

**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**

Perry Watford, Appellant,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2014-000768

---

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court  
Deborah Brooks Durden, Administrative Law Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2015-UP-241  
Submitted February 1, 2015 – Filed May 6, 2015

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Perry Watford, pro se.

Daniel John Crooks, III, of the South Carolina  
Department of Corrections, of Columbia, for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Sanders v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 379 S.C. 411, 417, 665 S.E.2d 231, 234 (Ct. App. 2008) ("In an appeal of the final decision of an administrative agency, the standard of appellate review is whether the [Administrative Law Court's] findings are supported by substantial evidence."); *Slezak v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 361

S.C. 327, 331, 605 S.E.2d 506, 508 (2004) ("Summary dismissal may be appropriate where the inmate's grievance does not implicate a state-created liberty or property interest."); *Brown v. Evatt*, 322 S.C. 189, 195, 470 S.E.2d 848, 851 (1996) ("[An inmate] has no liberty interest in his security and custody classification."); *Skipper v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 370 S.C. 267, 275, 633 S.E.2d 910, 914 (Ct. App. 2006) ("[T]he classifications . . . of prisoners in such institutions are matters of prison administration, within the discretion of the prison administrators, and do not require fact-finding hearings as a prerequisite for the exercise of such discretion." (quoting *Altizer v. Paderick*, 569 F.2d 812, 812-13 (4th Cir. 1978))).

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

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

---

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