## 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.

Billy Nelson Chestnut and Dorothy Kay McDougal Chestnut, Defendants,

Of Whom Dorothy Kay McDougal Chestnut is the Appellant.

**AND** 

Amanda Ruth Smith and Corey Brandon Smith, Respondents,

v.

Dorothy Kay McDougal Chestnut, Billy Nelson Chestnut, and Baby Girl, a minor under the age of four (4) years, and South Carolina Department of Social Services, Defendants,

Of whom Dorothy Kay McDougal Chestnut is the Appellant.

In the interest of minors under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2014-002404

## Appeal From Laurens County John M. Rucker, Family Court Judge

\_\_\_\_

Unpublished Opinion No. 2015-UP-315 Submitted May 27, 2015 – Filed June 24, 2015

**AFFIRMED** 

Chad A. Mitchell, of The Chad Alexander Mitchell Law Firm, LLC, of Laurens, for Appellant.

Nancy H. Bailey, of Law Office of Nancy H. Bailey, of Florence, for Respondents Amanda Smith and Corey Smith.

Laura Jo Bardsley Houck, of the South Carolina Department of Social Services, of Laurens, for Respondent South Carolina Department of Social Services.

Elizabeth Dyal Medlin, of Medlin Law Firm, LLC, of Laurens, for Guardian ad Litem Sheila Putnam.

Marcus Wesley Meetze, of Law Office of Marcus W. Meetze, LLC, of Simpsonville, for Guardian ad Litem Angela Young.

**PER CURIAM:** Dorothy Chestnut appeals the family court's final order terminating her parental rights to her minor children. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-2570 (Supp. 2014). Upon a thorough review of the record and the family court's findings of facts and conclusions of law pursuant to *Ex parte Cauthen*, 291 S.C. 465, 354 S.E.2d 381 (1987), we find no meritorious issues that warrant briefing. Accordingly, we affirm the family court's ruling and relieve Chestnut's counsel.

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

SHORT, LOCKEMY, and McDONALD, JJ., concur.

\_

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