



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

December 08, 2021

Laura Toney
PO Box 722
Bishopville SC 29010

Re: Laura Toney v. USA
Appellate Case No. 2019-000361

Dear Ms. Toney:

Enclosed is the decision of the Court. The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules.

Very truly yours,

V. Claire Allen

CLERK

cc: US Department of Agriculture
The Honorable George M. McFaddin, Jr.

**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**

Laura Toney, Appellant,

v.

United States of America, United States Department of
Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration,
Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2019-000361

Appeal From Lee County
George M. McFaddin, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2021-UP-440
Submitted October 1, 2021 – Filed December 8, 2021

AFFIRMED

Laura Toney, of Bishopville, pro se.

PER CURIAM: Laura Toney appeals the circuit court's dismissal of her case against "the United States of America, acting through the Farmers Home Administration, [and the] United States Department of Agriculture." On appeal, Toney argues the circuit court erred because (1) the circuit court "had general jurisdiction over this case because it deal[t] with [s]tate issues" and (2) she was entitled to a default judgment. Because the circuit court properly determined it did not have jurisdiction, we affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the

following authorities: *United States v. Bormes*, 568 U.S. 6, 9-10 (2012) ("Sovereign immunity shields the United States from suit absent a consent to be sued that is "unequivocally expressed." (quoting *United States v. Nordic Vill., Inc.*, 503 U.S. 30, 33-34 (1992))); *United States v. Mitchell*, 463 U.S. 206, 212 (1983) ("It is axiomatic that the United States may not be sued without its consent and that the existence of consent is a prerequisite for jurisdiction."); *Fed. Deposit Ins. Co. v. Meyer*, 510 U.S. 471, 475 (1994) ("Sovereign immunity is jurisdictional in nature."); *id.* ("Absent a waiver, sovereign immunity shields the [f]ederal [g]overnment and its agencies from suit."); *Robinson v. U.S. Dep't of Educ.*, 917 F.3d 799, 801 (4th Cir. 2019) ("A waiver of the [f]ederal [g]overnment's sovereign immunity must be unequivocally expressed in statutory text . . . and will not be implied." (omission by court) (quoting *Lane v. Pena*, 518 U.S. 187, 192 (1996))).¹

AFFIRMED.²

LOCKEMY, C.J., and WILLIAMS and MCDONALD, JJ., concur.

¹ Because the circuit court properly determined it did not have jurisdiction, we need not reach Toney's remaining issue. *See Futch v. McAllister Towing of Georgetown, Inc.*, 335 S.C. 598, 613, 518 S.E.2d 591, 598 (1999) (stating an appellate court need not review remaining issues when its determination of a prior issue is dispositive of the appeal).

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