

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

RECEIVED

Appeal from Spartanburg County
Court of Common Pleas

Sep 19 2023

J. Derham Cole, Circuit Court Judge

SC Court of Appeals

Case No. 2018-CP-42-03421
Appellate Case No. 2020-001146

Armando J. Acevedo,
through his Attorney-in-Fact,
Marianne Acevedo,

Respondent,

v.

Hunt Valley Holdings, LLC;
THI of South Carolina, LLC; and
THI of South Carolina at Camp Care, LLC,
d/b/a Lake Emory Post Acute Care,

Appellants.

APPELLANTS' PETITION FOR REHEARING

CLEMENT RIVERS, LLP
Stephen L. Brown (SC Bar No. 66468)
D. Jay Davis, Jr. (SC Bar No. 12084)
Russell G. Hines (SC Bar No. 72100)
25 Calhoun Street, Suite 400
Charleston, South Carolina 29401
P.O. Box 993 (29402)
(843) 720-5488

Attorneys for Appellants

By and through their undersigned counsel, pursuant to Rule 221(a), SCACR, the Facility¹, THISC², and HVH³ (collectively, “Appellants”), hereby petition this Honorable Court for rehearing of this matter, which it decided via Unpublished Opinion No. 2023-UP-281 (S.C. Ct. App. filed August 2, 2023) (the “Subject Opinion,” a copy of which, with page numbers added for ease of reference, is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**), affirming the circuit court’s denial of the Facility’s motion to compel Plaintiff’s⁴ claims against it to arbitration and, in turn, its denial of THISC’s corresponding motion to stay this lawsuit pending the outcome of the Facility’s motion to compel arbitration and any resulting arbitration between Plaintiff and the Facility and declining to address HVH’s appeal regarding its motion to dismiss. As particularly stated and explained below, Appellants most respectfully contend that the Court misapprehended or overlooked a number of material points.

¹ The “Facility” refers to Defendant/Appellant THI of South Carolina at Camp Care, LLC, d/b/a Lake Emory Post Acute Care. It is a skilled nursing facility in Spartanburg County.

² “THISC” refers to Defendant/Appellant THI of South Carolina, LLC.

³ “HVH” refers to Defendant/Appellant Hunt Valley Holdings, LLC.

⁴ “Plaintiff” refers to Plaintiff/Respondent, Armando J. Acevedo (“Mr. Acevedo”), through his Attorney-in-Fact, Marianne Acevedo (“Mrs. Acevedo”).

BACKGROUND

With the help of his wife and duly appointed attorney-in-fact, Mrs. Acevedo,⁵ Mr. Acevedo was admitted to the Facility on July 12, 2017. (R. p. 43 ¶ 50.) In conjunction with Mr. Acevedo’s admission, Mrs. Acevedo signed an Arbitration Agreement on his behalf. (R. p. 183.)^{6 7}

Plaintiff commenced this nursing home malpractice action in Spartanburg County on October 3, 2018, in the Court of Common Pleas, asserting various claims for damages arising out of allegedly deficient care/treatment Mr. Acevedo received during his residency at the Facility. (*See* R. pp. 32–90.)

The Facility moved to compel Plaintiff’s claims against it to arbitration (the “Motion to Compel Arbitration”). (R. pp. 180–82.)⁸ THISC moved to stay the

⁵ (*See* R. p. 183, pp. 199–204, pp. 205–07 ¶¶ 2–3, 8–14, p. 240 ¶¶ 1, 6–7.)

⁶ It is undisputed that Mrs. Acevedo was duly authorized to sign the Arbitration Agreement for Mr. Acevedo as his attorney-in-fact. (*See, e.g.*, R. p. 209 (“[Mrs. Acevedo] . . . has power of attorney over [Mr. Acevedo] who was admitted into [the Facility] on July 12, 2017.”).)

⁷ It is undisputed that the Arbitration Agreement is governed by the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. §§ 1–16 (the “FAA”). (*See, e.g.*, R. p. 2 (“The FAA applies to [the] [A]rbitration [A]greement.”), p. 19 (same).) The Arbitration Agreement expressly states that the FAA applies. (R. p. 183.) Moreover, the Supreme Court of South Carolina has held that skilled nursing facility admission agreements implicate interstate commerce and, thus, the FAA. *Dean v. Heritage Healthcare of Ridgeway, LLC*, 408 S.C. 371, 381–82, 759 S.E.2d 727, 732–33 (2014).

⁸ Without question, Plaintiff’s claims against the Facility are within the scope of the Arbitration Agreement. Its plain language clearly embraces the subject matter of Plaintiff’s claims. (*See* R. p. 183 (“It is the intention of the parties to this

action as to Plaintiff’s claims against it until the arbitrability issue, i.e., the issue raised by the Motion to Compel Arbitration, was finally decided and any and all arbitration proceedings were completed (the “Motion to Stay”). (R. pp. 184–85.) HVH moved to be dismissed from the action for lack of personal jurisdiction (the “Motion to Dismiss”). (R. pp. 178–79.)

Following the parties’ submission of briefs⁹ and a hearing held February 1, 2019,¹⁰ the circuit court, the Honorable J. Derham Cole presiding, denied the Motion to Compel Arbitration by order filed October 21, 2019. (R. pp. 1–13.) The order was silent as to the Motion to Stay. (*Id.*) The order was silent as to the Motion to Dismiss, too, but unlike the Motion to Stay, the Motion to Dismiss had been

[Arbitration] Agreement to bind not only themselves, but also their successors, assigns, heirs, personal representatives, guardians or any persons deriving their claims through or on behalf of [Mr. Acevedo].”), *id.* (“It is . . . understood that in the event of any controversy or dispute between the parties arising out of or relating to [the] Facility’s Admission Agreement, or breach thereof, or relating in any way to [Mr. Acevedo’s] stay at [the] Facility, or to the provisions of care or services to [Mr. Acevedo] . . . and the parties are unable to resolve such through negotiation, then the parties agree that such Dispute(s) shall be resolved by arbitration”).) But even if there were “any doubts concerning the scope of arbitrable issues[,] [they] should be resolved in favor of arbitration” *Towles v. United HealthCare Corp.*, 338 S.C. 29, 41, 524 S.E.2d 839, 846 (Ct. App. 1999). And to be clear, there is no contention from Plaintiff that her claims are outside the scope of the Arbitration Agreement.

⁹ (R. pp. 186–98, pp. 208–34.)

¹⁰ (R. pp. 124–56.)

withdrawn—with Plaintiff’s consent and without prejudice to HVH refiling it—on the record at the outset of the February 1, 2019, hearing. (R. pp. 126:1–129:5.)¹¹

On October 31, 2020, pursuant to Rule 59(e), SCRCP, Appellants timely moved the circuit court to alter, amend, and/or reconsider its decision (the “Motion to Reconsider”). (R. pp. 242–52.) The bulk of the Motion to Reconsider took issue with the court’s denial of the Motion to Compel Arbitration and sought rulings from the court on every distinct issue/argument the Facility raised in support thereof;¹² however, out of an abundance of caution, the Motion to Reconsider also asked the court to clarify the scope of its October 21, 2019, order, specifically, to clarify whether it disposed of the Motion to Compel Arbitration only or if it also disposed of the Motion to Stay and/or the Motion to Dismiss. (R. p. 243.)

Following a hearing on January 22, 2020,¹³ the circuit court filed a Form 4 order on June 9, 2020, granting the Motion to Reconsider “to the extent that clarification is needed for the benefit of defendant’s counsel” and directing Plaintiff’s counsel to submit a proposed formal order “separately addressing each defendant’s motion(s) and its grounds presented in support of the relief requested

¹¹ Indeed, consistent with the withdrawal of the Motion to Dismiss, shortly after the February 1st hearing, on February 12, 2019, HVH answered Plaintiff’s complaint, “*specifically reserving its right to move to dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction.*” (R. pp. 105–23 (emphasis in original).)

¹² (See generally R. pp. 242–52.)

¹³ (R. pp. 157–71.)

and to specifically state that [the Motion to Dismiss] is denied, [the Motion to Compel Arbitration is] denied, and [the Motion to Stay] is denied.” (R. pp. 14–16.) The court filed its formal order to this effect on July 10, 2020. (R. pp. 17–31.)

This appeal timely followed by notice served and filed August 10, 2020,¹⁴ and in due course, it was briefed and made ready for decision.

The case was submitted for decision during the June 2023 term without oral argument and decided on August 2, 2023, via the Subject Opinion, which affirmed the circuit court’s denial of the Motion to Compel Arbitration and, in turn, its denial of the Motion to Stay and declined to address HVH’s appeal of the Motion to Dismiss.

This petition for rehearing timely follows.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

A circuit court’s determination of whether a claim is subject to arbitration is reviewed de novo on appeal. *Gissel v. Hart*, 382 S.C. 235, 240, 676 S.E.2d 320, 323 (2009). This includes de novo review of the determination of whether an arbitration agreement is enforceable against a nonsignatory. *Wilson v. Willis*, 426 S.C. 326, 334, 827 S.E.2d 167, 172 (2019). “Under de novo review, a circuit court’s factual findings will not be reversed on appeal if any evidence reasonably supports those findings.” *Id.* Issues of law, however, are reviewed without any particular deference

¹⁴ (R. pp. 257–61.)

to the lower court. *See, e.g., Duke Energy Corp. v. S.C. Dep't of Revenue*, 415 S.C. 351, 782 S.E.2d 590 (2016). Even where a ruling is on a matter within circuit court's discretion, if the ruling is based on a misunderstanding of the law, rather than upon the exercise of discretion, the question presented on appeal is one of law. *See Bain v. Self Mem'l Hosp.*, 281 S.C. 138, 152, 314 S.E.2d 603, 611 (Ct. App. 1984).

ARGUMENT

I. Most respectfully, the Court erred in affirming the circuit court's denial of the Motion to Compel Arbitration and, in turn, the Motion to Stay.

A. The Court erred in affirming the circuit court on the basis that the power of attorney document (the "HCPOA") did not give Mrs. Acevedo authority to execute the Arbitration Agreement on Mr. Acevedo's behalf, because Plaintiff already conceded in the circuit court Mrs. Acevedo's authority to sign the Arbitration Agreement for Mr. Acevedo.

The Court overlooked or misapprehended the fact that, as explained in Appellants' principal brief, "It is undisputed that Mrs. Acevedo was duly authorized to sign the Arbitration Agreement for Mr. Acevedo as his attorney-in-fact." (*See, e.g., R. p. 209* ("[Mrs. Acevedo] . . . has power of attorney over [Mr. Acevedo] who was admitted into [the Facility] on July 12, 2017."); *see also R. p. 129:6–14* (where Appellants' counsel explained as follows to the circuit court without any dispute or contradiction from Plaintiff's counsel: "Your Honor, obviously, I know that many arbitration motions are before the Court and more recently in our appellate courts, most of those having to do with authority and who can bind a loved one and whether

or not they have sufficient legal authority to waive the constitutional right to a jury trial. Those issues are not before the Court, because Ms. Acevedo had a power of attorney over her husband. The plaintiff is not challenging authority.”.) Moreover, Mrs. Acevedo has brought this lawsuit on behalf of Mr. Acevedo on the basis that she holds power of attorney over him—which power she necessarily concedes authorizes her to affect his legal rights, including the right to waive his right to a jury trial¹⁵—and there is no indication anywhere in the record of any other power of attorney that Mrs. Acevedo holds over Mr. Acevedo besides the HCPOA. Because Plaintiff already conceded Mrs. Acevedo’s authority to sign the Arbitration Agreement for Mr. Acevedo, this is not a valid ground on which to affirm the circuit court. *TNS Mills, Inc. v. S.C. Dep’t of Revenue*, 331 S.C. 611, 617, 503 S.E.2d 471, 474 (1998) (“An issue conceded in a lower court may not be argued on appeal.”).

B. The Court erred in not reaching the remaining issues/arguments regarding the circuit court’s denial of the Motion to Compel Arbitration.

As explained in the Subject Opinion, “[a]s a result of [its] finding [Mrs. Acevedo] lacked authority to enter the Arbitration Agreement on [Mr.] Acevedo’s behalf, [the Court] [did] not address Appellants’ remaining issues regarding the

¹⁵ In this regard, Appellants note that agreeing to arbitration is not the only way to waive the right to a jury trial. Agreeing to settle a lawsuit is to agree to forego the right to a jury trial.

Arbitration Agreement.” (Subject Opinion p. 3.) Specifically, these issues/arguments include the following:

- (1) That the circuit court erred in finding that the Arbitration Agreement lacks consideration and mutuality;
- (2) That the circuit court erred in finding that the Arbitration Agreement lacks material terms;
- (3) That the circuit court erred in finding that the Arbitration Agreement is unconscionable; and
- (4) That assuming, *arguendo*, it is both (1) a finding and (2) material, the circuit court erred in finding that the Facility is insufficiently named in the Arbitration Agreement.

Therefore, for the same reasons that the Court erred in affirming the circuit court on the basis that the HCPOA did not give Mrs. Acevedo authority to execute the Arbitration Agreement on Mr. Acevedo’s behalf, it likewise erred in not reaching the remaining issues/arguments regarding the circuit court’s denial of the Motion to Compel Arbitration.

C. Had it reached the remaining issues/arguments regarding the circuit court’s denial of the Motion to Compel Arbitration, as it should have, the Court should have found that the circuit court erred as follows.

(1) The circuit court erred in finding that the Arbitration Agreement lacks consideration and mutuality.

The Arbitration Agreement clearly reflects the parties’ mutual and concurrent promises to give up their respective litigation rights in favor of arbitration. Without question, this is adequate consideration. *See Rickborn v. Liberty Life Ins. Co.*, 321 S.C. 291, 304, 468 S.E.2d 292, 300 (1996) (“Valuable consideration for a contract may consist of some forbearance given or detriment suffered.”); *O’Neil v. Hilton Head Hosp.*, 115 F.3d 272, 274–75 (4th Cir. 1997) (“O’Neil first argues the contract to arbitrate was not supported by adequate consideration because the agreement was not binding on the hospital. O’Neil’s argument fails because its premise is mistaken. . . . It is true that courts have refused to enforce arbitration agreements where the agreement specifically allows the employer to ignore the results of arbitration. That is not the case here, however. There is no such clause in the arbitration agreement signed by O’Neil, and we decline to read such a clause into the contract. *A mutual promise to arbitrate constitutes sufficient consideration for this arbitration agreement.*”) (citing *Rickborn*, *supra*) (internal citation omitted) (emphasis added); *id.* at 275 (“O’Neil’s argument is especially misplaced in the circumstances of this case. Not only has the hospital consistently argued that it is bound by the arbitration

agreement, it has, by virtue of this suit, shown its commitment to the arbitration process. Indeed, the only party to this case who has shown a desire to avoid binding arbitration is O’Neil herself.”) (applying South Carolina law).

Moreover, the FAA mandates that arbitration agreements be placed on equal footing with other contracts and that, while a court may set aside arbitration agreements by state-law defenses that govern the validity, revocability, and enforceability of contracts generally, it may not do so “by defenses that apply only to arbitration or derive their meaning from the fact that an agreement to arbitrate is at issue.” *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, 563 U.S. 333, 339 (2011). To require additional consideration for the Arbitration Agreement beyond the parties’ mutual and concurrent promises (to give up their respective litigation rights in favor of arbitration) is to require additional consideration to support the Arbitration Agreement beyond what South Carolina law requires to support other contracts and, thus, to violate the FAA.

Likewise, and besides the fact that it has nothing to do with the issue of consideration, the quote the circuit court cites from *Thompson v. Pruitt Corporation*, 416 S.C. 43, 784 S.E.2d 679 (Ct. App. 2016)—“any possible benefit emanating from the [Arbitration Agreement] alone is offset by the [Arbitration Agreement’s] requirement that [the resident] waive her right to access the courts and her right to a

jury trial”¹⁶—cannot properly support the court’s decision because it places arbitration agreements on unequal footing from other contracts.¹⁷ Under the FAA, it simply cannot be the case that mutual promises constitute sufficient consideration to form a binding agreement except in the case of arbitration agreements.

Further still, the idea that mutual promises to arbitrate do not effect an exchange of benefits to both sides is irreconcilable with the strong presumption *in favor of* arbitration agreements and the state and federal policy *favoring* arbitration of disputes. *Simpson v. MSA of Myrtle Beach, Inc.*, 373 S.C. 14, 24, 644 S.E.2d 663, 668 (2007) (“There is a strong presumption in favor of the validity of arbitration agreements because both state and federal policy favor arbitration of disputes.”). There is no way to square the logic of the quote from *Thompson*—and its negative view of arbitration—with the policy preference in favor of arbitration under both South Carolina and federal law. The whole point of arbitration is to make use of an alternative—i.e., outside the traditional litigation process—form of dispute resolution. The giving up—on both sides—of this process (and all that comes along with it) in favor of the alternative of arbitration is the benefit.¹⁸

¹⁶ (R. p. 6 (emphasis omitted), p. 22 (same) (emphasis omitted).)

¹⁷ *See Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 339.

¹⁸ Appellants recognize the language in Supreme Court’s decision in *Palmetto Construction Group, LLC v. Restoration Specialists, LLC*, 432 S.C. 633, 856 S.E.2d 150 (2021), that “statements [in our appellate jurisprudence] that the law ‘favors’ arbitration,” which are numerous, *e.g.*, *Parsons v. John Wieland Homes & Neighborhoods of the Carolinas, Inc.*, 418 S.C. 1, 6, 791 S.E.2d 128, 131 (2016) (“The

Regarding the circuit court’s reference to Plaintiff’s argument that *if* the Arbitration Agreement is a *precondition* of admission it constitutes an improper benefit or other consideration under federal law relating to Medicare/Medicaid

policy of the United States and of South Carolina is to favor arbitration of disputes.”); *Zabinski v. Bright Acres Assocs.*, 346 S.C. 580, 596, 553 S.E.2d 110, 118 (2001) (same); *Bradley v. Brentwood Homes, Inc.*, 398 S.C. 447, 455, 730 S.E.2d 312, 316 (2012) (“There is a strong presumption in favor of the validity of arbitration agreements because of the strong policy favoring arbitration.”) (quoting *Towles v. United HealthCare Corp.*, 338 S.C. 29, 37, 524 S.E.2d 839, 844 (Ct. App. 1999)), “mean simply that courts must respect and enforce a contractual provision to arbitrate as it respects and enforces all contractual provisions” and that “[t]here is . . . no public policy—federal or state—‘favoring’ arbitration;” however, it is impossible to square this language in *Palmetto Construction Group* with language in other Supreme Court decisions, for instance, the language in *Zabinski* (which the Court thereafter echoed in *Parsons*) that “[t]he policy of the United States and South Carolina is to *favor arbitration of disputes.*” 346 S.C. at 596, 553 S.E.2d at 118 (emphasis added). More than just recognizing that contractual provisions to arbitrate must be respected and enforced in the same way as other contractual provisions, this plain language expressly recognizes the existence of a public policy—federal and state—that “favor[s]” arbitration *as a method of dispute resolution*. Moreover, the *Zabinski* Court instructs that “[a]ny doubts concerning the scope of arbitrable issues should be resolved in favor of arbitration;” that, “unless the court can say with positive assurance that the arbitration clause is not susceptible to an interpretation that covers the dispute, arbitration should be ordered;” and that “[a] motion to compel arbitration made pursuant to an arbitration clause in a written contract should only be denied where the clause is not susceptible to any interpretation which would cover the asserted dispute.” *Id.* at 597, 553 S.E.2d at 118–19. These rules do not merely ensure that contractual provisions to arbitrate are respected and enforced in the same way as other contractual provisions: They affirmatively tip the scales in favor of arbitration. Indeed, citing our Supreme Court’s decision in *Cape Romain Contractors, Inc. v. Wando E., LLC*, 405 S.C. 115, 747 S.E.2d 461 (2013), this Court has expressly recognized that “[d]ue to the strong South Carolina and federal policy favoring arbitration, arbitration agreements are *presumed valid.*” *Doe v. TCSC, LLC*, 430 S.C. 602, 607, 846 S.E.2d 874, 877 (Ct. App. 2020) (emphasis added) (citing *Cape Romain Contractors*, 405 S.C. at 125, 747 S.E.2d at 466)).

reimbursements, this argument fails of its essential premise: namely, that the Arbitration Agreement was such a *precondition*, which it was *not*,¹⁹ as indeed the circuit court itself recognized. (R. p. 1 (“A separate contract called ‘Arbitration Agreement’ was also signed on July 12, 2019 during the admission process but was not a condition of admission.”); R. p. 18 (same).)

Lastly, the circuit court conflates the question of whether the Arbitration Agreement is a precondition of admission with the question of whether there is consideration to support the Arbitration Agreement. (*See* R. p. 6 (“If the jury waiver was not a precondition to admission, then it fails for lack of consideration. Here, Defendants cannot have it both ways. They cannot, on the one hand, argue that the waiver was not consideration for the admission, but on the other, argue that the admission was valuable consideration for the waiver.”), p. 23 (same).) The fact that the Arbitration Agreement is *not a precondition of admission* means that it cannot possibly violate any federal rule against the Facility accepting additional consideration *as a precondition of admission*. It does not, however, mean that there was no consideration to support the Arbitration Agreement, which there certainly was (as explained above). It just means that the Arbitration Agreement itself did not constitute any form of unlawful consideration to the Facility.

¹⁹ (*See also* R. p. 207, ¶ 9.)

(2) The circuit court erred in finding that the Arbitration Agreement lacks material terms.²⁰

The circuit court erroneously found that the Arbitration Agreement is indefinite and/or silent as to material terms and therefore unenforceable, as there was no meeting of the minds. (R. pp. 7–9, pp. 24–25.) Specifically, the court found that the Arbitration Agreement lacks definiteness as to: (1) arbitrator selection, (2) the rules of evidence, and (3) allowance of pre-hearing discovery. (*Id.*) This was error.

In *Grant v. Magnolia Manor-Greenwood, Inc.*, 383 S.C. 125, 678 S.E.2d 438 (2009), the arbitration agreement at issue *specifically required* a particular entity to serve as arbitrator and was silent as to any alternative, neither specifying an alternate arbitrator nor providing a mechanism to select an alternate. 383 S.C. at 128, 678 S.E.2d at 437. When the designated entity was no longer able to serve as arbitrator, a dispute arose. *Id.* Finding that the specification of the named arbitrator was a material term of the agreement and that it had been rendered ineffective, the *Grant* Court held arbitration was no longer required. *See Id.* at 128–132, 678 S.E.2d at 437–39 (“Where designation of a specific arbitral forum has implications that may substantially affect the substantive outcome of the resolution, we believe that it is neither ‘logistical’ nor ‘ancillary.’”). The Court also held that the default selection

²⁰ Issues/Arguments I.B.2 and I.B.3 correspond to Issues/Arguments I.B and I.C in Appellants’ principal brief. As in Appellants principal brief, there is some overlap between these Issues/Arguments, and to the extent relevant, they are incorporated by referenced into each other.

mechanism in FAA § 5 was inapplicable *when the parties make a specific arbitrator an integral term*. *Id.* at 131, 678 S.E.2d at 438.²¹

Although *Grant* does require all material terms to exist within an arbitration agreement for a meeting of the minds to result, the terms that the circuit court found to be absent or unduly vague are distinguishable from the material terms required under *Grant*.

The lack of a specified arbitrator does not constitute the omission of a material term. *York v. Dodgeland of Columbia, Inc.*, 406 S.C. 67, 82, 749 S.E.2d 139, 147 (Ct. App. 2013) (“[T]he lack of a specified arbiter is not an omission of a material term.”). While the *Grant* Court held that a named arbitrator is a material term *when*

²¹ FAA § 5 provides as follows:

If in the [arbitration] agreement provision be made for a method of naming or appointing an arbitrator or arbitrators or an umpire, such method shall be followed; but if no method be provided therein, or if a method be provided and any party thereto shall fail to avail himself of such method, or if for any other reason there shall be a lapse in the naming of an arbitrator or arbitrators or umpire, or in filling a vacancy, then upon the application of either party to the controversy the court shall designate and appoint an arbitrator or arbitrators or umpire, as the case may require, who shall act under the said agreement with the same force and effect as if he or they had been specifically named therein; and unless otherwise provided in the agreement the arbitration shall be by a single arbitrator.

one is specified within an agreement and that FAA § 5 does not apply when such a specification exists, these holdings are inapplicable when, as here, the contract does not specify a particular arbitrator. Id.

With regard to arbitrator selection, the Arbitration Agreement states as follows: “The parties shall select an arbitrator from a panel having experience and knowledge of the health care industry. If the parties cannot reach a mutual decision on the selection of an arbitrator, the parties agree that an arbitrator shall be selected by the Court.” (R. p. 183.) The only reasonable interpretation of this plain language is that either the parties can agree on an arbitrator or the court will decide.²² And to be clear, if the parties cannot agree and the court is called upon to decide, this is not the court supplying omitted terms, this is the court giving effect to the agreed-upon terms.

The other matters cited by the circuit court do not rise to the level of material terms but rather are mere ““ancillary logistical concerns”” that are ““not required within an arbitration agreement.”” *York*, 406 S.C. at 83, 749 S.E.2d at 147 (explaining that matters like discovery rules, cost allocations, or arbitration initiation

²² Beyond the alternative arbitrator selection process expressly provided for in the Arbitration Agreement, there is also the alternative provided by FAA § 5, which applies not only “if no method [of naming or appointing an arbitrator] [is] provided [in the arbitration agreement]” but also “if a method [is] provided and any party . . . fail[s] to avail himself of such method, or if for any other reason there shall be a lapse in the naming of an arbitrator or arbitrators or umpire, or in filling a vacancy” 9 U.S.C. § 5.

procedures are not material terms but rather “‘ancillary logistical’ ones” that are “not required within an arbitration agreement”) (citing *Grant*, 383 S.C. at 131–32, 678 S.E.2d at 439).

The Arbitration Agreement does not lack any material term or suffer from any fatal ambiguity. Provided they meet their mutual obligations of good faith and fair dealing,²³ there is no good reason why the parties cannot arbitrate the instant dispute in accordance with the Arbitration Agreement. In addition to clearly stating the parties’ mutual and concurrent promises to arbitrate, the Arbitration Agreement sets out the scope of the disputes that are subject to arbitration, how the arbitrator is either to be agreed upon or alternatively selected, the applicability of both the South Carolina ADR Rules (which contain substantive and procedural rules geared “to secure the just, speedy, inexpensive and collaborative resolution in every action to which they apply,” Rule 1, SCADR; *see also* Rules 2, 9, 11, 12, 13, SCADR) and the FAA, and makes clear that the arbitrator’s decision is binding and enforceable in a court of competent jurisdiction. (*See* R. p. 183.) And, here again, to require more just because the contract in issue is an arbitration agreement would violate the FAA’s requirement that arbitration agreements be placed on equal footing with all other contracts. *See Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 339.

²³ There is, of course, an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing in every contract. *Adams v. G.J. Creel & Sons, Inc.*, 320 S.C. 274, 277, 465 S.E.2d 84, 86 (1995).

(3) The circuit court erred in finding that the Arbitration Agreement is unconscionable.

Unconscionability requires *both* (1) an absence of meaningful choice on the part of one party due to one-sided contract provisions *and* (2) terms that are so oppressive that no reasonable person would make them and no fair and honest person would accept them. *Simpson*, 373 S.C. at 25, 644 S.E.2d at 668. Neither is present here.

The first part of the unconscionability test (absence of meaningful choice) is undermined by the express acknowledgement in the Arbitration Agreement itself that the “Resident/Representative is not required to use the . . . Facility for Resident’s healthcare needs and . . . there are numerous other health care providers in the State where Facility is located that are qualified to provide such care to Resident.” (R. p. 183.) Moreover, as explained above, the Arbitration Agreement was *not a precondition of admission*. In other words, *it did not have to be agreed to* for Mr. Acevedo to be admitted to the Facility, but it was agreed to on his behalf by Mrs. Acevedo, his duly appointed attorney-in-fact, who, having signed it, is legally presumed to have read it, understood it, and agreed to its terms. *Gibson v. Epting*, 426 S.C. 346, 352, 827 S.E.2d 178, 181 (Ct. App. 2019) (“[O]ne who has signed a contract is presumed to have read, understood, and assented to its terms.”).

As for the second part of the test (unreasonably oppressive terms), the Arbitration Agreement simply binds the parties (both sides) to submit to arbitration.

Not only is this not oppressive, again, “both state and federal policy favor arbitration of disputes.” *Simpson*, 373 S.C. at 24, 644 S.E.2d at 668. And there is nothing about the Arbitration Agreement that suggests it is not geared towards achieving an unbiased decision by a neutral decision-maker. *Id.* at 25, 644 S.E.2d at 668 (“In analyzing claims of unconscionability in the context of arbitration agreements, the Fourth Circuit has instructed courts to focus generally on whether the arbitration clause is geared towards achieving an unbiased decision by a neutral decision-maker.”).

Regarding any supposed incongruity between the arbitration process and the discovery needs in nursing home malpractice cases, first off, this amounts to a wholesale attack on the enforceability of arbitration agreements in the nursing home malpractice context, which violates the FAA. *See Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 339. In any event, however, the South Carolina ADR Rules (*see* Rule 12²⁴) and the FAA itself (*see* § 7²⁵) provide all the tools necessary for the proceedings, including

²⁴ To be clear, regarding the language in Rule 12(a), SCADR, stating, “Arbitrations selected by the parties under these rules are deemed non-binding arbitrations *unless otherwise expressly agreed by the parties*” (emphasis added), the Arbitration Agreement expressly states the parties’ agreement to *binding* arbitration conducted under the South Carolina ADR Rules. (R. p. 183.)

²⁵ FAA § 7 provides:

The arbitrators selected either as prescribed in this title or otherwise, or a majority of them, may summon in writing any person to attend before them or any of them as a witness and in a proper case to bring with him or them any

discovery therein, to be conducted in a way that affords Plaintiff a fair and meaningful opportunity to present her case in arbitration, with no more limitation thereon than that which is inherent in the arbitration process generally as an alternative to litigation, an alternative, which, again, “both state and federal policy favor” *Simpson*, 373 S.C. at 24, 644 S.E.2d at 668. Indeed, by their express terms, the South Carolina ADR Rules must (“shall”) be “construed to secure the just, speedy, inexpensive and collaborative resolution” of disputes. (Rule 1, SCADR.)

- (4) Assuming, *arguendo*, it is both (1) a finding and (2) material, the circuit court erred in finding that the Facility is insufficiently named in the Arbitration Agreement.**

book, record, document, or paper which may be deemed material as evidence in the case. The fees for such attendance shall be the same as the fees of witnesses before masters of the United States courts. Said summons shall issue in the name of the arbitrator or arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be signed by the arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be directed to the said person and shall be served in the same manner as subpoenas to appear and testify before the court; if any person or persons so summoned to testify shall refuse or neglect to obey said summons, upon petition the United States district court for the district in which such arbitrators, or a majority of them, are sitting may compel the attendance of such person or persons before said arbitrator or arbitrators, or punish said person or persons for contempt in the same manner provided by law for securing the attendance of witnesses or their punishment for neglect or refusal to attend in the courts of the United States.

By way of “Background,” the circuit court stated, “The alleged Arbitration Agreement, purportedly a contract between the Facility and Armando, does not contain the legal name of the Defendant but rather references a name of a nonexistent entity not registered with the South Carolina Secretary of State called ‘Lake Emory Post-Acute Care.’” (R. p. 2, p. 18 (same).) The significance, if any, of this language is not clear, but assuming, *arguendo*, it is both (1) a finding and (2) material, the circuit court erred in finding that the Facility is insufficiently named in the Arbitration Agreement.

Of course, as an arbitration agreement covered by the FAA, the Arbitration Agreement “must [be] place[d] . . . on equal footing with other contracts . . . and enforce[d] . . . according to [its] terms[.]” *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 339. The purpose of South Carolina’s rules of contract construction is to ascertain the intention of the parties as gathered from the contents of the entire document and not from any particular provision within the contract. *Litchfield Co. of S. C., Inc. v. Kiriakides*, 290 S.C. 220, 223, 349 S.E.2d 344, 346 (Ct. App. 1986). Where one interpretation of a contract makes it unusual or extraordinary and another interpretation, equally consistent with the language employed, would make it reasonable, fair, and just, the latter construction prevails. *Farr v. Duke Power Co.*, 265 S.C. 356, 362, 218 S.E.2d 431, 434 (1975). Indeed, “[a]n interpretation which establishes the more reasonable and probable agreement of the parties should be adopted while an interpretation

leading to an absurd result should be avoided.” *Koon v. Fares*, 379 S.C. 150, 155, 666 S.E.2d 230, 233 (2008). Also, for a contract to be ambiguous, “the terms of the contract [must be] *reasonably* susceptible of more than one interpretation.” *See S.C. Dep’t of Natural Resources v. Town of McClellanville*, 345 S.C. 617, 623, 550 S.E.2d 299, 302 (2001) (emphasis added); *see also Rodarte v. University of South Carolina*, 419 S.C. 592, 604, 799 S.E.2d 912, 918 (2017) (“[A]n unambiguous contract is by definition capable of only one *reasonable* interpretation.”) (citation omitted) (emphasis added).

There is no ambiguity about the identification of the contracting parties here. The Arbitration Agreement is not *reasonably* susceptible of more than one interpretation in this regard. The circuit court itself recognized that the Arbitration Agreement was “signed . . . during the admission process” (R. p. 1, p. 18 (same).) Who else but the Facility, i.e., the facility into which Mr. Acevedo was then being admitted, would be the other party to the contract? Moreover, “[a] contract is good between the parties, no matter how incorrect the names used in the paper may be, if it appears they were intended as the names of the parties to be bound by the contract or to receive its benefits.” *Cobb & Seal Shoe Store v. Aetna Ins. Co.*, 78 S.C. 388, 58 S.E. 1099 (1907). Without question, the names of the parties to be bound to the contract at issue, i.e., the Arbitration Agreement, were sufficiently

stated/identified here, and refusal to enforce the Arbitration Agreement cannot properly be based on the (supposed) discrepancy at issue.

D. The Court erred in not reaching the circuit court’s denial of the Motion to Stay.

As explained in the Subject Opinion, “[a]s a result of [its] finding [Mrs. Acevedo] lacked authority to enter the Arbitration Agreement on [Mr.] Acevedo’s behalf, [the Court] [did] not address Appellants’ remaining issues regarding the Arbitration Agreement” and “[l]ikewise, . . . dismiss[ed] the appeal of the circuit court’s denial of THI[SC]’s motion to stay as moot.” (Subject Opinion p. 3.) Therefore, for the same reasons that the Court erred in affirming the circuit court on the basis that the HCPOA did not give Mrs. Acevedo authority to execute the Arbitration Agreement on Mr. Acevedo’s behalf (plus the reasons why the Court should have reached and ruled in Appellants’ favor on the remaining issues/arguments regarding the circuit court’s denial of the Motion to Compel Arbitration), it likewise erred in not reaching the circuit court’s denial of the Motion to Stay.

E. Had it reached the circuit court’s denial of the Motion to Stay, as it should have, the Court should have found that the circuit court erred in denying the Motion to Stay.

The relationship between the Motion to Compel Arbitration and the Motion to Stay is such that, insofar as the circuit court was concerned, the denial of the former mooted the latter. The fates of these motions (or, more precisely, the fates

of the appeals taken from the circuit court’s rulings thereon) are likewise intertwined in this Court: whether the Motion to Stay is properly viewed as moot depends on whether the Motion to Compel Arbitration was properly denied—which, most respectfully, it was not.

Accordingly, showing (as is done elsewhere herein) that the Court erroneously affirmed the circuit court’s denial of the Motion to Compel Arbitration in turn shows that the Court should have found that the circuit court erred in denying the Motion to Stay, which is not properly viewed as moot and should have been (or, alternatively, on remand should be) granted. *See* 9 U.S.C. § 3 (“If any suit or proceeding be brought in any of the courts of the United States upon any issue referable to arbitration under an agreement in writing for such arbitration, the court in which such suit is pending, upon being satisfied that the issue involved in such suit or proceeding is referable to arbitration under such an agreement, *shall* on application of one of the parties *stay the trial of the action until such arbitration has been had in accordance with the terms of the agreement*, providing the applicant for the stay is not in default in proceeding with such arbitration.”) (emphasis added); *Stokes v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.*, 351 S.C. 606, 612, 571 S.E.2d 711, 715 (Ct. App. 2002) (“[The] FAA clearly requires a court stay ‘any suit or proceeding’ pending the arbitration of ‘any issue referable to arbitration under an agreement in writing for such arbitration’ upon the application of one of the parties.”); *see also Episcopal*

Housing Corp. v. Federal Ins. Co., 269 S.C. 631, 641, 239 S.E.2d 647, 652 (1977) (“The fact that Federal is not a party to an arbitration agreement does not prevent an order staying the judicial proceedings pending arbitration between those who are parties to such an agreement. However, the Circuit Court included in its order the requirement that all parties be included in one arbitration proceeding. Federal has signed no arbitration agreement and cannot be forced into compulsory arbitration. We feel it was erroneous to condition the relief to which respondents are plainly entitled upon the voluntary submission of Federal to arbitration proceedings. This provision has been deleted from the foregoing Order of the lower court.”).

II. Most respectfully, the Court erred in declining to reach HVH’s appeal regarding the Motion to Dismiss on the basis that the denial of a motion to dismiss is not immediately appealable.

As explained in Appellants’ principal brief, by the time that the circuit court ruled on it, the Motion to Dismiss had already been withdrawn with Plaintiff’s consent and without prejudice to HVH refiling it. (R. pp. 126:1–129:5.) Indeed, by the time that the circuit court ruled on it, the Motion to Dismiss had already been marked completed by the Clerk of Court²⁶ and, accordingly, was not in fact on the docket. *See* Rule 40(a)(1), SCRCF (“The Clerk of Court shall maintain . . . a Nonjury Docket of all nonjury matters including all motions filed in the Circuit Court.”); Rule 40(h), SCRCF (“All motions on the Motions Calendar and motions filed in any case

²⁶ (See R. pp. 253–56.)

shall be immediately placed on the Nonjury Docket.”). Thus, to the extent that it constitutes error that HVH must seek to correct on appeal, as opposed to a matter that HVH may address in the circuit court directly (via Rule 60 or any other appropriate procedural vehicle for relief), HVH argued (and continues to argue that) the circuit court erred in ruling on the Motion to Dismiss after it had already been withdrawn with Plaintiff’s consent and without prejudice to HVH refiling it, as the Motion to Dismiss was not properly before the court for decision—indeed, at the time the court ruled on the Motion to Dismiss, the motion was nonexistent—as this Court should have found.

In declining to reach this issue/argument, the Court only cited authority for the proposition that the denial of a motion to dismiss is not immediately appealable (Subject Opinion p. 3), and did not recognize that this matter does not involve the mere denial of a motion to dismiss but the circuit court’s ruling on a motion to dismiss after it had already been withdrawn with the opposing party’s consent and without prejudice to it being refiled, i.e., a motion to dismiss that was not properly before the court for decision and, indeed, at the time the court ruled on it, was nonexistent. Moreover, the Court did not recognize precedents providing that ““an order that is not directly appealable will nonetheless be considered if there is an appealable issue before the [c]ourt and a ruling on appeal will avoid unnecessary litigation,”” *Watson v. Underwood*, 407 S.C. 443, 459, 756 S.E.2d 155, 163–64 (Ct.

App. 2014) (quoting *Hite v. Thomas & Howard Co.*, 305 S.C. 358, 360, 409 S.E.2d 340, 341 (1991), overruled on other grounds by *Huntley v. Young*, 319 S.C. 559, 462 S.E.2d 860 (1995)), and that, “[g]enerally, ‘[t]his [c]ourt reviews interlocutory orders when they contain other appealable issues.’” *Watson*, 407 S.C. at 459, 756 S.E.2d at 164 (quoting *Ferguson v. Charleston Lincoln Mercury, Inc.*, 349 S.C. 558, 565, 564 S.E.2d 94, 98 (2002)).

The circuit court dealt with the Motion to Dismiss in orders that are undeniably immediately appealable because they involve the denial of the Motion to Compel Arbitration. (R. pp. 14–31.) At a minimum, the Court had discretionary authority to address HVH’s motion to dismiss, and judicial economy compels exercising that authority here, with, conversely, there is no countervailing interest compelling it to refrain from doing so.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, along with any other or further reason(s) set forth in their appellate briefs already on file, the entirety of which they hereby adopt and incorporate herein by reference and reiterate/reassert in support hereof, Appellants ask this Honorable Court to grant the instant petition, to rehear this matter, to withdraw the Subject Opinion, and to decide this appeal anew via an opinion that reverses the circuit court, specifically, an opinion compelling Plaintiff’s claims against the Facility to arbitration (or, alternatively, an opinion remanding the case to

the circuit court with instructions that it do so); staying this action until any and all arbitration proceedings are completed (or, alternatively, an opinion remanding the case to the circuit court with instructions that it either do so or conduct any further proceedings necessary to decide the Motion to Stay on the merits); and, to the extent that it constitutes error that HVH must seek to correct on appeal, as opposed to a matter that HVH may address in the circuit court directly (via Rule 60 or any other appropriate procedural vehicle for relief), vacating the circuit court's denial of the Motion to Dismiss (or, alternatively, an opinion remanding the case to the circuit court with instructions that it do so).

Respectfully submitted,
CLEMENT RIVERS, LLP

By: s/Russell G. Hines
Stephen L. Brown (SC Bar No. 66468)
D. Jay Davis, Jr. (SC Bar No. 12084)
Russell G. Hines (SC Bar No. 72100)
25 Calhoun Street, Suite 400
Charleston, South Carolina 29401
P.O. Box 993 (29402)
(843) 720-5488
Attorneys for Appellants

Charleston, South Carolina

September 18, 2023

THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals**

RECEIVED

Sep 19 2023


SC Court of Appeals

Armando J. Acevedo, through his Attorney-In-Fact,
Marianne Acevedo, Respondent,

v.

Hunt Valley Holdings, LLC; THI of South Carolina,
LLC; and THI of South Carolina at Camp Care, LLC,
d/b/a Lake Emory Post Acute Care, Appellants.

Appellate Case No. 2020-001146



Appeal From Spartanburg County
J. Derham Cole, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2023-UP-281
Submitted June 1, 2023 – Filed August 2, 2023

AFFIRMED

Stephen Lynwood Brown, Russell Grainger Hines, and
Donald Jay Davis, Jr., all of Clement Rivers, LLP, of
Charleston, for Appellants.

Gary W. Poliakoff and Raymond Paul Mullman, Jr., both
of Poliakoff & Assoc., PA, of Spartanburg; Jordan
Christopher Calloway, of McGowan Hood Felder &
Phillips, of Rock Hill; Patrick E. Knie, of Knie & Shealy

Attorneys at Law, of Spartanburg; and Edward John Waelde, of Greenville, all for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Hunt Valley Holdings, LLC (HVH); THI of South Carolina, LLC (THI); and THI of South Carolina at Camp Care, LLC d/b/a Lake Emory Post Acute Care (the Facility; collectively, Appellants) appeal the circuit court's order denying their motion to compel arbitration, motion to dismiss, and motion to stay. Appellants argue the circuit court erred by finding (1) the at-issue arbitration agreement (Arbitration Agreement) lacked consideration and mutuality; (2) the Arbitration Agreement lacked material terms; (3) the Arbitration Agreement was unconscionable; and (4) the Facility was insufficiently named in the Arbitration Agreement. Appellants further argue that to the extent HVH must seek to address it on appeal, the circuit court erred by ruling on HVH's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction after the motion had been withdrawn with the consent of Armando J. Acevedo, through the consent of his wife and Attorney-in-Fact, Marianne Acevedo. We affirm.

1. We hold the health care power of attorney document (HCPOA) did not give Marianne authority to execute the Arbitration Agreement on Acevedo's behalf. *See* Rule 220(c), SCACR (explaining this court may affirm "upon any ground(s) appearing in the Record on Appeal"); *Zabinski v. Bright Acres Assocs.*, 346 S.C. 580, 596, 553 S.E.2d 110, 118 (2001) ("The question of the arbitrability of a claim is an issue for judicial determination, unless the parties provide otherwise."); *New Hope Missionary Baptist Church v. Paragon Builders*, 379 S.C. 620, 625, 667 S.E.2d 1, 3 (Ct. App. 2008) (explaining an "[a]ppel from the denial of a motion to compel arbitration is subject to de novo review"); *Stokes v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.*, 351 S.C. 606, 609-10, 571 S.E.2d 711, 713 (Ct. App. 2002) ("However, the circuit court's factual findings will not be overruled if there is any evidence reasonably supporting them."); *Arredondo v. SNH SE Ashley River Tenant, LLC*, 433 S.C. 69, 80-84, 856 S.E.2d 550, 556-58 (reviewing an identical authorization provision of a healthcare power of attorney document and finding the authorization did not grant the patient's daughter authority to grant the waivers recited in an arbitration agreement because the authorization was limited to action "necessary" concerning the patient's healthcare and the patient's daughter was not required to sign the agreement), *cert. denied*, 142 S. Ct. 584 (2021); *id.* at 84-85, 856 S.E.2d at 558-59 (holding the healthcare power of attorney document did not grant the patient's daughter the authority to execute the arbitration agreement because the "pursuing any legal action" language in the healthcare power of attorney document was in the context of forcing compliance with the patient's wishes and daughter did not

execute the arbitration agreement in connection with an existing claim against the facility). Here, as in *Arredondo*, Appellants acknowledge "the Arbitration Agreement was not a precondition of admission." Thus, Marianne's signature on the Arbitration Agreement was not necessary to Acevedo receiving care at the Facility. Here, also as in *Arredondo*, Marianne did not execute the Arbitration Agreement in connection with an existing claim against the Facility, as the document was executed on the day of Acevedo's admission and prior to his fall. Thus, Marianne did not execute the Arbitration Agreement in the pursuit of legal action in the context of forcing compliance with Acevedo's wishes. Accordingly, we conclude the HCPOA did not give Marianne authority to grant the waivers recited in the Arbitration Agreement; we, therefore, affirm the denial of the motion to compel arbitration.

As a result of our finding Marianne lacked authority to enter the Arbitration Agreement on Acevedo's behalf, we need not address Appellants' remaining issues regarding the Arbitration Agreement. *See Futch v. McAllister Towing of Georgetown, Inc.*, 335 S.C. 598, 613, 518 S.E.2d 591, 598 (1999) (ruling an appellate court need not address remaining issues when its resolution of a prior issue is dispositive). Likewise, we dismiss the appeal of the circuit court's denial of THI's motion to stay as moot. *See Sloan v. Greenville County*, 380 S.C. 528, 535, 670 S.E.2d 663, 667 (Ct. App. 2009) ("An appellate court will not pass judgment on moot and academic questions; it will not adjudicate a matter when no actual controversy capable of specific relief exists. A case becomes moot when judgment, if rendered, will have no practical legal effect upon the existing controversy." (citation omitted)).

2. Regarding HVH's motion to dismiss, we hold that the denial of a motion to dismiss is not immediately appealable; therefore, we decline to address this issue. *See Mid-State Distribs., Inc. v. Century Imps., Inc.*, 310 S.C. 330, 336, 426 S.E.2d 777, 781 (1993) (explaining an order denying a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction "is interlocutory and not directly appealable"); *McLendon v. S.C. Dep't of Highways and Pub. Transp.*, 313 S.C. 525, 526 n.2, 443 S.E.2d 539, 540 n.2 (1994) ("Like the denial of a motion for summary judgment, the denial of a motion to dismiss does not establish the law of the case and the issue raised by the motion can be raised again at a later stage of the proceedings.").

AFFIRMED.¹

¹ We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.

WILLIAMS, C.J., and GEATHERS and VERDIN, JJ., concur.

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

Appeal from Spartanburg County
Court of Common Pleas

J. Derham Cole, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2018-CP-42-03421
Appellate Case No. 2020-001146

RECEIVED

Sep 19 2023

SC Court of Appeals

Armando J. Acevedo,
through his Attorney-in-Fact,
Marianne Acevedo,

Respondent,

v.

Hunt Valley Holdings, LLC;
THI of South Carolina, LLC; and
THI of South Carolina at Camp Care, LLC,
d/b/a Lake Emory Post Acute Care,

Appellants.

PROOF OF SERVICE

CLEMENT RIVERS, LLP
Stephen L. Brown (SC Bar No. 66468)
D. Jay Davis, Jr. (SC Bar No. 12084)
Russell G. Hines (SC Bar No. 72100)
25 Calhoun Street, Suite 400
Charleston, South Carolina 29401
P.O. Box 993 (29402)
(843) 720-5488

Attorneys for Appellants

I, Russell G. Hines, of Clement Rivers, LLP, attorneys for Appellants, hereby certify that **APPELLANTS' PETITION FOR REHEARING** was served on Respondent on September 18, 2023, by emailing (see attached) a copy of the same to her counsel of record:

Gary W. Poliakoff, Esquire
atty@gpoliakoff.com
Raymond P. Mullman, Jr., Esquire
rmullmanjr@gmail.com
POLIAKOFF & ASSOCIATES, P.A.

Jordan C. Calloway, Esquire
jcalloway@mcgowanhood.com
MCGOWAN HOOD FELDER &
PHILLIPS

Patrick E. Knie, Esquire
pat@knieshealy.com
KNIE & SHEALY
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Respectfully submitted,
CLEMENT RIVERS, LLP

By: s/Russell G. Hines
Russell G. Hines (SC Bar No. 72100)
Attorneys for Appellants

Charleston, South Carolina

September 18, 2023

RECEIVED

Sep 19 2023

SC Court of Appeals

From: Hines, Russell
To: atty@gpoliakoff.com; rmullmanjr@gmail.com; pknie@knielaw.com; jordan@mcgowanhood.com; pat@knieshealy.com; jcalloway@mcgowanhood.com
Cc: Justman, Aimee; [Bell, Pollyana \(Polly\)](mailto: Bell, Pollyana (Polly)); [Brown, Stephen L.](mailto: Brown, Stephen L.); [Davis, Jay](mailto: Davis, Jay)
Subject: Acevedo v. Hunt Valley Holdings (Appellate Case No. 2020-001146) (CR 180125) -- Appellants' Petition for Rehearing
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 11:47:41 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[Acevedo v. HVH \(2020-001146\) -- Petition for Rehearing.pdf](#)
[Ex. A -- Ct. App. Opinion.pdf](#)

Attached for service please find **Appellants' Petition for Rehearing** and **Exhibit A** thereto in the above-referenced matter.

Russell G. Hines
CLEMENT RIVERS, LLP
www.ycrlaw.com
25 Calhoun Street, Suite 400
Charleston, South Carolina 29401
P.O. Box 993 (29402)
Phone: (843) 720-5488
Fax: (843) 579-1327
Email: rhines@ycrlaw.com



CLEMENT RIVERS, LLP
25 Calhoun Street • Suite 400 • Charleston, SC 29401
ycrlaw.com