THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SUPREME COURT

In Case No. 2009-0071, Syncom Industries, Inc. d/b/a Syncom Services v. Eldon Wood & a., the court on April 16, 2010, issued the following order:

Defendant William Hogan appeals a final order of the trial court following our remand of Syncom Indus. v. Wood, 155 N.H. 73 (2007) (Syncom I). He argues that the trial court, after awarding no damages to the plaintiff, Syncom Industries, Inc. (Syncom), against him, erred by then awarding the plaintiff \$100,000 in attorney's fees and ruling that he is jointly and severally liable for the attorney's fees with defendant Eldon Wood. Syncom has cross-appealed the trial court's decision not to award any damages against Hogan. We vacate and remand.

A prevailing party may be awarded attorney's fees when recovery is authorized by statute, an agreement between the parties or an established judicial exception to the general rule that precludes recovery of such fees. Tulley v. Sheldon, 159 N.H. 269, 272 (2009). We will affirm the trial court's award of attorney's fees unless it is an unsustainable exercise of discretion. Id.

In Syncom I, we held that the restrictive covenants contained in the contracts executed by the defendants and Syncom were unreasonably broad in scope. Syncom I, 155 N.H. at 81. We remanded the case to allow the trial court to determine whether the restrictive covenants should be reformed as to one or both defendants. Id. We also vacated the trial court's awards of compensatory damages and attorney's fees, noting that proper calculation of both depended upon the scope of the restrictive covenants. Id. at 88-89.

Upon remand, the trial court first determined that "justice requires that no monetary award for damages be levied against William Hogan." In so ruling, the trial court noted that Hogan was employed by Syncom for less than five months and that his "misdeeds without the leadership of Wood in all probability would not have cost [Syncom] any loss of business."

The trial court then reaffirmed its original award of \$100,000 in attorney's fees to Syncom, finding that the award was the joint and several liability of both defendants. The parties' employment contracts provided: "In any successful action by the Company to enforce this contract, the Company

医精膜系统 医维罗氏管 医电影 医电影 计

ka kije o daji oprirah sejihi kesantaja, ji v pideovin obroska ka kai and the fight for any color of the first of the fill become the fill that the color of the first of the fill of eneligamentale allichten allande ande les alle filme

and a character for the relation or discount is status at a company to the second of the second of the second of of after jerge) which is to be to find the Tenrishme.

ting the state of range so ble his himse a call ha herrich hill sublema driede hill it is a region. All the first figures a partial stand during the color of the same and the same and the same and the first line धीर विधिन के देन के दिन में प्रिकार पर्देश में दिल्ली अनिवर्ध है, के उन्हर्त के एक में में प्रकार के कुछू अरोज भिक्र the course ducted a ration around any agreements against block a Worker and

The property and the second size of the second seco thought arrest to the active of east the except treatment are the confident will be triving that The first territory of the property of the state of the s de brown king op illeg bei raging Web 1960s; with 1966 the ther illeditional like Life and the collistic of the following state is a state in the second of the collision of

end of books not sire on to wholese officers into each decide of ry trace. I fill the court offer rector traces for fourth suspected actions to you become as a suspicion or or their sens woll had prope out the improve of hit in the tell of American's referre os para miles pomendos, refestos de respectaçõe existições estrecitas estrecitas estrecitas de la referencia ot Transe figurace to also a decision that old bidisofy but, and the probabilished

ton tedd trong at the supplicate from mission of their passing as the supplication of the . 6 รา (พ.ศ.ษา จัง 5) " (คงคู้สรี) กระธานีพระที่สำนักแล้งที่จะได้จากสุดให้ เพิ่มสุดให้ พร้องคุ้ง พร้องคุณส arial cours noted that Hogary wils anaphys young symposis is the state before annach guidegeachd Lie a Buddwith eileidheimigh ann maidh beathaideach at daitheadh bana exercised to each year to country vain each ton

The inalicinal than prafficied by original level is 100 and अस्पानिकारिक विदेश के विष्याक्ष्मात् विस्तर्वीकांत्रीतिवार्वी विदेश हे अस्तर्वति विदेश है । tiskelither of the principal and artist parties and sparse i give he as provided in eign ark occurred both or the Continue or contract this concern the conquery shall be entitled to recover its attorney's fees and expenses incurred in such action." Syncom I, 155 N.H. at 75.

In its original order which gave rise to Syncom I, the trial court cited both the parties' employment agreement and their conduct throughout the litigation as supporting an award of \$100,000 in attorney's fees. In reaffirming its award, the trial court cited Hogan's "obvious misconduct" and his lying under oath to the court. We consider first whether these findings support an award under an established judicial exception to the rule that each party is responsible for paying his own counsel fees. See, e.g., LaMontagne Builders v. Brooks, 154 N.H. 252, 259 (2006). Those exceptions apply to cases where litigation is instituted or unnecessarily prolonged due to a party's bad faith conduct or where a party must litigate against an opponent whose position is patently unreasonable. Id. In this case, although the trial court found that Hogan had engaged in misconduct as a result of his employment, it also found that his misconduct "in all probability would not have cost [Syncom] any loss of business." The conduct cited by the trial court in favor of an equitable award of attorney's fees did not result in unreasonable delays in litigation; rather, the trial court found Hogan's testimony not credible. Nor can Hogan's position be said to be patently unreasonable given that he prevailed at least in part in Syncom I.

Whether the terms of the parties' contract support an award of attorney's fees to Syncom against Hogan remains unresolved. As the trial court noted, the litigation in this matter was lengthy. Only the fact finder can determine whether, and to what extent, Syncom prevailed in its action against Hogan as required for an award of attorney's fees under the terms of Hogan's employment contract with Syncom. Resolution of this issue may require the trial court upon remand to reform the unenforceable restrictive covenants. See Syncom I, 155 N.H. at 81. Accordingly, we vacate and remand this portion of the trial court's order so that it can make such a determination.

In its cross-appeal, Syncom argues that the trial court erred in failing to award Syncom compensatory damages. Although Syncom cites its memorandum and motion for partial reconsideration as the portions of the record where it raised these issues before the trial court, see Sup. Ct. R. 16(3)(b), the documents have not been provided on appeal. Moreover, it is not clear from the transcript of the hearing on remand nor from the trial court's order that the arguments Syncom advances on appeal in support of an award of compensatory damages were raised before the trial court. Accordingly, we conclude that Syncom has failed to satisfy its appellate burden. See Bean v. Red Oak Prop. Mgmt., 151 N.H. 248, 250 (2004) (supreme court rules require moving party to provide sufficient record on appeal and to demonstrate where each question presented on appeal was raised before trial court; failure to do so may be

considered by court regardless of whether opposing party objects on those grounds).

Vacated and remanded.

DALIANIS, HICKS and CONBOY, JJ., concurred.

Eileen Fox, Clerk

Distribution:
Clerk, Rockingham County Superior Court, 02-E-0188
Honorable Kenneth R. McHugh
Honorable Robert J. Lynn
Joshua L. Gordon, Esquire
William S. Gannon, Esquire
V. Richards Ward, Jr., Esquire
Marcia McCormack, Supreme Court
Michelle A. Caraway, Supreme Court
Lorrie S. Platt, Supreme Court
Irene Dalbec, Supreme Court
File