

**RECEIVED**

**Aug 30 2021**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

Appeal from Marion County  
Court of Common Pleas

---

The Honorable W. Haigh Porter, Special Referee

---

Case Number 2019-CP-33-00853  
Appellate Case No. 2021-00340

---

Avatar Partners CT, LLC, .....Respondent,

-v-

HSGCHG Investments, LLC f/k/a Carolina  
Entertainment Complex, LLC, Partners 95  
LLC, Oil Barons, Inc., and Robert D.  
Hartmann, Sr., ..... Appellants.

---

APPELLANTS' INITIAL REPLY BRIEF

---

Louis H. Lang, SC Bar No. 3127  
CALLISON TIGHE & ROBINSON, LLC  
1812 Lincoln St., Ste. 200  
PO Box 1390  
Columbia SC 29202-1390  
Telephone: 803-404-6900  
Facsimile: 803-404-6902  
Email: [louislang@callisontighe.com](mailto:louislang@callisontighe.com)  
**ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANTS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... i

TABLE OF CASES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES..... ii

ARGUMENT IN REPLY .....1

**I.**

**The Circuit Court erred in denying Appellants’ Motion to Dismiss under Rule 12(b)(8), SCRCP, because the issues in this case are identical to a foreclosure action pending in Connecticut. ....1**

CONCLUSION..... 3

**TABLE OF CASES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES**

*Beatty v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Group*,  
893 N.E.2d 1079 (Ind. App. Ct. 2008).....1

*Brightpoint, Inc., v. Pedersen*,  
930 N.E. 2d 34 (Ind. App. Ct. 2010).....2

*Capital City Ins. Co. v. BP Staff, Inc.*,  
382 S.C. 92, 674 S.E.2d 524 (Ct. App. 2009).....1

*Poston v. Homes Ins. Co. of N.Y.*,  
191 S.C. 314, 4 S.E. 2d 261 (1939) .....2, 3

**COURT RULES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES**

Ind.R.Trial P. 12(b)(8) .....2

Rule 12(b)(8), SCRCP .....1, 2, 3

## ARGUMENT IN REPLY

### I.

**The Circuit Court erred in denying Appellants’ Motion to Dismiss under Rule 12(b)(8), SCRPC, because the issues in this case are identical to a foreclosure action pending in Connecticut involving the same debt and the same foreclosure claim.<sup>1</sup>**

Citing *Capital City Ins. Co. v. BP Staff, Inc.*, 382 S.C. 92, 674 S.E.2d 524 (Ct. App. 2009), also cited by Appellants, Respondent, Avatar Partners, CT, LLC (Avatar) asserts the Circuit Court did not err in denying Appellants’ Rule 12(b)(8), SCRPC, motion to dismiss because the rule only applies “when there [is] identity of the parties, causes of action and relief.”

That is, however, precisely the case here.

The parties to this action and the Connecticut Lawsuit are identical. This action and the Connecticut Lawsuit seek enforcement of the payment provisions of the same note and guaranty. To enforce either, Avatar must establish the amount owed under the note and guaranty. Both actions seek a deficiency judgment against the makers of the note and a judgment against the guarantor.

Accordingly, as between this action and the Connecticut Lawsuit, there is an identity of the parties, claims, and relief sought.

The only difference between the two lawsuits is collateral – property in South Carolina and Connecticut. However, the relief sought regarding both sets of collateral is identical – foreclosure.

In citing *Capital City Ins. Co.*, Avatar neglects to refer to an Indiana case the *Capital City Ins. Co.* Court of Appeals panel cited with approval, *Beatty v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Group*, 893 N.E.2d 1079, 1084 (Ind. App. Ct. 2008). In *Beatty*, the Indiana Court of Appeals said that the Indiana

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellants respectfully stand on their opening brief regarding their other Issues on Appeal.

version of “[Rule 12(b)(8)<sup>2</sup>] applies where the parties, subject matter and remedies are precisely the same, and ... *also where they are only substantially the same.*” (Emphasis added).

Appellants respectfully submit the parties, subject matter and remedies involved in the this case, and the Connecticut Lawsuit are identical. If not, they are so substantially similar that Rule12(b)(8) applies and the Circuit Court erred in failing to dismiss this lawsuit.

A second Indiana case cited by the *Beatty* court is instructive. In *Brightpoint, Inc., v. Pedersen*, 930 N.E. 2d 34 (Ind. App. Ct. 2010), the Indiana Court of Appeals affirmed the lower court’s dismissal of Brightpoint, Inc.’s Indiana lawsuit because there was pending at the same time a Danish arbitration court proceeding regarding similar subject matter. Though the *Brightpoint, Inc.*, decision was based on the concept of comity, the Indiana Court of Appeals, looked to its jurisprudence regarding Indiana’s version of Rule 12(b)(8), finding that even though the Indiana lawsuit and the Danish arbitration court proceedings involved somewhat different parties and only related, but not identical subject matter, nevertheless, the Indiana lawsuit should be dismissed. *Id.* at 40 – 41.

Here, the parties are identical, the claims are identical, and the relief sought is identical.

Finally, citing *Poston v. Homes Ins. Co. of N.Y.*, 191 S.C. 314, 317, 4 S.E. 2d 261 (1939), Avatar argues the Circuit Court was correct in denying Appellants’ Rule 12(b)(8) motion because the rule only applies to suits involving the same parties, in the same jurisdiction, with the same object. Avatar Brief at 5.

*Poston*, however, is inapposite. *Poston*’s attorney moved for a continuance, which was denied, because when his client’s civil case was called for trial, the client was under federal

---

<sup>2</sup> Rule 12(b)(8), SCRCF, and Ind. R. Trial P. 12(b)(8) are identical with one, important exception. South Carolina’s Rule 12(b)(8) calls for dismissal of “another action pending between the same parties for the same claim.” Indiana’s Rule 12(b)(8) calls for dismissal of the “same action pending in another state court of this state.”

indictment for stealing the car which was the subject of his insurance claim against the defendant, as well as mail fraud for having filed the claim – the subject matter of Poston’s claim against the defendant, Homes Insurance Company of New York.

Poston’s attorney argued that “the public interest would suffer if the civil case [was] tried....” before Poston’s federal charges were disposed of, suggesting that forcing his client to go to trial in the face of those pending criminal charges, would “thereby [disclose] the testimony [to be] relied upon by the government to convict.” *Id.* at 316, 4 S.E. 2d at 262, The South Carolina Supreme Court rejected this argument, without mention of any predecessor rule to our modern 12(b)(8).

For the reasons set forth above, and in Appellants’ opening brief, Appellants respectfully submit the Circuit Court erred in denying their Rule 12(b)(8) motion, and that denial should be reversed.

### **CONCLUSION**

As set out in their opening brief, Appellants respectfully request the following relief:

As to Issue on Appeal I, reverse the Circuit Court and dismiss this case or, alternatively reverse the Circuit Court and remand the case with instructions to stay the case pending disposition of the Connecticut Lawsuit.

As to Issue on Appeal II, reverse the Order and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale in part, and remand with instructions to direct Avatar to marshal the encumbered assets and to sell only such assets as are sufficient to satisfy Avatar’s debt.

As to Issue on Appeal III, reverse the Order and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale, and dismiss Avatar’s Complaint.

As to Issue on Appeal IV, reverse the Order and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale, and dismiss Avatar’s complaint.

As to Issue on Appeal V, reverse the Order and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale in part,  
and remand the case with instructions to sell the property by lots or parcels.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Louis H. Lang

Louis H. Lang, SC Bar No. 3127

CALLISON TIGHE & ROBINSON, LLC

Post Office Box 1390

Columbia, South Carolina 29202-1390

Telephone: 803-404-6900

[LouisLang@callisontighe.com](mailto:LouisLang@callisontighe.com)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANTS

August 30, 2021  
Columbia, South Carolina

**RECEIVED**

**Aug 30 2021**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM MARION COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Haigh Porter, Special Referee

---

Case No. 2019-CP-33-00853  
Appellate Case No. 2021-000340

---

HSGCHG Investments, LLC f/k/a Carolina  
Entertainment Complex, LLC; Partners 95,  
LLC; Oil Barons, Inc.; and Robert D.  
Hartmann, Sr.,

Appellants,

v.

Avatar Partners CT, LLC,

Respondent.

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

---

I hereby certify that, on this date, the **APPELLANTS' INITIAL REPLY BRIEF** was served on Respondent's counsel via email, pursuant to Supreme Court Or-325der dated June 4, 2020, as amended on May 29, 2020, and by first class U.S. mail as follows:

**ATTORNEY FOR AVATAR PARTNERS CT, LLC:**

Magalie A. Creech (S.C. Bar 78855)  
FINKEL LAW FIRM LLC  
Post Office Box 41489  
Charleston, South Carolina 29423  
Telephone: (843) 577-5460  
Facsimile: (866) 800-7954  
[MCreech@FinkelLaw.com](mailto:MCreech@FinkelLaw.com)

A copy of the service email is attached hereto, as required.

I further certify that all parties required by Rule to be served have been served.

/s/ Louis H. Lang  
Louis H. Lang

August 20, 2021  
Columbia, South Carolina

**From:** [Crystal Smith](#)  
**To:** [mcreech@finkellaw.com](mailto:mcreech@finkellaw.com)  
**Cc:** [Louis Lang](#)  
**Subject:** Avatar Partners v. HSGCHG (2021-000340)  
**Date:** Monday, August 30, 2021 2:18:39 PM  
**Attachments:** [Clerk.Court of Appeals.006.pdf](#)  
[POS \(for Initial Reply Brief\).pdf](#)  
[Initial Reply Brief v.1.pdf](#)

---

Dear Counsel,

Attached please find Appellants' Initial Reply Brief, Proof of Service, and letter to the appellate clerk regarding the above-referenced matter. The attached documents are being submitted today to the Court of Appeals for filing. Thank you.

With kind regards,

*Crystal Smith*

Legal Secretary to D. Reece Williams, III  
& Louis H. Lang

**CALLISON**  **TIGHE**

**Crystal C. Smith**  
Legal Secretary to D. Reece Williams, III, Esq.  
and Louis H. Lang, Esq.  
CALLISON TIGHE & ROBINSON, LLC  
Palmetto Armory Building  
1812 Lincoln St., Ste. 200  
Columbia SC 29201

**Direct Dial:** 803.404.6984  
**Phone:** 803.404.6900  
**Fax:** 803.404.6902  
**Email:** [CrystalSmith@CallisonTighe.com](mailto:CrystalSmith@CallisonTighe.com)

**Mailing Address:**  
PO Box 1390  
Columbia SC 29202-1390

**CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION:** The information contained in this message may contain legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us by telephone or email immediately and return the original message to us or destroy all printed and electronic copies.

---

LOUIS H. LANG - Member  
Direct: 803-404-6963  
Main: 803-404-6900  
[LouisLang@callisontighe.com](mailto:LouisLang@callisontighe.com)

August 30, 2021

**RECEIVED**  
**Aug 30 2021**  
**SC Court of Appeals**

**VIA EMAIL:** [ctappfilings@sccourts.org](mailto:ctappfilings@sccourts.org)

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

**Re: Avatar Partners CT, LLC, vs. HSGCHG Investments, LLC f/k/a Carolina Entertainment Complex, LLC; Partners 95, LLC; Oil Barons, Inc.; and Robert D. Hartmann, Sr.  
Appellate Case No. 2021-000340  
Our File No. 6151.014**

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed herewith please find Appellants' Initial Reply Brief, together with the Proof of Service, in the above-referenced matter.

Kindly file the same and return a clocked-in copy of each to the undersigned via return email.

The enclosed documents have been served upon Respondents' counsel today via email as indicated in the Proof of Service. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

**CALLISON TIGHE & ROBINSON, LLC**

*s/ Louis H. Lang*

Louis H. Lang

LHL:cs

Enclosures

cc: (w/ encls.) Magalie A. Creech, Esq. (via email and first-class mail)  
Clerk.Court of Appeals.006