



OPINIONS
OF
THE SUPREME COURT
AND
COURT OF APPEALS
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA

ADVANCE SHEET NO. 19
May 17, 2023
Patricia A. Howard, Clerk
Columbia, South Carolina
www.sccourts.org

CONTENTS

THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

PUBLISHED OPINIONS AND ORDERS

Order – In the Matter of David Scott Robinson	12
Order – Re: Rescission of Administrative Orders Governing Mortgage Foreclosure Actions	13

UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS

None

PETITIONS - UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

28114 – Patricia Damico v. Lennar Carolinas	Pending
28120 – State v. Angela D. Brewer	Pending
28126 – Barry Clarke v. Fine House, Inc.	Pending

EXTENSION TO FILE PETITION - UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

None

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

28095 – The Protestant Episcopal Church v. The Episcopal Church	Pending
28133 – Glenn Odom v. McBee Municipal Election Commission	Pending
28134 – Brad Walbeck v. The I’On Company	Pending
28142 – State v. Stewart Jerome Middleton	Pending
28145 – State v. Timothy Ray Jones, Jr.	Pending

28149 – State v. Mary Ann German	Pending
28151 – Ani Creation Inc., et al. v. City of Myrtle Beach	Pending
28153 – Town of Sullivan’s Island v. Michael Murray	Pending

THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

PUBLISHED OPINIONS

None

UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS

2023-UP-180 – The State v. Samuel L. Burnside

2023-UP-181 – Troy D. Hunter v. State

2023-UP-182 – Leonard R. Jordan, Jr. v. Marian J. Kirk

2023-UP-183 – The State v. James W. Almond

2023-UP-184 – Sula Adams v. PennyMac Loan Services, LLC

2023-UP-185 – The State v. Jermaine D. Grier

2023-UP-186 – Craig B. Stoneburner v. George Moluf, III

2023-UP-187 – Tony T. Good v. Tomekia Means

2023-UP-188 – The State v. Robert L. Hawkins

2023-UP-189 – SCDSS v. Caressa S. Norris
(Filed May 15, 2023)

2023-UP-190 – SCDSS v. Shayne Duckworth
(Filed May 15, 2023)

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

5964 – Aracelis Santos v. Harris Investment (3)

Denied 5/15/2023

5965 – National Trust for Historic Preservation v. City of North Charleston	Denied 5/11/2023
5972 – McEntire Produce v. S.C. Dep’t of Revenue	Pending
5974 – The State v. Calvin D. Ford	Pending
5975 – Rita Glenn v. 3M Company	Pending
5977 – Jackie Chalfant v. Carolinas Dermatology Group, PA	Pending

EXTENSIONS TO FILE PETITION FOR REHEARING

None

PETITIONS – SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

5832 – State v. Adam Rowell	Pending
5834 – Vanessa Williams v. Bradford Jeffcoat	Pending
5839 – In the Matter of Thomas Griffin	Pending
5855 – SC Department of Consumer Affairs v. Cash Central	Pending
5860 – Kelaher, Connell & Conner, PC v. SCWCC	Pending
5882 – Donald Stanley v. Southern State Police	Pending
5903 – State v. Phillip W. Lowery	Pending
5906 – Isaac D. Brailey v. Michelin N.A.	Pending
5911 – Charles S. Blackmon v. SCDHEC	Pending

5912 – State v. Lance Antonio Brewton	Pending
5914 – State v. Tammy D. Brown	Pending
5916 – Amanda Huskins v. Mungo Homes, LLC	Pending
5921 – Cynthia Wright v. SCDOT	Pending
5922 – State v. Olandio R. Workman	Pending
5923 – Susan Ball Dover v. Nell Ball	Pending
5925 – Patricia Pate v. College of Charleston	Pending
5926 – Theodore Wills v. State	Pending
5930 – State v. Kyle M. Robinson	Pending
5931 – Stephen R. Edwards v. Scapa Waycross, Inc.	Pending
5932 – Basilides Cruz v. City of Columbia	Pending
5933 – State v. Michael Cliff Eubanks	Pending
5934 – Nicole Lampo v. Amedisys Holding, LLC	Pending
5935 – The Gulfstream Café v. Palmetto Industrial	Pending
5942 – State v. Joseph L. Brown, Jr.	Pending
5943 – State v. Nicholas B. Chhith-Berry	Pending
5946 – The State v. Frankie L. Davis, III	Pending
5947 – Richard W. Meier v. Mary J. Burnsed	Pending
5948 – Frankie Padgett v. Cast and Crew Entertainment	Pending
5951 – State v. Xzariera O. Gray	Pending

5953 – State v. Nyquan T. Brown	Pending
5954 – State v. Rashawn Carter	Pending
5955 – State v. Philip Guderyon	Pending
5956 – Trident Medical v. SCDHEC (Medical University)	Pending
5957 – SCDSS v. Brian Frank	Pending
5969 – Wendy Grungo-Smith v. Joseph Grungo	Pending
2021-UP-242 – G. Allen Rutter v. City of Columbia	Pending
2021-UP-252 – Betty Jean Perkins v. SCDOT	Pending
2021-UP-277 – State v. Dana L. Morton	Pending
2021-UP-288 – Gabriel Barnhill v. J. Floyd Swilley	Pending
2022-UP-095 – Samuel Paulino v. Diversified Coatings, Inc.	Pending
2022-UP-113 – Jennifer McFarland v. Thomas Morris	Pending
2022-UP-118 – State v. Donald R. Richburg	Pending
2022-UP-119 – Merilee Landano v. Norman Landano	Pending
2022-UP-161 – Denis Yeo v. Lexington Cty. Assessor	Pending
2022-UP-170 – Tony Young v. Greenwood Cty. Sheriff’s Office	Pending
2022-UP-175 – Brown Contractors, LLC v. Andrew McMarlin	Pending
2022-UP-186 – William B. Justice v. State	Pending
2022-UP-189 – State v. Jordan M. Hodge	Pending

2022-UP-197 – State v. Kenneth W. Carlisle	Pending
2022-UP-205 – Katkams Ventures, LLC v. No Limit, LLC	Pending
2022-UP-209 – The State v. Dustin L. Hooper	Pending
2022-UP-213 – Dr. Gregory May v. Advanced Cardiology	Pending
2022-UP-228 – State v. Rickey D. Tate	Pending
2022-UP-243 – In the Matter of Almeter B. Robinson (2)	Pending
2022-UP-245 – State v. John Steen d/b/a John Steen Bail Bonding	Pending
2022-UP-251 – Lady Beaufort, LLC v. Hird Island Investments	Pending
2022-UP-252 – Lady Beaufort, LLC v. Hird Island Investments (2)	Pending
2022-UP-253 – Mathes Auto Sales v. Dixon Automotive	Pending
2022-UP-255 – Frances K. Chestnut v. Florence Keese	Pending
2022-UP-256 – Sterling Hills v. Elliot Hayes	Pending
2022-UP-269 – Steven M. Bernard v. 3 Chisolm Street	Pending
2022-UP-270 – Latarsha Docena-Guerrero v. Government Employees Insurance	Pending
2022-UP-276 – Isiah James, #096883 v. SCDC (2)	Pending
2022-UP-282 – Roger Herrington, II v. Roger Dale Herrington	Pending
2022-UP-293 – State v. Malette D. Kimbrough	Pending
2022-UP-294 – Bernard Bagley #175851 v. SCDPPPS (2)	Pending
2022-UP-296 – SCDOR v. Study Hall, LLC	Pending

2022-UP-298 – State v. Gregory Sanders	Pending
2022-UP-303 – Daisy Frederick v. Daniel McDowell	Pending
2022-UP-305 – Terri L. Johnson v. State Farm	Pending
2022-UP-307 – Frieda H. Dortch v. City of Columbia	Pending
2022-UP-308 – Ditech Financial, LLC v. Kevin Snyder	Pending
2022-UP-309 – State v. Derrick T. Mills	Pending
2022-UP-312 – Guardian ad Litem, James Seeger v. Richland School Dt.	Pending
2022-UP-313 – Vermell Daniels v. THI of SC	Pending
2022-UP-314 – Ronald L. Jones v. Rogers Townsend & Thomas, P.C.	Pending
2022-UP-316 – Barry Adickes v. Phillips Healthcare (2)	Pending
2022-UP-319 – State v. Tyler J. Evans	Pending
2022-UP-320 – State v. Christopher Huggins	Pending
2022-UP-323 – Justin R. Cone v. State	Pending
2022-UP-326 – Wells Fargo Bank v. Michelle Hodges	Pending
2022-UP-331 – Ex Parte: Donald Smith (In re: Battersby v. Kirkman)	Pending
2022-UP-333 – Ex Parte: Beullah and James Belin	Pending
2022-UP-334 – Anthony Whitfield v. David Swanson	Pending
2022-UP-336 – In the Matter of Ronald MJ Gregg	Pending
2022-UP-337 – U.S. Bank, N.A. v. Rhonda Lewis Meisner (3)	Pending
2022-UP-338 – State v. Derrick J. Miles	Pending

2022-UP-340 – State v. Amy N. Taylor	Pending
2022-UP-354 – Chicora Life Center v. Fetter Health Care Network	Pending
2022-UP-360 – Nationstar Mortgage LLC v. Barbara A. Gibbs	Pending
2022-UP-362 – Jonathan Duncan v. State	Pending
2022-UP-380 – Adonis Williams v. State	Pending
2022-UP-382 – Mark Giles Pafford v. Robert Wayne Duncan, Jr.	Pending
2022-UP-402 – Todd Olds v. Berkeley County	Pending
2022-UP-410 – Alvetta L. Massenberg v. Clarendon County Treasurer	Pending
2022-UP-413 – Lucas Marchant v. John Doe	Pending
2022-UP-415 – J. Morgan Kears v. The Kears Family Education Trust	Pending
2022-UP-422 – Paula Russell v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.	Pending
2022-UP-425 – Michele Blank v. Patricia Timmons (2)	Pending
2022-UP-435 – Andrew Desilet v. S.C. Dep’t of Motor Vehicles	Pending
2022-UP-437 – Nicholas Thompson v. Bluffton Township Fire District	Pending
2022-UP-444 – State v. James H. Baldwin	Pending
2022-UP-450 – State v. Melvin J. White	Pending
2022-UP-452 – In the Matter of Kevin Wright	Pending
2022-UP-462 – Karrie Gurwood & Howard Gurwood v. GCA Services Group, Inc.	Pending
2023-UP-020 – Bridgett Fowler v. Fedex	Pending

2023-UP-037 – Diana Bright v. Craig Bright	Pending
2023-UP-041 – Joy Wymer v. Floyd Hiott	Pending
2023-UP-044 – Deutsche Bank National Trust Company v. Doris J. Dixon	Pending
2023-UP-051 – State v. Jason E. Stoots	Pending
2023-UP-064 – Karen K. Baber v. Summit Funding, Inc.	Pending
2023-UP-070 – James Kincannon v. Ashely Griffith	Pending
2023-UP-075 – Dana Dixon v. SCDMH (2)	Pending

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Scott David Robinson, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2023-000715

ORDER

By order dated February 9, 2023, this Court placed Respondent Scott David Robinson on interim suspension and appointed the Receiver. *In re Robinson*, 438 S.C. 442, 883 S.E.2d 663 (2023). Since that time, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) has received letters from two medical doctors as to Respondent's condition. The first letter establishes that Respondent is currently unable to practice law and will not be able to resume the practice of law in the future due to his condition. The second letter establishes that Respondent's current condition renders him incapable of participating in any disciplinary investigation or assisting in the defense of formal disciplinary proceedings. Accordingly, ODC requests that Respondent be transferred to incapacity inactive status under Rule 28, RLDE, Rule 413, SCACR, and that formal proceedings be deferred. Respondent, who is represented by counsel, consents to ODC's request.

IT IS ORDERED that Respondent is hereby placed on incapacity inactive status. Based on the record and the parties' consent, the Court finds Respondent is unable to practice law or participate in the disciplinary investigation, and further proceedings under Rule 28(b), RLDE, are unnecessary at this time. Any formal disciplinary proceedings against Respondent are hereby deferred; however, ODC may continue to investigate any complaints. Rule 28(f), RLDE. Respondent shall remain on incapacity inactive status until further order of this Court.

s/ Donald W. Beatty _____ C.J.
FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina
May 15, 2023

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Re: Rescission of Administrative Orders Governing
Mortgage Foreclosure Actions

ORDER

In 2009, former Chief Justice Toal issued an Administrative Order to ensure compliance with the Home Affordable Modification Program (HAMP), which was part of the Making Home Affordable Program (MHAP) of the United States Department of the Treasury.¹ S.C. Sup. Ct. Admin. Order dated May 22, 2009.² At the time, HAMP required the temporary suspension of certain foreclosure proceedings, and the order stated it was intended to ensure eligible homeowners were afforded the benefits available under HAMP, procedures for handling issues

¹ MHAP was designed to stabilize the housing market and assist struggling homeowners in owner-occupied homes avoid mortgage foreclosure during the financial crisis that began in 2008. HAMP was funded through the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP), and financial incentives were offered to certain borrowers who participated in HAMP and other programs to offer modifications of mortgages and avoid foreclosures.

² This order is available at:
<https://www.sccourts.org/courtOrders/displayOrder.cfm?orderNo=2009-05-22-01>.

related to HAMP were uniform throughout the state, and foreclosure actions were not unnecessarily dismissed or delayed while HAMP issues were resolved.

A revised order was issued on May 2, 2011. *In re Mortg. Foreclosure Actions*, 396 S.C. 209, 720 S.E.2d 908 (2011). The 2011 Order includes additional obligations that were intended to ensure foreclosure intervention occurs in cases where it is required. Among other things, the 2011 Order requires that Mortgagees serve a notice of the right to foreclosure intervention together with the summons and complaint, and also certify that loss mitigation efforts have been unsuccessful before a final hearing or sale could occur. *Id.* at 211, 720 S.E.2d at 909. Counsel for Mortgagees in mortgage foreclosure actions are obligated to receive mitigation information from Mortgagors throughout the intervention process. *Id.* at 213, 720 S.E.2d at 909-10.

Congress ended the Making Home Affordable Program at the end of 2016. *See* <https://www.makinghomeaffordable.gov/need-help> ("As of December 30, 2016, no new applications or new requests for assistance under any MHA program will be accepted."). Section 709(b), Title VII, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, P.L. 114-113, states:

(b) TERMINATION. --

(1) IN GENERAL. -- The Making Home Affordable initiative of the Secretary of the Treasury, as authorized under the

Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5201 et seq.), shall terminate on December 31, 2016.

(2) APPLICABILITY. -- Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any loan modification application made under the Home Affordable Modification Program under the Making Home Affordable initiative of the Secretary of the Treasury, as authorized under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5201 et seq.), before December 31, 2016.

HAMP is inapplicable in new foreclosure actions, unless the borrower sought a modification prior to December 31, 2016. The Treasury Department issued guidance to implement termination of the Program prior to termination. *See* March 3, 2016 Supplemental Directive 16-02; and May 2, 2016 Supplemental Directive 16-03, U.S. Dept. of the Treasury.³

Because HAMP has ended, we find that the 2009 Order and 2011 Order must be rescinded. While HAMP has ended, we recognize various loss mitigation programs apply to mortgage loans secured by property that is a borrower's principal residence. *See* 12 C.F.R. § 1024.30(c)(2). A number of federal regulations govern the conduct of lenders and servicers when they choose to offer specific forms of loss mitigation, which may include forbearance, refinancing, and modification, among others. *See* 12 C.F.R. §§ 1024.39-1024.41. For example,

³ These directives are available at: https://www.hmpadmin.com/portal/programs/docs/hamp_servicer/sd1602.pdf, and https://www.hmpadmin.com/portal/programs/docs/hamp_servicer/sd1603.pdf.

current regulations prohibit lenders or servicers from making a first filing in a foreclosure matter or seeking a judgment or order of sale when a borrower is performing pursuant to the terms of an offered payment forbearance program or repayment plan. 12 C.F.R. § 1024.41(c)(2)(iii). Various other temporary loss mitigation programs exist or may be offered following emergencies, such as hurricanes or COVID-19. *See, e.g.*, 12 C.F.R. § 1024.19(e) (setting forth requirements for temporary COVID-19-related live contact).

Accordingly, notwithstanding the rescission of the 2009 and 2011 Orders, nothing in this order should be read to imply that Mortgagee-plaintiffs in foreclosure actions are not required to comply with applicable federal regulations with respect to loss mitigation in foreclosure actions in South Carolina. Further, nothing in this order prohibits the circuit court, the master-in-equity, or a special referee from inquiring about the status of loss mitigation or requiring that counsel for a Mortgagor confirm or certify that there are no ongoing loss mitigation efforts underway, that a Mortgagor has failed to qualify for a program, or a Mortgagor defaulted under a loss mitigation agreement prior to scheduling a final hearing, entering a final order of foreclosure, or conducting a sale.

Finally, although the 2011 Order has been rescinded, counsel for Mortgagees in foreclosure actions shall continue to serve as the point of contact

between their clients and Mortgagors with respect to loss intervention. This includes, without limitation, submission of all required information, negotiations, and consummation of any loan modification or other loss mitigation agreement, and providing reliable information to the court about the status of any loss mitigation.

s/ Donald W. Beatty C.J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ John Cannon Few J.

s/ George C. James, Jr. J.

s/ D. Garrison Hill J.

Columbia, South Carolina
May 17, 2023