

**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**

In the Matter of the Care and Treatment of Tarl Bradford
Rollings, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2017-001334

Appeal From Georgetown County
Steven H. John, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2019-UP-347
Submitted September 1, 2019 – Filed October 16, 2019

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender David Alexander, of Columbia, for
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General Deborah R.J. Shupe,
both of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Tarl Bradford Rollings appeals his commitment to the Department of Mental Health, arguing the trial court erred in refusing to allow him to cross-examine the State's expert witness regarding her income generated from testifying at sexually violent predator trials. Because we find any potential error would have been harmless in light of the other testimony presented concerning the expert's alleged bias, we affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authority: *Way v. State*, 410 S.C. 377, 384, 764 S.E.2d 701, 705 (2014)

("Error is harmless where it could not have reasonably affected the result of the trial." (quoting *Judy v. Judy*, 384 S.C. 634, 646, 682 S.E.2d 836, 842 (Ct. App. 2009))); *id.* at 383-85, 764 S.E.2d at 705-06 (finding any error in allowing the cross-examination about the defendant's expert was harmless and could not have reasonably affected the outcome of the trial).

AFFIRMED.¹

SHORT, THOMAS, and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.

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