



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

November 26, 2025

Mr. Brian Hollis Gibbs, Esquire
PO Box 11549
Columbia SC 29211-1549

Ms. Jessica M. Saxon, Esquire
1330 Lady Street, Suite 401
PO Box 11589
Columbia SC 29201

Re: The State v. Antonio Anderson
Appellate Case No. 2023-001257

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,

Jasmine D. Smith, Deputy

CLERK

cc: Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
William Benjamin Rogers, Jr., Esquire
The Honorable Paul M. Burch

**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.

Antonio Anderson, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2023-001257

Appeal From Marlboro County
Paul M. Burch, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2025-UP-393
Submitted November 1, 2025 – Filed November 26, 2025

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender Jessica M. Saxon, of Columbia, for
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant
Attorney General Brian Hollis Gibbs, both of Columbia;
and Solicitor William Benjamin Rogers, Jr., of
Bennettsville, all for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Antonio Anderson appeals his convictions for voluntary manslaughter and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime and his concurrent sentences of twenty-one years' imprisonment and five

years' imprisonment. On appeal, Anderson argues the trial court abused its discretion by not instructing the jury on self-defense. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR.

We hold the trial court did not abuse its discretion because the record contains no evidence Anderson had no probable means of escape other than to shoot the victim. Here, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to Anderson, we find the record showed that Anderson had multiple opportunities to escape the fatal confrontation—he could have driven away on three separate occasions, which he admitted at trial, or he could have walked through the open parking lot where no one and nothing blocked his path. *See State v. Wilson*, 345 S.C. 1, 5, 545 S.E.2d 827, 829 (2001) ("In criminal cases, the appellate court sits to review errors of law only."); *id.* at 6, 545 S.E.2d at 829 ("[The appellate court is] bound by the trial court's factual findings unless they are clearly erroneous."); *State v. Gaines*, 380 S.C. 23, 31, 667 S.E.2d 728, 732 (2008) ("To warrant reversal, a trial court's refusal to give a requested jury charge must be both erroneous and prejudicial to the defendant."); *State v. Williams*, 400 S.C. 308, 314, 733 S.E.2d 605, 608-09 (Ct. App. 2012) ("When reviewing the [trial] court's refusal to deliver a requested jury instruction, appellate courts must consider the evidence in a light most favorable to the defendant."); *State v. Light*, 378 S.C. 641, 649, 664 S.E.2d 465, 469 (2008) ("A self-defense charge is not required unless it is supported by the evidence."); *id.* at 650, 664 S.E.2d at 469 ("If there is any evidence in the record from which it could reasonably be inferred that the defendant acted in self-defense, the defendant is entitled to instructions on the defense, and the trial [court's] refusal to do so is reversible error."); *State v. Slater*, 373 S.C. 66, 69-70, 644 S.E.2d 50, 52 (2007) ("To establish self-defense in South Carolina, four elements must be present: (1) the defendant must be without fault in bringing on the difficulty; (2) the defendant must have been in actual imminent danger of losing his life or sustaining serious bodily injury, or he must have actually believed he was in imminent danger of losing his life or sustaining serious bodily injury; (3) if his defense is based upon his belief of imminent danger, defendant must show that a reasonably prudent person of ordinary firmness and courage would have entertained the belief that he was actually in imminent danger and that the circumstances were such as would warrant a person of ordinary prudence, firmness, and courage to strike the fatal blow in order to save himself from serious bodily harm or the loss of his life; and (4) the defendant had no other probable means of avoiding the danger."); *State v. Bixby*, 388 S.C. 528, 554, 698 S.E.2d 572, 586 (2010) ("It is an axiomatic principle of law that [self-]defense has not been established if any one element is disproven."); *State v. Santiago*, 370 S.C. 153, 161, 634 S.E.2d 23, 27-28 (Ct. App. 2006) (ruling the defendant failed to establish self-defense because he had other

means of avoiding the danger such as retreating from the unarmed victim or closing a trunk containing the gun).

AFFIRMED.¹

KONDUROS, GEATHERS, and VINSON, JJ., concur.

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