

**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.

Natasha Shealy, Vernon L. Smith, Margaret Smith, and
Thomas Smith, Defendants,

Of whom Natasha Shealy is the Appellant.

In the interest of a minor under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2020-000096

Appeal From Laurens County
Mindy W. Zimmerman, Family Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2020-UP-251
Submitted August 13, 2020 – Filed August 21, 2020

AFFIRMED

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

PER CURIAM: Natasha Shealy (Mother) appeals the family court's judicial review order that placed custody of her minor child (Child) with a relative; allowed the Department of Social Services to close its case and forego providing further services; permitted Mother visitation with Child when Child's therapist recommended it; and instructed Mother, Child, and their therapists to work on Mother and Child's relationship. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1700 (Supp. 2019); S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1640 (Supp. 2019). 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 Mother's counsel.

AFFIRMED.²

THOMAS, HILL, and HEWITT, JJ., concur.

¹ *See also* S.C. *Dep't of Soc. Servs. v. Downer*, S.C. Sup. Ct. Order dated Feb. 2, 2005 (expanding the *Cauthen* procedure to situations when "an indigent person appeals from an order imposing other measures short of termination of parental rights").

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