

**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.

Andre Decosta, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2011-196666

---

Appeal From Beaufort County  
Thomas W. Cooper, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2015-UP-442  
Submitted August 1, 2015 – Filed August 26, 2015

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Appellate Defender Laura Ruth Baer, of Columbia, for  
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant  
Attorney General Mark Reynolds Farthing, both of  
Columbia; and Solicitor Isaac McDuffie Stone, III, of  
Bluffton, for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Andre Decosta appeals his convictions for grand larceny of  
property valued at \$10,000 or more, second-degree burglary, and third-degree

arson, arguing the trial court erred in refusing to suppress evidence obtained as a result of the stop of a vehicle. We affirm.

We find that even if the trial court erred in finding the police officer had reasonable suspicion of criminal activity to justify the stop, the evidence was admissible because the evidence would have inevitably been discovered by lawful means when the officer learned the vehicle's license tag was suspended. *See State v. Spears*, 393 S.C. 466, 482, 713 S.E.2d 324, 332 (Ct. App. 2011) (stating that under the inevitable discovery doctrine, evidence obtained in violation of the Fourth Amendment is admissible "if the prosecution can establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the [evidence] ultimately or inevitably would have been discovered by lawful means"); *State v. Pichardo*, 367 S.C. 84, 97, 623 S.E.2d 840, 847 (Ct. App. 2005) ("Where probable cause exists to believe that a traffic violation has occurred, the decision to stop the automobile is reasonable per se.").

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

**SHORT, KONDUROS, and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.**

---

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