes concerning the amounts contained in this form may be addressed by way of motion pursuant to the SC Rules of Civil Procedure. Amounts to be computed such as interest or additional taxable costs not available at the time the form and final order are submitted to the judge may be provided to the clerk.

Note: Title abstractors and researchers should refer to the official court order for judgment details.

E-Filing Note: In E-Filing counties, the Court will electronically sign this form using a separate electronic signature page.

<u>Frank R. Addy, Jr.</u>	<u>2159</u>	<u>July 20, 2026</u>
Circuit Court Judge	Judge Code	Date

For Clerk of Court Office Use Only

This judgment was entered on the _____ day of _____, 20____ and a copy mailed first class or placed in the appropriate attorney's box on this _____ day of _____, 20____ to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S)

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)

CLERK OF COURT

Court Reporter: Renee Stanera

E-Filing Note: In E-Filing counties, 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 judgement to parties who are not E-Filers or who are appearing pro se. See Rule 77(d), SCRCP.



Orangeburg Common Pleas

Case Caption: Robert Geathers , plaintiff, et al VS National Collegiate Athletic Association
Case Number: 2019CP3800550
Type: Order/Form 4

So Ordered

S/ Frank R. Addy, Jr.
