

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from S.C. Administrative Law Court
Administrative Law Judge, John D. McLeod

Case No.: 2013-002277
Lower Court Case No. 2013-ALS-04-0476-AP

Michael Goins ----- Appellant

vs.

South Carolina Department of Corrections ----- Respondents

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Michael Goins, hereby certify that on November 1, 2013 I did serve the following agencies:

- 1.) S.C. Administrative Law Court 1205 Pendleton St., Ste 224 Colo, S.C. 29001
- 2.) SCCC Office of General Counsel P.O. Box 21787 Columbia, S.C. 29221
- 3.) S.C. Court of Appeals P.O. Box 11629 Columbia, S.C. 29211

by depositing a copy of Appellant's Notice of Appeal, Motion to Proceed IFP, the order being Appealed and a copy of this Proof of Service into the U.S. Mail, postage prepaid.

November 1, 2013
Pelzer, South Carolina

151 Michael Goins
Mr. Michael D. Goins #302385
430 Oaklawn Rd.
Pelzer, S.C. 29669

SWORN to and subscribed before me
this 5th day of November 2013

Nancy Muchant (L.S.)
Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission expires: 1-23-2023

RECEIVED

NOV 08 2013

SC Court of Appeals

Mr. Michael D. Goins #302385
430 Oaklawn Rd.
Pelzer, S.C. 29669

S.C. Court of Appeals
P.O. Box 11629
Columbia S.C. 29211

In Re: Appellate Case No. 2013-002277
Lower Court Case No. 13-ALS-D4-D476-AP

November 1, 2013

Dear Clerk,

Pursuant to the SCACR and your letter dated October 29, 2013 addressed to me, the Proof of Service is enclosed informing you that the Administrative Law Court & SCOC Office of General Counsel were served with the enclosed following documents:

- 1.) Notice of Appeal;
- 2.) Motion to Proceed IFP;
- 3.) Order that is being appealed; and
- 4.) the PROOF OF SERVICE.

Respectfully,

Mr. Michael D. Goins

RECEIVED

NOV 08 2013

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from S.C. Administrative Law Court
Administrative Law Judge John D. McLeod

Case No.: 2013-002277

Lower Court Case No. 2013-ALT-04-0476-AP

Michael Grains _____ Appellant

VS.

South Carolina Department of Corrections _____ Respondents

Notice of Appeal

I, Michael Grains, do hereby appeal the order of dismissal of ALJ John D. McLeod of the Administrative Law Case #: 2013-ALT-04-0476-AP filed October 1, 2013. The order by Judge McLeod is attached.

November 1, 2013
Pelzer, South Carolina

Respectfully submitted,
Mr. Michael Grains

RECEIVED

NOV 08 2013

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from S.C. Administrative Law Court
Administrative Law Judge, John D. McLeod

Case No.: 13-ALJ-04-0476-AP

South Carolina Department of Corrections ----- Respondents

VS.

Michael Goins ----- Appellant

Motion To Proceed In Forma Pauperis

I, Michael Goins, hereby Motion the Courts to Proceed in forma pauperis for the \$25.00 filing fee of this appeal. The Appellant is an completely indigent prisoner with ~~a~~ no source of income.

November 1st, 2013
Pelzer, South Carolina

Respectfully Submitted,
By Michael D. Goins
Mr. Michael D. Goins # 302385
430 Oaklawn Road
Pelzer, S.C. 29669

RECEIVED

NOV 08 2013

SC Court of Appeals

**STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT**

Michael Goins, #302385,

Appellant,

vs.

South Carolina Department of Corrections,

Respondent.

Docket No. 13-ALJ-04-0476-AP

ORDER AFFIRMING DECISION

This matter is before the South Carolina Administrative Law Court (ALC or Court) pursuant to the Notice of Appeal filed by Appellant (Inmate) above named, who is incarcerated in the South Carolina Department of Corrections . His conviction for Exhibitionism and Public Masturbation (854), SCDC Policy OP-22.14 Inmate Disciplinary System, was affirmed. He was sanctioned with the loss of **three (3)** good time credits so a state created liberty interest is involved.

Appellant is classified as mentally ill but “able to understand the nature and quality of the act committed.”

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Court's jurisdiction to hear this matter is derived entirely from the decision of the South Carolina Supreme Court in Al-Shabazz v. State, 338 S.C. 354, 527 S.E.2d 742 (2000). The Court's appellate jurisdiction in inmate appeals is limited to state created liberty interests typically involving: (1) cases in which an inmate contends that prison officials have erroneously calculated his sentence, sentence-related credits, or custody status; and (2) cases in which an inmate has received punishment in a major disciplinary hearing as a result of a serious rule violation. Id.

When reviewing the Department's decisions in inmate grievance matters, the Court sits in an appellate capacity. Id. at 756. Consequently, the review in these inmate grievance cases is limited to the Record presented. An Administrative Law Judge may not substitute his judgment for that of an agency "as to the weight of the evidence on questions of fact." S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-380(5) (Supp. 2012).

FILED

OCT 01 2013

SC ADMIN. LAW COURT

Furthermore, an Administrative Law Judge may not reverse or modify an agency's decision unless substantial rights of the Appellant have been prejudiced because the decision is clearly erroneous in view of the substantial evidence on the whole Record, arbitrary or affected by an error of law.*See Section 1-23-380(5); See also Marietta Garage, Inc. v. South Carolina Dep't of Public Safety, 337 S.C. 133, 522 S.E.2d 605 (Ct. App. 1999); South Carolina Dep't of Labor, Licensing and Regulation v. Girgis, 332 S.C. 162, 503 S.E.2d 490 (Ct. App. 1998). "Substantial evidence' is not a mere scintilla of evidence nor the evidence viewed blindly from one side of the case, but is evidence which, considering the Record as a whole, would allow reasonable minds to reach the conclusion that the administrative agency reached or must have reached in order to justify its action." Lark v. Bi-Lo, 276 S.C. 130, 135, 276 S.E.2d 304, 306 (1981). Accordingly, the possibility of drawing two inconsistent conclusions from the evidence does not prevent an administrative agency's finding from being supported by substantial evidence. Grant v. South Carolina Coastal Council, 319 S.C. 348, 461 S.E.2d 388 (1995).

Additionally, in Superintendent, Massachusetts Corr. Inst., Walpole v. Hill, 472 U.S. 445, 105 S. Ct. 2768 (1985), the U.S. Supreme Court held that "the relevant question is whether there is any evidence in the record that could support the conclusion reached by the disciplinary board."

LAW/ANALYSIS

Since a state created liberty interest is involved, it is necessary to determine if Inmate received the process he was due.

It is well settled that SCDC must meet certain minimum constitutional requirements for procedural due process in matters where an inmate is disciplined for serious misconduct. Al-Shabazz, 527 S.E.2d at 750 (internal citations omitted). However, these requirements must be balanced against the need to maintain an orderly and safe prison environment. Id. To that end, the Supreme Court has prescribed the following five requirements which, if established, will ensure procedural due process in inmate disciplinary matters:

- (1) that advance written notice of the charge be given to the inmate at least twenty-four hours before the hearing;
- (2) that factfinders must prepare a written statement of the evidence relied on and reasons for the disciplinary action;
- (3) that inmate should be allowed to call witnesses and present documentary evidence;
- (4)

that counsel substitute should be allowed to help illiterate inmates or in complex cases an inmate cannot handle alone; and (5) that the persons hearing the matter, who may be prison officials or employees, must be impartial.

Al-Shabazz, 527 S.E.2d at 751 citing Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539, 563-72, 94 S.Ct. 2963, 2978-82 (1974).

To facilitate checking against the record, the requirements of Wolff are summarized as follows:

- 1.) 24 hours advance written notice of charges;
- 2.) Written statement by factfinder as to evidence relied upon;
- 3.) Written statement by factfinders as to reason for disciplinary action taken;
- 4.) Opportunity to call witnesses and present documentary evidence;¹
- 5.) Counsel substitute allowed if inmate illiterate or if case is complex; and
- 6.) Impartial hearing tribunal.

Applying those requirements to the record in this case we find the following:

1.) 24 hours advance written notice of charges;

Inmate was served with notice of the charge on 5-30-12 and the hearing was held on 6-7-12. See Disciplinary Report and Hearing Record (DRHR) and transcript of testimony.

2.) Written statement by factfinder as to evidence relied upon;

DRHR shows that conviction was based upon the report of officer and written "request to staff" wherein Appellant admitted the offense (see record).

3.) Written statement by factfinders as to reason for disciplinary action taken:

First offense of 854 and three priors of 822.

4.) Opportunity to call witnesses and present documentary evidence;

Appellant did not seek to introduce any documentary evidence. Appellant asserted at hearing that he wanted his accuser present but the DRHR indicated that he had waived the presence of his accuser. Appellant, at hearing, also asserted that he wanted to call witnesses but the hearing officer had not

¹ Right to call witnesses and present documentary evidence is limited if it will be unduly hazardous to institutional safety or correctional goals.

received any request for witnesses prior to the hearing and properly denied the request.

Section 8.2.4 of SCDC Policy OP-22.14, Inmate Disciplinary System, sets forth that a request for witnesses, whether by a Counsel Substitute or by an Inmate, is made by submitting SCDC Form 19-11, "Request to Staff Member", no later than 24 hours prior to the hearing.

The Record on Appeal shows that Appellant submitted a Form 19-11 that is dated 5-30-2012. However, Appellant made no request for the appearance of any witnesses at his disciplinary hearing.

5.) Counsel substitute allowed if inmate illiterate or if case is complex;

Inmate was represented by counsel substitute (McCarthy).

6.) Impartial hearing tribunal.

There is nothing in the record to suggest that the Hearing Officer was otherwise than neutral or detached.

It is thus clear that Inmate has been afforded the minimal process due in prison disciplinary proceedings as required by Wolff. Additionally, it is clear that the conviction is supported by substantial evidence including the written admission of Appellant.


CONCLUSION

In the case at hand, I will not substitute my judgment for that of the agency because there is substantial evidence to support the conviction which is clearly not arbitrary, capricious or affected by any personal bias or prejudice. Further, I conclude that the procedure used met the requirements of Wolff, id., that there was substantial evidence to support the findings of the lower tribunal; and, that Appellant's arguments are without merit and are denied.

Therefore, the order appealed from is **AFFIRMED** and this appeal **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

Columbia, S.C.
October 1, 2013



John D. McLeod, Judge
S.C. Administrative Law Court

It is to be noted that the undersigned has this date served this order in the above entitled action upon all parties to this cause by depositing a copy hereof, in the United States mail, postage paid, or in the Interagency Mail Service addressed to the party(ies) or their attorney(s).

This 1 day of October, 2013
By: Anthony R. Dollman
Judicial Law Clerk