



# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS  
CLERK

CATHERINE S. HARRISON  
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)

February 26, 2025

Mrs. Wanda H. Carter, Esquire  
Appellate Defense  
PO Box 11589  
Columbia SC 29211

Mr. Joshua Abraham Edwards, Esquire  
PO Box 11549  
Columbia SC 29211-1549

Re: The State v. Malik D. White  
Appellate Case No. 2023-000164

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  
Isaac McDuffie Stone, III, Esquire  
The Honorable Brooks P. Goldsmith

**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Unpublished Opinion No. 2025-UP-068  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.**<sup>1</sup>

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

---

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