

RECEIVED

AUG 12 2013

SC Court of Appeals

**STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
MASTER-IN-EQUITY**

HON. MIKELL SCARBOROUGH, MASTER-IN-EQUITY

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2012-213389

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC..... APPELLANT/RESPONDENT

v.

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC..... RESPONDENT/APPELLANT

RECORD ON APPEAL

**Donald H. Howe
Law Offices of Donald H. Howe, LLC
SC Bar#002690
47 State Street
Post Office Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402-0598**

**Attorney for Appellant/Respondent
56 Leinbach Investors, LLC**

**William S. Barr
Barr, Unger & McIntosh, LLC
11 Broad Street
Charleston, SC 29401**

**Attorney for Respondent/Appellant
Magnolia Paradigm, Inc.**

INDEX

I. ORDERS

Consent Order of Reference (August 28, 2009)	1
Order of Master-In-Equity (June 11, 2012).....	3
Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Reconsider.....	16

II. PLEADINGS

Complaint (June 24, 2008)	17
Amended Complaint (July 2, 2008).....	20
Answer to Amended Complaint and Counterclaim (July 17, 2008)	22
Plaintiff's Answer to Defendant's Counterclaim (August 17, 2008)	29
Motion to Amend Complaint (August 31, 2010).....	31
Amended Complaint (August 31, 2010).....	33
Answer to Second Amended Complaint and Counterclaim (October 18, 2010)	37
Defendant's Motion to Reconsider (July 9, 2012).....	45

III. TRANSCRIPTS

Transcript of Trial (October 11, 2011)	57
--	----

IV. EXHIBITS

Trial Exhibit 1: Lease (June 5, 2003)	189
Trial Exhibit 2: Design Plans (April 21, 2003).....	214
Trial Exhibit 3: Optima Lease (February 23, 2006)	217
Trial Exhibit 4: Tower Design Plan.....	228
Trial Exhibit 5: Photographs.....	229
Trial Exhibit 6: Sketch of Proposed Parking (December 12, 2002)	237

Trial Exhibit 7: Letter – Barr to Howe (December 18, 2007)	238
Trial Exhibit 8: Magnolia Paradigm Payment Summary	246
Trial Exhibit 9: Optima Towers Payment Summary	247
Trial Exhibit 10: Survey	249
Trial Exhibit 11: Title to Real Estate	250
Trial Exhibit 12: Letter of Abatement – Barr to Howe (January 31, 2008)	254
Trial Exhibit 13: Carnevale Associates Letter to Bill Cochran (September 11, 2002)	256
Trial Exhibit 14: Carnevale Associates Letter to Bill Cochran (October 24, 2002).....	258
Trial Exhibit 15: Summary of Rents Received	259
Trial Exhibit 16: Survey and Plans for Parking Lot (April 21, 2003)	260
Trial Exhibit 17: Facsimile Transmittal from Cochran to Carnevale (December 18, 2002)	263
Trial Exhibit 18: Cochran Memo to File (February 7, 2000)	265
Trial Exhibit 19: Cochran Memo to File (September 5, 2002).....	266
Trial Exhibit 20: Affidavit of William Barr (October 10, 2011).....	267

V. NOTICE OF APPEAL

Respondent/Appellant’s Notice of Appeal	281
Appellant/Respondent’s Notice of Appeal	283

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)

Plaintiff,)

-versus-)

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)

Defendant.)

**CONSENT ORDER OF
REFERENCE**

JULIE A. BARRING
CLERK OF COURT

2009 SEP - 1 PM 12:57


FILED

Pursuant to Rule 53(b) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, this matter came before me on motion of William S. Barr, of the law firm Barr, Unger & McIntosh, LLC, Attorneys for the Defendant, by and with the consent of Donald H. Howe, of the law firm Howe & Wyndham, LLP, for an Order of Reference in the above captioned matter.


It appearing that pursuant to Rule 53(b) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, that this Court may, upon application of any party, direct a reference in this action of all or any of the issues, whether of fact or law.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the within action be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Honorable Mikell R. Scarborough, Master-In-Equity for Charleston County pursuant to Rule 53 of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure to take testimony arising under the pleadings and to make his findings of fact and conclusions of law, with authority to enter a final judgment in the cause with any appeal from the said final judgment to be taken directly to the South Carolina Supreme Court.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.


Judge Deadra L. Jefferson
Circuit Court Chief Administrative Judge


Charleston, South Carolina
August 24, 2009

PAID
DATE 8-24-09
AMOUNT 25.00
MIKELL R. SCARBOROUGH
MASTER IN EQUITY
BY: 

I SO MOVE:


Donald H. Howe
Attorney for the Plaintiff

I CONSENT:


William S. Barr
Attorney for the Defendant



000
002

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
-versus-)
)
MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)
)
Defendant.)

ORDER

This matter came before me on Tuesday, October 11, 2011 for a trial on the merits. Present at the hearing were the Plaintiff's representative Clyde L. Hiers and his attorney, Donald H. Howe, and the Defendant's representative Tommy B. Baker and his attorneys, William S. Barr and Capers G. Barr, IV. Also in attendance were the Plaintiff's (or hereinafter Leinbach) and Defendant's (or hereinafter Magnolia) witnesses, Keith Powell of Optima Towers, Bill Cochran, a former employee of Baker Motor Company of Charleston, Inc. and Corky Carnevale, the Plaintiff's realtor in connection with the matter which is the subject of this case.

1. This action was commenced by the filing of a Summons and Complaint on June 24, 2008. Thereafter, the Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint to attach the actual lease to the Complaint as alleged therein which had been inadvertently omitted as an attachment. Thereafter, the Defendant filed an Answer and Counterclaim on July 18, 2008. This matter was referred to me by Order of Reference which was filed on September 1, 2009. On August 3, 2010, Plaintiff filed a Motion to amend its Complaint with a proposed unsigned Second Amended Complaint attached thereto. No hearing on the motion was held; however, the Defendant filed an Answer and Counterclaim to the Second Amended Complaint asserting a further additional cause of action on October 18, 2010.



2. After hearing the testimony of the Plaintiff and the Defendant and the witnesses, I make the following findings of fact and conclusions of law.¹

APPLICABLE LAW

3. As stated in McGill v. Moore, 381 S.C. 179, 672 S.E.2d 571, "The cardinal rule of contract is to ascertain and give legal effect to the parties' intentions as determined by the contract language. Where the contract's language is clear and unambiguous, the language alone determines the contract's force and effect. A contract is read as a whole document so that one may not create an ambiguity by pointing out a single sentence or clause. Id. It is a question of law for the court whether the language of a contract is ambiguous." 672 S.E.2d 574 (citations omitted). See also McPherson v. J.E. Sirrine & Co., 206 S.C. 183, 33 S.E.2d 501: "It is not the province of the court to alter a contract by construction or to make a new contract for the parties; its duty is confined to the interpretation of the one which they have made for themselves..." Id. at 510.

FINDINGS OF FACT

4. This action arises out of a lease between the Plaintiff as lessee and the Defendant as lessor dated June 1, 2003 (Exhibit 1) in connection with property located on Leinbach Drive in the City of Charleston known as Parcel H-2 and described on a survey of the property recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County at Plat Book DB, Page 47 (Exhibit 10). In the lease, the property is referred to as the "demised premises."

5. After entering into the lease with Defendant, the Plaintiff thereafter was approached by and entered into a lease of a portion of the premises to Optima Towers, LLC to erect a cellular telephone tower (Exhibit 3). Despite the fact that the 100' (one hundred foot) tall monopole

¹ First I note that this has been a difficult case to determine due to its unusual and exceptional circumstances. Ultimately, the court spent an inordinate amount of time wrestling with the remedy in this matter.

tower is readily visible from the surrounding area, the Defendant contends it only learned the cell tower was on the demised premises when it discovered the existence of the subsequent lease in 2007 during negotiations between the parties to sell the demised premises to the Defendant. After the parties were unable to reach an agreement to purchase the property, Defendant through counsel, placed Plaintiff on notice that it was in default as a result of the erection of the cell tower and demanded that the Plaintiff remove the tower to cure its default or Defendant would commence abating the rent (Exhibit 7).

6. After the Plaintiff failed to remove the tower, Defendant's counsel notified counsel for the Plaintiff, by letter dated January 31, 2008, (Exhibit 12) that it would commence abating the rent effective February 1, 2008 in the amount of \$800.00 per month; this figure Defendant learned from the failed real estate closing constituted the initial rent provided for in the lease between the Plaintiff and Optima Towers (Ex. 3).

7. As a result of the abatement of the rent by defendant, Plaintiff filed its complaint alleging the Defendant was in default.

8. The Defendant filed an Answer and Counterclaim for breach of contract as a result of Plaintiff's leasing a portion of the property already leased to it and for breach of contract accompanied by a fraudulent act.

9. Thereafter, Plaintiff filed a Motion to amend its Complaint to assert a cause of action for unjust enrichment and equitable estoppel; however, the Motion was never heard and the Amended Complaint never filed. Defendant filed an Answer and Counterclaim to the Second Amended Complaint and in its Answer to the Second Amended Complaint asserted an additional cause of action for unjust enrichment.



10. The case was tried without objection by either party based upon the Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint and the Defendant's Answer to the Second Amended Complaint. Furthermore, at trial the pleadings were amended by the parties to conform to the proof.

11. At trial, Plaintiff's owner testified under cross-examination that he had made a mistake in that he did not realize that the area leased to Optima Towers was a portion of the property already leased to the Defendant. Mr. Hiers testified he thought the "demised premises" was only the area where the Defendant had improved the premises for parking. In support of that contention, the Plaintiff introduced, over Defendant's objection, a sketch of the proposed parking area (Exhibit 6), and a design plan prepared by LS3P Architects (Exhibit 2). Both of these exhibits were prepared for Defendant but neither of them were attached to the lease or incorporated into the terms of the lease.

12. Based on the Court's review of the lease itself and hearing the testimony of the Plaintiff and Defendant's witnesses and, in particular, Mr. Carnevale, who was Plaintiff's real estate agent at the time, the Court finds that Section 1.01 of the lease entitled "demised premises" describes the premises as the entire 1.21 acre parcel shown on the plat at Plat Book DB, Page 47 (Ex. 10).

13. Plaintiff argues that, even though he leased a portion of the demised premises already leased to the Defendant, he has not breached the lease as the area of the property leased was not being used by the Defendant and only encompasses a small portion of the entire 1.21 acre parcel and therefore does not "substantially interfere" with Defendant's intended use. Plaintiff contends that the Defendant's lease is further defined by the fact that it was to be used for a parking lot. After Defendant constructed its parking lot, it did not utilize the area which is now used by the cellular tower. As Defendant witness Bill Cochran explained, it was not cost effective to build into the "wooded area" of the lot and so the Defendant left that parcel of the

property vacant. Defendant contends that, although it is not now using the area in question, there are still 12 years left on the lease and there is no way he could say that he would never use the area in question. It is apparent that Plaintiff's actions in leasing the area to Optima Towers now prevents the Defendant from using that portion of the demised premises.

14. Article 12 of the lease provides that "there will be no leases... which in any manner would prevent or interfere with tenant... and tenant shall enjoy all the rights herein granted without any let, hindrance, ejection, molestation or interference by any person". The lease term "Demised Premises", when defined, begins "Subject to...the terms, covenants, conditions, and provisions of this Lease, Landlord hereby demises and leases...1.21 acres..." etc.

15. The conditions are addressed both in Section 6.01 and Section 1.02 Use of Space: "the demised premises shall be used by the Tenant as parking for employees of Tenant or Baker Motor Company and for no other purpose without the prior written consent of the Landlord." Thus, since the "wooded area" has no parking area on it, it is not subject to use by Magnolia, because parking is the only purpose for which Magnolia has any right of use pursuant to the lease.

16. Likewise under Title to Premises on page 17 of the lease: "the Demised Premises shall hereafter be subject to no leases...which in any manner interfere with Tenant". Notably, it does not say the Demised Premise is not subject to any lease. It only forbids leases that interfere with use of the parking area.

17. I find the Optima Tower clearly did not interfere with Magnolia's use. The cars are parked in the same spaces with the same ingress and egress. The only difference to the parking area would be the occasional shadow of the tower which is of no consequence. Tommy Baker conceded as much in his testimony before this court.



18. Magnolia argues it is entitled to the quiet enjoyment of the entire parcel. On page 17 of the lease, however, the enjoyment of quiet title and peaceful possession is limited to "all rights herein granted" and those rights, as noted above are limited to the use of parking in the designated area.

19. Even finding that there been a breach of the lease by Leinbach, I find that Magnolia is not entitled to abatement of the rent in the amount of \$886.97 month. First of all, Tommy Baker described the only damage Magnolia sustained as the deprivation of the "opportunity" to expand the existing lot into the "wooded area". Such expansion, however, is entirely speculative because it would be contingent on 1) approval by Hiers; 2) approval by the City of Charleston; and 3) economic feasibility. None of these factors have been shown to be either likely or reasonably probable. Such speculative damages are not recoverable under South Carolina Law. Gray v. Southern Facilities, Inc., 256 S.C. 558, 183 S.e.2d 438 (S.C. Ct. 1971). Yadkin Brick Company Inc. v. Materials Recovery Company, 339 S.C. 640, 529 S.E.2d 764 (S.C. Ct. App. 2000).

20. Thus, the only arguable damage would be to the quiet title, use and enjoyment of the wooded area. Obviously, no use of the wooded area was material to the underlying purpose of the lease (parking). As such a collateral and non-material part of the agreement, damages, even if awarded, would be nominal at most. See Stevens v. Alter, 342 S.C. 47, 536 S.E.2d 633 (S.C. Ct. 2000). Certainly the reasons for abatement of rent in the amount of \$886.97 per month had no reasonable relationship to Magnolia's "limited" resulting use of the property under the original lease. While Magnolia attempts to seek unjust enrichment, that principle requires that the enrichment be "at the expenses" of the other party. Harper v. McCoy, 276 S.C. 170, 276

S.E.2d 782 (S.Ct. 1981). Baker conceded the parking area had not suffered any compromise in its use. Therefore I find Defendant's claim for unjust enrichment would not be a proper result.

21. Plaintiff's leasing of a portion of the demised premises already leased to Defendant constitutes a violation of Article 12 of the lease. While I find that the Plaintiff breached its lease with the Defendant, I further find that Defendant's failure to utilize the area in question amounted to an abandonment of that part of the demised premises which resulted in a mutual mistake of fact – both parties were unaware that the “wooded area” was contained within the demised premises at the time that either lease was entered into. I further find that this abandonment occurred prior to Plaintiff's breach of the express terms of the lease by again renting part of the demised premises.

22. Plaintiff contends that Defendant breached the lease by reducing its lease payments by the amount of the lease payments received by Plaintiff from Optima Towers. I agree. Article 6.03 of the lease clearly allows for abatement of the rent. The leasing of a portion of the property to another, including fencing off the entire area, prevents Defendant's access to that area; however, I specifically find that the Plaintiff's action does not interfere with the Defendant's normal use of the area of the demised premises. It does however effectively eject Defendant from future use of this part of the original demised premises.

23. While the Defendant did effect a remedy allowed by the Lease, I find that the self-help remedy that Defendant has utilized is excessive and also constitutes a breach in the payment terms of the Lease. I find the abatement of the full amount of rent paid by Optima Towers provides an unjust enrichment to Defendant which abandoned the tower premises and allowed its construction by failure to object when the tower was being erected. To allow the Defendant to benefit from its failure to object to use of its demised premises and then to wait and claim that

Plaintiff has been unjustly enriched from its own efforts smacks this court as both a breach of the parties' agreement and inequitable conduct.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

24. I conclude that Section 6.03 of the lease provides Defendant's remedy for Plaintiff's interference with Defendant's use of the demised premises. This Section 6.03 permits the tenant (the Defendant) to abate rent due to the landlord during the time that such interference persists.

25. Plaintiff's argument in regard to its cause of action for equitable estoppel does not lie. Plaintiff contends that, since Defendant did not object during the construction of the cell tower, that they have somehow lost the ability to object and further that the failure to file a memorandum of lease should further estop them. The elements of equitable estoppel are:

- a) Conduct by the party estopped (the defendant here) amounted to a false representation or concealment;
- b) Intention to be acted upon;
- c) Knowledge of the true facts;
- d) Good faith reliance; and
- e) Detrimental change of position.

7 S.C. Juris Estoppel and Waiver.

26. None of these elements have been established by the facts of this case. The tower lease was entered into by the Plaintiff under the mistaken belief that it had not leased the property to the Defendant. This lease was entered into without any assistance or objection from the Defendant. Plaintiff's argument that Defendant's failure to file a memorandum of lease should give rise to an estoppel is without merit. A memorandum of lease is for the benefit of third parties and not the parties themselves. Both Plaintiff and Defendant should have known the extent of the demised premises and should not have leased a portion of the demised premises to Optima Towers. Their mutual mistake has been the common denominator in this action.

27. The Optima Towers lease was entered into after a mutual mistake of fact was made by the two parties to this action. This provides for an equitable remedy such as rescission of the contract. King v. Oxford, 282 SC 307, 318 SE2d 125 (SC App. 1984). Because the parties do not seek to void the contract, only to determine what is fair to both under the facts of this case, this court concludes that the contract between the parties should be ratified with an adjustment made to the amount of rent payable from Defendant for only that part of the demised premises that Defendant continues to use.

28. Plaintiff's claim for unjust enrichment against the Defendant is granted. Plaintiff asserts that Defendant has been unjustly enriched because they are not paying the full amount of the rent bargained for under the lease. A lease is tantamount to a conveyance of real property for the period of time of the lease. Subject to the terms of the lease, the tenant is entitled to the use and benefits of the leased property. Plaintiff argues that the Defendant would have to obtain permission from the landlord to sublet the property. This is true; however, having allowed the construction of the tower, both parties were mistaken over the boundary of the property which allowed for the construction of the tower. I conclude it would be inequitable for the Defendant to get the full benefit of the amount of the rental payments from Optima Towers after having sat on their rights to stop the tower's construction. The tower is there and the parties will have to live with this fact for the remainder of the term of the lease.

THE REMEDY

29. The Court must now seek to fashion an appropriate remedy for the respective breaches of the lease. Plaintiff has requested the Court to find that the Defendant breached the lease and require Defendant to pay back all monies abated and be denied any right to abate any rent into

the future. Defendant asks the Court to find that the Plaintiff breached the lease and that it be reimbursed for all money received by Plaintiff from Optima Towers, since the inception of the lease and that it be allowed to continue to abate its rent to Plaintiff into the future in an amount equal to the cell tower lease payments to Plaintiff.

Neither of these proposed remedies is acceptable to the court.

30. Plaintiff argues that Defendant has not been damaged, or if it was damaged, only nominally. Defendant claims it seeks to prevent unjust enrichment to Plaintiff. Defendant's witnesses testified it seeks to continue to abate the rent to prevent Plaintiff from continuing to be unjustly enriched and further seeks to recover any payments that Plaintiff has received in excess of what Plaintiff bargained to receive from Defendant.

31. I find that, because the **Plaintiff's efforts** led to the receipt of additional rent from the cell tower lease without any objection by the Defendant, it would be unjust to allow the Defendant a total offset for these payments as abatement of the rent.

32. The original demised premises were described by deed as consisting of 1.21 acres more or less. The Optima cell tower agreement sought to lease only 5000 square feet of space. In looking at the demised premises used by the Defendant, it appears that the parking area consists of approximately one acre, which is what the Defendant sought in their initial negotiations. (Def. Ex. 18). The premises left vacant and/or used by the cell tower approximates the remaining 0.2 acres of land. Accordingly, the court hereby fashions what it considers an appropriate remedy under the circumstances of this case.

33. The original base rent owed by Defendant will be reduced by one-sixth of its amount which constitutes the loss of use of the 0.2 acres of land from the original 1.21 acre parcel which the court finds to be one-sixth of the original amount of the demised premises. I conclude that the

amount of rent that should be abated is \$300 ($\$1800/6=\$300$) per month and not what Plaintiff receives, and has received, from Optima Towers, LLC. Accordingly, rent shall be owed on the base rent of \$1500 from the time that the cell tower began to pay on its rental term. This figure can then be adjusted, pursuant to the terms of the lease, as calculated for the percentage rental increases over the life of the 20 year lease term provided the Defendant continues to exercise his right to continue with the lease.

34. The testimony from Plaintiff and Defendant was that the rent for the demised premises was calculated based on a rate of return of 8-10% per annum on the fair market value of the entire parcel. (Exhibit 8) This calculation was conceded by the Plaintiff as well as Plaintiff's agent, Corky Carnevale. Furthermore, the parties were in negotiations between \$1600 and \$2000 per month for the property and so \$1500 reflects a reasonable figure for the parties anticipated expectations of rent to be paid for the parking lot. (Plaintiff's Ex. 14).

35. Total rent owed by Magnolia Paradigm to Plaintiff through the month of October 2011 was \$193,352.65 and total rent paid was \$153,561.00. (Exhibit 8). The Optima rent payments schedule (Def. Ex. 9) reveals that Optima paid Plaintiff during the same period \$54,116.65. This amount, when added to the rent paid by Defendant, yields an amount greater than Plaintiff would have received had he not rented the property to Optima (Def. Ex. 15). While I find that Plaintiff received a total of \$207,677.65 through the month of October 2011, it received this amount through its own efforts and not at the unjust expense of the Defendant. I find that the Plaintiff received an enrichment over the contract amount but find this amount was not unjust.

36. Accordingly the Court finds the Defendant has been unjustly enriched in the amount of \$500.00 per month. Defendant has sought its self-help remedy to abate the full amount of \$886.97 per month and will continue to be unjustly enriched unless Defendant is allowed to

abate its rent by the amount of \$300 per month (as originally calculated) until the end of its lease. For the time period from April 1, 2006 until October 1, 2011 (a period of 66 months), this court finds that Defendant therefore owes Plaintiff the sum of \$39,791.65 (\$193,352.65 – \$153,561.00) as base unpaid rent. This figure has not been adjusted for rental increases or additional time since the date of trial and so will need to be adjusted upwards according to the mathematical calculations of time and percentage rent increases in rent.


37. Under the facts of this case, which I find to be quite unusual, I conclude that an award of attorneys' fees is not warranted. While it may be said that one side has prevailed over the other, ample opportunities were afforded these parties to try and resolve this dispute between themselves. Having crafted a remedy from the facts presented here, the court determines no award of attorney's fees shall be made in this case.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

1. That Defendant received in excess of that which it bargained for with the Plaintiff by withholding the full amount of the cell tower rental payments (\$866.97 per month) from its monthly rental obligation.
2. That Defendant is hereby authorized to reduce its rent to Plaintiff in an amount of \$300 per month (based upon the base rent figure) for the period of time for which the rent received by Plaintiff from Optima Towers until the termination of Defendant's lease with Plaintiff. Toward that end Plaintiff is ordered to account to Defendant annually for the amount of the rent it receives from Optima Towers as the amount changes from time to time.

3. That Plaintiff be granted judgment on its claim for unjust enrichment.
4. That Defendant shall pay over to Plaintiff the sum of \$39,791.65 being the amount of rent it has not paid to Plaintiff pursuant to its self-help determination of withholding all rental payments against the amount paid Plaintiff under the cell tower lease.
5. No attorney's fees shall be awarded in this matter; and
6. The Defendant shall provide Plaintiff with payment of the aforementioned amounts within 30 days of the date of this order; and

IT IS SO ORDERED!


Mikell R. Scarborough
Master in Equity
Charleston County South Carolina

Charleston, South Carolina
June 11, 2012

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

FORM 4

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CASE NO. 2008 CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.

PLAINTIFF(S)

DEFENDANT(S)

Submitted by:

Attorney for: ☐ Plaintiff ☐ Defendant
or
☐ Self-Represented Litigant

DISPOSITION TYPE (CHECK ONE)

- ☐ **JURY VERDICT.** This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.
- ☐ **DECISION BY THE COURT.** This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.
- ☐ **ACTION DISMISSED (CHECK REASON):** ☐ Rule 12(b), SCRPC; ☐ Rule 41(a), SCRPC (Vol. Nonsuit); ☐ Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled); ☐ Other
- ☐ **ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON):** ☐ Rule 40(j), SCRPC; ☐ Bankruptcy; ☐ Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award; ☐ Other
- ☐ **DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (CHECK APPLICABLE BOX):**
☐ Affirmed; ☐ Reversed; ☐ Remanded; ☐ Other

NOTE: ATTORNEYS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING LOWER COURT, TRIBUNAL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT RULING IN THIS APPEAL.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED: ☐ See attached order (formal order to follow) ☐ Statement of Judgment by the Court:

ORDER INFORMATION

This order ☒ ends ☐ does not end the case.

Additional Information for the Clerk :

THE COURT HAVING CONSIDERED DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER OR ALTER AND AMEND PURSUANT TO RULE 59(e) IS RESPECTFULLY DENIED.

INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC INDEX		
Complete this section below when the judgment affects title to real or personal property or if any amount should be enrolled. If there is no judgment information indicate "N/A" in one of the boxes below.		
Judgment in Favor of (List name(s) below)	Judgment Against (List name(s) below)	Judgment Amount To be Enrolled (List amount(s) below)
		\$
		\$
		\$
If applicable, describe the property, including tax map information and address, referenced in the order:		

The judgment information above has been provided by the submitting party. Disputes concerning the amounts contained in this form may be addressed by way of motion pursuant to the SC Rules of Civil Procedure. Amounts to be computed such as interest or additional taxable costs not available at the time the form and final order are submitted to the judge may be provided to the clerk. Note: Title abstractors and researchers should refer to the official court order for judgment details.

Circuit Court Judge

3062

Judge Code

8/31/2012

Date

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
-versus-)
)
MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)
)
Defendant.)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-

Amended
COMPLAINT

FILED
2008 JUN 24 AM 11:51
JULIE J. ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT
BY _____

FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Breach of Contract)

1. Plaintiff is a duly organized Limited Liability Corporation pursuant to the laws of the State of South Carlina.
2. Defendant is duly organized corporation pursuant to the laws of the State of South Carolina.
3. Plaintiff owns a parcel of land on Leinbach Drive comprising of approximately 1.21 acres as more particularly described as parcel H-2 of TMS#349-01-00-45.
4. Plaintiff and Defendant entered into a Lease Agreement dated June 1, 2003 a copy of which is attached hereto and identified as Exhibit A.
5. Defendant subsequently installed a parking lot on the above described property.
6. In the fall of 2006, Plaintiff allowed, pursuant to a written contract, Optima Towers L.L.C. to erect a communications tower.
7. On January 31, 2008 Defendant began deducting \$800.00 per month from the rent due claiming that the communications tower interfered with Defendant's ability to use the parking area

as contemplated by the lease.

8. Upon information and belief the Defendant's use of the parking area has not been compromised by the erection of the tower.

9. Plaintiff believes that Defendant's deduction of \$800.00 per month from his rent payments are therefor a breach of contract.

FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Declaratory Judgement)

10. Plaintiff realleges each and every paragraph above as if set forth below verbatim.

11. Plaintiff believes it is entitled to a determination of his rights under the June 1, 2003 Agreement to the Uniform Declaratory Judgement Act, specifically Section 15-53-30 of the S.C. Code of Laws.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for a judgment of all past due rent up to the time of trial and reasonable attorney's fees and expenses on the first cause of action and, on the second cause of action, a declaration of his rights as to all future rent payments and as to attorney's fees.

Howe & Wyndham, L.L.P.
Post Office Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402
843-853-6121

BY: Donald H. Howe
Donald H. Howe
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: June 24, 08

1
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)
Plaintiff,)

-versus-

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)
Defendant.)

AMENDED SUMMONS

BY
JULIE J. ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT

2008 JUL -2 AM 9:28

FILED

TO THE DEFENDANT ABOVE NAMED:

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to answer the attached Amended Complaint in this action, a copy of which is herewith served upon you, and to serve a copy of your Answer to the said Complaint on the subscriber at his offices at 47 State Street, Charleston, South Carolina, within thirty (30) days after the service hereof, exclusive of the day of such service; and if you fail to answer the Complaint within the time aforesaid, the Plaintiff in this action will apply to the Court for the relief demanded in the Complaint and judgment by default will be rendered against you.

Howe & Wyndham, L.L.P.
Post Office Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402
843-853-6121

BY: Donald H. Howe
Donald H. Howe
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: July 1, 08

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)

Plaintiff,)

-versus-)

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)

Defendant.)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

AMENDED COMPLAINT

FILED
2008 JUL -2 AM 9:28
JULIE J. ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT

FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Contract)

1. Plaintiff is a duly organized Limited Liability Corporation pursuant to the laws of the State of South Carlina.
2. Defendant is duly organized corporation pursuant to the laws of the State of South Carolina.
3. Plaintiff owns a parcel of land on Leinbach Drive comprising of approximately 1.21 acres as more particularly described as parcel H-2 of TMS#349-01-00-45.
4. Plaintiff and Defendant entered into a Lease Agreement dated June 1, 2003 a copy of which is attached hereto and identified as Exhibit A.
5. Defendant subsequently installed a parking lot on the above described property.
6. In the fall of 2006, Plaintiff allowed, pursuant to a written contract, Optima Towers L.L.C. to erect a communications tower.
7. On January 31, 2008 Defendant began deducting \$800.00 per month from the rent due

claiming that the communications tower interfered with Defendant's ability to use the parking area as contemplated by the lease.

8. Upon information and belief the Defendant's use of the parking area has not been compromised by the erection of the tower.

9. Plaintiff believes that Defendant's deduction of \$800.00 per month from his rent payments are therefor a breach of contract.

FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Declaratory Judgement)

10. Plaintiff realleges each and every paragraph above as if set forth below verbatim.

11. Plaintiff believes it is entitled to a determination of his rights under the June 1, 2003 Agreement to the Uniform Declaratory Judgement Act, specifically Section 15-53-30 of the S.C. Code of Laws.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for a judgment of all past due rent up to the time of trial and reasonable attorney's fees and expenses on the first cause of action and, on the second cause of action, a declaration of his rights as to all future rent payments and as to attorney's fees.

Howe & Wyndham, L.L.P.
Post Office Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402
843-853-6121

BY: _____

Donald H. Howe
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: _____

July 10, 08

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)
)
56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC)
)
Plaintiff)
)
vs.)
)
MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)
)
Defendant)
_____)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

**ANSWER TO AMENDED COMPLAINT
AND COUNTERCLAIM**

The Defendant answering the Amended Complaint herein would allege and show:

AS TO THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(BREACH OF CONTRACT)

1. The Defendant admits the allegations of Paragraph 1, 2, 3 and 4.
2. Responding to the allegations of Paragraph 5, the Defendant would admit that it installed a parking lot on the above described property but would further assert that it went into occupancy of the leased property of 1.2 acres described in Exhibit "A" to the Complaint in accordance with the terms of the lease.
3. Responding to the allegations of Paragraph 6, the Defendant denies same and asserts that Plaintiff entered into a long term lease with Optima Towers, LLC and leased a portion of the property leased to Defendant to Optima Towers, LLC in violation of Defendant's written lease with Plaintiff.

4. Responding to the allegations of Paragraph 7, the Defendant admits it began deducting \$800.00 per month from the rent due but would deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 7.
5. The Defendant denies the allegations of Paragraph 8 and 9.

AS TO THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT)

6. Responding to the allegations of Paragraph 10, the Defendant repeats and reiterates responses to the allegations of Paragraph 1 through 9 as if fully repeated herein.
7. The Defendant is without sufficient information to form a belief as to the allegations of Paragraph 11 and therefore would deny same and demand strict proof thereof.

COUNTERCLAIM

Further responding to the complaint and as a counterclaim thereto, the Defendant would assert:

8. The Defendant is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of South Carolina with its principal office in Charleston County, South Carolina.
9. The Defendant is a LLC duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of South Carolina and is the owner of a parcel of property situate on Leinbach Drive comprising of approximately 1.21 acres and more particularly described as Parcel H-2 on a plat of a Hoffman Lester Associates, Inc. dated April 4, 1994 and attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

10. That on or about June 1, 2003 the parties entered into a lease wherein the Defendant leased Parcel H-2 by virtue of the lease attached to the Plaintiff's complaint as Exhibit "A". The parcel is more fully described as Parcel H2 of TMS #: 349-01-00-045 and more fully shown on the attached plat.
11. The lease provides in Article XII that the landlord has full right and power and lawful authority to execute and deliver and perform its obligation under the lease, that the demised premises shall hereafter be subject to no leases, and that the tenants shall, during the demise term, have lawful, quiet and peaceful possession and occupation of the demised premises and shall enjoy all of the rights herein granted without any let, hindrance, ejection, molestation or interference by any person.
12. The lease further provides in Article XII that the landlord shall indemnify and hold tenant harmless from and against any and all claims, actions, demands, losses, costs, expenses, liabilities and judgments arising in connection with a material breach of any of landlords representations, warranties or covenants in this lease.
13. On or about February 23, 2006 the Plaintiff entered into a lease with Optima Towers, LLC, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "B", and leased a portion of the demised premises without the permission of the Defendant thereby breaching the landlord's covenant of lawful, quiet and peaceful possession and occupation of the demised premises and its

covenant that after the lease with Defendant that thereafter that the property would not be subject to any other leases.

14. Under the terms of the lease at Article XIII, the Defendant was entitled to assign or sublet in whole or in part of the demised premises with the written consent of the landlord. The Defendant is informed and believes that the Plaintiff usurped the Defendant's ability to sublet a portion of the property to Optima Towers, LLC and as a result thereof, the Defendant has been damaged in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact.
15. The lease further provides at Section 14 that in the event that an action is brought in law or in equity then the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees from the other. The Defendant is informed and believes that in addition to any other relief that it may be entitled, that it is entitled to its reasonable attorney's fees necessitated in the enforcement of its lease against the Plaintiff and the defense of the Plaintiff's suit against it for damages and declaratory relief.
16. The Defendant is informed and believes that as a result of the Plaintiff's breach of the covenant of quiet enjoyment, that it has been damaged in an amount equal to the rental payments received by the Plaintiff from the subtenant, Optima Towers, LLC from the commencement date of that lease until such time as the Defendant commenced offsetting the rental payments to the Plaintiff.

17. The Defendant is informed and believes that it is entitled to interest on the monies that the Plaintiff has received from Optima Towers, LLC in accordance with Paragraph 14.12 of the subject lease.
18. The Defendant is further informed and believes that the Plaintiff has breached the provision of the lease concerning its right of first refusal in that it is not only granted the Defendant a right of first refusal but is now granted the said Optima Towers, LLC a right of first refusal to purchase the subject property.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

BREACH OF CONTRACT ACCOMPANIED BY A FRAUDULENT ACT

19. The Defendant repeats and reiterates the allegations of Paragraphs above as if fully stated herein.
20. The Defendant is informed and believes that the Plaintiff commenced negotiations with Optima Towers, LLC to sublet a portion of the subject property knowing full and well that it had leased the entire property to the Defendant.
21. The Defendant is informed and believes that the Plaintiff intentionally breached its contract with the Defendant by interfering with its rights of quiet and peaceful enjoyment of the property in that it leased a portion of the property to a third party without the Defendant's approval.
22. The Defendant is informed and believes that the Plaintiff knew at the time that it entered into the contract to lease a portion of the property which it had already leased to the Defendant that the Plaintiff intended to violate its

contractual obligations with the Defendant fraudulently or with dishonest intent.

23. The Defendant is informed and believes that the Plaintiff's acts in breaching the contract in the fashion as pled herein were, in fact, dishonest and designed to breach its obligation to the Defendant.

24. Defendant is informed and believes that the actions of the Plaintiff were done with willful wanton and reckless disregard of the Defendant's rights and is entitled to actual and punitive damages as a result thereof.

FAILURE TO STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION PURSUANT TO RULE 12(b)(6)


SCRCP

25. The Defendant repeats and reiterates the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 25 as if fully stated herein.

26. The Defendant moves to dismiss the Plaintiff's complaint on the grounds that it fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action.

WHEREFORE, the Defendant having replied to the Complaint herein prays that the Court would inquire into the matters here and allege and issue its judgment accordingly, dismissing the Complaint of the Plaintiff and granting the Defendant judgment on its counterclaim as well as reasonable attorney's fees and for such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

BARR, UNGER & McINTOSH, LLC



William S. Barr
11 Broad Street
Charleston, SC 29401
843-577-5083
Attorney for the Defendant

Charleston, South Carolina
July 17, 2008

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)
)
56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
-versus-)
)
MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)
)
Defendant.)
_____)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

**PLAINTIFF'S ANSWER TO
DEFENDANT'S COUNTERCLAIM**

The Plaintiff, 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC, in answers the Defendant's Counterclaim filed by the Defendant Magnolia Paradigm Inc. as follows:

1. The Plaintiff denies each and every allegation unless hereinafter specifically admitted.
2. Plaintiff admits the allegations of Paragraph 8.
3. Plaintiff admits the allegations of Paragraph 9.
4. Plaintiff admits so much of Paragraph 10 in which the Defendant leased a certain portion of the property from the Plaintiff but Plaintiff would crave reference to the Lease itself which outlines the exact nature and limits of the property that was leased.
5. Plaintiff admits so much of Paragraph 11 that is consistent with the written lease and denies the other portion thereof.
6. Plaintiff admits so much of Paragraph 12 as is consistent with the lease and denies any other portion thereof.
7. As to Paragraph 13, the Plaintiff admits that it entered into a lease with Optima Towers, LLC but denies this breached the landlord's covenant to lawful quite and peaceful possession and occupation of the premises for any portion of the lease.

8. Plaintiff admits so much of Paragraph 14 that alleges that the Defendant was entitled to assign or sublet and in whole or in part parts of the premises with the written consent of the landlord but denies the remainder of the allegations of Paragraph 14 and demands strict proof thereof.

9. That as to Paragraph 14, the Plaintiff admits that in certain situations, the Defendant, if it prevailed in litigation, would be entitled to attorneys' fees but denied that the facts and circumstances of this action constitutes such an instance.

10. Plaintiff denies the allegations of Paragraph 16.

11. Plaintiff denies the allegations Paragraph 17.

12. Plaintiff denies the allegations of Paragraph 18.

13. Plaintiff denies the allegations of Paragraph 19.

14. Plaintiff denies the allegations of Paragraphs 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25.

15. As to Paragraph 26, Plaintiff believes that it has stated a cause of action and should be granted relief as outlined in its Complaint.

Howe & Wyndham, L.L.P.
Post Office Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402
843-853-6121

BY:

Donald H. Howe

Donald H. Howe
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: Aug 17, 08

Defendant.

MOTION TO AMEND COMPLAINT

031

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)
)
Plaintiff,)

-versus-

AMENDED SUMMONS

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)
)
Defendant.)
_____)

TO THE DEFENDANT ABOVE NAMED:

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to answer the attached Amended Complaint in this action, a copy of which is herewith served upon you, and to serve a copy of your Answer to the said Amended Complaint on the subscriber at his offices at 47 State Street, Charleston, South Carolina, within thirty (30) days after the service hereof, exclusive of the day of such service; and if you fail to answer the Amended Complaint within the time aforesaid, the Plaintiff in this action will apply to the Court for the relief demanded in the Amended Complaint and judgment by default will be rendered against you.

Howe & Wyndham, L.L.P.
Post Office Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402
843-853-6121

BY: _____
Donald H. Howe
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: _____

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)

Plaintiff,)

-versus-

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)

Defendant.)

AMENDED COMPLAINT

FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Contract)

1. Plaintiff is a duly organized Limited Liability Corporation pursuant to the laws of the State of South Carlina.

2. Defendant is duly organized corporation pursuant to the laws of the State of South Carolina.

3. Plaintiff owns a parcel of land on Leinbach Drive comprising of approximately 1.21 acres as more particularly described as parcel H-2 of TMS#349-01-00-45.

4. Plaintiff and Defendant entered into a Lease Agreement dated June 1, 2003 a copy of which is attached hereto and identified as Exhibit A.

5. Defendant subsequently installed a parking lot on the above described property.

6. In the fall of 2006, Plaintiff allowed, pursuant to a written contract, Optima Towers L.L.C. to erect a communications tower.

7. On January 31, 2008 Defendant began deducting \$800.00 per month from the rent due

claiming that the communications tower interfered with Defendant's ability to use the parking area as contemplated by the lease.

8. Upon information and belief the Defendant's use of the parking area has not been compromised by the erection of the tower.

9. Plaintiff believes that Defendant's deduction of \$800.00 per month from his rent payments are therefore a breach of contract.

FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Declaratory Judgement)

10. Plaintiff realleges each and every paragraph above as if set forth below verbatim.

11. Plaintiff believes it is entitled to a determination of his rights under the June 1, 2003 Agreement to the Uniform Declaratory Judgement Act, specifically Section 15-53-30 of the S.C. Code of Laws.

FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unjust Enrichment)

12. Plaintiff realleges each and every paragraph above as if set forth below verbatim.

13. That prior to entering into the attached Lease (Exhibit A) on June 1, 2003, Defendant hired local professionals to design a proposed parking area for the property Defendant sought to lease from the Plaintiff.

14. That the proposed parking area had to be approved by the City of Charleston before it could be constructed.

15. That the parking area was ultimately constructed according to the plans that Defendant's agent had designed.

16. That the Defendant has had the full and uninterrupted use of the parking area since it was constructed.

17. That the construction of the communication tower did not invade the parking area that was constructed according to the plans which Defendant had prepared.

18. That at no time during the construction of the communication tower did the Defendant notify Plaintiff of any objection to the installation of the tower.

19. That even after the tower was constructed, Defendant made no objection to the tower until Defendant attempted to by the property several years after the tower was constructed.

20. That Defendant has therefore been unjustly enriched at Plaintiff's defense.

FOR A FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Equitable Estoppel/Laches)

21. Plaintiff realleges each and every paragraph above as if set forth below verbatim.

22. That Plaintiff believes Defendant should be equitably estopped from raising any objections to the existence of the tower now when Defendant failed to assert any alleged right of any objections to the construction of the tower in a timely manner.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for a judgment of all due rents along with reasonable attorney's fees and prejudgment interest as set out by Section 34-31-20 of the South Carolina Code of Laws on the First, Third and Fourth Causes of Action, and on the Second Cause of Action a declaration of his rights as to all future payments and as to attorney's fees.

Howe & Wyndham, L.L.P.
Post Office Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402
843-853-6121

BY: _____
Donald H. Howe
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: _____

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)
)
Plaintiff,)

-versus-

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)
)
Defendant.)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that on this 31 day of August, 2010, I served the
Motion to Amend Complaint by depositing same in the United States Mail, at Charleston, South-
Carolina with postage prepaid to the following:

William S. Barr, Esquire
Barr, Unger and McIntosh, LLC
11 Broad Street
Charleston, SC 29401

Howe & Wyndham, L.L.P.
Post Office Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402
843-853-6121

BY: Donald M. Barr

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)

Plaintiff,)

-versus-)

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)

Defendant.)

**ANSWER TO SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
COUNTERCLAIM**

FILED
20 OCT 18 PM 12:52
J. ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT

FILED

The Defendant answering the Amended Complaint herein would allege and show:

AS TO THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(BREACH OF CONTRACT)

1. The Defendant admits the allegations of Paragraph 1, 2, 3 and 4.
2. Responding to the allegations of Paragraph 5, the Defendant would admit that it installed a parking lot on the above described property but would further assert that it went into occupancy of the leased property of 1.2 acres described in Exhibit "A" to the Complaint in accordance with the terms of the lease.
3. Responding to the allegations of Paragraph 6, the Defendant denies same and asserts that Plaintiff entered into a long term lease with Optima Towers, LLC and leased a portion of the property leased to Defendant to Optima Towers, LLC in violation of Defendant's written lease with Plaintiff.

4. Responding to the allegations of Paragraph 7, the Defendant admits it began deducting \$800.00 per month from the rent due but would deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 7.

5. The Defendant denies the allegations of Paragraph 8 and 9.

AS TO THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT)

6. Responding to the allegations of Paragraph 10, the Defendant repeats and reiterates responses to the allegations of Paragraph 1 through 9 as if fully repeated herein.

7. The Defendant is without sufficient information to form a belief as to the allegations of Paragraph 11 and therefore would deny same and demand strict proof thereof.

AS TO THE THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

8. Responding to the allegations of Paragraph 12, the Defendant repeats and reiterates the responses to the allegations of Paragraph 1 through 11 as if fully stated herein.

9. The Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 13, 14 and 15.

10. The Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 16.

11. The Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 17.

12. The Defendants admit, upon information and belief, the allegations of Paragraph 18 and 19.

13. The Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 20.

14. Further responding to the Plaintiff's praying for unjust enrichment, the Defendant would repeat and reiterate the allegations of its Counterclaim as if fully stated herein indicating that the Plaintiff usurped an opportunity of the Defendants in utilizing a portion of the property which it leased to the Defendants to its own gain.

AS TO THE FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

15. Responding to the allegations of Paragraph 21, the Defendants repeat and reallege the responses to the allegations of Paragraph 1 through 20 as if fully stated herein verbatim.
16. The Defendant denies the allegations of Paragraph 22.

COUNTERCLAIM

Further responding to the complaint and as a counterclaim thereto, the Defendant would assert:

17. The Defendant is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of South Carolina with its principal office in Charleston County, South Carolina.
18. The Defendant is a LLC duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of South Carolina and is the owner of a parcel of property situate on Leinbach Drive comprising of approximately 1.21 acres and more particularly described as Parcel H-2 on a plat of a Hoffman Lester Associates, Inc. dated April 4, 1994 and attached hereto as Exhibit "A".
19. That on or about June 1, 2003 the parties entered into a lease wherein the Defendant leased Parcel H-2 by virtue of the lease attached to the

Plaintiff's complaint as Exhibit "A". The parcel is more fully described as Parcel H2 of TMS #: 349-01-00-045 and more fully shown on the attached plat.

20. The lease provides in Article XII that the landlord has full right and power and lawful authority to execute and deliver and perform its obligation under the lease, that the demised premises shall hereafter be subject to no leases, and that the tenants shall, during the demise term, have lawful, quiet and peaceful possession and occupation of the demised premises and shall enjoy all of the rights herein granted without any let, hindrance, ejection, molestation or interference by any person.
21. The lease further provides in Article XII that the landlord shall indemnify and hold tenant harmless from and against any and all claims, actions, demands, losses, costs, expenses, liabilities and judgments arising in connection with a material breach of any of landlords representations, warranties or covenants in this lease.
22. On or about February 23, 2006 the Plaintiff entered into a lease with Optima Towers, LLC, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "B", and leased a portion of the demised premises without the permission of the Defendant thereby breaching the landlord's covenant of lawful, quiet and peaceful possession and occupation of the demised premises and its covenant that after the lease with Defendant that thereafter that the property would not be subject to any other leases.

23. Under the terms of the lease at Article XIII, the Defendant was entitled to assign or sublet in whole or in part of the demised premises with the written consent of the landlord. The Defendant is informed and believes that the Plaintiff usurped the Defendant's ability to sublet a portion of the property to Optima Towers, LLC and as a result thereof, the Defendant has been damaged in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact.
24. The lease further provides at Section 14 that in the event that an action is brought in law or in equity then the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees from the other. The Defendant is informed and believes that in addition to any other relief that it may be entitled, that it is entitled to its reasonable attorney's fees necessitated in the enforcement of its lease against the Plaintiff and the defense of the Plaintiff's suit against it for damages and declaratory relief.
25. The Defendant is informed and believes that as a result of the Plaintiff's breach of the covenant of quiet enjoyment, that it has been damaged in an amount equal to the rental payments received by the Plaintiff from the subtenant, Optima Towers, LLC from the commencement date of that lease until such time as the Defendant commenced offsetting the rental payments to the Plaintiff.
26. The Defendant is informed and believes that it is entitled to interest on the monies that the Plaintiff has received from Optima Towers, LLC in accordance with Paragraph 14.12 of the subject lease.

27. The Defendant is further informed and believes that the Plaintiff has breached the provision of the lease concerning its right of first refusal in that it is not only granted the Defendant a right of first refusal but is now granted the said Optima Towers, LLC a right of first refusal to purchase the subject property.

FAILURE TO STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION PURSUANT TO RULE 12(b)(6)

SCRCP

28. The Defendant repeats and reiterates the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 27 as if fully stated herein.
29. The Defendant moves to dismiss the Plaintiff's complaint on the grounds that it fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action.


UNJUST ENRICHMENT

30. The Defendant repeats and reiterates the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 29 as if fully stated herein.
31. The Plaintiffs entered into a lease to lease to Defendant the entire premises as described in the attached lease to the Defendants.
32. Thereafter, in breach of said lease, Plaintiffs leased a portion of the property already leased to the Defendants for additional consideration increasing the consideration it was receiving based on its contract with the Defendant.
33. The Defendant is informed and believes that the Plaintiffs have therefore been unjustly enriched in an amount equal to the additional sums which

they have been receiving from Optima Towers above the stated
consideration received from the Defendant.

WHEREFORE, these Defendants pray that the Court will inquire into the matters
herein and alleged and issue its judgment accordingly, dismissing the Complaint of the
Plaintiff and granting the Defendant judgment on its Counterclaim as well as reasonable
attorney's fees and for such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and
proper.

BARR, UNGER & McINTOSH, LLC



William S. Barr
11 Broad Street
Charleston, SC 29401
843-577-5083
Attorney for the Defendants

Charleston, South Carolina
September 1, 2010

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)

Plaintiff,)

-versus-)

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)

Defendant.)


CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

2010 OCT 18 PM 12:52
JULIE J. ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT
BY _____

FILED

I hereby certify that I have served a copy of the foregoing document on
Plaintiffs by placing a copy of same in the United States mail with sufficient postage
attached thereto and addressed as follows:

Donald H. Howe, Esquire
47 State Street
Charleston, SC 29401


Legal Assistant to William S. Barr

Charleston, South Carolina
September 7 2010

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA) IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON) FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)

Plaintiff,)

-versus-)

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)

Defendant,)

MOTION TO RECONSIDER,
ALTER OR AMEND
PURSUANT TO RULE 59(E)
OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA
RULES OF CIVIL
PROCEDURE

2012 JUL -9 PM 12:15
JULIE J. ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT

FILED

TO: DONALD H. HOWE, ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF
56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to Rule 59(e), South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, the Defendant, moves the Honorable Mikell R. Scarborough, Master-in-Equity for Charleston County, to reconsider, alter or amend his Order of June 11, 2012. The said Order being filed in the Clerk of Court for the Ninth Judicial Circuit on June 15, 2012 and notice of entry of the order was received on June 28, 2012 by E--mail from the clerk of court and the mailed copy was received on June 29, 2012. A copy of said Order is attached hereto and specifically incorporated by reference herein.

The grounds for this motion are as follows:

1. The finding of fact page 4 Paragraph 12 fails to establish whether or not the court considers the description of the demised premises to ambiguous or not. Defendant requests the court to determine that the lease unambiguously describes the demised premises as the entire 1.21 acre parcel shown on the plat at Plat Book DB page 47 (ex 10).

2. The finding of fact at Page 5, Paragraph 15, states "The conditions are addressed both in Sections 6.01 and 1.02 Use of Space..." A clear reading of the lease is that the those Sections merely define the use of the demised premises and are covenants in

the lease not conditions. (*See 49 Am jur 2nd Landlord and Tenant §58*) The heading for the sections state “ Section 1.02 Use of Space and Section 6.01 Use.”

The finding “Thus since the “wooded area” has no parking area on it, it is not subject to the use by Magnolia, because parking is the only purpose for which Magnolia has any right of use pursuant to the lease.” is without factual support in that the lease allows the entire demised premises to be used by Magnolia for parking and now that the tower has been built that is impossible.

3. The finding of fact at Page 5, Paragraph 16 which states in pertinent part that “it only forbids leases that interfere with use of the parking area”, the error being “parking area” is not a defined term in the lease and further it conflicts with the clear language of the lease which states “which in any manner prevent or interfere with tenant” not with parking area.

Further the finding “notably, it does not say the Demised Premises is not subject to any lease” this finding is contrary to the clear language in the lease that states “no leases” which defendant submits is the same as “not subject to any leases” as asserted by Plaintiff.

4. The finding of fact at Page 5, Paragraph 17 “that the Optima Tower clearly did not interfere with Magnolia’s use”. This finding is in direct conflict with Page 7, Paragraph 22 that states that “the tower...affectively ejects Defendant from future use of this part of the original demised premises” and page 4 Paragraph 13 which states “it is apparent that Plaintiff’s actions in leasing the area to Optima Towers now prevents the Defendant from using that portion of the demised premises.” This finding should be stricken from the order.

5. The finding of fact at Page 6, Paragraph 18. The finding therein "quiet title and peaceful possession is limited to 'all rights herein granted' and those rights as noted above are limited to the use of parking in the designated area". The error being that the lease contains no designated parking area. Quiet enjoyment refers to the entire demised premises not just a portion of the demised premises. Further the only limitation in Article XII of the lease is that the Tenant discharge its obligations under the lease. This finding should also be stricken from the order.

6. The finding of fact at Page 6, Paragraph 19 is contrary to the relief requested in the Defendant's prayer for relief, Defendant submitted under its theory of unjust enrichment that it was entitled to restitution damages measured by the Plaintiff's windfall and not damages calculated by the size of the area of the demised premises in question. (*Harper v. McCoy*, 276 Se2d 282 , S.Ct. 1981). In the alternative the court should consider the value of the lost area at the rental value of a cell tower not a parking lot since its use was changed by the Plaintiff.

7. The finding of fact at Page 6, Paragraph 20 is contrary to the relief Defendant prayed for, Defendant argued, under its theory of unjust enrichment, that it was entitled to restitution damages measured by the Plaintiff's windfall and not damages calculated by the size of the area of the demised premises in question and further the finding that "while Magnolia attempts to seek unjust enrichment, that principal requires that the enrichment be at the expense of the other party", the grounds are that this finding contradicts the finding at Page 7, Paragraph 22 that reflects that the Defendant was ejected from the area in question. Ejecting Defendant for a portion of the demised premises is at the Defendant's expense. The demised premises is Defendant's property. Plaintiff's gain

was the Defendant's loss and therefore at Defendant's expense. Plaintiff exploited Defendant's property to its gain. Defendant's action was to recover its property right that was exploited and was allowed in the lease by abatement.

8. The finding of fact at Page 7, Paragraph 21, "Defendant's failure to utilize the area in question amounted to an abandonment of that part of the demised premises". The grounds being that the finding is not supported by the evidence or the law. Abandonment is the intentional relinquishment of a known right. (*Holly Hill Lumber Company, Inc. v Grooms*, 16 SE2d 816. 1941). Mere failure to use a portion of the demised premises cannot rise to abandonment without intent to abandon.

The finding that "both parties were unaware that the "wooded area' was contained within the demised premises at the time the lease was entered into" is contrary to the testimony of Mr. Carnevale and Mr. Cochran and paragraph 12 of the order. Both testified at the time that the lease was entered into there was no question that the entire 1.21 acre parcel was the demised premises.

The finding that the "abandonment occurred prior to Plaintiff's breach of the express terms of the lease by again renting a portion of the demised premises", is not supported by the evidence. The only evidence was that Mr. Heirs mistakenly leased the property to Optima Towers long after the lease with the Defendant was entered into.

9. The finding of fact at Page 7, Paragraph 22, The finding, "Plaintiff contends that Defendant breached the lease by reducing its lease payments by the amount of the lease payments received by Plaintiff from Optima Towers. I agree." This finding is inconsistent with the remainder of paragraph 22 and fails to take into consideration the Tenants right to abate. Defendant cannot be in breach of the lease by exercising a right

allowed by the lease. (*See 49 Am jur 2nd Landlord and Tenant §599*)

Further the finding "I specifically find that the Plaintiff's action does not interfere with Defendant's normal use of the are of the demised premises" contradicts the next sentence that states, "It does however effectively eject Defendant from future use of this part of the original demised premises" and page 4 paragraph 13 which states "it is apparent that Plaintiff's actions in leasing the area to Optima Towers now prevents the Defendant from using that portion of the demised premises." This finding should therefore be stricken.

10. The findings of fact at Page 7 Paragraph 23, "I find that abatement of the full amount of the rent paid by Optima Towers provides unjust enrichment to Defendant". This finding fails to consider that any enrichment to Defendant was not at the expense of the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff receives the full amount of the benefit it bargained for under the leases with Defendant and Optima Towers.

The finding " I find that the self help remedy that Defendant utilizes is excessive and also constitutes a breach of the payment terms of the lease", contradicts the Defendant's right to abate in the event of a breach of the lease by the Plaintiff. The lease allows the total abatement of the rent. The total rent at the time of the Plaintiff's breach was \$1,909.00 per month and the Defendant abated the rent by \$800.00 per month which was less than the full amount of the rent that the Plaintiff was receiving from Optima Towers. The lease allows a total abatement. Inasmuch as the Defendant had the right to abate the rent based upon the Plaintiff's breach, then the amount of the abatement goes to the damages only and not to a breach of the lease itself. (*See 49 Am jur 2nd Landlord and Tenant §599*)

A remedy allowed by the lease should not create a default by Defendant.

The finding “that to allow the Defendant to benefit from its failure to object to the use of its demised premises and then wait and claim that the Plaintiff has been unjustly enriched from its own efforts smacks this Court as both a breach of the party’s agreement and inequitable conduct.” There’s no support in the record that there was any inequitable conduct on the part of the Defendant. Further the acts of the Defendant were passive while the acts of the Plaintiff were active, if there was any inequitable conduct it should be cast upon the Plaintiff. Again since the Defendant’s acts were not at the expense of the Plaintiff there is no basis for the Plaintiff to recover from the Defendant in unjust enrichment. All Defendant did was to exercise its rights under the lease when it came to its attention that the Plaintiff had breached the terms of the lease. Defendant is entitled to enforce the lease against the Plaintiff.

Plaintiff’s “own efforts” were in violation of the terms of the lease and should not be rewarded.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

11. Page 9, Paragraph 26, the conclusion, “ Both Plaintiff and Defendant should have known the extent of the demised premises and should not have leased a portion of the demised premises to Optima Towers” is in error. Only the Plaintiff leased to Optima Towers, not both Plaintiff and Defendant.

12. Page 9, Paragraph 27, the conclusion, “that there was a mutual mistake by the two parties in this action.” The grounds being that the foregoing is not supported by the evidence. Mr. Heirs testified he made a mistake but there is no evidence to support that Magnolia was mistaken. In order to have been a mutual mistake, the mutual mistake

would have had to occurred at the time that the contract was entered into. Clearly there is no evidence that Defendant was mistaken as to the extent of the demised premises at the time the lease was entered into. See paragraph 12 of the order. The Plaintiff's mistake occurred after the lease was entered into and after he had already authorized the tower to be built, all subsequent to the entry of the contract, the ignorance that the Defendant was constructing the cell tower on a portion of the lease premises does not constitute a mistake on Magnolia's part.

13. Page 9, Paragraph 27, the conclusion that Optima Tower's lease was entered into after a mutual mistake of fact was made by the two parties to this action" is not supported by the evidence. The grounds being that Magnolia was not a party to the Optima lease at the time of execution so therefore there could be no mistake on its part. The evidence was that they did not learn that the Tower was on its leased property until after it was constructed due to Plaintiff unilateral mistake.

The remedy of reformation of the lease between the parties will only lie if there truly is a mutual mistake of fact at the time of the execution of the lease between the parties not related to subsequent mistake of one of the parties and the ignorance of the other party. Again, the court should consider the value of the lost area as a cell tower not as a parking lot and the Plaintiff changed the use of that area.

The conclusion, that "an adjustment made to the amount of rent payable from Defendant for only that part of the demised premises that Defendant continues to use", is contrary to the remedy that Defendant seeks that being restitution for the acts of the Plaintiff to prevent the Plaintiff from benefiting from its unilateral mistake and capitalizing on its mistake.

14. Page 9, Paragraph 28, The conclusion, "Plaintiff's claim for unjust enrichment against the Defendant is granted". The grounds for objecting to this conclusion is that the Plaintiff has failed to establish that the Defendant's unjust enrichment was "at the expense of the Plaintiff". The Plaintiff is entitled to the full benefit of its bargain with the Defendant, Magnolia, which it is receiving through the payments by Magnolia and through Optima Towers. Thus it cannot be said that Magnolia has been unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiff since the Plaintiff has not been damaged in any fashion by its unilateral acts in leasing the subject property to Optima.

The conclusion, Plaintiff asserts that "Defendant has been unjustly enriched because they are not paying the full amount of the rent bargained for under the lease." This conclusion fails to consider that the Plaintiff has not been damaged by the Defendant abating the rent in accordance with the lease. Plaintiff seeks to measure its recovery by what is occurring to Defendant, not by its own damages. In essence, Plaintiff seeks restitution measured from Defendant's perspective rather than its own damage perspective. Plaintiff has not been damaged at all.

The conclusion that "it would inequitable for the Defendant to get the full benefit of the amount of the rental payments from Optima after having sat on their rights to stop the Tower's construction" is not supported by the evidence. Plaintiff's conduct was active, it leased the property to another when it knew or should have known that the property was leased to Magnolia. Defendant's conduct was passive and based upon ignorance of the fact that the Plaintiff would have the audacity to lease property to two different people. Plaintiff now seeks forgiveness and a ruling that would allow it to profit from its unilateral mistake. If there was any inequitable conduct it was the conduct of the Plaintiff.

The Defendant passively may have acquiesced in the construction off the tower but it did not waive any of its rights to demand strict compliance with the terms of the lease upon learning of the Plaintiff's breach.

THE REMEDY

15. Page 10 paragraph 31. There is no evidence that would support the position that the Plaintiff's efforts should be rewarded. The fact that the Plaintiff mistakenly leased the property to Optima Towers should not be lauded but condemned.

The finding that it "would be unjust to allow the Defendant a total offset for theses payments as abatement of rent" fails to consider that total abatement of the rent is allowed in accordance with the lease and restitution is the appropriate remedy in this situation. The grounds for this being the Plaintiff's conduct is totally responsible for the error being made. The Plaintiff bargained for \$193,000.00 in rent through October 2011 and has received in excess of \$207,000.00. Plaintiff is receiving it in the form of rent payments from Magnolia and rent payments from Optima and therefore has not been damaged. (*See 49 Am Jur 2nd Landlord and Tenant §599*)

Since the Plaintiff is not damaged it therefore would not be unjust to allow the abatement which is the remedy provided for under the terms of the lease.

From the Defendant's perspective, Plaintiff is the author of its own dilemma to allow it to profit from leasing the property twice is unjust.

16. The Remedy, Page 10, Paragraph 32. The statement "In looking at the demised premises used by the Defendant, it appears that the parking area consists of approximately one acre, which is what the Defendant sought in their initial negotiations." is contrary to paragraph 12 of the order that finds "that Section 1.01 of the lease entitled

demised premises' describes the premises as the entire 1.21 acre parcel shown on the plat at Plat book DB, Page 47 (E. 10)." Based on the forgoing the Defendant leased the entire 1.21 acres not the parking area within the demised premises.

Defendant takes no issue at the Court's calculation of the area in question, however, that is not the measure of damages that Defendant sought. Defendant sought restitution not damages for the lost area. Looking at it another way, if the court is inclined to award damages to the Defendant based on the area lost, it should measure that damages based on the lost area being used as a cell tower and not as a parking lot.

17. Paragraph 33 concerning the calculation of the disputed area, the Defendant does not question the calculation being one-sixth of the total, but again asserts restitution is the appropriate remedy. In the alternative the defendant asserts that since the lost area is now a cell tower the should be calculated, not as a parking lot but as a cell tower.

18. Paragraph 34 page 11, The conclusion is in error and not supported by the facts. The parties expectation was that they were leasing 1.21 acres for the consideration stated in the lease not merely for the parking lot.

19. Paragraph 35, Page 11, the statement "while I find that the Plaintiff received a total of \$207,677.65 through the month of October 2011, it received this amount through its own efforts and not at the unjust expense of the Defendant. I find that the Plaintiff received an enrichment over the contract amount but I find that the amount was not unjust." This finding is not support by the evidence. The fact that the Plaintiff sought and leased property already leased to Defendant through its own efforts is a characterization of the Plaintiff's breach of the lease for which it should not be rewarded. Plaintiff should not have been making any effort to lease property already leased to the Defendant.

Defendant asserts that if the Plaintiff was enriched, it would have to be unjust enrichment given the fact that it had bargained for a specific amount of rent from the Defendant for the full term of the lease and would receive greater than it bargained for and it would be unjust for the Plaintiff to receive greater than the rent it initially bargained for.

The grounds being that restitution allows a recovery from Plaintiff's all of its ill-gotten gain. The Court should not equitably allow Plaintiff to profit from its lease of the same property to two different tenants when the fair remedy is presented in the lease itself. There is no need to explain or justify the benefit the Defendant is receiving since it is the benefit called for in the lease, that is abatement.

Defendant asserts that the lease with Optima was based on the sole illicit efforts of the Plaintiff for which it should not be rewarded.

The finding "not at the unjust expense of the Defendant" fails to consider that Plaintiff exploited a valuable property right of the Defendant and therefore it has to be at the Defendant's expense and it is unjust to allow it to happen. Additionally the correct statement of unjust enrichment requires it to be at the expense of the Defendant, not at the unjust expense.

20. The Remedy, Page 11, Paragraph 36. Although Defendant has received a benefit by virtue of the Optima Lease, it has not been at the Plaintiff's expense. Plaintiff will receive the benefits of its lease with Optima and Defendant for the rest of the term. Since it is not at the expense of the Plaintiff, the Defendant has not been unjustly enriched and Plaintiff has not been damaged. Plaintiff's argument fails for the same reason that the Court found the Defendant's request for unjust enrichment fails, that being the failure to show that the enrichment has been "at the expense of the other party."

The Remedy is restitution to prevent the landlord from capitalizing on its illicit ill-gotten gain. The property right, the Optima Lease, belongs to the Defendant not the Plaintiff.

Defendant takes issue with the Court's math. the Court found the difference in rent paid by Magnolia, \$153,561.00 and in rent owed of \$193,352.65, is \$39,791.00 and found that was what the Defendant owed the Plaintiff. The alleged amount due is incorrect. This fails to take into consideration the \$300.00 abatement from the inception of the Tower lease of \$300.00 per month previously stated in the Order, page 11 paragraph 33. . . Sixty-six months at \$300.00 per month would result in a reduction of \$19,800.00 to the \$39,291.65 to \$19,999.65. This is consistent with the finding on page 11 paragraph 33 "Accordingly, rent shall be owed on the base rent of \$1500 from the time that the cell tower began to pay on its rental term."

21. Remedy, Page 12, Paragraph 37, Attorney's Fees. Assuming the court agrees with Defendants motions to amend the Defendant request the Court to reconsider it's decision regarding attorney's fees. The lease provides for the prevailing party to attorney's fees. At the trial of the case, the Defendant presented evidence of attorney's fees and an affidavit in support of the Defendant's attorney's fees. The Plaintiff did not submit any evidence which would support its intent to seek attorney's fees and therefore should be considered to have abandoned its claim for attorney's fees.

In its counterclaim the Defendant sought abatement of rent which is what the Court found was appropriate. Although the Court found that the amount of abatement was somewhat less than what the Defendant sought, it still was a beneficial and prevailing result as it defeated at least a portion of the Plaintiff's claim for a breach of contract.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

EXCERPT

56 LEINBACH,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CASE NO. 2008-CP-10-3590

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM,

Defendant.

HEARING BEFORE: HONORABLE MIKELL R. SCARBOROUGH
DATE: October 11, 2011
TIME: 9:50 AM
LOCATION: Charleston County Courthouse
100 Broad Street
Charleston, SC
TAKEN BY: Counsel for the Plaintiff
REPORTED BY: LORA L. McDANIEL,
Registered Professional Reporter

A. WILLIAM ROBERTS, JR. & ASSOCIATES

Fast, Accurate & Friendly

Charleston, SC (843) 722-8414	Hilton Head, SC (843) 785-3263	Myrtle Beach, SC (843) 839-3376
Columbia, SC (803) 731-5224	Greenville, SC (864) 234-7030	Charlotte, NC (704) 573-3919

1 APPEARANCES:

2 ATTORNEYS FOR THE PLAINTIFF

56 LEINBACH:

3

HOWE & WYNDHAM, LLP

4

BY: DONALD H. HOWE

47 State Street

5

Charleston, SC 29401

(843) 853-6121

6

howewyndham@bellsouth.net

7

8

ATTORNEYS FOR THE DEFENDANT

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM:

9

BARR, UNGER and McINTOSH

10

BY: WILLIAM S. BARR

CAPERS G. BARR, IV

11

11 Broad Street

Charleston, SC 29401

12

(843) 577-5083

cbarr@barrungermcintosh.com

13

wsh@barrungermcintosh.com

14

15

16

17

18

19

(INDEX AT REAR OF TRANSCRIPT)

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 (PLF. EXH. 1, Lease, was marked for
2 identification.)

3 (PLF. EXH. 2, Design plans, was marked for
4 identification.)

5 (PLF. EXH. 3, Optima lease, was marked for
6 identification.)

7 (PLF. EXH. 4, Topographical drawing, was
8 marked for identification.)

9 (PLF. EXH. 5, Photographs, was marked for
10 identification.)

11 (PLF. EXH. 6, Diagram, was marked for
12 identification.)

13 (PLF. EXH. 7, Letter dated 12-18-07 from
14 William Barr to Donald Howe, was marked for
15 identification.)

16 (PLF. EXH. 8, Rental summary, was marked
17 for identification.)

18 (PLF. EXH. 9, Optima Towers Transaction
19 Detail, was marked for identification.)

20 (PLF. EXH. 10, Plat, was marked for
21 identification.)

22 (PLF. EXH. 11, Title, affidavit dated
23 8-25-99, recording receipt, was marked for
24 identification.)

25 (PLF. EXH. 12, Letter dated 1-31-08 from

1 William Barr to Donald Howe, was marked for
2 identification.)

3 THE COURT: We have 56 Leinbach versus
4 Magnolia Paradigm, Inc., case number 2008-CP-10-3590.
5 This case was commenced in 2008, arising out of a
6 lease agreement between these parties that was
7 entered into in 2003. The matter was referred to me
8 by Judge Jefferson September 2009.

9 I've had several hearings with attorneys.
10 Ultimately, The Court denied motions, defense motions
11 for summary judgement. That was entered in December
12 of last year, and we set this case for trial couple
13 times. That's why we're here today.

14 Mr. Donald Howe for the Plaintiff. Mr.
15 William Barr for the Defendants, along with
16 Mr. Capers Barr. Good morning, gentlemen.

17 I previously asked if there were any
18 matters to come up before we started today. I was
19 told no. Anything else you want to present?

20 MR. HOWE: Just to let you know, we have
21 marked as Plaintiff's Exhibits, they're really joint
22 exhibits, Your Honor, to a certain extent, exhibits 1
23 through 12. And I believe that number 2 and number 5
24 are going to be objected to, but the others are okay.

25 MR. WILLIAM BARR: And 6.

1 (PLF. EXH. 1 was received into evidence.)

2 (PLF. EXH. 3 was received into evidence.)

3 (PLF. EXH. 4 was received into evidence.)

4 (PLF. EXH. 7 was received into evidence.)

5 (PLF. EXH. 8 was received into evidence.)

6 (PLF. EXH. 9 was received into evidence.)

7 (PLF. EXH. 10 was received into evidence.)

8 (PLF. EXH. 11 was received into evidence.)

9 (PLF. EXH. 12 was received into evidence.)

10 MR. HOWE: I'm assuming since we had
11 enough, we don't really need opening statements. You
12 know more about this than you need to know already.

13 THE COURT: It's an interesting case, I'll
14 give you that. We're ready

15 MR. HOWE: Yes, sir. The Plaintiff will
16 call Mr. Keith Powell.

17 THE COURT: Mr. Powell, come on up.

18 STEVEN KEITH POWELL
19 being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

20 DIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. HOWE:

22 Q. Mr. Powell, what is your full name,
23 please, sir?

24 A. Steven Keith Powell.

25 Q. How old are you?

1 A. Forty-one.

2 Q. What is your occupation?

3 A. I'm self-employed.

4 Q. Self-employed as what?

5 A. Telecommunications.

6 Q. Does part of that involve communication
7 towers?

8 A. Yes, sir, I build, construct for a group
9 of partners telecommunications towers and also
10 commercial real estate for those companies involved
11 in that industry.

12 Q. And one of the companies I think you
13 worked with is called Optima?

14 A. I'm a member of that LLC, yes, sir.

15 Q. And in connection with your work in
16 telecommunications and work with Optima, you entered
17 into a lease with Mr. Hiers; is that correct?

18 A. Optima Towers did, yes, sir.

19 Q. And that had to do with a tower that's at
20 the end of Leinbach Drive, I guess -- I forget
21 whether it's Drive or Street -- down by the
22 Charleston Montessori School?

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. How did all this get started? How did you
25 happen to come into contact or choose this site, or

1 how did that become an idea or an option?

2 A. Can you be more specific.

3 Q. Did you choose this -- first of all, who
4 approached who? Did you approach Mr. Hiers, or did
5 he approach you?

6 A. I approached Mr. Hiers.

7 Q. How did you decide to approach Mr. Hiers
8 as even being a possibility?

9 A. We had determined that one of his
10 properties at Leinbach Road fit into our need for a
11^v communication center.

12 Q. In what way did it fit in? How do you
13 determine it? What was it about it that fit in?

14 A. His property was in our area, what we call
15 a search ring. We contacted him based on that.

16 Q. How do you actually go about finding a
17 site?

18 A. There's so many variables. We'll be here
19 for the next four days if I explain it to you like
20 that.

21 Q. Tell me about the ones in this particular
22 case, how you came up with it.

23 A. There was a need. From my industry
24 expertise and knowledge, we determined there's a need
25 there.

1 Q. How did you decide to contact Mr. Hiers?

2 A. His property was in that area of need.

3 Q. How did you decide or find out it was his
4 property?

5 A. Went to the tax records.

6 Q. Tell me, are you familiar --

7 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Your Honor, I'm going
8 to interpose an objection. This is an action that
9 really construed -- declaratory judgement construed
10 the lease between the parties. Incident to the
11 parties' lease, Optima Towers has a part because it
12 leased a portion of the property that my client had
13 already leased. Incident to the background and how
14 he got it and where he went to and what he looked
15 for, et cetera, I don't find to be relevant to the
16 determination of the issue between these two parties.

17 THE COURT: Where are we going, Mr. Howe?

18 MR. HOWE: The next question, there was a
19 memorandum of lease that they used to put the public
20 on notice. No memorandum of lease was filed by the
21 Defendant to put the public on notice of its claim
22 that it now asserts against my client.

23 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Relevance still.

24 THE COURT: I'll allow it.

25 MR. WILLIAM BARR: On the point of

1 memorandum of lease, memorandum of lease is to put
2 third parties on notice of the existence of the
3 lease, not the parties themselves. As far as him
4 having notice, he's not party to this action. His
5 lease is not in jeopardy.

6 The memorandum of lease, whether we filed
7 one or not, is irrelevant to the determination of the
8 case.

9 THE COURT: Go ahead.

10 BY MR. HOWE:

11 Q. In what's already been agreed as part of
12 exhibit number 3, tell me what that is.

13 A. That is a memorandum of lease that we use,
14 and that looks like it's signed between 56 Leinbach
15 and Optima Towers.

16 Q. What do you do with a memorandum of lease?

17 A. We record it in the local courthouse. In
18 fact, it would be here in this building.

19 Q. What is the purpose of the memorandum?

20 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Objection, Your Honor.

21 I don't think this witness is qualified to make these
22 determinations.

23 MR. HOWE: What he does for a living.

24 THE COURT: I'll allow it. Go ahead.

25 THE WITNESS: We do it to fill title

1 insurance requirement, to verify and make notice of
2 our interest in the property.

3 BY MR. HOWE:

4 Q. That's so, if somebody checks --

5 A. If somebody like myself walks in a
6 courthouse, they can make a record that we have an
7 interest in the property.

8 Q. Through the lease?

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. Was there a memorandum of lease -- did you
11 looked to see if there was any memorandum of lease in
12 regards to this particular --

13 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Objection; hearsay.

14 MR. HOWE: Whether he looked for
15 something?

16 THE COURT: Confine it to his knowledge.

17 THE WITNESS: From my experience, we pay a
18 title abstractor to do that search for us because
19 they're very specific, and they're knowledgeable,
20 much so than ourselves. And the report came back
21 with nothing of any record that I'm aware of.

22 BY MR. HOWE:

23 Q. When you say nothing, no memorandum of
24 lease by Mr. Baker's company about this particular?

25 A. About this incident, yes, sir.

1 Q. How long did it take to build this tower?

2 A. 45, 60 days once we start construction.

3 Q. How big is it?

4 A. It's 160 feet tall.

5 Q. Did anyone from Mr. Baker's, Mr. Baker or
6 anyone on his behalf, ever approach you during the
7 construction phase and object or say anything to you
8 about it?

9 A. I don't recall them approaching us. I do
10 know we had contacted them because we had to flag off
11 part of their lot where he parked their cars there to
12 set a crane up and, obviously, to take care of the
13 area, make sure no damage would happen to the area.

14 Q. And so, I guess -- I'm trying to
15 visualize. The crane was actually in the lot a
16 little bit?

17 A. The specifics, that's five years ago. I
18 can't recall. I do know we had contacted him.
19 Mr. Hiers had asked us to contact Mr. Baker's group
20 up there, and we did.

21 MR. HOWE: That's all the questions I
22 have. Thank you very much.

23 THE COURT: Any questions?

24 CROSS-EXAMINATION

25 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

1 Q. Mr. Powell, just a couple. We've marked
2 as exhibit 9, and I'm going to ask you if you can
3 identify that for me.

4 A. This is a -- this is basically a Quick
5 Books file we pulled up of all the rent we paid 56
6 Leinbach partners since inception.

7 Q. The total amount of rent you paid during
8 December is how much?

9 A. What does it say? It says 54,116. That's
10 based on annual years from January 2006 to the
11 present.

12 Q. That has 3 percent increases per year?

13 A. You would have to look at the lease. I
14 can't recall.

15 Q. You said that you contacted Mr. -- you
16 contacted Mr. Hiers in regard to this lease to do
17 this project?

18 A. Yes, sir, I did.

19 Q. And did you visit the site?

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. And did Mr. Hiers visit the site with you?

22 A. I think originally -- I just don't truly
23 recall that much. I assume so. We generally do it
24 with most owners.

25 Q. When you went to the site, were you

1 targeting a specific area of the site, or did you
2 want to put the tower over in the middle?

3 A. I don't recall. I mean, there's clearly
4 an area where there was parking lot and where there
5 wasn't. We were looking where there wasn't.

6 Q. And you knew that the parking lot was used
7 by Baker?

8 A. At that time, no, sir.

9 Q. There's not a sign out front --

10 A. No, sir.

11 Q. -- that says Baker?

12 A. No, sir, at that time there was just cars.

13 Q. Just cars parked there?

14 A. I guess. There were cars and there was, I
15 think, an employee lot, to be honest with you.

16 That's the only thing I recall.

17 Q. You don't recall the sign on front saying
18 Baker parking, employees only?

19 A. No, sir.

20 Q. Mr. Hiers told you that Baker's people had
21 an interest in the parking lot, though?

22 A. He told us when we wanted to know what it
23 was, Baker's parking was in the gravel area.

24 Q. That's what Mr. Hiers told you?

25 A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. You didn't investigate that any further?

2 A. Nothing came up in our title. We didn't
3 know whose it was. We knew it was obviously a
4 parking lot.

5 Q. You didn't report that fact to your
6 lawyer?

7 A. Yeah, I'm sure we did. It's a parking
8 lot.

9 Q. You notified your lawyer that Baker's had
10 some interest in the parking lot. You weren't sure
11 of the extent?

12 A. That's five years ago. I don't know. I
13 mean, we basically, standard, look at our title
14 policy and our work from our abstractors and
15 exceptions. There's nothing there that showed any
16 interest of Baker or Magnolia or anything like that.

17 Q. Do you recall who did -- you said that
18 someone from your company contacted Baker?

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 Q. Was that you?

21 A. No, sir, it was not.

22 Q. Do you know who it was?

23 A. It was probably one of my other two
24 partners.

25 Q. And they say they contacted Baker?

1 A. Well, they did. We had somebody from
2 Baker's, whether it's general manager or somebody,
3 came out and flagged off the lot where the employees
4 could park or couldn't park.

5 Q. Do you remember the Baker representative
6 who you spoke to?

7 A. No, sir, they flagged it off. I do not
8 recall.

9 MR. WILLIAM BARR: No further questions.

10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. HOWE:

12 Q. How big a crane is this that has to put
13 this tower up?

14 A. It's 160-foot tall tower, so something
15 bigger than that.

16 Q. You can see it from 17, can't you?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 MR. HOWE: That's all the questions I
19 have.

20 THE COURT: Mr. Powell, just so I'm clear,
21 you said somebody from Baker came out and flagged the
22 lot so you would know where to put your towers. Is
23 that what I heard?

24 THE WITNESS: We were setting our crane up
25 in the area, and Mr. Hiers told us to contact

1 Mr. Baker's lot or the car dealership, let them know
2 that we would be setting a crane up a certain day,
3 certain time and that needed to be flagged off so
4 employees wouldn't park there.

5 THE COURT: Were you there for that aspect
6 of it?

7 THE WITNESS: No, sir, I was not.

8 THE COURT: That's y'all's usual,
9 customary practice to do that?

10 THE WITNESS: If we have to set a crane
11 up, yes, in a certain area, we do.

12 THE COURT: This would've been in what?
13 2006 time frame?

14 THE WITNESS: We paid rent, yes, sir

15 THE COURT: Very good. Any follow-up,
16 gentlemen?

17 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Follow-up.

18 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

19 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

21 Q. Did your people flag off where you were
22 going to put the crane?

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. Baker didn't come off and flag where you
25 were going to put the crane?

1 A. Not that I'm aware of, no, sir. We
2 flagged where we would put the crane, and then they
3 marked where they could and could not park.

4 Q. Basically, you flagged where the crane was
5 going to go and asked them not to park in that area
6 so you could put your crane there?

7 A. From my recollection, yes, sir.

8 MR. HOWE: Always another follow-up.

9 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. HOWE:

11 Q. And they came in and marked their own
12 parking?

13 A. I guess so, yes. They clearly were not
14 parking in the area where we needed the crane to sit.

15 MR. HOWE: That's all I have.

16 THE COURT: Mr. Powell, thank you, sir.
17 You may step down.

18 You want to release him?

19 MR. HOWE: Yes, please. He has a 10:30.
20 I think he might be able to make it.

21 Call my client.

22 (The witness exited the stand.)

23 CLYDE LARRY HIERS

24 being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

25 DIRECT EXAMINATION

1 BY MR. HOWE:

2 Q. Could you state your full name for me,
3 please, sir.

4 A. Clyde Larry Hiers. Last name is spelled
5 H-I-E-R-S.

6 Q. How old are you?

7 A. Sixty next Wednesday.

8 Q. What do you do for a living?

9 A. I'm a CPA.

10 Q. And you are also, I guess, the principal
11 of 56 Leinbach Investors, which is the Plaintiff in
12 this matter?

13 A. That is correct.

14 Q. And 56 Leinbach, as I understand it, owns
15 some property at the end of Leinbach Drive?

16 A. That is correct. Originally we owned two
17 parcels; one parcel has since been sold.

18 Q. And what is on the parcel that was sold?

19 A. The parcel that was sold contained
20 approximately 8,000 square -- no, I'm sorry -- about
21 15,000 square feet.

22 Q. Charleston Montessori School?

23 A. Charles Towne Montessori School, yes, sir.

24 Q. This piece of property that's subject to
25 the lawsuit today, as I understand it, you go kind of

1 to the end -- I think we're all on the same page.
2 You go to the end of the cul-de-sac. This is
3 obviously not to scale. There's a cul-de-sac and
4 there's a property line. And sort of on this side is
5 Charles Towne Montessori School, and on this side,
6 what is now where the parking lot is?

7 A. That is correct. The line that you sort
8 of drew in the middle of the key is actually a
9 drainage easement created by the City of Charleston.
10 Everything to the left was Charles Towne Montessori
11 School. Everything to the right was what was
12 commonly referred to as the soccer field.

13 Q. This was a soccer field that was an empty
14 lot?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. At some point you entered into a lease
17 with Magnolia Paradigm, which is Mr. Baker, about the
18 use of that soccer field lot; is that correct?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. And that lease is exhibit number 1 in the
21 exhibits we have submitted to The Court; is that
22 correct?

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. Prior to entering into that lease, what
25 documents, if any, have been supplied by Baker to you

1 to discuss what would and would not be done with the
2 lease?

3 A. When it was determined that Mr. Baker
4 wished to lease the soccer field for use as an
5 employee parking lot, we first went to Barry Whalen,
6 who was a landscape architect. He represents the
7 Leinbach family. Also, he was an owner-tenant of one
8 of the nearby buildings.

9 The covenants and restrictions for that
10 particular neighborhood require approval before any
11 construction can occur. We told Mr. Whalen what
12 Mr. Baker proposed. We asked him for approximate
13 number of parking spaces that we could get. He did
14 not create a detailed drawing. He gave us an
15 approximate number.

16 We went back to Mr. Cochran, Mr. Baker's
17 representative, and said, Barry Whalen has given
18 preliminary approval on behalf of the Leinbach
19 family, and he thinks you can achieve approximately
20 75 parking spaces.

21 At that point, Mr. Cochran then submitted
22 to us a more detailed drawing showing, approximately,
23 90 parking spaces.

24 Q. Let me hand you a copy of a document.

25 MR. HOWE: This is one he has objection

1 to.

2 MR. WILLIAM BARR: One of the objections I
3 have. Your Honor, a key component of this particular
4 case and really what is at issue, what is the demised
5 premises.

6 THE COURT: I agree.

7 MR. WILLIAM BARR: And the document
8 Mr. Hiers is about to testify to is a document that
9 was prepared sometime prior to the entering of the
10 lease during the time that the parties were
11 negotiating the terms of the lease, et cetera.

12 And there's a provision in the lease
13 itself, and I believe in the law, these are referred
14 to as integration clauses. And the integration
15 clause in this particular lease is on page 22. And
16 it's section 14.13.

17 And essentially it says: This lease
18 embodies the entire agreement between landlord and
19 tenant with respect to the subject matter hereof and
20 supersedes all prior agreements and understandings
21 whether written or oral. Landlord and tenant have
22 neither made nor relied upon any promises,
23 representations or warranties in connection with this
24 lease that are not expressly set forth in this lease.

25 In entering into this lease, Landlord and

1 tenant have relied on the representations of
2 warranties contained in this lease.

3 And I believe that the document that
4 Mr. Hiers has in his hand is a document, which is not
5 part and parcel of the lease. The lease refers to
6 parcel H2 of TMS such and such. And that particular
7 plat has been marked as exhibit 10.

8 And essentially what that document
9 constitutes is just a sketch of what the proposed
10 parking area was to be to satisfy the requirements
11 that the landlord had previously approved. It is not
12 part of the lease, not incorporated by a reference in
13 the lease; therefore, I object to the introduction of
14 this particular document into the record for that
15 purpose, as well as the design plans which have been
16 previously marked as exhibit 2. Again, it's all
17 because of the integration clause of the lease
18 itself.

19 THE COURT: Mr. Howe.

20 MR. HOWE: The lease in section one says
21 subject to. And the subject to, with the benefit of
22 the terms, subject to other conditions in the lease.
23 This is the lease.

24 And the first -- the next one is parking,
25 and it refers to the parking area. It says they

1 shall have exclusive use of the parking area.

2 And the evidence -- we haven't got this
3 far yet -- will show that plans were drawn up showing
4 the parking area, that the plans had to be approved
5 by the city before any construction could be done.
6 That the plans that were approved by the city were
7 the plans that went there. And that the parking area
8 is the parking area reflected on those documents.

9 It's explaining a term within there. It's
10 not integrated. It certainly shows -- there's
11 nothing in the lease that says the parking area shall
12 be the metes and bounds of this, you know, these
13 measurements or anything like that. So it's offered
14 to show what is the parking area and explain that
15 term within the lease. I think that's proper.

16 THE COURT: You're under section 102 on
17 use of space? Is that where you're referring to?

18 MR. HOWE: Section 1.02 on the very first
19 page: Throughout the demise term, tenant and its
20 employee shall have exclusive right to use any
21 parking area within the demise.

22 The question is: What are the parking
23 areas? Well, those were -- there's nothing in the
24 lease that says parking area shall mean this piece of
25 property or that piece of property. And so it's

1 being offered to show what the parking area was.

2 And also, if you look up at section 1.01
3 when it says demise, it says: Subject to the
4 conditions. Well, the conditions have to do with the
5 parking area. So it's being offered to show the
6 nature and extent of the parking area was.

7 MR. WILLIAM BARR: I don't want to be
8 Clinton-essing here, Judge, I think the use of the
9 term the parking area is critical. Basically, this
10 is a general statement in the lease. Any parking
11 areas within the demised premises, period. Okay.

12 It's not intended to be a limitation. It
13 just basically refers to it as exclusive versus
14 nonexclusive. And essentially under this -- so as a
15 result of that, to the extent that this document only
16 describes and fulfills an obligation of the lease and
17 that is that the landlord give prior approval to the
18 plans of the parking area. And that is the limit of
19 that particular document.

20 THE COURT: Is the diagram -- what diagram
21 is attached then to the lease?

22 MR. WILLIAM BARR: No diagram is attached
23 to the lease. The only thing -- that's my key
24 consideration is that the description of the demised
25 premise is parcel H2. And parcel H2 is reflected on

1 exhibit 10, which we've marked at least for
2 identification. But there is no document in the
3 lease that would -- that describes it.

4 Again, we're dealing with the issue of the
5 demised premises, period. All this is, is a sketch
6 to fulfill the requirement in the lease that he
7 approve or have knowledge of it. And also we had to
8 have it to get approval from the city.

9 MR. HOWE: And the city approved it; can't
10 build it until you get approval. The question is:
11 Was the parking area approved by the city?

12 THE COURT: I'm going to allow it on the
13 basis I've got some inconsistency going on here. Let
14 me figure out where we're going. I will allow it.

15 This is exhibit what?

16 MR. HOWE: 6.

17 BY MR. HOWE:

18 Q. Do you recognize that document?

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 Q. Tell me what it is.

21 A. It is a rough drawing of a parking plan
22 dated December 12, 2002. And it's labeled Plus-Minus
23 100 Total Parking Spaces. It says: Baker's Motors
24 Gravel Parking Lot. It was drawn by Lucas and
25 Stubbs, who eventually drew the very detailed plan.

1 Q. Did you hire Lucas and Stubbs?

2 A. No, sir.

3 Q. Who hired Lucas and Stubbs?

4 A. Baker Motors.

5 Q. Basically, once those detailed plans are
6 drawn, they have to be approved by the city; correct?

7 A. Yes, sir.

8 Q. Was that approval of the project prior to
9 or after the signing of the lease?

10 A. Prior.

11 Q. There had been plans approved by the city;
12 correct?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. After those plans were approved by the
15 city, you entered into the lease?

16 A. Well, this preliminary drawing is dated
17 December 16, 2002. The lease was dated -- I believe
18 June 1, 2003.

19 Q. Now, there were some additional plans.

20 MR. HOWE: These are subject to objection
21 as well. These are numbered exhibit number 2.

22 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Same objection.

23 BY MR. HOWE:

24 Q. If you'll look at exhibit number 2. I
25 believe there is three pages in there. Check and see

1 if I have everything.

2 A. Yes, sir.

3 Q. Tell me what those three pages are.

4 A. The first page is a topographic survey.

5 It shows the cul-de-sac, and it shows parcel H2

6 without any drawings for parking spaces.

7 The second drawing is labeled Grading

8 Plan. It's the same parcel of land with detailed

9 parking spaces.

10 The third is called a Landscape Plan,

11 which has taken the Grading Plan along with the

12 outlined parking spaces, and they have added the

13 designated landscaping as required by the city.

14 Q. Were these, in fact, the plans that the
15 city okayed for this work?

16 A. Yes, sir.

17 Q. Now you just heard Mr. Powell, who was on
18 the stand; is that correct?

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 Q. How did you happen to come in contact with
21 him?

22 A. Mr. Powell telephoned me, made a general
23 inquiry, wanted to verify that I was the correct
24 person, the member of 56 Leinbach Investors, and
25 wanted to know if he could come in and discuss a cell

1 tower with me.

2 He came to my office within 45 minutes to
3 an hour later. And he told me what he wanted to do.
4 And I told him then -- he actually wanted to put the
5 cell tower in the middle of the soccer field.

6 I said, no, that is leased on a long-term
7 basis to Baker Motor. And I apologize. I guess all
8 day long we're going to interchange Baker with
9 Magnolia Paradigm.

10 And I said: But there is a finger of land
11 that contains a drainage easement. And if you think
12 you can get the city to approve a cell tower for that
13 site, have at it.

14 Q. What happened after that?

15 A. He went and did his homework. And very
16 surprised when he came back, said they had received
17 preliminary approval to proceed with detailed
18 drawings.

19 Q. I think if you'll look at number four in
20 that package, that's sort of a drawing of where the
21 tower ultimately ended up; is that correct?

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. Again, that was something that had to be
24 approved by the city as well?

25 A. Correct.

1 Q. Did anyone from either Mr. Baker or anyone
2 on his behalf contact you during the construction of
3 this?

4 A. No, sir.

5 Q. The construction of this particular tower
6 had other, I guess, public notoriety as well, didn't
7 it?

8 A. Yes, it did.

9 Q. Very briefly, tell me what that was.

10 A. We were on all three of the television
11 stations. We were in the News and Courier, and we
12 were on the front page of several of the smaller
13 local newspapers. The parents of the students at the
14 Montessori School protested the erection of the cell
15 tower, claiming that we were going to inflict bodily
16 harm upon their children.

17 Q. From the waves of the communications?

18 A. I'm going to say electromagnetic field. I
19 may be overruled by someone with more scientific
20 knowledge.

21 Q. To say lightly, quite a controversy about
22 that tower even going up?

23 A. There was controversy. We were in
24 television, we were in the newspapers. There were
25 editorials. I received threatening phone calls.

1 There was also several hearings held at the
2 Montessori School, which involved not only the
3 parents of the school but interested parties within
4 the neighborhood.

5 Q. I want to turn your attention now to some
6 pictures that are in exhibit number 5. I understand
7 there might be some objections to these as well.

8 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Objection; relevance,
9 Your Honor. What does a photograph of the tower have
10 to do with the interpretation of the lease?

11 THE COURT: As to exhibit 6, I checked it
12 off as entered. Exhibit 2, did you want to enter
13 those as well?

14 MR. HOWE: Yes, I would move to enter.

15 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Same objection I made
16 before.

17 THE COURT: I'll note it. I'm going to
18 allow it on the same basis.

19 (PLF. EXH. 6 was entered into evidence.)

20 (PLF. EXH. 2 was entered into evidence.)

21 THE COURT: Where are we now? Exhibit 5?

22 MR. HOWE: Yes.

23 THE COURT: These are photographs?

24 MR. HOWE: These are photographs of the
25 tower. You can also see the lot.

1 THE COURT: Same objection?

2 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Same objection.

3 THE COURT: I'm going to allow those as

4 well.

5 (PLF. EXH. 5 was entered into evidence.)

6 BY MR. HOWE:

7 Q. If you'll turn to the third page of

8 pictures.

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 MR. HOWE: Do you have those up there? It

11 should be in the packet.

12 THE COURT: I may have it. Hold on a

13 second.

14 MR. HOWE: It should be number 5.

15 THE COURT: That I don't have.

16 BY MR. HOWE:

17 Q. It's just a quick question.

18 Just to orient The Court, if you will look

19 at the top picture with me.

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. There's a driveway, there's asphalt,

22 correct, in the foreground?

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. What is that the driveway to?

25 A. That is both the ingress and the egress

1 into the Baker Motor Company parking lot.

2 Q. So the Baker Motor parking lot is over
3 here on the right?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. And over on the left, kind of behind the
6 tree there, is the tower?

7 A. Is the tower, yes, sir.

8 Q. When you look down at the next picture, a
9 little bit further back on Leinbach, you can see the
10 top of the tower a little bit better?

11 A. Yes, sir.

12 Q. And also the Baker cars over on the right?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. Can you see the tower from Savannah
15 Highway?

16 A. Yes, you can.

17 Q. When did the existence of the tower first
18 become an issue between you and Mr. Baker or the
19 Magnolia Paradigm group?

20 A. The existence of the tower -- let me start
21 over, please. Mr. Baker had always expressed an
22 interest to buy the soccer field. He approached us
23 once again about purchasing the soccer field. We
24 agreed to enter into a contract. We had an executed
25 contract. He had a period of due diligence.

1 And his realtor brought to his attention,
2 approximately one or two days before the expiration
3 of the due diligence period, that the cell tower, in
4 his opinion, was sitting on the property that
5 Mr. Baker had leased. At that point, Mr. Baker
6 withdrew his contract to purchase.

7 Q. Had you had any negative feedback from
8 Baker or anybody on his behalf prior to that?

9 A. No, sir, none whatsoever.

10 Q. Thereafter, you received, I believe, a
11 letter from Mr. Barr, which is exhibit number 7?

12 A. Yes, I did.

13 Q. If you'll look at the fourth paragraph.
14 Read that for me, please; the erection of the cell
15 tower.

16 THE COURT: What exhibit are we on now?

17 MR. HOWE: This is exhibit 7.

18 THE WITNESS: Fourth paragraph says: The
19 erection of the cell tower on a portion of the leased
20 premises substantially interferes with my client's
21 operation of the demised premise; in particular, the
22 area encompassed by the cell tower prevents them from
23 utilizing the area for the intended purposes of the
24 lease; that is a parking lot.

25 BY MR. HOWE:

1 Q. Had anyone complained to you prior to this
2 letter that it was interfering with the parking lot?

3 A. No, sir.

4 Q. Were you present at Mr. Baker's
5 deposition?

6 A. Yes, I was.

7 Q. What did he say when asked about whether
8 or not it interfered with the parking lot?

9 MR. WILLIAM BARR: I'm going to object. I
10 think Mr. Baker is going to testify instead of him
11 sitting there reading Mr. Baker's deposition.

12 THE COURT: I'll sustain that objection.

13 MR. HOWE: I just want it for the record,
14 an important part of my case, Your Honor, under the
15 Rules, a deposition can be used for any purpose; an
16 out-of-court statement by a party is not hearsay and
17 comes in.

18 He's sitting in the room while he's under
19 oath, and Mr. Baker takes the position totally
20 different from his lawyer in the letter, that goes to
21 the breach of the contract. That shows the breach.
22 That's the essence of the breach.

23 THE COURT: Do you want to be heard on
24 that?

25 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Your Honor, Mr. Baker

1 was in the room in his deposition. Mr. Baker is
2 present. If he wants to bring Mr. Baker on, put him
3 on in his case in chief, he can question him on that
4 issue.

5 MR. HOWE: Rules say I don't have to; I
6 can use the deposition for any purpose. It is
7 out-of-court statement.

8 THE COURT: What do you recall him saying?
9 Do you recall what he said?

10 THE WITNESS: Without reading the
11 deposition, I recall him saying that it did not
12 interfere with his intended purpose.

13 THE COURT: That's good enough. I'll
14 allow that.

15 BY MR. HOWE:

16 Q. What did he, as best you recall, say that
17 it did interfere with?

18 A. The possibility that he could have
19 expanded into what we always call the finger of
20 wooded land.

21 Q. The place where the tower is?

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. And expanded parking area?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. I want to direct your attention to section

1 5.01 of the lease and ask you did Mr. Baker have the
2 absolute right to expand the parking area?

3 A. No, sir.

4 Q. What has to happen before that happens?

5 A. Section 5.01 says: Tenant's plans and
6 specification for the improvements must first receive
7 written approval by landlord.

8 Q. Look at 5.04 for me as well. I think it's
9 the next page.

10 A. It says, midway through the sentence:
11 Landlord's prior written consent shall be required
12 for any structural or exterior alterations or
13 additions.

14 MR. HOWE: There's also a letter that
15 we've agreed to, number 12, Your Honor.

16 BY MR. HOWE:

17 Q. What's the date of that letter?

18 A. January 31, 2008.

19 Q. What does that letter inform you?

20 A. It tells me they are escrowing \$800 per
21 month of Mr. Baker's rent.

22 Q. Is that basically what the situation is
23 now? Kind of tell The Court a little bit about --
24 what kind of rent checks do you get from Mr. Baker,
25 and what is your understanding of their position?

1 A. The rent, according to my calculation --

2 MR. HOWE: I have these exhibits.

3 THE WITNESS: I was looking for my copy.

4 Mr. Barr has prepared a schedule, and I have no
5 reason to contest the arithmetic accuracy of the
6 schedule. He has stated the rent in terms of annual
7 amount. That would be the only difference between
8 the way I look at it on a monthly basis.

9 If I'm not mistaken, we can verify this,
10 the rent right now should be approximately \$2,200 per
11 month. And the check that I receive is approximately
12 \$1,200 per month. And that differs from the 800 ,
13 original offset due to inflationary increases that
14 have not been honored.

15 BY MR. HOWE:

16 Q. What about after the lease? After the
17 parking area is prepared and established, before the
18 tower goes up, are you with me so far?

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 Q. What was on this finger of land where the
21 tower ultimately ends up? Was there anything out
22 there?

23 A. From the very first day that I became
24 aware of the Montessori School, long before I
25 purchased the property, there had always been a very

1 large ocean-going container, which the school used
2 for storage. There were also two small aluminum
3 buildings near the container.

4 Q. Did Mr. Baker or anyone on his behalf ever
5 ask you to move that?

6 A. No, sir.

7 Q. Ever complain about it being there?

8 A. Not that I'm aware of.

9 Q. So your lease with Baker is that you get
10 approximately \$2,200 a month, whatever is on the
11 schedule from Mr. Barr?

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. What are they paying you?

14 A. Approximately \$1,200 per month.

15 Q. They're doing it based on the idea they're
16 going to keep this rent from the tower?

17 A. Correct.

18 Q. You believe that's a breach of contract?

19 A. Yes, I do.

20 Q. You've reviewed the lease itself since all
21 this litigation; correct?

22 A. Yes, I have.

23 Q. And do you believe that you have breached
24 it?

25 A. No, sir.

1 Q. Explain to The Court why you do not
2 believe you have breached the contract.

3 A. When we look at the very first page of the
4 lease --

5 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Your Honor, I'm going
6 to object to this. This is parole evidence,
7 attempting to vary the terms, simple and plain.
8 Parole evidence attempting to vary the written terms
9 of the lease, period.

10 THE COURT: You've asked him what his
11 understanding of the terms of the lease are?

12 MR. HOWE: Yes.

13 THE COURT: I'm going to allow it.

14 THE WITNESS: Page 1 of the lease states
15 that it is a lease agreement. And it contains
16 general statement of what the lease involves. And
17 then it gets into very specific paragraphs. And
18 section 101 addresses demised premises. And it says:
19 Subject to the other items in this lease. And it
20 talks about the terms and covenants, the conditions
21 and the provisions of this lease.

22 And then more specifically in 102, it
23 talks about exclusive right to use the parking area.
24 The parking area was always a soccer field. There
25 was never any discussion of any other area being used

1 other than the soccer field.

2 BY MR. HOWE:

3 Q. Have you used this parking area in any
4 way?

5 A. No, sir.

6 Q. Has Mr. Baker and his people had exclusive
7 use of the parking area?

8 A. Yes, they have.

9 Q. There's a section a little further down,
10 if I can find it, that talks about whether you can
11 lease the property. I'm looking for my note.

12 Do you have it in front of you?

13 A. I believe you might be referring to page
14 18.

15 Q. Yeah, just about to get there. 17 and 18,
16 I think. On 17, when it says title to premises --

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. It says, about halfway down that the
19 demised premises -- what does it say there?

20 A. It says: Demised premises shall hereafter
21 be subject to no leases, easements, covenants,
22 restrictions or the like which in any manner would
23 prevent or interfere with tenant.

24 There have been no leases that I executed
25 that interfered with his exclusive use of the parking

1 lot.

2 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Same objection.

3 THE COURT: Noted.

4 THE WITNESS: Farther down, third sentence
5 from the bottom, it says: Shall enjoy all the rights
6 herein granted.

7 The only rights I granted him were the
8 right to use the soccer field as a parking lot
9 subject to those drawings.

10 BY MR. HOWE:

11 Q. If you'll look at 6.03. What is that
12 provision entitled?

13 A. Landlord interference: Landlord shall use
14 its best efforts to not interfere with tenant's
15 operations.

16 Q. When Mr. Powell came to see you -- we're
17 talking about this tower going up.

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. I guess, what was your intent in terms of
20 Mr. Baker? Were you trying to pull anything on him?
21 Do anything?

22 A. No, sir, no, sir. At that time, the
23 Montessori School was having severe difficulty paying
24 their rent. Some months we received a rent payment,
25 some months we did not. Regardless, we still had to

1 make our mortgage payment. When this opportunity
2 came along, we considered it a godsend.

3 Q. We being you and your wife, I guess?

4 A. Yes, sir.

5 Q. What are you asking The Court to do today?

6 A. To ask Mr. Baker to release the escrowed
7 funds and to pay rent according to the schedule
8 agreed upon.

9 MR. HOWE: That's all the questions I
10 have. Thank you.

11 THE COURT: Mr. Barr.

12 CROSS-EXAMINATION

13 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

14 Q. I'd like to first just set a few matters
15 on the record, if I could. I want to show you a copy
16 of a deed that was from the directors of the Charles
17 Towne Montessori School to 56 Leinbach Investors.
18 And it includes parcel H2, reflected on the Plat Book
19 D47. Can you identify that for me.

20 A. My understanding is this is a title to the
21 real estate, the sale. I believe it's August 25,
22 1999. ~

23 Q. That property described in that legal
24 description is the parcel of property that you
25 referred to it as the soccer field, parcel H2?

1 A. No, sir.

2 Q. Go ahead.

3 A. I may be mistaken. ' But it's my
4 understanding that the Montessori School owned the
5 property on which it occupied, and Charles and
6 Celeste Patrick owned the soccer field.

7 When my original partner and I approached
8 the school about bailing them out of their financial
9 debacle, our purchase of the school itself was
10 contingent upon Mr. Patrick also agreeing to sell us
11 the soccer field. We just felt that it was an
12 extremely bifurcated transaction not to have complete
13 control of that cul-de-sac. There was always the
14 possibility that the school would not have use of the
15 soccer field unless there was a purchase of both
16 parcels.

17 Your records may indicate that the
18 Patricks sold the soccer field to the school and then
19 the school simultaneously sold the soccer field to 56
20 Leinbach. I do not recall if it was a two-step
21 transaction or a one step.

22 Q. I'm showing you the deed. This is a deed
23 from the Montessori School to 56 Leinbach. You agree
24 with that?

25 A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. Do you agree, in the legal description, it
2 refers to parcel H2 as reflected on plat book D, page
3 47; the second parcel, not the first one?

4 A. Yes, sir.

5 Q. I'm going to show you a copy which we
6 previously marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 10. And
7 it's plat book D, page 47. Is that a picture of
8 parcel H2?

9 A. Yes, it is.

10 Mr. Howe, would you be so kind as to give
11 me a refill.

12 MR. HOWE: Yes, sir.

13 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

14 Q. During the course of the negotiations with
15 Mr. Baker, or Mr. Baker's company to lease this
16 property, wasn't Corky Carnevale your agent during
17 those periods of time?

18 A. Yes, he was.

19 Q. I'm going to show you a letter dated 9/11
20 of '02 from Mr. Carnevale to Bill Cochran and ask you
21 if you've ever seen that.

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 MR. WILLIAM BARR: I'd like to mark that
24 as 13.

25 (PLF. EXH. 13, Letter dated 9-11-02 from

1 Carnevale to Cochran, was marked for identification.)

2 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

3 Q. And this letter basically says that the
4 parcel size that you're going to lease is 1.2 acres.
5 That they could lease all or part of it. And the
6 value of the property, of the parcel is \$250,000 per
7 acre. And you were looking for 8 to 10 percent
8 return on your investment, depending on who pays
9 taxes.

10 Mr. Baker or Baker's company would
11 actually perform all of the required work to get the
12 parcel ready.

13 MR. HOWE: Your Honor, I don't mind it
14 coming in for the limited purposes of negotiation. I
15 have the same; obviously it doesn't redefine the
16 lease. Lease is the lease.

17 MR. WILLIAM BARR: It doesn't redefine.

18 THE COURT: Exhibit 13 in evidence.

19 All right. Got it.

20 (PLF. EXH. 13, was entered into evidence.)

21 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

22 Q. Mr. Carnevale, I presume, did some further
23 negotiations with Mr. Cochran and wrote Mr. Cochran a
24 letter on 10/24/02, and ask you if you've seen that
25 letter.

1 A. Yes, sir.

2 (PLF. EXH. 14, Letter dated 10-24-02 from
3 Carnevale to Cochran, was marked for identification.)
4 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

5 Q. Basically, this letter says: I wanted to
6 reply in writing. And essentially, the only point
7 that y'all had any difference on was the amount of
8 the rent. And they had offered you 1,600 a month,
9 and you wanted 2,000 a month. And y'all finally
10 agreed on 1,800 a month.

11 A. Yes, sir.

12 Q. And the letter further says that the site
13 contains 1.2 acres, with a value of \$250,000 an acre,
14 would equate to value of 300,000 on 1.2 acres?

15 A. Yes, sir, that's what it says.

16 Q. That letter goes on to say: Corky would
17 undertake the responsibility of getting a lease
18 prepared?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. Ultimately, a lease was prepared?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. Ultimately the lease, which has now been
23 marked as exhibit 3 was prepared and signed and
24 approved in June '03, I guess it was.

25 A. That's correct.

1 Q. Do you agree that the lease pretty well
2 tracks the 10/24 letter?

3 A. Yes, sir.

4 Q. It refers to the parcel, the demised
5 premises as 1.21 acres. And the rental term is for
6 \$1,800 a month with the first three years -- with no
7 increases until after the first three years?

8 A. Yes, sir.

9 Q. It tracks the 10/24 letter?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. That lease was drawn up by your attorney;
12 is that not correct?

13 A. The lease was drawn by my attorneys Mary
14 Murray and David Pagliarini. It was then given to
15 Mr. Cochran. Mr. Cochran gave it to Mr. Baker.
16 Mr. Baker gave it to you.

17 Q. Moving on to 2006, basically you then
18 entered into negotiations with Optima Towers to build
19 a tower on the parcel down there at the end of the
20 cul-de-sac?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And we've previously marked as exhibit 10
23 this survey.

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 Q. And do you agree that parcel H2 on that

1 survey containing 1.21 acres is the same property
2 described in the lease at paragraph 1.01?

3 A. Yes, sir.

4 Q. And the other exhibit, the Optima lease,
5 which is exhibit 5 in the record, refers to -- has a
6 sketch attached to it. And you agree that the sketch
7 of the Optima tower lease falls squarely within
8 parcel H2?

9 A. Yes, the sketch of the Optima tower site
10 is on what we call the wooded finger of land, which
11 also contained the storage container and the metal
12 buildings.

13 Q. It's on parcel H2?

14 A. Yes, it is.

15 Q. And at the time that you executed this
16 lease with Mr. Baker's company, in this lease -- I'm
17 going to go from 2003. What happens in 2006, you
18 know, is different than what occurred in 2003.

19 In 2003, you leased parcel H2 as reflected
20 on this plat in plat book D47. There's nowhere in
21 this lease where you reserve the right to utilize any
22 portion of parcel H2 in the future, is there?

23 A. I recall that, other than the soccer
24 field, the cleared area that I had first refusal of
25 any additions or alterations that Mr. Baker proposed.

1 Q. I think Mr. Howe pointed that out to you,
2 I believe, in paragraph six that you could approve
3 that.

4 What I'm asking you, in the lease itself,
5 is there a reservation that you could utilize unused
6 portions of parcel H2 for your future development?

7 A. I do not believe so.

8 Q. When it was pointed out to you in 2007
9 that the Optima tower was on parcel H2, did that come
10 as a surprise to you?

11 A. Yes, sir, it did.

12 Q. My next question is: Did you make a
13 mistake here, or did you intentionally do what you
14 did?

15 A. Mr. Barr, there was no intention on my
16 part to attempt to make a mistake or defraud
17 Mr. Baker. As I stated earlier, we had a situation
18 where the Montessori School was struggling to pay
19 rent and pay taxes. And we saw an opportunity to
20 minimize the deficit. There was no profit on our
21 part.

22 Q. I understand that part. I understand
23 that. What I'm saying is, I'm asking you, when you
24 leased the entire parcel H2 to Mr. Baker's company
25 and then you lease a portion of the property to

1 Optima Towers, you did not do that intentionally?

2 A. No, sir. In my mind, Mr. Baker had leased
3 the soccer field. He had leased the soccer field
4 generally. And then he specifically leased the
5 soccer field according to his very detailed drawing
6 whereby he got 94 parking spaces.

7 Q. Paragraph 1.01, demised premises, clearly
8 defines the demise premises as parcel H2?

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. Again, you keep going back to subject to
11 the benefit of the terms and conditions of the lease,
12 which is some boilerplate in there. Again, you
13 leased them the whole parcel 1 and 2, not just a
14 little bit of it?

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. It's fair to state then that you made this
17 unilateral mistake and leased --

18 MR. HOWE: Objection; legal conclusion,
19 which he's not going to admit.

20 THE COURT: I'm going to allow. Go ahead.

21 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

22 Q. You made the unilateral mistake and leased
23 out a portion of the property that you had previously
24 leased to Mr. Baker to Optima Towers?

25 A. Clearly that's why we are in court today.

1 Q. Essentially, I guess what you're doing
2 now, you're asking forgiveness for making that
3 mistake?

4 A. Had Mr. Baker wanted to use the wooded
5 finger, his original drawing and his detailed drawing
6 would've included additional parking spaces. But
7 with the additional use of that land would have come
8 substantial additional cost on the part of Mr. Baker.
9 Mr. Cochran testified in his deposition they didn't
10 want to incur that additional cost.

11 Mr. Cochran further stated, yes, we got
12 everything we bargained for.

13 Q. Is it not fair to state that what
14 Mr. Baker bargained for was 1.21 acres described in
15 paragraph 1.01?

16 A. Once again, I think you're asking me a
17 legal question, which is what the judge is going
18 to --

19 Q. You just said it as a statement of fact by
20 Mr. Baker. Let me ask you this.

21 Based upon these letters from
22 Mr. Carnevale to Mr. Cochran, in one of these
23 letters, the October 24, '02 letter, Mr. Carnevale
24 asked Mr. Cochran to sign it and return it,
25 evidencing his agreement to the terms.

1 Mr. Cochran signed that and sent it back.

2 And I put a notation on the bottom, the lessee will
3 be Magnolia Paradigm. And the lease will be based
4 upon receiving approval from City of Charleston.

5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. The rent was calculated at that time as
7 somewhere between 8 and 10 percent calculation on the
8 value of 1.2 acres?

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. That's what you bargained for, for the
11 next 20 years because Mr. Baker's lease has a
12 five-year term and three 5-year options; right?

13 A. Yes, sir.

14 Q. For the next 20 years, you bargained for
15 the -- with 3 percent increases after the first three
16 years. You bargained for a roughly 8 to 10 percent
17 return on the value of that property for the next 20
18 years?

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 Q. Mr. Scott³ Powell testified that, it looks
21 like, including it looks like deposits, since
22 February '06 through October of 2011, you've received
23 \$54,116.65 from Optima Towers?

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 Q. During that same period of time, based

1 upon exhibit 8, you have also received \$153,500.61
2 from Mr. Baker's company?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. This is math, Mr. Hiers. I just want to
5 see if you agree with the math. You being CPA,
6 you're a little bit better than I am at this. I want
7 you to take a look at that.

8 Based on the exhibits I have here, rent
9 paid by Magnolia, you received 153,561; rent paid by
10 Optima, 54,116.65. During this period of time,
11 you've received \$207,477.65 in total rent from this
12 property.

13 A. I will accept that as being correct.

14 Q. Based upon exhibit A, the total rent that
15 you were due from the property, the whole parcel H2,
16 was \$193,352.65?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. Right now you've been overpaid from the
19 property \$14,125?

20 A. And obviously I disagree with that
21 conclusion.

22 Q. Why do you disagree with that conclusion?

23 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Mark this as an
24 exhibit.

25 (DFT. EXH. 15, Summary of Rents, was

1 marked for identification.)

2 THE WITNESS: In Mr. Baker's deposition,
3 he said I did not interfere with his lease. He said
4 the only interference may have been the possibility
5 of expanding into that finger of wooded land.

6 Mr. Cochran said: We never wanted to go there. We
7 did not want to incur the additional cost for the
8 limited number of parking spaces we would've gotten.

9 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

10 Q. Back to the lease. The demised property
11 is 1.21 acres?

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. You made a mistake and leased a portion of
14 the property to Optima Towers?

15 A. I clearly have leased the property to
16 Optima and to Baker.

17 Q. And if this was a single-family home, you
18 leased the house to me, and I just so happen not to
19 be using one room, could you lease out the other room
20 to somebody else and not breach the lease with me?

21 A. No, sir, I appreciate the analogy, but
22 it's inappropriate.

23 Q. Under the terms of the lease, the term
24 demised premises is used in other areas of the lease
25 more than just in paragraph 1.01; isn't that correct?

1 A. I believe so.

2 Q. For instance, section 2.04: Holding over;
3 if tenant remains in possession of the demise
4 premises, then they would be holding over. It
5 doesn't say the parking area within the demised
6 premises?

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q. Section 3.04: Tax assessments on the
9 demised premises shall be the responsibility of the
10 tenant.

11 Basically right now Mr. Baker's company is
12 paying the taxes on the whole parcel, including the
13 taxes on the cell phone tower.

14 A. And in the Optima lease, they are
15 responsible for any taxes incurred as a result of the
16 increase in the value as a result of their tower.

17 Q. Have you received any tax payments from
18 Optima Towers?

19 A. No, sir, I would not be looking to Optima
20 for a tax reimbursement unless Mr. Baker brought to
21 my attention that his taxes had increased because of
22 the tower.

23 Q. Article five, maintenance and equipment
24 refers to the tenant's responsibilities on the
25 demised premises. No limitation to maintenance and

1 equipment in the parking areas. Article six uses --

2 A. At the time that the lease was created,
3 there was no maintenance to be done to that finger of
4 wooded land. It would've only encompassed the
5 parking lot.

6 Q. At the time the lease was signed, there
7 wasn't even a parking lot there. It wasn't
8 constructed until sometime after the lease was
9 executed?

10 A. I agree.

11 Q. Section 6.01: Demised premises shall be
12 used by the tenant and Baker Motor Company as parking
13 for employees. The demised premises, not the parking
14 area within the demised premises.

15 6.02, maintenance: Tenant shall maintain
16 his business at the demised premises in the same
17 fashion that it operates Baker Motor Company.

18 6.03: If a landlord creates a condition
19 that interferes with the normal use of the demised
20 premises or pertinent parking, et cetera. Then
21 again, the term demised premises doesn't refer to
22 parking area within demised premises; it talks about
23 demised premises.

24 A. That's correct. It also refers to
25 interference with his normal use. There has been no

1 interference with his normal use.

2 Q. It also refers to pertinent parking. More
3 than likely, if you review this lease that your
4 lawyers prepared, it was something they pulled off
5 the shelf for a building, and the building would've
6 possibly had a parking lot. And the tenants of the
7 building would've had the use of the pertinent
8 parking to the building. That's the only reason that
9 could've been in there; isn't that correct?

10 A. I think you're asking me a legal question.

11 Q. Article seven, utilities: Tenant shall be
12 responsible in the operation of his business on the
13 demised premises.

14 Taxes and liability insurance: All of
15 these sections require the tenant to maintain those
16 on the demised premises.

17 Article 11 -- excuse me. If tenant
18 defaults, landlord may take possession of the demised
19 premises. Damages to the demised premises, article
20 ten.

21 Article 11, imminent domain: Notice of
22 intention to take a portion of the demised premises.

23 Article 12, title. You only read a
24 portion of paragraph 12 into the record, Mr. Hiers.
25 And what I'd like to do is read the rest of it.

1 The demised premises shall hereafter be
2 subject to no leases, easements, covenants,
3 restrictions or the like which in any manner would
4 prevent or interfere with the tenant, and to defend
5 the demised premises against the claim of all persons
6 claiming by or through or under the landlord.

7 And tenant shall discharge its obligations
8 set forth herein to be formed by tenant, tenant
9 during the demised term shall have lawful, quiet and
10 peaceful possession and occupation of the demised
11 premises and shall enjoy all the rights herein
12 granted without any let, hindrance, ejection,
13 molestation or interference by any person; right?

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q. Having constructed this tower in the
16 corner of this property, have you not basically
17 ejected Mr. Baker's company from that portion of this
18 property?

19 He can't sure get in there now and park
20 cars, could he, even if he wanted to?

21 A. Not in my opinion, no.

22 Q. You ejected him from that portion of the
23 property?

24 A. No, sir, not in my opinion.

25 Q. Article 14.13, entire agreement: The

1 lease embodies the entire agreement between landlord
2 and tenant with respect to the subject matter hereof
3 and supersedes all prior agreements or
4 understandings, whether written or oral. The tenant
5 have neither conveyed nor relied upon any promises,
6 representations or warranties in connection with this
7 lease that are not expressly set forth therein.

8 You agree with that statement?

9 A. Yes, sir, that's what it says.

10 Q. Mr. Howe introduced, as exhibit 2 -- I
11 think you've testified -- these are the plans that
12 were prepared by LS3P. I believe you characterized
13 the first sketch as a topo?

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q. Tell me something. Does that topo reveal
16 the existence of any buildings, containers or any
17 storage facilities on that portion which you
18 described them being on it?

19 A. With the naked eye, I do not see an
20 outline of the storage container; however, the
21 drawing for the Optima lease clearly shows an outline
22 of the storage container.

23 Q. The drawing for the Optima lease?

24 A. Yes, sir, the drawing attached to the
25 Optima lease.

1 Q. Is this the drawing you're referring to?

2 A. Yes, sir, you may need a magnifying glass.
3 I can outline those little dotted lines, if that will
4 help you. And then there's an arrow going to it,
5 telling you what it is.

6 Q. I see it now. This was in 2006?

7 A. I'll have to look at the date.

8 Q. This was dated 3/29 of '06?

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. And the topo was done in what? 2003?

11 A. I don't know the engineering requirements
12 of a topographic survey.

13 Q. It's clear in 2003 the topo does not
14 reflect a storage container or other buildings as
15 you've described in your testimony?

16 A. The drawing does not contain those
17 buildings. Those buildings have been there since
18 1999 or perhaps earlier. As I was about to say, I
19 don't know on a topographic survey what they are
20 required to show. I always thought a topo, as it is
21 commonly referred to, is nothing but trees; trees and
22 elevations.

23 Q. I think even on the sketch it says to be
24 removed?

25 A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. If it was a mobile storage, it could've
2 been moved at any point in time should Mr. Baker have
3 decided that he wanted to utilize that portion of the
4 property in the future, just like you got -- like
5 Optima had it removed?

6 A. The simple removal of that container would
7 not have given him additional use of that property.
8 The trees would've had to have been removed. And he,
9 of course, would've needed permission from both the
10 city and from me to create those additional parking
11 spaces.

12 Q. Essentially, I want to summarize this. I
13 just want to make sure we've got it straight. You
14 leased all of parcel H2 to Mr. Baker's company?

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. You subsequently made a mistake and you
17 leased a portion of that property to Optima Towers?

18 A. It clearly was an inadvertent mistake.

19 Q. Essentially, when you entered into
20 negotiations with Mr. Baker concerning the return you
21 wanted on the value of the property, the entire
22 parcel H2, based upon this letter from Mr. Carnevale,
23 that was done at 8 to 10 percent return per annum?

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 Q. Then based upon the calculations of the

1 rent you have received from all sources, from Optima
2 Towers and from Baker, you've actually received more
3 rent over the last -- what is that, '03 -- nine years
4 than you originally bargained ever to get from
5 Mr. Baker?

6 A. Mr. Baker has reduced his rent by,
7 approximately, 55 percent. Even a strict
8 interpretation would show that the portion that the
9 tower sits on is less than 9 percent of total
10 property.

11 Q. Why, just practically and equitably, does
12 that belong to you?

13 A. It is my property. I have assumed the
14 risk and the rewards of property ownership, which in
15 this economy is skeptical.

16 The tower company took a finger of land
17 that required substantial alteration. They invested
18 large amount of capital. In exchange for being able
19 to invest their capital on my property, they have
20 agreed to pay me rent. Mr. Baker did not want to
21 invest additional capital to have the use of that
22 parcel if, in fact, he even knew it was available.

23 Q. Your rights as a property owner, okay, are
24 subject to Mr. Baker's lease?

25 A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. So you don't have the unilateral right to
2 utilize this property without first insuring that
3 you're in compliance with the terms of your lease
4 with Mr. Baker?

5 A. And, again, I had no reason to believe I
6 was not in compliance. I was not interfering with
7 his right to use it as a parking lot.

8 Q. At no time when this started, negotiations
9 with Optima, did you ever call up Mr. Baker and say:
10 Hey, Mr. Baker, hey Tommy, I have an opportunity here
11 to put a tower up here. We could split it or
12 something like that. You never did that, did you?

13 A. No, sir, I did not see a need in as much
14 as -- let's go back to my deposition. I told you --

15 Q. Let's go to your testimony now, not your
16 deposition.

17 A. Well, then I will restate what I said in
18 my deposition. At the time Mr. Powell came to me, I
19 had just had esophageal surgery. I had just had
20 heart surgery. And I had just had a partner killed
21 in a plane crash in Canada. That partner lived in
22 Denver.

23 I told him my plate was full at the time.
24 And if he wanted to pursue this opportunity, he was
25 going to need to contact the city, Mr. Baker, and

1 everyone else, and he was responsible for getting
2 this done if, in fact, that's what he wanted to do.

3 I also had a severely injured shoulder,
4 which later in 2006 had to be completely
5 reconstructed. As you said to me in my deposition:
6 Were you falling apart? Yes, sir, I was.

7 Q. Mr. Hiers, those are all excuses for your
8 not basically paying attention to business because of
9 your multiple problems, are those not?

10 A. I don't consider it an excuse. I consider
11 it an explanation of why I shifted the burden back to
12 Mr. Powell in that he had to get approval from all
13 interested parties if he wanted to put up that tower.

14 Q. You still made a mistake; right?

15 A. I made an inadvertent mistake.

16 Q. Now, you basically, you know, want to be
17 compensated for your mistake?

18 A. Mr. Baker has not been deprived of
19 anything.

20 Q. Mr. Baker is the tenant on parcel H2;
21 correct?

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. He has been deprived of that portion of
24 parcel H2 where you put the cell tower by mistake;
25 right?

1 A. I think that's why we're here.

2 Q. And the value of that corner is based upon
3 what's there now. We sure as the Dickens can't move
4 it, take it down. And the value of that cell tower
5 is 800 bucks or \$9,600 a year with 3-and-a-half
6 percent escalation over the next 20 years, if they
7 continue to renew; right?

8 A. It can clearly be taken down and the
9 tenant has an obligation to remove the tower at
10 termination of the lease.

11 Q. If he takes it down and the property is
12 restored, then Mr. Baker could move over in that
13 corner if he wanted to; correct?

14 A. Possibly.

15 Q. You're telling me, if the tower was down
16 and he wanted to put parking over there, you would
17 deny that?

18 A. We would certainly need the approval of
19 the city. I don't know what conditions.

20 Q. I'm -- not asking about approval. Subject
21 to approvals from all governmental authority, you're
22 telling me, as a landlord, you would deny him that?

23 A. There are additional trees that did not
24 interfere with the tower site. If Mr. Baker wanted
25 to pursue that finger of land as parking, those

1 additional trees would need to come down.

2 Q. Subject to all governmental approvals, you
3 would then allow him to do that then; right?

4 A. It would be based on facts and
5 circumstances at the time.

6 MR. WILLIAM BARR: No further questions,
7 Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Any follow-up?

9 MR. HOWE: Yes.

10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. HOWE:

12 Q. Mr. Barr mentioned this 10/24/02 letter to
13 Mr. Cochran. Do you have that in front of you,
14 exhibit 14?

15 A. No, sir, I believe it's in that stack
16 right there.

17 Q. I'm going to look over your shoulder.
18 This is a letter to Mr. Bill Cochran from
19 Mr. Carnevale; correct?

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. It sets out what Mr. Carnevale is doing in
22 the negotiations at that time; is that correct?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. October of '02, this is approximately
25 eight months before the signing of the lease?

1 A. Yes, sir.

2 Q. It's signed, looks like, for Baker Motors,
3 by Mr. Cochran?

4 A. Yes, sir.

5 Q. Someone has written in there -- it looks
6 like Mr. Cochran because it's not typed. What does
7 it say?

8 A. That's Mr. Cochran's handwriting. He has
9 very good handwriting. And it says: Lessee will be
10 Magnolia Paradigm, Incorporated. Lease based on
11 receiving approval for a parking lot from the city
12 and Mrs. Leinbach.

13 Q. The whole deal was conditioned on getting
14 a parking area approved by the city.

15 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Object to the form.

16 THE WITNESS: Based on the drawings I have
17 seen.

18 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Objection.

19 THE COURT: Just one second.

20 MR. WILLIAM BARR: He's actually leading
21 him. Parking area.

22 BY MR. HOWE:

23 Q. For a parking lot from the city and Mrs.
24 Leinbach?

25 A. That's what it says.

1 Q. And the parking lot that was approved by
2 the city ended up being what?

3 A. I believe it's 94 parking spaces.

4 Q. Is that the same parking lot that's in the
5 drawings?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. You mentioned there was a little arrow
8 that you didn't actually read the words. I want to
9 make sure this is in the record. On exhibit number
10 4, which was the Optima drawing, what do those words
11 say? What do they point to?

12 A. Existing storage container to be removed.

13 Q. This is the Optima drawing of what's out
14 there?

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. It's got an arrow to an existing storage
17 container to be removed?

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. How long has that container been there?

20 A. At least since 1999.

21 Q. I believe you testified this lease that
22 came out, kind of made the rounds, didn't it, before
23 it was signed?

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 Q. What rounds did it make?

1 A. It went from Hinchey, Murray & Pagliarini,
2 simultaneously to me and Mr. Carnevale.
3 Mr. Carnevale gave it to Mr. Bailey. Mr. Bailey gave
4 it to Mr. Cochran. Mr. Cochran gave it to Mr. Baker.
5 It then went to Mr. Barr.

6 Mr. Barr came back with some correction,
7 amendment, whatever. The correction was made by
8 Hinchey, Murray & Pagliarini. Everyone signed it.

9 Q. Mr. Barr talked about the various places
10 that the word demised premises were used; correct?

11 A. Yes, sir.

12 Q. The very first one is the definition of
13 what demised premises means, isn't it?

14 A. Yes, sir, it says subject to.

15 Q. Subject to conditions?

16 A. Conditions, provisions.

17 Q. Although it's not part of the lease,
18 Mr. Barr was making the point about, did you expect
19 to 10 percent return. And that's on the value of the
20 property?

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. Has the value of the property increased
23 with the tower on it?

24 A. Not that I'm aware of.

25 Q. Would the rent from the tower make the

1 property in terms of sales go up?

2 A. I'm sorry, the entire parcel, yes.

3 Q. 8 to 10 percent return on the value of the
4 property now would be much greater than what you're
5 getting, wouldn't it?

6 A.- Yes, sir, it was recently reassessed by
7 Charleston County.

8 Q. What was that reassessment?

9 A. Approximately 375,000.

10 MR. HOWE: That's all the questions I
11 have. Thank you.

12 THE COURT: Mr. Barr.

13 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Your Honor, I want to
14 make sure that we did move and they were entered into
15 evidence exhibits 14 and 15.

16 THE COURT: I have 15 over here.

17 MR. WILLIAM BARR: 14 is the letter of
18 October 24th.

19 THE WITNESS: I don't have any exhibits.

20 MR. WILLIAM BARR: 13 is the letter of
21 September 11th.

22 THE COURT: 13, 14, 15, without objection?

23 MR. HOWE: Yes, no objection.

24 THE COURT: Okay.

25 (PLF. EXH. 14 was received into evidence.)

1 (PLF. EXH. 15 was received into evidence.)

2 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

4 Q. In connection with the questions Mr. Howe.
5 was just asking you about the value of your lease,
6 your lease with Mr. Baker's company has an inflation
7 guard in it, does it not?

8 A. Yes, sir.

9 Q. After the first three years, your rent
10 goes up 3 percent per annum?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. That guards you against increases in value
13 over the term of the lease?

14 A. I believe you're asking a fairly technical
15 question. The lease guards me against inflationary
16 increases. There are a number of reasons, most of
17 which I'm not qualified to testify to, as to why that
18 property would go up in value. Clearly, the lease
19 protects me from inflationary increases.

20 Q. Had you wanted to protect yourself against
21 increases in value such as Mr. Howe has discussed,
22 then essentially you could've put that in the lease
23 as increases in rents based upon other circumstances?

24 A. Subject to Mr. Baker agreeing to what was
25 in the lease.

1 Q. The bottom line here, Mr. Hiers, you made
2 a mistake, and you leased out a single piece of
3 property to two people?

4 A. We have never denied that the parcel has
5 been inadvertently leased to two people. Again, I
6 contend that Mr. Baker was not interfered with. He
7 got exactly what he bargained for. He saved over
8 \$100,000 by not trying to develop that finger of land
9 for a few additional parking spaces.

10 Q. And you bargained for \$21,600 per year in
11 the first three years and then 3 percent increases on
12 parcel H2 for the next 20 years. And now you're
13 getting, based over the same period of time, now
14 you're getting \$207,000 or \$14,000 more year-to-date
15 than what you originally bargained for?

16 A. I agree with the calculation.

17 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Thank you.

18 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. HOWE:

20 Q. You are not getting that money because he
21 isn't paying it to you, is he?

22 A. No, sir, I'm not.

23 Q. That's what you consider the breach?

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 THE COURT: That's what got us here. This

1 is new information, sitting on this case for about a
2 year.

3 At the time that the lease with Magnolia
4 Paradigm was entered into, this property which now
5 contains the tower was wooded?

6 THE WITNESS: It was very wooded and
7 contained a 40-foot storage container. The city
8 had --

9 THE COURT: Let me stop you right there.
10 I want to make sure what we're talking about.

11 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

12 THE COURT: And those storage containers
13 are what's shown in the diagram to Optima Tower's
14 lease; is that right?

15 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. Even if you'll
16 look at the Optima Tower original drawing, they still
17 see the trees within the circle of where they
18 proposed to put their tower.

19 THE COURT: Right. I'm assuming the
20 square shaped lot is where they put the tower?

21 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

22 THE COURT: It's contained within that
23 tree area?

24 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

25 THE COURT: That's why, when the parking

1 lot was built, it didn't extend that far?

2 THE WITNESS: Had you seen the parcel, we
3 always called it the soccer field. It was not laid
4 out in exact dimensions. There were white lines.
5 There were goal posts, things like that. It was
6 really just a practice soccer field, let's call it
7 that. There was a natural tree line right there that
8 basically said: You're not going left of this.

9 THE COURT: Within that tree area is where
10 the drainage easement divided these two lots?

11 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

12 THE COURT: And these containers were
13 contained?

14 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

15 THE COURT: When you're talking, you're
16 talking in terms of the soccer field, you're thinking
17 whatever the non-tree area was?

18 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

19 THE COURT: And whatever else was tree-ed,
20 that is where this ended up going?

21 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

22 THE COURT: That's not necessarily where
23 the property line was.

24 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

25 THE COURT: You've sold the property since

1 1999?

2 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

3 THE COURT: That's all I have.

4 MR. WILLIAM BARR: One clarification.

5 I've got a large version of the topo that was done,
6 which I'll be glad to substitute, if you want it.

7 THE COURT: Does it provide us with new
8 information?

9 MR. WILLIAM BARR: This is topo of the
10 property in 2003 when Baker was getting ready to
11 build the property. This right now is design plans,
12 exhibit 2.

13 MR. HOWE: It's two; four is Optima.

14 MR. WILLIAM BARR: It's hard to see. This
15 is exhibit 2. It's hard to see this, if you look at
16 the full-size version, in the area where the tower
17 was ultimately constructed, the topo shows one
18 17-inch pine, one 23-inch pine, one 36-inch pine. As
19 far as the area being, quote unquote, heavily wooded,
20 it was not heavily wooded. There were three trees in
21 there that could've been taken down.

22 The concrete spillway, which is an
23 easement as described on the survey, chunks over
24 here, some railroad tracks over here on the left.
25 For the record, it was not heavily wooded at the

1 time. If The Court would like, I can substitute or
2 mark this as exhibit also.

3 THE COURT: You want to do that? Any
4 objection to that?

5 MR. HOWE: No objection.

6 (DFT. EXH. 16, Large Topo Survey, dated
7 2003, was marked for identification.)

8 THE COURT: Defendant's 16 is the same as
9 Plaintiff's 2 in the package in evidence by Mr. Howe.

10 (DFT. EXH. 16, was received into
11 evidence.)

12 THE COURT: Anything further of Mr. Hiers?

13 MR. HOWE: Nothing, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Mr. Hiers, you may step down,
15 sir.

16 (The witness exited the stand.)

17 THE COURT: Let me ask Mr. Howe. You have
18 two witnesses.

19 MR. HOWE: Yeah, the only other thing I
20 have, pictures are worth 1,000 words. I would like
21 to move that The Court at sometime, don't have to do
22 it today, ride-by, look at the site. I think it's
23 something. Pictures help. The scale of it is hard
24 to get in the pictures. I think sort of the overall,
25 just looking at the site. I'll be happy for you to

1 go without any of us. At some point, I think you
2 ought to look at.

3 THE COURT: Any objection to that?

4 MR. WILLIAM BARR: No, the only objection
5 is that we're here to construe the terms of the
6 lease. And the photographs and the testimony thus
7 far is, basically, Mr. Hiers made a mistake..

8 Whatever the topography is, how tall the
9 tower is, what it looks like as you come around the
10 curb, that's all in the eye of the beholder. Has
11 nothing to do with what I believe The Court's job is,
12 to ascertain or construe the terms of the lease.

13 MR. HOWE: It could be -- it's up to The
14 Court -- it could go back to principals in equity as
15 well. And those are pled. If it ever gets into
16 equity, some of those things become a little fuzzier,
17 taking a look at what was seen, what was done.

18 THE COURT: This property backs up to the
19 greenway?

20 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Big fence along the
21 back. You can't get to it. It is along the
22 greenway. Leinbach is clearly accessible.

23 MR. HOWE: The entrance is on Markfield by
24 the I-Hop.

25 THE COURT: By the Kmart?

1 MR. HOWE: Yes.

2 THE COURT: Behind where Baker Motors is.

3 Hard to miss.

4 Motions from the Defendants.

5 MR. WILLIAM BARR: I do have a motion for
6 directed verdict, Your Honor. This action was
7 brought by the Plaintiff against the Defendant for
8 declaratory judgment to construe the rights of the
9 parties under the lease and for breach of contract.
10 And The Court's job, of course, is to determine if
11 there are any ambiguities in the lease. And then if
12 there are any ambiguities in the lease, then parole
13 evidence may be admissible to explain the
14 ambiguities.

15 Essentially, Your Honor, we have an
16 unambiguous document in front of us. And we have the
17 unambiguous testimony of the Plaintiff. And I think
18 the key factor in this case is that this entire
19 matter could've been handled a lot differently by the
20 Plaintiff from the get-go had he just came to someone
21 and said: Hey, I made a mistake.

22 What has happened here, during the course
23 of this litigation is that they've tried to give The
24 Court his version of what he thought he was doing and
25 then trying to interpret the lease to justify his

1 contorted version of the lease, which I don't really
2 believe is allowable parole evidence.

3 You know, all it is, Mr. Hiers thought
4 that he did not lease that portion of the property
5 out to Mr. Baker's company. He made a mistake.
6 People make mistakes. We're not infallible. He
7 didn't do it intentionally; however, a unilateral
8 mistake is not grounds for rescission nor is a
9 unilateral mistake grounds for reformation of the
10 contract.

11 When you get right down to it, he's
12 testified to it, I believe he testified to it
13 truthfully, the demised premises is 1.21 acres as
14 reflected in his deed and is reflected in that
15 survey, which is plat book D, page 47; therefore, the
16 declaratory judgement aspect of the case should be
17 decided, we would submit, against the Plaintiff and
18 in favor of the Defendant. That is, that the
19 construction of the lease of the demised premises is
20 1.21 acres.

21 Then we come to whether or not Mr. Baker
22 has breached his contract with Mr. Hiers. The lease,
23 again, introduced into evidence, has a provision in
24 it, and the letters which Mr. Howe introduced and I
25 introduced into evidence indicate that, if the

1 landlord, paragraph 6.03 -- in my letter to Mr. Howe
2 of January 31st of '08, I reference paragraph 6.03.
3 Paragraph 6.03 gives the tenant the right to abate
4 the rent during the time of the interference of the
5 premises.

6 I think Mr. Hiers has truthfully testified
7 that, by the erection of the tower -- although I
8 think he disagreed with my terminology -- Mr. Baker's
9 company has been effectively denied the use of that
10 particular corner there. No matter what he wanted to
11 do, whether he wanted to do it 15 years from now. He
12 can't do it. And the 6.03 says that the rent and
13 other charges shall be abated during the time such
14 interference persists.

15 This interference persists today and this
16 interference is going to persist for at least five
17 years after Mr. Baker's lease is over so, therefore,
18 under the breach of contract cause of action, since
19 we have the right to abate the rent during these
20 periods, then we have not breached our contract. All
21 we have done is strictly complied with the terms of
22 the lease. We put him on notice 30-days hence; if
23 you don't cure your interference, then we're going to
24 abate the rent.

25 Then the question becomes: What is the

1 value of that? And I submit to you the only way you
2 can value the abatement is by looking at it from the
3 standpoint of the rent, the additional rent which is
4 being paid to Mr. Hiers.

5 Mr. Hiers has testified that he has
6 received \$153,561 from Mr. Baker. And he's paid
7 \$54,116.65 from Optima, total of 207,477. How in the
8 world could he have been damaged under those
9 circumstances?

10 His source of income is the property. If
11 this property was sitting over on the Montessori
12 School, and he was receiving \$800 rent from it and
13 receiving \$21,600 in rent initially from Mr. Baker,
14 then Mr. Hiers -- and we tried to do something in
15 regard to that, Mr. Hiers would be right.

16 This 1.21 acres has a definitive
17 production of income. And the definitive production
18 of income from this 1.21 acres is defined by the
19 lease with Mr. Baker. And over the term of this
20 lease, as reflected in exhibit number 8, and to date
21 at least, Mr. Baker should have paid \$193,352.65.

22 There's no way that Mr. Hiers has been
23 damaged as a result of Mr. Baker's exercise of his
24 rights to abate the rent under the terms of the
25 lease.

1 Based upon that, I don't think that the
2 Plaintiff has presented any other evidence than: I
3 made a unilateral mistake, and I want you to get me
4 out of it. I don't think that meets the bar. Thank
5 you.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Howe.

7 MR. HOWE: Couple things; number one, when
8 you look at the terms of the lease, yes, you have to
9 look at them carefully because what Mr. Barr wants to
10 do is paint a broad brush and say it's just demised
11 premises, and that's the motion he lost at summary
12 judgment, okay.

13 So, essentially, I think that's the same
14 motion that he made before. Demised premises is this
15 property when, in fact, the definition in the lease
16 is this property subject to these other conditions.
17 That's the definition. They're stuck with that
18 definition in the lease.

19 Number two, when you look carefully at the
20 language -- and I have to back up one second. As you
21 heard from Mr. Hiers, this wasn't like a consumer
22 transaction where someone goes to Mr. Baker for a car
23 and they say, here's the document, sign them if you
24 want this car. This was a lease that made the
25 rounds. Mr. Barr made some changes to the lease.

1 This was not your ordinary thing.

2 What the lease does say, it specifically
3 says: Mr. Hiers shall not make any other leases that
4 interfere. It doesn't say Hiers cannot make any
5 subleases or any other leases without Baker's prior
6 permission. Doesn't say that.

7 It has, again, a condition. It says Hiers
8 can't do anything to interfere with Baker's use of
9 the property. Then they say, well, we might have
10 parked some cars there. We might have done this.

11 Number one, they can't do it without his
12 permission. Number two, the city would have to give
13 it. It's entirely speculative that those things
14 would happen. You can't get damages for something
15 that's entirely speculative.

16 And, in fact, as Mr. Hiers testified at
17 his deposition, Mr. Baker said: You know, my only
18 damages, I might have tried to go back to the city
19 and get permission to put more parking spaces in.
20 That's just speculation. He hadn't tried it. He
21 hadn't entered into evidence that it's economically
22 feasible, that he couldn't get permission. He had to
23 go to Mr. Hiers permission, which he said: I don't
24 know that I'm going to give it or not.

25 The basis upon which they look for the

1 damage, boy, we could have gone out there and used
2 this, is entirely speculative by their own admission,
3 even though it's in my case.

4 The last thing that happens where Mr. Barr
5 is a good lawyer, but I won't call his bluff on it.
6 He says: Clyde, you made a mistake, didn't you?

7 Clyde said: Yeah, I made a mistake. In
8 his world, he probably wouldn't have done this had he
9 been aware, okay. That mistake that Mr. Barr wants
10 to say, well, mistake means mistake legally in
11 contract law. Those things don't necessarily equate.

12 He's taking the word, gee, I wouldn't have
13 done that, hindsight being 20-20, I would have
14 differed. He's saying mistake; Clyde has admitted he
15 breached the contract. We don't admit we breached
16 the contract. He would have handled things
17 differently in a business manner had he been aware.

18 That doesn't mean he's breached the
19 contract. The contract is defined by the terms, and
20 the terms are very specific, and they had the chance
21 to redefine them anyway they wanted. They let them
22 go through with those terms.

23 Yes, it's fine print. These are business
24 people where these leases matter, and they both
25 signed off on what's in their contract. If you look,

1 it gives them the right to do other things because it
2 doesn't deny him the right to do other things.

3 Lastly, we go to the damages real quickly.
4 There's, basically, three ways to look at damages.
5 Even if you were to decide that there was a breach,
6 if you say he wasn't really damaged, he might reason:
7 Well, gosh, they say Mr. Hiers is getting windfall.
8 Mr. Baker is getting a windfall. He's getting all
9 the spaces he wanted. It never even occurred to
10 him -- he can't say I was losing my peaceful use of
11 this property.

12 He's a businessman. He would've been
13 knocking on the door if it was interfering with
14 anything. He didn't even know it until he tried to
15 buy it. So he can't say: Boy, they're keeping me
16 from doing something, they interfered. There's just
17 no damage there.

18 Court may find that the law says there's
19 nominal damages for that. They're limited to that.

20 The next thing you could look at and say:
21 Well, as Mr. Hiers pointed out, as you can see from
22 the plat, 10 percent. It at most interferes with 10
23 percent of the property.. The 10 percent that it
24 interferes with still gives him 100 percent of the
25 use that was the essential part of his bargain. You

1 might have to put a value on that 10 percent.

2 To say he gets all of the rent, that
3 theory only comes in under a restitution theory when
4 they can show that Mr. Hiers intentionally tried to
5 basically defraud and flimflam somebody.

6 The only evidence -- and Mr. Barr
7 submitted a restatement thing in summary judgement.
8 The only evidence at this point is that that's not
9 even on the radar. That amount of damage would not
10 comport with anything.

11 Bottom line is we have a contract with
12 Mr. Baker, with Magnolia. He's had 100 percent of
13 all the uses. The only thing he can show that could
14 be damage is so speculative it doesn't rise to the
15 level of being any damage. For that reason we think
16 we should win.

17 THE COURT: Anything in reply?

18 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Yes, sir, keep in mind,
19 this is a motion for directed verdict at the close of
20 Plaintiff's case; does not involve Mr. Baker's
21 damages. He sued for breach of contract and damages.
22 And the damages, he takes the position that the
23 damages are based upon what Mr. Baker has paid him
24 and what he was entitled to. That's his damages.

25 In arriving at his damages, you cannot

1 ignore the income he's receiving from the tower. The
2 property generates the income. We don't have a side
3 deal going on where somebody has a hotdog stand down
4 there generating income. The property in and of
5 itself generates income.

6 Interfere; he can not make any leases that
7 interfere. This is the most common sense case I have
8 ever been involved in. Interfere. You can't tell me
9 that if you take this corner of the property you are
10 already leased to me, you put a fence around it, you
11 have not interfered with some use of parcel H2
12 reflected on that survey.

13 There's 12 more years left on Mr. Baker's
14 lease. We've got -- our lease term is from, with
15 options from 2003 to 2023. We got about, if my math
16 is right, 12 more years, 11 more years to go that we
17 have to do this. This is not insignificant to us.
18 You can't define whether we would have done something
19 or not done something.

20 We're dealing with interference with the
21 total terms of the lease, which is five years, plus
22 three five-year options to renew. And we've already
23 renewed one, and the next one comes up in '13. We
24 will renew that one also.

25 The lease does not give Mr. Hiers, as

1 stated by Mr. Howe, the unilateral right to do other
2 things with the property. Mr. Howe uses the term,
3 peaceful use of the property. I think that's a sort
4 of a contortion of the covenant of quiet enjoyment.
5 The covenant of quiet enjoyment is a legal principal,
6 not just peaceful enjoyment practically speaking.

7 In the covenant of quiet enjoyment, he
8 warranted and he bound himself that, during the
9 demised term, that the tenant, article 12: Will have
10 lawful, quiet and peaceful possession and occupation,
11 occupation of the demised premises, 1.21 acres, and
12 enjoy all rights herein granted without any let or
13 lease, hindrance, ejection, molestation or
14 interference by any person; in particular, the
15 landlord himself.

16 I think based upon all these arguments,
17 the Plaintiff has just not proved his case and would
18 ask that The Court direct a verdict in favor of the
19 Defendant.

20 MR. HOWE: Lastly, their equitable
21 principal might have estopped them from asserting
22 that. They didn't file a memorandum of lease, which
23 is the standard thing that's done. The evidence from
24 Mr. Powell, there was no memorandum of lease to put
25 the public on notice of their interest.

1 When it went up, they were advised it was
2 going up. And they sat there and let it go up. And
3 they actually marked off pieces of the property and
4 let it go up.

5 Now they're coming back, oh, my goodness,
6 you pulled this over on us and breached this contact.
7 You can't just stand there and let somebody paint
8 your house and then say: Gosh, you just painted the
9 wrong house.

10 THE COURT: Without getting something for
11 it.

12 MR. HOWE: Without getting something.
13 That goes to all those of things. That's why it's
14 not a directed verdict at this juncture.

15 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to probably
16 regret this. I'm going to deny the motion at this
17 time. Looking at the matter in the light most
18 favorable to the nonmoving party, which is the
19 Plaintiffs, the Plaintiffs bring a cause of action
20 for declaratory judgment. What I will tell you, I'm
21 not sure that there is any ambiguity as to what the
22 demised premises are.

23 What I find there to be ambiguity about is
24 with the use of those demised premises has been put
25 to. That runs throughout this entire lease. I'm

1 specifically looking at article 12, the title of the
2 premises. It talks in terms of it should not be
3 leased in any manner which would prevent or
4 interferes with the tenant. The tenant has not put
5 forth any evidence at this point in time. It's on
6 that basis I'm going to deny the motion as to the
7 declaratory judgment.

8 On the issue of damages, that's frankly
9 what's bothered me throughout this whole case. I'm
10 not sure exactly what the damages are, if any, and so
11 how to reconcile them. I'm going to deny the motion
12 on those bases alone and allow the Defendant to put
13 forth any testimony that they'd like to put forth.

14 Let me just ask you. It's now noon. You
15 indicated two witnesses.

16 MR. WILLIAM BARR: I have three. I've
17 subpoenaed Corky Carnevale.

18 THE COURT: Do you want to break now?

19 MR. WILLIAM BARR: If I could ask you,
20 Mr. Baker teaches at the College of Charleston, among
21 his other -- and he's got a class at 12:15 that he
22 would like to make.

23 MR. HOWE: That's fine. I don't have any
24 problem.

25 MR. WILLIAM BARR: He could be back here,

1 he says 1:45. We might be able to push him.

2 MR. BAKER: 2:00.

3 THE COURT: Two o'clock.

4 MR. HOWE: I don't want him cutting class
5 on my account.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Baker, I'll be happy to
7 cut you loose. Let's just come back at 2:00.

8 (A luncheon recess transpired from 11:53
9 a.m. until 2:25 p.m.)

10 THE COURT: We had concluded the
11 Plaintiff's case. I had denied motion for directed
12 verdict or nonsuit. We should be at the Defendant's
13 case. Mr. Barr.

14 MR. WILLIAM BARR: I'd like to call Corky
15 Carnevale. He has an appointment at 4:00, told him
16 we would get him out of here.

17 ROBERT CARNEVALE
18 being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

19 DIRECT EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

21 Q. Mr. Carnevale, state your full name for
22 the record.

23 A. Robert Bernard Carnevale.

24 Q. A/k/a Corky?

25 A. Correct.

1 Q. Mr. Carnevale, you're aware that the case
2 we're in trial today is the case of 56 Leinbach
3 versus Magnolia Paradigm, involving the property at
4 the end of Leinbach Drive where Baker Motor Company
5 has or Magnolia Paradigm has its parking back there?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. In that particular lease, what was your
8 role?

9 A. I was working as Mr. Hiers' real estate
10 agent.

11 Q. You were his agent during the course of
12 that?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. During that process, did you work with
15 Bill Cochran representing Magnolia Paradigm?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Did Mr. Bailey have anything to do with it
18 back then?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Nothing at all. I'm going to show you a
21 couple of letters, Mr. Carnevale. This is a letter
22 from Bill Cochran to you dated November 11, 2002 and
23 ask if you can identify that.

24 A. I'm familiar with this.

25 Q. Was that letter a result of some meeting

1 you had with Mr. Cochran where he wanted you to put
2 in writing a proposal for the lease of the property?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. And that particular proposal offered to
5 lease him either the whole parcel or a part of it?

6 A. I think we only had one parcel there.

7 Q. I think the letter says parcel 1.2 acres,
8 you can lease all or a part of it?

9 A. Correct, right.

10 Q. The value per acre was 250,000?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. The lease calculation was based upon
13 return on investment?

14 A. That's right.

15 Q. It was for the entire 1.2 acre parcel that
16 the lease was calculated?

17 A. Right.

18 Q. Now I'm going to show you a letter dated
19 10/24/02 and see if you can identify that.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Based upon that letter, that was basically
22 some understanding that you had with Bill Cochran
23 that Mr. Hiers or 56 Leinbach would lease him the
24 entire 1.2 acres. What you did was split the baby on
25 the rent from his 1,600' to your 2,000?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Ultimately, was there a lease drawn?

3 A. Yes, there was.

4 Q. Please don't read this.

5 A. I'm not.

6 Q. This was the lease that was signed in June
7 2002. In Section 1.01, it describes the devised
8 premises as 1.21 acres.

9 A. Okay.

10 Q. I believe if you wanted to read it, you
11 would find that the rental in there was 1,800 a month
12 with 3 percent increases after the first year. Is
13 that consistent with the October 24th letter?

14 A. Correct, we prepared the lease.

15 Q. Y'all prepared the lease, okay.

16 At the time of the preparation of the
17 proposal to lease and the execution of the lease, was
18 there any question that Mr. Baker's company was going
19 to acquire the entire 1.2 acre parcel?

20 A. No question in my mind.

21 Q. Were they restricted? Could they use the
22 entire parcel for parking, or were they restricted to
23 just use a part of the parcel for parking?

24 A. Didn't make any difference to us.

25 Q. Didn't may any difference?

1 A. They were leasing it. Whatever they could
2 do with it was fine as long as it was legal.

3 Q. As long as they paid the rent?

4 A. Right.

5 MR. WILLIAM BARR: I have no further
6 questions.

7 CROSS-EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. HOWE:

9 Q. For it to be legal, it had to get
10 authorized by the city, didn't it?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. In fact, Mr. Cochran's letter to you
13 specifically, he writes in hand saying: We're not
14 signing any lease unless there's a parking lot
15 approved by the city; correct?

16 A. That's correct. It says: Lease based on
17 receiving approval for a parking lot from the city
18 and Mrs. Leinbach.

19 Q. I'm going to hand you two pages real
20 quick. RB Corky Carnevale. That's you?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. That's a letter or writing from
23 Mr. Cochran who was representing Mr. Baker?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. It had attached to it a drawing?

1 A. Yes.

2 MR. HOWE: And this will be exhibit 17.

3 (PLF. EXH. 17, Memo dated 12-18-02, was
4 marked for identification.)

5 BY MR. HOWE:

6 Q. Would you read for The Court -- first of
7 all, what is the date on this document?

8 A. December 18, 2002.

9 Q. As I understand it, it's sent from
10 Mr. Cochran to you; is that correct?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. What is the subject of the document?

13 A. Can I read it?

14 Q. Yeah. What does it say it's about?

15 A. As per our phone conversation today, I'm
16 sending the parking lot layout drawn by LS3P. We
17 have to apply to the city for a variance because lot
18 will be grout -- because the lot will be gravel.

19 LS3P will meet with the city staff on
20 12/19/02 for layout approval. The next meeting for
21 the variance is February 6, 2003. I have not heard
22 from our attorney on the lease but will call you as
23 soon as he completes his review.

24 Q. As of that time, they were already
25 reviewing leases? Some lease documents?

1 A. Yes, apparently so.

2 Q. And the subject of this?

3 A. Parking lot.

4 Q. You're not a lawyer?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Didn't draw the lease?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Didn't consult on the terms of the lease
9 or how they were defined or any of that stuff?

10 A. No, other than to tell them what we had
11 agreed upon.

12 MR. HOWE: That's all I have. Thank you.

13 MR. WILLIAM BARR: One quick question.

14 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

16 Q. The exhibit that Mr. Howe has just shown
17 you, did you consider this parking lot layout a
18 restriction on the area of the parking or the area
19 that they could use?

20 MR. HOWE: Objection; relevance.

21 THE COURT: I'm going to allow it. Go
22 ahead.

23 THE WITNESS: I looked at it, and it
24 really didn't concern us. Didn't concern me. If
25 they were happy with what they got, that was fine

1 with us, you know. We were just glad that they were
2 able to get approval so that they would lease it.

3 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

4 Q. Did that sketch ever become a part and
5 parcel of the written lease?

6 A. If not, it should have been. I honestly
7 don't know.

8 MR. WILLIAM BARR: No further questions.

9 THE COURT: All your purposes had to do
10 with finding parking spaces for, in this case,
11 Magnolia Paradigm, the company that took it. That
12 was all your negotiations concerned?

13 THE WITNESS: Not really. We were just
14 interested in leasing the property. And I think at
15 one point Mr. Hiers and I went to Barry Whalen, I
16 can't remember the name of his company, but he's been
17 around for a good while, and sat down with him and
18 made sure that we could get enough parking on there
19 that it would be worthwhile to even talk to them
20 about leasing it as a parking lot.

21 We thought that if we could go in there
22 with some sort of sketch plan saying we know we could
23 get 80 -- I don't know how many numbers we were
24 talking about at that time, but enough places that it
25 would interest them in leasing it, which we did.

1 And then we took the piece of land to them
2 and said: Would you be interested in leasing this.

3 As far as my recollection, we weren't
4 concerned how many parking places they could get out
5 of there. They either got enough in there they were
6 interested in leasing it or they couldn't.

7 THE COURT: Would you have anticipated
8 that diagram to be made part of a lease agreement?

9 THE WITNESS: I would have anticipated it,
10 yes, but I wouldn't have been involved in that.

11 THE COURT: Are you the Corky Carnevale
12 that used to play for the Gamecocks?

13 THE WITNESS: Long time ago.

14 MR. HOWE: Just as fast as he ever was.

15 CONTINUED REDIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

17 Q. That sketch didn't limit them from going
18 over into an area that's not where it's not sketched
19 out?

20 A. Did not. Not to my knowledge. You
21 could've double deck. We didn't really -- it wasn't
22 my concern.

23 MR. WILLIAM BARR: I have no further
24 questions.

25 THE COURT: Mr. Carnevale. You are free.

1 (The witness exited the stand.)

2 (Off-the-record discussion.)

3 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Plaintiff calls Bill
4 Cochran.

5 WILLIAM G. COCHRAN, JR.

6 being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

7 DIRECT EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

9 Q. Mr. Cochran, will you state your full name
10 for the record, please.

11 A. William G. Cochran, Jr.

12 Q. Where do you presently reside?

13 A. One Brigadoon Place, Charleston.

14 Q. Are you familiar with the Defendant in
15 this case, Magnolia Paradigm?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. What was your relationship with that
18 company in the time frame that we're here on, which
19 was about 2002?

20 A. That was a holding company that Mr. Baker
21 had. I was employed by Baker Motor Company.

22 Q. How long had you been employed by Baker
23 Motor Company?

24 A. I started in August of '93 and retired in
25 February of 2004.

1 Q. Where were you prior to that?

2 A. I was with GMAC.

3 Q. For how many years?

4 A. Thirty.

5 Q. At Baker, what was your position^{at} Baker?

6 A. I was the operations manager.

7 Q. What did that entail?

8 A. Entailed a lot of things. I reviewed
9 financial statements, took care of insurance for the
10 company, personnel, expense control, approval of
11 purchases, machinery and equipment. I also
12 coordinated expansions with architects and builders.

13 Q. Incident to those roles, did you have
14 anything to do with sales?

15 A. No, sir, not at all.

16 Q. Incident to your duties at Baker, did you
17 have anything to do with the leasing of the property
18 from Mr. Hiers' company, 56 Leinbach?

19 A. I did.

20 Q. I'm going to show you some notes which are
21 dated February 7, 2000 and ask if you can identify
22 those.

23 A. Yes, sir, I can. Those are my notes.

24 MR. WILLIAM BARR: If we could mark them.

25 (DFT. EXH. 18, Handwritten notes, was

1 marked for identification.)

2 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

3 Q. Again, the date of this is February 7,
4 2000. What is the gist of this particular -- of
5 these particular notes?

6 A. I believe that's the time that
7 Mr. Carnevale came to us with a proposal about
8 leasing that property back there. And as stated in
9 here, they said they could lease that property and
10 could get about 70 spaces for car placement and rent
11 them out, 1,800 a month. That would give them about
12 10 percent return.

13 And we would improve the property, do all
14 the work, paving, stripping. And Mr. Carnevale at
15 the time said probably take about \$75,000, \$80,000 to
16 do that.

17 Q. What happened to the February 7, 2000
18 proposal?

19 A. I had a note down here, on February 16,
20 2000, I had advised Corky that we would not be
21 interested in the property at that time.

22 Q. I'm going to show you a note of September
23 5, '02 and ask if you can identify that.

24 A. Yes, sir, that is my handwriting.

25 Q. What is the gist of that particular note?

1 A. Just a notation that I met with Mr. Hiers
2 and Mr. Carnevale for leasing Leinbach Drive for
3 employee parking, and that they would put the other
4 proposal and get back with us.

5 (DFT. EXH. 19, Handwritten notes, was
6 marked for identification.)

7 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Your Honor, I would
8 like to introduce into evidence Defendant's 18,
9 February 7, 2000 and his note of Defendant's Exhibit
10 19.

11 THE COURT: Any objection?

12 MR. HOWE: No objection.

13 THE COURT: Very good.

14 (DFT. EXH. 18 was received into evidence.)

15 (DFT. EXH. 19 was received into evidence.)

16 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

17 Q. After September 5th, did you, in fact,
18 receive a letter from Corky Carnevale?

19 A. We did. We received a letter.

20 Q. I'm going to show you what has already
21 been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 13 and ask you if
22 that's the letter.

23 A. It is.

24 Q. What was the nature of that? What was
25 their offer to lease?

1 A. Well, in essence, stating they would like
2 to make satisfactory arrangements with Baker Motor
3 Company for the partial size. They put 1.2 acres.
4 You can lease all or part of this 1.2 acres, valued
5 at 250,000 an acre. They wanted 8 to 10 percent
6 return on the value, depending on who paid the tax.
7 We would do all the planning and approval process.
8 We would do the improvements, insurance, maintenance.
9 And the lease would expire in ten years with
10 renewals.

11 Q. When was the next communication that you
12 had?

13 I'm going to show you a letter dated 10/24
14 and ask if you can identify that.

15 A. That's a letter to me from Mr. Carnevale,
16 yes.

17 Q. What was their proposal -- do you have any
18 idea what happened between September 11th and October
19 24th?

20 A. It's been nine, ten years ago. I really
21 don't. I'm sure we had discussions back and forth;
22 must have because of the way he wrote the letter and
23 started out to discuss and propose what they're
24 offering us. I'm sure we had some discussion. I
25 don't remember specifically.

1 Q. Was the proposal for all or part of 1.2
2 acres?

3 A. Well, the proposal is, as I read it,
4 because the valuation of the property was at
5 \$300,000, it was for the entire amount, 1.2 acres.
6 And that's how they got their return, based on that
7 1.2 acres.

8 And the 8 percent return would've been
9 \$2,000 a month. We had originally said we would
10 consider \$1,600 a month. And they came to terms,
11 leased it for \$1,800 a month. It was still the 1.2
12 acres.

13 Q. That actually constituted a compromise.
14 You're reading from Plaintiff's Exhibit 14?

15 A. Right.

16 Q. The next thing that happened, you then, in
17 fact, entered into a lease. And I want to show you
18 what's already been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1
19 and ask you if that's the lease that you ultimately
20 entered into?

21 A. Yes, that's the lease, as far as I know.

22 Q. Was the lease consistent with the October
23 24th proposal?

24 A. Yes, in as much they offered us -- it took
25 care of the 1.2 acres at \$1,800 a month. I would say

1 it was consistent, yes.

2 Q. Other than the 2000 discussions, based on
3 your notes of February 2000, was there any further
4 discussion of leasing just a portion of the property
5 at that time?

6 A. No, there wasn't.

7 Q. Mr. Howe just questioned Mr. Carnevale in
8 regards to a fax that you sent to Mr. Carnevale
9 12/18/02 and ask you if you recall that.

10 A. I do, that was fax that I sent to him.

11 Q. And what was the purpose of that?

12 A. Confirming our telephone conversation.
13 Sent him a parking lot layout drawn by LS3P and let
14 him know we had applied to the city for variance.
15 There's going to be gravel and not paved. Told him
16 when the meeting would be, have not heard from our
17 attorney on the lease. You were reviewing it, I
18 assume at that point.

19 Q. Do you recall why, if you look at the
20 sketch there, why you didn't put any parking over in
21 the corner, off the cul-de-sac?

22 A. Yes, in my position, I was responsible for
23 expense control. When this opportunity came and we
24 decided to go with it, I wanted to get as many
25 parking places as we could at the least amount

1 expense of turning dirt. As they referred to it,
2 that was a soccer field. It was compacted, that
3 whole area. That was the easiest place to put it. I
4 don't recall exactly, that's why that area was used,
5 and that's why this parking lot design was drawn.

6 Over in the corner was an area that
7 would've cost much more at the time to do. We had
8 some trees to take down. We would have to fell and
9 do that. We didn't need that at that time. And so
10 the least expensive way I could turn this piece into
11 a parking lot for us was what we did right there.

12 Q. Did you feel that precluded you from
13 putting parking over there or something over there in
14 the future?

15 A. I didn't think that it would preclude for
16 anything because we had leased the entire parcel.

17 Q. Of course, that would've been subject to
18 Mr. Hiers' approval or governmental authorities'
19 approval?

20 A. Sure, just like this was.

21 Q. To your knowledge, did Mr. Hiers, during
22 the period of time -- did you really have any contact
23 with Mr. Hiers, or was all of your contact with
24 Mr. Carnevale?

25 A. I think most of it with Mr. Carnevale. I

1 may have had some with Mr. Hiers. I don't
2 specifically -- most of the negotiation was with
3 Mr. Carnevale. One of the memos I said I met with
4 Clyde and Mr. Carnevale -- excuse me -- Mr. Hiers and
5 Mr. Carnevale at one meeting. Most of it was with
6 Corky. He was handling everything, yes, sir.

7 Q. When did you leave Baker Motor Company's
8 employ?

9 A. End of February 2004.

10 Q. Fair to state you were not around when
11 they built the cell tower?

12 A. No, sir.

13 Q. When you were doing the negotiations with
14 Mr. Carnevale in connection with the property, the
15 1.2 acres, were there any discussions that Mr. Hiers
16 might want to withhold a portion of the property for
17 future development?

18 A. No, sir.

19 Q. Do you recall, based upon the notes that
20 you've seen and the letters from Mr. Carnevale, how
21 was the lease payment calculated, to the best of your
22 knowledge, by Mr. Hiers?

23 A. Well, I mean, it was calculated on an 8
24 percent return on \$300,000 valuation of property,
25 which would be \$2,000 a month. We would get that

1 return. That's where their figure came from.

2 Q. When you were there -- withdraw that.

3 MR. WILLIAM BARR: I have no further
4 questions at this time.

5 MR. HOWE: Just a couple things.

6 CROSS-EXAMINATION

7 BY MR. HOWE:

8 Q. Do you have exhibit number 19 in front of
9 you? That's September 5, '02 note that you wrote.

10 A. I don't have exhibit 19.

11 Q. We put it back on the table. Tell me if
12 I'm reading this right. This is September 5, '02:
13 Met this a.m. with Clyde Hiers and Corky Carnevale,
14 re: lot on Leinbach Drive to be used for employee
15 parking only; is that correct?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. The next one says February 7, 2002, that's
18 exhibit 18. Do you have that one?

19 A. Uh-huh. That's February 7, 2000.

20 Q. This is way back.

21 A. That's almost two years before this other
22 note came into play.

23 Q. At the end of the first paragraph, though,
24 again, employee parking lot is what it was about?

25 A. Right.

1 Q. And rent for 70 car spaces around one
2 acre. That was the first note?

3 A. That's what they brought to us.

4 Q. Right. You were the operations guy at
5 Baker; correct?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. And you, more or less, became the
8 operations guy for this project about this piece of
9 property?

10 A. Just included in my duties, yes, sir.

11 Q. And your goal was to get as many parking
12 spaces as possible, economically feasible on that
13 piece of property, wasn't it?

14 A. My goal was to create a parking area for
15 employees and put it on the area that was already
16 compacted, yes.

17 Q. And to get as many spaces as you possibly
18 could?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And you did that, didn't you, in
21 connection with architects, didn't you?

22 A. What they drew out, yes, I got that.

23 Q. And you knew and y'all had it arranged and
24 you have it in the correspondence with Mr. Carnevale,
25 had those plans of LS3P not been approved by the

1 city, this would've never gone through, would it?

2 A. Well, had the plans not been approved for
3 us to put a parking lot there, it probably would not
4 have gone through.

5 Q. Y'all were looking for parking spaces?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. According to your note in December of '02,
8 I think it was, the one you wrote to Mr. Carnevale?

9 A. I have it here.

10 Q. There were some versions of this lease
11 already going around?

12 A. I don't understand what you mean, versions
13 of the lease going around.

14 Q. You know what a lease is, right?

15 A. I do.

16 Q. You know what the lease was in this;
17 right?

18 A. I've read that, yes.

19 Q. You talk about the lease and something
20 about the attorney and the lease. What does it say?

21 The last sentence: I have not heard from
22 our attorney on the lease but will call you as soon
23 as he completes his review.

24 A. Which exhibit are you referring to?

25 Q. I'm looking at the note.

1 A. I didn't know what exhibit you had. I had
2 the wrong one.

3 Q. Last sentence.

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. You were aware that your attorney had some
6 version of the lease at that point?

7 A. He had the -- he had the lease that was
8 sent to us by Corky Carnevale.

9 Q. This was in December 18th of 2002;
10 correct?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Six-and-a-half months before the lease was
13 signed?

14 A. I don't know the date the lease was
15 signed.

16 Q. June 1, '03, okay. After the plans that
17 LS3P had drawn up, were approved by the city?

18 A. I don't have the date that the city
19 approved it.

20 Q. But you remember that the leases weren't
21 signed until after?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. On the lease itself, which is exhibit 1,
24 are you with me? It talks about parking area. Do
25 you see that?

1 A. I see 1.02, yes, sir.

2 Q. That parking area is the same parking area
3 that was in the plans prepared by LS3P and approved
4 by the city, wasn't it? It wasn't some other parking
5 area, was it?

6 A. I don't know that's true, sir.

7 Q. What else would it be? Was there another
8 parking area there?

9 A. There was land that would not be used.

10 Q. Right. If it couldn't be used because it
11 wasn't approved for parking area, you wouldn't call
12 it a parking area, would you?

13 A. Well, I'm just reading: Throughout the
14 demised term, tenant and its employees shall have the
15 exclusive right to use any parking areas within the
16 demised premises. It didn't say to the plat. I
17 mean, I don't know the question, sir.

18 Q. The parking area that was the subject of
19 this lease, are you saying it was something different
20 than what you got approved by the city?

21 A. No, sir.

22 Q. That's all I wanted to know.

23 MR. HOWE: That's all I have.

24 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

25 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

1 Q. Mr. Cochran, just to follow up on this
2 parking area with the lease. Do you recall when you
3 first got the lease from Mr. Carnevale? Must have
4 been prior to December of '02; is that correct?

5 A. Yes, it must have been. I don't know
6 when.

7 Q. We've already marked --

8 A. Mr. Barr, may I say, we had it awhile, the
9 lease, the first one we had typed in January 2003,
10 beginning. It was struck to June.

11 Q. It may have been as early as June that it
12 was contemplated as being written?

13 A. I can't answer.

14 Q. You don't remember?

15 A. I don't remember.

16 Q. This is what we refer to as Defendant's
17 Exhibit 16. These are the large versions of the LS3P
18 plans. And I believe the date -- tell me what date
19 down here on bottom right corner is.

20 A. April 21, '03.

21 Q. This particular topographic survey, I
22 guess these were the plans that were ultimately
23 approved by the city?

24 A. I'm sure they were, yes.

25 Q. Is it fair to say these plans came into

1 existence after the lease?

2 A. I would say yes.

3 Q. And so in regard to Mr. Howe's question
4 about paragraph 1.02, did section 1.02 really relate
5 to these plans?

6 A. Not that I know of.

7 MR. WILLIAM BARR: No further questions.

8 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. HOWE:

10 Q. Lease wasn't signed until after those
11 plans were approved by the city and said, this is the
12 plans and this is the project, wasn't it?

13 A. The lease wasn't what, sir?

14 Q. The lease was not signed. There was no
15 lease. There was no legal document. There was no
16 deal until after the city had approved those plans;
17 isn't that correct?

18 A. Well, the lease was signed what? June
19 1st.

20 Q. That's right. And the city had been
21 approved. You said in your own letter, Mr. Cochran,
22 no deal if the city doesn't approve it?

23 A. That would probably be correct then, yes,
24 sir.

25 Q. Had Mr. Baker wanted to change the parking

1 area, you know by the terms of that lease he would
2 need to have Mr. Hiers' approval, wouldn't he?

3 A. That's what the original small plat was
4 for when it was sent to Corky, yes.

5 Q. And you also know that it would need city
6 approval, 'cause you can't build something like that
7 without approval, can you?

8 A. I think that's been established. We had
9 to get approval for the gravel lot, yes.

10 Q. It would also, from a business standpoint,
11 need to make economic sense, wouldn't it?

12 A. It would.

13 Q. You had already made a determination that
14 it didn't make economic sense at that time?

15 A. Originally that's what I determined, yes.

16 Q. Has anybody asked you to re-evaluate that,
17 see if it makes any economic sense?

18 A. I think you need to rephrase it when you
19 say make economic sense. I did it for the least cost
20 to Baker Motor Company to give us the parking there.

21 Q. To get as many spaces as you could?

22 A. To get as many spaces I could without
23 moving any dirt because it was an economical value to
24 me.

25 Q. Your job is to make --

1 A. Hold down expenses.

2 Q. Keep down expenses and make a profit that
3 is logical, for lack of a better reason; right? Get
4 your best return; correct?

5 A. Yes.

6 MR. HOWE: That's all I have.

7 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Nothing further, Your
8 Honor.

9 THE COURT: I don't have any questions
10 Mr. Cochran, thank you very much. You may step down.

11 (The witness exited the stand.)

12 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Call Mr. Baker.

13 TOMMY B. BAKER

14 being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

15 DIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

17 Q. Would you state your full name for the
18 record, please.

19 A. Tommy B. Baker.

20 Q. And what is your position with the
21 Defendant Magnolia Paradigm in this case?

22 A. My position?

23 Q. What is your position? Do you own it?

24 A. I own it, yes.

25 Q. Is it a single member LLC that's in your

1 name?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Did you have anything to do with the
4 negotiations of a particular lease between Mr. Hiers
5 and the company?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Who did you leave that up to?

8 A. Mr. Cochran.

9 Q. Were you personally aware that, in 2006,
10 that there was a cell tower going up adjacent or on
11 the property?

12 A. No.

13 Q. Were you, as a representative of Magnolia
14 Paradigm, ever contacted or notified concerning the
15 use of that or putting that cell tower up?

16 A. No.

17 Q. We've already introduced, Mr. Baker, as
18 Plaintiff's Exhibit 8, a schedule of payments and ask
19 if you're familiar with that.

20 A. Yes. Yes, I am.

21 Q. That schedule of payments, what does that
22 reflect the total amount of payments that your
23 company has paid to Mr. Hiers' company?

24 A. That is correct, 153,561.

25 Q. Earlier today, Mr. Keith Powell was here.

1 And he prepared -- we introduced exhibit 9. And this
2 is the total payments that Optima Towers has paid
3 Mr. Hiers. And I believe that number is
4 54,000-and-some change?

5 A. 54,116.66, yes.

6 Q. There's an additional column on the
7 Plaintiff's Exhibit 8 called Due From The Property.
8 Is that something that your people calculated for
9 you?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. What is that total amount there?

12 A. 193,352.05.

13 Q. And that's the total amount that should've
14 been paid to Mr. Hiers over the term of the lease?

15 A. Right.

16 Q. Sometime back in '08, I think you've heard
17 the testimony, y'all started withholding an amount of
18 money from the lease because of the tower?

19 A. Right.

20 Q. We will show you something that's called
21 Defendant's Exhibit 15. Tell me what that states.

22 A. Well, the total overpayment was from the
23 numbers; the rent paid Magnolia 153-and-some change;
24 rent by Optima Towers, 54-and-some change. Total
25 rent 207,477.65, less owed by Magnolia Paradigm,

1 193,352.65 for a total overpayment of \$14,125.

2 Q. Is that an amount of money that you think
3 that you are entitled to be reimbursed by Mr. Hiers
4 because he was overpaid --

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. -- from the property during the course of
7 your tenancy?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Are you also asking The Court to allow you
10 to continue to abate the rent based upon the Optima
11 Tower payments?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. How many more years do you have on this
14 lease?

15 A. I think 12.

16 Q. There's an area over in the corner, I
17 believe that you've seen and heard testify, where the
18 tower went up?

19 A. Right.

20 Q. Is that an area that, at the time that it
21 went up, impacted upon your parking at the time?

22 A. At the time, no.

23 Q. Does it impact upon your ability to use
24 the property in the future?

25 The tower being there now, does it impact

1 your ability to use that corner of the property in
2 the future?

3 A. Yes, absolutely.

4 Q. How would it impact you?

5 A. Well, you never know what you're going to
6 use property for. I'm in a situation right now where
7 we have a ditch to fill in for another franchise that
8 we're acquiring. And I didn't use that property for
9 15 years. Based on that, I would've never known
10 that, if I filled it in, that I could use it and put
11 a service department on it. At some point, you don't
12 know. The only thing you know is you own it; you
13 don't know what the use is. Thank God we had it.

14 Q. Mr. Baker, are you also asking The Court
15 to award you attorney's fees in connection with
16 this --

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. -- action?

19 A. Yes.

20 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Your Honor, for The
21 Court's edification, section 14.11 of the lease
22 provides that the central parties entitled to receive
23 attorney's fees in this matter. I've prepared an
24 attorney's fees affidavit that I would like to mark.

25 (DFT. EXH. 20, Affidavit, was marked for

1 identification.)

2 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

3 Q. I believe also, Mr. Baker, that this
4 affidavit also reflects that there's some costs
5 you've incurred. Basically, you're asking The Court
6 to reimburse -- have Mr. Hiers reimburse you for the
7 defense of this action?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. What is your financial arrangement with me
10 as your attorney?

11 A. Well, Bill, you want the world to know
12 this?

13 Q. We have to put it on the record.

14 A. On the record, you charge \$200 an hour for
15 your services.

16 Q. That's what the statement that is attached
17 to the attorney's fees affidavit requests?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. We have introduced various exhibits into
20 the record. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 which is
21 an initial sketch of the area that was going to be
22 used for parking. And then later on, there was an
23 LS3P plan. And I'm going to show you the reduced
24 version that showed the area that was going to be
25 used for parking. Did you consider that sketch or

1 the LS3P plans as limiting your ability to utilize
2 the entire property for parking?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. It did limit or it did not?

5 A. Did not.

6 MR. WILLIAM BARR: I have no further
7 questions.

8 CROSS-EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. HOWE:

10 Q. As I understand it, what happened was, as
11 Baker Motors was growing, your need for parking grew;
12 correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And the way that you needed to accommodate
15 that parking for Baker Motors was through the parking
16 lot at this site; is that correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And that is, in fact, what you've done?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And the tower that's there has not
21 interfered at all with any of the parking on any of
22 the sites?

23 A. For the time being, yes.

24 Q. Your testimony is, basically, you just
25 really don't know what the future brings?

1 A. I don't think anybody does.

2 Q. That's right. Neither do you today, do
3 you?

4 A. No, sir.

5 Q. It would be speculation to try to say what
6 it is?

7 A. Right.

8 Q. And you did agree to that? You said
9 right?

10 A. I did.

11 Q. I guess you at a point met with
12 Mr. Cochran, and he did the negotiations. We have
13 been through that; correct?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. You agree his goal and your goal was to
16 get as many spaces as you could, economically
17 feasible, on that piece of property?

18 A. That was part of the goal. The other part
19 was to secure the total property, 1.2 acres.

20 Q. The only damage that you contend, at some
21 point in the future, you might be able to expand into
22 that other little piece; is that correct?

23 A. I don't know that it's the only. For the
24 moment, I think that is, yes.

25 Q. To do that, you would need Mr. Hiers'

1 approval, wouldn't you?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. You don't know if you can get that or not,
4 do you?

5 A. I think it's part of the process, thank
6 you.

7 Q. You don't know that you can get that, do
8 you?

9 A. I don't know that it's not going to rain
10 today either.

11 Q. You don't know that the city would approve
12 it either, do you?

13 A. Don't know that.

14 Q. You don't know that it would make any
15 economic sense?

16 A. That would be for a future determination.

17 Q. You haven't run any numbers to see if it
18 would make any economic sense?

19 A. There's no need for the moment.

20 Q. When the tower went up, no one on your
21 behalf ever voiced any opposition to Mr. Hiers or
22 anybody to say, yikes, what's that 160-foot tower
23 doing going up, did they?

24 A. I had no idea.

25 Q. You didn't even know it was there until

1 Mr. Bailey told you some year-and-a-half or two years
2 after it was up?

3 A. Don't know that I recall that.

4 Q. The first time you found out was when
5 Mr. Bailey told you; correct?

6 A. I think that's right, yes.

7 Q. He found it out in connection with doing
8 some work about y'all were buying the property?

9 A. Right.

10 Q. The tower being there hadn't interfered
11 with anything in your daily life at all up to that
12 point, had it?

13 A. I don't know that's the point. I think
14 the point --

15 Q. That's the question, Mr. Baker.

16 A. All right.

17 Q. The question is: The tower hadn't
18 interfered with anything in your life up to that
19 point. You didn't even know it was there. Wasn't
20 even on your radar, was it?

21 A. No.

22 Q. You can see it from Baker Motors, can't
23 you? You can see it from Highway 17, can't you?

24 A. I've never looked back there to see
25 whether it was there or not.

1 Q. You certainly can't miss it if you go down
2 to the parking lot, can you?

3 A. If you go down the parking lot, you're
4 right.

5 Q. I think this is clear. I want to make
6 sure. Your company went and got the design from
7 LS3P; correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. You paid for that design?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. That was the design that was approved by
12 the city?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And that approval by the city was prior to
15 the signing of the lease?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. No memorandum of lease was filed by
18 Magnolia Paradigm in connection with your lease?

19 A. I don't know that.

20 Q. Do you have any evidence that it was
21 filed?

22 A. No.

23 MR. HOWE: That's all the questions I
24 have?

25

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

1 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

2 Q. Mr. Baker, you were getting ready to
3 answer a question for Mr. Howe whether or not the
4 tower interfered in your daily activities. You
5 indicated, I think you said that's not the point.
6 Mr. Howe interrupted and said: That's the question.

7 What is the point, Mr. Baker?

8 A. I think the point is we leased 1.2 acres,
9 and we have adhered to everything that we agreed
10 upon. And the point is we would -- there's a
11 possibility that we have future use of that property.
12 We're denied that because of the cell tower.

13 MR. WILLIAM BARR: Thank you, sir. No
14 questions.

15 MR. HOWE: Nothing else.

16 THE COURT: Mr. Baker, what do y'all use
17 this for? Employee parking?

18 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

19 THE COURT: Strictly employee parking?

20 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

21 THE COURT: Some note in there about not
22 for storage.

23 THE WITNESS: No.

24 THE COURT: When new cars come in, they're
25 not going back there.

1 THE WITNESS: We have another lot for that
2 down the street.

3 THE COURT: When your employees go to work
4 is when they would park down there and walk up to
5 wherever they're going on the site?

6 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

7 THE COURT: I guess what I'm quizzical
8 about, the cell tower itself was not brought to your
9 attention --

10 THE WITNESS: No, sir.

11 THE COURT: -- until a potential purchase
12 of the property?

13 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

14 THE COURT: At that point in time is when
15 all this --

16 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

17 THE COURT: -- generated. But it had been
18 for -- I'm still not sure on the timing. Was it a
19 number of years, number of months, do you know?

20 THE WITNESS: I really don't.

21 THE COURT: The numbers that we've got in
22 the record are numbers that y'all have run based on
23 your experience and what they provided to you, I
24 assume, in discovery. That's how we come up with the
25 number that you have.

1 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

2 THE COURT: Is it your intention -- I'm
3 going to ask this of both parties. So long as I got
4 you here, may as well ask you. Is it your intention
5 to fulfill the terms of the lease agreement as you
6 understand it to be today and into the future for
7 whatever the period of time is?

8 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

9 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Baker. You may
10 step down.

11 Anything further? Do you have a question
12 for him?

13 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

14 BY MR. WILLIAM BARR:

15 Q. You intend to honor the lease in the
16 future. Would you like The Court to allow you to
17 continue to abate the rent on account of the cell
18 tower?

19 A. Absolutely.

20 THE COURT: That was my question; continue
21 as you've done?

22 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

23 THE COURT: I'm with you.

24 Mr. Barr.

25 MR. WILLIAM BARR: If I could, Your Honor,

1 I would like to renew my motion for directed verdict.
2 Previously stated the ground. I'll try to do it
3 again, if you want me to. If not, I'll go on.

4 * * * * *

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Lora McDaniel, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public for the State of South Carolina at Large, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true, accurate, and complete record.

I further certify that I am neither related to, nor counsel for, any party to the cause pending or interested in the events thereof.

Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my official seal this 7th day of January, 2013 at Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.

Lora L. McDaniel,

My Commission expires:

September 18, 2016

LEASE AGREEMENT

This LEASE AGREEMENT ("Lease"), made this 1st day of JUNE 2003, by and between 56 Leinbach Investors (hereinafter referred to as "Lessor" or "Landlord") and Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as "Lessee" or "Tenant").

WITNESSETH:

In consideration of the premises, the mutual covenants herein contained, the conditions and agreement to be kept and performed hereunder by the parties, Tenant hereby Leases and hires from Landlord certain space, hereinafter called "demised premises" located at Leinbach Drive City of Charleston, County of Charleston, South Carolina, which is approximately 1.2 acres of land, more particularly described as parcel H-2 of TMS# 349-01-00-045

ARTICLE 1


PREMISES

Section 1.01. Demised Premises. Subject to and with the benefit of the terms, covenants, conditions and provisions of this Lease, Landlord hereby demises and leases to Tenant, and Tenant hereby takes and leases from Landlord, certain premises (herein called the "Demised Premises") consisting of the real estate and any improvements located or to be located thereon described 1.21 acres of real estate located at Leinbach Dr. City of Charleston, State of South Carolina and as more particularly described as parcel H-2 of TMS# 349-01-00-045 to have and to hold during the Demised Term (as defined in Section 2.03).

Section 1.02. Parking. Throughout the Demised Term, Tenant and its employees shall have the exclusive right to use any parking areas within the Demised Premises.

Section 1.02. Use of Space. The demised premises shall be used by Tenant as parking for employees of Tenant or Baker Motor Company and for no other purposes without the prior written consent of Landlord. Tenant will not use the demised premises for the purpose of parking inventory or conducting sales. Tenant shall not do or permit to be done in or about the demised premises or bring or keep or permit to be brought or kept herein, anything which is prohibited by or will in any way conflict with any law, statute, ordinance or government rule or

"Exhibit A"



regulation now in force or which may hereafter be enacted or promulgated or which in any way increased the existing rate of or affect of any insurance.

ARTICLE II

TERMS AND RENEWALS

Section 2.01. Original Term. The "Original Term" of this Lease is for a period of 60 months, commencing on the ~~15th day of December, 2002~~ ^{1st day of JUNE, 2003} (the "Commencement Date") and ending at midnight on the ~~14th day of December 2008~~ ^{JUNE} or at such earlier date as this Lease may terminate as hereinafter provided.

Section 2.02. Renewals. So long as Tenant is not in default hereunder beyond any Applicable Grace Period, Landlord grants to Tenant options ("Option(s)") to extend the Original Term for three (3) additional renewal terms on the same terms and conditions as herein set forth except that there shall be no further Option to extend beyond the last Renewal Term. Should Tenant elect to exercise any Option, it shall do it so by written notice to Landlord at least on hundred eighty (180) days before the expiration of the Original Term or Renewal Term that is in effect at the time of such notice.

Section 2.03. Demised Term. The Original Term and any Renewal Terms for which an Option is exercised by Tenant are collectively referred to in this Lease as the "Demised Term."

Section 2.04. Holding Over. If Tenant remains in possession of the Demised Premises after the expiration of the Demised Term, it shall be deemed to be occupying the Demised Premises as a tenant from month to month at the Rent herein specified (prorated and paid on a monthly basis), subject to all conditions, provisions and obligations of this Lease insofar as the same are applicable to a month-to-month tenancy.

ARTICLE III

RENT

Section 3.01. Rent. Tenant shall pay to Landlord, without any prior demand therefore, the amount \$21,600.00 per annum (hereinafter referred to as the "Rent"), for the first three (3) years of the initial term, payable in advance in equal monthly installments on the first day of each

full month of the Demised Term after the Rent Commencement Date (as defined in Article V hereof), Three (3) years following the Lease Commencement Date, the \$1800 monthly rent shall increase at the rate of 3% annum. If the Rent Commencement Date is not the first day of a calendar month, Tenant shall, on the Rent Commencement Date, pay Landlord the pro rate portion of the Rent for the number of days from the Rent Commencement Date to the end of such fractional month. The Rent for any fractional month at the end of the Demised Term shall also be prorated. Prorations for any fractional month shall be made on the basis of a 365-day year regardless of the actual number of days in such fractional month.

Section 3.02. Payments. Rent checks shall be made payable to Landlord and mailed 56 Leinbach LLC, P.O. Box 31324 Charleston, SC 29417, or elsewhere as designated by Landlord from time to time in a written notice delivered to Tenant at least thirty (30) days prior to the effective date of such address change.

Section 3.03. Lease Year and Fractional Lease Year. The term "Lease Year" shall mean a period of twelve (12) consecutive calendar months, the first Lease Year commencing on the First January 1st following the commencement Date and each succeeding Lease Year commencing on the anniversary of the first Lease Year. The term "Fractional Lease Year" shall mean (i) the period from the Commencement Date through the first December 31st following the Commencement Date, or (ii) the period of the Demised Term subsequent to the last December 31st of the Demised Term, whether this Lease expires by its terms or otherwise.

Section 3.04. Net Lease. The Rent reserve herein shall be absolutely net to the Landlord so that this Lease shall yield net to the Landlord the Rent specified, and all costs, expense and obligations of every kind and nature whatsoever, whether now existing or hereafter arising, even if beyond the current contemplation of, the parties, shall be the obligation of and paid by the Tenant, except only for (i) any mortgage payments or related mortgage expenses of Landlord, (ii) taxes based on income assessed against Landlord, and (iii) taxes which are not specifically the obligation of the Tenant and which shall hereafter be imposed upon the Landlord by law, if any;

provided, however, that any tax assessment charge or imposition in lieu of any real estate tax or assessment on the Demised Premises shall be the obligation of Tenant.

ARTICLE IV

COMMENCEMENT DATE

The Demised Term of this Lease shall commence on JUNE 1, 2003

ARTICLE V

MAINTENANCE AND EQUIPMENT

Section 5.01. Construction of the Demised Premises. Any improvements on the Demised Premises will be constructed by Tenant, at Tenant's sole cost and expense. Tenant's plans and specifications for the improvements must first receive written approval by Landlord. Such approval shall not be unreasonably withheld.

Section 5.02. Tenant's Fixtures and Equipment. Any and all movable or removable fixtures, equipment and personally purchased by, belonging to or leased from third parties by Tenant and installed on the Demised Premises (whether or not affixed), are herein called "Tenant's Fixtures and Equipment." Tenant shall own all Tenant's Fixtures and Equipment to the exclusion of Landlord. So long as Tenant is not in monetary default under this Lease, Tenant shall have the right to remove all of Tenant's Fixtures and Equipment from the Demised Premises within thirty (30) day period, repair any damage Tenant caused to the Demised Premises by such removal.

Section 5.03. Demised Premises Maintenance. Tenant, at its sole cost and expense, shall keep the Demised Premises, including all portions of any building, equipment and landscaping, in good condition and repair throughout the Demised Term, reasonable wear and tear and the effects of time excepted. Tenant's obligation to keep the Demised Premises in good condition and repair shall include all necessary repairs, replacements and maintenance, whether ordinary or extraordinary and whether or not structural. All such work shall be done in a good and

workmanlike manner, and when completed, be free and clear of all claims for liens by mechanics or materialmen for and on account of labor and material furnished in connection therewith.

Section 5.04. Alterations by Tenant. Except as otherwise provided in this Lease, any alterations and additions to the Demised Premises that Tenant may deem necessary during the Demised Term may be made by Tenant, at Tenant's sole cost and expense, but Landlord's prior written consent shall be required for any structural or exterior alterations or additions. Landlord shall promptly sign and execute such documents or otherwise evidence its approval, consent or grant of authority, as required by any public authorities having jurisdiction thereover, to facilitate issuance to Tenant of necessary licenses or permits to make or perform any permissible alteration or addition.

Section 5.05. Entry by Landlord. Landlord may enter the Demised Premises upon reasonable notice to inspect same and, beginning six (6) months before the end of the Demised Term, to exhibit same to prospective tenants, so long as such entry does not interfere with Tenant's business activities. Landlord may enter the Demised Premises at any time in the event of an emergency. Landlord shall not display "For Rent," "For Sale" or other similar signs or notices on or about the Demised Premises.

Section 5.06. Improvements Become Landlord's Property. Subject to section 5.02, any and all buildings and improvements placed on the Demised Premises shall become the sole property of the Landlord upon the expiration or earlier termination for this Lease.

ARTICLE VI

USE

Section 6.01. Use. The demised premises shall be used by Tenant and Baker Motor Company as parking for employees of Tenant and for no other purposes without the prior written consent of Landlord. Tenant will not use the demised premises for the purpose of parking inventory or conducting sales. Tenant shall be responsible for (i) obtaining any required licenses and permits issuable by applicable governmental authorities for Tenant's operations in the Demised Premises, and (ii) complying with all laws concerning the cleanliness, safety and

operation of the Demised Premises. Tenant may in good faith, after notifying Landlord, contest the validity or application of any law and delay compliance therewith pending the outcome of such contest, provided no civil or criminal penalty would be incurred by Landlord and no lien or charge would be imposed upon or satisfied out of the Demised Premises due to such delay.

Section 6.02. Maintenance. Tenant shall maintain its business at the Demised Premises in accordance with the same standards of operation and in the same quality as Baker Motor Company operates its dealerships. Tenant shall not cause injury or waste to the Demised Premises, reasonable wear and tear excepted. Tenant shall keep the Demised Premises clean and free from rubbish, trash and garbage, and, at its own expense, arrange for removal of same. Tenant shall store all such rubbish, trash and garbage within the Demised Premises.

Section 6.03. Landlord Interference. Landlord shall use its best efforts to not interfere with Tenant's operations. If Landlord creates a condition that substantially interferes with the normal use of the Demised Premises or appurtenant parking or service areas as allowed herein, the Rent and other charges due hereunder shall be abated during the time such interference persists, but such abatement shall not continue beyond the time at which such interference persists regardless of any delay by Tenant in resuming normal operations after that time. This Section 6.03 shall be subject to Section 16.09 hereof, and Landlord shall be excused to the extent that Landlord's compliance with this Section 6.03 is prevented by any of the causes specified in Section 16.09.

ARTICLE VII

UTILITY SERVICES

Tenant shall be responsible, at Tenant's expense, for obtaining utilities in the amounts, sizes and pressures as needed by Tenant in the operation of its business on the Demised Premises. Tenant shall pay for all utility usage by Tenant in the Demised Premises during the Demised Term.

ARTICLE VIII

INSURANCE, TAXES AND LIABILITY

Section 8.01. Insurance.

A. Liability Insurance. Tenant shall maintain comprehensive Commercial General Liability insurance on the Demised Premises and all buildings and improvements located thereon, with limits of at least \$1,000,000.00 for each occurrence, bodily injury and property damage combined, protecting Landlord and Tenant against loss, cost or expense by reason of injury to or death of persons or damage to or destruction of property by reason of the use and occupancy of the Demised Premises by Tenant and its invitees.

B. Fire Insurance – Improvements. Tenant shall maintain Special Form Insurance (previously known as "all-risk" fire and extended coverage insurance) on all improvements constructed by Tenant on the Demised Premises (excluding footings, foundations, paved areas and Tenant's Fixtures and Equipment) in amounts equal to one hundred percent (100%) of their full replacement cost, including Builder's Risk Insurance.

C. General Policy Requirements. The insurance provided by Tenant pursuant to this Section 8.01 shall (i) be carried with reputable companies licensed to do business in the State in which the Demised Premises is located, (ii) name Landlord as an additional insured and (iii) not be subject to change, cancellation or termination without at least ten (10) days' prior written notice to Landlord.

D. Blanket Policies. The insurance required to be carried pursuant to this Section 8.01 may be carried under policies of a blanket insurance that may cover other liabilities and locations; provide, however, in all other respects each of such policies shall comply with the provisions of this Section 8.01 without any diminution or dilution of coverage.

Section 8.02. Taxes.

A. Tenant's Obligation. Tenant shall pay all real estate, personal property and use taxes and assessments that accrue during the Demised Term on the Demised Premises, any

improvements thereon and any personal property therein (and all taxes and assessments that are imposed in lieu of the foregoing).

B. Payment of Taxes. Tenant agrees to pay all Real Estate Taxes prior to their due date, provided that statements for such taxes and copies of the actual tax bills are received by Tenant so as to permit timely payment. If the Demised Premises is separately assessed and local practice permits, Landlord shall cause the taxing authority to send the bill for the Real Estate Taxes on the Demised Premises to Tenant, and Tenant shall pay directly to the taxing authority the Real Estate Taxes on the Demised Premises. If the taxing authority requires that payment be made by Landlord, Tenant shall pay to Landlord the amount of Tenant's tax obligation prior to the date on which such taxes are due. If the tax statement for the Real Estate Taxes on the Demised Premises is sent to Landlord, Landlord shall forward the statement to Tenant promptly. Tenant shall not be liable for any penalties, surcharges or interest that may be incurred by Landlord or result from Landlord's failure to forward any tax bill to Tenant at least twenty (20) days before date due. Landlord or Tenant shall, within thirty (30) days after written request from the other, provide satisfactory evidence of such payment. Landlord and Tenant may take the benefit of any law allowing taxes or assessments to be paid in installment payment.

C. Landlord's Obligation. Nothing contained in this Section 8.02 shall be construed so as to require Tenant to pay or be liable for any gift, inheritance, estate, franchise, succession, transfer, income, profits, capital or similar tax, or any tax in lieu of any of the foregoing, imposed upon Landlord or the successors or assigns of Landlord.

D. Timing. Payment of taxes, assessments and the like as required hereunder shall be deemed to be timely if made within the period in which payment is permitted without penalty (whether or not interest accrues on the unpaid balance). Landlord or Tenant shall, within thirty (30) days after written request from the other provide satisfactory evidence of such payment. Landlord and Tenant may take the benefit of any law allowing taxes or assessments to be paid in installments.

E. Proration. Real Estate taxes and assessments for which tenant is responsible shall be prorated between Landlord and Tenant as of the end of the Demised Term. For the Lease Year or Fractional Lease Year in which the Demised Term ends, taxes shall be prorated on the basis of one hundred percent (100%) of the previous Lease Year's taxes. Upon final assessment of taxes for the year of termination, the tax proration will be adjusted to reflect the tax obligation of Tenant. If an assessment that is payable in periodic installments is levied on the Demised Premises, Tenant shall pay only those installments that are attributable to the Demised Term.

F. Right to Contest. Tenant may in good faith, by appropriate proceedings and at Tenant's expense, contest any taxes, assessments or similar items, provided that Tenant shall provide Landlord with security reasonably satisfactory to Landlord; or at Tenant's election, where such procedure is provided for by law, Tenant may pay such items under protest or make proper deposit in court. When any such contested items shall have been paid or canceled, any security so deposited to cover them shall be repaid to Tenant. Any documents required to enable Tenant to effect the foregoing shall be executed and delivered by Landlord on reasonable demand and in default thereof Tenant may execute the same as attorney-in-fact of Landlord.

Section 8.03. Mutual Waiver of Subrogation. Landlord and Tenant and their successors in interest hereby waive any legal rights each may later acquire against the other party during the Demised Term for the loss of or damage to their respective property or to property in which they may have an interest, which loss or damage is caused by an insured hazard arising out of or in connection with the Demised Premises.

Section 8.04. Indemnification of Landlord. Tenant covenants to defend and save the Landlord harmless from any and all claims, demands, caused of action, suits, judgments, damages, losses and expenses, including reasonable attorney's fees and costs of court, including, without limitation, loss or damage which may occur with respect to any person or persons, corporation, property or chattels on the Demised Premises, or to the property itself, resulting from Tenant's acts or omissions and the acts and omissions of others, except (i) when such loss results from a default by Landlord under this Lease or the willful conduct or negligent act or omission of

Landlord, its agents, employees, independent contractors or invites, or (ii) to the extent of any insurance proceeds received (or receivable) by Landlord or payable under Landlord's, insurance as a result of Landlord's contributory culpability. With respect to any loss from which Landlord claims Tenant is required to hold Landlord harmless, Landlord shall notify Tenant of (a) any acts or omissions causing such loss, such notification to be made within ten (10) days after Landlord becomes aware of the occurrence of such acts or omissions, and (b) any proceedings initiated in connection with such acts or omissions such acts or omissions, such notification to be made no later than ten (10) days after Landlord becomes aware of the initiation of such proceedings or twenty (20) days prior to the date by which any initial response must be made in such proceedings, whichever comes first. Tenant shall have the right to select and direct the attorneys handling such proceedings. Tenant's obligations under this Section 9.04 shall be released to the extent that Tenant is prejudiced by Landlord's failure to give timely notice.

Section 8.05. Liens. Tenant shall use its best efforts to prevent the creation of any lien against the Demised Premises on account of labor or material furnished in connection with any construction, maintenance, repairs or alterations each shall undertake. If any such lien is filed against the Demised Premises, Tenant shall cause such lien to be released within ninety (90) days after actual notice of the filing thereof or shall furnish to Landlord a bond or other security reasonably satisfactory to Landlord, conditioned to indemnify Landlord against the foreclosure of such lien. Tenant shall have the right, after notice to Landlord, to contest in good faith and with all due diligence any such lien and shall not be required to pay any claim secured by such lien; provided that (i) such lien would not impair the rights or be satisfied out of the interest of Landlord in the Demised Premises by reason of such delay and (ii) Tenant will at its expense defend Landlord and pay all costs reasonably incurred by Landlord relating to the contest if Landlord is joined in any suit pertaining thereto or if any lien is placed upon the other's interest in the Demised Premises.

ARTICLE IX

DEFAULT AND REMEDIES

Section 9.01. Rights of Tenant's Default. If Tenant fails to perform any of its obligations as required by this Lease, and if Tenant fails to cure such failure within the Applicable Grace Period (as defined in Section 9.03), Landlord, in addition to all other rights and remedies available to Landlord under applicable law, may, at Landlord's option, elect the following remedies:

- (i) Landlord shall have the right to take possession of the Demised Premises (without such action being deemed an acceptance of a surrender of this Lease or termination of Tenant's liability hereunder) and, upon taking possession, Landlord shall make reasonable efforts to relet the same on reasonable terms, with Tenant remaining liable to pay Rent, real estate taxes and other leasehold charges or obligations for the remainder of the Demised Term less the net amount realized from such reletting, if any; or
- (ii) Landlord shall have the right to terminate this Lease, thereby releasing Tenant from any further liabilities hereunder.

In the event that Tenant:

- (a) is adjudicated as bankrupt;
- (b) has a receiver in equity appointed for its property and the appointment of such trustee is not set aside within one hundred twenty (120) days;
- (c) has a trustee in reorganization appointed for its property and the appointment of such trustee is not set aside within one hundred twenty (120) days;
- (d) files a voluntary petition for reorganization or arrangement under any state or federal bankruptcy or insolvency laws; or
- (e) files a voluntary petition in bankruptcy or a petition to take advantage of any insolvency laws;

then, in any of such events, the Landlord may terminate this Lease and immediately take possession of the Demised Premises, using such force as may be necessary without being deemed guilty of trespass or forcible entry. The grace periods specified in subparts (b) and (c) above shall not apply unless all payments by Tenant under this Lease are current. Should the sum realized from any reletting hereunder be less than the Rent, Tenant shall pay such deficiency each month upon demand therefore. No act of Landlord shall be deemed an act terminating this Lease or declaring the Demised Term ended unless notice is served upon Tenant by Landlord expressly setting forth therein that Landlord elects to terminate this Lease or declare the term ended.

Section 9.02. Default by Landlord. If Landlord shall fail to perform any of its obligations as required by the Lease, and if Landlord shall fail to cure such failure within the Applicable Grace Period, then Tenant shall have its rights and remedies at law or in equity.

Section 9.03. Applicable Grace Period. Except as may be provided elsewhere in this Lease, the grace period for curing a party's failure to perform its obligations under this Lease (the "Applicable Grace Period") shall be one of the following time periods:

- (i) for failure to perform any covenant to pay money or for any breach that adversely affects the normal operation of Tenant's business at the Demised Premises ten business (10) days after the non-performing or breaching party's receipt of notice from the other party specifying such non-performance or breach; and
- (ii) for failure to perform any other obligation under this Lease, thirty (30) day period, institutes efforts to cure said non-performance and diligently prosecutes said efforts to completion.

Section 9.04. DEFICIENCY. Notwithstanding anything hereinabove to the contrary, in any case where Landlord has recovered possession of the Premises by reason of Tenant's default, Landlord may, at Landlord's option, occupy the Premises or cause the Premises to be

redecorated, altered, divided, consolidated with other adjoining premises, or otherwise changed or prepared for reletting, and may relet, the Premises or any part thereof as agent of tenant or otherwise, for a term or terms to expire prior to, at the same time as, or subsequent to, the original expiration date of this Lease, at Landlord's option and receive the rent therefore. Rent so received shall be applied first to the payment of such reasonable expenses a Landlord may have incurred in connection with the recovery of possession, redecorating, altering, dividing, consolidating with other adjoining premises, or otherwise changing or preparing for reletting, and the reletting, including brokerage and reasonable attorney's fees, and then to the payment of damages in amounts equal to the rent hereunder and to the costs and expenses of performance of the other covenants of Tenant as herein provided. Tenant agrees, in any such case, whether or not Landlord has relet, to pay to the Landlord damages equal to the base and additional rent and other sums herein agreed to be paid by Tenant, less the net proceeds of the reletting, if any, as ascertained from time to time, and the same shall be payable by Tenant on the several rent days above specified. Tenant shall not be entitled to any surplus accruing as a result of any such reletting. In reletting the Premises as aforesaid, Landlord may grant rent concessions, and Tenant shall not be credited therewith. No such reletting shall constitute a surrender and acceptance or be deemed evidence thereof. If Landlord elects, pursuant hereto, actually to occupy and use the Premises or any part thereof during any part thereof during any part of the balance of the term as originally fixed or since extended, there shall be allowed against Tenant's obligation for rent or damages as herein defined, during the period of Landlord's occupancy, the reasonable value of such occupancy, not to exceed in any event the basic and additional rent herein reserved and such occupancy shall not be construed as a release of Tenant's liability hereunder.

Landlord's remedies hereunder are in addition to any remedy allowed by law. Landlord reserves the right of re-entry in the event of any breach of Tenant of any provisions of the Lease.

Section 9.05. Additional Landlord's Remedies. If Tenant defaults in the payment of rent, or additional rent, or defaults in the performance of any of the other covenants or conditions

hereof, Landlord shall give Tenant notice of such default, and if Tenant does not cure any rent, or additional rent or other default within ten (10) days, after the giving of such notice (or if such other default is of such nature that it cannot be completely cured within such period, if Tenant does not commence such curing within such ten (10) days and thereafter proceed with reasonable diligence and in good faith to cure such default), then Landlord may terminate this Lease on not less than twenty (20) days notice to Tenant, and on the date specified in said notice, Tenant's

right to possession of the premises shall cease, and Tenant shall then quit and surrender the Premises to Landlord, but Tenant shall remain liable as hereinafter provided. Non-payment of rent as used herein includes non-payment of additional rent items. If this Lease shall have been so terminated by Landlord, Landlord may, at any time thereafter, resume possession of the Premises by any lawful means, including but not limited to summary dispossession actions and remove Tenant or other occupants and their effects.

ARTICLE X

DAMAGE TO DEMISED PREMISES

Section 10.01. Restoration of the Demised Premises. If the improvements on the Demised Premises are damaged or destroyed during the Demised Term, then, except as otherwise provided in Section 10.02 hereof, Tenant, at its sole cost and expense, shall repair, restore or rebuild the improvements constructed by Tenant on the Demised Premises to substantially the condition they were in immediately prior to such damage or destruction, repair, restoration or rebuilding shall be performed with due diligence in a good and workmanlike manner and in accordance with applicable law and plans and specifications for such work reasonably approved by Landlord and Tenant.

Section 10.02. Option Not to Restore. Notwithstanding Section 10.01 hereof, if during the last two years of the Original Term or during the last two (2) years of any of any Renewal Term the Demised Premises is damaged in an amount equal to fifty percent (50%) or more of the replacement cost of the improvements constructed by Tenant on the Demised Premises (exclusive of footings, foundations and paved areas), Tenant may terminate this Lease by giving Landlord

written notice of termination within sixty (60) days after the occurrence of such damage or destruction. Upon termination of this Lease by Tenant, any unearned rent or other charges paid in advance by Tenant shall be refunded to Tenant, Landlord shall be entitled to receive any and all property insurance proceeds paid with respect to any fire and extended coverage insurance required under Section 8.01(B) hereof and the parties shall be released hereunder, each to the other, from all liability and obligations thereafter arising.

Section 10.03 Property Insurance Proceeds. All proceeds of fire and extended coverage insurance collected as a result of any casualty to the improvements on the Demised Premises shall be held by the insurance carrier or, at Tenant's election exercised by notice to such insurance carrier and Landlord, by an independent escrow agent, as the case may be, in progress payments to Tenant for the purpose of reimbursing Tenant for its cost of restoring the Demised Premises. Notwithstanding the foregoing, any such proceeds in an amount less than Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00) shall be disbursed to Tenant for the purpose of making necessary repairs.

ARTICLE XI

EMINENT DOMAIN

Section 11.01. The Taking. If Landlord receives notice of the intention of any authority to appropriate, take or condemn any portion of the Demised Premises for public or quasi-public use under any right of eminent domain, condemnation or other law (collectively, a "Taking"), Landlord shall promptly notify Tenant thereof. In the event of such Taking or like proceeding, the parties shall represent their own interests and shall present and prosecute their own claims for damages insofar as possible. ~~If the parties are not permitted to proceed as separate parties, they~~ shall jointly select counsel to present and prosecute their claim, and all costs thereof shall be paid by the parties in proportion to the amount of the award, settlement or sale proceeds that each receives.

Section 11.02. Settlement. Any apportionment of the final award or settlement of damages entered into by Landlord and Tenant with the authority over a Taking shall be binding

upon the parties. If no such apportionment is made, then the parties shall agree on the value of their respective interests and distribution shall be made in accordance with such agreement. If the parties are unable to agree on the value of their respective interests, the parties agree to proceed forthwith to arbitrate the issue in accordance with the Commercial Arbitration Rules of the American Arbitration Association. The decision of the arbiter shall be binding unless within thirty (30) days after such decision is made either Landlord or Tenant files suit in a court of competent jurisdiction to litigate the value of the parties' interests. In such event the arbitration shall be of no force or effect and the cost of the arbitration, as well as the cost of the litigation (including reasonable attorney's fees), shall be paid by the non-prevailing party in the litigation.

Section 11.03. Tenant's Option. Tenant shall have the right to receive an award or settlement of damages as aforesaid and the option to terminate this Lease upon sixty (60) days notice to Landlord if such Taking or sale results in (i) a limitation of access to the Demised Premises preventing or materially affecting the operation of Tenant's business at the Demised Premises, unless Landlord provides alternate access that is reasonably acceptable to Tenant; (ii) the loss of all or a portion of the parking area of the Demised Premises, which loss prevents or substantially affects the operation of Tenant's business in the Demised Premises, unless Landlord provides substitute parking spaces that are located on land contiguous to the Demised Premises and reasonably acceptable to Tenant; or (iii) the remaining portion of the Demised Premises being in, Tenant's reasonable judgment, unusable by Tenant in the operation of its business.

Section 11.04. Allocation of Award. In any allocation of awards, Landlord shall be entitled to receipt of the fair market value of the Land and a proportionate amount of the fair market value of all improvements based upon the proportionality obtained by dividing the number of years remaining in the term of the Lease by the Lease Term. As for an example of the foregoing, say the fair market value of the improvements at the time of taking is \$1,000,000.00 and there are fifteen (15) year remaining in the thirty (30) year term. In that event, Landlord would be entitled to \$500,000.00 of the award respecting the Improvements in addition to the fair market value for the Land.

Section 11.05. Partial Taking. If any such Taking is less than described in Section 11.03 hereof or if Tenant elects not to terminate this Lease in accordance with Section 11.03 hereof, this Lease shall continue and Tenant shall proceed diligently to restore the Demised Premises. All proceeds from the award, settlement or sale (including any proceeds payable to the Landlord) shall first be applied to restoration of the Demised Premises and thereafter as described in Section 11.01. If, for any reason, such proceeds are not made available to Tenant for such restoration, Tenant shall have the right to terminate this Lease without further obligation.

Section 11.06. Temporary Taking. If a Taking shall be for a period of less than six (6) months, this Lease shall continue in full force and effect, the Rent and other charges shall not abate, and any award or settlement shall belong solely to Tenant.

Section 11.07. More than One Taking. If more than one Taking occurs during the Demised Term, the rights of the parties shall be determined as if all such Takings had all occurred at the time of the last Taking, and the effect of all such Takings shall be considered cumulatively.

ARTICLE XII

TITLE TO PREMISES

Landlord represents and warrants that Landlord has full right, power and lawful authority to execute, deliver and perform its obligations under this Lease, in the manner and upon the terms contained herein, and to grant the estate herein demised, with no other person needing to join in the execution hereof in order for this Lease to be binding on all parties having an interest in the Demised Premises; that the Demised Premises shall hereafter be subject to no leases, easements, covenants, restrictions or the like which in any manner would prevent or interfere with Tenant and defend the Demised Premises against the claim of all persons claiming by, through or under Landlord, and if Tenant shall discharge the obligations herein set forth to be performed by Tenant, Tenant shall, during the Demised Term, have lawful, quiet and peaceful possession and occupation of the Demised Premises and shall enjoy all the rights herein granted without any let, hindrance, ejection, molestation or interference by any person. The person(s) required to execute this Lease in order to bind Landlord. Landlord shall indemnify and hold Tenant harmless from and

against any and all claims, actions, demands, losses, costs, expenses, liabilities and judgments arising in connection with a material breach of any of Landlord's representation, warranties or covenants in this Lease. If Tenant is made a party to any litigation in connection with any such representation, warranty or covenant of Landlord, Landlord shall defend and hold Tenant harmless from all damages, losses, costs, expenses and reasonable attorneys' fees paid or incurred in connection therewith.

ARTICLE XIII

ASSIGNMENT AND SUBLETTING

A. Tenant covenants and agrees not to assign this Lease or to sublease the whole or any part of the Demised Premises or to permit any other persons to occupy same without the prior written consent of Landlord, references elsewhere herein to assignees or subleases notwithstanding. Tenant shall provide Landlord with notice of any such assignment, with a written assumption of the obligations of the Tenant hereunder by a permitted assignee. Tenant shall not be released from any further liability or obligation under this Lease. Landlord's consent to any assignment or subletting shall not constitute a waiver of the necessity for such consent to any subsequent assignment or subletting. The acceptance of rent from any other person shall not be deemed to be a waiver of any of the provisions of this Lease or to be a consent to the assignment of this Lease or subletting of the Demised Premises. Any transfer of ownership interest in Tenant by merger, consolidation, or sale of stock or transfer of a partnership or limited partnership or limited liability company membership interest shall constitute an assignment for the purpose of this Lease and shall require the prior written consent of the Landlord.

B. In the event of any assignment expressly approved by the Landlord, Tenant shall nevertheless remain liable for all of its obligations under the Lease.

C. In the event of the transfer and assignment by Landlord of its interest in this Lease and in the building containing the Demised Premises to a person or other entity expressly assuming Landlord's obligations under this Lease, Landlord shall thereby be released from any

subsequent responsibility hereunder and Tenant agrees to look solely to such successor-in-interest of Landlord for performance of such obligations.

D. Notwithstanding anything hereinabove to the contrary, and so long as Tenant is not in default hereunder, Tenant, on notice to the Landlord, shall have the right to assign this Lease to a Corporation or Limited Liability Company or similar entity in which Tenant is a principal, provided, however, Tenant shall remain liable for performance of the terms, provisions and obligations hereunder.

ARTICLE XIV.

MISCELLANEOUS

Section 14.01. Waivers. No waiver of any condition or covenant in this Lease by either party shall be deemed to imply or constitute a future waiver of the same or any other condition of this Lease.

Section 14.02. Notices. Unless otherwise provided in this Lease, all notices required under this Lease to Landlord or Tenant shall be in writing and shall be addressed to the addresses indicated in Section 3.02 of this Lease hereof or to any subsequent address which Landlord or Tenant may designate in writing delivered at least thirty (30) days in advance to the other party for such purpose. Invoices, bills and the like from Landlord to Tenant shall be sent to the attention of the Treasurer of Tenant and all other notices from Landlord to Tenant shall be sent to the attention of the Treasurer of Tenant and all other notices from Landlord to Tenant shall be sent to the attention of Tenant's General Counsel. All notices shall be deemed to be properly served if delivered to the appropriate address by hand delivery, registered or certified mail (with postage prepaid and return receipt requested), or courier, telegram, electronic transmission or similar methods of communication (provided that there is independent verification of delivery). Date of service of a notice served by mail shall be the date of posting; otherwise the date of refusal of receipt.

Section 14.03 Relationship of Parties. Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed by the parties hereto, nor by any third party, as creating the relationship of principal and

agent, partnership, joint venture, or any relationship between the parties hereto other than that of the landlord and tenant.

Section 14.04. Construction. Whenever a word appears herein in its singular form, such word shall include the plural; and the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders. This Lease shall be construed without reference to titles of Articles, Sections or Clauses, which titles are inserted for convenient reference only. References to specific Articles, Sections or Exhibits shall, unless otherwise expressly stated, refer to the Articles, Sections or Exhibits of this Lease. This Lease shall be construed without regard to any presumption or other rule permitting construction against the party causing this Lease to be drafted and shall not be construed more strictly in favor of or against either of the parties hereto.

Section 14.05. Certificate of Performance. At any time, either party shall, within twenty (20) days after receipt of a written request from the other, execute, acknowledge and deliver a statement in writing certifying whether this Lease is unmodified and in full force and effect (or if modified, whether the same is in full force and effect as so modified), whether any conditions to the full enforceability of this Lease remain unsatisfied, the dates to which rent, charges or other performances have been paid or completed, and such other facts, including the nature any claim of default on the part of the other, as either party may reasonably request.

Section 14.06. Governing Law. This Lease shall be construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of South Carolina in which the Demised Premises is located.

Section 14.07. Invalidity or Inapplicability of Clause. If any term or provision of this Lease or the application thereof to any person or circumstances shall, to any extent, be invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this Lease, or the application of such term or provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid or unenforceable, shall not be affected thereby, and each term and provision of this Lease shall be valid and enforceable to the fullest extent permitted by law.

Section 14.08. Excuse for Nonperformance. If either party hereto shall be delayed or prevented from the performance of any act required hereunder by reason of acts of God, strikes, lockouts, labor troubles, plan approval delay, inability to procure materials, restrictive governmental laws or regulations, adverse weather, unusual delay in transportation, delay by the other party hereto or other cause without fault and beyond the control of the party obligated to perform (financial inability excepted), then upon notice to the other party, the performance of such act shall be excused for the period of the delay and the period for the performance of such act shall be extended for a period equal to the period of such delay; provided, however, the party so delayed or prevented from performing shall exercise good faith efforts to remedy any such cause of delay or cause preventing performance, and nothing in this Section shall excuse Tenant from the prompt payment of any rental or other charges required of Tenant except as may be expressly provided elsewhere in this Lease.

Section 14.9. Successors or Assigns. Except as otherwise specified in this Lease, the provisions contained in this Lease shall run with the land and bind and inure to the benefit of Landlord and Tenant and their respective heirs, successors and assigns.

Section 14.10. Disputes. If at any time a dispute shall arise as to any amount or sum of money to be paid by one party to the other or any work to be performed by either of them under the provisions hereof, the party against whom the obligation to pay or to perform is asserted shall have the right to make payment or perform such work and pay the cost thereof "under protest," and such payment or performance shall not be regarded as a voluntary payment or performance and the right of said party to institute suit to recover the amount paid "under protest" or so much thereof as it was not legally required to pay under the provisions of this Lease, plus interest thereon at the Interest Rate specified in Section 16.13 hereof, from the date on which such payment was made until the date on which reimbursement is received.

Section 14.11. Attorney's Fees. If Landlord or Tenant brings an action at law or equity against the other in order to enforce the provision of this Lease or as a result of an alleged default

under this Lease, the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees from the other.

Section 14.12. Interest Rate. Except where a different rate of interest is expressly provided for elsewhere in this Lease, whenever any interest is payable by Tenant to Landlord or Landlord to Tenant under this Lease, such interest shall be paid at an annual rate (the "Interest Rate") equal to the lesser of (i) the prime interest rate plus two percent (2%), or (ii) the highest interest rate permitted by law.

Section 14.13. Entire Agreement Representations. This Lease embodies the entire agreement between Landlord and Tenant with respect to the subject matter hereof and supersedes all prior agreements and understandings, whether written or oral. Landlord and Tenant have neither made nor relied upon any promises, representations or warranties in connection with this Lease that are not expressly set forth in this Lease. In entering into this Lease, Landlord and Tenant have relied on the representation and warranties contained in this Lease.

Section 14.14. Modification. This Lease may not be modified except by a written agreement signed by the party against whom such modification is sought to be enforced.

Section 14.15. Broker Representations. Except as otherwise set forth herein, Landlord and Tenant represent and warrant that they have not dealt with any real estate agent or broker in connection with this transaction, and each agrees to indemnify and save the other harmless from and against all liability, damage, loss, cost and expense incurred by reason of the indemnitor's breach of said representation and warranty. Landlord does hereby agree to pay by separate agreement Carnevale Associates, LLC and Joe Griffith, Inc. Realtors, a commission in connection with this transaction and further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless Tenant from and against all liability, damage, loss, cost and expenses incurred by reason of Landlord's breach of said separate agreement.

Section 14.16. Name and Plans and Specifications. Landlord acknowledges that any plans, specifications and proprietary material provided by Tenant and Tenant's trademarks and service marks are the sole property of Tenant and Landlord shall have no rights thereto.

Section 14.17. Right of First Refusal. So long as Tenant is not in default under this Lease beyond any Applicable Grace Period, Landlord hereby grants to Tenant while they are under this Lease but not thereafter, a right of first refusal with respect to any sale by Landlord of all or a portion of the Demised Premises to other than an affiliated or related entity of Landlord. An affiliated or related entity shall include any members of Landlord's family or any family-controlled entities. Landlord shall give Tenant at least thirty (30) days' prior written notice of the proposed terms of any such sale, together with a copy of the proposed purchase and sale documents, and Tenant shall, if it elects to do so, exercise its first right of refusal by notifying Landlord in writing, within thirty (30) days of Tenant's receipt of such purchase and sale documents, of Tenant's election to exercise its right of first refusal. Tenant shall have the right to record notice of its right of first refusal with the RMC Office for Charleston County and Landlord will cooperate in executing any documents necessary to accomplish that.

Section 14.18. Hazardous Substances. "Hazardous Substance" is any petroleum product, asbestos product or any other material, substance or waste that is recognized as being hazardous or dangerous to health or the environment by any federal, state or local agency having environmental protection jurisdiction over the Demised Premises. Tenant agrees not to generate, store, handle or dispose of any Hazardous Substance in or upon the Demised Premises during the Demised Term of the Lease. In the event, however, that any substance used in Tenant's business shall, during the Demised Term, become designated as a Hazardous Substance, then Tenant shall discontinue the use of substance in or upon the Demised Premises. Tenant shall indemnify and hold Landlord harmless from and against any and all demands, claims, enforcement actions, costs and expenses, including reasonable attorneys fees, including the cost of all clean-up plans, if any, arising out of the breach of this Section 14.18 by Tenant, and/or the violation of any rules, regulations, statutes or ordinances promulgated by any federal,

state or local governing body or agency and relating to the environmental condition of the Demised Premises.

Tenant shall not (either with or without negligence) cause or permit the escape, disposal or release of any biologically or chemically active or other hazardous substances, or materials. Tenant shall not allow the storage or use of such substances or materials in any manner not sanctioned by law or by the highest standards prevailing in the industry for the storage and use of such substances or materials, nor allow to be brought into the Premises any such materials or substances except to use in the ordinary course of Tenant's business. Without limitation, hazardous substances and materials shall include those described in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, 42 U.S.C. Section 9601 et seq., the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. Section 9601 et seq., any applicable state or local laws and the regulations adopted under these Acts. If any lender or governmental agency shall ever reasonably require testing to ascertain whether or not there has been release of hazardous materials, then the reasonable costs thereof shall be reimbursed by Tenant to Landlord upon demand as additional charges if such requirement applies to the Premises, provided that any such required testing is in connection with a spill, discharge or release by the Tenant or its agents, employees, invitees and licensees. In addition, Tenant shall execute affidavits, representations and the like from time to time at Landlord's request concerning Tenant's best knowledge and belief regarding the presence of hazardous substances or materials on the Premises. In all events, Tenant shall indemnify Landlord in the manner elsewhere provided in this Lease from any release of hazardous materials on the Premises occurring while Tenant is in possession or elsewhere if caused by Tenant or other persons acting under Tenant. The within covenants shall survive the expiration or earlier termination of the Lease term.

Section 14.19. Date of Lease. All references to the "date of this Lease,," The "date hereof," the "date upon which this Lease is fully executed" and the like shall be deemed to be the last date on which this lease shall be executed by Landlord and by Tenant.


ARTICLE XV

SECURITY DEPOSIT


Tenant, concurrently with the execution of this Lease has deposited with Landlord the sum of \$1800.00 the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, which sum shall be retained by Landlord as a security deposit. The security deposit shall be held by Landlord without liability for interest and as security for the performance by Tenant of Tenant's covenants and obligations under this Lease, it being expressly understood that such deposit shall not be considered an advance payment of Rent, Additional Rent or a measure of Landlord's damage in case of default by Tenant.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have set forth their ands and seals on the 5th day of June, 2003.

EXECUTED by Landlord:




LANDLORD: 56 Leinbach Investors LLC

By: 



TENANT: Magnolia Paradigm, Inc.


By: 

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

Before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said County and State, on this date personally appeared TOMMY B. BAKER, to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn, did say that he is the Tenant under the foregoing Lease and that the foregoing instrument was signed by him as his free act and deed.

Given under my hand and seal of this office 30 day of May, 2003.





JOSEPH J. WICK

Notary Public of South Carolina

My Commission expires: 1-30-2005

SHB 6-23-10
EXHIBIT
DEFENDANT'S


10-11-11
EXHIBIT
PLAINTIFF'S



STATION	CHORD	ARCS	CHORD	CHORD	CHORD	CHORD
1	10.11	10.11	10.11	10.11	10.11	10.11
2	10.11	10.11	10.11	10.11	10.11	10.11
3	10.11	10.11	10.11	10.11	10.11	10.11

- LEGEND**
- RF - REBAR FOUND
 - CP - CORNER POINT
 - TM - TEMPORARY BENCHMARK
 - X 2.7 - 3.0' ELEVATION (GROUND)
 - X 2.7 - 3.0' ELEVATION (PAVEMENT, CONCRETE)
 - - CONTOUR LINE
 - - AIR CONDENSER
 - CP - CORRODED PLASTIC PIPE
 - DI - DROP PAINT

- NOTES**
- 1) THE PROPERTY IS OWNED BY LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC.
 - 2) THIS JOB 349-01-00-105.
 - 3) REFERENCE PLAT BY JOHN S. LESTER DATED 6/9/91 AND RECORDED IN THE CHARLESTON COUNTY AND OFFICE IN PLAT BOOK 6A PAGE 48.
 - 4) THE TOTAL AREA = 3.216 ACRES (50,857 SQ. FT.)
 - 5) THIS SURVEY DOES NOT REFLECT THE EXISTENCE OR NONEXISTENCE OF U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS' JURISDICTIONAL WETLANDS.
 - 6) ACCORDING TO FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP 455412 0000 D DATED NOVEMBER 5, 1996, THIS PROPERTY LIES IN ZONE C AND ZONE AS WITH A 1% FLOOD ELEVATION OF 11' MVD09.
 - 7) UTILITIES ARE NOT SHOWN ON THIS SURVEY.
 - 8) THE VERTICAL DATUM IS MVD09 (NATIONAL GEODESIC VERTICAL DATUM 1929).
 - 9) THE PROPERTY IS ZONED CENTRAL BUSINESS. HEIGHT DISTRICT 3C.



BAKER
MOTORS
EMPLOYEE
PARKING LOT

FORBES ENGINEERING
AND SURVEYING, INC.
1007 S. WILSON STREET
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405
TEL: 771-1111 FAX: 771-1111



CHARLESTON, CHARLOTTE

LS3P ASSOCIATES LTD.
21 NORTH WILSON STREET SUITE 300
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405
TEL: 771-1111 FAX: 771-1111
HTTP://WWW.LS3P.COM




OWNER OF THE HEREIN PROPERTY, F. HEDGECOCK
COPYRIGHT 2000. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.
PRINTED ON ELECTRONIC COPIES AND
REPRODUCTION MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED
IN ANY FORM WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION
FROM LS3P ASSOCIATES LTD.

REVISIONS:

PROJECT: 1103-0703342
DATE: 01/31/03
DRAWN BY: LMK
CHECKED BY: CHL

TOPOGRAPHIC
SURVEY
C101

SOLUTIONS THROUGH LISTENING SERVICE BY ORS-24



CORPORATE QUARTERS EXECUTIVE PARK

TMS 349-01-00-044
& TMS 349-01-00-0BZ THRU 09B
ZONED GA

BRILLIANT ESTES ASSOCIATES
PARCEL H-1
TMS 349-01-00-045
ZONED CB

LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC
TMS 349-01-00-046
ZONED CB

SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION

- SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION**
1. PLACE SILT FENCING AND TREE PROTECTION AND INSTALL CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE. CALL BRENDA MITRELL (CITY OF CHARLESTON 724-3782) AND ERIC SCHULTZ (724-3790) FOR INSPECTION AND APPROVAL.
 2. STRIP GRASS AND TOP SOIL.
 3. PREPARE SUBGRADE.
 4. PLACE GRAVEL BASE AND ASPHALT PAWING.
 5. INSTALL LANDSCAPING AND VEGETATIVE STABILIZATION.
 6. REMOVE TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL AFTER STABILIZATION.

CURVE	LENGTH	PIEDM	TANGENT	CHORD	CH. ANG.	CE. RA.
C1	124.49	50.00	191.08	94.74	52°12'33"Y	170°12'33"
C2	120.02	175.00	65.68	172.23	10°11'09"W	179°11'09"

LEGEND-EXOSING

RBF - REBAR FOUND
 CP - COMPUTED POINT
 TM - TEMPORARY DIMENSION
 X 6.7 - SPOT ELEVATION (GROUND)
 X 8.79 - SPOT ELEVATION (PAVEMENT, CONCRETE)
 ---S--- - CONTOUR LINE
 1/2 - AIR CONDITIONER
 CPP - CORRUGATED PLASTIC PIPE
 D3 - DROP VILET

LEGEND-MEW

 - FINISHED GRADE SPOT ELEVATION
 - FINISHED GRADE CONTOUR
 - DRAINAGE FLOW ARROW
 - SPLIT FENCE

DETAIL/SECTION INDICATOR

DETAIL/SECTION NUMBER

SHEET ON WHICH DETAIL/SECTION IS DEPICTED

NOTES

- 1.) THE PROPERTY IS OWNED BY LEMMON INVESTORS LLC
- 2.) THIS INFO 31-01-81-00-105.
- 3.) REFERENCE MADE BY JOHN S. LESTER DATED 6/8/78 AND
RECORDED IN THE CHARLOTTE COUNTY REC OFFICE IN
BOOK PAGE 100-105
- 4.) THE TOTAL AREA = 1.214 ACRES (25,537 SQ. FT.)
- 5.) THIS SURVEY DOES NOT REFLECT THE EXISTENCE OR
NONEXISTENCE OF U.S. ARMY CODES OF ENGINEERS' ARCHITECTURAL
TECHNICALS.
- 6.) ACCORDING TO FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP 455412 0010 D
DATED NOVEMBER 3, 1986, THIS PROPERTY LIES IN ZONE C
WHICH IS A BASE FLOOD EXTENSION OF 1% RISK
ANNUAL FLOOD.
- 7.) UTILITIES ARE NOT SHOWN ON THIS SURVEY.
- 8.) THE VERTICAL DATUM IS MGD-000 (NATIONAL CELESTIAL VERTICAL
DATUM 1929).
- 9.) THE PROPERTY IS ZONED GENERAL BUSINESS. 10001
DISTRICT 32.

EROSION CONTROL NOTES

- 17 ALL LANDS CONTROLLED HEREIN SHALL BE IN PLACE PRIOR TO 15 JANUARY OF CONSTRUCTION.
- 18 CONTRACTOR SHALL RETAIN ALL BULK OILS ON SITE ON ALL REMEDIATION RELATED ISSUES TO PROVIDE US WITH DRAINAGE CONNECTION.
- 19 EARTH REMEDIATION SHALL BE COMPLETED WITH THE LEVEL OF PROTECTION REQUIRED FOR REMEDIATION OF THE SITE.
- 20 CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE ALL NECESSARY CONSTRUCTION SERVICES AT LEAST ONE MONTH BEFORE EXISTING GATES AND AFTER THAT TIME EXISTENCE GATES SHALL BE CLOSED OF CONSTRUCTION.
- 21 CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES AS FEASIBLE IN ALL PORTIONS OF THE SITE WHERE CONSTRUCTION INCURRIES LESS THAN ANNUALLY OR QUARTERLY, BUT IN NO CASE MORE THAN FOURTEEN DAYS AFTER CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES HAVE COMPLETED.
- 22 SITE PROPOSED SHALL BE MAINTAINED AND/OR REPLACED AS IT EXISTS WITH PERMANENT BARRIERS AND IN PLACE.
- 23 THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT SHOW AS SECOND OR UNLOCATED SHALL BE SECOND PER SURVEY INFORMATION.

NOTE

THE DISTANCE VISIBILITY AT ALL ENDS AND/OR DIRECTIONS WILL BE MAINTAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SCHOOL'S ACCESS AND EGRESS MINIMUM DISTANCE STANDARDS MANUAL. ALL TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES WILL BE TO STANDARDS IN EFFECT ON LAYDOWN STREET CONTROL DEVICES.

BAKER
MOTORS
EMPLOYEE
PARKING LOT

**FORSBERG ENGINEERING
AND SURVEYING, INC.**
1547 SAVANNAH INDUSTRIAL BLVD.
P.O. BOX 5027
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405
(312) 311-2621 FAX (843) 351-1748
DUPLICATE (1) AND MAIL TO THE
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS



CHARLESTON • CHA-LOTTE

LS3P ASSOCIATES LTD.
21 NORTH MARKET STREET SUITE 300
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29401
TEL 843.377.4111 FAX 843.224.4789
HTTP://WWW.LS3P.COM

215



OWNERS OF THE AMERICAN WEAPONS OF INTERESTS
COPYRIGHT 2000 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
PRINTED ON ELECTRONIC PAPER AND
DOCUMENTATION MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED
OR ANY FORM WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION
FROM LSP ASSOCIATES, LTD.

- REYNOLDS

PROJECT: 1103-0701202
DATE: 04/21/03
DRAWN BY: LNF
CHECKED BY: CML

GRADING
PLAN


C102

2907
SOLUTIONS THROUGH LISTENING

SERVICE BY DESIGN

LS3 ASSOCIATES LTD.
28 NORTH MARKET STREET SUITE 200
CHARLESTON SOUTH CAROLINA 29101
TEL 803.722.6448 FAX 803.722.6700
[HTTP://WWW.LS3.COM](http://www.ls3.com)

915



QUAN	IDENTY	BOOKING/EDITION	BOOK#	SPACING	CONE	CA/SPACING	NOTES
East 95							
TRICE							
10	CEPC	Circle rearside Easton 10000	10-12'	6-8"	140	2 1/2"	Not-banded
8	LBP	Lepidomyia bicolor "Palmco" "Palmco" Oxytropis	12'	3'	15 Col		Wald-blues
14	OLCS	Overcup Shumoff Shumoff Oak	15-18'	6-1'	240	2 1/2"	Stem trees
SHADE							
40	LEV	Lee rearside Tadpole hole	3-4'	15"	8 Col	5' s.e.	Full shrub
80	UCJ	Ulexion Juncus Juncus 10000	3-4'	12"	7 Col	5' s.e.	Full shrub

MODERN & THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS
COPYRIGHT 1960 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
PRINTED BY ELECTRONIC DRAWINGS AND
DOCUMENTATION INC. NOT TO BE REPRODUCED
IN ANY FORM WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION
FROM L&P ASSOCIATES LTD.

REVISITING WFO. E. 333?

PROJECT: E3-3215-02
DATE: 3/23/03
DRAWN BY: JIC
CHECKED BY: JIC

LANDSCAPE
PLAN.

L201

294

SOLUTIONS THROUGH LISTENING

SERVICE MY DESIGN

PCS SITE AGREEMENT

Site Name West Ashley

January 2006

Site ID SC-1006

1. Premises and Use. Owner leases and demises to Optima Towers, LLC (OT), a South Carolina Corporation, the site described below: [Check appropriate box (es)]

☒ Land consisting of approximately 5,000 square feet upon which OT will construct its equipment base station and antenna structure;

☐ Building interior space consisting of approximately _____ square feet;

☐ Building exterior space for attachment of antennas;

☐ Building exterior space for placement of base station equipment;

☐ Tower antenna space between the _____ foot and _____ foot level on the Tower.

☐ Space required for cable runs to connect PCS equipment and antennas, in location(s) ("Site") shown on Exhibit A, together with a non-exclusive easement for reasonable access thereto and to the appropriate, in the discretion of OT, source of electric and telephone facilities. The Site will be used by OT for the purpose of installing, removing, replacing, modifying, maintaining and operating, at its expense, a personal communications service system facility ("PCS"), including, without limitation, antenna equipment, cable wiring, related fixtures and if applicable to the Site, and antenna structure. OT will use the Site in a manner which will not unreasonably disturb the occupancy of the Owner's other tenants. OT will have access to the Site 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

2. Term. The term of this Agreement (the "Initial Term") is 5 years commencing on the date ("Commencement Date") both OT and Owner have executed this Agreement. This Agreement will be automatically renewed for four additional terms (each a "Renewal Term") of 5 years each, unless OT provides Owner notice of intention not to renew not less than 90 days prior to the expiration of the Initial Term or any Renewal Term.

3. Rent. Until the first day of the month following the commencement of the physical preparation of the Site, the rent will be a one-time aggregate payment of \$ 100.00, the receipt of which Owner acknowledges. Thereafter, rent will be paid in equal annual installments of \$9,600.00 (paid monthly) (until increased as set forth herein), partial months to be prorated, in advance. Rent for each year will be the annual rent in effect for the previous year of the initial year or prior year, as the case may be, increased by three and one-half (3.5) percent (%) annually.

4. Title and Quiet Possession. Owner represents and agrees (a) that it is the Owner of the Site; (b) that it has the right to enter into this Agreement; (c) that the person signing this Agreement has the authority to sign; (d) that OT its successors, affiliates, and related parties and its authorized contractors are entitled to access to the Site at all times and to the quiet possession of the Site throughout the Initial Term and each Renewal Term so long as OT is not in default beyond the

expiration of any cure period; and (e) that Owner shall not have unsupervised access to the Site or to the PCS equipment.

5. Assignment/Subletting. Tenant shall have the right to sublease or assign its rights under this Agreement without notice or consent of Owner.

6. Notices. All notices must be in writing and are effective only when deposited in the U.S. mail, certified and postage prepaid, or when sent via overnight delivery. Notices to OT are to be sent to:

Optima Towers, LLC
845 Lowcountry Blvd
Mt Pleasant, SC 29464
Attn: Property Manager

Notices to Owner must be sent to the address shown underneath Owner's signature.

7. Improvements. OT may, at its expense, make such improvements on the Site, as it deems necessary from time to time for the operation of the PCS system. Owner agrees to cooperate with OT with respect to obtaining any required zoning approvals for the Site and such improvements. Upon termination or expiration of this Agreement, OT may remove its equipment and improvements and will restore the Site to substantially the condition existing on the Commencement Date, except for ordinary wear and tear and casualty loss.


8. Compliance with Laws. Owner does not warrant or guarantee Owner's property, and all improvements located thereon, are in compliance with building, life/safety, disability and other laws, codes and regulations of applicable governmental authorities. OT will comply with all applicable laws relating to its possession and use of the Site.

9. Interference. OT will resolve technical interference problems with other equipment located at the Site on Commencement Date or any equipment that becomes attached to the Site at any future date when OT desires to add additional equipment to the Site. Likewise, Owner will not permit or suffer the installation of any future equipment, which (a) results in technical interference problems with OT then existing equipment or (b) encroaches onto the Site.

10. Utilities. OT will pay for all utilities used by it at the Site. Owner will cooperate with OT in OT's efforts to obtain utilities from any location provided by Owner or the servicing utility, including signing any easement or other instrument reasonably required by the utility company.

11. Termination. OT may terminate this Agreement at any time by notice to Owner without further liability if OT does not obtain all permits or other approvals (collectively

Initial(s) CK



PCS SITE AGREEMENT

Site Name West Ashley

January 2000

Site ID SC-1026

"approval") required from any governmental authority or any easements required from any third party to operate the PCS system, or if any such approval is cancelled, expires or is withdrawn or terminated, or if Owner fails to have proper ownership of the Site or authority to enter into this Agreement, or if OT, for any reason, in its sole discretion, determines that it will be unable to use the Site. Upon termination, all prepaid rent will be retained by Owner unless such termination is due to Owner's failure of proper ownership or authority, or such termination is a result of Owner's default.

12. **Default.** If either party is in default under this Agreement for a period of (a) 10 days following receipt of notice from the non-defaulting party with respect to a default which may be cured solely by the payment of money, or (b) 30 days following the receipt of notice from the non-defaulting party with respect to a default which may not be cured solely by the payment of money, then, in either event, the non-defaulting party may pursue any remedies available to it against the defaulting party under applicable law, including, but not limited to, the right to terminate this Agreement. If the non-monetary default may not reasonably be cured within a 30-day period, this Agreement may not be terminated if the defaulting party commences action to cure the default with such 30-day period and proceeds with due diligence to fully cure the default.

13. **Indemnity.** Owner and OT each indemnifies the other against and holds the other harmless from any and all costs (including reasonable attorneys' fees) and claims of liability or loss which arise out of the ownership, use and/or occupancy of the Site by the indemnifying party. This indemnity does not apply to any claims arising from the sole negligence or intentional misconduct of the indemnified party. The indemnity obligations under this Paragraph will survive termination of this Agreement.

14. **Hazardous Substances.** Owner represents that it has no knowledge of any substance, chemical waste (collectively "substance") on the Site that is identified as hazardous, toxic or dangerous in any applicable federal, state or local law or regulation. OT will not introduce or use any such substance on the Site in violation of any applicable law.

15. **Subordination and Non-Disturbance.** This Agreement is subordinate to any mortgage or deed of trust now of record against the Site. However, promptly after Agreement is fully executed, Owner will use diligent efforts to obtain a non-disturbance agreement reasonably acceptable to OT from the holder of any such mortgage or deed of trust.

16. **Taxes.** OT will be responsible for payment of all personal property taxes assessed directly upon and arising solely from its use of the communications facility on the Site. OT will pay to Owner any increase in real property taxes attributable solely to any improvements to the Site made by

OT within 60 days after receipt of satisfactory documentation indicating calculation of OT's share of such real estate taxes and payment of the real estate taxes by Owner. Owner will pay when due all other real estate taxes and assessments attributable to the property of the Owner of which the Site is a part.

17. **Insurance.** OT will produce and maintain commercial liability insurance, with limits of not less than \$1,000,000 combined single limit per occurrence for bodily injury and property damage liability, with a certificate of insurance to be furnished to Owner within 30 days of written request. Such policy will provide that cancellation will not occur without at least 15 days prior written notice to Owner. Each party hereby waives its right of recovery against the other for any loss or damage covered by any insurance policies maintained by the waiving party. Each party will cause each insurance policy obtained by it to provide that the insurance company waives all rights of recovery against the other party in connection with any damage covered by such policy.

18. **Maintenance.** OT will be responsible for repairing and maintaining the PCS system and any other improvements installed by OT at the Site in a proper operating and reasonably safe condition; provided, however if any such repair or maintenance is required due to the acts of Owner, its agents or employees, Owner shall reimburse OT for the reasonable costs incurred by OT to restore the damaged areas to the condition which existed immediately prior thereto. Owner will maintain and repair all other portions of the property of which the Site is a part in a proper operating and reasonably safe condition.

19. **FAA Compliance.** OT accepts sole responsibility for the Site's compliance with all tower or building marking and lighting regulations promulgated by the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") or the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"), as applicable. OT represents and warrants that the Site complies with all applicable tower or building marking or lighting regulations promulgated by the FAA or the FCC.

Owner agrees that OT may install, at OT's sole cost and expense and as required for OT's PCS, a (i) backup generator to provide backup AC power in the event of an AC power outage at the Site, and/or (ii) tower lighting alarm monitoring system (including, but not limited to, commercial power and a dedicated surveillance telephone line) to monitor the status of the tower/building lighting.

20. **Waiver of Owner's Lien.** (a) Owner waives any lien rights it may have concerning OT's PCS which are deemed OT's personal property and not fixtures, and OT has the right to remove the same at any time without Owner's consent. (b) Owner acknowledges that OT has entered into a financing arrangement and may enter into additional financing

Initial(s) Carl OT

PCS SITE AGREEMENT

Version 1.0.0

Site Name West Ashley

January 2000

Site ID: SC-1006

arrangements in the future including promissory notes and a financial and security agreement ("Financing Agreement") for the financing of OT's PCS ("Collateral") with a third party or parties (the "Financing Entity"). In connection therewith, Owner (i) consents to the installation of the Collateral; (ii) agrees that the Collateral shall be exempt from execution, foreclosure, sale, levy, attachment, or distress for any rent due or to become due and that such Collateral may be removed at any time without recourse to legal processing.

21. Miscellaneous. (a) This Agreement applies to and binds the heirs, successors, executors, administrators and assigns of the parties to this Agreement; (b) this Agreement is governed by the laws of the state in which the Site is located; (c) If requested by OT, Owner agrees promptly to execute and deliver to OT a recordable Memorandum of this Agreement in the form of Exhibit B; (d) this Agreement (including the Exhibits) constitutes the entire agreement between the parties and supercedes all prior written and verbal agreements, representations, promises or understandings between parties. Any amendments to this Agreement must be in writing and executed by both parties; (e) if any provision of this Agreement is invalid or unenforceable with respect to any party, the remainder of this Agreement or the application of such provision to persons other than those as to whom it is held invalid or unenforceable, will not be affected and each provision of this Agreement will be valid and enforceable to the fullest extent permitted by law; and (f) the prevailing party in any action or proceeding in court or mutually agreed upon arbitration proceeding to enforce the terms of this Agreement is entitled to receive its reasonable attorneys' fees and other reasonable enforcement costs and expenses from the non-prevailing party.

22. Non-Binding until Fully Executed. This Agreement is for discussion purposes only and does not constitute a formal offer by either party. This Agreement is not and shall not be binding on either party until and unless it is fully executed by both parties.

23. Right of First Refusal. If, during the term of the Agreement, Owner receives and desires to accept an offer to purchase, exchange, assign, transfer, convey or otherwise alienate all or any portion of the Site, then Owner shall provide OT written notice of such offer, which notice shall include a complete and legible copy of such offer ("Owner's Notice"). OT shall have a right of first refusal to purchase, at its election and on the terms and conditions as in Owner's Notice, the Site (or such lesser portion thereof as is described in Owner's Notice), all on the same terms and conditions as in the offer accompanying Owner's Notice. If OT does not exercise its right of first refusal by written notice to Landlord given within ninety (90) days after receipt of Owner's Notice, Owner may sell the property described in the Owner's Notice to such third person in accordance with the terms and conditions of the offer. If OT fails or declines to exercise its

right of first refusal, then this Agreement shall continue in full force and effect and Tenant's right of first refusal shall survive any such sale and conveyance and shall remain effective with respect to any subsequent offers to purchase the Site.

The following Exhibits are attached to and made a part of this Agreement: Exhibits A, B and _____

OWNER: 56 Lienbach Investors, LLC

By: [Signature]

Printed Name: Clyde Hiers

Its: MEMBER

S.S./Tax No.: 57-1089398

Address: 1634 Ashley River Road

Charleston, SC 29407-5902

WITNESS: [Signature]

(Signature Witness #1)

(Signature Witness #2)

Date: 2/23/06

Optima Towers, LLC., a South Carolina Limited Liability Company

By: [Signature]

Printed Name: Johnny Crawford

Its: Member

Address: 845 Lowcountry Blvd., Suite J

Mount Pleasant, SC 29464

WITNESS: [Signature]

(Signature Witness #1)

(Signature Witness #2)

Date: 2/23/06

Attach Exhibit A - Site Description

Exhibit B - Memorandum of Lease

Initial(s) CH JC

Acknowledgement by Owner
(Corporation, Partnership or L.L.C.)

STATE OF South Carolina
COUNTY OF Charleston

Janene K. Schmidt, a notary public, do hereby certify that: Clyde Hiers
(Name of Official) (Name)
As the Managing Member of the above signed 50 Lienback Investors LLC
(Title) (Name of Entity)
personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the due execution of the foregoing instrument on behalf of said entity.

Witness my hand and official seal this 23rd day of February 2006

(SEAL)

[Signature]
(OFFICIAL NOTARY SIGNATURE)
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF South Carolina

My commission expires: Aug 12, 2008
Janene K. Schmidt
(PRINTED, TYPED OR STAMPED NAME OF NOTARY)
COMMISSION NUMBER: _____

Acknowledgement by Optima Towers, LLC.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

I, Jason P. Shanker, a notary public, do hereby certify that Johnny R. Crawford as Member of Optima Towers, LLC. personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the due execution of the foregoing instrument on behalf of Optima Towers, LLC.

Witness my hand and official seal this 23rd day of February, 2016.

(SEAL)

Jason P. Shanker
(OFFICIAL NOTARY SIGNATURE)
NOTARY PUBLIC—STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

My commission expires: 9-29-13

Jason P. Shanker
(PRINTED, TYPED OR STAMPED NAME OF NOTARY)
COMMISSION NUMBER: _____

EXHIBIT A
Site Description

Site situated in City of Charleston, County of Charleston, State of South Carolina commonly described as follows:

Legal Description:

A 5,000 square foot leased parcel, with easements for access and utilities, located in City of Charleston, County of Charleston, State of South Carolina, as a portion of parcel more commonly known as parcel #349-01-00-105 and more specifically described in deed book E333-page 031 in the Charleston County, South Carolina, RMC office. Owner expressly acknowledges and agrees that, if and when a survey of the Site and access right-of-way thereto is obtained by Optima Towers, LLC, this Exhibit A will be replaced with a substitute Exhibit A containing such legal description, and Owner will, at the request of Optima Towers, LLC and without delay, initial such substitute Exhibit A.


Sketch of Site:

See attached sketch on following page

Note: Optima Towers, LLC may, at Optima Towers, LLC option, replace this Exhibit with an exhibit setting forth the legal description of the property on which the Site is located and/or an as-built drawing depicting the Site.

Initial(s) CS me

Site Sketch

Initial(s) CB, JPL

PCS Site Agreement

January 2004

Site ID: SC-1006

Version 1.2 - OT

Site Name West Ashley

EXHIBIT B

Initial(s) ent 1/2/04

State of South Carolina
County of Charleston

Memorandum of Lease

This memorandum evidences that a lease was made and entered into by written PCS Site Agreement dated _____, 20____, between 56 Lienbach Investors, LLC ("Owner") and Optima Towers, LLC, (OT). Therefore, Owner leases and demises to OT the Site described in Exhibit A attached hereto in accordance with the terms of the aforesaid Agreement.

Such an Agreement provides in part that 56 Lienbach Investors, LLC, Owner, lease and demises to OT a certain ("Site") located at land lying between US Highway 17, Markfield Drive, and Lienbach Drive, City of Charleston, County of Charleston, State of South Carolina, within the property of Owner which is described in Exhibit A attached hereto, with grant of easement for unrestricted rights of access thereto and to electric and telephone facilities for a term of five (5) years commencing on this _____ day of _____, 20____, which term is subject to four (4) additional five (5) year extension periods..

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Memorandum under seal as of the day and year first above written.

OWNER: 56 Lienbach Investors, LLC

By: [Signature]

Printed Name: Clyde Hiers

Its: Member

S.S./Tax No.: 57-1089398

Address: 1634 Ashley River Road

Charleston, SC 29407-5902

WITNESS:

[Signature]
(Signature Witness #1)

[Signature]
(Signature Witness #2)

Date: 2/23/06

Optima Towers, LLC, a South Carolina LLC

By: [Signature]

Printed Name: Johnny Crawford

Its: Member

Address: 845 Low County Boulevard

Suite J

Mount Pleasant, SC 29464

WITNESS:

[Signature]
(Signature Witness #1)

[Signature]
(Signature Witness #2)

Date: 2/23/06

Attach Exhibit A to Memorandum of Lease

Acknowledgement by Owner
(Corporation, Partnership or L.L.C.)

STATE OF South Carolina
COUNTY OF Charleston

I Janene K. Schmidt a notary public, do hereby certify that Clyde Hiers
(Name of Official) (Name)
As the Member of the above signed 5k Lieblich Investments LLC
(Title) (Name of Entity)
personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the due execution of the foregoing instrument on behalf of said entity.

Witness my hand and official seal this 23rd day of February, 2006
(SEAL) [Signature]
(OFFICIAL NOTARY SIGNATURE)
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF South Carolina

My commission expires: Aug 12, 2006
Janene K. Schmidt
(PRINTED, TYPED OR STAMPED NAME OF NOTARY)
COMMISSION NUMBER: _____

Acknowledgement by Optima Towers, LLC.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

I JASON P. SPRINKS, a notary public, do hereby certify that Johnny R. Crawford as Member of Optima Towers, LLC. personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the due execution of the foregoing instrument on behalf of Optima Towers, LLC.

Witness my hand and official seal this 23rd day of FEBRUARY, 2006.

(SEAL)

J. P. Sprinks
(OFFICIAL NOTARY SIGNATURE)
NOTARY PUBLIC—STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

My commission expires: 9-29-13

JASON P. SPRINKS
(PRINTED, TYPED OR STAMPED NAME OF NOTARY)
COMMISSION NUMBER: _____




NOTES:

1. THIS PLAN HAS BEEN PREPARED WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF A REPORT OF TITLE.
2. THIS PLAN DOES NOT REPRESENT A TITLE SURVEY.
3. THE BASIS OF THE MERIDIANS AND COORDINATES FOR THIS PLAN IS THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE PLANE COORDINATE SYSTEM, NORTH AMERICAN DATUM 1983 (SCSPCS NAD 83), BASED ON DIFFERENTIAL GPS OBSERVATIONS PERFORMED ON MARCH 15, 2008.
4. VERTICAL INFORMATION SHOWN, BASED ON THE NORTH AMERICAN VERTICAL DATUM OF NAVD 1988 IN FEET.
5. ALL DISTANCES ARE GROUND UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
6. THIS PROPERTY IS NOT LOCATED IN A FLOOD HAZARD AREA. THE PROPOSED LOCATION OF THE TOWER IS LOCATED IN FLOOD ZONE "X". OUTSIDE THE 500-YEAR FLOOD PLAIN (FEMA/FIRM COMMUNITY NUMBER 45019C, PANEL NUMBER 04924, DATED NOVEMBER 17, 2004).

INDEX OF SHEETS			
NO.	SHEET TITLE	REV	DATE
C-1	SITE PLAN	0	03-29-08
C-2	TOWER ELEVATION	0	03-29-08
C-3	COMPOUND DETAIL	0	03-29-08

LEGEND	
	EXIST. PROPERTY LINE
	EXIST. UTILITY POLE
	EXIST. TELCO PEDESTAL
	PROPERTY CORNER
	EXIST. CONTOUR LINE
	EDGE OF PAVEMENT
	OVERHEAD WIRE
	RIGHT-OF-WAY
	CHAIN LINK FENCE
	EXISTING TREE LINE
	PROPOSED TREE LINE

SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1" = 40'



IF YOU DIG IN
SOUTH CAROLINA...
CALL US FIRST!
1-800-922-0983
PALMETTO UTILITY
PROTECTION SERVICES
IT'S THE LAW

THE UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON ARE FOR THE CONTRACTOR'S CONVENIENCE ONLY. THERE MAY BE OTHER UTILITIES NOT SHOWN ON THESE PLANS. THE ENGINEER/SURVEYOR ASSUMES NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE LOCATION SHOWN AND IT SHALL BE THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO VERIFY ALL UTILITIES WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE WORK. ALL DAMAGE MADE TO EXISTING UTILITIES BY THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR.

UTILITY STATEMENT

PLANS PREPARED FOR:
OPIMA Towers
845 LOW COUNTRY BLVD., SUITE J
MOUNT PLEASANT, SC 29404
OFFICE: (843) 375-1001

PROJECT INFORMATION:
WEST ASHLEY MONTESSORI
SITE # SC-1006
LEINBACH DRIVE
CHARLESTON, SC 29407
(CHARLESTON COUNTY)

PLANS PREPARED BY:

TOWER ENGINEERING PROFESSIONALS
3703 JUNCTION BOULEVARD
RALEIGH, NC 27603-5263
OFFICE: (919) 661-6351

SEAL:


0	03-29-08	ZONING
REV	DATE	ISSUED FOR:
DRAWN BY: JDC		CHECKED BY: CGP


SHEET TITLE:
SITE PLAN


SHEET NUMBER:
Z-1


REVISION:
0
T.E.P. # 060226


228























BARR, UNGER AND McINTOSH, L.L.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

11 BROAD STREET

P. O. Box 1037

CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29402-1037

TELEPHONE 843-577-5083

FAX 843-723-9039

CAPERS G. BARR, III
H. WAYNE UNGER, JR.
WILLIAM S. BARR
H. THOMAS McINTOSH, JR.
ADAM E. BARR
B. KIM MILLER

OF COUNSEL
CAPERS G. BARR, IV

December 18, 2007

WALTERBORO OFFICE
111A EAST WASHINGTON ST.
WALTERBORO, SC 29488-3915
TELEPHONE 843-549-9406
FAX 843-549-1058

EDISTO ISLAND OFFICE
806 OYSTER PARK
EDISTO ISLAND, SC 29438
TELEPHONE 843-869-2389

Donald H. Howe, Esquire
PO Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402

RE: 56 Leinbach Investors/Clyde Hiers

Dear Dingle:

Thank you for your letter. In your letter you asked whether or not you were missing something, quite frankly I think you are.

To begin with, the lease provides that the demised premise consists of 1.21 acre parcel, being parcel H-2, which is shown on the attached survey.

The next section, 1.02 Parking, states we have the exclusive right to use any parking areas within the demised premises, ie the entire 1.21 acres. The next section, also 1.02 provides we can use the property only for parking. Neither of these sections impliedly give the landlord concurrent use of the demised premises.

The erection of the cell tower on a portion of the lease premises substantially interferes with my client's operation of the demised premise. In particular, the area encompassed by the cell tower prevents them from utilizing the area for the intended purposes of the lease, that is, the parking lot.

Section 6.03 simply indicates that if the landlord creates a condition that substantially interferes with the normal use of the demised premises, or appurtenant parking, the rent and other charges due under the lease should be abated during such time as such interference persists. So, therefore, if there's a temporary interference by the landlord of the use and possession of the tenants use of the demised premises, then we have the right to abate the rent until such time as the interference is removed. We therefore have the right to abate the rent until the interference is removed.



In regard to your estoppel argument, Baker was not aware at the time that the tower was being erected, that it was on property that they had leased. It would be natural for a tenant to assume that it would take some gaul on the part of the landlord to rent away a portion of the property that he had already rented to another person.


I have obtained a copy of the site plan of the proposed parking area for this property which was submitted to the City of Charleston for approval and to Mr. Hiers. Although as originally constructed the area encompassed by the tower lease may not have totally interfered with our parking, it surely does at the present time and will continue to do so in the future. The fact that we were not parking in that area at the time does not preclude us from parking in that area in the future nor give the landlord the right to lease it to a third party.

Section 9.03 of the lease allows either party to cure any non-performance under the lease if either party is in default. That section gives either party thirty (30) days to cure any defaults. Please let this letter act as notice for Mr. Hiers to cure his defaults under the lease. Should he not cure his defaults then we intend to abate the rent until such time as he does.

Please also be advised that your clients acts in allowing the erection of the cell tower constitutes a violation of the provision of Section 6.12 in that the use by the cell tower company violates my client's lawful, quiet and peaceful possession and occupation of the demised premise. Also please be advised that the leasing of the subject premises to the cell tower company constitutes a violation of Section 14.17 which is my client's right of first refusal.

At the present time, it is my client's position that it is suffering damages equal to the amount of the rent which 56 Lienbach Investors receive from the cell tower company. To date, that amount to date is in excess of \$17,000.00. This amount will continue to accrue until such time as Mr. Hiers figures out a way to cure his default under the lease.

Sincerely yours,


William S. Barr

Enclosure (as stated)
cc: Tommy B. Baker
WSB:seg

Cabinet : BAK_A (72 items)						
	Refer	Document Description	Amount paid	Date	Due	Notes
	55894	55894 29MAY03 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS	1800	2003/05/29		
	56017	56017 09JUN03 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	Void	2003/06/09		Security deposit
1	56018	56018 09JUN03 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2003/06/09		
2	56309	56309 01JUL03 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2003/07/01		
3	56716	56716 01AUG03 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2003/08/01		
4	57082	57082 31AUG03 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2003/09/02		
5	57445	57445 01OCT03 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2003/10/01		
6	57879	57879 04NOV03 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2003/11/04		
7	58149	58149 01DEC03 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2003/12/01		
	Refer	Document Description	Amount Paid	Date		
8	58519	58519 02JAN04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/01/02		
9	58853	58853 02FEB04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/02/02		
10	59168	59168 01MAR04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/03/01		
11	59599	59599 01APR04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/04/01		
12	59981	59981 03MAY04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/05/03		
			21600			
13	60372	60372 01JUN04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/06/01		
14	60750	60750 01JUL04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/07/01		
15	61168	61168 02AUG04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/08/02		
16	61549	61549 02SEP04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/09/02		
17	61868	61868 04OCT04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/10/04		

18	62250	62250 01NOV04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/11/01		
19	62608	62608 01DEC04 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2004/12/01		
	Refer	Document Description	Amount Paid	Date		
20	62951	62951 03JAN05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2005/01/03		
	62954	62954 03JAN05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	Void	2005/01/03		
21	63337	63337 01FEB05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2005/01/31		
22	63678	63678 01MAR05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2005/03/01		
23	64092	64092 01APR05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC duplex	1800	2005/04/01		
24	64389	64389 02MAY05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC duplex	1800	2005/05/02		
			21600			
25	64814	64814 01JUN05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC duplex	1800	2005/06/01		
26	65186	65186 01JUL05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC duplex	1800	2005/07/01		
27	65526	65526 01AUG05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC duplex	1800	2005/08/01		
28	66071	66071 01SEP05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC duplex	1800	2005/09/01		
29	66453	66453 03OCT05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC duplex	1800	2005/10/03		
30	66858	66858 01NOV05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC duplex	1800	2005/11/01		
31	67245	67245 01DEC05 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC duplex	1800	2005/12/01		
	Refer	Document Description	Amount	Date		
32	67609	67609 03JAN06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC duplex	1800	2006/01/03		
33	68162	68162 02FEB06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2006/02/06		
34	68503	68503 01MAR06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2006/03/01		
35	69104	69104 01APR06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2006/04/03		
36	69475	69475 01MAY06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2006/05/01		
			21600			

37	69931	69931 01JUN06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2006/06/01		
38	70324	70324 01JUL06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2006/07/03		
39	70697	70697 01AUG06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2006/07/31		
40	71191	71191 01SEP06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2006/09/01		
41	71565	71565 02OCT06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1800	2006/09/29		
42	71987	71987 01NOV06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	2124	2006/10/31		
	72385	72385 01DEC06 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2006/12/01		
	Refer	Document Description	Amount	Date		
43	72795	72795 01JAN07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2006/12/29		
44	73227	73227 01FEB07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/01/31		
45	73603	73603 01MAR07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/02/28		
46	74002	74002 02APR07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/03/30		
47	74395	74395 01MAY07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/04/30		
			22248			
48	74900	74900 01JUN07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/06/01		
49	75326	75326 02JUL07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/07/02		
50	75766	75766 01AUG07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/08/01		
51	76128	76128 01SEP07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/08/31		
52	76441	76441 01OCT07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/10/01		
53	76866	76866 01NOV07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/10/31		
54	77202	77202 03DEC07 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/12/03		
	Refer	Document Description	Amount	Date		

55	77531	77531 01JAN08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1854	2007/12/31		
	77891	77891 29JAN08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	Void	2008/01/29		
56	77899	77899 31JAN08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1054	2008/01/31		
57	78297	78297 01MAR08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1054	2008/03/01		
58	78612	78612 28MAR08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1054	2008/03/28		
59	79007	79007 01MAY08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1054	2008/05/01		
			19048			
60	79364	79364 02JUN08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1054	2008/06/02		
61	79717	79717 01JUL08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1054	2008/07/01		
62	80094	80094 01AUG08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1054	2008/08/01		
63	80426	80426 02SEP08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1054	2008/09/02		
64	80787	80787 02OCT08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1054	2008/10/02		
65	81153	81153 04NOV08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1054	2008/11/04		
66	81426	81426 01DEC08 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1054	2008/12/01		
	Refer	Document Description	Amount	Date		
	81782	81782 02JAN09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	Void	2009/01/02		
	81894	81894 12JAN09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1576	2009/01/12		
67	82110	82110 02FEB09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2009/02/02		
68	82361	82361 02MAR09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2009/03/02		
69	82685	82685 02APR09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2009/04/02		
70	82980	82980 01MAY09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2009/05/01		
71	83255	83255 02JUN09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	Void	2009/06/02		
			13622			

72	83438	83438 22JUN09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2009/06/22		
73	83549	83549 01JUL09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2009/07/01		
74	83812	83812 04AUG09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2009/08/04		
75	84174	84174 02SEP09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2009/09/02		
76	84475	84475 02OCT09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2009/10/02		
77	84827	84827 03NOV09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2009/11/03		
	85177	85177 02DEC09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	payment stopped	2009/12/02		
78	85394	85394 21DEC09 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2009/12/21		
	Refer	Document Description	Amount	Date		
79	85501	85501 05JAN10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/01/05		
80	85785	85785 02FEB10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/02/02		
81	86092	86092 02MAR10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/03/02		
82	86402	86402 02APR10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/04/02		
83	86690	86690 03MAY10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/05/03		
			14004			
84	86994	86994 02JUN10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/06/02		
85	87283	87283 01JUL10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/07/01		
86	87627	87627 02AUG10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/08/04		
87	87884	87884 02SEP10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/09/02		
88	88172	88172 01OCT10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/10/01		
89	88485	88485 02NOV10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/11/02		
90	88732	88732 02DEC10 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2010/12/02		

	Refer	Document Description	Amount	Date		
91	89006	89006 04JAN11 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2011/01/04		
92	89324	89324 02FEB11 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2011/02/02		
93	89550	89550 01MAR11 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2011/03/01		
94	89870	89870 01APR11 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2011/04/01		
95	90164	90164 03MAY11 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2011/05/03		
			14004			
96	90451	90451 02JUN11 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2011/06/02		
97	90717	90717 02JUL11 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2011/07/02		
98	91147	91147 02AUG11 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2011/08/02		
99	91482	91482 02SEP11 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2011/09/02		
100	91709	91709 02OCT 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC	1167	2011/09/02		
			5835			

RENTAL PAYMENT SUMMARY
6/1/2003 - 10/1/2011
FROM MAGNOLIA PARADIGM
to
56 LEINBACH

	Rent from Magnolia	Due From Property
6/1/2003-6/1/2004	\$ 21,600.00	\$ 21,600.00
6/1/2004-6/1/2005	\$ 21,600.00	\$ 21,600.00
6/1/2005-6/1/2006	\$ 21,600.00	\$ 21,600.00
6/1/2006-6/1/2007	\$ 22,248.00	\$ 22,248.00
6/1/2007-6/1/2008	\$ 19,048.00	\$ 22,915.44
6/1/2008-6/1/2009	\$ 13,622.00	\$ 23,602.90
6/1/2009-6/1/2010	\$ 14,004.00	\$ 24,310.99
6/1/2010-6/1/2011	\$ 14,004.00	\$ 25,040.32
6/1/2011-10/1/2011	\$ 5,835.00	\$ 10,435.00
Totals	\$ 153,561.00	\$ 193,352.65



1:55 PM

10/5/11

Cash Basis

Optima Towers, LLC Transaction Detail By Account January 1, 2006 through October 5, 2011


Type	Date	Num	Name	Paid Amount	Balance
Jan - Dec 06					
Check	2/22/2006	1013	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	100.00	100.00
Check	10/8/2006	1065	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	800.00	900.00
Check	11/6/2006	1076	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	1,600.00	2,500.00
Jan - Dec 06				2,500.00	2,500.00
Jan - Dec 07					
Check	1/3/2007	1101	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	1,600.00	1,600.00
Check	2/25/2007	1115	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	1,656.00	3,256.00
Check	5/26/2007	1134	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	1,656.00	4,912.00
Check	5/29/2007	1129	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	1,656.00	6,568.00
Check	8/21/2007	1140	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	1,656.00	8,224.00
Check	9/28/2007	1151	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	3,312.00	11,536.00
Check	12/28/2007	1168	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	828.00	12,364.00
Jan - Dec 07				12,364.00	12,364.00
Jan - Dec 08					
Check	2/1/2008	1003	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	828.00	828.00
Check	2/28/2008	1009	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	828.00	1,656.00
Check	3/31/2008	1016	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	828.00	2,484.00
Check	4/23/2008	1027	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	828.00	3,312.00
Check	5/29/2008	1036	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	828.00	4,140.00
Check	6/30/2008	1042	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	828.00	4,968.00
Check	7/29/2008	1062	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	828.00	5,796.00
Check	7/30/2008	1047	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	828.00	6,624.00
Check	9/20/2008	1068	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	828.00	7,452.00
Check	11/4/2008	1078	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	828.00	8,280.00
Check	11/23/2008	1082	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	1,126.00	9,406.00
Check	12/23/2008	1091	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	857.00	10,263.00
Jan - Dec 08				10,263.00	10,263.00
Jan - Dec 09					
Check	2/4/2009	1104	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	857.00	857.00
Check	3/1/2009	1107	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	857.00	1,714.00
Check	3/31/2009	1111	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	857.00	2,571.00
Check	4/30/2009	1116	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	857.00	3,428.00
Check	5/30/2009	1121	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	857.00	4,285.00
Check	6/29/2009	1125	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	857.00	5,142.00
Check	7/30/2009	1129	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	857.00	5,999.00
Check	9/25/2009	1135	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	857.00	6,856.00
Check	10/6/2009	1139	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	857.00	7,713.00
Check	11/9/2009	1143	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	857.00	8,570.00
Check	11/18/2009	1148	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	20.06	8,590.06
Check	12/10/2009	1145	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	9,477.03
Check	12/27/2009	1149	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	10,364.00
Jan - Dec 09				10,364.00	10,364.00
Jan - Dec 10					
Check	1/27/2010	1155	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	886.97
Check	2/24/2010	1161	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	1,773.94
Check	3/30/2010	1170	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	2,660.91
Check	5/1/2010	1176	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	3,547.88
Check	5/19/2010	1180	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	4,434.85
Check	6/23/2010	1185	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	5,321.82
Check	7/28/2010	1193	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	6,208.79
Check	9/1/2010	1198	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	7,095.76
Check	9/22/2010	1205	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	7,982.73
Check	10/20/2010	1208	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	8,869.70
Check	12/1/2010	1212	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.79	9,756.49
Check	12/29/2010	1219	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.79	10,643.28
Jan - Dec 10				10,643.28	10,643.28
Jan 1 - Oct 5, 11					
Check	2/7/2011	1228	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.79	886.79
Check	3/2/2011	1233	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.79	1,773.58
Check	3/25/2011	1239	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	2,660.55
Check	4/22/2011	1245	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	3,547.52
Check	5/20/2011	1251	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	4,434.49
Check	7/1/2011	1256	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	5,321.46
Check	7/22/2011	1262	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	6,208.43
Check	8/24/2011	1272	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	7,095.40



1:55 PM
10/05/11
Cash Basis

Optima Towers, LLC
Transaction Detail By Account
January 1, 2006 through October 5, 2011

Type	Date	Num	Name	Paid Amount	Balance
Check	9/21/2011	1276	56 Leinbach Inv., LLC	886.97	7,982.37
Jan 1 - Oct 5, 11				7,982.37	7,982.37
TOTAL				54,116.65	54,116.65



STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

TITLE TO REAL ESTATE

BKE 333PG031


WHEREAS, at a meeting of the Board of Directors of Charles Towne Montessori School, duly called and held, it was unanimously resolved pursuant to the by-laws of said institution that the below described premises be conveyed to the Grantee below for the consideration hereinafter expressed and that Ingrid Tugwell, President was authorized and directed to deliver the deed conveying said property; NOW THEREFOR

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that CHARLES TOWNE MONTESSORI SCHOOL sometimes hereinafter called "Grantor"), in consideration of the sum of SEVEN HUNDRED TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND AND NO 00/100THS (\$725,000.00) DOLLARS in hand paid at and before the sealing of these presents by 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC (sometimes hereinafter called "Grantee"), the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, has granted, bargained, sold and released, and by these presents does grant, bargain, sell and release unto 56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC its successors and assigns forever, the following described premises to-wit:

SEE EXHIBIT "A" HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF BY REFERENCE

TOGETHER with all and singular the Rights, Members, Hereditaments, and Appurtenances to the said premises belonging, or in anywise incident or appertaining.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD all and singular the said Premises before mentioned unto the Grantee hereinabove named and its successors and



ALL those certain pieces, parcels, or lots of land, situate, lying and being in the City and County of Charleston, South Carolina, and shown and designated as Parcel "F" and Parcel "G" on a plat dated April, 1981 made by W. L. Stevens, Jr., R.L.S., entitled, Harrison Executive Park, City of Charleston, County of Charleston, South Carolina", and recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Plat Book AW, at page 33 on September 30, 1982; measuring and containing, butting and boundings as will appear by reference to said plat.

BEING a property of the property conveyed to the Grantor herein by deed of Kathryn B. Leinbach, dated July 27, 1984 and recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Book A139 at page 644.

TMS# 349-01-00-046 and ~~349-01-00-047~~

ALSO

ALL that lot, piece or parcel of land with the buildings and improvements thereon, situate, lying and being in the City of Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina being known as Parcel H-2 as shown on a plat made by Hoffman Lester Associates, Inc., entitled, "HARRISON EXECUTIVE PARK PLAT SHOWING THE SUBDIVISION OF PARCEL 11 (TMS# 349-01-00-045) INTO PARCELS H-1 AND H-2 OWNED BY CHARLES W. PATRICK, JR. AND STEPHEN ZIFF", dated April 4, 1994 and revised June 2, 1994 and recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Plat Book DA, page 48. Said lot having such size, shape, metes, bounds and dimensions as shown on said plat.

Under and subject to a private drainage easement fifteen feet in width along the western property line as set forth in deed from Charles W. Patrick, Jr. and Stephen Ziff to Brilliant Estes Associates dated June 21, 1994 and recorded in Book F251 at page 224, in the RMC Office for Charleston County.

THIS CONVEYANCE IS MADE subject to restrictive covenants, or modifications thereto, easements and/or rights-of-way heretofore granted affecting the above-described property and recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County, South Carolina.

Being the same property conveyed to the Grantor herein by deed of Charles W. Patrick, Jr., dated August 25, 1999 and recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County simultaneously herewith.

TMS# 349-01-00-105

GRANTEE'S ADDRESS:

Post Office 935

Charleston, SC 29402

1. I have read the information on this Affidavit and I understand such information.

TO 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ON August 25, 1999

(a) XX subject to the deed recording fee as a transfer for consideration paid or to be paid in money or money's worth.

(b) subject to the deed recording fee as a transfer between a corporation, a partnership, or other entity and a stockholder, partner, or owner of the entity, or is a transfer to a trust or as distribution to a trust beneficiary;

(c) _____ EXEMPT from the deed recording fee because (exemption# _____)
(Explanation if required) _____

(If exempt, please skip items 4-6, and go to item 7 of this affidavit.)

4. Check one of the following if either item 3(a) or item 3(b) above has been checked.
(a) XX The fee is computed on the basis of the fee schedule in effect for the year in which the fee is due.

(a) XX The fee is computed on the consideration paid or to be paid in money or money's worth in the amount of \$ 725,000.00

(b) _____ The fee is computed on the fair market value of the realty which is \$ _____

(c) _____ The fee is computed on the fair market value of the realty which is \$ _____

(c) The fee is computed on the fair market value of the realty as established for property tax purposes which is \$ _____

5. Check YES__ or NO X to the following: A lien or encumbrance existed on the land, tenement, or realty before the transfer and remained on the land, tenement, or realty after the transfer. If "YES," the amount of the outstanding balance of this lien or encumbrance is \$ _____

6. The DEED Recording Fee is computed as follows:

(a) \$725,000.00 the amount listed in item 4 above

(b)	0.00	the amount listed in item 4 above
(c)	\$725,000.00	the amount listed in item 5 above (no amount place zero)
Subtract Line 6(b) from Line 6(a) and place the result.		

(c) \$725,000.00 Subtract Line 6(b) from Line 6(a) and place the result.

7. As required by Code Section 12-24-70, I state that I am a responsible person who was connected with the transaction as : Grantor

8. I understand that a person required to furnish this affidavit who wilfully furnishes a false or fraudulent affidavit is guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Sworn to before me this 25
day of August 19 99

Notary Public for SC
My Commission Expires: 01/07/07

Grantor, Grantee, or Legal Representative
connected with this transaction

Charles Towne Montessori School

Print or Type Name here

Sandra Lempesis
mtl
sl

BKE 333PG035

FILED
E 333-031
1999 AUG 26 PM 3:16
CHARLIE LYBRAND
REGISTER
CHARLESTON COUNTY SC

Recording Fee	<u>10.00</u>
State Fee	<u>1885.00</u>
County Fee	<u>797.50</u>
Postage	<u> </u>
TOTAL	<u>2692.50</u>

A

Recorded this 26 day of AUG Year 99
On Property Record Card

Reggie A Mosley
Auditor Charleston County

TMS VERIFIED
BAC mtl
DTG 8/30/99

BARR, UNGER AND MCINTOSH, L.L.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

11 BROAD STREET

P. O. Box 1037

CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29402-1037

CAPERS G. BARR, III.
H. WAYNE UNGER, JR.
WILLIAM S. BARR
H. THOMAS MCINTOSH, JR.
ADAM E. BARR
B. KIM MILLER

OF COUNSEL
CAPERS G. BARR, IV

TELEPHONE 843-577-5083

FAX 843-723-9039

January 31, 2008

WALTERBORO OFFICE

111A EAST WASHINGTON ST.
WALTERBORO, SC 29486-3915
TELEPHONE 843-549-9406
FAX 843-549-1058

EDISTO ISLAND OFFICE

806 OYSTER PARK
EDISTO ISLAND, SC 29438
TELEPHONE 843-869-2389

Donald H. Howe, Esquire
PO Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402

RE: 56 Leinbach Investors/Clyde Hiers


Dear Dingle:

Please find enclosed the rent payment on the above property which is due on February 1. You will note that this rent payment has been reduced by \$800.00 which is the amount which we understand Mr. Hiers receives for rent from the cell tower company.

On December 18 I wrote you a letter and pursuant to Section 9.03 of the Lease demanded that Mr. Hiers cure his non-performance. Inasmuch as Mr. Hiers non-performance within thirty (30) days of that date, as provided by that section, we are exercising our rights pursuant to Section 6.03 to abate the rent.

By abating the rent at this time, please be advised that the tenant does not waive any rights that it may have for further set-off on account of the landlord's previous interference.

Sincerely yours,


William S. Barr

Enclosure (as stated)
WSB:seg



CONTROL NO. 77899

ISSUED BY: BARBARA

BAKER MOTOR COMPANY
OF CHARLESTON, INC.
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29407

PAGE 1

INVOICE STOCK NO	INVOICE DATE	PURCHASE ORDER NO	COMMENT/V.I.N.	AMOUNT	DISCOUNT/ ACCOUNT NO	NET AMOUNT
	013108	FEB RENT FOR LESS \$800	EMPLOYEE PARKING LOT	77899	20203 8 000 8 020	1,054.00 -1,054.00 895.9 158.1
TOTAL					20203	1,054.00

DETACH AT PERFORATION BEFORE DEPOSITING CHECK

REMITTANCE ADVICE

VERIFY THE AUTHENTICITY OF THIS MULTITONE SECURITY DOCUMENT

CHECK BACKGROUND AREA CHANGES COLOR GRADUALLY FROM TOP TO BOTTOM

BAKER MOTOR COMPANY
OF CHARLESTON, INC.
1511/1513 SAVANNAH HIGHWAY
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29407
Telephone: 843-852-4000

Bank of America


077899

77899

67-44
632DATE
31 JAN 08PAY THIS AMOUNT
*****1,054 DOLLARS 00 CENTSAMOUNT OF CHECK
*****1,054.00

424

BAKER MOTOR COMPANY OF CHARLESTON, Inc.

TO
THE
ORDER
OF56 LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC
225 SEVEN FARMS DRIVE
DANIEL ISLAND SC 29492-8353

⑈077899⑈ ⑆053904483⑆ 000729026416⑈

THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT HAS A WHITE REFLECTIVE WATERMARK ON THE BACK. HOLD AT AN ANGLE TO SEE THE MARK WHEN CHECKING THE ENDORSEMENT.

255

CARNEVALE ASSOCIATES

975 PITT STREET
MOUNT PLEASANT, SOUTH CAROLINA 29464
843-884-0455 FAX 843-856-1492

9-11-02

Mr. Bill Cochran
Baker Motors
1511 Savannah Hwy
Charleston, SC 29407

Dear Bill:

Thank you for the time you spent last week with Clyde Hiers and myself. Your expansion plans at Baker Motors have to be exciting for all of your fine folks.

Before I outline our proposal to you, let me tell you that we would very much like to make a satisfactory arrangement with Baker Motors. Please keep this in mind when you review the following:

PARCEL SIZE 1.2 acres (you can lease all or part)

VALUATION OF PARCEL \$250,000.00 per acre

RETURN TO LESSOR 8% to 10% depending on who pays property tax

PLANNING AND APPROVAL PROCESS by Baker Motors

SURVEY to be supplied by Lessor

IMPROVEMENTS by Baker Motors

INSURANCE by Baker Motors

MAINTENANCE by Baker Motors

LEASE TERM 5 to 10 years with renewals. (we are flexible here and understand you need to recapture your improvements)

RENTAL INCREASES Lessor will hold the lease rate flat for the first three (3) full years of the lease. Thereafter the lease rate will increase three percent (3%) annually.




These are the major points that would be included in any potential lease arrangement on this parcel. Frankly , in entering a lease with Baker Motors , we would have to forget about any expansion plans for the Montessori School. This is the main reason we have no problem with a long term lease.

It is our understanding , that you will have to improve the lot to city standards. If you can use it "as is " that is fine with us. We are not interested in improving the lot to your specifications. Further , if in the future , we decide to offer this parcel "For Sale", we will offer Baker Motors the first option to purchase.

After you have had the time to digest the above , please call and we can discuss same and answer any questions you might have. We would be available to meet with you as well.

Sincerely submitted;



R.B. "Corky" Carnevale

CARNEVALE ASSOCIATES

975 PITT STREET
MOUNT PLEASANT, SOUTH CAROLINA 29464
843-884-0455 FAX 843-856-1492

10-24-02

Mr. Bill Cochran
Baker Motors
1511 Savannah Hwy
Charleston, SC 29407

Dear Bill:

I want to reply in writing, to the discussions and proposal, which you suggested at our meeting this week. As I mentioned in my letter to you 9-11-02, Clyde, Gary and I are very interested in making a satisfactory arrangement with Baker Motors.

The only point that we have a difference with you is on the monthly rental rate. You suggested \$1600 per month for the initial 3-year term, which at a 8% return equates to a value on the property of \$250,000. The site contains 1.2 acres, which at a value of \$250,000 per acre would equate to a value on the property of \$300,000. An 8% return on this value would yield a monthly rental of \$2000.

We are prepared to split this difference with Baker Motors and offer an initial rental rate of \$1800 per month. This would be for a 5 year lease with ~~two~~ 5 year options. The agreement would also include the "Right of First Refusal" to purchase the property should it become available for sale.

If the above is satisfactory to Baker Motors, please sign on the line provided, and I will generate a formal lease agreement for your consideration.

I look forward to finalizing this transaction with you.

Sincerely;


R.B. Carnevale
R.B. "Corky" Carnevale

For Baker Motors:

William [Signature]


NOTE: LESSEE WILL BE MAGNOLIA PARADISE, INC.

LEASE BASED ON RECEIVING APPROVAL
FOR A PARKING LOT FROM THE CITY
AND MRS. LEINBACH.



SUMMARY OF RENTS RECEIVED BY LANDLORD
JUNE 1, 2003 – OCTOBER 1, 2011

Rent paid by Magnolia Paradigm.	\$153,561.00
Rent paid by Optima Towers	\$ <u>54,116.65</u>
Total Rent received by Landlord	\$ 207,477.65
Less :	
Rent owed by Magnolia Paradigm	\$193, 352.65
Total overpaid to Landlord	\$ 14,125.00



COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC WORKS OF THE CITY OF CHARLESTON

TMS 349-01-00-087



ZONED GB

CORPORATE QUARTERS EXECUTIVE PARK
TMS 349-01-00-044
& TMS 349-01-00-082 THRU 098
ZONED GB

PARCEL H-2

BRILLIANT ESTES ASSOCIATES
PARCEL H-1
TMS 349-01-00-045
ZONED GB

LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC
TMS 349-01-00-046
ZONED GB



CURVE TABLE					
CURVE LENGTH	RADIUS	TANGENT	CHORD	CHORD BEARING	AREA
13.14	20.00	15.18	18.14	120.00°	100.00
13.14	20.00	15.18	18.14	120.00°	100.00



LEGEND

- REF - REBAR FOUND
- CP - COMPUTED POINT
- TBM - TEMPORARY BENCHMARK
- 2 8.7 - SPOT ELEVATION (GROUND)
- 2 8.79 - SPOT ELEVATION (PAVEMENT, CONCRETE)
- 8.7 --- - CONTOUR LINE
- A/C - AIR CONDITIONER
- CPP - CORRUGATED PLASTIC PIPE
- DI - DROP INLET

NOTES

- 1) THE PROPERTY IS OWNED BY LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC.
- 2) TMS NO. 349-01-00-105.
- 3) REFERENCE PLAT BY JOHN S. LESTER DATED 6/9/84 AND RECORDED IN THE CHARLESTON COUNTY REC. OFFICE IN PLAT BOOK DA PAGE 48.
- 4) THE TOTAL AREA = 1.216 ACRES (52,957 SQ. FT.)
- 5) THIS SURVEY DOES NOT REFLECT THE EXISTENCE OR NONEXISTENCE OF U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS JURISDICTIONAL WETLANDS.
- 6) ACCORDING TO FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP 455412 0020 D DATED NOVEMBER 5, 1986, THIS PROPERTY LIES IN ZONE C AND ZONE AS WITH A BASE FLOOD ELEVATION OF 11 HIGHER.
- 7) UTILITIES ARE NOT SHOWN ON THIS SURVEY.
- 8) THE VERTICAL DATUM IS NGVD29 (NATIONAL GEODESIC VERTICAL DATUM 1929).
- 9) THE PROPERTY IS ZONED GENERAL BUSINESS. HEIGHT DISTRICT 3X.

EXPIRATION NOTICE
THIS APPROVAL EXPIRES WITHIN ONE YEAR OF 5/12/11



BAKER
MOTORS
EMPLOYEE
PARKING LOT

POBSBERG ENGINEERING
AND SURVEYING, INC.
1907 SAYBORN HIGHWAY SUITE 10
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405
(843) 551-2222 FAX (843) 551-1780
CIVIL, ENGINEERING, SURVEYING
AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE



CHARLESTON • CHARLOTTE

LS3P ASSOCIATES LTD.
24 NORTH MARKET STREET SUITE 300
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29401
TEL. 843.577.4444 FAX 843.723.4789
HTTP://WWW.LS3P.COM



NOTES OF THE REVIEWER OF THE PROJECT
COPYRIGHT 2000. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.
PRINTED OR ELECTRONIC DRAWINGS AND
DOCUMENTATION MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED
OR ANY FORM WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION
FROM LS3P ASSOCIATES LTD.

REVISIONS:


PROJECT: 1103-03010 02
DATE: 04/21/05
DRAWN BY: LHR
CHECKED BY: CML

TOPOGRAPHIC
SURVEY
C101

SOLUTIONS THROUGH LISTENING SERVICE BY DESIGN

SERVICE BY DESIGN


BAKER
MOTOR'S
EMPLOYEE
PARKING LOT



CHARLOTTE • CHARLOTTE


LS3P ASSOCIATES LTD
24 NORTH MARKET STREET, SUITE 300
CHARLOTTE, SOUTH CAROLINA 28201
TEL: 843.577.4411 FAX: 843.722.4789
HTTP://WWW.LS3P.COM

262



LEINBACH INVESTORS LLC
TMS 349-01-00-045

QUANTITY	ABBREV	NOTES/PLANT/COMMENTS	HEIGHT	SPREAD	CONF.	CHL./SPACING	NOTES
BASE BID							
10	CERC	Cycas revoluta Savanna Palm	10-12'	8-8'	50%	1 1/2'	Full spread
8	LAP	Lagotis indica 'Palmatus'	12'	3'	85%		Multi-stem
14	QUES	Quercus macrocarpa Shumard Oak	12-14'	5-6'	80%	1 1/2'	Stem trees
SPRINK							
40	KEY	Key Brand Hydrangea	3-4'	18"	50%	2' o.c.	Full stock
80	LOJ	Liquidambar styraciflua Japanese Liquidambar	3-4'	18"	70%	2' o.c.	Full stock




REVISIONS: APRIL 8, 2003

PROJECT: 1103-020130 02
DATE: 04/21/03
DRAWN BY: OGC
CHECKED BY: OGC

LANDSCAPE
PLAN
L201

SOLUTIONS THROUGH LISTENING SERVICE BY DESIGN

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	PRICE	TOTAL
1	10' CERC	10	EA	120.00	1200.00
2	8' LAP	8	EA	150.00	1200.00
3	14' QUES	14	EA	100.00	1400.00
4	40' KEY	40	EA	3.00	120.00
5	80' LOJ	80	EA	1.50	120.00
6	CONCRETE ROLL CURB & GUTTER	100	LF	1.00	100.00
7	ASPHALT PAVEMENT	100	SF	1.00	100.00
8	STEEL EXCISING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
9	ISLANDS TO BE PERIMED	10	EA	10.00	100.00
10	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
11	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
12	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
13	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
14	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
15	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
16	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
17	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
18	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
19	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
20	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
21	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
22	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
23	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
24	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
25	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
26	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
27	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
28	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
29	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
30	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
31	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
32	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
33	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
34	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
35	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
36	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
37	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
38	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
39	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
40	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
41	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
42	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
43	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
44	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
45	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
46	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
47	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
48	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
49	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
50	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
51	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
52	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
53	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
54	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
55	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
56	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
57	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
58	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
59	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
60	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
61	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
62	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
63	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
64	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
65	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
66	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
67	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
68	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
69	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
70	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
71	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
72	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
73	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
74	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
75	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
76	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
77	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
78	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
79	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
80	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
81	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
82	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
83	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
84	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
85	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
86	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
87	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
88	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
89	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
90	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
91	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
92	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
93	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
94	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
95	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
96	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
97	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
98	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
99	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00
100	EXISTING 24" DRAINAGE CASING	10	EA	10.00	100.00



BAKER MOTOR COMPANY

1511-1513 SAVANNAH HWY.

CHARLESTON, SC 29407

843-852-4000

843-852-4039 FAX

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO: R.B. "CORKY" CARNEVALE FROM: BILL COCHRAN
COMPANY: CARNAVALE ASSOC., LLC DATE: 12/18/02
FAX NUMBER: 723-6686 TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER: 2
PHONE NUMBER: 577-2230
RE: PARKING LOT.


☐ URGENT ☐ FOR REVIEW ☐ PLEASE COMMENT ☐ PLEASE REPLY ☐ PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

AS PER OUR PHONE CONVERSATION TODAY
I AM SENDING THE PARKING LOT LAYOUT
DRAWN BY LS3P. WE HAVE TO APPLY TO
THE CITY FOR A VARIANCE BECAUSE LOT
WILL BE GRAVEL. LS3P WILL MEET WITH
THE CITY STAFF ON 12/19/02 FOR LAYOUT APPROVAL.
THE NEXT MEETING FOR THE VARIANCE IS
FEB 6, 2003. I HAVE NOT HEARD FROM OUR
ATTORNEY ON THE LEASE BUT WILL
CALL YOU AS SOON AS HE COMPLETES
HIS REVIEW



TX/RX No. 5096 @ 10:10AM



February 7, 2000

Met with Corkey Carnevale today. He & his group met with the city, tenants on Leimbach Dr. and Darnell, Mrs Leimbach. No problem with the concept of using as a employee parking lot.

Carnevale laid out the following proposal. If we are in agreement ~~they will~~ they will proceed with permits, approvals etc.

- Rent for 70 car spaces - Approximately 35,000 sq ft (1 acre)

- Rent will come out to be about \$1800/mo or \$21,600/year

This gives owners a 10% return

- We improve property: ie pave, stripe etc - Corkey said cost would be approximately \$75K \$80K

- Employee parking only

- We provide liability insurance

They will design.




I told Corkey I would get with TBB & review and let them know in a few days.

2/16/00 @ 9:40 - Advised Corkey we would not be interested in his proposal at this time

Mike Laboone - son-in-law of Katherine Leimbach

Clyde Area - 577-1040 (#2)

9/5/02 - Met this AM with Clyde Hiers and
Corey Carnevale re lot on Leebah Rd.
to be used for employee parking
only - Not storage -
They will put a proposal
together and get with me
on Wed 9/11/02.



STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

IN THE COURT OF COMMONS PLEAS
FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
CASE NO.: 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,)

Plaintiff,)

-versus-)

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,)

Defendant.)

AFFIDAVIT OF
WILLIAM S. BARR



PERSONALLY appeared before me WILLIAM S. BARR, Attorney at Law, who being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

- a) That Affiant is the attorney for Defendant above named.
- b) That Affiant was admitted to the South Carolina Bar in 1974, and, since that time, has been engaged in private practice; and that Affiant is extensively engaged in the practice of all areas of the law particularly in the area of real property.
- c) That Affiant has represented Defendant in the proceedings in this Court, and that such proceedings involved the issues of the parties rights under a lease; and that this Affidavit is filed in support of a motion on behalf of Defendant for attorney's fees, suit money, and costs as provided in their lease.
- d) That Affiant incorporates herein Rule 32, Rules of the South Carolina Supreme Court, which contains the Canons of Ethics concerning the setting of attorney's fees; that Affiant further calls to the attention of the Court the numerous decisions by the Supreme Court of South Carolina and the Court of Appeals concerning the factors and criteria which should be considered in the setting of attorney's fees; that Affiant relies upon the discretion of this Court in the determination of the amount of fees, based, among other things, upon the Court's record

herein and the Court's first hand knowledge of the litigation between the parties, the difficulty of the services rendered, the time necessarily expended, the result accomplished and the other factors and criteria which are set forth in the Canons of Ethics and the decisional law of this State.

e) That the time spent in the representation of Defendant, as set forth more fully hereinafter, was necessary to the protection of the client's interest and the proper representation of the client.

f) That based upon Affiant's time and expense records, which are maintained on a daily basis in the ordinary course of business and is part of the business records of Affiant's firm, Affiant states to the Court that the following time was necessarily expended by Affiant as aforesaid: 109.7 hours from June 27, 2008 to October 10, 2011.

g) That, as of the date of this Affidavit, costs have been incurred, which expenditures include, but not limited to, filing fee, service of process, deposition costs, courier service, postage, and photocopying; it being the information and belief of the undersigned that said expenditures should equitably be added into any fees which this Court may hereafter award.


h) That the foregoing time and expenditures are through October 10, 2011 and do not include time and money expended subsequent to October 10, 2011, (the date of the hearing) or any to be incurred thereafter.

i) That Affiant, on behalf of Affiant's client, based not only on the time necessarily devoted to this case, but also upon the other factors and criteria which have been held to be relevant in the setting of attorney's fees, requests that this Court review the record herein and this Affidavit, and take into consideration its relevant first hand knowledge and grant and award to Affiant's client attorney's fees and costs, plus fees incurred thereafter, or an amount determined

by the Court to be reasonable for attorney's fees, suit money, and costs, and that Plaintiff be required to pay the same within a reasonable time as determined by the Court.

10. Attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference is an itemization of all time spent, including attorney and paralegal time, and costs incurred by his law firm in this case.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.


WILLIAM S. BARR

SWORN to before me this 10th
day of October, 2011

 (L.S.)
NOTARY PUBLIC FOR SOUTH CAROLINA
My Commission Expires : 10-25-16

Client	Trans Date	Tmkr	H P	Tcode/ Task Code	Rate	Hours Worked	Hours to Bill	Amount		Ref #
Transaction Date 06/27/2008										
20081229.00	06/27/2008	2	A	1	200.00	0.50	0.50	100.00	Review and revise answer and counterclaim. Tel Dingle. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 06/27/2008										
Transaction Date 07/03/2008										
20081229.00	07/03/2008	2	A	1	200.00	0.70	0.70	140.00	Review and revise answer and counter claim. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 07/03/2008										
Transaction Date 07/07/2008										
20081229.00	07/07/2008	2	A	1	200.00	0.90	0.90	180.00	Review and revise answer and counter claim. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 07/07/2008										
Transaction Date 07/11/2008										
20081229.00	07/11/2008	2	A	1	200.00	0.40	0.40	80.00	Review and revise complaint. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 07/11/2008										
Transaction Date 08/19/2008										
20081229.00	08/19/2008	2	A	1	200.00	1.10	1.10	220.00	Prepare discovery and request for admissions. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 08/19/2008										
Transaction Date 08/22/2008										
20081229.00	08/22/2008	2	A	1	200.00	0.50	0.50	100.00	Clyde Hiers matter. Research tenant's right of quiet enjoyment. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 08/22/2008										
Transaction Date 10/16/2008										
20081229.00	10/16/2008	2	A	1	200.00	0.45	0.45	90.00	Review Discovery responses, letter to Dingle Howe. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 10/16/2008										
Transaction Date 11/07/2008										
20081229.00	11/07/2008	2	A	1	200.00	0.30	0.30	60.00	Review letter from Hiers e-mail Barbara a response. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
20081229.00	11/07/2008	2	A	1	200.00	0.30	0.30	60.00	Review letter from Clyde Hiers to TB re rent increase. E-mail Barbara cc of the lease, review Barbara's spread sheet. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 11/07/2008										
Transaction Date 02/19/2009										
20081229.00	02/19/2009	2	A	1	200.00	0.40	0.40	80.00	Prepare response to discovery and supplemental request to produce for the Optima Tower file. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 02/19/2009										
Transaction Date 02/20/2009										
20081229.00	02/20/2009	2	A	1	200.00	0.60	0.60	120.00	Review and revise discovery response and supplemental request for production.	ARCH

Client	Trans Date	Tmkr	H P	Tcode/ Task Code	Rate	Hours Worked	Hours to Bill	Amount		Ref #
Transaction Date 02/20/2009										
Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC										
Total for Transaction Date 02/20/2009					Billable	0.80	0.80	120.00		
Transaction Date 04/15/2009										
20081229.00	04/15/2009	2	A	1	200.00	0.40	0.40	80.00	Tel Hop Iglehart, prepare subpoena to Optima Towers. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 04/15/2009					Billable	0.40	0.40	80.00		
Transaction Date 05/15/2009										
20081229.00	05/15/2009	2	A	1	200.00	0.30	0.30	60.00	Tel Hop re discovery. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 05/15/2009					Billable	0.30	0.30	60.00		
Transaction Date 07/28/2009										
20081229.00	07/28/2009	2	A	1	200.00	0.10	0.10	20.00	Letter to Dingle Howe re discovery. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 07/28/2009					Billable	0.10	0.10	20.00		
Transaction Date 08/05/2009										
20081229.00	08/05/2009	2	A	1	200.00	0.10	0.10	20.00	Review docket, case referred in error, prepare letter to Dingle to see if he would consent to it being referred. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 08/05/2009					Billable	0.10	0.10	20.00		
Transaction Date 10/12/2009										
20081229.00	10/12/2009	2	A	1	200.00	0.10	0.10	20.00	Letter to Dingle for some depositions dates. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 10/12/2009					Billable	0.10	0.10	20.00		
Transaction Date 11/05/2009										
20081229.00	11/05/2009	2	A	1	200.00	0.80	0.80	160.00	Review lease and title docs, tel Bill Cochran. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 11/05/2009					Billable	0.80	0.80	160.00		
Transaction Date 11/06/2009										
20081229.00	11/06/2009	2	A	1	200.00	0.60	0.60	120.00	Review discovery request, review rules of civil procedure re taking TB's deposition. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
20081229.00	11/06/2009	2	A	1	200.00	0.80	0.80	160.00	Review File from Barbara, tel Bill Cochran Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 11/06/2009					Billable	1.40	1.40	280.00		
Transaction Date 11/09/2009										
20081229.00	11/09/2009	2	A	1	200.00	1.20	1.20	240.00	Work on Case Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 11/09/2009					Billable	1.20	1.20	240.00		
Transaction Date 11/11/2009										
20081229.00	11/11/2009	2	A	1	200.00	3.05	3.05	610.00	Meet with Bill Cochran, review records on Cell tower construction, tel Joe Lynch and Eric to see if they recall speaking with anyone in regard to a cell tower. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH

Client	Trans Date	Tmkr	H P	Tcode/ Task Code	Rate	Hours Worked	Hours to Bill	Amount	Ref #
Transaction Date 11/11/2009									
Total for Transaction Date 11/11/2009									
Transaction Date 11/12/2009									
20081229.00	11/12/2009	2 A	1		200.00	1.70	1.70	340.00	ARCH
Tel City of Chas, prepare FIFO request to the City to get file. E-mail Hop for same info. E-mail Corky Carnevale. E-mail Jimmy Bailey. Review file before sending it to be copied. Tel Corky Carnevale, prepare subpoena to get his file. letter to Dingle with Subpoena's E-mail to Corky with Subpoena for his file. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 11/12/2009									
Transaction Date 11/13/2009									
20081229.00	11/13/2009	2 A	1		200.00	0.60	0.60	120.00	ARCH
Review info from Corky Carnevale Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 11/13/2009									
Transaction Date 11/16/2009									
20081229.00	11/16/2009	2 A	1		200.00	1.50	1.50	300.00	ARCH
Review docs from Corky, letter to Dingle. Tel LS3P will pull the file and get back for me to review. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 11/16/2009									
Transaction Date 11/23/2009									
20081229.00	11/23/2009	2 A	1		200.00	1.50	1.50	300.00	ARCH
Review article from Jimmy Bailey from the Post Courier. Pull appraisal from Corky's file and e-mail to Jimmy. Review Tower Company file at Hop Iglehart office. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 11/23/2009									
Transaction Date 12/03/2009									
20081229.00	12/03/2009	2 A	1		200.00	0.30	0.30	60.00	ARCH
Review info from the City of Chas building inspectors office. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 12/03/2009									
Transaction Date 01/19/2010									
20081229.00	01/19/2010	2 A	1		200.00	1.20	1.20	240.00	ARCH
Review Docs from LS3P Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 01/19/2010									
Transaction Date 02/18/2010									
20081229.00	02/18/2010	2 A	1		200.00	0.50	0.50	100.00	ARCH
Prepare deposition notices. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 02/18/2010									
Transaction Date 02/23/2010									
20081229.00	02/23/2010	2 A	1		200.00	0.10	0.10	20.00	ARCH
E-mail lawyers re deposition. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 02/23/2010									
Transaction Date 03/11/2010									
20081229.00	03/11/2010	2 A	1		200.00	0.10	0.10	20.00	ARCH
E-mail Dingle re depositions. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									

Client	Trans Date	Tmkr	H P	Tcode/ Task Code	Rate	Hours Worked	Hours to Bill	Amount	Ref #
Transaction Date 03/11/2010									
Total for Transaction Date 03/11/2010					Billable	0.10	0.10	20.00	
Transaction Date 03/15/2010									
20081229.00	03/15/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.10	0.10	20.00	Prepare depositions, e-mail Hop Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 03/15/2010					Billable	0.10	0.10	20.00	
Transaction Date 03/16/2010									
20081229.00	03/16/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.10	0.10	20.00	Review and revise subpoena for Keith Powell with Optima Towers Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 03/16/2010					Billable	0.10	0.10	20.00	
Transaction Date 04/20/2010									
20081229.00	04/20/2010	2	A	1	200.00	1.10	1.10	220.00	Review file for deposition Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 04/20/2010					Billable	1.10	1.10	220.00	
Transaction Date 04/21/2010									
20081229.00	04/21/2010	2	A	1	200.00	2.70	2.70	540.00	Attend deposition. Review lease research Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 04/21/2010					Billable	2.70	2.70	540.00	
Transaction Date 06/02/2010									
20081229.00	06/02/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.10	0.10	20.00	E-mail; Dingle re depositions Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 06/02/2010					Billable	0.10	0.10	20.00	
Transaction Date 06/21/2010									
20081229.00	06/21/2010	2	A	1	200.00	4.05	4.05	810.00	Work on Summary Judgment motion. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 06/21/2010					Billable	4.05	4.05	810.00	
Transaction Date 06/22/2010									
20081229.00	06/22/2010	2	A	1	200.00	3.90	3.90	780.00	Prepare for Deposition. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 06/22/2010					Billable	3.90	3.90	780.00	
Transaction Date 06/23/2010									
20081229.00	06/23/2010	2	A	1	200.00	1.25	1.25	250.00	Tel Dingle take Clyde Hiers deposition. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 06/23/2010					Billable	1.25	1.25	250.00	
Transaction Date 06/24/2010									
20081229.00	06/24/2010	2	A	1	200.00	1.90	1.90	380.00	Research re terms of lease. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 06/24/2010					Billable	1.90	1.90	380.00	
Transaction Date 06/29/2010									
20081229.00	06/29/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.20	0.20	40.00	Tel Bill Cochran re his deposition. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 06/29/2010					Billable	0.20	0.20	40.00	
Transaction Date 07/01/2010									
20081229.00	07/01/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.40	0.40	80.00	Work on Summary Judgment motion Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH

Client	Trans Date	Tmkr	H P	Tcode/ Task Code	Rate	Hours Worked	Hours to Bill	Amount		Ref #
Transaction Date 07/01/2010										
Total for Transaction Date 07/01/2010					Billable	0:40	0:40	80.00		
Transaction Date 07/06/2010										
20081229.00	07/06/2010	2	A	1	200.00	2.10	2.10	420.00	Work on motion for Summary Judgment Magnolia Paradgm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 07/06/2010					Billable	2:10	2:10	420.00		
Transaction Date 07/19/2010										
20081229.00	07/19/2010	2	A	1	200.00	1.70	1.70	340.00	Meet with Bill Cochran to prep for his deposition. Magnolia Paradgm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 07/19/2010					Billable	1:70	1:70	340.00		
Transaction Date 07/20/2010										
20081229.00	07/20/2010	2	A	1	200.00	2.20	2.20	440.00	Meet with Bill Cochran, attend Bill's deposition. Get memo of lease signed. Prepare acknowledgement for memo of lease Magnolia Paradgm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 07/20/2010					Billable	2:20	2:20	440.00		
Transaction Date 08/02/2010										
20081229.00	08/02/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.80	0.80	160.00	Staus Conference with J. Scarborough Magnolia Paradgm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 08/02/2010					Billable	0:80	0:80	160.00		
Transaction Date 08/03/2010										
20081229.00	08/03/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.30	0.30	60.00	E-mail Bachman re mediation dates. Magnolia Paradgm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 08/03/2010					Billable	0:30	0:30	60.00		
Transaction Date 09/01/2010										
20081229.00	09/01/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.50	0.50	100.00	Prepare answer to amended complaint. Revise letter to Dingel, prepare forwarding letter to J. Scarborough. Magnolia Paradgm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 09/01/2010					Billable	0:50	0:50	100.00		
Transaction Date 09/02/2010										
20081229.00	09/02/2010	2	A	1	200.00	2.10	2.10	420.00	Prepare for Deposition and deposition Magnolia Paradgm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 09/02/2010					Billable	2:10	2:10	420.00		
Transaction Date 09/14/2010										
20081229.00	09/14/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.80	0.80	160.00	Work on Summary Judgment / letter to mediator. Magnolia Paradgm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 09/14/2010					Billable	0:80	0:80	160.00		
Transaction Date 09/16/2010										
20081229.00	09/16/2010	2	A	1	200.00	1.50	1.50	300.00	Research Magnolia Paradgm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 09/16/2010					Billable	1:50	1:50	300.00		
Transaction Date 09/17/2010										
20081229.00	09/17/2010	2	A	1	200.00	2.10	2.10	420.00	Memo to Bachman Magnolia Paradgm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH

Client	Trans Date	Tmkr	H P	Tcode/ Task Code	Rate	Hours Worked	Hours to Bill	Amount	Ref #
Transaction Date 09/17/2010									
Total for Transaction Date 09/17/2010					Billable	2.10	2.10	420.00	
Transaction Date 09/22/2010									
20081229.00	09/22/2010	2	A	1	200.00	4.80	4.80	960.00	ARCH
Mediation, tel Jimmy re his role. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 09/22/2010					Billable	4.80	4.80	960.00	
Transaction Date 09/27/2010									
20081229.00	09/27/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.65	0.65	130.00	ARCH
Tel Jimmy Bailey re meeting today with Corky. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 09/27/2010					Billable	0.65	0.65	130.00	
Transaction Date 09/28/2010									
20081229.00	09/28/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.70	0.70	140.00	ARCH
Work on Summary Judgment motion. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 09/28/2010					Billable	0.70	0.70	140.00	
Transaction Date 09/29/2010									
20081229.00	09/29/2010	2	A	1	200.00	1.20	1.20	240.00	ARCH
Research Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 09/29/2010					Billable	1.20	1.20	240.00	
Transaction Date 09/30/2010									
20081229.00	09/30/2010	2	A	1	200.00	2.50	2.50	500.00	ARCH
E-mail Jimmy for status, prepare Summary Judgment motion. Tel Jimmy re value. Tel Bachman. Research Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 09/30/2010					Billable	2.50	2.50	500.00	
Transaction Date 10/01/2010									
20081229.00	10/01/2010	2	A	1	200.00	1.30	1.30	260.00	ARCH
Work on Summary Judgment motion. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 10/01/2010					Billable	1.30	1.30	260.00	
Transaction Date 10/06/2010									
20081229.00	10/06/2010	2	A	1	200.00	1.30	1.30	260.00	ARCH
Tel Bachman re matter, discussed the price, he seems to agree that the \$302K is a good price. He has a call into Dingle. Research damages issue Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 10/06/2010					Billable	1.30	1.30	260.00	
Transaction Date 10/07/2010									
20081229.00	10/07/2010	2	A	1	200.00	4.00	4.00	800.00	ARCH
Research damages. Tel Bachman prepare e-mail to Jimmy. Review Jimmy's response and respond. Tel Aaron. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 10/07/2010					Billable	4.00	4.00	800.00	
Transaction Date 10/13/2010									
20081229.00	10/13/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.50	0.50	100.00	ARCH
Tel TB re settlement Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 10/13/2010					Billable	0.50	0.50	100.00	
Transaction Date 10/15/2010									
20081229.00	10/15/2010	2	A	1	200.00	1.20	1.20	240.00	ARCH
Work on Memo for Summary Judgment Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									

Detail Transaction File List Barr, Unger & McIntosh, LLC

Client	Trans Date	Tmkr	H P	Tcode/ Task Code	Rate	Hours Worked	Hours to Bill	Amount	Ref #
Transaction Date 10/15/2010									
Total for Transaction Date 10/15/2010					Billable	1:20	1:20	240.00	
Transaction Date 10/18/2010									
20081229.00	10/18/2010	2	A	1	200.00	3.90	3.90	780.00	Work on Summary Judgement memo. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 10/18/2010					Billable	3:90	3:90	780.00	
Transaction Date 10/19/2010									
20081229.00	10/19/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.90	0.90	180.00	Work on memo. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 10/19/2010					Billable	0:90	0:90	180.00	
Transaction Date 10/21/2010									
20081229.00	10/21/2010	2	A	1	200.00	2.10	2.10	420.00	Work on Summary Judgment. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
20081229.00	10/21/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.20	0.20	40.00	Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 10/21/2010					Billable	2:30	2:30	460.00	
Transaction Date 10/25/2010									
20081229.00	10/25/2010	2	A	1	200.00	5.60	5.60	1,120.00	Prepare for Summary Judgment motion. Attend hearing. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 10/25/2010					Billable	5:60	5:60	1,120.00	
Transaction Date 10/26/2010									
20081229.00	10/26/2010	2	A	1	200.00	2.10	2.10	420.00	Research, letter to J. Scarborough. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 10/26/2010					Billable	2:10	2:10	420.00	
Transaction Date 11/02/2010									
20081229.00	11/02/2010	2	A	1	200.00	0.30	0.30	60.00	Review letter from Dingle to J. Scarborough. Prepare response. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 11/02/2010					Billable	0:30	0:30	60.00	
Transaction Date 01/05/2011									
20081229.00	01/05/2011	2	A	1	200.00	0.25	0.25	50.00	Review Order from J. Scarborough denying motion for Summary Judgement. E-mail Jeff re pretrial conference Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 01/05/2011					Billable	0:25	0:25	50.00	
Transaction Date 02/21/2011									
20081229.00	02/21/2011	2	A	1	200.00	1.00	1.00	200.00	Trial Prep. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 02/21/2011					Billable	1:00	1:00	200.00	
Transaction Date 02/22/2011									
20081229.00	02/22/2011	2	A	1	200.00	0.70	0.70	140.00	Meet with partner in regard to pre trial. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 02/22/2011					Billable	0:70	0:70	140.00	
Transaction Date 03/14/2011									
20081229.00	03/14/2011	2	A	1	200.00	0.10	0.10	20.00	E-mail Dingle re consent order to continue the trial date. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH

Client	Trans Date	Tmkr	H P	Tcode/ Task Code	Rate	Hours Worked	Hours to Bill	Amount	Ref #
Transaction Date 03/14/2011									
Total for Transaction Date 03/14/2011					Billable	0:10	0:10	20.00	
Transaction Date 04/29/2011									
20081229.00	04/29/2011	2 A	1		200.00	0.10	0.10	20.00	Hearing notice to Dingle Howe, Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 04/29/2011					Billable	0:10	0:10	20.00	
Transaction Date 08/01/2011									
20081229.00	08/01/2011	2 A	1		200.00	1.20	1.20	240.00	Attend Pre trial, set for October 11, 2011 Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 08/01/2011					Billable	1:20	1:20	240.00	
Transaction Date 09/20/2011									
20081229.00	09/20/2011	2 A	1		200.00	3.20	3.20	640.00	Trial Prep Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 09/20/2011					Billable	3:20	3:20	640.00	
Transaction Date 09/21/2011									
20081229.00	09/21/2011	2 A	1		200.00	3.70	3.70	740.00	Trial Prep, tel Barbara re lease payments, review her schedule. Prepare comparison schedule. review Corky's file. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 09/21/2011					Billable	3:70	3:70	740.00	
Transaction Date 09/22/2011									
20081229.00	09/22/2011	2 A	1		200.00	1.00	1.00	200.00	Trial Prep, tel Bill Cochran left message. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 09/22/2011					Billable	1:00	1:00	200.00	
Transaction Date 10/03/2011									
20081229.00	10/03/2011	2 P	1		200.00	0.40	0.40	80.00	Prepare atty fee affidavit Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC 118
Total for Transaction Date 10/03/2011					Billable	0:40	0:40	80.00	
Transaction Date 10/05/2011									
20081229.00	10/05/2011	2 P	1		200.00	2.80	2.80	560.00	Meet with Bill Cochran to prepare for Trial. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC 121
Total for Transaction Date 10/05/2011					Billable	2:80	2:80	560.00	
Transaction Date 10/06/2011									
20081229.00	10/06/2011	2 P	1		200.00	4.20	4.20	840.00	Trial Prep. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC 122
Total for Transaction Date 10/06/2011					Billable	4:20	4:20	840.00	
Transaction Date 10/07/2011									
20081229.00	10/07/2011	2 P	1		200.00	0.30	0.30	60.00	Trial Prep Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC 124
Total for Transaction Date 10/07/2011					Billable	0:30	0:30	60.00	
Transaction Date 10/08/2011									
20081229.00	10/08/2011	2 P	1		200.00	2.90	2.90	580.00	Trial Prep. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC 125
Total for Transaction Date 10/08/2011					Billable	2:90	2:90	580.00	
Transaction Date 10/10/2011									
20081229.00	10/10/2011	2 P	1		200.00	3.60	3.60	720.00	Review motion for summary judgment in 126

Detail Transaction File List
Barr, Unger & McIntosh, LLC

Client	Trans Date	Tmkr	H P	Tcode/ Task Code	Rate	Hours Worked	Hours to Bill	Amount	Ref #
Transaction Date 10/10/2011									
preparation for trial. Tel Dingle re sale in settlement, tel Jimmy Bailey. tel TB. E-mail Dingle proposal and counter proposal from August. Calculate the differenced based on rental owed. Meet with TB. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC									
Total for Transaction Date 10/10/2011									
Billable 3:60 3:60 720:00									
GRAND TOTALS									
Billable 109.70 109.70 21,940.00									

Detail Cost Transaction File List
Barr, Unger & McIntosh, LLC

Page: 1

Client	Trans Date	Tmkr	H P	Tcode/ Task Code	Rate	Amount	Ref #
Transaction Date 08/20/2009							
20081229.00	08/20/2009	2	A	61		25.00 Filing Fee Charleston County Clerk of Court Magnolia Paradigm, Inc.	ARCH
20081229.00	08/20/2009	2	A	61		125.00 Filing Fee Master in Equity Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 08/20/2009					Billable	150.00	
Transaction Date 11/06/2009							
20081229.00	11/06/2009	2	A	55		80.63 West Law Charges Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 11/06/2009					Billable	80.63	
Transaction Date 11/13/2009							
20081229.00	11/13/2009	2	A	61		193.84 ProCopy, Inc. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 11/13/2009					Billable	193.84	
Transaction Date 04/21/2010							
20081229.00	04/21/2010	2	A	99		219.80 Legal Media Inc. - Transcript Steven Keith Powell Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 04/21/2010					Billable	219.80	
Transaction Date 08/10/2010							
20081229.00	08/10/2010	2	A	99		188.65 A. William Roberts, Jr. & Associates Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 08/10/2010					Billable	188.65	
Transaction Date 08/17/2010							
20081229.00	08/17/2010	2	A	99		67.75 Legal Media Inc. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 08/17/2010					Billable	67.75	
Transaction Date 09/02/2010							
20081229.00	09/02/2010	2	A	99		54.50 Legal Media Inc. Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 09/02/2010					Billable	54.50	
Transaction Date 09/30/2010							
20081229.00	09/30/2010	2	A	99		25.00 Charleston County Clerk of Court Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 09/30/2010					Billable	25.00	
Transaction Date 10/07/2010							
20081229.00	10/07/2010	2	A	55		121.06 West Law Charges Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 10/07/2010					Billable	121.06	
Transaction Date 10/19/2010							
20081229.00	10/19/2010	2	A	55		59.61 West Law Charges Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
Total for Transaction Date 10/19/2010					Billable	59.61	
Transaction Date 03/14/2011							
20081229.00	03/14/2011	2	A	99		25.00 Charleston County Clerk of Court Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH
20081229.00	03/14/2011	2	A	99		35.00 Charleston County Master In Equity Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC	ARCH

WSB

Monday 10/10/2011 4:28 am

Detail Cost Transaction File List
Barr, Unger & McIntosh, LLC

Client	Trans Date	Tmkr	H Tcode/ P Task Code	Rate	Amount	Ref #
Total for Transaction Date 03/14/2011						
				Billable	60.00	
GRAND TOTALS						
				Billable	1,220.84	

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
MASTER-IN-EQUITY

Mikell R. Scarborough, Master-In-Equity for Charleston County

Case No. 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,

Respondent,

vs.

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,

Appellant.

BY

JULIE J. ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT


2012 NOV 14 PM 1:25

FILED

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Magnolia Paradigm, Inc. appeals the Order of the Honorable Mikell R. Scarborough dated June 11, 2012 and the Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion Pursuant to Rule 59(e), SCRCP, dated July 9, 2012. Appellant received written notice of entry of the Order on October 15, 2012.

November 12, 2012.



WILLIAM S. BARR

11 Broad Street, P. O. Box 1037

Charleston, SC 29402

(803) 577-5083

ATTORNEY FOR THE APPELLANT

Other Counsel of Record:

Donald H. Howe, Esquire
Howe & Wyndham, LLP
47 State Street
Charleston, SC 29401

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
MASTER-IN-EQUITY

Mikell R. Scarborough, Master-In-Equity, Ninth Judicial Circuit

Case No. 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC,

Respondent,

vs.

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.,

Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served a Notice of Appeal on the Respondent, 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC, by hand delivery of same, on November 12, 2012, addressed to his attorney of record, Donald H. Howe, Esquire, Howe & Wyndham, LLP, 47 State Street, Charleston, SC 29402.



WILLIAM S. BARR
Barr, Barr & McIntosh
P. O. Box 1037
Charleston, SC 29402
(803) 577-5083

November 12, 2012

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

BY

JULIE J. ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT

2012 NOV 14 PM 1:25

FILED

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
MIKELL R. SCARBOROUGH, MASTER-IN-EQUITY

CASE NUMBER: 2008-CP-10-3590

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC.....Appellant,

v.

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.....Respondent.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

56 Leinbach Investors, LLC appeals the Judgment of the Honorable Mikell R. Scarborough dated August 31, 2012 (filed October 8, 2012). Appellant received written notice of entry of this Judgment on October 11, 2012.



DONALD H. HOWE
HOWE & WYNDHAM, L.L.P.
47 State Street
Post Office Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402-0598
(843) 853-6121
Attorney for Appellant

Other Counsel of Record:

William S. Barr
Barr, Unger & McIntosh, LLC
11 Broad Street
Charleston, SC 29401
(843) 577-5083
Attorney for Respondent

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
MASTER-IN-EQUITY

HON. MIKELL SCARBOROUGH, MASTER-IN-EQUITY

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2012-213389

56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC.....APPELLANT/RESPONDENT

v.

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC RESPONDENT/APPELLANT

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

Appellant/Respondent, 56 Leinbach Investors, LLC, hereby certifies pursuant to South Carolina Rules of Appellate Procedure 210(g) that the Record on Appeal contains all material proposed to be included by any of the parties and not any other material.

LAW OFFICES OF DONALD H. HOWE, LLC



Donald H. Howe, Esquire

47 State Street

Post Office Box 598

Charleston, SC 29402-0598

(843)853-6121

Attorney for Appellant/Respondent

August 7, 2013

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Master-In-Equity

Hon. Mikell Scarborough, Master-In-Equity

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2012-213389


56 LEINBACH INVESTORS, LLC.....Appellant/Respondent

v.

MAGNOLIA PARADIGM, INC.....Respondent/Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Respondent/Appellant with the Record On Appeal by delivering a copy of it by hand on August 9, 2013, addressed to the attorney of record, William S. Barr, Esquire, 11 Broad Street, Charleston, SC 29401.



DONALD H. HOWE
Law Offices of Donald H. Howe, LLC
SC BAR#002690
47 State Street
Post Office Box 598
Charleston, SC 29402-0598

Attorney for Appellant/Respondent
56 Leinbach Investors, LLC

RECEIVED

AUG 12 2013

SC Court of Appeals