

RECEIVED

AUG 01 2016

SC SUPREME COURT

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM JASPER COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

The Honorable Carmen T. Mullen, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No.: 2016-001507
Unpublished Opinion No. 2016-UP-151 (S.C. Ct. App. Filed March 30, 2016)

Randy Horton.....Petitioner,

-vs-

Jasper County School District.....Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

J. Ashley Twombly
Twenge + Twombly Law Firm
S.C. Bar #72916
311 Carteret Street
Beaufort, SC 29902
Telephone: (843) 982-0100
twombly@twlawfirm.com
Attorney for Petitioner

Dwayne T. Mayzck, Esquire
CHILDS & HALLIGAN, P.A.
P.O. Box 11367
Columbia, SC 29211-1367
Telephone: (803) 254-4035
dmazyck@childs-halligan.net
Attorney for Respondent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities.....ii

Certificate of Counsel 1

Questions Presented2

Statement of the Case3

Argument6

 I. The Court of Appeals erred in failing to recognize a complete absence of
 evidentiary support for the lower court’s decision6

 II. The Court of Appeals erred in failing to recognize that the lower court’s order
 chills the pursuit of FOIA rights, benefits those who violate FOIA and
 conflicts with prior decisions of this Court.9

Conclusion 10

Certificate of Service 12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Burton v. York County Sherriff's Department,
358 S.C. 339, 594 S.E.2d 888 (Ct. App. 2004)4, 5, 7

CEL Products, LLC v. Rozelle,
357 S.C. 125, 591 S.E.2d 643 (Ct. App. 2004)6

Fontaine v. Peitz,
291 S. C. 536, 354 S. E. 2d 565 (1987)6, 8

Kiriakides v. School Dist. Of Greenville County,
382 S.C. 8, 675 S.E.2d 439 (2009)6

Marshall v. City of Miami, Dep't of Conventions & Marinas,
920 So. 2d 107, 108 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2006)8

Samples v. Mitchell,
329 S.C. 105, 495 S.E.2d 213 (Ct. App. 1997)6

Sloan v. Friends of the Hunley,
393 S.C. 152, 711 S.E.2d 895 (2011) 10

Society of Prof'l Journalists v. Sexton,
283 S.C. 563, 324 S.E.2d 313 (1984) 10

Statutes

S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-15 9

S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-30(c) 9

S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-100(b)..... 3, 6, 9

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

Counsel for Petitioner certifies that he filed a Petition for Rehearing on May 16, 2016, and the Court of Appeals denied the Petition for Rehearing on June 23, 2016.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- I. Did the Circuit Court err in reducing counsel's hourly rate under FOIA from \$295 to \$100 per hour, when no evidence supported the reduction?
- II. Did the Circuit Court reduction of the hourly rate under FOIA conflict with prior decisions of this Court?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner Randy Horton (Horton) is an elected member of the Board of Trustees for Respondent Jasper County School District (School District). Horton requested that the School District provide him with documents under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). (R. pp. 41-46). The School District failed to properly respond to Horton's FOIA requests and did not provide any of the documents requested. (R. pp. 30-54, R. pp. 92-93).

Horton filed a Summons and Complaint dated June 19, 2013 alleging violations of the South Carolina FOIA. (R. pp. 30-54). Horton's Complaint also requested attorney fees. (R. pp. 30-54). The School District filed an Answer dated August 22, 2013, denying that Horton was entitled to any records he was requesting under the South Carolina FOIA. (R. pp. 55-75).

Horton filed a Motion for Summary Judgment dated October 9, 2013. (R. pp. 85 - 102). The Motion included a memorandum of law outlining Horton's numerous attempts to obtain the documents in question without litigation, as well as relevant law related to Horton's entitlement to the documents at issue. Id. In the motion, Horton asked that summary judgment be entered finding that the School District violated FOIA, and asked for an award of attorney fees and litigation costs under S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-100(b). (R. pp. 85-102).

The Circuit Court heard arguments on the Motion for Summary Judgment on January 31, 2014 in Jasper County. Both of Horton's attorneys traveled to and appeared at the hearing. (R. p. 81). The Circuit Court heard arguments on whether Horton was entitled to the requested public records. At the conclusion of the hearing, the court

requested that counsel prepare additional legal memorandum, and scheduled another hearing for March 31, 2014.

On March 31, 2014, Horton's attorneys traveled to Jasper County for a second hearing on Horton's Motion for Summary Judgment. At the conclusion of this hearing, the court ruled from the bench that the School District was required to provide Horton with all of the documents he requested through FOIA, and directed Horton's counsel to submit an Affidavit related to attorney fees and litigation costs after all of the documents at issue were produced. (R. pp. 118-119).

Over the next three and a half months, the School District produced the documents at issue in numerous productions and in numerous formats. (R. p.16, p.104). On July 9, 2014, Horton's attorneys filed an Affidavit relating to attorney fees and litigation costs. (R. pp. 103-116). The Affidavit attached a redacted copy of the line item invoice related to legal services provided, and an unredacted copy was provided to the court for an *in camera* review. (R. p. 16, pp. 103-116, pp. 118-119). The Affidavit outlined the time Horton's counsel devoted to the case, the standard hourly rates of counsel, addressed each of the six (6) factors outlined in *Burton v. York County Sheriff's Department*, 358 S.C. 339, 594 S.E.2d 888 (Ct. App. 2004) and provided that the "hourly rates listed in this Affidavit are customary for litigation cases in the Fourteenth Judicial Circuit." (R. p. 103-116). The Court was also informed that the hourly rates used in the Affidavit were the hourly rates Horton's counsel "charges to virtually all of its clients that pay by the hour." (R. pp. 76-85). The Affidavit also showed litigation costs of \$1,096.56. (R. pp. 103-116).

The School District never objected to any of the matters covered in the Affidavit, never offered any counter affidavits, and never requested a hearing on the amount of the fees.

On September 5, 2014, the court granted Horton's Motion for Summary Judgment. The court found that the School District was a public body subject to FOIA, that Horton had properly requested documents under FOIA, that the School District was required to provide written notification as to the availability of the requested records within 15 days, and to ultimately produce the requested records to Horton. (R. pp. 15-16). The court further found that the School District did not comply with FOIA, did not provide written notification as to the availability of the requested records, and after requesting an extension of time to file its Answer, "denied Plaintiffs entitlement to any of the requested documents." Id.

The court found that Horton was "entitled to costs and attorney's fees." (R. p. 16). In doing so, the court addressed each of the six (6) factors outlined in *Burton v. York County*, finding in favor of Horton's counsel as to each element. (R. pp. 16-17). The court also found that the Affidavit submitted by counsel "portrays commensurate time, nature, extent and difficulty expended by [counsel] in procuring the FOIA requested documents and litigation related there to . . . Counsel has a combined twenty-five years of experience in litigation. Ultimately, my ruling produces beneficial results for their client." (R. pp. 16-17). The court concluded that Horton's counsel was entitled to be compensated for "a total of 135.3 hours documented by [counsel] for their work in compelling the document production at issue." (R. p. 17).

Notwithstanding the above, the court reduced counsels' hourly rates from \$295.00 and \$250.00 per hour to a flat rate of \$100.00 per hour with no explanation.¹ (R. pp. 20-21). Horton timely filed a Motion for Reconsideration regarding what he believed was the improper reduction of counsels' hourly rates and the lack of evidentiary support for the flat rate of \$100 per hour. (R. pp. 76-85). The court denied the Motion for Reconsideration, issuing a Form 4 Order, without a hearing. (R. pp. 2-18).

Horton timely filed a Notice of Appeal with the Court of Appeals. On March 30, 2016, the Court of Appeals filed an unpublished opinion affirming the lower court's decision. Horton timely filed a Petition for Rehearing, and the Court of Appeals denied the Petition for Rehearing on June 23, 2016. Horton now petitions this Court for a writ of certiorari.

ARGUMENT

I. The Circuit Court Abused Its Discretion in Lowering the Hourly Rate.

A failure to exercise discretion is an error of law. *Fontaine v. Peitz*, 291 S. C. 536, 354 S. E. 2d 565 (1987); see also *CEL Products, LLC v. Rozelle*, 357 S.C. 125, 130, 591 S.E.2d 643, 645 (Ct. App. 2004) ("A failure to exercise discretion amounts to an abuse of that discretion."); *Samples v. Mitchell*, 329 S.C. 105, 112, 495 S.E.2d 213, 216 (Ct. App. 1997) ("A failure to exercise discretion amounts to an abuse of that discretion.").

The decision to award attorney's fees under S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-100(b) is discretionary with the court. *Kiriakides v. School Dist. Of Greenville County*, 382 S.C. 8,

¹ The lower court did not award the paralegal and legal assistant time as set forth in the Affidavit. Horton is not challenging that portion of the decision.

675 S.E.2d 439 (2009). This gives the court the power and privilege to review *the evidence* and make a decision as to a fair and reasonable award, based upon *the evidence*.

In this case, there was no evidence to support cutting a normal hourly rate to \$100 per hour.² The Record on Appeal contains not a single page, sentence, clause or word of evidence to support an hourly rate of \$100 per hour for Horton's Counsel. The only evidence in the record was supplied by Horton's Counsel, who submitted a fee affidavit and verified that the rate of \$295 per hour and \$250 per hour were the "customary" rates "for litigation cases in the Fourteenth Judicial Circuit" and that these were the hourly rates Horton's counsel "charges to virtually all of its clients that pay by the hour." (R. pp. 105-106, ¶ 6(f); R. pp. 76-85). In addition, Horton's lead counsel is an AV Preeminent rated attorney, and Horton's counsel has a combined twenty-five years of experience. (R. p. 105).

The School District submitted no evidence regarding attorney fees, hourly rates or customary hourly rates in the Fourteenth Judicial Circuit. The School District did not argue that the rates were too high. The School District did not argue that the hourly rates were outside of the norm. The School District did not argue that Horton did not prevail in the litigation. The School District did not submit any evidence or argument regarding attorney's fees or hourly rates. There was no evidence to support reducing counsel's hourly rates from the "customary" rates "for litigation cases in the Fourteenth Judicial

² The court properly found that Appellant was entitled to an award of attorney fees under each of the factors listed in *Burton v. York County*, 358 S.C. at 339, 594 S.E.2d at 888. In its order, the court found that the Affidavit Regarding Legal Fees and Costs "portrays commensurate time, nature, extent, and difficulty expended by [Horton's counsel] in procuring the FOIA requested documents and litigation related thereto," (R. pp. 20-21); that the legal fees relate to the preparation of the pleadings, preparation of a brief to the court relating to jurisdiction, standing, and the merits of the case, and review of over 2,000 pages of documents provided in seven separate submissions over the course of several months; (R. pp. 19-22) and that "[u]ltimately, my ruling produces beneficial results" for Appellant. (R. p. 21). The court awarded fees "for a total of 135.3 hours documented by J. Ashley Twombly, Esq. and Jennifer Campbell, Esq. for their work in compelling the document production at issue." (R. p. 21).

Circuit” and the hourly rates Horton’s counsel “charges to virtually all of its clients that pay by the hour” to \$100 per hour.³

Because there was no evidence to support reducing the hourly rate to \$100 per hour, the court failed to exercise discretion in selecting that rate. The record contains no evidentiary support for the lower court’s decision. “When a trial judge is vested with discretion, but his ruling reveals no discretion was, in fact, exercised, an error of law has occurred.” *Fontaine*, 291 S.C. at 538, 354 S.E.2d at 566.

Other appellate courts have recognized that, in exercising discretion to set hourly rates associated with an attorney’s fee award, a lower court’s decision must be based on the evidence before the court. For example, in *Marshall v. City of Miami, Dep’t of Conventions & Marinas*, 920 So. 2d 107, 108 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2006), a District Court of Appeal of Florida overruled a lower court when it reduced a workers compensation attorney’s hourly rate from \$275 per hour to \$150 per hour, when there was no evidence in the record to support the rate selected by the lower court.:

We agree with claimant that the judge erroneously determined that “[t]he fee customarily charged in the locality for similar legal services” was \$150.00 per hour, when the only evidence presented was that the customary hourly rate would be \$275.00. See *Morris v. Dollar Tree Store*, 869 So.2d 704, 706-07 (Fla. 1st DCA 2004) (the standard of review from a determination of a reasonable hourly rate for an attorney’s fee is whether the determination is supported by competent substantial evidence and, therefore, **the judge may not choose an hourly rate unsupported by any evidence**); *Smith v. U.S. Sugar Corp.*, 624 So.2d 315, 319 (Fla. 1st DCA 1993) (reversing an attorney-fee award based on a \$150.00 hourly rate when **the only evidence established that \$200.00 would**

³ The court did not explain why it felt it was appropriate to reduce counsels’ hourly rates or how it reached its decision as to which hourly rate to use. Horton filed a Motion for Reconsideration asking that the court to either award attorney fees at the hourly rates set forth in the fee petition and affidavit, or explain why an hourly rate of \$100 was used. The court denied the motion with a Form 4 Order which included no justification for the court’s decision. (R. pp. 76-85; R. pp. 2-18).

be a reasonable rate, and remanding with directions to award fees at the rate of \$200.00 per hour).”

Id. (emphasis added).

Accordingly, the lower court’s decision to reduce counsels’ hourly rate to \$100 was an abuse of discretion and an error of law.

II. The Circuit Court Decision Conflicts with Decisions of This Court.

Respondents violated S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-30(c). The General Assembly delineated the rationale and purposes of FOIA:

The General Assembly finds that it is **vital** in a democratic society that public business be performed in an open and public manner so that citizens shall be advised of the performance of public officials and of the decisions that are reached in public activity and in the formulation of public policy. Toward this end, provisions of this chapter **must be construed** so as to make it possible for citizens, or their representatives, to learn and report fully the activities of their public officials **at a minimum cost or delay** to the persons seeking access to public documents or meetings.

S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-15 (emphasis added).

In the case before the Court, the Respondents’ refusals and delays contravened these purposes. Even after suit was filed, Respondent continued to refuse and delay production of public documents.

South Carolina Code Ann. § 30-4-100(b) protects FOIA rights. Petitioners petitioned the Circuit Court for costs and attorneys’ fees pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-100(b), the FOIA attorneys’ fees provision (R. pp. 72-79).

(b) If a person or entity seeking such relief prevails, he or it may be awarded reasonable attorney fees and other costs of litigation. If such person or entity prevails in part, the court may in its discretion award him or it reasonable attorney fees or an appropriate portion thereof.

S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-100(b) (emphasis added).

This Court ruled in *Society of Prof'l Journalists v. Sexton*, 283 S.C. 563, 324 S.E.2d 313 (1984), one reason to “award attorney fees is to encourage agencies to comply with FOIA requests.” *Id.* at 568, 324 S.E.2d at 316. See also *Sloan v. Friends of the Hunley*, 393 S.C. 152, 711 S.E.2d 895 (2011) (awarding reasonable attorney fees honors legislative intent of FOIA and serves as an impetus to comply with FOIA).

Reducing an attorney fee award from \$295 per hour to \$100 per hour with no evidentiary support is not reasonable, and it will discourage litigants from bringing FOIA litigation and discourage skilled attorneys from taking FOIA cases, even when it may be clear that FOIA has been violated. Such a result is at odds with the legislature’s intent to encourage compliance with FOIA, and reward litigants and lawyers who prevail in enforcing FOIA rights, and with this Court’s decisions relating to the award of attorney fees under FOIA.


Here, the Circuit Court's decision produces a particularly unjust result because the attorneys who defended the School District (pursuant to a contract that guaranteed payment irrespective of whether or not the lower court concluded that the School District violated FOIA) are in all likelihood compensated at a higher rate than the prevailing attorney (who undertook the representation with the possibility of not getting paid). Such a result is unfair, improper and at odds with FOIA attorney’s fee jurisprudence, including opinions issued by this Court.

CONCLUSION

Because the only evidence in the record supports the rates requested by counsel, this Court should grant this Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, reverse the Court of Appeal’s decision, and award fees as requested in Petitioner’s Counsel Affidavit Regarding Legal Fees and Costs.

TWENGE + TWOMBLEY LAW FIRM

BY:



J. ASHLEY TWOMBLEY

S.C. Bar #72916

311 Carteret Street

Beaufort, SC 29902

Telephone: (843) 982-0100

Facsimile: (843) 982-0103

www.twlawfirm.com

Attorneys for *Petitioner*

Beaufort, South Carolina

July 28, 2016

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM JASPER COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

The Honorable Carmen T. Mullen, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No.: 2014-002612
Unpublished Opinion No. 2016-UP-151 (S.C. Ct. App. Filed March 30, 2016)

Randy Horton..... Petitioner,

-vs-

Jasper County School District..... Respondent.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned, J. Ashley Twombly of TWENGE + TWOMBLY LAW FIRM, Attorneys for Petitioner, and that on the 28th day of July 2016, a true and accurate copy of the attached Petition for a Writ of Certiorari was placed in an envelope with first class postage thereon prepaid through the United States Postal Service and mailed to the following:

Dwayne T. Mayzck, Esquire
Mary Allison Caudell
CHILDS & HALLIGAN, P.A.
P.O. Box 11367
Columbia, SC 29211-1367
Telephone: (803) 254-4035
Facsimile: (803) 771-4422
dmazyck@childs-halligan.net
Attorneys for Respondent

BY:



J. ASHLEY TWOMBLY #72916
TWENGE + TWOMBLY LAW FIRM