STATE ETHICS COMMISSION
RECEIVED NOV7'25 PM1:32:28

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

COMPLAINT FORM

FOR COMMISSION USE ONLY:
CASE NUMBER
C 2025-102

COMPLAINANT: Ashley Glenn
ADDRESS: [redacted]
TELEPHONE NUMBER: [redacted]
TITLE: Prior Council Member

RESPONDENT: Nicole Perkins
ADDRESS: [redacted]
TELEPHONE NUMBER: [redacted]
TITLE: Current Mayor

Set forth in detail specific facts upon which you based your complaint against above-named respondent (only detailed, clear factual allegations will be considered. If additional space is needed, attach supplemental sheets).

Ordinances set by the town are not being followed. All ordinances for Purchasing are set at $1000, or all council and mayor have to approve the expense. Council has not approved any expenses over $1000 since Nicole Perkins became mayor. She is finishing up her second term this year. Also, people are hired without council approval. We have Tina Davis working in the office who left last January and has come back in without council being notified. We received a grant from SC DHEC - $500,000. Council did not get to be a part of funds appropriated. We used this grant to do electrical repairs on town rental buildings. Council was not notified when the electrician was hired, and he did about $130,000 without an electrical license. Tina Davis and Nicole Perkins hired him. Nicole also paid her husband to do several jobs without Council approving hiring him. He made over $10,000 from the grant money.

If there is a finding of probable cause, the following documents become public record: the complaint, the response (if any) by respondent, and the notice of hearing. If a hearing is to be held, the final order and all exhibits become public record. If no hearing is held following a finding of probable cause, the final disposition of the matter becomes public record.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF York
Personally appeared before me Ashley Glenn who, first being duly sworn, says that he/she has read and knows the contents of the above complaint and that the allegations contained therein, are true and correct to the best of his/her own knowledge, except for those matters therein based upon information and belief, and as to those he/she believes them to be true.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this
3rd day of November, 2025

[redacted]
Complainant Signature

[redacted]
Notary Public for South Carolina
My Commission expires 10 - 21 - 2032

JENNIFER LINGERFELT
Notary Public-State of South Carolina
My Commission Expires
October 21, 2032

SEC-7 (Revised 3/2022)

REPLY TO: 201 Executive Center Drive, Suite 150, Columbia, South Carolina 29210 (803)253-4192
ELECTRONIC COPIES WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

C102form

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA COUNTY OF RICHLAND	)	BEFORE THE STATE ETHICS COMMISSION
IN THE MATTER OF:	)	
Complaint C2025-102	)	
Ashley "Brooke" Glenn Complainant.	)	**NOTICE OF HEARING**
Nicole Perkins Respondent.	)	

The State Ethics Commission has determined that there is probable cause pursuant to Section 8-13-320(10)(i), Code of Laws, South Carolina, 1976, as amended, in the above-captioned complaint. The Commission will convene a formal hearing into the matter in accordance with Section 8-13-320(10)(i) & (j), Code of Laws, South Carolina, 1976, as amended, and State Ethics Commission Regulations, S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 52-707 (1997 Cum. Supp.) on Thursday, October 15, 2026, at 9:30 a.m. at the Commission Hearing Room located at: 201 Executive Center Drive, Suite 150, Columbia, South Carolina 29210.

The following allegations will be heard:

COUNT ONE
USE OF OFFICE FOR FINANCIAL GAIN
SECTION 8-13-700(A), S.C. CODE ANN., 1976, AS AMENDED

That Nicole Perkins, Mayor for the Town of Sharon, knowingly used her official position to obtain an economic interest for herself by issuing four (4) checks to herself for reimbursements and stipends totaling $1,777.58, in violation of Section 8-13-700(A), as follows: (1) check number 3314 dated June 10, 2022 in the amount of $247.12;(2) check number 3351 dated August 14, 2022 in the amount of $238.17; (3) check number 4012 dated October 9, 2025 in the amount of $32.29; and (4) check number 4108 dated November 4, 2025 in the amount of $1,260.00.

COUNT TWO
USE OF OFFICE FOR FINANCIAL GAIN
SECTION 8-13-700(A), S.C. CODE ANN., 1976, AS AMENDED

That Nicole Perkins, Mayor for the Town of Sharon, knowingly used her official position to obtain an economic interest for her brother Adam Robinson, by issuing check number 3797 dated May 31, 2024 in the amount of $500.00 to him for work performed for the Town of Sharon, in violation of Section 8-13-700(A).

COUNT THREE
USE OF OFFICIAL POSITION FOR FINANCIAL GAIN; DISCLOSURE OF POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST
SECTION 8-13-700(B), S.C. CODE ANN., 1976, AS AMENDED

That Nicole Perkins, Mayor for the Town of Sharon, participated in the selection, approval, and payment of her husband, Kenneth Perkins, for work performed for the Town of Sharon, in violation of Section 8-13-700(B), resulting in payments totaling $8,450.00 as follows: (1) check number 3476 dated February 22, 2023 in the amount of $750.00; (2) check number 3501 dated April 19, 2023 in the amount of $800.00; (3) check number 3596 dated August 14, 2023 in the amount of $2,100.00; and (4) check number 3648 dated November 13, 2023 in the amount of $4,800.00.

COUNT FOUR
USE OF OFFICIAL POSITION FOR FINANCIAL GAIN; DISCLOSURE OF POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST
SECTION 8-13-700(B), S.C. CODE ANN., 1976, AS AMENDED

That Nicole Perkins, Mayor for the Town of Sharon, participated in the selection, approval, and payment to Underground Substation Services, a business with which Respondent is associated, for work performed for the Town of Sharon, in violation of Section 8-13-700(B), resulting in payments totaling $50,900.00 as follows: (1) check number 3814 dated June 21, 2023 in the amount of $21,500.00; (2) check number 3765 dated April 15, 2024 in the amount of $7,900.00;

and (3) check number 3795 dated May 31, 2024 in the amount of $21,500.00.

COUNT FIVE
FAILURE TO DISCLOSE BUSINESS INTEREST
SECTION 8-13-1120(A)(5) S.C. CODE ANN., 1976, AS AMENDED

That Nicole Perkins, Mayor for the Town of Sharon, failed to disclose a business interest in Underground Substation Services LLC on her 2024 and 2025 Statements of Economic Interest, in violation of Section 8-13-1120(A)(5).

You have the right to be represented by counsel, the right to call and examine witnesses, the right to introduce exhibits, and the right to cross-examine opposing witnesses. This hearing will be open to the public as required by Section 8-13-320(10)(j), Code of Laws, South Carolina, 1976, as amended. The procedures to be followed are set forth in the Administrative Procedures Act, Section 1-23-10, et seq., Code of Laws, South Carolina, 1976, as amended, the State Ethics Act, Section 8-13-100, et seq., Code of Laws, South Carolina, 1976, as amended, and State Ethics Commission Regulations, S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 52-707 (1997 Cum. Supp.).

A pre-hearing conference may be scheduled prior to the hearing to allow exchange of witness lists and evidence, marking of exhibits, and disposition of motions or pleadings. In the event you fail to appear, judgment by default will be rendered against you. If there are any questions concerning the above notice or hearing times, please contact the State Ethics Commission.

[redacted]
Meghan Walker Dayson, Executive Director
State Ethics Commission

Dated this 16th day,
of July 2026

Certificate of Service by Certified Mail

I hereby certify that a copy of this **NOTICE OF HEARING** was duly served on RESPONDENT Nicole Perkins, 4025 Woodlawn Street, Sharon, SC 29742 by depositing said **NOTICE OF HEARING** in the United States mail, Columbia, South Carolina on this 17 day of July 2026, by CERTIFIED MAIL, E-RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED, appropriate postage affixed, and a return address clearly indicated on said envelope.

[redacted]

Maquita S. Kessler, Paralegal

Columbia, South Carolina — State Ethics Commission — (803) 253-4192

STATE ETHICS COMMISSION
RECEIVED NOV 26 4:11 PM

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF RICHLAND

IN THE MATTER OF:
Complaint 2025-102

Ashley Brooke Glenn,
Complainant.

Nicole Perkins,
Respondent.

BEFORE THE STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

CONSENT ORDER

This matter comes before the State Ethics Commission (Commission) by way of a complaint received on November 7, 2025. Pursuant to Section 8-13-320(10)(i) of the South Carolina Ethics, Government Accountability, and Campaign Reform Act (Ethics Act), the Complaint against Nicole Perkins (Respondent) was considered by the Commission and probable cause was found to warrant an evidentiary hearing. Prior to the call of the case, Respondent agreed to the following:

STATEMENTS OF FACT

1. Respondent was elected Mayor for the Town of Sharon (Town) on November 2, 2021, and has served in that role continuously since.
2. Respondent's husband, Oatis "Ken" Perkins incorporated Perkins & Family Construction & Landscaping, LLC on March 9, 2023. The LLC's name was changed to Underground Substation Services, LLC (Underground Substation) on April 18, 2024.
3. On November 7, 2025, the Commission received a complaint alleging Respondent was not complying with Town purchasing ordinances and that Respondent hired her brother, Adam

Robinson, and her husband, Ken Perkins, to perform work for the Town.[1]

4. Commission Investigator William B. White, Jr. reviewed records from the Town's checking account at South State Bank and those produced by the Town related to expenditures made to Ken Perkins or Underground Substation. The records revealed the following payments made to Respondent, Respondent's brother, and Respondent's husband or his business:

Check #	Date	Payee	Signer	Amount	Notes
3314	6/10/2022	Nicole Perkins	Nicole Perkins	$247.12	Town Supplies
3351	8/14/2022	Nicole Perkins	Nicole Perkins	$238.17	Town Supplies
3470	2/15/2023	Adam Robinson	Tina Davis	$500.00	Concession Stand
3476	2/22/2023	Ken Perkins	Tina Davis	$750.00	Fabricate Rack
3501	4/19/2023	Ken Perkins	Tina Davis	$800.00	Invoice 100
3814	6/21/2023	Underground Substation	Tina Davis	$21,500.00	Invoice 203
3596	8/14/2023	Ken Perkins	Tina Davis	$2,100.00	Invoice 103
3648	11/13/2023	Ken Perkins	Tina Davis	$4,800.00	Invoice 104
3765	4/15/2024	Underground Substation	Tina Davis	$7,900.00	Pump Station
3795	5/31/2024	Underground Substation	Tina Davis	$21,500.00	Invoice 202
3797	5/31/2024	Adam Robinson	Nicole Perkins	$500.00	Roof Repair
4012	10/19/2025	Nicole Perkins	Nicole Perkins	$32.29	Illegible
4108	11/4/2025	Nicole Perkins	Nicole Perkins	$1,260.00	Mayor & Cell Phone

5. On April 24, 2026, Investigator White interviewed Respondent at her attorney's office, and the following information was revealed:

   a. Regarding check numbers 3314, 4012, 3351, and 4108, totaling $1,777.58, Respondent wrote these checks to herself from the Town account and signed them. Respondent explained that checks 3314, 4012, and 3351 were written as reimbursement for items

[1] The complaint contained other allegations, but the Commission's investigation found no evidence substantiating them, and they are therefore not discussed herein.

purchased for the Town. Check 4108 was for her annual mayoral stipend and her cellular phone stipend. Receipts were made available and reviewed.

b. Regarding check numbers 3476, 3501, 3596, and 3648, which totaled $8,450.00, Respondent admitted Ken Perkins was her husband. Respondent explained that for each expenditure, she was not the sole decision maker, and that she consulted with the Town Administrator or members of Council before decisions were made.

   i. As to check 3476, the Town Administrator's documents provided that she called around for prices regarding a welding project. When all of the prices quoted were more expensive than anticipated, Respondent asked her husband what he would perform the work for. Respondent's husband provided a quote for less than each of the others received.

   ii. As to check 3501, the Town Administrator's records provided that Respondent and the Mayor Pro-Tem sought to have a historical marker repaired, and that they initially reached out to a masonry contractor but the quote provided was too expensive. Respondent and Mayor Pro-Tem decided to ask Respondent's husband to perform the work, and he did so for less than the original contractor quoted.

   iii. As to check 3596, the Town Administrator's records show that upon discovering a street within the Town limits had never received any maintenance from the County or the Town, the Town Administrator asked a grading/paving vendor to perform work. The vendor indicated he would complete the job for less money if the roadside ditches were first remediated. The Town's usual remediation vendor was not available, so Respondent's husband said he would do the work.

iv. As to check 3648, the Town Administrator's records noted a Town-owned rental property was "left in a mess" by the previous tenet. Respondent sought estimates from several contractors, and her husband offered to do the work at a lower cost than the others.

c. Regarding check numbers 3814, 3765, and 3795, which totaled $50,900.00, Respondent confirmed that Underground Substation was a company founded by her husband, of which she was a member. Respondent stated that checks 3814 and 3795 were two portions of the same job. She stated that her husband was the only contractor who provided a quote, and that the decision to hire his company was discussed among Council. The Town Administrator's documents noted that work provided under check 3765 was performed on an emergency basis.

d. Regarding check numbers 3470 and 3797 written to Adam Robinson, totaling $1,000.00, Respondent confirmed Robinson was her brother. Respondent stated she was not involved with the payment of check 3470. Respondent stated check 3797 was discussed in a Council meeting, but no vote was taken as the amount was under $500.01.

6. Respondent acknowledged that she participated in discussions concerning work by her husband and his business and did not prepare a written conflict statement or formally recuse from those matters. She stated that the projects were discussed openly with the Town Administrator or Council, and that some expenditures were made without a Council vote. Respondent also provided the following written statement:

> Please note all projects were discussed openly among the full council wherein each councilmember was afforded the opportunity to express any concerns, approval or disapproval of the projects and payment. I feel the council and I exhibited the utmost

> transparency...The full council shared a goal to accomplish projects as quickly and effectively as possible for the betterment of our town and community.

Respondent's statement also provided that her husband and Underground Substation performed work for the Town "at or below cost." Investigator White's review of the Town's documents revealed the same.

7. Respondent also provided that throughout her tenure, the Town had three authorized signers for its checking account: Respondent, the Town Administrator, and the Mayor Pro-Tem. Respondent explained it was difficult to coordinate occasions when they would be in the office together, so signing checks to themselves for payroll or reimbursement was not out of the ordinary. Respondent also stated that checks were only issued for compensation which was actually due to the recipient. The Town has since developed and implemented appropriate internal-control mechanisms to separate payment approval and check-signing authority.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based upon the Statements of Fact, the Commission concludes, as a matter of law:

1. At all times relevant, Respondent was a public official, as defined by Section 8-13-100(27), and the Commission therefore has personal and subject matter jurisdiction.
2. At all times relevant, Underground Substation was a business with which the Respondent was associated, defined in Section 8-13-100(4) as:

> A business of which the person or a member of his immediate family is a director, an officer, owner, employee, a compensated agent, or holder of stock worth one hundred thousand dollars or more at fair market value and which constitutes five percent or more of the total outstanding stock of any class.

3. Respondent, her brother, her husband, and Underground Substation held economic interests in payments received from the Town. Economic interest is defined in Section 8-13-100(11)(a) as:

> An interest distinct from that of the general public in a purchase, sale, lease, contract, option, or other transaction or arrangement involving property or services in which a public official, public member, or public employee may gain an economic benefit of fifty dollars or more.

4. At all times relevant, Respondent's husband was an "immediate family" member, defined in Section 8-13-100(18)(b) as the "spouse of a [] public official."

5. At all times relevant, Respondent's husband and her brother were Respondent's "family members," defined in Section 8-13-100(15)(a) as the public official's:

> Spouse, parent, brother, sister, child, mother-in-law, father-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, grandparent, or grandchild.

6. By signing checks payable to herself for Town expenses and stipends, and check 3797 payable to her brother for Town work, Respondent used her official check-signing authority in transactions in which she or a family member held an economic interest, in violation of Section 8-13-700(A), which provides, in relevant part:

> No public official [] may knowingly use his official office [] to obtain an economic interest for himself, a family member, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated.

7. By participating in discussions and decisions concerning work performed by her husband and Underground Substation without a written disclosure and formal recusal, Respondent violated Section 8-13-700(B), which provides, in relevant part:

> No public official [] may make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use his office [] to influence a governmental decision in which he, a family member, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated has an economic interest. A public official [], who, in the discharge of his official responsibilities, is required to take an action or make a decision which affects an economic interest of himself, a family member, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated shall:

> (1) prepare a written statement describing the matter requiring action or decisions and the nature of his potential conflict of interest with respect to the action or decision;
>
> (4) if he is a public official, other than a member of the General Assembly, he shall furnish a copy of the statement to the presiding officer of the governing body of an agency, commission, board, or of a county, municipality, or a political subdivision thereof, on which he serves, who shall cause the statement to be printed in the minutes and require that the member be excused from any votes, deliberations, and other actions on the matter on which the potential conflict of interest exists and shall cause the disqualification and the reasons for it to be noted in the minutes.

8. Section 8-13-130 allows the Commission to "levy an enforcement or administrative fee on a person who is in violation of any provision of the Ethics Act."
9. Section 8-13-320(10)(l)(i) allows the Commission to require payment of a civil penalty of up to two thousand dollars for each violation of the Ethics Act.
10. Section 8-13-320(10)(l)(ii) allows the Commission to require forfeiture of the value of any amounts obtained in violation of the Ethics Act.

DISCUSSION

The Commission found probable cause to charge Respondent with two counts of Section 8-13-700(A), arising from the use of her check-signing authority to execute payments to herself and her brother, and two counts of Section 8-13-700(B), arising from her participation in decisions involving her husband and Underground Substation as Town contractors.

Section 8-13-700(A), in relevant part, prohibits a public official from knowingly using his position to obtain an economic interest for himself, a family member, or a business with which he is associated. Likewise, Section 8-13-700(B) prohibits a public official from influencing or attempting to influence a governmental decision in which the public official, a family member, or a business with which the public official is associated has an economic interest. In the event such

a matter comes before the public official, Section 8-13-700(B) prescribes the course of action the public official should take to recuse themselves.

The Commission's investigation revealed that Respondent signed four Town checks to herself for reimbursement of Town expenditures, her mayoral stipend, and her cellular phone stipend, and signed one check to her brother for roofing repairs. The payments underlying these reimbursements, stipends, and work were due or performed; the Commission makes no finding that Respondent obtained unearned funds, inflated an amount, or diverted Town funds. These transactions form the basis of the two Section 8-13-700(A) counts. The investigation also revealed that Council selected Respondent's husband or his business for Town construction work. Respondent acknowledges that she participated in discussions or decisions concerning that work without the written disclosure and recusal required by Section 8-13-700(B). These matters form the basis of the two Section 8-13-700(B) counts.

In mitigation, the checks payable to Respondent were for Town purchases or stipends due to her, and the check payable to her brother was for work performed. Additionally, Town records reflect that lower quotes or a lack of available vendors led to selection of Respondent's husband on several occasions. Respondent stated that her husband and/or Underground Substation performed the subject work at or below cost, which was confirmed by Investigator White's review of Town records. The Town has since separated payment approval from check-signing authority.

DISPOSITION

1. The Commission hereby finds Respondent in violation of two counts of Section 8-13-700(A) and two counts of Section 8-13-700(B).
2. The Commission hereby adopts the Statements of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Discussion, and Disposition as agreed upon by the Respondent.

THEREFORE, the Commission hereby issues this Public Reprimand to Respondent for violations of the Ethics Act;

AND orders Respondent to pay to the Commission, within six (6) months of receipt of this Order, a civil penalty of $1,000.00 ($500.00 per violation of Section 8-13-700(B)), and an administrative fee of $200.00, for a total of $1,200.00.[2]

By executing this Consent Order, Respondent understands that she is admitting violations of the Act and agrees to the payment terms above. If payment is not made within the time provided, Respondent will be subject to a judgment of $8,500.00 ($2,000.00 per violation and an increased administrative fee of $500.00), less any amount already paid to the Commission. In this event, the Commission shall file a judgment against Respondent with the Clerk of Court in Respondent's last known county of residence, who shall enter this Order in the amount of $8,500.00 (less any amount already paid to the Commission) in its judgment rolls, without cost to the Commission.

[signature page following]

---

[2] The Commission declines to assess a civil penalty for the two violations of Section 8-13-700(A), as the investigation revealed all checks were written for compensation actually due. The Commission declines to assess any restitution for the same reason.

AND IT IS ORDERED THIS 28th DAY OF October 2026.

STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

[redacted]

Sara Parrish

[redacted]

NICOLE PERKINS,
RESPONDENT

[redacted]

JUSTIN HOLLOWAY,
ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT

[redacted]

ANDREW B. MOORMAN, SR.,
ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT