

**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**

The State, Respondent,

v.

Michael Watson, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2010-173126

---

Appeal From Saluda County  
William P. Keesley, Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2013-UP-276  
Heard June 4, 2013 – Filed June 26, 2013

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Appellate Defender Kathrine Haggard Hudgins, of  
Columbia, for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan M. Wilson, Chief Deputy  
Attorney General John W. McIntosh, Senior Assistant  
Deputy Attorney General Salley W. Elliott, and Assistant  
Deputy Attorney General David A. Spencer, all of  
Columbia; and Solicitor Donald V. Myers, of Lexington,  
for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Michael Watson appeals his convictions for voluntary manslaughter, pointing and presenting a firearm, and possession of a firearm during the commission of a violent crime. Watson argues the trial court erred in (1) denying his motion to reconsider his sentence for voluntary manslaughter, and (2) refusing to suppress his statement to Officer Cockrell. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities:

1. As to whether the trial court erred in denying Watson's motion to reconsider his sentence for voluntary manslaughter: *State v. Warren*, 392 S.C. 235, 237-38, 708 S.E.2d 234, 235 (Ct. App. 2011) ("The authority to change a sentence rests solely and exclusively within the discretion of the sentencing judge."); *id.* at 238, 708 S.E.2d at 235 ("An abuse of discretion occurs where the conclusions of the trial court are either controlled by an error of law or lack evidentiary support.").

2. As to whether the trial court erred in refusing to suppress Watson's statement to Officer Cockrell: *State v. Miller*, 375 S.C. 370, 378, 652 S.E.2d 444, 448 (Ct. App. 2007) ("The trial [court] determines the admissibility of a statement upon proof of its voluntariness by a preponderance of the evidence."); *id.* ("On appeal, the conclusion of the trial [court] as to the voluntariness of a statement will not be reversed unless so erroneous as to show an abuse of discretion."); *id.* at 378-79, 652 S.E.2d at 448 ("When reviewing a trial [court]'s ruling concerning voluntariness, the appellate court does not re-evaluate the facts based on its own view of the preponderance of the evidence, but simply determines whether the trial [court]'s ruling is supported by any evidence.").

**AFFIRMED.**

**FEW, C.J., and GEATHERS and LOCKEMY, JJ., concur.**