

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

JAN 16 2015

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
HONORABLE R. MARKLEY DENNIS, JR.

SC Court of Appeals

Case No. 2013-CP-10-7203
Appeal Case No. 2014-001907

Nationwide Property & Casualty
Insurance Company, Plaintiff/Appellant

V.

Gary Mccombs, Ragan McCombs and Robert G Albertt,
Defendants/Respondents

Brief of Appellant

TRACE DILLON
SC Bar No. 16857
Attorney for Appellant
THE DILLON LAW FIRM PC
1130 Hurricane Shoals Rd
Suite 600
Lawrenceville, GA 30043
(770) 513-6400 (Office)
(770) 513-6577 (Facsimile)
Trace@dillonlawfirm.com

Andrew Halio, Esq.
Law Office of Halio & Halio
68 1/2 QUEEN STREET
CHARLESTON, SC 29401
843/577-5200
Attorney for Respondent Gary McCombs

Helen F. Hiser
Robert R. Sansbury
McAngus, Goudlock & Courie LLC
P.O. Box 650007
Mount Pleasant SC 29465
843-576-2900
Attorneys for Respondent Ragan McCombs Albert

Table of Contents

1. Table of Contents [page 2]
2. Table of cases, statutes and authorities [page 2]
3. Statement of Issues on Appeal [page 3]
4. Statement of the Case [page 3]
5. Background facts relating to the case [page 4]
6. Argument [page 5]
7. Standard of Review [page 5]
8. Appellant has alleged sufficient facts to overcome Appellees Motions for Summary Judgment [page 6]
9. Conclusion [page 8]

I. Table of cases, statutes and other authorities.

1. Rule 56 SCRPC [pages 5,]
2. Lord v. D&J Enters. 407 S.C. 544, 757 S.E. 2d 695 (2014) [page 6]
3. Willams v. Chesterfield Lumber Co., 267 S.C. 607, 230 S.E. 2d 447 (1976) [page 6, 7]

II. Statement of Issues on Appeal

Whether the trial court erred in granting defendants motions for summary judgment on Plaintiff's negligence case.

III. Statement of the Case

Appellant Nationwide Property & Casualty Insurance Company ("Nationwide") filed its subrogation action to recover property damage payments made to its insured Alison Smith Thornly ("Ms.Thornly"). Appellants allege the Appellees Gary McCombs and Ragan Mccombs Albert ("Appellees") caused the damage by failing to keep water from leaking from their condominium on December 17, 2013. Amended Complaint para. 10 and 11. Plaintiff seeks to recover \$18,923.91 in payments plus interest and costs in its Amended Complaint. The original complaint was amended on February 19, 2014. The defendants answered generally denying the complaint. Discovery was conducted and the parties filed Motions for Summary Judgment. This appeal comes from the granting of summary judgment, prior to trial, to all Defendants. The Appeal was filed on September 4, 2014 and appeals the Trial Court's Order dated August 4, 2014.

A. Background facts relating to the case:

As developed in the pleadings, affidavits and discovery, Ms. Thornly made a claim on its policy with Nationwide for water damage she discovered on December 17, 2010. See Affidavit of Rich Gallion at Para 6 and Deposition of Ms. Thornly at pages 26-30.

Ms. Thornly owned a condominium at 1515 Cambridge Lakes Drive Mount Pleasant SC 29462. See Affidavit of Rich Gallion at Para 6a and Deposition of Ms. Thornly at pages 6-7. The Appellee Ragan McCombs Albert owns the unit above Ms. Thornly and Appellee Gary McCombs installed a hot water heater after a leak that occurred in 2009 that may have leaked a second time. See Affidavit of Gary McCombs. Ms. Thornly believes, and Nationwide concluded after it's investigation, that this was the second time Ms. Thornly's apartment had been harmed by water damage from the Appellees unit. See Affidavit of Rich Gallion at Para 6 and Deposition of Ms. Thornly at pages 26-30. Ms. Thornly was told the second leak came from the Appellees unit. Deposition of Ms. Thornly at page 24. The Defendants affidavits filed in this case do not deny a leak came from their condominium, only that the leak did not come from the hot water heater. See Affidavit of Ragan McCombs Albert

and Affidavit of Gary Mccombs. The defendants admit that there had been a previous leak from their condominium. See Affidavit of Ragan MCombs Albert and Affidavit of Gary Mccombs. Ms. Thornly testified that the same damage occurred again. Deposition of Ms. Thornly at page 22. Ms Thornly also testified that the appellant sent a representative over to assess the damage. Deposition of Ms. Thornly at page 25. Richard Gallion testified that it was determined that the loss was the result of water intrusion from the above condominium unit for both incidents. Affidavit of Richard Gallion at para 6.

After filing suit to recover on the claim and before trial, Appellees filed Motions for Summary Judgment. These motions were granted and Appellant now appeals this decision. Based on the above facts and following arguments of law, Appellants asks that this court reverse the trial court ruling and deny the Appellees Motions for Summary Judgment.

IV. Argument

A. Standard of Review:

Summary judgment is only appropriate where there is no genuine issue of material fact and it is clear the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law. Rule 56

SCRCP. With respect to a motion for summary judgment, in determining whether any triable issues of fact exist, the court must view the evidence and all reasonable inferences that may be drawn from the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Lord v. D & J Enters., 407 S.C. 544, 757 S.E. 2d 695 (2014). In cases applying the preponderance of the evidence burden of proof, the non-moving party is only required to submit a mere scintilla of evidence in order to withstand a motion for summary judgment. Id. Because summary judgment is a drastic remedy, it should be cautiously invoked to ensure a litigant is not improperly deprived of a trial on disputed factual issues. Id. An appellate court reviews the granting of summary judgment under the same standard applied by the trial court pursuant to S.C.R. Civ. P. 56. Id.

B. Appellant has alleged sufficient facts to overcome

Appellees Motions for Summary Judgment:

In Williams v. Chesterfield Lumber Co, the South Carolina Supreme court was faced with a factual scenario similar to this case. In the Williams case, a repairman was injured when he entered a machine to fix it. The machine became unexpectedly operational and the workman was

injured. The injured workman was unable to identify who started the machine or who was negligent. The trial court granted summary judgment against the workman and the South Carolina Supreme Court reversed. The Supreme Court held that there was an issue as to whether the Defendants were negligent. Williams v. Chesterfield Lumber Co. 267 S.C. 607, 230 S.E. 2d 447 (1976).

In this case, appellant has alleged that the Appellees negligently allowed water to intrude into its insured's condominium on two occasions. See Affidavit of Rich Gallion at Para 6 and Deposition of Ms. Thornly at pages 26-30. Moreover, Ms. Thornly (Appellant's insured) was told the second leak came from the Appellees unit. Deposition of Ms. Thornly at page 24. Ms. Thornly testified that the same damage occurred again. Deposition of Ms. Thornly at page 22. Ms Thornly testified that the appellant sent a representative over and assess the damage. Deposition of Ms. Thornly at page 25. Richard Gallion testified that it was determined that the loss was the result of water intrusion from the above condominium unit for both incidents. Affidavit of Richard Gallion at para 6. The defendants have not denied that water came from their conodominium on the second occasion, only that it was

not from a hot water heater. See Affidavit of Ragan MCombs Albert and Affidavit of Gary Mcombs. There is direct evidence of Rich Gallions Affidavit that the Appellant determined that the water came from Appellees condominium. In addition, Ms. Thornly's testimony that the same damage occurred a second time leads to a reasonable inference that the damage was caused by a leak from Appellees condominium. Indeed, Appellees do not deny a leak came from their unit, only that the leak was not from the same hot water heater.

Given this evidence and reasonable inference, there is more than a scintilla of evidence that Appellees are liable for the damage. Construing the facts in the light most favorable to appellant requires that the trial court be reversed and that the drastic remedy of summary judgment be vacated.

Conclusion

Wherefore, for the reasons cited above, Appellant requests this court grant its appeal, deny Defendants Motions for Summary Judgment and remand this case for trial.

Respectfully Submitted this 15 Day of July, 2015, by:

BY: 

TRACE DILLON

Bar No. 16857

Attorney for Appellant

THE DILLON LAW FIRM PC

1130 Hurricane Shoals Rd

Suite 600

Lawrenceville, GA 30043

(770) 513-6400 (Office)

(770) 513-6577 (Facsimile)

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

HONORABLE R. MARKLEY DENNIS, JR.

RECEIVED

JAN 16 2015

SC Court of Appeals

Case No. 2013-CP-10-7203

Appeal Case No. 2014-001907

Nationwide Property & Casualty

Insurance Company, Plaintiff/Appellant

v.

Gary McCombs, Ragan McCombs and Robert G Albertt,

Defendants/Respondents

Designation of Matters to be included in the Record on

Appeal


Comes now Appellant in the above styled matter and for its Designation of Matters to be included in the Record on Appeal states that the following items should be included:

1. Amended Complaint;
2. Affidavit of Gary McCombs;
3. Transcript of Deposition of Alison Smith Thornly;

4. Affidavit of Richard Gallion and exhibits attached thereto;
5. Order of Court dated August 4, 2014;
6. Affidavit of Ragan McCombs Albert;
7. Plaintiff's Reply to Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment.

Appellant certifies that the Designation does not contain a matter irrelevant to the appeal.

Respectfully Submitted this 15 Day of July 2015, by:

BY: 
TRACE DILLON
Bar No. 16857
Attorney for Appellant
THE DILLON LAW FIRM PC
1130 Hurricane Shoals Rd
Suite 600
Lawrenceville, GA 30043
(770) 513-6400 (Office)
(770) 513-6577 (Facsimile)

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
HONORABLE R. MARKLEY DENNIS, JR.

RECEIVED
JAN 16 2015
SC Court of Appeals

Case No. 2013-CP-10-7203
Appeal Case No. 2014-001907

Nationwide Property & Casualty
Insurance Company, Plaintiff/Appellant

V.

Gary McCombs, Ragan McCombs and Robert G Albertt,
Defendants/Respondents

Certificate of Service

This is to certify that I have this day served a copy
of the foregoing Initial Brief of Appellant and designation
of the Record by U.S. Mail, sufficient postage prepaid and
addressed as follows:

Andrew Halio, Esq.
Law Office of Halio & Halio
68 1/2 QUEEN STREET
CHARLESTON, SC 29401
843/577-5200
Attorney for Respondent Gary McCombs

Helen F. Hiser
Robert R. Sansbury
McAngus, Goudlock & Courie LLC
P.O. Box 650007
Mount Pleasant SC 29465
843-576-2900
Attorneys for Respondent Ragan McCombs Albert

Dated this 15 day of July, 2015.

BY: TD
TRACE DILLON
Bar No. 16857
Attorney for Appellant
THE DILLON LAW FIRM PC
1130 Hurricane Shoals Rd
Suite 600
Lawrenceville, GA 30043
(770) 513-6400 (Office)
(770) 513-6577 (Facsimile)

Trace Dillon, Esq.
Admitted to GA, SC & TN
Bars

THE DILLON LAW FIRM, PC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1130 Hurricane Shoals Rd
Suite 600
Lawrenceville, GA 30043

Toll Free (855) 591-0067
Facsimile (770) 513-6577
trace@dillonlawfirmpc.com
www.dillonlawfirmpc.com

November 10, 2014

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS


Clerk of Court of Appeals
1015 Sumter Street
Columbia SC 29201

RE: NATIONWIDE PROPERTY & CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY
VS. GARY MCCOMBS
RAGAN MCCOMBS ALBERT
Our File No.: 13001448
Appeal Case Number: 2014-001907

Dear Clerk:

Enclosed, please find Documents to file.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to call.

Sincerely yours,
THE DILLON LAW FIRM PC

TRACE DILLON

cc: Andrew Steven Halio
Robert Rhett Sansbury, III
Helen Faith Hiser

RECEIVED

JAN 16 2015

SC Court of Appeals



From: (770) 513-6400
 christy dillon
 the dillon law firm, pc
 1130 HURRICANE SHOALS ROAD
 SUITE 600
 lawrenceville, GA 30043

Origin ID: MGEA



J142214092303.lv

Ship Date: 15JAN15
 ActWgt: 0.5 LB
 CAD: 2735250/NET3550

Delivery Address Bar Code



SHIP TO: (770) 513-6400 **BILL SENDER**
CLERK OF COURT FOR APPEALS


1015 SUMTER STREET
 COLUMBIA, SC 29201

Ref #
 Invoice #
 PO #
 Dept #

FRI - 16 JAN AA
 STANDARD OVERNIGHT


TRK# 7725 8985 5998

0201



XH USCA

29201
 SC-US
 CAE



522G1&F15/8AC9

After printing this label:

1. Use the 'Print' button on this page to print your label to your laser or inkjet printer.
2. Fold the printed page along the horizontal line
3. Place label in shipping pouch and affix it to your shipment so that the barcode portion of the label can be read and scanned.

Warning: Use only the printed original label for shipping. Using a photocopy of this label for shipping purposes is fraudulent and could result in additional billing charges, along with the cancellation of your FedEx account number.
 Use of this system constitutes your agreement to the service conditions in the current FedEx Service Guide, available on fedex.com. FedEx will not be responsible for any claim in excess of \$100 per package, whether the result of loss, damage, delay, non-delivery, misdelivery, or misinformation, unless you declare a higher value, pay an additional charge, document your actual loss and file a timely claim. Limitations found in the current FedEx Service Guide apply. Your right to recover from FedEx for any loss, including intrinsic value of the package, loss of sales, income interest, profit, attorney's fees, costs, and other forms of damage whether direct, incidental, consequential, or special is limited to the greater of \$100 or the authorized declared value. Recovery cannot exceed actual documented loss. Maximum for items of extraordinary value is \$1,000, e.g. jewelry, precious metals, negotiable instruments and other items listed in our Service Guide. Written claims must be filed within strict time limits, see current FedEx Service Guide.