

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF GEORGETOWN

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FOR THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 2026-CP-22-_____

John Doe and Jane Doe, individually and
as Parents, Guardians, and Next Friends of
their a minor child,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Pawleys Island Community Church;
Pawleys Island Christian Academy;
Donald James Williams, individually and
in his capacity as former Senior Pastor of
Pawleys Island Community Church;
Virginia Lee "Ginny" Williams,
individually and in her capacity as an
employee and member of the leadership of
Pawleys Island Community Church;
Jennifer "Niki" Howard, individually and
in her capacity as former Director of
Pawleys Island Christian Academy; John
Doe Elders 1-10, individually and in their
representative capacities as members of the
Elder Board of Pawleys Island Community
Church; Warren Spence Perry; and South
Carolina Department of Probation, Parole
and Pardon Services,

Defendants.

SUMMONS

(Jury Trial Demanded)

TO THE DEFENDANTS ABOVE NAMED:

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED AND REQUIRED to answer the Complaint in this action. A copy of the Complaint is attached to this Summons and is herewith served upon you. Your answer must be in writing and signed by you or by your attorney and must state your address or the address of your attorney if signed by your attorney. Your answer must be served upon the undersigned attorneys for the Plaintiff within thirty (30) days after the service hereof, exclusive of the day of service at 12019 Ocean Highway, Post Office Box 1885, Pawleys Island, South Carolina 29585.

YOU ARE HEREBY GIVEN NOTICE FURTHER that, if you fail to appear and defend and fail to answer the Complaint as required by this Summons within thirty (30) days after the service hereof, judgment by default will be rendered against you for the relief demanded in the Complaint.

HOPKINS LAW FIRM, LLC

s/ J. Clay Hopkins

J. Clay Hopkins (SC Bar #102053)

clay@hopkinsfirm.com

William E. Hopkins, Jr. (SC Bar #66474)

bill@hopkinsfirm.com

12019 Ocean Highway

Post Office Box 1885

Pawleys Island, South Carolina 29585

(843) 314-4202 – Telephone

(843) 314-9365 – Facsimile

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

July 27, 2026

Pawleys Island, South Carolina

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF GEORGETOWN

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FOR THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 2026-CP-22-_____

John Doe and Jane Doe, individually and
as Parents, Guardians, and Next Friends of
their a minor child,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Pawleys Island Community Church;
Pawleys Island Christian Academy;
Donald James Williams, individually and
in his capacity as former Senior Pastor of
Pawleys Island Community Church;
Virginia Lee “Ginny” Williams,
individually and in her capacity as an
employee and member of the leadership of
Pawleys Island Community Church;
Jennifer “Niki” Howard, individually and
in her capacity as former Director of
Pawleys Island Christian Academy; John
Doe Elders 1-10, individually and in their
representative capacities as members of the
Elder Board of Pawleys Island Community
Church; Warren Spence Perry; and South
Carolina Department of Probation, Parole
and Pardon Services,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

(Jury Trial Demanded)

Plaintiffs John Doe and Jane Doe, individually and as Parents, Guardians, and Next Friends
of their minor child, complaining of the Defendants above-named, respectfully show unto this
Honorable Court and allege as follows:

NATURE OF ACTION

1. This is a civil action arising from Defendants’ knowing, negligent, grossly
negligent, reckless, willful, and wanton placement, retention, concealment, and protection of a

registered sex offender in a position of repeated and unrestricted access to minor children at Pawleys Island Christian Academy.

2. Pawleys Island Community Church and Pawleys Island Christian Academy held themselves out to parents as a place of safety and assumed a corresponding duty to protect the children entrusted to their care from foreseeable harm.

3. That duty was at its highest where, as here, the child entrusted to Defendants was a very young child, unable to fully understand, report, or protect himself from danger.

4. Instead, for years, Defendants knowingly allowed Warren Spence Perry, a convicted sex offender and registered sex offender, to occupy a volunteer, custodial, maintenance, or similar role giving him recurring daily access to children enrolled at the Academy, including their minor child

5. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of their minor child, who was entrusted to Defendants' care and exposed to Perry in the very environment Defendants represented as safe.

6. Because of their minor child's youth and vulnerability, and because of Defendants' concealment and continued placement of Perry among children, Plaintiffs may never be able to determine the full extent of what their minor child saw, experienced, or may have been subjected to during the period of Perry's access.

7. That uncertainty is itself a permanent and profound injury inflicted upon both their minor child and his parents by Defendants' conduct.

8. This action also arises from the negligence and gross negligence of Defendant South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services ("SCDPPPS"), which, upon information and belief, retained legal authority to supervise Perry after his November 23, 2023

sentencing and failed to exercise even slight care in monitoring, investigating, and enforcing the conditions designed to keep him away from children.

9. Upon information and belief, Perry was subject to standard sex-offender supervision conditions requiring him to refrain from contact with minors and to refrain from working within one thousand (1,000) feet of minors, yet he remained regularly present on a church campus that also operated a school and childcare facility.

10. This action does not require this Court to resolve any question of religious doctrine. It asks only that Defendants be held to the same secular principles of law governing the operation of childcare and educational facilities, the supervision of known dangers, the truthfulness of safety representations made to parents, and the discharge of governmental supervision duties that apply to every other institution and agency.

PARTIES

11. Plaintiff's minor child is a minor child who, at all times relevant to this Complaint, was a citizen and resident of Georgetown County, South Carolina, and was enrolled at Pawleys Island Christian Academy during the relevant period.

12. Plaintiffs John Doe and Jane Doe are the biological parents, natural guardians, and next friends of their minor child, and are citizens and residents of Georgetown County, South Carolina.

13. Plaintiffs John Doe and Jane Doe bring this action individually and in their representative capacities as parents, guardians, and next friends of their minor child.

14. Plaintiffs proceed under pseudonyms because this action concerns the exposure of a minor child to a registered sex offender and matters that would subject the child and his family

to humiliation, embarrassment, stigma, and amplified injury if their identities were publicly disclosed.

15. The public interest in disclosure of Plaintiffs' identities is minimal and is substantially outweighed by the harm that public identification would inflict upon their minor child and his family.

16. Defendants are not prejudiced by Plaintiffs' use of pseudonyms because Plaintiffs' identities will be disclosed to Defendants in a confidential manner upon service and the appearance of counsel, if not already known.

17. Plaintiffs will seek leave to proceed under pseudonyms to the extent such leave is required.

18. Defendant Pawleys Island Community Church ("PICC" or "the Church") is, and at all relevant times was, a non-profit religious corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of South Carolina, with its principal place of business in Georgetown County, South Carolina.

19. Upon information and belief, the Church was formerly known as Pawleys Island Baptist Church and is an independent, self-governing, elder-led congregation not subject to the control of a parent denomination or hierarchical body.

20. Defendant Pawleys Island Christian Academy ("PICA" or "the Academy") is, and at all relevant times was, a childcare and educational ministry operated by, through, under, or within Pawleys Island Community Church, serving children in Georgetown County, South Carolina.

21. To the extent the Academy is separately organized or licensed, it is named separately. To the extent it is a ministry, division, assumed name, instrumentality, or operational arm of the Church, the Church is liable for its acts and omissions.

22. The Church and the Academy are referred to collectively herein as the “Institutional Defendants.”

23. Defendant Donald James Williams (“Pastor Williams”) is, and at all relevant times was, the Senior Pastor of Pawleys Island Community Church and is, upon information and belief, a citizen and resident of South Carolina.

24. Pastor Williams exercised leadership, governance, oversight, and supervisory authority over the Church and Academy, including persons permitted to serve in positions of access to children.

25. Upon information and belief, Perry’s conviction and status as a registered sex offender were actually known to Pastor Williams, and Pastor Williams personally provided a character reference or other support to SCDPPPS on Perry’s behalf in connection with Perry’s request or approval to work or volunteer at the Church.

26. Defendant Virginia Lee “Ginny” Williams (“Ginny Williams”) is, and at all relevant times was, an employee, agent, and member of the leadership of Pawleys Island Community Church and is, upon information and belief, a citizen and resident of South Carolina.

27. Upon information and belief, Ginny Williams had knowledge of, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have had knowledge of, the matters alleged herein and participated in, ratified, or approved decisions affecting Perry’s role and access.

28. Defendant Jennifer “Niki” Howard (“Howard”) is, and at all relevant times was, the Director of Pawleys Island Christian Academy and is, upon information and belief, a citizen and resident of South Carolina.

29. Howard was responsible for the day-to-day operation of the Academy, including the screening, placement, supervision, and monitoring of staff and volunteers, the safety of the children enrolled there, and the receipt, investigation, and remediation of complaints regarding child safety.

30. Upon information and belief, Howard had actual knowledge that Perry was a registered sex offender and permitted him to remain in a position of access to children.

31. Defendants John Doe Elders 1-10 are the members of the Elder Board, Session, or equivalent highest governing body of Pawleys Island Community Church, whose true identities are presently unknown to Plaintiffs and will be ascertained through discovery.

32. The Elder Defendants are sued individually and in their representative capacities as members of the governing body that exercised ultimate corporate and governance authority over the Church and Academy.

33. Because the Church is, upon information and belief, independent and self-governing, the Elder Board constituted the single, continuous, self-perpetuating governing body in which the ultimate corporate authority of the Church resided.

34. Defendant Warren Spence Perry (“Perry”) is, upon information and belief, an adult citizen and resident of Georgetown County, South Carolina.

35. Perry was convicted in Georgetown County in 2023 of sexual exploitation of a minor and is a registered sex offender.

36. At all relevant times, Perry occupied a volunteer, custodial, maintenance, or similar role at the Church and Academy, with repeated, direct, daily, and unrestricted access to children enrolled there, including their minor child.

37. Defendant South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (“SCDPPPS”) is an agency of the State of South Carolina.

38. At all relevant times, SCDPPPS employed, supervised, and was responsible for the officer or officers and personnel charged with supervising Perry following his November 23, 2023 sentencing.

39. SCDPPPS is sued as the governmental entity answerable under the South Carolina Tort Claims Act for the acts and omissions of its employees acting within the scope of their official duties.

40. Whenever this Complaint refers to any act or omission of the Church, the Academy, or any Institutional Defendant, such reference includes the acts and omissions of their officers, elders, agents, servants, employees, volunteers, representatives, administrators, and other personnel acting within the course and scope of their employment, agency, or engagement, both directly and vicariously.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

41. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the parties and claims alleged herein.

42. Each Defendant has present, continuous, and substantial contacts with the State of South Carolina such that this Court may exercise personal jurisdiction over each Defendant consistent with due process.

43. Venue is proper in Georgetown County, South Carolina pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 15-7-30 because the Institutional Defendants maintain their principal place of business in

Georgetown County, the Academy is located in Georgetown County, one or more Defendants reside in Georgetown County, and the most substantial acts and omissions alleged herein occurred in Georgetown County.

JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY

44. The Defendants, other than SCDPPPS to the extent limited by statute, are jointly and severally liable to the extent permitted by law because their negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, willful, and wanton acts and omissions, singularly and in combination, were direct and proximate causes of Plaintiffs' injuries and damages.

NEUTRAL PRINCIPLES OF LAW AND ABSENCE OF ECCLESIASTICAL BAR

45. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution protects religious organizations in matters of faith, doctrine, and internal ecclesiastical governance.

46. It does not immunize a church or school from liability for operating a childcare or educational enterprise in a negligent, reckless, or unlawful manner.

47. South Carolina courts may adjudicate disputes touching religious organizations where those disputes may be resolved through neutral principles of law without deciding questions of religious doctrine.

48. The screening, placement, retention, supervision, monitoring, and concealment of a registered sex offender around children; the operation of a childcare facility; the truthfulness of safety representations made to parents; and the discharge of duties owed to children entrusted to institutional care are secular matters governed by neutral principles of law.

49. This action therefore presents no ecclesiastical bar to adjudication.

THE SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP, VULNERABLE POPULATION, AND DUTIES OF CARE

50. The Institutional Defendants accepted custody of minor children from their parents, including their minor child, for educational, supervisory, custodial, and childcare purposes.

51. In doing so, the Institutional Defendants stood in a special relationship to their minor child and to his parents and owed affirmative, non-delegable duties to supervise, protect, and safeguard their minor child from reasonably foreseeable harm.

52. These duties were heightened because the population served by the Academy included infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and young children who were uniquely vulnerable and dependent on adults for protection.

53. The Institutional Defendants further undertook duties of protection through their public representations, enrollment materials, website statements, parent communications, and assumption of responsibility for children entrusted to their care.

54. Plaintiff's minor child was at all relevant times a student, business invitee, and child in custodial care on the premises of the Church and Academy.

55. The duties owed by the Institutional Defendants and the individual defendants included, without limitation, the following:

- a. The duty to screen, investigate, and complete all criminal history, sex-offender-registry, and other required background checks on every employee, volunteer, and other adult placed in a position of access to children;
- b. The duty not to place or retain a known registered sex offender in a position of access to children;
- c. The duty to supervise and monitor adult interactions with children on the premises and prohibit unrestricted or unsupervised access by a known danger;

- d. The duty to receive, investigate, document, and remediate complaints and warnings concerning child safety;
- e. The duty to report suspected abuse, neglect, or danger to proper authorities as required by law;
- f. The duty to disclose material safety risks known to Defendants to parents who were entrusting and paying them for the care of their children; and
- g. The duty to refrain from making false or misleading representations of safety.

56. Each of these duties is secular in nature and governed by neutral principles of law.

THE INSTITUTIONAL DEFENDANTS' REPRESENTATIONS OF SAFETY

57. The Institutional Defendants induced parents, including Plaintiffs, to entrust and pay them for the care and education of their children by representing that the environment was safe.

58. Upon information and belief, the Institutional Defendants represented on their website, in ministry materials, and in admissions and parent communications that volunteers were background checked and trained and that the environment was safe for children.

59. These representations were false.

60. All volunteers were not properly screened and trained.

61. A registered sex offender occupied a recurring position of access to the children.

62. Upon information and belief, the Academy had been cited on multiple occasions for background-check deficiencies and related child-safety noncompliance.

63. Plaintiffs reasonably relied upon the Institutional Defendants' safety representations in enrolling their minor child and paying tuition and fees for his care and education.

PRIOR NOTICE, ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE, AND THE TOTAL ABSENCE OF CARE

64. The harm to their minor child and his parents was foreseeable because the Institutional Defendants and the individual defendants had actual and constructive notice of the very danger that caused it.

65. Nearly twenty years before the events giving rise to this action, the Church, then operating under its former name, was sued in connection with allegations involving failure to protect a minor from sexual misconduct by a person placed around children.

66. Upon information and belief, that prior action placed the Church on direct notice that failure to screen and supervise those placed around children creates a foreseeable risk of sexual harm.

67. Upon information and belief, the South Carolina Division of Early Care and Education and/or Department of Social Services cited the Academy for repeated failures to comply with staff background-check requirements in or about February 2024, March 2024, and March 2026.

68. Those repeated citations placed the Institutional Defendants on direct and particularized notice that their screening and child-safety practices were deficient.

69. Perry was convicted in 2023 of sexual exploitation of a minor and became and remains a registered sex offender.

70. Upon information and belief, Perry occupied his role at the Church and Academy beginning before his conviction and continuing through July 2026, with repeated access to children throughout that period.

71. Upon information and belief, Perry's conviction and sex-offender status were actually known to Church and Academy leadership, including Pastor Williams and Howard.

72. Upon information and belief, Pastor Williams personally provided a character reference or similar support to SCDPPPS on Perry's behalf and omitted or failed to disclose the full extent of Perry's child access at the Church and Academy.

73. Upon information and belief, the Academy advertised an auction or similar event in which a child could spend a day assisting the custodians, one of whom was Perry.

74. Upon information and belief, a teacher at the Academy raised concerns to leadership about Perry's registered sex-offender status and continued presence around children.

75. Rather than remove Perry, restrict him, disclose the risk to parents, or notify authorities, Defendants dismissed the concerns and, upon information and belief, forced out or silenced the person who raised them.

76. This conduct was not mere oversight. It was a conscious failure to exercise even slight care for the safety of the children entrusted to Defendants' custody.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS AS TO THEIR MINOR CHILD AND PLAINTIFFS

77. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs enrolled their minor child at Pawleys Island Christian Academy during the period in which Perry occupied his role with repeated access to children.

78. Plaintiff's minor child was a young child during his enrollment and was among the vulnerable children entrusted to the care of the Institutional Defendants.

79. Plaintiffs paid tuition, enrollment fees, and other sums for their minor child's care, custody, supervision, and education.

80. Neither the Church, nor the Academy, nor Pastor Williams, nor Ginny Williams, nor Howard, nor the Elder Defendants disclosed to Plaintiffs that Perry, a registered sex offender, occupied a position of repeated access to the children on campus.

81. Neither the Church, nor the Academy, nor any of the individual defendants disclosed to Plaintiffs that the Academy had, upon information and belief, been cited for child-safety and background-check deficiencies.

82. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff's minor child was exposed to a convicted child sex offender in the very environment his parents were told would be safe.

83. Because of their minor child's age, the full extent of what he saw, experienced, or may have been subjected to while a registered sex offender had access to him cannot presently be known.

84. Plaintiff's minor child has suffered and will continue to suffer emotional, developmental, psychological, and evaluative harm as a result of this exposure, the disruption of his sense of safety, and the need to determine the extent of his injury.

85. Plaintiffs John Doe and Jane Doe have suffered and will continue to suffer severe emotional distress, anguish, fear, loss of security, pecuniary losses, and the permanent burden of not knowing what their child was exposed to in the custody of those they trusted and paid to keep him safe

CHARITABLE IMMUNITY, RECKLESSNESS, AND MULTIPLE OCCURRENCES

86. Upon information and belief, the Institutional Defendants may contend that they are entitled to some form of charitable immunity or statutory limitation on liability.

87. Any such asserted protection does not bar or cap the recovery sought herein for multiple reasons, including because Plaintiffs allege reckless, willful, wanton, and grossly negligent conduct by the individual defendants and because the conduct alleged falls outside the protection of any legitimate charitable purpose.

88. Each separate negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, willful, or wanton act or omission contributing to Plaintiffs' injury constitutes a separate occurrence to the extent permitted by law.

89. The separate occurrences alleged herein include, without limitation:

- a. The placement of Perry in a position of access to children;
- b. The retention of Perry after actual knowledge of his conviction and sex-offender status;
- c. The provision of support or a character reference to SCDPPPS facilitating his continued presence;
- d. The repeated failure to conduct legally required background checks and safety compliance;
- e. The concealment of Perry's status from parents and teachers;
- f. The failure to act on internal warnings;
- g. The misrepresentations of safety to parents; and
- h. The failures of SCDPPPS to monitor and enforce Perry's supervision conditions.

90. Plaintiffs reserve the right to prove, and to have the finder of fact determine, the number of occurrences.

FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Negligence, Gross Negligence, Recklessness, Willful and Wanton Conduct)
(Against All Defendants Except SCDPPPS)

91. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

92. At all relevant times, Defendants owed Plaintiff's minor child and his parents duties of reasonable care, including affirmative and non-delegable duties to supervise, protect, and safeguard Plaintiff's minor child from foreseeable harm.

93. Perry, as a person vested with a role that gave him access to children, owed a duty to exercise reasonable care, refrain from accepting prohibited access to minors, disclose disqualifying restrictions, and refrain from conduct that endangered the children around him.

94. The Institutional Defendants, Pastor Williams, Ginny Williams, Howard, the Elder Defendants, and Perry breached duties owed to Plaintiffs in one or more of the following respects:

- a. In placing a known registered sex offender in a position of repeated access to children;
- b. In retaining that registered sex offender in that position after actual knowledge of his conviction and registry status;
- c. In failing to complete the background checks and screening required by law and sound child-safety practices;
- d. In failing to supervise, monitor, and restrict Perry's access to children;
- e. In failing to protect Plaintiff's minor child, a vulnerable child, from exposure to a known danger;
- f. In failing to investigate and act on complaints and warnings;
- g. In failing to report the danger to proper authorities;
- h. In failing to disclose the danger to Plaintiffs and other parents; and
- i. In engaging in such other negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, willful, or wanton conduct as discovery may reveal.

95. The failures of these Defendants, in cumulative effect and in light of the actual prior notice alleged above, amounted to a total absence of care for the safety of Plaintiff's minor child.

96. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer the injuries and damages alleged herein.

97. Plaintiffs are entitled to recover actual, compensatory, consequential, and, where permitted by law, punitive damages.

FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

**(Negligent Hiring, Selection, Authorization, Retention, Supervision, Training, and Control)
(Against the Institutional Defendants, Pastor Williams, Howard, Ginny Williams, and the Elder Defendants)**

98. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

99. Under South Carolina law, an institution and its responsible leaders owe a duty of reasonable care in the screening, hiring, placement, authorization, retention, supervision, monitoring, and training of persons placed in positions of access to and authority around children.

100. This duty is at its highest where the affected population consists of infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and young children entrusted to a childcare or school environment.

101. These Defendants breached that duty in one or more of the following respects:

- a. In failing to conduct and document legally required background checks;
- b. In placing and retaining Perry, a registered sex offender, in a role with access to children;
- c. In facilitating Perry's continued presence through affirmative approval, support, ratification, or concealment;
- d. In failing to supervise and monitor Perry's interactions with children;
- e. In failing to train staff and volunteers in child-protection and mandatory-reporting obligations;
- f. In failing to act on complaints and warnings; and
- g. In committing such other negligent, grossly negligent, or reckless acts as discovery may reveal.

102. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs sustained the injuries and damages alleged herein.

FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

**(Negligent Misrepresentation)
(Against the Institutional Defendants, Pastor Williams, and Howard)**

103. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

104. In the course of operating a tuition-based childcare and educational enterprise and in transactions in which they had a pecuniary interest, these Defendants made affirmative representations to Plaintiffs and to other parents that the Academy and child ministries were safe and that persons placed around children were properly screened and trained.

105. These representations were false in material respects because a registered sex offender occupied a role with access to children and the Academy had, upon information and belief, repeated compliance deficiencies regarding background checks and supervision.

106. These Defendants made such representations without exercising the reasonable care and competence expected of an institution operating a childcare facility for young children.

107. These Defendants intended that Plaintiffs rely upon those representations in deciding whether to enroll their minor child and pay tuition and fees.

108. Plaintiffs reasonably relied on those representations.

109. But for those representations, Plaintiffs would not have enrolled their minor child at the Academy.

110. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs have suffered pecuniary loss and other consequential damages.

FOR A FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Breach of Contract and Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing)
(Against the Institutional Defendants)

111. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

112. Plaintiffs entered into an agreement with the Institutional Defendants for the enrollment, supervision, care, protection, and education of their minor child in exchange for payment of tuition, enrollment fees, and related charges.

113. The agreement is reflected in, and includes, written enrollment documents, parent handbooks, website representations, admissions communications, and the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing inherent in the contractual relationship.

114. Under the terms of that agreement, the Institutional Defendants were required to provide a reasonably safe environment for Plaintiff's minor child, to screen and supervise those placed around him, and to comply with the safety-related representations used to induce enrollment.

115. Plaintiffs fully performed their obligations by paying tuition and fees as required.

116. The Institutional Defendants breached the agreement by, among other things, placing and retaining a registered sex offender in a position of access to Plaintiff's minor child, failing to conduct required screening and background checks, failing to provide the safe environment promised, and breaching the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

117. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs suffered damages including tuition and fees paid and consequential damages flowing from the breach.

FOR A FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Violation of the South Carolina Unfair Trade Practices Act)
(Against the Institutional Defendants)

118. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

119. The Institutional Defendants are engaged in trade or commerce within the meaning of the South Carolina Unfair Trade Practices Act in that they market and sell childcare, educational, and custodial services to families in exchange for tuition and fees.

120. The Institutional Defendants engaged in unfair and deceptive acts or practices in the conduct of that trade or commerce, including by representing that their services and

environment were safe and that appropriate background checks and child-safety protections were in place when they were not.

121. These representations created a likelihood of confusion and misunderstanding among parents, including Plaintiffs.

122. The unfair and deceptive conduct adversely affects the public interest because the same representations were made to all enrolling and prospective families and the conduct is capable of repetition.

123. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs suffered an ascertainable loss of money and property and are entitled to such relief as the statute permits.

FOR A SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Reckless Infliction of Emotional Distress)
(Against the Institutional Defendants, Pastor Williams, Howard, Ginny Williams, the Elder Defendants, and Perry)

124. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

125. Defendants recklessly inflicted severe emotional distress upon Plaintiff's minor child and his parents by knowingly placing and keeping a registered sex offender in a position of daily access to children, concealing that danger, suppressing warnings, and representing to parents that their children were safe.

126. This conduct was extreme and outrageous and exceeded all possible bounds of decency.

127. It was substantially certain, or at minimum highly foreseeable, that severe emotional distress would result from such conduct.

128. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs have suffered severe emotional distress and related damages.

FOR A SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Direct Corporate and Institutional Negligence, Malfeasance, and Ratification)
(Against the Institutional Defendants and the Elder Defendants)

129. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

130. The injuries to Plaintiff's minor child and his parents were not caused by a single isolated actor alone, but by an institution-wide failure at the governance level of the Church and Academy to identify, disclose, and remediate a known and recurring danger to children.

131. A non-profit corporation operating a childcare and school ministry owes children and their parents a non-delegable corporate duty, exercised through its governing body, officers, and institutional policymakers, to identify, evaluate, disclose, and remediate known and foreseeable risks of harm.

132. The Institutional Defendants and Elder Defendants had actual and repeated notice of the danger alleged herein, including Perry's criminal history, registry status, internal warnings, and the Academy's alleged compliance deficiencies.

133. Despite that notice, they failed to conduct meaningful governance-level investigation, failed to remove or restrict Perry, failed to disclose the danger to parents, failed to correct deficient child-safety practices, and continued to represent the environment as safe.

134. This continuing course of conduct amounts to ratification of the very acts and omissions that caused Plaintiffs' injuries.

135. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs sustained the injuries and damages alleged herein.

FOR AN EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Civil Conspiracy)
(Against the Institutional Defendants, Pastor Williams, Ginny Williams, Howard, the Elder Defendants, and Perry)

136. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

137. Upon information and belief, two or more of these Defendants combined, agreed, and acted in concert for the purpose of concealing Perry's status, suppressing warnings, avoiding outside scrutiny, preserving institutional reputation, and allowing Perry to remain in a position of access to children.

138. The object of the conspiracy was unlawful and wrongful in that it placed children, including Plaintiff's minor child, in foreseeable danger and deprived parents of material information necessary to protect their children.

139. In furtherance of the conspiracy, these Defendants committed overt acts including, without limitation:

- a. Knowingly allowing Perry to remain on campus and around children despite actual knowledge of his status;
- b. Concealing Perry's criminal history and registry status from parents, teachers, caregivers, and others charged with child safety;
- c. Suppressing or disregarding complaints and warnings made by teachers or other personnel;
- d. Providing false or misleading assurances of safety to parents;
- e. Failing to report material information to outside authorities; and
- f. Coordinating decisions about Perry within a small leadership circle to prevent outside intervention.

140. As a direct and proximate result of this conspiracy, Plaintiffs suffered special and additional damages, including amplified emotional distress, loss of the opportunity to protect Plaintiff's minor child sooner, pecuniary losses associated with continued enrollment, and other damages to be established in discovery and at trial.

141. Plaintiffs are entitled to actual and punitive damages as permitted by law.

FOR A NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Necessaries on Behalf of John Doe and Jane Doe, Individually)

142. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

143. As the parents of their minor child, Plaintiffs John Doe and Jane Doe are and have been legally responsible for the care, evaluation, counseling, treatment, and necessities of their minor child during his minority.

144. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for forensic, developmental, psychological, educational, and medical evaluation and treatment for their minor child, together with related expenses, lost time, lost wages, and extraordinary care.

145. Plaintiffs are entitled to recover all economic damages flowing from their necessities obligation.

FOR A TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Grossly Negligent Supervision, Monitoring, Investigation, and Enforcement Under the South Carolina Tort Claims Act)
(Against SCDPPPS)

146. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

147. SCDPPPS is the exclusive proper governmental defendant for tort claims arising from the acts and omissions of its employees acting within the scope of their official duties.

148. Plaintiffs bring this claim under the South Carolina Tort Claims Act, S.C. Code Ann. § 15-78-10 et seq., and do not seek punitive damages against SCDPPPS.

149. At all relevant times following Perry's November 23, 2023 sentencing, SCDPPPS retained legal authority and responsibility to supervise Perry's compliance with the terms and conditions of his community supervision.

150. Upon information and belief, SCDPPPS policy provided for an enhanced supervision program for sex offenders designed to reduce the likelihood of future sexual victimization and contemplated operational monitoring measures such as check-ins, audits, treatment-provider contact, and related supervision tools.

151. Upon information and belief, Perry was subject to standard sex-offender supervision conditions including a condition requiring him to refrain from contact with minors and a condition requiring him to refrain from working within one thousand (1,000) feet of minors.

152. Upon information and belief, SCDPPPS later alleged in its own affidavit that Perry failed to provide truthful reports to his agents by stating that he had no contact with minors and had not been in restricted areas.

153. The conduct for which Perry was placed at the Church and Academy was exactly the type of conduct those conditions were designed to prevent.

154. By virtue of its continuing legal authority over Perry, his conviction, his sex-offender status, and the conditions governing his activities, SCDPPPS owed a duty to exercise reasonable care, and at minimum to refrain from gross negligence, in carrying out the operational supervision, monitoring, investigation, and enforcement associated with Perry's community supervision.

155. SCDPPPS knew, or in the exercise of even slight care should have known, that Perry's actual or proposed activities at a church campus that also operated a school and childcare facility created a substantial and foreseeable risk of serious harm to children.

156. SCDPPPS breached its duty in a grossly negligent manner, including by one or more of the following acts or omissions:

- a. In failing to investigate, verify, monitor, or timely act upon information that Perry was performing custodial, maintenance, volunteer, or other work at a site where minor children were regularly present;
- b. In failing to determine whether Perry's actual activities, work location, and access to children complied with the conditions of his supervision;
- c. In failing to use reasonable operational supervision tools to confirm the true nature of the site where Perry was working or volunteering;
- d. In failing to take timely enforcement action after actual or constructive notice that Perry was violating supervision conditions or gaining prohibited access to minors;
- e. In failing to document, communicate, report, or act as required by applicable policies, conditions, and obligations; and
- f. In committing such other operational acts and omissions as discovery may reveal.

157. The omissions alleged in this cause of action constitute a conscious failure to exercise even slight care under the circumstances and therefore constitute gross negligence.

158. This claim is based on ongoing, non-adjudicative, operational supervision and enforcement conduct after Perry was placed under SCDPPPS supervision. It does not challenge the judicial, quasi-judicial, or discretionary decision to sentence Perry, release Perry, or schedule any hearing.

159. As a direct and proximate result of SCDPPPS's grossly negligent acts and omissions, Plaintiff's minor child was exposed to foreseeable danger and Plaintiffs sustained the injuries and damages alleged herein.

160. Plaintiffs seek only such actual and compensatory damages, costs, and other relief against SCDPPPS as are available under the South Carolina Tort Claims Act and subject to its statutory limitations, defenses, and damage caps.

DAMAGES

161. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' acts and omissions, Plaintiff's minor child has suffered and will continue to suffer damages including, without limitation, developmental disruption, emotional and psychological injury, the need for forensic and psychological evaluation, treatment expenses, injury to his sense of safety, and loss of enjoyment of life.

162. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' acts and omissions, John Doe and Jane Doe have suffered and will continue to suffer damages including tuition and fees paid to the Institutional Defendants, past and future costs of evaluation and care for Plaintiff's minor child, severe emotional distress and permanent anguish, transportation and related expenses, lost wages or time, and other consequential damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, having fully set forth their Complaint, Plaintiffs request judgment against Defendants as follows:

- A. For actual, compensatory, consequential, and special damages against all Defendants in amounts to be determined by the finder of fact, subject as to SCDPPPS to the South Carolina Tort Claims Act;
- B. For punitive damages against all Defendants other than SCDPPPS whose conduct is found to be reckless, willful, wanton, grossly negligent, or intentional;
- C. For treble damages, attorney's fees, and costs to the extent authorized under the South Carolina Unfair Trade Practices Act;
- D. For the economic damages of Plaintiffs John Doe and Jane Doe on their individual claim for necessities;

- E. For costs and disbursements of this action;
- F. For pre-judgment and post-judgment interest where authorized by law; and
- G. For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper.

Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPKINS LAW FIRM, LLC

s/ J. Clay Hopkins

J. Clay Hopkins (SC Bar #102053)

clay@hopkinsfirm.com

William E. Hopkins, Jr. (SC Bar #66474)

bill@hopkinsfirm.com

12019 Ocean Highway

Post Office Box 1885

Pawleys Island, South Carolina 29585

(843) 314-4202 – Telephone

(843) 314-9365 – Facsimile

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

July 28, 2026

Pawleys Island, South Carolina