

**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**

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental
Control, Respondent,

v.

Blessed Births, Inc., d/b/a Blessed Births Family
Wellness and Birth Center, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2016-000190

Appeal From Greenville County
Shirley C. Robinson, Administrative Law Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2017-UP-290
Submitted May 1, 2017 – Filed July 12, 2017

AFFIRMED

Randall Scott Hiller, of Greenville, for Appellant.

Vito Michael Wicevic, of the South Carolina Department
of Health and Environmental Control, of Columbia, for
Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following
authorities: *Risher v. S.C. Dep't of Health & Envtl. Control*, 393 S.C. 198, 204, 712
S.E.2d 428, 431 (2011) ("A decision of the ALC should be upheld . . . if it is

supported by substantial evidence in the record."); *S.C. Dep't of Mental Retardation v. Glenn*, 291 S.C. 279, 281, 353 S.E.2d 284, 286 (1987) ("Substantial evidence is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion."); *id.* at 282, 353 S.E.2d at 286 ("The possibility of drawing two inconsistent conclusions from the evidence does not prevent the agency's findings from being supported by substantial evidence.").

AFFIRMED.¹

LOCKEMY, C.J., and HUFF and THOMAS, JJ., concur.

¹ We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.