



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

December 23, 2025

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

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

Re: The State v. Celia E. Windham
Appellate Case No. 2023-000283

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
Ernest Adolphus Finney, III, Esquire
The Honorable George M. McFaddin, Jr.

**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.

Celia Elizabeth Windham, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2023-000283

Appeal From Sumter County
George M. McFaddin, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2025-UP-425
Submitted November 1, 2025 – Filed December 23, 2025

AFFIRMED

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

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Assistant
Attorney General Joshua Abraham Edwards, both of
Columbia; and Solicitor Ernest Adolphus Finney, III, of
Sumter, all for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Celia Elizabeth Windham appeals her conviction for breach of trust with fraudulent intent¹ and sentence of one year's incarceration suspended upon payment of a \$100 fine. On appeal, Windham argues the trial court erred in denying a directed verdict in her favor because section 16-13-230 of the South Carolina Code (2015) requires the State to prove a trust relationship formed between Windham and the victim. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR.

We hold the trial court properly denied Windham's motion for directed verdict because the State presented evidence reasonably tending to prove the elements of breach of trust with fraudulent intent. *See State v. Weston*, 367 S.C. 279, 292, 625 S.E.2d 641, 648 (2006) ("When ruling on a motion for a directed verdict, the trial court is concerned with the existence or nonexistence of evidence, not its weight."); *State v. Harris*, 351 S.C. 643, 653, 572 S.E.2d 267, 273 (2002) ("If there is any direct evidence or any substantial circumstantial evidence reasonably tending to prove the guilt of the accused, an appellate court must find that the case was properly submitted to the jury."); *State v. Brandt*, 393 S.C. 526, 542, 713 S.E.2d 591, 599 (2011) ("When reviewing a denial of a directed verdict, an appellate court views the evidence and all reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the State."); § 16-13-230(A) ("A person committing a breach of trust with a fraudulent intention . . . is guilty of larceny."); *State v. Shirer*, 20 S.C. 392, 408 (1884) ("The question under our act is, whether the party charged received the property in trust, which he afterwards violated. . . ."); *McPhatter v. Leeke*, 442 F. Supp. 1252, 1256 (D.S.C. 1978) ("Although the lending of the car to the petitioner created no fiduciary obligations, his possession of the car nonetheless created a 'trust'. . . . Petitioner's claim that no trust was established is without merit."); *State v. Parris*, 363 S.C. 477, 485, 611 S.E.2d 501, 505 (2005) (Pleicones, J., concurring) ("Because there is evidence that [the defendant] converted the [victim's] money for his own use, thus breaching their confidence, [the defendant] was not entitled to a directed verdict.").

AFFIRMED.²

WILLIAMS, C.J., and THOMAS and CURTIS, JJ., concur.

¹ S.C. Code Ann. § 16-13-230 (2015).

² We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.