

Attachment B

Order Filed August 11, 2017

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

John Doe 2 and Jane Doe 4,)
)
Plaintiffs,)

CASE NO.: 2010-CP-10-5520

v.)

ORDER ON
LAWYER DEFENDANTS'
MOTIONS FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

The Bishop of Charleston, et. al.)
)
Defendants.)

John Doe 10,)
)
Plaintiff,)

CASE NO.: 2010-CP-10-7233

v.)

The Bishop of Charleston, et. al.)
)
Defendants.)

FILED
2017 AUG 11 PM 2:39
JULIE J. ANDERSON
CLERK OF COURT

Jane Doe 11,)
)
Plaintiff,)

CASE NO.: 2012-CP-10-5559

v.)

The Bishop of Charleston, et. al.)
)
Defendants.)

gen

John Doe 193,)
)
Plaintiff,)

CASE NO.: 2013-CP-10-3733

v.)

The Bishop of Charleston, et. al.)
)
Defendants.)

RECEIVED

SEP 27 2017

SC Court of Appeals

Father Doe 194,) CASE NO.: 2013-CP-10-4175
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 The Bishop of Charleston, et. al.)
)
 Defendants.)

John Doe 194,) CASE NO.: 2013-CP-10-4176
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 The Bishop of Charleston, et. al.)
)
 Defendants.)

John Doe 245 and Father Doe 245,) CASE NO.: 2015-CP-10-5486
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 The Bishop of Charleston, et. al.)
)
 Defendants.)

John Doe 297,) CASE NO.: 2016-CP-10-1632
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 The Bishop of Charleston, et. al.)
)
 Defendants.)

gen

THESE MATTERS CAME BEFORE THE COURT on motions of the Defendants Lawrence E. Richter, Jr., David A. Haller and Richter and Haller, LLC ("the Lawyer Defendants") for summary judgment pursuant to Rule 56, SCRPC. The Lawyer Defendants filed an omnibus

motion for summary judgment in each case on the same grounds. The Lawyer Defendants also filed separate motions for summary judgment on additional grounds against Jane Doe 4 (Case No. 2010-CP-10-5520) and John Doe 193 (Case No. 2013-CP-10-3733). This Order will address the omnibus motion in each case as well as the motions for summary judgment against Jane Doe 4 and John Doe 193.¹

BACKGROUND

The above-captioned matters consist of eight (8) separate cases filed between 2010 and 2016 on behalf of ten (10) different plaintiffs. Each case arises out of alleged sexual abuse by priests of the Diocese Defendants. Seven (7) of the plaintiffs are alleged victims of sexual abuse and three (3) are spouses or parents of alleged abuse victims. Nine (9) of the plaintiffs are non-residents of South Carolina and one (1) is a South Carolina resident who alleges he repressed memory of the abuse.

gm
The Lawyer Defendants represented alleged victims of sexual abuse in class action lawsuits against the Diocese Defendants that were settled in 2007 (Case Nos. 2006-CP-18-13109, 1311 and 1636; "the Underlying Case").² Seven of the Plaintiffs claim that they were members of the Primary Class³ and that the Lawyer Defendants committed legal malpractice while representing

¹ The Lawyer Defendants also filed an omnibus motion for summary judgment as to the civil conspiracy claims in each case. They are now moot because the Plaintiffs abandoned their claims for civil conspiracy at the hearing held on July 20, 2017.

² While the record reflects the negotiation of a Settlement and Arbitration Agreement between the Lawyer Defendants and the Diocese Defendants in 2006, the settlement was not formalized and approved by the court until 2007.

³ The Primary Class of abuse victims was defined as "All individuals born on or before August 30, 1980, who, as minors, were sexually abused at any time by the agents or employees of the Dioceses

them. Three of the Plaintiffs claim that they were members of the "Consortium Class" of spousal and parental victims who allege that the Lawyer Defendants committed legal malpractice while representing them as well.⁴ All of the claims against the Lawyer Defendants arise out of their activities in the Underlying Case.

The crux of all but one of the Plaintiffs' claims is that the Lawyer Defendants defined the Primary and Consortium Classes without geographical limitation but geographically limited the notice that would be given of the settlement by publication to class members in South Carolina.⁵ The non-resident Plaintiffs allege that, as a result, they were bound by the class action settlement but were never given notice of that settlement.

If they were bound by the settlement in the Underlying Case, then the doctrine of *res judicata* would deprive them of the opportunity to sue the Diocese Defendants without giving them notice of the settlement that satisfied their due process rights. The allegations in the Complaint filed by John Doe 2 and Jane Doe 4 are typical of each plaintiffs' complaint:

23. **If the Diocese agrees, or the court finds, that the plaintiffs are not precluded by the class action from bringing claims against the Diocese**, either because the state court's ruling left room for persons not receiving notice or because the deliberate restrictions on notice clearly failed to comply with plaintiffs' due process rights, **then the causes of action against the Richter defendants** who, for a fee, abandoned their clients, and those who conspired against them through the class action, **are irrelevant because plaintiffs can make their claims against the Diocese.** If the court finds that the plaintiffs are precluded for any reasons, including the *res judicata* effect of the class action, charitable immunity, or by the statute of

of Charleston who have not previously had any similar claim adjudicated, resolved, or released" (hereinafter "the Primary Class").

⁴ The Consortium Class was defined as "The spouses and parents, of all individuals qualified pursuant the Primary Class and who suffered a loss of the abused individual's consortium, and who as spouses or parents have not previously had any similar claim adjudicated, resolved, or released" (hereinafter "the Consortium Class").

⁵ The notice plan approved by the class action court was for publication in ten South Carolina daily newspapers and *The Augusta Chronicle*, and *The Catholic Miscellany*.

limitations, then the causes of action alleged against the Diocese defendants for sexual abuse are irrelevant, and those claims are properly made against those who conspired against them as well as against the Richter defendants who failed to properly represent them. (Emphasis added).

See John Doe 2 and Jane Doe 4 v. The Diocese of Charleston, et. al., Case No. 2010-CP-10-5520, Complaint, ¶ 23 (emphasis added).

The claims alleged by John Doe 193 are slightly different.⁶ John Doe 193 alleges that he repressed the memory of his sexual abuse until 2010. As a result, even though he lived in South Carolina, he claims he did not receive notice of the class action settlement until 2010 (when he recovered his memory) and alleges the Lawyer Defendants failed to make a provision for repressed memory victims like him in the settlement.⁷

The Plaintiffs allege causes of action for professional negligence, breach of fiduciary duty, and unfair trade practices against the Lawyer Defendants.

I. Summary Judgment Standard

Summary judgment is appropriate where there are no genuine issues of material fact and it is clear the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law. Rule 56(c), SCRCP. In determining whether any triable issues of fact exist, the evidence and all inferences that reasonably can be drawn from the evidence must be viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. *Argoe v. Three Rivers Behavioral Ctr. & Psychiatric Solutions*, 388 S.C. 394, 697 S.E. 2d 551 (2010); *Hansson v. Scalise Builders of S.C.*, 374 S.C. 352, 355, 650 S.E. 2d 68, 70 (2007).

⁶ Case No. 2013-CP-10-3733.

⁷ John Doe 193's claim for professional negligence was dismissed by Order of the Honorable Kristi Lea Harrington dated January 16, 2014. His claim for civil conspiracy was abandoned by Plaintiff's counsel at the hearing on July 2017. Thus, only the claim for breach of fiduciary duty remains for John Doe 193.

Under Rule 56(c), SCRCP, the party seeking summary judgment has the initial burden of demonstrating the absence of a genuine issue of material fact, *Baughman v. AT&T*, 306 S.C. 101, 410 S.E. 2d 537 (1991). With respect to an issue upon which the nonmoving party has the burden of proof, this initial responsibility may be discharged by pointing out to the trial court that there is an absence of evidence to support the nonmoving party's case. *Id.* (citing *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 106 S. Ct. 2548, 91 L. Ed. 2d 265 (1986)). Once the moving party carries its initial burden, the "opposing party must, under Rule 56(e), do more than simply show that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the material facts' but 'must come forward with specific facts showing that there is a *genuine issue for trial*.'" *Id.* (quoting *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 586-87, 106 S. Ct. 1348, 1356, 89 L. Ed. 2d 538 (1986)) (emphasis in original). The party opposing summary judgment cannot simply rest on mere allegations or denials contained in the pleadings. *Id.*; *George v. Empire Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 344 S.C. 582, 545 S.E. 2d 500 (2001).

II. The Lawyer Defendants' Motions

The Lawyer Defendants contend that they are entitled to summary judgment because:

- A. the Court has determined that the Plaintiffs can sue the Diocese Defendants making their respective claims against the Lawyer Defendants "irrelevant";
- B. the Plaintiffs have no damages proximately caused by the Lawyer Defendants;
- C. no attorney-client relationship existed between the Lawyer Defendants and the Plaintiffs, who were unnamed class members; and
- D. the Lawyer Defendants did not breach a fiduciary duty to the Plaintiffs.

A. Plaintiffs' Claims Against the Lawyer Defendants are Irrelevant

As noted above, the Plaintiffs' Complaints explicitly allege that if they are not precluded by the class action settlement from bringing claims against the Diocese Defendants, then the causes

of action against the Lawyer Defendants are "irrelevant". The keystone of their argument revolves around the concept of notice. The Plaintiffs allege that since they were included in the definition of the Primary Class, they should have been given notice of the settlement in accordance with their due process rights. Thus, if the Court were to find that they are precluded from maintaining their claims against the Diocese Defendants as a result of the class settlement, only then can Plaintiffs assert their claims against the Lawyer Defendants for not giving them notice of the settlement. In other words, when viewed in the light most favorable to the Plaintiffs, the complaints make a finding of preclusion by the Court a predicate upon which the Plaintiffs' claims against the Lawyer Defendants rise or fall.

In this Court's Amended Order on Limited Collateral Review dated May 3, 2017, I found that the Plaintiffs' Complaints, by their own terms, presented a threshold question: Are the Plaintiffs precluded from pursuing claims against the Diocese Defendants? I then answered the question in the negative, finding that the Plaintiffs were not precluded from bringing their claims against the Diocese Defendants because the notice plan approved in the Underlying Case "did not incorporate safeguards to provide sufficient notice because notice by publication was not provided by the court substantially outside of the geographic territory of South Carolina."

I concluded that "the notice plan directed by the class action court did not satisfy due process as to putative class members who (1) did not receive actual notice and (2) lived outside of the areas in which notice was published".⁸ I further found that it would be inconsistent with due process to bind John Doe 193 to the class action settlement if he could prove a repressed memory

⁸ This finding was consistent with the finding by Judge Roger Young in his Order dated June 17, 2011 in Case No. 2010-CP-10-5520 denying in part and granting in part the Diocese Defendants Motion to Dismiss.

by the preponderance of the evidence. In light of that ruling, even when this Court views the allegations in the complaints in the light most favorable to Plaintiffs, the only reasonable conclusion is the Plaintiffs have no claims against the Lawyer Defendants because the class settlement did not preclude their claims against the Diocese Defendants.

B. Plaintiffs Have No Damages Proximately Caused by the Lawyer Defendants

After the Amended Order on Limited Collateral Review was entered, this Court scheduled several of the cases against the Diocese Defendants for trial in May 2017. Soon thereafter, five (5) Plaintiffs and the Diocese Defendants voluntarily settled four (4) of the cases.⁹ Since all Plaintiffs were allowed to present their claims against the Diocese Defendants and five (5) Plaintiffs in four (4) of the cases voluntarily settled their claims with the Diocese Defendants, the allegations against the Lawyer Defendants are not pertinent and are, in the Plaintiffs' own words, "irrelevant". Those Plaintiffs who have settled with the Diocese Defendants have had "their day in court" and their opportunity to hold the Diocese Defendants financially responsible for their abuse. In so doing, those Plaintiffs stood exactly where they would have stood had the underlying class actions never existed.

The Plaintiffs who did not settle with Diocese Defendants¹⁰ were subject to a motion for summary judgment filed by the Diocese Defendants and scheduled to be heard by the Court on

⁹ The Diocese settled with the Plaintiffs in 2010-CP-10-7233 (filed by John Doe 10), 2013-CP-10-4175 (filed by Father Doe 194), 2013-CP-10-4176 (filed by John Doe 194) and 2015-CP-10-5486 (filed by John Doe 245 and Father Doe 245).

¹⁰ The non-settling Plaintiffs were John Doe 2 and Jane Doe 4, Case No. 2010-CP-10-5520; Jane Doe 11, Case No. 2012-CP-10-5559; John Doe 193, Case No. 2013-CP-10-3733; and John Doe 297, Case No. 2016-CP-10-1632.

June 28, 2017. In that motion, the Diocese Defendants contended that the remaining Plaintiffs' claims were absolutely barred by the defense of charitable immunity. At the outset of the hearing on those motions, Plaintiffs' counsel voluntarily surrendered his clients' claims to the Diocese Defendants' charitable immunity defense and agreed that the Court should grant summary judgment to the Diocese Defendants on all claims in those four cases *except* civil conspiracy (which, as noted above, was later abandoned) and aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty.¹¹

Thus, the Plaintiffs have either voluntarily settled with the Diocese Defendants or voluntarily conceded to the defense of charitable immunity. In either event, the Plaintiffs have been allowed to maintain their claims against the Diocese Defendants, have had their day in court and have no damages to assert against the Lawyer Defendants. Nothing the Lawyer Defendants did or failed to do in the Underlying Case caused harmed to the Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs have the same rights, and are subject to the same defenses, that existed prior to the class action settlement.

gun
Damages are an essential element any plaintiff must prove to prevail on a legal malpractice claim. None of the Plaintiffs' have testified to any damages they believe they have suffered due to the alleged legal malpractice, nor have they offered any competent evidence proving damages as to the Lawyer Defendants. Absent damages, Plaintiffs have no claim for legal malpractice. *RFT Mgmt. Co. v. Tinsley & Adams, L.L.P.*, 399 S.C. 322, 732 S.E. 2d 166 (2012) ("plaintiff in a legal malpractice action must establish four elements: (1) the existence of an attorney-client relationship, (2) a breach of duty by the attorney, (3) damage to the client, and (4) proximate causation of the client's damages by the breach.")

¹¹ As previously noted, Plaintiffs' counsel abandoned his clients' claims for civil conspiracy at the hearing on July 20, 2017.

Plaintiffs' counsel argues that the four (4) cases that were settled fall under S.C. Code Ann. §15-38-50 (1976, as amended) and thus do not affect the liability of the Lawyer Defendants. That statute provides:

When a release or a covenant not to sue or not to enforce judgment is given in good faith to one of two or more persons liable in tort for the same injury or the same wrongful death:

(1) it does not discharge any of the other tortfeasors from liability for the injury or wrongful death unless its terms so provide, but it reduces the claim against the others to the extent of any amount stipulated by the release or the covenant, or in the amount of the consideration paid for it, whichever is the greater; and

(2) it discharges the tortfeasor to whom it is given from all liability for contribution to any other tortfeasor.

gen

The Court has carefully considered this argument and concludes §15-38-50 does not apply here. The release given to the Diocese Defendants in those settlements was not given to a joint tortfeasor, notwithstanding what the settlement agreements may say. The Plaintiffs' claims are based upon one loss – the abuse at the hands of the Diocese defendants. They assert claims against the Diocese Defendants and, in the alternative, against the Lawyer Defendants. Nonetheless, they may obtain but one recovery. Civil conspiracy was the only cause of action in the complaints as to which joint and several liability could apply. As previously noted, Plaintiffs' counsel voluntarily conceded at the hearing on July 20, 2017 that summary judgment in favor of all defendants on the cause of action for civil conspiracy was appropriate. That concession resulted from a) the Plaintiffs' having pled civil conspiracy as presuming that "the class action order is interpreted to bind the Plaintiff to its *res judicata* effect...", and b) the Court having determined in its Amended Order on Limited Collateral Review that the Plaintiffs who did not receive actual notice and lived outside of the published notice area were not bound by the *res judicata* effect of the class action settlement.

Consequently, since there is but one recovery for a single wrong, the Plaintiffs who settled with the Diocese Defendants have made their recovery and have no further damages.

C. There was No Attorney-Client Relationship

1. The Majority Rule.

The Lawyer Defendants also contend Plaintiffs' claims are barred because there was no attorney-client relationship with the Plaintiffs. A plaintiff in a legal malpractice action must establish four elements: (1) the existence of an attorney-client relationship, (2) a breach of duty by the attorney, (3) damage to the client, and (4) proximate causation of the client's damages by the breach. *RFT Mgmt. Co., supra*.

gm
In response, the Plaintiffs, relying on *Premium Investment Corp. v. Green*, 283 S.C. 464, 324 S.E. 2d 72 (Ct. App. 1984), contend that an attorney-client relationship arose between the Lawyer Defendants and the Plaintiffs at the time the lawyers filed the class action complaints in the Underlying Case.

The majority rule in the United States appears to be that class counsel does not represent unnamed, absent class members unless and until the class is certified. *Bobryk v. Durand Glass Mfg. Co.*, No. 12-cv-5360 (NLH/JS), 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145758, at *29-31 (D.N.J. Oct. 9, 2013) (noting "the majority of case law that holds that the attorney-client relationship with putative class members 'does not begin until the class has been certified and the time for opting out by a potential member of the class has expired'."); *Palumbo v. Tele-Communications, Inc.*, 157 F.R.D. 129, 133 (D.D.C. 1994) (stating class certification confers status of litigant on absent class members and creates attorney-client relationship with class counsel); *Garret v. Metro Life Ins. Co.*, No. 95-CIV-2406, 1996 WL 325725, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. June 12, 1996) ("before class certification, the putative class members are not 'represented' by the class counsel."); *Formento v. Joyce*, 168

Ill. App. 3d 429, 522 N.E.2d 312 (Ill. App. Ct. 1988) (finding that defendant attorneys owed no duty to plaintiffs, the unnamed members of an uncertified class action); *Restatement (Third) of the Law Governing Lawyers* § 99 cmt. 1 (“prior to certification, only those class members with whom the lawyer maintains a personal client-lawyer relationship are clients”); *Resnick v. Am. Dental Ass'n*, 95 F.R.D. 372, 376 (N.D. Ill. 1982) (“Without question the unnamed class members, once the class has been certified, are ‘represented by’ the class counsel.”); *Gillespie v. Scherr*, 987 S.W. 2d 129, 1998 Tex. App. LEXIS 8089 (Tex. App. 1998) (“[W]e have found no case finding an implied attorney-client relationship to exist before class certification between an attorney who files the class action and any unnamed class members”).

gm
The majority rule is persuasive to this Court for several reasons. The identity of the absent plaintiffs and the exact nature of their interests in the action is not known until class certification. 3 H. Newberg, *Class Actions* § 5050 (1977); *United States Parole Comm'n v. Geraghty*, 445 U.S. 388, 415, 100 S.Ct. 1202, 1218, 63 L Ed.2d 479, 502, 1980 U.S. LEXIS 12, *49, 29 Fed. R. Serv. 2d (Callaghan) 20 (U.S. Mar. 19, 1980). Similarly, in federal court, class counsel is appointed by the class action court when the class is certified. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(1)(B) (“An order that certifies a class action must define the class and the class claims, issues, or defenses, and must appoint class counsel under Rule 23(g)”). Furthermore, under Rule 23(a), SCRCF, the heading specifies that there is no class action until the Court finds certain “Prerequisites”.¹² Only after class certification can the absent class members be bound to the outcome of the case.

In the Underlying Case, the Primary and Consortium Classes were not certified until January 19, 2007 when Judge Goodstein entered the Order Certifying Classes and Giving

¹² When the Underlying Case was filed and adjudicated, South Carolina had enacted Rule 23, SCRCF, drawn principally from Federal Rule 23.

Preliminary Approval to Settlement. In their complaints, the Plaintiffs allege that the Lawyer Defendants abandoned them and breached duties to them as clients by failing to give notice of the settlement to absent putative class members who reside outside of South Carolina. While the initial Motion to Certify Classes and for Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement filed by the Lawyer Defendants in October 2006 indicated that notice would be published in *USA Today*, that motion was amended. Later, on January 16, 2007, an amended Motion to Certify Classes and for Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement was filed by the Lawyer Defendants. In the second motion, notice was limited to ten daily newspapers in South Carolina, *The Augusta Chronicle*, and *The Catholic Miscellany*. The Order Certifying Classes and Giving Preliminary Approval to Settlement was dated January 17, 2007.

fun
The gravamen of the Plaintiffs' complaints is that notice of the settlement in the Underlying Case was not given to them. It appears from the record that a decision was made between October 2006 and January 2007 to change the scope of the notice and that decision was made before Judge Goodstein signed the Order Certifying Classes and Giving Preliminary Approval to Settlement. Therefore, the very act about which the Plaintiffs complain took place before the classes in the Underlying Case were certified – at a point in time when an attorney-client relationship did not exist between the Plaintiffs and the Lawyer Defendants.

Applying the majority rule to the facts of the Underlying Case, there was no attorney-client relationship between the Lawyer Defendants and the Plaintiffs at the time the alleged duties were allegedly breached. Absent an attorney-client relationship, the Plaintiffs' claims for professional negligence must fail.

2. *Premium Investment Corp. v. Green*

Plaintiffs posit that *Premium Investment Corp. v. Green, supra*, supports their contention.

that the attorney-client relationship and its attendant duties arose by operation of law when the Lawyer Defendants filed the class action complaints in the Underlying Cases. This is not correct because *Premium Investment Corp.* was a constructive class certification case that predated Rule 23, SCRC. Moreover, the Underlying Case before me is an actual certification case under Rule 23.

gm
In the underlying matter discussed in *Premium Investment Corp.*, a lawyer filed a complaint on behalf of a homeowner "individually and as a representative of a class of property owners" against the developer of a subdivision. After a hearing, the trial court entered an order finding that the homeowner brought two class actions: (i) as a member of a class owning property adjoining the lake, and (ii) as a member of a class owning property in the subdivision. The court found in favor of the plaintiffs and enjoined the developer. The developer appealed, and the case settled while on appeal.

Years later, Premium Investment Corp., a property owner in the subdivision, sued the homeowner and the lawyer to recover the proceeds of the two settlements. The Court of Appeals affirmed the trial court's order granting relief to Premium Investment. In considering whether the underlying case was a class action the Court of Appeals agreed that "court certification of the class is an important step in a class action," observing:

It represents a judicial finding that injured parties other than the named plaintiff exist. It also provides a definition by which they can be identified. Certification identifies and sharpens the interests of unnamed class members in the outcome; only thereafter will they be bound by the outcome. After certification, class members can be certain that the action will not be settled or dismissed without appropriate notice. *United States Parole Commission v. Geraghty*, 445 U.S. 388, 415 n. 8, 100 S. Ct. 1202, 1218 n. 8, 63 L. Ed. (2d) 479 (1980) (Powell, J., dissenting).

Id. at 470.

The Court of Appeals struggled to determine what constituted class certification where there was no formal class certification and concluded that in the case at hand, where there was no formal certification order, the trial court had "constructively certified" the class when it identified "those persons with an interest in and entitled to benefit" from the action. It found that certification had occurred simultaneous with the judgment on the merits.

Premium Investment Corp. stands for the proposition that where there is a class that has not been formally certified (as under Rule 23, SCRCF), a lawyer's and a class representative's duties to absent class members arise with the constructive certification of the class. *Premium Investment Corp.* is in line with the majority rule that an attorney-client relationship does not arise between absent class members and class counsel until class certification. Since its adoption in 1985, Rule 23(a) has required specific prerequisites to certification and pursuit of a class action, while *Premium Investment Corp.*, which predates Rule 23, allows for constructive certification. It is undisputed in the case before me that Rule 23, SCRCF, was referenced and observed by Judge Goodstein in her orders in the Underlying Case and that constructive certification is not at issue before me.

3. The Plaintiffs' Testimony.

As noted above, none of the Plaintiffs have offered any sworn statement or other evidence from which any reasonable fact-finder could conclude they had an attorney-client relationship with the Lawyer Defendants. To the contrary, when examined, none of the Plaintiffs knew who the Lawyer Defendants were or why they had sued them. Instead, as noted above, the Plaintiffs claim, in essence, that the Lawyer Defendants breached duties owed prior to class certification. For the reasons discussed above, the Court finds the Lawyer Defendants owed no duties to the absent class members prior to class certification.

Having found the duties allegedly breached did not exist, I find the Plaintiffs cannot prevail on their claims against the Lawyer Defendants.

D. No Breach of Fiduciary Duty.

The Lawyer Defendants assert the Plaintiffs' claims are also barred because they owed no fiduciary duties to the Plaintiffs before class certification. Plaintiffs, in response, argue a fiduciary duty was owed upon filing the class complaints. That fiduciary duty arose by operation of law, Plaintiffs contend, upon filing the pleading, pursuant to *Premium Investment Corp.*

As discussed above, the Court disagrees with Plaintiffs' argument that *Premium Investment Corp.* stands for the proposition that the filing of a class action complaint gives rise to fiduciary duties to unnamed and unidentified class members. Furthermore, the Court notes that while the Plaintiffs argue a fiduciary duty existed upon filing, they have yet to articulate what that duty was, nor have they explained the scope of it. Rather, they rely on the following excerpt from *Premium Investment Corp.*:

It is now generally conceded that a plaintiff who sues on behalf of a class and the attorney representing the class assume a fiduciary obligation to absent members of the class, including the obligation to inform them of proposed compromises of the group action. *Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 69 S. Ct. 1221, 93 L. Ed. 1528 (1949); *La Sala v. American Savings & Loan Association*, 5 Cal. (3d) 864, 97 Cal. Rptr. 849, 852, 489, P. (2d) 1113 (1971).

Id. at 470.

The Lawyer Defendants contend such statements refer to obligations that arise after class certification, whether certification pursuant to Rule 23, as here, or by constructive certification, as in *Premium Investment Corp.* The line of cases holding that an implied fiduciary duty arises when a lawyer files a complaint alleging a class action was discussed in *Gillespie v. Scherr*, 987 S.W.2d 129, 1998 Tex. App. LEXIS 8089 (Tex. App. 1998), where the court observed:

Appellants have cited and we have found no case finding an implied attorney-client relationship to exist before class certification between an attorney who files the class action and any unnamed class members. Appellants urge us to follow federal decisions which, in the context of class certification, recognize the *general* existence of a fiduciary duty to unnamed class members once a class action suit is filed. *See, e.g., In re General Motors Corp. Pick-up Truck Fuel Tank*, 55 F. 3d 768, 801 (3rd Cir. 1995) (stating that class attorneys owe the entire class a fiduciary duty once the class complaint is filed), *cert. denied*, 516 U.S. 824, 116 S. Ct. 88, 133 L. Ed. 2d 45 (1995). However, appellants have cited and we have found no decision which has defined the scope of such a duty or addressed it with regard to an actual claim for recovery against an attorney for its breach. **Although not cited by either side, the only case we have found in which the issue was addressed held that lawyers for named plaintiffs in an uncertified class action owe no duty to unnamed class members.** *See Formento v. Joyce*, 168 Ill. App. 3d 429, 522 N.E. 2d 312, 317, 118 Ill. Dec. 857 (Ill. App. Ct. 1988).

Id. (emphasis added).

Similarly, here the Plaintiffs have not defined the scope of the fiduciary duty they claim was violated by the Lawyer Defendants. One District Court examining the question found:

gem
Under this analysis, we may venture a few statements about the scope of the fiduciary duty owed by class counsel to putative class members prior to class certification. In short, the scope of those duties is limited to protecting the substantive legal rights of putative class members that form the basis of the class action suit from prejudice in an action against the class defendant resulting from the actions of class counsel.

Schick v. Berg, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6842, 2004 WL 856298; *aff'd* 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 24671 (2d Cir. N.Y. 2005). Even if there were a basis to assume a general fiduciary duty, as asserted by the Plaintiffs, the question then is who are the intended beneficiaries of that fiduciary duty. Here, Plaintiffs claim to be the intended beneficiaries based on the definitions and notice plan of the Primary and Consortium classes. Yet, those class definitions (and the classes themselves) did not exist until the Court certified the class under Rule 23 in its January 19, 2007 Order. If the intended beneficiaries are to be identified based upon the filing of a class complaint, the better approach is to look to the allegations in the class complaints, for it is those individuals

included in the class definitions in the complaints whom the Lawyer Defendants arguably sought to represent and to whom this alleged, general fiduciary duty would run.

The class action complaints in the Underlying Case defined the class of victims of sexual abuse sought to be certified as follows:

41. Plaintiff is entitled to the certification of a class of plaintiffs against the defendant representing all individuals, save for those barred by law from asserting an action against the defendants, in South Carolina who were sexually abused and/or otherwise molested by agents or employees of the catholic church under the supervision and/or control of the defendants.

John Doe #53, et. al. v. The Bishop of Charleston, et. al., Case No. 2006-CP-18-1636, Complaint ¶ 41. Therefore, the complaints relevant to the Primary Class clearly limited the putative classes to individuals within the geographical boundaries of South Carolina. *See also Id.* ¶ 36 (“Plaintiff is informed and believes that the number of other individuals in South Carolina have been the victims of childhood priest sexual abuse may exceed the hundreds and that the joinder of all such individuals in the instant suit is impracticable [sic].”).

gun
With respect to the Consortium Class, the complaint in the Underlying Case alleged:

The spouses, parents, and/or legal guardians of all individuals who were sexually abused and/or otherwise molested by agents or employees of the Catholic Church under the supervision and/or control of the defendants in South Carolina between January 1, 1950 and December 31, 2000 and who suffered a loss of the abused individual's consortium.

Jane Doe 1, et. al. v. The Bishop of Charleston, et. al., Case No. 2006-CP-18-1310, Complaint ¶ 25. Later, that complaint alleged:

Plaintiffs are informed and believes that the number of other individuals in South Carolina who fall within the definition of the class defined above may exceed the hundreds and that the joinder of all such individuals in the instant suit is impracticable [sic].

Id. ¶ 27. Therefore, the same geographical limitation applied to the Consortium Class.

This examination of the underlying complaints shows the Lawyer Defendants sought to represent a class of South Carolina residents who were sexually abused by priests of the Diocese Defendants and who were not barred by law from asserting a claim against those defendants. In addition, the Lawyer Defendants sought to represent South Carolina residents who were spouses, parents, and/or legal guardians of all individuals sexually abused by priests of the Diocese Defendants and who suffered a loss of the abused individual's consortium. In these cases before me, all of the Plaintiffs, save for John Doe 193, allege themselves to be non-residents of South Carolina. Therefore, even under the Plaintiffs' argument that there is a general fiduciary duty imposed upon lawyers who file a complaint alleging class action claims, I find that the Lawyer Defendants in the cases before me owed no duty to the Plaintiffs because the Plaintiffs all fall outside the class definitions alleged in the underlying class action complaints. The Court further notes that because the definition of the putative class of abuse victims specifically excluded victims whose claims were barred by law, none of the Plaintiffs whose claims are admittedly barred by the Diocese Defendants' defense of charitable immunity can prove any fiduciary duty owed by the Lawyer Defendants.

III. The Claims of Jane Doe 4:

The Lawyer Defendants filed a separate motion for summary judgment as to the claims of Jane Doe 4. The claims Jane Doe 4 alleges against the Lawyer Defendants are professional negligence and breach of fiduciary duty. Since the breach that Jane Doe 4 alleges took place before certification, when there was no attorney-client relationship, her claim for professional negligence must be dismissed. Additionally, since Jane Doe 4 was a non-resident, she was not the intended beneficiary of any general fiduciary duty owed by the Lawyer Defendants upon filing the class action complaints and her claim for breach of fiduciary duty must be dismissed as well. Finally,

and in light of the rulings set forth above, the Court need not address the issue of whether Jane Doe-4 lived in an area in which notice was published.

IV. The Claims of John Doe 193.

John Doe 193's sole surviving claims are those for breach of fiduciary duty and unfair trade practices. Since John Doe 193 is a.) a South Carolina resident, and b.) an abuse victim whose claim against the Diocese Defendants is barred by law, he was not an intended beneficiary of any general fiduciary duty that Plaintiff alleges was owed by the Lawyer Defendants when they filed the complaints. Thus, the Lawyer Defendants breached no fiduciary duty to John Doe 193 and his claim for breach of fiduciary duty must be dismissed.

V. The UTPA Claims.

Five (5) Plaintiffs have alleged claims for violation of the South Carolina Unfair Trade Practices Act, S.C. Code Ann. § 39-5-10, *et. seq.* ("UTPA").¹³ In their complaints, the Plaintiffs allege their claims under the UTPA presume the Plaintiffs are precluded, for one reason or another, from maintaining claims against the Diocese Defendants. Since the Court has already determined that the Plaintiffs are not precluded from asserting their claims against the Diocese Defendants as a result of the Lawyer Defendants, those claims also fail.

Additionally, the Court views these UTPA claims as thinly veiled, duplicative claims for legal malpractice. It is well-established that where a plaintiff asserts claims against an attorney for professional negligence and breach of fiduciary duty, both of which arise from the same materials facts, the claims are duplicative and merge into a single cause of action for legal malpractice. *RFT Mgmt. Co., L.L.C. v. Tinsley & Adams L.L.P.*, 399 S.C. 322, 337, 732 S.E.2d 166, 173-74 (2012);

¹³ Those cases in which unfair trade practices claims were alleged are 2013-CP-10-3733, 2013-CP-10-4176, 2015-CP-10-5486 and 2016-CP-10-1632.

Doe v. Howe, 367 S.C. 432, 448 n.27, 626 S.E.2d 25, 33 (Ct. App. 2005). In this case, Plaintiffs' UTPA claims are based upon the same material facts and same loss. Therefore, I find the UTPA claims merge into Plaintiffs' other claims. Because the Lawyer Defendants are entitled to summary judgment on their professional negligence and breach of fiduciary duty claims, as discussed above, the UTPA claims must also be dismissed. I further note the record before the Court contains no evidence from which any fact-finder could reasonably determine the Lawyer Defendants committed any unfair or deceptive act. The Court is compelled, therefore, to grant summary judgment on Plaintiffs' UTPA claims.


CONCLUSION

Having considered the motions made and filed by the Lawyer Defendants, the supporting and opposing memoranda submitted by the parties, the admissible evidence in the record, the arguments of counsel, and applicable law, I find and conclude that there are no genuine issues of material facts in these cases preventing summary judgment as to the Lawyer Defendants and, therefore, that the Lawyer Defendants are entitled to summary judgment as a matter of law on all claims.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that all claims alleged against the Lawyer Defendants in the above-captioned matters should be, and hereby are, dismissed with prejudice.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 8/8/17
Charleston, SC


The Honorable J. C. Nicholson, Jr.
Presiding Judge, Ninth Judicial Circuit