

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM FLORENCE COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

William H. Seals, Circuit Judge

---

Case No. 2016-CP-21-1230

---

**RECEIVED**

DEC 15 2016

SC Court of Appeals

Harvey R. Campbell, Jr.,..... Appellant

Vs.

Lee Lyerly and Ellen Marie Stone Lyerly ..... Respondents

---

INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

---

LOUIS D. NETTLES  
Folkens Law Firm, PA  
PO Box 6139  
Florence, South Carolina 29502  
Attorney for Appellant  
943-665-0100

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	-ii-
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	-iii-
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	-1-
ARGUMENT	-3-
CONCLUSION	-5-

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

Duckworth v. Cameron, 244 S.E.2d 217, 270 S.C. 647 (S.C., 1978). 2

### STATUTES

South Carolina Code § 40-59-130 (1976) 2

South Carolina Code § 40-59-130 (amended 2002) 3

South Carolina Code § 40-59-130 (amended 2009) 2

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR IN GRANTING JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADING BECAUSE THE AMENDMENT TO THE STATUTE RELIED ON BY THE COURT TO BAR APPELLANT CLAIM MEANT THAT THE APPELLANT COULD PROCEED ONCE HIS LICENSE HAD BEEN REINSTATED.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant, Campbell brought this suit on a contract for residential construction work by complaint filed May 17, 2016. The complaint alleged that Appellant had a contract for residential construction with Respondents, Lyerly, that Appellant performed the contract and Respondents refused to pay. The complaint also alleged that Appellant has been licensed as a residential contractor, but that the license had expired at the time the contract was performed. The complaint alleged that Appellant's residential license had been reinstated.

Respondent's filed a timely answer and motion for judgment on the pleadings arguing that because Appellant did not have a valid residential builder's license at the time the work was performed barred his claim.

The motion for judgment on the pleading came before Judge William H. Seals, Jr. and Judge Seals granted the Respondent's motion dismissing the Complaint by order entered on October 12, 2016. Respondent filed and served the Notice of Appeal on November 14, 2016.

## ARGUMENT

QUESTION ONE: THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN GRANTING JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADING BECAUSE THE AMENDMENT TO THE STATUTE RELIED ON BY THE COURT TO BAR APPELLANT CLAIM MEANT THAT THE APPELLANT COULD PROCEED ONCE HIS LICENSE HAD BEEN REINSTATED.

This is an appeal for the dismissal of a complaint and is appealable.

The Plaintiff argues that the licensing statute has been amended and does not bar Plaintiffs claim.

Previous South Carolina case laws held that a Residential Homebuilder cannot sue if he did not have a license at the time contract was made. *Duckworth v. Cameron*, 244 S.E.2d 217, 270 S.C. 647 (S.C., 1978). The *Duckworth* case was decided on South Carolina Code § 40-59-130. At that time that section read:

"(n)o residential home builder who does not have the license required herein may bring any action either at law or in equity to enforce the provisions of any contract for residential home building which he entered into in violation of this chapter."

The current statute §40-59-30 reads:

(B) Notwithstanding Section 29-5-10, or another provision of law, a person or firm who first has not procured a license or registered with the commission and is required to do so by law may not file a mechanics' lien or bring an action at law or in equity to enforce the provisions of a contract for residential building or residential specialty contracting which the person or firm entered into in violation of this

chapter.

Chapter 59 of Title 40 was completely revised in 2002 by Act 237. It was amended again in 2009 to its current form;

Section 40 59 30. (A) A person or firm who engages or offers to engage in the business of residential building or residential specialty contracting without first having registered with the commission or procured a license from the commission, which has not expired or been revoked, suspended, or restricted or who knowingly presents to, or files with, the commission false information for the purpose of obtaining a license or registering with the commission is guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, must be fined not less than five hundred dollars or more than ten thousand dollars or imprisoned for not less than thirty days, or both.

(B) Notwithstanding Section 29-5-10, or another provision of law, a person or firm who first has not procured a license or registered with the commission and is required to do so by law may not file a mechanics' lien or bring an action at law or in equity to enforce the provisions of a contract for residential building or residential specialty contracting which the person or firm entered into violation of this chapter.


Appellant argues that the current language of the statute allows a contractor who obtains or reinstates his license may thereafter sue on the contract. In the Duckworth case the Supreme Court decided the language of the then current statute prohibited a residential contractor from enforcing a contract made without a current license. This is a very harsh penalty. The statute focused on the status of the license at the time the contract was made. The Legislature subsequently amended the licensing statute to change the prohibition on enforcing the contract to add the language "who first has not

procured a license" may not enforce the contract. This language has no meaning unless it is to allow enforcement of the contract after obtaining the proper license and there would be no purpose for the amendment. It changes to focus of the licensing from the time the contract was made to the time the suit is filed.

## CONCLUSION

If the amendments to the licensing statute made in 2002 and 2009 are to have any meaning or purpose they should be construed to allow enforcement of a residential contractor who has a valid license at the time the enforcement action brought.

Respectfully submitted,



Louis D. Nettles  
Folkens Law Firm P.A  
P. O. Box 6139  
Florence SC 29502  
843-665-0100

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM FLORENCE COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

William H. Seals, Circuit Judge

**RECEIVED**

DEC 15 2016

SC Court of Appeals

Case No. 2016-CP-21-1230

Harvey R. Campbell, Jr., ..... Appellant

Vs.


Lee Lyerly and Ellen Marie Stone Lyerly ..... Respondents

DESIGNATION OF MATTER  
TO BE INCLUDED IN THE RECORD ON APPEAL

The Appellant proposes the following be included in the Record on Appeal.

- 1. Order of Judge Seals
- 2. Complaint
- 3. Answer and Counterclaim
- 4. Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings

5. Act 40, S.C. Legislature 2009



LOUIS D. NETTLES  
Folkens Law Firm, PA  
PO Box 6139  
Florence, South Carolina 29502  
Attorney for Appellant  
943-665-0100

December 14, 2016

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

**RECEIVED**

APPEAL FROM FLORENCE COUNTY DEC 15 2016  
Court of Common Pleas

SC Court of Appeals

William H. Seals, Circuit Judge

---

Case No. 2016-CP-21-1230

---

Harvey R. Campbell, Jr., ..... Appellant

Vs.

Lee Lyerly and Ellen Marie Stone Lyerly ..... Respondents

---

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

---

I certify that I have served the Appellant's Initial Brief, Designation of Matters To Be Included in the Record on Appeal on Respondent's Attorney by depositing copies of the same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on December 14, 2016 addressed to the following addresses:

Gary I. Finklea, Esq.  
Finklea Law Firm  
P. O. Box 1317  
Florence, South Carolina 29503



LOUIS D. NETTLES  
Folkens Law Firm, PA  
PO Box 6139  
Florence, South Carolina 29502  
Attorney for Appellants  
843-665-0100

December 14, 2016

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

RE: Campbell v. Lyerly 2016-CP-21-1230  
2016-002315

**RECEIVED**  
DEC 15 2016  
SC Court of Appeals

Dear Ms. Kitchings;

Enclosed please find Appellant's Initial Brief, Designation of Record and a Certificate of Service showing this was served on Respondent's counsel by mail,

With kind regards, I am,

Yours very truly,




Louis D. Nettles

CC: Gary I. Finklea, Esq

**RECEIVED**

DEC 15 2016

SC Court of Appeals



**FLF** | **FOLKENS**  
LAW FIRM, P.A.

PO Box 6139  
Florence SC 29502

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