

RECEIVED

SEP 16 2024

SC Court of Appeals

State of South Carolina
In the Court of Appeals

Jonathan Goad

Appellant

Lee County

Dkt. No.

v.

South Carolina Dept. of
Correction.

Respondent

ACTION

Notice of Appeal

Sat below: Hon. Ralph

King Anderson, III

Dkt. No: 23-ALJ-04-0740-

AP

Please Take Notice, that Appellant,
Jonathan Goad appeal the dismissal of
his claim decided on August 22, 2024
the Administrative Law Court, Hon. Ralph
King Anderson, III.

Dated: 9-11-2024.

Jonathan Goad

RECEIVED

SEP 16 2024

SC Court of Appeals

The State of South Carolina
In the Court of Appeals
(In the Supreme Court)

Case NO. below:

Sat below: Hon. Ralph K. Anderson, III

Jonathan Good Appellant,

v.

South Carolina Dept. of Correction Respondent.

Record on Appeal

Attorney For Appellant

Jonathan Good # 216638

Lee Correctional Inst.

990 Wisacky Hwy

Bishopville, S.C. 29010

Attorney For Respondent

Malone, Thompson & Summers LLC

339 Heyward Street, Suite 200

Columbia, S.C. 29201

Date: 9-11-2024

sign: Jonathan Good

Table of Contents

	Page
Table of Authorities	ii
Statement of Facts	3
LEGAL ARGUMENT:	
<u>Point One</u>	
THE Administrative Law Court Erred When Affirming SCLC's Denial of Appellant's Grievance	5
CONCLUSION	7

Designation of Matter

Step One Grievance	Da 1
Step two Grievance	Da 2
Opinion and Order below	Da 3-8

Table of Authorities

	Page
Ackerman v. South Carolina Dept. of Correction, 415 S.C. 412 (2016).	5

Statement of the Issue

1. Did the Administrative Law Court err when dismissing Appellant's Prevailing Wage Claim on the grounds of being untimely filed?

Statement of Facts

Appellant initiated an informal resolution concerning SEDC's failure to adhere to S.C. Code 24-3-430. The same was initiated on or about May 3, 2023. In response, Appellant was informed to file/submit a Step One Grievance. A Step One Grievance was filed on May 4, 2023. The same was held in abeyance and forward to Step 2, which was denied November 14, 2023.

Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Law Court and the case was assigned to Hon. Ralph K. Anderson, III.

On April 22, 2024, respondent (SEDC) filed a motion to dismiss on the grounds that Appellant failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. Respondent's motion was denied May 17, 2024.

On June 3, 2024, respondent filed the Record on Appeal. Respondent never filed a brief with the Court.

On August 22, 2024, the Administrative Law Court dismissed appellant's appeal on

the grounds that Appellant's Claim did not meet the 15-day deadline under SCDC Policy ADM-15.13, Section 12.1.

This appeal follows.

LEGAL ARGUMENT

Point One

THE Administrative Law Court Erred When Affirming SCDC's Denial of Appellant's Grievance

The Court below erroneously dismissed Appellant's Claim on the grounds that Appellant initiated his Claim untimely. Essentially, the Court below affirmed SCDC's denial of Appellant's Step 2 Grievance on the grounds that Appellant failed to meet the 15-day deadline outlined in SCDC's Policy ADM-15.13, Section 12.1. In Pertinent Part, SCDC Policy ADM-15.13, Section 12.1 reads:

"An inmate must report any Problems in their Pay to their inmate Pay designee within 15-days of the Payroll date error,"

Appellant asserts that the Court below completely ignored this Court's ruling in Ackerman v. South Carolina Department of Correction, 415 S.C. 412 (2016).

In Ackerman, Supra, Appellant filed a Step

2 Grievance alleging that he was not paid the prevailing wages in accordance to S.C. Code 24-3-430. The Department of Correction denied Appellant's grievance on the grounds that Appellant failed to meet the 15-day deadline. Ackerman (Appellant) appealed and the Administrative Law Court affirmed SCDC's denial. Appellant appealed the Administrative Law Court decision and the Court of Appeals reversed on the grounds that SCDC's 15-day Policy did not apply to Appellant's claim because Appellant's claim did not concern an incident, rather concerned the Department's Policy and Procedures, which are exempt from the filing deadline.

In the present case, the facts and legal issues involved are identical to those in Ackerman, supra. Appellant's claim alleges that SCDC failed to pay him the prevailing wages in accordance to S.C. Code 24-3-~~374~~⁴³⁰. As outlined in Appellant's amended brief filed with the Court below, Appellant challenges the specific pay rate in the contract made with the private sector, Nephron. The

at hand is governed by statute and, as in the Case of Ackerman, Supra, is an expression of the legislature's Policy on inmate Pay. As Such, Appellant's Claim is not subject to SCDC's 15-day deadline. Appellant's Claim has nothing to do with a Pay-roll error, rather, has to do with SCDC's day to day unlawful Practices, in Violation of S.C. Code 24-3-430.

For these reasons, Appellant's Claim should not have been dismissed on the grounds that Appellant failed to meet the 15-day deadline.

CONCLUSION

For reasons outlined above, the decision below should be reversed.

Dated: 9-11-2024

for the record

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INMATE GRIEVANCE FORM
STEP 2

Office Use Only

INMATE NAME: Goad, Jonathan Grievance No. Lee-0213-23
SCDC NUMBER: 2146-38 Code: General M/1105
INSTITUTION: LCI MAY 17 2023 Policy _____
HOUSING UNIT: _____ INMATE GRIEVANCE Disc. Hear. _____
WORK ASSIGNMENT: _____ Class _____
PREA _____
Date Received: _____
IGC Initials: _____
Date Received: _____
IGA Initials: _____

INMATE'S REASON FOR APPEAL (state specific dissatisfaction):

In accordance with SCDC Policy GA-01.12, "Inmate Grievance System," due to the nature of allegations you have raised in your Grievance, it has been forwarded to the Inmate Grievance Branch Central Office and Office of General Counsel for a response. Inmate's signature has been adopted from SCDC 10-5, Step 1 Inmate Grievance Form.

Grievant Signature _____ Date _____

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL'S DECISION AND REASON:

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL'S DECISION & REASON

Responsible Official Signature Bate Vincent Date 11-14-23

The decision rendered by the responsible official exhausts the appeal process of the Inmate Grievance Procedure. I hereby acknowledge receipt of the official's response and understand this is the Agency's final response to this matter.

Grievant Signature _____ Date _____ IGC Signature _____ Date _____

(SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

SCDC 10-5A (Rev. May 2015)

Jonathan Goad #216638

LEE CI INMATE



US POSTAGE PAID BY PITNEY BOWES

ZIP 29010 \$002.31⁰
02 4W
0000373846 SEP 12 2024

L.C.I F6A-1161
990 Wisacky Hwy
Bishopville, S.C. 29010

RECEIVED

SEP 16 2024

SC Court of Appeals

South Carolina Court of Appeal

P.O Box 11629

Columbia, S.C. 29211