

**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**

Michelle Cha Holliman, individually and as personal
representative of the Estate of Allen B. Holliman,
Respondent,

v.

We Are Sharing Hope SC, Medical University of South
Carolina, United Network for Organ Sharing, Jacqueline
Honig, M.D., and Darla Welker, Defendants,

of which We Are Sharing Hope SC and United Network
for Organ Sharing are the Appellants.

Appellate Case No. 2021-000487

Appeal From Charleston County
Debra R. McCaslin, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2023-UP-205
Submitted May 17, 2023 – Filed May 24, 2023

APPEAL DISMISSED

Mary Agnes Hood Craig, of Hood Law Firm, LLC, of
Charleston; Jean Marie Jennings, of Charleston; and
Deborah Harrison Sheffield, of Columbia, all for
Appellant We Are Sharing Hope SC.

Jack G Gresh, of Dodds Hennessy & Stith, LLP, of Mount Pleasant; Lauren Spears Gresh, of Hall Booth Smith, PC, of Mount Pleasant; and Robert L. Widener of Burr and Forman, LLP, of Columbia, all for Appellant United Network for Organ Sharing.

John Carroll Moylan, III, Mary Lucille Dinkins, and James Hunter May, all of Wyche, PA, of Columbia; and Rachael Lewis Anna, of Wyche, PA, of Greenville, all for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: We Are Sharing Hope SC (WASH) and United Network for Organ Sharing appeal the circuit court's order denying their collective motions for a protective order and granting Michelle Cha Holliman's motion to compel WASH to produce documents withheld on a claim of peer review privilege. This order is not immediately appealable under section 44-7-394 of the South Carolina Code (2018) because WASH is not "a hospital or affected person." Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Grosshuesch v. Cramer*, 377 S.C. 12, 30, 659 S.E.2d 112, 122 (2008) ("[D]iscovery orders, in general, are interlocutory and are not immediately appealable because they do not, within the meaning of the appealability statute, involve the merits of the action or affect a substantial right."); § 44-7-394(C) ("If the court orders a hospital or affected person to produce documents to a third party under this section, the hospital or affected person shall have the right to immediately appeal that order"); § 44-7-394(B) ("For purposes of this section an 'affected person' means a *person*" (emphasis added)).

APPEAL DISMISSED.¹

WILLIAMS, C.J., and VINSON and VERDIN, JJ., concur.

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