

**RECEIVED**

**Jul 23 2020**

S.C. SUPREME COURT

**RECEIVED**

**Jul 23 2020**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM YORK COUNTY  
In The Circuit Court

William A. McKinnon, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2019-001061

James Stephen Nivens and Carolyn Nivens. .... Appellant

v.

JB & E Heating & Cooling, Inc..... Respondent

---

**INITIAL BRIEF OF RESPONDANT**

---

James W. Boyd  
Post Office Box 36425  
1544 Ebenezer Road  
Rock Hill, SC 29732  
(803) 328-2600  
Attorney for Respondent

July 23, 2020

Other Counsel of Record:

Mr. John Martin Foster  
PO Box 106  
Rock Hill, SC 29731-6106  
Attorney for Appellant

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Table of Authorities .....ii

Statement of Issues on Appeal..... 1

Facts ..... 1

Arguments.....2

I. THE PREDOMINANT PURPOSE OF THE CONTRACT WAS NOT A SALE  
OF GOODS AS CONTEMPLATED BY SOUTH CAROLINA CODE  
§36-2-725 .....2

Conclusion .....3

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

Ranger Construction Co. v. Dixie Floor Co., 433 F. Supp. 442 (D.S.C.1977) .....2

Fournie Furniture, Inc. v. Waltz-Holst Blow Pipe Co., 980 F. Supp. 187, 189  
(W.D. Va. 1997) .....2

Coakley & Williams, Inc. v. Shatterproof Glass Corp., 706 F.2d 456, 460  
(4th Cir.1983) .....2

Republic Contract Corporation v. SCDHPT, 332 S.C. 197, 503 SE2nd 761  
(SC App. 1998) .....3

**STATUTES**

South Carolina Code §36-2-725 .....2

## STATEMENT OF ISSUES

- I. THE PREDOMINANT PURPOSE OF THE CONTRACT WAS NOT A SALE OF GOODS AS CONTEMPLATED BY SOUTH CAROLINA CODE §36-2-725.**

## FACTS

On or about October 4, 2010, Appellant contracted with the Respondent for the installation of a geothermal HVAC unit at 105 Mountain View Street, Clover, SC. Pursuant to the contract the Respondent installed the unit. In March 2011 an email was sent by the Respondent that addressed the allegation by the Appellant that the unit was not working properly. The last time that the unit was worked on by the Respondent was 2012. On or about March 28, 2012, a complaint was filed with the South Carolina Department of Labor and Licensing Regulation before the Residential Builders Commission alleging that the Respondent had improperly installed of the unit. On February 13, 2013, Panther Heating and Cooling, Inc. prepared an inspection report for Appellant, identifying alleged defects in the installation of the HVAC system. On July 23, 2014, the Hearing Officer of the Commission issued a recommendation that the Complaint be dismissed. The Hearing Officer's recommendation was adopted as a final Order, was issued January 27, 2015. The Appellant commenced this action on August 10, 2017 by the filing of a Summons and Complaint. The Respondent timely answered and thereafter filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. The Motion for Summary Judgment was heard by the Court on February 7, 2019. On March 18, 2019 the Court issued its Order granting the Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment.

## ARGUMENTS

### **I. THE PREDOMINANT PURPOSE OF THE CONTRACT WAS NOT A SALE OF GOOD AS CONTEMPLATED BY SOUTH CAROLINA CODE §36-2-725.**

In order for a contract to fall under the six year statute of limitations of the South Carolina Code §36-2-725 the contract must be for goods rather than services. If a contract provides for both good and services the Court use the “Predominant Purpose” test to determine if the UCCS applies. *Ranger Construction Co. v. Dixie Floor Co.*, 433 F. Supp. 442 (D.S.C.1977). If the predominant purpose of the contract is the rendition of service with goods incidentally involved the UCC is not applicable. In determining the predominant purpose of the contract, the Court should consider the language of the contract the structure of compensation and ratio of materials supplied to labor expended. *Fournie Furniture, Inc. v. Waltz-Holst Blow Pipe Co.*, 980 F. Supp. 187, 189 (W.D. Va. 1997). In the Court’s Order, the Court found that the total value of the contract was \$15,280.00. The Court further found that only \$6,100.00, including sales tax, was for the material which is less than 40% of the total value of the contract. The Appellant agreed with this calculation. <sup>1</sup> There were no allegations that the equipment was defective. The complaint was concerning the services provided by the Respondent including an allegation that the Respondent did not chose the correct equipment. The Respondent did not design, fabricate or manufacture the Climate Master Unit. The Respondent acquired the unit its necessary materials to the removal and installation service contract.

The Respondent cites the case *Coakley & Williams, Inc. v. Shatterproof Glass Corp.*, 706 F.2d 456, 460 (4th Cir.1983) In *Coakley* the Court looked at the language of

---

<sup>1</sup> Transcript of Record dated May 31, 2019, Pg. 7, line 2-7;

the contract, the nature of the supplier's business and the intrinsic worth of the materials provided as the factors in determining predominant nature of the contract. In the present case the contract itself is unclear as to whether it is predominantly for the sale of goods or for services. In looking at the second factor, the nature of the suppliers business, the Respondent is not a manufacturer or a store selling a product. It is a heating and cooling company that installs products. In looking at the intrinsic materials provided the undisputed fact is that over 60% of the contract was for insulation. These factors clearly weigh in the Respondent's favor.

The statute of limitations runs from the date the injury is discoverable by the exercise of reasonable diligence. *Republic Contract Corporation v. SCDHPT*, 332 S.C. 197, 503 SE2nd 761 (SC App. 1998) The appellant had the inspection report of Panther Heating and Cooling, Inc. on February 13, 2013. The report identified problems in the system, so Appellant had notice of the problems by that date. This action was not filed until August 10, 2017, and therefore was not filed within the three year statute of limitations.

### CONCLUSION

Fore the reason stated, the Court should affirm the judgment of the Circuit Court.

Respectfully Submitted,

s/James W. Boyd 824  
1544 Ebenezer Road  
Post Office Box 36425  
Rock Hill, SC 29732  
(803) 328-2600 T  
(803) 328-5747 F  
[jamesboyd@comporium.net](mailto:jamesboyd@comporium.net)

July 23, 2020

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM YORK COUNTY  
In The Circuit Court

William A. McKinnon, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2019-001061

James Stephen Nivens and Carolyn Nivens. .... Appellant

v.

JB & E Heating & Cooling, Inc..... Respondent

---

PROOF OF SERVICE

---

I, certify that I served the Respondent's Initial Brief and Designation of Matter on James Steven Nivens and Carolyn Nivens by depositing a copies of the same in the United States mail, postage prepaid, on July 23, 2020, addressed to its attorney, Mr. John Martin Foster, PO Box 106, Rock Hill, SC 29731-6106.

s/James W. Boyd  
1544 Ebenezer Road  
Post Office Box 36425  
Rock Hill, SC 29732  
(803) 328-2600  
Attorney for Respondent

July 23, 2020

RECEIVED

Jul 23 2020

S.C. SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

Jul 23 2020

SC Court of Appeals