

**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**

Marion Driggers, Appellant,

v.

Daniel Shearouse, Honorable Jean Toal, Honorable Costa  
Pleicones, Honorable Donald Beatty, and Honorable  
John Kittredge, Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2012-212819

---

Appeal From Williamsburg County  
R. Ferrell Cothran, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2013-UP-358  
Submitted August 1, 2013 – Filed September 11, 2013

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Marion Driggers, pro se, of Lake City.

Elizabeth Van Doren Gray and Tina Marie Cundari, both  
of Sowell Gray Stepp & Laffitte, LLC, of Columbia, for  
Respondents.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following  
authorities: *Shirley's Iron Works, Inc. v. City of Union*, 403 S.C. 560, 573, 743

S.E.2d 778, 785 (2013) ("An unappealed ruling is the law of the case and requires affirmance."); *Jones v. Lott*, 387 S.C. 339, 346, 692 S.E.2d 900, 903 (2010) ("Under the two issue rule, where a decision is based on more than one ground, the appellate court will affirm unless the appellant appeals all grounds because the unappealed ground will become the law of the case."); *id.* at 346, 692 S.E.2d at 904 ("It should be noted that although cases generally have discussed the 'two issue' rule in the context of the appellate treatment of general jury verdicts, the rule is applicable under other circumstances on appeal, including affirmance of orders of trial courts." (quoting *Anderson v. S.C. Dep't of Highways & Pub. Transp.*, 322 S.C. 417, 420 n.1, 472 S.E.2d 253, 255 n.1 (1996) (quotation marks omitted))); *id.* at 346, 692 S.E.2d at 903 ("Ordinarily, no point will be considered which is not set forth in the statement of the issues on appeal." (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Bochette v. Bochette*, 300 S.C. 109, 112, 386 S.E.2d 475, 477 (Ct. App. 1989) ("An appellant may not use either oral argument or the reply brief as a vehicle to argue issues not argued in the appellant's brief.").

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

**FEW, C.J., and PIEPER and KONDUROS, JJ., concur.**

---

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