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

Spartanburg Sanitary Sewer District, Respondent,
v.
Randy P. Silver, Appellant.
Appellate Case No. 2010-155428

Appeal From Spartanburg County Gordon G. Cooper, Master-in-Equity

Unpublished Opinion No. 2013-UP-259 Submitted May 1, 2013 – Filed June 19, 2013

AFFIRMED

Reginald L. Foster, of Reginald L. Foster, PA, of Spartanburg, for Appellant.

Lawrence E. Flynn, Jr., of Lister, Flynn & Kelly, PA, of Spartanburg; and Norman Ward Lambert, of Harper Lambert & Brown, P.A., of Greenville, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Inlet Harbour v. S.C. Dep't of Parks, Rec. & Tourism*, 377 S.C. 86, 91, 659 S.E.2d 151, 154 (2008) ("In an action at equity, tried by a judge alone, an

appellate court may find facts in accordance with its own view of the preponderance of the evidence."); Straight v. Goss, 383 S.C. 180, 192, 678 S.E.2d 443, 449 (Ct. App. 2009) ("However, [appellate courts] are not required to disregard the findings of the trial [court] who saw and heard the witnesses and was in a better position to judge their credibility."); Regions Bank v. Schmauch, 354 S.C. 648, 674-75, 582 S.E.2d 432, 446 (Ct. App. 2003) ("Elements of equitable estoppel as to the party estopped are: (1) conduct by the party estopped which amounts to a false representation or concealment of material facts; (2) the intention that such conduct shall be acted upon by the other party; and (3) knowledge, actual or constructive, of the true facts."); id. at 675, 582 S.E.2d at 446 ("Application of equitable estoppel does not require an intentional misrepresentation."); S. Dev. Land & Golf Co., Ltd. v. S.C. Pub. Serv. Auth., 311 S.C. 29, 33, 426 S.E.2d 748, 751 (1993) ("Silence, when it is intended, or when it has the effect of misleading a party, may operate as equitable estoppel."); Queen's Grant II Horizontal Prop. Regime v. Greenwood Dev. Corp., 368 S.C. 342, 358, 628 S.E.2d 902, 911 (Ct. App. 2006) (providing estoppel by silence occurs when a party observes another acting in a manner inconsistent with his rights and "makes no objection while the other party changes his position based on the party's silence").

AFFIRMED.¹

FEW, CJ., and GEATHERS and LOCKEMY, JJ., concur.

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