

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Town of Arcadia Lakes, Robert L. Jackson, Linda Z.
Jackson, Robert E. Williams, Barbara S. Williams,
Elizabeth M. Walker, Louis E. Spradlin, Thomas Hutto
Utsey, Tony Sinclair, Aaron Small, Bette Small, Gene F.
Starr, M.D., Elaine J. Starr, Sanford T. Marcus, Ruth L.
Marcus, and Steven Brown, Petitioners,

v.

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental
Control and Roper Pond, LLC, Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2013-001521

Lower Court Case No. 2009AL0700069

ORDER





We granted a petition for a writ of certiorari to review the court of appeals' decision in *Town of Arcadia Lakes v. South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control*, 404 S.C. 515, 745 S.E.2d 385 (Ct. App. 2013), in which the court of appeals affirmed certifications for certain construction activities (including land disturbance and storm water discharges) under a state-wide general permit. Essentially, Petitioners' contention is that Respondent Roper Pond, LLC, (Roper) does not qualify for coverage under a state-wide general permit, and therefore, Roper's construction activities are not authorized to proceed.

At oral argument before this Court, the parties conceded Roper's construction project proceeded and was completed during the pendency of this matter.¹ As all

¹ "[T]he serving and filing of the notice of appeal does not itself stay enforcement of the administrative law judge's decision." S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-610 (A)(2) (Supp. 2014); *see also* S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-600(H)(5) (Supp. 2014) ("A final decision issued by the Administrative Law Court in a contested case may not be stayed except by order of the Administrative Law Court or the court of appeals.");

construction activities subject to and authorized by the state-wide general permit have been completed, Roper's coverage under the state-wide general permit has now terminated.

Accordingly, we dismiss this matter as moot, as it is now impossible for this Court to grant any redress in the context of the issues as framed and litigated below (i.e., modify or revoke authorization for Roper's construction activities under the state-wide general permit).² See *Sloan v. Friends of Hunley, Inc.*, 369 S.C. 20, 26, 630 S.E.2d 474, 477 (2006) ("A moot case exists where a judgment rendered by the court will have no practical legal effect upon an existing controversy because an intervening event renders any grant of effectual relief impossible for the reviewing court. If there is no actual controversy, this Court will not decide moot or academic questions." (citing *Mathis v. South Carolina State Highway Dep't*, 260 S.C. 344, 346, 195 S.E.2d 713, 715 (1973))).

	_____	C.J.
	_____	J.
	_____	J.
	_____	J.
	_____	A.J.

Columbia, South Carolina

April 9, 2015

Rule 241(b)(11), SCACR (noting that, in appeals from administrative tribunals, the service of a notice of appeal does not automatically stay matters decided in orders).

² As to Petitioners' concerns regarding post-construction stormwater, sedimentation, and water-quality issues, counsel for Respondent South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) assured this Court at oral argument that DHEC has the ongoing ability to receive and investigate post-construction complaints and the prosecutorial discretion to initiate regulatory enforcement proceedings for any violations of applicable law.

cc:

W. Thomas Lavender, Jr., Esquire

Joan Wash Hartley, Esquire

Amy Elizabeth Armstrong, Esquire

Stephen Philip Hightower, Esquire

Jacquelyn Sue Dickman, Esquire

James Blanding Holman, IV, Esquire

The Honorable Jana Shealy