

**RECEIVED**

**Aug 29 2023**

**S.C. SUPREME COURT**

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

---

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals  
Appeal from Oconee County  
Honorable Letitia H. Verdin, Circuit Court Judge  
Appellate Case No. 2023-001062

---

THE STATE,

Respondent,

vs.

GARY MARTIN WIRTZ,

Petitioner.

---

**RETURN TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

ALAN WILSON  
Attorney General

MARK R. FARTHING  
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General

Post Office Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
(803) 734-3727

DAVID R. WAGNER, JR.  
Solicitor, Tenth Judicial Circuit

Post Office Box 8002  
Anderson, SC 29622  
(864) 260-4046

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... i

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON CERTIORARI.....1

COUNTER-STATEMENT OF ISSUE ON CERTIORARI .....1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....1

Procedural History. .....1

Factual History. .....2

STANDARD OF REVIEW .....13

ARGUMENT .....14

    The Court of Appeals correctly affirmed the trial judge’s ruling denying Wirtz’s pre-trial motion to suppress the methamphetamine and gun found during the search of a car Wirtz had recently been driving because: (1) Wirtz was lawfully arrested, including on an outstanding arrest warrant, during the course of an encounter with a law enforcement officer; (2) the car, which did not belong to Wirtz and was parked directly in front of the entrance to a private business, had to be impounded and towed pursuant to constitutionally-appropriate policies and procedures due to Wirtz’s arrest; and (3) Wirtz’s contraband was found during the course of a valid inventory search that was properly conducted pursuant to the applicable policies and procedures and for legitimate caretaking purposes, which rendered the search constitutionally reasonable. Furthermore, to the extent the Court of Appeals rejected some of Wirtz’s appellate arguments on issue preservation grounds, those rejected arguments were—just as the Court of Appeals correctly found—not properly preserved for appellate review because they were neither raised to nor ruled upon by the trial judge and, thus, could not properly be considered for the first time on appeal. ....14

CONCLUSION.....23

## STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON CERTIORARI

### I.

“Whether the Court of Appeals erred in holding the State carried its burden to justify the warrantless inventory search of Petitioner’s vehicle where there was a clear investigatory motive on the part of the police rendering the inventory a violation of Petitioner’s rights under the United States and South Carolina Constitution?”

### II.

“Whether the Court of Appeals erred in holding that portions of Petitioner’s argument were not preserved for appellate review?”

## COUNTER-STATEMENT OF ISSUE ON CERTIORARI

Did the Court of Appeals correctly affirm the trial judge’s ruling denying Wirtz’s pre-trial motion to suppress the methamphetamine and gun found during the search of a car Wirtz had recently been driving because: (1) Wirtz was lawfully arrested, including on an outstanding arrest warrant, during the course of an encounter with a law enforcement officer; (2) the car, which did not belong to Wirtz and was parked directly in front of the entrance to a private business, had to be impounded and towed pursuant to constitutionally-appropriate policies and procedures due to Wirtz’s arrest; and (3) Wirtz’s contraband was found during the course of a valid inventory search that was properly conducted pursuant to the applicable policies and procedures and for legitimate caretaking purposes, which rendered the search constitutionally reasonable? Furthermore, did the Court of Appeals correctly reject some of Wirtz’s appellate arguments on issue preservation grounds when those rejected arguments were not properly preserved for appellate review since they were neither raised to nor ruled upon by the trial judge?

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

### Procedural History

In February of 2020, the Oconee County Grand Jury indicted Petitioner Gary Martin Wirtz for trafficking in methamphetamine and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime. On October 12, 2020, a jury trial was commenced in the Oconee County Court of General Sessions with the Honorable Letitia H. Verdin, circuit court judge, presiding. At the conclusion of the two-day trial, the jury convicted Wirtz as indicted. Following the verdict, the trial judge sentenced Wirtz to concurrent terms of imprisonment of twenty-five years for

trafficking in methamphetamine and five years for possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime. Wirtz then timely filed and perfected an appeal.

On appeal, the Court of Appeals—following briefing—issued an unpublished decision unanimously affirming Wirtz’s convictions. State v. Wirtz, Op. No. 2023-UP-172 (S.C. Ct. App. filed May 3, 2023). Thereafter, Wirtz timely filed a petition for rehearing, and the petition was denied. Wirtz then filed a petition for a writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court.

### **Factual History**

Around 4:40 p.m. on the afternoon of July 31, 2019, Sergeant Justin Pelfrey of the Oconee County Sheriff’s Office was on patrol in his law enforcement vehicle and positioned in the parking lot of a church when he observed a car with a cracked windshield drive by his location. (R. pp. 29-30). As soon as the car passed his position, its driver rapidly sped up, which Sergeant Pelfrey perceived as an unusual reaction to the presence of a law enforcement vehicle. (R. p. 30). In response, Sergeant Pelfrey moved to follow the car, and, by the time he caught up to it, its driver had parked it directly under an awning in front of the door to a tractor dealership located in Westminster, South Carolina. (R. pp. 29-31; Court’s Ex. # 3 (Bodycam Recording)).

After catching up to the car, Sergeant Pelfrey parked nearby, exited his vehicle, and approached Wirtz, who had been the car’s driver and was already out of the vehicle by that time. (R. pp. 30-31; Court’s Ex. # 3). Upon doing so, Sergeant Pelfrey asked Wirtz, who was holding a small black bag, about having taken off after passing the officer’s vehicle, and Wirtz denied doing so while contending he was simply going to the store. (R. p. 31; p. 44; Court’s Ex. # 3). Sergeant Pelfrey then asked Wirtz if he had any identification, and Wirtz indicated he did not. (R. pp. 30-32). However, Wirtz proceeded to verbally identify himself—falsely—as “Jeremy”

Wirtz, provided a supposed address, and claimed his birthdate was August 25, 1985. (R. pp. 31-32; p. 52; Court's Ex. # 3).

Following that, Sergeant Pelfrey relayed the information Wirtz had provided to dispatch along with information that had been provided by the car's passenger, who identified herself as Virginia Rowland. (R. p. 32; Court's Ex. # 3). While waiting to hear back from dispatch, Sergeant Pelfrey asked Wirtz if there was any contraband like alcohol, guns, or drugs in the vehicle, and Wirtz denied any was present. (Court's Ex. # 3). Sergeant Pelfrey then requested the insurance and registration information for the car, and Wirtz began looking for that paperwork while asserting the car was registered to his uncle. (Court's Ex. # 3). As he searched, Wirtz attempted to call his uncle to find out where the requested documentation was located, but the passenger found it before Wirtz was able to get into contact with his uncle. (Court's Ex. # 3).

At roughly 4:46 p.m., dispatch reported Jeremy Wirtz's information was all clear while Rowland's driver's license was suspended. (R. p. 32; Court's Ex. # 3). After receiving that information, Sergeant Pelfrey asked Wirtz for the last four digits of his social security number in order to verify his identity, and Wirtz responded he did not know those numbers. (R. p. 33; Court's Ex. # 3). Wirtz's inability to provide even a portion of his own social security number despite being an adult raised the officer's suspicions, so Sergeant Pelfrey posed another basic question by asking Wirtz how old he was at the time. (R. p. 33; p. 48; Court's Ex. # 3). In response to that simple query, Wirtz paused for a moment and then—while not yet providing an answer—asked the officer if he thought he was lying. (Court's Ex. # 3).

At that point, Sergeant Pelfrey handcuffed Wirtz for safety purposes, and Wirtz continued to insist—falsely—his real name was Jeremy. (R. p. 33; Court's Ex. # 3). Wirtz also finally provided an answer concerning his age and claimed to be twenty-five years old. (R. p. 33;

Court's Ex. # 3). However, since Wirtz had previously asserted he was born in 1985, that information could not have been accurate if Wirtz's earlier assertion was true, so Sergeant Pelfrey requested photographs of Jeremy Wirtz and Rowland from dispatch to verify their identities. (R. p. 33; Court's Ex. # 3). He then secured Wirtz in his vehicle while he waited for that information and advised Wirtz he believed he was lying. (R. p. 34; Court's Ex. # 3).

At approximately 4:50 p.m., Wirtz—after apparently giving the matter more thought—advised the officer he was actually thirty-two years old and now indicated he was born on April 25, which Sergeant Pelfrey noted was again inconsistent with the information he had previously provided. (Court's Ex. # 3). The officer then approached Rowland and twice asked her if there was anything in the car he needed to know about it. (R. p. 34; Court's Ex. # 3). In response, Rowland indicated she did not know of anything and insisted she had only obtained a ride home from Wirtz, whom she claimed she knew as Jeremy. (Court's Ex. # 3).

A few minutes later, one of Sergeant Pelfrey's fellow officers arrived at the scene to provide support. (R. pp. 61-62; Court's Ex. # 3). Just after that, Sergeant Pelfrey received a photograph of Jeremy Wirtz from dispatch, showed it to Wirtz, and advised him the photograph was not of him. (Court's Ex. # 3). In response, Wirtz insisted he was the person depicted in the photograph while claiming it was taken before he got tattoos. (Court's Ex. # 3). Sergeant Pelfrey then asked Wirtz if he should look up the information for Gary Wirtz, and Wirtz asserted Gary Wirtz was his brother. (Court's Ex. # 3). Shortly after that, Sergeant Pelfrey pulled up Gary Wirtz's photograph and information, showed it to Wirtz, and advised him it was, in fact, a picture of him. (Court's Ex. # 3). Nevertheless, Wirtz continued to deny he was Gary Wirtz and now claimed to be thirty-five years old. (Court's Ex. # 3).

At that point, Sergeant Pelfrey asked Wirtz what was in the vehicle, advised him he was going to be taken to jail and fingerprinted, and noted his driver's license was suspended. (R. p. 35; Court's Ex. # 3). When confronted with that information, Wirtz claimed he had not actually been driving the car, but the officer quickly pointed out he had personally observed Wirtz doing so. (Court's Ex. # 3). Wirtz then signaled for the sergeant to come speak with him on the other side of the law enforcement vehicle and indicated he was supposed to be going to pick "something" up for someone. (R. p. 35; Court's Ex. # 3). In response, Sergeant Pelfrey again asked Wirtz for his true identity, and Wirtz finally confirmed he was actually Gary Wirtz. (R. p. 35; pp. 48-49; Court's Ex. # 3).

Following that, Sergeant Pelfrey asked Wirtz one more time if there was anything in the car, and Wirtz responded "there was about to be" if the officer would "work" with him. (Court's Ex. # 3). Sergeant Pelfrey then advised Wirtz they were going to search the car, Wirtz stated they would not do so, and Sergeant Pelfrey responded by explaining they had to search it because they were going to be inventorying and towing it. (R. p. 36; p. 49; Court's Ex. # 3). Upon hearing that, Wirtz continued to protest to any search being conducted but responded: "Well, they can tow it." (R. p. 36; Court's Ex. # 3).

Shortly thereafter, Sergeant Pelfrey informed the other officers Wirtz was going to be taken to jail for driving on a suspended license and the car would be inventoried prior to towing. (R. p. 49; Court's Ex. # 3). The sergeant then asked dispatch to check Wirtz's information, and dispatch quickly confirmed Wirtz had an outstanding arrest warrant. (Court's Ex. # 3). Upon learning of that information, Sergeant Pelfrey alerted Wirtz of the warrant's existence, advised him of his rights, and again asked him if there was anything in the car. (Court's Ex. # 3). Once again, Wirtz claimed there was nothing inside it. (Court's Ex. # 3). Sergeant Pelfrey then again

advised Wirtz the car was going to be inventoried and asked Wirtz who he wanted to tow it. (R. p. 36; Court's Ex. # 3). In response, Wirtz stated: "Whoever." (R. p. 36; Court's Ex. # 3).

As Sergeant Pelfrey began to prepare for the inventory search, Wirtz asked him if he was willing to make a deal and claimed he could get them someone they "really want[ed]." (R. p. 35; Court's Ex. # 3). In response, Sergeant Pelfrey—while retrieving a blank inventory form from his vehicle—explained to Wirtz he had to arrest him due to the outstanding warrant. (Court's Ex. # 3). The sergeant then headed toward the car to begin an inventory search at approximately 5:04 p.m., and, as he did, Wirtz insisted there was nothing in the vehicle that needed to be inventoried while requesting the sergeant's supervisor be summoned out. (Court's Ex. # 3).

At that time, the Oconee Sheriff's Office had a written policy governing the agency's procedures for vehicle impoundment and inventory searches. (R. pp. 135-137). Pursuant to that policy, the following procedure was applicable when the driver of a vehicle was arrested:

All vehicles shall be towed when the driver of that vehicle has been arrested, or charged with an offense that does not allow them to operate that vehicle. Except when the driver/owner of the vehicle designates another person within the vehicle (or close by at the discretion of the deputy) to take possession of the vehicle. The designated person must be of responsible age and possess a valid driver's license. In such cases the deputy shall record that person[']s name[,] address, telephone number and driver's license number in their incident report.

(R. p. 36; pp. 135-137). Additionally, the policy specified an officer was to request towing services from a company identified by the vehicle's "driver/owner" so long as a wrecker could arrive at the scene within forty-five minutes, from the closest available company, or from the next company in the agency's rotation for such services. (R. p. 36; pp. 135-137). The policy further dictated an inventory search be performed on "all vehicles towed." (R. pp. 135-137).

Likewise, as to the required documentation, the policy stated:

Deputies will fill out an inventory form completely on all tows, taking special care to note the following:

- i. Vehicle Identification Number (VIN)
- ii. Name and address of the registered owner
- iii. Name and address of the lien holder(s)
- iv. Incident report number
- v. Any damage, defects, etc., with the wrecker operator before the vehicle is towed.

(R. pp. 135-137). Furthermore, the policy stated:

Any time a vehicle is directed to be towed by this agency, a towing information only incident report will be filed, regardless of whether the reason for the tow is criminal or civil. If the tow is due to a situation where an incident report will be filed, a separate towing information only report is not necessary, the appropriate information may be included in the original incident report.

(R. pp. 135-137).

In addition to that, the Oconee County Sheriff's Office also had a procedural manual directing inventory searches be conducted of the entire vehicle, including "the trunk and all containers therein consistent with the caretaker purpose[.]" while expressly delineating the interests such searches serve. (R. pp. 138-139). The procedural manual further directed:

When expedient and practical the inventory should be conducted by two officers (deputy sheriffs), and the interior and exterior of the vehicle photographed when necessary. Non-evidentiary items of significant value found in the vehicle should be removed for safekeeping and afforded adequate security. Contraband for evidence found in the vehicle should be immediately seized and preserved in accordance with existing procedures governing the seizure of physical evidence. A receipt should be given for all items removed from the vehicle. If the doors, the glove compartment, the trunk, or any other containers therein are locked or otherwise sealed, great care should be taken to minimize damage to property while gaining access to conduct the inventory[.]

(R. pp. 138-139). Likewise, the procedural manual stated the inventory search should be "recorded" as directed by the agency's inventory policy. (R. pp. 138-139).

Pursuant to those delineated policies and procedures, Sergeant Pelfrey began conducting the inventory search of the car along with another officer. (R. p. 37; p. 49; p. 62; Court's Ex. # 3). Shortly after he did, Sergeant Pelfrey found the black bag Wirtz had previously been carrying on the car's driver's seat. (R. p. 37; p. 55; Court's Ex. # 3). Upon looking inside it, he

discovered several bags of a crystalline substance, cash, a digital scale, and other items.<sup>1</sup> (R. p. 37; p. 46; Court's Ex. # 3). At that point, Sergeant Pelfrey detained Rowland and then continued on with inventory search while another officer who had arrived at the scene to provide support proceeded with filling out the inventory form. (Court's Ex. # 3). During the renewed search, Sergeant Pelfrey found a loaded pistol hidden underneath the driver's seat. (R. pp. 37-38; p. 40; p. 50; Court's Ex. # 3). He then finished fully searching the interior of the car before examining its trunk, which contained a tattooing kit.<sup>2</sup> (R. pp. 37-38; p. 65; Court's Ex. # 3). Shortly after that, he finished the inventory search and, at approximately 5:11 p.m., asked for the next towing company "in rotation" to be dispatched to the scene to tow the vehicle. (Court's Ex. # 3).

A few minutes later, Sergeant Pelfrey examined the evidence discovered during the search and gathered the currency that had been stored with the drugs. (Court's Ex. # 3). He then brought the money to Wirtz and asked him if it belonged to him, and Wirtz promptly claimed ownership of it.<sup>3</sup> (R. p. 38; Court's Ex. # 3). At that point, the sergeant advised Wirtz the cash had been located with drugs, and Wirtz quickly asserted the money was not supposed to be with "the drugs." (R. p. 38; Court's Ex. # 3). Perhaps realizing the incriminating nature of that remark, Wirtz then rapidly pivoted and stated: "What drugs?" (R. p. 38; Court's Ex. # 3).

Following that, Sergeant Pelfrey spoke with Rowland for a few moments and then discussed the inventory form with the officer who was in the process of completing it. (Court's

---

<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile, one of the other officers looked inside Rowland's bag and found several pills concealed within it. (R. pp. 60-63; Court's Ex. # 3). The pills were later confirmed to be buprenorphine, a controlled substance. (R. pp. 148-150; Court's Ex. # 3).

<sup>2</sup> Significantly, the tattooing kit was the only item of significant value found inside the car aside from the contraband. (R. pp. 64-65; Court's Ex. # 3).

<sup>3</sup> When asked about how much cash he had, Wirtz indicated it should be approximately \$80 to \$90. (R. p. 38; Court's Ex. # 3). In total, the cash found in the bag with the drugs equaled \$82. (R. p. 38; Court's Ex. # 3).

Ex. # 3). During the discussion, Sergeant Pelfrey indicated a tattooing kit was the only item of value found during the search, instructed him to note that on the form, indicated he would also put it in his report, confirmed there was no radio in the car, and asked the officer to also note on the form the inventory search was recorded on his body camera. (Court's Ex. # 3). Sergeant Pelfrey then personally reviewed the inventory form to ensure it was properly filled out, made some edits, and asked the other officer to make sure he signed it. (Court's Ex. # 3).

Thereafter, upon completing his responsibilities at the scene, Sergeant Pelfrey began to transport Wirtz to jail at roughly 5:25 p.m., and, when he did so, Wirtz instructed him he needed to be taken to the hospital. (R. pp. 38-39; p. 51; Court's Ex. # 3). When asked why, Wirtz asserted he had swallowed a "baggie" just before the officer arrived at the scene. (R. pp. 38-36; p. 51; Court's Ex. # 3). In response, Sergeant Pelfrey immediately took Wirtz to the hospital. (R. p. 52; Court's Ex. # 3).

Subsequently, the drugs recovered during the inventory search were submitted to the Anderson Oconee Regional Forensics Laboratory for analysis. (R. pp. 75-78). At the lab, one of the recovered bags was tested, and the crystalline substance inside was determined to constitute a little over eleven grams of methamphetamine. (R. pp. 79-80; pp. 184-150). Based on that, Wirtz was indicted for trafficking in methamphetamine and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime. (R. p. 4; pp. 151-152; pp. 155-156).

Shortly before Wirtz's trial on those charges, defense counsel submitted a written suppression motion challenging the lawfulness of the vehicle search that led to the discovery of Wirtz's methamphetamine and gun. (R. pp. 5-6; pp. 129-130). Through that motion, defense counsel contended the search was unlawful for two distinct reasons: (1) it was supposedly pretextual in nature based on the fact the officer asked Wirtz several times about what would be

found in the car prior to the search; and (2) the Oconee County Sheriff's Office's written procedures purportedly did not contain any provisions "regarding the opening of containers inside the vehicle pursuant to an inventory search." (R. pp. 129-130).

Toward the outset of Wirtz's trial, the trial judge conducted an in limine hearing on defense counsel's motion. (R. p. 5). During that hearing, defense counsel began by indicating she had received supplemental information from the State that contained "the magic language required by the two cases" she had cited to in her written motion. (R. pp. 5-6). As a result, defense counsel indicated she was going to "pivot [her] argument slightly." (R. p. 6). Following that, defense counsel solely contended the drugs should be suppressed because the inventory search was pretextual in nature in light of the motives she believed were reflected by Sergeant Pelfrey asking Wirtz several times what would be found in the car before first mentioning the word "inventory." (R. pp. 6-7). However, in making that argument, defense counsel conceded the officers "did eventually do an inventory" and further conceded "they ha[d] a policy governing it." (R. p. 6). In rebuttal, the solicitor asserted the officers conducted an inventory search after Wirtz was arrested for driving under suspension, on an outstanding arrest warrant, and for providing false information to an officer. (R. pp. 7-8). Furthermore, the solicitor argued the inventory search conducted was proper because it was consistent with the Oconee County Sheriff's Office policies and procedures on such searches. (R. p. 8).

After considering the arguments of counsel and reviewing the recording of the incident, the trial judge denied the suppression motion. (R. pp. 9-11). In doing so, the trial judge ruled: (1) Sergeant Pelfrey acted in full accordance with the applicable agency policy; (2) the policy was constitutionally proper; (3) the decision to tow the car was proper in light of Wirtz's arrest and because the car necessarily needed to be towed from the scene under the circumstances

involved; (4) the officers “acted in accordance with the policy and did not act in a pretextual manner in inventorying” the car; and (5) the bag in which the drugs were found “necessarily need[ed] to be inventoried” in order to protect Wirtz and his property, to protect the officers from allegations of theft, and to protect the officers from anything dangerous that could have been inside it. (R. pp. 9-10).

Following the trial judge’s ruling, the trial proceeded forward. (R. p. 13). During the course of trial, Sergeant Pelfrey recounted the details of the incident leading to Wirtz’s arrest and the discovery of the incriminating evidence. (R. pp. 29-59). As part of his testimony, Sergeant Pelfrey also specifically confirmed he “was going to have to” arrest Wirtz and take him to jail once he learned Wirtz’s true identity and discovered he had both a suspended driver’s license and an outstanding arrest warrant, which occurred prior to the inventory search being conducted. (R. pp. 35-36). Likewise, Sergeant Pelfrey explained he conducted a complete inventory search of the car prior to it being towed pursuant to agency policy, which led to the discovery of Wirtz’s methamphetamine and hidden pistol. (R. pp. 36-38). Furthermore, Sergeant Pelfrey explained inventory searches like the one he conducted were performed for the purposes of: (1) protecting property in the vehicle; (2) protecting against claims something was removed from it; and (3) protecting against harm that could be caused by anything dangerous inside it. (R. p. 36).

After that testimony was presented, the solicitor moved to admit the pistol into evidence, and defense counsel responded: “No objection, Your Honor.” (R. pp. 39-40). Hearing that, the trial judge replied: “All right. Then it’s admitted without objection.” (R. p. 40). Thereafter, similar colloquies occurred when the State sought to admit photographs, including of Wirtz’s gun and methamphetamine, along with the recording of the incident, and the trial judge admitted

that evidence without objection after defense counsel specifically stated she had no objections to those items. (R. pp. 41-42; p. 47; pp. 140-147).

In addition to that, several other witnesses offered testimony related to the incident, including the forensic drug chemist who had confirmed the identity of the methamphetamine. (R. pp. 60-71; p. 80). Once that testimony was admitted, the State moved to admit both the drugs and the chemist's report into evidence, and, once again, the trial judge admitted that evidence "[w]ithout objection" after speaking with and confirming the lack of objections from defense counsel.<sup>4</sup> (R. pp. 81-83).

Ultimately, at the conclusion of trial, the jury convicted Wirtz as indicted after just under forty minutes of deliberations. (R. pp. 121-122). Wirtz then appealed. (App'x p. 2).

On appeal, the Court of Appeals affirmed. (App'x pp. 1-3). In doing so, the Court of Appeals first found the circumstances reasonably justified the impoundment of the vehicle Wirtz had been driving because there were multiple grounds that required Wirtz to be arrested that

---

<sup>4</sup> Because defense counsel explicitly indicated she had no objections to the evidence when it was actually sought to be admitted during trial, defense counsel's earlier objections were *abandoned* instead of simply not renewed, and, therefore, any issue concerning the admission of the evidence found during the inventory search was not properly preserved for appellate review due to the fact that evidence was expressly admitted without objection during trial, which constitutes a compelling reason for Wirtz's petition for a writ of certiorari to be denied in addition to the reasons for which the Court of Appeals correctly affirmed Wirtz's convictions. See Burke v. AnMed Health, 393 S.C. 48, 55, 710 S.E.2d 84, 88 (Ct. App. 2011) ("When a party states to the trial court that it has no objection to the introduction of evidence, even though the party previously made a motion to exclude the evidence, the issue raised in the previous motion is not preserved for appellate review."); State v. Dicapua, 373 S.C. 452, 455, 646 S.E.2d 150, 152 (Ct. App. 2007) ("Dicapua's sole objection to the videotape came in the form of a motion in limine to suppress the videotape because of its lack of audio. Once the State moved to enter the videotape into evidence and publish it to the jury, however, Dicapua's counsel specifically stated he had 'no objection.' We find this amounted to a waiver of any issue Dicapua had with the videotape."); see also State v. Jones, 435 S.C. 138, 144, 866 S.E.2d 558, 561 (2021) ("[A] different approach is warranted where a court rules after a[n in limine] hearing on a constitutional issue. Under those circumstances, the ruling is final and, unless something changes during trial that may reasonably cause the trial judge to alter the pretrial ruling, no further objection is required to preserve the issue for appellate review.").

were discovered by Sergeant Pelfrey soon after he initiated contact with Wirtz. (App'x p. 2). Next, the Court of Appeals found the trial judge correctly determined the officers who conducted the inventory search did not violate the standard written procedures in effect at the time of the incident due to the wording employed in it. (App'x pp. 2-3). Finally, the Court of Appeals found Wirtz's appellate claims the officers purportedly disregarded a requirement regarding the completion of a written inventory form and should have allowed him to contact the car's owner prior to impoundment were not properly preserved for appellate review because those particular claims were neither raised to nor ruled upon by the trial judge. (App'x p. 3).

### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

In criminal cases, appellate courts sit to review errors of law only. State v. Baccus, 367 S.C. 41, 48, 625 S.E.2d 216, 220 (2006). When reviewing a ruling on a constitutional search-and-seizure issue on appeal, the appellate court will "review the trial court's factual findings for any evidentiary support" and treat "the ultimate legal conclusion" as "a question of law subject to de novo review." State v. Frasier, 437 S.C. 625, 633, 879 S.E.2d 762, 766 (2022).

## ARGUMENT

**The Court of Appeals correctly affirmed the trial judge's ruling denying Wirtz's pre-trial motion to suppress the methamphetamine and gun found during the search of a car Wirtz had recently been driving because: (1) Wirtz was lawfully arrested, including on an outstanding arrest warrant, during the course of an encounter with a law enforcement officer; (2) the car, which did not belong to Wirtz and was parked directly in front of the entrance to a private business, had to be impounded and towed pursuant to constitutionally-appropriate policies and procedures due to Wirtz's arrest; and (3) Wirtz's contraband was found during the course of a valid inventory search that was properly conducted pursuant to the applicable policies and procedures and for legitimate caretaking purposes, which rendered the search constitutionally reasonable. Furthermore, to the extent the Court of Appeals rejected some of Wirtz's appellate arguments on issue preservation grounds, those rejected arguments were—just as the Court of Appeals correctly found—not properly preserved for appellate review because they were neither raised to nor ruled upon by the trial judge and, thus, could not properly be considered for the first time on appeal.**

Wirtz contends the Court of Appeals erred by affirming the trial judge's ruling denying the suppression motion based on the purported unconstitutionality of the inventory search. In support of that contention, Wirtz maintains the officers who conducted the inventory search possessed a clear investigatory motive and, thus, the search was constitutionally invalid. Wirtz further maintains the Court of Appeals also erred by finding some of his appellate arguments were not properly preserved for appellate review. To the contrary, the inventory search conducted in Wirtz's case was not improperly pretextual and, instead, was validly conducted pursuant to standardized policies and procedures for legitimate caretaking purposes only after Wirtz was lawfully arrested, which triggered a need for the car he had been driving to be impounded and towed from the scene under the circumstances involved. Therefore, the search that resulted in the discovery of Wirtz's methamphetamine and gun was constitutionally reasonable, the trial judge properly denied Wirtz's suppression motion, and the Court of Appeals correctly affirmed that ruling on appeal. Likewise, just as the Court of Appeals recognized, a number of Wirtz's appellate arguments were neither raised to nor ruled upon by the trial judge,

and, thus, those particular arguments were, in fact, not properly preserved for appellate review. Accordingly, the Court of Appeals committed no error by affirming Wirtz's convictions on appeal. Wirtz's petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Generally, warrantless searches are considered to be unreasonable *per se unless* they fall under an exception to the warrant requirement. State v. Weaver, 374 S.C. 313, 319, 649 S.E.2d 479, 482 (2007). Of the recognized exceptions, the inventory search exception is a "well-defined" one. Illinois v. Lafayette, 462 U.S. 640, 643 (1983); *see* State v. Lemacks, 275 S.C. 181, 183-184, 268 S.E.2d 285, 286 (1980) (rejecting a constitutional challenge to a routine inventory search of a vehicle that was raised pursuant to both the federal constitution and the state constitution). For a warrantless search of a vehicle to be valid pursuant to that exception, the vehicle must be in the lawful custody of police officers, which involves determining whether the officers' decision to impound the vehicle was reasonable under the particular circumstances involved. State v. Miller, 423 S.C. 95, 100, 814 S.E.2d 166, 169 (2018). If a vehicle has been properly impounded, officers are constitutionally permitted to conduct an inventory search of it for the legitimate caretaking purposes of: (1) protecting the vehicle's owner's property while it is in the custody of the police; (2) providing protection against claims of lost, stolen, or vandalized property; and (3) guarding against any dangers that could be posed by the items concealed within the vehicle. Colorado v. Bertine, 479 U.S. 367, 372 (1987); *see* Whren v. United States, 517 U.S. 806, 812 n. 1 (1996) ("An inventory search is the search of property lawfully seized and detained, in order to ensure that it is harmless, to secure valuable items (such as might be kept in a towed car), and to protect against false claims of loss or damage."). However, any such search must be conducted pursuant to standardized criteria, and those criteria must serve the legitimate caretaking purposes that justify inventory searches while also limiting the discretion of

individual officers such that officers are not allowed “so much latitude that inventory searches are turned into a purposeful and general means of discovering evidence of crime.” Florida v. Wells, 495 U.S. 1, 3-4 (1990) (citation and internal quotations omitted). Furthermore, the officers must not act in bad faith in carrying out the inventory search and are not permitted to conduct one for “the *sole* purpose of investigation.” Bertine, 479 U.S. at 372 (emphasis added). Importantly though, the mere fact an officer suspects contraband may be present prior to searching a vehicle is *not* alone sufficient to render an otherwise valid inventory search unreasonable or constitutionally improper unless an investigatory motive is the officer’s sole reason for carrying out the search. See United States v. Magdirila, 962 F.3d 1152, 1157 (9th Cir. 2020) (explaining the mere presence of an investigatory motive or a dual motive—one legitimate and one improper—does not render an inventory search invalid and explaining a pretext analysis involves looking to whether the search would have occurred in the absence of an impermissible reason); United States v. Evans, 781 F.3d 433, 437 (8th Cir. 2015) (“An investigatory motive does not render an inventory search invalid unless that motive is the officers’ sole motivation in carrying out the search.”).

In the case sub judice, Sergeant Pelfrey—within just a few minutes of initiating contact with Wirtz after observing him driving a car with a noticeable crack in its windshield and speeding up suspiciously in response to the officer’s presence—discovered Wirtz: (1) had committed the offense of driving on a suspended license; (2) was currently wanted on an outstanding arrest warrant; and (3) had unlawfully provided false information to the officer about his identity.<sup>5</sup> See S.C. Code Ann. § 16-17-725(B) (“It is unlawful for a person to misrepresent his identification to a law enforcement officer during a traffic stop or for the purpose of avoiding

---

<sup>5</sup> As the Court of Appeals noted, Wirtz expressly acknowledged in his reply brief Sergeant Pelfrey was entitled to initiate the encounter with him. (App’x p. 2; App. Reply Br. p. 7).

arrest or criminal charges.”); S.C. Code Ann. § 56-1-460(A) (making it unlawful to drive on a South Carolina public highway with a suspended driver’s license); S.C. Code Ann. § 56-5-5310 (“No person shall drive or move on any highway any vehicle unless the equipment thereon is in good working order and adjustment as required in this chapter and the vehicle is in such safe mechanical condition as not to endanger the driver or other occupant or any person upon the highway.”). As a result, Sergeant Pelfrey decided—prudently—to arrest Wirtz instead of to simply ignore both Wirtz’s freshly-committed crimes *and* the judicially-issued warrant calling for Wirtz’s arrest, and the officer’s decision to do so under such circumstances was plainly constitutionally reasonable.<sup>6</sup> See Atwater v. City of Lago Vista, 532 U.S. 318, 354 (2001) (“If an officer has probable cause to believe that an individual has committed even a very minor criminal offense in his presence, he may, without violating the Fourth Amendment, arrest the offender.”); see also S.C. Code Ann. § 17-13-30 (“The sheriffs and deputy sheriffs of this State may arrest without warrant any and all persons who, within their view, violate any of the criminal laws of this State if such arrest be made at the time of such violation of law or immediately thereafter.”).

Significantly, at the time of Wirtz’s lawful arrest, the car Wirtz had just been driving was parked directly in front of the entrance to a private business, Wirtz—who was *not* the car’s owner—was obviously no longer able to move it from its location by virtue of his arrest, the only other occupant of the car could also not drive it because she—like Wirtz—did not possess a valid driver’s license, and there was no one else present at the scene who had any connection to the car. Cf. United States v. Brown, 787 F.2d 929, 932 (4th Cir. 1986) (“[T]he police officer in this case could reasonably have impounded Brown’s vehicle either because there was no known

---

<sup>6</sup> Notably, before the inventory search was conducted, Sergeant Pelfrey even explicitly explained to Wirtz he *had* to arrest him based on the outstanding warrant. (Court’s Ex. # 3).

individual immediately available to take custody of the car, or because the car could have constituted a nuisance in the area in which it was parked.”). Under such circumstances, it was necessary for Sergeant Pelfrey to take temporary custody of the car, and, in fact, the Oconee County Sheriff’s Office’s standardized policy required *all* vehicles to be impounded and towed upon the arrest of the driver unless the “driver/owner”—which was a designation that did not appear to apply to Wirtz since he did not personally own the car—identified a person within the vehicle or close by to take possession of it. See United States v. Martin, 982 F.2d 1236, 1240 (8th Cir. 1993) (“Police may take protective custody of a vehicle when they have arrested its occupants . . . even if it is lawfully parked and poses no public safety hazard.” (citation omitted)). Therefore, Sergeant Pelfrey’s act of impounding the car for towing was constitutionally reasonable and proper under the circumstances involved. See South Dakota v. Opperman, 428 U.S. 364, 376 (1976) (“[I]n following standard police procedures, prevailing throughout the country and approved by the overwhelming majority of courts, the conduct of the police was not ‘unreasonable’ under the Fourth Amendment.”); cf. Miller, 423 S.C. at 103, 814 S.E.2d at 170 (concluding the officers’ decision to impound a vehicle was constitutionally reasonable where all the requirements for impoundment in the governing policy were met).

Additionally, because the properly-impounded car needed to be towed from the scene to both secure it and prevent it from serving as a nuisance by simply being abandoned directly in front of the tractor dealership’s entrance, Sergeant Pelfrey was constitutionally permitted to inventory the car prior to it being towed based on the Oconee County Sheriff’s Office’s standardized policies and procedures governing inventory searches. And, those policies and procedures were constitutionally appropriate since they: (1) were expressly designed to serve the legitimate caretaking purposes of such searches; (2) would result in an inventory being

completed when followed; (3) were sufficiently limited such that an officer like Sergeant Pelfrey would *not* be afforded excessive discretion that would permit the officer to conduct an inventory search in any manner desired and only when the officer wanted to do so for purely investigative purposes; and (4) specifically required the entire vehicle, including containers like the one that contained Wirtz’s methamphetamine, to be searched. See Wells, 495 U.S. at 4 (“The policy or practice governing inventory searches should be designed to produce an inventory.”); Bertine, 479 U.S. at 375 (“Nothing . . . prohibits the exercise of police discretion so long as that discretion is exercised according to standard criteria and on the basis of something other than suspicion of evidence of criminal activity.”). Likewise, since those standardized policies and procedures were constitutionally proper, the inventory search conducted pursuant to them was similarly constitutionally reasonable regardless of whether someone—such as a defendant who wished his methamphetamine and gun had not been found—could conceive of some *other* way in which the policies and procedures could have been written that would be more narrow or refined. See Bertine, 479 U.S. at 373-374 (instructing “reasonable police regulations relating to inventory procedures administered in good faith satisfy the Fourth Amendment even though courts might as a matter of hindsight be able to devise equally reasonable rules requiring a different procedure”); Lafayette, 462 U.S. at 647 (acknowledging there perhaps could have been less intrusive means for achieving the aims of an inventory search than the means set out in the applicable inventory policy but nevertheless explaining “the real question is not what ‘could have been achieved,’ but whether the Fourth Amendment *requires* such steps; it is not our function to write a manual on administering routine, neutral procedures of the stationhouse”).

Furthermore, just as the trial judge found, Sergeant Pelfrey’s inventory search of the vehicle was conducted in good faith and not improperly pretextual. Supporting such a finding,

Sergeant Pelfrey lawfully arrested Wirtz for multiple reasons, including due to an outstanding arrest warrant the officer could not simply ignore, *prior to* any search being conducted, and the officer carried out the inventory search along with other officers in compliance with standardized policies and procedures that required him to act just as he did to achieve the legitimate caretaking purposes connected to securing the car and the property within it before it was towed from the scene. Cf. United States v. Snoddy, 976 F.3d 630, 636 (6th Cir. 2020) (“The problem for Snoddy is that, regardless of Trooper Malone’s motivations and beliefs, Trooper Malone was going to have the car towed no matter what.”); Magdirilla, 962 F.3d at 1158 (“Department Policy required the officers to impound the vehicle upon determining that Magdirila was unlicensed. Robinson established that fact during his initial questioning of Magdirila and decided to impound the vehicle *before* discovering methamphetamine in the glove compartment. Given the early stage at which Robinson decided to impound the vehicle, it is a ‘reasonable view’ of the evidence that Robinson’s intent at the time the vehicle was impounded was administrative rather than investigatory.” (citation omitted)); United States v. Matthews, 591 F.3d 230, 235 n. 7 (4th Cir. 2009) (“[T]he facts in this case support the conclusion that the inventory search was performed in good faith. After placing Matthews under arrest, Deputy Clark reasoned that the car would need to be towed because it was on private property and there was no other driver at that time to take the vehicle away. Only after making such a determination did Deputy Clark begin the inventory search of the vehicle, and he performed this search because the department policy at the time stated that he had to take full inventory of the vehicle. Under these circumstances, it is entirely reasonable for an officer to perform an inventory search, . . . and Matthews has presented no evidence to either contradict or impeach Deputy Clark’s testimony.” (citations, brackets, and internal quotations omitted)). Under such circumstances, the trial judge

could and did validly find Sergeant Pelfrey's motive for the search was not an improper one, and that factual finding was not rendered incorrect or unsupported as a matter of law simply because Sergeant Pelfrey may have *also* harbored a belief drugs or other contraband might be located in the vehicle prior to beginning the inventory search. See Cady v. Dombrowski, 413 U.S. 433, 443 (1973) (explaining a determination concerning an individual officer's motivation in carrying out a vehicle search constituted a fact finding and instructing the particular fact finding made in that regard in Dombrowski's case should not have been disregarded by a reviewing court in light of the fact "enforcement of the traffic laws and supervision of vehicle traffic may be a large part of a police officer's job"); cf. United States v. Lewis, 3 F.3d 252, 254 (8th Cir. 1993) ("Having conducted the search of Lewis's van according to standardized inventory procedures, the officers' *coexistent* suspicions that incriminating evidence might be discovered did not invalidate their lawful inventory search." (emphasis added)).

In arguing to the contrary and maintaining the search was truly pretextual in nature, Wirtz alleged on appeal and continues to allege Sergeant Pelfrey did not actually conduct the inventory search pursuant to the applicable policies and procedures because he purportedly did not properly complete the required inventory form and also should have permitted him to contact the car's owner to avoid impoundment. However, just as the Court of Appeals correctly recognized, those arguments were neither raised to nor ruled upon by the trial judge, and, in fact, the inventory form itself was not even introduced to make it a part of the record in Wirtz's case. (R. pp. 5-7; pp. 9-11; pp. 129-130). Under such circumstances, Wirtz's arguments in that regard were not properly preserved for appellate review and cannot be meaningfully reviewed on appeal

in the absence of the form he now claims was not properly filled out.<sup>7</sup> See State v. Gee, 262 S.C. 373, 379, 204 S.E.2d 727, 729 (1974) (“Only matter that has been ruled on below can be reviewed[.]”); see also State v. Cabbagestalk, 281 S.C. 35, 36, 314 S.E.2d 10, 11 (1984)

---

<sup>7</sup> Beyond that, even if those arguments could somehow have properly been addressed on appeal without being raised during trial and assuming for the sake of argument Sergeant Pelfrey did not fully complete the inventory form, such a deviation from the applicable policies and procedures would not necessarily establish the inventory search was unconstitutional. Cf. United States v. Morris, 995 F.3d 665, 670 (8th Cir. 2021) (explaining “a failure to follow standard procedures does not ineluctably render a search unreasonable” and rejecting a claim a deputy’s failure to complete the required reports after conducting an inventory search rendered the search improperly pretextual); United States v. Stanley, 4 F. App’x 148, 150 (4th Cir. 2001) (“Stanley was subject to arrest under the outstanding New Jersey warrant and upon his arrest the car he was driving, which was registered to another who was not presented, would have been impounded and searched under written police policy. An inventory search, even if not thorough and complete, satisfies the Fourth Amendment if administered in good faith. Any omissions from the inventory list created from the search of Stanley’s car were not sufficient to create an inference of bad faith on the part of the police.” (citation omitted)). Moreover, Sergeant Pelfrey’s discovery of Wirtz’s drugs almost immediately after beginning the inventory search gave him a valid and independent basis to search the vehicle pursuant to the automobile exception from that point going forward, and, thus, what began as an inventory search in Wirtz’s case was lawfully permitted to shift to another type of warrantless search once the methamphetamine was found without becoming constitutionally unreasonable even assuming the things Sergeant Pelfrey did from that point going forward did not fully comply with the applicable inventory search policies and procedures. See Michigan v. Thomas, 458 U.S. 259, 261-262 (1982) (explaining the discovery of contraband during a valid inventory search can establish a probable cause basis to believe there was contraband elsewhere in the vehicle, which would justify a warrantless search pursuant to the automobile exception). Finally, Wirtz’s claims concerning an opportunity to make alternative arrangements has already been directly considered and rejected by the United States Supreme Court, which constitutes a compelling reason for it to be rejected once again due to its incompatibility with what is meant by a standard of reasonableness. See Bertine, 479 U.S. at 373-374 (concluding the inventory search conducted in Bertine’s case was constitutionally reasonable even though “giving Bertine an opportunity to make alternative arrangements would undoubtedly have been possible” in light of what is meant by the term “reasonable” in a constitutional sense); see also Lafayette, 462 U.S. at 647-648 (“The reasonableness of any particular governmental activity does not necessarily or invariably turn on the existence of alternative ‘less intrusive’ means. . . . We are hardly in a position to second-guess police departments as to what practical administrative method will best deter theft by and false claims against its employees and preserve the security of the stationhouse. It is evident that a stationhouse search of every item carried on or by a person who has lawfully been taken into custody by the police will amply serve the important and legitimate governmental interests involved.”); cf. United States v. Trujillo, 993 F.3d 859, 870 (10th Cir. 2021) (“The deputies were not required to allow [Trujillo] to call someone to come pick up the Mustang and then, assuming he was successful, wait around for the new driver to arrive.”).

(“Failure to make an offer of proof precludes the appellant from raising the issue on appeal.”); cf. State v. Adams, 332 S.C. 139, 144, 504 S.E.2d 124, 126 (Ct. App. 1998) (“This precise argument was neither raised to nor ruled upon by the trial court. Appellant argued only that the evidence did not rise to the ‘level of a reasonable doubt as to counts 1, 2, and 3.’ . . . Adams’s argument, therefore, is not preserved for our review.”).

Accordingly, for all those reasons, the trial judge properly declined to suppress the evidence discovered during that constitutionally-reasonable inventory search, and the Court of Appeals correctly affirmed that ruling—including the trial judge’s factual finding concerning an absence of pretext—on appeal. See Frasier, 437 S.C. at 633, 879 S.E.2d at 766 (explaining a trial judge’s factual findings are reviewed on appeal for any evidentiary support). Wirtz’s petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

### CONCLUSION


For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted Petitioner’s petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

ALAN WILSON  
Attorney General

MARK R. FARTHING  
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General

DAVID R. WAGNER, JR.  
Solicitor, Tenth Judicial Circuit

BY:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark R. Farthing  
S.C. Bar Number 76901

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

August 29, 2023