

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Supreme Court

RECEIVED

Dec 22 2025

S.C. SUPREME COURT

APPEAL FROM BEAUFORT COUNTY

R. Ferrell Cothran, Jr. Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2024-002098

315 Corley CW LLC; 368 Mount Pelia LLC; Bridge Charleston Investments B LLC; Bridge Charleston Investments C LLC; Bridge Charleston Investments E LLC; Bridge Charleston Investments H LLC; Anne Bosler and Dylan Hart as Trustees of the Bosler-Hart Trust; Geoffrey J. Block; R. Jeffrey Kimball and Deborah S. Kimball; Sebrina Leigh-Jones and Chris Leigh-Jones; Jennifer Albero; Live Oak Assets LLC; Matthew N. Lynch and Barbara A. Lynch; MKM 22 West LLC; One Rumford Lane LLC; Salt Works LLC; and TTJR LLC; individually, derivatively, and as class representative ..... Respondents,

v.

Palmetto Bluff Development, LLC; Palmetto Bluff Club, LLC; Palmetto Bluff Real Estate Company, LLC; PLBH, LLC; Montage Palmetto Bluff, LLC; Palmetto Bluff Preservation Trust, Inc.; Palmetto Bluff Preservation Trust Board of Stewards: Jordan Phillips; Mark Polites; Gray Ferguson; Henry Armistead; South Street Partners LLC; and John Does 1-25 ..... Petitioners.

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE  
TO FILE AN AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF  
FOR THE PUBLIC INVESTORS ADVOCATE BAR ASSOCIATION**

The Public Investors Advocate Bar Association (PIABA) submits the reply in support of its December 11, 2025 motion for leave to file an amicus brief in this matter.

Petitioners oppose PIABA's motion solely on timeliness. In doing so, they concede that Rule 213, SCACR, has no deadline by which amicus briefs must be filed. Here, PIABA sought leave and conditionally filed its amicus brief less than two months after Petitioners filed their reply brief. And to PIABA's knowledge, this case has not yet been calendared for oral argument. PIABA's

motion for leave thus fits well within Rule 213. Indeed, this Court routinely accepts amicus briefs submitted much later in a case than PIABA's brief here. *E.g.*, *Thompson v. Killian*, Appellate Case No. 2023-000442 (motions for leave filed by multiple amici 14 months after briefing was completed and after the case was scheduled for oral argument); *Ruh v. Metal Recycling Servs., Inc.*, Appellate Case No. 2022-000094 (motion for leave filed 99 days after the parties completed briefing); *ArrowPointe Fed. Credit Union v. Bailey*, Appellate Case No. 2021-000149 (motion for leave filed approximately 6 weeks after oral argument); *Jones v. State*, Appellate Case No. 2020-000188 (motion for leave filed 8 months after briefing was completed and after parties were advised the case would be submitted). Waiting to seek leave until after briefing has been completed also allows amici to better limit their arguments to issues presented by the parties and minimizes the risk that an amicus brief is merely repetitive of the parties' own arguments.

PIABA's motion for leave to submit an amicus brief therefore is timely. If the Court grants leave and accepts PIABA's brief as filed, it is within the Court's discretion to determine whether and when the parties may respond to it. *See* Rule 213, SCACR.

Respectfully submitted,

**WILLOUGHBY HUMPHREY & D'ANTONI, P.A.**

*s/R. Walker Humphrey, II*

R. Walker Humphrey, II  
133 River Landing Drive, Suite 200  
Charleston, South Carolina 29492  
(843) 619-4426

*Attorney for Public Investors Advocate Bar Association*

December 22, 2025