

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Supreme Court

**RECEIVED**

**Aug 02 2022**

APPEAL FROM YORK COUNTY  
In The Circuit Court

S.C. SUPREME COURT

William A. McKinnon, Circuit Court Judge

---

Appellate Case No. 2022-000910

---

James Stephen Nivens and Carolyn Nivens..... Petitioners

v.

JB & E Heating & Cooling, Inc. ....Respondent

---

**RETURN FOR WRIT FOR CERTIORARI**

---

James W. Boyd SC Bar #824  
James W. Boyd Law Firm LLC  
Post Office Box 36425  
Rock Hill, SC 29732  
Phone (803) 328-2600  
jamesboyd@comporium.net  
Attorney for Respondent

August 2, 2022

Other Counsel of Record:  
Mr. John Martin Foster  
Post Office Box 106  
Rock Hill, SC 29731-6106  
Attorney for Petitioners

## FACTS

On or about October 4, 2010, Petitioners contracted with the Respondent for the installation of a geothermal HVAC unit at 105 Mountain View Street, Clover, SC. Pursuant to the contract the Respondent installed the unit. In March 2011 an email was sent by the Respondent that addressed the allegation by the Petitioners that the unit was not working properly. The last time that the unit was worked on by the Respondent was 2012. On or about March 28, 2012, a complaint was filed with the South Carolina Department of Labor and Licensing Regulation before the Residential Builders Commission alleging that the Respondent had improperly installed of the unit. On February 13, 2013, Panther Heating and Cooling, Inc. prepared an inspection report for Petitioners, identifying alleged defects in the installation of the HVAC system. On July 23, 2014, the Hearing Officer of the Commission issued a recommendation that the Complaint be dismissed. The Hearing Officer's recommendation was adopted as a final Order, was issued January 27, 2015. The Petitioners commenced this action on August 10, 2017, by the filing of a Summons and Complaint. The Respondent timely answered and thereafter filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. The Motion for Summary Judgment was heard by the Court on February 7, 2019. On March 18, 2019, the Court issued its Order granting the Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment.

## ARGUMENT

### **THE SIX YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS SET OUT IN S.C. CODE 36-2-725 DOES NOT APPLY TO THIS ACTION**

In order for a contract to fall under the six-year statute of limitations of the South Carolina Code §36-2-725 the contract must be for goods rather than services. If a contract provides for both good and services, the Court uses the "Predominant Purpose" test to determine if the UCCS

applies. *Ranger Construction Co. v. Dixie Floor Co.*, 433 F. Supp. 442 (D.S.C.1977). If the predominant purpose of the contract is the rendition of service with goods incidentally involved the UCC is not applicable. In determining the predominant purpose of the contract, the Court should consider the language of the contract the structure of compensation and ratio of materials supplied to labor expended. *Fournie Furniture, Inc. v. Waltz-Holst Blow Pipe Co.*, 980 F. Supp. 187, 189 (W.D. Va. 1997). In the Court's Order, the Court found that the total value of the contract was \$15,280.00. The Court further found that only \$6,100.00, including sales tax, was for the material which is less than 40% of the total value of the contract. The Petitioners agreed with this calculation.<sup>1</sup> There were no allegations that the equipment was defective. The complaint concerned the services provided by the Respondent including an allegation that the Respondent did not chose the correct equipment. The Respondent did not design, fabricate or manufacture the Climate Master Unit. The Respondent acquired the unit and its necessary materials incident to the removal and installation service contract.

The Respondent cites the case *Coakley & Williams, Inc. v. Shatterproof Glass Corp.*, 706 F.2d 456, 460 (4th Cir.1983) In *Coakley* the Court looked at the language of the contract, the nature of the supplier's business and the intrinsic worth of the materials provided as the factors in determining predominant nature of the contract. In the present case the contract itself is unclear as to whether it is predominantly for the sale of goods or for services. In looking at the second factor, the nature of the supplier's business, the Respondent is not a manufacturer or a store selling a product. It is a heating and cooling company that installs products. In looking at the intrinsic materials provided the undisputed fact is that over 60% of the contract was for insulation. These factors clearly weigh in the Respondent's favor.

---

<sup>1</sup> Transcript of Record dated May 31, 2019, Pg. 7, line 2-7.

The statute of limitations runs from the date the injury is discoverable by the exercise of reasonable diligence. *Republic Contract Corporation v. SCDHPT*, 332 S.C. 197, 503 SE2nd 761 (SC App. 1998) The Petitioners had the inspection report of Panther Heating and Cooling, Inc. on February 13, 2013. The report identified problems in the system, so Petitioners had notice of the problems by that date. This action was not filed until August 10, 2017, and therefore was not filed within the three-year statute of limitations.

Appellate Court rule 242(b) provides that certiorari “will be granted only where there are special and important reasons.” Rule 242(b) lists five (5) character of reasons which will be considered by the Court in deciding whether or not to grant certiorari. None of the reasons listed apply to this case.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons stated, the Petition for Writ of Certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully Submitted,

s/James W. Boyd  
James W. Boyd SC Bar #824  
James W. Boyd Law Firm LLC  
1544 Ebenezer Road  
Post Office Box 36425  
Rock Hill, SC 29732  
(803) 328-2600 Phone  
(803) 328-5747 Fax  
jamesboyd@comporium.net  
*Attorney for the Respondent*

August 2, 2022