

**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.

Ralph B. Hayes, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2012-213261

---

Appeal From Greenville County  
G. Edward Welmaker, Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2014-UP-385  
Heard September 11, 2014 – Filed November 5, 2014

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Appellate Defender Susan Barber Hackett, of South  
Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense, of Columbia,  
for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Chief Deputy  
Attorney General John W. McIntosh, Senior Assistant  
Deputy Attorney General Donald J. Zelenka, Assistant  
Attorney General Kaycie S. Timmons, all of Columbia;  
and Solicitor W. Walter Wilkins, III, of Greenville, for  
Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Ralph B. Hayes appeals his convictions for murder and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime, arguing he should have received a directed verdict of acquittal because the State failed to present sufficient evidence of his guilt. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b)(1), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Logan*, 405 S.C. 83, 97, 747 S.E.2d 444, 451 (2013) ("Unlike direct evidence, evaluation of circumstantial evidence requires jurors to find that the proponent of the evidence has connected collateral facts in order to prove the proposition propounded—a process not required when evaluating direct evidence."); *State v. Odems*, 395 S.C. 582, 586, 720 S.E.2d 48, 50 (2011) ("[I]f there is any direct or *substantial* circumstantial evidence reasonably tending to prove the guilt of the accused, an appellate court must find the case was properly submitted to the jury."); *State v. Al-Amin*, 353 S.C. 405, 413, 578 S.E.2d 32, 36 (Ct. App. 2003) ("Flight from prosecution is admissible as evidence of guilt."); *State v. Caulder*, 287 S.C. 507, 516, 339 S.E.2d 876, 882 (Ct. App. 1986) ("By incriminating response we refer to any response—whether inculpatory or exculpatory—that the *prosecution* may seek to introduce at trial." (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

**AFFIRMED.**

**FEW, C.J., and THOMAS and LOCKEMY, JJ., concur.**