



OPINIONS
OF
THE SUPREME COURT
AND
COURT OF APPEALS
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA

ADVANCE SHEET NO. 7
February 19, 2014
Daniel E. Shearouse, Clerk
Columbia, South Carolina
www.sccourts.org

CONTENTS

THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

PUBLISHED OPINIONS AND ORDERS

None

UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS AND ORDERS

None

PETITIONS – UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

27124 - The State v. Jennifer Rayanne Dykes Pending

27306 - In the Interest of Justin B. Pending

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

27345 - John Doe v. The Bishop of Charleston Pending

27348 - Frances Hudson v. Lancaster Convalescent Center Pending

27352 - Gloria Pittman v. Jetter Pittman Pending

27353 - The State v. James Giles Pending

27354 - The State v. Davontay Henson Pending

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

PUBLISHED OPINIONS

5199 - The State v. Antonio Scott

14

UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS

2014-UP-067 - In the Matter of the Care and Treatment of Michael Hargrove

2014-UP-068 - The State v. Stephon Robinson

2014-UP-069 - Joseph G. Carew v. RBC Centura Bank

2014-UP-070 - The State v. Quentin Gause

2014-UP-071 - The State v. Larry Todd Perry

2014-UP-072 - The State v. Juwan Darnell Lomax

2014-UP-073 - Pamela Maner v. Marion Maner, IV

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

5185-Hector G. Fragosa v. Kade Construction

Pending

5186-Andreal Holland v. Morbark Inc.

Pending

5188-Mark Teseniar v. Professional Plastering

Pending

2013-UP-296-Parsons v. John Wieland Homes

Pending

2013-UP-381-L. G. Elrod v. Berkeley Cty. Sheriff's Dep't

Denied 01/24/14

2013-UP-435-State v. Christopher Spriggs

Pending

2014-UP-005-State v. Breyon Toney

Pending

2014-UP-010-Mell Woods v. John Hinson

Pending

2014-UP-013-Roderick Bradley v. State

Pending

2014-UP-017-E. Shawn Sorrell v. SCDPS	Pending
2014-UP-054-SCDSS v. Selentia O.	Pending

PETITIONS-SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

4750-Cullen v. McNeal	Pending
4764-Walterboro Hospital v. Meacher	Pending
4832-Crystal Pines v. Phillips	Pending
4851-Davis v. KB Home of S.C.	Granted in part, denied in part 01/08/14
4888-Pope v. Heritage Communities	Pending
4895-King v. International Knife	Pending
4909-North American Rescue v. Richardson	Pending
4956-State v. Diamon D. Fripp	Pending
4960-Justin O'Toole Lucey et al. v. Amy Meyer	Pending
4973-Byrd v. Livingston	Pending
4975-Greeneagle Inc. v. SCDHEC	Pending
4979-Major v. City of Hartsville	Pending
4992-Gregory Ford v. Beaufort County Assessor	Pending
4995-Keeter v. Alpine Towers International and Sexton	Pending
4997-Allegro v. Emmett J. Scully	Pending
5008-Willie H. Stephens v. CSX Transportation	Pending
5010-S.C. Dep't of Transportation v. Janell P. Revels et al.	Pending
5011-SCDHEC v. Ann Dreher	Pending

5013-Geneva Watson v. Xtra Mile Driver Training	Pending
5016-The S.C. Public Interest Foundation v. Greenville Cty. et al.	Pending
5017-State v. Christopher Manning	Pending
5019-John Christopher Johnson v. Reginald C. Lloyd et al.	Pending
5020-Ricky Rhame v. Charleston Cty. School District	Pending
5022-Gregory Collins v. Seko Charlotte and Nationwide Mutual	Pending
5025-State v. Randy Vickery	Pending
5031-State v. Demetrius Price	Pending
5032-LeAndra Lewis v. L.B. Dynasty	Pending
5033-State v. Derrick McDonald	Pending
5034-State v. Richard Bill Niles, Jr.	Granted 02/06/14
5035-David R. Martin and Patricia F. Martin v. Ann P. Bay et al.	Pending
5041-Carolina First Bank v. BADD	Pending
5052-State v. Michael Donahue	Pending
5053-State v. Thomas E. Gilliland	Pending
5055-Hazel Rivera v. Warren Newton	Pending
5059-Kellie N. Burnette v. City of Greenville et al.	Pending
5060-State v. Larry Bradley Brayboy	Pending
5061-William Walde v. Association Ins. Co.	Pending
5062-Duke Energy v. SCDHEC	Pending
5065-Curiel v. Hampton Co. EMS	Pending

5071-State v. Christopher Broadnax	Pending
5072-Michael Cunningham v. Anderson County	Pending
5074-Kevin Baugh v. Columbia Heart Clinic	Pending
5077-Kirby L. Bishop et al. v. City of Columbia	Pending
5078-Estate of Livingston v. Clyde Livingston	Pending
5081-The Spriggs Group, P.C. v. Gene R. Slivka	Pending
5082-Thomas Brown v. Peoplease Corp.	Pending
5084-State v. Kendrick Taylor	Pending
5087-Willie Simmons v. SC Strong and Hartford	Pending
5090-Independence National v. Buncombe Professional	Pending
5092-Mark Edward Vail v. State	Pending
5093-Diane Bass v. SCDSS	Pending
5095-Town of Arcadia Lakes v. SCDHEC	Pending
5097-State v. Francis Larmand	Pending
5099-Roosevelt Simmons v. Berkeley Electric	Pending
5101-James Judy v. Ronnie Judy	Pending
5110-State v. Roger Bruce	Pending
5111-State v. Alonza Dennis	Pending
5112-Roger Walker v. Catherine Brooks	Pending
5113-Regions Bank v. Williams Owens	Pending
5116-Charles A. Hawkins v. Angela D. Hawkins	Pending

5117-Loida Colonna v. Marlboro Park (2)	Pending
5118-Gregory Smith v. D.R. Horton	Pending
5119-State v. Brian Spears	Pending
5121-State v. Jo Pradubsri	Pending
5122-Ammie McNeil v. SCDC	Pending
5125-State v. Anthony Marquese Martin	Pending
5126-A. Chakrabarti v. City of Orangeburg	Pending
5127-Jenean Gibson v. Christopher C. Wright, M.D.	Pending
5130-Brian Pulliam v. Travelers Indemnity	Pending
5131-Lauren Proctor v. Whitlark & Whitlark	Pending
5132-State v. Richard Brandon Lewis	Granted 01/31/14
5135-Microclean Tec. Inc. v. Envirofix, Inc.	Pending
5137-Ritter and Associates v. Buchanan Volkswagen	Pending
5139-H&H Johnson, LLC v. Old Republic National Title	Pending
5140-Bank of America v. Todd Draper	Pending
5144-Emma Hamilton v. Martin Color Fi	Pending
5148-State v. Henry Jermaine Dukes	Pending
5151-Daisy Simpson v. William Simpson	Pending
5152-Effie Turpin v. E. Lowther	Pending
5154-Edward Trimmier v. SCDLLR	Pending
5156-State v. Manuel Marin	Pending

5157-State v. Lexie Dial	Pending
5159-State v. Gregg Henkel	Pending
5160-State v. Ashley Eugene Moore	Pending
5161-State v. Lance Williams	Pending
5164-State v. Darren Scott	Pending
5165-Bonnie L. McKinney v. Frank J. Pedery	Pending
5166-Scott F. Lawing v. Univar USA Inc.	Pending
5175-State v. Karl Ryan Lane	Pending
5176-Richard A. Hartzell v. Palmetto Collision, LLC	Pending
5178-State v. Michael J. Hilton	Pending
5181-Henry Frampton v. SCDOT	Pending
2011-UP-108-Dippel v. Horry County	Pending
2011-UP-109-Dippel v. Fowler	Pending
2011-UP-400-McKinnedy v. SCDC	Pending
2011-UP-495-State v. Arthur Rivers	Denied 02/06/14
2011-UP-502-Heath Hill v. SCDHEC and SCE&G	Pending
2012-UP-078-Seyed Tahaei v. Sherri Tahaei	Pending
2012-UP-081-Hueble v. Vaughn	Pending
2012-UP-152-State v. Kevin Shane Epting	Pending
2012-UP-203-State v. Dominic Leggette	Pending
2012-UP-219-Dale Hill et al. v. Deertrack Golf and Country Club	Pending

2012-UP-267-State v. James Craig White	Pending
2012-UP-270-National Grange Ins. Co. v. Phoenix Contract Glass, LLC, et al.	Pending
2012-UP-274-Passaloukas v. Bensch	Pending
2012-UP-276-Regions Bank v. Stonebridge Development et al.	Pending
2012-UP-278-State v. Hazard Cameron	Pending
2012-UP-285-State v. Jacob M. Breda	Pending
2012-UP-286-Diane K. Rainwater v. Fred A. Rainwater	Pending
2012-UP-295-Larry Edward Hendricks v. SCDC	Pending
2012-UP-293-Clegg v. Lambrecht	Pending
2012-UP-302-Maple v. Heritage Healthcare	Pending
2012-UP-312-State v. Edward Twyman	Pending
2012-UP-314-Grand Bees Development v. SCDHEC et al.	Pending
2012-UP-321-James Tinsley v. State	Denied 02/06/14
2012-UP-348-State v. Jack Harrison, Jr.	Pending
2012-UP-351-State v. Kevin J. Gilliard	Pending
2012-UP-365-Patricia E. King v. Margie B. King	Pending
2012-UP-404-McDonnell and Assoc v. First Citizens Bank	Pending
2012-UP-432-State v. Bryant Kinloch	Pending
2012-UP-433-Jeffrey D. Allen v. S.C. Budget and Control Bd. Employee Insurance Plan et al.	Pending
2012-UP-460-Figueroa v. CBI/Columbia Place Mall et al.	Denied 02/06/14

2012-UP-462-J. Tennant v. Board of Zoning Appeals	Pending
2012-UP-479-Elkachbendi v. Elkachbendi	Pending
2012-UP-502-Hurst v. Board of Dentistry	Pending
2012-UP-552-Virginia A. Miles v. Waffle House	Pending
2012-UP-561-State v. Joseph Lathan Kelly	Denied 02/06/14
2012-UP-563-State v. Marion Bonds	Pending
2012-UP-569-Vennie Taylor Hudson v. Caregivers of SC	Pending
2012-UP-573-State v. Kenneth S. Williams	Pending
2012-UP-576-State v. Trevee J. Gethers	Pending
2012-UP-577-State v. Marcus Addison	Pending
2012-UP-579-Andrea Beth Campbell v. Ronnie A. Brockway	Pending
2012-UP-580-State v. Kendrick Dennis	Pending
2012-UP-600-Karen Irby v. Augusta Lawson	Pending
2012-UP-603-Fidelity Bank v. Cox Investment Group et al.	Pending
2012-UP-608-SunTrust Mortgage v. Ostendorff	Pending
2012-UP-616-State v. Jamel Dwayne Good	Pending
2012-UP-623-L. Paul Trask, Jr., v. S.C. Dep't of Public Safety	Pending
2012-UP-647-State v. Danny Ryant	Pending
2012-UP-654-State v. Marion Stewart	Pending
2012-UP-658-Palmetto Citizens v. Butch Johnson	Pending
2012-UP-663-Carlton Cantrell v. Aiken County	Pending

2013-UP-010-Neshen Mitchell v. Juan Marruffo	Pending
2013-UP-014-Keller v. ING Financial Partners	Pending
2013-UP-015-Travelers Property Casualty Co. v. Senn Freight	Pending
2013-UP-020-State v. Jason Ray Franks	Pending
2013-UP-034-Cark D. Thomas v. Bolus & Bolus	Pending
2013-UP-056-Lippincott v. SCDEW	Pending
2013-UP-058-State v. Bobby J. Barton	Pending
2013-UP-062-State v. Christopher Stephens	Pending
2013-UP-063-State v. Jimmy Lee Sessions	Pending
2013-UP-066-Dudley Carpenter v. Charles Measter	Pending
2013-UP-069-I. Lehr Brisbin v. Aiken Electric Coop.	Pending
2013-UP-070-Loretta Springs v. Clemson University	Pending
2013-UP-071-Maria McGaha v. Honeywell International	Pending
2013-UP-078-Leon P. Butler, Jr. v. William L. Wilson	Pending
2013-UP-081-Ruth Sturkie LeClair v. Palmetto Health	Pending
2013-UP-082-Roosevelt Simmons v. Hattie Bailum	Pending
2013-UP-084-Denise Bowen v. State Farm	Pending
2013-UP-085-Brenda Peterson v. Hughie Peterson	Pending
2013-UP-090-JP Morgan Chase Bank v. Vanessa Bradley	Pending
2013-UP-095-Midlands Math v. Richland County School Dt. 1	Pending
2013-UP-110-State v. Demetrius Goodwin	Pending

2013-UP-120-Jerome Wagner v. Robin Wagner	Pending
2013-UP-125-Caroline LeGrande v. SCE&G	Pending
2013-UP-127-Osmanski v. Watkins & Shepard Trucking	Pending
2013-UP-133-James Dator v. State	Pending
2013-UP-147-State v. Anthony Hackshaw	Pending
2013-UP-158-CitiFinancial v. Squire	Pending
2013-UP-162-Martha Lynne Angradi v. Edgar Jack Lail, et al.	Pending
2013-UP-183-R. Russell v. DHEC and State Accident Fund	Pending
2013-UP-188-State v. Jeffrey A. Michaelson	Pending
2013-UP-189-Thomas J. Torrence v. SCDC	Pending
2013-UP-199-Wheeler Tillman v. Samuel Tillman	Pending
2013-UP-224-Katheryna Mulholland-Mertz v. Corie Crest	Pending
2013-UP-232-Theresa Brown v. Janet Butcher	Pending
2013-UP-251-Betty Jo Floyd v. Ken Baker Used Cars	Pending
2013-UP-256-Woods v. Breakfield	Pending
2013-UP-257-Matter of Henson (Woods) v. Breakfield	Pending
2013-UP-267-State v. William Sosebee	Pending
2013-UP-272-James Bowers v. State	Pending
2013-UP-279-MRR Sandhills v, Marlboro County	Pending
2013-UP-286-State v. David Tyre	Pending
2013-UP-288-State v. Brittany Johnson	Pending

2013-UP-290-Mary Ruff v. Samuel Nunez	Pending
2013-UP-294-State v. Jason Thomas Husted	Pending
2013-UP-297-Greene Homeowners v. W.G.R.Q.	Pending
2013-UP-304-State v. Johnnie Walker Gaskins	Pending
2013-UP-310-Westside Meshekoff Family v. SCDOT	Pending
2013-UP-322-A.M. Kelly Grove v. SCDHEC	Pending
2013-UP-323-In the interest of Brandon M.	Pending
2013-UP-326-State v. Gregory Wright	Pending
2013-UP-327-Roper LLC v. Harris Teeter	Pending
2013-UP-340-Randy Griswold v. Kathryn Griswold	Pending
2013-UP-358-Marion L. Driggers v. Daniel Shearouse	Pending
2013-UP-360-State v. David Jakes	Pending
2013-UP-380-Regina Taylor v. William Taylor	Pending
2013-UP-389-Harold Mosley v. SCDC	Pending
2013-UP-403-State v. Kerwin Parker	Pending
2013-UP-424-Lyman Russell Rea v. Greenville Cty.	Pending

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals**

The State, Respondent,

v.

Antonio Scott, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2011-205448

Appeal From Jasper County
Carmen T. Mullen, Circuit Court Judge

Opinion No. 5199
Heard January 8, 2014 – Filed February 19, 2014

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender Benjamin John Tripp, of Columbia,
for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Chief Deputy
Attorney General John W. McIntosh, Senior Assistant
Deputy Attorney General Donald J. Zelenka, and
Assistant Attorney General J. Anthony Mabry, all of
Columbia; and Solicitor Isaac McDuffie Stone, III, of
Bluffton, for Respondent.

FEW, C.J.: A jury convicted Antonio Scott for the murder of Cynthia Nelson. Scott asserts the trial court erred by not charging involuntary manslaughter because under his version of the facts, he unintentionally caused Nelson's death when he

lawfully but recklessly performed a martial arts move in self-defense. We find no basis to conclude Scott acted recklessly in defending himself because the circumstances Scott alleges to be reckless are the same circumstances that justified his use of force. We affirm.

I. Facts and Procedural History

On March 20, 2011, first responders from Jasper County Fire and Rescue arrived at the home of Scott's sister to investigate a "possible stabbing." They found Nelson "slumped over" on the couch with "a significant amount of blood on her clothing, emanating from her neck." Upon inspecting the wound, one of the first responders concluded "an object or some type of weapon was . . . put into [the left side of] her neck." Paramedics transported Nelson to Coastal Carolina Medical Center, where she later died due to blood loss.

The State indicted Scott for murder. At trial, the State's witnesses established the events leading up to Nelson's death. Nelson and her daughter Akera—who has a child with Scott—drove to Scott's sister's apartment to drop off the child. Nelson remained in the car while Akera took the child inside. When Akera walked in, she and Scott began arguing. "A minute later," Nelson walked into the apartment and began yelling at Scott.

Under the State's version of events, Scott had a knife in his hand when Akera walked in, and during the argument with Nelson, he stabbed Nelson in the neck with the knife. Scott's statement to police, however, described a different version of events.¹ Investigator Daniel Litchfield testified to what Scott told the police:

[Scott] had an altercation, a verbal argument, with Cynthia Nelson. During this argument, he stated that Cynthia Nelson pulled something shiny and silver out of her pocket, went towards him, and he stepped to the side and did a -- for lack of a better term, a martial arts move, pushing her elbow up, causing her to stab herself in the throat.

¹ Scott did not testify at trial.

Dr. Lee Tormos, a forensic pathologist, performed Nelson's autopsy and testified to his findings. Initially, Dr. Tormos stated Nelson's stab wound was not "the result of an accident" and was "consistent with someone having a knife in their hand [and] striking someone." He further testified he had never "seen a wound like this that was self-inflicted," and stated, "It is not possible that this could be a self-inflicted wound." On cross-examination, however, Scott's attorney demonstrated a martial arts move similar to what Scott allegedly performed and asked Dr. Tormos whether this move could cause a person holding a knife to stab herself in the neck. Dr. Tormos admitted the stabbing "could have been an accident," and acknowledged "[i]t is very possible" Nelson's wounds were caused by a self-inflicted stab wound.

Scott requested the trial court charge self-defense and involuntary manslaughter. The court agreed to charge self-defense but expressed concerns with charging involuntary manslaughter. The court explained, "I honestly think that it has to be either murder or voluntary manslaughter or self-defense" because "I don't see how . . . under any of the circumstances he could be criminally negligent" in defending himself. Scott argued the martial arts move could be considered negligent, to which the court responded, "[t]hat would be purely self-defense," and "[Scott] should be acquitted" and not "convicted of involuntary manslaughter." The State agreed with the court's position, arguing a person cannot "act in self-defense in a criminally negligent way, because it is an intentional act."

The court instructed the jury on murder, voluntary manslaughter, and self-defense. The jury found Scott guilty of murder, and the court sentenced him to thirty years in prison.

II. Involuntary Manslaughter

Involuntary manslaughter is defined as the unintentional killing of another without malice while engaged in (1) an unlawful activity not naturally tending to cause death or great bodily harm or (2) a lawful activity with reckless disregard for the safety of others. *State v. Smith*, 391 S.C. 408, 414, 706 S.E.2d 12, 15 (2011). Scott argues the trial court erred by not charging involuntary manslaughter because there was evidence he unintentionally caused Nelson's death while engaged in the

lawful activity of self-defense with reckless disregard for her safety.² We find no basis to conclude Scott acted recklessly because if he was justified in defending himself with the martial arts move, there is no ground on which to find he did so recklessly. *See State v. Gibson*, 390 S.C. 347, 355-56, 701 S.E.2d 766, 770 (Ct. App. 2010) ("The evidence presented at trial determines the law to be charged . . .").

Scott premises his argument—that performing the martial arts move was reckless—on his belief that the "shiny and silver" object Nelson pulled from her pocket was a knife. He argues he exceeded the amount of justifiable force because the combination of his action and the presence of the knife created a danger to Nelson that could support a jury finding that he consciously disregarded the risk his conduct created. *See State v. Brayboy*, 387 S.C. 174, 180, 691 S.E.2d 482, 485 (Ct. App. 2010) ("Recklessness is a state of mind in which the actor is aware of his or her conduct, yet consciously disregards a risk which his or her conduct is creating." (citation omitted)). The argument is counterintuitive. If Nelson approached Scott in a manner that gave him a reasonable fear of imminent bodily harm, but she had no knife, Scott would be entitled to use a reasonable amount of force to defend himself. *See generally State v. Dickey*, 394 S.C. 491, 499, 716 S.E.2d 97, 101 (2011) (providing a person may use reasonable force in defending himself when he "believed he was in imminent danger" and "a reasonable prudent man . . . would have entertained the same belief" (citation omitted)). However, under Scott's version of the facts, in which Nelson approached Scott with a knife, the degree of force Scott was entitled to use increased, not decreased, based on the heightened threat posed by the knife. *See Douglas v. State*, 332 S.C. 67, 72, 504 S.E.2d 307, 309 (1998) (stating the law allows a defendant "the right to use as much force as required for his complete protection from loss of life or serious bodily harm" (citation omitted)). Thus, the circumstance Scott relies on to argue he recklessly exceeded justifiable force—Nelson's possession of a knife—actually justifies the use of more force. This is the basis on which the trial court refused to charge involuntary manslaughter, and we agree with the trial court's reasoning.

² Scott asserts only that his conduct falls under the second definition of involuntary manslaughter. Thus, we do not address whether Scott was engaged in "an unlawful activity not naturally tending to cause death or great bodily harm" for the purposes of determining whether he was entitled to an involuntary manslaughter charge. *See id.* (addressing only the second definition of involuntary manslaughter when the defendant did not seek a charge under the first definition).

III. *State v. Light*

Scott cites *State v. Light*, 378 S.C. 641, 651, 664 S.E.2d 465, 470 (2008), to support his argument. We find *Light* is inapplicable to this case because the supreme court's ruling in *Light* depended on the existence of evidence showing the defendant acted unintentionally. From that evidence, the court found the jury could infer the defendant acted recklessly. *Id.* Here, there is no evidence Scott acted unintentionally. Therefore, Scott's argument that we may find evidence of recklessness based on the reasoning of *Light* is misplaced.

In *Light*, the victim pulled a gun on the defendant. 378 S.C. at 645-46, 664 S.E.2d at 467. When the defendant "jerked the weapon out of [the victim's] hand, . . . it fired." 378 S.C. at 646, 664 S.E.2d at 467. The defendant admitted he had possession of the gun "when it went off," 378 S.C. at 644, 664 S.E.2d at 466, but claimed "it was not intentional[]." 378 S.C. at 646, 664 S.E.2d at 467. The supreme court found there was evidence that the defendant "recklessly handled the gun because . . . it fired almost immediately after he took possession of it." 378 S.C. at 648, 664 S.E.2d at 469.

The *Light* court's discussion of *State v. Pickens*, 320 S.C. 528, 466 S.E.2d 364 (1996), indicates the *Light* court relied on evidence that the defendant unintentionally fired the gun to find the defendant's conduct was reckless. In *Pickens*, the court held the defendant was not entitled to a charge of involuntary manslaughter when he "admit[ted] he intentionally shot his gun, but that he did so while acting lawfully but recklessly in defending himself." *Light*, 378 S.C. at 650, 664 S.E.2d at 470. The *Light* court clarified its holding in *Pickens*, stating,

[A] self-defense charge and an involuntary manslaughter charge are not mutually exclusive, as long as there is any evidence to support both charges. When there is a factual issue as to whether the shooting was committed intentionally in self-defense or was committed unintentionally, then the defendant is entitled to both charges as there is "any evidence" to support each charge.

378 S.C. at 650-51, 664 S.E.2d at 470 (internal citations omitted).

The evidence in *Light* that distinguished the case from *Pickens* was evidence that the defendant did not intentionally fire the gun.³ *Light*, 378 S.C. at 648, 664 S.E.2d at 468-69. Thus, the *Light* court held an involuntary manslaughter charge was warranted because there was a factual issue as to whether the defendant fired the gun intentionally in self-defense, or unintentionally in the course of a struggle. 378 S.C. at 651, 664 S.E.2d at 470. Here, there is no evidence Scott acted unintentionally. Therefore, we find *Light* is inapplicable.

IV. Conclusion

We find the trial court correctly refused to charge involuntary manslaughter. The decision of the trial court is **AFFIRMED**.

KONDUROSO, J., concurs.

PIEPER, J., dissenting.

I respectfully dissent and would find the evidence in the record warrants an involuntary manslaughter charge. *See State v. Wharton*, 381 S.C. 209, 216, 672 S.E.2d 786, 789 (2009) ("If there is any evidence warranting a charge on involuntary manslaughter, then the charge must be given."). Accordingly, I would find the trial court erred by failing to charge involuntary manslaughter, and I would reverse and remand for a new trial.

³ *See also State v. Burriss*, 334 S.C. 256, 265 n.10, 513 S.E.2d 104, 109 n.10 (1999) ("*Pickens* may be distinguished from this case because there we based our decision on the fact [the] defendant admitted he shot intentionally. Here, Appellant claimed the shooting was not intentional." (internal citation omitted)).