

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM AIKEN COUNTY  
In the Court of Common Pleas

Courtney Clyburn Pope, Circuit Court Judge  
Civil Action No.: 2021-CP-02-02457

---

Appellate Case No.: 2022-000685

---

**RECEIVED**

JUL 20 2023  
SC Court of Appeals

Glen Fleming, .....Respondent,

v.


Vance Mack Fleming...Appellant.

---

**APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF**

---

By: \_\_\_\_\_



William H. Edwards  
Moore Bradley Myers Law Firm  
1700 Sunset Boulevard  
P.O. Box 5709  
West Columbia, SC 29171  
803-796-9160  
will@mbmlawsc.com  
Attorney for Appellant

July 20, 2023

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iii

ARGUMENT ..... 1

CONCLUSION.....3

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### **Cases**

<i>Henning v. Kaye</i> 307 S.C. 436, 437, 415 S.E.2d 794, 794 (1992) .....	1
<i>State v. Burton</i> 356 S.C. 259, 589 S.E.2d 6 (2003) .....	1
<i>State v. Hollman</i> 232 S.C. 489, 498, 102 S.E.2d 873, 877 (1958) .....	2
<i>Stevenson v. State</i> 335 S.C. 193, 516 S.E.2d 434 (1999) .....	2
<i>HHHunt Corp. v. Town of Lexington</i> 389 S.C. 623, 635-36, 699 S.E.2d 699, 705 (Ct.App. 2010) .....	2
<i>State v. Colf</i> 332 S.C. 313, 322, 504 S.E.2d 360, 364 (Ct.App. 1998) .....	2
<i>Emerson Elec. Co. v. S.C. Dep't of Revenue</i> 395 S.C. 481, 719 S.E.2d 650 (2011) .....	2
<i>Glasscock, Inc. v. U.S. Fidelity and Guar. Co.,</i> 348 S.C. 76, 557 S.E.2d 689 (Ct. App. 2001) .....	2
<i>Englert, Inc. v. Netherlands Ins. Co.,</i> 315 S.C. 300, 433 S.E.2d 871 (Ct. App. 1993) .....	2

### **Rules**

South Carolina Appellate Court Rule 208(b)(2), SCACR.....	1, 3
South Carolina Appellate Court Rule 208(b)(1)(A)-(F), SCACR.....	1
South Carolina Appellate Court Rule 208(b)(1)(E), SCACR .....	1
South Carolina Appellate Court Rule 208(b)(1)(D), SCACR.....	3

## ARGUMENTS

### **D) THE RESPONDENT'S ARGUMENT SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED BECAUSE RESPONDENT'S INITIAL BRIEF DOES NOT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF SOUTH CAROLINA APPELLATE COURT RULES.**

Pursuant to Rule 208(b)(2), SCACR, Appellant Vance Mack Fleming, respectfully moves this Court for an Order to strike the Initial Brief of Respondent, Glen Fleming or alternatively, to disregard the issues, argument, and authorities raised in the Respondent's Initial Brief in violation of the appellate court rules and decisional law.

The Respondent's Initial Brief is required to comply with the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. Rule 208(b)(2), SCACR, provides that:

“The brief of respondent shall conform to the requirements of Rule 208(b)(1)(A)-(F), except that a statement of the issues, of the case, or of the standard of review need not be made unless the respondent is dissatisfied with the statement of the issues, of the case, or of the standard of review by appellant. If a respondent does not include his own statement of the case, he shall be bound by the matters stated or alleged in appellant's statement of the case. If a respondent does include his own statement of the case, he shall be bound by the matters stated or alleged in his statement of the case.

Rule 208(b)(2), SCACR. The requirements of Rule 208(b)(1)(E), SCACR, require that the Respondent's argument “be divided into as many parts as there are issues to be argued. At the head of each part, the particular issue to be addressed shall be set forth in distinctive type, followed by discussion and citations of authority.”

“[T]he South Carolina Appellate Court Rules are not mere technicalities but provide the parties and this Court with an orderly mechanism through which to guide appeals in this State. It is incumbent upon counsel to provide material that complies with the Rules and facilitates appellate review.” *Henning v. Kaye*, 307 S.C. 436, 437, 415 S.E.2d 794, 794 (1992). See also *State v. Burton*, 356 S.C. 259, 265, n. 5, 589 S.E.2d 6, 9 n. 5 (2003) (“A *pro se* litigant who knowingly

elects to represent himself assumes full responsibility for complying with substantive and procedural requirements of the law.”); *State v. Hollman*, 232 S.C. 489, 498, 102 S.E.2d 873, 877 (1958) (stating that established rules of procedure are not to be discarded on appeal merely because a party appeared *pro se*), overruled on other grounds by *Stevenson v. State*, 335 S.C. 193, 516 S.E.2d 434 (1999).

In *HHHunt Corp. v. Town of Lexington*, the Court held that conclusory arguments and arguments not supported by authorities are deemed abandoned. *HHHunt Corp. v. Town of Lexington*, 389 S.C. 623, 635-36, 699 S.E.2d 699, 705 (Ct.App. 2010); *State v. Colf*, 332 S.C. 313, 322, 504 S.E.2d 360, 364 (Ct.App. 1998); *see also Emerson*, 395 S.C. at 488 n.6, 719 S.E.2d at 654 n.6. Short, conclusory statements made without supporting authority are deemed abandoned on appeal and therefore not presented for review. *Glasscock, Inc. v. U.S. Fidelity and Guar. Co.*, 348 S.C. 76, 557 S.E.2d 689 (Ct. App. 2001). In *Englert, Inc. v. Netherlands, Ins. Co.*, the court has stated that a "one-sentence" argument is too conclusory to present any issue on appeal. *Englert, Inc. v. Netherlands Ins. Co.*, 315 S.C. 300, 433 S.E.2d 871 (Ct. App. 1993).

The respondent argues that he is the sole owner and has shown the Court that he is the sole owner, but the Respondent’s argument is not supported by citation to the record, nor is it accurate. (R.PP. 338-345).


In this case, the Respondent’s Initial Brief does not meet the requirements of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules. While the Respondent submitted its brief *pro se*, the Respondent still assumed full responsibility to comply with the substantive and procedural requirements and the Respondent’s failure to comply should not be discarded merely because he is not represented by counsel. *State v. Hollman*, 232 S.C. 489, 498, 102 S.E.2d 873, 877 (1958).

The Respondent did not comply with the requirements Rule 208(b)(2), SCACR and 208(b)(1)(D). Respondent's argument section of the Initial Brief includes a heading with only two short sentences and without any supporting authority. (R.PP. 338-345). Respondent's Initial Brief consisted of only conclusory arguments on page "5", which state "that either the Court vacate the Appellant from the premises owned by the Respondent or the matter be remanded to the Magistrate's Court." (R.PP. 338-345). The Respondent's Initial Brief did not provide any supporting evidence for its argument. The Respondent's argument was also improper and insufficient by failing to discuss, reference, or cite authority as seen on Page 5 of Respondent's Initial Brief. (R.PP. 338-345). Thus the Respondent's Initial Brief does not comply with the legal requirements. Therefore, the Court should Strike the Respondent's Initial Brief and disregard all arguments and authorities that are not properly raised under the rules and case law governing appellate practice.

### CONCLUSION

For the preceding reasons, Appellant respectfully asks this Court to reverse the trial court's decision and Appellant be allowed to pursue whatever remedies available to him in Circuit Court or Probate Court.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

William H. Edwards  
Moore Bradley Myers Law Firm  
1700 Sunset Boulevard  
West Columbia, SC 29171  
803-796-9160  
will@mbmlawsc.com  
Attorney for Appellant

July 20, 2023

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM AIKEN COUNTY  
In the Court of Common Pleas

**RECEIVED**

Courtney Clyburn Pope, Circuit Court Judge  
Civil Action No.: 2021-CP-02-02457

JUL 20 2023  
SC Court of Appeals

Appellate Case No.: 2022-000685

Glen Fleming .....Respondent,


v.

Vance Mack Fleming ... Appellant.

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I certify that I have served a copy of the Appellant's Reply Brief, upon the Respondent at  
the address listed below:

Glen T. Fleming  
10943 Indies Drive North  
Jacksonville, FL 32246



William H. Edwards

July 20, 2023

# MBM MOORE BRADLEY MYERS

S. Jahue Moore†  
James Edward Bradley†  
Sheila McNair Robinson  
Christian G. Spradley  
William H. Edwards  
Stanley L. Myers  
Jane H. Downey\*  
S. Jahue Moore, Jr.  
William B. Fortino  
Ralph Nichols Riley, Jr.  
John C. Bradley, Jr.  
Lester McGill Bell, Jr.

Melissa K. Moore  
Bryan C. Letteer  
Sierra D. Carini  
Lawrence D. Turner  
Emily E. Collins

*Retired*  
J. Mark Taylor\*\*  
Robert D. Hazel†  
C. David Sawyer, Jr.†  
Billy C. Coleman (1916-2019)

July 20, 2023

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
Clerk of Court  
The South Carolina Court of Appeals  
Post Office Box 11629  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Re: Glen Fleming v. Vance Mack Fleming  
Appellate Case No.: 2022-000685

RECEIVED

JUL 20 2023  
SC Court of Appeals

Dear Mrs. Kitchings:

Enclosed for filing is the original and three copies of Appellant's Reply Brief and Proof of Service in the above-referenced matter. Please return the clocked-in copies via our courier.

Please do not hesitate to contact our office if you have any questions or need additional information.

Yours very truly,



William H. Edwards

WHE  
Enclosures

cc: Glen Fleming, Respondent (w/enclosures)  
Vance M. Fleming (w/ enclosures)