

**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**

Walt Parker, Appellant,

v.

John C. Curl, Respondent,

v.

Palmetto Floor Covering Installation, LLC, and Florence  
Custom Countertops, Inc., Third-Party Defendants.

Appellate Case No. 2019-001370

---

Appeal From Florence County  
Michael G. Nettles, Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2022-UP-304  
Submitted June 1, 2022 – Filed July 20, 2022

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

William Reynolds Williams, of Willcox Buyck &  
Williams, PA, of Florence, for Appellant.

Jon Rene Josey and Jeffrey L. Payne, both of Turner  
Padget Graham & Laney, PA, of Florence, for  
Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Walt Parker appeals the circuit court's order denying his request for specific performance and permanent injunction. Parker argues the circuit court erred by (1) considering the defense of unclean hands when it was not raised by John C. Curl and (2) finding Parker's post-contractual activity divested him of his entitlement to additional shares in Florence Carpet & Tile, Inc. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR.

We find Parker's arguments have been abandoned on appeal. *See State v. Lindsey*, 394 S.C. 354, 363, 714 S.E.2d 554, 558 (Ct. App. 2011) ("An issue is deemed abandoned and will not be considered on appeal if the argument is raised in a brief but not supported by authority."); *Glasscock, Inc. v. U.S. Fid. & Guar. Co.*, 348 S.C. 76, 81, 557 S.E.2d 689, 691 (Ct. App. 2001) ("South Carolina law clearly states that short, conclusory statements made without supporting authority are deemed abandoned on appeal and therefore not presented for review."). In his appellate brief, Parker makes short, conclusory statements and fails to cite to any relevant legal authority in support of his arguments. The majority of Parker's brief is a mere recitation of the evidence and testimony presented at trial. Accordingly, we find Parker's arguments are abandoned on appeal and decline to address the merits of the issues.

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>1</sup>

**WILLIAMS, C.J., and KONDUROS and VINSON, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.