

Margaret Miles Bluestein
John Shannon Nichols
Stacy Elizabeth Thompson
John Dennis Delgado
Allison Paige Sullivan
Ashley Trout Thompson
Blake Alexander Hewitt
Kenneth Henry Dojaquez
John Clarke Newton

OF COUNSEL
O. Eugene Powell, Jr.

January 13, 2014

VIA HAND DELIVERY

The Honorable Daniel E. Shearouse
Clerk of Court
Supreme Court of South Carolina
Post Office Box 11330
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

RE: Dharmendra Chaudhari, Husband of Anita Chaudhari vs. AVNI Grocers,
and The South Carolina Uninsured Employers' Fund
Case Tracking No.: 2013-000282

Virendra Puniyani, Deceased Employee, and Rajkumari Puniyani vs. The South
Carolina Uninsured Employers' Fund
Case Tracking No.: 2013-000412

Dear Mr. Shearouse:

These cases are currently pending at the South Carolina Court of Appeals. Please find enclosed for filing the original and seven (7) copies of a motion requesting that the Supreme Court consolidate and certify these cases for review. I have enclosed a proof of service upon counsel of record and the Court of Appeals and a check in the amount of \$25.00 for filing the motion. Please return the additional filed copy to me via our courier.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Erin Bridges

Paralegal to John S. Nichols
BLUESTEIN, NICHOLS, THOMPSON &
DELGADO, LLC

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2014

SC Court of Appeals

/emb

Enclosures

cc: Jarrel L. Wigger, Esquire

Margaret M. Urbanic, Esquire
Lisa Glover, Esquire
The Honorable Jenny A. Kitchings

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
J.C. Nicholson, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2012-CP-10-6355
Case Tracking No. 2013-000282

Dharmendra Chaudhari, Husband of Anita
Chaudhari, Deceased Respondent,

v.

Avni Grocers, Employer, and South Carolina
Uninsured Employers' Fund, Carrier Defendants,

of whom
South Carolina Uninsured Employers' Fund, Carrier, is Appellant.

Case No. 2012-CP-1006357
Appellate Case No. 2013-000412

Virendra Puniyani, Deceased Employee, and
Rajkumari Puniyani, Claimant, Respondents,

v.

Avni Grocers, Employer, and South Carolina
Uninsured Employers' Fund, Carrier Defendants,

of whom
South Carolina Uninsured Employers' Fund, Carrier, is Appellant.

MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE, CERTIFY, AND EXPEDITE

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2014

SC Court of Appeals

Pursuant to Rules 204(b) and 240 SCACR, the Respondents in these cases request that this Court certify these appeals from the Court of Appeals, consolidate them, and expedite these matters for appellate review.

BACKGROUND

These are workers' compensation cases that share the same tragic set of facts and a very long history before the Commission and the courts. The Claimant/Respondent, Rajkumari Puniyani, is the mother of the deceased Employee, Virendra Puniyani. Mr. Puniyani and his sister-in-law, Anita Chaudhari, were murdered in November 2002 by a co-worker and an accomplice while on the job with Avni Grocers (the Employer). Each deceased worker's estate brought claims under the Act, asserting the deaths occurred during the course and scope of each decedent's employment. The South Carolina Uninsured Employers' Fund (the Fund) became involved in the matter because the Employer was operating without Workers' Compensation coverage. Since this case's inception over eight years ago, the primary issue has been whether Avni Grocers regularly employed four (4) or more employees so as to be subject to the Act at the time of the Claimants' deaths.

The matters were consolidated and called for a hearing before Commissioner David Huffstetler, on January 4, 2006. The Fund appeared and took the position that it did not have timely notice of the claims and did not submit any evidence. Commissioner Huffstetler instructed the Claimants to agree to continue the matter. Because the Claimants had been waiting a year for a hearing, one Claimant had traveled from Atlanta, Georgia, and because the Claimants produced proof that the Fund *had* been properly

served with notice of the hearing, the Claimants indicated a desire to proceed.

Commissioner Huffstetler continued to strongly insist that the Claimants continue the hearing (confessing in his instructions for an order that he was rude to the Claimants in this effort), but he ultimately concluded that the Fund was properly served with both Forms 52 and received adequate notice of the hearing.

Apparently, the Fund did very little work on the file following the retirement of the lawyer that was previously assigned to work on these matters. The Fund called outside counsel to cover the hearing before Commissioner Huffstetler, and the Fund's counsel filed *no* Form 51, *no* Form 53, and *no* other response. The Fund also did not file a Form 58 pre-hearing brief. In fact, the Fund did not give *any* notice to the Claimants regarding any objectionable issues the Fund had as to coverage or benefits.¹

The Employer, Avni Grocers, failed to appear at the hearing. Following the hearing, Commissioner Huffstetler ruled that the Claimants failed to produce substantial evidence that Avni Grocers regularly employed four (4) or more employees so as to be subject to the Act. Commissioner Huffstetler ruled that at best, the Claimants offered proof that there were only three (3) employees where the Claimants worked. This roster consisted of both murdered claimants and the co-worker who participated in the crime.

Following the hearing before Commissioner Huffstetler, the Claimants located Harendra Pal, the owner of Avni Grocers, who had moved out of state. The Claimants obtained an affidavit from Mr. Pal that conclusively established Avni Grocers was subject

¹ Current counsel for the Fund was not involved in this matter at the time. In fact, current counsel is the *fifth* lawyer to represent the Fund in this case over its long, tortured history.

to the Act. The Claimants then filed a motion to add additional evidence to the record. The Appellate Panel of the Commission, however, refused to accept the additional evidence. The Panel affirmed Commissioner Huffstetler's order.

Both of the Claimants appealed the Appellate Panel's affirmance of Commissioner Huffstetler's order and the Commission's denial of the motion to accept the additional evidence. The matters continued to be consolidated for purposes of judicial review.

Following briefing and oral arguments, the circuit court (Judge D. Garrison Hill) held the Commission erred as a matter of law in refusing to accept Mr. Pal's affidavit as additional evidence. Judge Hill further ruled that *even without Mr. Pal's affidavit*, the preponderance of the evidence established that Employer regularly employed four (4) or more employees so as to be subject to the Act. Judge Hill declined to address any additional issues and remanded the matter to the Commission for further proceedings consistent with his rulings. That order was entered September 18, 2007.

The Fund appealed Judge Hill's order to the Court of Appeals. On May 28, 2008, the Court of Appeals advised the parties that the two cases would no longer be consolidated. Hence, each case was briefed separately.

On March 2, 2010, the Court of Appeals heard oral arguments on both cases jointly. At oral argument, the Claimants pointed out that Judge Hill's order was not immediately appealable because it contained a remand to the Commission. *See, e.g., Bone v. U.S. Food Service*, 404 S.C. 67, 744 S.E.2d 552 (2013) (circuit court order that contains a remand to the commission is not immediately appealable). The Court of

Appeals requested additional briefing, and on June 29, 2010, the Court of Appeals issued a consolidated opinion dismissing both appeals without prejudice because the Circuit Court's order was not immediately appealable. *Puniyani, et al. v. Avni Grocers, Employer*, 2010-UP-338 (S.C. Ct. App. filed June 29, 2010). The Court of Appeals issued the remittiturs in these cases on July 7, 2010, and the cases were returned to the Commission.

The cases were consolidated once again for trial and were heard before Commissioner Avery Wilkerson on November 29, 2011. The parties stipulated that Mr. Dharmendra Chaudhari would reaffirm his prior testimony. They also agreed to present the prior deposition of Mrs. Puniyani's mother. Claimant also subpoenaed Mr. Pal to testify live. The Defendants objected to consideration of Mr. Pal's affidavit or his live testimony, but Commissioner Wilkerson overruled the Defendants' objections and admitted both Mr. Pal's affidavit as well as Mr. Pal's live testimony.

On February 6, 2012, Commissioner Wilkerson entered an order finding Avni Grocers had four (4) or more employees at the time of the murders and was therefore subject to the Act. Commissioner Wilkerson ordered compensation accordingly:

On February 29, 2012, the Fund filed a Form 30 seeking Appellate Panel review. The issues stated involved (1) the finding that Employer employed four (4) or more employees, and (2) the admission of Mr. Pal's affidavit as well as his live testimony. The parties briefed the issues, and on August 28, 2012, the Appellate Panel affirmed Commissioner Wilkerson's order based upon its own review of the record. The Panel also found there was no issue before it regarding the admission of Mr. Pal's live testimony.

The Fund served a Petition for Judicial Review on September 25, 2012. The Circuit Court (Judge J.C. Nicholson) heard arguments on the appeal on January 9, 2013. The Fund noted that “the primary issue up on appeal goes back to our first round of appeals....” The Fund’s argument was that the prior order by Judge Hill was improper as a matter of law. The Fund made it plain that it was not raising any new issues from the prior appeal in 2010, nor was the Fund specifically challenging anything that happened at the hearing before Commissioner Wilkerson, the second time the case was tried. Judge Nicholson ruled that he could not overturn Judge Hill’s order and entered a Form 4 order that same date denying the appeal.

On February 5, 2013, the Fund served a notice of appeal, but the notice referenced *only* Judge Nicholson’s ruling and did not mention or attach Judge Hill’s 2007 order.

The appeal in Puniyani has been perfected. The briefing has been done in Chaudhari, but the Court of Appeals is considering Respondents’ letter advising the Court that the Fund had unilaterally altered the caption on this round of appeals (the Fund included the words “Alleged Uninsured Employer” following Avni Grocers, and the Court of Appeals advised Respondent to do the same). Thus, although the briefing is done and the record has been designated, the final briefs and the Record on Appeal have not been filed.

DISCUSSION

This Court recently commented on the long procedural history in a workers’ compensation case that the Court decided. See *Hudson v. Lancaster Convalescent Center*,

Op. No. 27348 (S.C. Sup. Ct. filed Jan. 8, 2014) (Shearouse Adv. Sh. No. 1 at 86) (noting a workers' compensation case came to the court after multiple workers' compensation hearings/appeals spanning more than 11 years). Like the *Hudson* case, the appeals in these cases have also been pending for over a decade and have been subject to multiple hearings and appeals before both the Commission and the Court. Despite failing to file any responsive pleadings or pre-hearing briefs in the original matter before Commissioner Huffstetler in January 2006, the Fund orally raised an affirmative challenge at the hearing to the number of employees in this case. The Fund continues to cling to this challenge even though it knows it is factually wrong.

In reviewing the Commission's 2006 ruling, Judge Hill made two rulings: (A) the Pal affidavit was wrongfully excluded and established Avni Grocers had four or more employees at the time the Claimants were murdered; and (B) even without the Pal affidavit, the preponderance of the evidence established Avni Grocers had four or more employees. The Fund challenged Judge Hill's ruling regarding the admission of the Pal affidavit, but *did not* challenge the alternative ruling (the Commission so found following the remand). Thus, there are significant error preservation problems with the issues the Fund continues to try to raise here.

Despite the unchallenged rulings and the existence of overwhelming evidence to support both Judge Hill's ruling and the Commission's decision on remand, the Fund continues to pursue appellate review of these cases. The Fund has demonstrated a resolve not to pay these claims until the last appeal has been exhausted. No benefits have been paid even though these deaths occurred over 11 years ago.

Rule 204 provides:

(b) Certification by Supreme Court. In any case which is pending before the Court of Appeals, the Supreme Court may, in its discretion, on motion of any party to the case, on request by the Court of Appeals, or on its own motion, certify the case for review by the Supreme Court before it has been determined by the Court of Appeals. Certification is normally appropriate where the case involves an issue of significant public interest or a legal principle of major importance. The effect of such certification shall be to transfer jurisdiction over the case to the Supreme Court for all purposes.

This Court has never published any specific standards by which it considers a request for certification, although the Rule provides some guidance as to when certification is “normally appropriate.” At bottom, whether to certify a case for review is within this Court’s broad discretion.

The Fund has made it abundantly clear that it is pursuing only the issues it initially raised in the first appeal from Judge Hill’s order (an appeal that was fully briefed and argued before the Court of Appeals in March 2010, nearly four years ago). The Fund has also made it abundantly clear that it intends to pursue every avenue of review and to delay the resolution of this matter for as long as possible. Again, these cases have been pending in one forum or another for over a decade, and the likelihood of reversal is minimal at best.

CONCLUSION


As this Court recently stated, the oft-quoted phrase “justice delayed is justice denied,” while invoked usually in the criminal context, “is no less applicable to civil cases.” *In re Atwater*, 397 S.C. 518, 528, 725 S.E.2d 686, 691 (2012). The maxim applies

fully to these appeals.

Accordingly, Respondents respectfully request that this Court do three things:

- (1) certify the matters from the Court of Appeals pursuant to Rule 204(b), SCACR;
- (2) consolidate the matters for decision, *cf. Limehouse v. Hulsey*, 404 S.C. 93, 744 S.E.2d 566 (2013) (wherein this Court certified related case and consolidated with pending matter where the dispositive issue in each case was identical); and
- (3) expedite review of these cases. *See* Rule 263 (b) (“The time prescribed by these Rules for performing any act except the time for serving the notice of appeal under Rules 203 and 243 may be extended or shortened by the appellate court, or by any judge or justice thereof.”).

Respectfully submitted,



John S. Nichols, SC Bar No. 4210
Bluestein, Nichols,
Thompson & Delgado, LLC
Post Office Box 7965
Columbia, South Carolina 29202
(803) 779-7599 Telephone
(803) 779-8995 Facsimile
jsnichols@bntdlaw.com

Jarrel L. Wigger, Esquire
Wigger Law Firm, Inc.
8086 Rivers Avenue, Suite A
North Charleston, South Carolina
29406
(843) 553-9800 Telephone
(843) 553-1648 Facsimile

January 13, 2014

Attorneys for Respondents

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
J.C. Nicholson, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2012-CP-10-6355
Case Tracking No. 2013-000282

Dharmendra Chaudhari, Husband of Anita
Chaudhari, Deceased Respondent,

v.

Avni Grocers, Employer, and South Carolina
Uninsured Employers' Fund, Carrier Defendants,

of whom
South Carolina Uninsured Employers' Fund, Carrier, is Appellant.

Case No. 2012-CP-1006357
Appellate Case No. 2013-000412

Virendra Puniyani, Deceased Employee, and
Rajkumari Puniyani, Claimant, Respondents,

v.

Avni Grocers, Employer, and South Carolina
Uninsured Employers' Fund, Carrier Defendants,

of whom
South Carolina Uninsured Employers' Fund, Carrier, is Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE


RECEIVED

JAN 14 2014

SC Court of Appeals

The undersigned hereby certifies that on the date indicated below she served counsel for the Appellant with a copy of the *Motion to Consolidate, Certify and Expedite* by mailing copies of the same by United States Mail with first class postage prepaid to the following address:

Margaret M. Urbanic, Esquire
Clawson & Staubes, LLC
126 Seven Farms Drive, Suite 200
Charleston, South Carolina 29492



Erin Bridges
BLUESTEIN, NICHOLS, THOMPSON
& DELGADO, LLC


January 13, 2014
Columbia, South Carolina




BLUESTEIN · NICHOLS · THOMPSON · DELGADO LLC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1614 Taylor Street | PO Box 7965 | Columbia, SC 29202

The Honorable Jenny Kitchings
Clerk of Court
South Carolina Court of Appeals
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, South Carolina 29211



UNITED STATES POSTAGE

PITNEY BOWES
02 1P \$ 000.860
0004661464 JAN 13 2014
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 29201

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2014

SC Court of Appeals

29211 162929

