

**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.

Kristina Arsenault, Frank Russick, Sarah Arsenault, and
John Doe, Defendants,

Of whom Frank Russick is the Appellant.

In the interest of minors under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2022-001700

Appeal From Horry County
Jan B. Bromell Holmes, Family Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2023-UP-267
Submitted July 11, 2023 – Filed July 12, 2023

AFFIRMED

John Brandt Rucker and Allyson Sue Rucker, both of
The Rucker Law Firm, LLC, of Greenville, for Appellant
Frank Russick.

Christopher Craig Jackson, of Chris Jackson Law Firm,
LLC, of Mauldin, for Respondent.

Heather Moore, of Axelrod & Associates, PA, of Myrtle Beach, for the Guardian ad Litem.

PER CURIAM: Frank Russick appeals the family court's final order removing his minor child from his care, granting permanent custody of the child to a relative, authorizing the Department of Social Services to forego reasonable efforts at reunification, and closing the case. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1640 (Supp. 2022); § 63-7-1660 (2010 & Supp. 2022). 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.¹ Accordingly, we affirm the family court's ruling and relieve Russick's counsel.

AFFIRMED.²

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

¹ *See also* S.C. Dep't of Soc. Servs. v. Downer, S.C. Sup. Ct. Order dated Feb. 2, 2005 (expanding the *Cauthen* procedure to situations when "an indigent person appeals from an order imposing other measures short of termination of parental rights").

² We decide this case without argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.