

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Ex Parte:

Builders Mutual Insurance Company and Nationwide
Mutual Insurance Company, Appellants,

In Re:

Palmetto Pointe at Peas Island Condominium Property
Owners Association, Inc., and Jack Love, Individually,
and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs,

v.

Island Pointe, LLC; Leonard T. Brown; Complete
Building Corporation; Tri-County Roofing, Inc.;
Creekside, Inc.; American Residential Services, LLC
d/b/a Rescue Rooter Charleston; Andersen Windows,
Inc.; Atlantic Building Construction Services, Inc. n/k/a
Atlantic Construction Services, Inc.; Christopher N.
Union; Builder Services Group, Inc. d/b/a Gale
Contractor Services; Novus Architects, Inc. f/k/a SGM
Architects, Inc.; Tallent and Sons, Inc.; WC Services,
Inc., CRG Engineering, Inc.; Certainteed Corporation;
Kelly Flooring Products, Inc. d/b/a Carpet Baggers and
John Doe 1-60, Defendants,

Tri-County Roofing, Inc., Third-Party Plaintiff,

v.

Cornerstone Construction and Mark Malloy d/b/a
Cornerstone Construction; Gutter Works, Inc. and
Michael L. Segars d/b/a Gutter Works; Mr. Gutter;
Litchfield Seamless Gutters & Windows, LLC and
Thomas Litchfield d/b/a Litchfield Seamless Gutter;
Miracle Siding, LLC and Wilson Lucas Sales d/b/a

Miracle Siding, LLC; Mark Palpoint a/k/a Micah Palpoint; Elroy Alonzo Vasquez; and Chris a/k/a John Doe 61, Third-Party Defendants.

And

Complete Building Corporation, Inc., Third-Party Plaintiff,

v.

Alderman Construction; Stanley's Vinyl Fence Designs; Cohen's Drywall; and Mosley Concrete, Third-Party Defendants,

Of Whom Palmetto Pointe at Peas Island Condominium Property Owners Association, Inc. and Jack Love, Individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Tri-County Roofing, Inc., Stanley's Vinyl Fence Designs, and WC Services, Inc. are the Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2019-000238

ORDER

Respondents seek a twenty-day extension to serve and file a return to the motion to appear as an amicus curiae. The extension is granted until October 7, 2019.

Respondents also move to hold the briefing time in abeyance until their extension request is ruled on. Since the time for the respondents to serve and file any brief in response to the amicus curiae brief can only begin to run if this Court grants the motion to appear as an amicus curiae, the motion to hold in abeyance is denied as unnecessary. Rule 213, SCACR ("If leave to file an amicus curiae brief is granted, the appellate court will specify the period in which a response to the

brief may be filed.").


C.J.
FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina
September 17, 2019

cc: John Lucius McCants, Esquire
Justin O'Toole Lucey, Esquire
Stephanie D. Drawdy, Esquire
Joshua Fletcher Evans, Esquire
Edward D. Buckley, Jr., Esquire
Steven L. Smith, Esquire
Zachary James Closser, Esquire
Samuel Melvil Wheeler, Esquire
John Robert Murphy, Esquire
Timothy J. Newton, Esquire
George Troy Thames, Esquire
James A. Atkins, Esquire
Mark Steven Barrow, Esquire
Christy Elizabeth Mahon, Esquire