

**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**

Frank Melton and Mary Frances Holder, Appellants,

v.

John C. Tibbs, Respondent.

Big Oak Hunt Club and Jimmie E. Nunnery, Intervenors.

Appellate Case No. 2011-192667

Appeal From Chester County
William C. Tindal, Special Referee

Unpublished Opinion No. 2012-UP-515
Submitted September 4, 2012 – Filed September 12, 2012

AFFIRMED

Bruce M. Poore, of Rock Hill, for Appellants.

Randall M. Eason, of The Eason Law Firm, of Columbia,
for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Coker v Cummings*, 381 S.C. 45, 53, 671 S.E.2d 383, 387 (Ct. App. 2008) ("A boundary dispute is an action at law, and the location of a disputed

boundary line is a question of fact." (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)); *Townes Assocs., Ltd v City of Greenville*, 266 S.C. 81, 86, 221 S.E.2d 773, 775 (1976) ("In an action at law, on appeal of a case tried without a jury, the findings of fact of the judge will not be disturbed upon appeal unless found to be without evidence which reasonably supports the judge's findings.").

AFFIRMED.¹

FEW, C.J., WILLIAMS and PIEPER, JJ., concur.

¹ We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.