

**RECEIVED**

**Oct 27 2025**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM AIKEN COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas  
Martha M. Rivers, Circuit Court Judge

---

Appellate Case No. 2025-000150  
Case No. 2022-CP-02-2323  
Case No. 2022-CP-02-2324

---

Heather Crespo,

Respondent/Appellant,

v.

Rhett Riviere, Josee Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC, and  
R.C. Riviere Properties, LLC,

Defendants,

AND

Gabriel Crespo,

Respondent/Appellant,

v.

Rhett Riviere, Josee Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC, and  
R.C. Riviere Properties, LLC,

Defendants,

of which Rhett Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC, and  
R.C. Riviere Properties, LLC, are the

Appellants/Respondents,

and

Josee Riviere is the

---

Respondent/Appellant.

**Respondents/Appellants Heather Crespo and Gabriel Crespo's Reply Brief to  
Appellants/Respondents Brief of Rhett Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC, and R.C. Riviere  
Properties, LLC**

---

/s/Wesley D. Few

Wesley D. Few, S.C. Bar. No. 15565

WESLEY D. FEW, LLC

Post Office Box 9398

Greenville, South Carolina 29605

Phone: (864) 527-5906

Email: wes@wesleyfew.com

Deborah B. Barbier, S.C. Bar No. 6920

DEBORAH B. BARBIER, LLC

1811 Pickens Street

Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Phone: (803) 445-1032

Email: dbb@deborahbarbier.com

Ryan L. Beasley, S.C. Bar No. 68307

RYAN L. BEASLEY, ATTORNEY AT LAW, P.A.

416 East North Street

Greenville, South Carolina 29601

Phone: (864) 679-7777

Email:rlb@ryanbeasleylaw.com

Attorneys for Respondents/Appellants Heather  
Crespo and Gabriel Crespo

October 27, 2025  
Greenville, South Carolina

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....iv

ARGUMENTS .....1

    I.    The circuit court erred in limiting the damages recoverable under the UTPA and revising the jury’s verdict.....

    II.   The circuit court erred by invading the jury’s province and substituting its damages calculation amount for the jury’s verdict under the UPTA claim.

    III.  The circuit court erred by invading the jury’s province substituting its damages calculation for the jury’s verdict under the constructive fraud claim. ....

    IV.  The circuit court erred by awarding only 1/6 of the requested attorneys’ fees based simply on the UTPA claim being one of the six claims brought by Plaintiffs.....

CONCLUSION .....4

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### **Cases**

*Fields v. Yarborough Ford, Inc.*, 307 S.C. 207, 414 S.E.2d 164 (1992)

*Global Prot. Corp. v. Halbersberg*, 332 S.C. 149, 503 S.E.2d 483 (Ct. App. 1998)

*Green v. Momentum Motor Grp., LLC*, No. 0:17-cv-01499-CMC, 2017 WL 5593750 (D.S.C. Nov. 21, 2017)

*Jones v. Ram Med., Inc.*, 807 F. Supp. 2d 501, 510 (D.S.C. 2011)

*Payne v. Holiday Towers Inc.*, 283 S.C. 210, 321 S.E.2d 179 (Ct. App. 1984)

*Riley v. Ford Motor Co.*, 414 S.C. 193, 777 S.E.2d 824 (2015)

*Taylor v. Nix*, 307 S.C. 551, 416 S.E.2d 619 (1992)

### **Statutes**

S.C. Code Ann. § 39-5-20

S.C. Code Ann. § 39-5-140

## ARGUMENT

### **I. The circuit court erred in limiting damages under the South Carolina Unfair Trade Practice Act and revising the jury's verdict.**

The South Carolina Unfair Trade Practices Act (“UTPA”), provides that “[a]ny person who suffers any ascertainable loss of money or property, real or personal, as a result of the use or employment by another person of an unfair or deceptive method, act or practice declared unlawful by § 39-5-20 may bring an action individually, but not in a representative capacity, to recover actual damages.” S.C. Code Ann. § 39-5-140. Citing to two federal cases, Appellants/Respondents Rhett Rivere, Chase Enterprises, LLC of South Carolina, and R.C. Rivere Properties, LLC (herein “Respondents”) argue that the UTPA does not allow for the recovery of any non-economic damages. (Appellants/Respondents’ Initial Br. at 9) (citing *Jones v. Ram Med., Inc.*, 807 F. Supp. 2d 501, 510 (D.S.C. 2011) and *Green v. Momentum Motor Grp., LLC*, No. 0:17-cv-01499-CMC, 2017 WL 5593750, at \*6 and 15 (D.S.C. Nov. 21, 2017)). While the courts in these two cases discuss damages under the UTPA, neither actually analyzes the issue. In *Jones*, the court held that because the plaintiff did not join in the UTPA claim, “there is no issue to be resolved.” 807 F. Supp. 2d at 510. Likewise, in *Green*, the court essentially ruled that in the “the absence of any South Carolina decision holding emotional distress damages available under SCUTPA, the court finds such damages are not recoverable.” 2017 WL 5593750, at 16. The court did not conduct any statutory analysis. Moreover, these decisions are not binding South Carolina precedent.

Turning to the South Carolina cases cited by Respondents, these cases also did not rule on the specific issue before the Court. In *Global Prot. Corp. v. Halbersberg*, the Court specifically stated “[a]ctual damages under the UTPA include special or consequential damages that are a natural and proximate result of deceptive conduct.” 332 S.C. 149, 503 S.E.2d 483 (Ct. App. 1998). Contrary to Respondents’ argument, actual damages were not limited to “demonstrable economic

losses or applied common-law measures of economic harm.” The Court also did not limit damages in that manner in *Fields v. Yarborough Ford, Inc.*, 307 S.C. 207, 210-11, 414 S.E.2d 164, 166-67 (1992); and *Payne v. Holiday Towers Inc.*, 283 S.C. 210, 216, 321 S.E.2d 179, 182 (Ct. App. 1984). In fact, in *Payne*, the court held that actual damages “means common law damages” and “[a]ctual damages’ or ‘compensatory damages’ are damages in satisfaction of, or in recompense for, loss or injury sustained.” 283 S.C. at 216, 321 S.E.2d at 182.

The evidence supports the jury’s verdicts and the circuit court erred in reducing them. Despite acknowledging in its own finding that both Plaintiffs testified as to reputational injury, (Jan. 3, 2025 Order on Post-Trial Mots. as to the Rhett Riviere Defs. at 4 n.3; Jan. 3, 2025 Order on Post-Trial Mots. as to Josee Riviere at 3), the circuit court erred in failing to consider any special or consequential damages, which includes reputational injury. The circuit court erred in limiting damages under the UTPA.

**II. The circuit court erred by invading the jury’s province and substituting its damages calculation amount for the jury’s verdict under the UTPA claim.**

Respondents acknowledge that the circuit court erred by invading the jury’s province when it substituted its damages calculation amount for the jury’s verdict under the UTPA claim. (Appellants/Respondents’ Br. at 6). Here, the circuit court did not find the verdict was grossly excessive nor provide compelling reasons to invade the jury’s province. When reducing a verdict amount, the trial court must (1) provide “compelling reasons” to invade the province of the jury with respect to damages determinations and (2) support that decision with unassailable evidence that the jury disregarded the facts to reach a grossly excessive award. *See Riley v. Ford Motor Co.*, 414 S.C. 185, 193, 777 S.E.2d 824, 828 (2015). Here, the circuit court specifically held that the verdicts were not excessive, but yet it still reduced the verdict for the UTPA claim relying on a

speculative assessment of how the jury determined different damages. The circuit court should not, and could not, simply reduce the amount of the verdict for the UTPA claim. In doing so, the circuit court improperly invaded the jury's province. Accordingly, the circuit court erred in reducing the verdicts.

**III. The circuit court erred by invading the jury's province and substituting its damages calculation amount for the jury's verdict under the constructive fraud claim.**

As Respondents acknowledge, the circuit court by substituting its own valuation for the jury's verdict on the constructive fraud claim committed the same procedural error as it did on the UTPA claim. (Appellants/Respondents' Br. at 6).

**IV. The circuit court erred by awarding only 1/6 of the requested attorneys' fees based simply on the UTPA claim being one of the six claims brought by Plaintiffs.**

Respondents contend that the circuit court's approach was reasonable and the award of one-sixth of the requested fees was "mathematically logical and conservative" and necessary because the fee petition was not detailed enough to discern what time was spent on which claim. Plaintiffs disagree.

Specifically, Respondents argue that Plaintiffs mischaracterize the holding in *Taylor v. Nix*, 307 S.C. 551, 557, 416 S.E.2d 619, 622 (1992). (Appellants/Respondents' Br. at 12). Plaintiffs, however, did not mischaracterize the holding in *Taylor*; rather Respondents attempt to create an exception and misapply *Taylor*. In *Taylor*, the Court specifically held that "when an action in which attorney fees are recoverable by statute is joined with alternative theories of recovery based on the same transaction, *no allocation of attorney's services need be made except to the extent counsel admits that a portion of the services was totally unrelated to the statutory claim* or it is shown that

the services related to issues which were clearly beyond the scope of the statutory claim proceeding. 307 S.C. at 557, 416 S.E.2d at 622 (emphasis added).

Respondents acknowledge that *Taylor* holds that no allocation is required when counsel admits services were unrelated to the statutory claim or when services are clearly beyond its scope, but argue that the exception does not apply here because “counsel sought to recover the entirety of their fees based on success in (sic) one of six claims.” (Appellants/Respondents’ Br. at 11). Nothing in *Taylor* supports this argument. In fact, the holding in *Taylor* contradicts such an argument.

Plaintiffs’ counsel did not admit that a portion of their services were unrelated to the UTPA claim. In fact, counsel argued the exact opposite – that the claims were intertwined such that it was not possible to separate the time spent on each individual claim. Importantly, the circuit court agreed that the claims were intertwined and could not be broken down by claims. (Mar. 14, 2025 Order at 8) (finding that “the plaintiffs were not able to break down the fees and costs by causes of action and all causes are based on the same nexus of fact.”). Respondents also acknowledge all of the claims arose from the same factual nucleus and that the UTPA claim required more specific proof of deceptive trade practices, ascertainable monetary losses, and willfulness. (Appellants/Respondents’ Br. at 11). As argued in their Initial Brief, the circuit court erred by reducing the attorneys’ fees award to only 1/6 of the fees requested when the claims here are intertwined and cannot be broken down by claim - as everyone has acknowledged they are in this case. Accordingly, the circuit court erred in reducing the fees sought by 5/6.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons and those stated in Respondents/Appellants’ Brief, the Court should reinstate the jury’s verdict and reverse the circuit court’s award of attorneys’ and award the fees sought in the fee petition.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Deborah B. Barbier  
Deborah B. Barbier, S.C. Bar No. 6920  
DEBORAH B. BARBIER, LLC  
1811 Pickens Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201  
Phone: (803) 445-1032  
Email: [dbb@deborahbarbier.com](mailto:dbb@deborahbarbier.com)

Wesley D. Few, S.C. Bar. No. 15565  
WESLEY D. FEW, LLC  
Post Office Box 9398  
Greenville, South Carolina 29605  
Phone: (864) 527-5906  
Email: [wes@wesleyfew.com](mailto:wes@wesleyfew.com)

Ryan L. Beasley, S.C. Bar No. 68307  
RYAN L. BEASLEY, ATTORNEY AT LAW, P.A.  
416 East North Street  
Greenville, South Carolina 29601  
Phone: (864) 679-7777  
Email: [rlb@ryanbeasleylaw.com](mailto:rlb@ryanbeasleylaw.com)

Attorneys for Respondents/Appellants Heather  
Crespo and Gabriel Crespo

October 27, 2025  
Greenville, South Carolina

**RECEIVED**

**Oct 27 2025**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM AIKEN COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Martha M. Rivers, Circuit Court Judge

---

Appellate Case No. 2025-000150

Case Nos. 2022-CP-02-2323 and 02324

---

Gabriel Crespo, Respondent/Appellant,  
v.

Rhett Riviere, Josee Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC, and R.C. Riviere Properties, LLC,  
Defendants,

AND

Gabriel Crespo, Respondent/Appellant,  
v.

Rhett Riviere, Josee Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC, and R.C. Riviere Properties, LLC,  
Defendants,

of which Rhett Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC, and R.C. Riviere Properties, LLC, are  
the Appellants/Respondents,  
and

Josee Riviere is the Respondent/Appellant.

---

/s/ Wesley D. Few  
Wesley D. Few, S.C. Bar. No. 15565  
WESLEY D. FEW, LLC  
Post Office Box 9398  
Greenville, South Carolina 29605  
Phone: (864) 527-5906  
Email: [wes@wesleyfew.com](mailto:wes@wesleyfew.com)

Deborah B. Barbier, S.C. Bar No. 6920  
DEBORAH B. BARBIER, LLC  
1811 Pickens Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201  
Phone: (803) 445-1032  
Email: [dbb@deborahbarbier.com](mailto:dbb@deborahbarbier.com)

Ryan L. Beasley, S.C. Bar No. 68307  
RYAN L. BEASLEY, ATTORNEY AT LAW, P.A.  
416 East North Street  
Greenville, South Carolina 29601  
Phone: (864) 679-7777  
Email: [rlb@ryanbeasleylaw.com](mailto:rlb@ryanbeasleylaw.com)

### **PROOF OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that on October 27, 2025, **Respondents/Appellants Heather Crespo and Gabriel Crespo's Reply Brief to Appellants/Respondents Brief of Rhett Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC, and R.C. Riviere Properties, LLC** filed and served on all counsel of record and the Court of Appeals Clerk of Court via Email as follows:

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
South Carolina Court of Appeals, Clerk of Court  
Post Office Box 11629  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211  
[ctappfilings@sccourts.org](mailto:ctappfilings@sccourts.org)

Jim Griffin, Esq.  
Griffin Davis  
4408 Forest Drive  
Columbia, SC 29206  
[jgriffin@griffindavislaw.com](mailto:jgriffin@griffindavislaw.com)

Attorneys for Appellant-Respondents Rhett Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC, and R.C. Riviere Properties, LLC

Joseph M. McCulloch, Esq.  
McCulloch & Schillaci, Attorneys at Law  
P. O. Box 11623  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211  
[joe@mccullochlaw.com](mailto:joe@mccullochlaw.com)

Attorneys for Appellant-Respondents Rhett Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC, and R.C. Riviere Properties, LLC

John Harte, Esq.  
Law Office of John W. Harte  
P.O. Box 7215  
Aiken, SC 29804  
[john@jwhartlaw.com](mailto:john@jwhartlaw.com)

Attorneys for Respondent Josee Riviere

James D. Mosteller III  
The Mosteller Law Firm LLC  
P.O. Box 1832  
Barnwell, SC 29812  
[jdmosteller@gmail.com](mailto:jdmosteller@gmail.com)

Attorneys for Respondent Josee Riviere

/s/Cassy Young  
Cassy Young

October 27, 2025  
Columbia, South Carolina

# WESLEY D. FEW, LLC

Attorney at Law

P.O. Box 9398, Greenville, South Carolina 29604

[www.wesleyfew.com](http://www.wesleyfew.com) | [wes@wesleyfew.com](mailto:wes@wesleyfew.com)

O: 864-527-5906 | M: 864-404-7792

October 27, 2025

**RECEIVED**

**Oct 27 2025**

**SC Court of Appeals**

**Via Email-Filing:**

The Hon. Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Clerk of Court  
South Carolina Court of Appeals  
P.O. Box 11629  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211  
[ctappfilings@sccourts.org](mailto:ctappfilings@sccourts.org)

**RE:** Gabriel Crespo/Heather Crespo v. Rhett Riviere, Josee Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC and R.C. Riviere Properties, LLC  
Appellate Case No. 2025-000150  
Case No. 2022-CP-02-2324; 2022-CP-02-2323  
Our File No.: 00305-002

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed please find Appellants Heather Crespo and Gabriel Crespo's Reply Brief to Appellants/Respondents Brief of Rhett Riviere, Chase Enterprises, LLC, and R.C. Riviere Properties, LLC and proof of service for same.

Sincerely Yours,



Wesley D. Few

Enclosures

WDF/cgy

CC: All Counsel of Record (*Via Email*)  
Client (*Via Email*)