

**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.

Ferris Harvley, James Bascomber, Gary Thomas, Gail
Henson, Hannah Purnell, and Brian Purnell, Defendants,

Of whom Ferris Harvley is the Appellant.

In the interest of minors under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2019-001592

Appeal From Laurens County
Joseph C. Smithdeal, Family Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2020-UP-217
Submitted June 24, 2020 – Filed July 13, 2020

AFFIRMED

Melinda Inman Butler, of The Butler Law Firm, of
Union, for Appellant.

Nathaniel B. Senn, III, of The Law Office of N.B. Senn,
LLC, of Laurens, as Guardian ad Litem for Appellant.

Rosemerry Felder-Commander, of the South Carolina
Department of Social Services, of Laurens, for
Respondent.

Marcus Wesley Meetze, of Law Office of Marcus W.
Meetze, LLC, of Simpsonville, for the Guardian ad Litem
for the minor children.

PER CURIAM: Ferris Harvley appeals the family court's order removing her minor children from her custody, placing them in the custody of alternate caregivers, and allowing the Department of Social Services (DSS) to forego reasonable efforts at reunification and close its case. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1660(E) (2010) (setting forth findings a family court must make when removing children from the custody of their parents); S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1640(C) (Supp. 2019) (setting forth situations when a family court may authorize DSS to forego reasonable efforts at family reunification). 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 Harvley's counsel.

AFFIRMED.²

HUFF, THOMAS, and MCDONALD, JJ., concur.

¹ *See also* S.C. Dep't of Soc. Servs. v. Downer, S.C. Sup. Ct. Or. dated Feb. 2, 2005 (expanding the *Cauthen* procedure to removal actions).

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