

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

---

Appellate Case No. 2019-001254  
WCC File No. 1506114

---

**RECEIVED**

JUN 08 2020

**SC Court of Appeals**

Frankie Padgett, Claimant..... Respondent,

v.

Cast & Crew Entertainment Services, Inc., Employer and  
American Zurich Insurance Company, Carrier..... Appellants,

---

**INITIAL REPLY BRIEF**

---

Vernon F. Dunbar  
McAngus Goudelock & Courie, LLC  
55 East Camperdown Way  
Suite 300  
Greenville, South Carolina 29601  
864-239-6735  
[vernon.dunbar@mgclaw.com](mailto:vernon.dunbar@mgclaw.com)  
Attorney for Appellants

## ARGUMENTS

Respondent simply ignores the fact that the Commission is not empowered to award benefits under the workers' Compensation Act because it is deprived of jurisdiction on either one or two grounds: (1) the language of the clincher, judgment and/or judicial decree filed on October 22, 2012, voids any potential future employer/employee relationship between Respondent and Cast & Crew and/or (2) payment in excess of 500 weeks of disability benefits have been paid to Respondent.

### **I. THE COMMISSION'S FINDINGS AND LEGAL CONCLUSIONS THAT RESPONDENT WAS AN EMPLOYEE OF CAST & CREW WERE NOT APPEALED AND IS THE LAW OF THE CASE.**

Respondent artfully argues on one hand that there is no employment relationship between he and Cast and Crew Entertainment Services. On the other hand, Respondent argues that the supposedly non-existent employment relationship cannot be voided based upon the common law defense set forth in the case of *Cooper v. McDevitt & Street*, 260 S.C. 463, 196 S.E. 2d 833 (1973).

Appellants never argued that the employment relationship between it and Respondent was voidable on the holding promulgated in the case of *Cooper v. McDevitt & Street*, *supra*. Rather, Appellants argued that Respondent willfully and knowingly breached the clincher agreement by seeking and securing re-employment with Cast & Crew. As such, Respondent's re-employment in 2015 violated/breached the contractual agreement, which should serve as a bar to Respondent's request for workers' compensation benefits.

In short, Respondent's argument that his employment with Cast & Crew beginning in 2015 is not subject being voided or rescinded because of the holding in *Cooper v. McDevitt & Street, supra.*, is simply legally inapplicable, incorrect and misleading to the Court.

Respondent avers that an employment relationship was established beginning on March 30, 2015 between Cast and Crew Entertainment Services. To this end, Respondent asserts that the employment relationship cannot be voided. Ironically, Respondent at the same time advances a very perplexing and illogical argument that an employment relationship does not exist between the parties. In a feeble effort to advance this argument, Respondent argues that Cast and Crew was not his employer, but rather Danger Boy Productions. Respondent failed to appeal the Commission's findings of fact and rulings of law on this issue. The Hearing and Full Commission found and determined that Cast and Crew was in fact Respondent's employer at the time of his accident on May 6, 2015 in findings of fact 1-4. Specifically, the Full Commission's Order states:

- 1. Claimant was an employee of Cast & Crew Entertainment Services on May 6, 2015, the date of his accident. Claimant completed employment application documents dated March 30, 2015, that clearly reflect his employer was "Cast & Crew"...**
- 2. Cast & Crew Entertainment Services is listed as a business entity in public documents obtained from the South Carolina Secretary of State's office. No documents were submitted which reflects Danger Boy Production was a recognized business entity operating within the jurisdiction of the state of South Carolina.**

3. **Cast & Crew Entertainment Services' designation as an employer was proven by "sic" preponderance of the evidence. Moreover, Cast & Crew's designation as an employer is analogous to an upstream contractor and a Professional Employer Organization (PEO). In both instances, the upstream contractor and the PEO are entities not directly controlling the daily operations of the employee, nevertheless, each entity is designated as the employer. See S.C. Code Ann. §§ 42-1-400 et. seq. and 40-68-60 "sic" 275 (2018).**
4. **Danger Boy Productions was the production company for the show which Claimant was providing transportation services, but was not Claimant's actual employer. Claimant's testimony that he thought Danger Boy Productions was his employer is not supported by the greater weight of the evidence. The greater weight of the evidence, including the personnel paperwork and Claimant's pay stubs, support a finding the Cast & Crew is Claimant's employer.**

Because Respondent failed to timely file an appeal with regard to the Commission's factual findings and legal conclusions that Cast & Crew was his employer, this argument is not preserved for review and will not be considered by this Court as a matter of law. *See Brunson the American Koyo Bearings, 367 S. C. 161, 165-166, 623 S. E. 2d 870, 872 (Ct. App. 2005).*

**II. THE COMMISSION DETERMINED THAT THERE IS COMPELLING EVIDENCE REFLECTING RESPONDENT DECEITFULLY USED TWO VERSIONS OF HIS NAME TO OBTAIN RE-EMPLOYMENT WITH CAST & CREW.**

Respondent's argument that Appellants were not confused about his identity ignores the Commission's un-appealed findings of fact regarding Respondent's obvious deceit in securing workers' compensation benefits by utilizing a drastic variation in his name. In finding of fact 5, the Full Commission affirmed the Hearing Commissioner's finding that there was compelling evidence of breach of promise by deception committed by Respondent in order to conceal his true identity and avoid the prohibition to seek re-employment with Cast & Crew. *Foxfire Village, Inc. v. Black & Veatch, Inc.*, 304 S.C. 366, 404 S.E.2d 912 (Ct. App. 1991).

Again, Respondent failed to appeal the finding of fact that he acted in a deceitful and deliberate manner in concealing his identity and breach the contract/agreement preventing him for seeking employment with Cast & Crew. As such, this argument is not preserved for review. *Brunson v. American Koyo Bearings*, 367 S. C. 161, 623 S. E. 2d 87 (Ct. App. 2005).

Last, Respondent's deception and acts to conceal his identity in view of the presupposition that he was contractually and legally prohibited from working with Cast & Crew after October 22, 2012, is reflected in finding of fact 5. Specifically, the Full Commission affirmed the Hearing Commissioner in finding that:

**[O]nce Claimant reviewed the hiring or initial paperwork and discovered that Cast & Crew was to pay his wages and did in fact pay his salary, he had ample opportunity [to] decline the assignment. However, the facts show Claimant expressly and knowingly accepted the work assignment with Cast & Crew, which violated the terms of the contract and the settlement agreement, and release.**

There is no doubt from the findings of the Full Commission that it unequivocally determined Respondent's actions were intended to breach the agreement/clincher and to deceive and confuse Appellants in order for him to circumvent the settlement, judgment and judicial decree to obtain employment. As such, Respondent's disingenuous argument that he acted honorably and honestly should be dismissed and afforded no consideration.

### **III. THE ORDER COMPELLING THE PAYMENT OF BENEFITS IS NULL AND VOID BECAUSE THE COMMISSION LACKS SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION.**

The decision of the Full Commission to order reinstatement of Respondents' temporary total disability compensation benefits absent subject matter jurisdiction constitutes an error of law. *See Hairston v. Re: Leasing, Inc.*, 286 S.C. 493, 334 S.E.2d 825 (Ct. App. 1985). In short, the Commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction on following three grounds.

First, the clincher agreement reached between the Appellants and Respondent with respect to the 2009 case rendered void any future employment relationship. In particular, Respondent's August 27, 2009, work related accident was resolved on October 22, 2012, by virtue of payment of \$150,000.00 as consideration for a settlement agreement and release or clincher. The clincher was also designated as an official act, judgment or decree of South Carolina. As such, the clincher, which is also designated as a judgment or judicial decree filed with the Commission on October 22, 2012, cannot be altered, amended, modified or interpreted in any other fashion according to *Section VIV* of the agreement.

In short, the Commission violated *Section VIV* of the clincher by ignoring the plain and simple terms of the agreement restricting Respondent seeking re-employment and awarding benefits by finding an employment relationship existed in view of Respondent's subversive actions.

Second, clincher agreement states that it shall serve a dual purpose. One purpose is to resolve the workers' compensation claim. The second purpose is the clincher agreement is to serve as a binding contract, enforceable in a court of competent jurisdiction.

Respondent clearly now wishes to challenge the second purpose of the agreement, which is the validity of the agreement entered into 2012 that Respondent would not seek future employment with Cast & Crew. In order to challenge the validity of the employment clause reflected in the agreement, Respondent is legally and contractually required to dispute the provision that "he will not seek future employment" in a court of competent jurisdiction--which is not the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission.

Because our courts do not restrict parties' right to contract and Respondent's failure to properly challenge the validity of the employment provision in a court of competent jurisdiction, the prohibition against Respondent seeking future employment with Cast & Crew remains binding upon Respondent and Appellants. *S.C. code Ann. §42-9-390 (2020)*. See also, *Stonhard, Inc., v. Carolina flooring Specialists, Inc.*, 366 S.C. 156, 621 S.E.2d 352 (2005). Accordingly, absent proof or evidence that the judicial decree, judgement or act should be vacated or rescinded, the terms of the document are controlling. *Id.*

Third, Respondent has been paid in excess of 500 weeks of compensation benefits as a result of the 2009 and 2015 claims. Temporary total disability benefits resulting from the 2015 claim are currently being paid pursuant to the order of the Full Commission.

Respondent conveniently overlooks the fact the clincher states that the payment of \$150,000.00 was in consideration for his demand of payment of permanent disability benefits for various bodily injuries suffered in 2009. As such, Respondent was paid \$150,000.00 in

permanent disability benefits in 2012, which is equivalent to 1,704.56 weeks of compensation according to the terms of the clincher.

Claimant had pled in a Form 50 dated November 19, 2010, he was disabled by virtue of general disability (section 42-9-10 to wit: left and right leg; and left and right hip); wage loss (42-9-20); and scheduled loss of numerous body parts--left foot, left and right leg, back, left and right hip, and skin--for permanent and total disability (section 42-9-30). *S.C. Code Ann. §§41-9-10 to 42-9-30 (2020)*. Respondent's unilateral demand for an allocation of a lump sum payment for payment of permanent disability benefits over 1,704.56 weeks is uncontroverted. Undoubtedly, Respondent has been paid in excess of 500 weeks of benefits in contravention to the 500 week limitation as set forth in section 42-9-170. *S.C. Code Ann. §42-9-170 (2020)*.

Respondent's reliance upon *Lemon v. Mt. Pleasant Waterworks*, 429 S.C. 59, 837 S.E.2d 738 (Ct. App. 2019) is factually and legally misplaced and is not applicable to the case at bar. *Lemon v. Mt. Pleasant Waterworks*, *supra*, does not stand for the legal proposition that Appellants are not entitled to credit for benefits previously paid; and that Respondent can recover in excess of 500 weeks of benefits in the absence of involvement by the Second Injury Fund. Simply, section 42-9-10(A) does not remotely enter into the legal analysis because of allegations on the Form 50 that Respondent was disabled because of loss of both legs and hips per section 42-9-10(B) or in the alternative, he was compensated for loss of use of the left foot, left hip, back and disfigurement per section 42-9-30.

Because Respondent has been paid in excess of 500 weeks of disability compensation benefits, payment of additional benefits cannot be lawfully ordered. Because jurisdiction is a question of law, the findings and conclusions of the Commission are reviewable and are subject

to appellate review, and in which case, this Court can reach its own legal conclusions. *Addison v. Dixie Chevrolet Co.*, 246 S.C. 86, 142 S.E.2d 442 (1965).

Recognizing that this court is empowered to make its own findings and conclusions with regard to the jurisdictional and legal issues raised in this appeal, the Court must consider the fact disability compensation benefits with regard to the 2015 claim has been paid continuously since May 7, 2015 to the present.<sup>1</sup> Thus, as of June 3, 2020 Respondent will have been paid an additional 265 weeks of workers' compensation benefits. Even when calculating the most conservative figures regarding the number of weeks paid pursuant to the 2009 claim, Respondent has been paid in excess of 639 weeks of compensation benefits.<sup>2</sup> Hence, payment of additional benefits are not warranted under the Act. As a result, the Commission did not possess subject matter jurisdiction to lawfully order additional benefits beyond the payment of 500 weeks of benefits.

### CONCLUSION

In summary, the arguments set forth in Respondent's brief simply ignore the obvious fact the South Carolina Workers Compensation Commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction over this proceeding. Furthermore, Respondents' argument that the 2012 clincher is void under public policy is not persuasive and is not supported by any factual evidence or legal basis.

The clincher is deemed an act, judgement or judicial decree, in addition to being deemed a contract, and subject to enforcement by a "court of competent jurisdiction". Candidly, the use

---


<sup>1</sup> Weeks of compensation paid for 2015 claim from May 7, 2015 through June 3, 2020 and continuing presently totals 265 weeks.

<sup>2</sup> Weeks of compensation paid for 2009 claim reflects 154.84 weeks of temporary total disability benefits was paid. A minimum of 220.14 weeks of permanent disability benefits have been paid [\$150,000.00 divided by a compensation rate of \$681.36]. A grand total of 374.98 weeks were paid as a result of the 2009 claim.

of the words “court of competent jurisdiction” clearly deprives the Commission of jurisdiction. Thus, the Commission’s action in awarding benefits are null and void. Accordingly, the decision of the Full Commission must be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

McANGUS GOUDELOCK & COURIE, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Vernon F. Dunbar", is written over a horizontal line.

Vernon F. Dunbar

Post Office Box 2980

55 East Camperdown Way, Suite 300 (29601)

Greenville, South Carolina 29602

(864) 239-4000

June 3, 2020

Attorneys for Appellants

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA WORKERS' COMPENSATION  
COMMISSION

---

Appellate Case No. 2019-001254  
WCC File No. 1506114

---

**RECEIVED**  
JUN 08 2020  
SC Court of Appeals

Frankie Padgett, Claimant..... Respondent,

v.

Cast & Crew Entertainment Services, Inc., Employer,  
and American Zurich Insurance Company, Carrier, .....Appellants.


---

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

---

I hereby certify that I have this 3rd day of June 2020, caused to be served a copy of  
REPLY BRIEF, by electronic mail and by mailing a copy of same, postage prepaid, in the  
United States mail, with sufficient postage affixed as follows:

Stephen B. Samuels, Esquire  
Samuels Reynolds Law Firm  
1320 Richland Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

  
Vernon F. Dunbar  
McAngus, Goudelock & Courie LLC  
Post Office Box 2980  
55 East Camperdown Way, Suite 300 (29601)

Greenville, South Carolina 29602  
(864) 239-4000

Attorneys for Appellants

**Reply To**  
VERNON F. DUNBAR  
Direct Dial: (864) 239-6735  
vernon.dunbar@mgclaw.com

June 3, 2020

**RECEIVED**

JUN 08 2020

**SC Court of Appeals**


The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
South Carolina Court of Appeals  
Post Office Box 11629  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

RE: Frankie Padgett v. Cast & Crew Entertainment Services, Inc. and American  
Zurich Insurance Company c/o Zurich North America  
Date of Accident: May 6, 2015  
WCC File No.: 1506114  
Our File No.: 20216.17069  
Claim No.: 2840202414

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Please find attached/enclosed Appellants' Initial Reply Brief in the above  
referenced matter, along with proof of service reflecting service of the Reply Brief upon  
Stephen B. Samuels, attorney for Respondent.


Very truly yours,



Vernon F. Dunbar

VFD/\_amc

cc: Shana'e Montgomery, Zurich North America  
Stephen B. Samuels, Esquire, Samuels Reynolds Law Firm  
Enclosure: Reply Brief



**mgc** | INSURANCE  
DEFENSE

POST OFFICE BOX 11629  
ORLEANSVILLE, SC 29112

**RECEIVED**

JUN 08 2020

**SC Court of Appeals**

20216.17069/VFD/ma  
The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
South Carolina Court of Appeals  
Post Office Box 11629  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211