

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM EDGEFIELD COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Hon. Brian M. Gibbons, Circuit Judge

---

Case No. 2022-CP-19-0114  
Appellate Case No. 2023-000541  
Opinion No. 2026-UP-027

---

George William Rauton, III, Appellant,

vs.

Patsy R. Lightle, Respondent.

---

PETITION FOR REHEARING

---

February 11, 2026

D. Randolph Whitt  
S.C. Bar No. 13068  
344 Blossom View Ct.  
West Columbia, SC 29170  
(803) 422-2176 Tel  
dwhitt2001@aol.com  
Attorney for Appellant

**RECEIVED**

**Feb 11 2026**

**SC Court of Appeals**

## INTRODUCTION

This Court issued its decision in this appeal which was filed January 28, 2026. Appellant was not notified of this decision, via email, on January 28, 2026.

## ARGUMENT FOR REHEARING

**The Court misapprehended South Carolina authority regarding issue presentation by requiring Appellant to make a request this Court to recognize the tort of intentional interference with inheritance**

The Court affirmed the trial court's dismissal and declined to rule on the errors Appellant identified in the trial court's ruling because "South Carolina has not formally recognized the tort of intentional interference with inheritance and Rauton has not requested this court do so:"

This Court's ruling misapprehends the provisions of SCACR Rule 208(b)(1)(B) that "Broad general statements may be disregarded by the appellate court." Moreover, the ruling misapprehends the long established authority on how issues are presented in an appeal. To be appropriate for review an issue must have been raised and ruled upon by the trial court. *Holy Loch Distributors, Inc. v. Hitchcock*, 340 S.C. 20, 24, 531 S.E.2d 282, 284 (2000) The ruling on the issue must also have been prejudicial to the appellant. *Broom v. Jennifer*, 403 S.C. 96, 742 S.E.2d 382 (2013).

In the instant case the issue of the existence of the tort of intentional interference with inheritance was not raised in the the trial court in the sense of being contested by the parties. The trial court's order notes that: "Plaintiff relies on the Federal District Court case of *Wellin v. Wellin*, 135 F. Supp.3d 502 (D.S.C. 2015) to support his assertion that his claim would be recognized by the South Carolina Supreme Court. (Order appealed from R. p. 3) The order further recognizes: "Defendant agrees that Judge Norton's prediction is well-reasoned and that the South Carolina Supreme Court would likely recognize Intentional Interference with Inheritance. (Emphasis added, Order appealed

from R. p. 3).

The trial court's order also does not make a definitive ruling on the existence of the tort of intentional interference with inheritance, rather the trial court reasoned that there were flaws in the complaint, which are the issues stated in the Issues on Appeal set forth in Appellant's brief. To the extent the trial court addressed the issue of existence, it did so favorably to Appellant: "Despite the likelihood of the Supreme Court's recognizing Intentional Interference,..."(Order appealed from R. p. 3).


Therefore, the opinion requires Appellant to have appealed an issue the was not contested by the parties, was not definitively ruled on by the trial court, and to the extent it was addressed, was addressed by the trial court favorably to Appellant and thus was not prejudicial to Appellant.

#### CONCLUSION

The established authority on issue presentation means a broad request to "formally recognize" the existence of the tort of intentional interference with inheritance not essential to consideration of the issues that were actually raised and contested by the parties and were actually ruled upon by the trial court in a manner that was prejudicial to Appellant.

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should grant rehearing, consider the issues raised in the briefs and reverse the trial court's order.

Respectfully submitted,



D. Randolph Whitt  
S.C. Bar No. 13068  
344 Blossom View Ct.  
West Columbia, SC 29170  
(803) 422-2176 Tel  
dwhitt2001@aol.com  
Attorney for Appellant

February 11, 2026

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

**RECEIVED**

**Feb 11 2026**

**SC Court of Appeals**

APPEAL FROM EDGEFIELD COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

Hon. Brian M. Gibbons, Circuit Judge

---

Case No. 2022-CP-19-0114  
Appellate Case No. 2023-000541  
Opinion No. 2026-UP-027

---

George William Rauton, III, Appellant,

vs.

Patsy R. Lightle, Respondent.

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

---

I certify that I have served Appellant's Petition for Rehearing on Respondent listed above via emailing a copy of it on February 11, 2026, addressed to her attorney of record as follows:

Adam T. Silvernail      adam@silvernaillawfirm.com

/s/D.RandolphWhitt

D. Randolph Whitt  
S.C. Bar no. 13068  
344 Blossom View Ct.  
West Columbia, SC 29170  
(803) 422-2176 Tel  
dwhitt2001@aol.com

February 11, 2026

Attorney for Appellant

## Petition for Rehearing

**RECEIVED**

**Feb 11 2026**

**SC Court of Appeals**

---

From: dwhitt2001@aol.com (dwhitt2001@aol.com)

To: adam@silvernaillawfirm.com

Date: Wednesday, February 11, 2026 at 03:57 PM EST

---

Good Afternoon Adam,

Attached and served upon you are our petition for rehearing and proof of service.

Regards,  
Randy Whitt



Rauton SVC 6.pdf  
42.7 kB



Rauton rehearing.pdf  
878.1 kB