

**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.

Michael Richter and Emily Segars (Poling), Defendants,

v.

Julia Blalock, Intervenor,

Of whom Michael Richter is the Appellant.

In the interest of minors under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2020-000884

Appeal From York County
Thomas Henry White, IV, Family Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2021-UP-222
Submitted June 4, 2021 – Filed June 11, 2021

AFFIRMED

Kimberly Yancey Brooks, of Kimberly Y. Brooks,
Attorney at Law, of Greenville, for Appellant.

Andrew Troy Potter, of Anderson, and R. Chadwick Smith, of South Carolina Department of Social Services, of Rock Hill, both for Respondent.

Rebecca T. McNerney, of Waxhaw, North Carolina, for the Guardian ad Litem.

PER CURIAM: Michael Richter appeals the family court's final order finding Richter's home was not safe for reunification, an extension of reunification should not be granted, and a permanent plan of termination of parental rights and adoption was in the children's best interests. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1700 (Supp. 2020). 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. However, we deny Richter's counsel's motion to be relieved.

AFFIRMED.²

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, and HILL, 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.