

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**

Luther Harris,

Appellant,

v.

Industrial Minerals, Inc.,
Employer, and Key Risk
Management Services, Inc.,
Carrier,

Respondents.

Appeal from the Appellate Panel
South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission

Unpublished Opinion No. 2012-UP-511
Submitted June 1, 2012 – Filed September 5, 2012

AFFIRMED

Brent P. Stewart, of Rock Hill, and James B.
Richardson, Jr., of Columbia, for Appellant.

Mark A. Allison, of Greenville, for Respondents.

PER CURIAM: Luther Harris (Employee) appeals the order of the Appellate Panel of the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission (Appellate Panel), arguing the Appellate Panel erred in (1) holding Employee did not suffer a change of condition, (2) stating that objective evidence is required for a finding of change of condition, and (3) issuing an order that failed to comply with section 1-23-350 of the South Carolina Code (2005). We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b)(1), SCACR.¹

1. We find substantial evidence supports the Appellate Panel's holding that Employee did not suffer a change of condition. See Hall v. Desert Aire, Inc., 376 S.C. 338, 347, 656 S.E.2d 753, 757 (Ct. App. 2007) ("It is not within the reviewing court's province to reverse findings of the Appellate Panel which are supported by substantial evidence."); id. at 348, 656 S.E.2d at 758 ("The possibility of drawing two inconsistent conclusions from the evidence does not prevent [the Appellate Panel]'s findings from being supported by substantial evidence."); id. ("Where there are conflicts in the evidence over a factual issue, the findings of the Appellate Panel are conclusive.").

2. We find the Appellate Panel did not commit reversible error in stating that objective evidence is required for a finding of change of condition. The record reflects that the Appellate Panel applied the appropriate legal standard in reviewing Employee's request for additional benefits and, as stated above, substantial evidence supports the Appellate Panel's determination.

3. We find the Appellate Panel's order complies with section 1-23-350 of the South Carolina Code (2005). See Martinez v. Spartanburg Cnty., 394 S.C. 224, 230, 715 S.E.2d 339, 342 (Ct. App. 2011) ("The findings of fact made by the Appellate Panel must be sufficiently detailed to enable the reviewing court to determine whether the evidence supports the findings.").

AFFIRMED.

FEW, C.J., and HUFF and SHORT, JJ., concur.

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