

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

Administrative Law Judge Deborah Brooks Durden

---

ALC Case No. 23-ALJ-04-0683-AP  
Appellate Case No. 2024-001892

---

**RECEIVED**

AUG 01 2025

SC Court of Appeals

DARREN G. SCOTT, # 233182

APPELLANT,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

RESPONDENT.

---

**FINAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT**

---

**SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF CORRECTIONS**

**Christina Catoe Bigelow**  
Deputy General Counsel  
Office of General Counsel  
South Carolina Dept. of Corrections  
Post Office Box 21787  
Columbia, South Carolina 29221  
(803) 896-8508

**ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....ii

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE ON APPEAL .....1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE ..... 2

STANDARD OF REVIEW .....3

ARGUMENT .....4

CONCLUSION.....7

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

Hendley v. S.C. Budget & Cntrl, 325 S.C. 413, 481 S.E.2d 159 (Ct. App. 1996) ... 3

Wicker v. South Carolina Dep't of Corr., 360 S.C. 421, 602 S.E.2d 56 (2004)..... 6

**STATUTES AND RULES**

S.C. Code § 1-23-380 ..... 3

S.C. Code § 1-23-610..... 3

S.C. Code § 24-1-290 ..... 4

S.C. Code § 24-1-295..... 4, 5, 6

S.C. Code § 24-3-430 ..... 4, 5

**STATEMENT OF ISSUE ON APPEAL**

**THE LOWER COURT PROPERLY DISMISSED THE APPEAL BECAUSE APPELLANT'S GRIEVANCE DID NOT IMPLICATE A STATE-CREATED LIBERTY OR PROPERTY INTEREST WHERE APPELLANT WORKED IN A PRISON INDUSTRIES SERVICE PROJECT AND NOT A PRISON INDUSTRIES ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, AND LABOR FOR PRISON INDUSTRIES SERVICE PROEJCTS ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE PREVAILING WAGE STATUTE.**

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This matter comes before the Court pursuant to the appeal of Darren Scott (“Appellant”), an inmate in the South Carolina Department of Corrections (“SCDC”). On July 7, 2023, Appellant filed a Step One Grievance seeking to be paid pursuant to the prevailing wage statute, S.C. Code Ann. § 24-3-430(D), for work performed in two Prison Industries Service Projects operated at Lieber Correctional Institution in which Carolina Textiles Inc. (“Carolina Textiles”) and Caterpillar Reman Powertrain Services Inc. (“Caterpillar”) served as the contracting companies. This grievance was elevated to the Step Two level and denied on October 25, 2023. Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal in the Administrative Law Court (ALC) on November 21, 2023. On October 22, 2024, Judge Deborah Brooks Durden issued an order dismissing the appeal on the ground that the work performed by Appellant was not subject to the prevailing wage statute and therefore no state-created liberty or property interest was implicated. This appeal follows.

## STANDARD OF REVIEW

S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-610(B) provides the applicable standard of review:

The review of the administrative law judge's order must be confined to the record. The reviewing tribunal may affirm the decision or remand the case for further proceedings; or it may reverse or modify the decision if the substantive rights of the petitioner have been prejudiced because the finding, conclusion, or decision is:

- (a) in violation of constitutional or statutory provisions;
- (b) in excess of the statutory authority of the agency;
- (c) made upon unlawful procedure;
- (d) affected by other error of law;
- (e) clearly erroneous in view of the reliable, probative and substantial evidence on the whole record; or
- (f) arbitrary or capricious or characterized by abuse of discretion or clearly unwarranted exercise of discretion.

S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-380(5).

In an appeal of a final decision of an administrative agency, the standard of appellate review is whether the ALC's findings are supported by substantial evidence. S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-610(B). "Substantial evidence" is evidence which, considering the record as a whole, would allow a reasonable mind to reach the same conclusion that administrative agency reached. Hendley v. S.C. State Budget & Control Bd., 325 S.C. 413, 481 S.E.2d 159 (Ct. App. 1996). A reviewing court shall not substitute its own judgment for that of the ALC as to findings of fact, but it may reverse or modify decisions that are controlled by errors of law or that are clearly erroneous in view of the substantial evidence on the record as a whole. Id.

## ARGUMENT

**THE LOWER COURT PROPERLY DISMISSED THE APPEAL BECAUSE APPELLANT'S GRIEVANCE DID NOT IMPLICATE A STATE-CREATED LIBERTY OR PROPERTY INTEREST WHERE APPELLANT WORKED IN A PRISON INDUSTRIES SERVICE PROJECT AND NOT A PRISON INDUSTRIES ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, AND LABOR FOR PRISON INDUSTRIES SERVICE PROEJCTS ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE PREVAILING WAGE STATUTE.**

Despite Appellant's allegation that he was denied a prevailing wage under S.C. Code 24-3-430(D), the job Appellant actually worked was not subject to the prevailing wage statute. Accordingly, the Administrative Law Court properly dismissed the appeal as not implicating a state-created liberty or property interest.

There are three types of prison industries programs in the South Carolina Department of Corrections: (1) Prison Industries Enhancement Programs (commonly referred to as "PIE or PIECP"); (2) Prison Industries Service Projects; and (3) traditional prison industries. Only "PIE" or "PIECP" programs are subject to the prevailing wage statute, S.C. Code 24-3-430(D). This statute generally covers the use of inmate labor for manufacturing and processing of goods. See S.C. Code 24-3-430 (A) ("The Director of the Department of Corrections may establish a program involving the use of inmate labor by a nonprofit organization or in private industry for the manufacturing and processing of goods, wares, or merchandise or the provision of services or another business or commercial enterprise considered by the director to enhance the general welfare of South Carolina. . .").

Appellant claimed below that he performed service work for Carolina Textiles, Inc., and Caterpillar Reman Powertrain Services, Inc. (See R. p. 1-31). Prison Industries Services Projects are governed by S.C. Code § 24-1-290 & -295. S.C. Code 24-1-295 states in relevant part:

The Director of the Department of Corrections may enter into contracts with private sector entities that allow inmate labor to be provided for prison industry service work and export work that involves exportation of products. The use of inmate labor may not result in the displacement of employed workers within the local region in which work is being performed. Pursuant to this section, service work is defined as any work that includes repair, replacement of original manufactured items, packaging, sorting, recycling, labeling, or similar work that is not original equipment manufacturing. *The department may negotiate the wage to be paid for inmate labor provided under prison industry service work contracts and export work contracts, and these wages may be less than the prevailing wage for work of a similar nature in the private sector.....*

S.C. Code Ann. § 24-1-295 (emphasis added).

Appellant acknowledged below that his participation with Prison Industries was in Service Projects. (See R. p. 10 & p. 16). Consistent with working in Prison Industries Service Projects, the pay stubs marked as Exhibit 23-29 to Appellant's Brief to the ALC show a base pay rate of \$0.40. (See Supp. R. p. 3). Additionally, Appellant has never had a private industry account. (See Supp. R. p. 2). Additionally, during the time periods Appellant worked, Lieber Correctional Institution did not have a PIE or PIECP. (See Supp. R. p. 1). All of these facts support that Appellant did not work for a PIE or PIECP.

Appellant claims he worked for Carolina Textiles for a period of time. Appellant did not specify what years he participated in the Carolina Textile Project, however the contracts dated January 8, 2011 and February 14, 2013 are included in the record. (See R. p. 61-79). Both Carolina Textiles contracts state in the recitals on the first page, "WHEREAS ... engage in the business of cutting fabric component..." (See R. p. 61 and p. 71). Both contracts further provide in section 2 of Article 3.1, that the contractor shall provide "component parts for cutting wiping rags from scrap

material...” (emphasis added). (See R. p. 64 & p. 73). Lastly, both contracts are production-based contracts. (See R. p. 66 & p. 75). The cutting of rags from scrap materials is recycling work which falls within the definition of service work and therefore the prevailing wage statute does not apply. See S.C. Code Ann. § 24-1-295.

Appellant also claims to have worked for Caterpillar. Appellant does not specify the dates he alleges to have worked for Caterpillar project, however the contract dated September 30, 2008, is included in the record. (See R. p. 51-60). The Caterpillar program was not a PIE or PIECP program. (See Supp. R. p. 1). The Caterpillar project was a repair operation and therefore was a prison industries service project. (See R. p. 51 - “[Caterpillar] intends to engage in the business of disassembly and/or remanufacturing of its product lines at Lieber Correctional Institution...”); R. p. 53 (“training of inmates in the disassembly and/or remanufacturing of its product lines...”; “will disassemble and/or remanufacture CRPSI’s product lines ...”).

Since Appellant did not manufacture any goods but instead provided services, Appellant worked for Prison Industries Service Projects which were not subject to the prevailing wage requirement of S.C. Code 24-3-430(D). Compare Wicker v. South Carolina Dep’t of Corrections, 360 S.C. 421, 602 S.E.2d 56 (2004) (holding that the ALC could properly entertain a grievance regarding payment of a prevailing wage for work performed under S.C. Code 24-3-430, and that the statute required payment of a prevailing wage to Wicker for such work). Significantly, the statute governing service work **specifically states** that the wages may be less than the prevailing wage for work of a similar nature in the private sector. See S.C. Code §24-1-295 (“The department may negotiate the wage to be paid for inmate labor provided under prison industry service work contracts and export work contracts, and these wages may be less than the prevailing wage for work of a

similar nature in the private sector...”). Because Appellant worked for a Prison Industries Service Project governed by S.C. Code Ann. § 24-1-295, he was not entitled to be paid pursuant to the prevailing wage statute, S.C. Code 24-3-430(D). Therefore, the ALC properly dismissed the case for failing to implicate a state-created liberty or property interest.

**CONCLUSION**

For the reasons discussed above, Respondent respectfully requests that this Court affirm the determination of the Administrative Law Court.

Respectfully submitted,

**SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF CORRECTIONS**

BY:



**CHRISTINA CATOE BIGELOW**  
Deputy General Counsel  
Office of General Counsel  
S. C. Department of Corrections  
Post Office Box 21787  
Columbia, South Carolina 29221  
(803) 896-8508

August 1, 2025

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

RECEIVED

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT AUG 01 2025

Administrative Law Judge Deborah Brooks Durden SC Court of Appeals

---

ALC Case No. 23-ALJ-04-0683-AP  
Appellate Case No. 2024-001892

---

DARREN G. SCOTT, # 233182

APPELLANT,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,


RESPONDENT.

---

**CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL**

---

The undersigned hereby certifies that the **Final Brief of Respondent** complies with Rule 211(b), SCACR, and also complies with the South Carolina Supreme Court's April 15, 2014, order entitled "Revised Order Concerning Personal Identifying Information and Other Sensitive Information in Appellate Court Filings."



**Christina Catoe Bigelow**  
Deputy General Counsel  
Office of General Counsel  
S. C. Department of Corrections  
Post Office Box 21787  
Columbia, S. C. 29221  
(803) 896-8508

August 1, 2025