

**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.

Jason Scott Morton, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2015-002641

Appeal From Chester County
Brian M. Gibbons, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2018-UP-372
Submitted September 1, 2018 – Filed October 10, 2018

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender David Alexander, of Columbia, for
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant
Attorney General William Frederick Schumacher, IV,
both of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following
authorities: *State v. Copeland*, 321 S.C. 318, 324, 468 S.E.2d 620, 624 (1996)
("The trial court has broad discretion when dealing with the propriety of the
[State]'s argument . . ."); *id.* ("The trial court's discretion will not be overturned

absent a showing of an abuse of discretion amounting to an error of law that prejudices the defendant."); *id.* at 324, 468 S.E.2d at 624-25 ("On appeal, the appellate court will view the alleged impropriety of the [State]'s argument in the context of the entire record. The appellant has the burden of proving [he] did not receive a fair trial because of the alleged improper argument."); *Humphries v. State*, 351 S.C. 362, 373, 570 S.E.2d 160, 166 (2002) ("The relevant question is whether the [State]'s comments so infected the trial with unfairness as to make the resulting conviction a denial of due process."); *State v. Hornsby*, 326 S.C. 121, 129, 484 S.E.2d 869, 873 (1997) ("A denial of due process occurs when a defendant in a criminal trial is denied the fundamental fairness essential to the concept of justice.").

AFFIRMED.¹

KONDUROS, MCDONALD, and HILL, JJ., concur.

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