

**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.

Tiffany Thomas, Gary Thomas, Connie Randall, and  
Jody Lowe, Defendants,

Of whom Gary Thomas is the Appellant

and

Tiffany Thomas is a Respondent.

In the interest of minors under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2019-000744

---

Appeal From Anderson County  
Karen F. Ballenger, Family Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2021-UP-339  
Submitted September 15, 2021 – Filed September 20, 2021

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Gary Thomas, of Pelzer, pro se.

Tiffany Marie Thomas, of Belton, pro se.

Kristin Kelly Millonzi, of Anderson, for Respondent  
South Carolina Department of Social Services.

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

---

**PER CURIAM:** Gary Thomas appeals an April 8, 2019 family court order denying his Rule 60, SCRCF, motion. On appeal, he argues the family court erred in its August 9, 2017 merits order. Thomas did not timely appeal the August 9, 2017 merits order because he did not serve the notice of appeal within thirty days after receipt of written notice of entry of the order. *See* Rule 203(b)(3), SCACR (providing a notice of appeal from the family court shall be served on all respondents within thirty days after receipt of written notice of entry of the order or judgment). Thus, Father's issue on appeal is not properly before this court. Moreover, because Father did not raise any issue related to the April 8, 2019 order on appeal in his appellate brief, we find he has abandoned any challenge to this order. *See* Rule 208(b)(1)(B), SCACR ("Ordinarily, no point will be considered [on appeal] which is not set forth in the statement of the issues on appeal."); *First Sav. Bank v. McLean*, 314 S.C. 361, 363, 444 S.E.2d 513, 514 (1994) (considering an issue abandoned because the appellant failed to provide pertinent argument or supporting authority).

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>1</sup>

**KONDUROS, HILL, and HEWITT, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.