

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY

J. C. Nicholson, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2016-002130

RECEIVED

JUL 17 2017

SC Court of Appeals

ROBIN S. FORMAN, AS PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE ESTATE OF BURTON J. APAT, Respondent,

v.

NATIONAL DENTAL SYSTEMS, LLC, D/B/A DENTALSMART Appellant.

APPELLANT'S FINAL REPLY BRIEF

Paul A. Dominick, Esquire
S.C. Bar No.: 001718
Stephen P. Groves, Sr., Esquire
S.C. Bar No.: 007854
Alexandra H. Austin, Esquire
S.C. Bar No.: 102646
NEXSEN PRUET, LLC
205 King Street, Suite 400
Charleston, South Carolina 29401
Telephone: 843.720.1734
Telecopier: 843.414.8203
Email: PDominick@nexsenpruet.com
SGroves@nexsenpruet.com
AAustin@nexsenpruet.com

Attorneys for the Appellant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

ARGUMENT AND CITATION OF AUTHORITY 1

 A. The Schleifer Affidavit Submitted
 By National Dental In Opposition
 To The Motion For Summary
 Judgment Presented Admissible
 Evidence Refuting The CBC Claim. 1

 B. The Circuit Court’s Grant of Summary
 Judgment On The CBC Claim Was
 Premature Because National Dental
 Demonstrated The Need For Further
 Discovery. 2

CONCLUSION..... 3

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Case Decisions

<u>Baughman v. American Telephone and Telegraph Co.</u> , 306 S.C. 101, 410 S.E.2d 537 (1991)	2
<u>Hancock v. Mid-South Management Co., Inc.</u> , 381 S.C. 326, 673 S.E.2d 801 (2009)	2
<u>Higgins v. Medical University of South Carolina</u> , 326 S.C. 592, 486 S.E.2d 269 (Ct. App. 1997)	2
<u>Hook v. Rothstein</u> , 275 S.C. 187, 268 S.E.2d 288	2
<u>Schmidt v. Courtney</u> , 357 S.C. 310, 592 S.E.2d 326	3
<u>USAA Property and Casualty Insurance Company v Clegg</u> , 377 S.C. 643, 661 S.E.2d 791 (2008)	2

The Appellant, National Dental Systems, LLC, d/b/a DentalSmart (“National Dental”), respectfully submits this Initial Reply Brief in response to the Initial Brief of Respondent, Robin S. Forman, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Burton J. Apat (“Mr. Apat”).

ARGUMENT AND CITATION OF AUTHORITY

A. **The Schleifer Affidavit Submitted By National Dental In Opposition To The Motion For Summary Judgment Presented Admissible Evidence Refuting The CBC Claim.**

The affidavit of Brian Schleifer (the “Schleifer Affidavit”) submitted by National Dental in opposition to Mr. Apat’s motion for summary judgment presented admissible evidence to refute the claim that, pursuant to the terms of the Loan Agreement, National Dental is required to pay for construction work performed by Complete Building Corporation (“CBC”) on its premises (the “CBC Claim”). Specifically, the Schleifer Affidavit presented evidence supporting National Dental’s assertion that the Loan Agreement expressly limited the right of recovery after default to a 6% percent no-liability, equity-only interest in National Dental. (*R. pp. 33-35*).

The Circuit Court’s conclusion that National Dental did not dispute the CBC Claim by way of the submission of admissible evidence ignores both the facts and the law. National Dental’s assertion, supported by the Schleifer Affidavit, that the Loan Agreement only provided a single remedy upon default of its terms necessarily negated and contradicted Mr. Apat’s claim of a separate remedy for enforcement of the Loan Agreement’s CBC provision. (*R. pp. 29; 34-35; 43; 54, lines 15-24; and 60, lines 19-23*). The Circuit Court’s ruling was factually unsupported because National Dental, via the Schleifer Affidavit, clearly disputed the inferences and/or conclusions which could

reasonably be drawn from the Loan Agreement's terms regarding the CBC Claim.¹ (*R. pp. 33-35*). Additionally, the Circuit Court's apparent disregard of the Schleifer Affidavit in granting summary judgment on the CBC Claim was improper as a matter of law.²

B. The Circuit Court's Grant Of Summary Judgment On The CBC Claim Was Premature Because National Dental Demonstrated The Need For Further Discovery.

The Circuit Court's grant of summary judgment on the CBC Claim was premature because it deprived National Dental of a full and fair opportunity to engage in and complete discovery when National Dental had demonstrated the existence of genuine issues of fact.³ Not only did National Dental state in its Brief in Opposition to Summary Judgment and again in its Motion for Reconsideration that summary judgment was inappropriate because material issues of fact existed, including the parties' intent with respect to the terms of the Loan Agreement and the remedies available thereunder, (*R. pp. 28, 31, and 43*), but, as a matter of law, National Dental's assertions at the hearing

¹ See Hancock v. Mid-South Mgmt. Co., Inc., 381 S.C. 326, 330, 673 S.E.2d 801, 803 (“[National Dental] [was] only required to submit a mere scintilla of evidence in order to withstand a motion for summary judgment”). See also USAA Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Clegg, 377 S.C. 643, 653, 661 S.E.2d 791, 796 (2008) (even in situations where “there is no dispute as to evidentiary facts, but only as to conclusions or inferences to be drawn there from, summary judgment should be denied”) (*quoting Nelson v. Charleston County Parks & Recreation Comm’n*, 362 S.C. 1, 5, 605 S.E.2d 744, 746 (Ct.App. 2004)).

² See Higgins v. Medical University of South Carolina, 326 S.C. 592, 599, 486 S.E.2d 269, 272 (Ct.App. 1997) (holding that, when ruling on a motion for summary judgment, the trial judge must consider all of the documents and evidence within the record, including affidavits).

³ See Baughman v. American Tel. & Tel. Co., 306 S.C. 101, 112, 410 S.E.2d 537, 543 (1991) (in South Carolina, summary judgment “must not be granted until the opposing party has had a full and fair opportunity to complete discovery”). See also Hook v. Rothstein, 275 S.C. 187, 189, 268 S.E.2d 288, 289 (1980) (reversing the circuit court's grant of summary judgment where the record established that issues existed which must be determined by a trier of fact and explaining that “[the South Carolina Supreme Court] has often noted that summary judgment is appropriate only where it is perfectly clear that no genuine issue of fact is involved”).

on the motion for summary judgment were sufficient to establish the need for further discovery.⁴ (R. pp. 52, lines 7-8; 56, lines 7-9; and 57, lines 4-14).

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing arguments and citation of authority, the Appellant, National Dental Systems, LLC d/b/a DentalSmart, respectfully requests this Court of Appeals to reverse the Circuit Court's grant of partial summary judgment and remand this matter back for a trial on the merits.

Respectfully submitted:

NEXSEN PRUET, LLC

By:  *w/express permission by*

Paul A. Dominick, Esquire

S.C. Bar No.: 001718

Stephen P. Groves, Sr., Esquire

S.C. Bar No.: 007854

Alexandra H. Austin, Esquire

S.C. Bar No.: 102646

NEXSEN PRUET, LLC

205 King Street, Suite 400

Charleston, South Carolina 29401

Telephone: 843.720.1734

Telecopier: 843.414.8203

Email: PDominick@nexsenpruet.com

SGroves@nexsenpruet.com

AAustin@nexsenpruet.com

Attorneys for the Appellant

Charleston, South Carolina

July 17, 2017

⁴ See Schmidt v. Courtney, 357 S.C. 310, 318, 592 S.E.2d 326, 317 (Ct. App. 2003) (holding that the circuit court's grant of summary judgment was premature where, even though the appellant had not requested a continuance to complete discovery, it was clear from the hearing transcript that the judge was aware of the appellant's desire to obtain further discovery).

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY

J. C. Nicholson, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2016-002130

RECEIVED
JUL 17 2017
SC Court of Appeals


ROBIN S. FORMAN, AS PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE ESTATE OF BURTON J. APAT, Respondent,

v.

NATIONAL DENTAL SYSTEMS, LLC, D/B/A DENTALSMART Appellant.

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

The undersigned certifies that this **Appellant's Final Brief and Appellant's Final Reply**
Brief complies with Rule 211(b) of South Carolina Appeal Court Rules.

w/ express permission


Paul A. Dominick, Esquire
S.C. Bar No.: 001718
Stephen P. Groves, Sr., Esquire
S.C. Bar No.: 007854
Alexandra H. Austin, Esquire
S.C. Bar No.: 102646
NEXSEN PRUET, LLC
205 King Street, Suite 400
Charleston, South Carolina 29401
Telephone: 843.720.1734
Telecopier: 843.414.8203
Email: pdominick@nexsenpruet.com
sgroves@nexsenpruet.com
aaustin@nexsenpruet.com

Attorneys for the Appellant
NATIONAL DENTAL SYSTEMS, LLC, D/B/A
DENTALSMART