



# 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)

April 21, 2023

The Honorable Renee Elvis  
PO Box 677  
Conway SC 29528-0677

## REMITTITUR

Re: In the Matter of John O'Neil Johnson  
Lower Court Case No. 2006CP2607123  
Appellate Case No. 2021-000249

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Catherine Hannison, deputy".

CLERK

Enclosure

cc: James Kristian Falk, Esquire  
Deborah R.J. Shupe, Esquire  
Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire  
The Honorable Benjamin H. Culbertson

**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 John O'Neil  
Johnson, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2021-000249

---

Appeal From Horry County  
Benjamin H. Culbertson, Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2023-UP-139  
Submitted February 1, 2023 – Filed April 5, 2023

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

James Kristian Falk, of Falk Law Firm, LLC, of  
Charleston, for Appellant.

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

---

**PER CURIAM:** This is an appeal of an order issued pursuant to an annual review hearing under to section 44-48-110 of the South Carolina Code (2018). The circuit court declined to schedule a release hearing for John O'Neil Johnson and directed that he remain confined and in the custody of the South Carolina Department of Mental Health for long term control, care, and treatment pursuant to the Sexually

Violent Predator Act (SVP Act).<sup>1</sup> Johnson appeals, arguing his due process rights were violated because the circuit court improperly weighed the evidence he presented in support of his request for release. We affirm.

Contrary to Johnson's suggestion that no published South Carolina decision has addressed the appropriate probable cause standard under section 44-48-110, *State v. Tucker*, 353 S.C. 466, 578 S.E.2d 719 (2003), which concerned an annual review hearing with competing evidence about the eligibility of a person committed to a sexually violent predator treatment program (SVPTP) for release, is on point and controlling authority. In that case, our supreme court affirmed the circuit court's finding that, notwithstanding an expert opinion that the committed person could be safely released into the community with restrictions, the person failed to establish probable cause that would support a finding that he was safe to be at large and unlikely to commit acts of sexual violence. *Id.* at 468-69, 578 S.E.2d at 721. Furthermore, section 44-48-110 requires the hearing court to schedule a trial on the issue of a committed person's eligibility for release from an SVPTP only if the "the court determines that probable cause exists to believe that the person's mental abnormality or personality disorder has so changed that the person is safe to be at large and, if released, is not likely to commit acts of sexual violence." Considering this provision along with this court's statement in *In re Care & Treatment of Corley*, 365 S.C. 252, 256-57, 616 S.E.2d 441, 443 (Ct. App. 2005), that "in making a probable cause determination in an annual review hearing under the [SVP] Act, the circuit court should substantially comply with Rule 52(a)," SCRCPP, we hold the legislative intent of section 44-48-110 was to entrust the circuit court to review and weigh all the evidence presented at the hearing to determine whether the committed person has carried the burden set forth in *Tucker* "of showing the hearing court that probable cause exists to believe that his mental condition has so changed that he is safe to be released." *See Tucker*, 353 S.C. at 470, 578 S.E.2d at 722. Therefore, we hold the circuit court did not violate Johnson's due process rights in weighing the evidence he presented in support of his request for a hearing to adjudicate his eligibility for release from the SVPTP.

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>2</sup>

**KONDUROUS and VINSON, JJ., and LOCKEMY, A.J., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> S.C. Code Ann. §§ 44-48-10 through -170 (2018).

<sup>2</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.