

RECEIVED

May 08 2025

SC Court of Appeals

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

Appeal from Spartanburg County
Court of Common Pleas

Grace Gilchrist Knie, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2020-CP-42-01163

Appellate Case No. 2023-001612

Supreme Court Case No. 2025-000398

Timothy Hutley,
Guardian for Jane Doe,

Respondent,

v.

THI of South Carolina at Magnolia Manor Inman, LLC,
THI of Baltimore, Inc., THI of South Carolina, LLC,
Hunt Valley Holdings, LLC, THI of South Carolina at Inman, LLC,
Murray Forman, and Kathy Scroggs, Individually,

Defendants.

Of which THI of South Carolina at Magnolia Manor Inman LLC, THI of Baltimore,
Inc., THI of South Carolina, LLC, and Hunt Valley Holdings, LLC, are the

Appellants.

RETURN TO WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Dan Pruitt Law Firm
C. Daniel Pruitt (SC Bar No. 66497)
300 Pettigru Street

Greenville, SC 29601

864-232-4273

Attorney for Respondent

Table of Contents

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... 3

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL..... 4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 4

STANDARD OF REVIEW..... 6

ARGUMENT..... 7

**I. The Court of Appeals properly refused to apply the Merger
Doctrine to find the Arbitration Agreement enforceable.... 6**

**II. The Court of Appeals properly denied the Appellants’ request for
additional discovery on the issue of the arbitration
agreement..... 13**

CONCLUSION..... 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Am. Bureau of Shipping v. Tencara Shipyard S.P.A., 170 F.3d 349, 353 (2d Cir.1999)

Carr v. Main Carr Dev., LLC, 337 S.W.3d 489, 496 (Tex. App. 2011)

Coleman v. Mariner Health Care, Inc., 407 S.C. 346, 755 S.E.2d 450 (2014).

Deloitte Noraudit A/S v. Deloitte Haskins & Sells, U.S., 9 F.3d 1060, 1064 (2d Cir.1993)

Gissel v. Hart, 382 S.C. 235, 676 S.E.2d 320 (2009).

Hodge v. UniHealth Post-Acute Care of Bamberg, LLC, 422 S.C. 544, 813 S.E.2d 292 (Ct. App. 2018).

Int'l Paper Co. v. Schwabedissen Maschinen & Anlagen GMBH, 206 F.3d 411, (4th Cir. 2000)

Jackson v. Iris.Com, 524 F. Supp 2d 742 (E. Dist. Va. 2007).

Klutts Resort Realty, Inc. v. Down'Round Dev. Corp., 268 S.C. 80, 232 S.E.2d 20, (1977)

Pearson v. Hilton Head Hosp., 400 S.C. 281, 733 S.E.2d 597 (Ct. App. 2012)

Solesbee v. Fundamental, 438 S.C. 638,885 S.E.2d 144 (Ct. App. 2023)

Thompson v. Pruitt Corporation, 416 S.C. 43, 784 S.E.2d 679 (Ct. App.

2016)Wilson v. Willis, 426 S.C. 326, 827 S.E.2d 167 (2019)

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

- I. Did the Court of Appeals properly refused to apply the Merger Doctrine to find the Arbitration Agreement enforceable.**

- II. Did the Court of Appeals properly deny the Appellants' request for additional discovery?**

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Jane Doe, a Medicare recipient, was admitted to Magnolia Manor Inman (hereinafter Appellants' facility) on August 22, 2018. While a resident, Ms. Doe experienced a violent attack with resulting injury on or around September 8, 2018. Plaintiffs filed a Summons and Complaint alleging certain wrongful conduct and seeking a jury trial. Appellants filed an Answer and a Motion to Compel Arbitration and to Stay the Court proceedings.

The parties conceded that there was no Power of Attorney in place at the time of admission. Appellants had Jane Doe's son sign the admission agreement and a separate "Facility-Resident/Representative Arbitration Agreement" which was submitted for the Court's evaluation. Appellants conceded in their Memorandum that neither agreement is signed by Jane Doe. No affidavits were submitted.

The separate one-page Arbitration Agreement states:

It is further understood that in the event of any controversy or dispute between the parties arising out of or relating to Facility's Admission Agreement, or breach thereof, or relating in any way to Resident's stay at Facility, or to the provisions of care or services to Resident, including but not limited to any alleged tort, personal injury, negligence or other claim; or any federal or state statutory or regulatory claim of any kind; or whether or not there has been a violation of any right or rights granted under State law (collectively "Disputes"), and the parties are unable to resolve such through negotiation, then the parties agree that such Dispute(s) shall be resolved by arbitration, as provided by the South Carolina Alternate Dispute Resolution/Mediation Rules.

The separate agreement purports to waive Jane Doe's right to Jury Trial and require that any controversy or dispute between the parties be submitted to binding arbitration in accordance with the South Carolina Alternate Dispute/ Resolution Rules.

At the hearing, Appellants based their arguments on merger and equitable estoppel. Appellants argued that both the admission agreement and the arbitration agreement were signed at the same time and there should be a merger of the two documents. Respondents strongly objected arguing that the agreement was invalid and unenforceable because Timothy Hutley lacked authority, either express or apparent, to waive Jane Doe's right to jury trial and to enter the agreement for binding arbitration. Further, Respondents argued the agreements were separate and no merger resulted.

The Circuit Court held the agreement was unenforceable and denied the request for discovery on the issue.

The Court of Appeals upheld the Order of the Circuit Court.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The parties agree that the de novo review is the correct standard of review to determine whether the circuit court properly held an arbitration agreement was unenforceable. When the circuit court exercises its discretion for example in denying discovery, the circuit court's decision should not be reversed absent a finding of abuse of discretion.

ARGUMENT

I. The Court of Appeals properly refused to apply the Merger Doctrine to find the Arbitration Agreement enforceable.

Our Courts have held that arbitration is a matter of contract and a party cannot be required to submit to arbitration any dispute which he has not agreed to submit." [*Gissel*, 382 S.C. at 241, 676 S.E.2d at 323](#). "[T]he presumption in favor of arbitration applies to the scope of an arbitration agreement; it does not apply to the existence of such an agreement or to the identity of the parties who may be bound to such an agreement." [*Wilson*, 426 S.C. at 337, 827 S.E.2d at 173](#) (emphasis

omitted) (quoting [*Carr v. Main Carr Dev., LLC*, 337 S.W.3d 489, 496 \(Tex. App. 2011\)](#)). "[B]ecause arbitration, while favored, exists solely by agreement of the parties, a presumption against arbitration arises where the party resisting arbitration is a nonsignatory to the written agreement to arbitrate." *Id.* at 337-38, 827 S.E.2d at 173 (emphasis omitted). Nevertheless, "[w]ell-established common law principles dictate that in an appropriate case a nonsignatory can enforce, or be bound by, an arbitration provision within a contract executed by other parties." [*Pearson v. Hilton Head Hosp.*, 400 S.C. 281, 288, 733 S.E.2d 597, 600 \(Ct. App. 2012\)](#) (quoting [*Int'l Paper Co. v. Schwabedissen Maschinen & Anlagen GMBH*, 206 F.3d 411, 416-17 \(4th Cir. 2000\)](#)).

"Whether an arbitration agreement may be enforced against nonsignatories, and under what circumstances, is an issue controlled by state law." [*Wilson*, 426 S.C. at 338, 827 S.E.2d at 173-74](#). "South Carolina has recognized several theories that could bind nonsignatories to arbitration agreements under general principles of contract and agency law, including (1) incorporation by reference, (2) assumption, (3) agency, (4) veil piercing/alter ego, and (5) estoppel." *Id.* at 338, 827 S.E.2d at 174. This court has held the theory of equitable estoppel precludes parties from asserting their nonsignatory status, compelling them to submit their claims to arbitration. *Id.* at 339, 827 S.E.2d at 174. Under this theory, "[a] nonsignatory is estopped from refusing to comply with an arbitration clause `when it receives a

direct benefit from a contract containing an arbitration clause." [Pearson, 400 S.C. at 290, 733 S.E.2d at 601](#) (quoting [Int'l Paper, 206 F.3d at 418](#)). "In the arbitration context, the doctrine recognizes that a party may be estopped from asserting that the lack of his signature on a written contract precludes enforcement of the contract's arbitration clause when he has consistently maintained that other provisions of the same contract should be enforced to benefit him." *Id.* (emphasis omitted) (quoting [Int'l Paper, 206 F.3d at 418](#)).

Notably, in those opinions addressing equitable estoppel in the arbitration context, the nonsignatory's contractual benefit is not typically an alleged benefit of arbitration such as "avoiding the expense and delay of extended court proceedings" or being "capable of enforcing the [AA]," as touted by Appellants in the present case — rather, the contractual benefit typically arises from another provision of the same contract that includes the arbitration provision. See [Pearson, 400 S.C. at 296-97, 733 S.E.2d at 605](#) (ability to work at the defendant's hospital facility and receive payment for work); see also [Int'l Paper Co., 206 F.3d at 418](#) (warranty provisions); [Jackson, 524 F.Supp.2d at 750](#) (entitlement to retain a \$150,000 payment pursuant to the contract's liquidated damages provision); [Am. Bureau of Shipping v. Tencara Shipyard S.P.A., 170 F.3d 349, 353 \(2d Cir.1999\)](#) (lower insurance rates on a yacht 60*60 and the ability to sail under the French

flag); [*Deloitte Noraudit A/S v. Deloitte Haskins & Sells, U.S.*, 9 F.3d 1060, 1064 \(2d Cir.1993\)](#) (continuing use of a name).

Appellants argued the court should find the Arbitration Agreement merged with the Admission Agreement because merger is presumed when the instruments in question are executed at the same time, by the same parties, for the same purpose, and in the course of the same transaction.

In [*Coleman v. Mariner Health Care, Inc.*](#), our Supreme Court held:

In South Carolina, "[t]he general rule is that, in the absence of anything indicating a contrary intention, where instruments are executed at the same time, by the same parties, for the same purpose, and in the course of the same transaction, the courts will consider and construe the documents together. The theory is that the instruments are effectively one instrument or contract."

[407 S.C. at 355, 755 S.E.2d at 455](#) (quoting [*Klutts Resort Realty, Inc. v. Down'Round Dev. Corp.*](#), 268 S.C. 80, 88, 232 S.E.2d 20, 24 (1977)).

The *Coleman* court found the documents in that case were executed at the same time, by the same parties, for the same purpose, and in the course of the same transaction; thus, unless there was a contrary intention, there was a

merger. *Id.* However, the court determined that "[b]y their own terms, the contracts between these parties indicated an intent that the common law doctrine of merger not apply." *Id.* And, even if a clause in the contract created an ambiguity as to merger, the law is clear that any ambiguity in such a clause is construed against the drafter. *Id.* at 355-56, 755 S.E.2d at 455. Thus, there was no merger in that case, and the appellants' equitable estoppel argument was properly denied. *Id.* at 356, 755 S.E.2d at 455.

Also, in [*Hodge v. UniHealth Post-Acute Care of Bamberg, LLC*](#), the Court held the admission agreement and arbitration agreement did not merge because: (1) the admission agreement indicated it was governed by South Carolina law, whereas the arbitration agreement stated it was governed by federal law; (2) like in *Coleman*, the arbitration agreement recognized the two documents were separate, stating "[a]ny and all claims or controversies arising out of or in any way relating to this Agreement or the Patient/Resident's Admission Agreement"; (3) the arbitration agreement stated it could be revoked within thirty days, whereas the admission agreement contained no such indication and instead provided the admission agreement could only be amended; (4) each document was separately paginated and had its own signature page; and (5) the arbitration agreement stated signing it was not a precondition to admission. [422 S.C. at 562-63, 813 S.E.2d at 302.](#)

Here, the Admission Agreement provides it is governed by South Carolina law, and the Arbitration Agreement provides it is governed by federal law. The Arbitration Agreement recognized the two documents were separate, stating the Arbitration Agreement "shall survive any termination or breach of this Agreement or the Admission Agreement." The Arbitration Agreement is silent as to whether it could be revoked, but the Admission Agreement provides, "Resident and/or his/her legal representative may terminate this Agreement at any time, upon written notice to Facility." The Admission Agreement and Arbitration Agreement were separately paginated and had their own signature pages. The Parties have conceded there was no Power of Attorney in effect at the time of admission. Thus, like the *Coleman* and *Hodge* courts, there was no merger in this case and Defendants' equitable estoppel argument is denied.

The *Coleman* court also considered whether the Adult Health Care Consent Act (Act)^[7] gave a family member authority to execute an arbitration agreement on behalf of another. The court held:

The scope of Sister's authority [under the Act] to consent to "decisions concerning Decedent's health care" extended to the admission agreement, which was the basis upon which Facility agreed to provide health care and Sister agreed to pay for it. The separate arbitration agreement concerned neither health care nor payment, but instead provided an optional method for dispute resolution between Facility and Decedent or Sister should issues arise in the future. Under the Act, Sister did not have the capacity to bind Decedent to this

voluntary arbitration agreement. We therefore affirm the circuit court's holding that the Act did not confer authority on Sister to execute a document which involved neither health care nor financial terms for payment of such care.

[407 S.C. at 353-54, 755 S.E.2d at 454](#). In [Thompson v. Pruitt Corporation](#), this court also held the admission agreement did not merge with the arbitration agreement and the son's authority under the Act to execute the admission agreement did not cover the terms of the arbitration agreement. [416 S.C. at 52-53, 784 S.E.2d at 684-85](#).

In 2023, our Court of Appeals issued an Order addressing the same Resident/Representative Arbitration Agreement in the present case. [Solesbee v. Fundamental](#) 438 S.C. 638,885 S.E.2d 144 (Ct. App. 2023). In reviewing the agreement used in that case, which is the same facility in question in the present case, the Court of Appeals found there was no express authority because in [Solesbee](#), at the time her son signed the agreement, he was not operating under a Power of Attorney and there was no merger.

In [Solesbee](#), the Court construed the purported arbitration agreement and relied on [Coleman v. Mariner Health Care, Inc.](#), [407 S.C. 346, 755 S.E.2d 450 \(2014\)](#); [Hodge v. UniHealth Post-Acute Care of Bamberg, LLC](#), [422 S.C. 544, 813 S.E.2d 292 \(Ct. App. 2018\)](#); and [Thompson v. Pruitt Corporation](#), [416 S.C. 43, 784 S.E.2d 679 \(Ct. App. 2016\)](#) to rule the Arbitration Agreement in question in the

present case was unenforceable because there was no merger. The critical circumstances are virtually identical and therefore the result should be the same in the present case.

Here, the Admission Agreement provides it is governed by South Carolina law, and the Arbitration Agreement provides it is governed by federal law. The Arbitration Agreement recognized the two documents were separate, stating the Arbitration Agreement "shall survive any termination or breach of this Agreement or the Admission Agreement." The Arbitration Agreement is silent as to whether it could be revoked, but the Admission Agreement provides, "Resident and/or his/her legal representative may terminate this Agreement at any time, upon written notice to Facility." The Admission Agreement and Arbitration Agreement were separately paginated and had their own signature pages. Appellants have admitted at the hearing that the arbitration agreement was voluntary. Thus, like the *Coleman* and *Hodge* courts, there was no merger in the Solesbee case and similarly there is no merger in the present case and the merger and equitable estoppel arguments were properly denied.

II. The Court of Appeals properly denied the Appellants' request for additional discovery on the issue of the arbitration agreement.

Here, the circuit court exercised its discretion in denying the Appellants additional time for discovery. At no time during the proceedings have the Appellants served any written discovery or sought any depositions. To have delayed the decision further to order discovery would have been an unreasonable delay. The circuit court did not abuse its discretion in denying the Appellants a delay for discovery. In addition, Appellants could have submitted Affidavits from its agents or employees who were involved in the admissions process. No such affidavits were filed with the circuit court. The Court of Appeals properly upheld the ruling of the Circuit Court.

Conclusion

The arbitration agreement was not valid because Jane Doe did not sign it. In addition, Hutley did not have authority, express or apparent, to bind Jane Doe to an arbitration agreement. The Admission Agreement and the Arbitration Agreement were separate and did not merge. In addition, there was no evidence that Jane Doe did or said anything to mislead the Defendants so as to support an argument of equitable estoppel.

Respectfully Submitted,

s/ C. Daniel Pruitt
(Bar # 66497)
Attorney for Plaintiff

300 Pettigru Street
Greenville, South Carolina 29601
(864) 232-4273
dan@danpruittlaw.com

Dated: May 8, 2025
Greenville, South Carolina

RECEIVED

May 08 2025

SC Court of Appeals

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

Appeal from Spartanburg County
Court of Common Pleas

Grace Gilchrist Knie, Circuit Court Judge

Sup. Ct. Case No. 2025-000398

Case No. 2022-CP-42-01163

Appellate Case No. 2023-001612

Unpublished Opinion No. 2024-UP-399 (S.C. Ct. App. Filed Nov. 27, 2024)

Timothy Hutley, Guardian for Jane Doe,

Respondent,

v.

THI of South Carolina at Magnolia Manor Inman, LLC,
THI of Baltimore, Inc., THI of South Carolina, LLC,
Hunt Valley Holdings, LLC, THI of South Carolina at
Inman, LLC, Murray Forman, and Kathy Scroggs, Individually,

Defendants.

Of which THI of South Carolina at Magnolia Manor Inman, LLC,
THI of Baltimore, Inc., THI of South Carolina, LLC, and Hunt
Valley Holdings, LLC, are the

Appellants.

PROOF OF SERVICE

The Dan Pruitt Law Firm
C. Daniel Pruitt (SC Bar No. 66497)
300 Pettigru Street
Greenville, SC 29601
864-232-4273

Attorney for Respondent

I, **C. Daniel Pruitt**, of the Dan Pruitt Law Firm, attorney for the Respondent, hereby certify that **RESPONDENT'S RETURN TO APPELLANTS' WRIT OF CERTIORARI** was served on Appellants' on May 8, 2025, by emailing (see attached email) a copy of the same to Appellants' counsel of record:

Russell G. Hines, Esquire (rhines@yclaw.com)
D. Jay Davis, Jr., Esquire (jdavis@yclaw.com)
James D. Gandy, III, Esquire (tgandy@yclaw.com)
Gaillard T. Dotterer, III, Esquire (gdotterer@yclaw.com)
Stephen L. Brown, Esquire (sbrown@yclaw.com)

CLEMENT RIVERS, LLP
25 Calhoun Street, Suite 400
Charleston, SC 29401

Attorneys for Appellants

Respectfully submitted,

By: s/ C. Daniel Pruitt
Bar # 66497
Attorney for Respondent
300 Pettigru Street
Greenville, SC 29601
(864) 232-4273
dan@danpruittlaw.com

Greenville, South Carolina
May 8, 2025

Lindsay Harrison

From: Lindsay Harrison
Sent: Thursday, May 8, 2025 9:29 AM
To: rhines@yclaw.com; Davis, Jay; Gandy, III, James D. (Tripp); Dotterer III, Gaillard T. (Gilly); sbrown@yclaw.com
Cc: Dan Pruitt; Wakeham, Rebecca (Becky); Justman, Aimee; Bell, Pollyana (Polly)
Subject: RE: Hutley v. THI; Sup. Ct. Case No. 2025-000398
Attachments: Respondent's Response to Writ of Certiorari.pdf

Good morning,

Attached for service, please find **Respondent's Return to Appellants' Writ of Certiorari** in the above-captioned matter.

Kindest regards,



LINDSAY C. HARRISON
PARALEGAL TO C. DANIEL PRUITT

Phone: 864-232-4273
Facsimile: 864-232-7781
Email: lindsay@danpruittlaw.com

300 Pettigru Street
Greenville, South Carolina 29601

www.danpruittlawfirm.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail has been sent by a law firm, and the contents may contain confidential, privileged, or otherwise legally protected information. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not read, retain, or disseminate this message. Instead, you must delete this message immediately. It is the intent of the sender and the recipient(s) to preserve the attorney-client privilege, and any unintentional publication of this e-mail is not a waiver of such.