

**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.

Candice Beasley, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2016-001908

Appeal From Lexington County
Doyet A. Early, III, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2018-UP-418
Submitted October 1, 2018 – Filed November 7, 2018

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender Lara Mary Caudy, of Columbia, for
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General Deborah R.J. Shupe,
both of Columbia; and Solicitor Samuel R. Hubbard, III,
of Lexington, all for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Candice Beasley appeals her conviction of infliction of great
bodily injury upon a child, arguing the trial court erred in denying her motion for a

directed verdict because the record contains no evidence of great bodily harm.¹ We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Weston*, 367 S.C. 279, 292, 625 S.E.2d 641, 648 (2006) ("When ruling on a motion for a directed verdict, the trial court is concerned with the existence or nonexistence of evidence, not its weight."); *id.* at 292-93, 625 S.E.2d at 648 ("If there is any direct evidence or any substantial circumstantial evidence reasonably tending to prove the guilt of the accused, [this c]ourt must find the case was properly submitted to the jury."); *State v. Butler*, 407 S.C. 376, 381, 755 S.E.2d 457, 460 (2014) ("On appeal from the denial of a directed verdict, this [c]ourt views the evidence and all reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the State."); S.C. Code Ann. § 16-3-95(A) (2015) ("It is unlawful to inflict great bodily injury upon a child."); S.C. Code Ann. § 16-3-95(C) (2015) ("'[G]reat bodily injury' means bodily injury . . . [that] causes serious . . . disfigurement . . .").

AFFIRMED.²

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

¹ Beasley was convicted of both infliction of great bodily harm upon a child and unlawful conduct toward a child. Beasley does not challenge her conviction of unlawful conduct toward a child.

² We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.