

**RECEIVED**

**May 21 2026**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

ON APPEAL FROM THE REVIEWING AUTHORITY  
The Honorable Chief Judge H. Bruce Williams

Appellate Case No. 2023-001376  
Related Family Court Case No. 2022-DR-10-3072  
Related Appellate Court Case No. 2026-000472

Justin McGee .....Respondent,

v.

Lindsay F. McGee.....Petitioner.

**Husband’s Return to Wife’s Motion for Costs**

Appellant Justin McGee (“Husband”) opposes the May 12, 2026 Motion for Costs filed by Petitioner Lindsay F. McGee (“Wife”) for four reasons.

First, the Reviewing Authority has already denied Wife’s requests for fees. (Suppression Order at 3.) Wife had specifically asked for fees related to her appellate proceedings, which the Court refused. (*Id.*) Wife did not appeal or seek review of this portion of the Suppression Order. She should not be able to do now through Court rule what the Reviewing Authority prohibited her from doing under substantive law.

Second, the Reviewing Authority directed that any further motions in this matter should be directed to the Family Court. (*Id.*) This would include any requests for fees for Wife’s claims. (*Id.*) Such a request would be a motion “concerning these cases” as addressed by the Reviewing Authority. (*Id.*) Wife did not appeal or seek review of this portion of the Suppression Order either.

Third, an award of fees would be inequitable. Not only did this appeal address novel issues for which no reported cases are directly on point, but the appeal raised substantial procedural questions regarding the proper mechanism for seeking reviewing that have not been definitively addressed by this Court. What's more, the Reviewing Authority's stay of this matter for nearly two years from September 14, 2023, despite a properly filed and unopposed motion by Husband to lift the stay back in June 21, 2024, left Husband without the ability to manage certain assets in light of the Family Court's temporary order limiting both parties from selling or encumbering potentially marital assets. That stay also limited his ability to seek Family Court intervention to require Wife to pay substantial portions of shared expenses for the children. As a result, the Reviewing Authority's extensive stay of the parties' divorce and custody action caused Father to go into substantial debt to provide for the family and fund his defense. (*See Mot. to Lift Stay at 5–6, June 21, 2024.*)

Fourth, Wife's motion is duplicative of the Motion for Costs she has filed in Appellate Court Case No. 2026-000472. Wife should not be permitted to recover duplicative fees for the same work arising from the same challenge to the Reviewing Authority's Suppression Order.

### **Conclusion**

Wife's legal machinations have forced Husband to defend himself in multiple courts and an award of fees in this case would unjust, inappropriate, and inequitable. Simply put, the issue of legal fees should be reserved for the final merits of the underlying divorce action.

For the reasons set forth above, the Court should deny Wife's Motion for Costs.

**[Signature on following page.]**

NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP

By: /s/ Matthew A. Abee

Matthew A. Abee, SC Bar No. 101100  
E-Mail: matt.abee@nelsonmullins.com  
1320 Main Street / 17th Floor  
Post Office Box 11070 (29211-1070)  
Columbia, SC 29201  
(803) 799-2000

May 21, 2026

*Attorney for Appellant Justin M. McGee*

**RECEIVED**

**May 21 2026**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY FAMILY COURT  
The Honorable Spiros Ferderigos, Special Referee

Appellate Case No. 2023-001376  
Related Appellate Case No. 2026-000472  
Related Family Court Case No. 2022-DR-10-3072

Justin McGee .....Respondent,

v.

Lindsay F. McGee.....Petitioner.

**Proof of Service**

I, the undersigned partner of the law offices of Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP, attorneys for Respondent Justin McGee, certify that I have served all counsel in this action with a copy of the document(s) set forth below by email under *In re Methods of Electronic Filing and Service Under Rule 262 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules*, Appellate Case No. 2020-000447 (April 24, 2024):

Document(s):           **Husband’s Return to Wife’s Motion for Costs**

Counsel Served:       Peter G. Currence  
McDougall, Self, Currence & McLeod, LLP  
791 Greenlawn Drive, Suite 4  
Columbia, SC 29209  
pete@mscmlaw.com  
lori@mscmlaw.com  
  
Richard G. Whiting  
Law Offices of Richard Whiting  
1515 Lady Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
dick.whiting@whitinglawsc.com  
bonnie.kyzer@whitinglawsc.com

Brandon R. Gottschall  
Hubbard & Gottschall Law  
1320 Main Street, Suite 300  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201  
brg@hglawsc.com  
aek@hglawsc.com  
vlp@hglawsc.com

*Counsel for Petitioner*

Elizabeth J. Stringer  
Elizabeth J. Stringer LLC  
PO Box 12370  
Charleston, SC 29422-2370  
liz@stringerlaw.us

*Guardian ad litem*

NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP

By: /s/ Matthew A. Abee

Matthew A. Abee, SC Bar No. 101100  
E-Mail: matt.abee@nelsonmullins.com  
1320 Main Street / 17th Floor  
Post Office Box 11070 (29211-1070)  
Columbia, SC 29201  
(803) 799-2000

*Attorney for Respondent Justin McGee*

Columbia, South Carolina  
May 21, 2026