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1. Facts

Mark Hadfield brought suit against Sam Gilchrist, seeking damages and compensation for the vandalism and destruction of personal property while in the care of Mr. Gilchrist. Hadfield’s car was towed by Gilchrist, a licensed Bailee by the City of Charleston, and held in a company lot until payment was made. During the time Hadfield’s car was impounded, vandals entered the lot and vandalized and stole internal components of the vehicle. Estimated damages to the vehicle were $4,021.43.

1. Issue

Mr. Gilchrist was deemed responsible for the vehicle during the course of impoundment, thus making Gilchrist liable in all counts for the condition of the vehicle.

1. Decision

Hadfield was awarded $4,035 for the damages. Gilchrist appealed to the Circuit Court, which affirmed the decision of the magistrate.

1. Decision Opinion

Undoubtedly, Mr. Gilchrist was liable for the vehicle during the time Hadfield’s vehicle was impounded. It is the responsibility of a Bailee to return said impounded property to the owner in exactly the same condition it was at the moment of impoundment.