

**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.

Malik Deon White, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2023-000164

Appeal From Beaufort County
Brooks P. Goldsmith, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2025-UP-068
Submitted February 1, 2025 – Filed February 26, 2025

AFFIRMED

Deputy Chief Appellate Defender Wanda H. Carter, of
Columbia, for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant
Attorney General Joshua Abraham Edwards, both of
Columbia; and Solicitor Isaac McDuffie Stone, III, of
Bluffton, all for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Malik Deon White appeals his conviction for attempted armed robbery and sentence of fifteen years' imprisonment. On appeal, White argues the

sentencing court erred in refusing to award him credit for time served while wearing an electronic monitor. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR.

We hold the sentencing court did not abuse its discretion in refusing to credit White with time served while wearing an electronic monitor because the court was not required to award such credit under the statute. *See State v. Pogue*, 430 S.C. 384, 386, 844 S.E.2d 397, 398 (Ct. App. 2020) ("A sentence will not be overturned absent an abuse of discretion . . ."); *State v. King*, 367 S.C. 131, 136, 623 S.E.2d 865, 868 (Ct. App. 2005) ("An abuse of discretion occurs when the decision by the [sentencing court] is based on an error of law."); S.C. Code Ann. § 24-13-40 (2025) ("In every case in computing the time served by a prisoner, full credit against the sentence *must* be given for time served prior to trial and sentencing, and *may* be given for any time spent under monitored house arrest." (emphasis added)).

AFFIRMED.¹

THOMAS, HEWITT, and CURTIS, JJ., concur.

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