

**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.

Brooke Bailey and Joseph Green, Defendants,

Of whom Joseph Green is the Appellant.

In the interest of a minor under the age of eighteen.

Appellate Case No. 2020-001331

Appeal From Horry County
Ronald R. Norton, Family Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2021-UP-093
Submitted March 4, 2021 – Filed March 19, 2021

AFFIRMED

Harry A. Hancock, of Columbia, for Appellant.

Scarlet Bell Moore, of Greenville, for Respondent.

Michael Julius Schwartz, of Russell B. Long, PA; and
Heather Marie Moore, of Axelrod & Associates, PA,

both of Myrtle Beach, for the Guardian ad Litem.

PER CURIAM: Joseph Green appeals the family court's order removing his minor child from his custody, finding he physically abused and physically neglected his minor child, and allowing the Department of Social Services (DSS) to forego reasonable efforts at reunification. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1660(E) (2010) (setting forth findings a family court must make when removing children from the custody of their parents); S.C. Code Ann. § 63-7-1640(C) (Supp. 2020) (setting forth situations when a family court may authorize DSS to forego reasonable efforts at family reunification). 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),¹ we find no meritorious issues warrant briefing. Accordingly, we affirm the family court's ruling and relieve Green's counsel.

AFFIRMED.²

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, and HILL, 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 oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.