

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

ORIGINAL

APPEAL FROM FLORENCE COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

R. Knox McMahon, Circuit Judge

2013-CP-21-927
Appeals Case No. 2013-001622

Derick Ward , Appellant

Vs.

Margaret Ashbaugh Respondent

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF

RECEIVED

MAY 08 2014

SC Court of Appeals

LOUIS D. NETTLES
Folkens Law Firm, PA
PO Box 6139
Florence, South Carolina 29502
Attorney for Respondent
843-665-0100

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES -ii-

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL -iii-

I. DID THE MAGISTRATES COURT HAVE SUBJECT MATTER
JURISDICTION OVER A DISPUTE BETWEEN PARTIES OVER
A RENT TO OWN AGREEMENT INVOLVING A
MANUFACTURED HOME VALUED AT \$7,000. -iii-

III. ARE APPELLANT’S PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS CLAIMS
PRESERVED FOR APPEAL -iii-

STATEMENT OF THE CASE -1-

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS -3-

ARGUMENT -5-

THE MAGISTRATES COURT HAD SUBJECT MATTER
JURISDICTION OVER A DISPUTE BETWEEN PARTIES OVER
A RENT TO OWN AGREEMENT INVOLVING A
MANUFACTURED HOME VALUED AT \$7,000. -5-

QUESTIONS II AND III -7-

II. APPELLANT’S SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS CLAIMS ARE
NOT PRESERVED FOR APPEAL -7-

III. APPELLANT’S PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS CLAIMS ARE NOT
PRESERVED FOR APPEAL -7-

CONCLUSION -8-

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Holy Loch Distribs., Inc. v. Hitchcock, 340 S.C. 20, 531 S.E.2d 282 (2000) . . . -8-

I'ON, LLC v. Town of Mt. Pleasant, 338 S.C. 406, 526 S.E.2d 716 (S.C., 2000)
..... -8-

Lake v. Reeder Constr. Co., 330 S.C. 242, 248, 498 S.E.2d 650, 653-54
(Ct.App.1998) -6-

Majors v. S.C. Sec. Comm'n, 373 S.C. 153, 159, 644 S.E.2d 710, 713 (2007) . -6-

Peterson v. Peterson, 333 S.C. 538, 547, 510 S.E.2d 426, 431 (Ct.App.1998) . -6-

Pye v. Estate of Fox, 633 S.E.2d 505, 369 S.C. 555 (S.C., 2006) -8-

Staubes v. City of Folly Beach, 339 S.C. 406, 529 S.E.2d 543 (2000) -8-

STATUTES

§22-3-10 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (1976) -5-, -7-

§23-3-10 (10) Code of Laws of South Carolina (1976) as amended -6-

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

I. DID THE MAGISTRATES COURT HAVE SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OVER A DISPUTE BETWEEN PARTIES OVER A RENT TO OWN AGREEMENT INVOLVING A MANUFACTURED HOME VALUED AT \$7,000.

II. ARE APPELLANT'S SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS CLAIMS PRESERVED FOR APPEAL

III. ARE APPELLANT'S PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS CLAIMS PRESERVED FOR APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is an appeal from a June 7, 2013 decision of the Florence County Circuit Court upholding a magistrate court's order of ejectment against Appellant Derick Ward.

On March 26, 2013, Ashbaugh filed an Application for a Rule to Vacate or Show Cause in the Florence County Magistrate's Court. RoA p. 7. In her Application, Ashbaugh alleged that Ward had "failed to pay rent when due or demanded." RoA p. 8. On March 28, 2013, Ward filed an Answer.

On April 4, 2013, the Magistrate conducted a hearing on the merits of Ashbaugh's summary ejectment action. RoA. 13. Both parties appeared pro se and no transcript of the hearing was taken, although a summary of the parties' testimony is given by the Magistrate in his Return. After hearing from both parties, the Magistrate issued a Writ of Ejectment against Ward. RoA p. 5

Following the issuance of the Writ of Ejectment, Ward retained counsel and timely appealed the magistrate's decision to the Florence County Circuit Court. RoA p. 10-12. On April 11, 2013, the magistrate held a bond hearing, ordered the Writ stayed and required Ward to pay Ashbaugh \$200 per month during the pendency of the appeal. RoA p. 6 Also on April 11, 2013, the Magistrate tiled a Return on Appeal, in which he stated: "[T]his court could only conclude that the Plaintiff was the actual owner of the home and that any agreement to rent to own was breached by the failure

of the Defendant to make payments as required and therefore the Plaintiff had a right to evict the Defendant." RoA p. 17. Ashbaugh then hired counsel, who filed a Response to the Appeal.

On June 7, 2013, the circuit court heard Ward's appeal from the Magistrate's ejectment ruling. RoA p. 23-32. Following the hearing, in a Form 4 Order the circuit court affirmed the issuance of the Writ of Ejectment, stating: "This Court finds that the magistrate did have jurisdiction." RoA p. 2-3.

On June 17, 2013, Ward tiled a Rule 59 Motion to Reconsider, requesting an explanation of the court's holding or a new hearing on the merits RoA p. 20 In his Motion, Ward contended: "this Court did not rule as to whether or not there was a landlord-tenant relationship." RoA p. 20-21. Following the circuit court's denial of Ward's Motion, (RoA p. 4) he filed this appeal with the South Carolina Court of Appeals.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

In December 2011, Appellant Derick Ward and his aunt, Respondent Margaret Ashbaugh, made an oral agreement that Ward would "rent to own" Ashbaugh's manufactured home. RoA p. 9; RoA p. 13. The parties agreed to a purchase price of \$7,000, to be paid in monthly installments of \$200. RoA p. 13. In August 2012, the owner of the lot upon which the home was situated ordered Ashbaugh to remove the home from the property. RoA p. 13. Thereafter, Ward moved the home to a lot rented by Ward's girlfriend, Brandy Blackburn, located at 2911 Effingham Highway, Effingham, South Carolina.' RoA p. 13-14 Subsequently, Ashbaugh issued a bill of sale for the home to Blackburn. RoA p. 14.

According to the Return, Ashbaugh stated that Ward "agreed to rent to own the mobile home by verbal agreement for a price of \$7000 in 'as is condition' in October 2011." RoA p. 13 Ashbaugh also stated that Ward "agreed to pay the lot rent to a third party...and make a rent to own payment of \$200 per month on the mobile home," as well as "pay the property taxes" on the mobile home. RoA p. 13. Ward stated that he agreed to purchase the mobile home for \$7000 at \$200 per month. RoA p. 13-14 . The Magistrate's Return also states that both parties agreed that Ashbaugh issued a Bill of Sale to Ward (through his live-in girlfriend, Brandy Blackburn), as Ward and Blackburn were responsible for moving the mobile home from one lot to another and

required the Bill of Sale to do so. RoA p. 13-14 agreed, Ward and Blackburn moved the mobile home to a lot that they are currently leasing from a third party. (Id. at 5.) The parties disagreed as to (1) whether the cost of moving and setting up the mobile home on a new lot would be deducted from the purchase price, and (2) whether Ward tendered the balance of the purchase price to Ashbaugh after moving the mobile home. After hearing from both parties, the Magistrate issued a Writ of Ejectment against Ward. RoA p. 5. According to the Return, Ashbaugh stated that Ward "agreed to rent to own the mobile home by verbal agreement for a price of \$7000 in 'as is condition' in October 2011." (Id.) Ashbaugh also stated that Ward "agreed to pay the lot rent to a third party...and make a rent to own payment of \$200 per month on the mobile home," as well as "pay the property taxes" on the mobile home. (Id.) Ward stated that he agreed to purchase the mobile home for \$7000 at \$200 per month. (Id.) The Magistrate's Return also states that both parties agreed that Ashbaugh issued a Bill of Sale to Ward (through his live-in girlfriend, Brandy Blackburn), as Ward and Blackburn were responsible for moving the mobile home from one lot to another and required the Bill of Sale to do so. As agreed, Ward and Blackburn moved the mobile home to a lot that they are currently leasing from a third party. The parties disagreed as to (1) whether the cost of moving and setting up the mobile home on a new lot would be deducted from the purchase price, and (2) whether Ward tendered the balance of the purchase price to Ashbaugh after moving the mobile home. After

hearing from both parties, the Magistrate issued a Writ of Ejectment against Ward.

RoA p. 5

ARGUMENT

THE MAGISTRATES COURT HAD SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OVER A DISPUTE BETWEEN PARTIES OVER A RENT TO OWN AGREEMENT INVOLVING A MANUFACTURED HOME VALUED AT \$7,000.

The sole issue presented by this appeal is the existence of subject matter jurisdiction of the Magistrates Court.

The parties appeared before the Magistrate and tried this case on April 4, 2013. No objection was made as to the timing of the hearing or the jurisdiction of the Magistrate's Court. The parties presented the case as a dispute over the ownership of a manufactured home that Ward purchased from Ashbaugh for \$7,000.00.

The civil jurisdiction of the Magistrate's Court is set out in §22-3-10 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (1976) as amended. Subparagraph 11 of that grant of jurisdiction includes jurisdiction

in any action to recover the possession of personal property claimed, the value of which ... does not exceed the sum of seven thousand five hundred dollars;

Magistrates Court jurisdiction also extends to all matters between landlord and tenant, without limitation as to the value of the property. §23-3-10 (10) S.C. Code.

This appeal seeks to raise a subject matter jurisdiction challenge to the

judgement below. Because the pro se pleading were couched in terms of a landlord tenant dispute Ward now contends that the Magistrates Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction. No issue of jurisdiction was raised at trial. The records shows that the actual dispute between the parties was over a manufactured home valued at less than seven thousand five hundred dollars. While this objection was not raised at trial, subject matter jurisdiction can be raised for the first time on appeal. Lack of subject matter jurisdiction can be raised at any time, even for the first time on appeal, by a party or by the court. *Lake v. Reeder Constr. Co.*, 330 S.C. 242, 248, 498 S.E.2d 650, 653-54 (Ct.App.1998). "Subject matter jurisdiction is the power to hear and determine cases of the general class to which the proceedings in question belong." *Majors v. S.C. Sec. Comm'n*, 373 S.C. 153, 159, 644 S.E.2d 710, 713 (2007). "The jurisdiction of a court over the subject matter of a proceeding is determined by the Constitution, the laws of the state, and is fundamental." *Peterson v. Peterson*, 333 S.C. 538, 547, 510 S.E.2d 426, 431 (Ct.App.1998).

Ward's brief acknowledges that this dispute tried by the magistrate was over a manufactured home valued at less that \$7,000.

The uncontested facts in this case show that the relationship between Ashbaugh and Ward is not that of a landlord and a tenant, but rather that of a seller and a purchaser of personal property. The parties in this case agree that they had an oral contract whereby Ward was purchasing the mobile home on a rent-to-own basis from Ashbaugh, paying \$200 a month, and that those monthly payments we going toward the purchase price of \$7,000. Once Ward paid the full \$7,000, Ashbaugh would transfer the paper title to Ward. This seller-purchaser

relationship is distinct from the landlord-tenant relationship.
Appellant's Brief page 12.

So the question for this Court is whether or not such a dispute is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Magistrate's court. §23-3-10 (11) is the grant by the legislature of that subject matter jurisdiction to the Magistrates Court. Since the dispute before the Magistrate is within the Magistrate's jurisdiction, Ward's appeal must fail, as the Circuit Judge ruled.

QUESTIONS II AND III

II. APPELLANT'S SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS CLAIMS ARE NOT PRESERVED FOR APPEAL

III. APPELLANT'S PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS CLAIMS ARE NOT PRESERVED FOR APPEAL

Ward's remaining arguments are not properly preserved for appeal.


Ward's claims as to substantive due process and procedural due process are raised for the first time on appeal RoA p. 10-12. The notice of appeal does not raise these questions and they were not argued before the Circuit Court. RoA p. 23-26. Unlike challenges to subject matter jurisdiction which may be raised at anytime, these questions must be presented to the trial court. It is well settled that an issue cannot be raised for the first time on appeal, but must have been raised to and ruled upon by the trial court to be preserved. See generally *I'ON, LLC v. Town of Mt. Pleasant*, 338 S.C. 406, 526 S.E.2d 716 (S.C., 2000) *Holy Loch Distribs., Inc. v. Hitchcock*, 340 S.C. 20,

531 S.E.2d 282 (2000); *Staubes v. City of Folly Beach*, 339 S.C. 406, 529 S.E.2d 543 (2000). *Pye v. Estate of Fox*, 633 S.E.2d 505, 369 S.C. 555 (S.C., 2006). Because Appellant Ward did not raise these issues before the Magistrate or before the Circuit Court, this court should not consider them.

CONCLUSION

The record below shows that the dispute between the parties was within the subject matter of the Magistrates Court and the remaining claims were not presented to the Magistrate or the Circuit Court, therefore the ruling of the Circuit Court should be affirmed..

Respectfully submitted



LOUIS D. NETTLES
Folkens Law Firm, PA
PO Box 6139
Florence, South Carolina 29502
Attorney for Respondent
843-665-0100

May 5, 2014

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM FLORENCE COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

R. Knox McMahon, Circuit Judge

Appeals Case No. 2013-001622

Derick Ward, Appellant

Vs.


Margaret Ashbaugh Respondent

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Respondent's Brief on Appellant's Attorney by depositing a copies of the same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on May 7, 2014, addressed to the following address:

David E. Tait Esq
320 S. Coit St.
Florence SC 20501

May 7, 2014



LOUIS D. NETTLES
Folkens Law Firm, PA
PO Box 6139
Florence, South Carolina 29502
Attorney for Appellants
843-665-0100

RECEIVED

MAY 08 2014

SC Court of Appea

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM FLORENCE COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

R. Knox McMahon, Circuit Judge

Appeals Case No. 2013-001622

Derick Ward, Appellant


Vs.

Margaret Ashbaugh Respondent

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

The undersigned certifies that the Respondent's Brief complies with Rule 211(b), SCACR.

May 7, 2014



LOUIS D. NETTLES
Folkens Law Firm, PA
PO Box 6139
Florence, South Carolina 29502
Attorney for Respondent
843-665-0100

RECEIVED

MAY 08 2014

SC Court of Appeals