

**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**

Richard Ridley, Respondent,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2012-213507

---

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court  
Carolyn C. Matthews, Administrative Law Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2014-UP-079  
Submitted January 1, 2014 – Filed February 26, 2014

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Shanika Kenyetta Johnson, of the South Carolina  
Department of Corrections, of Columbia, for Appellant.

Richard Ridley, pro se.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Sanders v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 379 S.C. 411, 417, 665 S.E.2d 231, 234 (Ct. App. 2008) ("In an appeal of the final decision of an administrative agency, the standard of appellate review is whether the [Administrative Law Court's (ALC)] findings are supported by substantial evidence."); *id.* ("Although this court

shall not substitute its judgment for that of the AL[C] as to findings of fact, we may reverse or modify decisions which are controlled by error of law or are clearly erroneous in view of the substantial evidence on the record as a whole."); *id.* ("In determining whether the AL[C]'s decision was supported by substantial evidence, this court need only find, considering the record as a whole, evidence from which reasonable minds could reach the same conclusion that the AL[C] reached."); S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-610(B) (Supp. 2012) ("The review of the [ALC's] order must be confined to the record.").

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

**HUFF, GEATHERS, and LOCKEMY, JJ., concur.**

---

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