

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE  
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING  
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals**

John T. Lucas, Sr., as Trustee of the John T. Lucas  
Revocable Trust and Carolyn C. Lucas Revocable Trust,  
Appellant,

v.

The Bristol Condominium Property Owners Association,  
Respondent,

and

The Bristol Condominium Property Owners Association,  
Plaintiff,

John T. Lucas, Sr., as Trustee of the John T. Lucas  
Revocable Trust Dated November 10, 2004, and Carolyn  
C. Lucas Revocable Trust Dated November 10, 2004,  
Defendants/Counterclaim Plaintiffs,

v.

The Bristol Condominium Property Owners Association,  
Counterclaim Defendant.

Appellate Case No. 2014-000118

---

Appeal From Charleston County  
James C. Williams, Jr., Special Referee

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2015-UP-313

Heard May 7, 2015 – Filed June 24, 2015

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Joseph A. Mooneyham, of Mooneyham Berry, LLC, of Greenville, for Appellant.

M. Dawes Cooke, Jr. and Kenneth Michael Barfield, of Barnwell Whaley Patterson & Helms, LLC; and David B. Wheeler and Joseph Timothy Belton, of Moore & Van Allen, PLLC, all of Charleston, for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** In this civil appeal, John Lucas argues the circuit court erred in finding he failed to prove his claims for (1) breach of fiduciary duty, (2) fraud, (3) negligent misrepresentation, and (4) wrongful or retaliatory foreclosure. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Jordan v. Holt*, 362 S.C. 201, 205, 608 S.E.2d 129, 131 (2005) ("[A] claim of breach of fiduciary duty is an action at law. . . ." (citation omitted)); *Moseley v. All Things Possible, Inc.*, 395 S.C. 492, 495, 719 S.E.2d 656, 658 (2011) ("An action for fraud is an action at law."); *Epworth Children's Home v. Beasley*, 365 S.C. 157, 164, 616 S.E.2d 710, 714 (2005) ("When reviewing an action at law, on appeal of a case tried without a jury, the appellate court's jurisdiction is limited to correction of errors at law. The appellate court will not disturb the [circuit court]'s findings of fact as long as they are reasonably supported by the evidence." (citation omitted)).<sup>1</sup>

**AFFIRMED.**

**FEW, C.J., and HUFF and WILLIAMS, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Lucas's brief cited no authority in support of his wrongful foreclosure claim; therefore, we find this issue abandoned on appeal. See *Potter v. Spartanburg Sch. Dist.* 7, 395 S.C. 17, 24, 716 S.E.2d 123, 127 (Ct. App. 2011) ("An issue is deemed abandoned if the argument in the brief is not supported by authority or is only conclusory.").