

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeal

APPEAL FROM ANDERSON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
Hon. R. Scott Sprouse, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2019-CP-04-01942
Appellate Case No. 2023-001401

Natalie Zitek, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated; Plaintiff,

v.

D.R. Horton, Inc., Jane Doe #1-10; and, John Doe #1-50, Defendant,

D.R. Horton, Inc., Appellant,

v.

AJ Landscaping & Grading LLC, A/K/A AJ Landscaping & Grading, Inc;
Allpro Textures, LCC; Alpha Omega Construction Group, Inc.; American
Concrete and Precast, Inc., A/K/A ACP Concrete, Inc.; A&J Framing, Inc;
Alpha E.M.C; A-Z, Inc.; Atlanta Floor Designs Center; A Grade Above
Others, LLC; Brand-Vaughan Lumber Co., Inc.; BKF Builders, Inc;
Builders Designhouse, LLC; BMC East, LLC D/B/A Coleman Floor,
LLC; Builders Firstsource Southeast Group, LLC, A/K/A Builders
Firstsource, Inc; Bravo Carpenters, Inc.; Caryl Mechanics II, Inc.; Caryl
Mechanicals, Inc.; Cannaday Siding and Gutter, Inc; Cortes Painting,
LLC; CBU Enterprises, Inc.; CPI Security Systems, Inc.; Dom Group,
LLC; Ferguson Enterprises, Inc.; Five Star Construction Inc.; Five Star
Foundations, LLC; Galloway-Bell, Inc.; A/K/A Galloway-Bell, Inc. II
BGET Floored, LLC; GBS Building Supply-Us LBM, LLC, A/K/A GBS
Building Supply, Inc.; General Shale Brick Inc.; Greener Pastures, Inc.
A/K/A Greener Pastures of Aiken, Inc; IBP Asset, LLC D/B/A Blue Ridge
Building Products; JLS Masonry, Inc.; Kings Landscaping, LLC;
Landshapers, LLC; Lade-Danler, Inc.; Lansing Building Products, Inc.;
Long Heating & Air Conditioning, Inc.; L&M Electric, Inc.; Manale
Landscaping, LLC; MJ Cowboys, LLC; M&L General Construction, LLC.
A/K/A M&L General Construction, Inc.; M&Lreyna Construction, LLC;
M&M Foundations, LLC; Nazareth Builders, LLC, NB Contractors, LLC;
Poinsett Development, LLC; Poinsett Homes, LLC; P&T Construction,
LLC; P&L Enterprises, LLC; Probuild Company, A/K/A Probuild

Holdings, Inc.; Rite Rug Co.; Rodney Howard Grading Co.; Sandlapper Concrete, LLC; Sodfather, Inc., Landscape Contractors; Stock Building Supply, LLC; Topbuild Home Services, Inc, A/K/A Gale Contractors Service; Tucker Materials, Inc., A/K/A Gypsum; UTM Enterprises, Inc., Dupree Plumbing Company, Inc.; Willow Tree Landscaping, Inc.,Third-Party Defendants, of which Builder Services Group (f/k/a Masco Contractor Services Central Inc. f/k/a Gale Industries, Inc. d/b/a Gale Contractors Services) and IBP Assets, LLC d/b/a Blue Ridge Building Products, are the Respondents.

MOTION REGARDING FINAL BRIEFS

Respondent IBP Assets, LLC d/b/a Blue Ridge Building Products (hereinafter “Blue Ridge”) hereby requests the following regarding the record and final briefs:

1. Pursuant to Rule 211(a), SCACR, final briefs are due on July 2, 2024. However, Respondents’ Joint Motion to Strike is pending, and the disposition of that motion may affect the record on appeal and final briefs. The Rules also provide that motions generally do not stay time limits. Rule 240(b), SCACR. Accordingly, Blue Ridge requests that the deadline for filing final briefs be stayed until the pending motion is resolved.

2. Blue Ridge inadvertently designated incorrect pages from the transcript of the hearing held February 8, 2023. The correct pages should have been 75 and 76. This does not affect a substantive issue. The pages were merely cited to show that Blue Ridge reminded the trial court that it had not yet ruled on Blue Ridge’s pending dispositive motion, as quoted below:

At a hearing held February 8, 2023, counsel for Blue Ridge reminded the trial court about Blue Ridge's pending motion. (ROA pp. (transcript pp. 71-73).)

(Blue Ridge Init. Br. filed Apr. 10, 2024, p. 2.) Blue Ridge requests leave to supplement the Record on Appeal to include pages 75 and 76. (See Exh. A, attached.)

3. In its Counter-Statement of Facts in its Initial Brief, Blue Ridge stated the following regarding the relevant trial court order on appeal:

The court further found that DR Horton’s third-party claims therefore collapsed into indemnity, and the subcontract was not clear and unequivocal.

This characterization appears to be mistaken. In a footnote, the trial court indicated it did not reach the Stoneledge argument because its finding that there was no evidence of wrongdoing was dispositive. (R. pp. 77-78 n.1.) Thus, the trial court did not find “that DR Horton’s third-party claims therefore collapsed into indemnity.” To avoid a mischaracterization of a judicial ruling, Blue Ridge calls this to the Court’s attention and requests leave to correct its statement, either in final briefs or in any other way the Court deems fitting. Blue Ridge believes that a more accurate characterization of the trial court’s ruling is as follows:

The court further found that DR Horton’s *contractual indemnity claim failed because the subcontract was not clear and unequivocal.* (R. pp. 73-77.)

(Corrected language italicized.) Blue Ridge does not consider this to affect the merits of this appeal. Again, Blue Ridge brings this to the Court’s attention to avoid a mischaracterization of a judicial ruling. (A copy of the trial court order is attached as Exhibit B—see pp. 8-9.)

Respectfully submitted,

s/Timothy J. Newton
MURPHY & GRANTLAND, P.A.
Everett A. Kendall, II (SC Bar No. 8450)
Timothy J. Newton, (SC Bar No. 71640)
P.O. Box 6648
Columbia, SC 29260
(803) 782-4100
Attorneys for Respondent
IBP Assets, LLC d/b/a
Blue Ridge Building Products

June 28, 2024

1 THE COURT: Okay.

2 MR. KENDALL: Your Honor, this is Everett Kendall for
3 Blue Ridge again. I don't have a motion that appears on this
4 docket. I just want to remind the Court I've written a letter
5 to this effect. We presented a motion at the September 8th
6 hearing that was a motion to dismiss the third-party claims
7 against my client. It was factually -- it was we argued on a
8 different basis than other third-party contractors had argued.

9 Somehow, I believe that motion has gotten lost in terms
10 of being ruled upon. And so if I just -- I don't know what
11 else I might need to do and just asking for that direction
12 from the Court in order to get -- to know where we are with
13 that motion.

14 THE COURT: I'll go back and look at that.

15 MR. KENDALL: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: I'll go back and look at your filing to say
17 to make sure that it was something that was considered.

18 MR. KENDALL: It was filed and argued --

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 MR. KENDALL: -- at the September 8th docket, but it
21 was -- again, it was -- it had a similar title to the other
22 motions you heard, but it was being argued on a very different
23 theory. And so I'm just -- I'm afraid it just might have
24 gotten buried.

25 THE COURT: I'll go back and look at that. Thank you for

1 calling that (indiscernible), Mr. Kendall.

2 MR. KENDALL: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you.

3 THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else? Okay.

4 MR. IMHOFF: Does that mean it's back to me, Your Honor?

5 THE COURT: All right. I'll listen. And then I'll give
6 Mr. Imhoff and then Mr. Lucey last opportunity here. So go
7 ahead, Mr. Imhoff.

8 MR. IMHOFF: Your Honor, I'm going to try to be brief. I
9 have to put some things on the record. I'm not going to keep
10 us here forever, but I have to put some things on the record.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. IMHOFF: Everyone on this -- in this case is in a
13 little bit different position. And D.R. Horton, my client,
14 obviously, is in a position where it is defending 221 homes in
15 a class action lawsuit, and all aspects of them, and also
16 prosecuting the third-party claims against all of the
17 subcontractors.

18 And so what we're asking you to do is extend this. And I
19 think Emily Sheets and a couple other people said it. We're
20 concerned -- and we're trying to do it as quickly as we can.
21 We're concerned that the current scheduling order and even
22 future ones may not make it there. And I want to point out to
23 Your Honor -- and I can put it up on the screen -- the
24 plaintiffs have had four years to talk to their homeowners,
25 inspect these houses, do destructive testing on all of these

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

COUNTY OF ANDERSON

CIVIL ACTION NO: 2019-CP-04-01942

Natalie Zitek, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

D.R. Horton, Inc., Jane Doe #1-10; and John Doe #1-50,

Defendants.

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

D.R. Horton, Inc.

Third-Party Plaintiff

v.

IBP Asset, LLC d/b/a Blue Ridge Building Products, et al.

This matter is before the Court upon the Motion of IBP Assets, LLC d/b/a Blue Ridge Building Products (“Blue Ridge”) seeking an Order granting Summary Judgment in its favor on the claims by D.R. Horton, Inc. set forth in the Second Amended Answer and Third-Party Complaint. For the reasons set forth herein, the Motion is GRANTED.

Procedural History

On September 25, 2019, Plaintiff Natalie Zitek (“Plaintiff Zitek”) brought a class action lawsuit on behalf of herself and a proposed class of other similar situated Rose Hill homeowners (collectively the “Class”) against D.R. Horton, Inc. and Jane and John Does. In her Complaint, Plaintiff Zitek alleged that the prerequisites of South Carolina Rule of Civil Procedure (SCRCP) 23(a) had been satisfied and that class certification is appropriate. Pertinent to the present

**EXHIBIT
B**

Motion, Plaintiff Zitek alleged in her Complaint that her claims are “typical of the class” and that “questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over questions affecting only individual members.”

On October 20, 2020, Plaintiff Zitek moved for an Order certifying the Class under SCRCR Rule 23, wherein she re-alleged that her claims are “typical of the Class members’ claims.” Plaintiff Zitek filed an affidavit contemporaneously with the motion for class certification, identifying the defects common to the Class.

On January 27, 2021, this Court certified the Class, finding, *inter alia*, that Plaintiff Zitek’s claims are typical of the Class.

On March 11, 2021, Horton filed an Amended Answer and Third-Party Complaint, naming Blue Ridge as a Third-Party Defendant. On February 23, 2022, Horton filed a Second Amended Answer and Third-Party Complaint. In its Third-Party Complaint, Horton demands that Blue Ridge defend Horton in this lawsuit and indemnify Horton for the damages it has and will sustain as a result of Blue Ridge’s work in the Rose Hill subdivision.

Blue Ridge first filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on August 1, 2022, which was argued September 8, 2022. However, due to administrative oversight, no ruling was issued based on the initial arguments and the Court heard the Motion again on April 21, 2023. At that time, the factual issues concerning the underlying allegations of defect that had been asserted against Blue Ridge were largely conceded as not being included in the class claims. However, Zitek’s counsel suggested that there could be a class issue related to doors that had been tested and found to leak through or around the doorknob. Blue Ridge’s counsel requested additional opportunity to investigate that suggested concern.

A hearing was held again on July 21, 2023. All parties to this motion were present and participated in the presentation to the Court. Multiple briefings have been submitted by all parties and considered by the Court.

Finding of Fact

Based upon the evidence submitted to the Court, the Stipulation of the Plaintiff and the statements of counsel on the record, I find that the following material facts are not in dispute:

1. Blue Ridge and Horton entered a “South Carolina Independent Contractor Agreement” (hereinafter “Subcontract”) on or about January 12, 2010. In the paragraph entitled “Scope of Work,” reference is made to Exhibit A for a list of “construction-related” activities that Blue Ridge was contracted to undertake. However, Exhibit A is not attached to the Subcontract and no party has produced the document. The Court finds that Exhibit A does not exist.
2. The Subcontract also references a “Pricing Schedule” at Paragraph 3.1. No Pricing Schedule has been submitted in evidence.
3. According to excerpt from a “Vendor Spend” spreadsheet produced by Horton, Blue Ridge installed a number of different products on various homes in the Rose Hill subdivision between 2012 and 2017. Relevant to the allegations and motions before the Court is the installation of gutters, attic insulation and door hardware. Blue Ridge did not work on every house in Rose Hill and did not perform the same work on each of the houses where it did work.
4. Blue Ridge did not work on the home of the Class Representative, Natalie Zitek.
5. Plaintiff has stipulated that batt and blown insulation and gutters are not included in the class claims.
6. Plaintiff has submitted evidence that water may have infiltrated the patio door at 8 Duxbury Lane through a doorknob when tested by Plaintiff’s Expert, Dr. Rhett Whitlock. Blue Ridge did not perform any work at this residence. There is no evidence that Blue Ridge installed door hardware on any patio door. Furthermore, Dr. Whitlock testified that he did not know why the doorknob leaked and did not testify that this is a systemic issue throughout the neighborhood. Thus, there is no evidence that Blue Ridge contributed to the water infiltration on any residence in the Class.

Conclusions of Law

I. Summary Judgment Standard

Summary judgment is appropriate when the movant demonstrates that the material facts of the case are undisputed, and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. *Baughman v. American Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 306 S.C. 101, 410 S.E.2d 537 (1991); Rule 56(c), SCRPC. If the moving party meets its initial burden of showing an absence of evidentiary support for the nonmoving party's case, the nonmoving party cannot simply rest on mere allegations or denials contained in the pleadings. *Singleton v. Sherer*, 377 S.C. 185, 197–98, 659 S.E.2d 196, 203 (Ct. App. 2008). Instead, the nonmoving party must come forward with specific evidentiary support showing there is a genuine dispute for trial. *Rife v. Hitachi Const. Mach. Co.*, 363 S.C. 209, 213, 609 S.E.2d 565, 568 (Ct. App. 2005).

“[W]hen plain, palpable, and indisputable facts exist on which reasonable minds cannot differ, summary judgment should be granted.” *BPS, Inc. v. Worthy*, 362 S.C. 319, 326, 608 S.E.2d 155, 159 (Ct. App. 2005). Here, there is no dispute regarding any material fact.

II. Summary Judgment Should be Granted on all Causes of Action Against Blue Ridge

Blue Ridge seeks Summary Judgment on all causes of action brought by Horton in the Second Amended Answer and Third-Party Complaint (“Third-Party Complaint”).

In its First Cause of Action of the Third-Party Complaint, Horton claims that Blue Ridge is liable under a theory of Contractual Indemnification and demands that Blue Ridge indemnify Horton for the damages it has and will incur as a result of Blue Ridge's work in the Rose Hill subdivision. The specific contract provision is not cited in the Third-Party Complaint, nor attached as an exhibit. The Subcontract has been submitted to the Court in conjunction with this Motion.

Horton demands contractual indemnification under Section 10 of the contract between itself and Blue Ridge. The contractual indemnity provision demands that Blue Ridge “hold harmless, indemnify, protect and defend” Horton from and against all “losses . . . arising out of, or resulting from, or related in any way to the work performed and/or the materials supplied under this contract” The full text is as follows:

10. CONTRACTOR'S INDEMNITY.

10.1 GENERALLY. TO THE FULLEST EXTENT PERMITTED BY LAW, CONTRACTOR HEREBY AGREES TO HOLD HARMLESS, INDEMNIFY, PROTECT AND DEFEND OWNER, ITS PARENT CORPORATION, SUBSIDIARIES, AFFILIATES, SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS, AND EACH OF THE AFOREMENTIONED ENTITIES' RESPECTIVE OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, PARTNERS, EMPLOYEES, AGENTS AND INSURERS (INDIVIDUALLY OR COLLECTIVELY HEREINAFTER, "INDEMNITEE"), FROM AND AGAINST ANY AND ALL DEMANDS, CLAIMS, ACTIONS, CAUSES OF ACTION, PROCEEDINGS, LAWSUITS, SETTLEMENTS, JUDGMENTS, FINES, PENALTIES, LOSSES, ATTORNEYS FEES, LITIGATION COSTS, INTEREST, AND EXPENSES OF ANY KIND (INDIVIDUALLY OR COLLECTIVELY HEREINAFTER, "LOSSES") FOR DAMAGES FROM BODILY OR PERSONAL INJURY, DEATH, THE DESTRUCTION OR LOSS OF PROPERTY (INCLUDING LOSS OF USE), OR ANY OTHER KIND OF DAMAGES OR HARM, ARISING OUT OF, OR RESULTING FROM, OR RELATED IN ANY WAY TO THE WORK PERFORMED AND/OR THE MATERIALS SUPPLIED UNDER THIS CONTRACT, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER OR NOT CAUSED IN PART BY INDEMNITEE. SUCH LOSSES SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE, BUT ARE IN NO WAY LIMITED TO LOSSES ARISING OUT OF OR ATTRIBUTABLE TO: (1) A BREACH OF ANY WARRANTIES, REPRESENTATIONS, COVENANTS OR OBLIGATIONS OF CONTRACTOR SET FORTH HEREIN; (2) THE WORK PERFORMED OR TO BE PERFORMED OR MATERIAL SUPPLIED BY CONTRACTOR, CONTRACTOR'S AGENTS OR EMPLOYEES, SUPPLIERS OR SUBCONTRACTORS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE AGENTS AND EMPLOYEES, AND/OR ALL OTHER ENTITIES OVER WHOM THE CONTRACTOR MAY EXERCISE CONTROL (INDIVIDUALLY OR COLLECTIVELY HEREINAFTER, "CONTRACTOR'S AGENTS"); (3) ANY NEGLIGENT, GROSSLY NEGLIGENT, AND/OR INTENTIONAL ACT AND/ OR OMISSION OF CONTRACTOR AND/ OR CONTRACTOR'S AGENTS; OR (4) ANY NEGLIGENT, GROSSLY NEGLIGENT, AND/ OR INTENTIONAL ACT AND/OR OMISSION OF THE INDEMNITEE RELATED IN ANY WAY TO THE WORK, NOTWITHSTANDING THE FOREGOING, NOTHING HEREIN SHALL REQUIRE INDEMNITY FOR LOSSES CAUSED SOLELY BY FAULT OR NEGLIGENCE OF THE INDEMNITEE. THE LOSSES DESCRIBED HEREIN SHALL INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, DEMANDS, CLAIMS, OR ACTIONS ASSERTED BY (1) ANY PRESENT OR FUTURE OWNER OF THE HOUSE INCORPORATING THE WORK; AND (2) ANY OWNER, CONTRACTOR, OR ANY THIRD PARTY (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PERSONNEL FURNISHED BY CONTRACTOR AND/OR CONTRACTOR'S AGENTS). THE INDEMNIFICATION OBLIGATION UNDER THIS CONTRACT SHALL NOT BE LIMITED BY ANY LIMITATION ON THE AMOUNT OF DAMAGES, COMPENSATION OR BENEFITS PAYABLE BY OR FOR CONTRACTOR UNDER WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACTS, DISABILITY BENEFIT ACTS OR OTHER EMPLOYEE BENEFIT ACTS. THE INDEMNITY PROVISIONS CONTAINED HEREIN ARE INTENDED TO BE AS BROAD AND INCLUSIVE AS PERMITTED BY LAW.

For the reasons set forth below, Summary Judgment is Granted as to the First Cause of Action.

First, Summary Judgment is appropriate because there is no evidence that Horton has sustained “losses . . . arising out of, or resulting from, or related in any way to the work performed and/or the materials supplied under this contract” As set forth above, Plaintiff is not pursuing a claim for work within the scope that Blue Ridge performed. Thus, there are no losses within the defined scope of the indemnity agreement.

Horton contends that it is entitled to recovery for losses incurred prior after the Notice of Claim was received and prior to the Stipulation being filed. However, there is no evidence in the

record that any such losses were incurred or what they might have been. However, irrespective of any proof of losses, Horton is not entitled to recover from Blue Ridge because the indemnity agreement is unenforceable as a matter of law.

In South Carolina, contracts purporting to relieve an indemnitee from the consequences of its own negligence must be stated in “clear and unequivocal terms.” *Concord & Cumberland Horizontal Prop. Regime v. Concord & Cumberland, LLC*, 424 S.C. 639, 647, 819 S.E.2d 166, 171 (Ct. App. 2018) (citing, *Fed. Pac. Elec. v. Carolina Prod. Enters.*, 298 S.C. 23, 26, 378 S.E.2d 56, 57 (Ct. App. 1989)) (“Indeed, most courts agree with the basic rule that a contract of indemnity will not be construed to indemnify the indemnitee against losses resulting from its own negligent acts unless such intention is expressed in clear and unequivocal terms.”). The Court of Appeals in *Federal Pacific Electric v. Carolina Prod. Enterprises* addressed the issue of contracts attempting to seek indemnification of damages arising from the indemnitee’s concurrent negligence:

A contract of indemnity will be construed in accordance with the rules for the construction of contracts generally. Because it is somewhat unusual for an indemnitor to indemnify the indemnitee for losses resulting from the indemnitee’s own negligence, a contract containing an indemnity provision that purports to relieve an indemnitee from the consequences of its own negligence will be strictly construed.

Fed. Pac. Elec., 298 S.C. at 26 (internal citations omitted). “[B]road, comprehensive, and general terms” are inadequate to show the parties intended the indemnitor to indemnify the indemnitee for the indemnitee’s own concurrent negligence. See, *Concord & Cumberland*, 424 S.C. at 656–57, 819 S.E.2d at 176. The Court of Appeals in *Concord & Cumberland* explains that in *Federal Pacific*, the same Court found the use of general terms such as ‘indemnify . . . against any damage suffered or liability incurred . . . or any loss or damage of any kind in connection with the leased premises during the term of the lease’ did not disclose an intention to indemnify for consequences arising from the indemnitee’s own negligence.” *Id.* at 651, 819 S.E.2d at 173 (citing, *Fed. Pac.*

Elec. 298 S.C. at 29, 378 S.E.2d at 58-59) (brackets removed). “Although there is no verbatim phrase that must be used to meet the clear and unequivocal standard, there must be some language in the indemnity clause that **clearly shows** the parties intent to absolve the indemnitee of the consequences of its own concurrent negligent.” *Concord & Cumberland*, 424 S.C. at 657, 819 S.E.2d at 176 (emphasis added). Our Court of Appeals noted the challenges that this standard presents to attorneys as quoted by the Texas Supreme Court:

As the Texas Supreme Court has observed, this strict construction test has caused drafters of indemnity provisions to write them in a way that can be read as indemnifying the indemnitee for its own negligence, “yet be just ambiguous enough to conceal that intent from the indemnitor.” *Ethyl Corp. v. Daniel Constr. Co.*, 725 S.W.2d 705, 707-08 (Tex. S. Ct. 1987). What results are law suits that burden courts with deciding whether the parties’ intent was camouflaged or “clear and unequivocal.”

Concord & Cumberland, 424 S.C. at 658 n.6, 819 S.E.2d at 176 (Ct. App. 2018).

I find that the indemnification provisions of the Subcontract between Horton and Blue Ridge are not clear and unequivocal for the following reasons:

First, nowhere does the provision expressly state that Blue Ridge is responsible to indemnify Horton for its concurrent liability to a homeowner. Rather, it uses exception clauses to avoid the broad form indemnity that is statutorily prohibited. The Subcontract requires indemnity for losses “regardless of whether or not caused in part by [Horton].” But, then inserts a vague exception for “losses caused solely by fault of negligence of [Horton].” This structure is not unequivocal.

This confusion is amplified by the extremely complicated grammatical structure of the provision itself. The indemnification requirement is described within a single sentence containing 260 words, 48 commas and 34 conjunctions/disjunctions. The sentence includes multiple serial

lists, definitions, sub-parts, sub-ordinate clauses, parenthetical notes and prepositional phrases. As a result, the indemnity provision of this contract is manifestly unclear.

Finally, the Subcontract itself does not clearly set forth the material term of the “scope of work” that triggers the obligations for indemnity. The contract must be “clear and unequivocal” to the parties at the time of its acceptance. Otherwise, a subcontractor cannot fairly appreciate the risks that it might be accepting through an indemnity provision. Because there is nothing in this contract that established the work to be performed, it cannot be said that the work that was performed was part of the bargain at the time the indemnification provision was offered.

In its Second Cause of Action, Horton demands equitable indemnification based on the “special relationship” existing between Horton and Blue Ridge and because Horton has and will incur damages as a result of Blue Ridge’s work in the Rose Hill subdivision. As stated above, there is no evidence of wrongdoing by Blue Ridge for which Horton is exposed to liability from the Plaintiff Class. Therefore, there is no basis for equitable indemnity.

Finally, Horton also brings causes of action against Blue Ridge for breach of contract (Third Cause of Action), breach of express warranties (Fourth Cause of Action), breach of implied warranties (Fifth Cause of Action), and negligence, gross negligence, and recklessness (Sixth Cause of Action). Again, as stated above, there is no evidence that Plaintiff is asserting any claim on behalf of the class arising out of work performed by Blue Ridge, thus there is no basis for a derivative claim. Likewise, Horton has produced no evidence of negligence, breach of contract or breach of warranty for which Horton has sustained independent damages for which it is entitled to recovery.¹ Whether Blue Ridge procured insurance as may have been required

¹ Blue Ridge contends that, because these causes of action are dependent solely on the potential liability that may arise from Plaintiff Zitek’s claims against Horton and because Horton’s damages arise exclusively from having to defend itself from Plaintiff Zitek’s lawsuit, these causes of action are in reality claims for equitable indemnification and should be dismissed in accordance with the South Carolina Court of Appeals’ ruling in *Stoneledge at Lake*

under the Subcontract was not pled in the Third-Party Complaint and is therefore not before this Court.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, Summary Judgment is GRANTED to Blue Ridge on all causes of action against in the Second Amended Answer and Third-Party Complaint of D.R. Horton.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Keowee Owners' Ass'n, Inc. v. Builders FirstSource-Se. Grp., 413 S.C. 630, 635, 776 S.E.2d 434, 437 (Ct. App. 2015). See also, *Hampton Hall, LLC v. Chapman Coyle Chapman & Assocs. Architects AIA, Inc.*, 2018 WL 3475472, at *1-2 (D.S.C. July 19, 2018). Because the Court has found that there is no evidence of any wrong-doing or breach on the part of Blue Ridge, this question is rendered moot and is not addressed in this Order.



Anderson Common Pleas

Case Caption: Natalie Zitek , plaintiff, et al VS Jane Doe 1 , defendant, et al

Case Number: 2019CP0401942

Type: Order/Summary Judgment

s/R. Scott Sprouse, Judge #2752

Tenth Judicial Circuit

RECEIVED

Jun 28 2024

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeal

APPEAL FROM ANDERSON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
Hon. R. Scott Sprouse, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2019-CP-04-01942
Appellate Case No. 2023-001401

Natalie Zitek, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated; Plaintiff,

v.

D.R. Horton, Inc., Jane Doe #1-10; and, John Doe #1-50, Defendant,

D.R. Horton, Inc., Appellant,

v.

AJ Landscaping & Grading LLC, A/K/A AJ Landscaping & Grading, Inc; Allpro Textures, LCC; Alpha Omega Construction Group, Inc.; American Concrete and Precast, Inc., A/K/A ACP Concrete, Inc.; A&J Framing, Inc; Alpha E.M.C; A-Z, Inc.; Atlanta Floor Designs Center; A Grade Above Others, LLC; Brand-Vaughan Lumber Co., Inc.; BKF Builders, Inc; Builders Designhouse, LLC; BMC East, LLC D/B/A Coleman Floor, LLC; Builders Firstsource Southeast Group, LLC, A/K/A Builders Firstsource, Inc; Bravo Carpenters, Inc.; Caryl Mechanics II, Inc.; Caryl Mechanicals, Inc.; Cannaday Siding and Gutter, Inc; Cortes Painting, LLC; CBU Enterprises, Inc.; CPI Security Systems, Inc.; Dom Group, LLC; Ferguson Enterprises, Inc.; Five Star Construction Inc.; Five Star Foundations, LLC; Galloway-Bell, Inc.; A/K/A Galloway-Bell, Inc. II BGET Floored, LLC; GBS Building Supply-Us LBM, LLC, A/K/A GBS Building Supply, Inc.; General Shale Brick Inc.; Greener Pastures, Inc. A/K/A Greener Pastures of Aiken, Inc; IBP Asset, LLC D/B/A Blue Ridge Building Products; JLS Masonry, Inc.; Kings Landscaping, LLC; Landshapers, LLC; Lade-Danler, Inc.; Lansing Building Products, Inc.; Long Heating & Air Conditioning, Inc.; L&M Electric, Inc.; Manale Landscaping, LLC; MJ Cowboys, LLC; M&L General Construction, LLC. A/K/A M&L General Construction, Inc.; M&Lreyna Construction, LLC; M&M Foundations, LLC; Nazareth Builders, LLC, NB Contractors, LLC; Poinsett Development, LLC; Poinsett Homes, LLC; P&T Construction, LLC; P&L Enterprises, LLC; Probuild Company, A/K/A Probuild Holdings, Inc.; Rite Rug Co.; Rodney Howard Grading Co.; Sandlapper Concrete, LLC; Sodfather, Inc., Landscape Contractors; Stock Building Supply, LLC; Topbuild Home Services, Inc, A/K/A Gale Gale Contractors Service; Tucker Materials, Inc., A/K/A Gypsum; UTM Enterprises, Inc., Dupree Plumbing Company, Inc.; Willow Tree Landscaping, Inc., Third-Party Defendants,

of which Builder Services Group (f/k/a Masco Contractor Services Central Inc. f/k/a Gale Industries, Inc. d/b/a Gale Contractors Services) and IBP Assets, LLC d/b/a Blue Ridge Building Products, are the Respondents.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that the *Respondent IBP Assets, LLC d/b/a Blue Ridge Building Products'* *Motion Regarding Final Briefs* was served on counsel of record on June 28, 2024, via email under Paragraph (d)(1) of Order Re: Methods of Electronic Filing and Service Under Rule 262 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (As Amended May 6, 2022), Appellate Case No. 2020-000447.

s/Timothy J. Newton

Everett A. Kendall, II (SC Bar No. 8450)
Timothy J. Newton, (SC Bar No. 71640)
MURPHY & GRANTLAND, P.A.
P.O. Box 6648
Columbia, SC 29260
(803) 782-4100
rkendall@murphygrantland.com
tnewton@murphygrantland.com
Attorneys for Respondent
IBP Assets, LLC d/b/a
Blue Ridge Building Products

Other counsel of record:

[following page]

Carl F. Muller, Attorney-at-Law, P.A.
P.O. Box 1717
Greenville, SC 29602-1717
Phone 864-991-8904
Fax 864-751-2831
carl@carlmullerlaw.com

John T. Crawford, Jr. (SC Bar No. 69355)
Kenison, Dudley & Crawford, LLC
704 McBee Ave.
Greenville, SC 29601
(864) 242 4899
(864) 242-4844 (fax)
crawford@conlaw.com
Attorneys for Appellant
D.R. Horton, Inc.

Alicia N. Bolyard
Resnick & Louis, P.C.
146 Fairchild St., Suite 130
Charleston, SC 29492
abolyard@rlattorneys.com
(843) 410-2534
Attorney for Respondent
Builder Services Group (f/k/a Masco
Contractor Services Central Inc. f/k/a
Gale Industries, Inc. d/b/a Gale
Contractors Services)



Timothy J. Newton
Phone: (803) 454-1242
tnewton@murphygrantland.com

June 28, 2024

RECEIVED
Jun 28 2024
SC Court of Appeals

Sent Via U.S. Mail

Jenny A. Kitchings
South Carolina Court of Appeals
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29211

Re: Zitek v. IBP Asset, LLC, et al.
Appellate Case No. 2023-001401
Our File No.: 6035-0008

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed please find our check in the amount of \$50.00 for the Respondents IBP Assets, LLC d/b/a Blue Ridge Building Products' Motion Regarding Final Briefs in the above-referenced matter. The Joint Motion to Strike was submitted by email on June 28, 2024.

Sincerely,

s/Timothy J. Newton

Timothy J. Newton

TJN/dlb
Enclosure