

**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**

The State, Respondent,

v.

Dustin Lee Hooper, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2019-001502

Appeal From Anderson County
R. Lawton McIntosh, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2022-UP-209
Submitted March 1, 2022 – Filed May 18, 2022

APPEAL DISMISSED

Donald Loren Smith, of Attorney Office of Donald
Smith, of Anderson, for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General William M. Blich,
Jr., both of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Dustin Lee Hooper appeals his conviction and sentence for driving under the influence (DUI), arguing the trial court should have dismissed his case because the applicable DUI statute was not complied with. Because a Rule 60(b)(1), SCRPC, motion does not toll the time for serving an appeal, we find

Hooper's appeal is untimely and dismiss the appeal. See Rule 29(a), SCRCrimP ("[P]ost-trial motions shall be made within ten (10) days after the imposition of the sentence. . . . The time for appeal for all parties shall be stayed by a timely post-trial motion and shall run from the receipt of written notice of entry of the order granting or denying such motion."); Rule 203(b)(2), SCACR ("After a . . . trial resulting in conviction . . . , a notice of appeal shall be served on all respondents within ten (10) days after the sentence is imposed."); *Coward Hund Constr. Co. v. Ball Corp.*, 336 S.C. 1, 5, 518 S.E.2d 56, 59 (Ct. App. 1999) (noting that a Rule 60 motion "d[oes] not toll the time for the filing and service of [a] notice of appeal"); *Camp v. Camp*, 386 S.C. 571, 574-75, 689 S.E.2d 634, 636 (2010) ("Service of the notice of appeal is a 'jurisdictional requirement, and [the appellate c]ourt has no authority to extend or expand the time in which the notice of intent to appeal must be served.'" (quoting *Mears v. Mears*, 287 S.C. 168, 169, 337 S.E.2d 206, 207 (1985))).

APPEAL DISMISSED.¹

THOMAS, MCDONALD, and HEWITT, JJ., concur.

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