

**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.

Tia O'Connor and Jose Hilario Sacayon Garcia,
Defendants,

Of whom Tia O'Connor is the Appellant.

In the interest of a minor under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2021-000250

Appeal From Laurens County
Matthew P. Turner, Family Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2021-UP-307
Submitted August 16, 2021 – Filed August 24, 2021

AFFIRMED

Heather Vry Scalzo, of Byford & Scalzo, LLC, of
Greenville, for Appellant.

Rosemerry Felder-Commander, of the South Carolina
Department of Social Services, of Laurens, for
Respondent.

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

PER CURIAM: Tia O'Connor appeals the family court's order allowing the Department of Social Services (DSS) to retain custody of her minor child and authorizing DSS to forego reasonable efforts at reunification. *See* S.C. Code § 63-7-1700(D) (Supp. 2020) (setting forth situations in which the family court may return a child to a parent's home following removal); S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1640(C) (Supp. 2020) (setting forth situations in which the family court may authorize DSS to forego reasonable efforts at family reunification). 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),¹ we find no meritorious issues warrant briefing. Accordingly, we affirm the family court's ruling and relieve O'Connor's counsel.

AFFIRMED.²

LOCKEMY, C.J., and WILLIAMS and MCDONALD, JJ., concur.

¹ *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").

² We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.