

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

**RECEIVED**

JUL 14 2014

APPEAL FROM NEWBERRY COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

**SC Court of Appeals**

Frank R. Addy, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2013-CP-36-332

Raymond D. Hobby ..... Respondent

vs.

Mary T. Hobby ..... Appellant

**APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF**

Pope D. Johnson, III  
Attorney at Law  
1230 Richland Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
803-799-9791  
803-253-6084 (fax)  
[pope@popejohnsonlaw.com](mailto:pope@popejohnsonlaw.com)  
**Attorney for the Appellant**

Having read the Respondent's Initial Brief, a response is necessary.

1. The Appellant has asked the Court to resolve and reconcile a question of subject matter jurisdiction where two statutes are in direct conflict. Section 22-3-20 states in clear and unambiguous terms that a magistrate has no jurisdiction to determine questions of title to real property. However, Section 15-67-610 requires the magistrate to determine questions of title to real property. Respondent has not addressed the conflict in the statutory provisions.


2. The Appellant has asked the Court to determine whether the magistrate has subject matter jurisdiction to set a bond for an amount in excess of \$7,500.00. This was not an issue addressed by Judge McMahon. The bond amount was raised for the first time before the magistrate. Respondent testified that his damages were \$23,400.00 for purposes of a security bond. The magistrate required the Appellant to post a bond in the amount of \$10,000.00. However, neither the magistrate nor Judge Addy identify a statutory basis for exceeding the magistrate court's jurisdictional limitation of \$7,500.00. If the magistrate can require a security bond of \$10,000.00, the magistrate could set one for any amount. The Respondent failed to address this issue in his brief.

3. The Appellant has asked this Court to determine the magistrate's authority to overrule a circuit court judge and order ejectment when the circuit court judge has previously found that the status quo should be maintained. The Respondent has failed to address this issue.

4. The Respondent has argued that the law of the case doctrine, res judicata, collateral estoppel and judicial estoppel bar the re-litigation of the issue of the subject matter jurisdiction of the magistrate's court. However, Judge McMahon's Order cannot be read to

say anymore than it does and it in no way ruled on the issues set forth above.

Judge McMahon held that the circuit court did not have subject matter jurisdiction to order ejectment pursuant to Section 15-67-610 *et. seq.* Judge McMahon also held that the circuit court's jurisdiction was appellate jurisdiction and that ejectment and bond setting were within that exclusive jurisdiction of the magistrate court. Obviously, the magistrate court has subject matter jurisdiction under Section 15-67-610 to order ejectment and to set security bonds. However, that subject matter jurisdiction is not without other jurisdictional limitations which are discussed above. Judge McMahon did not rule on whether the magistrate could make a finding related to title to real property or whether the magistrate can set a security bond in an amount exceeding \$7,500.00. These issues relate to subject matter jurisdiction and are open questions for this Court.

  
Pope D. Johnson, III  
Attorney at Law  
1230 Richland Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
803-799-9791  
803-253-6084 (Fax)  
[pope@popejohnsonlaw.com](mailto:pope@popejohnsonlaw.com)  
**Attorney for Appellant**

Columbia, South Carolina  
July 14, 2014

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

**RECEIVED**

JUL 14 2014

APPEAL FROM NEWBERRY COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

**SC Court of Appeals**

Frank R. Addy, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2013-CP-36-332

Raymond D. Hobby ..... Respondent

vs.

Mary T. Hobby ..... Appellant

**PROOF OF SERVICE**


I, Sherry W. Wise, of Pope D. Johnson, III, Attorney at Law, hereby certify that I have served Benjamin C. Bruner, attorney for the Respondent, with the following pleadings by mailing a copy of same, postage prepaid and return address clearly indicated, to him at the following address on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2014.

**COUNSEL SERVED:**

Benjamin C. Bruner  
Bruner Powell Wall & Mullins, LLC  
P.O. Box 61110  
Columbia, SC 29260-1110

**PLEADINGS:**

Appellant's Reply Brief

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sherry W. Wise

POPE D. JOHNSON, III  
Attorney at Law

1230 RICHLAND STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE 803-799-9791  
FAX 803-253-6084

Direct Dial: 803-376-8965  
E-Mail: [pope@popejohnsonlaw.com](mailto:pope@popejohnsonlaw.com)

July 14, 2014

**(Via Hand Delivery)**

Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
Clerk of Court  
South Carolina Court of Appeals  
1015 Sumter Street  
Columbia, SC 29201


RE: Raymond D. Hobby v. Mary T. Hobby  
Appellate Case No. 2013-002434

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed herewith are the original and a copy of the **Appellant's Reply Brief** regarding the above-referenced action. Please file the original and clock and return the additional copy to me.

With a copy of this letter to Benjamin C. Bruner, attorney for the Respondent, I am serving a copy of the Reply Brief upon him.

Sincerely,

  
Pope D. Johnson, III

PDJIII/sww  
Enclosures

cc: Benjamin C. Bruner, Esquire

**RECEIVED**

JUL 14 2014

**SC Court of Appeals**