

**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**

William Ford, Appellant,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2015-002114

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court
S. Phillip Lenski, Administrative Law Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2017-UP-007
Submitted October 1, 2016 – Filed January 11, 2017

AFFIRMED

William Ford, pro se.

Christina Catoe Bigelow, of the South Carolina
Department of Corrections, of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Howard v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 399 S.C. 618, 625, 733 S.E.2d 211, 215 (2012) ("[The] standard of review derives from the APA. We may affirm, remand, reverse, or modify the appealed decision if the appellant's substantive rights have suffered prejudice because the decision is: (a) in violation of constitutional or

statutory provisions; (b) in excess of the statutory authority of the agency; (c) made upon unlawful procedure; (d) affected by other error of law; (e) clearly erroneous in view of the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence on the whole record; or (f) arbitrary or capricious or characterized by abuse of discretion or clearly unwarranted exercise of discretion." (citation omitted) (citing S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-610(B) (Supp. 2011)); *Slezak v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 361 S.C. 327, 331, 605 S.E.2d 506, 508 (2004) ("[T]he [ALC] is not required to hold a hearing in every matter. Summary dismissal may be appropriate where the inmate's grievance does not implicate a state-created liberty or property interest.").

AFFIRMED.¹

HUFF and SHORT, JJ., and MOORE, A.J., concur.

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