

**RECEIVED**

**Jul 08 2025**

**SC Court of Appeals**

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM ANDERSON COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas

R. Scott Sprouse, Circuit Court Judge

---

Appellate Case No. 2025-000046

---

Pennie Wolfe, as Personal Representative  
of the Estate of Jason Wolfe,

Appellant,

v.

Anderson County Sheriff's Office and  
Security Transport Services, Inc.,

Defendants,

Of Which Anderson County Sheriff's Office is the

Respondent.

---

RECORD ON APPEAL

---

## INDEX

Order Granting Summary Judgment	2
Order Denying Motion to Alter or Amend	9
Complaint	12
Motion for Summary Judgment	25
Motion to Alter or Amend	26
Motion to Compel	28
Transcript of Hearing	29
Affidavit of Qing Liu, MD	44
Affidavit of Pennie Wolfe	55
ACSO Medicine Log	57
ACSO Intake Documents	58
Certificate of Appellant	65



The governmental entity is not liable for a loss resulting from: . . . (25) responsibility or duty including but not limited to supervision, protection, control, confinement, or custody of any student, patient, prisoner, inmate, or client of any governmental entity, except when the responsibility or duty is exercised in a grossly negligent manner . . . . Id. § 15-78-60 (25) (emphasis added).

Defendant Anderson County argues that Plaintiff’s action should be dismissed because he has failed to assert any facts which would imply gross negligence on the part of this Defendant. The Court of Appeals has held that the South Carolina Tort Claims Act “removes the common law bar of sovereign immunity in certain circumstances, but only to the extent mandated by the Act.” Summers v. Harrison Constr., 298 S.C. 451, 454, 381 S.E.2d 493, 495 (Ct. App. 1989). The Court went on to state that “the provisions relating to limitations on and exemptions to liability are to be liberally construed in favor of limiting the liability of the state.” Id.; see also S.C. Code Ann. § 15-78-20(f) (“The provisions of this chapter establishing limitations on and exemptions to the liability of the State, its political subdivisions, and employees, while acting within the scope of official duty, must be liberally construed in favor of limiting the liability of the State.”).

Gross negligence has been defined as, “‘the failure to exercise slight care’; ‘the intentional, conscious failure to do something which it is *incumbent* upon one to do or the doing of a thing intentionally that one ought not to do’; and ‘a relative term’ meaning ‘the *absence of care that is necessary under the circumstances.*’” Duncan v. Hampton County Sch. Dist. No. 2, 335 S.C. 535, 544, 517 S.E.2d 449, 453 (Ct. App. 1999) (emphasis in original) (quoting Hollins v. Richland County Sch. Dist. One, 310 S.C. 486, 490, 427 S.E.2d 654, 656 (1993)). When the evidence regarding gross negligence supports but one reasonable inference, the question becomes a matter of law for the court to resolve. Clyburn v. Sumter County Sch. Dist. No. 17, 317 S.C. 50, 53, 451 S.E.2d 885, 887-88 (1994).

Defendant Anderson County submitted the affidavit of Dr. Qing Liu, the Chief Medical

Officer of Mediko, Inc., a company that provides health care services to jails and prisons. Dr. Liu stated in his affidavit that he began working with Mediko in September 2017 and has treated thousands of inmate patients since that time. He has specialized training in anesthesiology and pain management. Dr. Liu stated that Mediko was the health care contractor for ACDC in December 2021 while Plaintiff was at ACDC. Dr. Liu did not personally treat Plaintiff, but reviewed the medical records from Plaintiff's incarceration at ACDC and is familiar with the policies and procedures followed by Mediko staff in December 2021. Dr. Liu attached a copy of Plaintiff's medical records to his affidavit.

Dr. Liu stated in his affidavit that Plaintiff was 43 years old when he was incarcerated at ACDC on December 3, 2021. Plaintiff claims in his Complaint that he did not receive four medications, Duloxetine HCL 30 mg, Lithium Carbonate 300 mg, Klonopin, and Lyrica 300 mg, while he was incarcerated at ACDC. Dr. Liu stated that two of the medications, Klonopin and Lyrica, carry a high risk of addiction and abuse due to effects on the central nervous system. Klonopin is a benzodiazepine, a depressant that produces sedation and hypnosis. Lyrica is a nerve pain medication. Klonopin and Lyrica are, respectively, Schedule VI and V controlled substances because of their high potential for abuse and/or dependency.

Dr. Liu stated that when inmates arrive at the jail with these medications, the medications are typically discontinued unless there is an acute need that cannot be addressed through alternative treatments. Also, inmates who present with pre-existing mental illnesses are scheduled for appointments with mental health staff within 14 days of arrival.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Liu stated that in this case, Mediko staff reviewed Plaintiff's medications and, consistent with the need to keep all inmates safe from substance abuse and diversion, refused the Klonopin and Lyrica. On December 3, 2021,

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff was released from ACDC eight days after arrival and before an appointment with mental health staff occurred.

Mediko nurse Nora Heaton, LPN, signed off on a Home Medication List reflecting this refusal.

On December 4, 2021, James Walker, MD, ordered that Plaintiff's vital signs be monitored twice daily for five days to ensure he remained stable following the discontinuation of Klonopin and Lyrica. Also, Dr. Walker prescribed a tapering dose of Ativan to address any potential withdrawal symptoms due to the discontinuation of Klonopin. Like Klonopin, Ativan is a benzodiazepine, but it has a lesser potency and is more effective at treating withdrawal symptoms.

Dr. Liu stated that based on the records, the allegation in the Complaint that Plaintiff received only "some of his medication some of the time" is inaccurate. As evidenced by the Medication Administration Record ("MAR"), Plaintiff received all scheduled doses of Duloxetine (once daily) and Lithium Carbonate (twice daily). Plaintiff also received the tapering dose of Ativan as prescribed. Dr. Liu noted that from the MAR Plaintiff did not take his evening dose on December 5, 2021 and stated this was perhaps due to refusal.

Dr. Liu stated the allegation in the Complaint that Plaintiff experienced "extreme and significant withdrawals while in the custody of ACSO" was also unsupported by the evidence. Plaintiff's vital signs remained stable throughout the week he was at ACDC and there are no notes to suggest he voiced any complaints to medical staff. On December 11, 2021, Plaintiff was released to the custody of the State Prisoner Transfer Officer for transfer to a correctional facility in Kansas. At the time of his departure, Mediko staff released his medications to the State Prisoner Transfer Officer. Dr. Liu stated that based upon his education, training and experience, and upon his review of the medical records, it is his opinion that the medical staff at ACDC acted appropriately in treating Plaintiff and that Plaintiff received appropriate medical care throughout his incarceration in December 2021. He further stated that he saw no basis from the medical records to conclude that Plaintiff suffered any harm from the discontinuation of Lyrica and/or Klonopin.

The Court agrees that Plaintiff has failed to assert facts to show gross negligence, “the failure to exercise slight care.” As shown by Dr. Liu’s affidavit and Plaintiff’s medical records, Plaintiff was provided all doses of Lithium and Duloxetine while at ACDC. Furthermore, it was ordered that Plaintiff’s vital signs be monitored twice daily for five days to ensure he remained stable following the discontinuation of Klonopin and Lyrica.

Plaintiff was not provided Lyrica, a Schedule V controlled substance, due to its high risk of addiction and abuse due to its effects on the central nervous system. On these facts, Plaintiff fails as a matter of law to show absence of slight care. Plaintiff was provided Lithium and Duloxetine. He was also provided Ativan as a substitute for Klonopin and was not provided Lyrica due to its high risk of addiction and abuse. In addition, though Plaintiff was not provided Klonopin, he was given a tapering dose of Ativan to address any potential withdrawal symptoms due to the discontinuation of Klonopin. Based on the records and Dr. Liu’s affidavit, there was a conscious decision made not to provide the medication. Further, he stated that in his opinion Plaintiff did not suffer any harm from the discontinuation of Lyrica. Plaintiff fails to show “the failure to exercise slight care” and his action must be dismissed.

Plaintiff has failed to meet his burden in this action. As discussed above, Plaintiff must show gross negligence, the absence of slight care. The provision of Ativan to address withdrawal issues would be slight care as would monitoring Plaintiff’s vital signs twice daily to ensure he remained stable following the discontinuation of Klonopin and Lyrica. Defendant also argued that Plaintiff’s action be dismissed for failure to provide expert testimony. In light of the Court’s ruling, the Court did not address the issue of expert witness testimony.

Based on the above, Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment is granted and Plaintiff's action is dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Honorable R. Scott Sprouse  
Judge, Tenth Judicial Circuit

Anderson, South Carolina



Anderson Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** Jason Wolfe VS Anderson County Sheriffs Office , defendant, et al

**Case Number:** 2023CP0402442

**Type:** Order/Summary Judgment

s/R. Scott Sprouse, Judge #2752

Tenth Judicial Circuit

Electronically signed on 2024-12-02 10:46:43 page 7 of 7

Jason Wolfe  
PLAINTIFF(S)

Anderson County Sheriffs Office et al  
DEFENDANT(S)

**DISPOSITION TYPE (CHECK ONE)**

- JURY VERDICT.** This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.
- DECISION BY THE COURT.** This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.
- ACTION DISMISSED (*CHECK REASON*):**  Rule 12(b), SCRPC;  Rule 41(a), SCRPC (Vol. Nonsuit);  Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled);  
 Other
- ACTION STRICKEN (*CHECK REASON*):**  Rule 40(j), SCRPC;  Bankruptcy;  
 Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award;  
 Other
- STAYED DUE TO BANKRUPTCY**
- DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (*CHECK APPLICABLE BOX*):**  
 Affirmed;  Reversed;  Remanded;  
 Other

NOTE: ATTORNEYS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING LOWER COURT, TRIBUNAL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT RULING IN THIS APPEAL.

**IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:**  See attached order (formal order to follow)  Statement of Judgment by the Court:

After careful consideration of the able argument and filings of Counsel and review of the record, the Court is unable to discover any material fact or principle of law that either has been overlooked or disregarded and further finds no error of law or fact not appropriately considered. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider, Alter, or Amend is DENIED.

**ORDER INFORMATION**

This order  ends  does not end the case.  See Page 2 for additional information.

**For Clerk of Court Office Use Only**

This judgment was electronically entered by the Clerk of Court as reflected on the Electronic Time Stamp, and a copy mailed first class to any party not proceeding in the Electronic Filing System on 12/12/2024 .

**NAMES OF TRADITIONAL FILERS SERVED BY MAIL**

**Court Reporter:**

**E-Filing Note:** The date of Entry of Judgment is the same date as reflected on the Electronic File Stamp and the clerk's entering of the date of judgment above is not required in those counties. The clerk will mail a copy of the judgment to parties who are not E-Filers or who are appearing pro se. See Rule 77(d), SCRCP.

---



Anderson Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** Jason Wolfe VS Anderson County Sheriffs Office , defendant, et al

**Case Number:** 2023CP0402442

**Type:** Order/Electronic Form 4

s/R. Scott Sprouse, Judge #2752

Tenth Judicial Circuit

Electronically signed on 2024-12-12 14:10:31 page 3 of 3

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	)	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
	)	
COUNTY OF ANDERSON	)	TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
	)	
JASON WOLFE,	)	Case No. 2023-CP-04-_____
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
	)	<b>COMPLAINT</b>
	)	<b>(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)</b>
ANDERSON COUNTY SHERIFF’S	)	
OFFICE, SHERIFF CHAD MCBRIDE,	)	
individually and as Sheriff of Anderson	)	
County, and SECURITY TRANSPORT	)	
SERVICES, INC.	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

Plaintiff Jason Wolfe, complaining of the above-named Defendants, alleges and would show unto this Honorable Court as follows:

**PARTIES AND VENUE**

1. Plaintiff was, at all times relevant hereto, a citizen and resident of Anderson County, South Carolina.
  
2. The Anderson County Sheriff’s Office (“ACSO”) is a governmental entity and political subdivision of the State of South Carolina. The Anderson County Sheriff’s Office operates the Anderson County Detention Center. According to S.C. Code § 15-78-70(c), “...a person, when bringing an action against a governmental entity under the provisions of this chapter, shall name as a party defendant only the agency or political subdivision for which the employee was acting...” The employees who injured the plaintiff through gross negligence were employed at all relevant times by the Anderson County Sheriff’s Office, so that is the entity named as the defendant, as required by the Tort Claims Act. In some cases like this one, government defendants have take the position that the sheriff

must be named personally, but that is not what the Tort Claims Act requires. Upon information and belief, defendants do this so that they may attempt to mislead juries into thinking sheriffs have personal liability for these cases, which they do not.

3. Sheriff Chad McBride is and was, at all times relevant hereto, the Sheriff of Anderson County and is a resident of Anderson County. Sheriff McBride is named as a defendant in his individual and official capacity as Sheriff for Anderson County. All references to the Anderson County Sheriff's Office/ACSO herein are intended to refer to both ACSO and Sheriff McBride.
4. Defendant Security Transport Services, Inc. is a corporation organized under and existing pursuant to the laws of one of these United States.
5. The most pertinent acts or omissions giving rise to this action occurred in Anderson County, South Carolina.
6. This action is brought pursuant to the South Carolina Tort Claims Act, sec. 15-78-10, *et seq.*, South Carolina Code of Laws (1976), as amended.
7. Venue and jurisdiction are proper for the foregoing reasons.

#### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

8. According to the Anderson County Sheriff's Office website (<https://www.andersonsheriff.org>), the mission of the ACSO is "to enforce the law equitably and with compassion within our legal authority...to enhance public trust through accountability, professionalism, and visibility...to maintain a constitutionally sound and rehabilitative approach to incarceration...and to work in partnership with communities we serve to ensure the highest possible quality of life." The ACSO failed each of these stated missions in its interaction with Plaintiff.

9. On or about December 3, 2021, Plaintiff was taken into custody by ACSO and detained at the Anderson County Detention Center on a foreign arrest warrant originating from Shawnee County, Kansas. The charges on which Plaintiff was arrested were ultimately dismissed, but not before Defendants subjected Plaintiff to physical and mental suffering due to Defendants' acts and omissions described herein.
10. Plaintiff was held at the Anderson County Detention Center from December 3, 2021 until December 11, 2021, when he was placed into the custody and control of Defendant Security Transport Services, Inc., who transported Plaintiff to Shawnee County, Kansas in connection with the aforementioned arrest warrant.
11. As part of its intake procedure, on December 3, 2021, at 16:53 (4:53pm), ACSO interviewed Plaintiff to obtain details concerning Plaintiff's medical history, medications prescribed, and other information pertinent to Plaintiff's well-being. During the initial interview conducted by Officer Anita Robinson, Plaintiff stated he was prescribed Lyrica, Lithium, Duloxetine, and Klonopin.
12. Lyrica is a pain medication used to treat pain caused by nerve damage.
13. Duloxetine is a type of antidepressant medicine known as a serotonin-noradrenaline reuptake inhibitor (SNRI) used to treat depression, anxiety, and chronic pain and neuropathy.
14. Klonopin is a sedative belonging to a class of drugs known as benzodiazepines. It is used to treat anxiety and panic disorders.
15. Lithium is used to treat bipolar disorder and requires a certain therapeutic level. Too little and lithium is ineffective. Too much (lithium toxicity) can be life threatening or cause derangements in blood chemistry, mental cognition, breathing, and walking. Therefore,

lithium is to be taken in the same amounts, at the same time, each day. In addition, lithium is known to result in dangerous interactions with nearly 300 other substances, commonly requiring alterations to doses or frequency to avoid lithium toxicity.

16. During Plaintiff's interview with Officer Robinson, he provided her additional medical information, including concerning his mental health history.
17. Immediately after completing his interview with Officer Robinson, Plaintiff allegedly met with Officer Devin Holcombe. Purportedly, Officer Holcombe conducted a mental health interview of Plaintiff. Strangely, Officer Holcombe reported Plaintiff was not taking any medication for emotional or mental health problems. As a result, Officer Holcombe indicated no further mental health follow-up was needed.
18. Pursuant to ACSO's policies, procedures, and documentation, a follow-up mental health evaluation should have been conducted.
19. Despite the irregularities surrounding Officer Holcombe's "interview," ACSO was aware of Plaintiff's existing medical condition and prescriptions because Officer Robinson properly documented Plaintiff's responses. In fact, ACSO asked Plaintiff's wife to bring his prescriptions to the detention center, which she did.
20. Even though ACSO was aware of the medications Plaintiff was prescribed, and even though ACSO had possession of Plaintiff's medications, ACSO failed to administer Plaintiff his medications as prescribed.
21. ACSO knows, or should know, that individuals in its custody at the detention center often require the administration of medication.
22. ACSO knows, or should know, that it has an obligation to administer prescribed medications to individuals in its custody at the detention center.

23. ACSO has put in place policies and procedures concerning administering prescription medications to individuals in its custody at the detention center.
24. As part of these policies and procedures, ACSO maintains a “medicine log” for individuals in its custody. The medicine log includes entries for each medication prescribed, the amount prescribed, the amount dispensed, the time of day to be administered, and the starting/ending date for each. In addition, the medicine log contains space to record the date medication was dispensed, the amount, who dispensed, results, and an additional space for comments.
25. Plaintiff’s medicine log is completely blank. ACSO failed to record on Plaintiff’s medicine log the prescribed medications, the amount prescribed, the amount dispensed, the time of day to be administered, and the start/end date.
26. According to the medicine log, the Plaintiff was denied his prescription medication for the entirety of Plaintiff’s time in ACSO’s custody.
27. However atrocious the failure to deny Plaintiff’s medication while in ACSO custody was, the reality is even worse, because ACSO provided Plaintiff with *some* of his prescribed medication *some* of the time.
28. ACSO administered lithium and duloxetine to Plaintiff on at least an occasional basis, but never provided Plaintiff Lyrica or Klonopin.
29. Because he was not provided his medications as prescribed, Plaintiff experienced extreme and significant withdrawals while in the custody of ACSO, affecting his physical and mental health.
30. On December 11, 2021, Plaintiff was transferred to the custody of Defendant Security Transport Services, Inc. for extradition to Kansas via passenger vehicle.

31. ACSO failed to inform Security Transport Services of Plaintiff's medical conditions and prescription medications when they transferred custody.
32. Security Transport Services failed to perform an independent intake interview of Plaintiff to confirm Plaintiff's medical conditions and medications.
33. As a result, Security Transport Services did not administer Plaintiff's medications to him while transporting Plaintiff to Kansas resulting in further withdrawal symptoms.
34. During his transport, Plaintiff was denied the ability to stop for restroom breaks, was placed in restraints that were too small, was forced to sleep in a cell with five other individuals, and was otherwise subjected to physical and mental suffering.
35. Upon arriving in Kansas, Security Transport Services failed to provide to Shawnee County law enforcement information concerning Plaintiff's medical history and prescriptions, leading to Plaintiff being deprived of medications while in the custody of Shawnee County Sheriff's Department.
36. The above acts and omissions by Defendants directly resulted in significant and life-altering physical, mental, emotional, and psychological injury by Plaintiff which continues to this day and which entitles him to recover damages associated with those injuries.

**FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(NEGLIGENCE, GROSS NEGLIGENCE, RECKLESSNESS)**

37. Each and every allegation contained hereinabove is realleged and incorporated herein as if fully restated.
38. Governmental entities and employees each have a duty to exercise that degree of knowledge, skill, and care required of police officers and/or guards and/or governmental

employees and/or public officials and/or municipalities that is ordinarily possessed and exercised by those in their special line of work.

39. Breaches of these duties constitute gross negligence and, in some circumstances, recklessness.

40. The defendant breached its duties in a grossly negligent and reckless manner in some or all of, but not limited to, the following particulars:

- a. by failing to exercise slight care;
- b. by failing to take reasonable measures to protect inmates' liberty and freedom;
- c. by failing to make any effort to protect the plaintiff's basic rights;
- d. by failing to schedule necessary and appropriate medical appointments;
- e. by delaying medical appointments;
- f. by causing the plaintiff to miss medical appointments;
- g. by depriving/failing to provide the plaintiff with access to appropriate medical care and medications;
- h. by failing to properly document the plaintiff's medical conditions and medications;
- i. by failing to adequately investigate the employees' and officers' conduct prior to the tortious actions described herein;
- j. by failing to adequately supervise employees;
- k. by failing to have adequate and appropriate procedures in place to prevent the harms described herein;
- l. by violating policies and procedures, including, but not limited to, those related to medical care and treatment;

- m. by failing to ensure that officers and others complied with all applicable policies and procedures;
  - n. by authorizing, adopting, and ratifying employees' and officers' conduct toward the plaintiff;
  - o. by hiring employees and officers who were incompetent, lacked proper education and training, or were otherwise unfit;
  - p. by failing to take the plaintiff's mental and physical health conditions into account;
  - q. by failing to preserve and/or spoliating evidence; and,
  - r. in other such particulars as the evidence may show.
41. As a direct and proximate result of the grossly negligent and reckless acts and omissions of ACSO as described herein, Plaintiff has sustained injuries and damages, including those set forth above and some or all of the following:
- a. pain and suffering;
  - b. stress;
  - c. future damages resulting from permanent injuries;
  - d. mental pain and anguish;
  - e. out-of-pocket expenses;
  - f. humiliation;
  - g. emotional and psychological distress;
  - h. loss of enjoyment of life; and,
  - i. such as other damages as will be shown through discovery and at trial.

42. Plaintiff alleges each instance in which ACSO failed to administer medication, to administer medication properly, and to advise Security Transport Services of Plaintiff's medical history and prescriptions constitute multiple "occurrences," as the term is used in the South Carolina Tort Claims Act. As a result, Plaintiff may obtain an award against ACSO for several hundred thousand dollars, or millions of dollars, even if the defendant is entitled to the protection of any caps pursuant to the South Carolina Tort Claims Act. See, *Boiter v. SCDOT*, 393 S. C. 123, 712 S.E.2d 401 (2011); *Chastain v. Anmed Health Found*, 388 S.C. 170, 174, 694 S.E.2d 541, 543 (2010) ("more than one single act of negligence" constitutes multiple occurrences).
43. Plaintiff is therefore informed and believes that he is entitled to judgment against ACSO in an amount to be determined by a jury.

**FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(NEGLIGENCE, GROSS NEGLIGENCE, RECKLESSNESS)**

44. Each and every allegation contained hereinabove is realleged and incorporated herein as if fully restated.
45. Defendant Security Transport Services, Inc. owed duties to Plaintiff while Plaintiff was in its custody, including to provide for basic human needs, to provide him with his medications, to refrain from causing injury during his transport, and other duties under the common law and the laws of the State of South Carolina and the United States of America.
46. Security Transport Services was negligent, grossly negligent, and reckless in breaching the duties owed to Plaintiff in some or all, but not limited to, the following particulars:
- a. by failing to exercise due care to a person in its custody;

- b. by failing to take reasonable measures to ensure basic needs, such as bathroom breaks, rest stops, and proper sleeping conditions, were met;
- c. by failing to protect the plaintiff's basic rights;
- d. by failing to investigate the plaintiff's medical needs;
- e. by delaying or failing to provide medical prescriptions;
- f. by depriving/failing to provide the plaintiff with access to appropriate medical care;
- g. by failing to adequately investigate the employees' and officers' conduct prior to the tortious actions described herein;
- h. by failing to properly document the plaintiff's medical conditions and medications;
- i. by failing to adequately supervise employees;
- j. by failing to adequately train employees;
- k. by failing to have adequate and appropriate procedures in place to prevent individuals from the harms described herein;
- l. by violating policies and procedures, including, but not limited to, those related to medical care and treatment;
- m. by failing to ensure that employees complied with all applicable policies and procedures;
- n. by authorizing, adopting, and ratifying employees' conduct toward the plaintiff;
- o. by hiring employees and officers who were incompetent, lacked proper education and training, or were otherwise unfit;

- p. by failing to take the plaintiff's mental and physical health conditions into account;
  - q. by failing to preserve and/or spoliating evidence; and,
  - r. in other such particulars as the evidence may show.
47. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent, grossly negligent, and reckless acts and omissions of Security Transport Services as described herein, Plaintiff has sustained injuries and damages, including those set forth above and some or all of the following:
- a. pain and suffering;
  - b. stress;
  - c. future damages resulting from permanent injuries;
  - d. mental pain and anguish;
  - e. out-of-pocket expenses;
  - f. humiliation;
  - g. emotional and psychological distress;
  - h. loss of enjoyment of life; and,
  - i. such as other damages as will be shown through discovery and at trial.
48. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover nominal, compensatory, and punitive damages from Security Transport Services, Inc., in amounts to be determined by a jury.

**FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(NEGLIGENT HIRING, RETENTION, SUPERVISION, TRAINING)**

49. Each and every allegation contained hereinabove is realleged and incorporated herein as if fully restated.

50. Defendants owe duties to hire competent and fit employees; to perform background checks; to require appropriate education, training, experience, and other qualifications; to properly supervise employees; and to terminate unfit employees.
51. Defendants breached their duties to adequately hire and supervise employees in a negligent, grossly negligent, and reckless manner in some or all of the following particulars:
- a. in failing to ensure that employees and officers complied with applicable procedures;
  - b. in failing to ensure employees complied with employment policies and procedures regarding detention, incarceration, interaction, and transportation of persons such as Plaintiff;
  - c. in failing to appropriately interview candidates or require that candidates be qualified before hiring them;
  - d. in failing to require sufficient education and training before hiring employees;
  - e. in failing to adequately train agents and/or employees;
  - f. in failing to properly screen applicants, perform appropriate background checks, check references, and perform sufficient and formal interviews; and,
  - g. in other such particulars as the evidence may show.
52. As a direct and proximate result of the grossly negligent/reckless acts and omissions of the defendant, the plaintiff suffered injuries and damages, including those set forth above.
53. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover nominal, compensatory, and punitive damages from Security Transport Services, Inc., and compensatory damages from ACSO, in amounts to be determined by a jury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against the defendant and an award of actual damages, nominal damages, costs, and such other relief the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG LAW FIRM LLC

s/William T. Young III

William T. Young III (SC Bar No. 75153)

141 Traction Street

P.O. Box 9567

Greenville, SC 29604

(864) 403-8300

bill@younginjurylawyer.com

Greenville, South Carolina

November 28, 2023

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF ANDERSON

) IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
) TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
)

Jason Wolfe,

) C/A NO. 2023-CP-04-02442  
)

Plaintiff,

) DEFENDANT ANDERSON COUNTY  
) SHERIFF'S OFFICE'S  
) MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
) JUDGMENT  
)

v.

Anderson County Sheriff's Office and  
Security Transport Services, Inc.

Defendants.  
)  
)

**TO: WILLIAM T. YOUNG, III, ESQUIRE, AS ATTORNEY FOR THE PLAINTIFF:**

Defendant Anderson County Sheriff's Office by and through its undersigned attorneys, will move before the presiding Judge for the Court of Common Pleas of Anderson County, Anderson, South Carolina at the Anderson County Courthouse on the tenth day after service thereof, or at such other time and place as the Court may direct that Defendant Anderson County Sheriff's Office should be granted Summary Judgment pursuant to Rule 56 of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure as to the causes of action set forth in the Plaintiff's Complaint on the grounds that Plaintiff has failed to establish gross negligence and his action should be dismissed pursuant to the South Carolina Tort Claims Act.

McDONALD PATRICK POSTON HEMPHILL & ROPER, LLC

By: s/ Steven M. Pruitt

Steven M. Pruitt, Esquire  
414 Main Street (29646)  
Post Office Box 1547  
Greenwood, SC 29648  
864-388-1014 [spruitt@mcdonaldpatrick.com](mailto:spruitt@mcdonaldpatrick.com)

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT  
ANDERSON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE**

October 15, 2024  
Greenwood, South Carolina



- b. Plaintiff presented evidence establishing genuine issues of material fact precluding summary judgment. In particular, Plaintiff pointed to ACSO's own intake documents related to Mr. Wolfe which revealed contradictory information on the very matters on which this action is based. Notably, ACSO did not dispute the accuracy or validity of the documents. Plaintiff also presented evidence supporting Mr. Wolfe was not provided his medications. Where the evidence is susceptible to more than one reasonable inference, summary judgment is not proper and the matter is to be decided by the jury. *See Vaughan v. Town of Lyman*, 370 S.C. 436, 448, 635 S.E.2d 631, 638 (2006).
- c. Plaintiff has not been afforded a full and fair opportunity to conduct discovery in the matter which precludes the grant of summary judgment.
- d. The Court failed to view the evidence in the light most favorable to Plaintiff. Instead, it accepted ACSO's version of events as true and correct, disregarding evidence that raised genuine issues of material fact.

Respectfully Submitted,

YOUNG LAW FIRM LLC

s/William T. Young III  
William T. Young III (SC Bar No. 75153)  
141 Traction Street  
P.O. Box 9567  
Greenville, SC 29604  
(864) 403-8300  
bill@younginjurylawyer.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

December 11, 2024  
Greenville, South Carolina



STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF ANDERSON

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

Jason Wolfe, )  
Plaintiff, )  
 )  
V )  
 )  
Anderson County Sheriff's Office, )  
Defendant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

2023-CP-04-02442  
TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD

November 18, 2024  
Anderson, South Carolina

B E F O R E:

The Honorable R. Scott Sprouse, Judge

A P P E A R A N C E S:

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF:  
Bill Young, Esquire

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT:  
Steven M. Pruitt, Esquire

Tara T. Scott, CVR  
Official Court Reporter

INDEX

<u>WITNESS</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
Hearing.....	3
Certificate of Court Reporter.....	15

(NO EXHIBITS INTRODUCED DURING THIS HEARING)

1           THE COURT: This is Jason Wolfe v Anderson County  
2 Sheriff's Office and Security Transport Services, Inc. This  
3 is the Defendant Anderson County Sheriff's Office motion for  
4 summary judgment. I'll be glad to hear from you.

5           MR. PRUITT: Your Honor, may it please the Court. This  
6 is on a motion for summary judgment. Just basically, the  
7 Plaintiff in this case was incarcerated at the Anderson  
8 County Detention Center from December 3rd until December  
9 11th, 2021. In his complaint, Plaintiff alleges that he was  
10 not provided four medications while at the detention center.  
11 Lyrica, Lithium, Duloxetine, and Klonopin. Pursuant to 15-  
12 78-60, subsection 25 of the Tort Claims Act, the Plaintiff  
13 must show gross negligence, which has been described as the  
14 absence of slight care. We submitted our memo, Your Honor,  
15 previously. I think I emailed that to you. So, I'm not  
16 going to read it. I'm just going to, kind of, hit the  
17 highlights. We submitted an affidavit from Dr. Qing Liu,  
18 the chief medical officer of Mediko. Mediko is a company  
19 that provides medical care for correctional facilities and  
20 was the medical provider, care provider, at Anderson  
21 Detention Center at the time Mr. Wolfe was housed there.  
22 Mr. Liu, or Dr. Liu, I'm sorry, did not personally treat the  
23 Plaintiff, but reviewed the medical records from his  
24 incarceration and he also said, in his affidavit that he  
25 submitted as well, that he was familiar with the policies

1 and procedures from Mediko staff. And he attached a copy of  
2 the medical records to his affidavit. Dr. Liu stated while  
3 Plaintiff was incarcerated at the Detention Center. Again,  
4 he claimed the four medications he did not receive. Dr. Liu  
5 stated that two of those medications, Klonopin and Lyrica,  
6 carry a very high risk of addiction and abuse due to the  
7 effects on the central nervous system. Klonopin is a  
8 benzodiazepine. It is a depressant. It produces like  
9 sedation, hypnosis-type effects. Lyrica is a nerve pain  
10 medicine. Klonopin and Lyrica are respectively Schedule VI  
11 and Schedule V controlled substances because of their high,  
12 kind of, problem for abuse and dependency. Dr. Liu stated  
13 in his affidavit that when inmates arrive at the jail with  
14 these type medications, Klonopin and Lyrica, typically these  
15 are discontinued unless there is considered to be an acute  
16 need and it cannot be addressed through some other  
17 treatment.

18 Now, in this case, the Mediko staff reviewed the  
19 Plaintiff's medications and they refused the Klonopin and  
20 the Lyrica. Now, on December 4, Dr. James Walker, who was a  
21 physician at the Detention Center, employed by Mediko, he  
22 ordered that Mr. Wolfe's vital signs be monitored twice a  
23 day for five days to ensure that he remained stable  
24 following the discontinuation of Klonopin and Lyrica. Dr.  
25 Walker also prescribed a tapering dose of Ativan to address

1 any potential withdrawal symptoms. Ativan is like Klonopin,  
2 a benzodiazepine, but it has a lesser potency and it's used  
3 often to treat withdrawal. That's a lot of times what it's  
4 used for. Dr. Liu again put in his medical records to the  
5 affidavit. He said in the medical administration record  
6 that showed that Mr. Wolfe received all of his scheduled  
7 doses of Duloxetine and of Lithium. He received all those  
8 medications. He also received the tapering dose of Ativan  
9 as it was prescribed.

10 Dr. Liu also stated in the complaint that the Plaintiff  
11 experienced -- well, it states in the complaint that he  
12 experienced extreme and significant withdrawals while in the  
13 custody of Anderson County Detention Center. He said that  
14 based on his review of the records, that is not supported by  
15 the records or the evidence. He said his vital signs  
16 remained stable throughout the week and there were no notes  
17 of any voice complaints in the records. On December 11,  
18 2021, he was released from custody from Anderson County  
19 Detention Center and transferred to the -- I'm sorry, to  
20 Security Transport for transport to Kansas. And that's  
21 where the warrant and all had originated, was in Kansas.  
22 So, Dr. Liu stated in his opinion that the medical staff at  
23 the Detention Center acted appropriately, and he saw no  
24 basis from the medical records that Mr. Wolfe suffered any  
25 harm from not being provided the Klonopin and or Lyrica.

1       Our position is there's a failure to show gross negligence  
2       or the absence of slight care in this case. That's shown by  
3       the affidavit, and that's shown by the medical records. And  
4       he was provided all doses of Lithium and Duloxetine. And  
5       again, though he was not provided Klonopin, but he was  
6       provided a tapering dose of Ativan in order to taper him off  
7       and get him off of the Klonopin. He was not again provided  
8       the Lyrica, which is a Schedule V controlled substance, due  
9       to its high risk of abuse and effects on the central nervous  
10      system, but its abuse in the jail or correctional system.  
11      Our position, again, is there's a failure to show that there  
12      was at least slight care. We don't feel there was  
13      negligence, but at a minimum, there was slight care. He was  
14      provided Lithium and Duloxetine. He was provided a  
15      substitute for the Klonopin. He was not provided the Lyrica  
16      by the medical decision due to its high risk of addiction  
17      and abuse. So, there was a conscious decision there on  
18      that.

19             So, we find, Your Honor, there is no -- there's no  
20      gross negligence here. Now, there is one thing, the --  
21      well, just to hit this as well, there is a requirement. I  
22      cited all the law, and I'm not going to go through all that,  
23      but there is a requirement in South Carolina in a medical  
24      malpractice case that there has to be expert testimony as to  
25      both the standard of care, the breach in the standard, and

1 that there's proximate causation of damages. Now, we did  
2 receive an affidavit on Friday afternoon, and this is from  
3 Mr. Wolfe's wife, Pennie Wolfe. It states in the affidavit  
4 that she is a critical care nurse and that, based on her  
5 experience, Mr. Wolfe was going through withdrawal. We  
6 don't believe that she has the proper credentials or  
7 education or experience in order to render an opinion and be  
8 qualified as an expert in this matter. First, as a nurse,  
9 Ms. Wolfe would not be able to prescribe medications. She  
10 can't do that. She also would not be able to diagnose in  
11 this situation. So, the fact -- and she also did not state  
12 that she had even reviewed the medical records. It's not  
13 stated in the affidavit, but the medical records again, show  
14 he was given Ativan to address the issues of potential  
15 withdrawal. So if he -- even if it's assumed that he did  
16 have some withdrawal symptoms, he was given medication for  
17 this to try to alleviate these issues and concerns. He was  
18 given the Ativan. That is slight care at a minimum. That  
19 is at least slight care by doing -- by providing that  
20 medication. So again, she cannot prescribe the medications.  
21 She cannot diagnose.

22 And there is a statement also that she said that Mr.  
23 Wolfe allegedly made statements to her about not receiving  
24 his medications. But that's not admissible testimony.  
25 That's hearsay from her, a statement that he allegedly made.

1 It certainly cannot be admissible in this situation. So,  
2 Your Honor, that's our position is that there's a failure to  
3 show gross negligence in this case and the action ought to  
4 be dismissed. Thank you.

5 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Young, your response?

6 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please the  
7 Court. Bill Young here for, unfortunately, the estate of  
8 Jason Wolfe. As you may have noted in Mr. Pruitt's brief,  
9 Mr. Wolfe passed away in August of this year, unrelated to  
10 this lawsuit and we're in the process of having his wife  
11 appointed PR and adjusting the caption to reflect that. But  
12 he is no longer with us. We intend to pursue this action on  
13 behalf of his estate.

14 I want to first address some of the background here.  
15 Jason was arrested on a foreign warrant from Shawnee County,  
16 Kansas. He was detained here in Anderson County for a  
17 period of ten or eleven days, just over a week, and he was  
18 then transported to Kansas. The charges that he was  
19 transported to Kansas on were ultimately dropped. They  
20 didn't have any evidence of it, so he was completely  
21 absolved of any criminal liability, but yet he experienced  
22 significant issues during his detention at Anderson County  
23 and during his transfer to Kansas.

24 Mr. Pruitt provided the Court with the Mediko medical  
25 records. What was not provided, and what forms the basis of

1 the claim against the Anderson County Sheriff's Department,  
2 are the Anderson County Sheriff's Department records which I  
3 can provide to you, Your Honor. So, the first one has been  
4 marked Exhibit 1, and this is the Anderson County medicine  
5 log that shows nothing, no record of any sort of dispensing  
6 of medication. Then, Exhibit 3 is a packet, part of the  
7 inmate intake file. And what you will notice here is page  
8 one of that document is the standard medical questions.  
9 This was in -- Mr. Wolfe was interviewed on December 3, 2021  
10 at 16:53. And you'll note down at the bottom, he identifies  
11 that he suffers from PTSD. He identifies that he's on  
12 medication and is supposed to be taking medication, and he  
13 lists those medications. However, if you were to believe  
14 the Anderson County records, on page four, when he was  
15 subjected to a mental health screen, if you look at page  
16 four, it was conducted at 17:24, so about a half an hour  
17 after his general health screening. According to the  
18 interviewer there, Mr. Wolfe denied taking any medication  
19 for any emotional or mental health problems, denied being in  
20 a hospital for emotional or mental health problems when he  
21 previously noted that he had attempted suicide before. The  
22 fifth page, medical staff, "Was the individual clinically  
23 assessed to have a serious mental illness? No. Did the  
24 individual agree to treatment? No." Those are all things  
25 that are simply betrayed by the basic facts that Mr. Pruitt

1 even offered. So, the issue here is what the Sheriff's  
2 Department and its personnel was doing.

3 Another issue, as reflected in Ms. Wolfe's affidavit,  
4 was after Jason was taken into custody, she took his  
5 medications to the jail. The Lyrica, which we know was not  
6 given to him, was taken into possession on December 3rd.  
7 And, in fact, I believe that was evidenced by the exhibits  
8 that Mr. Pruitt provided shows that it was taken in on  
9 December 3rd, but when it was returned to Mr. Wolfe, it was  
10 taped shut with a date of December 7th on it. So, they're  
11 claiming the policy is, well, we don't give them this.  
12 Well, for some reason, this very addictive medication that  
13 is so bad they can't give it to inmates, even though he's  
14 prescribed it by a medical doctor, it was left out in the  
15 open, uncovered, who knows what, for four days. We think  
16 that's an issue. I think there are plenty of issues here  
17 related to what Anderson County, what the Sheriff's  
18 Department did while Jason was being detained by them.

19 Ms. Wolfe also, in her affidavit, testifies that she  
20 recognized he was going through withdrawal. I don't think  
21 she needs to be an expert to say what she believed about  
22 that, but even if she did, it creates a question of fact on  
23 whether he was actually being provided the medication.  
24 Because he told her he wasn't being provided his  
25 medications. And I disagree with Mr. Pruitt. That is

1 admissible, I think, under a couple of different hearsay  
2 exceptions. One is his present sense impression. Another  
3 would be statement for purpose of medical diagnosis or  
4 treatment. He's telling her what's going on, and therefore  
5 it would be admissible. So, we do have questions here.

6 The affidavit that Dr. Liu signed only addresses the  
7 Mediko. It does not address a single Anderson County  
8 Sheriff's Department employee. And as referenced in the  
9 records that I handed up, they're obviously involved in the  
10 intake, in the medical screening, in the medical records, in  
11 the providing prescription medications. Their own records  
12 have a document that they're supposed to fill out to show  
13 when medication is dispensed. And according to Anderson  
14 County, he wasn't given anything.

15 Now, we are in very early stages of this case, Your  
16 Honor. We have not taken any depositions. We have not  
17 fully fleshed out the details. I think, at a minimum, we  
18 are entitled to find out from the Sheriff's Department  
19 what's going on with their records, what their policies are  
20 related to retention of medications, what their policies are  
21 related to record keeping of medications, what that  
22 interplay is with the Mediko staff, who's supposed to  
23 provide what information to whom and when. All of those  
24 things create questions of fact here that preclude summary  
25 judgment at this early stage.

1           Finally, Dr. Liu, in his affidavit, says that Lyrica is  
2 not supposed to be provided unless there's an acute need for  
3 it. And I'm paraphrasing, so forgive me, but the phrase  
4 "acute need" is referenced. I believe Ms. Wolfe's affidavit  
5 establishes an acute need here. Jason was -- she said his  
6 eyes were sunken in. He had lost weight. He seemed very  
7 anxious. He did not look well. He was not being given his  
8 medication prescribed by a medical doctor, and the only  
9 reason why is because he was being detained on a bogus  
10 arrest warrant from Kansas. And despite his appearance in  
11 the jail, he still wasn't given the medication. He was  
12 given a lesser medication that's supposed to help. Well, it  
13 obviously wasn't. We believe it would be grossly improper  
14 for this case to be knocked out at summary judgment in this  
15 early stage when we have not done even a minimal amount of  
16 discovery into their policies and procedures.

17           THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Young. Brief response, Mr.  
18 Pruitt?

19           MR. PRUITT: Just briefly, Your Honor.

20           THE COURT: Mr. Pruitt, you have a response?

21           MR. PRUITT: Yes, Your Honor, just briefly, a few  
22 things. As far as the fact that the charges were dismissed  
23 and all, we don't dispute that. But these were not Anderson  
24 County charges. This was a valid warrant from Kansas.  
25 Anderson had no choice but to pick somebody up on a valid

1 warrant, and that's what was done. As to the initial  
2 screening and all, and there's no records that the Detention  
3 Center personnel provided medications. That's correct.  
4 Detention Center personnel, the correctional officers, do  
5 not provide medications. They contract, as I said, with Dr.  
6 Liu, who said in his affidavit, they contract with Mediko,  
7 who provides all medical care to inmates. And if you look  
8 at the MAR, he was receiving the medications beginning on  
9 December 4th. So, he was receiving the other medicines that  
10 soon, the next day after his arrival. So, if he got in --  
11 I'm not good with military time, but it sounds like that  
12 afternoon, he was getting medications the next morning. So  
13 the -- you know, we're not disputing that he was not giving  
14 the Lyrica, but one thing I would say is there's been no  
15 testimony that -- basically, I don't know if it directly  
16 addressed. I think the inference from Dr. Liu's affidavit  
17 is that Klonopin is something that can cause withdrawals. I  
18 don't think there's any evidence here that the failure to  
19 provided Lyrica is something that provides or causes  
20 withdrawal symptoms. That would be the Klonopin, and that's  
21 why he was given the Ativan. That, in itself, is slight  
22 care by providing that, his other medications and the Ativan  
23 to try to deal with any type of withdrawal type issues. So  
24 again, our position would be that Ms. Wolfe would not be a  
25 proper expert in the case of the arguments before. That

1 would be our position, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: What I'm going to do is I want to read these  
3 affidavits that have been submitted, look at your brief.  
4 So, I'll take this under advisement.

5 MR. YOUNG: May I make one more point, Your Honor?

6 THE COURT: Yes.

7 MR. YOUNG: Mr. Pruitt brought up the MAR. There's  
8 nothing in the affidavit submitted by the Defendants  
9 attesting to the accuracy or validity of it. We don't have  
10 any knowledge, information at this point who filled out the  
11 MAR and when. And I think based upon what Ms. Wolfe has  
12 offered in her affidavit, not only of her personal  
13 observations of her late husband, but also of what he told  
14 her, that there is a question of whether he was being given  
15 those medications at all.

16 THE COURT: Thank you. I'll be in touch with y'all.

17 \*\*\*END OF REQUESTED TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD)\*\*\*

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Certificate of Reporter

I, the undersigned, Tara T. Scott, CVR, Official Court Reporter for the Tenth Judicial Circuit of the State of South Carolina, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, accurate, and complete transcript of record of all the proceedings had and evidence introduced in the trial/hearing of the captioned case, relative to appeal, in the Court of Common Pleas for Anderson County, South Carolina, on the 18th day of November, 2024.

I do further certify that I am neither of kin, counsel, nor interest to any party hereto.



Tara T. Scott, CVR

Official Court Reporter

February 26, 2025

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	)	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
	)	
COUNTY OF ANDERSON	)	TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
	)	
JASON WOLFE,	)	Case No. 2023-CP-0402442
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
ANDERSON COUNTY SHERIFF'S	)	
OFFICE, et al.,	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**AFFIDAVIT OF QING LIU, MD**

I, Qing Liu, MD, state the following under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, as follows:

1. My name is Qing Liu, MD. I am a medical doctor, licensed in the Commonwealth of Virginia. I am the Chief Medical Officer of Mediko, Inc., a company that provides health care services to jails and prisons. I began working with Mediko in September 2017 and have treated thousands of inmate patients since then. I have specialized training in anesthesiology and pain management.
2. In December 2021 and until August 2023, Mediko was the health care contractor at Anderson County Detention Center ("ACDC").
3. I did not personally treat the patient in this case, Jason Lee Wolfe, although I have reviewed the medical records from his incarceration at ACDC and am familiar with the policies and procedures followed by Mediko staff in December 2021.
4. I attach to this affidavit a copy of Plaintiff's pertinent medical records. There are seven (7) pages in total.

5. Mr. Wolfe was 43 years old when he was incarcerated at ACDC on December 3, 2021. He claims in his Complaint that he did not receive four medications, Duloxetine HCL 30 mg, Lithium Carbonate 300 mg, Klonopin, and Lyrica 300 mg, while he was incarcerated at ACDC.

6. Two of the medications, Klonopin and Lyrica, carry a high risk of addiction and abuse due to effects on the central nervous system. Klonopin is a benzodiazepine, a depressant that produces sedation and hypnosis. Lyrica is a nerve pain medication. Klonopin and Lyrica are, respectively, Schedule VI and V controlled substances because of their high potential for abuse and/or dependency.

7. When inmates arrive at jail with these medications, typically the medications are discontinued unless there is an acute need that cannot be addressed through alternative treatments. Also, inmates who present with pre-existing mental illnesses are scheduled for appointments with mental health staff within 14 days of arrival.

8. In this case, Mediko staff reviewed Mr. Wolfe's medications and, consistent with the need to keep all inmates safe from substance abuse and diversion, refused the Klonopin and Lyrica. On December 3, 2021, Mediko nurse Nora Heaton, LPN, signed off on a Home Medication List reflecting this refusal.

9. On December 4, 2021, James Walker, MD, ordered that Mr. Wolfe's vital signs be monitored twice daily for five days, to ensure he remained stable following the discontinuation of Klonopin and Lyrica. Also, Dr. Walker prescribed a tapering dose of Ativan to address any potential withdrawal symptoms due to the discontinuation of Klonopin. Like Klonopin, Ativan is a benzodiazepine, but it has a lesser potency and is more effective at treating withdrawal symptoms.

10. Mr. Wolfe refused to have his vitals checked on December 4, 2021.


11. The allegation in the Complaint that Mr. Wolfe received only “some of his medication some of the time” is inaccurate. As evidenced by the Medication Administration Record (“MAR”), for the next week, Mr. Wolfe received all scheduled doses of Duloxetine (once daily) and Lithium Carbonate (twice daily). Also, Mr. Wolfe received the tapering dose of Ativan as prescribed. It appears from the MAR that Mr. Wolfe did not take his evening dose on December 5, 2021, perhaps due to refusal.

12. The allegation in the Complaint that Mr. Wolfe experienced “extreme and significant withdrawals while in the custody of ACSO” is unsupported by the evidence. Mr. Wolfe’s vital signs remained stable throughout the week he was at ACDC, and there are no notes to suggest he voiced any complaints to medical staff.

13. On December 11, 2021, Mr. Wolfe was released to the custody of the State Prisoner Transfer Officer for transfer to a correctional facility in Kansas. At the time of his departure, Mediko staff released his medications to the State Prisoner Transfer Officer.

14. Notably, Mr. Wolfe was released from ACDC eight days after arrival and before an appointment with mental health staff occurred.

15. Based upon my education, training and experience, and upon my review of the medical records, it is my opinion that the medical staff at ACDC acted appropriately in treating Mr. Wolfe. Mr. Wolfe received appropriate medical care throughout his incarceration in December 2021. I see no basis from the medical records to conclude that Mr. Wolfe suffered any harm from the discontinuation of Lyrica and/or Klonopin.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
QING LIU, MD

STATE OF VIRGINIA, AT LARGE  
IN THE CITY/COUNTY OF Lynchburg, to wit:

I, Andrew Lee Jobe, a Notary Public in the State of Virginia, at Large, do hereby certify that this day personally appeared before me, Qing Liu, MD, who being first duly sworn, made oath that the foregoing Affidavit is true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

Subscribed and sworn to me this 6<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2024.

ANDREW LEE JOBE  
NOTARY PUBLIC  
Commonwealth of Virginia  
Registration # 7971380  
My Commission Expires 04/30/2025



Notary Public

My commission expires: April 30, 2025

# PHYSICIAN'S ORDERS

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2024 Nov 11 9:26 AM - ANDERSON - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2023CP0402442

SIG	Ativan 2mg 1 tab p.o. BID X 3 days : then Ativan 1mg 1 tab p.o. BID X 5 days : then Ativan 1mg 1 tab p.o. QHS X 2 days Phenergan 25mg 1 tab p.o. BID X 4 days PRN Imodium 2mg 1 tab p.o. BID X 4 days PRN	Noted by: <hr/> Date: <hr/> Time: <hr/>
Telephone Order Provider: <u>Dr Walker</u> Nurse: <u>N Heaton</u> Date/Time: <u>12/4/21</u>		
Provider's Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Date/Time: <u>12/4/21</u>		

Vital signs monitoring  
~~BID~~ x 5d  
 Omeprazole 20mg 1 cap po  
 QD x WS

SIG	Bupropion HCL 150mg 3 po q day x WS Lithium Carb 300mg 3 po q day x WS Lithium Carb 300mg 4 po q HS x WS Duloxetine HCL 30mg 3 po q day x WS	Noted by: <hr/> Date: <hr/> Time: <hr/>
Telephone Order Provider: <u>Dr Cranford</u> Nurse: <u>APM</u> Date/Time: <u>12/4/21</u>		
Provider's Signature: <u>see Dr Cranford note</u> Date/Time:		

SIG		Noted by: <hr/> Date: <hr/> Time: <hr/>
Telephone Order Provider: Nurse: Date/Time:		
Provider's Signature: Date/Time:		

SIG		Noted by: <hr/> Date: <hr/> Time: <hr/>
Telephone Order Provider: Nurse: Date/Time:		
Provider's Signature: Date/Time:		

PATIENT'S NAME: Wolfe, Jason      DOB: \_\_\_\_\_


 Allergies: NKA



1/2

**MEDICATION RECORD**

MEDICATIONS	HOUR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31		
Ativan 2mg 1 tab PO BID x 3d then ... 12-3-21	AM																																	
Ativan 1mg 1 tab PO BID x 5d then ... 12-7-21	AM																																	
Ativan 1mg 1 tab PO QHS x 2 days 12-12-21	PM																																	
Phenergan 25mg 1 tab PO BID x 4d PRN 12-4-21	AM																																	
Imodium 2mg 1 tab PO BID x 4d PRN 12-4-21	AM																																	
Lithium Carb. 300mg <u>3</u> tabs PO QDXLOS 12-3-21	AM																																	
Lithium Carb. 300mg <u>4</u> tabs PO QHS x LOS 12-3-21	PM																																	
Duloxetine 30mg <u>3</u> caps PO QD x LOS 12-3-21	AM																																	
Omeprazole 20mg 1 cap PO QD x LOS 12-3-21	AM																																	

CHARTING FOR 12-3-21 THROUGH 12-31-21

Physician: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone No. \_\_\_\_\_ Medical Record No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Alt. Physician: \_\_\_\_\_ Alt. Telephone \_\_\_\_\_  
 Allergies: NKA Rehabilitative Potential \_\_\_\_\_

Diagnosis: \_\_\_\_\_ Approved By Doctor: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Medicaid Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Medicare Number: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_

RESIDENT: Wolfe, Jason SEX: 50 M ROOM #: DSM7 PATIENT CODE: \_\_\_\_\_ ADMISSION DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

Form # MP2901S (Rev. 09/10) Reorder From: MED-PASS 800-438-9894 XPM 03/21/98



**RELEASE OF MEDICATIONS**

DATE: 12/11/21 TIME: 1521 Facility: Anderson County Detention Center

Patient's Name: Wolfe, Jason Jail ID# \_\_\_\_\_

Reason for Medication Release: pt Released

MEDICATION	# of tablets	Initials
Pregabalin 300mg	*36 - Controlled*	
omeprazole 20mg		
Duloxetine 30mg		
Lithium Carbonate 300mg		
Risperidone 150mg		

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2024 Nov 11 9:26 AM - ANDERSON - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2023CP0402442

MEDICATIONS RELEASED TO: State Prisoner Transfer Officer - Placed in bag for transfer

SIGNATURE OF INDIVIDUAL RECEIVING MEDICATIONS: \_\_\_\_\_  
NURSE/STAFF RELEASING MEDICATIONS SIGNATURE: [Signature] Jimmy [Signature] (pt signed)



### HOME MEDICATION LIST

DATE: 12/31/21

Facility: Anderson County Detention Center

Patient's Name: Wolfe, Jason

Jail ID# \_\_\_\_\_

MEDICATION	RX PHYSICIAN	DATE RX FILLED:	AMOUNT
Lyrica 300mg	*locked in	wooden cart	36
Bupropion HCL 150mg			
Duloxetine HCL 30mg			
Omeprazole 20mg			
Lithium Carbonate 300mg t6			
*did not accept	Klonopin	nor	flexeril

Person Who Brought Meds in (Print)

Dora Heaton LPN

Nurse Name: (Print)

Signature of Person Who Brought in Meds

Dora Heaton LPN

Signature of Nurse

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2021 NOV 11 9:26 AM - ANDERSON - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2023CP0402442

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
COVID-19 Pre-Intake Screening Form

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2024 Nov 11 9:26 AM - ANDERSON - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#20230 P0402442

Inmate Name: Wolfe, Jason

Present Facility: Anderson County Detention Center

DOB: \_\_\_\_\_ Last 4 of SSN: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Admitted to Present Facility: 12/3/21

Has this inmate been tested for COVID-19?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	If yes, date tested: _____
If yes, were the results positive or negative?	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive	Results pending, expected by: _____ (date)
Was this inmate ever housed with an inmate that tested positive for COVID-19?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	If yes, date range: _____
Was this inmate held in isolation or quarantine at your facility?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	If yes, date range: _____
Is this inmate exhibiting any of the following signs and symptoms of COVID-19? (Check all that apply)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No symptoms		
OR			
<input type="checkbox"/> Fever _____ °F	<input type="checkbox"/> Chills	<input type="checkbox"/> Body Aches	
<input type="checkbox"/> Nasal Congestion	<input type="checkbox"/> Loss of Taste/Smell	<input type="checkbox"/> Shortness of Breath	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sore Throat	<input type="checkbox"/> Cough	<input type="checkbox"/> Diarrhea	
<input type="checkbox"/> Nausea	<input type="checkbox"/> Vomiting		

Additional Comments: \*\*\* Please conduct temperature checks for all inmates before transporting: 98.0 F \*\*\*

Screening Completed By: Amber B Brown, RN  
(Please Print Name)

Date: 12/7/21

*This form is to be completed in advance by the county facility. Please submit this form to on-site staff on the date of arrival. Due to the critical nature of this screening, inmates will not be accepted until a completed screening form is received by our staff. Any questions regarding the substance of this form can be directed to Medical Services at (803) 896-5257. Any questions regarding the submission or processing of this form can be directed to Kirkland R&E at (803) 896-3927 or (803) 896-3933.*



STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	)	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
	)	
COUNTY OF ANDERSON	)	TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
	)	
JASON WOLFE,	)	Case No. 2023-CP-04-02442
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>AFFIDAVIT</b>
	)	
ANDERSON COUNTY SHERIFF’S	)	
OFFICE, SHERIFF CHAD MCBRIDE,	)	
individually and as Sheriff of Anderson	)	
County, and SECURITY TRANSPORT	)	
SERVICES, INC.	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

The undersigned, being duly sworn, deposes and states as follows:

1. My name is Pennie Wolfe, I am over the age of 18 and am competent to testify to the matters contained herein.
2. I was married to Jason Wolfe until his death on August 18, 2024 and was married to him in December 2021, in which the events giving rise to this litigation occurred.
3. I have knowledge of the truthfulness of matters contained herein, except as those stated upon information and belief, and to those I believe them to be true.
4. Jason was taken into custody by the Anderson County Sheriff’s Department on December 3, 2021, on a foreign arrest warrant that was later dismissed. When he was taken into custody, he did not have his prescribed medications. I delivered his medications to the Anderson County Detention Center later that evening.
5. The medications Jason was taking on December 3, 2021, included:
6. While Jason was detained in the Anderson County Detention Center, I visited him on or about December 9, 2021. A glass partition separated us during our visit, but I could observe him and his condition.

7. Throughout our visit, I observed Jason shaking. He was pale, he had lost weight, his eyes were sunken in. He was also very anxious. Based on my experience as an emergency room and critical care nurse for approximately six years, and knowing the medications Jason was prescribed at the time he was taken into custody, I recognized Jason's condition as being consistent with one going through withdrawal.
8. During the visit, Jason and I discussed his condition. He informed me that his medication was not being provided to him.
9. After Jason was released and his belongings were returned, I noticed that the Lyrica prescription had been sealed shut with tape and dated "12/7/21." I found the date odd because I delivered it to the Detention Center on December 3, 2021, after Jason was taken in to custody. I do not know what was done with the medication between December 3<sup>rd</sup> and December 7<sup>th</sup>.
10. It was clear to me that Jason was suffering while in the Anderson County Detention Center. Once he returned home, he continued to suffer.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Pennie Wolfe

Sworn to and Subscribed Before Me  
this the 14<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission Expires: 7/2032



Medicine Log

Printed on April 12, 2023

**WOLFE, JASON LEE (#2021005075)**

Prescribed Medicine

Medicine	Prescription Amount	Dispense Amount	M	A	E	N	w/FoodAs Needed	Start	End
----------	---------------------	-----------------	---	---	---	---	-----------------	-------	-----

Dispensed Medicine

Medicine	Dispense Date	Dispensed By	Amount	Result	Comments
----------	---------------	--------------	--------	--------	----------





**WOLFE, JASON LEE (#2021005075)**

Form Title Standard Medical Questions

Name WOLFE, JASON

Inamte # 2021005075

Date of Birth [REDACTED]

Interviewer J-31 - Robinson, Anita (984)

Date / Time 12/03/21 16:53

**DOES THE NEW INMATE HAVE OBVIOUS PAIN OR BLEEDING OR OTHER SYMPTOMS SUGGESTING NEED FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES**

No

**ARE THERE VISIBLE SIGNS OF TRAUMA OR ILLNESS REQUIRING IMMEDIATE EMERGENCY OR DOCTOR'S CARE?**

No

**IS THERE EVIDENCE OF VERMIN OR OTHER SKIN DISEASE**

No

**DOES THE INMATE APPEAR TO BE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF ALCOHOL?**

No

**DOES THE INMATE APPEAR TO BE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF BARBITURATES, HEROIN, OR ANY OTHER DRUGS**

No

**ARE THERE ANY VISIBLE SIGNS OF ALCOHOL/DRUG WITHDRAWAL SYMPTOMS?**

No

**DOES THE INMATES BEHAVIOR SUGGEST THE RISK OF SUICIDE?**

No

**DOES THE INMATES BEHAVIOR SUGGEST THE RISK OF ASSAULT TO STAFF OR OTHER INMATES?**

No

**WAS THE INMATE SENT TO THE EMERGENCY ROOM PRIOR TO BOOKING**

No

Refuses to Answer

No

**DO YOU HAVE MEDICAL PROBLEMS WE NEED TO KNOW ABOUT?**

Yes

Health Condition(s)

Other Health Condition(s)

Not in List

PTSD

Refuses to Answer

No

**IF FEMALE ARE YOU PREGNANT**

No

Refuses to Answer

No

**ARE YOU ON ANY MEDICATION? ARE YOU SUPPOSED TO BE ON ANY MEDICATION?**

Yes

Medication(s)

Other Medication(s) Not in List

LYRICA, LITHIUM, DIALOXTINE, HYDROCODONE

Refuses to Answer

No

**ARE YOU ALLERGIC TO ANY MEDICATIONS?**

No

Medication(s)

Other Medication(s) Not in List

Refuses to Answer

No

**DO YOU HAVE ANY SPECIAL NEEDS OR PROBLEMS?**

Yes

Special Needs or Problems

Glasses

Other Special Needs



**Refuses to Answer**

No

**DO YOU HAVE ANY FOOD ALLERGIES?**

No

**Refuses to Answer**

No

**HAVE YOU BEEN RECENTLY HOSPITALIZED**

Yes - ANMED FOR COVID, 2 WEEKS AGO

**Refuses to Answer**

No

**DO YOU TAKE ANY ILLEGAL DRUGS?**

No

**Type(s) of Drug**

**Refuses to Answer**

No

**DO YOU CONSUME ALCOHOL DAILY?**

No

**Refuses to Answer**

No

**HAVE YOU EVER ATTEMPTED SUICIDE?**

Yes - 2016

**Refuses to Answer**

No

**DO YOU HAVE ANY SEXUAL DEVIATIONS?**

No

**Refuses to Answer**

No

**DO YOU HAVE ANY CUTS, BRUISES OR SORES ON YOU?**

No

**Offender's Signature**

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

**Officer's Signature**

Signed \_\_\_\_\_



**WOLFE, JASON LEE (#2021005075)**

Form Title PREA Intake Questions

Name WOLFE, JASON

Inmate # 2021005075

Date of Birth [REDACTED]

Interviewer J-31 - Robinson, Anita (984)

Date / Time 12/03/21 16:53

Refuses to Answer  
No

Admits previously approached for sex while incarcerated, or threatened with sexual assault?  
No

Refuses to Answer  
No

Admits victim of prison/jail rape, sexual predatory behavior, or unwanted homosexuality?  
No

Refuses to Answer  
No

Openly homosexual, feminine, transgender (or in process of change) or diagnosed with gender identity disorder?  
No

Refuses to Answer  
No

Admits unable to fight or protect self in prison/jail? Picked on or bullied by other inmates, disliked or considered annoying by other inmates? Small size, thin build, or frail youthful appearance?  
No

Refuses to Answer  
No

Developmentally Disabled, confused/disoriented? (Who is the President of the US? What is the day of the week? Do you know where you are?)  
No



**WOLFE, JASON LEE (#2021005075)**

Form Title Mental Health Screening

Name WOLFE, JASON

Inmate # 2021005075

Date of Birth [REDACTED]

Interviewer B-120 - Holcombe, Devin (962)

Date / Time  
12/03/21 17:24

**Booking**

Refuses to Answer  
No

1. Do you currently believe that someone can control your mind by putting thoughts into your head or taking thoughts out of your head?  
No

Refuses to Answer  
No

2. Do you currently feel that other people know your thoughts and can read your mind?  
No

Refuses to Answer  
No

3. Have you currently lost or gained as much as two pounds a week for several weeks without even trying?  
No

Refuses to Answer  
No

4. Have you or your family or friends noticed that you are currently much more active than you usually are?  
No

Refuses to Answer  
No

5. Do you currently feel like you have to talk or move more slowly than you usually do?  
No

Refuses to Answer  
No

6. Have there currently been a few weeks when you felt like you were useless or sinful?  
No

Refuses to Answer  
No

7. Are you currently taking any medication prescribed for you by a physician for any emotional or mental health problems?  
No

Refuses to Answer  
No

8. Have you ever been in a hospital for emotional or mental health problems?  
No

This individual self-reported a need for clinical assessment/evaluation based on the above responses  
No

If YES to items 7, 8 or Yes to at least 2 items 1 through 6 = YES Self Report Needed  
No = Self Report Not Needed

**Assessment**

MEDICAL STAFF: Was there a follow-up with a mental health professional?

No

**MEDICAL STAFF: Was the individual clinically assessed to have a serious mental illness?**

No

**MEDICAL STAFF: Did the individual agree to treatment?**

No

**Offender's Signature**

**Officer's Signature**

**Signed**

**Signed**

---



**WOLFE, JASON LEE (#2021005075)**

**Escape Risk**  
No

**Prea Classification**

**Protective Custody - Requested by Detainee**  
No

**Other**  
No

**Administrative Segregation/Protective Custody**  
No

**Electronic Monitoring Required Prior to Release**  
No

**Inmate Refused to Answer Questions**  
No

**Needs Print Prior to Release**  
No



**WOLFE, JASON LEE (#2021005075)**

Form Title Arresting Officer Questions

Name WOLFE, JASON

Inmate # 2021005075

Date of Birth [REDACTED]

Interviewer J-31 - Robinson, Anita (984)

Date / Time 12/03/21 16:53

**WAS THERE ANY INFORMATION PROVIDED TO ARRESTING OFFICER BY FAMILY, FRIENDS, ETC DURING ARREST THAT WE NEED TO KNOW?**

No

**DID YOU OBSERVE DETAINEE INGESTING ANYTHING HARMFUL SUCH AS DRUGS, CHEMICALS, ETC?**

No

**DID DETAINEE MAKE ANY COMMENTS REGARDING THEIR INCARCERATION SUCH AS SUICIDAL TENDENCIES, CONCERNS?**

No

**DO YOU KNOW IF THE DETAINEE IS A THREAT FOR ASSAULTS, ESCAPES, ETC?**

No

**IS THERE ANY OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION WE NEED TO KNOW IN REGARDS TO THIS DETAINEE?**

No

Certificate of Counsel

The undersigned hereby certifies that the Record on Appeal contains all material proposed to be included by any of the parties and not any other material.

s/William T. Young III  
William T. Young III (SC Bar No. 75153)  
141 Traction Street  
P.O. Box 9567  
Greenville, SC 29604  
(864) 403-8300  
Bill@YoungInjuryLawyer.com

July 8, 2025  
Greenville, South Carolina