

**RECEIVED**

**Oct 23 2023**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM NEWBERRY COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Charles M. Watson Jr., Special Referee

---

Appellate Case No.: 2023-001143

Case No.: 2022-CP-36-00326

---

Lena Sue Yarborough .....Appellant,

v.

Joel F. Yarborough, III.....Respondent.

---

**INITIAL REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT**

---

Beth B. Richardson (SC Bar No. 69552)  
[brichardson@robinsongray.com](mailto:brichardson@robinsongray.com)  
Sarah C. Frierson (SC Bar No. 104643)  
[sfrierson@robinsongray.com](mailto:sfrierson@robinsongray.com)  
ROBINSON GRAY STEPP & LAFFITTE, LLC  
2151 Pickens Street, Suite 500 (29201)  
Post Office Box 11449  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211  
(803) 929-1400 Telephone  
(803) 929-0300 Fax

*Counsel for Appellant Lena Sue Yarborough*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... ii

ARGUMENT ..... 1

CONCLUSION.....3

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Ball v. Deas</i> , 2 Strob. Eq. 24 (S.C. 1848) .....	1
<i>Herbemont v. Thomas</i> , 15 Chev. Eq. 21 (S.C. 1839).....	1
<i>Smith v. Cutler</i> , 366 S.C. 546, 623 S.E.2d 644 (2005) .....	1, 2
<i>Smith v. Rucker</i> , 357 S.C. 532, 593 S.E.2d 497 (Ct. App. 2004), <i>overruled by Smith v. Cutler</i> , 366 S.C. 546, 623 S.E.2d 644 (2005).....	2

### Statutes

S.C. Code Ann. § 27-7-40.....	1, 2
S.C. Code Ann. § 62-2-804.....	1

## ARGUMENT

Respondent failed to address the significant issues before the Court on appeal and Appellant's arguments establishing the Special Referee erred in several respects when determining Deed 482-207 unambiguously created a tenancy in common with a right of survivorship (TICWRS) rather than a joint tenancy with right of survivorship (JTWRS). Instead, the arguments Respondent makes in response to Appellant's brief are the same surface level arguments presented to the Special Referee below and should be rejected for at least *three* reasons.

*First*, Respondent is wrong that "South Carolina did not recognize the joint right of survivorship created in deeds until 2000." Resp't's Br. at 5. To be sure, in 2000, the General Assembly enacted a statute to specifically provide for JTWRS. S.C. Code Ann. § 27-7-40 (Supp. 2004). But, before this time, including in 1998 when Bonnelle G. Yarborough executed the particular deed at issue here, Deed 482-207, "the estate of joint tenancy still existed in South Carolina." *Smith v. Cutler*, 366 S.C. 546, 551, 623 S.E.2d 644, 647 (2005); *see also* S.C. Code Ann. § 62-2-804 (1996) (providing for the "Effect of provision for survivorship on succession to joint tenancy").

In *Cutler*, after one party insisted that JTWRS had been abolished, the Court specifically rejected the argument stating, "joint tenancy has not been entirely abolished. Joint tenancy was disfavored as a rule of construction, but has existed and continues to exist today." *Id.* at 551 n.4, 623 S.E.2d at 647 n.4 (citing *Herbemont v. Thomas*, 15 Chev. Eq. 21 (S.C. 1839); *Ball v. Deas*, 2 Strob. Eq. 24 (S.C. 1848)). Further, when enacting section 27-7-40, the General Assembly recognized that this statutory language was "[i]n addition to any other methods for the creation of a joint tenancy in real estate which may exist by law." S.C. Code Ann. § 27-7-40 (emphasis

added). Therefore, Respondent's argument that Deed 482-207 did not create a JTWRS simply because Bonnelle executed it before 2000 fails.<sup>1</sup>

*Second*, Respondent quotes the granting clause language from *Cutler* four times over rather than responding in any meaningful way to Appellant's argument that *Cutler* does not control here for many reasons. Although the granting clause language in Deed 482-207 is the same as the granting clause language in *Cutler*, in 1998, when Deed 482-207 was executed, there was ample authority indicating that practitioners in South Carolina frequently used that granting clause language under common and statutory law to create a JTWRS. Just as the Special Referee did, Respondent ignores whole cloth these legal citations and sources. Further, coupling the common usage with the Deed title, "Warranty Deed (Joint Tenants with Right of Survivorship)," which is different from the deed title in *Cutler*, Bonnelle unambiguously intended to convey to herself and Respondent a JTWRS not a TICWRS, and Respondent fails to respond to this argument in any manner too.

*Third*, if Deed 482-207 did not unambiguously create a JTWRS, the Court must at least find it is susceptible to more than one reasonable interpretation under the circumstances discussed above, including a JTWRS. Respondent does not address this point; perhaps, because it is difficult to escape the fact that even in *Cutler*, three former members of this Court found that the same granting language "unambiguously created a joint tenancy with rights of survivorship" in 2004. *Smith v. Rucker*, 357 S.C. 532, 536, 593 S.E.2d 497, 499 (Ct. App. 2004), *overruled by Smith v. Cutler*, 366 S.C. 546, 623 S.E.2d 644 (2005). And only after the supreme court looked to extrinsic evidence—that the wife testified "she wanted to make sure that if she were to predecease [her

---

<sup>1</sup> And to the extent Respondent is arguing Appellant cannot rely on section 27-7-40, Appellant is not and has never relied on that statute to argue Deed 482-207 created a JTWRS.

husband] that he would get the property”—as well as the equities at play—between a husband and wife there, and not between a mother and son as here—did that court interpret the meaning of the granting clause language there to create a TICWRS.

### CONCLUSION

In sum, for the many reasons argued in Appellant’s initial brief, the Court should reject Respondent’s simple repetition of the Special Referee’s errors and find either that Deed 482-207 unambiguously created a JTWRS or, at the very least, is subject to more than one reasonable interpretation and requires consideration of extrinsic evidence to determine the grantor’s intent. A review of that extrinsic evidence<sup>2</sup> establishes Bonnelle intended to convey to herself and Respondent a JTWRS, which she could and did sever in 2020 in Deed 2242-183, providing a life estate to herself with the remainder to Appellant. Consequently, the Court should hold Appellant and Respondent now hold equal interests in the Newberry Timber Tract as tenants in common.

*[Signature page to follow]*

---

<sup>2</sup> As set forth more fully in Appellant’s Brief at pages 16–19, the extrinsic evidence here establishes that Bonnelle knew the difference between JTWRS and TICWRS as she held several other properties as JTWRS with Respondent before 2020 and other properties as TICWRS with her mother before that. Further, she later severed the JTWRS she held with Respondent in these other properties in the same manner she intended to sever the Newberry Timber Tract here, by granting to herself a life estate with the remainder to Appellant.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Beth B. Richardson

Beth B. Richardson (SC Bar No. 69552)

[brichardson@robinsongray.com](mailto:brichardson@robinsongray.com)

Sarah C. Frierson (SC Bar No. 104643)

[sfrierson@robinsongray.com](mailto:sfrierson@robinsongray.com)

ROBINSON GRAY STEPP & LAFFITTE, LLC

2151 Pickens Street, Suite 500 (29201)

Post Office Box 11449

Columbia, South Carolina 29211

(803) 929-1400 Telephone

(803) 929-0300 Fax

*Counsel for Appellant Lena Sue Yarborough*

Columbia, South Carolina

October 23, 2023

RECEIVED

Oct 23 2023

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM NEWBERRY COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Charles M. Watson, Jr., Special Referee

---

Appellate Case No.: 2023-001143

Lower Court Case No.: 2022-CP-36-00326

---

Lena Sue Yarborough ..... Appellant,

v.

Joel F. Yarborough, III..... Respondent,

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

---

Pursuant to Rule 262(c)(3), SCACR, I certify that I have caused the **INITIAL REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT** to be served on the following counsel of record by AIS email at the following addresses:

Charles V. Verner, Esquire  
PO BOX 484  
Newberry, South Carolina 29108  
[lawyer@sc.rr.com](mailto:lawyer@sc.rr.com)  
*Counsel for Respondent*

s/Beth B. Richardson  
Beth B. Richardson (SC Bar No. 69552)  
[brichardson@robinsongray.com](mailto:brichardson@robinsongray.com)  
Post Office Box 11449  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211  
*Counsel for Appellant Lena Sue Yarborough*

Columbia, South Carolina  
October 23, 2023

**From:** [Cynthia D. Nygord](#)  
**To:** [lawyer@sc.rr.com](mailto:lawyer@sc.rr.com)  
**Cc:** [Beth B. Richardson](#); [Sarah Frierson](#); [Dara Carmichael](#); [Cynthia D. Nygord](#)  
**Subject:** 2023-001143 - Yarborough Appeal - Initial Reply Brief of Appellant and Record on Appeal  
**Date:** Monday, October 23, 2023 3:16:30 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[2023-10-23 - Initial Reply Brief of Appellant with Proof of Service\(38864638.1\).pdf](#)  
[2023-10-23 - Record on Appeal ALL - to Verner.pdf](#)  
[2023-10-23 - Proof of Service - Record on Appeal.pdf](#)

---

Mr. Verner:

Attached herewith for service upon you please find the Initial Reply Brief of Appellant which is being filed with Court of Appeals this afternoon along with the Proof of Service for the same. A copy of this email will be filed with the Proof of Service.

Additionally, attached for service upon you please find the Record on Appeal along with the Proof of Service for the same. The Proof of Service for the ROA will be filed with Court of Appeals.

Please note: Although AIS lists another email address for you, we are serving you via the email address that has been used for communication throughout this case.

Please let us know if receipt and service is confirmed.

With kindest regards,  
Cyndi Nygord



---

**CYNDI NYGORD** PARALEGAL

DIRECT 803.231.7845

**VCARD**

**ROBINSONGRAY.COM**

2151 Pickens Street

Suite 500

PO Box 11449 (29211)

Columbia, SC 29201

---

**MERITAS** LAW FIRMS WORLDWIDE



**NOTICE:** This e-mail is confidential and may contain information which is legally privileged or otherwise exempt from disclosure. If you received this message in error, please delete this message from your device.

**Supporting Green** print wisely.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM NEWBERRY COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Charles M. Watson, Jr., Special Referee

---

Appellate Case No.: 2023-001143

Lower Court Case No.: 2022-CP-36-00326

---

Lena Sue Yarborough .....Appellant,

v.

Joel F. Yarborough, III.....Respondent,

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

---

Pursuant to Rule 262(c)(3), SCACR, I certify that I have caused the **RECORD ON APPEAL** to be served on the following counsel of record by AIS email at the following addresses:

Charles V. Verner, Esquire  
PO BOX 484  
Newberry, South Carolina 29108  
[lawyer@sc.rr.com](mailto:lawyer@sc.rr.com)  
*Counsel for Respondent*

s/Beth B. Richardson  
Beth B. Richardson (SC Bar No. 69552)  
[brichardson@robinsongray.com](mailto:brichardson@robinsongray.com)  
Post Office Box 11449  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211  
*Counsel for Appellant Lena Sue Yarborough*

Columbia, South Carolina  
October 23, 2023

**From:** [Cynthia D. Nygord](#)  
**To:** [lawyer@sc.rr.com](mailto:lawyer@sc.rr.com)  
**Cc:** [Beth B. Richardson](#); [Sarah Frierson](#); [Dara Carmichael](#); [Cynthia D. Nygord](#)  
**Subject:** 2023-001143 - Yarborough Appeal - Initial Reply Brief of Appellant and Record on Appeal  
**Date:** Monday, October 23, 2023 3:16:30 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[2023-10-23 - Initial Reply Brief of Appellant with Proof of Service\(38864638.1\).pdf](#)  
[2023-10-23 - Record on Appeal ALL - to Verner.pdf](#)  
[2023-10-23 - Proof of Service - Record on Appeal.pdf](#)

---

Mr. Verner:

Attached herewith for service upon you please find the Initial Reply Brief of Appellant which is being filed with Court of Appeals this afternoon along with the Proof of Service for the same. A copy of this email will be filed with the Proof of Service.

Additionally, attached for service upon you please find the Record on Appeal along with the Proof of Service for the same. The Proof of Service for the ROA will be filed with Court of Appeals.

Please note: Although AIS lists another email address for you, we are serving you via the email address that has been used for communication throughout this case.

Please let us know if receipt and service is confirmed.

With kindest regards,  
Cyndi Nygord



**CYNDI NYGORD** PARALEGAL

DIRECT 803.231.7845

[VCARD](#)

[ROBINSONGRAY.COM](http://ROBINSONGRAY.COM)

2151 Pickens Street

Suite 500

PO Box 11449 (29211)

Columbia, SC 29201

 **MERITAS** LAW FIRMS WORLDWIDE



**NOTICE:** This e-mail is confidential and may contain information which is legally privileged or otherwise exempt from disclosure. If you received this message in error, please delete this message from your device.

[Supporting Green](#) print wisely.