

**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.

Ericka James, Terrell Edwards, Anthony Dandy, Michael
Martin, Danny Wofford, Shannon Shippy, Cecile
Brannon, Eyvonne Lynch, Allen Lynch, and Cornelia
Smith, Defendants,

Of whom Ericka James is the Appellant.

In the interest of minors under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2020-000151

Appeal From Spartanburg County
Phillip K. Sinclair, Family Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2020-UP-330
Submitted November 19, 2020 – Filed December 3, 2020

AFFIRMED

Heather Vry Scalzo, of Byford & Scalzo, LLC, of
Greenville, for Appellant.

Robert C. Rhoden, III, of the South Carolina Department
of Social Services, of Spartanburg, for Respondent.

Wendy Nicole Griffith, of Talley Law Firm, P.A., of
Spartanburg, for the Guardians ad Litem.

PER CURIAM: Ericka James appeals a permanency planning order concerning her minor children. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1700 (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), we find no meritorious issues warrant briefing.¹ Accordingly, we affirm the family court's ruling and relieve James's counsel.

AFFIRMED.²

HUFF, WILLIAMS, and GEATHERS, 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.