

**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.

Andrea Pruitt and Joseph Pennington, Defendants,

Of whom Andrea Pruitt is the Appellant.

In the interest of minors under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2019-002058

Appeal From Greenville County
Karen S. Roper, Family Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2020-UP-135
Submitted May 7, 2020 – Filed May 12, 2020

AFFIRMED

Kimberly Yancey Brooks, of Kimberly Y. Brooks,
Attorney at Law, of Greenville, for Appellant.

Rebecca Rush Wray, of South Carolina Department of
Social Services, of Greenville, for Respondent.

Don J. Stevenson, of Don J. Stevenson, Attorney at Law,
of Greenville, for the Guardian ad Litem.

PER CURIAM: Andrea Pruitt appeals the family court's order finding Pruitt's home was not safe for reunification, an extension should not be granted, and a permanent plan of termination of parental rights and adoption was in the children's best interests. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1700 (Supp. 2019). 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), we find no meritorious issues warrant briefing. Accordingly, we affirm the family court's ruling. Pruitt's counsel's motion to be relieved is granted.

AFFIRMED.¹

LOCKEMY, C.J., and GEATHERS and HEWITT, JJ., concur.

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