

RECEIVED

DEC 04 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

Certiorari to Greenville County

Honorable Alex Kinlaw, Circuit Court Judge

CHRISTOPHER ERIC MEJEAN,

PETITIONER

V.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT

APPELLATE CASE NO 2019-000468

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

JESSICA M. SAXON
Appellate Defender

South Carolina Commission on Indigent
Defense
Division of Appellate Defense
PO Box 11589
Columbia, SC 29211-1589
(803) 734-1330

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General

TAYLOR Z. SMITH
Assistant Attorney General
Rembert Dennis Building
1000 Assembly Street, Room 519
Columbia, SC 29201

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

INDEX

INDEXi
COURT OF APPEALS OPINION NO. 2017-UP-259 (S.C. CT. APP FILED JUNE 28, 2017)1

**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.

Christopher Eric Mejean, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2015-001282

Appeal From Greenville County
R. Keith Kelly, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2017-UP-259
Submitted May 1, 2017 – Filed June 28, 2017

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender John Harrison Strom, of Columbia,
for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General Deborah R.J. Shupe,
both of Columbia; and Solicitor William Walter Wilkins,
III, of Greenville, all for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following
authorities: *State v. Harry*, 321 S.C. 273, 277, 468 S.E.2d 76, 79 (Ct. App. 1996)
("A motion for a directed verdict made at the close of the [State's] case is not

sufficient to preserve error unless renewed at the close of all the evidence, because once the defense has come forward with its proof, the propriety of a directed verdict can only be tested in terms of all the evidence." (quoting *Kimbrough v. Commonwealth*, 550 S.W.2d 525, 529 (Ky. 1977)); *State v. Bailey*, 368 S.C. 39, 43 n.4, 626 S.E.2d 898, 900 n.4 (Ct. App. 2006) ("If a defendant presents evidence after the denial of his directed verdict motion at the close of the State's case, he must make another directed verdict motion at the close of all evidence in order to appeal the sufficiency of the evidence.").

AFFIRMED.¹

WILLIAMS and KONDUROS, JJ., and LEE, A.J., concur.

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