



# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS  
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
1220 SENATE STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890  
FAX: (803) 734-1839  
[www.sccourts.org](http://www.sccourts.org)

December 14, 2022

Mr. Michael Douglas Ross, Esquire  
PO Box 11549  
Columbia SC 29211-1549

Ms. Susan Barber Hackett, Esquire  
Division Of Appellate Defense  
PO Box 11589  
Columbia SC 29211-1589

Re: The State v. Michael L. Williams  
Appellate Case No. 2019-001759

Dear Counsel:

Enclosed is the decision of the Court. The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules.

Very truly yours,

  
CLERK

cc: Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire  
Melody Jane Brown, Esquire  
Donald J. Zelenka, Esquire  
The Honorable William P. Keesley

**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**

The State, Respondent,

v.

Michael Larone Williams, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2019-001759

---

Appeal From Lexington County  
William P. Keesley, Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2022-UP-449  
Submitted October 1, 2022 – Filed December 14, 2022

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Appellate Defender Susan Barber Hackett, of Columbia,  
for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Deputy  
Attorney General Donald J. Zelenka, Senior Assistant  
Deputy Attorney General Melody Jane Brown, and  
Assistant Attorney General Michael Douglas Ross, all of  
Columbia, for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Michael Larone Williams appeals his convictions for murder and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime and aggregate

sentence of life imprisonment. On appeal, he argues the trial court erred in excluding evidence regarding the victim's toxicology report that he asserts was essential to his defense. We hold the trial court did not abuse its discretion by excluding the toxicology report under Rule 403, SCRE. Any probative value was substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury. Accordingly, we affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *See State v. Pagan*, 369 S.C. 201, 208, 631 S.E.2d 262, 265 (2006) ("The admission of evidence is within the discretion of the trial court and will not be reversed absent an abuse of discretion."); *id.* ("An abuse of discretion occurs when the conclusions of the trial court either lack evidentiary support or are controlled by an error of law."); *Seabrook Island Prop. Owners' Ass'n v. Berger*, 365 S.C. 234, 241, 616 S.E.1d 431, 435 (Ct. App. 2005) ("As a general rule, the admission of evidence is a matter addressed to the sound discretion of the trial court."); *id.* at 242, 616 S.E.2d at 435 ("The trial judge's decision will not be reversed on appeal unless it appears he clearly abused his discretion and the objecting party was prejudiced by the decision."); Rule 401, SCRE (defining relevant evidence as "evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence"); Rule 403, SCRE ("Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, [] misleading the jury, . . . or needless presentation of cumulative evidence."); *State v. Spears*, 403 S.C. 247, 253, 742 S.E.2d 878, 881 (Ct. App. 2013) ("Unfair prejudice means an undue tendency to suggest [a] decision on an improper basis." (alteration in original) (quoting *State v. Gilchrist*, 329 S.C. 621, 627, 496 S.E.2d 424, 427 (Ct. App. 1998))); *State v. Phillips*, 430 S.C. 319, 327, 844 S.E.2d 651, 655 (2020) ("To understand the probative value of any evidence, we must consider what was practically in dispute at trial.").

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

**WILLIAMS, C.J., THOMAS, J., and LOCKEMY, A.J., concur.**

---

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