

RECEIVED

Mar 22 2024

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Robert Bonds, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2023-CP-1003278

Appellate Case No. 2024-000210

Kathy Kennedy,

Appellant

v.

Bernard Myatt, III and Myatt Air Conditioning, LLC,

Respondents

INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Kathy Kennedy
774 Norfolk Dr
James Island, SC 29412
(843) 795-8775
Pro Se

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents 1

Table of Authorities 2

Statement of Issues on Appeal 3

Statement of the Case 3

Standard of Review 5

Argument 6

 The Circuit Court Erred in Granting Summary Judgment to Respondents
 Despite the Presence of Genuine Issues of Material Fact 6

 A. The Circuit Court Inappropriately Determined Appellant Kennedy
 Could Not Prove Gross Negligence a Matter of Law 6

 B. The Circuit Court Inappropriately Determined Appellant Kennedy Knew or
 Should Have Known She Had A Cause of Action For Damage To Her
 Other Property Prior to Discovery of the Hidden Defect that Caused the
 Damage 7

 C. The Circuit Court Inappropriately Failed to Consider Equitable Tolling
 and Covid-19 10

Conclusion 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Allwin v. Russ Cooper Association, Inc., 426 S.C. 1, 825 SE2d 707
(S.C. Ct. App. 2019) 7

Beck v. Carolina Power & Light Co., 57 N.C. App. 373, 291 S.E.2d 897
(N.C. Ct. App. 1982) 6

Cullen v. Logan Developers, Inc., 887 S.E.2d 455 (N.C. Ct. App. 2023) 6

Ferris v County of Suffolk, 174 AD2d 70, 76 (1992) 8

Gonzalez v. Banzer, 2004 N.Y. Slip Op. 51509 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2004) 8

Hampton Hall, LLC v. Chapman Coyle Chapman & Assocs., 2018 WL 2305658
(D.S.C. May 21, 2018) 7

Hickman v. Grover, 178 W.Va. 258, 358 S.E.2d 810 (1987) 7

Jahagirdar v. The Comput. Haus NC, Inc., 1:20-cv-33-MOC-WCM, 3-4
(W.D.N.C. Feb. 15, 2022) 10, 11

Jolly v. Eli Lilly & Co. (1988) 44 Cal.3d 1103, 1109 (245 Cal.Rptr. 658, 751 P.2d 92)8

Laurens Emergency Med. Specialists, P.A. v. M.S. Bailey & Sons Bankers,
355 S.C. 104, 108-09, 584 S.E.2d 375, 377 (2003).5

McNair v Rainsford, 330 S.C. 332, 342, 499 S.E.2d 488, 493 (Ct.App. 1998) 5

Moore v. Crumpton, 306 N.C. at 624, 295 S.E.2d at 441 (1982).....6, 10

Mulherin-Howell v. Cobb, 362 S.C. 588, 597, 608 S.E.2d 587, 592 (Ct. App. 2005)5

Quail Hill, LLC v. Cnty. of Richland, 387 S.C. 223, 235, 692 S.E.2d 499, 505 (2010)5

Rapino v City of New York, AD2d 470 (2002) 8

Stoneledge at Lake Keowee Owners' Association, Inc. v. Clear View
Construction, LLC, 413 S.C. 615, 776 S.E.2d 426 (Ct. App. 2015).....4, 7

Zabinski v. Bright Acres Assocs., 346 S.C. 580, 553 S.E.2d 110 (2001)9

Zuniga v. Bean, Case No. 2:20-cv-00619-GMN-BNW (D. Nev. Apr. 20, 2021) 10

STATUTES AND RULES

South Carolina Code Sections 15-3-6303
South Carolina Code Sections 15-3-6403
South Carolina Code Sections 15-3-6703, 6, 7
South Carolina Rule of Civil Procedure 565

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

- A. Did the Circuit Court inappropriately determine Appellant Kennedy could not prove gross negligence as a matter of law despite the fact that Respondent Myatt was found guilty of violating multiple applicable building codes?
- B. Did the Circuit Court inappropriately determine Appellant Kennedy knew or should have known she had a cause of action for damage to her other property prior to discovery of the hidden defect that caused that damage?
- C. Did the Circuit Court inappropriately fail to consider Equitable Tolling and the Covid-19 Pandemic?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case arises out of negligence based construction defects and the damage to other property (sub-floors and floors) caused by those defects, at 774 Norfolk Drive, Charleston SC, Appellant Kennedy’s residence. This case is an action against a contractor based upon gross negligence with respect to defective improvement to real property, which resulted in damage to property other than the defective property; therefore, the case falls under S.C. Code Ann. §15-3-630, S.C. Code Ann. §15-3-640 and S.C. Code Ann. §15-3-670. (See Complaint Attachment).

Appellant Kennedy, who is a 64 year old disabled individual, entered into a contract with Respondents Bernard Myatt III and Myatt Air Conditioning, LLC (Respondent Myatt), on or about, November 14, 2018 for the fabrication and installation of an entirely metal duct system in the crawl space under her residence. Respondent Myatt failed to follow multiple applicable building codes and standards in the fabrication and installation of the partial duct system in the crawl space under Appellant Kennedy's residence, for some of which, he was fined by the South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (SC LLR). One of the building codes and standards Respondent Myatt failed to follow caused damage to Appellant Kennedy's other property (sub-floors and floors); it was a hidden defect which was only discovered by destructive means May 2021. Appellant Kennedy filed her complaint April 2023, within three years from the date of discovery of the hidden defect. There was over a one year delay in Appellant Kennedy's case due to the government mandated shutdowns caused by the Covid-19 Pandemic. The facts of the case are outlined in Appellant Kennedy's Circuit Court Brief at 4-6.

Appellant Kennedy filed a complaint with the Charleston County Small Claim April 13, 2021. On May 5, 2023, Defendant Myatt, through counsel, filed a motion for Summary Judgment. A Summary Judgment Motion was held in front of Judge Laura Beck on June 1, 2023. Judge Beck ruled for the Respondents on June 26, 2023. Appellant Kennedy filed an appeal with the Circuit Court on July 7, 2023. An appeal hearing was held in front of Judge Robert Bonds on January 31, 2024. Judge Robert Bonds affirmed the lower court ruling January 31, 2024. This appeal followed.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The appellate court reviews the grant of summary judgment by applying the same standard the circuit court applied pursuant to Rule 56(c) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, which provides “the circuit court shall grant summary judgment if ‘there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law.’ ” Stoneledge at Lake Keowee Owners' Association, Inc. v. Clear View Construction, LLC, 413 S.C. 615, 776 S.E.2d 426 (Ct. App. 2015). “When the circuit court grants summary judgment on a question of law, we review the ruling de novo.” Id. “In determining whether any triable issue of fact exists, the evidence and all inferences which can reasonably be drawn therefrom must be viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party.” Id. (quoting Quail Hill, LLC v. Cnty. of Richland, 387 S.C. 223, 235, 692 S.E.2d 499, 505 (2010)). Because summary judgment is a drastic remedy, it should be cautiously invoked to ensure that a litigant is not improperly deprived of a trial on disputed factual issues. Mulherin-Howell v. Cobb, 362 S.C. 588, 597, 608 S.E.2d 587, 592 (Ct. App. 2005). Summary judgment should not be granted even when there is no dispute as to the evidentiary facts, if there is a dispute as to the conclusions to be drawn there from. Laurens Emergency Med. Specialists, P.A. v. M.S. Bailey & Sons Bankers, 355 S.C. 104, 108-09, 584 S.E.2d 375, 377 (2003). “The party seeking summary judgment has the burden of clearly establishing the absence of a genuine issue of material fact.” McNair v Rainsford, 330 S.C. 332, 342, 499 S.E.2d 488, 493 (Ct.App. 1998).

ARGUMENT

THE CIRCUIT COURT ERRED IN GRANTING SUMMARY JUDGMENT TO RESPONDENTS, DESPITE THE PRESENCE OF GENUINE ISSUES OF MATERIAL FACT

A. THE CIRCUIT COURT ERRED IN DETERMINING APPELLANT KENNEDY COULD NOT PROVE GROSS NEGLIGENCE AS A MATTER OF LAW.

SC Code § 15-3-670 provides that violations of building codes are per se evidence of gross negligence. Evidence was provided that Respondent Myatt violated multiple applicable building codes, was found guilty and was fined by the South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (SC LLR) for some of those violations (Myatt Consent Agreement 2). One of the applicable building codes violated by Respondent Myatt was willfully failing to seal any of the of the longitudinal seams, transverse joints and duct wall penetrations (duct system seams); which rendered the entire partial duct system fabricated and installed by Respondent Myatt defective (SC LLR Addendum 2). See Beck v. Carolina Power & Light Co., 57 N.C. App. 373, 291 S.E.2d 897 (N.C. Ct. App. 1982), where the evidence, which showed numerous violations of the National Electrical Safety Code was sufficient to show gross negligence and the issue of punitive damages was submitted to the jury.

Respondent Myatt provided no evidence to dispute the issue of gross negligence; thereby, failing to establish the lack of a genuine issue of material fact on the issue of gross negligence. Moore v. Crumpton, 306 N.C. at 624, 295 S.E.2d at 441 (1982). The evidence in Appellant Kennedy's case states a claim for gross negligence and raises a genuine issue of material fact of whether Respondent Myatt's multiple violations of applicable building codes amount to "wanton conduct done with conscious or reckless disregard for the .safety of others" such that it cannot be said Respondent

Myatt was not grossly negligent as a matter of law. Cullen v. Logan Developers, Inc., 887 S.E.2d 455 (N.C. Ct. App. 2023).

The Circuit Court inappropriately made its decision based on its erroneous determination that the Magistrate Judge's findings of law were correct. The Magistrate Judge inappropriately determined that the Court in Allwin, changed the South Carolina Code of Laws regarding the statute of limitations and gross negligence. Contrary to the Magistrate Judge's assertion, S.C. Code Ann. §15-3-670 has not changed and still clearly states that the statute of limitations is not available as a defense to a person guilty of gross negligence. The Magistrate Judge inappropriately alleges:

"In Allwin v. Russ Cooper Association, Inc., 426 S.C. 1, 825 SE2d 707 (S.C. Ct. App. 2019), the Court held that the three-year statute of limitations is applied in a property owner's suit against an architectural firm and general contractor for negligence, gross negligence, and breach of warranty stemming from alleged construction defects in a house built for the property owner." (M.J. Ret. 4)

This Court, as the Court in Hampton Hall, LLC v. Chapman Coyle Chapman & Assocs., 2018 WL 2305658 (D.S.C. May 21, 2018), should find that evidence of a building code violation can be evidence of gross negligence, thus creating triable issues of material fact; and summary judgment should be reversed.

B. THE CIRCUIT COURT INAPPROPRIATELY DETERMINED APPELLANT KENNEDY KNEW OR SHOULD HAVE KNOWN SHE HAD A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DAMAGE TO HER OTHER PROPERTY PRIOR TO DISCOVERY OF THE HIDDEN DEFECT THAT CAUSED THAT DAMAGE.

At issue is whether or not Appellant Kennedy knew or should have known about a hidden defect prior to May 2021. This Court should find that discovery of a hidden defect and the date when it could have been discovered raises a triable issue of

material fact and deny summary judgment, as it did in Stoneledge at Lake Keowee Owners' Association, Inc. v. Clear View Construction, LLC, 413 S.C. 615, 776 S.E.2d 426 (Ct. App. 2015). The statute of limitations begins to run when the plaintiff knows all of the essential elements of a cause of action, that is, the injury, what caused the injury and who caused the injury. Hickman v. Grover, 178 W.Va. 258, 358 S.E.2d 810 (1987). The discovery rule provides that the accrual date of a cause of action is delayed until the plaintiff is aware of the plaintiff's injury and its negligent cause. Jolly v. Eli Lilly & Co. (1988) 44 Cal.3d 1103, 1109 (245 Cal.Rptr. 658, 751 P.2d 92).

Respondent Myatt's assertion that Appellant Kennedy knew or should have known about the hidden defect is without merit. No evidence has been provided that shows Appellant Kennedy knew or should have known about the hidden defect prior to May 2021. See Gonzalez v. Banzer, 2004 N.Y. Slip Op. 51509 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2004). This Court should find, as did the Court in Gonzalez, quoting Ferris v County of Suffolk, 174 AD2d 70, 76 [1992], "Constructive notice will not be imputed where the defect is latent, i.e., where, as here, the defect is of such a nature that it would not be discoverable even upon a reasonable inspection." This Court should find, as did the Court in Gonzalez, "If a defect could not have been discovered by a layman, even by a reasonable inspection, it is considered a latent defect. (see Rapino v City of New York, AD2d 470 (2002))." The defect in Appellant Kennedy's case was not discovered by professionals (TJI Inspector and SC LLR Inspector); therefore, there should be no question as to it being a latent defect. The entire partial duct system fabricated and installed by Respondent Myatt in the crawl space under Appellant Kennedy's residence was completely covered with insulation, mastic and tape; thereby, rendering the entire

unsealed duct system a hidden defect. The fact that neither the Town of James Island (TJI) Inspector, nor the first SC LLR Inspector found the hidden defect, clearly shows the hidden defect could not be found by reasonable inspection. (See TJI Email; SC LLR Add. 4; Myatt Consent Agreement 2). Further, as Appellant Kennedy has stated and testified, the James Island Inspector told her that there was nothing that he could see in Respondent Myatt's fabrication and installation that could cause the damage to Appellant Kennedy's sub-floors and floors; that it could be caused by a water pipe leak. (See Apt. Cir. Ct. Brf. 5; Tr. 5, 17-18; SC LLR Add. 4; TJI Email).

The Circuit Court's decision "that the statute of limitations had run" (Tr. 20), was made without any evidence that Appellant Kennedy knew or should have known by reasonable inspection about the hidden defect prior to May 2021. Further, the Circuit Court's determination that Appellant Kennedy was wrong to rely on the TJI Inspector and the SC LLR Inspector is completely unfounded. The Circuit Court in making its decision:

"Number one, I think that, perhaps, some of the information that you got and was provided to you (indiscernible) may have been the right information or may have been the wrong information, or they didn't know, or they were telling you things that they weren't sure, or we didn't think this was related. And, you know, I think that you did what a lot of people would do, and that is you relied on what they told you." (Tr. 19)

No evidence was provided that supports the Circuit Court's determination that Appellant Kennedy knew or should have known about the hidden defect by reasonable diligence prior to May 2021. No evidence has been provided that support the Circuit Court's determination that Appellant Kennedy was wrong to rely on the TJI Inspector and the SC LLR Inspector; especially, since they are the entities given the responsibility (established by statute) of enforcing the applicable building codes (established by

statute), which were violated by Respondent Myatt. See Zabinski v. Bright Acres Assocs., 346 S.C. 580, 553 S.E.2d 110 (2001) (stating that abuse of discretion occurs where trial court is controlled by error of law or where trial court's order is based on factual conclusions without evidentiary support).

Evidence was provided that the hidden defect was not discoverable by reasonable diligence. Respondent Myatt provided no evidence that shows Appellant Kennedy knew or should have known about the hidden defect prior to May 2021; thereby, failing to establish the lack of a genuine issue of material fact on the date of discovery of the hidden defect. Moore v. Crumpton, 306 N.C. at 624, 295 S.E.2d at 441 (1982).

C. THE CIRCUIT COURT FAILED TO CONSIDER EQUITABLE TOLLING, DESPITE THE FACT THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC CAUSED OVER A ONE YEAR DELAY IN APPELLANT KENNEDY'S CASE.

Appellant Kennedy repeatedly raised the issue that the Covid-19 Pandemic (Pandemic) shutdowns caused over a year delay in her case (Ptf. Mot. Deny MSJ 2, Apt. Magis. Ct. App. Atch. 3). The Magistrate Judge states, "*She filed the formal complaint in January of 2020 with LLR, due to COVID the inspector come in March 2022*" (M.J. Ret. 2), thereby acknowledging there was an over one year delay in Appellant Kennedy's case that was due to the Pandemic; however, the Magistrate Judge failed to recognize the applicability of equitable tolling to remedy the exigencies created by the Pandemic, unlike many others who did. See Jahagirdar v. The Comput. Haus NC, Inc., 1:20-cv-33-MOC-WCM, 3-4 (W.D.N.C. Feb. 15, 2022), ("This Court joined "many others in recognizing the applicability of equitable tolling to remedy

exigencies created by COVID-19.” See Zuniga v. Bean, Case No. 2:20-cv-00619-GMN-BNW (D. Nev. Apr. 20, 2021”).

This court should take judicial notice, as the Court in Jahagirdar, “that the onset of the pandemic's disruption in the United States was in February and March 2020 and continued for much of that year. In other words, severe disruptions induced by the pandemic began almost immediately after Plaintiff Jahagirdar initiated this action and persisted for months thereafter.” Appellant Kennedy contacted the SC LLR January 2020; however, due to the Pandemic shutdowns, it was over a year before SC LLR inspected Appellant Kennedy’s residence, in March 2021. Appellant Kennedy exercised reasonable diligence as is evidenced by her contacting the TJI and the SC LLR.

This Court should, as did the Court in Jahagirdar, find that Covid-19 amounted to an “extraordinary circumstance.” and “that it would be unconscionable and grossly injustice for Plaintiffs to be unduly prejudiced by their unfortunate timing.” and grant equitable tolling.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Appellant respectfully requests that this court reverse the decisions of the Circuit Court.

March 22, 2024



KATHY KENNEDY
774 Norfolk Drive
James Island, SC 29412
(843) 795-8775
katrrme@gmail.com
APPELLANT, PRO SE