

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM BERKELEY COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas  
Bentley Price, Circuit Court Judge

Case No: 2018-CP-08-00266 & 2018-CP-08-01008  
Appellate Case No.: 2019-001169

**RECEIVED**  
JUL 22 2022  
SC Court of Appeals

Aracelis Santos, .....Appellant,

vs.

Harris Investment Holdings, L.L.C., .....Respondent.

&

Case No. 2021-CP-08-00513  
Appellate Case No.: 2021-000768

Aracelis Santos, .....Appellant,

vs.

Harris Investment Holdings, L.L.C.  
City of Hanahan,  
City of Hanahan Police Department,  
John Doe #1 and John Doe #2  
Employees of the City of Hanahan Police Department, .....Defendants,  
of which  
Harris Investment Holdings, L.L.C. is the .....Respondent.

REPLY TO RESPONDENT'S RETURN TO  
APPELLANT'S MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE

July 18, 2022

/s/ Thomas R. Goldstein  
Thomas R. Goldstein, S. C. Bar No. 2186  
Belk, Cobb, Infinger & Goldstein, P.A.  
P. O. Box 71121  
N. Charleston, South Carolina 29415-1121  
(843) 554-4291 (843) 554-5566 (fax)  
E-mail: [tgoldstein@cobblaw.net](mailto:tgoldstein@cobblaw.net)  
ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT

Pursuant to Rules 240(d), *South Carolina Appellate Court Rules*, Appellant files this brief Reply to the Respondent's July 15, 2022 Return.

Respondent gratuitously asserts on page 3 of its July 15<sup>th</sup> Return that the Magistrate entered ejectment “[a]fter receiving reports from Hanahan authorities of **repeated dangerous criminal activity** at El Alamo.” This “dangerous criminal activity” is summarized in the first appeal at pages 232-237 and in the second appeal at pages 158-162 and 188-191. For the Court's convenience, a summary of this “repeated dangerous criminal activity” is attached here as Exhibit 1, and, the Court can reach its own conclusion as to whether Hanahan's prosecution of multiple alleged zoning violations and alleged fire code violations, all of which were dismissed, constitute “dangerous criminal activity.” However the Court chooses to characterize the 17 municipal violations, the Magistrate found them sufficient to establish the Appellant as a “public nuisance” and ordered ejectment. However, while that decision was under judicial review, on or about March 22, 2019, Harris Investment Holdings, L.L.C. decided to take matters into its own hands and bulldoze the building and its contents to dust. This act prevented this Court from reviewing the ejectment decision because the destruction mooted the issue since Appellant could no longer obtain meaningful relief to possess a building that no longer existed. This mootness conclusion is *res judicata* by the un-appealed decision of Judge Curtis and by the holding of the Supreme Court in *Skydive Myrtle Beach, Inc. v. Horry County*, 428 S.C. 638, 837 S.E.2d 485 (2020). Judge Curtis' un-appealed June 11, 2019, finding is the law of the case: “The magistrate court judge's award of attorney fees is affirmed. All other issues in this appeal are now moot as the subject property has been demolished.” R.O.A. page 49, attached here as Exhibit 2 for the Court's convenience.

One further misstatement requires correction. On page 6 of its Return, the Respondent asserts that the Appellant has unnecessarily delayed justice by stating incorrectly: “HIH is

nowhere near being able to enforce its judgment.” Return at page 6. Respondent fails to acknowledge two irrefutable legal principles:

First, money judgements are never stayed by appeal. Rule 241(b)(1) *South Carolina Appellate Court Rules*. Of course, executing on a money judgment while a case is on appeal is a risky proposition, but then Harris Investment Holdings has demonstrated repeatedly it is not adverse to risky behavior.

Second, the Respondent knows that Appellant is of modest financial strength against whom an execution on its judgment is not practical because of Appellant’s modest circumstances. Reading between the lines, Respondent is really complaining that David will not stop throwing stones and get out of the path of Goliath. (For a measure of financial disparity, consider that the Landlord’s requested attorney’s fees at a half-day, non-jury, Magistrate Court trial were \$54,340.58. R.O.A. page 126. Tenant incurred \$2,500.00 for the same trial. For the mathematical reader, that disparity is just short of a 22-fold difference.)

In summary, the Respondent is correct: it will be prejudiced by consolidation, but not by the kind of **legal prejudice** that defeats consolidation.

**Legal Prejudice.** Legal prejudice which will defeat plaintiff’s motion to dismiss is such as deprives defendant of substantive rights of property, or concerns his defense, which will not be available or may be endangered in a second suit. *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. See also *Prime Medical Corp. v. First Medical Corp.*, 291 S.C. 296, 353 S.E.2d 294 (S. C. App. 1987): “. . . First Medical failed to carry its burden of showing legal prejudice. The only reasons appearing in the record for the administrative law judge to deny the motion were that the case was the oldest on the docket and that First Medical was ready for trial.”

Here Respondent offers no evidence of legal prejudice to consolidation. Instead, it resists consolidation to hinder the Court’s ability to review the full spectrum of its conduct and to wear down the Appellant with its superior financial strength. Not to put too fine a point it, Respondent weaponizes the judicial system and is hardly the first to do so. Second, consolidation shines a bright light on the Respondent’s conduct in destroying the building and its contents while the

appeal was pending, and in the annals of South Carolina jurisprudence, there is no record of a landlord charting the route taken by Harris Investment Holdings, L.L.C. Harris Investments has the temerity (chutzpah in Yiddish<sup>1</sup>) to invoke Rule 1 of the *South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure*, a *reductio ad absurdum* where Respondent redefines “just” and “speedy” and “inexpensive” into their opposites. Two separate appeals in the place of one is the opposite of “speedy” and the opposite of “inexpensive,” and does not become more “just” than a streamlined resolution. Thus, while Respondent is correct in asserting the two appeals are from different orders, it is misleading to omit the fact the two appeals involve the same parties, the same subject matter, the same transaction, and neither appeal can be understood without reference to the other. In fact, the Records on Appeal are substantially overlapping. Thus the “prejudice” to Harris Investment Holdings L.L.C. is not the type of legal prejudice that defeats consolidation; rather, it is credibility prejudice it suffers from having its conduct examined in the full spectrum of its actions as opposed to piecemeal defenses. If Respondent believes that the rules of court “shall be construed to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action” (Return at page 6, quoting Rule 1 of the *South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure*), then it cannot possibly have a sincere objection to consolidation.

Respectfully submitted,

July 18, 2022

/s/ Thomas R. Goldstein

Thomas R. Goldstein, S. C. Bar No. 2186  
Belk, Cobb, Infinger & Goldstein, P.A.  
P. O. Box 71121  
N. Charleston, South Carolina 29415-1121  
(843) 554-4291 (843) 554-5566 (fax)  
E-mail: [tgoldstein@cobblaw.net](mailto:tgoldstein@cobblaw.net)  
ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT

---

<sup>1</sup> Chutzpah is sometimes defined by the defendant charged with murder of his parents seeking mercy on the ground he is an orphan.

# **EXHIBIT 1**

**(Revised March 13, 2018)**

DATE	DEFENDANT	CHARGE
<b>Hanahan Municipal Court</b>		
<b>(1)</b> August 20, 2016 Ticket No. 4102P0213362—Officer Dodd	Benjamin F. Reyna	After Hours Consumption
<b>Consolidated Bench Trial—Tried December 14, 2017</b>		
<b>(2)</b> October 1, 2016 Ticket No. 2007—Officer Dodd	Benjamin F. Reyna	After Hours Consumption
<b>Consolidated Bench Trial—Tried December 14, 2017</b>		
<b>(3)</b> October 2, 2016 2008—Officer Dodd	Benjamin F. Reyna	After Hours Consumption
<b>Consolidated Bench Trial—Tried December 14, 2017</b>		
<b>(4)</b> October 2, 2016 Ticket No. 2009	Benjamin F. Reyna	Public Nuisance
<b>Consolidated Bench Trial—dismissed (Nuisance = Violation of § 4-2)</b>		
<b>(5)</b> October 2, 2016 Ticket No. 2010	Benjamin F. Reyna	Disorderly House
<b>Jury Trial—dismissed</b>		
<b>(6)</b> October 2, 2016 Ticket No. 2011	Benjamin F. Reyna	Unsafe Building (Occupancy)
<b>Case re-opened, No contest plea Feb. 16, 2018 \$50.00 fine</b>		
<b>(7)</b> October 23, 2016 Ticket No. 52737GT	Aracelis Santos Gomez	Assault & Battery 3d degree
<b>Dismissed</b>		
<b>(8)</b> October 29, 2016 Ticket No. 2012	Benjamin F. Reyna	After Hours Consumption
<b>Consolidated Bench Trial—trial in absence—on appeal (same as (6))?</b>		

(9) November 5, 2016 Nicole Lynn Franz After Hours Consumption  
4102P0213823—Officer Dodd

**Consolidated Bench Trial**

(10) November 5, 2016 Agustin Torres-Sanchez After Hours Consumption  
4102P0213825—Officer Dodd

**Consolidated Bench Trial (?)**

(11) November 5, 2016 Guillermina Anastacio- After Hours Consumption  
4102P0213828—Officer Dodd Eleuterio

**Consolidated Bench Trial (?)**

(12) November 5, 2016 Angela Hernandez After Hours Consumption  
4102P0213829—Officer Dodd

**No Contest Plea Feb. 16, 2018. \$50.00 fine**

(13) November 5, 2016 Arelia Santos Gomez After Hours Consumption  
4102P0213830—Officer Dodd

**Consolidated Bench Trial**

(14) November 5, 2016 Cruz Torres After Hours Consumption  
4102P0213824—Officer Dodd

**Consolidated Bench Trial (?)**

(15) November 5, 2016 Juan Balderas After Hours Consumption  
(No ticket number)—Officer Dodd

**Consolidated Bench Trial**

(16) November 5, 2016 Gisel Gonzales Cruz After Hours Consumption  
4102P0213827—Officer Dodd

**No Contest Plea Feb. 16, 2018 \$50.00 fine**

(17) November 6, 2016 Arelis Santos Gomez Unlicensed Sales  
4102P0213834

**Deferred Prosecution for 90 days from Feb. 16, 2018**

- (18) November 11, 2016                      Arelis Santos Gomez                      After hours Consumption  
Ticket No. 4102P0213835—Officer Dodd  
**No Contest Plea Feb. 16, 2018 \$50.00 fine**
- (19) November 16, 2016                      Benjamin F. Reyna                      Disorderly Conduct  
Ticket No. 52738GT  
**Dismissed by Court Order**
- (20) November 16, 2016                      Benjamin F. Reyna                      After Hours Consumption  
Ticket No. 52739GT  
**Dismissed by Court Order**
- (21) November 26, 2016                      Brandon Leroy Washington-Brown                      After Hours Consumption  
Ticket No. 4102P0214311—Officer Dodd  
**No Contest Plea Feb. 16, 2018 \$50.00 fine**
- (22) December 10, 2016                      Leroy Washington-Brown                      Operating w/o license  
Ticket No. 4102P0214334  
**Dismissed**
- (23) December 10, 2016                      Leroy Washington-Brown                      After Hours Consumption  
4102P0214335—Officer Dodd  
**No Contest Plea Feb. 16, 2018 \$50.00 fine**
- (24) December 10, 2016                      Leroy Washington-Brown                      Noise Ordinance  
4102P0214336  
**Chief Turner reviewing**
- (25) December 24, 2016                      Anthony Dale Foster                      After Hours Consumption  
4102P0214347—Officer Dodd  
**Consolidated Bench Trial—dismissed**
- (26) January 7, 2017                      Arelis D. Santos Gomez                      After Hours Consumption  
4102P0214411—Officer Dodd  
**Consolidated Bench Trial**
- (27) January 7, 2017                      Arelis D. Santos Gomez                      Operating w/o business  
4102P0214412—Officer Dodd                      license  
**Dismissed**
- (28) January 7, 2017                      Arelis D. Santos Gomez                      Interfering with City  
4102P0214413—Officer Dodd                      employees  
**Dismissed by Court Order (Judge Stokes)**

**(29-42)**

January 7, 2017

3400	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 609.3.3.3.1
3401	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 609.3.3.3
3402	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 609.3.3.1
3403	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 509.1
3404	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 901.6
3405	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 315.3.3
3406	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 605.1
3407	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 605.3
3408	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 605.4
3409	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 605.5
3410	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 605.6
3411	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 1010.1.9.1
3412	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 1010.1.9.3.2.2
3413	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 110.1.1
3414	Arelis D. Santos Gomez	2015 IFC, 111.1

**29-42: Dismissed**

**(43)**

November 6, 2016

Ticket No. 4102P0210213836

Lance Grimes

Disorderly conduct

**Dismissed**

**(44)**

Ticket No. unknown

Evodio Hernandez Santos

Unlawful use of 911

**Chief Turner reviewing—Clerk's Office says convicted**

(45) Arelis Santos Gomez Assault & Battery 3d degree  
Ticket No. 52737 GT  
**Dismissed.** (Same as No. 7)

(46) Arelis Santos Gomez Unlawful Consumption  
September 3, 2017 Ordinance 4-2  
Ticket No. 4102P0216292  
**No Contest Plea Feb. 16, 18 \$50.00 fine**

(47) Arelis Santos Gomez Unlawful Consumption  
November 23, 17 Ordinance 4-2  
Ticket 2251  
**Consolidated Bench Trial**

**Moncks Corner-Traffic Tickets- SLED**

(48) Anthony Dale Foster Unlawful sale of beer/and  
March 20, 2017 Operating w/o a permit  
Ticket No. 26437 DB  
**No Contest Plea, fine \$50.00**

(49) Arelis Santos Gomez Unlawful sale of beer/and  
March 20, 2017 Operating w/o a permit  
Ticket No. 26438 DB  
**Dismissed**

(50) Arelis Santos Gomez Unlawful sale of beer  
October 2, 2017  
Ticket No. 86689 EF  
**Pending**

(51) Benjamin Reyna Flores Unlawful sale of beer  
October 2, 2017  
Ticket No. 86690 EF  
**Pending**

- 25 Dismissed
- 1 Deferred
- 8 No contest
- 16 pending

# **EXHIBIT 2**

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

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE  
CASE NO. 2018CP0800266

Aracelis Santos  
PLAINTIFF(S)

Harris Investment Holdings, LLC  
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:

The magistrate court judge's award of attorney fees is affirmed. All other issues in this appeal are now moot as the subject property has been demolished.

**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 06/06/2019

Magistrate Court Goose Creek

**NAMES OF TRADITIONAL FILERS SERVED BY MAIL**



**Berkeley Common Pleas**

**Case Caption:** Aracelis Santos VS Harris Investment Holdings, LLC

**Case Number:** 2018CP0800266

**Type:** Order/Electronic Form 4

So Ordered

s/ Kristi F. Curtis, Circuit Court Judge, No. 2762

Electronically signed on 2019-06-06 11:28:07 page 3 of 3

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM BERKELEY COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas  
Bentley Price, Circuit Court Judge

**RECEIVED**  
JUL 22 2022  
SC Court of Appeals

Case No. 2018-CP-08-00266 & 2018-CP-08-01008  
Appellate Case No.: 2019-001169

Aracelis Santos, .....Appellant,

vs.

Harris Investment Holdings, L.L.C., .....Respondent.

&

Case No. 2021-CP-08-00513  
Appellate Case No.: 2021-000768

Aracelis Santos, .....Appellant,

vs.

Harris Investment Holdings, L.L.C.  
City of Hanahan,  
City of Hanahan Police Department,  
John Doe #1 and John Doe #2  
Employees of the City of Hanahan Police Department, .....Defendants,

of which

Harris Investment Holdings, L.L.C. is the .....Respondent.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Appellant's Reply to Respondent's Return to Motion to Consolidate Appeals upon the Respondent, Harris Investment Holdings, L.L.C., by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on July 18, 2022, addressed to the attorneys of record for the Harris Investment Holdings, L.L.C., Merritt Abney, 151 Meeting Street, Sixth Floor, Charleston, S. C. 29401-2239 (and to counsel for the City of Hanahan, *et. al.*, by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid the same date to Stafford J. McQuillin, III at P. O. Box 340, Charleston, S. C. 29402).

July 18, 2022

/s/ Thomas R. Goldstein

Thomas R. Goldstein, S. C. Bar # 2186

BELK, COBB, INFINGER, & GOLDSTEIN, P.A.

Post Office Box 71121

N. Charleston, South Carolina 29415-1121

[tgoldstein@cobblaw.net](mailto:tgoldstein@cobblaw.net)

(843) 554-4291; (843) 554-5566 (fax)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT

**BELK, COBB, INFINGER AND GOLDSTEIN, P.A.**

Harry C. Belk (1919-2003)  
Dale T. Cobb, Jr.

Peggy M. Infinger  
pinfinger@cobblaw.net

Thomas R. Goldstein  
tgoldstein@cobblaw.net

ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
2344 COSGROVE AVENUE  
CHARLESTON, SC 29405

Mailing Address:  
P.O. Box 71121  
Charleston, SC  
zip 29415-1121  
Ph: (843) 554-4291  
Fax: (843) 554-5566

July 18, 2022

**RECEIVED**  
JUL 22 2022  
SC Court of Appeals

Hon. Jenny A. Kitchings,  
Clerk of Court  
S. C. Court of Appeals  
P. O. Box 11629  
Columbia, S. C. 29211

Re: Aracelis Santos v. Harris Investment Holdings, L.L.C., et. al.  
Case Nos.: 2021-CP-08-00513

Dear Ms. Kitchings,

I enclose Appellant's Reply to Respondent's Return to Motion for Consolidation. By copy of this letter, I am providing a copy to opposing counsel. Please let me know if you require anything further.

I thank you in advance for your attention to this request. With kind regards, I am

Very truly yours,

  
BELK, COBB, INFINGER & GOLDSTEIN, P.A.  
Thomas R. Goldstein

TRG/

enclosure: Reply to Respondent's Return, Exhibit 1 and 2

cc:  
Merritt Abney, Esq.  
151 Meeting Street  
Sixth Floor  
Charleston, S. C. 29401  
Stafford J. McQuillin, Esq.

FIRST CLASS



US POSTAGE PINNEY BOWES

207 5405 \$ 002.16<sup>0</sup>  
82 71  
9500845291 JUL 18 2022

**FIRST CLASS MAIL**

Belk, Cobb, Infinger & Goldstein, PA  
P. O. Box 71121  
N. Charleston, S. C. 29415-1121

**RECEIVED**

JUL 22 2022

SC Court of Appeals

Hon. Jenny A. Kitchings,  
Clerk of Court  
S. C. Court of Appeals  
P. O. Box 11629  
Columbia, S. C. 29211

