

RECEIVED

MAY 08 2024

S.C. SUPREME COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF Horry

ORDER IN A CRIMINAL CASE
WARRANT(S) K002194

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

INDICTMENT(S): 2006GS2604735

State of South Carolina

JAMIE GOSS
DEFENDANT(S)

MOTION FOR COMPASSIONATE RELEASE

This form order Assistant Sol. Seth Oskin
submitted by:

Attorney for : State Defendant
or
 Self-Represented Litigant

DISPOSITION TYPE

- DECISION BY THE COURT AFTER HEARING.** This action came to a hearing before the court. The issues have been heard and a decision rendered. See below for additional information.
- DECISION BY THE COURT AFTER STATUS CONFERENCE.** This case came for a status conference before the court. The status of this case and pending issues in this case were discussed and a decision rendered. See below for additional information.
- MOTION:**
 - GRANTED DENIED CONTINUED WITHDRAWN
 - WITHDRAWN BY MOVING PARTY: _____
Signature of Moving Party
 - OTHER:

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED: See Order of the Court below See attached order
 Formal Order to follow; to be prepared by: State Defendant Other: _____

ORDER INFORMATION

This order ends does not end the case.
Additional Information for the Clerk : _____

This is an improper venue for this motion as it is based on a Federal statute. However, the Hon. Judge Cothran heard the motion and denied it. Accordingly, this motion is denied.

Circuit Court Judge

2157
Judge Code

Date

FILED
HORRY COUNTY
2021 SEP 18 PM 3:21
SHARON N. EVISS
CLERK OF COURT
HORRY COUNTY, SC

51

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF Horry

ORDER IN A CRIMINAL CASE
WARRANT(S) K902194

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

INDICTMENT(S): 2006GS2604735

State of South Carolina

JAMIE GOSS

DEFENDANT(S)

MOTION FOR COMPASSIONATE RELEASE

This form order submitted by: *Asst. Sol. Seth Calkin*

Attorney for: State Defendant
or
 Self-Represented Litigant

DISPOSITION TYPE

- DECISION BY THE COURT AFTER HEARING—This action came to a hearing before the court. The issues have been heard and a decision rendered. See below for additional information.
- DECISION BY THE COURT AFTER STATUS CONFERENCE. This case came for a status conference before the court. The status of this case and pending issues in this case were discussed and a decision rendered. See below for additional information.
- MOTION:
 - GRANTED DENIED CONTINUED WITHDRAWN
 - WITHDRAWN BY MOVING PARTY: _____
Signature of Moving Party
 - OTHER: _____

FILED
2021 AUG -9 AM 11:00
RENEEM ELVIS
CLERK OF COURT
HORRY COUNTY SC

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED: See Order of the Court below See attached order
 Formal Order to follow; to be prepared by: State Defendant Other: _____

ORDER INFORMATION

This order ends does not end the case.
Additional Information for the Clerk: _____

Seth Calkin
Circuit Court Judge

2144
Judge Code

Aug. 4, 2020
Date

For Clerk of Court Office Use Only

This judgment was entered on the 9th day of August, 2021 and a copy mailed first class or placed in the appropriate attorney's box on this 9th day of August, 2021 to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

SETH OSKIN
[Signature]

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE STATE

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)
Benee N. Elvis

CLERK OF COURT

Court Reporter:

FILED
2021 AUG -9 AM 11:00
RENEE N. ELVIS
CLERK OF COURT
HORRY COUNTY, SC

PROCESS RECEIPT AND RETURN
See "Instructions for Service of Process by U.S. Marshal"

PLAINTIFF Jamie Goss	COURT CASE NUMBER 2023-001660
DEFENDANT SEE Attachment Complaint	TYPE OF PROCESS

SERVE AT { NAME OF INDIVIDUAL, COMPANY, CORPORATION, ETC. TO SERVE OR DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY TO SEIZE OR CONDEMN
ADDRESS (Street or RFD, Apartment No., City, State and ZIP Code)

SEND NOTICE OF SERVICE COPY TO REQUESTER AT NAME AND ADDRESS BELOW	Number of process to be served with this Form 285	36
	Number of parties to be served in this case	36
	Check for service on U.S.A.	

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR OTHER INFORMATION THAT WILL ASSIST IN EXPEDITING SERVICE (Include Business and Alternate Addresses, All Telephone Numbers, and Estimated Times Available for Service):

Fold

Fold

Signature of Attorney other Originator requesting service on behalf of:	<input type="checkbox"/> PLAINTIFF <input type="checkbox"/> DEFENDANT	TELEPHONE NUMBER	DATE
---	--	------------------	------

SPACE BELOW FOR USE OF U.S. MARSHAL ONLY-- DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

I acknowledge receipt for the total number of process indicated. (Sign only for USM 285 if more than one USM 285 is submitted)	Total Process	District of Origin	District to Serve	Signature of Authorized USMS Deputy or Clerk	Date
		No. _____	No. _____		

I hereby certify and return that I have personally served, have legal evidence of service, have executed as shown in "Remarks", the process described on the individual, company, corporation, etc., at the address shown above on the on the individual, company, corporation, etc. shown at the address inserted below.

I hereby certify and return that I am unable to locate the individual, company, corporation, etc. named above (See remarks below)

Name and title of individual served (if not shown above)	<input type="checkbox"/> A person of suitable age and discretion then residing in defendant's usual place of abode	
	Date	Time <input type="checkbox"/> am <input type="checkbox"/> pm
	Signature of U.S. Marshal or Deputy	

Service Fee	Total Mileage Charges including endeavors)	Forwarding Fee	Total Charges	Advance Deposits	Amount owed to U.S. Marshal* or (Amount of Refund*)
-------------	--	----------------	---------------	------------------	---

REMARKS:

1. CLERK OF THE COURT
2. USMS RECORD
3. NOTICE OF SERVICE
4. BILLING STATEMENT*: To be returned to the U.S. Marshal with payment, if any amount is owed. Please remit promptly payable to U.S. Marshal.
5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT

54

PRIOR EDITIONS MAY BE USED

McMaster Governor
State House
1100 Gervais Street
Columbia, SC 29201

General Counsel
SC Dept. of Corrections
Post Office Box 21787
Columbia, SC 29221

Bryan Stirling Director
4444 Broad River Rd
PO Box 21787
Columbia, SC 29221

SC General Assembly
510 Gressette Building
Columbia, SC 29201

SC Criminal Justice Academy
5400 Broad River Rd
Columbia, SC 29212

Sallie B. Todd
PO Box 677
Conway, SC 29528

Brenda F. Shealy
Deputy Clerk of Court
Supreme Court Building
1231 Gervais Street
Columbia, SC 29201

Judge # Bruce Williams
1220 Senate St
Columbia, SC 29201
Court of Appeals

Court of Appeals
John D. Geathers
1220 Senate St.
Columbia, SC 29201

Stephanie P McDonald
Court of Appeals
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201

Jerry Drinson Jr
Court of Appeals
1220 Senate St.
Columbia, SC 29201

Chief Justice Donald W. Beatty
Supreme Court
1231 Gervais Street
Columbia, SC 29201

R Ferrell Cothran Jr
PO Box 32
3 West Keitt Street
Manning, SC 29102

f Supreme Court of SC
PO Box 11330
Columbia, SC 29211

Ronald W. Hazzard
Circuit Public Defender
1300 Second Avenue
Suite 301
Conway, SC 29526

Mark Farthing, SC Attorney General Office
PO Box 11549
Columbia, SC 29211

Donald Trump
Executive Office
115 Eagle Tree Terrace
~~Jupiter~~ Jupiter, FL 33477

Chief Judge James E. Lockemy
Court of Appeals
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201

Renee Elvis
Clerk of Court
PO Box 677
Conway, SC 29528

Levern Cohen, Warden, Ridgeland
PO Box 2039
Ridgeland, SC 29936

Seth Oskin Attorney
Fifteen Circuit Solicitor's Office
PO Box 1276
Conway, SC 29528

William Bitch
Office of Disciplinary Counsel
PO Box 12159
Columbia, SC 29211

Joe Biden
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington DC 20500

William Seal Attorney
SC Circuit Court
103 N Main St.
Marion, SC 29521

Warden T. Wallace Kirkland
4344 Broad River Rd
Columbia, SC 29210

Brian Truex
SCLaw Enforcement Division
1100 Oak Drive
Myrtle Beach, SC 29577

Ms. Jenny Abbott Kitchings
SC Court of Appeals
1720 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201

~~Ridgeland, SC~~
Ridgeland Water & Sewer Dept.
One Town Square
Ridgeland, SC 29936

All defendant in
S.C.D.C. Address is
the same

PO Box 119 Ridgeland SC 29936

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

1. Was Petitioner's arguments raised in proper form and venue?
2. Did Judge err in failing to apply Federal statutes where State statute did not exist?
3. Did Judge take into consideration that S.C. Depart. of Corrections, Ridgeland facility and all other SCDC facilities being short of Staff, overcrowded inmate population, lack of clean air and cleaning supplies?
4. Did the Judge take into consideration the fact that my mother has a life threatening illness which require her to rely upon Respiratory Breathing Machine, and she has custody of my two (2) children ages 14 and 15?
5. Did the Judge take into consideration that my wife is currently in the custody of Immigration Detention facing deportation, she has custody of my other two (2) children ages 15 and 16?
6. Did Courts fail to acknowledge Covid-19 as a condition in the language of statute governing "compassionate release in S. Carolina?

Petitioner has contracted Covid-19 which has proved to be a life threatening illness, under unpredictable circumstances. The World, including the (BOP) has acknowledged the dangers of over-crowded confinement, cause the "Cares Act" to be amended and effective. South Carolina has no State statute with language governing release after Covid-19 to inmates. The substantial risk that presents on a consistent basis lead to a Motion for "Compassionate Release".

Petitioner is moving the Courts for a compassionate release in accordance with the language of the "Cares Act"(Section 12003(b)(2). Petitioner argues the supremacy clause gives rise to the rights, which have ben violated in accordance with S.C. Constitution Art. I §15. The State has raised their objection, stating petitioner's arguments are not in the proper venue to receive the relief he seeks. The State contends South Carolina has a governing statute regarding compassionate although does not acknowledge the Covid-19 pandemic, as the Cares Act.

STATEMENT OF CASE

Petitioner is an inmate in the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC), governed by §24-1-20. After serving 15 years of a 28 year sentence for drug trafficking, petitioner filed a Motion for Release Under Extraordinary circumstances with Horry County.

In 2021, petitioner submitted a letter to the Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services requesting a "compassionate release due to extraordinary circumstances" [Cares Act §12003(b)(2)]. The DPPP denied petitioner's request. Petitioner wrote a similar request to the Warden of the Institution.

After being denied, petitioner filed the motion in Horry County, the county of conviction. An oral hearing was conducted before the Honorable Judge Cothran on April 16, 2022. Defendant raised their argument using language in the S.C. Const. Art. I§15, "Cruel & Unusual Punishment". Petitioner argued he was entitled to relief under "extraordinary circumstances" in the (Cares Act). the deprivation of his constitutional rights initiated the (Supremacy Clause), Supreme Law of the Land. Petitioner directed his argument to the factual basis of the Department of Correction's inability, uniformed by negligence, to meet the statutory standards placed in (§24-1-20). Also that he is the only legal guardian of his children, succeeding his mother whom has a terminal illness. Judge Cothran stated the courts had no jurisdiction to grant petitioner's relief. A re-hearing was conducted in Horry County before the Honorable William Seals, Jr. His opinion was similar to Judge Cothran, and so the motion was denied. *Following this Motion file in Appeal Court Honorable Chief William denied Rule 2410/v Oct 26, 2022.*

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Unless the parties otherwise provide, "the question of arbitrability of a claim is an issue for judicial determination" [Zabinski v. Bright Acres Assocs, 346 S.C. 580, 596; 553 S.E.2d 110, 118 (2001)]. Determinations of arbitrability are subject to de novo review, but if any evidence reasonably supports the circuit court's factual finding this court will not overrule those findings. [Stokes v. Mebro Life Ins. Co., 351 S.C. 606, 609-10; 571 S.E. 2d 711, 713 (Ct. App 2002)].

An appellate court reviews the circuit court's ruling is based upon an error of law, such as application of the wrong legal principle; or when based upon factual conclusions, the ruling is without evidentiary support; or when the circuit court is vested with discretion, but the ruling reveals no discretion was exercised; or when the ruling

STANDARD OF REVIEW (cont.)

does not fall within range of permissible decisions applicable in a particular case, such as it may be arbitrary and capricious.

S.C. Code Annotated §17-15-50; "Amendment of Order" states "The Court with jurisdiction of the offense, at any time after notice and hearing, may amend the order to impose additional or different conditions of release.

S.C. Const. Art. I §15 addresses the cruel and unusual standard. Const. Art. I §8 addresses judicial discretion in sentencing, also acknowledging the restrictions of legislatures by state and federal statutes alike.

ARGUMENT I

The South Carolina Constitution gives the judge of the court discretionary power to conduct the subject matter and its constitutionality.

Petitioner argued the Agency, South Carolina Department of Corrections (DOC) does not provide, and institute policies regarding Covid-19 protocol. The Agency provided a copy of protocol they have in place, and in doing so, created a question of law as to whether Agency (DOC) has instituted the protocols to meet the statutory provisions set by the "Declaration of Policy Statute" in the 1976 Code Annotated §24-1-20.

Petitioner argues the (DOC) have not implemented these policies which would violate the §24-1-20 statutory provision, infringing petitioner's right under the South Carolina Const. Art. I §15, "Prohibition of Cruel and Unusual Punishment".

Petitioner addressed these concerns with an Agency Warden and the Department of Probation, Parole and Pardons, which is vested the power of clemency through §24-21-920 of the SC Code 1976 Annotated.

After petitioner has gone through the procedural process of notifying and petitioning the Agency, the Agencies have a responsibility to, at least, review claims and make proper corrections to claims. The argument that they have not, in favor of petitioner, creates a question of law eligible for review under the jurisdiction of the courts presiding over the case of petitioner.

ARGUMENT II

"Except in matters governed by the Federal Constitution or by Acts of Congress, the law to be applied in any case is the law of the State". [Erie R.R. Co. v. Tompkins, 304 U.S. 64, 78; 58 S.Ct. 817; 82 L.Ed. 1188 (1938)].

"And whether the law of the State shall be declared by its legislature in a statute or by its highest court in a decision is not a matter of Federal concern. There is no federal common law. id]

Petitioner argues the Supremacy Clause provides the "preemption doctrine". In regards to the State preemption is compelled whether Congress command is explicitly stated in the Statute's language or implicitly contained in its structure.

In this particular case, petitioner raises the argument of the unconstitutionality of the "Operation" of (DOC), not its ruling/governing statute(s). That the (DOC) is operating under extraordinary circumstances which would be over-crowded, and understaffed during the Covid-19 pandemic.

At the very least, the Courts have an obligation, powered by the Constitution, to review claims of constitutional infringement, which was properly identified through hearings and notice to the (DOC).

Judicial intervention is most necessary when the constitutional rights of a person is infringed upon, in accordance with S.C. Const. Art. I§15. In petitioner's Motion for Release Under Extraordinary Circumstances, he pleaded with the courts to use powers of a federally enacted law that Congress intended to help prisoners and families during and after the Covid-19 pandemic.

The BOP explicitly states its reasoning to the amended Cares Act. South Carolina does not provide similar relief for their prisoners in fact have no regulation or statutes to combat Covid-19 while understaffed and overcrowded. The Circuit Judge's ruling were in fact conceived in error of law.

The State argued the courts had no jurisdiction on the matter, which was a premature argument. The subject matter was never reviewed through facts and questions of law. The State raised claim to having a statute that addresses sentence reductions, but failed to mention Covid-19 protocols were not amended within its language. Herein lies the error of law.

ARGUMENT II (cont.)

S.C. Const. Art. V §11 vests the circuit court with original jurisdiction in civil and criminal cases, and shall have appellate jurisdiction as provided by law. The Court's claim of no jurisdiction is a clear abuse of discretion.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Petitioner argues Motion for Compassionate Release Under Extraordinary Circumstances was argued in the proper form and venue. Circuit Judges have an obligatory duty to review any and all constitutional infringements, specifically those of prisoners, in this case.

The Federal Cares Act preempts State law due to its conflict of interest, explicitly the fact that South Carolina does not provide Covid relief to Prisoners, even under the extraordinary circumstances of over-crowding and short of staff.

Petitioner's specific relief would be that the petition be reviewed through facts of law and circumstance. Petitioner asks that the S.C. Supreme Court reverse and remand with an opinion.

Injunctive Power !!!!!!!

James Lass

Nov. 4. 2022

Attachment

A. South Carolina Constitution Article XII § 2 articulates specific requirement concerning the manner by which the State must treat its prisoners.

In the early 1970's, the General Assembly and the people of this State amended the South Carolina Constitution to mandate that the State provide specific services to its prisoners, The amendment reads as follows:

Article XII

§2. Institutions for confinement of persons convicted of crimes.

The General Assembly shall establish institutions for the confinement of all persons convicted of such crimes as may be designated by law, and shall provide for the custody, maintenance, health, welfare, education, and rehabilitation of the inmates.

In order to understand the meaning of any legal statute or phrase of law, it is necessary to determine the meaning of the language as it is used in the particular context. [Robinson v. Shell Oil Company, 117 S.Ct. 843, 846 (1977)].

[1] Our first step in interpreting a statute is to determine whether the language at issue has a plain and unambiguous meaning with regard to the particular dispute in the case. Our inquiry must cease if the statutory language is unambiguous and "the statutory scheme is coherent and consistent". [U.S. v. Ron Pair Enterprises, Inc., 109 S.Ct. 1026, 1030 (1989); see also Connecticut Nat. Bank v. Germain, 112 S.Ct. 1146, 1149-50 (1992)].

Article XII § 2 utilizes the words "shall provide..." In this context, "shall" is mandatory. [U.S. v. Myers, 106 F.3d 946, 941 (CA10 1997)].

[13]...It is basic canon of statutory construction that the use of the word "shall" indicates a mandatory intent. [Association of Civilian Technicians v. Federal Labor Relations Auth., 22 F.3d 1150, 1153 (D.C. Cir. 1994)].

While the focus of this argument is on the constraints placed on the legislature to provide meaningful rehabilitation to the State's prisoners, it should be noted that Art. XII § 2 stands as a command and State Constitutional guarantee.

The legal meaning of Rehabilitationis found in Black's Law Dictionary (6th ed. 1990), which states:

Investing or clothing again with some right, authority or dignity. Restoring person or thing to a former capacity; reinstating; qualifying again. Restoration of individual to his greatest potential, whether physically, mentally, socially or vocationally.

Accordingly, there can be no doubt that rehabilitation in the context of Article XII § 2 means restoring the prisoner to a capacity where he can physically, mentally, socially and vocationally reenter society as a productive member.

Futhermore, to ensure that the commands of the Constitution were abided by, the General Assembly and the people of South Carolina left no doubt as to their intentions in this regard by placing severe restrictions on the activities of all branches, agencies departments, and subdivisions of state government, thus limiting their authority only to that allowed by the Constitution.

Article 1

§ 23. Provisions of Constitutional Mandatory

The provisions of the Constitution shall be taken, deemed, and construed to be mandatory and prohibitory, and not merely directory, except where made directory or permissory by its own Constitution.

Hence, the Consitution of South Carolina is a limitation upon, rather than a grant of, legislative powers. [Smith v. Roberson, 210 S.C. 99, 41 S.E.2d 631 (1947)]. In other words, the government must abide by and is limited to the terms granted to it in the Constitution.

Although the commands of the Constitution are quite clear, there exists some confusion over the court's interpretation of this Constitutional Amendment because of two citations under the

due process, equal protection and the ban against cruel and unusual punishment, than that which is required under the United States Constitution.

1.

Like every other article, clause, phrase or word in the Constitution, Article XII § 2 of the South Carolina Constitution is a command. It is not meaningless phraseology without specific intent and purpose. The State Constitution does not allow the legislature unbridled authority in the passage of laws.

The General Assembly may only enact laws that are not expressly or by clear implication, prohibited by the Constitution. Elliot v. McNair 250 S.C. 75, 156 S.E.2d 421 (emphasis added).

In other words, the legislature must abide by and is limited to the terms granted to it in the Constitution, because the Constitution is the supreme law. Anton v. S.C. Coastal Council, 469 S.E.2d 604 (1996). (emphasis added)

...where there is a conflict between a statute and the State Constitution, the Constitution overrides the statute. State v. Whitener, 225 S.C. 244, 81 S.E.2d 784 (1954).

Simply put, the General Assembly made a contract with the people and prisoners of this state to ensure that the prisoners would receive sufficient rehabilitation during their incarceration. Thus, ensuring them a greater chance at being a successful and productive citizen if released back into society.

This constitutional obligation cannot be abridged or avoided simply by the passage of more restrictive sentencing laws. The passage of any restrictive sentencing laws that alter, deny or otherwise interfere with the commands of the Constitution, make the law unconstitutional.

Hence, Article XII § 2 is equivalent to a constitutional contract in which State prisoners have a liberty and property interest that must be honored. Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co., 455 U.S. 422, 430-31 (1982); see also Ken Moorhead Oil Co. v. Federated Mut. Ins., 476 S.E.2d 481, 485 (SC 1996).

66

2000

Therefore, South Carolina Constitution Article XII § 2 limits legislative authority to "provid[ing] for the custody, maintenance, health, welfare, education and rehabilitation of the inmates" in order to ensure that any prisoner returned to society would be "physically, mentally, socially [and] vocationally" prepared to be a productive member of society. (Jones v. Grinnel Corp., 362 A2d 139, 143). Any attempt by the legislature or other department or agency to abridge this right is unconstitutional. In other words, the legislature cannot avoid its constitutional duty by "putting slippage in the joints" that allows a state department or agency to do what the legislature is forbidden to do by giving that department or agency "unbridled discretion" in its decision making process. [U.S. Outdoor Advert. Inc. v. S.C. Dept. of Transportation, 481 S.E.2d 112, 113 (1997)].

[2, 3] An administrative regulation is valid so long as it is reasonably related to the purpose of the enabling legislation. [Hunter & Walden Co. v. S.C. State Licensing Bd. of Contractor, 272 S.C. 211, 251 S.E. 2d 186 (1978)]. However, although regulations have the force of law, they may not alter or add to the terms of a statute. Goodman v. City of Columbia, 318 S.C. 488, 458 S.E.2d 531 (1995); Society of Prof'd Journalist v. Sexton, 382 S.C. 563, #24 S.E.2d 313 (1984)].

Hence, any law passed by the legislature which denies or interferes with a prisoner's rehabilitation, or any delegation of authority to any state agency which does the same is unconstitutional.

2.

It is undisputed that under the United States Constitution although states must provide the basics to a prisoner, Estell v. Gamble, 97 S.Ct. At 290-91, they are not required to rehabilitate them. Williams v. McGinnis, 755 F.Supp. 230. However, unlike the federal consstitution, the South Carolina Constitution does require that prisoners be rehabilitated. Accordingly, federal rights can flow from a court's interpretation of a state constitution. [Mathis v. Eli Lilly and Co. 719 F.2d 134, 137 (1983)].

When presented with challenge to constitutionality of state statute under State Constitution, federal court must look to the decision of the state Supreme Court and, if there are none, must determine how the state Supreme Court would rule if presented with the same issue.

Hence, when a court takes into consideration the fact that the South Carolina Constitution demands rehabilitation for its prisoners and that this Constitution, itself, is a mandate to government from the people, the federal constitution takes on a different meaning. When a state violates its own constitution and the mandates of its people, that would be "truly irrational" in violation of substantive due process. [Thompson v. Ellenrecker, 935 F.Supp. 1037, 1040 (DCSC) 1995)].

The Eighth Circuit explained "[a] plaintiff asserting a substantial Due Process claim must establish that the government action complained of is "truly irrational", that is something more than... arbitrary, capricious, or in violation of state law. Anderson v. Douglas County, 4 F.3d 574, 577 (8th Cir. 1991)].

Moreover, the Eighth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution must also take on a different meaning since the people set the minimum standards of civilized decency in South Carolina by mandating rehabilitation as part of their Constitution. [Tropp v. Dulles, 78 S.Ct. 590, 598 (1958)]. The basic concept underlying the Eighth Amendment is nothing less than the dignity of man. The Amendment must draw its meaning from the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society.

Finally, the Equal Protection clause also requires more protection as South Carolina has elevated its prisoners to a protected class. Any legislation enacted that denies rehabilitation to them must be judged under strict scrutiny. Personnel Adm's of Mass. v. Feeney, 99 S.Ct. 2282; Feeney v. Comm. Of Mass., 475 F.Supp. 109, affirmed 100 S.Ct. 1075 (1980).

The problem in South Carolina can be summed up in one case: *Brown v. Evatt*, 470 S.E.2d 848, 851 (1996). The federal constitution vest no liberty interest in inmates retaining or receiving any particular security or custody status as long as the challenged conditions or degree of confinement are within the sentence imposed and are not otherwise violative of the constitution. (*Sandin v. Conner*), 115 S.Ct. 2293 (1995); *Slezak v. Evatt*, 21 F.3d 590 (4th Cir.). Within these limits and custody classification of state prison inmates is a matter for state prison official discretion whose exercise is not subject to federal procedural due process constraints. (*Sandin v. Conner*, *Supra*). Nonetheless, a liberty interest in state inmates to retain or attain a particular security or custody classification may be created by state law which places substantive limitations on official discretion. However even if a state law regime mandates both a detailed procedural process for making classification decisions and substantive criteria to be used in making those decisions, no constitutionally protected liberty interest is created if the regime either the primary decision maker or any reviewing authority is authorized to override, as a matter of discretion, any classification suggested by application of the prescribed substantive criteria. (*Slezak v. Evatt*, *Supra*). Holding that *Brown* had no liberty interest because "neither the state statutes which creates and defines the powers of SCDC's operational classification regulations create the required liberty interest". it is important to note that *Brown* brought his case under the United States Constitution without asking the court to consider the mandates of South Carolina Constitution Article XII § 2. Had *Brown* brought his claim under Art. XII § 2, the state would have been forced to implement procedures which are outcome determine by placing "substantive limitations on official discretion and a detailed procedural process for making classification decisions" along with a substantive criteria to be used in making those decisions as required by the mandatory language of Art. XII § 2. Once the allegations contained in the Plaintiff's Complaint along with the law and practices contained in the facts of this brief (*infra*) are given proper consideration, it is clear that the legislature has violated the commands of the state and federal constitution by passing laws which directly deny prisoners of access to meaningful rehabilitations programs. They have further violated the constitutions by passing laws which allow

or create "sippage in the joints" which permits the Department of Corrections and Parole Board to deny rehabilitation to prisoners by using "unbridled discretion" and no "detailed procedural process" or "substantive criteria" upon which their decisions must be made. Since the legislature has clearly exceeded the scope of authority granted to it by the Constitution, the conditions of confinement must be corrected as a matter of law. SCDC cannot save my life because so many people have died because shortness of staff. I need to be Released Under Extraordinary Circumstances due to under-staffing for more than 10 years. My life matters and I don't want to die and be forgotten about, like the rest of the inmates that die in SCDC. The law makers and Gov. has neglected duties of short of staff for over 15 years CAUSING me to catch Covid-19.

Jamie Goss
Jamie Goss



ATTACHMENT

As to Issue I, this court erred in concluding that Appellant is not entitled to Compassionate Release for Extraordinary Circumstances due to Covid-19. When South Carolina Department of Corrections, (herein after SCDC) has shown failures to adequately prevent, address and respond to Covid-19 pandemic. The substandard patterns or practices within SCDC, in which this court is aware of these deficiencies, i.e. overcrowding, short of staff, including but not limited to security, medical and mental health staff, which are the three main components in administering the Covid protocols.

Futhermore, SCDC is very much aware of their failures to correct these substandard patterns or practices which would lead to serious bodily and or mental injury.

The Covid-19 pandemic is still very much alive within SCDC and it is a health hazard due to all the above reasons stated.

Furthermore, SCDC's reponse is lock-down 24/7. Appellant's rights to be free from the threat of the Covid-19 pandemic under the amendments to the Constitution of the United States are being overlooked by this Court.

SCDC's response to the pandemic is problematic to the morale and overall mental health of prisoners systemwide.

Fact finders have shown that SCDC has substantially fallen below the ACA standard of a modern prison.

There is a substantial risk of harm with overcrowding, and remaining in close quarters during this pandemic. Quarantine has the effect of raising the risk due to shortage of staff in the medical and security divisions.

When systematic deficiencies in staffing facilities, or procedures make unnecessary suffering inevitable, a court should not hesitate to use the injunctive power. Todaro vs. Ward 565 F.2d 48, 52 (2nd Cir. 1977). The overcrowding and understaffing within SCDC has exposed Appellant to a constitutionally unacceptable substantial risk from the Covid-19 pandemic and physical violence. SCDC has manifested "deliberate indifference" toward this risk. If this court overlooks or misapprehended this issue, it too would have manifested further "deliberate indifference" toward this risk. *James L.*

Affidavit To Support Petition

1. My name is Jamie Goss 294885 living at P.O. Box 189 Rømbert S.C. 29128, All defendant in this matter have the same thing in common malice, intent to commit an unlawful act that cause harm. This is a great Criminal act of Fraud.
2. Why S.C.D.C. worrying about cell-phone but Not one time S.C.D.C. got on T.V. talking about 100 inmate die from Covid-19, I been suffering for the past three year from Covid-19 with NO help from the circuit Court, S.C. Court of Appeal Court and law maker ~~not~~ leave inmate population to die by not having a statute in place during Covid-19. Especially when S.C.D.C. is short of staff and overcrowded for the past 17 years. So many people have die in S.C.D.C. because of this shortage. But I have and other have save so many people life with cellphone in S.C.D.C. Cellphone are the only hope for prisoner because My years in S.C.D.C. they don't have the resource to restore prisoners, which have destroyed so many people life including all the

the death, but S.C.D.C. game plan is to talk about cellphone to blind the eyes of taxes payers ~~money~~ to get more money from the Federal Government. My years in S.C.D.C. I have exp this Fraud of America people money waste on S.C.D.C. There are 17,000 people in S.C.D.C that the Federal Government Fund over 600,000,000 dollars every year for nothing, but have come to kill, ~~steal~~ steal, destory. The America people need to wake up and see, there being Robed blind because of hard earn money, So America people don't even get paid this kind of money work 8 to 12 hour a day. The average pay for each inmate 40 to 30 thousand a year. The creation of S.C.D.C. has two legs Art.12 section 2 and title 24-1-20 to restore and give human treatment which has fail due to short of staff in every department and prison overcrowded for my 17 years in prison. Also S.C.D.C. have every evity and Contract with out side care which has violate Roe V. Wade because the other evity is ~~bound~~ bound by

Contract including my ~~contracting me~~ legal case. I'm bound by contract and no one in S.C.I.D.C. was train according to the law.

3. Joe Biden and Donald Trump has fail to put the CARE ACT in the state of emergency executive order knowing that the CARE ACT was for everyone in the United State and to demand that all ~~inmate~~ ~~to~~ State follow the CARE ACT and C.I.D.C. Guideline No matter what the circumstance's are because the executive order have it's own rules. (Covid-19)

4. Henry McMaster and Bryan P. Stirling and Melanie Davis and Jerry B. Adger and Warden L. Cohen and Warden Cohen should have release Inmate according to the CARE ACT because S.C.I.D.C. could not follow C.I.D.C. Guideline because short of staff in every department and prison overcrowded that led to violate Art 12 section 2 and Title 24-1-20.

5. John Geather, Bruce H. William,
~~William Geather~~, Jerry D. Vinson,
Stephanie P. McDonald, E. Lockemy James,
have violate the CARE ACT and
executive order by fighting against
the policy during Covid-19
6. United State Director C.D.C. Should have
in place herbal Medicine for every
medicine that is issue because I'm
suffering for years in S.C.D.C cause
of what I stand on and that's
God words. By not having that mandate
the Doctor ~~told~~^{said} me. I can wake up
dead any day because of my heart
beat is very bad and heart is leading to other
Problem
7. William Seal and R. Ferrell Cothran has
ignore policy of the CARE ACT and
Executive order during Covid-19
when I almost die in the shower
and was told that CARE ACT was
for everyone because I told
them I receive stimulus check
from CARE ACT.

8 General Assembly knowing the CARE ACT was for everyone and still did not amend Compassion Release to Compassion Release for Extraordinary ~~circumstances~~ Circumstance during Covid-19. Especially knowing S.C. don't have a statute in place for Covid-19.

9 S.C.D.C Director Doctor and P.A. Alden has done nothing for my ~~death~~ major health problem concerning herbal medicine but leaving me to die and suffer with no help. "We don't have that option and it's nothing we can do about this matter"; (Violation Art 12 section 2 and Title 24-1-20)

10 Ronald Hazzard and Seth Oskin has conspired together to fight against the policy of the CARE ACT and executive order knowing the law but fail to apply the law during Covid-19.

11 Brian Truix knowing the law has taken it upon his self to recorded over the video tape of the high speed Chase that put me in prison for 29 years

12 Donald Beatty C.J has put out an order during Covid-19 that violate the CARE ACT and knowing the CARE ACT was for everyone ~~but~~ but it was ignore.

13 Director Prisma Health Tuomey Hospital knowing when anyone had surgery it is mandatory that a follow up ~~is~~ ~~is~~ is giving. (This is why S.C.D.C should not have contact with other entity)

14 Director of Ridgeland Water Company knowing the defect of the water and has done nothing to evacuate the prison but leaving us to deal with the matter as of today that water will turn ~~to~~ a new white rag dark brown in minutes. (This matter need to be ~~investigate~~ investigate because something major happen with that water company)

15 Jenny A. Kitching and Brenda F. Shealy has violate policy of state of emergency executive order by allowing extension during emergency circumstance.

- 16 William Blietner and Mark R. Farthing has NO reason to fight against the policy of CARE ACT and State of emergency executive order during Covid-19.
- 17 S.C.D.C Director Security has done Nothing, but locked inmates in the cell due to being short of staff and prison overcrowder during Covid-19 and before Covid-19. This problem to know the major issue and don't do nothing are violateing Art ~~12~~ section 2 and Title 24-1-20. This issue has cause harm to inmate and staff member ~~them~~ by extra work load cause them to violate the policy and C.D.C guideline.
- 18 S.C. Academy Director has fail to train staff member according to the law for Art 12 section 2 and Title 24-1-20 and 24-21-715 which has cause officer's to be lose concerning the matter from Covid-19 and giving inmates humane treatment.

19 Jake Gadsden Jr. is over all program in S.C.D.C, which has fail all program cause of short of staff in every department, and has fail to train ~~the~~ staff according to C.D.C guideline during Covid-19.
(Violation of Art 12 section 2 and 24-1-20)

20