



# 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](http://www.sccourts.org)

May 18, 2022

Mrs. Wanda H. Carter, Esquire  
Appellate Defense  
PO Box 11589  
Columbia SC 29211

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

Re: The State v. Samuel L. Jackson  
Appellate Case No. 2020-000949

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  
Samuel R. Hubbard, III, Esquire  
The Honorable Walton J. McLeod, IV

**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 v. Respondent,

v.

Samuel Lee Jackson, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2020-000949

---

Appeal From Lexington County  
Walton J. McLeod, IV, Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2022-UP-206  
Submitted April 1, 2022 – Filed May 18, 2022

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Deputy Chief Appellate Defender Wanda H. Carter, of  
Columbia, for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant  
Attorney General Ambree Michele Muller, of Columbia;  
and Solicitor Samuel R. Hubbard, III, of Lexington, all  
for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Samuel Lee Jackson appeals his convictions for first-degree domestic violence, first-degree harassment, and tampering with or destroying an electronic monitor and sentence of four years' imprisonment. On appeal, Jackson

argues the plea court erred by denying his sentence reconsideration motion, which in effect denied him the opportunity to have the victim—his wife, Carol Littleton—appear and testify directly to the plea court on his behalf. Because the motion did not include a request that the plea court hold a hearing to allow Littleton to testify on Jackson's behalf, we find this issue not preserved for appellate review. Accordingly, we affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Dunbar*, 356 S.C. 138, 142, 587 S.E.2d 691, 693-94 (2003) (providing that if an issue was not raised and ruled upon below, it will not be considered for the first time on appeal); *id.* at 142, 587 S.E.2d at 694 ("[I]t must be clear that the argument has been presented [to the sentencing court] on that ground.").

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>1</sup>

**WILLIAMS, C.J., and KONDUROS and VINSON, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.