



# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS  
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN  
DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
1220 SENATE STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890  
FAX: (803) 734-1839  
[www.sccourts.org](http://www.sccourts.org)

July 06, 2015

The Honorable Julie J. Armstrong  
100 Broad St Ste 106  
Charleston SC 29401-2210

## REMITTITUR

Re: Arthur Rowe v. Bon Secours  
Lower Court Case No. 2013CP1000090  
Appellate Case No. 2013-001682

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

*V. Claire Allen, Deputy*

CLERK

Enclosure

cc: Arthur Peter Rowe  
Darren Kent Sanders, Esquire  
Fred W. Suggs, III, Esquire

Jack G Gresh, Esquire  
Andrew Steven Halio, Esquire  
Jonathan Hopkins Dunlap, Esquire  
James Bernard Hood, Esquire  
Christine Kent Toporek, Esquire  
Stephen Lynwood Brown, Esquire  
Russell Grainger Hines, Esquire  
Joseph John Tierney, Jr., Esquire  
Deborah Harrison Sheffield, Esquire  
Robert H. Hood, Esquire  
The Honorable R. Markley Dennis, Jr.

R. Markley Dennis, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2015-UP-288  
Submitted May 1, 2015 – Filed June 17, 2015

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Arthur Peter Rowe, of Charleston, pro se.

James B. Hood, Robert H. Hood, and Deborah H. Sheffield, all of the Hood Law Firm, LLC, of Charleston, for Respondent Christine C. Thompson, M.D.; Darren K. Sanders, of Buyck, Sanders & Simmons, LLC, of Mount Pleasant, for Respondents Byron N. Bailey, M.D. and Charleston Neurosurgical Associates, LLC; Jack G. Gresh, of Hall Booth Smith, P.C., of Charleston, for Respondent Charleston Surgery Center Limited Partnership d/b/a Charleston Surgery Center; Andrew S. Halio, of Halio & Halio, of Charleston, for Respondent Steven Heath Cobb; Jonathan H. Dunlap, of Batten Lee, PLLC, of Raleigh, North Carolina, for Respondents Nurse Anesthesia of South Carolina, LLC, Jeffery S. Wager, CRNA, and Tammy McGraw, CRNA, a/k/a Tammy McGraw Speicher, CRNA; Fred W. Suggs, III of Roe Cassidy Coates & Price, P.A., of Greenville, for Respondents Bon Secours Health Systems, Inc., Bon Secours St. Francis Health System Foundation, Inc., and Bon Secours St. Francis Hospital; and Stephen L. Brown, Joseph J. Tierney, Jr., Christine Kent Toporek, and Russell Grainger Hines, all of Young Clement Rivers, LLP, of Charleston, for Respondents Bon Secours-St. Francis Xavier Hospital, Inc. d/b/a Bon Secours St. Francis Xavier Hospital and Roper St. Francis Healthcare, Bon Secours St. Francis Health System, Inc., d/b/a Bon Secours St. Francis Xavier Hospital and Roper St. Francis Healthcare, Roper St. Francis Healthcare,

Roper St. Francis Foundation, d/b/a Roper St. Francis  
Healthcare, Roper St. Francis Healthcare, and Roper  
Hospital, Inc., d/b/a Roper St. Francis Healthcare.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Arthur Peter Rowe appeals a circuit court order dismissing his loss of consortium case under Rule 12(b)(6), SCRPC. Rowe argues the circuit court judge erred by (1) dismissing Rowe's complaint because he did not contemporaneously file an expert witness affidavit in compliance with sections 15-36-100 and 15-79-125 of the South Carolina Code (Supp. 2014), (2) finding the exception to the contemporaneous filing requirement codified in section 15-36-100(C)(1) was inapplicable, and (3) not recusing himself. We affirm.

1. As to issues one and two, we affirm because the record does not indicate Rowe ever filed or otherwise produced an expert witness affidavit at any time or that he requested an extension to file an affidavit. *See* Rule 220(c), SCACR ("The appellate court may affirm any ruling, order, decision or judgment upon any ground(s) appearing in the Record on Appeal."); *Wilkinson v. E. Cooper Cmty. Hosp., Inc.*, 410 S.C. 163, 169-70, 763 S.E.2d 426, 430 (2014) ("On appeal from the dismissal of a case pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), an appellate court applies the same standard of review as the [circuit] court. That standard requires the [c]ourt to construe the complaint in a light most favorable to the nonmovant and determine if the facts alleged and the inferences reasonably deducible from the pleadings would entitle the plaintiff to relief on any theory of the case." (internal citations and quotation marks omitted)); § 15-36-100 (governing the filing requirements for complaints alleging professional negligence); § 15-36-100(B) (requiring a plaintiff alleging professional negligence to submit with his complaint an expert witness affidavit that "must specify at least one negligent act or omission claimed to exist and the factual basis for each claim based on the available evidence at the time of the filing of the affidavit"); § 15-36-100(C)(1) (allowing a plaintiff additional time to file an expert affidavit after filing his complaint: forty-five days or as extended by the circuit court upon motion); *id.* ("If an affidavit is not filed within the period specified in this subsection or as extended by the [circuit] court and the defendant against whom an affidavit should have been filed alleges, by motion to dismiss filed contemporaneously with its initial responsive pleading that the plaintiff has failed to file the requisite affidavit, the complaint is subject to dismissal for failure to state a claim.").

2. We find issue three is not preserved for our review. *See Ness v. Eckerd Corp.*, 350 S.C. 399, 403-04, 566 S.E.2d 193, 196 (Ct. App. 2002) (stating a recusal issue is unpreserved if the circuit court does not rule on it and the appellant does not file a Rule 59(e), SCRPC, motion requesting a ruling).

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>1</sup>

**THOMAS, KONDUROS, and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.