

**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**

Larell Purvis, Appellant,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2019-001582

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court
Harold W. Funderburk, Jr., Administrative Law Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2022-UP-093
Submitted February 1, 2022 – Filed March 9, 2022

AFFIRMED

Larell Purvis, pro se.

Imani Diane Byas, of South Carolina Department of
Corrections, of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Larrell Purvis appeals the dismissal of his inmate grievance by the Administrative Law Court (ALC). On appeal, Purvis argues the ALC erred by concluding the disciplinary sanctions imposed by the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC) for possession of methamphetamine did not concern the loss of a state-created liberty interest. We affirm.

An SCDC disciplinary hearing officer found Purvis guilty of possession of methamphetamine. However, SCDC declined to impose a loss of good-time credits as a sanction. As a result, Purvis did not lose any accrued good-time credits or any other state-created liberty due to his conviction. Thus, we find substantial evidence supports the ALC's dismissal of Purvis's appeal. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-610(B) (Supp. 2020) (stating for an appeal of a final decision of an administrative agency, the standard of appellate review is whether the ALC's findings are supported by substantial evidence); *Laws v. Richland Cnty. Sch. Dist. No. 1*, 270 S.C. 492, 495-96, 243 S.E.2d 192, 193 (1978) ("Substantial evidence' is not a mere scintilla of evidence . . . but is evidence which, considering the record as a whole, would allow reasonable minds to reach the conclusion that the administrative agency reached or must have reached in order to justify its action."); *Sullivan v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 355 S.C. 437, 443, 586 S.E.2d 124, 127 (2003) (providing the ALC has jurisdiction only of matters implicating a state-created liberty interest); *Skipper v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 370 S.C. 267, 279, 633 S.E.2d 910, 917 (Ct. App. 2006) (stating the ALC should dismiss appeals that do not implicate a state-created liberty).

AFFIRMED.¹

THOMAS, MCDONALD, and HEWITT, JJ., concur.

¹ We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.