

RECEIVED

May 07 2021

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM ANDERSON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

R. Lawton McIntosh, Judge

Case No. 2015-CP-04-00667
Appellate Case No. 2020-000070

Ex Parte: Donald L. Smith,
In Re: Greg Battersby,

Appellant,
Plaintiff

v.

J. Kirkman Moorehead, Krause, Moorhead &
Draisen, P. A., All State Insurance Company,
And Allstate Northbrook Indemnity Company,

Defendants,

J. Kirkman Moorehead, Krause, Moorhead &
Draisen, P. A.,

Respondents.

REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Donald L. Smith (Bar No. : 6699)
Attorney for Appellant
122 N. Main Street
Anderson, SC 29621
Telephone: (864) 642-9284
Facsimile: (864) 642-9285
attorneydonaldsmith@gmail.com

Anderson, South Carolina
May 05, 2021.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	ii
Statement of Issues on Appeal	1
Statement of the Case	1
Arguments	
I. APPELLANT’S RIGHT TO APPEAL IS NOT LIMITED TO THE TRIAL COURT’S ORDER, DATED DECEMBER 16, 2019.....	1
II. THE SANTIONS WERE NOT WARRANTED AGAINST APPELLANT	2
Conclusion	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Statutes

Rules of Professional Conduct

Rule 3.3(a)

Rule 3.4

Rule 4.1

South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 11

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

- I. **WHETHER THE RIGHT TO APPEAL IS LIMITED TO THE TRIAL COURT'S MOST RECENT ORDER, DATED DECEMBER 16, 2019 DIRECTING THE MONETARY SANCTIONS TO BE ENTERED AS JUDGMENT.**

- II. **WHETHER THE SANCTIONS WERE WARRANTED AGAINST THE APPELLANT.**

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Appellant adopts and incorporates by reference the Statement of Case and Facts presented in his Initial Brief.

ARGUMENTS

I.

APPELLANT'S RIGHT TO APPEAL IS NOT LIMITED TO THE TRIAL COURT'S ORDER, DATED DECEMBER 16, 2019.

Rule 203 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR) provides in part:

...When a form or other short order or judgment indicates that a more full and complete order or judgment is to follow, a party need not appeal until receipt of written notice of entry of the more complete order and judgment.

Respondents contend the February 3, 2016 Order Granting the Sanctions was not appealed. (Respondent's Initial Brief, p. 7). What Respondents conveniently omitted in their Initial Brief was the fact Appellant filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the aforesaid Order, which was denied by the trial court in its Form 4, dated April 21, 2016. However, since the Form 4 explicitly indicated a formal order was to be issued, and the trial court instructed Respondent Moorhead to draft the same, the Form 4 may not be considered a complete Order or Judgment. The December 16, 2019 Order is an indication that Form 4 was not a complete judgment. In short, since the Form 4 was not a complete judgment, appeal at that time would

have been premature.

II.

THE SANTIONS WERE NOT WARRANTED AGAINST APPELLANT.

In their Initial Brief, Respondents' argued the Form 4 was the final order since no formal order was ever issued by the trial court. (Respondent's Initial Brief, p. 8). This analysis is illogical. Based on the fact the Court expressly stated a formal order would be forthcoming, when should an appeal have been filed? Would it have been after the first month without a formal order? Would it have been after the first year without an order? Would it have been after the third year without an order? Had Appellant appealed the Form 4 after the issuance of the Form 4, then it would have been dismissed as untimely and premature.

Respondents contend had the trial court issued a formal order, it would not have changed the substance of the ruling of Form 4. That is not necessarily the issue in his case. Appellant relied, and rightfully so, that a formal Order would be issued. The formal order would provide not only the issues on which to appeal, but a date certain to file a Notice of Appeal.

As an alternative theory, Respondents assert that if the matter was to be remanded when Trial Court issues a formal order then it would only give Appellant an opportunity to file an appeal on the underlying Monetary Sanctions against Appellant.

Firstly, despite the Formal Order, not having changed the substance of the court's ruling, it is still needed for Appellant to file his Notice of Appeal.

Secondly, since the December 16, 2019 Order contained clarification of the Form 4 issued on April 2016, this may not be considered merely an Administrative Order, and in fact may take the form of the Formal Order. The Court never filed the Formal Order it stated it

would issue.

Thirdly, in terms of the merits of this case, Respondents have mistakenly declared Appellant conceded to the governing law. To the contrary, Appellant has been consistent in his position the instant case presents an exception to the general rule of attorney immunity doctrine.

Appellant clearly challenged Respondents' and Trial Court's determination that he did not conduct research on the aforementioned doctrine. Appellant has alleged the basis for the filing of the Complaint is the genuine belief Respondent acted outside the scope of his representation. Appellant has presented circumstantial evidence establishing the claim of conspiracy between Dunaway, Neal and Morton, which Respondents' act facilitated. A jury comprised of Anderson County jurors saw the conspiracy to the tune of \$112,000.00, against the remaining defendants, Neal and Morton. (Exhibit 1-Jury Returns Verdict).

In arguing Respondent stepped outside the scope of their role as attorneys, Appellant did not refer only to Respondent's act of assisting their client with the online LLR Complaint, but in knowingly providing false information and/details on the LLR Complaint and/or deliberately failing to correct or amend the same. This act runs afoul with Rule 3.3 as well as 3.4 of the Rules of Professional Conduct. Therefore, contrary to Respondents' contentions that complaint was devoid of basis in law or in fact, Appellant had a legal basis in filing the claim for conspiring with the co-defendants to damage Appellant for financial gain.

Appellant filed this Complaint in good faith and did not seek to perpetrate fraud nor cause unnecessary delay on this Court. Respondents have not alleged nor proved Appellant's filing of this complaint is a reprehensible act, going beyond mere negligence and evincing intent. Neither did Respondents aver Appellant filed the Complaint with the sole objective of harassing them. Respondents failed to allege Appellant's bad faith motives.

In sum, Appellant reiterates his position that the sanction imposed against his counsel was improper for the following reasons: (a) the motion did not comply with the consultation requirement under Rule 11 SCRPC; (b) the Complaint and all pleadings, had been withdrawn (pursuant to court order) (Exhibit 2-Order-Withdrawal of Pleadings) prior to the request for sanction; (3) the Circuit Court erred in imposing the sanctions based on FCPSA “reasonable attorney” standards; (4) the complaint filed was not frivolous and was based on facts and documented evidence; (5) there was no finding Appellant was motivated by bad faith in filing the Complaint; (6) sanction was not appropriately tailored to achieve the purpose of the rule. Sanctions are meant to restore the balance to the matter, not to harass or injure the other party.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, in addition to the arguments made in the opening brief, Appellant respectfully requests this Honorable Court to grant Appellant’s appeal, and to reverse the trial court’s imposition of sanctions against him.

Anderson, South Carolina
Date: May 7, 2021

s/Donald L. Smith
Donald L. Smith (Bar No. 6699)
122 N. Main Street
Anderson, SC 29621
Telephone: (864) 642-9284
Facsimile: (864) 642-9285
attorneydonaldsmith@gmail.com
Attorney for Appellants

RECEIVED

May 07 2021

SC Court of Appeals

**FORM 7
PROOF OF SERVICE**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM ANDERSON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

R. Lawton McIntosh, Judge

Case No. 2015-CP-04-00667
Appellate Case No. 2020-000070

Ex Parte: Donald L. Smith,
In Re: Greg Battersby,

Appellant,
Plaintiff

v.

J. Kirkman Moorehead, Krause, Moorhead &
Draisen, P. A., All State Insurance Company,
And Allstate Northbrook Indemnity Company,

Defendants,

J. Kirkman Moorehead, Krause, Moorhead &
Draisen, P. A.,

Respondents.

PROOF OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Supreme Court of South Carolina's Amended Order 2020-05-29-02, I certify that I have served a copy of the Reply Brief of Appellant and Certificate of Counsel, and Proof of Service of same, upon The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings, Clerk of South Carolina Court of Appeals, through the AIS, and the Respondents, by and through their respective counsel of record, via electronic mail in the addresses as follows:

Ms. Jenny Abbott-Kitchings

ctappfilings@sccourts.org

Attorney for Respondents

Mr. Steven M. Krause, Esquire

steve@krauselaw.org

Mr. Daniel I. Draisen, Esquire

daniel@injuredSC.com

The above-mentioned documents have been served on May 7, 2021.

s/Donald L. Smith

Donald L. Smith (Bar No. : 6699)
Attorney for Appellant
122 N. Main Street
Anderson, SC 29621
Telephone: (864) 642-9284
Facsimile: (864) 642-9285
attorneydonaldsmith@gmail.com

Anderson, South Carolina
May 7, 2021.

**FORM 8
LETTER TO THE APPEALS COURT CLERK
FILING REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT**

RECEIVED
May 07 2021
SC Court of Appeals

May 7, 2021

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

**RE: Ex Parte: Donald L. Smith (In Re: Battersby v. Kirkman)
Appellate Case No. 2020-000070**

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Please find attach the following documents for filing:

- (1) Reply Brief of Appellant; and,
- (3) Proof of Service.

Sincerely,

s/Donald L. Smith
Donald L. Smith, (Bar#6699)
Attorney for Appellant
122 N. Main Street
Anderson SC 29621
Telephone: (864) 642-9284
Facsimile: (864) 642-9285
attorneydonaldsmith@gmail.com

cc: Mr. Steven M. Krause, Esquire
Mr. Daniel L. Draisen, Esquire