

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

---

Appeal from Lexington County  
The Honorable Thomas A. Russo, Circuit Court Judge  
Case No. 2013-000491

---

THE STATE, ..... RESPONDENT

v.

BRIAN E. LORICK, JR., ..... APPELLANT

---

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

---

**Matthew C. Buchanan**  
**General Counsel**

**South Carolina Department of Probation,  
Parole and Pardon Services  
P.O. Box 11589  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1589  
(803) 734-1343**

**ATTORNEY FOR THE RESPONDENT**

**RECEIVED**

JAN 09 2014

**SC Court of Appeals**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Table of authorities . . . . . 3

Statement of issue on appeal . . . . . 4

Statement of the case . . . . . 5

Arguments

The Appellant’s appeal should be dismissed because the circuit judge found other grounds with which to violate the Appellant’s probation beyond simply violating the “no contact” instruction . . . . . 6

The circuit judge did not err in denying counsel’s motion to dismiss the probation revocation action because the instruction to have no contact with the victim of the original offense was not a condition added in violation of Stevens. . . . . 9

Conclusion . . . . . 9

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

State v. Stevens, 373 S.C. 595; 646 S.E.2d 870 (2007) .....9

State v. Hicks #3, 387 S.C. 378, 692 S.E.2d 919 (2010).....7

State v. Hamilton, 333 S.C. 642, 511 S.E.2d 94 (1999) .....7

State v. Archie, 322 S.C. 135, 470 S.E.2d 380 (1996) .....10

**STATUTES**

S.C. Code Ann. § 24-21-430 .....9

S.C. Code Ann. § 24-21-280 ..... 10, 11

S.C. Const., Art. 1 § 8 .....10

**STATEMENT OF ISSUE ON APPEAL**

1. The Appellant's appeal should be dismissed because the circuit judge found other grounds with which to violate the Appellant's probation beyond simply violating the "no contact" instruction.
  
2. The circuit judge did not err in denying counsel's motion to dismiss the probation revocation action because the instruction to have no contact with the victim of the original offense was not a condition added in violation of Stevens.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On October 20, 2011, the Appellant Brian Lorick, Jr. struck the victim Bethany Leaphart in the head and strangled her with his hands. Lexington County Sheriffs deputies charged him with Criminal Domestic Violence of a High and Aggravated Nature. On June 21, 2012, the Appellant pled guilty to the reduced charge of Assault and Battery 2<sup>nd</sup> Degree before the Honorable D. Craig Brown. Upon accepting the plea, the Court sentenced Appellant to a term of imprisonment of three years suspended on the service of six months and two years of probation.

During his period of probation, the Appellant was served a warrant for having again assaulted the victim of the original charge. During a non-judicial review of the violation with a supervising agent and the Appellant on September 25, 2012, the Department's response was to instruct the Appellant to no longer have any direct or indirect contact with the victim. The Appellant signed the Form 1182 Notice of Violation and Response which was also signed by the agent and his supervisor.

On October 31, 2012, the Department issued another warrant against the Appellant, alleging that the Appellant has had continued contact with the victim in violation of the instructions of the agent. The warrant was also issued in response to allegations by the victim that the Appellant physically assaulted her after the first warrant was issued.

The Appellant first appeared before the Honorable Clifton Newman on February 8, 2013 in Lexington County General Sessions Court. He was represented by Robert M. Madsen, who moved to dismiss the probation warrant alleging that the "no contact" instruction was not a judicially-imposed condition of probation. Judge Newman continued the case upon request of the Department, as it was not prepared to argue the motion.

The Appellant then appeared before the Honorable Thomas A. Russo on March 1, 2013. He was again represented by Robert M. Madsen at the hearing, who renewed his motion to dismiss the probation warrant. Judge Russo denied the motion and after a full hearing, revoked Appellant's probation after finding the violations extreme and willful.

The Appellant now brings this appeal before this court.

### ARGUMENT

**The Appellant's appeal should be dismissed because the circuit judge found other grounds with which to violate the Appellant's probation beyond simply violating the "no contact" instruction.**

The warrant for violation of probation alleged the Appellant violated his supervision for two reasons: for assaulting the victim and for contacting the victim after being instructed by the agent to have no further contact with her.

During the full hearing on March 1, 2013, the Court conducted a thorough examination of the facts as well as the Appellant's actions after his arrest pursuant to the warrants. Specifically, Appellant continued to contact the victim through letters, many of which included "menacing" language.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court conducted this exchange with Appellant's counsel:

Mr. Madsen: -- just to back up what Ms. Leaphart is saying, these are excerpts from the many letters that Mr. Lorick has written.

The Court: Oh, I know. I'm sitting here reading them.

Mr. Madsen: They're quite menacing, sir.

The Court: They are.

Tr. 26, 19-15

Furthermore, the Court stated noted, “throughout every one of these letters that he writes, it’s clear, he’s adamant, ‘Please do not turn these in. Please keep this away from my agent. Please don’t.’ He’s doing everything in his power to do an end run around Probation – ain’t no question about it.” Tr. 27, l. 2-7.

Upon revoking the Appellant’s probation in full, the Court “[found] that the violations are extreme. They are definitely willful.” Tr. 27, l. 13-14.

The decision to revoke probation is within the sound discretion of the circuit court judge. State v. Hamilton, 333 S.C. 642, 511 S.E.2d 94 (1999). The Appellate court’s authority is only to review the circuit court’s decision to correct errors of law or if the evidence indicates the judge acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner. Id.

“Where the ruling of the trial judge is based on more than one ground, an appellate court must affirm unless the appellant appeals all grounds upon which the ruling was based.” State v. Hicks #3, 387 S.C. 378, 692 S.E.2d 919 (2010).

The petitioner in Hicks challenged only one of three conditions of probation the circuit judge found he violated. The appellate court’s decision regarding the judge’s ruling on the challenged condition was vacated by the Supreme Court because the other two conditions were unchallenged grounds for the revocation.

In the instant case, it is clear from the record that the judge found other grounds for which to find a violation of probation, most notably the referenced letters of the Appellant. These letters, far from just evidence of contact between the Appellant and the victim, were evidence of behavior that was appropriately addressed through revocation. The Court found that the letters were menacing, and that they contained requests that the victim keep the letters away from his probation agent, indicating that the Appellant *knew* that these letters were inappropriate.

Consequently, the circuit court determined Appellant violated his probation for failing to comport himself to the expectations of those given the grace of probation instead of incarceration. Although no condition specifically prohibits repeatedly harassing and sending menacing letters to the victim of the original assault, that the action would be a violation of probation speaks for itself. Again, the fact that the Appellant requested his letters be kept away from his agent further indicates he knew the letters would be a violation of his supervision.

Therefore, the circuit court's decision to revoke Appellant's probation was separate from merely violating the no contact instruction, and not made in an arbitrary or capricious manner. The revocation should not be disturbed.

**The circuit judge did not err in denying counsel's motion to dismiss the probation revocation action because the instruction to have no contact with the victim of the original offense was not a condition added in violation of Stevens.**

Appellant argues that the circuit judge erred when he refused to dismiss the probation revocation, citing State v. Stevens, 373 S.C. 595, 646 S.E.2d 870 (2007). Stevens holds that the Department may impose conditions upon a probationer that enhances the court-imposed conditions, pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 24-21-430. However, it also held that the Department may not add new conditions of supervision.

This issue in Stevens involved an agent placing the offender under GPS monitoring, a condition that he subsequently violated. However, the sentencing court did not impose any form of monitoring as a condition of supervision. Therefore, the probationer could not be violated for failing the GPS program. The Court specifically stated that if the sentencing court had ordered Stevens to "submit to intensive surveillance," then the agency could have imposed GPS monitoring as an enhancement of that condition, and respond with a warrant to violations of that type of monitoring.

Appellant argues that the holding of Stevens should be expanded to an agent's instructions and authority as a supervisor and law-enforcement officer. Such an expansion is untenable.

In the present case, the agent instructed that the Appellant have no contact with the victim of the original assault, after learning that he may have assaulted her again. When the Appellant continued to have contact with the victim, including another alleged assault, the agent responded by issuing a warrant and bringing him before the circuit court.

Probation agents are charged with a unique brand of law enforcement. They are officers that must ensure the safety of the community and encourage the rehabilitation of offenders. “[A probation agent] must use practicable and suitable methods to aid and encourage persons on probation, parole, or community supervision to bring about improvement in their conduct and condition.” S.C. Code Ann. § 24-21-280(A).

This statutory authority to encourage and enforce good behavior in those under supervision is also referenced in several places in the standard conditions of supervision, which are incorporated by reference on every sentence sheet. Condition 10 requires those on probation to “follow the advice and instructions of the agent.” Tr. 8, l. 20 – p. 11, l. 16. Furthermore, Condition 4 requires the offender “shall not associate with any person who has a criminal record or any person who [the] agent has instructed ... to avoid.” Tr. 7, l. 15-17 (Feb. 8, 2013).

An instruction by an agent to have no contact with a person, most notably a victim or other individuals such as those with criminal records, falls squarely within an enhancement of existing conditions, and also supports the probation agent’s statutory requirement to “bring about improvement in [the offenders’] conduct and condition.” S.C. Code Ann. § 24-21-280(A).

Appellant also argues that imposing an instruction on an offender like a no contact order violates the separation of powers clause per the South Carolina Constitution Article 1, § 8. The Appellant misapprehends the nature of the instruction, by labeling it as a special condition that must be ordered by the court for it to have any authority. As the Court noted in State v. Archie, 322 S.C. 135, 470 S.E.2d 380 (1996), “the imposition of *sentences* is a judicial function.” Id. at 138, 382 (emphasis added). Black’s Law Dictionary, 7<sup>th</sup> Ed. defines “sentence” as “[t]he judgment that a court formally pronounces after finding a criminal defendant guilty; the punishment imposed on a criminal wrongdoer.”


An instruction to have no contact with the victim is not punishment. Unlike the GPS monitoring at issue in Stevens, this instruction is about correcting the Appellant's conduct. A probation agent's statutory duty is to require and enforce improvements in the conduct of those he or she supervises. S.C. Code Ann. § 24-21-280(A).

Consequently, the agent's instruction did not violate the separation of powers by requiring the Appellant to have no further contact with the victim of his original offense.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing reasons the Respondent respectfully requests that the decision of the lower court to deny Appellant's motion be upheld.

Respectfully submitted,



**Matthew C. Buchanan**  
**General Counsel**

South Carolina Department of Probation,  
Parole and Pardon Services  
P.O. Box 50666  
Columbia, South Carolina 29250  
(803) 734-9220

Attorney for the Respondent

Columbia, South Carolina  
January 6, 2014

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

---

Appeal from Lexington County  
The Honorable Thomas A. Russo, Circuit Court Judge  
Case No. 2013-000491

---

THE STATE, ..... RESPONDENT

v.


BRIAN E. LORICK, JR., ..... APPELLANT

---

**DESIGNATION OF MATTER**

---

Respondent proposes no additional information to be included in the Record on Appeal.



---

Matthew Buchanan  
General Counsel

January 6, 2014

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

---

Appeal from Lexington County  
The Honorable Thomas A. Russo, Circuit Court Judge  
Case No. 2013-000491

---

THE STATE, ..... RESPONDENT

v.

BRIAN E. LORICK, JR., ..... APPELLANT

---

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

---

I, Dawn K. Nichols, Executive Administrative Assistant, hereby certify that I have served the within *Initial Brief of Respondent and Designation of Matter* dated January 6, 2014, on Appellant this 6th day of January, 2014, by depositing a copy of the same in the United States mail, postage prepaid, addressed to his attorney of record:


Wanda Carter, Deputy Chief Appellate Defender  
S.C. Commission on Indigent Defense  
PO Box 11589  
Columbia, S.C. 29211-1589

**RECEIVED**

JAN 09 2014

**SC Court of Appeals**

I further certify that all parties required by Rule to be served have been served.



**Dawn K. Nichols**  
**Executive Administrative Assistant**

South Carolina Department of Probation,  
Parole, and Pardon Services  
P. O. Box 50666  
Columbia, South Carolina 29250

State of South Carolina  
Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services

NIKKI R. HALEY  
Governor



KELA E. THOMAS  
Director

2221 DEVINE STREET, SUITE 600  
POST OFFICE BOX 50666  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29250  
Telephone: (803) 734-9220  
Facsimile: (803) 734-9440  
[www.state.sc.us/ppp](http://www.state.sc.us/ppp)

January 6, 2014

The Honorable Jenny Kitchings  
Clerk of the S.C. Court of Appeals  
P. O. Box 11629  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

**RE: State v. Brian Lorick, Jr.**

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed please find the original of the Initial Brief of Respondent and Designation of Matter dated January 6, 2014, along with proof of service in the above-referenced case.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Buchanan".

Matthew Buchanan  
General Counsel

MB:dn



Enclosures

cc: Wanda Carter, Deputy Chief Appellate Defender


**RECEIVED**

JAN 09 2014

**SC Court of Appeals**



U.S. POSTAGE >>> PITNEY BOWES



ZIP 29205 \$ 001.52<sup>0</sup>  
02 1W  
0001388679 JAN 07 2014

State of South Carolina  
Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services  
2221 DEVINE STREET, SUITE 600, POST OFFICE BOX 50666  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29250

RECEIVED

JAN 09 2014

SC Court of Appeals

The Honorable Jenny Kitchings  
Clerk of the S.C. Court of Appeals  
P. O. Box 11629  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211