



# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS  
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
1220 SENATE STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890  
FAX: (803) 734-1839  
[www.sccourts.org](http://www.sccourts.org)

October 20, 2020

The Honorable Julie J. Armstrong  
100 Broad St Ste 106  
Charleston SC 29401-2210

## **REMITTITUR**

Re: Stow Away Storage, LLC v. George W. Sisson(2)  
Lower Court Case No. 2011CP1002444  
Appellate Case No. 2017-001221

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

  
CLERK

Enclosure

cc: Ainsley Fisher Tillman, Esquire  
G. Dana Sinkler, Esquire  
George Hamlin O'Kelley, III, Esquire

# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Stow Away Storage, LLC, and MSC MTP, LLC,  
Petitioners,

v.

George W. Sisson, 4.0, LLC, The Sisson Foundation  
Limited Partnership, Sweetgrass Hardware, Inc. and  
Timarand, Inc., Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2020-000573

---

ORDER

---

Based on the vote of the Court, the petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

FOR THE COURT

BY  \_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

Columbia, South Carolina

October 19, 2020

cc:

George Hamlin O'Kelley, III, Esquire  
Ainsley Fisher Tillman, Esquire  
G. Dana Sinkler, Esquire  
Ian S. Ford, Esquire  
The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings

# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Stow Away Storage, LLC, and MSC MTP, LLC,  
Appellants,

v.

George W. Sisson, 4.0, LLC, The Sisson Foundation  
Limited Partnership, Sweetgrass Hardware, Inc. and  
Timarand, Inc., Respondents.


Appellate Case No. 2017-001221

---

## ORDER

---


After careful consideration of the petition for rehearing, the Court is unable to discover that any material fact or principle of law has been either overlooked or disregarded, and hence, there is no basis for granting a rehearing. Accordingly, the petition for rehearing is denied.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

J.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

J.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

A.J.

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Ainsley Fisher Tillman, Esquire  
G. Dana Sinkler, Esquire  
George Hamlin O'Kelley, III, Esquire  
The Honorable J. C. Nicholson, Jr.

**FILED**

March 9, 2020

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE  
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING  
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals**

Stow Away Storage, LLC, and MSC MTP, LLC,  
Appellants,

v.

George W. Sisson, 4.0, LLC, The Sisson Foundation  
Limited Partnership, Sweetgrass Hardware, Inc. and  
Timarand, Inc., Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2017-001221

---

Appeal From Charleston County  
J. C. Nicholson, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2019-UP-401  
Submitted November 1, 2019 – Filed December 18, 2019

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

G. Dana Sinkler, of Gibbs & Holmes, of Wadmalaw  
Island, and Ainsley Fisher Tillman, of Ford Wallace  
Thomson, LLC, of Charleston, both for Appellants.

George Hamlin O'Kelley, III, of Buist Byars & Taylor,  
LLC, of Mt. Pleasant, for Respondents.

---

**PER CURIAM:** This case stems from an easement dispute between Appellant Stow Away Storage, LLC ("Stow Away") and Respondents George W. Sisson ("Sisson") and Sweetgrass Hardware, Inc. ("Sweetgrass"). The action was bifurcated by the circuit court and Appellants prevailed on the easement interpretation issue. That order was affirmed by this court and the case was remanded to the circuit court for an order on damages.<sup>1</sup> The circuit court awarded Appellants \$20,382.41 in actual damages, but the court denied Appellants' request for attorney's fees, punitive damages, and the rental value of the easement. Appellants argue the circuit court erred by (1) failing to award attorney's fees against Sisson under the principle of equitable indemnification; (2) failing to award punitive damages against Sweetgrass for tortious interference with contract; and (3) failing to award lost rent. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities:

1. As to whether the circuit court erred in failing to award Appellants attorney's fees under the principle of equitable indemnification: *Townes Assocs., Ltd. v. City of Greenville*, 266 S.C. 81, 86, 221 S.E.2d 773, 775 (1976) ("In an action in equity, tried by the judge alone, without a reference, on appeal the [appellate court] has jurisdiction to find facts in accordance with its [own] view[] of the preponderance of the evidence."); *Baron Data Sys., Inc. v. Loter*, 297 S.C. 382, 383, 377 S.E.2d 296, 297 (1989) ("The general rule is that attorney's fees are not recoverable unless authorized by contract or statute."); *Addy v. Bolton*, 257 S.C. 28, 33–34, 183 S.E.2d 708, 709–10 (1971) (holding that in the absence of an express contract for indemnification, claimants may recover on the theory of (1) an implied contract to indemnify or (2) equitable indemnity); *id.* at 33, 183 S.E.2d at 709–10 ("In order to recover attorneys' fees under [equitable indemnity], the plaintiff must show: (1) that the plaintiff had become involved in a legal dispute either because of a breach of contract by the defendant or because of [the] defendant's tortious conduct; (2) that the dispute was with a third party—not with the defendant; and (3) that the plaintiff incurred attorneys' fees connected with that dispute." (citation omitted)); 13 S.C. Jur. *Implied Contracts* § 10 (1992) ("[Attorney fees] are awarded to a party seeking indemnity when the expenses were incurred in the successful defense of a claim . . .").

2. As to whether the circuit court erred in failing to award Appellants punitive damages for Respondent Sweetgrass's alleged tortious interference with contract: *Gamble v. Stevenson*, 305 S.C. 104, 110, 406 S.E.2d 350, 354 (1991) ("In South

---

<sup>1</sup> *Stow Away Storage, LLC v. Sisson*, Op. No. 2016-UP-014 (S.C. Ct. App. Jan. 13, 2016) (unpublished opinion).

Carolina, 'punitive damages are allowed in the interest of society in the nature of punishment and as a warning and example to deter the wrongdoer and others from committing like offenses in the future.'" (quoting *Laird v. Nationwide Ins. Co.*, 243 S.C. 388, 396, 134 S.E.2d 206, 210 (1964)); *id.* ("Moreover, they serve 'as a vindication of private rights when it is proved that such have been wantonly, willfully, or maliciously violated.'" (quoting *Harris v. Burnside*, 261 S.C. 190, 196, 199 S.E.2d 65, 68 (1973))); *Hollis v. Stonington Dev., LLC*, 394 S.C. 383, 398, 714 S.E.2d 904, 912 (Ct. App. 2011) ("Reckless disregard for the property rights of others can be sufficient misconduct to support an award of punitive damages."); *Eldeco, Inc. v. Charleston Cty. Sch. Dist.*, 372 S.C. 470, 480, 642 S.E.2d 726, 731 (2007) ("To establish a cause of action for tortious interference with contractual relations, a plaintiff must show: 1) the existence of a contract; 2) knowledge of the contract; 3) intentional procurement of its breach; 4) the absence of justification; and 5) resulting damages."); *id.* at 481, 642 S.E.2d at 732 ("[I]t is not necessary that the interfering party intend such harm. . . . Instead, it is only necessary that they intend to interfere with . . . an existing contract . . .").

3. As to whether the circuit court erred in failing to award Appellants the rental value of the easement against (1) Sisson for breach of the easement agreement and (2) Sweetgrass for tortious interference with contract: *Vortex Sports & Entm't, Inc. v. Ware*, 378 S.C. 197, 208, 662 S.E.2d 444, 450 (Ct. App. 2008) ("The [circuit] court is vested with considerable discretion over the amount of a damages award, and our review of the amount of damages is limited to the correction of errors of law."); 11 S.C. Jur. *Damages* § 58 (1992) ("In tort actions, damages may be recovered for all injuries [that] proximately follow. . . . In breach of contract actions, only such damages as may reasonably be supposed to have been in the contemplation of both parties at the time the contract was made may be collected." (footnote omitted) (quoting *Hutson v. Cont'l Assurance Co.*, 269 S.C. 322, 332, 237 S.E.2d 375, 379 (1977), *overruled on other grounds by O'Neal v. Bowles*, 314 S.C. 525, 431 S.E.2d 555 (1993))); *Peoples Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n of S.C. v. Res. Planning Corp.*, 358 S.C. 460, 472, 596 S.E.2d 51, 58 (2004) (clarifying that in *Yadkin Brick Co. v. Materials Recovery Co.*, 339 S.C. 640, 529 S.E.2d 764 (Ct. App. 2000) the supreme court held that where there is *physical injury* to real property resulting in the depreciation in the rental or usable value of the property, the landowner can recover damages in the amount of the depreciation); *Yadkin Brick Co.*, 339 S.C. at 645–46, 529 S.E.2d at 767 (Ct. App. 2000) ("Where the pollution . . . results in a temporary or nonpermanent injury to real property, the injured landowner can recover the depreciation in the rental or usable value of the property caused by the pollution." (quoting *Gray v. S. Facilities, Inc.*, 256 S.C. 558, 569, 183 S.E.2d 438, 443 (1971))); *Vortex Sports & Entm't, Inc.*, 378 S.C. at

208, 662 S.E.2d at 450 ("When the tortious conduct of a defendant causes a plaintiff to lose prospective profits, the plaintiff may recover such profits when he can prove: (1) it is reasonably certain that such profits would have been realized except for the tort; and (2) such lost profits can be ascertained and measured from the evidence produced with reasonable certainty."); *Eldeco, Inc.*, 372 S.C. at 480, 642 S.E.2d at 731 ("To establish a cause of action for tortious interference with contractual relations, a plaintiff must show: 1) the existence of a contract; 2) knowledge of the contract; 3) intentional procurement of its breach; 4) the absence of justification; and 5) resulting damages."); *id.* at 481, 642 S.E.2d at 732 ("[I]t is not necessary that the interfering party intend such harm. . . . Instead, it is only necessary that they intend to interfere with . . . an existing contract . . .").

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>2</sup>

**SHORT, THOMAS, and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>2</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.