

**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**

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental  
Control, Respondent,

v.

Blessed Births, Inc., d/b/a Blessed Births Family  
Wellness and Birth Center, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2016-000190

---

Appeal From Greenville County  
Shirley C. Robinson, Administrative Law Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2017-UP-290  
Submitted May 1, 2017 – Filed July 12, 2017

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Randall Scott Hiller, of Greenville, for Appellant.

Vito Michael Wicevic, of the South Carolina Department  
of Health and Environmental Control, of Columbia, for  
Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following  
authorities: *Risher v. S.C. Dep't of Health & Envtl. Control*, 393 S.C. 198, 204, 712  
S.E.2d 428, 431 (2011) ("A decision of the ALC should be upheld . . . if it is

supported by substantial evidence in the record."); *S.C. Dep't of Mental Retardation v. Glenn*, 291 S.C. 279, 281, 353 S.E.2d 284, 286 (1987) ("Substantial evidence is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion."); *id.* at 282, 353 S.E.2d at 286 ("The possibility of drawing two inconsistent conclusions from the evidence does not prevent the agency's findings from being supported by substantial evidence.").

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

**LOCKEMY, C.J., and HUFF and THOMAS, JJ., concur.**

---

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