

**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**

Levi Thomas Brown, Appellant,

v.

State Farm Fire and Casualty Insurance Company,  
Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2017-000479

---

Appeal From Charleston County  
W. Jeffrey Young, Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2018-UP-317  
Submitted June 1, 2018 – Filed July 11, 2018

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Robert Emmet Treacy, Jr., and Patrick Thomas Napolski,  
both of George Sink, PA Injury Lawyers, of North  
Charleston, for Appellant.

Timothy Alan Domin, of Clawson & Staubes, LLC, of  
Charleston, for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** In this appeal from a declaratory judgment action, Levi Thomas Brown appeals the circuit court's ruling that State Farm Fire and Casualty Insurance Company's uninsured motorist provision provided no coverage for a

gunshot injury Brown sustained while operating the insured vehicle. The circuit court found the injury was not covered under the policy because it was not foreseeably identifiable with the normal use of an automobile and the policy contained an exclusion for bodily injury resulting from the discharge of a firearm. Brown did not appeal the circuit court's ruling concerning the exclusion. We affirm<sup>1</sup> pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Jones v. Lott*, 387 S.C. 339, 346, 692 S.E.2d 900, 903 (2010) ("Under the two issue rule, [when] 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."); *Anderson v. Short*, 323 S.C. 522, 525, 476 S.E.2d 475, 477 (1996) (affirming the circuit court's decision when it ruled against the appellant on two grounds and the appellant only challenged the second ground on appeal).

**AFFIRMED.**

**SHORT, THOMAS, and HILL, JJ., concur.**

---

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