

**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 Social Services,
Respondent,

v.

Ashli Vice, Justin Brock, Christina Brock, Mark J.
Bowman, and Rachael Christian, Defendants,

Of whom Justin Brock is the Appellant,

and

Ashli Vice, Christina Brock, Mark J. Bowman, and
Rachael Christian are Respondents.

In the interest of minors under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2019-001729

Appeal From Anderson County
David E. Phillips, Family Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2020-UP-109
Submitted April 13, 2020 – Filed April 15, 2020

AFFIRMED

Gregory Lee Cole, Jr., of Cox & Cole, Attorneys at Law,
of Williamston, for Appellant.

Brittany Dreher Senerius, of Anderson, for Respondent
South Carolina Department of Social Services.

John Marshall Swails, Jr., of Greenville, for the Guardian
ad Litem.

PER CURIAM: Justin Brock appeals a family court order finding he did not remedy the conditions causing the removal of his daughter (Child); placing custody of Child with Christina Brock; and allowing the Department of Social Services to close its case. Upon a thorough review of the record and the family court's findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to *Ex parte Cauthen*, 291 S.C. 465, 354 S.E.2d 381 (1987),¹ we find no meritorious issues warrant briefing. Accordingly, we affirm the family court's ruling and relieve Brock's counsel.

AFFIRMED.²

LOCKEMY, C.J., and GEATHERS and HEWITT, JJ., concur.

¹ See also *SCDSS v. Downer*, S.C. Sup. Ct. Order dated February 2, 2005 (expanding the *Cauthen* procedure to situations where an indigent person appeals an order imposing measures short of termination of parental rights, such as removal based on abuse and neglect).

² We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.