

RECEIVED

Jun 01 2023

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COURT OF APPEALS

Daryl Parker,

Appellant,

v.

Orangeburg County,

Respondent.

REPLY BRIEF
Appellant Case No. 2022-001462



Skyler B. Hutto, Esquire (S.C. Bar 102741)
1281 Russell Street
Post Office Box 1084
Orangeburg, SC 29115
Tel: (803) 534-5218
Fax: (803) 536-6544
Email: skyler@williamsattys.com

Counsel for Appellant Daryl Parker

Table of Contents

REPLY BRIEF i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES 3

ARGUMENT4

PROOF OF SERVICE..... 7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Steinke v. S.C. Dept. of Labor, Licensing</i> , 336 S.C. 373 (1999).....	5
<i>Repko v. Cnty of Georgetown</i> , 424 S.C. 494 (2018).....	5
<i>Chakrabarti v. City of Orangeburg</i> , 403 S.C. 308 (2018).....	8

Statutes

S.C. Code Ann. § 24-5-90.....	4
S.C. Code Ann. § 44-23-220.....	4
S.C. Code Ann. § §24-5-10.....	5
South Carolina Tort Claims Act	5

ARGUMENT IN REPLY

RESPONDENT'S ARGUMENT FAILS TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES CENTRAL TO THE COURT'S CONSIDERATION.

Respondent, in its brief, focuses on the nature of Appellant's challenge to this Court. Respondent has focused its arguments in three prongs: "Respondent is required to detain individuals subject to confirmed, valid, bench warrants" and "Respondent has no discretion, authority to cancel or rescind bench warrants" and "Respondent used due care, as a matter of law, in regard to Appellant's detention."

These categorizations in themselves are reductive as applied to Appellant's position. Appellant was, undoubtedly, held longer than he should have been under the applicable criminal law. Appellant was responsible for, under the terms of his plea agreement in General Sessions, either a fine of one hundred dollars (\$100) plus court costs or thirty (30) days in jail. As previously noted, these thirty days would convert to a sentence of approximately twenty-one (21) days, well before the date when Appellant was held by the Orangeburg County Detention Center.

Appellant does not quarrel with portions of the Appellant's argument. It is within the purview of an arresting officer and detaining agency to detain someone with a bench warrant, at least initially, in the scenario presented by Appellant. It is also not immediately the responsibility of these entities to question a warrant issued by the Circuit Court. However, the Appellant's case extends beyond these purported limits. Numerous state statutes make it clear that jails have a duty to the people whom they house. *See, e.g.*, S.C. Code Ann. § 24-5-90 (not permitting discrimination against prisoners) and S.C. Code Ann. § 44-23-220 (not allowing mentally ill persons to be housed merely for safekeeping). These statutes and others like them demonstrate that prisoners are not held or treated pursuant to the whims of the State or the corrections system.

The Orangeburg County Detention Center does not abandon its duties to its inmates after their booking. S.C. Code Ann. § 24-5-10 has been interpreted to not permit jails to refuse bookings; however, the detention center's duties continue on. Appellant was in the detention center for multiple weeks. The failure of the detention center was and is that Appellant was housed there for weeks beyond the exhaustion of his maximum sentence. The Respondent took no steps to release Appellant and took no steps to alert a clerk of court, judge, or any person capable of addressing the Appellant's detention. Appellant took steps on multiple occasions to alert staff to his situation and his requests were ignored. This further emphasizes the ongoing duties of Respondent that Respondent breached through its failures to act.

With respect to Respondent's arguments regarding the Tort Claims Act, the South Carolina Supreme Court holds that under the SCTCA, "when an exception containing the gross negligence standard applies, that same standard will be read into any other applicable exception. Otherwise, portions of the Act would be a nullity, which the Legislature could not have intended." *Steinke v. S.C. Dept. of Labor, Licensing*, 336 S.C. 373, 398, 520 S.E.2d 142 (1999); see *Repko v. Cnty of Georgetown*, 424 S.C. 494, 507, 818 S.E.2d 743, 750 (2018) (holding that "in order for the gross negligence standard from one immunity provision to be read into an immunity provision that does not contain a gross negligence standard, the immunity provision containing the gross negligence standard must first apply to the case"); *Chakrabarti v. City of Orangeburg*, 403 S.C. 308, 320, 743 S.E.2d 109, 115 (Ct. App. 2013) ("We hold that when an exception containing the gross negligence standard applies, that same standard will be read into any other applicable exception."). As numerous provisions of the Tort Claims Act raised by the Respondents in this defense contain a gross negligence standard, including but not limited to exemption (25), the gross negligence standard should be read into all other exemptions, such that none of the exemptions operate as a complete bar to recovery.

CONCLUSION

Appellant reiterates the absurdity of his predicament; Respondent has indicated that no issues were presented by Appellant's continued detention. This means that Appellant could have been held indefinitely with no civil remedy. This cannot be the case.



Skyler B. Hutto, Esquire (S.C. Bar 102741)
1281 Russell Street
Post Office Box 1084
Orangeburg, SC 29115
Tel: (803) 534-5218
Fax: (803) 536-6544
Email: skyler@williamsattys.com

Counsel for Appellant Daryl Parker

RECEIVED

Jun 01 2023

SC Court of Appeals

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COURT OF APPEALS**

Daryl Parker,

Appellant,

v.

Orangeburg County,

Respondent.

PROOF OF SERVICE
Appellant Case No. 2022-001462

I certify that I have served the Appellant's Argument in Reply on opposing counsel, Alison D. Hood Ness & Jett LLC, by mailing U.S. Postal Service to the address PO Box 909 Bamberg, SC 29003.

May 5, 2023

Skyler B. Hutto, Esquire (S.C. Bar 102741)
1281 Russell Street
Post Office Box 1084
Orangeburg, SC 29115
Tel: (803) 534-5218
Fax: (803) 536-6544
Email: skyler@williamsattys.com
Counsel for Appellant Daryl Parker