

**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**

Patrick Williams, Appellant,

v.

Tyisha Alford, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2017-001423

---

Appeal From Richland County  
Michelle M. Hurley, Family Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2020-UP-282  
Submitted September 1, 2020 – Filed October 7, 2020

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Patrick Williams, of Columbia, pro se.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Patrick Williams (Father) appeals a June 19, 2017 order from the family court. On appeal, Father argues the family court erred by (1) rendering a decision based on his health without proof from medical records, (2) ruling against him after he complied with the family court's prior order, (3) finding he did not properly serve Tyisha Alford (Mother), and (4) modifying his visitation when he initiated the hearing by seeking a rule to show cause against Mother.

This court cannot conduct a de novo review because Father did not produce a sufficient record. Accordingly, we affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Simmons v. Simmons*, 392 S.C. 412, 414, 709 S.E.2d 666, 667 (2011) ("In appeals from the family court, this [c]ourt reviews factual and legal issues de novo."); *Taylor v. Taylor*, 294 S.C. 296, 299, 363 S.E.2d 909, 911 (Ct. App. 1987) ("The burden is on the appellant to furnish a sufficient record on appeal from which this court can make an intelligent review."); Rule 210(h), SCACR ("[T]he appellate court will not consider any fact which does not appear in the Record on Appeal."); *State v. Hutto*, 279 S.C. 131, 132, 303 S.E.2d 90, 91 (1983) (affirming the ruling of the trial court after finding the appellant "ha[d] not met its burden of presenting a record which [was] sufficiently complete to permit this [c]ourt to review the [trial] court's actions" because the appellant failed to include trial testimony in the record on appeal).

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>1</sup>

**THOMAS, HILL, and HEWITT, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.