

**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.

Candis Sheffield, Richard Mathews, Tammy Padgett, and
Ron Padgett, Defendants.

AND

Tammy Woodley Padgett and Ronald Eric Padgett,
Respondents,

v.

Candis Sheffield and Richard Mathews, Defendants,

AND

John Smith and Jane Smith, Respondents,

v.

Candis Sheffield, Richard Mathews, and South Carolina
Department of Social Services, Defendants.

In the interest of minors under the age of eighteen.

Of whom Candis Sheffield is the Appellant and Richard
Mathews is a Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2022-001808

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

Unpublished Opinion No. 2023-UP-298
Submitted August 17, 2023 – Filed August 21, 2023

AFFIRMED

Harry A. Hancock, of Columbia, for Appellant.

Melinda Inman Butler, of The Butler Law Firm, of
Union, for Respondent Richard Mathews.

James Fletcher Thompson, of Thompson Dove Law
Group LLC, of Spartanburg, for Respondents Tammy
Padgett and Ronald Padgett.

Jonathan Drew Hammond, of Greer, for Respondents
John Smith and Jane Smith.

Andrew Troy Potter, of Anderson, for Respondent South
Carolina Department of Social Services.

Justin Montgomery, of Charlotte, North Carolina, for
Guardian ad Litem Carol Ballard.

Joseph L.V. Johnson, of Saint-Amand Thompson &
Mathis, LLC, of Gaffney, as Guardian ad Litem.

PER CURIAM: Candis Sheffield appeals the family court's final order terminating her parental rights to her minor children. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-2570 (Supp. 2022). 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), we find no meritorious issues warrant briefing. Accordingly, we affirm the family court's ruling and relieve Sheffield's counsel.

AFFIRMED.¹

THOMAS, KONDUROS, and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.

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