



the inmate's grievance does not implicate a state-created liberty or property interest." *Id citing Sandin v. Conner*, 515 U.S. 472, 115 S.Ct. 2293 (1995).

When reviewing the Department's decisions in inmate grievance matters, the court sits in an appellate capacity. *SCDC v. Mitchell*, 377 S.C. 256, 659 S.E.2d 233 (Ct. App. 2008). Consequently, the review in these inmate grievance cases is limited to the Record presented.

In this case, the Appellant's denial of the opportunity to see a medical specialist is clearly not a state-created liberty or property interest. As such, this is a case in which this court must adhere to the traditional "hands off" doctrine regarding judicial involvement in prison disciplinary procedure and other internal prison matters. See *Pruitt v. State*, 274 S.C. 565, 266 S.E.2d 779 (1980) and *Al-Shabazz v. State*, 338 S.C. 354, 527 S.E.2d 742 (2000).

**THEREFORE**, for the foregoing reasons, the decision appealed from is **AFFIRMED** and this appeal is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. Phillip Lenski", written over a horizontal line.

S. Phillip Lenski  
Administrative Law Judge

August 22, 2013  
Columbia, South Carolina