

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

Deborah Brooks Durden, Admin. Law Judge

Appellate Case No. 2014-000367

ALC Rocket No. 2014-ALJ-04-0004-25

Grievance No. MCCI #23-13

RECEIVED

MAR 12 2014

SC Court of Appeals

T. Terrell Bryan, #254538, Appellant,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections, Respondent.

MOTION FOR LEGAL SUPPLIES
& EXTENSION OF TIME

I hereby move the court for an extension of time of thirty days per the clerk's 2/28/14 letter, in order to get additional sheets of paper to comply with the clerk's ten days deadline directive.

Per the attached step 1 & step 2 grievance with attachments in MCCI 0097-14, I've done everything I can to get the needed amount of paper. The file in this case shows I mainly write on the back of paper. My scratch paper I've been ~~writing~~^{writing} on the back of paper. My scratch paper I've been writing on the back is depleted & now I have to rely on 500 for paper.

Per attached EXHIBIT #86 - 3/04/14 Request to Corp. Jones, even if I show a need for more than ten sheets of paper, they'll still only give me ten.

WHEREFORE, I ask the court to contact opposing counsel, Shanika Johnson, & ask counsel to contact their client, & grant me

an extension of thirty days to comply with the clerk's 2/28/14 letter.

3/07/14, SC
dated

CC: Shanika K. Johnson/Staff Att.

Thank you,

X. R. EB

T. Terrell Boyan
#054538, SMJ-B19, MCCZ
385 Redemption Way
McCormick, SC 29899

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INMATE GRIEVANCE FORM

STEP 1

2-13-27

INMATE NAME: T. Turrell Bryan
SCDC NUMBER: 254639
INSTITUTION: MCCI
HOUSING UNIT: 3~~rd~~ smj-B14
WORK ASSIGNMENT: N/A FEB 10 2014

Office Use Only
Grievance No. MCCI0097-14
Code: General JP/IS
Policy _____
Disc. Hear. _____
Class. _____
Date Received 02-10-14
IGC Initials PT

STATE GRIEVANCE (include documentation, and date of incident; if SCDC Policy, indicate which policy)

PER ATTACHED EXHIBIT #45 - STEP 1 GRIEVANCE/MCCI-0079-14, I am refiling. I am being denied access to the court where I am not being given enough legal supplies to draft my 10 to 12 page brief to the S.C. Ct. of App. in CA. 14-ALJ-04-0004-IS. Per directive of AlWarden Parker, we are only given ten sheets of paper a week. See attached EXHIBIT #46 & #47 - forms 10-14, & EXHIBIT #40 - Initial Brief of Respondent. One brief like this to SCDC & myself, two to the Ct. & the rough draft, plus paper to do research. I'll need atleast 50 sheets of paper.

ACTION REQUESTED: Parker direct that I be given 50 sheets of paper.

SPECIFY HOW AND WHEN INFORMAL RESOLUTION WAS ATTEMPTED BY GRIEVANT:

see attached EXHIBIT #41 - 1/27/14 Request to Parker.

Without prejudice,
T. Turrell Bryan, all rights reserved, 2/09/14
Grievant Signature Date

ACTION TAKEN BY IGC:

Reviewed grievance
See Warden/s Decision

P. Turrell Bryan 02-26-14
IGC Signature Date

N/A
Grievant Signature Date

- I accept the action taken by the IGC and consider the matter closed.
- I do not accept the action taken and wish to appeal.


WARDEN'S DECISION AND REASON:

I/M Terance Bryan, 254638
MCCI 0097-14


I/M Bryan:


Your grievance has been reviewed. Per A/W Parker, along with your request to Cpl. Jones for additional sheets of paper, you must provide her with "proof" in detail as to why you need additional the paper. It is your responsibility to provided this proof to Cpl. Jones, not the officers.
Your grievance is **denied**.

If you are not satisfied with my decision, you may appeal to the appropriate responsible official within, (5) days of receipt, via the Institutional Grievance Coordinator.


Warden Signature 7-26-14
Date

- I accept the Warden's decision and consider the matter closed.
- I do not accept the Warden's decision and wish to appeal.


Grievant Signature 3/04/14
Date


IGC Signature 03-04-14
Date

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING STEP 1 GRIEVANCE FORM

1. An informal resolution shall be attempted prior to the filing of Step 1.
2. Complete each section in its entirety, writing only in the space provided for inmate use.
3. Only one (1) issue is to be addressed on each form.
4. Submit the completed form to the Institutional Grievance Coordinator within fifteen (15) days of an alleged incident; policy grievances at any time. Do not write in the space provided for the Warden's response.
5. If you are not satisfied with the Warden's decision, you may appeal to the appropriate responsible official within five (5) days of your receipt of the Warden's decision, via the Institutional Grievance Coordinator.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

INMATE GRIEVANCE FORM

STEP 1

INMATE NAME: <u>T. Tereki Bryan</u>	Grievance No. <u>MCCT 0079-14</u>
SCDC NUMBER: <u>254638</u>	Code: General <u>FP/IS</u>
INSTITUTION: <u>M.C.I.</u>	Policy _____
HOUSING UNIT: <u>SMD-019</u>	Disc. Hear. _____
WORK ASSIGNMENT: <u>N/A</u>	Class. _____
	PREA _____
	Date Received <u>02-05-14</u>
	IGC Initials <u>PT</u>

STATE GRIEVANCE (include documentation, and date of incident; if SCDC Policy, indicate which policy)

I am being denied access to the Court where I am not being given enough legal supplies to draft my 10 to 12 page brief to the S.C. Ct. of appeal in case # 14-ALJ-04-0004-15. Per directive of Al Warden Parker, we only given ten sheets of paper a week. See attached 1/31/14 SCDC form 10-14. See also EXHIBIT #40 - Initial Brief of Respondent, 13 Pages. I have to do a brief like this, one to SCDC lawyer, one for my self, two to the S.C. App. Ct. & I'll have to draft it, I'll need paper to do research, I'll need about 50 sheets of paper.

EXHIBIT
45


ACTION REQUESTED: I request 50 sheets of paper, that Parker
in

SPECIFY HOW AND WHEN INFORMAL RESOLUTION WAS ATTEMPTED BY GRIEVANT:
see attached EXHIBIT #41 - 1/27/14 Request to Parker.

[Signature] 2/03/14
Grievant Signature Date


This grievance is being returned to you unprocessed. **You have failed to attach the answered Request to Staff Form** regarding your informal resolution attempt on this issue as is required in GA-01.12 Inmate Grievance Procedures. You may re-file on a new grievance form within 5 days (due by 2-10-14) providing the required answered Request to Staff Form or within 5 days of receiving a response to the Request to Staff Form which you should have submitted within 5 days of the incident as your informal resolution attempt to the appropriate supervisor. Return this unprocessed grievance with any refile for date verification purposes.

WARDEN'S DECISION AND REASON:



Warden Signature Date

- I accept the Warden's decision and consider the matter closed.
- I do not accept the Warden's decision and wish to appeal.



Grievant Signature Date

IGC Signature Date

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING STEP 1 GRIEVANCE FORM

1. An informal resolution shall be attempted prior to the filing of Step 1 by sending an Inmate Request to Staff Member (RTSM) form to the appropriate supervisor. A copy of the answered RTSM must be attached to the grievance when the grievance is filed.
2. Complete each section in its entirety writing only in the space provided for inmate use. No additional pages will be permitted.
3. Only one (1) issue is to be addressed on each form.
4. Submit the completed form by placing in the Grievance Box within five (5) days of the date on the RTSM response; policy grievances can be filed at any time. Disciplinary and Classification Review appeals must be submitted within five (5) days of the hearing/review. Do not write in the space provided for the Warden's response.
5. If you are not satisfied with the Warden's decision, you may appeal to the appropriate responsible official within five (5) days of your receipt of the Warden's decision, via placement in the Grievance Box.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

Administrative Law Judge John D. McLeod

Case No. 11-ALJ-04-0614-AP

T. Terrell Bryan, # 254638.....Appellant,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections.....Respondent.

INITIAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

April 2, 2012

South Carolina Department of Corrections

Christopher D. Florian
Deputy General Counsel
S.C. Dept. of Corrections
P.O. Box 21787
Columbia, South Carolina 29221
(803) 896-8508

EXHIBIT
#40

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
STANDARD OF REVIEW	4
ARGUMENT AND CITATION OF AUTHORITY.....	5
I. THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT PROPERLY REVIEWED ALL ISSUES RELEVANT TO THE OUTCOME OF APPELLANT'S APPEAL.....	5
II. APPELLANT WAS AFFORDED ALL CONSTITUTIONALLY REQUIRED DUE PROCESS.....	7
III. RESPONDENT'S FINAL AGENCY DECISION IS SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.....	8
CONCLUSION.....	9
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

I. STATUTES

S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-610.....	4
S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-380.....	4

II. CASES

<u>Al-Shabazz v. State</u> , 338 S.C. 354, 527 S.E.2d 742 (2000).....	3-4
<u>DuRant v. S.C. Dep't of Health & Environmental Control</u> , 361 S.C. 416, 420, S.E.2d 704 (Ct. App. 2004).....	5
<u>Grant v. S.C. Coastal Council</u> , 319 S.C. 348, 461 S.E.2d 388 (1995).....	9
<u>Heater of Seabrook, Inc. v. Public Serv. Comm'n</u> , 332 S.C. 20, 503 S.E.2d 739 (1998).....	9
<u>Laws v. Richland County Sch. Dist. No. 1</u> , 270 S.C. 492, 243 S.E.2d 192 (1978).....	9
<u>Pearson v. JPS Converter & Indus. Corp.</u> , 327 S.C. 393, 489 S.E.2d 219 (Ct. App. 1997).....	8
<u>Porter v. S.C. Public Serv. Comm'n</u> , 333 S.C. 12, 507 S.E.2d 328 (1998).....	9
<u>McDill v. Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co.</u> , 368 S.C. 29, 629 S.E.2d 749 (Ct. App. 2006).....	6
<u>SCDC v. Mitchell</u> , 377 S.C. 256, 659 S.E.2d 233 (Ct. App. 2008).....	5
<u>State v. Boswell</u> , 391 S.C. 592, 707 S.E.2d 265 (2011).....	5
<u>Wolff v. McDonnell</u> , 418 U.S. 539 (1974).....	7

III. COURT RULES

SCALC Rule 58	7
SCALC Rule 59	6
SCALC Rule 71	6

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES ON APPEAL

- I. DID THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT PROPERLY REVIEW ALL ISSUES RELEVANT TO THE OUTCOME OF APPELLANT'S APPEAL?
- II. WAS APPELLANT AFFORDED ALL CONSTITUTIONALLY REQUIRED DUE PROCESS?
- III. IS RESPONDENT'S FINAL AGENCY DECISION SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE?

I. Is ~~the~~ ^{an unchallenged} ALC's ruling ^{binding to the party who fails to challenge such} the law of the case & can the ~~the~~ ALC's ruling be ~~extended~~ ^{altered or amended} by ~~respondent~~ ^{such party?}?

II. ~~Discovery~~ ^{the process would be offended if discovery} would ^{uncover transcript evidence to} show that the DHO tries to "zip" through ^{intentionally} cases & during the course of "zipping" through ^{denies} live testimony, ^{without reason}

II. Could ~~discovery~~ ^{unchallenged} I. The ALC's ruling must be binding to such party & such party may not act as Judge & Alter or Amend the ALC's ruling.

II. Does due process requires affording an inmate an opportunity to seek transcript evidence to establish prejudice? ^{WJLHM, p. 494}

III. Can a pattern of bias overcome an ^{intentional} undetailed incident report as substantial evidence

III. Pattern of bias must overcome an undetailed incident report, in the interest of due process, especially where officer gives details at hearing that must be included incident report

STATEMENT OF CASE

This matter comes before this Honorable Court pursuant to the appeal of T. Terrell Bryan ("appellant"), an inmate incarcerated with the South Carolina Department of Corrections ("SCDC"). Appellant was convicted of the inmate disciplinary infraction of exhibitionism and public masturbation, offense 854 under SCDC Policy OP-22.14, Inmate Disciplinary System, following a disciplinary hearing. (R.p.____) Appellant lost thirty-five days of good time due to the disciplinary conviction. (R.p.____).

Appellant filed a Step One Grievance – grievance number BRCI 1496-10 – on October 26, 2010, challenging his conviction. This grievance was investigated and denied. (R.p.____). Appellant filed a Step Two Grievance on February 15, 2011, which was also denied. (R.p.____).

Appellant also filed three other grievances related to this appeal. In grievance number BRCI 0895-11, appellant complained about delays in receiving a response to a prior grievance challenging his disciplinary conviction. Grievance number BRCI 0895-11 was returned unprocessed based on the determination appellant had exceeded the timeframe and had been provided with a response. (R.p.____).

In grievance number BRCI 0896-11, appellant attempted to challenge a disciplinary conviction for exhibitionism and public masturbation. This grievance was returned unprocessed because it duplicated an existing grievance. (R.p.____).

Finally, in grievance number BRCI 0979-11, appellant attempted to appeal two other disciplinary convictions – case numbers 108 and 109. This grievance was returned unprocessed because an inmate may only challenge one disciplinary conviction per

grievance. Appellant was provided five days to correct this problem and resubmit his grievance. (R.p. ___).

On July 9, 2011, appellant filed a notice of appeal in the Administrative Law Court (ALC), pursuant to Al-Shabazz v. State, 338 S.C. 354, 527 S.E.2d 742 (2000). In his notice of appeal, listed grievance numbers BRCI 1496-10, BRCI 0979-11, and BRCI 0895-11. (R.p. ___).

By way of an order dated November 15, 2011, Administrative Law Judge John D. McLeod, affirmed appellant's disciplinary conviction in disciplinary case number 101. The ALC specifically found appellant was provided with an opportunity to call witnesses at his disciplinary hearing, but he chose not to follow the proper procedure in requesting the witnesses. The ALC further found the disciplinary hearing officer did not abuse her discretion in limiting the questions appellant could ask his accuser. In addition, the ALC ruled the disciplinary conviction was supported by substantial evidence. (R.p. ___).

Appellant now seeks review of the ALC's decision. For the reasons that follow, SCDC respectfully requests that the ALC's decision be affirmed.

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 court may not substitute its judgment for the judgment of the administrative law judge as to the weight of the evidence on questions of fact. The court of appeals 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.

See also S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-380(A)(5); Al-Shabazz v. State, 338 S.C. 354, 380, 527 S.E.2d 742, 756 (2000).

In an appeal of the final decision of an administrative agency, the standard of appellate review is whether the ALC's findings are supported by substantial evidence. See S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-610(B). A reviewing Court shall not substitute its judgment for that of the ALC as to findings of fact, but it may reverse or modify decisions which are controlled by error of law or are clearly erroneous in view of the substantial evidence on the record as a whole. Id. In determining whether the ALC's decision was supported by substantial evidence, the Court need only find, considering the record as a whole.

evidence from which reasonable minds could reach the same conclusion that the ALC reached. Durant v. S.C. Dep't of Health & Environmental Control, 361 S.C. 416, 420, 604 S.E.2d 704, 706 (Ct. App. 2004). The mere possibility of drawing two inconsistent conclusions from the evidence does not prevent a finding from being supported by substantial evidence. Id. at 420.

ARGUMENT AND CITATION OF AUTHORITY

I. THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT PROPERLY REVIEWED ALL ISSUES RELEVANT TO THE OUTCOME OF APPELLANT'S APPEAL.

The ALC appropriately limited its review to those issues which were dispositive of appellant's appeal.

An appellate court need not address remaining issues when a decision on another issue is dispositive. State v. Boswell, 391 S.C. 592, 606 n. 12, 707 S.E.2d 265, 272 (2011); SCDC v. Mitchell, 377 S.C. 256, 260, 659 S.E.2d 233, 236 (Ct. App. 2008).

In the case at hand, appellant attempted to challenge the responses to several disciplinary grievances via a single Notice of Appeal filed in the ALC. Specifically, on the Notice of Appeal, appellant listed grievance numbers BRCI 1496-10, BRCI 0979-11, and BRCI 0895-11. (R.p. ___). Appellant now challenges the ALC's decision, claiming the ALC improperly limited its review to grievance BRCI 1496-10.

[The ALC appropriately based its determination in this matter on a resolution of the appeal of BRCI 1496-10 because that grievance dealt with the merits of appellant's due process claim. The remaining grievances were each procedurally flawed.]

Specifically, BRCI 0895-11 complained about the absence of a response to a grievance,

The ^{ALC} Respondent did not rule this, Respondent is adding to argument.

but BRCI 0895-11 had become moot because appellant had received the requested

response. (R.p. ___); see McDill v. Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co., 368 S.C. 29, 31,

629 S.E.2d 749, 750 (Ct. App. 2006) (explaining a case becomes moot when judgment, if

rendered, will have no practical legal effect upon the existing controversy). In BRCI

0896-11, the grievance duplicated an existing grievance. (R. ___). Last, in BRCI 0979-11,

appellant improperly attempted to challenge two disciplinary convictions in a single

grievance, and he was provided an opportunity to correct the problem and re-file the

grievance. (R.p. ___). Consequently, the only grievance properly before the ALC on its

merits was BRCI 1496-10.

Moreover, applicable ALC rules do not contemplate challenging multiple final agency decisions in a single appeal. Instead, the rules refer to individual agency decisions

with corresponding individual notices of appeal. See SCALC Rule 59 ("The notice of

appeal from the final decision to be heard by the Administrative Law Court shall be filed

with the Court and a copy served on each party, including the agency, within thirty (30)

days of receipt of the decision from which the appeal is taken."). In fact, allowing an

appellant to challenge multiple agency decisions could be seen as a way of circumventing

the requirement that an inmate pay filing fees for third and subsequent appeals in a

calendar year. See SCALC Rule 71(A) ("For appeals brought pursuant to Al-Shabazz v.

State, 338 S.C. 354, 527 S.E.2d 742 (2000), the fee will be assessed only for the third and

subsequent appeals filed by an inmate during a given calendar year. ").

Consequently, because appellant did not comply with ALC rules and because BRCI 1496-10 was the only grievance for which the disciplinary conviction could be

waived
not curing

addressed on its merits, the ALC properly focused its review on that grievance and declined to order discovery in the remaining grievances.¹ Further, for the reasons below, the ALC correctly affirmed SCDC's final agency decision.

II. APPELLANT WAS AFFORDED ALL CONSTITUTIONALLY REQUIRED DUE PROCESS.

The ALC properly upheld appellant's disciplinary conviction for exhibitionism and public masturbation because the disciplinary proceeding complied with due process and the conviction was supported by substantial evidence.

Prison disciplinary cases are not criminal trials in federal or state courts. Instead, they are administrative hearings in an institutional setting. Therefore, Due Process in prison disciplinary hearings is substantially less than would be required in a criminal trial before a court. Due Process requires the following in prison disciplinary cases:

- a) notice of charges;
- b) disclosure of evidence against defendant (may be limited);
- c) opportunity to be heard;
- d) no right to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses;
- e) neutral and detached hearing body;
- f) aid of counsel substitute or other substitute aid where inmate is illiterate or complex case (not attorney);
- g) written statement by the fact-finder as to the evidence relied upon.

Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539, 566 (1974).

The requirements enumerated in Wolff were complied with in this case. The Disciplinary Report and Hearing Record demonstrate that appellant had notice of the charge. (R.p. ____). The record also reveals there was proper disclosure of evidence due to the fact that the Disciplinary Offense Report was read at the disciplinary hearing. (R.p. _____)

¹ In addition, the ALC rules do not provide for discovery; instead, they require SCDC to

____). Furthermore, appellant was afforded an opportunity to be heard at the October 21, 2010 hearing. (R.p. ____). There was a neutral and detached hearing body at the hearing, an SCDC disciplinary hearing officer. (R.p. ____). Moreover, appellant was provided counsel substitute and there was disclosure of the written statement of the hearing officer's findings. (R.p. ____).

Appellant contends he was not permitted the opportunity to present witnesses at the disciplinary hearing. However, the transcript of the disciplinary hearing reveals the disciplinary hearing officer did not receive the request for witnesses twenty-four hours in advance of the hearing, as required. (R.p. ____). Consequently, the ALC correctly found appellant had the opportunity to call witnesses, but failed to follow the proper procedure in requesting them. (R.p. ____).

There was ample evidence to support appellant's disciplinary conviction.

Lieutenant Johnson reported that as she was unlocking the food flap for feeding, she

(observed) appellant masturbating. (R.p. ____). At the hearing, Lieutenant Johnson

explained that appellant was standing at the door at the food flap when she opened it.

(R.p. ____). Therefore, the record fully supports the disciplinary conviction, and the ALC correctly ruled that appellant's conviction was sufficiently supported by substantial evidence. Moreover, there was nothing in the record to suggest the agency's decision was

arbitrary, capricious, or the result of personal bias or prejudice.

III. RESPONDENT'S FINAL AGENCY DECISION IS SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.

A reviewing court will not disturb findings of an administrative agency if those

submit a Record on Appeal containing relevant material. See SCALC Rule 58.

findings are supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole. Pearson v. JPS Converter & Industry Corp., 327 S.C. 393, 396, 489 S.E.2d 219, 220 (Ct. App. 1997).

“Substantial evidence” is evidence which, considering the record as a whole, would allow a reasonable mind to reach the conclusion that the administrative agency reached to justify its action. Laws v. Richland County Sch. Dist. No. 1, 270 S.C. 492, 495-96, 243 S.E.2d 192, 193 (1978). The possibility of drawing two inconsistent conclusions from the evidence does not prevent an administrative agency’s findings from being supported by substantial evidence. Grant v. South Carolina Coastal Council, 319 S.C. 348, 353, 461 S.E.2d 388, 391 (1995). Administrative agencies are afforded wide latitude in making decisions, as shown in the deferential standard of appellate review. Heater of Seabrook, Inc. v. Public Svc. Comm’n, 332 S.C. 20, 27, 503 S.E.2d 739, 742 (1998).

All credible evidence presented at appellant’s hearing indicates appellant was guilty of this disciplinary offense. The record conclusively establishes that the “substantial evidence on the whole record” supports respondent’s final agency decision. (R.p. ____). The disciplinary hearing officer stated she found appellant was guilty based upon Johnson’s report and testimony. (R.p. ____).

Appellant has not carried his burden of proving that the decision of the Department is clearly erroneous, or arbitrary or capricious, or an abuse of discretion. See Porter v. S.C. Public Serv. Comm’n, 333 S.C. 12, 507 S.E.2d 328 (1998). Consequently, SCDC’s decision should be upheld.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for all the reasons stated above, this Court should affirm the

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

Administrative Law Judge John D. McLeod

Case No. 11-ALJ-04-0614-AP

T. Terrell Bryan, # 254638.....Appellant,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections.....Respondent.

**RESPONDENT'S DESIGNATION OF MATTER
TO BE INCLUDED IN THE RECORD ON APPEAL**

COMES NOW, respondent, South Carolina Department of Corrections, and
proposes the following be included in the Record on Appeal:

- 1) Incident Report from Lieutenant Johnson dated October 16, 2010 regarding appellant.
- 2) Disciplinary Report and Hearing Record for appellant's case number 101.
- 3) Transcript of October 21, 2010 disciplinary hearing.
- 4) Appellant's Notice of Appeal filed in the Administrative Law Court dated July 19, 2011, with all attachments, including:
 - a) Step One Grievance Number BRCI 1496-10;
 - b) Step Two Grievance Number BRCI 1496-10;
 - c) Step One Grievance Number BRCI 0979-11;
 - d) Step One Grievance Number BRCI 0895-11;
 - e) Step One Grievance Number BRCI 0896-11.

RECEIVED

MAR 12 2014

SC Court of Appeals

REQUEST

~~Cpl. Jones~~ Warden Parker
T. Terrell Bryan
McCI

1/27/14
254538
SMU-B19

32 sheets of paper
10 envelopes
2 Manila envelopes

I have to file a brief about 12 pages long 3 times in an appeal to the S.C. Ct. of appeal in ca. 14-12J-04-0004-15

IM Bryan,

Make your request to Cpl. C. Jones.
Mr. Parker does not fill request, *Mark Alw*
for legal supplies
1-27-14

EXHIBIT
#41

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
REQUEST TO STAFF MEMBER

TO: NAME: Corp. Jones	TITLE:	DATE: 3/04/14
INMATE'S NAME: T. Terrell Bryan		SCDC #: 254638
INSTITUTION: MCC I		LIVING QUARTERS: SMJ-B19

Attached is my deadlines in CIA: 9:13-CV-01826-TLW, 2014-000367, 2014-000366 & 12-6584 (MAS-TJB), total of 6 pages, please return all 6.

I request 50 sheets of paper, 10 envelopes, 3 manilla envelopes. Please contact Alwarden Parker.

CC: Chris P. Fioriani / staff AH.

EXHIBIT
#86

DISPOSITION BY STAFF MEMBER:

Filed 10 paper
5 envelopes

DATE:

3/4/14

SIGNATURE:

C Jones