



# 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)

April 29, 2026

Mr. Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire  
PO Box 11549  
Columbia SC 29211-1549

Ms. Kathrine Haggard Hudgins, Esquire  
1330 Lady St., Ste.401  
Columbia SC 29201

Re: The State v. Christopher S. Quick  
Appellate Case No. 2023-001621

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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jenny A. Kitchings".

CLERK

cc: Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire  
The Honorable Alex Kinlaw, 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, Appellant,

v.

Christopher Stephen Quick, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2023-001621

---

Appeal From Greenville County  
Alex Kinlaw, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2026-UP-186  
Submitted April 23, 2026 – Filed April 29, 2026

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Senior  
Assistant Deputy Attorney General Mark Reynolds  
Farthing, both of Columbia, for Appellant.

Senior Appellate Defender Kathrine Haggard Hudgins, of  
Columbia, for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** The State appeals the circuit court's denial of its motion to reconsider Christopher Stephen Quick's sentence for second-degree criminal sexual conduct with a minor. On appeal, it argues the circuit court abused its discretion when it awarded credit for time served under section 24-13-40 of the South

Carolina Code (2025) because Quick was placed under GPS monitoring with an exclusionary zone rather than monitored house arrest. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR.

We hold this issue is not properly before this court because, although the State filed a motion to reconsider Quick's sentence, it did not contemporaneously object to his sentence. *See State v. Cox*, 328 S.C. 371, 373, 492 S.E.2d 399, 400 (Ct. App. 1997) ("[A]n illegal sentence cannot be challenged on direct appeal absent a contemporaneous objection. This concept applies to the State as well as to criminal defendants." (citation omitted)); *id.* at 372-73, 492 S.E.2d at 399-400 (holding the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services's issue was not preserved when it filed a motion for reconsideration, but did not contemporaneously object to the defendant's sentences); *State v. Garner*, 304 S.C. 220, 222, 403 S.E.2d 631, 632 (1991) (finding a sentencing issue was not preserved because "[n]o objection to sentencing was raised at trial"); *State v. Hamilton*, 333 S.C. 642, 648, 511 S.E.2d 94, 97 (Ct. App. 1999) ("[I]t is improper to argue new matter in a motion for reconsideration."); *State v. Salisbury*, 330 S.C. 250, 276, 498 S.E.2d 655, 669 (Ct. App. 1998) ("[A]ny alleged error in sentencing . . . requires a contemporaneous objection to preserve the issue for appellate review."), *aff'd as modified*, 343 S.C. 520, 541 S.E.2d 247 (2001).

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>1</sup>

**THOMAS, MCDONALD, and TURNER, JJ., concur.**

---

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