

**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**

South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles,
Respondent,

v.

Christopher Platt, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2013-002614

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court
S. Phillip Lenski, Administrative Law Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2015-UP-090
Submitted January 1, 2015 – Filed February 25, 2015

AFFIRMED

Timothy Clay Kulp and C. Austin Elliott, both of Kulp
Law Firm, of Charleston, for Appellant.

Frank L. Valenta, Jr., Philip S. Porter, and Linda Annette
Grice, of the South Carolina Department of Motor
Vehicles, all of Blythewood, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following
authorities: *Ahrens v. State*, 392 S.C. 340, 353, 709 S.E.2d 54, 61 (2011) ("To

prove estoppel against the government, the relying party must prove (1) lack of knowledge and of the means of knowledge of the truth as to the facts in question, (2) justifiable reliance upon the government's conduct, and (3) a prejudicial change in position." (internal quotation marks omitted)); *id.* at 355, 709 S.E.2d at 62 (stating citizens are presumed to know the law and are responsible for exercising reasonable care to protect their interests); *Morgan v. S.C. Budget & Control Bd.*, 377 S.C. 313, 321, 659 S.E.2d 263, 267-68 (Ct. App. 2008) (holding the appellant failed to satisfy the first element of estoppel because a statute clearly outlined the law).

AFFIRMED.¹

WILLIAMS, GEATHERS, and McDONALD, JJ., concur.

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