



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

February 09, 2022

Mr. Victor R Seeger, Esquire
1330 Lady Street
Suite 401
Columbia SC 29201

Ms. Ambree Michele Muller, Esquire
PO Box 11549
Columbia SC 29211

Re: The State v. John W. Thomasson Sr.
Appellate Case No. 2019-001517

Dear Counsel:

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: Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Kevin Scott Brackett, Esquire
The Honorable Robert E. Hood

**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.

John W. Thomasson Sr., Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2019-001517

Appeal From York County
Robert E. Hood, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2022-UP-044
Submitted January 1, 2022 – Filed February 9, 2022

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender Victor R. Seeger, of Columbia, for
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant
Attorney General Ambree Michele Muller, both of
Columbia; and Solicitor Kevin Scott Brackett, of York,
all for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: John Wesley Thomasson appeals his conviction and five-year sentence for possession of methamphetamine. On appeal, Thomasson argues the trial court erred in denying his motion for a continuance.

We find the trial court did not abuse its discretion by denying Thomasson's motion for a continuance because he cited no facts showing he could have presented any other evidence had more time been granted. Therefore, we affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Tanner*, 299 S.C. 459, 462, 385 S.E.2d 832, 834 (1989) ("A motion for continuance is addressed to the sound discretion of the trial court and its ruling on such motion will not be reversed without a clear showing of abuse of discretion."); *State v. Williams*, 321 S.C. 455, 459, 469 S.E.2d 49, 51-52 (1996) ("Where there is no showing that any other evidence on behalf of the appellant could have been produced, or that any other points could have been raised had more time been granted for the purpose of preparing the case for trial, the denial of a motion for continuance is not an abuse of discretion."); *State v. Lytchfield*, 230 S.C. 405, 409, 95 S.E.2d 857, 859 (1957) ("[R]eversals of refusal of continuance are about as rare as the proverbial hens' teeth.").

AFFIRMED.¹

THOMAS, GEATHERS, and VINSON, JJ., concur.

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