

**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.

John Wilson Williamson, III, Respondent.

AND

The State, Appellant,

v.

Corey Lamont Rivera, Respondent.

AND

The State, Appellant,

v.

Keshawn Lamar Kelley, Respondent.

AND

The State, Appellant,

v.

Jasiah M. Brabham, Respondent.

AND

The State, Appellant,

v.

Jericho Knight-Hudson, Respondent.

AND

The State, Appellant,

v.

Shemar McKay Donaldson, Respondent.

AND

The State, Appellant,

v.

Jonathan William Eugene Blocker, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2024-001535

Appeal From Barnwell County
Courtney Clyburn Pope, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2026-UP-416
Heard June 2, 2026 – Filed August 19, 2026

REVERSED AND REMANDED

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General Mark Farthing,
Assistant Attorney General John Benjamin Aplin, all of

Columbia; and Solicitor Bill Weeks, of Aiken, all for Appellant.

Appellate Defender Molly M. Keegan, of Columbia, for Respondents.

PER CURIAM: Reversed and remanded to the magistrate court pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *City of Greer v. Humble*, 402 S.C. 609, 613, 742 S.E.2d 15, 17 (Ct. App. 2013) ("The appellate court's review in criminal cases is limited to correcting the order of the circuit court for errors of law."); *State v. Hilton*, 406 S.C. 580, 584, 752 S.E.2d 549, 551 (Ct. App. 2013) ("Questions of statutory interpretation are questions of law, which are subject to *de novo* review and which [appellate courts] are free to decide without any deference to the court below." (alteration in original) (quoting *State v. Whitner*, 399 S.C. 547, 552, 732 S.E.2d 861, 863 (2012))); S.C. Code Ann. § 14-3-330(2) (2017) (permits an appeal in a case from "[a]n order affecting a substantial right made in an action when such order (a) in effect determines the action and prevents a judgment from which an appeal might be taken or discontinues the action"); S.C. Code Ann. § 22-3-540 (2025) ("Magistrates shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all criminal cases in which the punishment does not exceed a fine of one hundred dollars or imprisonment for thirty days The provisions of this section shall not be construed so as to limit the jurisdiction of any magistrate whose jurisdiction has been extended beyond that stated above."); S.C. Code Ann. § 24-3-965 (2025) ("Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 22-3-540, 22-3-545, 22-3-550, 24-3-950, and 24-7-155, the offenses of furnishing contraband, other than weapons or illegal drugs, to an inmate under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections or to an inmate in a county jail, municipal jail, regional detention facility, prison camp, work camp, or overnight lockup facility . . . *must be tried exclusively in magistrates court.*" (emphasis added)); *State v. Taylor*, 436 S.C. 28, 34, 870 S.E.2d 168, 171 (2022) ("Where a statute's language is plain, unambiguous, and conveys a clear and definite meaning, the rules of statutory interpretation are not needed, and the Court has no right to impose another meaning.").

Because Respondents have not been tried or sentenced, we decline to address sentencing pursuant to the following authorities: S.C. Code Ann. § 24-7-155 (2025) ("It is unlawful for a person to furnish or attempt to furnish a prisoner in any county, municipal, or multijurisdictional jail, prison camp, work camp, or overnight lockup facility with a matter declared to be contraband. . . . A

person violating the provisions of this section is guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, must be punished by a fine of not less than one thousand dollars nor more than ten thousand dollars or imprisonment for not less than one year nor more than ten years, or both."); *Jowers v. S.C. Dep't of Health & Env't Control*, 423 S.C. 343, 353, 815 S.E.2d 446, 451 (2018) ("Our courts will not address the merits of any case unless it presents a justiciable controversy."); *id.* at 353–54, 815 S.E.2d at 451 ("We have explained ripeness by defining what is not ripe, stating 'an issue that is contingent, hypothetical, or abstract is not ripe for judicial review.'" (quoting *Colleton Cnty. Taxpayers Ass'n v. Sch. Dist. of Colleton Cnty.*, 371 S.C. 224, 242, 638 S.E.2d 685, 694 (2006))).

REVERSED AND REMANDED.

WILLIAMS, C.J., and KONDUROS and VINSON, JJ., concur.