

ORIGINAL

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2014

APPEAL FROM SPARTANBURG COUNTY
Court of General Sessions
J. Derham Cole, Circuit Court Judge

S.C. Supreme Court

Appellate Case No.: 2013-000487

State of South Carolina, Respondent,

v.

Shondre Lamond Williams, Appellant.

FINAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General

DAVID SPENCER
Senior Assistant Attorney General

ADAM L. WHITSETT
Assistant Attorney General
S.C. Bar No: 74888

Office of the Attorney General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, SC 29211
(803) 734-3177

BARRY J. BARNETTE
Solicitor, Seventh Judicial Circuit

180 Magnolia Street, 3rd Floor
Spartanburg, SC 29306
(864) 596-2575

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2014

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM SPARTANBURG COUNTY
Court of General Sessions
J. Derham Cole, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No.: 2013-000487

State of South Carolina, Respondent,

v.

Shondre Lamond Williams, Appellant.

FINAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General

DAVID SPENCER
Senior Assistant Attorney General

ADAM L. WHITSETT
Assistant Attorney General
S.C. Bar No: 74888

Office of the Attorney General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, SC 29211
(803) 734-3177

BARRY J. BARNETTE
Solicitor, Seventh Judicial Circuit

180 Magnolia Street, 3rd Floor
Spartanburg, SC 29306
(864) 596-2575

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents i

Table of Authorities ii

Statement of Issues on Appeal 1

Statement of the Case 1

Statement of the Facts 2

Standard of Review 7

Argument 7

 I. The circuit court did not err in refusing to suppress the search
 warrant of Appellant’s home. 7

 II. The circuit court did not err in refusing to suppress the drug
 evidence in this matter as the State clearly established a full
 and complete chain of custody..... 13

Conclusion 17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

State v. Adams, 354 S.C. 361, 580 S.E.2d 785 (Ct.App.2003)7

State v. Carter, 344 S.C. 419, 544 S.E.2d 835 (2001)13

State v. Covert, 368 S.C. 188, 628 S.E.2d 482 (Ct. App. 2006).....7

State v. Dunbar, 354 S.C. 479, 581 S.E.2d 840 (Ct. App. 2003).....7

State v. Hatcher, 392 S.C. 86, 708 S.E.2d 750 (2011)7, 13, 15, 16

State v. Pagan, 369 S.C. 201, 208, 631 S.E.2d 262 (2006)7

State v. Sullivan, 267 S.C. 610, 230 S.E.2d 621 (1976).....7, 12

State v. Wilson, 345 S.C. 1, 545 S.E.2d 827 (2001).....7

STATUTES

S.C. Code Ann. § 17-13-140.....7, 12

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

- I. The circuit court did not err in refusing to suppress the search warrant for Appellant's home.
- II. The circuit court did not err in refusing to suppress the drug evidence.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant was indicted for trafficking more than 200 grams of cocaine and for possession with intent to distribute cocaine base (crack cocaine). Appellant's trial took place in Spartanburg County, South Carolina and occurred from February 25, 2013 to February 27, 2013. Prior to trial, Appellant's counsel moved to suppress all evidence found pursuant to the search warrant and also moved to suppress the drug evidence alleging an incomplete chain of custody. The trial court denied both motions, and the case proceeded to the jury. The jury ultimately convicted Appellant of trafficking more than 200 grams of cocaine and of the lesser included offense of possession of cocaine base (crack cocaine). Upon conviction, the trial court sentenced Appellant to 25 years' imprisonment and imposed a \$50,000 fine for the trafficking cocaine conviction, and the trial court sentenced Appellant to 10 years' imprisonment and imposed a \$12,500 fine for the possession of cocaine base (crack cocaine) conviction. This appeal follows.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

On March 2, 2012, the Appellant purchased a “quarter kilo” of cocaine from an informant working with the Spartanburg County Sheriff’s Office. (Tr. pp. 229-30) (R. pp. 157-58). This purchase was conducted under surveillance and resulted in the issuance of a search warrant for the Appellant’s home and the subsequent seizure of 249.71 grams of cocaine and 4.91 grams of cocaine base (crack cocaine) from the Appellant. (Tr. pp. 257, 259-60, 291)(R. pp. 172, 174-75, 198). Ultimately, Appellant was convicted of trafficking cocaine and possession of cocaine base (crack cocaine). (Tr. p. 352)(R. p. 220).

This entire operation was a reverse buy operation coordinated and conducted under the supervision and surveillance of the Spartanburg County Police Department. (Tr. pp. 25-27)(R. pp. 12-14). On March 1, 2012, Investigator Travis McJunkin with the Spartanburg County Sheriff’s Office assisted officers with the Greenville County Sheriff’s Department in a drug search operation in Greenville County regarding an individual named Shondrell Williams. (Tr. p. 25)(R. p. 12). Subsequent to this operation, Shondrell Williams (hereinafter “Informant”) agreed to cooperate with law enforcement and arranged to sell Appellant a quantity of cocaine. *Id.* Informant was a known drug supplier and had sold drugs to Appellant on several prior occasions. (Tr. pp. 226-27)(R. pp. 154-55).

Thereafter, on March 2, 2012, the Spartanburg County Sheriff’s Office supplied Informant with a predetermined amount of cocaine, fixed recording devices on Informant’s person, and conducted surveillance on the entire operation. (Tr. pp. 25-26)(R. pp. 12-13). After receiving cocaine from law enforcement, Informant went to

Appellant's home, 815 Old Wynd Court in Spartanburg County, South Carolina, and exchanged the cocaine for \$4,000 of U.S. currency with Appellant.¹ (Tr. pp. 229-32)(R. pp. 157-160). After selling the Appellant cocaine, Informant met with Spartanburg County Sheriff's Office Investigator William Tillinghast and turned over the \$4,000. (Tr. p. 26)(R. p. 13). Subsequently, a search warrant was obtained for 815 Old Wynd Court. (Tr. pp. 42-44)(R. pp. 29-31). During this search, law enforcement recovered not only the 249.71 grams of cocaine that Informant had sold Appellant, but also an additional 4.91 grams of crack cocaine that was in Appellant's possession. (Tr. pp. 26-27, 291)(R. pp. 13-14, 198).

On the day of this operation, March 2, 2012, the Spartanburg County Sheriff's Office developed a coordinated plan to facilitate this reverse buy operation. (Tr. pp. 190-191)(R. pp. 142-43). This plan was communicated throughout the day amongst the various officers involved so that the proper preparations were coordinated and put in place. *Id.* Upon Informant agreeing to sell the Appellant cocaine, Spartanburg County Investigator Matt Hutchins retrieved cocaine from the Spartanburg County Sheriff's Office's evidence room. (Tr. p. 38)(R. p. 25). The cocaine was ultimately provided to Informant who sold it to the Appellant. (Tr. pp. 227-30)(R. pp. 155-58). However, upon retrieving the cocaine, Investigator Hutchins then returned to the Sheriff's Office to complete the search warrant for Appellant's home should the transaction occur. (Tr. p. 38)(R. p. 25). Throughout that day, Investigator McJunkin kept Investigator Hutchins apprised of the events that were transpiring during this operation so that Investigator Hutchins could accurately prepare the search warrant. (Tr. pp. 30, 39)(R. pp. 17, 26).

¹ Appellant actually purchased \$9,000 worth of cocaine from Informant, and Appellant agreed to pay the remaining \$5,000 at a later date.

In addition, Spartanburg County Investigator William Tillinghast, who followed Informant to and from the cocaine sale at Appellant's house, recovered the money that Appellant paid Informant for cocaine. (Tr. pp. 32-33)(R. pp. 19-20). Upon receiving this money, Investigator Tillinghast called Investigator Hutchins to inform him that Informant had left the sale and that Appellant had purchased cocaine from Informant in exchange for money. (Tr. pp. 33, 39)(R. pp. 20, 26). After speaking with Investigator Tillinghast, Investigator Hutchins completed the search warrant affidavit and took it before a magistrate to obtain a search warrant. (Tr. pp. 39-40)(R. pp. 26-27). Investigator Hutchins was not present on the scene for this operation; however, Investigator Hutchins confirmed that everything he placed in the search warrant affidavit had in fact happened before taking the search warrant to the magistrate and swearing the search warrant affidavit. (Tr. pp. 39-40, 45-49)(R. pp. 26-27, 32-36). This was accomplished by various personal contact and telephone calls with Investigator McJunkin throughout the day on March 2, 2012 and at least one phone call with Investigator Tillinghast on that date. (Tr. pp. 30, 33, 47)(R. pp. 17, 20, 34).

Ultimately, a Spartanburg County magistrate signed the search warrant and the Appellant's house was searched. (Tr. p. 43)(R. p. 30). During this search, Appellant directed Investigator McJunkin to the cocaine Appellant had just purchased from Informant, and this cocaine was recovered from a hiding place near a water heater in Appellant's garage.² (Tr. p. 197)(R. p. 149). Spartanburg County Investigator Dan Swad ultimately recovered this cocaine and sealed it in a tamper-resistant BEST evidence bag. (Tr. p. 257)(R. p. 172). In addition to the cocaine, Investigator Swad also located a

² At first, Appellant was not truthful regarding the location of the cocaine; however, Appellant ultimately acquiesced led the investigators to it. (Tr. pp. 196-97)(R. pp. 148-49).

quantity of crack cocaine on top of the cabinets in Appellant's kitchen. (Tr. p. 259)(R. p. 174). Investigator Swad also recovered this crack cocaine and placed it in the same tamper-resistant BEST evidence bag along with the cocaine. (Tr. pp. 259-60)(R. pp. 174-75). Investigator Swad did not alter or tamper with either substance at any time. (Tr. pp. 257, 259)(R. pp. 172, 174). Further, upon the completion of the search at Appellant's house, Investigator Swad immediately took the evidence to the evidence room at the Spartanburg County Sheriff's Office and placed it in the evidence locker. (Tr. pp. 260, 264)(R. pp. 175, 179). This occurred on March 2, 2012. (Tr. pp. 260, 264, 275)(R. pp. 175, 179, 182).³ In addition to the cocaine and the crack cocaine located in Appellant's house, law enforcement recovered a set of digital scales, \$12,500 in U.S. Currency, and a money counter. (Tr. pp. 260, 261-62)(R. pp. 175, 176-77).

On that same date, March 2, 2012, a Spartanburg County Sheriff's Office evidence custodian named Anita Mullinax retrieved the evidence in this case, including the BEST bag containing the cocaine and crack cocaine recovered from the Appellant's house and placed into evidence by Investigator Swad, entered this evidence into the evidence computer log, and put it in the secure drug room at the Sheriff's Office. (Tr. pp. 275-77)(R. pp. 182-84). When Ms. Mullinax received this evidence, it had not been opened or tampered with in any way. (Tr. p. 276)(R. p. 183). In addition, Ms. Mullinax did not alter or tamper with this evidence in any way. *Id.*

Ultimately, Spartanburg County Sheriff's Office's chemical analyst, Ashley Harris, who was qualified as an expert in chemical analysis at Appellant's trial, retrieved the evidence recovered from the Appellant's house from the drug room at the Sheriff's

³ However, it appears that Investigator Swad incorrectly dated one evidence form indicating this occurred on March 3, 2012, when in fact it occurred on March 2, 2012. This was a simple scrivener's error. (Tr. p. 274)(R. p.).

Office and performed a chemical analysis on it. (Tr. pp. 282, 284-85, 288)(R. pp. 189, 191-92, 195). However, initially upon retrieving this evidence and prior to performing the chemical analysis, Mr. Harris checked to make sure the BEST evidence bag containing these drugs had not been tampered with. (Tr. pp. 286-87)(R. pp. 193-94). Satisfied that this evidence had not been altered or tampered with in any way, Mr. Harris ultimately performed a series of chemical analyses on this evidence. (Tr. p. 287)(R. p. 194). All of the testing of these items resulted in both items testing positive for cocaine, one being crack cocaine and the other being cocaine. (Tr. p. 288)(R. p. 195). After the positive analysis, the cocaine weighed out to be 249.71 grams and the crack cocaine, after air drying, weighed out to be 4.91 grams. (Tr. p. 291)(R. p. 198). Prior to this testing, these items had not been altered or tampered with in any way. (Tr. pp. 286-7, 291-92)(R. pp. 193-94, 198-99).

STANDARD OF REVIEW

“The admission of evidence is within the discretion of the trial court and will not be reversed absent an abuse of discretion.” State v. Hatcher, 392 S.C. 86, 91, 708 S.E.2d 750, 753 (2011) (quoting State v. Pagan, 369 S.C. 201, 208, 631 S.E.2d 262, 265 (2006)).

“In criminal cases, an appellate court reviews errors of law only and is bound by factual findings of the trial court unless clearly erroneous.” State v. Covert, 368 S.C. 188, 193, 628 S.E.2d 482, 485 (Ct. App. 2006) aff’d as modified, 382 S.C. 205, 675 S.E.2d 740 (2009)(citing State v. Wilson, 345 S.C. 1, 5–6, 545 S.E.2d 827, 829 (2001)).

“A court's ruling on the admissibility of evidence will not be reversed on appeal absent an abuse of discretion or the commission of legal error that results in prejudice to the defendant.” State v. Adams, 354 S.C. 361, 377, 580 S.E.2d 785, 793 (Ct.App.2003).

ARGUMENT

I. The circuit court did not err in refusing to suppress the search warrant of Appellant’s home.

In South Carolina, a search warrant “shall be issued only upon affidavit sworn to before the magistrate, municipal judicial officer, or judge of a court of record establishing the grounds for the warrant.” S.C. Code Ann. § 17-13-140. However, South Carolina law clearly allows a search warrant affidavit to be based on hearsay and recognizes that an affiant may attest to information supplied by fellow officers. State v. Dunbar, 354 S.C. 479, 488, 581 S.E.2d 840, 845 (Ct. App. 2003) cert. granted, decision vacated in part, 356 S.C. 138, 587 S.E.2d 691 (2003); State v. Sullivan, 267 S.C. 610, 230 S.E.2d 621 (1976) (recognizing the validity of an affiant attesting to information supplied him by a fellow officer).

In this matter, Spartanburg County Investigator Matt Hutchins testified that he had personal knowledge of everything contained in the search warrant affidavit as Investigator Hutchins confirmed everything with his fellow officers who were on the scene observing each aspect of this operation. Investigator Hutchins specifically testified to this as follows:

Q: Okay. And you prepared the affidavit in the affiant section of that⁴?

A: I did.

Q: On the tape that the informant has played previously in court you hear Investigator Tillinghast tell you we got the money. What does that mean to you of what did that mean to you at that time?

A: Basically, that the informant had went to the address, had sold the target a quantity of cocaine and had received payment for the cocaine.

Q: And so when you received that phone call, what did you do?

A: I then typed the -- or finished typing the affidavit adding that part to the affidavit and then went before a magistrate to get it signed.

Q: So you did have part of the affidavit already typed out.

A: I was in the process of typing while it was going on, yes, sir.

Q: And everything that's in the affidavit, you did confirm that it occurred as it was in the affidavit before you submitted it?

A: Yes. Investigator McJunkin was the case agent, and had confirmed through him that that was the facts. And then when Investigator Tillinghast had told me that he had the money, then confirmed that. And the search warrant was signed.

Q: So you didn't sign the search warrant until after you heard -- you got the phone call from Tillinghast.

A: That's correct.

⁴ Referring to the disputed search warrant. (Tr. p. 38)(R. p. 25).

(Tr. pp. 38-40)(R. pp. 25-27). Investigator Hutchins also testified that he had spoken with the case agent, Investigator McJunkin throughout the day to obtain information for this affidavit. Specifically, he testified as follows:

Q: Okay. And the C.I. and the C.I.'s vehicle again were searched and no illegal contraband was located, checking, and they goes on from there to unrelated facts, but who -- who conveyed to you that the surveillance continued to be maintained on the residence until after the transaction and the C.I.'s vehicle had been searched again? Who informed you of that?

A: I believe it was Investigator McJunkin.

Q: And how did he inform you of that?

A: I know I had talked back and forth with him also in reference to the search warrant, because he was actually standing by for me to let him know it had been signed. So I believe that's who I would have got those facts from.

(Tr. p. 41)(R. p. 28). Investigator Hutchins further testified to the following:

Q: You say you were talking to Tillinghast or McJunkin by phone?

A: At which time? I actually --

Q: To get these facts. How did you get these facts?

A: I had spoke with both of them. I had spoke with McJunkin and I had spoke with Tillinghast....

Q: Okay. And these phone records would show that you were communicating these facts right here contemporaneous with their occurrence or at least some point before the warrant --

A: Was signed at some point, yes....

(Tr. pp. 47-48)(R. pp. 34-35). Investigator Hutchins ultimately indicated, “[b]efore I signed this search warrant these facts were conveyed to me that they had happened.” (Tr. p. 49)(R. p. 36). As such, it is clear that Investigator Hutchins had personal knowledge of the facts set forth in the affidavit.

Investigator McJunkin also confirmed that he had spoken with Investigator Hutchins several times throughout the day acknowledging, "I had several contacts with Investigator Hutchins throughout the day." (Tr. p. 28)(R. p. 15). Investigator McJunkin further indicated that he relayed a significant amount of information to Investigator Hutchins: "[t]he information that we had placed recorded phone calls to Shondre Williams in reference to the purchase or the sale of an amount of cocaine, would have given him a description of the premises to be searched, the facts of the case as I knew them at that time." (Tr. p. 30)(R. p. 17). Spartanburg County Investigator William Tillinghast also testified that he had spoken with Investigator Hutchins to supply information for the search warrant. Specifically, Investigator Tillinghast acknowledged that he told Investigator Hutchins "that our informant had left the location and that the cocaine has been given to Shondre in exchange for the U.S. Currency." (Tr. p. 33)(R. p. 20).

Further, Investigator Hutchins indicated that he did not complete the search warrant affidavit that he had been working on throughout the day until after he had spoken with Investigator Tillinghast to confirm the drug sale and the recovery of the money. (Tr. pp. 39, 42). (R. pp. 26, 29). The testimony was as follows:

Q: Okay. What portion of the affidavit was prepared in advance?

A: Well, I --

Q: Any of the facts?

A: While I was sitting there or when I'd started preparing it the part on the prior involvement in reference to the recorded phone calls showed the desire to purchase a quantity of cocaine. All of that along with the criminal history at the end would've been already typed up.

Q: Okay. So you're saying that this is on a computer and you can just insert the portion that happened when the C.I. got back to Tillinghast.

A: That's correct.

(Tr. p. 42)(R. p. 29). Investigator Hutchins next testified that upon the insertion of the information provided by Investigator Tillinghast, Investigator Hutchins had completed the search warrant affidavit. Upon completion, Investigator Hutchins printed a hard copy of this search warrant, drove it to the magistrate, and swore the affidavit on the personal knowledge he had received from his fellow officers to the magistrate, who ultimately signed the warrant. (Tr. p. 43)(R. p. 30).

Accordingly, the testimony presented in this matter clearly demonstrates that the search warrant affidavit sworn to the magistrate by Investigator Hutchins was based entirely on the personal knowledge Investigator Hutchins received and obtained from Investigator McJunkin and Investigator Tillinghast. The information contained in this affidavit was accurate and was based specifically on the personal knowledge of the Spartanburg County Sheriff's narcotics team acquired during the course of this coordinated operation. (Tr. p. 27)(R. p. 14).

Further, Appellant's assertion that the only conclusion to be drawn from the facts of this case is that Investigator Hutchins had already completed the affidavit in its entirety before speaking with Investigator Tillinghast is completely without merit. Put simply, there is no evidentiary support whatsoever for this assertion and the testimony in this matter directly contradicts this assertion.

In addition, any discrepancy between the time appearing on the undercover video camera and the time put down by the magistrate leads only to the logical conclusion that

these two clocks were not synchronized. Not surprisingly, Investigator Hutchins confirmed that there was no synchronization between the clocks answering the following:

Q: And did you synchronize your watches with video cameras before this -- this investigation took place?

A: I did not. I had no part of anything to do with the video in this.

(Tr. p. 46)(R. p. 33). Moreover, Investigator Hutchins also testified as to the inaccuracy of the clocks on undercover surveillance video cameras indicating,

Typically, there are a lot of times, though the batteries will go dead and the clocks will reset. So they may or may not be accurate.... The timestamps on them are preset. You hook it up to a computer, and then you punch in what time it was. So, you look at your watch and I look at mine. They may be minutes off what you set the time as, would be different from mine.

(Tr. p. 46)(R. p. 33). As such, there is no support whatsoever for the Appellant's contention that Investigator Hutchins did not confirm the facts set forth in the affidavit prior to swearing them to the magistrate.

In sum, in the words of Investigator Hutchins, "[b]efore I signed this search warrant these facts were conveyed to me that they had happened.... The facts that are in here would have been conveyed to me that they had happened." (Tr. p. 49)(R. p. 36). This is uncontroverted direct evidence that Investigator Hutchins had personal knowledge of the facts set forth in the search warrant affidavit, and clearly satisfies the personal knowledge requirements of South Carolina search warrant jurisprudence. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 17-13-140; State v. Sullivan, 267 S.C. 610, 230 S.E.2d 621 (1976). Accordingly, the trial judge was correct in denying the Appellant's motion to suppress based on arguments that the search warrant was defective, and this appellate ground is without merit. Therefore, this Court should affirm and uphold the trial court in this matter.

II. The circuit court did not err in refusing to suppress the drug evidence in this matter as the State clearly established a full and complete chain of custody.

“Proof of chain of custody need not negate all possibility of tampering so long as the chain of possession is complete.” State v. Hatcher, 392 S.C. 86, 92, 708 S.E.2d 750, 753 (2011)(quoting State v. Carter, 344 S.C. 419, 424, 544 S.E.2d 835, 837 (2001)). In applying this rule courts have “found evidence inadmissible only where there is a missing link in the chain of possession *because the identity of those who handled the [substance] was not established at least as far as practicable.*” *Id.* (emphasis in original). In this matter, there is no missing link in the chain of custody because the identity of each individual handling the evidence was established beyond a reasonable doubt.

The first link in the chain, Spartanburg County Investigator Dan Swad, testified that he collected the drug evidence at the scene. (Tr. pp. 257, 259-60)(R. pp. 172, 174-75). Specifically, Investigator Swad recovered the cocaine from the water heater in the Appellant’s garage and placed this evidence into a BEST evidence bag.⁵ (Tr. p. 257)(R. p. 172). In addition, Investigator Swad also located a quantity of crack cocaine on top of the cabinets in Appellant’s kitchen. (Tr. p. 259)(R. p. 174). Investigator Swad recovered the crack cocaine and placed it in the same tamper-resistant BEST evidence bag along with the cocaine. (Tr. pp. 259-60)(R. pp. 174-75). Investigator Swad did not alter or tamper with either substance at any time. (Tr. pp. 257, 259)(R. pp. 172, 174). Upon the completion of the search at Appellant’s house, Investigator Swad left the Appellant’s residence and immediately took all of the evidence to the evidence room at the Spartanburg County Sheriff’s Office and placed it in the evidence locker. (Tr. pp. 260,

⁵ This occurred after the Appellant directed law enforcement to this evidence. (Tr. p. 197)(R. p. 149).

264)(R. pp. 175, 179). All of these actions occurred on March 2, 2012. (Tr. pp. 260, 264, 275)(R. pp. 175, 179, 182).⁶

On that same date, March 2, 2012, the second link in the chain of custody, Spartanburg County Sheriff's Office evidence custodian Anita Mullinax, retrieved the evidence in this case, including the BEST bag containing the cocaine and crack cocaine recovered by Investigator Swad from the Appellant's house, from the evidence locker where Investigator Swad had put it, entered the evidence into the evidence computer log, and placed the evidence in the secure drug room of the Sheriff's Office. (Tr. pp. 275-77)(R. pp. 182-84). Ms. Mullinax further testified that this evidence had not been tampered with in any way when she initially received it. In addition, Ms. Mullinax testified that she did not alter or tamper with this evidence in any way. *Id.*

The final link in the chain of custody, Spartanburg County Sheriff's Office's chemical analyst, Ashley Harris, testified that he retrieved the evidence recovered from the Appellant's house from the drug room at the Sheriff's Office and performed a chemical analysis on it. (Tr. pp. 282, 284-85, 288)(R. pp. 189, 191-92, 195). However, Mr. Harris testified that he also inspected this evidence upon his retrieval of it. (Tr. pp. 286-87)(R. pp. 193-94). Mr. Harris testified that he specifically checked to make sure the BEST evidence bag containing these drugs had not been tampered with. (Tr. pp. 286-87)(R. pp. 193-94). Satisfied that this evidence had not been altered or tampered with in any way, Mr. Harris ultimately performed his chemical analyses on the evidence. (Tr. p. 287)(R. p. 194). All of the testing of these items resulted in both items testing positive for cocaine, one being crack cocaine and the other being cocaine. (Tr. p. 288)(R. p. 195).

⁶ However, it appears that Investigator Swad incorrectly dated one evidence form indicating this occurred on March 3, 2012, when in fact it occurred on March 2, 2012. This was a simple scrivener's error. (Tr. p. 274)(R. p. 181).

After the positive analysis, the cocaine weighed out to be 249.71 grams and the crack cocaine, after air drying, weighed out to be 4.91 grams. (Tr. p. 291)(R. p. 198). Further, Mr. Harris testified that his inspection upon retrieval of this evidence revealed that these items had not been altered or tampered with in any way. (Tr. pp. 286-87, 291-92)(R. pp. 193-94, 198-99). As such, the identity of each person who handled this drug evidence was established at trial. Accordingly, the trial court correctly denied the Appellant's motion to suppress this evidence based on a chain of custody argument.

Furthermore, the Appellant's argument that the scrivener's error on one evidence form is determinative in this matter is without merit. In South Carolina, the "[p]roof of chain of custody need not negate all possibility of tampering so long as the chain of possession is complete." State v. Hatcher, 392 S.C. 86, 92, 708 S.E.2d 750, 753 (2011). In this matter, a complete chain of custody was presented. Investigator Swad testified that he recovered the drugs from the Appellant's house and immediately took the drugs to the evidence locker at the Spartanburg County Sheriff's Office. (Tr. pp. 260, 264)(R. pp. 175, 179). That same day, March 2, 2012, Evidence Custodian Mullinax recovered the drugs, processed them into the lab and placed them in the secure drug room.⁷ (Tr. pp. 275-77)(R. pp. 182-84). And, the chemical analyst in this matter, Ashley Harris, testified that he retrieved the drugs from this drug room to perform his testing. (Tr. pp. 282, 284-85)(R. pp. 189, 191-92). In the face of Investigator Swad's direct testimony that he immediately took the drugs from the Appellant's house to the evidence locker and Evidence Custodian Mullinax's direct testimony that this evidence was recovered on March 2, 2013; Investigator Swad's scrivener's error on one evidence form is

⁷ Even assuming *arguendo* that this occurred on March 3, 2013, there is no break in the chain as Investigator Swad testified that he took the evidence immediately from the Appellant's house to the evidence locker where Ms. Mullinax retrieved it. (Tr. pp. 260, 264)(R. pp. 175, 179).

inconsequential and is certainly not determinative in this matter. Rather, the State of South Carolina's presentation of a full and complete chain of custody in this matter, with each link in the chain testifying that the drug evidence had not been tampered with or altered in any way prior to the chemical testing on this evidence, clearly satisfies South Carolina's chain of custody requirements. *See State v. Hatcher*, 392 S.C. 86, 708 S.E.2d 750 (2011). Accordingly, the trial court did not abuse his discretion in denying the Appellant's motion to suppress based on the chain of custody. Therefore, the trial court should be affirmed and this appeal should be denied.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, based on the foregoing and the applicable laws of the State of South Carolina, the trial court's decision should be affirmed and upheld in its entirety. The trial court did not abuse his discretion when he denied the Appellant's motion to suppress regarding the search warrant a. And, the trial court did not abuse his discretion when he denied the Appellant's motion to suppress regarding the chain of custody. Accordingly, the trial court should be affirmed and this appeal should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General


DAVID SPENCER
Senior Assistant Attorney General

ADAM L. WHITSETT
Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, SC 29211
(803) 734-3177

BARRY J. BARNETTE
Solicitor, Seventh Judicial Circuit

180 Magnolia Street, 3rd Floor
Spartanburg, SC 29306
(864) 596-2575

BY: 
Adam L. Whitsett

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

March 28, 2014

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM SPARTANBURG COUNTY
Court of General Sessions

J. Derham Cole, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No.: 2013-000487

State of South Carolina, Respondent,

v.

Shondre Lamond Williams, Appellant.

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

The undersigned certifies that the Final Brief of Respondent complies with Rule 211(b), SCACR.

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General

DAVID SPENCER
Senior Assistant Attorney General

ADAM L. WHITSETT
Assistant Attorney General

BARRY J. BARNETTE
Solicitor, Seventh Judicial Circuit

BY: 

Adam L. Whitsett
S.C. Bar No: 74888
Office of the Attorney General

Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, SC 29211
(803) 734-3177

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

March 28, 2014

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Spartanburg County
Court of General Sessions
Honorable J. Derham Cole, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Court No: 2013-000487

THE STATE,

Respondent,

vs.

SHONDRE LAMOND WILLIAMS,


Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Angela Bennett, certify that I have served the Final Brief of Respondent on appellant by depositing two copies of the same in the United States mail, postage prepaid, addressed to his attorney, Robert M. Dudek, Esquire, South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense, Division of Appellate Defense, P.O. Box 11589, Columbia, South Carolina 29201 and Carlyle R. Cromer, Esquire, P.O. Box 2116, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29578.

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

This 28th day of March, 2014.


ANGELA BENNETT
Administrative Assistant

Office of Attorney General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, SC 29211
(803) 734-3727

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2014

SC Court of Appeals