

**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 Supreme Court**

Pavilion Development Corp. & Larry McNair,  
Appellants,

v.

Nexsen Pruet, LLC, Respondent,

v.

DC & Sons, LLC, Counterclaim Defendant.

Appellate Case No. 2016-001632

---

Appeal from Charleston County  
Thomas Russo, Circuit Court Judge

---

Memorandum Opinion No. 2018-MO-017  
Heard March 27, 2018 – Filed April 11, 2018

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Andrew K. Epting, Jr., Jaan G. Rannik, Michelle N.  
Endemann and George J. Kefalos, all of Charleston, for  
Appellants.

Elizabeth Van Doren Gray, Tina Marie Cundari and  
Benjamin R. Gooding, all of Sowell Gray Robinson  
Stepp & Laffitte, LLC, of Columbia, for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** This case involved the purported assignment of a legal malpractice claim between adversaries in litigation in which the alleged malpractice arose. This Court affirmed the trial court's grant of summary judgment and dismissal of Appellants' case, holding the assignment was void as against public policy. *See Pavilion Development Corp. v. Nexsen Pruet*, Mem. Op. No. 2015-MO-047 (S.C. Sup. Ct. filed Aug. 12, 2015); *see also Skipper v. ACE Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co.*, 413 S.C. 33, 38, 775 S.E.2d 37, 39 (2015).

Following this Court's opinion, Appellants filed an untimely petition for rehearing, seeking an order to allow time to amend their complaint in the trial court. We denied the petition as untimely and directed Appellants to seek any further relief from the trial court.

Thereafter, Appellants made a motion to amend their complaint or substitute parties before the trial court. The trial court denied the motion in light of this Court affirming its decision to grant summary judgment for Respondent, as modified to be a dismissal without prejudice but without instruction that a reasonable time be allowed to amend the complaint.

Having carefully considered the applicable law, the record, and the parties' arguments, we find Appellants' arguments to be manifestly without merit and affirm the denial of Appellants' motion pursuant to Rule 220(b)(1), SCACR.

**AFFIRMED.**

**BEATTY, C.J., KITTREDGE, HEARN, FEW and JAMES, JJ., concur.**