

**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.

Derell Green, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2011-201486

Appeal From Charleston County
J. C. Nicholson, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2014-UP-345
Heard September 8, 2014 – Filed October 1, 2014

AFFIRMED

Chief Appellate Defender Robert Michael Dudek and
Appellate Defender Laura Mary Caudy, both of
Columbia, for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Chief Deputy
Attorney General John W. McIntosh, Assistant Deputy
Attorney General Donald J. Zelenka, and Assistant
Attorney General Alphonso Simon, Jr., all of Columbia;
and Solicitor Scarlett Anne Wilson, of Charleston, for
Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Derell Green appeals his murder conviction, arguing the trial court erred in admitting his inculpatory statement. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Pittman*, 373 S.C. 527, 566, 647 S.E.2d 144, 164 (2007) ("In determining whether a confession was given 'voluntarily,' this [c]ourt must consider the totality of the circumstances surrounding the defendant's giving the confession."); *id.* (explaining the totality of the circumstances in determining the voluntariness of a juvenile's confession includes "the youth of the accused, his lack of education or his low intelligence, the lack of any advice to the accused of his constitutional rights, the length of detention, the repeated and prolonged nature of the questioning, and the use of physical punishment such as the deprivation of food or sleep" (quoting *Schneckloth v. Bustamonte*, 412 U.S. 218, 226 (1973))); *id.* at 568, 647 S.E.2d at 165 ("Although courts have given confessions by juveniles special scrutiny, courts generally do not find a juvenile's confession involuntary where there is no evidence of extended, intimidating questioning or some other form of coercion."); *State v. Parker*, 381 S.C. 68, 74, 671 S.E.2d 619, 622 (Ct. App. 2008) ("When reviewing a trial court's ruling concerning voluntariness, this [c]ourt does not reevaluate the facts based on its own view of the preponderance of the evidence, but simply determines whether the trial court's ruling is supported by any evidence." (internal quotation marks omitted)).

AFFIRMED.

HUFF, SHORT, and KONDUROS, JJ., concur.