

**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 Social Services,  
Respondent,

v.

Michael Richter and Emily Segars (Poling), Defendants,

v.

Julie Blalock, Intervenor/Respondent,

Of whom Emily Segars (Poling) is the Appellant

and

Michael Richter is a Respondent.

In the interest of minors under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2020-000906

---

Appeal From York County  
Thomas Henry White, IV, Family Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2021-UP-221  
Submitted June 4, 2021 – Filed June 11, 2021

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Melinda Inman Butler, of The Butler Law Firm, of Union, for Appellant.

Nathan James Sheldon, of The Law Office of Nathan J. Sheldon, LLC, of Rock Hill, for Respondent Michael Richter.

Audrey Ann Butler, of Butler & Church Law, LLC, of Rock Hill, for Respondent Julie Blalock.

Andrew Troy Potter, of Anderson, and R. Chadwick Smith, of South Carolina Department of Social Services, of Rock Hill, both for Respondent.

Rebecca T. McNerney, of Waxhaw, North Carolina, for the Guardian ad Litem.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Emily Segars appeals the family court's final order finding Segars's home was not safe for reunification, an extension of reunification could not be granted, and a permanent plan of termination of parental rights and adoption was in the children's best interests. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1700 (Supp. 2020). Upon a thorough review of the record and the family court's findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to *Ex parte Cauthen*, 291 S.C. 465, 354 S.E.2d 381 (1987),<sup>1</sup> we find no meritorious issues warrant briefing. Accordingly, we affirm the family court's ruling.

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>2</sup>

**WILLIAMS, THOMAS, and HILL, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> *See also S.C. Dep't of Soc. Servs. v. Downer*, S.C. Sup. Ct. Order dated Feb. 2, 2005 (expanding the *Cauthen* procedure to situations when "an indigent person appeals from an order imposing other measures short of termination of parental rights").

<sup>2</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.