

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

RECEIVED

Ralph K. Anderson Administrative Law Judge OCT 07 2022

CASE NO. 22-ALJ-04-0113-AP

SC Court of Appeals

William Cathcart, # 249565,

APPELLANT,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections,

RESPONDENT,

INITIAL BRIEF

The Appellant William Cathcart # 249565 hereby appeals the order of the Honorable Ralph K. Anderson III, filed on August 29, 2022. The Appellant received this order on September 13 2022.

Date: 10-4-22

William Cathcart
APPELLANT

Joseph R. Shakibanasab
Office of General Counsel
4444 Broad River Rd
Columbia, SC. 29221-1787

William Cathcart # 249565
MacDougal Corner, First,
1516 Old Gilliland Rd
Midgeville, SC. 29472

Appellant Pro Se

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	pg. 1.
Statement of Issues on Appeal	pg. 2
Statement of the Case	pg. 3.
Argument	pg. 4-5
Conclusion	pg. 5.

TABLE OF CASES

<u>Hill v. United States exrel Wampler</u> 298 U.S. 460 56 S. Ct. 760	pg 4
<u>Easley v. Murray</u> 462 F. 3d 147 (2 nd Cir)	pg 4-5
<u>U.S. v. Marques</u> 506 F. 2d 620, 622 (2d Cir-1974)	pg 5.
U.S.C.A. 14 th Amendment	pg 4

Statement of the Issues on Appeal

Did the Administrative Law Court error when he found the Appellant did not have a Protected Due Process right under the United States Constitution to be sentence to the pronounce sentence of Judge Kinard which was thirty years at 85% of service.

Statement of the Case

The Appellant William Cathcart #249565 was told by a SCDC case worker that he was sentenced to a thirty year mandatory sentence. The Appellant reviewed his sentencing transcript and discovered that the Honorable Judge Kinard sentenced him to thirty years at 85% of service. The Appellant filed a Step 1 Grievance alleging that the sentencing court sentenced him 30 years 85% and the Respondent doesn't have the authority to modify the sentence on January 13 2022. The Step 1 Grievance was denied on February 15 2022. The Appellant filed a Step 2 alleging the violation on February 21 2022. The Step 2 Grievance was denied on March 31, 2022. The Appellant appeal to this Court. The Honorable Judge Anderson was assigned on April 28, 2022. The Honorable Judge Anderson denied the appeal on August 29, 2022. The Appellant Brief follows:

(ARGUMENT)

The Respondent enforcement of a mandatory thirty year sentence violates the Appellants Due Process Right. When the sentencing court did not impose a mandatory sentence at sentencing hearing. Under the U.S. Constitution U.S.C.A. Const. Amend 14

The Honorable Judge Kinard sentence the Appellant to thirty years 85% on May of 1998. (See Transcript pg 67 Lines 24+25, pg. 68 lines 1 thru 3 and pg 5 lines 18 thru 23.) However the Respondent calculated the Appellant sentence as a mandatory thirty years. The Appellant avers that this is an error that is forbidden by the U.S. Constitution and U.S. Supreme Court precedence. The United States Supreme Court held in Hill v. United States exel. Wampler 298 U.S. 460 56 S.Ct. 760.

("The only sentence known to the law is the sentence or judgment entered upon the records of the court.") The Respondent ignored the fact that they do not have the authority to change a Judges sentence. In Easley v. Murray, 462 F.3d 147 (2nd Cir.). The U.S. Court of Appeals held: ("when the sentence as imposed by the sentencing Judge is purportedly altered to reflect something other than the sentence imposed, the source of that alteration is immaterial; whether it is Correctional service administrators or the operation of New York Law that works the alteration, the alteration is of no effect.") (The Respondent position is that by the operation of State Law the mandatory sentence apply. The fact that the Federal Constitution Due Process Clause commands that a judicially imposed sentence includes only those elements explicitly ordered by the sentencing Judge. can't be ignored. Easley v. Murray.) The undisputed fact is that Judge Kinard sentence the Appellant to thirty years at 85%. (See Transcript pg 67 Lines 24+25, pg 68 lines 1 thru 3, and pg 5 lines 18 thru 23.) The only sentence known to the law is the sentence or Judgment entered upon the records of the court; until corrected in a direct proceeding, it says what it was meant to say and this by an irrebuttable presumption. Any alteration to that sentence unless made by a

judge in a subsequent proceeding, is of no effect.
See: Earley v. Murray 451 F.3d 71 (2nd Cir). The only way that the Appellant sentence can be altered is by another judge not the Respondent. When Judge Kinard colloquy with Appellant he orally specified that Appellant will be sentenced to 85% of service. (See transcript pg 67 lines 24+25, pg 68 lines 1 thru 3 and pg 5 lines 18 thru 23.) Holding that the oral sentence constitutes the judgment of the court and that it is that sentence that provides the authority for the execution of the sentence. (See U.S. v. Marques 506 F.2d 620 622 (2d Cir-1974).

Conclusion

The Appellant respectfully request that this court reverse and remand with instruction to release from custody.

Date: 10-4-22

Respectfully Submitted,
William Cathcart
APPELLANT

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

OCT 07 2022

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT
Ralph K. Anderson, Administrative Law Judge
Case No. 22-ALJ-04-0113-AP

SC Court of Appeals

William Cathcart, # 249565,

APPELLANT,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections,

RESPONDENT,

PROOF OF SERVICE

I William Cathcart, # 249565 hereby certify that I have this 4th day of October 2022 mail a copy of the INITIAL BRIEF upon the below listed service was by U.S. mail postage prepaid and addressed as follows:

William Cathcart
APPELLANT

Joseph R. Shokibanasab
Office of General Counsel
4444 Broad River Rd
Columbia, SC 29221-1787

S.C. Court of Appeals
Clerk's Office
1015 Sumter St.
Columbia, SC 29201

