



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

April 26, 2023

Mr. William M. Blich, Jr., Esquire
S.C. Attorney General's Office
PO Box 11549
Columbia SC 29211

Ms. Kathrine Haggard Hudgins, Esquire
1330 Lady St., Ste.401
Columbia SC 29201

Re: The State v. Terrell D. Knightner
Appellate Case No. 2020-001018

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,

Catherine Hannison, deputy
CLERK

cc: Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Byron E. Gipson, Esquire
The Honorable L. Casey Manning

**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.

Terrell Denard Knightner, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2020-001018

Appeal From Richland County
L. Casey Manning, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2023-UP-161
Submitted April 1, 2023 – Filed April 26, 2023

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender Taylor Davis Gilliam and Appellate
Defender Katherine H. Hudgins, both of Columbia, for
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General William M. Blich,
Jr., and Solicitor Byron E. Gipson, all of Columbia, for
Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Terrell Denard Knightner appeals the plea court's order granting the State's motion to reconsider and reinstating the probation court's order placing Knightner on the sex offender registry. On appeal, Knightner asserts the plea court erred in granting the State's motion to reconsider because no good cause existed to justify placing him on the registry. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR.

Initially, because Knightner did not appeal the plea court's sentencing order stating he would not be placed on the sex offender registry unless he violated the conditions of his probation, the order is the law of the case. *See Smith v. State*, 413 S.C. 194, 196, 775 S.E.2d 696, 697 (2015) (explaining an unappealed ruling, whether right or wrong, is the law of the case (quoting *Atl. Coast Builders & Contractors, L.L.C. v. Lewis*, 398 S.C. 323, 329, 730 S.E.2d 282, 285 (2012))). Additionally, the probation court could not alter provisions in the sentencing order because only the plea court had the authority to determine whether Knightner must register as a sex offender as a condition of his sentencing. *See In re M.B.H.*, 387 S.C. 323, 326, 692 S.E.2d 541, 542 (2010) ("A [sentencing court] has broad discretion in sentencing within statutory limits."); *id.* ("A [sentencing court] must be permitted to consider any and all information that reasonably might bear on the proper sentence for a particular defendant."); *id.* ("A sentence will not be overturned absent an abuse of discretion when the ruling is based on an error of law or a factual conclusion without evidentiary support."); S.C. Code Ann. § 23-3-430(D) (Supp. 2022) ("Upon . . . guilty plea . . . of a person of an offense not listed in this article, the presiding judge may order as a condition of sentencing that the person be included in the sex offender registry if good cause is shown by the prosecution."); *State v. Davis*, 375 S.C. 12, 17, 649 S.E.2d 178, 180 (Ct. App. 2007) ("The statute's plain language dictates that the court's authority for placing individuals in the Registry exists only as a condition of sentencing."); *id.* at 16, 649 S.E.2d at 180 ("[O]nce the Sentencing Judge's order became final, neither he, nor the Probation Judge would be permitted to alter the sentence he had handed down."). As a result, the sentencing order required the probation court to order Knightner to register as a sex offender when he violated his parole, and the plea court properly granted the State's motion to reconsider, reinstating the probation court's order.

AFFIRMED.¹

WILLIAMS, C.J., and GEATHERS and VERDIN, JJ., concur.

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