

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

Lisa M. Goldin and Harold W. Goldin v. Lowe’s Home Centers, LLC
d/b/a Lowe’s Home Improvement

Goldin v. Lowe’s Home Centers · No. 3:24-3190-MGL · Decided March 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina denied Lowe’s Home Centers, LLC’s motion for summary judgment in a premises-liability action. Lisa and Harold Goldin alleged negligence, gross negligence, and recklessness after Lisa tripped over a security cable between lawn mowers. The court held that genuine issues of material fact existed regarding whether Lowe’s should have anticipated the danger and whether its conduct contributed to the injury.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mary Geiger Lewis
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
DECIDED	March 24, 2026
DOCKET	3:24-3190-MGL
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant's motion for summary judgment in a diversity action asserting South Carolina negligence, gross negligence, and recklessness claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is proper when there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court viewed the evidence and reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving parties and assessed whether the evidence required submission to a jury.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- premises liability
- negligence
- summary judgment
- standard of care
- contributory negligence

PRACTICE AREAS

torts

premises liability

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Lowe's was entitled to summary judgment on the ground that the security cable was an open and obvious condition for which it owed Goldin no duty to warn or protect her.
2. Whether the evidence created a genuine dispute of material fact concerning whether Lowe's should have anticipated harm despite the cable's alleged open and obvious nature.
3. Whether Goldin's alleged contributory negligence entitled Lowe's to summary judgment.

HOLDINGS

1. Summary judgment was improper because the evidence created a genuine issue of material fact as to whether Lowe's should have anticipated that Goldin would encounter or fail to recognize the security cable despite its alleged open and obvious character, thereby requiring Lowe's to warn her or take other reasonable protective measures.
2. Lowe's was not entitled to summary judgment based on Goldin's alleged contributory negligence because comparison of the plaintiff's negligence with the defendant's negligence is a question of fact for the jury.
3. The record presented a triable dispute concerning the duty and breach elements of Plaintiffs' negligence claim, and Lowe's was not entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Accordingly, even assuming the danger of the security cable was known or obvious to Goldin, Plaintiffs have presented a genuine issue of material fact as to whether LHC "should [have] anticipate[d] the harm despite such knowledge or obviousness."

"The Court will thus refrain from granting summary judgment on the theory of Goldin's contributory negligence."

"Wherefore, based on the foregoing discussion and analysis, it is the judgment of the Court LHC's motion for summary judgment is DENIED."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Lisa Goldin walked between two lawn mowers in the outdoor equipment section of a Lowe's store. Her foot caught a yellow security cable secured between the mowers above the ground, causing her to trip and injure her leg and knee. Photographs and deposition testimony supported an inference that the cable was not positioned flat on the floor as Lowe's practice required, and Lowe's had knowledge of six similar customer incidents in South Carolina during the preceding two years.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed the action in the Richland County Court of Common Pleas after Lisa Goldin tripped over a security cable between lawn mowers at a Lowe's store. Lowe's removed the case to federal court under diversity jurisdiction and moved for summary judgment. After briefing, the district court denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 251-52, 255 (1986)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322-23 (1986)
- Beale v. Hardy, 769 F.2d 213, 214 (4th Cir. 1985)
- Ennis v. Nat'l Ass'n of Bus. & Educ. Radio, Inc., 53 F.3d 55, 62 (4th Cir. 1995)
- Felty v. Graves-Humphreys Co., 818 F.2d 1126, 1128 (4th Cir. 1987)
- Teamsters Joint Council No. 83 v. Centra, Inc., 947 F.2d 115, 119 (4th Cir. 1991)
- Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 587-88 (1986)
- Pulliam Inv. Co. v. Cameo Props., 810 F.2d 1282, 1286 (4th Cir. 1987)
- Morrison v. Nissan Motor Co., 601 F.2d 139, 141 (4th Cir. 1979)
- Stevens v. Howard D. Johnson Co., 181 F.2d 390, 394 (4th Cir. 1950)
- Doe v. Marion, 645 S.E.2d 245, 250 (S.C. 2007)
- Steinke v. S.C. Dep't of Lab., Licensing & Regul., 520 S.E.2d 142, 149 (S.C. 1999)
- Bass v. Gopal, Inc., 716 S.E.2d 910, 913 (S.C. 2011)
- Garvin v. Bi-Lo, Inc., 541 S.E.2d 831, 832 (S.C. 2001)
- Pennington v. Zayre Corp., 165 S.E.2d 695 (S.C. 1969)
- Callander v. Charleston Doughnut Corp., 406 S.E.2d 361, 362-63 (S.C. 1991)
- Roddey v. Wal-Mart Stores E., LP, 784 S.E.2d 670, 675 (S.C. 2016)
- Peterson v. Nat'l R.R. Passenger Corp., 618 S.E.2d 903, 906 (S.C. 2005)
- Creech v. S.C. Wildlife & Marine Res. Dep't, 491 S.E.2d 571, 575 (S.C. 1997)