

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM
THE SOUTH CAROLINA WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Full Commission Decision

Appellate Case No. 2016-001497

Ignacio RodriguezEmployee, Claimant, Respondent,

v.

Robert T. Pierson d/b/a Robert T. Pierson Constr. Co., Employer, and
ABC Care, Inc., Employers, Respondents,

and

South Carolina Uninsured Employers' Fund, Property & Casualty
Insurance Co. of Hartford, Carriers, Defendants

Of which Property and Casualty Insurance Co. of Hartford., is theAppellant.

FINAL REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

David M. Padgett (S.C. Bar #76026)
Holder Padgett Littlejohn + Prickett, LLC
1204 A. East Washington Street
Greenville, South Carolina 29601
(864) 335-8808
Attorney for Appellant

RECEIVED

DEC 09 2016

SC Court of Appeals

Other Counsel of Record:

William H. Ehlies, Esquire
310 Mills Avenue., Suite. 201
Greenville, South Carolina 29605
(864) 232-3503

Attorney for Respondent, Ignacio Rodriguez

Randall S. Hiller, Esquire
850-B Wade Hampton Boulevard
Greenville, South Carolina 29609
(864) 232-0026

Attorney for Respondents, Robert T. Pierson, d/b/a Robert T. Pierson Construction and ABC Care, Inc.

David H. Keller, Esquire
Turner Padgett Graham and Laney
Post Office Box 1509
Greenville, South Carolina 29602
(864) 552-4622

Attorney for Respondent, South Carolina Workers' Compensation Uninsured Employers Fund

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM
THE SOUTH CAROLINA WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Full Commission Decision

Appellate Case No. 2016-001497

Ignacio RodriguezEmployee, Claimant, Respondent,

v.

Robert T. Pierson d/b/a Robert T. Pierson Constr. Co., Employer, and
ABC Care, Inc., Employers, Respondents,

and

South Carolina Uninsured Employers' Fund, Property & Casualty
Insurance Co. of Hartford, Carriers, Defendants

Of which Property and Casualty Insurance Co. of Hartford., is theAppellant.

FINAL REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

David M. Padgett (S.C. Bar #76026)
Holder Padgett Littlejohn + Prickett, LLC
1204 A. East Washington Street
Greenville, South Carolina 29601
(864) 335-8808
Attorney for Appellant

Other Counsel of Record:

William H. Ehlires, Esquire
310 Mills Avenue., Suite. 201
Greenville, South Carolina 29605
(864) 232-3503
Attorney for Respondent, Ignacio Rodriguez

Randall S. Hiller, Esquire
850-B Wade Hampton Boulevard
Greenville, South Carolina 29609
(864) 232-0026
Attorney for Respondents, Robert T. Pierson, d/b/a Robert T. Pierson Construction and ABC Care, Inc.

David H. Keller, Esquire
Turner Padgett Graham and Laney
Post Office Box 1509
Greenville, South Carolina 29602
(864) 552-4622
Attorney for Respondent, South Carolina Workers' Compensation Uninsured Employers Fund

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	i
REPLY	1
CONCLUSION.....	3

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Shatto v. McLeod Reg'l Med. Ctr.</i> , 406 S.C. 470, 476, 753 S.E.2d 416, 419, (S.C. 2013)	1, 2
--	------

REPLY¹

Appellant's Reply Brief addresses assertions raised in the joint Response Brief filed by Ignacio Rodriguez (hereinafter "Claimant"), Robert T. Pierson d/b/a Pierson Construction Co., and the South Carolina Uninsured Employers Fund. Specifically, this Reply Brief will address Respondents' assertions regarding Claimant's employment status and Respondents' rational for why ABC Care, Inc. (hereinafter "ABC Care") built the residential home in question.

First, Respondents assert, on page 10 of their Response Brief, that Pierson, Claimant, Chavez, and Bello were all employees of ABC Care operating in South Carolina. The South Carolina Supreme Court provided the framework for analyzing an employer/employee relationship in *Shatto v. McLeod Reg'l Med. Ctr.* The Court provided four "right to control" factors to consider: "(1) direct evidence of the right or exercise of control; (2) furnishing of equipment; (3) method of payment and (4) right to fire." 406 S.C. 470, 476, 753 S.E.2d 416, 419, (S.C. 2013).

Despite Respondents' assertions, Claimant testified that he believed he worked for Robert Pierson Construction Co. (R. p. 35, lines 6-11). In addition, Claimant testified that he looked to Pierson for directions about the job. (R. p. 59, lines 8-11). Similarly, the record is clear that Pierson provided Chavez, Claimant, and Bellow with at least some of the equipment and tools used in the construction of 149 Lake Wood Lane. (R. p. 93, lines 2-25). This is, of course, logical because Pierson owned a construction company, Robert Pierson Construction Co. Third, it is undisputed that Claimant, and the two other employees, were paid with Robert Pierson Construction Co. checks. (R. p. 96, lines 23-25, p. 97, lines 1-6, p. 110, lines 7-23). Finally, Chavez testified that he had the power to terminate Claimant. (R. p. 99, lines 4-6).

¹ Respondents' Response Brief violates SCACR Rule 208. Specifically, Respondents failed to comply with Rule 208(b)(4) by failing to properly reference transcripts, pleadings, orders, exhibits, or other materials to support the factual basis of their brief.

Under the factors set forth in *Shatto*, Claimant was not an employee of ABC Care because ABC Care did not meet any of the four *Shatto* “right to control” factors. Appellant’s argument is aided by the fact that Claimant had never heard of ABC Care during his employment, and that he did not initially file a claim against ABC Care. (R. p. 70, lines 12-20). Claimant believed he was an employee of Robert T. Pierson Construction Co. and the overwhelming evidence on record points to the same conclusion. The only evidence which links Claimant to ABC Care is the fact that ABC Care owned 149 Lake Wood Lane. Claimant did not consider himself an employee of ABC Care at the time of his injury.

Second, Respondents assert, on pages 2 and 6 of their Response Brief, that ABC Care’s board of directors made a decision to build a residential house on Lake Keowee to significantly reduce the cost of food and lodging for the summer camp employees. Pierson testified that during the first week of camp, ABC Care had one employee working the camp and that this employee would drive ABC Care’s van to the county park and take care of the camp attendees, whose parents dropped them off at the county park. (R. p. 171, lines 17-25). Pierson and his wife were also present for the summer camp and would relieve the one employee throughout the day. (R. p. 176, lines 3-10). Pierson then testified that the camp had four attendees for a week of camp, six attendees in another week of camp, and nine attendees in another week of camp. (R. p. 180, lines 2-18).


Appellant points out the absurdity of this argument. Pierson and his wife, ABC Care’s executive director, intend to retire at Lake Keowee. (R. p. 172, lines 4-11). The assertion that, by constructing a home worth thousands of dollars, if not hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars, they would significantly reduce their cost of food and lodging for one to three summer camp employees, is ridiculous. The camp had less than twenty attendees over the course of a summer.

Pierson built this home so he and his wife could retire to Lake Keowee, and he is attempting to disguise this venture as a business investment at the cost of Claimant's injuries.

CONCLUSION

For the reason stated in Appellant's initial brief and this Reply Brief, this Court should reverse the decision of the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission.

Respectfully submitted,



David M. Padgett (S.C. Bar #76026)

Holder Padgett Littlejohn + Prickett, LLC

1204 A. East Washington Street

Greenville, South Carolina 29601


(864) 335-8808

Attorney for Appellant

December 8, 2016

Certificate of Counsel

The undersigned hereby certifies that the Final Reply Brief of Appellant contains all material proposed to be included by any of the parties and not any other material.



David M. Padgett (S.C. Bar #76026)

Holder Padgett Littlejohn + Prickett, LLC

1204 A. East Washington Street

Greenville, South Carolina 29601

(864) 335-8808

Attorney for Appellant

December , 2016

RECEIVED

DEC 09 2016

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM
THE SOUTH CAROLINA WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Full Commission Decision

Appellate Case No. 2016-001497

Ignacio Javier Rodriguez, Employee, Claimant, Respondent,

v.

Robert T. Pierson, d/b/a Robert Pierson Construction Co., Employer, and
ABC Care, Inc., Employers, Respondents,

and

South Carolina Uninsured Employers' Fund, Property & Casualty Insurance Co. of
Hartford, Carriers, Defendants

Of which Property & Casualty Insurance Co. of Hartford is the Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the Final Brief of Appellant and the Final Reply Brief of Appellant in the above referenced case has been served on all parties of record by mailing a copy of same in the United States mail, postage prepaid this 8th day of December, 2016, addressed as follows:

William H. Ehlires, Esquire
310 Mills Avenue., Suite. 201
Greenville, South Carolina 29605
Attorney for Respondent

Randall S. Hiller, Esquire
850-B Wade Hampton Boulevard
Greenville, South Carolina 29609

Attorney for Robert T. Pierson, d/b/a Pierson Construction and ABC Care, Inc.

RECEIVED

DEC 09 2016

SC Court of Appeals

David H. Keller, Esquire

Turner Padgett

Post Office Box 1509

Greenville, South Carolina 29602

Attorney for South Carolina Workers' Compensation Uninsured Employers Fund

South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission

Post Office Box 1715

Columbia, South Carolina 29202

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mary Pate", is written over a horizontal line.

Mary Pate, Paralegal

Holder, Padgett, Littlejohn + Prickett, LLC