

predecessors in title to the petitioners. Petitioners are all of the present owners and holders of the property described in such deed to the County of Greenville (hereinafter referred to as the "deed") and shown on plat recorded in Book 00 at Page 165 (hereinafter referred to as the "Plat"). Petitioners are also all of the present property owners whose property abuts and adjoins such purported roads and all of the present owners through whose land such purported roads pass.

On and after the date of execution of the deed to the County of Greenville, such property was annexed into the City of Greenville. The Respondents, therefore, are all of the governmental bodies with a prior or present interest in the existence or non-existence of such roads.

2. Such roads (Deed Wood Drive, Twin Oak Lane and Elderidge Circle) were never accepted for maintenance by the County of Greenville, or by the City of Greenville subsequent to its annexation of the property, and have never been used by the public. In fact, other roads have been cut through the property and such other roads are available for public use.

#2  
3. The aforesaid plat appears to be a subdivision of property through which the roads run. Such lots, however, have not been subdivided. Furthermore, the petitioners own all of the land which would constitute such subdivision and all of the petitioners consent to the closing and hereby expressly release any interest in the foregoing roads.

4. The Petitioners, pursuant to Code Section 57-9-10 of the 1976 Code of Laws of South Carolina, as amended, have published the requisite "Notice of Intention to File" once a week for the three consecutive weeks prior to filing this petition in the Greenville Piedmont, a newspaper published in the County where such roads are situated, such notice have been published on September 20, September 27 and October 4, 1979. Notice need not be sent by mailing requiring a return receipt to the last known address of all abutting property owners whose property would be affected by such change because the Petitioners constitute all of such owners.

5. It is in the best interest of petitioners, respondents, and any other party or parties who might be concerned that such roads be abandoned and closed. Such roads were never accepted by either of the

1113  
PAGE 80

4328 RV-2