

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

Kenneth Pace, Individually and as Personal
Representative of the Estate of Earl E. Pace,

Plaintiff,

2019-CP-42-03709

2019-CP-42-03708

v.

Lake Emory Post Acute Care; THI of South
Carolina at Camp Care, LLC; THI of South
Carolina, LLC; THI of Baltimore, Inc.;
Fundamental Administrative Services, LLC;
Fundamental Clinical and Operational Services,
LLC; Fundamental Clinical Consulting, LLC;
Fundamental Long Term Care Holdings, LLC,
and Kerry L. Wheeler, DO,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING
DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS TO
DISMISS, COMPEL
ARBITRATION, AND TO STAY
THE STATE COURT
PROCEEDING**

RECEIVED

Jul 27 2022

SC Court of Appeals

This matter is before the Court upon motions filed by the Defendants to stay the underlying state court litigation and compel the above-captioned matters to arbitration. The parties submitted written memoranda in support and opposition to the motions and the Court heard oral argument of counsel for both parties on January 20, 2021. For the reasons set forth below, the Defendants' motion are hereby DENIED.

I. FACTUAL & PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This Court finds that on or about July 10, 2014, Mr. Pace was taken into the protective custody of the South Carolina Department of Social Services, (hereafter "DSS"). A Guardian *ad Litem*, (hereafter "GAL"), and an attorney were appointed for Mr. Pace by the family court. Thereafter, Mr. Pace was admitted to Lake Emory Post Acute Care, (hereafter "Lake Emory"), for care and supervision. At the time Mr. Pace was admitted to Lake Emory, he was under the custody of DSS. A DSS employee executed Mr. Pace's

admission paperwork. The paperwork executed by the DSS employee, Calvin Hill, (hereafter “Mr. Hill”), included an admission agreement and a separate arbitration agreement. It is undisputed that Mr. Hill was the only signer of the admission paperwork and the arbitration agreement. DSS subsequently petitioned the court to be relieved of custody and recommended that Lake Emory designate the Plaintiff as Mr. Pace’s representative. DSS, with the consent of the Guardian *ad litem*, the attorney for the Guardian *ad litem*, and the court appointed attorney for Mr. Pace, submitted a consent order seeking to relieve DSS of custody of Mr. Pace, as well as relieving from their appointments the attorneys and Guardian *ad litem*. The Laurens County Family Court entered an Order April 24, 2015 relieving DSS of custody of Mr. Pace and also relieving the court appointed Guardian *ad litem*, the attorney appointed for the Guardian *ad litem*, as well as the attorney appointed for Mr. Pace.

The Plaintiff in this action is Kenneth Pace, the son of the Decedent. Plaintiff filed his Summonses and Complaints alleging a Survival Action and a Wrongful Death Action on or about October 21, 2019. Defendants filed motions to dismiss and compel arbitration on April 13, 2020. Defendants alleged that they were entitled to compel this matter to arbitration pursuant to the aforementioned arbitration agreement and sought a stay of these proceedings. Defendants assert Mr. Hill was acting pursuant to “court ordered powers” and alleges that South Carolina Code Ann. § 43-35-10 provides authority for DSS to execute an arbitration agreement on behalf of an individual in their custody.¹ This Court disagrees and finds the arbitration agreement unenforceable as a matter of law.

¹ Defendants assert that the doctrines of equitable estoppel and third-party beneficiary similarly require this Court to compel arbitration. These arguments are similarly without merit.

II. LAW/ANALYSIS

Unless the parties otherwise provide, the question of the arbitrability of a claim is an issue for judicial determination. *See New Hope Missionary Baptist Church v. Paragon Builders*, 379 S.C. 620, 667 S.E.2d 1 (S.C. Ct. App. 2008). The arbitration agreement presented by the Defendants is not enforceable because the arbitration agreement was executed by someone that did not possess the authority to execute such an agreement on behalf of Mr. Pace.

In order for a court to compel arbitration pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act, a litigant must demonstrate a valid arbitration agreement that purports to cover the dispute. *See Aiken v. World Finance Corp. of S.C.*, 373 SC 144, 149, 644 SE2d 705, 708 (2007). Where one party denies the existence of a valid arbitration agreement, a court must immediately determine whether the agreement exists in the first place. *See Simpson v. MSA of Myrtle Beach, Inc.*, 373 SC 14, 644 SE2d 663, 667 (2007). If no agreement is found to exist, the court must deny the request to arbitrate. *See id.* Whether a valid arbitration agreement exists is a matter for judicial determination. *See York v. Dodgeland of Columbia, Inc.*, 406 SC 67, 749 SE2d 139, 144 (Ct. App. 2013).

Although there is public policy favoring arbitration – it is applied only as an aid in interpreting the scope and enforcement of validly entered arbitration agreements. *See Weaver v. Brookdale Senior Living, Inc.*, 431 S.C. 223, 847 S.E.2d 268 (Ct. App. 2020). The FAA does not give the party seeking arbitration a “leg up in the threshold determination of whether a valid arbitration agreement exists.” *Id.*, 431 S.C.at 229, 847

S.E.2d at 271.. The “first principle that underscores all [] arbitration decisions is that [a]rbitration is strictly a matter of consent.” *Id* quoting *Lamps Plus, Inc., v. Varela*, 139 S.Ct. 1407, 1415 (2019).

Because Mr. Pace did not execute the arbitration agreement himself, Mr. Hill must have had the appropriate legal authority to execute the arbitration agreement for it to be enforceable.

Defendants argue that Mr. Hill was granted agency authority to act on Mr. Pace’s behalf. This argument is without merit. This Court finds that Calvin Hill lacked common law agency authority to execute an arbitration agreement for Mr. Pace.² Agency is a fiduciary relationship that results when one person consents to be subject to the control of the other and to act on his behalf. *See R & G Constr., Inc. v. Lowcountry Reg’l Transp. Auth.*, 343 S.C. 424, 540 S.E.2d 113 (S.C. Ct. App. 2000). It is undisputed that Mr. Pace was diagnosed with dementia, was incompetent, and unable to provide consent or acquiesce to Mr. Hill’s actions. Furthermore, the authority conveyed to an agent does not encompass executing an agreement to resolve legal claims through arbitration. *See Thompson v. Pruitt Corp.*, 416 S.C. 43, 784 S.E.2d 679 (Ct. App. 2016), citing *Dickerson v. Longoria*, 995 A.2d 721, 736-37 (Md. 2010).

Defendants assert that Mr. Hill was acting pursuant to “court ordered powers” and the “actual authority” provided by the Adult Protection Act. These arguments are similarly without merit.

The Adult Protection Statute codified at § 43-35-5 *et seq.* sets forth the authority

² Similarly, the South Carolina Health Care Consent Act, (hereafter “SCHCA”), codified at South Carolina Code Ann. § 44-66-10 *et seq.* does not give authority for DSS to waive the constitutionally protected right to a trial by jury of a vulnerable adult in its custody.

and procedure for the State of South Carolina to take a vulnerable adult into protective custody. The duties and responsibilities to the vulnerable adult under the Adult Protective Services program are set forth in § 43-35-45. The other provisions of the Adult Protective Services Program relate entirely to the duties and responsibilities of the GAL. This Court finds that while the statutes authorizing the Adult Protective Services Program would permit DSS to hire a doctor or medical facility for Mr. Pace, and would authorize DSS to hire an attorney to provide legal services for Mr. Pace, the statutes do not authorize DSS to perform legal services and do not provide any authority for DSS to execute an arbitration agreement that waives Mr. Pace's constitutional right to a jury trial.

Defendants argue that the "definitions" section of the Adult Protective Services statute grants authority in defining protective service. "Protective services" means those services whose objective is to protect a vulnerable adult from harm caused by the vulnerable adult or another. These services include, but are not limited to, evaluating the need for protective services, securing and coordinating existing services, arranging for living quarters, obtaining financial benefits to which a vulnerable adult is entitled, and securing medical services, supplies, and legal services." *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 43-35-10(9). Defendants place particular emphasis on the words "legal services." This Court interprets the statute as permitting DSS to arrange for living quarters, secure medical care, and hire an attorney for the vulnerable adult if one is needed. The statute does not authorize DSS to provide legal services to Mr. Pace or waive his constitutional right to a jury trial. Similarly, the family court order provides no such authority.

Defendants argue that Kenneth Pace should be estopped from denying the arbitration agreement under the doctrine of equitable estoppel. In this case, the

admission agreement and the arbitration agreement were wholly independent and shall not be construed together. *See Hodge v. Unihealth Post-Acute Care of Bamberg, LLC.*, 422 SC 544, 813 S.E.2d 292 (Ct. App. 2018). Because the admission agreement is not merged with the arbitration agreement, this argument is without merit.

Defendants argue that Mr. Pace is a third-party beneficiary to the arbitration agreement. For all the reasons set forth above, this Court has found that the arbitration agreement in this matter is not valid. Without a valid arbitration agreement, there can be no third-party beneficiary. *See Thompson, supra.* This argument is without merit.

Therefore, this Court finds that DSS did not have the authority to execute an arbitration on behalf of Mr. Pace. Because the arbitration agreement was executed by a person without authority, it cannot be enforced.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Adult Protective Services Statute does not permit DSS to execute an arbitration agreement on behalf of a vulnerable adult. However, this Court does find that the Adult Protective Services Statute does provide for DSS to arrange for legal services to be provided for a vulnerable adult.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the arbitration agreement presented by the Defendants is not enforceable.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Hon. R. Keith Kelly
Circuit Court Judge

February _____, 2021
Gaffney, South Carolina



Spartanburg Common Pleas

Case Caption: Kenneth Pace VS Lake Emory Post Acute Care , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2019CP4203709

Type: Order/Other

It is so Ordered.

s/ R. Keith Kelly - 2165