

**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**

Matthew S. Harris, Appellant,

v.

South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and  
Pardon Services, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2013-001399

---

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court  
John D. McLeod, Administrative Law Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2014-UP-408  
Submitted September 1, 2014 – Filed December 17, 2014

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Matthew S. Harris, of Bennettsville, pro se.

Tommy Evans, Jr., of the South Carolina Department of  
Probation, Parole and Pardon Services, of Columbia, for  
Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Matthew S. Harris appeals the order of the Administrative Law Court (ALC) affirming the denial of his parole and summarily dismissing his appeal with prejudice. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Cooper v. S.C. Dep't of Prob., Parole & Pardon Servs.*, 377

S.C. 489, 500, 661 S.E.2d 106, 112 (2008) ("[T]he Parole Board may avoid [reversal] if it clearly states in its order denying parole that it considered the factors outlined in section 24-21-640 [of the South Carolina Code (Supp. 2013)] and the fifteen factors published in its parole form. If the Board complies with this procedure, the decision will constitute a routine denial of parole and the ALC would have limited authority to review the decision to determine whether the Board followed proper procedure. Under that scenario, the ALC can summarily dismiss the inmate's appeal."); *Howard v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 399 S.C. 618, 629-30, 733 S.E.2d 211, 217-18 (2012) (acknowledging the South Carolina Legislature's authority to limit the subject matter jurisdiction of the ALC, but holding that the inmate appeals listed in subsection 1-23-600(D) of the South Carolina Code (Supp. 2013), are reviewable if they implicate a state-created liberty or property interest); *James v. S.C. Dep't of Prob., Parole & Pardon Servs.*, 376 S.C. 392, 396, 656 S.E.2d 399, 401 (Ct. App. 2008) ("[A]n inmate has a liberty interest in gaining *access* to the parole board, although there is no protected right to parole.").<sup>1</sup>

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>2</sup>

**WILLIAMS, GEATHERS, and McDONALD, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Harris's argument that the ALC erred in not adjudicating his FOIA claim is without merit because the ALC does not have jurisdiction to rule on FOIA claims. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-100(a) (2007) ("Any citizen of the State may apply to the circuit court for either or both a declaratory judgment and injunctive relief to enforce the provisions of this chapter in appropriate cases"); *Martin v. Ellisor*, 264 S.C. 202, 205, 213 S.E.2d 732, 733 (1975) (interpreting the FOIA statute as granting exclusive jurisdiction to the circuit court in FOIA matters).

<sup>2</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.