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

Re: Estate of James Rivers Karen Gibson Rivers, Appellant, v. Jasmine Frederick, Jewel Hayden, James Rivers, Jr., Jahmesha Rivers, and Angel Rivers, a minor child, Respondents. Appellate Case No. 2021-000772 Appeal From Orangeburg County James B. Jackson, Jr., Master-in-Equity Unpublished Opinion No. 2023-UP-105 Submitted January 1, 2023 – Filed March 15, 2023 **AFFIRMED**

Thomas Jefferson Goodwyn, Jr., of Goodwyn Law Firm, LLC, of Columbia, for Appellant.

Jasmine Frederick, Jewel Hayden, James Rivers, Jr., Jahmesha Rivers, and Angel Rivers, a minor child, all pro se.

PER CURIAM: Karen Rivers appeals a master-in equity's order affirming the probate court's denial of her petition for common-law marriage. On appeal, Rivers argues the master erred by finding she failed to present clear and convincing evidence that she was the common-law wife of the decedent, James Rivers. Because there is evidence in the record to support the probate court's finding that Rivers failed to present clear and convincing evidence of a common-law marriage, we affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *In re* Est. of Duffy, 392 S.C. 41, 46, 707 S.E.2d 447, 450 (Ct. App. 2011) ("The party seeking to establish the existence of a common[-]law marriage carries the burden of proof."); S.C. Code Ann. § 62-2-802(b)(4) (2022) (providing that for petitions for common-law marriage in which one party is deceased, a common-law marriage must be established by clear and convincing evidence); Tarnowski v. Lieberman, 348 S.C. 616, 619, 560 S.E.2d 438, 440 (Ct. App. 2002) ("[An appellate court's] review [of the probate court's decision on a petition for common-law marriage] is limited to a determination of whether . . . there is any evidence to support the findings of the [probate court].").

AFFIRMED.¹

WILLIAMS, C.J., THOMAS, J., and LOCKEMY, A.J., concur.

_

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