

**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**

David C. Deen, Appellant,

v.

Deborah B. Deen, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2017-001222

Appeal From Anderson County
Edgar H. Long, Jr., Family Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2019-UP-415
Submitted December 2, 2019 – Filed December 31, 2019

AFFIRMED

Scarlet Bell Moore, of Greenville, and Thomas Philip
Austin, of Watson Law Firm, of Greenwood, for
Appellant.

Deborah B. Deen, pro se, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: In this divorce action, David C. Deen appeals, arguing the family court erred in denying his request (1) to modify the alimony payable to Deborah B. Deen based on a substantial change in circumstances; and (2) for reimbursement of his attorney's fees. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Stoney v. Stoney*, 422 S.C. 593, 594, 813 S.E.2d 486, 486 (2018)

(stating on appeal from the family court, this court reviews factual and legal issues de novo); *Lewis v. Lewis*, 392 S.C. 381, 392, 709 S.E.2d 650, 655 (2011) ("[T]he family court's factual finding will be affirmed unless [the] 'appellant satisfies this court that the preponderance of the evidence is against the finding of the [family] court.'" (quoting *Finley v. Cartwright*, 55 S.C. 198, 202, 33 S.E. 359, 360-61 (1899)); *Butler v. Butler*, 385 S.C. 328, 336, 684 S.E.2d 191, 195 (Ct. App. 2009) ("Changes in circumstances must be substantial or material to justify modification or termination of an alimony award."); *id.* ("Moreover, the change in circumstances must be unanticipated."); *id.* ("The party seeking modification has the burden to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the unforeseen change has occurred." (quoting *Kelley v. Kelley*, 324 S.C. 481, 486, 477 S.E.2d 727, 729 (Ct. App. 1996))); Rule 208(b)(1)(E), SCACR (requiring citation to authority in the argument section of an appellant's brief); *First Sav. Bank v. McLean*, 314 S.C. 361, 363, 444 S.E.2d 513, 514 (1994) (noting when a party fails to cite authority or when the argument is simply a conclusory statement, the party is deemed to have abandoned the issue on appeal); *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.").

AFFIRMED.¹

SHORT, THOMAS, and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.

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