

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
**Administrative Law Court**

Ralph K. Anderson, III  
*Chief Judge*

Jana E. Cox Shealy  
*Clerk*



PHONE: (803) 734-0550  
FAX: (803) 734-6400  
WEB: WWW.SCALC.NET

September 27, 2022

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
Clerk, South Carolina Court of Appeals  
P.O. Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211

**RECEIVED**

SEP 29 2022

SC Court of Appeals

Re: Denis Yeo v. Lexington County Assessor  
ALC Docket No. 19-ALJ-17-0111-CC  
Appellate Case No. 2019-001867

Dear Clerk Kitchings:

In accordance with the Court's Order filed September 21, 2022, I am hereby returning the Remittitur in the above-captioned matter.

Please let me know if you have any questions. With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jana E. Shealy".

Jana E. Shealy  
Clerk

Enclosure

cc: Denis Yeo  
Jeffrey M. Anderson, Esquire

CMS



## The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS  
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
1220 SENATE STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890  
FAX: (803) 734-1839  
www.sccourts.org

July 18, 2022

The Honorable Jana E. Shealy  
Edgar A. Brown Building  
1205 Pendleton Street  
Suite 224  
Columbia SC 29201

### REMITTITUR

Re: Denis Yeo v. Lexington Co. Assessor  
Lower Court Case No. 2019ALJ170111CC  
Appellate Case No. 2019-001867

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

  
CLERK

Enclosure

cc: Denis Yeo  
Jeffrey M. Anderson, Esquire



**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE  
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING  
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

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

Denis Yeo, Appellant,

v.

Lexington County Assessor, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2019-001867

---

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court  
Deborah Brooks Durden, Administrative Law Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2022-UP-161  
Submitted March 1, 2022 – Filed April 6, 2022

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Denis Yeo, of Columbia, pro se.

Jeffrey M. Anderson, of Davis Frawley LLC, of  
Lexington, for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Denis Yeo appeals an order of the Administrative Law Court (ALC) finding his house at a neighboring property (neighboring property) to his legal residence did not qualify for the four-percent ratio for property tax assessment pursuant to section 12-43-220(c)(1) of the South Carolina Code (2014 & Supp. 2021). On appeal, Yeo argues the ALC erred in (1) finding neighboring property did not qualify for the four-percent ratio because it was not on the same

property as his legal residence at a different address (main property); (2) glossing over certain words in section 12-43-220(c)(1); (3) finding neighboring property was not used as a residence; (4) making a clause in section 12-43-220(c)(1) a requirement instead of a concession; (5) failing to consider the legislative history of section 12-43-220(c)(1); (6) summarizing the issue before the court; and (7) finding *Sonoco Products Co. v. South Carolina Department of Revenue*<sup>1</sup> did not resolve the case.

We hold the ALC did not err in finding Yeo was not entitled to the four-percent ratio on neighboring property. Although Yeo owns main property and neighboring property, Yeo resides at main property, not neighboring property. Further, main property and neighboring property are separate properties with different tax map numbers. Accordingly, we affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *CFRE, LLC v. Greenville Cnty. Assessor*, 395 S.C. 67, 73, 716 S.E.2d 877, 880 (2011) ("Tax appeals to the ALC are subject to the Administrative Procedure Act (APA)."); *id.* at 74, 716 S.E.2d at 881 (stating an appellate court reviews the ALC's decision for errors of law); *id.* ("Questions of statutory interpretation are questions of law, which [an appellate court is] free to decide without any deference to the [ALC]."); *Hodges v. Rainey*, 341 S.C. 79, 85, 533 S.E.2d 578, 581 (2000) ("The cardinal rule of statutory construction is to ascertain and effectuate the intent of the legislature."); *id.* ("Under the plain meaning rule, it is not [an appellate court's] place to change the meaning of a clear and unambiguous statute."); *id.* ("Where the statute's language is plain and unambiguous, and conveys a clear and definite meaning, the rules of statutory interpretation are not needed and [an appellate] court has no right to impose another meaning."); *Se.-Kusan, Inc. v. S.C. Tax Comm'n*, 276 S.C. 487, 489, 280 S.E.2d 57, 58 (1981) ("As a general rule, tax exemption statutes are strictly construed against the taxpayer."); *id.* ("This rule of strict construction simply means that constitutional and statutory language will not be strained or liberally construed in the taxpayer's favor."); *id.* ("It does not mean that [an appellate court] will search for an interpretation in [an assessor's] favor where the plain and unambiguous language leaves no room for construction."); *id.* at 489-90, 280 S.E.2d at 58 ("Only when the literal application of a statute produces an absurd result will we consider a different meaning."); § 12-43-220(c)(1) ("The legal residence and not more than five acres contiguous thereto, when owned totally or in part in fee or by life estate and occupied by the owner of the interest, and additional dwellings located on the same property and occupied by immediate family members of the owner of the interest, are taxed on an assessment equal to

---

<sup>1</sup> 378 S.C. 385, 662 S.E.2d 599 (2008).

four percent of the fair market value of the property."); *id.* (providing that "[f]or purposes of the assessment ratio allowed pursuant to this item, a residence does not qualify as a legal residence unless the residence is determined to be the domicile of the owner-applicant"); S.C. Code Ann. § 12-43-220(c)(2)(iv) (2014 & Supp. 2021) ("[T]he burden of proof for eligibility for the four percent assessment ratio is on the owner-occupant . . .").

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>2</sup>

**WILLIAMS, C.J., and KONDUROS and VINSON, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>2</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.



STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
**Administrative Law Court**  
EDGAR A. BROWN BUILDING  
1205 PENDLETON STREET, SUITE 224  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201

COLUMBIA SC 29201



US POSTAGE<sup>SM</sup> FITNEY BOWES



ZIP 29201 \$ 000.81<sup>0</sup>  
02 1W  
0001392766 SEP. 27. 2022

**RECEIVED**

SEP 29 2022

**SC Court of Appeals**

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
Clerk, South Carolina Court of Appeals  
P.O. Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211

29211-162929

