

RECEIVED

MAY 06 2014

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

J.C. Nicholson, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2013-002796
Trial Court Case No. 2011-CP-10-05774

Pavilion Development Corp. & Larry McNair,Appellants,

v.

Nexsen Pruet, LLC,Respondent,

v.

DC & Sons, LLC,Counterclaim Defendant.

**MOTION TO STRIKE DOCUMENTS IN DESIGNATION OF MATTER
AND TO REQUIRE APPELLANTS TO FILE AMENDED BRIEF**

Respondent Nexsen Pruet, LLC, seeks an order (1) striking documents in Appellants' Designation of Matter that were not presented to the trial court and that are not relevant to the appeal and (2) requiring Appellants to file an amended brief consistent with the Court's ruling. Appellants' Designation violates the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules because it includes documents that were never presented below.

Additionally, many of the documents designated relate solely to the merits of the underlying case between Appellants and DC & Sons, the case giving rise to the legal malpractice case against Nexsen Pruet. But this appeal is not about the merits of the underlying case between Appellants and DC & Sons. This appeal is about whether the

trial court properly granted summary judgment in favor of Nexsen Pruet based on the court's threshold finding that DC & Sons, and not Appellants, was actually pursuing the legal malpractice case against Nexsen Pruet and that the assignment of the legal malpractice claim to DC & Sons was void as against public policy. The trial court did not reach the merits of the underlying case in deciding the motion for summary judgment, and documents related to the merits of the underlying case should be stricken from the designation of matter.

Because the Court's ruling on this motion will impact the content of Nexsen Pruet's initial brief, Nexsen Pruet respectfully requests that the Court stay the deadline for Nexsen Pruet to file its initial brief and designation of matter pending a ruling on this motion.

BACKGROUND

This appeal presents the novel question of whether legal malpractice claims are assignable in South Carolina and whether the trial court properly granted summary judgment in favor of Nexsen Pruet on the basis that the assignment was void as against public policy. This appeal is not about the merits of the underlying case between Appellants and DC & Sons.

In granting summary judgment in favor of Nexsen Pruet, the trial court found that the case against Nexsen Pruet was not a genuine legal malpractice case but was instead an action to collect a \$4.5 million judgment that Appellant Pavilion Development Corporation confessed in favor of DC & Sons in settlement of the case between Appellants and DC & Sons. (Ex. A, p. 25.) The trial court found that as part of the settlement of the case between Appellants and DC & Sons, Appellants assigned to DC &

Sons “the proceeds, control, and the right to own all claims” Appellants had against Nexsen Pruet. *Id.* at p. 24. The trial court found that Appellants agreed to cooperate in the prosecution of the legal malpractice case and to pursue the litigation as if they retained the right to the proceeds. *Id.* The trial court further found that Appellants acknowledged that the suit would be brought in their names but that the cost of the litigation would be borne by DC & Sons alone. *Id.*

The trial court denounced this scenario, finding that Appellants and DC & Sons had “converted the legal malpractice action into a commodity to be exploited and transferred to an economic bidder (DC & Sons) that Nexsen Pruet has never represented or owed any legal duties to.” *Id.* The trial court also found that “[b]y placing full control of the litigation against Nexsen Pruet in the hands of DC & Sons and their counsel, including the right to waive the attorney-client privilege between [Appellants] and Nexsen Pruet, [Appellants] have brought embarrassment to the attorney-client relationship and have imperiled the sanctity of the highly confidential fiduciary nature of the relationship.” *Id.* at 13-14.

In their brief, Appellants appear to recognize the limited nature of the issues on appeal. The Statement of Issues and Argument sections of the brief focus on whether the assignment of the legal malpractice claim was lawful and whether dismissal with prejudice was the proper remedy. Appellants focus on the merits of the underlying case in the Statement of Facts only, doing so with very little citation to the record.

Because the trial court did not adjudicate the merits of the underlying case and because the merits are not relevant to the issues on appeal, documents related to the merits of the underlying case should be stricken from the designation of matter.

Allowing the documents to be included in the record on appeal will distract the Court from the discrete issues on appeal, unnecessarily clutter the record, and force Nexsen Pruet to respond to facts that were not adjudicated in this case and for which there is no record. The documents should be stricken from the designation of matter, and Appellants should be required to amend their initial brief consistent with the Court's ruling.

LAW

“The Record on Appeal shall include all matter designated to be included by any party under Rule 209,” but “shall not . . . include matter which was not presented to the lower court or tribunal.” Rule 210(c), SCACR. *See also Norris v. Ferre*, 315 S.C. 179, 183, 432 S.E.2d 491, 493 (Ct. App. 1993) (refusing to allow deposition testimony to be included in the Record on Appeal because it was not presented to the trial judge).

Additionally, “[a] party shall not include any matter in his Designation which is not relevant to the appeal.” *Id.* Rule 209(b), SCACR.

Further, “[t]he brief shall contain references to the transcript, pleadings, orders, exhibits, or other materials which may be properly included in the Record on Appeal [see Rule 210(c)] to support the salient facts alleged.” Rule 208(b)(4), SCACR .

“[T]he South Carolina Appellate Court rules are not mere technicalities but provide the parties and this Court with an orderly mechanism through which to guide appeals in this State.” *Henning v. Kaye*, 307 S.C. 436, 437, 415 S.E.2d 794, 794 (1992).

“It is incumbent upon counsel to provide material that complies with the Rules and facilitates appellate review.” *Id.*

“Whenever it appears that an appellant or a petitioner has failed to comply with the requirements of these Rules, the clerk shall issue an order of dismissal, which shall have the same force and effect as an order of the appellate court.” Rule 231(a), SCACR.

Although Nexsen Pruet is not seeking a dismissal of the appeal pursuant to Rule 231(a), the rule highlights the importance of the parties complying with the appellate court rules.

ARGUMENT

Documents related to the merits of the underlying case between Appellants and DC & Sons should be stricken from the designation of matter because they are not relevant to the issues on appeal and some of them were never presented to the trial court.

A. Matters not presented to the trial court.

The following documents were not presented to the trial court and should be stricken from the designation of matter:

1. August 9, 2007 Complaint filed by Nexsen Pruet in underlying case and lis pendens (Designation of Matter No. 8)
2. August 14, 2008 Complaint/Counterclaim against Pavilion in underlying case (Designation of Matter No. 9)
3. August 15, 2008 Amended Complaint of Pavilion in underlying case (Designation of Matter No. 10)

These documents are the pleadings and the lis pendens filed in the underlying case between Appellants and DC & Sons. They should be stricken from the designation of matter because they are not a part of the record in this case and are not relevant to the appeal. This appeal concerns the question of whether legal malpractice claims are assignable in South Carolina. It does not concern the merits of the case between Appellants and DC & Sons. The trial court did not adjudicate the merits of the

underlying case, and the merits of the underlying case are not before this Court for review. The insignificance of these documents is further supported by the fact that Appellants do not cite the documents in their initial brief and do not discuss them in the Argument section.

Because these documents were not made a part of the record in this case and are not relevant to the issues on appeal, they should be stricken from the designation of matter.

B. Matters not relevant to the appeal.

The following documents should be stricken from the designation of matter because they are not relevant to the appeal:

1. Discovery served with the complaint (Designation of Matter No. 1)
2. Exhibits to Appellants' Motion to Reconsider dated October 23, 2013 (Designation of Matter No. 5)
3. March 23, 2009 Order of the Honorable Roger M. Young in underlying case (Designation of Matter No. 11)
4. January 14, 2011 Pre-trial brief of DC & Sons in underlying case (Designation of Matter No. 12)
5. January 18, 2011 Order of the Honorable Roger M. Young granting DC & Sons' Renewed Motion for Summary Judgment in the underlying case (Designation of Matter No. 13)

Except for the discovery served with the complaint (No. 1 above), these documents all relate to the merits of the underlying case, which are not before this Court for review. The March 23, 2009, and January 18, 2011 orders of the Honorable Roger M. Young (Nos. 3 and 5 above) relate entirely to the merits of the underlying case between Appellants and DC & Sons. As explained above, the trial court in this case did not adjudicate the merits of the underlying case in granting summary judgment in favor of

Nexsen Pruet, and there is no record in this case on those issues. The orders are irrelevant and should not be a part of the record on appeal.

For similar reasons, the pre-trial brief of DC & Sons (No. 4 above) should be stricken. The brief presents DC & Sons's version of the facts in the case against Appellants, none of which were adjudicated by the trial court in this case. Further, DC & Sons is not a party to this appeal and any documents DC & Sons filed in anticipation of trial against Appellants are irrelevant.

Likewise, the exhibits to Appellants' motion to reconsider (No. 2 above) should be stricken because they are not relevant to the appeal or are duplicative.¹ The exhibits are as follows:

- Exhibit A, the order on appeal, is No. 3 on the designation of matter.
- Exhibit B, the January 18, 2011 transcript, is No. 15 on the designation of matter.
- Exhibit C is the pre-trial brief of DC & Sons with exhibits, which should be stricken both as an exhibit to Appellants' motion to reconsider and as No. 12 on the designation of matter. As explained above, DC & Sons is not a party to this appeal and the brief is not relevant to the appeal.
- Exhibit D, the Form 4 order of Judge Roger Young dated January 18, 2011, is No. 14 on the designation of matter.
- Exhibit E is the order granting summary judgment in favor of DC & Sons in the underlying case between Appellants and DC & Sons, which should be stricken both as an exhibit to Appellants' motion to reconsider and as No. 13 on the designation of matter. As explained above, the order concerns the merits of the underlying case and is not relevant to the appeal.

¹ Appellants' designation of matter does not expressly state that the exhibits to the motion to reconsider are to be included in the record on appeal. In the event Appellants do not intend to include the exhibits in the record, Nexsen Pruet withdraws its argument that the exhibits should be excluded.

- Exhibit F, the transcript from the summary judgment hearing, is No. 4 on the designation of matter.

Exhibits C and E relate solely to the merits of the underlying case and should be stricken for the reasons stated above. The remaining exhibits are duplicative of other documents listed in the designation of matter and should not be included in the record twice.

Finally, discovery served with the complaint (No. 1 above) should be stricken because it is not relevant to the appeal. The order granting summary judgment in favor of Nexsen Pruet does not address the discovery served with the complaint. Although Appellants argue that summary judgment should not have been granted prior to discovery, Appellants do not rely upon or cite the discovery to make this argument. Further, the discovery itself does not establish one way or the other whether Nexsen Pruet “refused” to participate in depositions as Appellants contend, and there is no evidence in the record to support this contention.

C. Amendments to the Brief

Appellants should be required to file an amended brief that is consistent with the Court’s ruling on the matters raised above, referencing only those documents that are properly part of the record on appeal. Additionally, Appellants should be required to amend their brief as explained below.

1. The Statement of Facts should be supported by references to the record.

“Rule 207(b) governs contents of the briefs, and requires ‘references to the transcript, pleadings, order, exhibits, or other materials which may be properly included in the Record on Appeal [see Rule 209(c)] to support the salient facts alleged.’” *Forner*

v. *Butler*, 319 S.C. 275, 277, 460 S.E.2d 425, 427 (Ct. App. 1995) (quoting Rule 207(b)(4), SCACR).

Here, the first two pages of Appellants' Statement of Facts do not contain a single reference to the transcript, pleadings, orders, exhibits, or other materials from the record in this case. Rather than providing facts to this Court, Appellants argue the merits of the underlying case between Appellants and DC & Sons. The Statement of Facts should be amended so that it contains references to the record and cites documents that were presented to the trial court.

2. Footnote 3 in Appellants' brief should be stricken.

Footnote 3 refers to documents (trial exhibits of DC & Sons in the case against Appellants) that are not part of the record in this case and that are not relevant to the issues on appeal. Accordingly, the footnote should be stricken from Appellants' brief.

CONCLUSION

Nexsen Pruet seeks an order striking the following documents from Appellants' Designation of Matter because they were not presented to the trial court or are not relevant to the appeal, or both: the discovery served with the complaint (Designation of Matter No. 1, in part); the exhibits to Appellants' motion to reconsider (Designation of Matter No. 5, in part); the pleadings and lis pendens filed in the underlying litigation (Designation of Matter Nos. 8, 9, and 10); orders regarding the merits of the underlying litigation (Designation of Matter Nos. 11 and 13); and the pre-trial brief of DC & Sons in the underlying litigation (Designation of Matter No. 12).

Additionally, Nexsen Pruet seeks an order requiring Appellants to amend their initial brief consistent with the Court's ruling on the motion and as set forth in section C above.

This appeal is not about trying the case between Appellants and DC & Sons. It is about answering the question of whether legal malpractice claims are assignable under South Carolina law and whether the trial court properly granted summary judgment in favor of Nexsen Pruet. Documents unrelated to these issues should be stricken from Appellants' designation of matter.

Nexsen Pruet respectfully requests that the deadline to file its initial brief and designation of matter be stayed pending a ruling on this motion.

SOWELL GRAY STEPP & LAFFITTE, LLC

By: 

Elizabeth Van Doren Gray
Tina Cundari
1310 Gadsden Street
Post Office Box 11449
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
(803) 929-1400
egray@sowellgray.com
tcundari@sowellgray.com

Attorneys for Nexsen Pruet, LLC

Columbia, South Carolina
May 6, 2014

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
 COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)
 PAVILION DEVELOPMENT CORP. &)
 LARRY McNAIR,)
)
 Plaintiffs,)
 v.)
 NEXSEN PRUET, LLC,)
)
 Defendant,)
 v.)
 DC & SONS, LLC,)
)
 Counterclaim Defendant.)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
 IN THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
 Civil Action No.: 2011-CP-10-05774

ORDER

FILED
 2013 OCT -9 AM 10:29
 JULIE J. ARMSTRONG
 CLERK OF COURT
 BY _____

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Nexsen Pruet LLC's motion for summary judgment. Nexsen Pruet seeks an order granting summary judgment in its favor as to all causes of action in the complaint and counterclaim on the ground that this case is proceeding pursuant to an assignment of a legal malpractice claim that is void as against public policy.


The motion was heard on March 13, 2013. Elizabeth Van Doren Gray and Tina Cundari of Sowell Gray Stepp & Laffitte, LLC, appeared on behalf of Nexsen Pruet. Andrew K. Epting, Jr., and George Kefalos appeared on behalf of Pavilion Development Corporation and Larry McNair (Plaintiffs) and on behalf of Counterclaim Defendant DC & Sons, LLC (DC & Sons). After considering the arguments presented by counsel and the written memoranda filed, the Court grants Nexsen Pruet's motion for summary judgment. The Court finds that this case, although brought in the name of Plaintiffs, is proceeding pursuant to an assignment of a legal malpractice claim from Plaintiffs to DC & Sons. The Court concludes the assignment in this



case is void as against public policy because it is an assignment between adversaries in litigation. Judgment is entered in favor of Nexsen Pruet.

BACKGROUND

This is a legal malpractice case. Pavilion Development Corporation and Larry McNair have sued Nexsen Pruet, LLC for legal malpractice that allegedly arose in litigation between Plaintiffs and DC & Sons. The litigation between Plaintiffs and DC & Sons began in 2007, when Plaintiffs sued DC & Sons for specific performance of a contract to purchase a piece of property at Shem Creek. [Compl. ¶ 13.] At the same time that they filed the complaint, Plaintiffs filed a notice of lis pendens. *Id.* Plaintiffs subsequently amended the complaint, dropping the cause of action for specific performance and pursuing claims for breach of contract and an equitable lien only. [Compl. ¶ 22.] Plaintiffs maintained the lis pendens, however, which DC & Sons alleged constituted an abuse of process. [Compl. ¶¶ 15, 23, 25.]

 Plaintiffs were represented by Nexsen Pruet from the beginning of the case until April 2009, when Nexsen Pruet was permitted to withdraw as counsel by order of the court. [Wallace Aff., Jan. 14, 2013, ¶¶ 3, 6, 7.] The court permitted Nexsen Pruet to withdraw as counsel because Nexsen Pruet's lawyers had become witnesses to the facts of the case due to the allegations of abuse of process. [*Id.* ¶¶ 6, 7.] Attorney Dan David was substituted as counsel for Plaintiffs. [Wallace Aff., Oct. 19, 2011, ¶¶ 7, 8.] DC & Sons was represented throughout the case by Andrew K. Epting, Jr., and George Kefalos, who represent DC & Sons in this action as well. [Wallace Aff., Jan. 14, 2013, ¶ 4.]

On January 18, 2011, nearly twenty-one months after Nexsen Pruet withdrew as counsel, Plaintiffs and DC & Sons settled the case. [Exs. A and B, Nexsen Pruet's Mem. in Supp. of Summ. J.] The settlement was reached during a court recess on what was to be the first day of

trial. [Ex. B, Nexsen Pruet's Mem. in Supp. of Summ. J., Jan. 18, 2011, Hr'g Tr. p. 14.] The recess was taken after DC & Sons argued its motion for summary judgment. *Id.* at pp. 13, 14. The trial judge stated that he intended to enter judgment in favor of DC & Sons. *Id.* The parties asked for time to see if they could reach an agreement. *Id.*

The Settlement

The terms of the settlement reached between Plaintiffs and DC & Sons are as follows. First, Pavilion Development Corporation (Pavilion) confessed judgment in favor of DC & Sons for \$4,580,015.93. [Ex. A, Nexsen Pruet's Mot. for Summ. J.] In exchange, Plaintiffs received a release of personal liability of Larry McNair and Lowell Frazier, the principals of Pavilion, and a waiver of trial against Pavilion on punitive damages. *Id.* Second, the parties entered into an agreement in which Plaintiffs assigned to DC & Sons all proceeds from a case to be brought against Nexsen Pruet for legal malpractice and breach of fiduciary duty, as well as the right to elect to own the claims themselves. *Id.* Plaintiffs also gave DC & Sons the right to control the litigation, including trial, appeal, settlement, and the waiver of the attorney-client and work-product privilege with Nexsen Pruet. *Id.*

The pertinent terms of the agreement are as follows:

- "Pavilion and McNair assign to DC & Sons all proceeds from a suit or suits to be filed by Pavilion and McNair against its counsel Nexsen Pruet and all other responsible parties."
- "At DC & Sons election Pavilion and McNair assign all claims to include [breach] of contract, breach of fid[uciary] duty, professional negligence, etc."
- "Further, Pavilion and McNair place full control of the said litigation in the hands of DC & Sons, to include the handling of the litigation, trial, appeal,

settlement, and the waiver of the attorney-client and work-product privilege with the Nexsen Pruet firm.”

- “Further, Pavilion and McNair agree to cooperate in the prosecution of this action and to pursue the litigation as if they retained the right to all proceeds.”
- “The cost of the litigation will be borne by DC & Sons alone.”
- “Pavilion and McNair acknowledge [that the] suit will be brought in their names.”
- “Pavilion and McNair direct that the earnest money [\$50,000] plus interest shall be turned over to DC & Sons and their counsel.”
- “DC & Sons agree that in the event of a settlement or judgment that the first \$250,000 will be split equally between DC & Sons and Pavilion and McNair so as to defray their defense cost and compensation for loss of business and emotional distress. All further funds shall be for the benefit of DC & Sons.”

gen
Id.

After reaching an agreement, the parties went back on the record. [Ex. B, Nexsen Pruet’s Mem. in Supp. of Summ. J., Hr’g Tr., Jan. 18, 2011, p. 14.] Counsel for DC & Sons announced to the court that the case had been settled. *Id.* Counsel for DC & Sons summarized the terms of the settlement by stating that “the effective deal is Mr. McNair is relieved from liability,” and that Pavilion confessed judgment in the amount of \$4,580,015.93, which according to counsel for DC & Sons, represented the actual damages to DC & Sons. *Id.* When the court asked how the amount was determined, counsel for DC & Sons provided an explanation “from memory,” without submitting any evidence or testimony. *Id.* at pp. 15-16. Although counsel for DC & Sons told the court that claims and proceeds had been assigned to DC & Sons, he did not say

which claims or which proceeds, and did not tell the court that the assignment was an assignment to DC & Sons of all proceeds from a legal malpractice case to be brought against Nexsen Pruet, and that it gave DC & Sons full control over the litigation, including the right to elect to own the very claims themselves. *Id.* at p. 14.

When the trial judge asked counsel for DC & Sons how the assignment should be reflected in the Form 4 order, counsel for DC & Sons stated that the assignment was handwritten and did not need to be reflected in the Form 4 Order. *Id.* at p. 17. The court then suggested that the Form 4 Order state merely that the case has been settled and the amount of damages was put on the record. *Id.* at pp. 17-18. Counsel for DC & Sons agreed. *Id.* at p. 18.

The Present Case


As contemplated in the agreement between Plaintiffs and DC & Sons, Nexsen Pruet has now been sued for legal malpractice and breach of fiduciary duty. [Compl.] The case was filed on August 16, 2011, and has been brought in the names of Pavilion Development Corporation and Larry McNair. *Id.* The assignment was not attached to or otherwise referenced in the complaint. *Id.* Plaintiffs are now represented by Andrew K. Epting, Jr., and George J. Kefalos, the very same lawyers who represented DC & Sons in the litigation between Plaintiffs and DC & Sons, and who represent DC & Sons in this action. *Id.*

Nexsen Pruet answered the complaint and asserted a counterclaim for declaratory judgment against Plaintiffs and a new party, DC & Sons, which was added to the case by Nexsen Pruet as a counterclaim defendant. [Ans. & Countercl.] Among other things, the counterclaim seeks an order declaring the assignment void as against public policy. Plaintiffs and DC & Sons moved to dismiss the counterclaim. [Mots. to Dismiss, Nov. 2, 2011, and Nov. 21, 2011.]

Following a hearing, the court denied the motions to dismiss, allowing the counterclaim against Plaintiffs and DC & Sons to proceed. [Order, Apr. 26, 2012.]

On January 14, 2013, Nexsen Pruet filed a motion for summary judgment arguing, among other things, that judgment should be entered in favor of Nexsen Pruet as to all causes of action in the complaint and counterclaim on the basis that this case is proceeding pursuant to an assignment of a legal malpractice claim that is void as against public policy.

STANDARD

 "The purpose of summary judgment is to expedite the disposition of cases which do not require the services of a factfinder." *Singleton v. Sherer*, 377 S.C. 185, 197-98, 659 S.E.2d 196, 203 (Ct. App. 2008). Summary judgment shall be granted "if the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." Rule 56(c), SCRPC.

"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." *Quail Hill, LLC v. Cnty. of Richland*, 387 S.C. 223, 235, 692 S.E.2d 499, 505 (2010). "Once the party moving for summary judgment meets the initial burden of showing an absence of evidentiary support for the opponent's case, the opponent cannot simply rest on mere allegations or denials contained in the pleadings." *Singleton*, 377 S.C. at 197-98, 659 S.E.2d at 203. "The nonmoving party must come forward with specific facts showing there is a genuine issue for trial." *Id.* at 198, 659 S.E.2d at 203.

An assignment is a contract, and the question of whether it is void as against public policy is a question of law. ("The interpretation of a contract is an action at law."). *See also*

Gurski v. Rosenblum & Filan, LLC, 885 A.2d 163, 167 (Conn. 2005) (“The question of whether an assignment is barred as a matter of public policy is an issue of law.”); *Comet Energy Servs., LLC v. Powder River Oil & Gas Ventures, LLC*, 185 P.3d 1259, 1261 (Wyo. 2008) (“Assignments are contracts and are construed according to the rules of contract interpretation.”).

LAW / ANALYSIS

Nexsen Pruet contends that summary judgment should be granted in its favor as to all causes of action in the complaint and counterclaim because this case is proceeding pursuant to an assignment of a legal malpractice claim that is void as against public policy. Nexsen Pruet further contends that the circumstances under which this case arose are tainted with collusion, and the taint cannot be cured by simply striking the assignment and allowing the case to proceed as filed. The Court agrees.

I. Assignment of Legal Malpractice Claims

A. Law

South Carolina appellate courts have not addressed the question of whether a legal malpractice claim is assignable. Courts in other jurisdictions have.

1. The majority view

The majority view is that legal malpractice claims are not assignable because they are void as against public policy. The following states have adopted the majority view: **Arizona**, *Botma v. Huser*, 39 P.3d 538 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2002); **California**, *Goodley v. Wank & Wank, Inc.*, 133 Cal. Rptr. 83 (Cal. Ct. App. 1976); **Colorado**, *Roberts v. Holland & Hart*, 857 P.2d 492 (Colo. Ct. App. 1993); **Florida**, *Law Office of David J. Stern v. Sec. Nat'l Servicing Corp.*, 969 So.2d 962 (Fla. 2007); **Illinois**, *Wilson v. Cornet Ins. Co.*, 689 N.E.2d 1157 (Ill. 1997), *but see Learning Curve Intern., Inc. v. Seyfarth Shaw LLP*, 911 N.E.2d 1073 (Ill. App. 2009) (allowing

an assignment as part of a transfer of assets in a merger); **Indiana**, *Picadilly, Inc. v. Raikos*, 582 N.E.2d 338 (Ind. 1991) and *State Farm Fire Mut. Auto Ins. Co. v. Estep*, 873 N.E.2d 1021 (Ind. 2007); **Kansas**, *Bank IV Wichita, Nat'l Ass'n v. Arn, Mullins, Unruh, Kuhn & Wilson*, 827 P.2d 758 (Kan. 1992); **Kentucky**, *Davis v. Scott*, 320 S.W.3d 87 (Ky. 2010) and *Coffey v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ.*, 756 S.W.2d 155 (Ky. Ct. App. 1988); **Michigan**, *Joos v. Drillock*, 338 N.W.2d 736 (Mich. Ct. App. 1983); **Minnesota**, *Wagener v. McDonald*, 509 N.W.2d 188 (Minn. Ct. App. 1993); **Missouri**, *Freeman v. Basso*, 128 S.W.3d 138 (Mo. Ct. App. 2004); **Nebraska**, *Earth Science Laboratories, Inc. v. Adkins and Wondra, P.C.*, 523 N.W.2d 254 (Neb. 1994); **Nevada**, *Chaffee v. Smith*, 645 P.2d 966 (Nev. 1982); **New Jersey**, *Alcman Servs. Corp. v. Samuel H. Bullock, P.C.*, 925 F. Supp. 252 (D.N.J. 1996) *aff'd*, 124 F.3d 185 (3d Cir.1997); **Tennessee**, *Can Do, Inc. Pension & Profit Sharing Plan v. Manier, Herod, Hollabaugh & Smith*, 922 S.W.2d 865 (Tenn. 1996); **Virginia**, *MNC Credit Corp. v. Sickels*, 497 S.E.2d 331 (Va. 1998); **West Virginia**, *Delaware CWC Liquidation Corp. v. Martin*, 584 S.E.2d 473 (W. Va. 2003). *See also* 6 Am. Jur. 2d *Assignments* § 57 (2012) (“Most jurisdictions have held that legal malpractice claims are nonassignable.”). **North Carolina** recently adopted the majority view. *Revolutionary Concepts, Inc. v. Clements Walker PLLC*, ___ S.E.2d ___, 2013 WL 1876777 (N.C. Ct. App. May 7, 2013).

Several public policy reasons have been recognized for prohibiting such assignments. “Most courts view the unique personal nature of the relationship between an attorney and his client to be the most compelling public policy reason for prohibiting the assignment of legal malpractice claims.” *Delaware CWC Liquidation Corp. v. Martin*, 584 S.E.2d 473 (W. Va. 2003). Assignments of legal malpractice claims are incompatible with the duty of loyalty and duty of confidentiality owed by attorneys to their clients, and “the unique and personal nature of

the relationship between an attorney and a client and the need to preserve the sanctity of that relationship” counsel against permitting such assignments. *Gurski v. Rosenblum & Filan, LLC*, 885 A.2d 163 (Conn. 2005). Assignments of legal malpractice claims “relegate the legal malpractice action to the market place and convert it to a commodity to be exploited and transferred to economic bidders who have never had a professional relationship with the attorney and to whom the attorney has never owed a legal duty, and who have never had any prior connection with the assignor or his rights.” *Goodley v. Wank & Wank, Inc.*, 133 Cal. Rptr. 83, 87 (Cal. Ct. App. 1976).

Additional reasons cited for prohibiting the assignment of legal malpractice claims are that they “place an undue burden on not only the legal profession but the already overburdened judicial system, restrict the availability of competent legal services, embarrass the attorney-client relationship and imperil the sanctity of the highly confidential and fiduciary relationship existing between attorney and client.” *Id.* Allowing legal malpractice claims to be assigned “would encourage the commercialization of such claims and in turn spawn increased and unwarranted malpractice actions.” *Gurski*, 885 A.2d at 170. Finally, allowing such assignments “would make attorneys hesitant to represent insolvent, underinsured or judgment proof defendants for fear that the malpractice claims would be used as tender.” *Id.*

2. The minority view

A minority of jurisdictions have declined to adopt a *per se* bar against the assignment of legal malpractice claims but have instead taken a case-by-case approach in evaluating whether a particular assignment is void. These include **Connecticut**, *Gurski v. Rosenblum & Filan, LLC*, 885 A.2d 163 (Conn. 2005); **District of Columbia**, *Richter v. Analex Corp.*, 940 F. Supp. 353 (D.D.C. 1996); **Georgia**, *Villanueva v. First Am. Title Ins. Co.*, 740 S.E.2d 108, 111 (Ga. 2013)

Maine, *Thurston v. Cont'l Cas. Co.*, 567 A.2d 922 (Me. 1989); **Massachusetts**, *New Hampshire Ins. Co., Inc. v. McCann*, 707 N.E.2d 332 (Mass. 1999); **New York**, *Vitale v. City of New York*, 183 A.D.2d 502, (N.Y. App. Div. 1992); **Oregon**, *Gregory v. Lovlien*, 26 P.3d 180 (Or. Ct. App. 2001); **Pennsylvania**, *Hedlund Mfg. Co. v. Weiser, Stapler & Spivak*, 539 A.2d 357 (Pa. 1988); **Rhode Island**, *Cerberus Partners, L.P. v. Gadsby & Hannah*, 728 A.2d 1057 (R.I. 1999); **Texas**, *Zuniga v. Groce, Locke & Hebdon*, 878 S.W.2d 313 (Tex. App. 1994); and **Washington**, *Kommavongsa v. Haskell*, 67 P.3d 1068, 1078 (Wash. 2003). *See also St. Luke's Magic Valley Reg'l Med. Ctr. v. Luciani*, 293 P.3d 661 (Idaho 2013) (holding that "while legal malpractice claims are generally not assignable, where the legal malpractice claim is transferred to an assignee in a commercial transaction, along with other business assets and liability, such a claim is assignable.").

3. Assignments between adversaries in litigation.

gm
Although there is division among courts as to whether to adopt an absolute bar against the assignment of legal malpractice claims or to take a case-by-case approach, courts uniformly hold that assignments between adversaries in litigation in which the alleged legal malpractice arose are void as against public policy. *See, e.g., Kim v. O'Sullivan*, 137 P.3d 61 (Ct. App. Wash. 2006) ("A client may not assign a claim of attorney malpractice to his adversary in the litigation out of which the alleged malpractice arose."); *Zuniga v. Groce, Locke & Hebdon*, 878 S.W.2d 313 (Tex. Ct. App. 1994) ("It is one thing for lawyers in our adversary system to represent clients with whom they personally disagree; it is something quite different for lawyers (and clients) to switch positions concerning the same incident simply because an assignment and the law of proximate cause given them a financial interest in switching."); *Picadilly, Inc. v. Raikos*, 582 N.E.2d 338 (Ind. 1991) (citing the "disreputable public role reversal that would

result during the trial” if assignments between adversaries were permitted), *abrogated on other grounds by Liggett v. Young*, 877 N.E.2d 178 (Ind. 2007); *Coffey v. Jefferson Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, 756 S.W.2d 155 (Ky. Ct. App. 1988) (holding an assignment to an adversary void as against public policy and the entire transaction involving a confession of judgment “so collusive that same should be held to be against public policy”). This is true even in states that have adopted the minority, case-by-case approach. See *Kommavongsa v. Haskell*, 67 P.3d 1068, 1078 (Wash. 2003) (“In sum, we can see no advantage flowing to the legal system or the public that it serves from permitting assignments of malpractice claims to adversaries in the same litigation that gave rise to the alleged malpractice.”).

There are several reasons for prohibiting assignments between adversaries in litigation in which the alleged legal malpractice arose. To begin, the “counterintuitive claim and reversal of roles, requiring the assignee to bring a claim for legal malpractice when she was the very party who benefited from that malpractice in the underlying litigation, would engender a perversion that would erode public confidence in the legal system.” *Gurski v. Rosenblum & Filan, LLC*, 885 A.2d 163, 174 (Conn. 2005). Additionally, assignments between adversaries provide an “opportunity and incentive for collusion in stipulating to damages in exchange for a covenant not to execute judgment in the underlying litigation.” *Kommavongsa*, 67 P.3d at 1078. “[S]uch a stipulated judgment cannot properly serve as an indication of the actual damages, if any there were, as a result of the legal malpractice.” *Id.* (citing *Coffey*, 756 S.W.2d at 156-57).

As one court has explained:

A party should not be permitted to transmute a claim against a penniless adversary into a claim against the adversary’s wealthier lawyer based on the lawyer’s supposed negligence towards the adversary. A legal malpractice action is not a commodity to be sold to a bidder who has never even had a relationship with the lawyer. The decision to bring a legal malpractice action “is one peculiarly vested in the client.” . . . There is, in addition, a high risk

that the plaintiff and defendant in the underlying litigation will collude to the detriment of the defendant's lawyer.

...

If assignments were permitted, we suspect that they would become an important bargaining chip in the negotiation of settlements.

Alcman Servs. Corp. v. Bullock, P.C., 925 F. Supp. 252, 258 (D.N.J. 1996) (internal citations omitted).

Further, "[a] defendant who can assign his or her legal malpractice claim in exchange for a covenant not to enforce a judgment in the underlying litigation would have little incentive to seriously litigate the amount of damages allegedly arising from his or her negligence." *Kommavongsa*, 67 P.3d at 1078. Additionally, "to permit such assignments would make lawyers hesitant to accept the defense of defendants who are judgment-proof or nearly so, and who are uninsured or underinsured." *Id.* Moreover, because legal malpractice cases present a "trial within a trial," an assignment to an adversary "arising from the same litigation that gave rise to the malpractice claim would lead to abrupt and shameless shift of positions that would give prominence (and substance) to the perception that lawyers will take any position, depending upon where the money lies, and that litigation is a mere game and not a search for truth, thereby demeaning the legal profession." *Id.*

Finally, courts have expressly denounced the scenario where a party confesses judgment in favor of his adversary and then assigns to his adversary the right to sue the party's lawyer for legal malpractice. See *Wagener v. McDonald*, 509 N.W.2d 188 (Minn. Ct. App. 1993) (describing the assignment and confession scenario as a "contrived and elaborate scheme" that has been denounced by other courts); *Coffey v. Jefferson Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, 756 S.W.2d 155 (Ky. Ct. App. 1988) (referring to a settlement involving an assignment of a legal malpractice

claim to an adversary and a confession of judgment as a “contrived and elaborate scheme” that is “so collusive that same should be held to be against public policy”).

B. Analysis

The present case involves a confession of judgment and an assignment of a legal malpractice claim between adversaries in litigation in which the alleged legal malpractice arose. To settle the litigation with DC & Sons, Pavilion confessed judgment in the amount \$4,580,015.93 in exchange for a release of personal liability as to Pavilion’s principals, Larry McNair and Lowell Frazier. Pavilion did so without challenging the amount or requiring DC & Sons to present evidence to support it. Plaintiffs then assigned to DC & Sons all proceeds from a case to be brought against Nexsen Pruet for legal malpractice and breach of fiduciary duty, and assigned the right to elect to own the claims themselves. Plaintiffs gave DC & Sons complete control over the malpractice case, including the trial, appeal, and settlement, and the power to waive the attorney-client privilege and work-product protection. Plaintiffs agreed to cooperate in the prosecution of the malpractice case and to pursue the litigation as if they retained the right to the proceeds. Plaintiffs acknowledged that the suit would be brought in their names but that the cost of the litigation would be borne by DC & Sons alone.

This scenario has been expressly denounced by other courts, and the Court denounces it here. Plaintiffs and DC & Sons have converted the legal malpractice action into a commodity to be exploited and transferred to an economic bidder (DC & Sons) that Nexsen Pruet has never represented or owed any legal duties to. By placing full control of the litigation against Nexsen Pruet in the hands of DC & Sons and their counsel, including the right to waive the attorney-client privilege between Plaintiffs and Nexsen Pruet, Plaintiffs have brought embarrassment to the attorney-client relationship and have imperiled the sanctity of the highly confidential and

fiduciary nature of the relationship. The assignment spawned this litigation, which appears to have been brought for the purpose of collecting a judgment confessed rather than remedying a wrong. Accordingly, the Court concludes that the assignment is void as against public policy.

In their opposition to Nexsen Pruet's motion for summary judgment, Plaintiffs do not defend the validity of the assignment or argue that it is not void as against public policy. Instead, Plaintiffs argue that they have not assigned the claims to DC & Sons, but rather have assigned only a portion of the proceeds, and argue that they remain the real parties in interest. This is contrary to the plain language of the assignment.

According to the plain language of the assignment, the proceeds have been assigned to DC & Sons. The assignment states: "Pavilion and McNair assign to DC & Sons *all proceeds* from a suit or suits to be filed by Pavilion and McNair against its counsel Nexsen Pruet and all other responsible parties." [Ex. A, Nexsen Pruet's Mot for Summ. J.] The assignment also states: "[Pavilion and McNair] agree to cooperate in the prosecution of this action and to pursue the litigation *as if they retained the right to all proceeds.*" *Id.* There is nothing unclear or ambiguous about the language in the assignment. Additionally, the assignment states: "At DC & Sons election, Pavilion and McNair assign all claims to include [breach] of contract, breach of fid[uciary] duty, professional negligence, etc." *Id.* This "right to elect" reinforces the fact that DC & Sons is in control and has the right at any time and without any notice to own the very claims themselves. DC & Sons simply has to say when.

The fact that DC & Sons agreed to give half of the first \$250,000 received in its pursuit of this action to Plaintiffs does not change the fact that DC & Sons owns the right to the proceeds. DC & Sons has simply agreed to allocate the proceeds in a way that gives Plaintiffs some nominal interest in the case, in an attempt to avoid the conclusion that an assignment of a

legal malpractice claim has occurred. At most, Plaintiffs stand to receive \$125,000 – \$50,000 of which represents the money they have already directed to be paid to DC & Sons in settlement of the prior case – when there is allegedly \$4,580,015.93 at stake. Plaintiffs' interest represents 2.7% of the total damages alleged. When the \$50,000 in earnest money is taken into account, Plaintiffs' interest diminishes to 1.637%. This is far less than the interest held by assignors in other cases, and yet the courts in those cases have held that an illegal assignment had occurred. See *Davis v. Scott*, 320 S.W.3d 87 (Ky. 2010) (holding that an illegal assignment had occurred even though the assignor retained a 20% interest in the proceeds); *Tate v. Goins, Underkofler, Crawford & Langdon*, 24 S.W.3d 627 (Tex. App. 2000) (holding that an assignment had occurred even though the assignor retained a 10% interest in any net recovery). Accordingly, the Court concludes that DC & Sons is the party that has the real, actual, material, and substantial interest in this case.

Moreover, the control that DC & Sons has over this case overcomes Plaintiffs' argument that only a portion of the proceeds has been assigned. Similar arguments have been made in other courts and rejected. For example, in one case the plaintiffs, conceding that Arizona law would not permit the assignment of the claim itself and in an effort to circumvent the prohibition, argued that only the proceeds of the action had been assigned, and not the cause of action itself. *Botma v. Huser*, 39 P.3d 538 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2002). In rejecting this argument, the court stated:

Whatever the form, whatever the label, whatever the theory, the result is the same. The policies create an interest in any recovery against a third party for bodily injury. Such an arrangement, if made or contracted for prior to settlement or judgment, is the legal equivalent of an assignment and therefore unenforceable.

Id. at 542.

Similarly, in another case, the plaintiff argued that only the proceeds had been assigned and that an assignment of the malpractice claim itself had not occurred. *Davis v. Scott*, 320


S.W.3d 87 (Ky. 2010). But after examining the substance of the agreement, the court disagreed.

In holding that the legal malpractice claim had been assigned, the court stated:

This level of control over a lawsuit is consistent with an assignment of the entire cause of action, not merely the proceeds of the litigation. The terms of this settlement agreement essentially placed the control of the malpractice suit in [the assignee's] hands and rendered [the assignor's] interest merely nominal. Though [the parties to the agreement] assert otherwise, what has occurred is an assignment not merely of the proceeds of the claim against [the lawyer], but of the entire claim itself.

Id. at 91 (internal citations omitted).

Applying this same principle of looking to the substance of the agreement, courts in other jurisdictions have reached similar conclusions. See *Kim v. O'Sullivan*, 137 P.3d 61 (Wash. App. 2006) (holding that an assignment of a legal malpractice claim had occurred because the assignee and his attorney were in complete control of the malpractice suit and only they would benefit from a settlement or judgment); *Gurski v. Rosenblum & Filan, LLC*, 885 A.2d 163 (Conn. 2005) (stating "we agree with those courts that have identified the 'meaningless distinction' between an assignment of a cause of action and an assignment of recovery from such an action, which distinction is made merely to circumvent the public policy barring assignments"); *Weiss v. Leatherberry*, 863 So.2d 368 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2003) (recognizing that the rule prohibiting the assignment of legal malpractice claims "has been applied even in the absence of a formal assignment of the claim"); *Tate v. Goins, Underkofler, Crawford & Langdon*, 24 S.W.3d 627 (Tex. App. 2000) (holding that an assignment had occurred despite the fact that the assignor retained a ten percent interest in any net recovery because the assignor gave his former adversary "absolute control over the litigation, including the unfettered right to settle the malpractice suit on such terms as [the adversary] determines").



Finally, Plaintiffs have all but admitted that an illegal assignment has occurred. On March 21, 2013, eight days after the hearing before this Court on Nexsen Pruet's motion for summary judgment, Plaintiffs and DC & Sons arranged a hearing before The Honorable Roger Young for the purpose of presenting an amended settlement agreement. [Tr. dated Mar. 21, 2013.] In the proposed amended settlement agreement, titled "Amended Agreement re: Assignment," Plaintiffs state: "the parties to the settlement wish to remove from the settlement the right of control by DC & Sons and to remove the right of assignment of proceeds or claims" [Ex. D, Pls.' Sur-Reply to Def. Nexsen Pruet's Mem. in Supp. of Summ. J.] By stating that the parties wish to remove the right of assignment of proceeds or claims, Plaintiffs appear to have conceded that the claims and proceeds have been assigned. Further, counsel's conduct of attempting to have another judge approve an amended settlement agreement after the hearing on the motion for summary judgment is a concession that the settlement agreement in its current form is illegal.

Plaintiffs also contend that summary judgment is not appropriate because they have not had a full and fair opportunity to complete discovery. But there are no facts to be discovered that will impact the analysis of whether the assignment is void as against public policy. The assignment is a contract, and the question of whether it is void as against public policy is a question of law. *Alexander's Land Co., LLC v. M & M & K Corp.*, 390 S.C. 582, 592, 703 S.E.2d 207, 212 (2010) ("The interpretation of a contract is an action at law."). See also *Gurski v. Rosenblum & Filan, LLC*, 885 A.2d 163, 167 (Conn. 2005) ("The question of whether an assignment is barred as a matter of public policy is an issue of law."); *Comet Energy Servs., LLC v. Powder River Oil & Gas Ventures, LLC*, 185 P.3d 1259, 1261 (Wyo. 2008) ("Assignments are contracts and are construed according to the rules of contract interpretation.").

No facts or testimony can change the Court's conclusion that the agreement between Plaintiffs and DC & Sons is an assignment of a legal malpractice claim that is void as against public policy. The assignment says what it says. There is no genuine issue of material fact regarding the terms of the assignment or the circumstances under which it was entered. Plaintiffs have not presented any evidence to dispute the existence of the assignment or the circumstances under which it was entered.

Accordingly, the Court finds that Plaintiffs have assigned the legal malpractice claim against Nexsen Pruet to their adversary in the litigation in which the alleged legal malpractice arose. The Court concludes as a matter of law that the assignment is void as against public policy. The Court reaches this conclusion without deciding whether South Carolina courts should adopt the majority or minority rule. That is for the appellate courts to decide. Instead, the Court is guided by decisions in other jurisdictions – some of which have adopted the majority view, and some of which have adopted the minority view – that hold that assignments between adversaries in litigation in which the alleged legal malpractice arose are void as against public policy. The Court is further persuaded by those courts that have expressly denounced scenarios like the one in the present case, involving a confession of judgment and an assignment.

The Court concludes that the assignment in this case is void as against public policy. Nexsen Pruet's motion for summary judgment is granted.

II. The Remedy

Plaintiffs argue that even if the assignment is void as against public policy, the proper remedy is to strike the assignment and to allow the case to proceed as pled and filed. Nexsen Pruet argues that the case is tainted with collusion and the taint cannot be cured by simply striking the assignment and allowing the case to proceed in its current form.

The Court finds that this case cannot simply proceed as filed because it was never filed by Plaintiffs in the first instance. Plaintiffs ceded all rights and control of the case to DC & Sons, including the right to determine whether to file the case in the first instance. The entire case has been controlled by DC & Sons and their counsel, who also represent Plaintiffs. Further, the facts and circumstances under which the assignment was entered created the opportunity for collusion, as did the conduct by counsel for Plaintiffs and DC & Sons following the hearing on the motion for summary judgment. Accordingly, the Court concludes that the appropriate remedy is to dismiss the case with prejudice.

A. Law

1. Dismissal with prejudice / Judgment in favor of law firm

Most courts that have addressed the question of whether an assignment of a legal malpractice claim is void as against public policy do not discuss the remedy. The courts either dismiss the case outright or enter summary judgment in favor of the law firm. *See, e.g., Gurski v. Rosenblum & Filan, LLC*, 885 A.2d 163, 167 (Conn. 2005) (dismissing the case outright and entering judgment in favor of the law firm); *Can Do, Inc. Pension & Profit Sharing Plan v. Manier, Herod, Hollabaugh & Smith*, 922 S.W.2d 865 (Tenn. 1996) (affirming dismissal of case brought pursuant to the illegal assignment); *Zuniga v. Groce, Locke & Hebdon*, 878 S.W.2d 313 (Tex. App. 1994); *Picadilly, Inc. v. Raikos*, 582 N.E.2d 338 (Ind. 1991) (affirming summary judgment in favor of the attorney or the law firm without addressing whether the client has the right to re-file the case), *abrogated on other grounds by Liggett v. Young*, 877 N.E.2d 178 (Ind. 2007); *Coffey v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ.*, 756 S.W.2d 155 (Ky. Ct. App. 1988) (same).


2. Dismissal without prejudice

At least three courts that have addressed the remedy question have concluded that the case should be dismissed without prejudice. This is because cases born out of an illegal assignment are “tainted in some respect,” and to allow them to proceed as filed would be “to wink at the rule against assignment of legal malpractice claims.” *Davis v. Scott*, 320 S.W.3d 87, 92 (Ky. 2010) (quoting *Botma v. Huser*, 39 P.3d 538, 543 (Ariz. 2002)). In *Davis*, the court held that the proper remedy was dismissal without prejudice and stated that although the client did not forfeit the malpractice claim, “the current suit, born of the improper assignment, cannot be permitted to continue.” 320 S.W.2d at 92. Accordingly, if the client decided to reassert his claim against the attorney, the client could do so “only upon showing that the attempted assignment is no longer in place and that he is the real party in interest.” *Id.* In *Botma*, the court ruled that the case could not continue in the client’s name because the client retained no interest in the lawsuit. 39 P.3d at 543. Any benefit that the client received in simply continuing the case would be used to pay the \$12 million judgment confessed in favor of the client’s adversary. *Id.*

Similarly, another court held that a case brought pursuant to illegal assignment should be dismissed without prejudice and that if the client wanted to re-file a malpractice claim against the law firm, the new case could not be controlled in any way by the party to whom the claims were initially assigned and the client could not be represented by attorneys associated with that party. *Edens Technologies, LLC v. Kile Goekjian Reed & McManus, PLLC*, 675 F. Supp. 2d 75, 86 (D.D.C. 2009). The court recognized that a dismissal without prejudice “does not eliminate the risk of collusion in future cases completely, but it does provide the client with more of an incentive to ‘seriously litigate the amount of damages’ in the underlying suit because now the

client bears the risk of not recovering in the legal malpractice action.” *Id.* “Furthermore, it eliminates the public and disreputable role reversals that have concerned many courts.” *Id.*

B. Analysis



The Court finds that the circumstances under which the present case arose and has proceeded require the Court to dismiss the case with prejudice. The present case was filed by Plaintiffs in name only and without notice to the Court or to Nexsen Pruet that Plaintiffs assigned the proceeds and the claims to their adversary in the litigation in which the alleged legal malpractice arose. [Compl.] Although brought in Plaintiffs’ name, the Court finds that the case has belonged to DC & Sons since its inception. As the owner of the claims and proceeds, and as the party with full control over the case, the Court finds that DC & Sons is responsible for every decision made in this case on behalf of Plaintiffs, including the choice of counsel, the filing and service of the complaint, the serving of discovery, and the filing of motions opposing all motions filed by Nexsen Pruet in the case, including the motion to disqualify counsel¹ and the present motion for summary judgment. The Court concludes that the case cannot proceed as pleaded because it was not brought by the client, Pavilion and McNair, in the first instance.

Moreover, the circumstances under which the assignment arose and the conduct of counsel for Plaintiffs and DC & Sons, indicate that the opportunity for collusion was present.

The circumstances are as follows:

1. The settlement of the case between Plaintiffs and DC & Sons was reached during a court recess on what was to be the first day of trial after Plaintiffs learned that the trial court

¹ Nexsen Pruet filed a motion to disqualify Andrew Epting and George Kefalos as counsel for Plaintiffs on the basis that they are witnesses to the facts of the case in which the alleged legal malpractice arose because they represented Plaintiffs’ adversary, DC & Sons, in the underlying litigation. Plaintiffs opposed the motion, and following a hearing, the court ruled that the motion be held in abeyance pending discovery and any necessary evidentiary hearing. [Order, Apr. 26, 2012.]

intended to grant DC & Sons's motion for summary judgment. [Ex. B, Nexsen Pruet's Mem. in Supp. of Summ. J., Hr'g Tr., Jan. 18, 2011.]

2. During the court recess, Pavilion confessed judgment in favor of DC & Sons for \$4.5 million without challenging the amount of damages or requiring DC & Sons to present evidence to support the amount confessed. [Exs. A and B, Nexsen Pruet's Mem. in Supp. of Summ. J.] In exchange, Plaintiffs obtained a full release of personal liability as to its principals, Larry McNair and Lowell Frazier. *Id.* At the same time, Plaintiffs assigned all proceeds in a case to be brought against Nexsen Pruet for legal malpractice and breach of fiduciary duty to DC & Sons and gave DC & Sons full control over the litigation, including the right to elect to own the claims themselves. *Id.* The assignment was drafted by counsel for DC & Sons. [Tr. 6:14-23, Mar. 13, 2013.]

3. Counsel for DC & Sons did not put all terms of the assignment on the record. [Ex. B, Nexsen Pruet's Mem. in Supp. of Summ. J., Hr'g Tr., Jan. 18, 2011.] Counsel did not tell Judge Young that the settlement included the assignment of a legal malpractice claim to be brought against Nexsen Pruet or that the legal malpractice case was to be controlled and funded by DC & Sons but brought in the names of Pavilion and McNair. *Id.*

4. Plaintiffs filed the present case against Nexsen Pruet without revealing the existence of the assignment. [Compl.] The existence of the assignment came to the Court's attention through the filing of the counterclaim by Nexsen Pruet. [Answer & Countercl.]

5. Counsel for Plaintiffs represented DC & Sons in the litigation between Plaintiffs and DC & Sons and also represent DC & Sons in the present case. [Wallace Aff., Jan. 14, 2013, ¶ 4.] This means that the lawyers who represented the adverse party in the case in which the alleged legal malpractice arose have now switched sides and represent the plaintiffs who were

once adverse to their client. At the same time, the lawyers continue to represent DC & Sons, in whose favor the judgment was confessed.

6. Eight days after the hearing on Nexsen Pruet's motion for summary judgment regarding whether the assignment is void as against public policy, Plaintiffs and DC & Sons obtained a hearing before Judge Young without notice to Nexsen Pruet (or its counsel) asking Judge Young to approve a proposed amended settlement agreement striking the assignment but keeping the confession of judgment in place. [Hr'g Tr., Mar. 21, 2013.]

7. After the hearing, Judge Young issued a Form 4 order and entered it in the present case, Case No. 2011-CP-10-05774. [Order, Mar. 21, 2013.] The order states: "The proposed Amended Settlement Agreement has been DISMISSED." *Id.* Thereafter, Nexsen Pruet filed the transcript from the hearing before Judge Young. [Not. of Filing Tr. of H'rg..]

8. According to the transcript, the attorneys present were Andrew K. Epting, Jr., George J. Kefalos, who represented DC & Sons in the litigation between Plaintiffs and DC & Sons and who represent both Plaintiffs and DC & Sons in the present case, and Dan David, who represented Plaintiffs in the prior litigation. [Hr'g Tr., Mar. 21, 2013.] The only attorneys who spoke on the record were Epting and Kefalos. *Id.* Dan David was silent. *Id.* Mr. Epting asked Judge Young to approve an amended agreement regarding the assignment of the legal malpractice claim to "put the control in the [malpractice suit] in McNair and Pavilion and to void the assignment." [Hr'g Tr. 4:6-8.] Mr. Kefalos stated:

I didn't want to have Judge Nicholson issue an order about the validity of this one way or another because then it would create some precedent in South Carolina about this thing, and my feeling was the best thing to do is just take it off the table and void the assignment so he doesn't have to decide and we'll give up – return the right to control back to Pavilion and we can move forward.

[Hr'g Tr. 5:20 – 6:6.] Judge Young declined to approve the amended agreement, stating: "I'm a little concerned that you're asking the Court to do something to help you out in the position in another case and there is another party out there that has an interest in what we do here in that it affects their case." [Hr'g Tr. 6:8-12.] Further, Judge Young repeatedly stated that he was "uncomfortable" with what he was being asking to do and that his "inner alarms" were going off. [Hr'g Tr. 6:15-16, 21; 7:1, 13-14, 20-21; 8:14.]

9. In response to Requests for Admission served by Nexsen Pruet, Plaintiffs admit that Pavilion has not paid anything to satisfy the \$4.5 million judgment. [Ex. C, Nexsen Pruet's Mem. in Supp. of Mot. for Summ. J.] Moreover, it does not appear that Pavilion is at risk of having to pay the judgment, given that its counsel has asked the Court to keep the confession of judgment in place. [Hr'g Tr. 34:3-7, Mar. 13, 2013.] In addition, counsel submitted a proposed amended agreement to Judge Young stating that Pavilion agrees that DC & Sons retains the judgment and all rights as judgment creditor. [Ex. D, Pls' Sur-Reply to Def. Nexsen Pruet's Mem. in Supp. of Summ. J.]

These circumstances lend further support to the Court's conclusion that the proper remedy is dismissal with prejudice. Plaintiffs have used the court system to litigate a claim they do not own, without revealing this important fact to the Court or to the defendant. By assigning the proceeds, control, and the right to own all claims to DC & Sons, Plaintiffs completely and voluntarily relinquished their right to sue Nexsen Pruet for legal malpractice and breach of fiduciary duty. Further, after the hearing on the motion for summary judgment, Plaintiffs and DC & Sons went to another judge to try to have the assignment voided while the motion was still pending.

Additionally, the confession of judgment for an unsupported, multi-million dollar amount, coupled with the assignment of the legal malpractice claims, strongly suggest that collusion has occurred. The fact that counsel for Plaintiffs and DC & Sons seek to have the confession of judgment remain in place further supports the conclusion that Plaintiffs do not have any intention of paying the judgment and DC & Sons does not have any intention of executing on it, and therefore the confession was never intended to have any purpose other than to be used in a case against Nexsen Pruet as purported evidence of damages. At the very least, the Court finds that the opportunity for collusion was present.

Given these facts and circumstances, the Court concludes that this case is not a genuine legal malpractice case. It is an action to collect a judgment confessed. The Court concludes that the only proper remedy under the circumstances is dismissal with prejudice. By dismissing the case with prejudice, the Court is not ruling on the merits of the legal malpractice or breach of fiduciary duty claims, especially given that the claims have been brought by an entity that has never been a client of Nexsen Pruet.


Because this case was brought by Plaintiffs in name only and under circumstances that suggest collusion, or the opportunity for collusion, the Court declines to simply strike the assignment and allow the case to proceed as pled. The conduct of Plaintiffs and DC & Sons with respect to the courts and with respect to Nexsen Pruet cannot be undone with the stroke of a pen. The case is dismissed with prejudice.

CONCLUSION

Nexsen Pruet's Motion for Summary Judgment is granted on the basis that this case is proceeding pursuant to an assignment of a legal malpractice claim that is void as against public

policy. Accordingly, judgment is entered in favor of Nexsen Pruet as to all causes of action in the complaint and counterclaim, and this case is dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



The Honorable J.C. Nicholson, Jr.
Circuit Court Judge

Charleston, South Carolina

10/18, 2013

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

J.C. Nicholson, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2013-002796
Trial Court Case No. 2011-CP-10-05774

Pavilion Development Corp. & Larry McNair,Appellants,

v.

Nexsen Pruet, LLC,Respondent,

v.

DC & Sons, LLC,Counterclaim Defendant.

PROOF OF SERVICE


I certify that I have served Respondent's Motion to Strike Documents in Designation of Matter and to Require Appellants to File Amended Brief on May 6, 2014, by email and U.S. mail to:

Andrew Epting, Esq.
Michelle N. Endemann, Esq.
46A State Street
Charleston, SC 29401
ake@epting-law.com
mne@epting-law.com

George J. Kefalos, Esq.
Oana D. Johnson, Esq.
46A State Street
Charleston, SC 29401
george@kefaloslaw.com
oana@kefaloslaw.com

SOWELL GRAY STEPP & LAFFITTE, LLC

By: _____



Elizabeth Van Doren Gray

Tina Cundari

1310 Gadsden Street

Post Office Box 11449

Columbia, South Carolina 29211

(803) 929-1400

egray@sowellgray.com

tcundari@sowellgray.com

Attorneys for Nexsen Pruet, LLC

Columbia, South Carolina

May 6, 2014

RECEIVED

MAY 06 2014

SC Court of Appeals



TINA M. CUNDARI
Direct Dial 803 231.7834
Direct Fax 803 231.7863
Email tcundari@sowellgray.com

May 6, 2014

RECEIVED

MAY 06 2014

SC Court of Appeals

BY HAND DELIVERY

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
South Carolina Court of Appeals Clerk of Court
Edgar Brown Building
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Re: Pavilion Development Corp. & Larry McNair, Appellants v. Nexsen Pruet, LLC, Respondent
Appellate Case No: 2013-002796
SGSL No.: 5347/1509

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed for filing are an original and seven copies of Respondent's Motion to Strike Documents in Designation of Matter and to Require Appellants to File Amended Brief. Also enclosed is a check in the amount of \$25.00 for the filing fee. Please return a filed-stamped copy of the motion to me by way of our courier.

Thank you for your assistance. Please call me if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Tina Cundari

TMC:tc
Enclosure

cc: By Electronic and U.S. Mail
Andrew K. Epting, Jr., Esq.
George J. Kefalos, Esq.
Michelle N. Endemann, Esq.
Oana D. Johnson, Esq.
James G. Long, Esq. (by electronic mail only)