

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Clifton Newman, Circuit Court Judge

RECEIVED

DEC 20 2017

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Opinion No. 2017-UP-296 (S.C. Ct. App. filed July 19, 2017)
Appellate Case No.: 2017-002133

Rivergate Homeowners' Association,.....Petitioner,
v.

WW & LB Development Company, LLC, RWG, Inc., Aiello Associates, Daniels Engineering, Inc., Rivergate Homeowners' Association, Rivergate Homeowners' Association Board of Directors, Wayne Winderman, individually, Salvatrice Foran, individually, Gerald Foran, individually, Marcos Soares Construction, William C. DeSouza, individually, James Eason, individually and d/b/a James Eason & Company, D&D Cleaning and Construction, Inc., Joel's Framing, Joe Freza, Aroldo Garcia, Joaquin Geraldo Zeferinao, individually, and d/b/a Zeferino Framing, Leo Trombley, Judy Schultz, J&D Interior Design, Jose Dasmercse d/b/a J.P. construction, Scott Chandler d/b/a Coastal Custom Windows & Doors, R&D Construction, Nicasio Ramirez Zunigo, Walchir Morais, Marco Trebbi, Blankenship Roofing, Inc., DLJ Construction, LLC, Dewayne Bates, The Bates Group, LLC, Bridges Construction Co., Brewer Construction, Inc., Speedy Concrete, REB-FEL, Inc., Mark Mychajluk, Eric Jazwinski, Southern Framing Corporation, AB Consulting Engineers, Inc., WWI Development Company, LLC, Michael Dawson Construction, Inc., Asphalt Paving & Maintenance Co., Inc. and Chuck's Construction Co., Inc. Right Way Group, Inc., Stevens Construction Co., Inc., Geometrics, Inc., Eric Yazwinski, Law Engineering, Inc., D&M Builders, Inc., Hill Construction Company, Bonnie Stone a/k/a Bonny Stone, DJL Construction Company, L.L.P., Adrian Mondragon, individually and d/b/a Mondragon Construction, Inc., and Glen Causey,Defendants,

Of Whom

Speedee Concrete, Inc. and Chuck's Construction, Inc. are the.....Respondents,

Chuck's Construction Co., Inc.,.....Third-Party Plaintiff,

v.

Vereen Concrete Co., Inc. and Asphalt Pavement Maintenance of Myrtle Beach, Inc.,
.....Third-Party Defendants.

Rivergate Homeowners' Association.....Petitioner,

v.

WW & LB Development Company, LLC, Speedy Concrete, AB
Consulting Engineers, Inc., and Chuck's Construction Co., Inc.Defendants

Of Whom
AB Consulting Engineers, Inc. is theRespondent.

***CHUCK'S CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.
RETURN TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI***

Christina A. Bisset
J. Christopher Clark
MCANGUS GOUDELOCK & COURIE
Post Office Box 1349
2411 N. Oak Street, Suite 401 (29577)
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29578
Tel: 843.848.6008
Fax: 843.449.2306

*Attorneys for Chuck's
Construction Co., Inc.*

Other counsel of record:

Stacy L. Stanley
V. Denise Hamilton
3303 Highway 9 East
Little River, SC 29566
(843) 390-9111
Attorney for Petitioners

Blake A. Hewitt
P.O. Box 7965
Columbia, SC 29202
(803) 779-7599
Attorney for Petitioner

G. Michael Smith
P.O. Box 1740
Conway, SC 29528
(843) 248-5741
Attorney for Speedee Concrete

Stephanie H. Burton
308 East Saint John Street
Spartanburg, SC 29302
(864) 327-5000
Attorney for AB Consulting Engineers, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 2

ARGUMENT..... 4

 A. The Court of Appeals Correctly Held that Petitioner’s Claims are Barred by the Statute of
 Limitations and that Equitable Tolling Does Not Apply 4

 B. The Court of Appeals Correctly Held that the HOA Lacks Standing to Litigate Issues
 Concerning the Concrete Driveways, Which are Limited Common Elements 7

CONCLUSION..... 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Holly Woods Ass'n of Residence Owners v. Hiller, 5
392 S.C. 172, 183, 708 S.E.2d 787,793 (Ct. App. 2011)

Hedgepath v. AT&T, 5
348 S.C. 340, 355-56, 559 S.E.2d 327, 336 (S.C. Ct. App. 2001)

True v. Moteith, 5
327 S.C. 116, 489 S.E.2d 615 (1997)

Pelzer v. State, 6
378 S.C. 516, 520, 662 S.E.2d 618, 620 (Ct. App. 2008)

Hooper v. Ebenezer Senior Serv. & Rehab, 6
386 S.C. 108, 687 S.E.2d 29 (2009)

Magnolia North Prop. Owners' Ass'n, Inc. v. Heritage Communities, Inc..... 7
397 S.C. 348, 725 S.E.2d 112 (Ct. App. 2012)

Roundtree Villas Association, Inc. v. 4701 Kings Corp..... 7
282 S.C. 415, 321 S.E.2d 46 (1984)

STATUTES

S.C. Code Ann. § 15-3-530(1), 4

S.C. Code Ann. § 15-30-530(5) 4

S.C. Code Ann. § 39-5-150..... 4

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Did the Court of Appeals correctly affirm the Trial Court's finding that Petitioner's claims are barred by the applicable statute of limitations and that the doctrine of equitable tolling does not apply?

2. Did the Court of Appeals correctly affirm the Trial Court's finding in that the HOA lacked standing to litigate issues concerning the concrete driveways, which are limited common elements?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On January 12, 2007, Robert Sanger, a homeowner at Rivergate, filed a complaint in Horry County, South Carolina, which contained allegations regarding alleged design and construction deficiencies in the construction of Rivergate. (Sanger Complaint). Specifically, that complaint contained allegations regarding defective construction of roadways, drainage issues and improper driveway slopes. Id. Chuck's Construction Co., Inc., (Chucks) was not a named Defendant in the Sanger Complaint. Id. Thereafter, an Amended Complaint was filed by Sanger on April 20, 2008, where Sanger named additional subcontractors and design professions, but Chucks was not named in that suit either. Id.

On June 13, 2008, Petitioner filed a complaint against multiple subcontractors alleging construction deficiencies similar to those alleged in the Sanger lawsuit, including allegations pertaining to the construction of roadways, drainage issues and driveway slopes. (Petitioner's Complaint). Chuck's was still not named as a Defendant in that action at that time. Id. Petitioner filed an Amended Complaint on March 21, 2009, and Chuck's was again not named as a defendant in that suit. (Petitioner's Amended Complaint). The Sanger Complaint and Petitioner's Amended Complaint were consolidated on March 31, 2009. (Order filed March 31, 2009). Thereafter, On August 18, 2009, the case was stricken pursuant to Rule 40(j) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure. (Order dated August 18, 2009). Petitioner's case was restored on April 28, 2010, which named Chuck's as a defendant for the first time. (Petitioner's Second Amended Complaint). The allegations contained in Petitioner's Second Amended Complaint pertaining to the roadways, drainage issues and driveway slopes were identical to those allegations contained in the Sanger and Petitioner's Complaints. Id. Chuck's filed an Answer to Petitioner's Second Amended Complaint on June 1, 2010, asserting multiple defenses

which included statute of limitations. (Chuck's Answer to Petitioner's Second Amended Complaint). On March 13, 2013, Chuck's filed a motion for summary judgment as to Petitioner's claims. (Chuck's Motion for Summary Judgment).

On March 10, 2014, Judge Newman issued an Order Granting summary judgment in favor of Chuck's. (Order March 10, 2014). Thereafter, Petitioner filed a motion for reconsideration as to Judge Newman's order dated March 10, 2014. (Petitioner's Motion dated April 9, 2014). Thereafter, on December 8, 2014, Judge Newman denied Petitioner's motion for reconsideration. (Order dated December 8, 2014).

On February 4, 2015, Petitioner filed a notice of appeal of Judge Newman's decision. (Notice of Appeal dated February 4, 2015). On February 13, 2015, Petitioner filed an Amended notice of appeal. (Amended Notice of Appeal dated February 13, 2015). On June 7, 2017, oral arguments were heard by the South Carolina Court of Appeals. The South Carolina Court of Appeals issued its decision affirming Judge Newman's decision on July 19, 2017. (Op. No. 2017-UP-296) Petitioner filed a petition for rehearing on August 14, 2017. (Petition for rehearing August 14, 2017). The Court of Appeals denied Petitioner's petition on September 22, 2017. (Order denying rehearing filed September 22, 2017).

ARGUMENT

A. The Court of Appeals Correctly Held that Petitioner's Claims are Barred by the Statute of Limitations and that Equitable Tolling Does Not Apply.

A three-year statute of limitations applies to the causes of action asserted by Petitioner in its civil action against Chuck's. S.C. Code Ann. Section 15-3-530(1) (three year statute for express or implied warranty claims); S.C. Code Ann. Section 15-30-530(5) (three year statute for negligence claims); S.C. Code Ann. Section 39-5-150 (three year statute for Unfair Trade Practices claims). Petitioner brought its claims against Chuck's in April of 2010, but the Petitioner's Ad Hoc Committee knew of specific problems with drainage at Rivergate by at least May, 2005 (R. at 673). The HOA's general manager, Wayne Winderman, knew about drainage issues by at least July, 2005, when he wrote to the Ad Hoc Committee specifically concerning an "inspection" of drainage at Rivergate (R. at 616 et. seq.). Thus, the Petitioner's claims were time-barred when brought in 2010 and summary judgment was appropriate in favor of Chuck's.

Petitioner hopes to avoid this result by application of the discovery rule. Appellant claims that it did not have sufficient knowledge of the drainage problems at Rivergate prior to receiving a full report from its expert engineer, Kimley-Horn, in June 2010. The Kimley-Horn report goes into expert detail concerning the alleged cause-in-fact of the drainage problems, including esoterica such as obstruction of drainage structures and improper elevation of outfall ditches. (R. at 1065 et. seq.) An employee of Kimley-Horn, J. Drew Wilkie, executed an affidavit for consideration at the summary judgment hearing asserting that the Appellant "may have been aware of undesirable symptoms such as standing water, erosion etc." prior to June 2010. (R. at 1062 et. seq.) Nonetheless, the affidavit optimistically concludes that the HOA "would not have been aware" that the symptoms were caused by civil construction or design

defects. (*Id.*) Unfortunately for Petitioner, it was not necessary for the HOA to know of specific civil construction defects impacting drainage at Rivergate before the statute of limitations began to run.

“Under the discovery rule, the three-year statute of limitations clock starts ticking on the date the injured party either knows or should have known by the exercise of reasonable diligence that a cause of action arises from the wrongful conduct.” *Holly Woods Ass’n of Residence Owners v. Hiller*, 392 S.C. 172, 183, 708 S.E.2d 787, 793 (Ct. App. 2011). It is not necessary for a party to know the full extent of its alleged damages; it is sufficient for the party to be put on notice of such facts as would lead a person of common knowledge and experience to conclude that some claim may exist.” *Hedgepath v. AT&T*, 348 S.C. 340, 355-56, 559 S.E.2d 327, 336 (S.C. Ct. App. 2001).

Here, Petitioner knew of substantial and ongoing drainage problems at Rivergate nearly five years before an action was commenced against Chuck’s. Petitioner concedes that its expert engineer “advised Appellant’s counsel of a potential action against the Respondents” prior to the issuance of the engineer’s June 18, 2010 report. (Br. Appellant at 18). While it is true, as Petitioner contends, that the Petitioner’s expert may have been the person “most knowledgeable concerning civil construction defects at Rivergate” by virtue of his civil engineering education, *id.* at 17, the discovery rule does not require the “most knowledgeable” actor to discover a potential cause of action. Instead, the rule is triggered whenever an ordinary party of common experience is put on notice of facts sufficient to alert them that a claim may exist against another. *True v. Moteith*, 327 S.C. 116, 489 S.E.2d 615 (1997). That test was easily satisfied in this case years before Petitioner’s Second Amended Complaint. A party of average experience would have no trouble recognizing that the conditions brought to the attention of the Ad Hoc

Committee in 2005, including standing water and erosion, potentially concerned the grading which Chuck's performed at the outset of the project. Even without the benefit of civil engineering education, people from time immemorial have known that water flows downhill and is trapped in culverts, valleys, and other land masses of uneven grade. Therefore, Petitioner was on notice of a potential claim against Chuck's in 2005 and was under a duty to act promptly to defend its interests.

Equitable tolling is a doctrine rarely applied in South Carolina to stop the running of a statute of limitations. *Pelzer v. State*, 378 S.C. 516, 520, 662 S.E.2d 618, 620 (Ct. App. 2008). The doctrine may be invoked only when (a) extraordinary circumstances prevented the party from filing despite due diligence, (b) the party actively pursued his remedies by filing a defective pleading during the statutory period or was induced or tricked by the defendant into allowing the deadline to pass, and (c) the party is unable to obtain vital information bearing on the existence of his claim despite due diligence. *Hooper v. Ebenezer Senior Serv. & Rehab Center*, 386 S.C. 108, 687 S.E.2d 29 (2009).

Here, the HOA - whether controlled by the developer or some other party - had ample capacity to bring suit against third parties such as Chuck's at any time prior the turnover in October, 2007. The pre-turnover HOA had both the incentive and knowledge to bring an action to recover for construction defects brought to light in 2005. Petitioner posits no confidential relationship, collusion, or other factual scenario which would have prevented the developer-controlled HOA from proceeding against third parties who allegedly performed negligent services at Rivergate. Thus, there are no facts sufficient to satisfy the equitable tolling factors set forth in *Hooper*.

Petitioner cites *Magnolia North Prop. Owners' Ass'n, Inc. v. Heritage Communities, Inc.*, 397 S.C. 348, 725 S.E.2d 112 (Ct. App. 2012) in support of its equitable tolling claim, but that case is inapposite. In *Magnolia North*, this Court held that the statute of limitations was tolled during the period that the defendant developer controlled the plaintiff homeowner's association. By contrast, Chuck's is not the developer, but a third party, and neither controlled nor had any representation on Petitioner's board while the statute ran. Thus, the Petitioner was not faced with the peculiar prospect of "initiat[ing] an action against itself" during the relevant period – the action would have commenced against an arm's-length actor. (*Id.* at 372.) Accordingly, the Petition should be denied.

B. The Court of Appeals Correctly Held that the HOA Lacks Standing to Litigate Issues Concerning the Concrete Driveways, Which are Limited Common Elements.


Petitioner alleges that the concrete driveways which lead to individual homeowner units are too steep; however Petitioner neither owns nor maintains these concrete driveways. Property at Rivergate was conveyed by WW&LB to Petitioner by the Master Deed and the associated amendments. (Article XXII of the Master Deed). Furthermore, Article XXII of the Master Deed indicates that these concrete driveways are Limited Common Elements and thus are not either owned by or maintained by Petitioner. *Id.* These concrete driveways are the sole responsibility of the unit owners and these owners "shall be expressly responsible for the damages and liability which his failure to do so may engender." *Id.* In *Roundtree Villas Association, Inc. v. 4701 Kings Corp.*, 282 S.C. 415, 421, 321 S.E.2d 46 (1984), the Supreme Court held that the homeowners association did not have the authority to bring suit for defects to balconies because they were limited common elements. This same reasoning was applied in this matter as the

concrete driveways were deemed to be “limited common elements” and solely the responsibility of the individual unit owner and not the HOA.

Petitioner incorrectly relies on Article IV in support of their position that the limited common elements are to be treated as common elements, which would give Petitioner standing to bring suit for the alleged deficiencies with the concrete driveways. Article IV of the Master Deed states: “In all other respects, and except as specifically provided in this Master Deed, LIMITED COMMON ELEMENTS shall be treated as, and included within the definition of the term ‘Common Elements’.” Petitioner’s reliance on this specific language of the Master Deed fails to take into account the language pertaining to “except as specifically provided in this Master Deed...” Article XXII of the Master Deed clearly provides that the concrete driveways are limited common elements and that the individual unit owners are solely responsible for any damages or liability for these concrete driveways.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the Order of the Trial Court granting summary judgment in favor of Chuck's and the Court of Appeals decision affirming the Trial Court's Order was proper and thus Petitioner's petition for writ of certiorari should be denied.



Christina A. Bisset
J. Christopher Clark
MCANGUS GOUDELOCK & COURIE
Post Office Box 1349
2411 N. Oak Street, Suite 401 (29577)
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29578
Tel: 843.848.6008
Fax: 843.449.2306

*Attorneys for Third-Party Plaintiff, Chuck's
Construction Co., Inc.*

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

RECEIVED

DEC 20 2017

APPEAL FROM HORRY COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Clifton Newman, Circuit Court Judge

Opinion No. 2017-UP-296 (S.C. Ct. App. filed July 19, 2017)
Appellate Case No.: 2017-002133

Rivergate Homeowners' Association,.....Petitioner,
v.

WW & LB Development Company, LLC, RWG, Inc., Aiello Associates, Daniels Engineering, Inc., Rivergate Homeowners' Association, Rivergate Homeowners' Association Board of Directors, Wayne Winderman, individually, Salvatrice Foran, individually, Gerald Foran, individually, Marcos Soares Construction, William C. DeSouza, individually, James Eason, individually and d/b/a James Eason & Company, D&D Cleaning and Construction, Inc., Joel's Framing, Joe Freza, Aroldo Garcia, Joaquin Geraldo Zeferinao, individually, and d/b/a Zeferino Framing, Leo Trombley, Judy Schultz, J&D Interior Design, Jose Dasmercse d/b/a J.P. construction, Scott Chandler d/b/a Coastal Custom Windows & Doors, R&D Construction, Nicasio Ramirez Zunigo, Walchir Morais, Marco Trebbi, Blankenship Roofing, Inc., DLJ Construction, LLC, Dewayne Bates, The Bates Group, LLC, Bridges Construction Co., Brewer Construction, Inc., Speedy Concrete, REB-FEL, Inc., Mark Mychajluk, Eric Jazwinski, Southern Framing Corporation, AB Consulting Engineers, Inc., WWI Development Company, LLC, Michael Dawson Construction, Inc., Asphalt Paving & Maintenance Co., Inc. and Chuck's Construction Co., Inc. Right Way Group, Inc., Stevens Construction Co., Inc., Geometrics, Inc., Eric Yazwinski, Law Engineering, Inc., D&M Builders, Inc., Hill Construction Company, Bonnie Stone a/k/a Bonny Stone, DJL Construction Company, L.L.P., Adrian Mondragon, individually and d/b/a Mondragon Construction, Inc., and Glen Causey,Defendants,

Of Whom

Speedee Concrete, Inc. and Chuck's Construction, Inc. are the.....Respondents,

Chuck's Construction Co., Inc.,.....Third-Party Plaintiff,

v.

Vereen Concrete Co., Inc. and Asphalt Pavement Maintenance of Myrtle Beach, Inc.,
.....Third-Party Defendants.

Rivergate Homeowners' Association.....Petitioner,

v.

WW & LB Development Company, LLC, Speedy Concrete, AB
Consulting Engineers, Inc., and Chuck's Construction Co., Inc.Defendants

Of Whom
AB Consulting Engineers, Inc. is theRespondent.

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned, Christina A. Bisset, certifies that on the 19th day of December 2017, she served copies of the Return to Petition for Writ of Certiorari of Chuck's Construction Co., Inc. by depositing in the United States mail, with due and proper postage affixed thereto, a copy of the same addressed to:

Stephanie H. Burton
Gibbes Burton, LLC
308 East Saint John Street
Spartanburg, South Carolina 29302

Stacy L. Stanley
V. Denise Hamilton
Stanley Law Firm
3303 Highway 9 East
Little River, SC 29566

G. Michael Smith
Thompson & Henry, P.A.
Post Office Box 1740
Conway, SC 29528

Blake A. Hewitt
Bluestein Thompson Sullivan
Post Office Box 7965
Columbia, SC 29202

Christina A. Bisset
J. Christopher Clark
MCANGUS GOUDELOCK & COURIE
Post Office Box 1349
2411 N. Oak Street, Suite 401 (29577)
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29578
Tel: 843.848.6008
Fax: 843.449.2306
Attorneys for *Chuck's*
Construction Co., Inc.

RECEIVED

DEC 20 2017

S.C. SUPREME COURT