

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

R. Markley Dennis, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2015-001644

RECEIVED  
OCT 01 2015  
SC Court of Appeals

Shipwatch Condominium Association, Inc.,.....Appellant,

v.

Carolina Concrete Systems, Inc.; Sisroy Engineering, LLC, Robert G. Sisroy,  
individually; Terrence J. McKelvey; Glasgow Roofing, Inc.; GlassTec, Inc.;  
Spectech, Inc.; Sonneborn, Inc.; Chimney Sweeps, Inc.; Low Country Chimneys, Inc.;  
EFCO Corp; W.C. Johnston Architectural Sales, Inc.; Charleston Glass Company, Inc.;  
First Exteriors, LLC; Acrocrete, Inc.; BASF Corp; Gary Freeman Architect, Inc.;  
Gary Freeman, individually; .....Defendants,

Of Which Carolina Concrete Systems, Inc.; Sisroy Engineering, LLC, Robert G. Sisroy,  
individually; Terrence J. McKelvey; Glasgow Roofing, Inc.; GlassTec, Inc.;  
Sonneborn, Inc.; EFCO Corp; W.C. Johnston Architectural Sales, Inc.; Charleston Glass  
Company, Inc.; First Exteriors, LLC; Acrocrete, Inc.; BASF Corp; Gary Freeman  
Architect, Inc.; Gary Freeman, individually; are..... Respondents.

Oscar Mendiondo, individually and as representative of a class of similarly situated owners  
of condominium units in the horizontal property regime known as Shipwatch  
Condominiums,

.....Appellants

v.

Carolina Concrete Systems, Inc.; Sisroy Engineering, LLC, Robert G. Sisroy,  
individually; Terrence J. McKelvey; Glasgow Roofing, Inc.; GlassTec, Inc.;  
Spectech, Inc.; Sonneborn, Inc.; Chimney Sweeps, Inc.; Low Country Chimneys, Inc.;  
EFCO Corp; W.C. Johnston Architectural Sales, Inc.; Charleston Glass Company, Inc.;  
First Exteriors, LLC; Acrocrete, Inc.; BASF Corp; Gary Freeman Architect, Inc.;  
Gary Freeman, individually; .....Defendants,

Of Which Concrete Systems, Inc.; Sisroy Engineering, LLC, Robert G. Sisroy,  
individually; Terrence J. McKelvey; Glasgow Roofing, Inc.; GlassTec, Inc.;

Sonneborn, Inc.; EFCO Corp; W.C. Johnston Architectural Sales, Inc.; Charleston Glass Company, Inc.; First Exteriors, LLC; Acrocrete, Inc.; BASF Corp; Gary Freeman Architect, Inc.; Gary Freeman, individually; are ..... Respondents.

---

INITIAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT FIRST EXTERIORS, LLC

---

Jonathan J. Anderson  
Danielle B. Wegener  
ANDERSON REYNOLDS &  
STEPHENS, LLC  
37 ½ Broad Street  
P O Box 87  
Charleston, SC 29402  
843-723-0185  
[janderson@arlawsc.com](mailto:janderson@arlawsc.com)  
[dwegener@arlawsc.com](mailto:dwegener@arlawsc.com)

AND

James H. Elliott, Jr.  
Richardson Plowden & Robinson, PA  
40 Calhoun Street  
Charleston, SC 29401  
843-805-6550  
[jelliott@richardsonplowden.com](mailto:jelliott@richardsonplowden.com)

*Attorneys for Respondent  
First Exteriors, LLC*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... 2

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL ..... 4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE ..... 5

FACTS OF THE CASE ..... 8

ARGUMENT ..... 11

I. APPELLANTS’ ARGUMENT CHALLENGING THE TRIAL COURT’S ORDER GRANTING CAROLINA CONCRETE PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT IS NOT PRESERVED FOR REVIEW BECAUSE APPELLANTS FAILED TO FILE A MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND THE JUDGMENT AFTER THE TRIAL COURT’S FORMAL ORDER WAS ISSUED. .... 11

II. THE TRIAL COURT PROPERLY APPLIED SCRPC 56(C) IN CONSIDERING CAROLINA CONCRETE’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT. .... 12

III. PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AGAINST APPELLANTS WAS PROPER BASED ON THE TRIAL COURT’S APPLICATION OF THE DISCOVERY RULE TO THE ACCRUAL OF APPELLANTS’ CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST CAROLINA CONCRETE. .... 19

CONCLUSION ..... 24

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Barr v. City of Rock Hill</i> , 330 S.C. 640, 500 S.E.2d 157 (Ct.App. 1998) . . . . .	14, 18
<i>Baughman v. American Tel. &amp; Tel. Co.</i> , 306 S.C. 101, 410 S.E.2d 537 (1991) . . . . .	13
<i>Binkley v. Burry</i> , 352 S.C. 286, 573 S.E.2d 838, (Ct. App. 2002) . . . . .	18
<i>Brailsford v. Brailsford</i> , 380 S.C. 443, 452, 669 S.E.2d 342 (Ct. App. 2008) . . . . .	12
<i>Brown v. Sandwood Development Corp.</i> , 277 S.C. 581, 291 S.E.2d 375 (1982) . . . . .	13
<i>Cluett, Peabody &amp; Company, Inc. v. Campbell, Rea, Hayes &amp; Large</i> , 492 F.Supp. 67 (Pa. 1980) . . . . .	21
<i>Creech v. South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Dep't.</i> , 328 S.C. 24, 491 S.E.2d 571 (1997). . . . .	11
<i>David v. McLeod Regional Medical Center</i> , 367 S.C. 242, 626 S.E.2d 1 (2006) . . . . .	13
<i>Dean v. Ruscon Corp.</i> , 321 S.C. 360,468 S.E.2d 645(1996) . . . . .	14, 17, 23
<i>Dillon County Sch. Dist. v. Lewis Sheet Metal Works, Inc.</i> , 286 S.C. 207, 332 S.E.2d 555 (Ct.App.1985) . . . . .	14, 17, 20, 21
<i>Graniteville Co. v. IH Servs., Inc.</i> ,316 S.C. 146, 447 S.E.2d 226 (Ct.App.1994) . . . . .	14
<i>Harrison v. Bevilaqua</i> , 354 S.C. 129, 138, 580 S.E.2d 109 (2003) . . . . .	21
<i>Hooper v. Ebenezer Sr. Services and Rehab. Center</i> , 386 S.C. 108, 687 S.E.2d 29 (2009) . . . . .	19
<i>I'On, LLC v. Town of Mt. Pleasant</i> , 338 S.C. 406, 411, 526 S.E.2d 716, 724 (2000) . . . . .	11
<i>Kelly v. Logan, Jolley &amp; Smith, L.L.P.</i> , 383 S.C. 626, 682 S.E.2d 1 (2009) . . . . .	14, 15, 17
<i>Kreutner v. David</i> , 320 S.C. 283, 465 S.E.2d 88 (1995) . . . . .	14
<i>Osborne v. Adams</i> , 346 S.C. 4, 550 S.E.2d 319 (2001) . . . . .	13
<i>Ross v. Ross</i> , 394 S.C. 261, 715 S.E.2d 359 (Ct.App. 2011) . . . . .	19
<i>Snell v. Columbia Gun Exchange, Inc.</i> , 276 S.C. 301, 278 S.E.2d 333(1981) . . . . .	14

<i>True v. Monteith</i> , 327 S.C. 116, 119, 489 S.E.2d 615 (1997) .....	14
<i>Watters v. Terminix Services, Inc.</i> , 376 S.C. 632, 658 S.E.2d 110 (Ct. App. 2008).....	17
<i>Wilder Corp. v. Wilke</i> , 330 S.C. 71, 479 S.E.2d 510 (1998) .....	11

**Statutes**

S.C. Code Ann. § 15-3-530 .....	13
S.C. Code Ann. § 15-3-535 .....	13

**Court Rules**

Rule 56(c), SCRCP .....	12, 13
Rule 58(a), SCRCP .....	12

**STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL**

- I. IS APPELLANTS' ARGUMENT CHALLENGING THE TRIAL COURT'S ORDER GRANTING CAROLINA CONCRETE PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT PRESERVED FOR REVIEW, WHEN APPELLANTS FAILED TO FILE A MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND THE JUDGMENT AFTER THE TRIAL COURT'S FORMAL ORDER WAS ISSUED?**
  
- II. DID THE TRIAL COURT PROPERLY APPLY RULE 56(C), SCRPC IN CONSIDERING CAROLINA CONCRETE'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT?**
  
- III. DID THE TRIAL COURT PROPERLY APPLY THE DISCOVERY RULE TO THE ACCRUAL OF APPELLANTS' CAUSE OF ACTION IN ITS DETERMINATION THAT CAROLINA CONCRETE WAS ENTITLED TO PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AGAINST APPELLANT?**

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is a construction defects lawsuit involving the Shipwatch condominiums (hereinafter "Project") located on Isle of Palms, South Carolina. The Project was originally constructed in the 1980's. First Exteriors, LLC (hereinafter "First Exteriors") served as a stucco subcontractor during a series of renovations which were performed to the buildings between the years 2002 and 2011. Carolina Concrete Systems, Inc. (hereinafter "Carolina Concrete") served as the general contractor during these repairs and renovations.

Appellant Shipwatch Condominium Association filed the instant lawsuit on June 13, 2012 against Carolina Concrete, First Exteriors, and other entities involved in the renovations. (ROA \_\_\_; Shipwatch Condominium Association Summons and Complaint). A companion case was filed against the same parties on behalf of the individual condominium owners by Oscar Mendiondo as class representative. (ROA \_\_\_; Mendiondo Summons & Complaint).

On September 12, 2014, Carolina Concrete filed a motion for summary judgment based on the statute of limitations against Appellant. (ROA \_\_\_; Carolina Concrete's Motion for Summary Judgment). A memorandum in support of this motion with attached exhibits was filed on October 27, 2014. (ROA \_\_\_; Carolina Concrete's Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment and attached exhibits). Appellants also filed a memorandum in opposition to Carolina Concrete's motion for summary judgment with attached exhibits. (ROA \_\_\_; Appellant's Memorandum in Opposition to Carolina Concrete's Motion for Summary Judgment and attached exhibits). A hearing was held by the trial court on Carolina Concrete's motion for summary judgment on October 27,

2014. At the hearing, counsel for Carolina Concrete presented argument in support of its motion for summary judgment and counsel for Appellants presented argument in opposition. (ROA \_\_\_; Hrg. Transcript p.2, line 1 – p. 7, line 12).

The trial court issued an oral order granting Carolina Concrete partial summary judgment based on the statute of limitations for any work performed at the Project prior to 2010. (ROA \_\_\_; Hrg. Transcript p.6, lines 20 - 22). The trial court signed a Form 4 Order granting Carolina Concrete partial summary judgment, which was filed on October 30, 2014. (ROA \_\_\_; Order granting Carolina Concrete Partial Summary Judgment). On November 11, 2014, prior to Carolina Concrete's submission of a proposed formal order granting them partial summary judgment, Appellants filed a motion for reconsideration of the Order granting Carolina Concrete Partial Summary Judgment. (ROA \_\_\_; Appellants' Motion for Reconsideration). On November 21, 2014, Appellants filed a Supplemental Response in Opposition to Carolina Concrete's Motion for Summary Judgment and Memorandum in Support of their Motion for Reconsideration and Rehearing. (ROA \_\_\_; Appellants' Supplemental Response in Opposition to Carolina Concrete's Motion for Summary Judgment and Memorandum in Support of their Motion for Reconsideration and Rehearing). On December 1, 2014, the Court issued an Order denying Appellants' Motion for Reconsideration. (ROA \_\_\_; Order denying Motion for Reconsideration).

Appellants filed Notices of Appeal in each case on December 30, 2014, appealing the Order granting summary judgment in part to Carolina Concrete. (ROA \_\_\_; Shipwatch Condominium Association Notice of Appeal, Mendiondo Notice of Appeal). Appellants filed Amended Notices of Appeal on January 8, 2015. (ROA \_\_\_; Shipwatch

Condominium Association Amended Notice of Appeal, Mendiondo Amended Notice of Appeal).

On July 2, 2015, the Court of Appeals dismissed the appeals on the grounds that the order from which the appeals were taken was not a final judgment upon which an appeal may be taken because the trial court's form order stated that a formal order was to follow. (ROA \_\_\_, Order Dismissing Appeal). The Court of Appeals issued a Remittitur on July 2, 2015. (ROA \_\_\_, Remittitur).

Following the cases being remitted to the trial court, the trial court conducted a status conference regarding the cases on July 27, 2015 after which it entered a formal order granting partial summary judgment to Carolina Concrete. (ROA \_\_\_, Order granting Carolina Concrete partial summary judgment). Without filing any motion for reconsideration of the trial court's formal order granting Carolina Concrete partial summary judgment, Appellants filed a Notice of Appeal on July 28, 2015. (ROA \_\_\_, Shipwatch Condominium Association Notice of Appeal dated July 28, 2015; ROA \_\_\_, Mendiondo Notice of Appeal dated July 28, 2015). Although the order from which this appeal stems grants partial summary judgment to only Carolina Concrete, the Appellants identified all defendants as Respondents to the appeal.<sup>1</sup> The Court of Appeals consolidated the appeals in the above-captioned cases on August 14, 2015. (ROA \_\_\_, Correspondence from Court of Appeals dated August 14, 2015). Appellants filed their initial brief on August 27, 2015.

---

<sup>1</sup> First Exteriors disagrees that it is a proper party to this appeal. First Exteriors has filed its own motion for summary judgment, which is stayed pending this appeal. First Exteriors has filed this brief out of an abundance of caution to the extent necessary to protect the record and ensure no findings by this Court adversely affect First Exteriors. First Exteriors does not waive any right to a hearing or decision on its pending motion for summary judgment by participating in this appeal.

## FACTS OF THE CASE

This is a construction defects case involving the Shipwatch condominiums located on the Isle of Palms, South Carolina. The Project includes four EIFS-clad oceanfront buildings which were constructed in the mid 1980's. Appellants filed a lawsuit against the Respondents on June 13, 2012 related to alleged deficiencies in the construction of the Project.

None of the Respondents were involved in the original construction of the Project. In 2002, Carolina Concrete was hired by Appellants as a general contractor to perform various renovations and upgrades to the four buildings, including the partial removal of the EIFS (exterior insulation finish system) cladding and replacement with a DEFS system (Durock wall system). Appellants elected to perform these renovations in a piecemeal approach over a period of several years spanning from 2002 to 2011. First Exteriors acted as a subcontractor of Carolina Concrete and was involved in the partial removal of the original EIFS and replacement with a DEFS system.

For several years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, Appellants were aware that there were issues with the construction of the Project. The below timeline of events highlights Appellants' repeated notice of issues with the construction of the Project:

- February 2005- Shipwatch Property Manager Linda Jernigan testified that leaking sliding glass doors had been a problem at Shipwatch since she returned to manage the property in February 2005. (ROA \_\_\_\_, Depo. of Linda Jernigan p. 219:8-18, p. 230: 9-12).

- April 1, 2005 – Shipwatch Board of Directors Meeting Minutes noted leaks continued at some sliding glass doors, including the fifth floor penthouse doors. (ROA \_\_\_\_, Shipwatch Board of Directors Mtg. of April 1, 2005).
- July 10, 2006 - Robert Sisnroy, P.E. issued a report to Appellants identifying chronic water intrusion at the sliding glass doors. (ROA \_\_\_\_; Sisnroy report of July 10, 2006, Exhibit to Carolina Concrete’s Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment).
- January 20, 2007 – Shipwatch Building Committee issued a report stating that a number of units on the fourth and fifth floors are experiencing leaking sliding glass doors. (ROA \_\_\_\_; Shipwatch Building Committee Report of January 20, 2007, Exhibit to Carolina Concrete’s Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment).
- March 9, 2007 - Shipwatch HOA Building Report issued acknowledging that past HOA boards have been well aware of a leakage problem with the sliding glass doors. (ROA \_\_\_\_; Shipwatch HOA Building Report, Exhibit to Carolina Concrete’s Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment).
- May 10, 2007 - Carolina Concrete issued an Exterior Building Inspection Report to Appellant stating that damage is being caused to new metal studs behind the DEFS from leaks which continue to be a problem at and around the old sliding glass doors. (ROA \_\_\_\_; Carolina Concrete Building Inspection Report, Exhibit to Carolina Concrete’s Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment).
- August 23, 2008 – Robert Sisnroy, P.E. issued a report to Appellant titled “Roof Flashing Installation Deficiencies and Exterior Cladding Failure Investigation”

which identified evidence of blistering of the DEFS lamina off of the concrete board substrate. Sisroy reported that this condition was indicative of DEFS failure. Sisroy also reported raised joint lines in the field of the wall in the areas of the first three floors and cracking of the DEFS on the stair towers. (ROA \_\_\_; Sisroy Report of August 23, 2008, Exhibit to Appellant's Supplemental Response to Carolina Concrete's Motion for Summary Judgment and Memorandum in Support of Motion for Reconsideration).

- February 5, 2009 – Carolina Concrete Inspection Report to Appellants stated that leaks continued to be a problem at and around the old sliding glass doors on the beachfront and golf course side of the buildings. Carolina Concrete notes that they have repeatedly shown the property manager and numerous board members the leaks, and they are sure that damage is occurring in the new metal stud walls with the DEFS. (ROA \_\_\_, Carolina Concrete Building Inspection Report dated February 5, 2009).

Despite repeated notice of issues with the construction of the Project, Appellants elected not to investigate the extent of the problems or to remove and replace all of the failed building components at that time. Appellants did not engage any engineers to investigate the Project until Sutton Kennerly & Associates, Inc. (hereinafter "SKA") was hired in January 2012. Appellants delayed filing suit until June 13, 2012 or five years and 11 months after Robert Sisroy, P.E. issued a report to Appellants identifying chronic water intrusion at the sliding glass doors.

## ARGUMENT

### **I. APPELLANTS' ARGUMENT CHALLENGING THE TRIAL COURT'S ORDER GRANTING CAROLINA CONCRETE PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT IS NOT PRESERVED FOR REVIEW BECAUSE APPELLANTS FAILED TO FILE A MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND THE JUDGMENT AFTER THE TRIAL COURT'S FORMAL ORDER WAS ISSUED.**

“It is axiomatic that an issue cannot be raised for the first time on appeal, but must have been raised to and ruled upon by the trial judge to be preserved for appellate review.” *Wilder Corp. v. Wilke*, 330 S.C. 71 (1998) citing *Creech v. South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Dep't.*, 328 S.C. 24, 491 S.E.2d 571 (1997). “The losing party must first try to convince the lower court it has ruled wrongly and then, if that effort fails, convince the appellate court that the lower court erred. This principle underlies the long-established preservation requirement that the losing party generally must both present his issues and arguments to the lower court and obtain a ruling before an appellate court will review those issues and arguments.” *I'On, LLC v. Town of Mt. Pleasant*, 338 S.C. 406, 411, 526 S.E.2d 716, 724 (2000). “If the losing party has raised an issue in the lower court, but the court fails to rule upon it, the party must file a motion to alter or amend the judgment in order to preserve the issue for appellate review.” *Id.* “Imposing this preservation requirement on the appellant is meant to enable the lower court to rule properly after it has considered all relevant facts, law, and arguments.” *Id.*

Appellants did not file a motion to alter or amend the judgment after the trial court issued its formal order granting partial summary judgment to Carolina Concrete. Although prior to the previous appeal in this case Appellants filed a motion for reconsideration, this was done before the formal order granting partial summary

judgment to Carolina Concrete was issued. In the Order of the Court of Appeals dismissing the previous appeal in this case, Chief Judge John Few stated that Appellants' motion for reconsideration was premature because the form order was not a "judgment" under the rules of civil procedure. (ROA \_\_\_\_, Order Dismissing Appeal). "An oral order of the court is not final and binding until reduced to writing, signed by the judge and delivered for recordation." *Brailsford v. Brailsford*, 380 S.C. 443, 452, 669 S.E.2d 342, 346 (Ct. App. 2008). SCRPC Rule 58(a) provides in part that "Every judgment shall be set forth on a separate document. A judgment is effective only when so set forth and entered in the record." Rule 58(a), SCRPC.

By not filing a motion to alter or amend the judgment before this appeal, the Appellants did not give the trial court the opportunity to fully consider its arguments in opposition to Carolina Concrete's motion for partial summary judgment. Appellants state in their brief that the trial court's order mischaracterizes Plaintiffs' claims, yet there was no motion to alter or amend filed following the written order which would give the trial court the opportunity to fully consider Appellants' arguments in its ruling. Therefore, the issue of whether the trial court erred in granting Carolina Concrete partial summary judgment is not preserved for review.

## **II. THE TRIAL COURT PROPERLY APPLIED SCRPC 56(C) IN CONSIDERING CAROLINA CONCRETE'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.**

### **A. Standard of Review.**

In reviewing the grant of a summary judgment motion, the appellate court applies "the same standard which governs the trial court under Rule 56(c), SCRPC: summary judgment is proper when there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and the moving

party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” *Osborne v. Adams*, 346 S.C. 4, 7, 550 S.E.2d 319 (2001) (quoting *Baughman v. American Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 306 S.C. 101, 115, 410 S.E.2d 537 (1991)); Rule 56(c), SCRCP.

**B. The trial court correctly applied SCRCP Rule 56(c) in considering Carolina Concrete’s motion for summary judgment.**

Rule 56(c) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure provides, “The judgment sought shall be rendered forthwith 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), SCRCP.

“A court considering summary judgment neither makes factual determinations nor considers the merits of competing testimony; however, summary judgment is completely appropriate when a properly supported motion sets forth facts that remain undisputed or are contested in a deficient manner.” *David v. McLeod Regional Medical Center*, 367 S.C. 242, 250, 626 S.E.2d 1, 5 (2006).

Appellants allege that the trial court failed to apply the proper standard for considering a motion for summary judgment by disregarding the existence of an issue of material fact as to when the Appellant discovered its legal claim against Respondents. This argument lacks merit. The applicable statute of limitations for Appellants’ causes of action against Respondents is three (3) years. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 15-3-530. The courts of South Carolina have adopted the “discovery rule” to determine when the statute of limitations begins to run. S.C. Code Ann. § 15-3-535. The discovery rule applies to construction defect cases. *See Brown v. Sandwood Development Corp.*, 277 S.C. 581, 583, 291 S.E.2d 375, 376 (1982). “Under the discovery rule, the statute of limitations

begins to run from the date the injured party either knows or should know, by the exercise of reasonable diligence that a cause of action exists for the wrongful conduct.” *True v. Monteith*, 327 S.C. 116, 119, 489 S.E.2d 615, 616 (1997). See also *Dean v. Ruscon Corp.*, 321 S.C. 360, 468 S.E.2d 645 (1996); *Barr v. City of Rock Hill*, 330 S.C. 640, 644-645, 500 S.E.2d 157, 160 (Ct. App. 1998). “Furthermore, the statute is not delayed until the injured party seeks advice of counsel or develops a full-blown theory of recovery; instead, reasonable diligence requires a plaintiff to act with some promptness.” *Kelly v. Logan, Jolley & Smith, L.L.P.*, 383 S.C. 626, 633, 682 S.E.2d 1, 4 (2009). “A party has constructive notice if the party knows of ‘facts and circumstances of an injury [that] would put a person of common knowledge and experience on notice that some right ... has been invaded or that some claim against another party might exist.’ ” *Barr*, 330 S.C. at 645, 500 S.E.2d at 160 citing *Graniteville Co. v. IH Servs., Inc.*, 316 S.C. 146, 148, 447 S.E.2d 226, 228 (Ct.App.1994) (quoting *Snell v. Columbia Gun Exchange, Inc.*, 276 S.C. 301, 303, 278 S.E.2d 333, 334 (1981)). “Failure of the injured party to comprehend the full extent of damages, however, is immaterial.” *Id.* citing *Dean v. Ruscon Corp.*, 321 S.C. 360, 468 S.E.2d 645; *Dillon County Sch. Dist. v. Lewis Sheet Metal Works, Inc.*, 286 S.C. 207, 332 S.E.2d 555 (Ct.App.1985); *Kelly v. Logan, Jolley & Smith, L.L.P.*, 383 S.C. at 635. “The date on which discovery should have been made is an objective, not subjective, question.” *Id.* citing *Kreutner v. David*, 320 S.C. 283, 285-86, 465 S.E.2d 88, 90 (1995).

“Statutes of limitations are not simply technicalities.” *Kelly*, 383 S.C. at 632. “On the contrary, they have long been respected as fundamental to a well-ordered judicial system.” *Id.* “Statute of limitations embody important public policy concerns as they

stimulate activity, punish negligence, and promote repose by giving security and stability to human affairs.” *Kelly v. Logan, Jolley & Smith, L.L.P.*, 383 S.C. 626, 632 (2009).

The below timeline of events highlights Appellants’ repeated notice of issues with the construction of the Project:

- February 2005- Shipwatch Property Manager Linda Jernigan testified that leaking sliding glass doors had been a problem at Shipwatch since she returned to manage the property in February 2005. (ROA \_\_\_\_, Depo. of Linda Jernigan p. 219:8-18, p. 230: 9-12).
- April 1, 2005 – Shipwatch Board of Directors Meeting Minutes noted leaks continued at some sliding glass doors, including the fifth floor penthouse doors. (ROA \_\_\_\_, Shipwatch Board of Directors Mtg. of April 1, 2005).
- July 10, 2006 - Robert Sisroy, P.E. issued a report to Appellants identifying chronic water intrusion at the sliding glass doors. (ROA \_\_\_\_; Sisroy report of July 10, 2006, Exhibit to Carolina Concrete’s Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment).
- January 20, 2007 – Shipwatch Building Committee issued a report stating that a number of units on the fourth and fifth floors are experiencing leaking sliding glass doors. (ROA \_\_\_\_; Shipwatch Building Committee Report of January 20, 2007, Exhibit to Carolina Concrete’s Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment).
- March 9, 2007 - Shipwatch HOA Building Report issued acknowledging that past HOA boards have been well aware of a leakage problem with the sliding glass

doors. (ROA \_\_\_; Shipwatch HOA Building Report of March 9, 2007, Exhibit to Carolina Concrete's Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment).

- May 10, 2007 - Carolina Concrete issued an Exterior Building Inspection Report to Appellant stating that damage is being caused to new metal studs behind the DEFS from leaks which continue to be a problem at and around the old sliding glass doors. (ROA \_\_\_; Carolina Concrete Building Inspection Report of May 10, 2007, Exhibit to Carolina Concrete's Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment).
- August 23, 2008 – Robert Sisroy, P.E. issued a report to Appellant titled “Roof Flashing Installation Deficiencies and Exterior Cladding Failure Investigation” which identified evidence of blistering of the DEFS lamina off of the concrete board substrate. Sisroy reported that this condition was indicative of DEFS failure. Sisroy also reported raised joint lines in the field of the wall in the areas of the first three floors and cracking of the DEFS on the stair towers. (ROA \_\_\_; Sisroy Report of August 23, 2008, Exhibit to Appellant's Supplemental Response to Carolina Concrete's Motion for Summary Judgment and Memorandum in Support of Motion for Reconsideration).
- February 5, 2009 – Carolina Concrete Inspection Report to Appellants stated that leaks continued to be a problem at and around the old sliding glass doors on the beachfront and golf course side of the buildings. Carolina Concrete notes that they have repeatedly shown the property manager and numerous board members the leaks, and they are sure that damage is occurring in the new metal stud walls

with the DEFS. (ROA \_\_\_\_, Carolina Concrete Building Inspection Report dated February 5, 2009).

Appellants' knowledge of issues with the construction of the Project placed Appellants on notice that it may have a claim against another party. Whether or not Appellants understood the full extent of the damages to the Project is immaterial. *See Dean v. Ruscon Corp.*, 321 S.C. 360, 468 S.E.2d 645 (1996); *Dillon County Sch. Dist. v. Lewis Sheet Metal Works, Inc.*, 286 S.C. 207, 332 S.E.2d 555 (Ct.App.1985); *Kelly v. Logan, Jolley & Smith, L.L.P.*, 383 S.C. 626, 635, 682 S.E.2d 1(2009). Appellants acknowledge in their brief that they were aware that the EIFS cladding was failing and the sliding glass doors were leaking more than three years prior to the filing of this lawsuit but argue that this does not constitute knowledge for purposes of triggering the statute of limitations to begin running. (Appellants' Brief at p. 8). This argument lacks merit.

The important date under the discovery rule is the date of discovery of the injury, not the date of discovery of the wrongdoer. Identifying the wrong source of damages does not delay the triggering of the statute of limitations. *Watters v. Terminix Services, Inc.*, 376 S.C. 632, 635, 658 S.E.2d 110, 112 (Ct. App. 2008)(plaintiff's expert identified the source of a moisture problem in the crawl space as related to the installation of the duct work. Plaintiff brought a claim against the HVAC installer, but failed to bring a claim within the statute of limitations against Terminix for not disclosing the moisture damage.)

“Once a reasonable person has reason to believe that some right of his has been invaded or that some claim against another party might exist, the requirement of

reasonable diligence to investigate this information further takes precedence over the inability to ascertain the amount of damages or even the possibility that damages may be forthcoming at all.” *Binkley v. Burry*, 352 S.C. 286, 297-298, 573 S.E.2d 838, 843 (Ct. App. 2002).

In *Barr v. City of Rock Hill*, the plaintiff homeowners filed suit against the developers and the City based on the sale and construction of their home. The defendants asserted the statute of limitations as a defense to plaintiff’s claims. After purchasing their home, plaintiff’s annual termite inspections revealed excessive moisture under the plaintiffs’ home, yet plaintiffs failed to file suit until after they received a report from a forensic engineer several years later which highlighted certain construction issues with the house. The Court, in holding that plaintiffs’ claims were barred by the statute of limitations, found that the termite inspection reports advised plaintiffs of water and other problems under their house, but Plaintiffs failed to correct the problems or investigate further to determine the extent of the problems. “If the [plaintiffs] had exercised reasonable diligence and investigated the problems noted in the termite inspection reports, they could have realized the magnitude of the problem and brought suit before the statute of limitations ran. They failed to act, however, and let the statute of limitations expire on any claim against the City or [developer].” *Barr v. City of Rock Hill*, 330 S.C. 640, 645-646 (1998).

Here, similarly the Appellants were repeatedly put on notice that they had problems with the buildings. The Record on Appeal is replete with evidence that Appellants were aware of issues with the construction of the Project more than three years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, and the timeline above highlights some of it.

Appellants even acknowledge in their brief and through testimony of Shipwatch homeowners awareness of issues with the EIFS and sliding glass doors. ( Appellants' Brief p. 8; ROA \_\_\_; Depo. of Fred Trombino p. 37, line 24 – p. 38, line 17; ROA \_\_\_; Depo. of Arnie Schaewe p. 78, lines 1-19; ROA \_\_\_; Depo. of Linda Jernigan taken on July 15, 2014, p. 219, lines 8-23). However, Appellants failed to investigate these issues further to determine the extent of the damage. Appellants waited until January 2012 to engage the services of SKA to investigate the Project. Appellants have failed to act with reasonable diligence to determine the extent of the problems with the Project and allowed the statute of limitations to expire.

**III. PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AGAINST APPELLANTS WAS PROPER BASED ON THE TRIAL COURT'S APPLICATION OF THE DISCOVERY RULE TO THE ACCRUAL OF APPELLANTS' CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST CAROLINA CONCRETE.**

**A. The Statute of Limitations expired prior to the filing of this action by Appellants and is not subject to equitable tolling.**

“‘Tolling’ refers to suspending or stopping the running of a statute of limitations; it is analogous to a clock stopping, then restarting.” *Hooper v. Ebenezer Sr. Services and Rehab. Center*, 386 S.C. 108, 115, 687 S.E.2d 29, 32 (2009). “Equitable tolling typically applies in cases where a litigant was prevented from filing suit because of an extraordinary event beyond his or her control.” *Hooper v. Ebenezer Sr. Services and Rehab. Center*, 386 S.C. 108, 115, 687 S.E.2d 29, 32 (2009); *Ross v. Ross*, 394 S.C. 261, 264, 715 S.E.2d 359, 360 (Ct.App. 2011)( “The time requirements in lawsuits between private litigants are customarily subject to equitable tolling if such tolling is necessary to prevent unfairness to a diligent plaintiff.”) “[E]quitable tolling is a doctrine that should be used sparingly and only when the interests of justice compel its use.” *Id.* at 117. The

burden of establishing sufficient facts to justify equitable tolling is borne by the party asserting the statute of limitations should be tolled. *Id.*

Appellants focus on the case of *Dillon County School* for the proposition that the statute of limitations should be tolled based on the conduct of Carolina Concrete. However, the actions of Carolina Concrete do not rise to the level of those of the defendants in *Dillon County School* and do not warrant the tolling of the statute of limitations. See *Dillon County School Dist. No. Two v. Lewis Sheet Metal Works, Inc.*, 286 S.C. 207, 332 S.E.2d 555 (Ct. App. 1985). Further, there is no evidence of First Exteriors taking any action which would toll the statute of limitations as to claims against it. In *Dillon County School*, the school filed suit regarding the design and construction of the school roof. The roof began leaking before the building was completely finished and became a persistent problem. *Id.* at 210. The architect reached out to the school and provided assurances that the issues with the roof would be corrected to the school's satisfaction. *Id.* at 211-212. They also employed roofing experts to investigate the leaks, met with the school multiple times to discuss the roof issues, and made repeated repairs to the roof. *Id.* The conduct of Carolina Concrete in this case does not rise to the level of the architect in *Dillon County School*. Unlike in *Dillon County School*, upon notification of blistering of the DEFS outlined in a report prepared by Robert Sisroy, P.E. on August 23, 2008, Appellants reached out to Carolina Concrete and requested that they "repair the failed claddings in accordance with the manufacturer's installation requirements and warranty requirements." (ROA \_\_\_; Sisroy Report of August 23, 2008, Exhibit 18 to Plaintiff's Supplemental Response in Opposition to Carolina Concrete's Motion for Summary Judgment). At that point it was clear that Appellants were on notice that the

DEFS was allegedly failing. Carolina Concrete did not reach out to Appellants and provide assurances as the architect did in *Dillon County School*, but instead Appellants reached out to them. Also, Carolina Concrete did not employ any expert to investigate the issues with the DEFS identified by Sisroy in his 2008 report.

Appellants also argue that the statute of limitations should be tolled based on the continuing work performed by Carolina Concrete on the project. However, South Carolina has declined to adopt the “continuous treatment” exception to the general rule regarding the accrual of a cause of action. *Harrison v. Bevilaqua*, 354 S.C. 129, 138, 580 S.E.2d 109, 113 (2003); *Dillon County School Dist. No. Two v. Lewis Sheet Metal Works, Inc.*, 286 S.C. 207, 332 S.E.2d 555 (1985). In *Dillon County School*, the Court declined to apply the continuous treatment exception based on the defendants’ continuous efforts to repair the school’s leaking roof. *Dillon County School*, 286 S.C. at 217, 332 S.E.2d at 560. In considering the issue, the Court looked to the Pennsylvania case of *Cluett, Peabody & Company, Inc. v. Campbell, Rea, Hayes & Large*, 492 F. Supp. 67 (Pa. 1980), where the court applied the discovery rule and held that plaintiff’s claims regarding the construction of the roof were barred by the statute of limitations despite the defendants’ efforts to repair the roof over a long period of time. If the continuous treatment rule were to apply, “a cause of action for breach of warranty or negligent performance ... would never accrue so long as the defendants periodically did some repair work, however ineffectual.” *Dillon County School*, 286 S.C. at 217, 332 S.E.2d at 560 (citing *Cluett, Peabody & Company, Inc. v. Campbell, Rea, Hayes & Large*, 492 F.Supp. at 77).

Additionally, the work performed by Carolina Concrete and its subcontractors, including First Exteriors, was not one continuous project as suggested by Appellants.

The below timeline shows the breakdown:

- November 5, 2002- Work by Carolina Concrete and subcontractors begins on the Project. Carolina Concrete enters into contract with Appellants for waterproofing repairs, application of traffic coating, and chimney repairs (ROA \_\_\_\_, Contract between Shipwatch and Carolina Concrete dated November 5, 2002).
- September 22, 2003 – Carolina Concrete enters into contract with Appellants for window and door repairs, re-sloping of balconies, and the removal of EIFS and replacement with DEFS on the end walls, fourth and fifth floors street side, stairwells, elevator towers, and privacy walls. (ROA \_\_\_\_, Contract between Shipwatch and Carolina Concrete dated September 22, 2003; ROA \_\_\_\_, Proposal of Carolina Concrete dated June 3, 2003).
- February 2, 2005 – Work at Shipwatch by Carolina Concrete and subcontractors ends and final pay application submitted. (ROA \_\_\_\_; February 2, 2005 Facsimile from Bob Wiggins to Shipwatch Properties, Exhibit to Appellants' Supplemental Response to Carolina Concrete's Motion for Summary Judgment).
- December 19, 2008 – Carolina Concrete enters into contract for the removal and replacement of 16 EFCO doors (ROA \_\_\_\_, December 19, 2008 Contract of Carolina Concrete)

- September 1, 2010 – Removal of EIFS on the ocean side of buildings A and B begins. (ROA \_\_\_; September 1, 2010 Contract between Shipwatch and Carolina Concrete, Exhibit to Appellants’ Supplemental Response in Opposition to Carolina Concrete’s Motion for Summary Judgment and Memorandum in Support of Motion for Reconsideration).


As demonstrated above, the work performed at the Project was not continuous. There is a large gap of time when Carolina Concrete and its subcontractors were not completing any repairs at the Project. The EIFS was removed and replaced in two separate phases from 2003-2005 and 2010-2011, and each phase involved different areas of the buildings. (ROA \_\_\_; Sisroy Report of August 23, 2008; ROA \_\_\_ Carolina Concrete Proposal of April 26, 2010; ROA \_\_\_; September 1, 2010 Contract between Carolina Concrete and Shipwatch.) Appellants are not entitled to equitable tolling of the statute of limitations based on a continuation of repair because separate contracts were entered into with Appellants for each particular scope of work completed and the repairs performed on the project were not continuous.

Appellants cite the case of *Dean v. Ruscon Corp.* for the proposition that the statute of limitations should be tolled based upon the investigations performed by SKA. However, similar to the plaintiff in *Dean*, Appellants failed to act with reasonable diligence. Appellants did not hire the SKA engineers to investigate the property until several years after Appellants were informed of issues with the construction of the Project. Despite knowledge of construction issues at the Project, Appellants chose not to take action and instead let the building components continue to deteriorate. Appellants’

failure to act with reasonable diligence in pursuing a claim is no reason to toll the statute of limitations until Appellants became aware of further damages to the Project.

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, First Exteriors respectfully requests that the decision of the trial court be affirmed.



Jonathan J. Anderson  
Danielle B. Wegener  
ANDERSON REYNOLDS &  
STEPHENS, LLC  
37 ½ Broad Street  
P O Box 87  
Charleston, SC 29402  
843-723-0185

AND

James H. Elliott, Jr.  
RICHARDSON PLOWDEN &  
ROBINSON, PA  
40 Calhoun Street  
Charleston, SC 29401  
843-805-6550

*Attorneys for Respondent  
First Exteriors, LLC*

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

R. Markley Dennis, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2015-001644

RECEIVED

OCT 01 2015

SC Court of Appeals

Shipwatch Condominium Association, Inc.,.....Appellant,

v.

Carolina Concrete Systems, Inc.; Sisroy Engineering, LLC, Robert G. Sisroy,  
individually; Terrence J. McKelvey; Glasgow Roofing, Inc.; GlassTec, Inc.;  
Spectech, Inc.; Sonneborn, Inc.; Chimney Sweeps, Inc.; Low Country Chimneys, Inc.;  
EFCO Corp; W.C. Johnston Architectural Sales, Inc.; Charleston Glass Company, Inc.;  
First Exteriors, LLC; Acrocrete, Inc.; BASF Corp; Gary Freeman Architect, Inc.;  
Gary Freeman, individually; .....Defendants,

Of Which Carolina Concrete Systems, Inc.; Sisroy Engineering, LLC, Robert G. Sisroy,  
individually; Terrence J. McKelvey; Glasgow Roofing, Inc.; GlassTec, Inc.;  
Sonneborn, Inc.; EFCO Corp; W.C. Johnston Architectural Sales, Inc.; Charleston Glass  
Company, Inc.; First Exteriors, LLC; Acrocrete, Inc.; BASF Corp; Gary Freeman  
Architect, Inc.; Gary Freeman, individually; are..... Respondents.

Oscar Mendiondo, individually and as representative of a class of similarly situated owners  
of condominium units in the horizontal property regime known as Shipwatch  
Condominiums,  
.....Appellants

v.

Carolina Concrete Systems, Inc.; Sisroy Engineering, LLC, Robert G. Sisroy,  
individually; Terrence J. McKelvey; Glasgow Roofing, Inc.; GlassTec, Inc.;  
Spectech, Inc.; Sonneborn, Inc.; Chimney Sweeps, Inc.; Low Country Chimneys, Inc.;  
EFCO Corp; W.C. Johnston Architectural Sales, Inc.; Charleston Glass Company, Inc.;  
First Exteriors, LLC; Acrocrete, Inc.; BASF Corp; Gary Freeman Architect, Inc.;  
Gary Freeman, individually; .....Defendants,

Of Which Concrete Systems, Inc.; Sisroy Engineering, LLC, Robert G. Sisroy,  
individually; Terrence J. McKelvey; Glasgow Roofing, Inc.; GlassTec, Inc.;

Sonneborn, Inc.; EFCO Corp; W.C. Johnston Architectural Sales, Inc.; Charleston Glass Company, Inc.; First Exteriors, LLC; Acrocrete, Inc.; BASF Corp; Gary Freeman Architect, Inc.; Gary Freeman, individually; are ..... Respondents.

---

PROOF OF SERVICE

---

I certify that I have served Respondent First Exteriors, LLC's Initial Brief and Designation of Matter to be Included in the Record on Appeal by depositing a copy in the U. S. mail, postage paid on September 28, 2015 mail addressed to counsel of record as set forth below:

R. Patrick Flynn, Esquire  
Robertson Hollingsworth & Flynn  
177 Meeting Street, suite 300  
Charleston, SC 29401  
*Attorney for Plaintiff/Appellant*

David S. Cobb, Esquire  
Turner Padget Graham & Laney, PA  
P O Box 22129  
Charleston, SC 29413  
*Attorney for Defendant/Respondent  
Carolina Concrete Systems, Inc.*

R. Britton Kelly, Esquire  
Rosen Rosen & Hagood, LLC  
P O Box 893  
Charleston, SC 29402  
*Attorney for Defendant/Respondent W. C.  
Johnston Architectural Sales, Inc.*

Erin D. Dean, Esquire  
Stacey P. Canaday, Esquire  
Tupper Grimsley & Dean, PA  
P O Box 2055

Samia H. Nettles, Esquire  
Richardson Plowden  
40 Calhoun Street, Suite 220  
Charleston, SC 29401

And  
L. Dean Best, Esquire  
Best Honeycutt, PA  
P O Box 13466  
Charleston, SC 29422  
*Attorneys for Defendant/Respondent  
Glasgow Roofing, Inc.*

Paul E. Sperry, Esquire  
Tyler P. Winton, Esquire  
Carlock Copeland & Stair, LLP  
40 Calhoun Street, Suite 400  
Charleston, SC 29401  
*Attorneys for Defendant/Respondent Sisnroy  
Engineering, LLC and Robert Sisnroy*

Amanda R. Maybank, Esquire  
Marshall A. Earhart, Esquire  
Maybank Law Firm, LLC  
P O Box 12579

Beaufort, SC 29901  
*Attorneys for Defendant/Respondent  
GlassTec, Inc.*

L. Gregory Horton, Esquire  
Adriane Belton, Esquire  
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice,  
PLLC  
P O Box 999  
Charleston, SC 29402  
*Attorneys for Defendant/Respondent  
Acrocrete, Inc.*

R. Britton Kelly, Esquire  
Rosen Rosen & Hagood  
P O Box 893  
Charleston, SC 29402  
*Attorneys for Defendant/Respondent  
EFCO Corp, Inc.*

Terence McKelvey  
1084 Winslow Drive  
Charleston, SC 29412  
*Pro Se Defendant*

Charleston, SC 29422  
*Attorneys for Defendant/Respondent  
Charleston Glass Company*

David A. Root, Esquire  
Kernodle Root & Coleman  
P O Box 13897  
Charleston, SC 29422  
*Attorney for Defendant/Respondent BASF  
Corp*

Michael Barfield, Esquire  
Barnwell Whaley Patterson & Helms, LLC  
P O Drawer H  
Charleston, SC 29402  
*Attorneys for Defendant/Respondent Gary  
Freeman*



---

Anderson Reynolds & Stephens, LLC  
P O Box 87  
Charleston, SC 29402

# ANDERSON REYNOLDS & STEPHENS, LLC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
37 ½ BROAD STREET  
POST OFFICE BOX 87  
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29402

JONATHAN J. ANDERSON  
LISA A. REYNOLDS  
SHANNA M. STEPHENS  
KATHERINE C. MIARS  
CURTIS B. MARTIN  
DANIELLE B. WEGENER

TEL. 843-723-0185  
FAX. 843-723-0977

email: [dwegener@arslawsc.com](mailto:dwegener@arslawsc.com)

**RECEIVED**

September 28, 2015

OCT 01 2015  
SC Court of Appeals

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
Clerk, South Carolina Court of Appeals  
P O Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211


Re: Shipwatch Condominium Association, Inc. v. Carolina Concrete Systems, Inc., *et al*  
-and-  
Oscar Mendiondo v. Carolina Concrete Systems, Inc. *et al*  
Case Number: 2012-CP-10-3857  
Case Number: 2012-CP-10-3858  
Claim No.: 72-39-288720 (PEG)  
ARS No.: 20120.38  
**Appellate Case No.: 2015-001644**

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Please find enclosed the original and one (1) copy each of Respondent First Exteriors, LLC's Initial Brief, Designation of Matter and Proof of Service. Please file the original and return the clocked copies to me in the self-addressed, postage paid envelope enclosed.

Your assistance in this matter is greatly appreciated. With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

  
Danielle B. Wegener

DBW/jcd

Enclosures

cc: All Counsel of Record  
(via U.S. mail)

ANDERSON REYNOLDS & STEPHENS, LLC

37 1/2 Broad Street  
Post Office Box 87  
Charleston, S.C. 29402



02 1P \$ 005.75  
0004667524 SEP 28 20  
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 294

RECEIVED

OCT 01 2015

SC Court of Appeals

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
Clerk, South Carolina Court of Appeals  
P O Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211

UNITED STATES  
POSTAL SERVICE®

USPS TRACKING #



9114 9999 5638 5050 2566 31

Lab400-26 May 2014  
7890-17-000-1895