

**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.

Annie Jackson, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2015-000667

Appeal From Spartanburg County
R. Keith Kelly, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2017-UP-105
Submitted January 1, 2017 – Filed March 8, 2017

AFFIRMED

Public Defender Clay T. Allen, of Spartanburg, for
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant
Attorney General Vann Henry Gunter, both of Columbia;
and Solicitor Barry Joe Barnette, of Spartanburg, for
Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Annie Jackson appeals the circuit court's order affirming her convictions in magistrate's court of public disorderly conduct and trespassing.

Jackson argues the magistrate's court should have granted her motion for directed verdict because she contends the State failed to present evidence the arrest occurred within the city limits of Spartanburg. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Weston*, 367 S.C. 279, 292-93, 625 S.E.2d 641, 648 (2006) ("If there is any direct evidence or any substantial circumstantial evidence reasonably tending to prove the guilt of the accused, the [c]ourt must find the case was properly submitted to the jury."); S.C. Code Ann. § 5-7-110 (2004) ("[P]olice officers shall exercise their powers on all private and public property within the corporate limits of the municipality and on all property owned or controlled by the municipality wheresoever situated . . ."); *State v. Padgett*, 354 S.C. 268, 272, 580 S.E.2d 159, 161 (Ct. App. 2003) ("[T]he mere fact that there existed some question as to whether the officers in the instant case were operating outside of their jurisdictional limitations does not automatically give rise to the propriety of a directed verdict on the issue. To the contrary, the facts and circumstances attendant to this case present quintessential factual issues regarding the exercise of the statutory grant of jurisdiction.").

AFFIRMED.¹

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.

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