

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

RE: Grants or Denials of Petitions for Writs of Certiorari
Under Rules 242, 243 and 247 of the South Carolina
Appellate Court Rules

ORDER

Under Rule 242(a) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR), a writ of certiorari to review a decision of the South Carolina Court of Appeals will only be issued upon the concurrence of two members of this Court. Further, under Rule 243(j), SCACR, a writ of certiorari to review a post-conviction relief case will only be issued upon the concurrence of two members of this Court. Additionally, under Rule 247(h), SCACR, a writ of certiorari to review an order in an Access to Justice Post-Conviction DNA Testing Act (DNA Testing Act) case will only be issued upon the concurrence of two members of this Court. In the past, the results of a vote under these rules have been reflected by an order signed by the Court. We now change this practice.

Based on the vote of the Court on a petition for a writ of certiorari filed under Rule 242, 243 or 247, SCACR, the Clerk or a Deputy Clerk of this Court shall issue an order on behalf of the Court either denying or granting the petition. If the petition is granted in whole or part, the order shall indicate the questions that will be considered. The votes of the individual justices will not be revealed.

In addition, in those post-conviction relief or DNA Test Act cases that are pending before the Court of Appeals, the Clerk or a Deputy Clerk of the Court of Appeals shall issue an order on behalf of the panel either denying or granting the petition

based on the vote of the panel under Rule 243(l) or 247(h), SCACR. If the petition is granted in whole or part, the order shall indicate the questions that will be considered. The votes of the individual judges will not be revealed.

s/ Costa M. Pleicones C.J.

s/ Donald W. Beatty J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn J.

Columbia, South Carolina
January 20, 2016

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Dale F. Park, Petitioner

Appellate Case No. 2015-002547

ORDER

Petitioner is currently admitted to practice law in South Carolina, and has now submitted a resignation under Rule 409 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. The resignation is accepted.

If petitioner is currently representing any South Carolina clients, petitioner shall immediately notify those clients of the resignation by certified mail, return receipt requested. Further, if petitioner is currently counsel of record before any court of this State, petitioner shall immediately move to be relieved as counsel in that matter.

Within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall:

(1) surrender the certificate of admission to the Clerk of this Court. If petitioner cannot locate this certificate, petitioner shall provide the Clerk with an affidavit indicating this fact and indicating that the certificate will be immediately surrendered if it is subsequently located.

(2) provide an affidavit to the Clerk of this Court showing that petitioner has fully complied with the requirements of this order.

s/ Costa M. Pleicones C.J.

s/ Donald W. Beatty J.

s/ John W. Kittredge _____ J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn _____ J.

Columbia, South Carolina
January 13, 2016

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Jennifer Jo Howard, Petitioner

Appellate Case No. 2015-002583

ORDER

Petitioner is currently admitted to practice law in South Carolina, and has now submitted a resignation under Rule 409 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. The resignation is accepted.

If petitioner is currently representing any South Carolina clients, petitioner shall immediately notify those clients of the resignation by certified mail, return receipt requested. Further, if petitioner is currently counsel of record before any court of this State, petitioner shall immediately move to be relieved as counsel in that matter.

Within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall:

(1) surrender the certificate of admission to the Clerk of this Court. If petitioner cannot locate this certificate, petitioner shall provide the Clerk with an affidavit indicating this fact and indicating that the certificate will be immediately surrendered if it is subsequently located.

(2) provide an affidavit to the Clerk of this Court showing that petitioner has fully complied with the requirements of this order.

s/ Costa M. Pleicones _____ C.J.

s/ Donald W. Beatty _____ J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn J.

Columbia, South Carolina
January 13, 2016

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of John R. Polito , Petitioner

Appellate Case No. 2015-002520

ORDER

Petitioner is currently admitted to practice law in South Carolina, and has now submitted a resignation under Rule 409 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. The resignation is accepted.

If petitioner is currently representing any South Carolina clients, petitioner shall immediately notify those clients of the resignation by certified mail, return receipt requested. Further, if petitioner is currently counsel of record before any court of this State, petitioner shall immediately move to be relieved as counsel in that matter.

Within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall:

(1) surrender the certificate of admission to the Clerk of this Court. If petitioner cannot locate this certificate, petitioner shall provide the Clerk with an affidavit indicating this fact and indicating that the certificate will be immediately surrendered if it is subsequently located.

(2) provide an affidavit to the Clerk of this Court showing that petitioner has fully complied with the requirements of this order.

s/ Costa M. Pleicones _____ C.J.

s/ Donald W. Beatty _____ J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn J.

Columbia, South Carolina
January 13, 2016

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Kathryn Stone Park, Petitioner

Appellate Case No. 2015-002546

ORDER

Petitioner is currently admitted to practice law in South Carolina, and has now submitted a resignation under Rule 409 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. The resignation is accepted.

If petitioner is currently representing any South Carolina clients, petitioner shall immediately notify those clients of the resignation by certified mail, return receipt requested. Further, if petitioner is currently counsel of record before any court of this State, petitioner shall immediately move to be relieved as counsel in that matter.

Within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall:

(1) surrender the certificate of admission to the Clerk of this Court. If petitioner cannot locate this certificate, petitioner shall provide the Clerk with an affidavit indicating this fact and indicating that the certificate will be immediately surrendered if it is subsequently located.

(2) provide an affidavit to the Clerk of this Court showing that petitioner has fully complied with the requirements of this order.

s/ Costa M. Pleicones _____ C.J.

s/ Donald W. Beatty _____ J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn J.

Columbia, South Carolina
January 13, 2016

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Lee Lawson Stockdale, Petitioner

Appellate Case No. 2015-002498

ORDER

Petitioner is currently admitted to practice law in South Carolina, and has now submitted a resignation under Rule 409 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. The resignation is accepted.

If petitioner is currently representing any South Carolina clients, petitioner shall immediately notify those clients of the resignation by certified mail, return receipt requested. Further, if petitioner is currently counsel of record before any court of this State, petitioner shall immediately move to be relieved as counsel in that matter.

Within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall:

(1) surrender the certificate of admission to the Clerk of this Court. If petitioner cannot locate this certificate, petitioner shall provide the Clerk with an affidavit indicating this fact and indicating that the certificate will be immediately surrendered if it is subsequently located.

(2) provide an affidavit to the Clerk of this Court showing that petitioner has fully complied with the requirements of this order.

s/ Costa M. Pleicones _____ C.J.

s/ Donald W. Beatty _____ J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn J.

Columbia, South Carolina
January 13, 2016

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Michelle D. Brodie, Petitioner

Appellate Case No. 2015-002657

ORDER

Petitioner is currently admitted to practice law in South Carolina, and has now submitted a resignation under Rule 409 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. The resignation is accepted.

If petitioner is currently representing any South Carolina clients, petitioner shall immediately notify those clients of the resignation by certified mail, return receipt requested. Further, if petitioner is currently counsel of record before any court of this State, petitioner shall immediately move to be relieved as counsel in that matter.

Within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall:

(1) surrender the certificate of admission to the Clerk of this Court. If petitioner cannot locate this certificate, petitioner shall provide the Clerk with an affidavit indicating this fact and indicating that the certificate will be immediately surrendered if it is subsequently located.

(2) provide an affidavit to the Clerk of this Court showing that petitioner has fully complied with the requirements of this order.

s/ Costa M. Pleicones _____ C.J.

s/ Donald W. Beatty _____ J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn J.

Columbia, South Carolina
January 13, 2016

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Susan Kirkpatrick Tuite, Petitioner

Appellate Case No. 2015-002519

ORDER

Petitioner is currently admitted to practice law in South Carolina, and has now submitted a resignation under Rule 409 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. The resignation is accepted.

If petitioner is currently representing any South Carolina clients, petitioner shall immediately notify those clients of the resignation by certified mail, return receipt requested. Further, if petitioner is currently counsel of record before any court of this State, petitioner shall immediately move to be relieved as counsel in that matter.

Within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall:

(1) surrender the certificate of admission to the Clerk of this Court. If petitioner cannot locate this certificate, petitioner shall provide the Clerk with an affidavit indicating this fact and indicating that the certificate will be immediately surrendered if it is subsequently located.

(2) provide an affidavit to the Clerk of this Court showing that petitioner has fully complied with the requirements of this order.

s/ Costa M. Pleicones _____ C.J.

s/ Donald W. Beatty _____ J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn J.

Columbia, South Carolina
January 13, 2016

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Trisha Cooper Ripley, Petitioner

Appellate Case No. 2015-002503

ORDER

Petitioner is currently admitted to practice law in South Carolina, and has now submitted a resignation under Rule 409 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. The resignation is accepted.

If petitioner is currently representing any South Carolina clients, petitioner shall immediately notify those clients of the resignation by certified mail, return receipt requested. Further, if petitioner is currently counsel of record before any court of this State, petitioner shall immediately move to be relieved as counsel in that matter.

Within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall:

(1) surrender the certificate of admission to the Clerk of this Court. If petitioner cannot locate this certificate, petitioner shall provide the Clerk with an affidavit indicating this fact and indicating that the certificate will be immediately surrendered if it is subsequently located.

(2) provide an affidavit to the Clerk of this Court showing that petitioner has fully complied with the requirements of this order.

s/ Costa M. Pleicones _____ C.J.

s/ Donald W. Beatty _____ J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn J.

Columbia, South Carolina
January 13, 2016

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Susan Wesley Warren Bales, Petitioner

Appellate Case No. 2015-002489

ORDER

Petitioner is currently admitted to practice law in South Carolina, and has now submitted a resignation under Rule 409 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. The resignation is accepted.

If petitioner is currently representing any South Carolina clients, petitioner shall immediately notify those clients of the resignation by certified mail, return receipt requested. Further, if petitioner is currently counsel of record before any court of this State, petitioner shall immediately move to be relieved as counsel in that matter.

Within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall:

(1) surrender the certificate of admission to the Clerk of this Court. If petitioner cannot locate this certificate, petitioner shall provide the Clerk with an affidavit indicating this fact and indicating that the certificate will be immediately surrendered if it is subsequently located.

(2) provide an affidavit to the Clerk of this Court showing that petitioner has fully complied with the requirements of this order.

s/ Costa M. Pleicones _____ C.J.

s/ Donald W. Beatty _____ J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn J.

Columbia, South Carolina
January 13, 2016



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

ADVANCE SHEET NO. 3
January 20, 2016
Daniel E. Shearouse, Clerk
Columbia, South Carolina
www.sccourts.org

CONTENTS
THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

PUBLISHED OPINIONS AND ORDERS

27601 - Richard Stogsdill v. SCDHHS 33

UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS

None

PETITIONS - UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

27502 - The State v. Ortho-McNeil-Janssen	Denied 1/11/2016
27563 - Columbia Venture v. Richland County	Pending
27569 - The State v. Shawn Reaves	Denied 1/11/2016
2014-000324 - Cynthia E. Collie v. South Carolina Commission on Lawyer Conduct, et al	Pending
2015-MO-027 - Kamell D. Evans v. The State	Pending
2015-MO-028 - Jonathan Kyle Binney v. The State	Pending
2015-MO-029 - John Kennedy Hughey v. The State	Pending
2015-MO-033 - The State v. Christopher Ryan Whitehead	Denied 1/11/2016

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

27572 - Stokes-Craven Holding Corporation v. Scott L. Robinson	Pending
27582 - In the Matter of Douglas M. Schmidt	Granted
27587 - Willie Homer Stephens v. CSX Transportation	Pending

27594 - Scott Lawing v. Univar USA	Pending
27596 - Clarence Kendall Cook v. The State	Pending
2015-MO-061 - Kennedy Funding v. Pawleys Island North	Pending
2015-MO-072 - Rest Assured v. SCDEW	Pending

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

PUBLISHED OPINION

5376-Paula Russell v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

35

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

2016-UP-017-SCDSS v. Victoria Lemay
(Filed January 11, 2016)

2016-UP-018-Stephanie Allyson Militano-Catanzaro v. Leonard V. Catanzaro

2016-UP-019-Antonio Hough v. Town of Pageland

2016-UP-020-Matthew H. Willimon, Jr. v. Jake Gilstrap

2016-UP-021-State v. Darius Ransom-Williams

2016-UP-022-State v. Michael Anderson Manigan

2016-UP-023-Frankie Lee Bryant, III v. State

2016-UP-024-State v. William D. Currie

2016-UP-025-Charles Alan Grubb v. The City of Clemson

2016-UP-026-SCDSS v. Marilyn Lawrence

2016-UP-027-State v. Jennifer Lorene Hatfield Griffin

2016-UP-028-Arthur Washington v. Resort Services, Inc.

2016-UP-029-State v. Brannon Jaisel Bryant, Jr.

2016-UP-030-State v. Tyrell Woods

2016-UP-031-State v. Tabitha Shea Jones

2016-UP-032-Drew John Monahan v. State
2016-UP-033-State v. Christopher Lee Meadows
2016-UP-034-State v. Tyrel Rashone Collins
2016-UP-035-State v. Christopher W. Berke
2016-UP-036-State v. Shana Robinson
2016-UP-037-Joseph Anthony Gelotte v. Davis Roofing and Maintenance, LLC
2016-UP-038-Lauren L. Kyle v. Dorchester County Chapter SPCA
2016-UP-039-State v. Fritz Allen Timmons
2016-UP-040-State v. Jonathan Xavier Miller
2016-UP-041-State v. David Terrell Gallman
2016-UP-042-William Russell Patterson v. State
2016-UP-043-State v. Tavish Dominique Yeargin

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

5359-Bobby Joe Reeves v. State	Pending
5360-Claude McAlhany v. Kenneth A. Carter	Pending
5361-Michael Bolin v. SCDC	Pending
5362-The SPUR v. Sunil Lalla	Pending
5365-Thomas Lyons v. Fidelity National	Pending
5366-David Gooldy v. The Storage Center	Pending
5368-SCDOT v. David Powell	Pending
5369-Boisha Wofford v. City of Spartanburg	Pending
5370-Ricky Rhame v. Charleston Cty. Schools	Pending

5371-Betty Fisher v. Bessie Huckabee	Pending
5372-Farid A. Mangal v. State	Pending
5373-Robert S. Jones v. Builders Investment Group	Pending
2015-UP-328-Billy Lisenby v. SCDC (7)	Pending
2015-UP-473-Mevers Kitchens v. Maryann Wagner	Pending
2015-UP-505-Charles Carter v. SCDC (3)	Pending
2015-UP-517-Kevin Fowler v. SCDC	Pending
2015-UP-523-State v. Gary Lane Prewitt	Pending
2015-UP-524-State v. Gary R. Thompson	Pending
2015-UP-536-Vondell Sanders v. State	Pending
2015-UP-540-State v. Michael McCraw	Pending
2015-UP-542-Frazier T. Williams v. State	Pending
2015-UP-547-Evalena Catoe v. City of Columbia	Pending
2015-UP-548-Thaddess Starks v. State	Pending
2015-UP-554-State v. David J. Benjamin	Pending
2015-UP-555-Moore, Taylor & Thomas v. Marsha Banks	Pending
2015-UP-556-State v. Nathaniel Witherspoon	Pending
2015-UP-557-State v. Andrew Antonio Clemmons	Pending
2015-UP-559-West Webb Mitchum v. State	Pending
2015-UP-564-State v. Tonya McAlhaney	Pending
2015-UP-568-State v. Damian Anderson	Pending
2015-UP-574-State v. Brett D. Parker	Pending

PETITIONS-SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

5209-State v. Tyrone Whatley	Pending
5247-State v. Henry Haygood	Pending
5250-Precision Walls v. Liberty Mutual Fire Ins.	Pending
5253-Sierra Club v. Chem-Nuclear	Pending
5254-State v. Leslie Parvin	Pending
5295-Edward Freiburger v. State	Pending
5301-State v. Andrew T. Looper	Pending
5307-George Ferguson v. Amerco/U-Haul	Pending
5308-Henton Clemmons v. Lowe's Home Centers	Pending
5312-R. C. Frederick Hanold, III v. Watson's Orchard POA	Pending
5313-State v. Raheem D. King	Pending
5314-State v. Walter M. Bash	Pending
5317-Michael Gonzales v. State	Pending
5322-State v. Daniel D. Griffin	Pending
5324-State v. Charles A. Cain	Pending
5326-Denise Wright v. PRG	Pending
5328-Matthew McAlhaney v. Richard McElveen	Pending
5329-State v. Stephen Douglas Berry	Pending
5331-State v. Thomas Stewart	Pending
5332-State v. Kareem Harry	Pending

5333-Yancey Roof v. Kenneth A. Steele	Pending
5335-Norman J. Hayes v. State	Pending
5336-Phillip Flexon v. PHC-Jasper, Inc.	Pending
5337-Ruben Ramirez v. State	Pending
5338-Bobby Lee Tucker v. John Doe	Pending
5341-State v. Alphonso Thompson	Pending
5342-John Goodwin v. Landquest	Pending
5344-Stoneledge v. IMK Development (Southern Concrete)	Pending
5345-Jacklyn Donevant v. Town of Surfside Beach	Pending
5346-State v. Lamont A. Samuel	Pending
5347-George Glassmeyer v. City of Columbia	Pending
5348-Gretchen A. Rogers v. Kenneth E. Lee	Pending
5351-State v. Sarah D. Cardwell	Pending
5352-Ken Lucero v. State	Pending
5355-State v. Lamar Sequan Brown	Pending
2014-UP-446-State v. Ubaldo Garcia, Jr.	Pending
2014-UP-470-State v. Jon Wynn Jarrard, Sr.	Pending
2015-UP-010-Latonya Footman v. Johnson Food Services	Pending
2015-UP-031-Blue Ridge Electric v. Kathleen Gresham	Pending
2015-UP-041-Nathalie Davaut v. USC	Pending
2015-UP-065-Glenda Couram v. Lula Davis	Pending

2015-UP-069-Amie Gitter v. Morris Gitter	Pending
2015-UP-091-U.S. Bank v. Kelley Burr	Pending
2015-UP-111-Ronald Jarmuth v. International Club	Denied 01/15/16
2015-UP-126-First National Bank v. James T. Callihan	Denied 01/14/16
2015-UP-155-Ashlie Outing v. Velmetria Weeks	Denied 01/15/16
2015-UP-167-Cynthia Griffis v. Cherry Hill Estates	Pending
2015-UP-174-Tommy S. Adams v. State	Pending
2015-UP-176-Charles Ray Dean v. State	Pending
2015-UP-201-James W. Trexler v. The Associated Press	Pending
2015-UP-203-The Callawassie Island v. Arthur Applegate	Pending
2015-UP-208-Bank of New York Mellon v. Rachel R. Lindsay	Pending
2015-UP-209-Elizabeth Hope Rainey v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg	Pending
2015-UP-215-Ex Parte Tara Dawn Shurling (In re: State v. Harley)	Pending
2015-UP-248-South Carolina Electric & Gas v. Anson	Pending
2015-UP-256-State v. John F. Kennedy	Pending
2015-UP-259-Danny Abrams v. City of Newberry	Pending
2015-UP-262-State v. Erick Arroyo	Pending
2015-UP-266-State v. Gary Eugene Lott	Pending
2015-UP-269-Grand Bees Development v. SCDHEC	Pending
2015-UP-273-State v. Bryan M. Holder	Pending
2015-UP-275-State v. David E. Rosier	Pending

2015-UP-280-State v. Calvin Pompey	Pending
2015-UP-281-SCDSS v. Trilicia White	Denied 01/15/16
2015-UP-300-Peter T. Phillips v. Omega Flex, Inc.	Pending
2015-UP-303-Charleston County Assessor v. LMP Properties	Pending
2015-UP-304-Robert K. Marshall, Jr. v. City of Rock Hill	Pending
2015-UP-307-Allcare Medical v. Ahava Hospice	Pending
2015-UP-320-American Community Bank v. Michael R Brown	Pending
2015-UP-327-State v. Shawn Justin Burris	Pending
2015-UP-330-Bigford Enterprises v. D. C. Development	Pending
2015-UP-331-Johnny Eades v. Palmetto Cardiovascular	Pending
2015-UP-333-Jennifer Bowzard v. Sheriff Wayne Dewitt	Pending
2015-UP-339-LeAndra Lewis v. L. B. Dynasty, Inc.	Pending
2015-UP-344-Robert Duncan McCall v. State	Pending
2015-UP-345-State v. Steve Young	Pending
2015-UP-350-Ebony Bethea v. Derrick Jones	Pending
2015-UP-351-Elite Construction v. Doris Tummillo	Pending
2015-UP-353-Wilmington Savings Fund v. Furmanchik	Pending
2015-UP-357-Linda Rodarte v. USC	Pending
2015-UP-359-In the matter of the estate of Alice Shaw Baker (Fisher v. Huckabee)	Pending
2015-UP-361-JP Morgan Chase Bank v. Leah Sample	Pending

2015-UP-362-State v. Martin D. Floyd	Pending
2015-UP-364-Andrew Ballard v. Tim Roberson	Pending
2015-UP-365-State v. Ahmad Jamal Wilkins	Pending
2015-UP-367-Angela Patton v. Dr. Gregory A. Miller	Pending
2015-UP-372-State v. Sheldon L. Kelly	Pending
2015-UP-376-Ron Orlosky v. Law Office of Jay Mullinax	Pending
2015-UP-377-Long Grove at Seaside v. Long Grove Property Owners (James, Harwick & Partners)	Pending
2015-UP-381-State v. Stepheno J. Alston	Pending
2015-UP-382-State v. Nathaniel B. Beeks	Pending
2015-UP-384-Robert C. Schivera v. C. Russell Keep, III	Pending
2015-UP-388-Joann Wright v. William Enos	Pending
2015-UP-391-Cambridge Lakes v. Johnson Koola	Pending
2015-UP-395-Brandon Hodge v. Sumter County	Pending
2015-UP-402-Fritz Timmons v. Browns AS RV and Campers	Pending
2015-UP-403-Angela Parsons v. Jane Smith	Pending
2015-UP-414-Christopher A. Wellborn v. City of Rock Hill	Pending
2015-UP-417-State v. Raheem Jamar Bonham	Pending
2015-UP-423-North Pleasant, LLC v. SC Coastal Conservation	Pending
2015-UP-427-William McFarland v. Sofia Mazell	Pending
2015-UP-428-Harold Threlkeld v. Lyman Warehouse, LLC	Pending
2015-UP-429-State v. Leonard E. Jenkins	Pending

2015-UP-432-Barbara Gaines v. Joyce Ann Campbell	Pending
2015-UP-439-Branch Banking and Trust Co. v. Sarah L. Gray	Pending
2015-UP-444-Bank of America v. Duce Staley	Pending
2015-UP-446-State v. Tiphani Marie Parkhurst	Pending
2015-UP-455-State v. Michael L. Cardwell	Pending
2015-UP-476-State v. Jon Roseboro	Pending
2015-UP-477-State v. William D. Bolt	Pending
2015-UP-478-State v. Michael Camp	Pending
2015-UP-485-State v. Alfonzo Alexander	Pending
2015-UP-513-State v. Wayne A. Scott, Jr.	Pending
2015-UP-518-SCDSS v. Bruce Walters	Pending

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court**

Richard Stogsdill, Petitioner,

v.

South Carolina Department of Health and Human
Services, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2014-002513

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from the Administrative Law Court
Carolyn C. Matthews, Administrative Law Judge

Opinion No. 27601
Heard November 17, 2015 – Filed January 20, 2016

DISMISSED AS IMPROVIDENTLY GRANTED

Patricia Logan Harrison, of Columbia, for Petitioner.

Richard G. Hepfer, of Columbia, for Respondent.

Anna Maria Darwin and Sarah Garland St. Onge, both of
Columbia, for Amicus Curiae Protection and Advocacy
for People with Disabilities, Inc.; Andrew J. Atkins, of
Columbia, for Amicus Curiae South Carolina Chapter of

the National Academy of Elder Law Attorneys; and
Stephen Suggs, of Columbia, for Amicus Curiae South
Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center.

PER CURIAM: We granted a writ of certiorari to review the court of appeals' decision in *Stogsdill v. South Carolina Department of Health and Human Services*, 410 S.C. 273, 763 S.E.2d 638 (Ct. App. 2014). We now dismiss the writ as improvidently granted.

DISMISSED AS IMPROVIDENTLY GRANTED.

PLEICONES, C.J., BEATTY, KITTREDGE, HEARN, JJ., and Acting Justice James E. Moore, concur.

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals**

Paula Russell, Appellant,

v.

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., and American Home Assurance,
Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2014-000454

Appeal From The Workers' Compensation Commission

Opinion No. 5376

Heard October 20, 2015 – Filed January 20, 2016

REVERSED AND REMANDED

C. Daniel Vega, of Chappell Smith & Arden, of
Columbia, and William Ashley Jordan, III, of Jordan
Law Center, LLC, of Greenville, both for Appellant.

Johnnie W. Baxley, III, of Willson Jones Carter &
Baxley, P.A., of Mount Pleasant, for Respondents.

SHORT, J.: In this workers' compensation action against Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. and American Home Assurance (Wal-Mart), Paula Russell appeals, arguing the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission erred in (1) requiring a change of condition to be established by objective evidence; (2) ruling substantial evidence existed to deny a change of condition; and (3) finding Russell's statements were self-serving and conclusory. We reverse and remand.

BACKGROUND FACTS

In 2009, Russell was employed by Wal-Mart as an assistant store manager and had been an employee for more than ten years. On November 3, 2009, she was lifting something in the course of her employment and hurt her back and pelvis. Because she was pregnant at the time, her treatment did not include diagnostic testing and was very conservative. After her pregnancy, she had an MRI scan and was treated with medication, exercises, and an injection. At the time, her treating doctor, Dr. James O. Merritt, IV, determined no surgery was required.

Russell continued to work at Wal-Mart with a heavy-lifting (over thirty pounds) restriction. The medical records indicated Russell was diagnosed with back strain and had degenerative disc disease at L5-S1. By single commissioner order filed June 8, 2011, Russell was found to have reached maximum medical improvement (MMI) on February 2, 2011, and was awarded seven percent permanent partial disability. The award also provided for "ongoing anti-inflammatory medication . . . as long as such medication is causally related to her work accident and tends to lessen her period of disability."

On December 9, 2011, Russell filed a Form 50, alleging a change of condition for the worse to her back requiring additional medical treatment, including surgery. After a hearing on February 11, 2013, the single commissioner noted Russell testified she experienced new symptoms, including pain radiating down into her legs and shaking; she found her hour-long drive to and from work difficult; she requested to be transferred to a Wal-Mart closer to home; and in December 2011, Wal-Mart fired her rather than honoring her request. Finding Russell's testimony to be credible and relying on the testimony of Drs. Merritt and William S. Edwards, the commissioner found Russell suffered a change of condition and ordered Wal-Mart to provide medical care and temporary total disability benefits.

After a hearing, the full commission (the Commission) reversed the single commissioner. The Commission gave "limited weight to the testimony of [Russell] as it is conclusory and self-serving." The Commission found Russell was unable to establish (1) she suffered any new complaints; (2) when her condition worsened; and (3) that her need for surgery was new or occurred after the original award.

Although the Commission stated it gave "more weight to the medical records, the diagnostic tests, and the testimony of the medical experts[,] the Commission concluded, "[t]he preponderance of the evidence indicates that there was no objective difference between the Claimant's MRI scan after the original award and the MRI scan before the original award." Thus, the Commission denied Russell's claim for additional benefits. This appeal followed.

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The South Carolina Administrative Procedures Act (APA) establishes the standard for judicial review of decisions by the Commission. *Carolinas Recycling Grp. v. S.C. Second Injury Fund*, 398 S.C. 480, 482, 730 S.E.2d 324, 326 (Ct. App. 2012). Under the scope of review established in the APA, this court may not substitute its judgment for that of the Commission as to the weight of the evidence on questions of fact, but may reverse or modify the Commission's decision if the appellant's substantial rights have been prejudiced because the decision is affected by an error of law or is "clearly erroneous in view of the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence on the whole record." *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-380(5)(e) (Supp. 2015).

LAW/ANALYSIS

I. Objective Evidence

Russell argues the Commission erred in requiring a change of condition to be established by objective evidence. We agree.

Section 42-17-90(A) of the South Carolina Code permits the review of a previous compensation award "on proof by a preponderance of the evidence that there has been a change of condition caused by the original injury, after the last payment of compensation." S.C. Code Ann. § 42-17-90(A) (2015). "A change in condition occurs when the claimant experiences a change in physical condition as a result of her original injury, occurring after the first award." *Gattis v. Murrells Inlet VFW No. 10420*, 353 S.C. 100, 109, 576 S.E.2d 191, 196 (Ct. App. 2003). "Generally, an appeal of a workers' compensation order is concerned with the conditions prior to and at the time of the original award of the commission. Review for a change of condition is concerned with conditions that have arisen thereafter." *Id.* at 109, 576 S.E.2d at 195 (citation omitted). "The determination of whether a claimant

experiences a change of condition is a question for the fact finder." *Id.* at 107, 576 S.E.2d at 194.

We recognize there is no requirement in the Workers' Compensation Act (the Act) that the evidence relied upon by the Commission be either subjective or objective. The appellate courts have affirmed awards based solely on objective evidence and awards based solely on subjective evidence. *See id.*, 353 S.C. at 110, 576 S.E.2d at 196 (affirming the Commission's finding, which was based in part on updated diagnostic tests); *Robbins v. Walgreens & Broadspire Servs., Inc.*, 375 S.C. 259, 265-66, 652 S.E.2d 90, 94 (Ct. App. 2007) (affirming the Commission's denial of a claim for change of condition where medical tests performed both before and after the settlement of the claim showed the same condition despite claimant's continuing pain); *Potter v. Spartanburg Sch. Dist. 7*, 395 S.C. 17, 23-24, 716 S.E.2d 123, 126-27 (Ct. App. 2011) (explaining the Commission may consider lay and medical evidence and disregard medical evidence if the record contains other competent evidence, and reiterating the appellate court does not balance objective against subjective findings of medical witnesses, or weigh the testimony of one witness against that of another, in reviewing the Commission's findings); *see also Tiller v. Nat'l Health Care Ctr. of Sumter*, 334 S.C. 333, 339-40, 513 S.E.2d 843, 846 (1999) (explaining the Commission has discretion to weigh and consider all evidence, both lay and expert, when determining causation); *Ballenger v. S. Worsted Corp.*, 209 S.C. 463, 467, 40 S.E.2d 681, 682-83 (1946) (finding despite doctor's testimony that there was not a connection with the accident that caused almost boiling dye to fly in claimant's face and eyes and his subsequent eye problems, lay testimony of claimant's good vision before the accident was sufficient to support an award).

We further recognize the Commission's order did not expressly and unequivocally state it was relying solely on objective evidence. Rather, the order states the Commission "reviewed the submitted evidence, including the medical records, the Claimant's testimony, the testimony of the various doctors, and the prior Orders." However, the hearing before the Commission and the Commission's order make it clear the Commission exclusively relied on the MRIs in finding Russell failed to objectively prove her claim. At the hearing, Wal-Mart argued, "This is really an issue over the doctors' testimony and whether or not there's been an objective physical change of condition for the worse." (Emphasis added.). Although the order stated the Commission gave "more weight to the medical records, the diagnostic tests, and the testimony of the medical experts" and they did "not

support a physical change of condition for the worse[,]" the order also concluded, "[t]he preponderance of the evidence indicates that there was no objective difference between" the MRIs. The Commission found both doctors "ultimately testified that [there] was no objective or significant radiographical difference to be noted in the MRI scans[,]" and "[t]he preponderance of the evidence shows that [Russell's] radiographic condition has not worsened." However, the order ignores that both doctors concluded, to a reasonable degree of medical certainty, that Russell suffered a change of condition. Dr. Merritt testified to a reasonable degree of medical certainty there was a change even if it was not an obvious, objective change. He based his opinion on the MRIs and "in part on her subjective complaints." Dr. Edwards testified to a reasonable degree of medical certainty there was a chronic change in Russell's nerve, making it more painful or more symptomatic.

We find the Commission relied exclusively on objective evidence, the MRIs, in denying Russell's claim. Mindful of our standard of review of factual finding, we nevertheless conclude the Commission erred as a matter of law by imposing a requirement to the statute mandating a claimant prove a change of condition by objective evidence. *See Grant v. Grant Textiles*, 372 S.C. 196, 200-01, 641 S.E.2d 869, 871 (2007) (stating an appellate court may not substitute its judgment for that of the Commission as to the weight of the evidence on questions of fact, but it may reverse where the decision is affected by an error of law or is unsupported by substantial evidence). The Act provides, "the [C]ommission may . . . make an award . . . on proof by a preponderance of the evidence that there has been a change of condition caused by the original injury" S.C. Code Ann. § 42-17-90(A) (2015). There is no requirement in the Act that a claimant prove the change of condition by objective evidence. Thus, we reverse and remand to the Commission.

II. Remaining Issues

Russell argues the Commission erred in finding she did not suffer a change of condition and in finding her statements were self-serving and conclusory. Because we find the Commission erred in requiring a change of condition to be established by objective evidence and reverse and remand on that issue, the court need not consider Stewart's remaining issues. *See Futch v. McAllister Towing of Georgetown, Inc.*, 335 S.C. 598, 613, 518 S.E.2d 591, 598 (1999) (finding it unnecessary to remaining issues when resolution of a prior issue was dispositive).

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, we find the Commission erred in requiring Russell to establish her claim for a change of condition by objective evidence and reverse and remand to the Commission.

REVERSED AND REMANDED.

GEATHERS and MCDONALD, JJ., concur.