

**RECEIVED**

**Jan 10 2024**

**SC Court of Appeals**

**FORM 14  
DESIGNATION OF  
MATTER TO BE  
INCLUDED IN THE  
RECORD ON APPEAL**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In The Court of Appeals  
[In The Supreme Court]

APPEAL FROM McCormick COUNTY

Court of Common Pleas s/r

lawton mcintosh, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2018-CP-35-00074

Steven m pruit,  
Respondent,

v.

Bryantavious Murray, Appellant.

RECORD ON APPEAL

Bryantavious Murray

2156 crethill columbia  
South Carolina

29223

(864) 5328257

Attorney for Appellant

stevenm pruit

414 main street

Greenwood, South  
Carolina

29646

(864) 000-0000

Attorney for Respondent

## INDEX

Order of July 17, 2023

Complaint 1

Answer 1

Request to Charge 1

Certificate of Appellant 3

Order of July 17, 2023

[This matter is before me on Defendant South Carolina Department of Corrections' (hereinafter SCDC) Motion to Dismiss. A hearing was held on this matter on July 17, 2023 at which time Steven M. Pruitt appeared on behalf of Defendant and Plaintiff appeared pro se. For the reasons discussed below, the Court grants Defendant's Motion and dismisses Plaintiff's action. Plaintiff filed this action alleging employees or agents of Defendant used excessive force against him on April 8, 2016. Plaintiff filed this action on August 28, 2018, but Defendants were not served. On February 1, 2019, the Court mailed Plaintiff a Dormant File Notice in which Plaintiff was instructed to file "an appropriate motion or Affidavit of Service" within 10 days or his action would be dismissed. There is no indication in the Court record that Plaintiff filed a motion or affidavit of service. On February 25, 2019, the Court issued an Order dismissing Plaintiff's action for failing to serve Defendants. Plaintiff then filed a letter and additional materials, including the Complaint, in April 2023. One copy of the Complaint was delivered to the SCDC General Counsel on May 25, 2023 by the Richland County Sheriff's Department.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2023 Jul 20 11:23 AM - MCCORMICK - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2018CP3500074

Defendant moved to dismiss first on the basis that Plaintiff's action was previously dismissed. The Court agrees. As stated above, an Order was issued on February 25, 2019 dismissing Plaintiff's action. As Plaintiff's action has been dismissed by prior Order of the Court, Plaintiff cannot continue to pursue this action and Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is granted. Defendant also moved to dismiss Plaintiff's action because it is barred by the two-year statute of limitations found in the South Carolina Tort Claims Act. South Carolina Code Ann. §15-78-110 (Supp. 2021). Section 15-78-110 of the South Carolina Code states "[e]xcept as provided for in Section 15-3-40, any action brought pursuant to this chapter is forever barred unless an action is commenced within two years after the date the loss was or should have been discovered ... ." South Carolina Code Ann. §15-78-110 (Supp. 2021). Plaintiff in his Complaint claims that the incident which is the subject of his claim occurred on April 8, 2016. According to Court records, Plaintiff initially filed this action on August 28, 2018, more than four months beyond the

two-year statute of limitations. Therefore, Plaintiff's action is barred by the two-year statute of limitations found in the South Carolina Tort Claims Act and is dismissed.

Only Defendant SCDC has appeared in this action and this Motion was filed only on behalf of Defendant SCDC. The Court would note that there is no evidence in the record that the remaining Defendants have been served. The Court finds that the grounds for dismissal discussed above would apply to all Defendants and based on the above, Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is granted and Plaintiff's action is dismissed as to all Defendants.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Honorable R. Lawton McIntosh

, 2023

McCormick, South Carolina

ELECTRONICALLY]

### Complaint

[ The state of south carolina scdc use excessive force, with empty hand control/defensive tactics with 1hr of medical malpractice delay to treat the appelliant on 4-8-2016 with no prior trial. the use of force or guard brutality was content under scdc custody, and was against any scdc policy. the scdc presented evidence that it used empty hand control on the appelliant why he was on the ground and or in handcuffs on the appelliant while housed in scdc . The total amount of injuries on the appelliant was three or four stitches in the face, eleven(11). behind left ear, and a brain concussion, and one right swollen eye. the defense attorney presented plenty of affidavits threw federal appeal of a grant threw reverse on charges which the appelliant has already went threw with the proper courts. that freshly cuts down to the use of force, and how much was applied and, were they errored with the amount of seconds, and minutes. The trial court errored on july 17 2023 when they failed to re amend plaintiffs motion to show not barred on complaint when the appelliant showed showed claim on paperwork dated back to 3/16/18 by buffy hodes courts clerk stating plaintiff(2) year inquiry to not barrer to plaintiff claim in the proper court. the courts judge mcintosh granted defendants motion to dissmis plaintiffs claim without the proper evidence , and checking. The defense attorney filed a motion to answer complaint with a 50-50 chance that excessive force did happen to the appelliant . which appelliant request for a new trial , and settlement to end case with \$8.0 million

Answer

[Defendant South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC), subject to and reserving any motions to strike or to dismiss, responds to the Complaint of the Plaintiff and alleges:

FOR A FIRST DEFENSE

1. The Defendant incorporates the allegations of its Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.
2. The Defendant would show that it has not been served and Plaintiff's Complaint should, therefore, be dismissed pursuant to Rule 12(b)(5) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

FOR A SECOND DEFENSE

3. The Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of its Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.
4. The Defendant has not been served and the action against it should be dismissed for failure to obtain personal service.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2023 Jun 12 2:47 PM - MCCORMICK - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2018CP3500074

FOR A THIRD DEFENSE

5. The Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of its Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.
6. The Defendant has not been properly served and this Court lacks jurisdiction over the persons of the Defendant.

FOR A FOURTH DEFENSE

7. The Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of its Answer to the extent not

inconsistent herewith.

8. The Defendant would show that the Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and his Complaint should, therefore, be dismissed pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

#### FOR A FIFTH DEFENSE

9. The Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of its Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

10. Defendant denies that improper or excessive force was used against the Plaintiff or that Defendant or employees or agents of Defendant acted improperly in regards to the Plaintiff in any way. Defendant denies that Defendant has taken any improper actions in relation to the Plaintiff. Defendant is not aware of any injuries sustained by the Plaintiff as a result of any action or inaction by the Defendant or employees or agents of Defendant. Defendant denies that any action or inaction of the Defendant caused injury to the Plaintiff. Defendant would also state that Defendant through its employees and agents acted appropriately in their dealings with the Plaintiff and have not been deliberately indifferent to the Plaintiff's needs. The Defendant denies the allegations contained in Plaintiff's Complaint and demands strict proof thereof.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2023 Jun 12 2:47 PM - MCCORMICK - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2018CP3500074

11. The Defendant would specifically state that the Plaintiff is not entitled to the relief requested in his Complaint or to any relief in this matter.

#### FOR A SIXTH DEFENSE

12. The Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of its Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

13. Defendant pleads the provisions of the South Carolina Tort Claims Act, S.C. Code Ann. § 15-78-10 et seq., including all of the immunities, limitations, and defenses granted or

preserved by the Act, including limitations of any recovery and restrictions against recovering punitive damages and attorney's fees.

FOR A SEVENTH DEFENSE

14. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

15. Defendant affirmatively pleads and asserts any and all applicable provisions of the South Carolina Tort Claims Act set forth in §15-78-60 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina. Further, Defendant herein pleads and asserts as a complete, absolute, and affirmative defense to the Plaintiff's claims any and all conditions of recovery, statute of limitations, limitations of liability, and above listed exceptions from liability and/or immunities as are set forth in the South Carolina Tort Claims Act.

16. Defendant pleads the South Carolina Tort Claims Act as a complete and absolute bar to any recovery by the Plaintiff from Defendant.

FOR AN EIGHTH DEFENSE

17. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2023 Jun 12 2:47 PM - MCCORMICK - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2018CP3500074

18. Any claim for punitive or exemplary damages against Defendant is barred by the South Carolina Tort Claims Act, in particular §15-78-120 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina.

FOR A NINTH DEFENSE

19. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not

inconsistent herewith.

20. Defendant affirmatively pleads and asserts the provisions of §15-78-120 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina as a defense to the Plaintiff's claim, and further, Defendant herein pleads and asserts the limitation of liability as set forth in §15-78-120 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina as a limitation on the amount and/or type of damages recoverable in this action.

#### FOR A TENTH DEFENSE

21. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

22. Any injury or damage sustained by the Plaintiff as a result of the matters alleged in the Complaint was a proximate result of one or more independent and intervening causes, which Defendant affirmatively pleads as a complete bar to this action.

#### FOR AN ELEVENTH DEFENSE

23. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

24. Any injury or damage sustained by the Plaintiff as a result of the matters alleged in the Complaint was caused by events over which Defendant had no control or right of control, thereby relieving Defendant from any liability or responsibility.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2023 Jun 12 2:47 PM - MCCORMICK - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2018CP3500074

#### FOR A TWELFTH DEFENSE

25. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

26. Defendant, at all times relevant hereto and during the performance or non-

performance of the acts alleged in the Complaint, did not perform any acts or fail to perform any acts in bad faith, in a malicious manner, or with corrupt motives and the Defendant is, therefore, immune from suit.

#### FOR A THIRTEENTH DEFENSE

27. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

28. Defendant alleges that if any injuries and damages were sustained by the Plaintiff, said injuries and damages were caused by the greater negligence and/or willfulness of the Plaintiff, which exceeds the negligence and/or willfulness, if any, on the part of this Defendant, without which greater negligence and/or willfulness on the part of the Plaintiff, said alleged injury or damage would not have occurred or been sustained and for that reason, the Plaintiff is totally barred from recovery.

#### FOR A FOURTEENTH DEFENSE

29. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

30. That even assuming Defendant was negligent, grossly negligent, careless, willful, wanton and reckless in any respect and that such conduct operated as a proximate cause of the accident and the Plaintiff's resulting injuries and damages, if any, all of which is expressly denied and admitted

solely for the purpose for this defense, Defendant alleges that the Plaintiff's negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, willful, and wanton conduct in the particulars set forth herein and above

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2023 Jun 12 2:47 PM - MCCORMICK - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2018CP3500074

contributed to more than 50% to cause the incident and the Plaintiff's resulting injuries and damages,

if any. As such, the Plaintiff's cause of action is barred.

#### FOR A FIFTEENTH DEFENSE

31. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

32. Defendant alleges that even if it was careless, negligent, grossly negligent, willful, wanton, or reckless, in any respect, which is expressly denied and admitted solely for the purpose of this defense, and even if such conduct on its part operated as a greater than 50% cause of the accident and the Plaintiff's resulting injuries and damages, if any, which is also expressly denied and admitted solely for the purpose of this defense and no other, Defendant is entitled to a determination as to the percentage which Plaintiff's negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, willful and wanton conduct contributed to this accident and to a reduction of any amount awarded to it by an amount equal to the percentage of Plaintiff's negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, willful and wanton conduct.

#### FOR A SIXTEENTH DEFENSE

33. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

34. Plaintiff has not suffered any damages caused by the actions of Defendant.

#### FOR A SEVENTEENTH DEFENSE

35. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

36. That there was no negligence, gross negligence, recklessness, and/or wantonness on behalf of Defendant which proximately caused the alleged damages referred to in the Plaintiff's

Complaint.

FOR A EIGHTEENTH DEFENSE

37. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

38. The individual Defendants are proper parties to this action pursuant to §15-78-70 of the South Carolina Tort Claims Act.

FOR A NINETEENTH DEFENSE

39. Defendant incorporates the previous allegations of the Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

40. Plaintiff's action has been dismissed by Order of the Court and cannot be maintained.

FOR A TWENTIETH DEFENSE

41. The Defendants incorporate the previous allegations of their Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

42. The Defendants state that the Plaintiff's claim is barred by the doctrines of res judicata and/or collateral estoppel.

FOR A TWENTY-FIRST DEFENSE

43. The Defendants incorporate the previous allegations of their Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

44. Plaintiff's action is barred by applicable the statute of limitations.

FOR A TWENTY-SECOND DEFENSE

45. The Defendants incorporate the previous allegations of their Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

46. Plaintiff's action is barred by the two-year statute of limitations contained in the South Carolina Tort Claims Act, S.C. Code Ann. § 15-78-10 et seq.

FOR A TWENTY-THIRD DEFENSE

47. The Defendants incorporate the previous allegations of their Answer to the extent not inconsistent herewith.

48. Defendant reserves, and specifically does not waive, any and all additional defenses which may become evident through the discovery process or otherwise in this matter; and, in addition, Defendant reserves the right to amend this answer to include additional defenses or withdraw others after the completion of discovery and at other times thereafter, up to and including, during a potential trial.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered the Complaint, Defendant prays that same be dismissed.

McDONALD PATRICK POSTON HEMPHILL & ROPER, LLC

By: s/Steven M. Pruitt

Steven M. Pruitt, Bar #66201

PO Box 1547, Greenwood, SC 29648

864-229-2511 spruitt@mcdonaldpatrick.com

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT SCDC]

## Request to Charge

[I bryantavious Murray request to charge the jury and the defendants guilty of excessive on date 4-8-2016 from the following evidence listed in the facts below. on are about the date of 4-8-2016 the listed above defendants scdc did unconsciously intended to allow premeditated excessive force the amount of force to accure without the adequte trained staff for an inmates safety to be in exact incoexsistance with scdc's policys's and procedures to insure the safety on the plaintiff..to be unconsciously and deliberately and failing to provide the appropriate number of adqutely trained staff members at verious locations threw out locations threw out the mccormick correctional institution to such adequtely insure to a inmates safety.. they unconscioulsy and deliberately failed to provide the most not minimum amount of adequte and appropriate amount of security officers personal in and at mmcormick correctional institution to include the proper yard supervision. unconsciously they deliberately failed to properly monitor the plaintiff so as much to not critize but therefore much more intend to premeditatedly harm the plaintiff. they also deliberately failed to protect the plaintiff from assault and battery gross negligence claim against officers employed by scdc agency failing to properly supervise the employees so as to ensure the safety of the plaintiff and inmates located at the mccormick correctional institution. failing to protect the plaintiff from any serious harm,. failing to provide any level of high nor minimum to fit the amount of a maximum security failing to insure safety on the plaintiff . not really clearly recognizing or acknowledging a clearly non tough but dangerous situation without 1st the thought to anylize the situation and how serious it appeared to the plaintiff. scdc failed to take any reasondable amount of action to prevent the delay of medical malpractice of 1hr and 30mins the amount of bodily use of force should have been investigated properly threw camera statements and documents to include clothing and or any cover ups which is not the proper chain of commands from first use of policy 1500. 2-1 which would inforce the new policy to plaintiff any and any charges that were filed on the plaintiff in the beginging were dismissed and or were reversed and not signed by the jury on grand jury indictment . not establishing a clear right to personally cover up and falsely incriminate the plaintiff or agencies to investigate. after the plaintiff severed a wrongfully 60 days with due process refferenced and unfiled paperwork which caused him excessive sanctions again failing to adhere to the scdc agency policys and procedures per 1500.40 . 1500.2-1 and 200.2-5 additionally again being indifferently to the plaintiffs health and safety again in awareness . intentionally being deliberately indifferent to the plaintiffs health and safety after having full knowledge of the dangerous condition, and still failing to take he atleast reasonable amount of measures to prevent it from stopping or occuring on the plaintiff in full awareness not adhearing the proper training academy's not supplying the appropriate on site rendered staff to have agencies pocket cameras to properly catch recordings of inmates use of force, including dorms and buildings camera futidge documentation to be avalible. after failing to not withhold within the 11th amendment to be considered as a public employee. after failing to calculate the amount of hits used as battery on the plaintiff. the incident reports done by the listed employees listed above in the appeal which showed a probable cause of empty hand controll would ammount to and evil intent which is a big issue the court should take into matters and investigate why first responders was not activated and specifically what offices tended to cover up a call for first responders being that the plaintiff was on the yard and around avalible staff and 50-60 inmates which would be faverously to what happend to the plaintiff.

appeallant would charge the jury for \$8.0 million dollars see sc madate bill: 2021- 2022 bill 4406:  
excessive force. section 23-1-250

]

january 10, 2024    /s/ bryantavious murray

bryantavious murray

2156 cresthill drivecolumbia , South Carolina  
29223 (864) 532-8257

Attorney for Appellant

