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.
Rosalinda Obregon-Mejia, Miguel Diaz-Duran, et al, Defendants,
v.
Dulce Navarrete, Third-Party Intervenor, Respondent,
and
Jane Doe and John Doe, Fourth-Party Intervenors, Respondents,
Of whom Miguel Diaz-Duran is the Appellant,
and
Rosalinda Obregon-Mejia is a Respondent.
In the interest of minors under the age of eighteen.
Appellate Case No. 2017-002063
Anneal From Anderson County

Appeal From Anderson County Karen F. Ballenger, Family Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2018-UP-459 Submitted November 6, 2018 – Filed December 6, 2018

AFFIRMED

Melinda Inman Butler, of The Butler Law Firm, of Union, for Appellant.

Kimberly Yancey Brooks, of Kimberly Y. Brooks, Attorney at Law, of Greenville, as Guardian ad Litem for Appellant.

Kathleen J. Hodges, of Anderson, for South Carolina Department of Social Services.

Thomas Harper Collins, of Harper Collins LLC, of Anderson, for Rosalinda Obregon-Mejia.

William E. Phillips, of Anderson, as Guardian ad Litem for Obregon-Mejia.

Samuel Johnston Briggs, of Briggs Law Firm, of Greenville, for Dulce Navarrete.

Betsy Buchanan Tanner, of Anderson Law Firm, LLC, of Fountain Inn, for Jane Doe and John Doe.

John Marshall Swails, Jr., of Greenville, for the Guardian ad Litem for the minor children.

PER CURIAM: Miguel Diaz-Duran appeals the family court's final order terminating his parental rights to his minor children. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-2570 (Supp. 2018). 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 and relieve Diaz-Duran's counsel.

AFFIRMED.¹

HUFF, SHORT, and WILLIAMS, JJ., concur.

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