

**RECEIVED**

**May 31 2022**

**SC Court of Appeals**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

---

APPEAL FROM BEAUFORT COUNTY  
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
THE HONORABLE BENTLEY D. PRICE  
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

---

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2022-000469  
CASE NO. 2019-CP-07-02629

---

Margaret A. Eberly and Barbara J. Pavelik,

**PLAINTIFFS,**

versus

Advanced Flooring & Design Division of ISI, LLC;  
Archer Exteriors, Inc.; Crossroads Enterprises, LLC;  
D.R. Horton, Inc.; East Coast Construction Cleanup Corp.;  
Hutton's Landscapes, Inc.; Lather Construction SC, Inc.;  
Lather Construction, Inc.; Professional Drywall & Paint Services, LLC;  
Professional Exteriors II, LLC; and Valim Construction, LLC,

**DEFENDANTS,**

Of whom

D.R. Horton, Inc. is

**APPELLANT,**

versus

Hutton's Landscapes, Inc.; Lather Construction SC, Inc.; and  
Lather Construction, Inc.

**RESPONDENTS.**

---

**RESPONDENT HUTTON'S LANDSCAPES, INC.'S REPLY TO  
D.R. HORTON, INC.'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO THE  
MOTON TO DISMISS APPEAL**

---

Respondent Hutton’s Landscapes, Inc. (“Hutton’s”) hereby submits its Reply to the Response in Opposition by Appellant D.R Horton, Inc. (“D.R. Horton”) to the Motion to Dismiss the Appeal and shows the Court as follows:

For this Court to obtain jurisdiction over D.R. Horton’s appeal against Hutton’s, D.R. Horton must show that it timely and properly served Hutton’s with a notice of appeal naming it as a respondent in accordance with the Appellate Court Rules. It cannot do so.

It is undisputed that when D.R. Horton filed its original Notice of Appeal on April 11, 2022, it did not name Hutton’s as a respondent. It is also undisputed that D.R. Horton did not serve the Notice of Appeal pursuant to the three methods of service authorized under Rule 262(c) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules – either by hand delivery, U.S. Mail, or by an e-mail sent to counsel for Hutton’s as permitted under the Supreme Court’s August 25, 2021 Order with a copy of the sent e-mail attached to the proof of service for the Notice of Appeal.

D.R. Horton did not attempt to correct its error until April 28, 2022 after the thirty (30) day time period for service of the Notice of Appeal expired. D.R. Horton failed to meet the jurisdictional requirement of timely and proper service of a notice of appeal naming Hutton’s as a respondent, and therefore, this Court lacks jurisdiction over D.R. Horton’s appeal as to Hutton’s. See, e.g., Camp v. Camp, 386 S.C. 571, 574–75, 689 S.E.2d 634, 636 (2010); State v. Brown, 358 S.C. 382, 387, 596 S.E.2d 39, 41 (2004); Ex Parte Sadisco of Greenville, Inc. v. Greenville Cnty. Bd. of Zoning Appeals, 340 S.C. 57, 59, 530 S.E.2d 383, 384 (2000).

D.R. Horton unscrupulously paints its failure to comply with the Appellate Court

Rules as a “trap” set by Hutton’s. As appellant, D.R. Horton was required to comply with the procedural requirements of the Appellate Court Rules in perfecting its appeal, as all litigants are expected to do. State v. Burton, 356 S.C. 259, 265, n.5, 589 S.E.2d 6, 9, n.5 (2003). D.R. Horton was responsible for ensuring it had appealed its case properly, something that should not be taken lightly, and as appellant, it alone controlled what was appealed, who was named in the appeal, and service of the appeal.

On April 19, 2022, this Court issued its initial appeal letter to D.R. Horton via e-mail, which, in providing the caption for the appeal, alerted D.R. Horton to the fact that Hutton’s was not a respondent. This Court’s letter also only copied counsel for the plaintiffs and did not copy counsel for Hutton’s because the Court did not consider Hutton’s as a respondent to the appeal.<sup>1</sup> See the Court’s April 19, 2022 e-mail and letter attached hereto as Exhibit “A.”

Despite the issuance of this Court’s initial appeal letter which clearly gave notice to D.R. Horton that Hutton’s was not a respondent in the appeal, D.R. Horton took no steps before the thirty (30) day time period for service of the notice of appeal expired on April 25, 2022 to properly add and serve Hutton’s as a respondent to the appeal. Nothing prevented D.R. Horton from correcting its own error – an error which if not corrected was fatal to this Court’s jurisdiction over Hutton’s.

D.R. Horton also insists that the Notice of Electronic Filing [NEF] generated by the Circuit Court’s E-Filing System complies with Paragraph (d)(1) of the Supreme Court’s August 25, 2021 Order permitting service of a document by a lawyer upon another lawyer via e-mail. The Supreme Court’s Order contemplates specifically sending

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of this letter was located by counsel for Hutton’s on the judicial department’s C-Track Public Access system.

the lawyer an e-mail with the document to be served attached and requires that the sent e-mail accompany all proofs, affidavits, or certificates of service.

The NEF, on the other hand, is a notice automatically generated by the circuit courts' E-Filing System which merely includes a description of the filed document and does not actually include the document as an attachment. See In re S.C. Elec. Filing Pol'ys & Guidelines, 415 S.C. 1, 2, 780 S.E.2d 600, 600 (2015). Under the rules for E-Filing in the circuit courts, the NEF constitutes proper service under only Rule 5 of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure. Id. at 7-8, 780 S.E.2d at 603.

On the other hand, the NEF does not constitute proper service for a notice of appeal under the Appellate Court Rules, and there is no order authorizing an NEF automatically generated by the circuit courts' E-Filing System to qualify as proper service of a notice of appeal. If the Supreme Court had intended an NEF automatically generated from the circuit courts' E-Filing System to suffice for the service of a notice of appeal under the Appellate Court Rules, it could have expressly authorized such manner of service in its August 25, 2021 Order but it chose not to do so. Therefore, D.R. Horton cannot rely upon the automatically generated NEF to constitute service of the April 11, 2022 Notice of Appeal upon Hutton's.

D.R. Horton's failure to serve Hutton's with a notice of appeal naming it as a respondent within the thirty (30) day time period for the service of the notice of appeal is not a mere clerical or scrivener's error which can be corrected because this Court has no authority to rescue a litigant from an untimely notice of appeal. Elam v. S.C. Dep't of Transp., 361 S.C. 9, 14-15, 602 S.E.2d 772, 775 (2004).

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth herein and in the Motion to Dismiss Appeal,

Respondent Hutton's Landscapes, Inc. therefore respectfully requests this Court to dismiss the appeal of Appellant D.R. Horton, Inc. for lack of appellate jurisdiction due to the untimely and improper service of the Notice of Appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Carmen V. Ganjehsani

Carmen V. Ganjehsani, S.C. Bar No. 73515  
RICHARDSON, PLOWDEN & ROBINSON, PA  
Post Office Drawer 7788  
Columbia, South Carolina 29202  
(803) 771-4400  
[cganjehsani@richardsonplowden.com](mailto:cganjehsani@richardsonplowden.com)

Emily Gifford Lucey (S.C. Bar No. 72785)  
Megan C. White (S.C. Bar No. 101895)  
RICHARDSON, PLOWDEN & ROBINSON, PA  
235 Magrath Darby Boulevard, Ste. 100  
Mount Pleasant, South Carolina 29464  
(843) 806-6550  
[egiffordlucey@richardsonplowden.com](mailto:egiffordlucey@richardsonplowden.com)  
[mwhite@richardsonplowden.com](mailto:mwhite@richardsonplowden.com)  
**ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT  
HUTTON'S LANDSCAPES, INC.**

May 31, 2022.

# **EXHIBIT “A”**

## Spencer, Shelby

---

**From:** Spencer, Shelby  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 19, 2022 3:37 PM  
**To:** 'dudley@conlaw.com'; 'imhoff@conlaw.com'; 'crawford@conlaw.com';  
'ali@bentraywicklaw.com'; 'ben@bentraywicklaw.com'  
**Subject:** Margaret Eberly v. D.R. Horton, Inc. (2022-000469)  
**Attachments:** Eberly v. D.R. Horton, Inc. - Initial Letter.pdf

Dear Counsel,

Attached is a copy of this Court's letter. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Warmly,

**Shelby Spencer**

Appeals Specialist II  
SC Court of Appeals  
1220 Senate Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Phone: 803.734.1890  
Fax: 803.734.1839  
E-Filing Email: [ctappfilings@sccourts.org](mailto:ctappfilings@sccourts.org)



# 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)

April 19, 2022

Mr. Jason Michael Imhoff, Esquire  
704 East Mcbee Avenue  
Greenville SC 29601

Mr. John T. Crawford, Jr., Esquire  
704 E. McBee Ave.  
Greenville SC 29601

Mr. Thomas Elihue Dudley, III, Esquire  
704 E. McBee Ave.  
Greenville SC 29601

Re: Margaret Eberly v. D.R. Horton, Inc.  
Appellate Case No. 2022-000469

Dear Counsel:

This Court has received your notice of appeal, and the case has been assigned the appellate case number that appears above. Please use this number on all future correspondence relating to this matter.

All parties to this matter are advised that all filings must comply with the requirements of Rule 267 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR). The SCACR are available online at [www.sccourts.org/courtreg](http://www.sccourts.org/courtreg). Additionally, any filings submitted by counsel admitted in South Carolina must include counsel's bar number.

The attention of the parties is directed to the order relating to the inclusion of personal data identifiers and other sensitive information in documents filed with the Supreme Court of South Carolina and the South Carolina Court of Appeals. The order can be found at [www.sccourts.org/courtOrders/displayOrder.cfm?orderNo=2014-04-15-02](http://www.sccourts.org/courtOrders/displayOrder.cfm?orderNo=2014-04-15-02). Please note that the responsibility for insuring that information is redacted or sealed as required by this order rests with counsel and the parties. This office will not review filings for redaction or to determine if materials should be sealed.

This is to advise that the title in the above matter has been changed to read as follows:

Margaret A. Eberly and Barbara J. Pavelik, Respondents,

v.

Advanced Flooring & Design Division of ISI, LLC; Archer Exteriors, Inc.; Crossroads Enterprises, LLC; D.R. Horton, Inc.; East Coast Construction Cleanup Corp.; Hutton's Landscapes, Inc.; Lather Construction SC, Inc.; Lather Construction, Inc.' Professional Drywall & Paint Services, LLC; Professional Exteriors II, LLC; and Valim Construction, LLC, Defendants,

Of which D.R. Horton, Inc. is the Appellant.

All future records in this matter should be changed to reflect this title. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Catherine J. Fanning, deputy". The signature is written in a cursive style.

CLERK

cc: Alexandra Scott Williams, Esquire  
Benjamin Alexander Crute Traywick, Esquire

**May 31 2022****CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned, attorney for Respondent Hutton's Landscapes, Inc., do hereby certify that I have this date served the foregoing Reply to D.R. Horton, Inc.'s Response in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss Appeal, dated May 31, 2022, by personally serving the same pursuant to Section (d)(1) of the Supreme Court's Order dated May 6, 2022, on the following counsel of record using the primary email addresses listed in the Attorney Information System (if applicable):

Jason Imhoff  
John T. Crawford, Jr.  
Thomas E. Dudley, III  
KENISON, DUDLEY & CRAWFORD, LLC  
704 E. McBee Ave.  
Greenville, South Carolina 29601  
[imhoff@conlaw.com](mailto:imhoff@conlaw.com)  
[crawford@conlaw.com](mailto:crawford@conlaw.com)  
[dudley@conlaw.com](mailto:dudley@conlaw.com)

Carl F. Muller  
CARL F. MULLER,  
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW, P.A.  
PO Box 1717  
Greenville, SC 29602-1717  
[carl@carlmullerlaw.com](mailto:carl@carlmullerlaw.com)  
**ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT  
D.R. HORTON, INC.**

Jeffrey A. Ross  
Philip P. Cristaldi, III  
Scott H. Winograd  
ROSS & CRISTALDI, LLC  
1242 White Flat Road  
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464  
[jross@rclawsc.com](mailto:jross@rclawsc.com)  
[pcristaldi@rclawsc.com](mailto:pcristaldi@rclawsc.com)  
[swinograd@rclawsc.com](mailto:swinograd@rclawsc.com)  
**ATTORNEYS FOR LATHER  
CONSTRUCTION, INC. AND  
LATHER CONSTRUCTION SC, INC.**

A copy of the sent email is enclosed with this Certificate of Service.

/s Carmen V. Ganjehsani  
Carmen V. Ganjehsani, S.C. Bar No. 73515  
RICHARDSON, PLOWDEN & ROBINSON, PA  
1900 Barnwell Street (29201)  
Post Office Drawer 7788  
Columbia, South Carolina 29202  
(803) 771-4400  
[cganjehsani@richardsonplowden.com](mailto:cganjehsani@richardsonplowden.com)  
**ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT  
HUTTON'S LANDSCAPES, INC.**

Dated: May 31, 2022.


## Carmen Ganjehsani

---

**From:** Carmen Ganjehsani  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2022 12:03 PM  
**To:** imhoff@conlaw.com; crawford@conlaw.com; dudley@conlaw.com; carl@carlmullerlaw.com; jross@rclawsc.com; pcristaldi@rclawsc.com; swinograd@rclawsc.com  
**Cc:** Emily Gifford Lucey; Megan White; Emily Seelig; teresa@bentraywicklaw.com; cappy@bentraywicklaw.com; Alexandra Williams; Kay Kelly; Benjamin Traywick; Lin McDougall; Tom Bacon; Hope Grate; kbarnes@rclawsc.com  
**Subject:** 2022-000469 Eberly v. D.R. Horton  
**Attachments:** 2022-000469 Eberly v. D.R. Horton (Reply to Response to Mtn to Dismiss Appeal).pdf

Pursuant to the Supreme Court's Order dated May 6, 2022, please find served upon you the Reply to D.R. Horton, Inc.'s Response in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss Appeal filed on behalf of Respondent Hutton's Landscapes, Inc. in the above-referenced appeal.

Thank you,  
Carmen Ganjehsani

<a href="#">HOME</a>	<a href="#">VCARD</a>	<a href="#">LOCATION</a>
	<b>Carmen V. Ganjehsani</b> Shareholder <a href="mailto:Cganjehsani@RichardsonPlowden.com">Cganjehsani@RichardsonPlowden.com</a>	<b>Richardson Plowden &amp; Robinson, P.A.</b> 1900 Barnwell Street Columbia, SC 29201 Tel: 803.253.8692 Fax: 803.779.0016 <a href="http://www.RichardsonPlowden.com">www.RichardsonPlowden.com</a>

The information contained in this e-mail message may be attorney-client privileged, attorney work product, or strictly confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of the communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone at (803) 771-4400 and permanently delete this e-mail.