

RECEIVED

Jul 27 2023

SC Court of Appeals

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2023 Jul 28 8:44 AM - AIKEN - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2021CP0200889

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM AIKEN COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
J. Cordell Maddox, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2021-CP-02-00889

Julianne Foster, Respondent,

v.

Rhett Riviere, Katherine A. Thomas, Chase Enterprises,
LLC of South Carolina, and Airbnb, Inc., Defendants,

Of which

Rhett Riviere, is the Appellant.

AND

Airbnb, Inc., Crossclaimant

v.

Rhett Riviere, Appellant

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Rhett Riviere (“Riviere”) appeals the Order filed July 26, 2023, denying Riviere’s Motion to Compel Arbitration and Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Stay. Riviere received written notice of the order denying its Motion to Compel Arbitration and Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Stay on July 26, 2023.

South Carolina case law provides that “[a]n order denying arbitration is immediately appealable.” *Cape Romain Contractors, Inc. v. Wando E., LLC*, 405 S.C. 115, 121, 747 S.E.2d 461, 464 (2013); *see also Towles v. United HealthCare Corp.*, 338 S.C. 29, 34-35, 524 S.E.2d 839,

842 (Ct. App. 1999) (noting section 16 of the FAA explicitly provides for an appeal from an order denying a motion to compel arbitration and finding that the circuit court's order refusing to compel arbitration was immediately appealable). Therefore, this appeal is ripe for the Court's review and consideration.

GRIFFIN HUMPHRIES LLC

By: 

James M. Griffin, SC Bar No.: 9995
Margaret N. Fox, SC Bar No.: 76228
4408 Forest Drive, Suite 300
P.O. Box 999 (29202)
Columbia, South Carolina 29206
Telephone: 803-744-0800
jgriffin@griffindavislaw.com
mfox@griffindavislaw.com

MCCULLOCH & SCHILLACI, ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Joseph M. McCulloch, SC Bar No.: 3760
Kathy R. Schillaci, SC Bar No.: 17248
1116 Blanding Street
P.O. Box 11623 (29211)
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Telephone: 803-779-0005
joe@mccullochlaw.com
kathy@mccullochlaw.com

Attorneys for Rhett Riviere

Columbia, South Carolina
July 27, 2023

RECEIVED

Jul 27 2023

SC Court of Appeals

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2023 Jul 28 8:44 AM - AIKEN - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2021CP0200889

Exhibit 1

Order, July 26, 2023

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA) IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
) SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
COUNTY OF AIKEN)

Julianne Foster,) Civil Action No. 2021-CP-02-00889
)

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

Rhett Riviere, Katherine A. Thomas,)
Chase Enterprises, LLC of South)
Carolina, and Airbnb, Inc.)

Defendants.)

**Order Denying Motions to Compel
Arbitration and Dismiss by Third-
Party Defendant Rhett Riviere**

RECEIVED

Jul 27 2023

SC Court of Appeals

This matter comes before the Court on Rhett Riviere’s (previously a Defendant, now a Third-Party Defendant) Motion to Compel Arbitration filed May 23, 2023, and his Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Stay filed on May 26, 2023. The Court held a hearing on June 13, 2023. All parties were represented by counsel. After consideration of the parties’ arguments based on the pleadings, exhibits, written submissions to date, oral argument, and applicable authorities, the Court **DENIES** Riviere’s motions to compel arbitration and dismiss or stay.

Factual Background

This action arose from an incident that occurred from May 17–18, 2019. (Am. Compl. ¶ 89.) Plaintiff alleges that she and her friend stayed at a rental property in Aiken, South Carolina. (*Id.* ¶ 93.) This property was owned by Defendant Chase Enterprises, which was managed by Riviere. (*Id.* ¶¶ 89–91.) Defendant Katherine Thomas held herself out to be the “host” or property manager for the property on Airbnb, Inc. (“Airbnb”). (*Id.* ¶ 95.) Plaintiff alleges that when she was staying at the property, Riviere had a hidden camera placed in a bedroom which captured recordings of her. (*Id.* ¶ 100.) Plaintiff dismissed her claims against Riviere pursuant to a confidential settlement agreement. Airbnb thereafter filed a third-party complaint against Riviere

seeking contractual and equitable indemnification. In response, Riviere filed a motion to compel Airbnb to arbitrate the indemnification claims.

Plaintiff's friend booked the property through Airbnb and the group "paid the Defendants to rent the Airbnb property." (*Id.* ¶ 100.) Riviere argues that Airbnb's Terms of Service attached as an exhibit to its Motion to Compel Arbitration govern the transaction. He argues that Plaintiff, Airbnb, and Thomas directly benefited from the transaction and the contractual provisions, including the incorporated policies, making them subject to those Terms. Riviere further contends that Plaintiff, Airbnb, and Thomas all agreed to the Terms as a condition of their being allowed to list and stay at his properties on Airbnb's online platform. Those Terms include an arbitration provision in Section 19 entitled "Dispute Resolution and Arbitration Agreement." (Terms of Service at 290–93.) Section 19.4 then states in bold:

Agreement to Arbitrate. You and Airbnb mutually agree that any dispute, claim or controversy arising out of or relating to these Terms or the applicability, breach, termination, validity, enforcement or interpretation thereof, or to the use of the Airbnb Platform, the Host Services, the Group Payment Service, or the Collective Content (collectively, "Disputes") will be settled by binding individual arbitration (the "Arbitration Agreement"). If there is a dispute about whether this Arbitration Agreement can be enforced or applies to our Dispute, you and Airbnb agree that the arbitrator will decide that issue.

(*Id.* at 291.) Section 19.6 then provides that the Arbitration Agreement "evidences a transaction in interstate commerce and thus the Federal Arbitration Act governs the interpretation and enforcement of this provision." (*Id.*) The Court disagrees with Defendants' arguments that an arbitrator, not the Court, should decide whether this case is arbitrable.

Legal Standard

Under the applicable Federal Arbitration Act ("FAA") "there is a potent public policy favoring arbitration, but this policy is deployed only as an aid in interpreting the scope and

enforcement of validly entered arbitration agreements.” *Weaver v. Brookdale Senior Living, Inc.*, 431 S.C. 223, 229-30, 847 S.E.2d 268, 271–72 (Ct. App. 2020). The “presumption in favor of arbitration applies to the scope of an arbitration agreement; it does not apply to the existence of such an agreement or to the identity of the parties who may be bound to such an agreement.” *Wilson v. Willis*, 426 S.C. 326, 337, 827 S.E.2d 167, 173 (2019) (internal quotation omitted).

Analysis

The Court **DENIES** Riviere’s Motion to Compel Arbitration and the Motion to Dismiss for three reasons: (1) The theory of direct benefits estoppel cannot be used to bind the Plaintiff non-signatory into arbitration, as she received no direct contractual benefit because she suffered harm while staying at the residence that was the subject of the contract; (2) South Carolina courts have declined to enforce arbitration provisions in cases of outrageous acts that are unforeseeable to reasonable consumers; and (3) Riviere waived the right to enforce arbitration by participating in the litigation before his dismissal and the third-party claims against him. The Court has considered and rejected all of the arguments raised by Riviere (whether directly or by way of joinder with Airbnb’s motion) in submissions filed and made to date in reaching its rulings on the pending motions.

I. Direct benefits estoppel does not apply here.

Riviere argues that direct benefits estoppel applies to require Plaintiff’s claims to be brought in arbitration. *See Wilson*, 426 S.C. at 340–41, 827 S.E.2d at 175 (quoting *Pearson v. Hilton Head Hosp.*, 400 S.C. 281, 290, 733 S.E.2d 597, 601 (Ct. App. 2012)). The Court disagrees. Instead, the Court relies on *Hodge v. UniHealth Post-Acute Care of Bamberg, LLC*, 422 S.C. 544, 556, 813 S.E.2d 292, 299 (Ct. App. 2018), a case cited by Plaintiff, to conclude that Plaintiff

received no direct contractual benefit because she suffered harm while staying at the residence that was the subject of the contract. Thus, the Court declines to compel the matter to arbitration.

II. The Court will not compel arbitration of outrageous acts that are unforeseeable.

In South Carolina, the outrageous torts exception has permitted “parties whose claims arose out of an opponent’s ‘outrageous’ tortious conduct to avoid arbitration.” *Parsons v. John Wieland Homes & Neighborhoods of the Carolinas, Inc.*, 418 S.C. 1, 9, 791 S.E.2d 128, 132 (2016). South Carolina first recognized the exception to arbitration enforcement in 2007. *See Aiken v. World Fin. Corp. of South Carolina*, 373 S.C. 144, 644 S.E.2d 705 (2007). The Supreme Court excepted from arbitration outrageous torts that are “unforeseeable to the reasonable consumer and legally distinct from the contractual relationship between the parties.” *Id.*

Although Airbnb’s third-party complaint against Riviere seeks equitable and contractual indemnification, the Court nevertheless invokes that exception here, which Plaintiff first raised in her June 16 and 29, 2023 letters to this Court. On the facts alleged in the Amended Complaint, the Court concludes the exception applies outside of the contractual relationship between the parties and declines to compel the action to arbitration. The Court disagrees that United States Supreme Court precedent disallows this result.

III. Riviere has waived the right to seek arbitration.

South Carolina traditionally followed a three-part test in assessing whether a party has waived its right to compel arbitration: “(1) whether a substantial length of time transpired between the commencement of the action and the commencement of the motion to compel arbitration; (2) whether the party requesting arbitration engaged in extensive discovery before moving to compel arbitration; and (3) whether the non-moving party was prejudiced by the delay in seeking arbitration.” *Rhodes v. Benson Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.*, 374 S.C. 122, 125, 647 S.E.2d 249, 250

(Ct. App. 2007). However, the Supreme Court of the United States recently clarified that courts could not develop an arbitration-specific variant of procedural rules such as requiring, for example, a showing of prejudice. *Morgan v. Sundance, Inc.*, 142 S. Ct. 1708, 1714 (2022). *Morgan* emphasized the general waiver rule of “voluntary relinquishment of a known right” and noted that the analysis should focus on the actions of the party who held the right. *Id.*

Regardless of the applicability of the arbitration agreement in the Airbnb’s Terms of Service to the claims asserted in this matter, Riviere has waived his right to enforce arbitration by participating in the litigation and settling Plaintiff’s claims against him. *See Rhodes v. Benson Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.*, 374 S.C. 122, 125, 647 S.E.2d 249, 250 (Ct. App. 2007). Plaintiff filed her Complaint on April 28, 2021. Riviere filed an answer on June 28, 2021, and an Amended Answer on July 23, 2021. Riviere also filed a Motion to Stay on July 23, 2021, while the criminal action against him proceeded, which was denied. The parties then proceeded with discovery and have exchanged written discovery, taken depositions, and litigated discovery-related motions. Plaintiff then amended her complaint on November 30, 2022, and then unilaterally dismissed Riviere on December 20, 2022, after reaching a settlement with him. Riviere was then brought into the case in response to third-party claims the Court required Airbnb to assert in lieu of crossclaims. It was not until May 23, 2023, that Riviere moved to compel arbitration. The Court finds that the nonwaiver provision in the Terms of Service is not dispositive on the issue of whether Riviere or Airbnb waived the right to arbitrate. *Nat’l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, P.A. v. NCR Corp.*, 376 F. App’x 70, 73 (2d Cir. 2010).

Conclusion

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Riviere's motions to compel arbitration is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

[Electronic signature page of the Honorable J. Cordell Maddox, Jr. to follow.]



Aiken Common Pleas

Case Caption: Julianne Foster , plaintiff, et al VS Rhett Riviere , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2021CP0200889

Type: Order/Other

So Ordered

s/ J. Cordell Maddox Jr.

RECEIVED
Jul 27 2023
SC Court of Appeals

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2023 Jul 28 8:44 AM - AIKEN - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2021CP0200889

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM AIKEN COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
J. Cordell Maddox, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2021-CP-02-00889

Julianne Foster, Respondent,

v.

Rhett Riviere, Katherine A. Thomas, Chase Enterprises,
LLC of South Carolina, and Airbnb, Inc., Defendants,

Of which

Rhett Riviere, is the Appellant.

AND

Airbnb, Inc., Crossclaimant

v.

Rhett Riviere, Appellant

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Jaime Harmon, legal assistant at Griffin Humphries LLC, attorneys for the Appellant, located at 4408 Forest Drive, Suite 300, Columbia, South Carolina 29206, hereby certify that on July 27, 2023, I have served all counsel in this action a copy of the **Notice of Appeal** by emailing a copy to each attorney listed below using their primary email address listed in the Attorney Information System.

Served: Wesley D. Few
WESLEY D. FEW, LLC
P.O. Box 9398
Greenville, South Carolina 29604
wes@wesleyfew.com

Deborah B. Barbier

DEBORAH B. BARBIER, LLC
1811 Pickens Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
dbb@deborahbarbier.com

Ryan L. Beasley
RYAN L. BEASLEY, ATTY. AT LAW, P.A.
416 East North Street
Greenville, South Carolina 29601
rlb@ryanbeasleylaw.com

Attorneys for Respondent

Richard A. Harpootlian
Phillip Donald Barber
RICHARD A. HARPOOTLIAN, P.A.
1410 Laurel Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
rah@harpootlianlaw.com
pdb@harpootlianlaw.com

C. Mitchell Brown
Blake T. Williams
Matthew A. Abee
NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP
1320 Main Street, 17th Floor
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Mitch.brown@nelsonmullins.com
Blake.williams@nelsonmullins.com
Matt.abee@nelsonmullins.com

Beattie B. Ashmore
650 East Washington Street
Greenville, South Carolina 29601
beattie@beattieashmore.com


Dawn Sestito (Admitted PHV)
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, California 90071
dsestito@omm.com

Damali A. Taylor (Admitted PHV)
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
San Francisco, California 94131
dtaylor@omm.com

Attorneys for Airbnb, Inc.

Damon Wlodarczyk
Riley Pope & Laney, LLC
P.O. Box 11412
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
803-799-9993
803-239-1414 – fax
damonw@rplfirm.com

Attorney for Katherine A. Thomas



Jaime Harmon

Columbia, South Carolina
July 27, 2023