

**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.

Edmund Antonio Pinckney, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2019-001563

Appeal From Greenville County
Edward W. Miller, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2022-UP-195
Submitted March 1, 2022 – Filed May 18, 2022

AFFIRMED

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

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant
Attorney General Mark Reynolds Farthing, both of
Columbia, and William W. Wilkins, III, of Greenville,
for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Edmund Antonio Pinckney appeals his concurrent sentences of ten years' imprisonment for two counts of shoplifting. On appeal, he argues the plea court improperly took into consideration more serious charges, of which he

was previously acquitted, and the plea court erred in denying his motion to reconsider his sentences. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Wilson*, 345 S.C. 1, 5, 545 S.E.2d 827, 829 (2001) ("In criminal cases, the appellate court sits to review errors of law only."); *In re M.B.H.*, 387 S.C. 323, 326, 692 S.E.2d 541, 542 (2010) ("A [sentencing court] has broad discretion in sentencing within statutory limits."); *id.* ("A judge must be permitted to consider any and all information that reasonably might bear on the proper sentence for a particular defendant."); *id.* ("A sentence will not be overturned absent an abuse of discretion when the ruling is based on an error of law or a factual conclusion without evidentiary support."); S.C. Code Ann. § 16-1-57 (2015) (prescribing Felony E punishment for a third or subsequent offense of "certain property crimes" depending upon the value of the property); S.C. Code Ann. § 16-1-20(A)(5) (2015) (defining a class E felony as one that is punishable by not more than ten years).

AFFIRMED.¹

THOMAS, MCDONALD, and HEWITT, JJ., concur.

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