

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

Deborah Brooks Purden, Judge

ALC Docket No. 14-ALJ-04-0004-IS & 0003-IS

Grievance No. MCCI 1129-13, 1123-11, 1109-13, & 1131-13

T. Terrell Bryan, 254638, Appellant,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections, Respondent.

PARTIAL APPELLANT'S BRIEF

RECEIVED

MAR 05 2014

SC Court of Appeals

College Guild

P.O. Box 6448

BRUNSWICK, ME 04011-6448

INVOLVED PARTY

T. Terrell Bryan  
#254638, FNU-B19, MCCI  
386 Redemption Way  
McCormick, SC 29839  
PRO SE APPELLANT

General Counsel  
4444 Broad River Rd.  
Columbia, SC 29216  
COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Table of Contents _____	2
Table of Authorities _____	3
Statement of Issue on Appeal _____	4
Statement of the Case _____	5
Argument	
I. THE CLERK ERRED BY HOLDING APPELLANT FILED 3 APPEALS WHERE HE ONLY FILED ONE NOTICE OF APPEAL. _____	6,7
II. NOT ONLY DOES THE POLICY OF TOTAL DENIAL OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS DO NOT MAKE SENSE, IT IS MALICIOUSLY DESIGNED TO ENSURE INMATES DO NOT SUCCEED!! <u>RECIDIVISM!!</u> _____	8-10
Conclusion _____	11
Proof of service _____	11

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGE
<u>Deaton v. Hernandez, 112 S.Ct. 1728</u>	7
<u>Howard v. SCDC, 399 S.C. 614, 733 S.E.2d 211 (S.C. 2012)</u>	7, 8
<u>Moore v. Selsky, 900 F.Supp. 670, 676 (S.D.N.Y. 1999)</u>	10
<u>Morrissey v. Brewer, 408 S.Ct. 2593 (1972)</u>	8, 9
<u>Slezak v. SCDC, 361 S.C. 327, 605 S.E.2d 506 (2004)</u>	8
<u>Turner v. Safley, 482 U.S. 78, 107 S.Ct. 2254 (1987)</u>	9

## STATUTES

<u>Rule 55</u>	6
<u>Rule 59(b)</u>	6
<u>SCDC Policy PS-10.08 §3.2 &amp; §3.3</u>	8

## CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

<u>14<sup>th</sup> Amendment of U.S. Const. Equal Protection Clause</u>	9
---	---

LEGAL MAIL

## STATEMENT OF ISSUE ON APPEAL

- I. DID THE CLERK ERR BY HOLDING APPELLANT FILED 3 APPEALS?
- II. WHETHER THE POLICY OF REFUSING TO MAKE ACCESSIBLE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS & DENYING ANY EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS THROUGH THE MAIL REASONABLY RELATES TO LEGITIMATE PEDAGOGICAL INTERESTS?

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This matter is before the South Carolina Court of Appeals pursuant to this PARTIAL BRIEF filed by the pro se Appellant, an Inmate confined &/or incarcerated within the custody, control, supervision & care of the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC).

This case involves several step 1 grievances: McCI 0263-13, step 1 w/ EXHIBITS & step 2, see attached EXHIBIT #59 & #58. **APPELLANT LOST 9 DAYS ACCUED GOOD TIME**. Petitioner filed the step one grievance on 3/18/13 which was denied on 4/17/13. Petitioner filed the step two on 4/23/13, which was denied.

The Appellant timely filed one Notice of Appeal citing Grievance No. McCI 0263-13, 1129-13, 1123-13, 1109-13, & 1131-13, see attached EXHIBIT #54 - 1/02/14 (ALC) Notice of Appeal. The clerk divided the one appeal into three appeals because Appellant "... Can file on 1 appeal form per step 1 &/or per step 2." **THIS WAS AN ERROR**. see attached EXHIBIT #53 - memo of the clerk. see also EXHIBIT #63 - #65, Appeal information in case number(s) 14C0002, 140003-IJ, & 14C0004.

The ALC denied relief on 1/22/14, see attached EXHIBIT #60 & #61, Thus is the timely appeal to this court.

expressly or specifically asserted constitutional violation.

SECOND, the factual basis stated that "... all cases taken together show a pattern of denial of due process." **NOT SEPARATELY**, but taken together they assert a constitutional violation. see Denton v. Hernandez, 112 S.Ct. 1728, "a different picture emerges from a reading of all five complaints together ... the purported modus operandi is identical in every case." The factual basis of the (ALC) Notice of Appeal shows an intent on my part to file only one appeal. **MY INTENT MUST BE UPHOLD.**

**MOREOVER**, the ALC could have still ruled on whether a party's constitutional rights have been violated. see Howard v. SCOC, 399 S.C. 618, 733 S.E.2d 211 (S.C. 2012).

# ARGUMENT

II. NOT ONLY DOES THE POLICY OF TOTAL DENIAL OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS DO NOT MAKE SENSE, IT IS MALICIOUSLY DESIGNED TO ENSURE INMATES DO NOT SUCCEED!! RECIDIVISM!!

## JURISDICTION

THE ALC HAD JURISDICTION! under SLEZAK v. SCOC, 361 S.C. 327, 605

S.E. 2d 506 (2004), the ALC is to have jurisdiction of all properly perfected Inmate appeals that implicate a state created liberty or property interest. A liberty interest is implicated if the Inmate (a) was sanctioned with the loss of any good time credits, (b) made contention that his sentence, sentence related credits or custody status has been erroneously calculated.

Appellant & other similarly situated Inmates have a liberty interest in independently rehabilitation &/or educating ones own self, helping ones self to "... reintegrate into society as [a] constructive individual ..." see Morrissey v. Brewer, 42 S.Ct. 2593 (1972). **NOTING** Appellant is entitled to Earned Education credits.

MOREOVER, the ALC ~~has jurisdiction~~ could have still ruled on whether a party's Constitutional rights have been violated. see Howard v. SCOC, 399 S.C. 618, 733 S.E. 2d 211 (S.C. 2012).

WHEREFORE, the ALC had jurisdiction.

Per SCOC's policy PS-08.06, titled Education Programs (March 1, 2010) §3.2 "SCOC will make available comprehensive & flexible education programs to all Inmates meeting specific criteria. While not all Inmates will be eligible to participate in all educational programs ... some type of educational access, outside of mere novels or mystery books, will be accessible to SMV Inmates." §3.3 "... Independent study ..."

SCOC refuses to make accessible to Appellant educational programs or materials because he is an SMV Inmate with a G.E.O.

PS-10.08 Inmate Correspondance Policy, an Inmate on SMV can not receive

through the mail any educational materials. see EXHIBIT#73 - Appellant's Affidavit, I was working on <sup>my</sup> Certificate for Drama, see EXHIBIT#28 - Certificate of Completion for Creative Language Course. This is in violation of §33.3 Independent Study & the 8th Amend. Civil & Usual punishment. see also S.C. Const. Art. I, §15.

The above is **UNDISPUTABLE EVIDENCE** that SCOC will not provide Appellant **ANY** educational materials & will not allow him to receive any through the mail. Leaving him no way to independently rehabilitate &/or educate himself, helping him own self to "... reintegrate into society as [a] Constructive individual..." Morrissey, supra.

### TURNER TEST

Pursuant to Turner v. Safley, 482 U.S. 79, 107 S.Ct. 2254 (1987), a Turner test was established to evaluate if a regulation (or action) is "reasonably related" by looking at four factors:

(1) whether there is a valid connection between the regulation & the government's justification for it;

(2) whether you still have other ways of exercising your Constitutional right despite the regulation;

(3) whether there will be a "ripple effect" on the rights of others if you are allowed to exercise the right; &

(4) whether there is an easy way to meet the regulation's goal without limiting your Constitutional right.

SCOC can not survive the Turner test because SCOC can not explain why prohibiting inmates in SMU from receiving educational materials through the mail is rational (that it makes sense). It does not make sense & it is designed to ensure an inmate does not successfully "... reintegrate into society as [a] Constructive individual ..." see Morrissey, supra. **RECIDIVISM.**

Being inmates in SMU can not receive educational materials through the mail & SCOC refuses to make accessible to SMU ~~inmate~~ inmates educational programs or materials, Appellant & other similiary situated inmates are being discriminated against, in violation of the 14th Amend.

of U.S. Const. Equal Protection clause. & we have no other way to exercise the right to independent rehabilitation of self &/or independently educate self.

In an article titled "A tired ILM is a good ILM" former director of SCOC William A. Byars allege to the world, that "You've got to start with education, ... You've got to teach people ... find jobs for the offenders to help the transition back into a Community," Byars cited the SCOC's self-paced In-class Education (SPICE), an ILM education & employment initiative.

A lot of courts are not willing to consider impartially that SCOC is malingering their Correctional doings. Compare Moore v. Selsky, 900 F. Supp. 670, 676 (S.D. N.Y. 1995) (finding that a dept. of corrections hearing officer may have a predetermined view that a urinalysis drug testing method is generally reliable, so long as the hearing officer would be willing to consider impartially the possibility of error.)

Education is the key to open doors of opportunity. After an Inmate sits in prison 5, 10, 15 years doing nothing but reading mere novels or mystery books & wait on the C.O.s to bring their food or escort them to the shower or pee, having no meaningful job skills or higher education, statistics say that the Inmate will relapse to crime. More crime means more money for SCOC so SCOC will not make the change. **THE COURTS HAVE TO MAKE THE CHANGE.**

### **EARNED EDUCATION CREDITS**

per SCOC's policy PS-10.08, § 8.2, "for those Inmates with 'No Parole' sentences, no more than 72 days will be awarded during any 12-month period." Not only is **RECIDIVISM** SCOC's objective but keeping an Inmate in prison as long as possible also is! **MONEY!** SCOC do not want Inmates on smu to have educational materials cause then SCOC would have to award Inmate's 72 days Earned Education Credits, which will require SCOC to release Inmates early.

