

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Re: Hurricane Dorian

ORDER

On August 31, 2019, the Governor of South Carolina issued an executive order declaring a state of emergency existed throughout the State of South Carolina in anticipation of the arrival of Hurricane Dorian. On September 1, 2019, the Governor issued an executive order mandating the evacuation of all persons located in certain designated evacuation zones in Beaufort, Berkeley, Charleston, Colleton, Dorchester, Horry, Georgetown, and Jasper Counties beginning at noon on September 2, 2019. Additionally, beginning on September 2, 2019, the Governor directed the closure of all schools and state government offices in the above-listed counties.

On Thursday, September 5, 2019, Hurricane Dorian passed along the entirety of the South Carolina coastline. On that day, county and/or state government offices were closed in twenty-three counties. As a result of Hurricane Dorian, over 270,000 homes and businesses lost electrical power, and an estimated 360,000 to 441,000 persons evacuated the coastal areas of South Carolina. The last of the mandatory evacuations were not lifted by the Governor until the morning of Friday, September 6, 2019.

In light of the foregoing, this Court finds that Hurricane Dorian adversely affected the ability of many lawyers and litigants to comply with deadlines in court proceedings. Accordingly, this Court finds it appropriate to declare the days of Tuesday, September 3, 2019, thru Friday, September 6, 2019, to be statewide "holidays" for the purposes of computing time under Rule 263 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules; Rule 6 of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure; Rule 35 of the South Carolina Rules of Criminal Procedure; and Rule 3 of the South Carolina Rules of Magistrates Court.

s/ Donald W. Beatty C.J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ Kaye G. Hearn J.

s/ John Cannon Few J.

s/ George C. James, Jr. J.

Columbia, South Carolina
September 9, 2019

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Vincent I. Parrett, Respondent

Appellate Case No. 2019-001444

ORDER

The records in the office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court show that on January 4, 2005, Petitioner was admitted and enrolled as a member of the Bar of this State.

Petitioner has now submitted a resignation from the South Carolina Bar pursuant to Rule 409 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. The resignation is accepted.

Within twenty (20) days from the date of this order, Petitioner shall surrender the certification 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.

FOR THE COURT

BY /s/ Daniel E. Shearouse
CLERK

Columbia, South Carolina

September 4, 2019



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

ADVANCE SHEET NO. 36
September 11, 2019
Daniel E. Shearouse, Clerk
Columbia, South Carolina
www.sccourts.org

CONTENTS

THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

PUBLISHED OPINIONS AND ORDERS

Order - In the matter of Dianne S. Riley	10
Order - Re: Postponement of Electronic Filing Pilot Program in Charleston County	12

UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS

None

PETITIONS - UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

27860 - Sarah Denise Cardwell v. State	Pending
2018-MO-039 - Betty and Lisa Fisher v. Bessie Huckabee	Pending
2018-MO-041 - Betty Fisher v. Bessie Huckabee AND Lisa Fisher v. Bessie Huckabee	Pending
Order - In the Matter of Cynthia E. Collie	Pending
2018-001253 - Steven Barnes v. SCDC	Pending

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

27859 - In the Matter of Jennifer Elizabeth Meehan	Pending
27900 - Anthony Marquese Martin v. State	Pending
27903 - State v. James S. Cross	Pending
27904 - Crystal Wickersham v. Ford Motor Co.	Pending

27905 - Daufuskie Island v. SC Office of Regulatory Staff	Pending
27908 - A. Marion Stone, III v. Susan B. Thompson	Pending
27910 - State v. Shane Adam Burdette	Pending
27911 - Derrick Fishburne v. State	Pending
27913 - Antrell Felder v. State	Pending
27915 - Vladimir W. Pantovich v. State	Pending
2019-MO-033 - State v. Gary Eugene Lott	Pending

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

PUBLISHED OPINIONS

5684-Lucille H. Ray v. City of Rock Hill 13

UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS

2019-UP-315-SCDSS v. April Bailey
(Filed September 4, 2019)

2019-UP-316-Lenora Peay v. Gerald Alexander

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

5633-William Loflin v. BMP Development, LP Pending

5636-Win Myat v. Tuomey Regional Medical Center Pending

5643-Ashley Reeves v. SCMIRF Pending

5661-Palmetto Construction Group, LLC v. Restoration Specialists (2) Pending

5669-Jeffrey Kennedy v. Richland School Dt. Two Pending

5671-S.C. Lottery Commission v. George Glassmeyer Pending

5673-Cricket Store 17 v. City of Columbia Pending

5676-H. Marshall Hoyler v. State of South Carolina Pending

5677-State v. Joseph Bowers Pending

5680-Steven Newbern v. Ford Motor Company Pending

2019-UP-099-John Doe v. Board of Zoning Appeals Pending

2019-UP-213-Timothy Hannah v. MJV Pending

2019-UP-256-Demetrius Simmons v. State	Pending
2019-UP-260-Edward Pugh v. CB&I AREVA MOX	Pending
2019-UP-265-Sharon Wazney v. Robert Wazney (3)	Pending
2019-UP-270-Deep Keel v. Atlantic Private Equity	Pending
2019-UP-272-State v. John M. Ghent, Jr.	Pending
2019-UP-283-Kathlenn Kelly v. James Rachels	Pending
2019-UP-284-Bank of New York Mellon v. Cathy Lanier	Pending
2019-UP-293-Thayer Arredondo v. SNH SE Ashley River Tenant	Pending
2019-UP-295-State v. Anthony M. Enriquez	Pending
2019-UP-297-Trey Williams v. State	Pending
2019-UP-305-Billy Henderson v. G&G Logging	Pending

PETITIONS-SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

5606-George Clark v. Patricia Clark	Pending
5617-Maria Allwin v. Russ Cooper Associates, Inc.	Pending
5618-Jean Derrick v. Lisa Moore	Pending
5625-Angie Keene v. CNA Holdings	Pending
5630-State v. John Kenneth Massey, Jr.	Pending
5637-Lee Moore v. Debra Moore	Pending
5639-Hugh Dereede v. Courtney Feeley-Karp	Pending
5641-Robert Palmer v. State et al.	Pending
5642-State v. Dean Alton Holcomb	Pending

5644-Hilda Stott v. White Oak Manor, Inc.	Pending
5646-Grays Hill Baptist Church v. Beaufort County	Pending
5650-State v. Felix Kotowski	Pending
5666-Ex parte: The Travelers Home and Marine Ins. Co,	Pending
2017-UP-338-Clarence Winfrey v. Archway Services, Inc. (3)	Withdrawn 08/14/19
2019-UP-067-Lorrie Dibernardo v. Carolina Cardiology	Pending
2019-UP-100-State v. Rhajon Sanders	Pending
2019-UP-110-Kenji Kilgore v. Estate of Samuel Joe Dixon	Pending
2019-UP-128-Wilson Garner, Jr. v. Nell Gaines	Pending
2019-UP-146-State v. Justin Antonio Butler	Pending
2019-UP-172-Robert Gillmann v. Beth Gillman	Pending
2019-UP-178-Arthur Eleazer v. Leslie Hughey	Pending
2019-UP-179-Paula Rose v. Charles Rose, III	Pending
2019-UP-215-Valerie Lawson v. Erin Smith	Pending

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Dianne S. Riley, Deceased, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2019-001468

ORDER

The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has filed a petition advising the Court that Dianne S. Riley, Esquire, died on August 23, 2019, and requesting the appointment of the Receiver, Peyre T. Lumpkin, Esquire, to inventory Ms. Riley's files and take action as appropriate to protect the interests of Ms. Riley and her clients pursuant to Rule 31, RLDE, Rule 413, SCACR. The petition is granted.

IT IS ORDERED that Peyre T. Lumpkin, Esquire, is hereby appointed to assume responsibility for Ms. Riley's client files, trust account(s), escrow account(s), operating account(s), and any other law office account(s) Ms. Riley maintained. Mr. Lumpkin shall take action as required by Rule 31, RLDE, Rule 413, SCACR, to protect the interests of Ms. Riley's clients. Mr. Lumpkin may make disbursements from Ms. Riley's trust account(s), escrow account(s), operating account(s), and any other law office account(s) Ms. Riley maintained that are necessary to effectuate this appointment.

This Order, when served on any bank or other financial institution maintaining any trust, escrow, and/or operating accounts of Ms. Riley, shall serve as notice to the bank or other financial institution that Peyre T. Lumpkin, Esquire, has been duly appointed by this Court.

Finally, this Order, when served on any office of the United States Postal Service, shall serve as notice that Peyre T. Lumpkin, Esquire, has been duly appointed by this Court and has the authority to receive Ms. Riley's mail and the authority to direct that Ms. Riley's mail be delivered to Mr. Lumpkin's office.

This appointment shall be for a period of no longer than nine months unless request is made to this Court for an extension.

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

Columbia, South Carolina

September 6, 2019

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Re: Postponement of Electronic Filing Pilot in Charleston
County

Appellate Case No. 2015-002439

ORDER

By Order dated August 28, 2019, the Pilot Program for the Electronic Filing (E-Filing) of documents in the Court of Common Pleas was expanded to include Charleston County effective September 18, 2019. On September 2, 2019, South Carolina Governor Henry McMaster declared a "state of emergency" and issued a mandatory evacuation for coastal areas, including Charleston County, based on the threat of inclement weather due to Hurricane Dorian.

I find the mandatory evacuation and the resulting closure of county offices in Charleston County will result in delays in testing and training of court personnel. Therefore, the prior Order directing that E-Filing commence in Charleston County on September 18, 2019, is hereby rescinded. An Order will be issued setting a new date for the commencement of E-Filing in Charleston once that decision has been made.

s/Donald W. Beatty
Donald W. Beatty
Chief Justice of South Carolina

Columbia, South Carolina
September 9, 2019

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

Lucille H. Ray, Appellant,

v.

City of Rock Hill, South Carolina, a Municipal Corporation, and South Carolina Department of Transportation, an agency of the State of South Carolina, Defendants,

Of which City of Rock Hill is the Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2016-002118

Appeal From York County
D. Garrison Hill, Circuit Court Judge
S. Jackson Kimball, III, Special Circuit Court Judge

Opinion No. 5684
Heard April 1, 2019 – Filed September 11, 2019

**AFFIRMED IN PART, REVERSED IN PART, AND
REMANDED**

Richard B. Fennell, of James, McElroy & Diehl, P.A., of Charlotte, NC, and Charles S. Bradford, of Charles S. Bradford, P.A., of York, for Appellant.

W. Mark White and Jeremy D. Melville, both of Spencer & Spencer, P.A., of Rock Hill, for Respondent.

LOCKEMY, C.J.: In this action, Lucille Ray asserts the special circuit court judge erred in granting summary judgment to the City of Rock Hill (the City) as to her claims for inverse condemnation and injunctive relief. In addition, Ray argues the circuit court erred in (1) excluding witness testimony regarding abatability, and (2) granting a directed verdict to the City as to her claim for trespass. We affirm in part, reverse in part, and remand to the circuit court.

FACTS

Ray's claims against the City in this action relate to a 24-inch storm water pipe (the Pipe) located under her property at 330 College Avenue (the Property) in the City. The Pipe begins at a City maintained catch basin on College Avenue in front of the Property and channels storm water underneath Ray's home and through the Property. The Property and the Pipe are located at the topographical low point of a watershed comprising approximately 29 acres.

Ray's predecessors-in-title constructed a home on the Property in the 1920's. The Pipe was installed on the Property prior to the construction of the home. The record contains no evidence of who originally installed the Pipe, who owns the Pipe, or the existence of any easement for piping water across the Property. The record reveals one of Ray's predecessors-in-title was aware of the Pipe and connected a drainage pipe into the Pipe.

Ray acquired the Property in May 1985 and acknowledges a history of sinkholes and cave-ins on the Property since the time of her acquisition. In 1992, Ray observed as her gardener fell waist deep into a sinkhole behind her home. Ray was also aware of bending and movement in the roof frame of the home in 1995 and again in 2007. By 2008, Ray was aware of the existence of the Pipe and was concerned that water leaking from the Pipe might be damaging her home. Ray noticed the front steps of her home appeared to be sinking and requested the City investigate the Pipe. In 2008, City employees came to the Property at least twice and informed Ray that a storm water pipe "ran toward the steps" of Ray's house.

On November 6, 2012, Ray filed suit against the City and the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT). In her complaint, Ray asserted causes of action for trespass and inverse condemnation; she also sought injunctive relief and attorney's fees. Ray claimed her home incurred structural damage due to foundation movement as a result of water leaking from the Pipe.

On March 24, 2014, SCDOT filed a motion for summary judgment on each of Ray's claims. The circuit court granted the motion and all causes of action asserted against SCDOT were dismissed.

On May 19, 2014, the City filed a motion for summary judgment. Following a hearing, the special circuit court judge granted the City partial summary judgment, dismissing Ray's claims for inverse condemnation, injunctive relief, and attorney's fees. The judge further held the collection and discharge of water under Ray's home may be considered an affirmative, intentional act, thus leaving a genuine issue for trial as to Ray's trespass claim. The judge ruled the statute of limitations began to run on Ray's trespass claim no later than 2008. However, the judge found a genuine issue of fact existed as to whether the asserted trespass in this case was abatable. The judge noted that, pursuant to case law, where the offending conduct is abatable, the statute of limitations begins to run with each new invasion of a plaintiff's property. Therefore, since abatability is an issue of fact, the judge found Ray's remaining claim for trespass survived as to each new invasion for the three years prior to November 6, 2009. The City's and Ray's subsequent motions to reconsider were denied.

On September 12, 2016, the first day of trial, the City moved to exclude certain testimony, including opinions expected to be offered by Michael Leonard, a structural engineer and Ray's expert witness. In deposition testimony, Leonard opined that the structural damage to Ray's home was partially the result of the leaking Pipe. Leonard further testified that to render a qualified opinion on the abatability of the flow of water to and through the Pipe would require a thorough engineering study. Leonard testified he had not performed a hydrology study or studied the flow of water to or through the Pipe. Leonard testified he was unable to testify to a reasonable degree of engineering certainty that the flow of water could be reasonably routed around the Property.

The circuit court granted the City's motion, excluding Leonard's opinion testimony regarding the issue of the abatability of the alleged trespass. Thereafter, Ray acknowledged she could not meet her burden of proof in light of the court's ruling and stated "it would be appropriate to enter judgment against me." In a subsequent order, the circuit court held that given the special circuit court judge's prior ruling on summary judgment, only an abatable trespass remained as a viable cause of action. The court explained that because it had excluded Leonard's opinion testimony as unreliable concerning abatement, Ray's trespass cause of action was unviable. With no genuine issue of material fact remaining, the court found the City was entitled to judgment as a matter of law. This appeal followed.

LAW/ANALYSIS

I. Summary Judgment

Ray argues the special circuit court judge erred in granting summary judgment as to her claims for inverse condemnation and injunctive relief.

"An appellate court reviews a grant of summary judgment under the same standard applied by the [circuit] court pursuant to Rule 56, SCRPC." *Lanham v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of S.C., Inc.*, 349 S.C. 356, 361, 563 S.E.2d 331, 333 (2002).

Summary judgment shall be granted when "the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that . . . no genuine issue [exists] as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." Rule 56(c), SCRPC. "In determining whether any triable issues of fact exist for summary judgment purposes, the evidence and all the inferences [that] can be reasonably drawn from the evidence must be viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. . . [who] is only required to submit a mere scintilla of evidence in order to withstand a motion for summary judgment." *Hancock v. Mid-S. Mgmt.*, 381 S.C. 326, 329-31, 673 S.E.2d 801, 802-03 (2009).

A. Inverse Condemnation

"An inverse condemnation occurs when a government agency commits a taking of private property without exercising its formal powers of eminent domain." *Hawkins v. City of Greenville*, 358 S.C. 280, 290, 594 S.E.2d 557, 562 (Ct. App. 2004). "To prove an inverse condemnation, a plaintiff must show: (1) an affirmative, positive, aggressive act on the part of the governmental agency; (2) a taking; (3) the taking is for a public use; and (4) the taking has some degree of permanence." *Marietta Garage, Inc. v. S.C. Dep't of Pub. Safety*, 352 S.C. 95, 101, 572 S.E.2d 306, 308 (Ct. App. 2002).

The special circuit court judge determined Ray's claim that the City collected water into its storm water drainage system and channeled it under her home did not support her claim of inverse condemnation. The judge found no positive, aggressive acts were committed by the City. The judge noted Ray did not allege the construction of any new improvements causing water to flow through the Pipe under her Property, and Ray failed to cite any case law which would categorize maintenance of the storm water drainage system as a positive, aggressive act.

Ray contends the City's maintenance in November 2012 of drainage pipes situated under College Avenue in front of her Property constituted an affirmative act sufficient to give rise to a claim for inverse condemnation. She maintains the City, after repairing several broken pipes under College Avenue, reconnected the subject Pipe to the City's storm water drainage system against her wishes.¹ Ray asserts the City undertook a permanent public project to modernize its infrastructure along College Avenue, and, as a result, it took positive steps to direct its storm water system flow directly under her home.

The City asserts there is no evidence it installed or owned the subject Pipe or that any new construction or improvements upstream from the Pipe resulted in an increase in the amount or flow rate of water toward Ray's Property. The City contends its maintenance of the pipes under College Avenue in November 2012 was not to the subject Pipe or to a pipe directly connected to the Pipe. The City argues summary judgment was proper because Ray was unable to produce any evidence to attribute the flow of water through the Pipe to any action by the City.

Although the City asserts its repair work in 2012 only involved one pipe and did not affect the subject Pipe, we believe questions of fact exist as to which pipes were damaged and in need of repair. On November 13, 2012, Ray's attorney advised the City that three large pipes in front of Ray's Property were damaged during the City's work on College Avenue and specifically advised the City that Ray did not consent to the reconnection of the Pipe to any of the replacement pipes. Ray submitted photographs of the damaged pipes in front of her home into evidence. These photos appear to show three large severed pipes and the City's subsequent work to reconnect the pipes and resume the flow of storm water.

This court addressed inverse condemnation and municipal drainage systems in *Hawkins v. City of Greenville*. Hawkins filed suit against the City of Greenville asserting a cause of action for inverse condemnation and alleging the City's neglect in designing and maintaining its storm water drainage system led to flooding which damaged his property. *Hawkins*, 358 S.C. at 285-86, 594 S.E.2d at 560. This court found Hawkins failed to allege any affirmative, positive, and aggressive acts by the City which damaged his property. *Id.* at 291, 594 S.E.2d at 562. Specifically, the court found: (1) the acts Hawkins alleged were merely failures to act; and (2) the only affirmative act Hawkins cited as a basis for his inverse condemnation claim

¹ On November 13, 2012, Ray's attorney sent a letter to the City instructing them not to reconnect the City's storm water drainage system to the Pipe.

was the replacement of a culvert and the installation of material around a nearby creek. *Id.* at 291, 594 S.E.2d at 562-63. The court held there was no evidence in the record that either of these acts caused the flooding on Hawkins's property. *Id.* at 291, 594 S.E.2d at 563.

We note that while the dissent in the present case finds *Hawkins* controlling, we believe *Hawkins* is distinguishable from the present case. Here, we find a genuine issue of material fact exists as to whether the City engaged in an affirmative, positive, and aggressive act in reconnecting City pipes to the Pipe after the City admitted it did not have an easement and Ray told the City not to reconnect. Accordingly, we reverse the special circuit court judge's grant of summary judgment as to Ray's inverse condemnation claim.

B. Injunctive Relief

"Actions for injunctive relief are equitable in nature." *Denman v. City of Columbia*, 387 S.C. 131, 140, 691 S.E.2d 465, 470 (2010). "In equitable actions, an appellate court may review the record and make findings of fact in accordance with its own view of the preponderance of the evidence." *Id.* "To obtain an injunction, a party must demonstrate irreparable harm, a likelihood of success on the merits, and the absence of an adequate remedy at law." *Id.* "An injunction is a drastic remedy issued by the court in its discretion to prevent irreparable harm suffered by the plaintiff." *Scratch Golf Co. v. Dunes W. Residential Golf Properties, Inc.*, 361 S.C. 117, 121, 603 S.E.2d 905, 907 (2004).

The special circuit court judge found Ray's claim for injunctive relief failed as a matter of law because her trespass claim provided an adequate remedy at law. The judge noted Ray "could be made whole by a damage award on the trespass claim."

Ray argues the City's trespass on the Property is continuing in nature as it recurs with each rainfall. She contends the judge's finding that a genuine issue of fact existed as to whether the trespass was abatable was inconsistent with its grant of summary judgment to the City as to her claim for injunctive relief. Ray asserts that repairing the damage caused by the flow of water through the Pipe beneath her home, while permitting the City to continue channeling water through the Pipe, guarantees further damage and litigation between the parties.

We agree with Ray that an injunction is the proper remedy for a continuing trespass. *See Mack v. Edens*, 306 S.C. 433, 437, 412 S.E.2d 431, 434 (Ct. App. 1991) ("Injunction is a proper remedy for a continuous trespass to land. Because

of the permanent and recurring nature of the injury, which cannot otherwise be prevented, the courts should enjoin the continuous trespasser to protect the landowner's property rights from hurt or destruction."'). However, as discussed below, we believe the circuit court properly granted a directed verdict in favor of the City as to Ray's trespass claim. Therefore, our finding below is dispositive of Ray's argument that the special circuit court judge erred in granting summary judgment as to her claim for injunctive relief for trespass.

II. Exclusion of Expert Testimony

Ray argues the circuit court erred in granting the City's motion to exclude Leonard's expert testimony. We disagree.

"If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, may testify thereto in the form of an opinion or otherwise." Rule 702, SCRE.

"Qualification of an expert and the admission or exclusion of his testimony is a matter within the sound discretion of the [circuit] court." *Fields v. Reg'l Med. Ctr. Orangeburg*, 363 S.C. 19, 25, 609 S.E.2d 506, 509 (2005). "[T]he trial court's decision [to admit or exclude expert testimony] will not be disturbed on appeal absent an abuse of discretion." *Id.* "An abuse of discretion occurs when the ruling is based on an error of law or a factual conclusion that is without evidentiary support." *Id.* at 26, 609 S.E.2d at 509. "A trial court's ruling on the admissibility of an expert's testimony constitutes an abuse of discretion when the ruling is manifestly arbitrary, unreasonable, or unfair." *Id.* "To warrant reversal based on the admission or exclusion of evidence, the appellant must prove both the error of the ruling and the resulting prejudice, i.e., that there is a reasonable probability the jury's verdict was influenced by the challenged evidence or the lack thereof." *Id.*

"The trial court serves as the gatekeeper in the admission of all evidence presented at trial" *Watson v. Ford Motor Co.*, 389 S.C. 434, 456, 699 S.E.2d 169, 180 (2010). "In determining whether to admit expert testimony, the court must make three inquiries." *Graves v. CAS Med. Sys., Inc.*, 401 S.C. 63, 74, 735 S.E.2d 650, 655 (2012). "First, the [circuit] court must determine whether the subject matter is beyond the ordinary knowledge of the jury, thus requiring an expert to explain the matter to the jury." *Watson*, 389 S.C. at 446, 699 S.E.2d at 175. Second, the expert must have "acquired the requisite knowledge and skill to qualify as an expert in the particular subject matter," although he "need not be a specialist in the

particular branch of the field." *Id.* Finally, the substance of the testimony must be reliable. *Id.* It is this final requirement of reliability which is the central feature of the inquiry. *State v. White*, 382 S.C. 265, 270, 676 S.E.2d 684, 686 (2009).

In analyzing the reliability of proposed expert testimony the court must consider the following factors: "(1) the publications and peer review of the technique; (2) prior application of the method to the type of evidence involved in the case; (3) the quality control procedures used to ensure reliability; and (4) the consistency of the method with recognized scientific laws and procedures." *Graves*, 401 S.C. at 74, 735 S.E.2d at 655 (quoting *State v. Council*, 335 S.C. 1, 19, 515 S.E.2d 508, 517 (1999)).

The circuit court ruled Ray may be able to establish a claim for continuing trespass to the extent she could show intentional collection and discharge of water under her home causing damage within the three-year limitations period. The central issue in distinguishing a continuing trespass from a permanent trespass is whether abatement of the trespass is reasonably and practically possible.

Hedgepath v. Am. Tel. & Tel. Co., 348 S.C. 340, 357, 559 S.E.2d 327, 337 (Ct. App. 2001). Thus, a material issue of fact with respect to Ray's claim for continuing trespass is whether the alleged trespass is abatable.

Prior to trial, the City moved to exclude Leonard's expert testimony on the grounds that it was unreliable. The circuit court granted the motion with respect to the issue of whether the City's alleged trespass was abatable because Leonard "had not done any engineering work on this issue, and it would not meet [the] criteria of being reliable or assist[ing] the jury." As the court noted in its subsequent order, given the prior ruling on summary judgment, only an abatable trespass remained as a viable cause of action. The court explained that because it had excluded Leonard's opinion testimony as unreliable concerning abatement, Ray's trespass cause of action was unviable.

We find the trial court did not abuse its discretion in granting the City's motion to exclude Leonard's testimony. Leonard testified that to render a qualified opinion on the abatability of the flow of water to and through the Pipe would require a thorough engineering study. Leonard testified he had not performed a hydrology study or studied the flow of water to or through the Pipe. Leonard testified he had not analyzed whether an alternative drainage line could be placed in any particular location to divert water flow; he had not analyzed whether any alternatives would conflict with other existing infrastructure; he had not analyzed the topography of the watershed area to know if and how an alternative line could reroute the water

flow; and he had not studied or analyzed the feasibility or cost of any alternatives to routing water flow. Leonard admitted that all of these factors would have to be studied to properly render an opinion as to the issue of whether the flow of water through the Pipe is reasonably and practically abatable. Finally, Leonard testified that although he believed the water flow could be rerouted around the Property, he was unable to testify to such with a reasonable degree of engineering certainty. As gatekeeper for expert testimony, the trial court properly excluded Leonard's opinions regarding abatability.

III. Directed Verdict

Ray argues the circuit court erred in granting a directed verdict on her trespass claim. We disagree.

When reviewing the circuit court's ruling on a directed verdict motion, this court must apply the same standard as the circuit court "by viewing the evidence and all reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party." *Elam v. S.C. Dep't of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 27-28, 602 S.E.2d 772, 782 (2004). An appellate court will reverse the circuit court's ruling on a directed verdict motion only when there is no evidence to support the ruling or when the ruling is controlled by an error of law. *Law v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 368 S.C. 424, 434-35, 629 S.E.2d 642, 648 (2006). "When the evidence yields only one inference, a directed verdict in favor of the moving party is proper." *Wright v. Craft*, 372 S.C. 1, 22, 640 S.E.2d 486, 498 (Ct. App. 2006). "On the other hand, the [circuit] court must deny a motion for a directed verdict when the evidence yields more than one inference or its inference is in doubt." *Id.* "When considering a directed verdict motion, neither the [circuit] court nor the appellate court has authority to decide credibility issues or to resolve conflicts in the testimony or evidence." *Burnett v. Family Kingdom, Inc.*, 387 S.C. 183, 188-89, 691 S.E.2d 170, 173 (Ct. App. 2010).

After granting the City's motion to exclude Leonard's expert testimony, Ray conceded a directed verdict was proper in light of the circuit court's exclusion of Leonard's testimony on the issue of abatability. With no genuine issue of material fact remaining, the court found the City was entitled to judgment as a matter of law. We find the court did not err in granting a directed verdict. Ray did not offer any evidence on the issue of abatability other than the proposed testimony of Leonard. After the court excluded Leonard's testimony, there was no issue of material fact regarding the critical element of continuing trespass. Thus, a directed verdict in favor of the City was proper.

CONCLUSION

We reverse the special circuit court judge's grant of summary judgment as to Ray's inverse condemnation claim. Additionally, we affirm the circuit court's exclusion of witness testimony regarding abatability and its grant of a directed verdict to the City as to Ray's claim for trespass.

AFFIRMED IN PART, REVERSED IN PART, AND REMANDED.

MCDONALD, J., concurs.

SHORT, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part: Respectfully, I concur in part and dissent in part. I agree with the majority to affirm the exclusion of expert testimony, the directed verdict on the trespass claim, and the injunctive relief. However, I would also affirm the trial court's grant of summary judgment on the inverse condemnation claim. "To establish an inverse condemnation, a plaintiff must show: '(1) an affirmative, positive, aggressive act on the part of the governmental agency; (2) a taking; (3) the taking is for a public use; and (4) the taking has some degree of permanence.'" *Hawkins v. City of Greenville*, 358 S.C. 280, 290, 594 S.E.2d 557, 562 (Ct. App. 2004) (quoting *Marietta Garage, Inc. v. S.C. Dep't of Pub. Safety*, 352 S.C. 95, 101, 572 S.E.2d 306, 308 (Ct. App. 2002)). I agree with the circuit court that Ray has failed to allege an affirmative, positive, aggressive act on the City's part and *Hawkins* is controlling. The evidence shows the pipes in the middle of College Avenue were broken during a City project, and the City repaired the pipes. I conclude this was maintenance to an existing system of pipes and not the basis for a claim for inverse condemnation. Thus, I would affirm.