

STATE of South Carolina
County of McCormick

Brandon K. Murray #356248
Plaintiff

-vs-

South Carolina Department of Corrections
Full Capacity, etc.,
Defendants

In the Court of Common Pleas
Case No. _____

v.d.1

Complaint

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

RECEIVED

MAY 26 2026

SC Court of Appeals

Comes NOW the Plaintiff Brandon K. Murray, by and through
this Complaint against the above-named defendants in accordance to
Rule 10 SCRPC and South Carolina Code of Laws 1976 Annotated South
Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, support hereof. Plaintiff Murray
would ALLY and show unto the Court...

~ PART I ~ AND ~ JURISDICTION ~

- (A) Plaintiff Brandon K. Murray is now inmate within the South Carolina Department of Corrections and was incarcerated at McCormick Correctional Institution located in McCormick, S.C. at all time relevant...
- (B) Defendant, South Carolina Department of Corrections is a governmental entity of the State...
- (C) This Court has Jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to the South Carolina Tort Claims Act, § 15-178-10 et seq...

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This action is brought against the SCOC officials Gross negligence and neglect of a vulnerable adult where SCOC officials and employees (1) Failed to provide me protective custody after I informed mental health MS. Goodwin 6/20/2016. After a documentation of (1): ORIGINAL COPY of an officers incident report that was lodged in on 6/22/2016. At Perry Correctional Institution by mental health MS. Goodwin. That I feared for my life and safety after being threatened, and beaten brutally thru physical contact by SCOC employees. (2) they used unnecessary MK-4 noted as other tear gas. to include unnecessary amount of excessive physical force against me while I was secured in restraints (3) they failed to provide me adequately but intentionally delayed me deliberate medical attention after having used MK-4 pepper spray and other physical force against me. (4) they failed to provide safety measures to prevent unauthorized touchings to inmate which exceeded to an excessive force history which is not ruled favorable but was used in a maliciously intent act which one (1) inmate was resulted to unlawful injuries to secure his gross negligence claims. (5). they unnecessarily destroyed my authorized personal property thru physically institution thru three institutions (5) to include a window board game set. (6). they failed to comply with medical instructions regarding my health - after care when I was released from the hospital and. (7). they failed to provide me prompt mental health assessments, treatment and counseling to include release from RMI following the traumatic blows that I suffered during the time of this use of force. . . . to include retaliation, and harassment throughout the time of this incident and after. . . . which meet the standards for a gross negligence claims. . . .

LEGAL

Statement of Facts

- 1). ON April, 8, 2016, at McCormick Correctional Institution ("McCormick") I WAS ASSIGNED to the F-2 housing unit. Due to MY mental health illnesses (CLASSIFICATION). ON the morning of April, 8, 2016, I inmate Bryan Shunious Murray #356248. IAS scheduled to follow up with an appointment concerns dealing with #166 follow-up dental appointment at 6:50 A.M. which IAS spaned off by William F. WREBS "Dentist" who rescheduled inmates order to report to "dental" to be approximately at 8:00 AM hrs. - 8:15 AM.
- 2). The McCormick Correctional Institution to include various "300C" institutions higher & number of untrained public employees who are very aggressive and assaultive. Who have high intents of premeditated/ pre-sentences towards violence, and who are generally disruptive to the operations at the South Carolina Department of Corrections....
- 3). ON the date of April, 8, 2016, I inmate Bryan Shunious Murray #356248, WAS let out of housing unit Dorm F-2, to attend A dental appointment at 8:00 AM hrs. The officer over the Dorm stated precisely to inmate, (A) to take the side walk towards the chapel. (B). as I inmate Bryan Shunious Murray WAS NEARLY PROCEEDING DOWN F-3 when (C). I noticed Lt. Geoffrey Rice, Lt. Rowland Cook, Lt. James Thompson, and Sgt. Jeremy Military walking about the Cafeteria. (D). AS I WAS NEARING the chapel, I (E) SAW officers Lt. Geoffrey Rice, Lt. Rowland Cook, Lt. James Thompson, and Sgt. Jeremy Military running towards me... (F). I then obeyed orders before any directives WAS given to 1). (G). Get down on both of my knees and place both of my arms behind my back...
- 4). The restraints were placed on by officer Lt. Geoffrey Rice. Lt. Geoffrey Rice then forcefully pushed inmate on the ground unwarrantedly. Face first, then (B). went about to punch me, and took out the Plaintiff. (C). The Plaintiff WAS punched severally numerous times in the front, and back of his head numerous times, which could have caused about an concussion.

LEGAL

At the time of this Planned use of force, an officer with the rank of Sgt. Jeremy McCarty intentionally and deliberately used excessive force on the Plaintiff by using some bodily injury in results of battery he intentionally (D) kicked, and went about punching the Plaintiff numerous times about the body to be (3) three hits exact. The Plaintiff intended to be some what of that of unconscious but in visualization to see (E). To include some time during this Planned or unplanned use of force the Plaintiff was punched about the body to include face by Correctional Officer who goes by the name of Lt. Ronald Cook to be about (2) times with the mix of that to be some what of maliciously intent motives that constituted the amount of an Planned use of excessive force. (F). At during or around this Planned use of excessive force the Plaintiff was to include some what of abusively slapped, by an officer who goes by the name of Lt. James Shonkows who at the time intentionally in full awareness used battery on the Plaintiff to not be in the amount of Seco's use of force Policy's 1500.40. (Camera/Audio). to include the amounts of handcuffs that were used as battery on the Plaintiff. and direct in counter hits of knee blows on the Plaintiff (G). The Plaintiff was then intentionally walked to operations by an officer by the name of Sgt. Jeremy McCarty who did (H) with eye pellets used battery on Plaintiff by going about to punch the Plaintiff in the face twice which was a known now matter of a premeditated cross neck gear Assault/battery excessive force claim. to include the amount of blows on Plaintiff (2), with one being in the back of his head, and two one (1) directly to the front of his skull.....

5). once the Plaintiff was inside of operations, it was under color of state law for the Major Frank Musier to intentionally grab the Plaintiff and run the Plaintiff up against the operations side, to include that of some what favorably used the Plaintiff was intentionally hooked by camera control both route to R.H. share (B). He was met and hit with battery amount of blow once (1) intentionally to the right brow, by an officer known by the name of Hurt Annaler Joseph Stevens, who was (C). Also present at the beginning Planned amount of excessive force (D) I have within a hold ring that he used to deprive the Plaintiff with private of the operations.....

6). The Plaintiff was then escorted out of operations BATH door SALLY Port by officers BY the NAME of OFFICER MAJOR Frank MUSIER, and officer UNITI MANAGER Joseph Stevens. (B). Shortly after BY the NAME of LT. Stanley TERRY, AND A UNIFORMED officer took Plaintiff to lock-up RHM SALLY Port. Where the Plaintiff was seen by mental health MS. MADDOX. Plaintiff was then examined BY the NURSE, E. COURSON Prior to her medical procedure. Plaintiff writes on APRIL 8, 2016 she examined Plaintiff to be AT 10:30 AM hrs. which is indifferent to the fact AS to the use of force being done at 9:00 AM hrs was enough for deliberate indifference ⁽²⁾ Correctional officers or Public official to deny Prisoner to serious medical needs to Plaintiff.

7). Prior to Plaintiff's TAN SCOC uniforms, they were cut off by officer LT. Stanley TERRY, and intentionally mistreated noted that they (B). had blood all over them (C). Where never put despite of contraband evidence to preference Jeffrey Scotts investigation. Prior to Scott's letter it should have not exceeded the amount of 11 years to be on camera video Audit... See Case Point 1500.40.01.16-11.08

8). Also AS A result to the above. The Plaintiff was taken BY emergency transportation to self memorial hospital in Greensboro S.C. BY officers LT. Stanley TERRY, and Sgt ANNEBETHA WIDEMAN BY vehicle # track # 2666. Followed BY Unit manager Eddie CALAHAN. track # 2655. Along with the Plaintiff's property contents. The Plaintiff remained in self memorial health care for approximately 11 one DAY. During this time, the Plaintiff was (B). treated for approximately the amount of 36 teeth (16) stitches, AND underwent surgery BY Doctor HEDIN for 19 mins after CT....

9). Additionally the Plaintiff suffered both mentally and physically to include permanent scarring, permanent impairment, and permanent disability.....

10). Additionally each and every defendant listed through this complaint here in mentioned had A (M). Constitutional duty to protect inmates from violence at the hands of other persons when they knew intentionally that certain conditions within the Department of Corrections presented a substantial safety risk. To include that at all times relevant, the Defendants were not on site at the facility, but also they were well aware that they had supervision to include TANK. And had been individually been involved in a excessive use of force....

- 11). Additionally they were also well aware that this created a highly dangerous situation for all inmate(s) to include the Plaintiff located in that area. Even though they had the opportunity and obligation, they consciously failed to take any steps to ensure the Plaintiff's safety. (B) Documents BY Sgt. Jeremy Wertz later revealed on the date of April, 18, 2017. There were around 50-60 inmates on the yard during that time... See exhibit: (D) Attachment...
- 12). Prior to April, 2016 the Plaintiff filed, and filed hand written "inmate request to staff member forms with the appropriate SOCC administrators S. Marshall #06449, and Frank Mueser; (2) written request notifying them of this issue, and the overall lack of inadequate security. Additionally all of the Plaintiff's request were either ignored or denied. These actions and/or inactions further exposed the Plaintiff to a substantial risk of harm in the future... (B). Plaintiff even went about re-submitting to the appropriate staff members; S. Marshall #06449, and Frank Mueser again on date of: 3/14/2017, and again was denied a response...
- 13). Additionally further more the Plaintiff is informed and believes that prior to the incident in question the investigation conducted by SOCC investigator Albert Jeffery Scott, revealed without evidence that repeatedly violent outbreaks occurred to be substantial at the McCormick Correctional Institution. AS WELL AS the fact that the inadequate security was not appropriate security personnel is dealings with the Plaintiff, and later in deed on site at the time this incident happened... or occurred...
- 14). Additionally upon the information and belief the Defendants were also each equally aware of the potential outbreaks of violence, and additionally intentionally deprived the Plaintiff, the Defendants even each consciously failed to take reasonable measures to abate the risk of harm done to the Plaintiff, so were fore the Plaintiff suffered serious injuries as a direct result thereof...
- 15). on or about the year of 2016, the Plaintiff was placed in the custody, and care of McCormick Correctional Institution - which is part of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, at institutional level (MCC) was run by a warden by the name of Wilbur LeRoy Curledge. The Plaintiff had remained in the McCormick Correctional Institution until on and about the date of April, 8, 2016. After his release from self memorial was affirmed by Dr. Hagan to discharge the Plaintiff. He was immediately van vehicle transported, by transportation van vehicle #2666, by officers who go by the names of Stanley Terry, and Annetta Wildman. Both being considered as public officials, but government state employees under the Eleventh Amendment immunity followed by vehicle #2650, of which contained an SOCC unit manager

LEGAL

officer of which of who goes by the name of Edie Pulliam. who also had full consent of the Plaintiff's Personal Property Bags of which was proceeded by a Zipie to be "Plastic" and lockable tracking number. The officer is also a SCDC employee. But is considered as an Public employee of her prior to the Eleventh Amendment. to transport the Plaintiff on transportation runs, medical runs, and emergency shipments... The Plaintiff was later transferred to an institution which goes by the name of Perry Correctional Institution which is also under the South Carolina Department of Corrections... The Plaintiff has been housed, and incarcerated at numerous institutions since the date of April 8, 2016. to include Perry Correctional Institution; Broad River Correctional Institution; housed Greenwood dorm ("Crisis"); the same Correctional Institution; Pecos Correctional Institution; Lee Correctional Institution (2) where she was prior back to Broad River Correctional Institution ("Crisis") for prior traumatization care, and prior staff abuse to include Battery; the physical touching of a person's (B) Body Parts; that is in an inappropriate manner to not minimum restrain but to inflict bodily harm... The Plaintiff was (1) once housed recently housed back at the same Correctional Institution; that lead to (1) one more recent housing to be for more housed again at (B) Greenwood "Crisis" stabilization unit dorm; for several months... He is now currently incarcerated at an institution housed called; Correctional Institution; which is also located within the South Carolina Department of Corrections offices...

16. Additionally upon information and belief, the McCormick Correctional Institution is classified as a level three (3) Correctional Institution denoting that the Plaintiff also has a history as of being "CLASSIFICATION" housed known to the mental health care and prior indictment convictions; which exposed him to a serious history of harm. (B) Being that it has been intentionally documented by the South Carolina Department of Corrections training coordinator Yolanda Delgado who testified in deposition that "less than a handful" of Correctional officers attended training sessions to improve the staff's knowledge and skills in dealing with mentally ill inmates which is not inconsistent with the rest to as much show a discrimination, and higher level of staff abuse... (C) The McCormick Correctional maximum security facility; in addition it was noted to have had and intensive amount and long history of a failure to provide the appropriate and adequately trained security personnel, and supervisory staff to ever see to address the responsibility, and care over the inmates housed at the McCormick Correctional Facility...

17). Then Additionally Failing to provide the Adequate number of Inmate Adequately Security Staff Personnel at Numerous Locations Throughout the Agency's Facility... States that each and every Allegation of Fact in these Paragraphs above is again restated, and re-Alleged herein, as if herein re-stated verbatim, ~~entirely~~ word for word. (B). That the So Said listed defendant's was indeed, and was acting under (1). the Pledge of Oath or Pretense of State Laws, State Customs, State Practices, State Usage, and/or State Policies, (2). to be at all times mentioned herein as Correctional Officers who are State employees, and (3) or all known Supervisors who had certain duties imposed upon their positions under the Agency's oath with regard to the Plaintiff's dignity. In Additionally and during the time of this incident of an excessive amount the use of force to force which they did not. The Defendants were well aware of the Plaintiff's Constitutional rights to be free from cruel and unusual punishment per Policy 1500-2-1, and 1500.40/1967 State v. Eamble...

18). Additionally Inconsciously ministerial duty has to be taken out. The Defendants cannot argue nor bring forth any excuse that they intended to intentionally follow and not deprive the Plaintiff because it is clearly established (B). That these Policies have not been followed, and that all Allegations mentioned above or herein (2) twice Actual... (C). Also the defendants were consciously and deliberately indifferent to deny the Plaintiff to medical treatment on the Plaintiff. And so acted in effort to avoid a such small amount of force to restore order but rather to inflict bodily harm on the Plaintiff which the Agency's Policies and Procedural Guidelines do not allow. See: 1107, 1500.400:5000...

19). IN the facts following Paragraphs:

(A). These listed SOCC employees inconsciously intended to allow premeditated excessive (5) amount of an use of force to allow without the Adequate trained staff for an inmates safety to be in exact coexistence with SOCC's Policies and Procedures to insure the Safety of the Plaintiff. (B). to be inconsciously and deliberately, and failing to provide the appropriate number of adequately trained staff members at various locations throughout the McComb Correctional Institution to such Adequately insure to inmates safety... (C). inconsciously and deliberately failing to provide the next not minimum amount of Adequate and appropriate amount of security officers personnel in and at McComb Correctional Institution (2) to include the Prison Yard supervision... (D). inconsciously and deliberately failing to properly monitor the Plaintiff so as much to not criticize... but there are much more intend to premeditatedly harm the Plaintiff... (E). inconsciously

and deliberately failing to protect the Plaintiff from an assault and battery across
Newspaper claim against officers employees by SOCC officers... (7) intentionally and
deliberately failing to properly supervise the employees so as to ensure the safety of
the Plaintiff, and inmates located at the maximum correctional institution. (E).
intentionally and deliberately failing to protect the Plaintiff from any and all serious
harm... (H). intentionally and deliberately failing to provide any level of high nor minimum
to the Plaintiff of a maximum security facility adequately to ensure safety on the Plaintiff...
(I). intentionally and deliberately not really clearly recognizing or acknowledging a clearly
now though, but dangerous situation without (1st) first the thought to (1). Analyze the sit-
uation and (2). How serious it appeared to the Plaintiff... (J). intentionally and De-
liberately failing to take any reasonable amount of action to prevent the inmate from be-
coming severely bodily injured... (K). intentionally and deliberately failing to properly in-
vestigate. By (1). Clothed inspection. 2). to include camera. 3). any cover up, and all documented
statements written by overrall and use of force staff. 4). Not following institutional head
inmate's policy's and procedures to follow the proper instructions to write all inmates listed
mentioned, and wanted through SOCC officers policy's, to include proper chain of command,
that states any officers mentioned within a use of force should go to corps. 5). Not properly
supervising 1500.40. and (1st) first 1500.2-1. at Warden head by subordinates to not see
that they did not meet and outside officers institution by Agent Jeffrey Scott...
and 6). not establishing a clear right, to personally cover up and falsify incriminate
the Plaintiff to Agents investigator Agent Jeffrey Scott to secure (land) second
conviction. After the Plaintiff served a lengthy 160 days, with one press reference,
and unlike inadequately low paper work, which cause him excessive sanctions. (L) in-
tentionally and deliberately failing to adhere to the SOCC agency's policies and
procedures, per 1500.40. 1500.2-1. and 200-25 (M) Additionally being intentionally
and deliberately indifferent to the Plaintiff's health and safety (2) within awareness.
(N). intentionally being intentionally and deliberately indifferent to the Plaintiff's health
and safety after having full knowledge of the dangerous conditions, and still failing
to take the atleast reasonable amount of measures to prevent it from stopping or occurring
on the Plaintiff... (O). intentionally in full awareness not attending the proper training
academy's... (P). intentionally not supplying the appropriate on site rendered staff
to have Agents pocket camera to properly catch recordings of inmate use of force...
(2) include dorms, and building camera footage documentation to be available... (Q). failing
to not hold within the 11th amendment to be considered as public employees, nor public
officers signed to their appropriate duties to maintain good faith in their official jobs
officer or duties. (R). failing to properly calculate the amount of hits used as battery
on the Plaintiff, in incident reports done by officers, Lt. Ronald Cook, Lt. Jeffrey etc.

LEGAL

... [T. Judge Thawkins, not to include Federal military law incident report wasn't to get, signed, documented, Brief, nor available at the date of April, 8, 2016 which expressed the amount of due process, and strengthened the case of a gross negligence assault and battery (Civil) done by Adult SOC Correctional officers. (S) Failure to properly produce (at Ohio hearings on 5/3/2016 for R. L. Turner, I.) statement written by Lt. James Thawkins, and Mrs. M.N. Verli Pearson, which were taken when the proper chain of command to meet (1st) Lt. Brent Price, and (2nd) Co. Partner Capt. S. Marshall; hearings took place at Ohio Correctional Institution, which showed a theory of an big issue of an excessive use of force over up (T). Failure to properly meet a call for (1st) response was it need for (1st) response, and specifically what of force tended to over-up a call for (1st) response being that the Plaintiff was in the yard and around available staff personal which would be favourable to the issue of what happened and, how the Plaintiff was treated. (U) ... Not properly mentioned that when the defendants came in contact with the Plaintiff did he pose as a threat, or that of so higher than a bear to get treated to the harsh amount of cruel and unusual punishment, and the lack of camera audio/ video wasn't documented to show that the Plaintiff did so betray the image of a threat isn't so counted for which is the question (V). Failure to properly list in the incident reports on 4.8.2016, by use of force officers the circumstances that would (1st) response is activated it is so recorded within the SOC agency's that once (1st) response is called all cameras at headquarters level automatically began to record. (W) Failure to properly state did the Plaintiff have a weapon during the take down of Plaintiff, or did he have a weapon, and the lack of video camera is the question as to officers Plaintiff. (X) Failure to properly not mention in use of force incident reports to the amount of blows and why did the Plaintiff have a possession, and had to receive in the amount of (16) strokes of self-reflexion Memorial is another question. (Y) Failure to properly state in incident reports who led Plaintiff to the McMorick Correctional Institution, side walk to a perimeter; ~~attacked~~ and why was Plaintiff hit with twice (2) battery blows to the face to mention Brown; and the words mentioned documentation of lack of ~~Miss~~ and incident reports. (Z) and; intentionally intentionally as a direct consequence, proximate result the defendants acts of conscious and deliberate indifference, jointly, severally, and in combination thereof which deprived the Plaintiff to suffer; conscious pain, mental and physical pain and suffering, and to go of his is and not must respect of dignity as a man.

LEGAL

10.) You may refer to documents, affidavits, or other materials that are referred to be attached at A.), B.), C.) D.). from Plaintiff Professor Eric Ronald Kok, James Matthews and Jeremy McCord.

IV. EXHAUSTION OF LEGAL REMEDIES Prison Litigation Reform Act. (F).

11. Plaintiff Brantinius Murad used the Prisoner Grievance Procedure available at [Memorial inst. Peay inst. Kershaw inst. Innes inst. Lee Correctional inst. Broad Correctional inst.] to try and solve numerous problems. on the date 4-8-2016 - 1-10-2018 Plaintiff Brantinius Murad presented the facts relating to this Penitentiary on 4-10-2017. Plaintiff Brantinius Murad was sent a response saying that the Grievance has been denied on date filed appeal. on 4-25-2017. he appealed the denial of the Grievance.

V. Legal Claims.

11.) The Conditions, beatings, deliberate indifference, medical needs, sexual discrimination, violated Plaintiff Brantinius Murad's rights and prohibited excessive force violation, and cruel and unusual punishment. is due Process violation. Under the 1st, 4th, 5th, 8th, and 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution...

12.) The Plaintiff has no plain, adequate or complete remedy at law to redress the wrongs described here. Plaintiff has been and will continue to be irreparably injured by the conduct of the defendants unless this Court grants the declaratory and injunctive relief which Plaintiff seeks...

* Duty of Care *

The SOSC and its employees, through the Director thereof, owed me a duty of property care and was so responsible for the in proper treatment of me during all times relevant hereto pursuant to section: 24-1-130; of S.C. Code.....

* Cause of Action *

(1) The SOSC is liable unto me, and for pursuant to the end clause of Section 15-78-60 (a5) of S.C. Code; of which were its employees, or their agents, holding the or their seats of their official duties; and capacities for the 11th Amendment as a Government Agent; employee, or other public official. Did intentionally subjected Plaintiff to great bodily injury to not include minor abrasions, and hum. abuse thought of Plaintiff. Pain and suffering, poor conditions of confinement, destruction of Plaintiff items to include not excessive sanctions... to include mental anguish BY the thoughts of exercising their official duties, and injuries pursuant to include intentional assaults; injuries, and or the proper care, and on the proper care, and to add treatment was used in a cruelty, negligent manner which approximately caused Plaintiff loss of a Parent without intent... to add not Punishment. Barr Maveci Per Article to law under: 16-600-3. Pursue North Carolina Statute and for Better Plaintiff...

I have read the Affidavit Complaint and hereby verify that the matters alleged therein are true, except as to matters alleged on information and belief, and, as to those, I believe them to be true, I certify under Penalty of Perjury that the Affidavit is true and correct...

Executed at Albendale Corrections 1057 Reinforcement
Fairfax J.C. 2982?

Signature: ~~Byron Thomas II~~ ~~Steph...~~

Name: Byron Thomas II Murray