

was whether a permittee is a necessary party to an action to revoke a development permit. Id. at 68, 367 S.E.2d, 161 (“The sole question we address here is whether a permittee is a necessary party to an action to revoke a development permit.”). The Court unanimously found that “a development permittee is a necessary party to an appeal of its permit.” Id. at 68, 367 S.E.2d, at 161. Petitioner appeals a decision of the DRB seeking to overturn its decision granting approval of a project but has failed to name the permittee in the appeal. For those reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Therefore, the Court **GRANTS** the motion to dismiss. The appeal is hereby **DISMISSED** for failure to join the owners of the subject property as required under Spanish Wells.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED!

[electronic signature on following page]