

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT


WKSC, LLC D/B/A SAVANAH'S)
GENTLEMAN'S CLUB &)
STEAKHOUSE,)
)
Petitioner,)
)
v.)
)
SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF)
REVENUE,)
)
Respondent.)

Docket No. 18-ALJ-17-0216-CC

NOTICE OF APPEARANCE

Please take note that Andrew L. Richardson, Jr. hereby enters his appearance as attorney for Representative Chip Huggins in this matter, who has protested the application.

MCANGUS GOUDELOCK & COURIE, L.L.C.



Andrew L. Richardson, Jr.
Bar No.: 76214
Post Office Box 12519
1320 Main Street, 10th Floor (29201)
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
Phone: (803) 779-2300
Email: drew.richardson@mgclaw.com
ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS,

August 29, 2018

RECEIVED
SEP 07 2018
SC Court of Appeals

FILED
AUG 29 2018

SC ADMIN LAW COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

WKSC, LLC D/B/A SAVANNAH'S)
GENTLEMEN'S CLUB &)
STEAKHOUSE,)
)
Petitioner,)
)
v.)
)
SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF)
REVENUE,)
)
Respondent.)


Docket No. 18-ALJ-17-0216-CC

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have served the Notice of Appearance in the above-captioned matter by depositing it in the United State Mail, postage prepaid, on August 30, 2018 to the below named parties at their address of record:

Kenneth E. Allen, Esquire
1201 Main Street, Suite 1980
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Jason P. Luther, Esquire
S.C. Department of Revenue
Post Office Box 12265
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-9979



Mollie Roche
Legal Assistant for Andrew L. Richardson, Jr.
McAngus, Goudelock & Courie LLC
Post Office Box 12519, Capitol Station
Meridian, 1320 Main Street, 10th Floor (29201)
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-2519
(803) 779-2300

August 30, 2018

FILED

AUG 30 2018


SC ADMIN LAW COURT

rights of the existing parties. For the foregoing reasons, Movant respectfully asserts it is vitally interested in and affected by the outcome of this proceeding.

In view of these allegations, any order issued by the Court in this proceeding would be binding on Movant and its interest in these proceedings would not be adequately protected unless it is permitted to intervene. Notwithstanding the above, Movant is aware that such motion has been filed outside the 20 day time limit as provided pursuant to Rule 20(c) of the Administrative Law Court Rules of Civil Procedure. However, Movant asserts that good cause is found for the tardiness to timely intervene due to (1) Movant asserting that its interest shall not be properly satisfied without the rights afforded to properly identified parties to the litigation, (2) Judicial Economy may be best served with an officially named Party Protestant and (3) due to the below listed counsel having been recently retained on August 29, 2018 (*See* filed Notice of Appearance for Representative Chip Huggins).

Wherefore, Movant respectfully moves that it be granted leave to intervene in this proceeding.

McANGUS GOUDELOCK & COURIE, L.L.C.



Andrew L. Richardson, Jr.
Post Office Box 12519, Capitol Station Meridian,
1320 Main Street, 10th Floor (29201)
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-2519
(803) 779-2300

ATTORNEY FOR MOVANT

August 30, 2018.

ORDER

The foregoing Motion to Intervene is hereby

_____ GRANTED.

_____ DENIED for the following reasons:

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

_____, 2018.

Administrative Law Judge

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

WKSC, LLC D/B/A SAVANNAH'S)
GENTLEMEN'S CLUB &)
STEAKHOUSE,)
)
Petitioner,)
)
v.)
)
SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF)
REVENUE,)
)
Respondent.)

Docket No. 18-ALJ-17-0216-CC

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have served the Motion for Leave to Intervene in the above-captioned matter by depositing it in the United State Mail, postage prepaid, on August 30, 2018 to the below named parties at their address of record:

Kenneth E. Allen, Esquire
1201 Main Street, Suite 1980
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Jason P. Luther, Esquire
S.C. Department of Revenue
Post Office Box 12265
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-9979


Mollie Roche
Mollie Roche
Legal Assistant for Andrew L. Richardson, Jr.
McAngus, Goudelock & Courie LLC
Post Office Box 12519, Capitol Station
Meridian, 1320 Main Street, 10th Floor (29201)
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-2519
(803) 779-2300

August 30, 2018

FILED

AUG 30 2018

SC ADMIN LAW COURT



Mollie Roche

From: Drew Richardson
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2018 3:13 PM
To: Mollie Roche; Tonya Deisn-Smith
Subject: Fwd: Order-Motion to Intervene WKSC, LLC, d/b/a Savannah's Gentlemen's Club & Steakhouse v. DOR 18a0216
Attachments: Order Denying Intervention 18a0216.pdf; ATT00001.htm

FYI

Andrew L. Richardson, Jr.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Erika S. Easler" <eeasler@scalc.net>
Date: September 5, 2018 at 2:53:26 PM EDT
To: Drew Richardson <drew.richardson@mgclaw.com>, Ken Allen Atty <kallenlaw@sc.rr.com>, "Patrick A. McCabe" <Patrick.McCabe@dor.sc.gov>
Subject: Order-Motion to Intervene WKSC, LLC, d/b/a Savannah's Gentlemen's Club & Steakhouse v. DOR 18a0216

Gentlemen,

Good afternoon!


Please find attached the Order denying the Motion to Intervene in the above referenced case.

Thank you.

V/R,

Erika S. Easler, Esq.
Judicial Law Clerk to the Honorable S. Phillip Lenski
South Carolina Administrative Law Court
1205 Pendleton Street, Suite 224
Columbia, S.C. 29201

Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the SC Administrative Law Court.



STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

Docket No. 18-ALJ-17-0216-CC

WKSC, LLC, d/b/a Savannah's Gentlemen's
Club & Steakhouse,

Petitioner,

v.

South Carolina Department of Revenue,

Respondent.

**ORDER DENYING
INTERVENTION**

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND BACKGROUND

This matter is before the Administrative Law Court (ALC or court) for a contested case hearing pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §§ 1-23-310 *et seq.* (2005 and Supp. 2017), S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-600(B) (Supp. 2014), and S.C. Code Ann. § 61-2-260 (2009 and Supp. 2017). The Petitioner, d/b/a Savannah's Gentlemen's Club and Steakhouse, applied for an on-premises beer and wine permit and restaurant liquor by the drink license, which was denied by the South Carolina Department of Revenue (Department) for several reasons, including the receipt of valid written protests, insufficient information provided by the Petitioner, and the suitability of the location. The Department received two hundred thirty-nine (239) written protests to the Petitioner's application. On June 19, 2018, the Department issued a Final Determination Letter denying the Petitioner's applications. On June 20, 2018, the Petitioner sought a contested case hearing with the ALC. On June 28, 2018, this matter was assigned to this court.

On July 19, 2018, this court issued an Order and Notice of Hearing, establishing the time and date of this hearing (10:00 a.m., September 22, 2018), its location, and the court's procedure, among other matters. Due to the extraordinarily large number of protestants in this case, the court had to make special preparations to accommodate the anticipated protestants and attendees at the hearing.¹ Because the logistics involved in such a large hearing, and to ensure timely adjudication of this

¹ With 239 protestants, in addition to spectators, this case has the largest number of attendees of any matter before the ALC. The largest courtroom in the court can only accommodate seventy (70) occupants. Therefore, the court had to make special accommodations and coordinate with an adjoining state agency co-located in the same building as the court to borrow its conference room for the day of the hearing. Large screen monitors in that agency's conference room have been equipped to receive live video and audio feed so spectators and protestants who cannot sit in the courtroom will still be able to view the proceedings, and so protestants will know when their turn has come to testify. Additionally, the court has had to modify security procedures to accommodate the large number of attendees and ensure the safety of the public.

FILED
SEP 05 2018
SC ADMIN. LAW COURT

matter, the court issued an Administrative Memorandum to Individuals Protesting A License or Permit. This memorandum set forth, among other things, that the protestants with common objections or who are members of a group or organization protesting the Petitioner's license applications should appoint a spokesperson who can effectively present the concerns of the group or organization, in order to minimize the number of witnesses that would be speaking at the hearing. Additionally, the Memorandum contained the following paragraph:

SCALC Rule 20 governs motions to intervene. If you wish to intervene as a party in this case, you must file a motion to intervene with the Administrative Law Judge assigned to hear the case no later than August 10, 2018. Any motion to intervene filed after that date will be deemed by the court to be untimely and prejudicial to the rights of existing parties. All motions to intervene must meet the qualifications set forth in SCALC Rule 20(B).

The court's Order and Notice of Hearing and the Memorandum were electronically transmitted to all parties and protestants on July 19, 2018.

On August 30, 2018, the court received a Motion for Leave to Intervene, filed by counsel, seeking to permit The Honorable Chip Huggins of South Carolina House of Representatives District 85 (Lexington County) to intervene in the matter. The Movant (already a protestant) sought to intervene, alleging that: (1) he would be aggrieved or adversely affected by potential issuance of the license; (2) his interests would not be properly represented by the Department; (3) his interest would not be represented by the Petitioner; and (4) he would not unduly prolong the proceeding or otherwise prejudice the rights of existing parties. The Movant further asserted that by permitting intervention, the court could potentially streamline the process of hearing the case and enhance the rights of existing parties. In addressing the tardiness of the motion, the Movant asserted that he had good cause for filing the motion late because (1) his interest would not be properly satisfied unless he was afforded the rights bestowed upon parties to the litigation, (2) judicial economy would best be served with an officially named Party Protestant, and (3) the Movant's counsel was not retained until August 29, 2018, the day before the filing of the motion.

On September 4, 2018, the court conducted a telephone conference with counsel for all existing parties and the Movant. During that telephone conference, the Movant's counsel restated his grounds for seeking leave to intervene. He asserted that the Movant did not feel that his interests or the interests of his constituents, residing in and around the proposed location, were adequately represented by the current parties, and that while Representative Huggins was the only person seeking to intervene, he believed that his arguments against licensing the Petitioner represented a

grassroots position in general opposition to the licensing of the establishment. Furthermore, he asserted that by permitting the intervention, it might streamline the process of hearing the matter because as a party, Representative Huggins could better present the objections held by the other protestants. While he could not represent that the Movant's intervention would curtail the number of protestants seeking to speak at the hearing, counsel for the Movant asserted that he believed such would be the case.

When asked about the reason for the tardiness of the motion, counsel for the Movant again pointed out to the court that he was retained on August 29, 2018 and filed his Motion for Leave to Intervene the following day. As to why the Movant waited until August 29, 2018 to retain counsel and seek to intervene, he stated that he believed there was some difficulty or delay in acquiring the funds for his representation, and that there may have been some uncertainty about the process, due to the Movant not being an attorney. Finally, the Movant's counsel asserted that he would be ready to proceed on the scheduled hearing date, and that he would not delay the proceedings.

Counsel for the Department did not take a position on the Motion for Leave to Intervene. However, counsel for the Petitioner strongly opposed the motion. The Petitioner's counsel pointed out that the Motion for Leave to Intervene was filed outside the standard timeline established in SCALC Rule 20(c), which requires motions to intervene to be filed within twenty (20) days before the hearing, and it was filed outside the specific August 10, 2018 deadline this court established for this hearing in the court's Administrative Memorandum attached to its July 19, 2018 Order and Notice of Hearing. Counsel for the Petitioner further asserted that the basis for seeking to intervene was political rather than based on real opposition to the location, in that the Movant is involved in a contested race for re-election and is seeking to curry political capital with constituents. Finally, the Petitioner's counsel asserted that permitting intervention at this late date would prejudice his client. He stated that he does not generally depose non-party protestants to a liquor license because protestants are mere witnesses and do not have the right to call witnesses, cross-examine, or make argument. On the other hand, he generally does depose an intervening party protesting a liquor license, and any witnesses the party may seek to call, due to the greater rights afforded a party. However, because of the late date of the Movant's motion, effectively one business week before the hearing, he would be unable to prepare and depose the Movant and any other witnesses the Movant might seek to call in his case before the court.

DISCUSSION

The issue before the court is whether the Movant should be granted leave to intervene. ALC Rule

20. ALC Rule 20 governs intervention in contested cases pending before the ALC. Rule 20 states in pertinent part:

Any person may intervene in any pending contested case hearing upon a showing that: (1) the movant will be aggrieved or adversely affected by the final order; (2) the interests of the movant are not being adequately represented by existing parties, or that it is otherwise entitled to intervene; (3) that intervention will not unduly prolong the proceedings or otherwise prejudice the rights of existing parties. ALC Rule 20(B).

A party seeking to intervene has the burden of showing that intervention is proper. *See In re Horry Co. State Bank*, 361 S.C. 503, 508, 604 S.E.2d 723, 725 (Ct. App. 2004) (stating that the applicant for intervention bears the burden of demonstrating required elements for intervention). The time for filing a motion to intervene is governed by ALC Rule 20(C), which provides:

The motion for leave to intervene shall be filed as early in the proceedings as possible to avoid adverse impact on the existing parties or the disposition of the proceedings. Unless otherwise ordered by the administrative law judge, the motion to intervene shall be filed at least twenty (20) days before the hearing. Any later motion shall contain a statement of good cause for the failure to intervene earlier.

In this case, the court is dealing with a cumbersome proceeding and an extraordinarily large number of attendees. The 239 protestants, all potential witnesses, coupled with anticipated spectators, have strained the court's ability to effectively and safely conduct the hearing. No other hearings have been scheduled during the date of the hearing², and the court has carefully developed a plan, borrowing space from a neighboring state agency, and wired an adjoining conference room with video and audio feed to accommodate the large number of attendees. In recognition of the unique nature of this proceeding, the court sent out a memorandum with its Order and Notice of Hearing, informing protestants that if they "...**wish to intervene as a party in this case, you must file a motion to intervene with the Administrative Law Judge assigned to hear the case no later than August 10, 2018.**" (emphasis included). Further, the memorandum stated "(a)ny motion to intervene filed after that date will be deemed by the court to be untimely and prejudicial to the rights

²The South Carolina Administrative Law Court has six judges who sit on its bench and there are three courtrooms in the building. No other hearings are being held on the scheduled day of this hearing due to the strain on the court's personnel and resources.

of existing parties.” A copy of the Order and Memorandum was electronically sent to all protestants on July 19, 2018, and the Movant electronically acknowledged receipt on the same day.

In evaluating the Movant’s Motion for Leave to Intervene, the court focuses on the timeliness of the motion, and the justification given for its late filing. The motion was not filed until Friday, August 30, 2018. It was filed twelve (12) days before the scheduled hearing, and on a Friday before the long Labor Day weekend, effectively leaving only one business week for the existing parties to adjust to the addition of a new party if granted. This is well outside the 20-day deadline for filing set forth in SCALC Rule 20, and 20 days after the August 10, 2018 deadline set by this court for this case. The Petitioner has asserted that granting the Movant’s motion at this late hour will prejudice the Petitioner’s ability to prepare for the hearing on the scheduled date, as he will be unable to schedule, conduct, and review depositions of any of the Movant’s witnesses.³

In the Movant’s motion, the grounds offered for its late filing are that (1) the Movant’s interest will not be properly satisfied unless he is afforded the rights bestowed upon parties to the litigation, (2) judicial economy would best be served with an officially named Party Protestant, and (3) the Movant’s counsel was not retained until August 29, 2018, the day before the filing of the motion. None of these offer any justification for the motion’s tardiness. While the Movant’s interests and any judicial economy realized by adding an intervenor may go towards good cause for being permitted to intervene, they fail to answer why the motion was filed out of time. The final justification, that counsel was not retained until the day before the filing, may address why the Movant’s counsel did not file the motion until August 30, 2018, however, it in no way addresses why the Movant failed to retain counsel until long after both the standard regulatory filing deadline and the special deadline set by the court in this case had expired. In the telephonic conference held by the court on September 4, 2018, the Movant’s counsel expounded upon the justifications asserted in the written motion establishing the Movant’s grounds for seeking intervention. However, when he attempted to explain or justify the late filing he could only suggest that there may have been some difficulty with the funding of counsel to intervene, and that there may have been some confusion about the administrative process, given that neither the Movant nor any of the other protestants the Movant has been communicating with are attorneys skilled in practicing before the court. While the court does not doubt this, the court does not find any of that explanation sufficient to justify permitting the Movant to intervene so late in the process, especially given the court’s written notice

³The Movant’s counsel points out that the Petitioner could have deposed the Movant and any other protestants at any time prior to the hearing, as he knew the names of all protesting persons. However, this assertion ignores that there are 239 protestants in this matter. The thought that the Petitioner could have deposed all of them prior to the hearing, in anticipation that one or more might move to intervene in the action, is unrealistic, especially given the

to the Movant sent and received on July 19, 2018, stating that motions to intervene must be received no later than August 10, 2018 or they would be deemed untimely and prejudicial.

The court is persuaded by the test employed by this state's Supreme Court in evaluating the timeliness of motions to intervene filed by movants in Circuit Court, pursuant to SCRPC Rule 24. In *Davis v. Jennings*, 304 S.C. 502, 405 S.E.2d 601 (1991), the South Carolina Supreme Court held that courts employ a four-part test for determining the timeliness of motions to intervene in civil proceedings pursuant to SCRPC Rule 24:


- (1) the time that has passed since the applicant knew or should have known of his or her interest in the suit;
- (2) the reason for the delay;
- (3) the stage to which the litigation has progressed; and
- (4) the prejudice the original parties would suffer from granting intervention and the applicant would suffer from denial.

Davis, 406 S.E.2d at 603. While SCALC Rule 20 is not identical to SCRPC Rule 24, they are analogous, and the test provides a sound basis for evaluating late filed SCALC Rule 20 motions to intervene. Here, the Movant was already a protestant in this action and had filed a written protest with the Department objecting to the Petitioner's license application sometime before June 19, 2018, the date the Department denied the Petitioner's application. Therefore, the Movant has known of and asserted his interest in this matter for months. The explanation for the late filing of this motion, discussed above, does not sufficiently justify its tardiness. The hearing, which is designed to be conducted expeditiously to afford the Petitioner an answer on whether its alcoholic beverage license and permit applications will be granted, is only one week away. Finally, the court accepts that the Petitioner would be prejudiced if it were to permit the Movant to intervene in that there is likely too little time for the Petitioner to schedule and conduct depositions of the Movant's witnesses. As to the harm the Movant will suffer, the court finds that while the Movant will not have the same rights as a party, he is still a protestant in this matter and will be afforded the opportunity to present his objections to the Petitioner's license applications on the day of the hearing.

Because the court finds that there was not good cause for the untimely filing of the Movant's Motion for Leave to Intervene, it must deny the motion.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Motion for Leave to Intervene is **DENIED**.
IT IS SO ORDERED.




September 5, 2018
Columbia, South Carolina

S. Phillip Lenski
Administrative Law Judge


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Erika S. Easler, hereby certify that I have this date served this Order upon all parties to this cause by depositing a copy hereof, in the United States mail, postage paid, in the Interagency Mail Service, or by electronic mail to the address provided by the party(ies) and/or their attorney(s).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Erika S. Easler", written over a horizontal line.

Erika S. Easler
Judicial Law Clerk

September 5, 2018
Columbia, South Carolina



THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM SOUTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

The Honorable S. Phillip Lenski, Administrative Law Judge

Case No. 18-ALJ-17-0216-CC

RECEIVED
SEP 05 2018
SC Court of Appeals

WKSC, LLC d/b/a Savannah's Gentlemen's Club & Steakhouse,..... Petitioner,

v.


South Carolina Department of Revenue,..... Respondent.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

On August 30, 2018, Representative Chip Huggins filed a Motion for Leave to Intervene the administrative proceeding between WKSC, LLC d/b/a Savannah's Gentlemen's Club & Steakhouse and South Carolina Department of Revenue. On September 4, 2018, The Honorable S. Phillip Lenski denied such Motion to Intervene. Appellants received written notice of entry of this Order on September 5, 2018.

September 5, 2018

MCANGUS GOUDELICK & COURIE, L.L.C.


Andrew L. Richardson, Jr.
Meridian, 1320 Main Street, 10th Floor (29201)
Post Office Box 12519, Capitol Station
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-2519
(803) 779-2300

Attorneys for Appellant,
Representative Chip Huggins

FILED

SEP 05 2018

SC ADMIN LAW COURT

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM SOUTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

The Honorable S. Phillip Lenski, Administrative Law Judge

Case No. 18-ALJ-17-0216-CC

RECEIVED

SEP 05 2018

SC Court of Appeals

WKSC, LLC d/b/a Savannah's Gentlemen's Club & Steakhouse,..... Petitioner,

v.

South Carolina Department of Revenue,..... Respondent.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Notice of Appeal on the Administrative Law Court and all counsel of record by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on the 5th day of September, 2018 addressed as follows:

Administrative Law Court
Edgar A. Brown Building
1205 Pendleton Street, Suite 224
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Kenneth E. Allen, Esquire
1201 Main Street, Suite 1980
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Jason P. Luther, Esquire
Patrick A. McCabe, Esquire
South Carolina Department of Revenue
Post Office Box 12265
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-9979

September 5, 2018

Mollie Roche
Mollie Roche

Legal Assistant to Andrew L. Richards, Jr.
McAngus, Goudelock & Courie LLC

FILED

SEP 05 2018

SC ADMIN LAW COURT

matter, the court issued an Administrative Memorandum to Individuals Protesting A License or Permit. This memorandum set forth, among other things, that the protestants with common objections or who are members of a group or organization protesting the Petitioner's license applications should appoint a spokesperson who can effectively present the concerns of the group or organization, in order to minimize the number of witnesses that would be speaking at the hearing. Additionally, the Memorandum contained the following paragraph:

SCALC Rule 20 governs motions to intervene. If you wish to intervene as a party in this case, you must file a motion to intervene with the Administrative Law Judge assigned to hear the case no later than August 10, 2018. Any motion to intervene filed after that date will be deemed by the court to be untimely and prejudicial to the rights of existing parties. All motions to intervene must meet the qualifications set forth in SCALC Rule 20(B).

The court's Order and Notice of Hearing and the Memorandum were electronically transmitted to all parties and protestants on July 19, 2018.

On August 30, 2018, the court received a Motion for Leave to Intervene, filed by counsel, seeking to permit The Honorable Chip Huggins of South Carolina House of Representatives District 85 (Lexington County) to intervene in the matter. The Movant (already a protestant) sought to intervene, alleging that: (1) he would be aggrieved or adversely affected by potential issuance of the license; (2) his interests would not be properly represented by the Department; (3) his interest would not be represented by the Petitioner; and (4) he would not unduly prolong the proceeding or otherwise prejudice the rights of existing parties. The Movant further asserted that by permitting intervention, the court could potentially streamline the process of hearing the case and enhance the rights of existing parties. In addressing the tardiness of the motion, the Movant asserted that he had good cause for filing the motion late because (1) his interest would not be properly satisfied unless he was afforded the rights bestowed upon parties to the litigation, (2) judicial economy would best be served with an officially named Party Protestant, and (3) the Movant's counsel was not retained until August 29, 2018, the day before the filing of the motion.

On September 4, 2018, the court conducted a telephone conference with counsel for all existing parties and the Movant. During that telephone conference, the Movant's counsel restated his grounds for seeking leave to intervene. He asserted that the Movant did not feel that his interests or the interests of his constituents, residing in and around the proposed location, were adequately represented by the current parties, and that while Representative Huggins was the only person seeking to intervene, he believed that his arguments against licensing the Petitioner represented a

grassroots position in general opposition to the licensing of the establishment. Furthermore, he asserted that by permitting the intervention, it might streamline the process of hearing the matter because as a party, Representative Huggins could better present the objections held by the other protestants. While he could not represent that the Movant's intervention would curtail the number of protestants seeking to speak at the hearing, counsel for the Movant asserted that he believed such would be the case.

When asked about the reason for the tardiness of the motion, counsel for the Movant again pointed out to the court that he was retained on August 29, 2018 and filed his Motion for Leave to Intervene the following day. As to why the Movant waited until August 29, 2018 to retain counsel and seek to intervene, he stated that he believed there was some difficulty or delay in acquiring the funds for his representation, and that there may have been some uncertainty about the process, due to the Movant not being an attorney. Finally, the Movant's counsel asserted that he would be ready to proceed on the scheduled hearing date, and that he would not delay the proceedings.

Counsel for the Department did not take a position on the Motion for Leave to Intervene. However, counsel for the Petitioner strongly opposed the motion. The Petitioner's counsel pointed out that the Motion for Leave to Intervene was filed outside the standard timeline established in SCALC Rule 20(c), which requires motions to intervene to be filed within twenty (20) days before the hearing, and it was filed outside the specific August 10, 2018 deadline this court established for this hearing in the court's Administrative Memorandum attached to its July 19, 2018 Order and Notice of Hearing. Counsel for the Petitioner further asserted that the basis for seeking to intervene was political rather than based on real opposition to the location, in that the Movant is involved in a contested race for re-election and is seeking to curry political capital with constituents. Finally, the Petitioner's counsel asserted that permitting intervention at this late date would prejudice his client. He stated that he does not generally depose non-party protestants to a liquor license because protestants are mere witnesses and do not have the right to call witnesses, cross-examine, or make argument. On the other hand, he generally does depose an intervening party protesting a liquor license, and any witnesses the party may seek to call, due to the greater rights afforded a party. However, because of the late date of the Movant's motion, effectively one business week before the hearing, he would be unable to prepare and depose the Movant and any other witnesses the Movant might seek to call in his case before the court.

DISCUSSION

The issue before the court is whether the Movant should be granted leave to intervene. ALC Rule

20. ALC Rule 20 governs intervention in contested cases pending before the ALC. Rule 20 states in pertinent part:

Any person may intervene in any pending contested case hearing upon a showing that: (1) the movant will be aggrieved or adversely affected by the final order; (2) the interests of the movant are not being adequately represented by existing parties, or that it is otherwise entitled to intervene; (3) that intervention will not unduly prolong the proceedings or otherwise prejudice the rights of existing parties. ALC Rule 20(B).

A party seeking to intervene has the burden of showing that intervention is proper. See *In re Horry Co. State Bank*, 361 S.C. 503, 508, 604 S.E.2d 723, 725 (Ct. App. 2004) (stating that the applicant for intervention bears the burden of demonstrating required elements for intervention). The time for filing a motion to intervene is governed by ALC Rule 20(C), which provides:

The motion for leave to intervene shall be filed as early in the proceedings as possible to avoid adverse impact on the existing parties or the disposition of the proceedings. Unless otherwise ordered by the administrative law judge, the motion to intervene shall be filed at least twenty (20) days before the hearing. Any later motion shall contain a statement of good cause for the failure to intervene earlier.

In this case, the court is dealing with a cumbersome proceeding and an extraordinarily large number of attendees. The 239 protestants, all potential witnesses, coupled with anticipated spectators, have strained the court's ability to effectively and safely conduct the hearing. No other hearings have been scheduled during the date of the hearing², and the court has carefully developed a plan, borrowing space from a neighboring state agency, and wired an adjoining conference room with video and audio feed to accommodate the large number of attendees. In recognition of the unique nature of this proceeding, the court sent out a memorandum with its Order and Notice of Hearing, informing protestants that if they "...wish to intervene as a party in this case, you must file a motion to intervene with the Administrative Law Judge assigned to hear the case no later than August 10, 2018." (emphasis included). Further, the memorandum stated "(a)ny motion to intervene filed after that date will be deemed by the court to be untimely and prejudicial to the rights

² The South Carolina Administrative Law Court has six judges who sit on its bench and there are three courtrooms in the building. No other hearings are being held on the scheduled day of this hearing due to the strain on the court's personnel and resources.

of existing parties." A copy of the Order and Memorandum was electronically sent to all protestants on July 19, 2018, and the Movant electronically acknowledged receipt on the same day.

In evaluating the Movant's Motion for Leave to Intervene, the court focuses on the timeliness of the motion, and the justification given for its late filing. The motion was not filed until Friday, August 30, 2018. It was filed twelve (12) days before the scheduled hearing, and on a Friday before the long Labor Day weekend, effectively leaving only one business week for the existing parties to adjust to the addition of a new party if granted. This is well outside the 20-day deadline for filing set forth in SCALC Rule 20, and 20 days after the August 10, 2018 deadline set by this court for this case. The Petitioner has asserted that granting the Movant's motion at this late hour will prejudice the Petitioner's ability to prepare for the hearing on the scheduled date, as he will be unable to schedule, conduct, and review depositions of any of the Movant's witnesses.³

In the Movant's motion, the grounds offered for its late filing are that (1) the Movant's interest will not be properly satisfied unless he is afforded the rights bestowed upon parties to the litigation, (2) judicial economy would best be served with an officially named Party Protestant, and (3) the Movant's counsel was not retained until August 29, 2018, the day before the filing of the motion. None of these offer any justification for the motion's tardiness. While the Movant's interests and any judicial economy realized by adding an intervenor may go towards good cause for being permitted to intervene, they fail to answer why the motion was filed out of time. The final justification, that counsel was not retained until the day before the filing, may address why the Movant's counsel did not file the motion until August 30, 2018, however, it in no way addresses why the Movant failed to retain counsel until long after both the standard regulatory filing deadline and the special deadline set by the court in this case had expired. In the telephonic conference held by the court on September 4, 2018, the Movant's counsel expounded upon the justifications asserted in the written motion establishing the Movant's grounds for seeking intervention. However, when he attempted to explain or justify the late filing he could only suggest that there may have been some difficulty with the funding of counsel to intervene, and that there may have been some confusion about the administrative process, given that neither the Movant nor any of the other protestants the Movant has been communicating with are attorneys skilled in practicing before the court. While the court does not doubt this, the court does not find any of that explanation sufficient to justify permitting the Movant to intervene so late in the process, especially given the court's written notice

³The Movant's counsel points out that the Petitioner could have deposed the Movant and any other protestants at any time prior to the hearing, as he knew the names of all protesting persons. However, this assertion ignores that there are 239 protestants in this matter. The thought that the Petitioner could have deposed all of them prior to the hearing, in anticipation that one or more might move to intervene in the action, is unrealistic, especially given the

to the Movant sent and received on July 19, 2018, stating that motions to intervene must be received no later than August 10, 2018 or they would be deemed untimely and prejudicial.

The court is persuaded by the test employed by this state's Supreme Court in evaluating the timeliness of motions to intervene filed by movants in Circuit Court, pursuant to SCRPC Rule 24. In *Davis v. Jennings*, 304 S.C. 502, 405 S.E.2d 601 (1991), the South Carolina Supreme Court held that courts employ a four-part test for determining the timeliness of motions to intervene in civil proceedings pursuant to SCRPC Rule 24:

- (1) the time that has passed since the applicant knew or should have known of his or her interest in the suit;
- (2) the reason for the delay;
- (3) the stage to which the litigation has progressed; and
- (4) the prejudice the original parties would suffer from granting intervention and the applicant would suffer from denial.

Davis, 406 S.E.2d at 603. While SCALC Rule 20 is not identical to SCRPC Rule 24, they are analogous, and the test provides a sound basis for evaluating late filed SCALC Rule 20 motions to intervene. Here, the Movant was already a protestant in this action and had filed a written protest with the Department objecting to the Petitioner's license application sometime before June 19, 2018, the date the Department denied the Petitioner's application. Therefore, the Movant has known of and asserted his interest in this matter for months. The explanation for the late filing of this motion, discussed above, does not sufficiently justify its tardiness. The hearing, which is designed to be conducted expeditiously to afford the Petitioner an answer on whether its alcoholic beverage license and permit applications will be granted, is only one week away. Finally, the court accepts that the Petitioner would be prejudiced if it were to permit the Movant to intervene in that there is likely too little time for the Petitioner to schedule and conduct depositions of the Movant's witnesses. As to the harm the Movant will suffer, the court finds that while the Movant will not have the same rights as a party, he is still a protestant in this matter and will be afforded the opportunity to present his objections to the Petitioner's license applications on the day of the hearing.

Because the court finds that there was not good cause for the untimely filing of the Movant's Motion for Leave to Intervene, it must deny the motion.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Motion for Leave to Intervene is **DENIED**.
IT IS SO ORDERED.



S. Phillip Lenski
Administrative Law Judge

September 5, 2018
Columbia, South Carolina

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Erika S. Easler, hereby certify that I have this date served this Order upon all parties to this cause by depositing a copy hereof, in the United States mail, postage paid, in the Interagency Mail Service, or by electronic mail to the address provided by the party(ies) and/or their attorney(s).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Erika S. Easler", written over a horizontal line.

Erika S. Easler
Judicial Law Clerk

September 5, 2018
Columbia, South Carolina

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

WKSC, LLC, d/b/a Savannah's
Gentlemen's Club & Steakhouse,

Petitioner,

v.

South Carolina Department of Revenue,

Respondent,

Docket No. 18-ALJ-17-0216-CC

ORDER AND NOTICE
OF HEARING

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action will be heard on the merits before the Honorable S. Phillip Lenski, Administrative Law Judge, beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, September 11, 2018, at the Administrative Law Court (ALC or Court), Edgar Brown Building, Second Floor, 1205 Pendleton Street, Columbia, South Carolina.

1. This hearing will be conducted in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the Administrative Law Court, a copy of which is available from the Clerk of the Court.
2. Unless otherwise determined by the Administrative Law Judge, the hearing will proceed as follows:
 - a. Call of the case;
 - b. Motions and other preliminary matters such as stipulations, agreements, or consent orders to be entered into the record;
 - c. Opening statements, not to exceed ten (10) minutes, with the party requesting the contested hearing proceeding first;
 - d. Presentation of evidence;
 - e. Final arguments, not to exceed fifteen (15) minutes, with the party requesting the contested hearing opening and closing.
3. All parties¹ are notified to bring to the hearing all documents, records and witnesses needed to present the party's case. NOTE: The courtrooms are equipped with ELMO document cameras and ELMO touch screen equipment. Please contact the Court in advance of the

¹ Individuals who have been identified as Protestants in this case are not parties. Protestants should read the enclosed memorandum describing the rights and duties of Protestants to matters before the ALC.


FILED
JUL 13 2018

ADMIN. LAW COURT

hearing to confirm the availability of the equipment if desired for your hearing. If special equipment is required for the presentation of evidence, the party presenting the evidence is responsible for obtaining the equipment and its custody.

4. Stipulations of fact and stipulations as to the admissibility of documents are encouraged by the Court. **Prior to the hearing the parties must confer and develop:**
 - a) a list of facts the parties agree upon; and
 - b) a list of documents all parties agree may be admitted as evidence at the hearing.
5. Subpoenas are available to the parties pursuant to SC Code Ann. § 1-23-320(d) (Supp. 2016) and the rules of the Court, to compel the attendance of witnesses or for the production of documents at the hearing. The parties are responsible for service of subpoenas.
6. An attorney representing a party must file a Notice of Appearance within ten (10) days of service of this Notice, unless previously filed with the Court.
7. **TAKE NOTICE THAT A FAILURE TO APPEAR AT THE HEARING MAY RESULT IN:**
 - a. A finding that the party who fails to appear does not object to the relief of which notice has been given;
 - b. Dismissal of the case or striking of the pleading of the party who fails to appear;
 - c. Exclusion of evidence proffered by the party who fails to appear; or
 - d. Such other rulings as are deemed appropriate by the Administrative Law Judge.
8. **Continuances will be granted only when extraordinary circumstances exist.** Parties seeking a continuance must do so in writing no later than 24 hours prior to the scheduled hearing date.
9. In case of settlement or dismissal, failure of the parties to inform the Court prior to the scheduled hearing that the hearing is not necessary may result in imposition of Court costs and Court Reporter fees against the parties.

July 19, 2018
Columbia, SC


S. Phillip Lenski
Administrative Law Judge

² Individuals or entities seeking to intervene in this matter pursuant to SCALC Rule 20 must file a Motion to Intervene with the court no later than August 10, 2018. Motions to Intervene filed after that date will be deemed by the court to be untimely and prejudicial to the rights of existing parties. Motions to Intervene must comply with the requirements set forth in SCALC Rule 20(B).

**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMORANDUM TO INDIVIDUALS
PROTESTING A LICENSE OR PERMIT**

To: All Valid Protestants
From: The South Carolina Administrative Law Court
Re: WKSC, LLC, d/b/a Savannah's Gentlemen's Club & Steakhouse vs.
South Carolina Department of Revenue, Docket #18-ALJ-17-0216-CC

Upon written request of a person who resides in the county where the license is requested to be issued, the Department of Revenue must not issue the permanent **alcoholic beverage license** until interested persons have been given an opportunity to be heard. S.C. Code Ann. § 61-6-1820 (Supp. 2016.) In the present case, the Applicant (WKSC, LLC, d/b/a Savannah's Gentlemen's Club & Steakhouse), upon being notified of your written protest, has requested a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge to hear evidence and determine whether its protested **alcoholic beverage application(s)** should be granted.

As a **Protestant**, you have the right to be notified of the date, time, and place of the hearing, to appear at the hearing, and to testify in opposition to the application(s). A group of Protestants with common opposition should designate a spokesperson to present evidence and speak for the group. There is no maximum number of witnesses which may be called, but the Administrative Law Judge will limit cumulative testimony. **In this case, due to the large number of Protestants, the court cannot hear from each individual Protestant. Therefore, it is incumbent upon Protestants with common opposition or who are members of a group or organization protesting the application to identify a spokesperson who can effectively present the concerns of the group or organization.**


A Protestant is not considered a party of record to the contested case. Byers v. S.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission, 316 S.E.2d 705 (S.C. App. 1984.) To have full participation rights at the hearing, including the right to cross examine witnesses, to request a continuance of the hearing, and to appeal an adverse decision, a Protestant must request to be admitted as a party, by making a motion to intervene. See Sabella v. S.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission, 346 S.E.2d 530 (S.C. App. 1986.) Protestants may choose to be represented by an attorney.

SCALC Rule 20 governs motions to intervene. **If you wish to intervene as a party in this case, you must file a motion to intervene with the Administrative Law Judge assigned to hear the case no later than August 10, 2018.** Any motion to intervene filed after that date will be deemed by the court to be untimely and prejudicial to the rights of existing parties. All motions to intervene must meet the qualifications set forth in SCALC Rule 20(B).

If you decide to withdraw your protest or are unable to attend the hearing, please let the Administrative Law Court know as soon as possible. You may reach us by telephone at: 803-734-0550, by mail at: South Carolina Administrative Law Court, Attn: Judge S. Phillip Lenski, 1205 Pendleton Street, Suite 224, Columbia, SC 29201, or by fax at: 803-734-6400. Please note the case name and docket number on your correspondence.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Erika S. Easler, hereby certify that I have this date served this Order upon all parties to this cause by depositing a copy hereof, in the United States mail, postage paid, in the Interagency Mail Service, or by electronic mail to the address provided by the party(ies) and/or their attorney(s).



Erika S. Easler
Judicial Law Clerk

July 11th, 2018
Columbia, South Carolina