

**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**

IN RE: Estate of Valerie D'Agostino

Nicholls & Crampton, P.A., Appellant,

v.

Estate of Valerie D'Agostino, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2014-002249

Appeal From Beaufort County
Marvin H. Dukes, III, Master-in-Equity

Unpublished Opinion No. 2016-UP-366
Submitted May 1, 2016 – Filed July 20, 2016

AFFIRMED

Jay Anthony Mullinax, of Law Office of Jay A.
Mullinax, LLC, of Hilton Head Island, for Appellant.

James Ashley Twombly, of Twenge & Twombly,
LLC, of Beaufort, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Nicholls & Crampton, P.A., appeals the master-in-equity's order denying its petition for allowance of a claim against the Estate of Valerie D'Agostino. On appeal, Nicholls & Crampton argues the master (1) erred by

deciding the case turned on an ambiguity within Nicholls & Crampton's letter of representation to Richard D'Agostino, Valerie's widower; (2) erred by failing to apply North Carolina law to the letter of representation; and (3) would have ruled in Nicholls & Crampton's favor had the master properly applied North Carolina law to the letter of representation. We affirm.¹

Nicholls & Crampton failed to appeal the master's ruling that Nicholls & Crampton "[was] estopped and/or barred from now taking the position that Richard D'Agostino contracted with it in his representative capacity." Thus, this ruling is the law of the case. *See Rumpf v. Mass. Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, 357 S.C. 386, 398, 593 S.E.2d 183, 189 (Ct. App. 2004) ("Any unappealed portion of the [master's ruling] is the law of the case, and must therefore be affirmed."). Because the master's order was based on more than one ground, we affirm the master. *See Jones v. Lott*, 387 S.C. 339, 346, 692 S.E.2d 900, 903 (2010) ("Under the two issue rule, whe[n] 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.").

AFFIRMED.

LOCKEMY, C.J., and WILLIAMS and MCDONALD, JJ., concur.

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