

STATE of South Carolina
In The Supreme Court

CA. No: 2009-CP-46-4556

Mr. Daniel E. Shearouse
Clerk of Court:

Please be advised that I AM
forwarding the information you requested.
I hope these forms are correct and in
order. Thanking for your time and
consideration in this matter.

Sincerely, Ralph L. Ewin
#51231

RECEIVED

SEP 04 2012

S.C. SUPREME COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
 COUNTY OF YORK
 IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE
 CASE NUMBER 2009CP4604556

Ralph Leroy Erwin	South Carolina State Of
PLAINTIFF(S)	DEFENDANT(S)

Submitted by:	Attorney for: <input type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Represented Litigant
---------------	--

DISPOSITION TYPE (CHECK ONE)

- JURY VERDICT.** This action came before the court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and a verdict rendered.
- DECISION BY THE COURT.** This action came to trial or hearing before the court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision rendered.
- ACTION DISMISSED (CHECK REASON):**
 - Rule 12(b), SCRPC; Rule 41(a), SCRPC (Vol. Nonsuit);
 - Rule 43(k), SCRPC (Settled); Other: _____
- ACTION STRICKEN (CHECK REASON):**
 - Rule 40(j) SCRPC; Bankruptcy;
 - Binding arbitration, subject to right to restore to confirm, vacate or modify arbitration award; Other: _____
- DISPOSITION OF APPEAL TO THE CIRCUIT COURT (CHECK APPLICABLE BOX):**
 - Affirmed; Reversed; Remanded; Other: _____

NOTE: ATTORNEYS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING LOWER COURT, TRIBUNAL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT RULING IN THIS APPEAL.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED: See attached order; (formal order to follow) Statement of Judgment by the Court.

Final Order of Dismissal

ORDER INFORMATION

This order ends does not end the case.

Additional Information for the Clerk:

INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC INDEX
 Complete this section below when the judgment affects title to real or personal property or if any amount should be enrolled. If there is no judgment information, indicate "N/A" in one of the boxes below.

Judgment in Favor of (List name(s) below)	Judgment Against (List name(s) below)	Judgment Amount To be Enrolled (List amount(s) below)
na	na	na

If applicable, describe the property, including tax map information and address, referenced in the order:

The judgment information above has been provided by the submitting party. Disputes concerning the amounts contained in this form may be addressed by way of motion pursuant to the SC Rules of Civil Procedure. Amounts to be computed such as interest or additional taxable costs not available at the time the form and final order are submitted to the judge may be provided to the clerk. Note: Title abstractors and researchers should refer to the official court order for judgment details.

s/ Lee S. Alford	2113	07/30/2012
Circuit Court Judge	Judge Code	Date

For Clerk of Court Office Use Only

This judgment was entered on August 1, 2012, and a copy mailed first class or placed in the appropriate attorney's box on August 1, 2012, to attorneys of record or to parties (when appearing pro se) as follows:

Ralph Leroy Erwin ,

Daniel E Grigg Office of the Attorney General P.O. Box 11549 Columbia,
SC 292111549

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S)

ATTORNEY(S) FOR THE DEFENDANT(S)

David Hamilton

David Hamilton - Clerk of Court

Court Reporter

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF YORK)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Ralph Leroy Erwin, #51231,)
Applicant,)

2009-CP-46-4556

v.)

FINAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL

State of South Carolina,)
Respondent.)

FILED-RECEIVED
2012 AUG -1 PM 3:51
XEROX REPRODUCTION
CC CP CLKS
YORK COUNTY, SC

This matter comes before the Court pursuant to an application for post-conviction relief (PCR) filed October 19, 2009. The Respondent (the State) made its Return and Motion to Dismiss on May 14, 2012, requesting that the Application be summarily dismissed. Pursuant to this request, and after reviewing the pleadings in this matter and all of the records attached thereto, this Court issued a Conditional Order of Dismissal dated May 16, 2012, provisionally denying and dismissing this action, while giving the Applicant twenty (20) days from the date of service of said Order in which to show why the dismissal should not become final.

In a document titled "Objection to Conditional Order of Dismissal Memorandum in Support thereof" filed June 5, 2012, the Applicant contends this application cannot be successive because he did not receive a hearing on the merits in his prior PCR actions and because of this, there has been no final and complete order from this Court. This Court has reviewed the Applicant's response to the State's motion to dismiss in its entirety, in conjunction with the original pleadings, and finds that a sufficient reason has not been shown why the Conditional Order of Dismissal should not become final.

Contrary to the Applicant's assertion, he received an evidentiary hearing in his 1991 PCR case on October 21, 1992, pursuant to which this Court denied and dismissed the application by **written Order** on December 17, 1992, which addressed the issues raised at the hearing (emphasis added). The Applicant has shown no reason why his current issues were not litigated in his first PCR hearing.

Further, S.C. Code § 17-27-90 states “[a]ll grounds for relief available to an applicant under this chapter must be raised in his original, supplemental or amended application. Any ground finally adjudicated or not so raised, or knowingly, voluntarily and intelligently waived in the proceeding that resulted in the conviction or sentence or in any other proceeding the applicant has taken to secure relief, may not be the basis for a subsequent application, unless the court finds a ground for relief asserted which for sufficient reason was not asserted or was inadequately raised in the original, supplemental or amended application.”

Additionally, this Court finds the current allegations are barred by *res judicata*. *Res judicata* prohibits subsequent actions by the same parties on the same issues. Bell v. Bennett, 307 S.C. 286, 414 S.E.2d 786 (Ct. App. 1992). A final judgment on the merits in a prior action bars subsequent consideration of those issues in a new action. Foran v. USAA Casualty Ins. Co., 311 S.C. 189, 427 S.E.2d 918 (Ct. App. 1993). *Res judicata* also bars any issues that could have been raised in the former action. Id.

The Applicant had a full opportunity to litigate all allegations regarding ineffective assistance of counsel in both the state and federal courts. *See* 1991-CP-46-1632; 2003-CP-46-2824; 6:07-959-RBH-WMC. The Applicant specifically raised the allegation that “the statute of limitations has run out on [his] sentence” in his 2003 PCR application. That action was denied and dismissed as this Court found no merit to his claims. Thus, this issue is precluded from being raised in a subsequent


action involving the same parties and the same claim. The public interest in finality of judgments requires that litigation must eventually come to an end. Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), SCRCP, the Court denies and dismisses these claims as barred by *res judicata*.

Accordingly, this Court finds no reason why the Conditional Order of Dismissal should not become final.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that, for the reasons set forth in the Court's Conditional Order of Dismissal, the Application for PCR is hereby denied and dismissed with prejudice.

This Court hereby notifies the Applicant that he must file and serve a Notice of Appeal within thirty (30) days of the service of this Order to secure appellate review. See Rule 203, SCACR. The Applicant's attention is directed to Rule 243, SCACR, for the procedures following the filing and service of the notice of appeal.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED this 30th day of July, 2012.



Lee S. Alford
Chief Administrative Judge
Sixteenth Judicial Circuit

York, South Carolina.

16
R)

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF YORK

RECEIVED

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

2012 MAY 24 AM 10:45

Ralph Leroy Erwin, #051231,

DAVID BRANTON
C.C.P. & GS
YORK COUNTY, SC

2009-CP-46-4556

Applicant,

v.

CONDITIONAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL

State of South Carolina,

Respondent.

This matter comes before this Court by way of an application for post-conviction relief filed October 19, 2009. The Respondent made its return and motion to dismiss on

May 14, 2012

Procedural History

The Applicant is presently on parole and living in Spartanburg County. The Applicant was indicted at the January 1961 term of the York County Grand Jury for murder. Harley Gaston, Esquire and Robert Hayes, Esquire, represented him. On March 24, 1961, the Applicant pled guilty as indicted to murder. He was sentenced by the Honorable James M. Brailsford to confinement for life. The Applicant did not appeal his conviction or sentence.

1991 PCR Action

The Applicant subsequently filed his first PCR application on October 10, 1991. An evidentiary hearing into the matter was held on October 21, 1992 at the York County Courthouse. The Applicant raised the following issues:

1 This is based on the information provided in the PCR application.

#1
R

1. Ex Post Facto violation in that:
 - a. The application of the 1986 S.C. Criminal Justice Improvement Act to Applicant's case results in Applicant only being eligible for parole every two years rather than every one; and
 - b. The application of the 1986 Criminal Justice Improvement Act to Applicant's case results in Applicant not being eligible to participate in the SCDC work release program.

The Honorable Thomas J. Erving denied and dismissed the Applicant's first PCR application by written Order in December 1992.

The Applicant then filed a timely appeal. The South Carolina Supreme Court granted the Applicant's Petition for Writ of Certiorari and reversed the PCR court's determination that there was not an ex post facto violation in this case. Erwin v. State, Memorandum Op. No. 93-MO-286 (filed August 20, 1993). The Remittitur was issued on October 8, 1993.

2003-CP-46-2824

The Applicant then filed his second PCR application on October 22, 2003. The Applicant raised the following issues:

1. "I was convicted under a statute which is unconstitutional"; and
2. "The statute of limitations has run out on the sentence."

The Respondent made its Return and Motion to Dismiss on November 11, 2004. The Honorable Lee S. Alford denied and dismissed the second application as successive and time barred by written Order dated April 27, 2005.

A timely appeal was filed on the Applicant's behalf pursuant to Johnson v. State, 294 S.C. 310, 364 S.E.2d 201 (1988). The South Carolina Supreme Court denied the Applicant's Petition for Writ of Certiorari by Order on November 29, 2006. The Remittitur was issued on January 9, 2007.

6:07-959-RBH-WMC



The Applicant subsequently filed a Petition for Habeas Corpus with the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina on April 9, 2007. The Honorable William M. Catoe issued a Report and Recommendation on January 7, 2008, recommending summary judgment be granted in favor of the Respondent. On February 28, 2008, the Honorable R. Bryan Harwell granted summary judgment in favor of the Respondent by written Order, thereby denying and dismissing the Applicant's Federal Habeas Corpus action.

In his current application for post conviction relief the Applicant alleges that he is being held in custody unlawfully for the following reason:

1. "The Statute of Limitation has run out on the sentence"

Incorporated herein is the York County Clerk of Court records, the South Carolina Department of Corrections' records and the prior PCR and Federal Habeas Corpus records by reference. The Respondent reserves the right to amend this information upon receipt of any relevant materials.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

This Court finds that the current application for post-conviction relief must be summarily dismissed because it is successive to his prior application for post-conviction relief. S.C. Code Ann. §17-27-90 provides that:

All grounds for relief available to an application under this chapter must be raised in his original, supplemental or amended Application. Any ground finally adjudicated or not so raised, knowingly, voluntarily and intelligently waived in the proceeding that resulted in the conviction or sentence or in any other proceeding Applicant has taken to secure relief, may not be the basis for a subsequent Application, unless the court finds a ground for relief asserted which for sufficient reason was not asserted or was inadequately raised in the original, supplemental or amended Application.

AS
00A

Successive applications are disfavored and the burden is on Applicant to establish that any new ground raised in a subsequent application could not have been raised by him in a previous application. Foxworth v. State, 275 S.C. 615, 274 S.E.2d 415 (1981); Aice v. State, 305 S.C. 448, 409 S.E.2d 392 (1991); Arnold v. State/Plath v. State, 309 S.C. 157, 420 S.E.2d 834 (1992).

This Court finds that the current allegations were or could have been raised in the proceedings based on Applicant's prior application for post-conviction relief and thus the current application is successive and barred under S.C. Code § 17-27-90. The Applicant has failed to establish sufficient reason why he could not have raised his current allegations in his previous application for post-conviction relief; therefore, he has failed to meet the burden imposed upon him. Land v. State, 274 S.C. 243, 262 S.E.2d 735 (1980); Aice v. State, 409 S.E.2d 392 (1991); Arnold v. State/Plath v. State, 420 S.E.2d 834 (1992).

This Court additionally finds that this Application for Post-Conviction Relief should be summarily dismissed for failure to comply with the filing procedures of the Uniform Post-Conviction Procedure Act. S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-10 to -160. S.C. Code Ann. §17-27-45(a) reads as follows:

An application for relief filed pursuant to this chapter must be filed within one year after the entry of a judgement of conviction or within one year after the sending of the remittitur to the lower court from an appeal or the filing of the final decision upon an appeal, whichever is later.

The South Carolina Supreme Court has held that the statute of limitations shall apply to all applications filed after July 1, 1996. Peloquin v. State, 321 S.C. 468, 469 S.E.2d 606 (1996). The Applicant was convicted of the offenses he challenges in this application on March 24, 1961. The Applicant was therefore required to file his application by July 1, 1996. This application was filed

#4
KCB

on October 19, 2009, well over thirteen (13) years after the statutory filing period had expired.

A motion for summary judgment may properly be used to raise the defense of statute of limitations. McDonnell v. Consolidated School District of Aiken, 315 S.C. 487, 445 S.E.2d 638 (1994). In addition, S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-70(c) (1985) authorizes the Court to "grant a motion by either party for summary disposition of [an] application when it appears from the pleadings ... that there is no genuine issue of material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Therefore, this Court finds that the application for post-conviction relief is summarily dismissed for failure to file within the time mandated by statute and for being successive.


CONCLUSION

Pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-70(b), the Court intends to dismiss this Application with prejudice unless the Applicant provides specific reasons, factual or legal, why the Application should not be dismissed in its entirety. The Applicant is granted twenty (20) days from the date of service of this Order upon him to show why this Order should not become final. The Applicant shall file any reasons he may have with the York County Clerk of Court and shall serve opposing counsel at the following address:

Office of the Attorney General
Attn: J. Rutledge Johnson, Esquire
P.O. Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

#5
10/21

AND IT IS SO ORDERED this 16th day of May, 2022.


LEE S. ALFORD
Chief Administrative Judge
Sixteenth Judicial Circuit

York, South Carolina

H 6
ABB

June 4, 2012

The Honorable David Hamilton
Clerk of Court, York County
Post Office Box 649
York, South Carolina 29745

Re: Ralph L. Erwin v. State of S.C.
2009-CP-46-4556

FILED - RECEIVED
2012 JUN -5 AM 10:38
DAVID HAMILTON
C.C.P. & GS
YORK COUNTY, SC

Dear Mr. Hamilton:

Please find enclosed my objection to
conditional order of dismissal in the
above captioned case, for filing in your
office. Thanking you in advance for
your time and consideration in the
matter.

Sincerely, Ralph L. Erwin

STATE of South Carolina
County of York

Ralph L. Erwin #051231,
Applicant,
V.
STATE of South Carolina
Respondent.

2009-CR-46-4556
Objection To Conditional
Order of Dismissal
Memorandum
Support Therefor

CLERK OF COURT
YORK COUNTY, SC

2012 JUN -5 AM 10:38

FILED - RECEIVED

Discussion

The Applicant, being a STATE parolee now residing AT The Miracle Hill Mission, AT 189 N. Forest St. in Spartanburg, S.C. 29301. Parole being a Conditional Release of prisoners before the Completion of their full Sentence. Once being released on parole a prisoners Sentence continues to run as if he is still in prison. The Petitioner has filed other PCR's pertaining to this same issue, but afterwards has come up with after discovered evidence which could not have been presented in his previous applications. The Applicant would like to show unto this Honorable

Court The following.

FACTS 1

A review of each petition the Applicant has filed clearly shows a hearing has never been held in regard to each issue presented in these applications.

Applicability of The South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure To Post Conviction Relief Action, See Rule 71.1 SCRPC. An Order in A Post Conviction Matter which does NOT include specific findings of fact and conclusion of law relating to each issue presented, does NOT constitute a final order or judgment, and therefore is NOT reviewable by a writ of certiorari. Therefore since there has yet to be a final order presented on the issues presented the case legally remains open. Furthermore, because of the states procedural irregularities the petitioner has been denied due process of law as guaranteed by the U.S. and S.C. Constitution. In addition these actions presented by the state has also denied

The Applicant The opportunity to exhaust Any STATE Court remedies. Petitioner has never received the benefit of a Direct review from either petition. Thus, his Applications Cannot be viewed As Successive.

FACTS 2

The U.S. Supreme Court has Listed six (6) Situation in which STATE errors Compelled the Federal Court to An evidentiary hearing.

- (1) The merits of The factual dispute were NOT resolved in The STATE hearing.
- (2) The STATE's factual determination is NOT fairly Supported by the record As A whole.
- (3) The fact finding procedure employed by The STATE Court WAS NOT Adequate to Afford A full AND fair hearing.
- (4) There is A Substantial Allegation of Newly or in This Case, After discovered evidence.
- (5) The MATERIAL facts were NOT Adequately developed AT A STATE Court hearing.
- (6) There is A reason why The STATE Court or Judge did NOT Afford The Applicant A

Full and Fair hearing.

In *Washington v. State*, 478 S.E. 2d 833 (S.C. 1996) The Court held that given many Procedural irregularities that occurred during the course of Petitioner's Judicial Process he was deprived Due Process. It further noted citing *Aice v. State* 409 S.E. 2d 392, 394; "With only the very rarest of exceptions, when the system has simply failed a defendant and where to continue the defendant's imprisonment without review would amount to a gross miscarriage of justice. The present case is one of those rare exceptions.

Facts 2

The Supreme Court has held that an order denying Post Conviction Relief improperly failed to address allegations raised in Application for Post Conviction relief. Vacated and remanded. This in effect denies Applicant of his right to direct Appeal on issues presented. Code 1976, Section 17-27-80; U.S. Const. Amend 6.

Also, In McCray V. STATE, 305 S.C. 329, 408 S.E. (2d) 241 (1991); S.C. Code Ann. Section 17-27-80 (1991). The Supreme Court has said; We Take This Opportunity To express Our Concern With The increasing Number of Orders in PCR Proceedings That fail To Address The Merits of The issues raised by Applicant. Not Only does this deprive the Parties of ruling on The issues raised, but it makes review by The Appellate Court more difficult. Again, A Carefull review of each Petition The Applicant has filed will show not only were issues Presented Not ruled upon, but, The fact is There has never been A hearing pertaining To These issues. This in itself deprive The Applicant of Due Process of Law.

Conclusion

An Appellate Court must Affirm A Post Conviction relief Court's decision when its findings are Supported by Any evidence of Probative Value. Pauline V. STATE (S.C. 2002) 350 S.C. 278, 565 S.E. 2d 769 CRIMINAL LAW

1158.36. Therefore since there has never been a complete final order on issues present for lack of hearing the issues there could be no statute of limitation and the issues should not be viewed as successive. The Applicant would also point out that according to SCDC records the Applicant is viewed as non-violent, which by laws of South Carolina is considered a misdemeanor, a crime which carries much less time than a felony. For all the reasons stated above the Applicant would ask this petition continue to evidentiary and that counsel be appointed to assist the Applicant in any amendment or appeals process. This will be forever pray.

Ralph Erwin
RALPH L. ERWIN #051231
189 N. Forest St,
Spartanburg, SC, 29301

June 4 2012

Copies sent to

J. Rutledge Johnson, Bar No. 78871
P.O. Box 11549
Columbia, SC, 29211-1549

(6)

Verification of Service By mail

I Ralph L. Erwin, First being duly sworn under oath, depose and says that I did place in the (U.S. Mail Spartanburg, S.C.) an exact copy of the attached, with first class postage affixed thereto, and that I did address a copy to the following.


Defendants Attorney:
J. Rutledge Johnson, Bar No. 78871
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, S.C. 29211-1549

FILED - RECEIVED
2012 JUN -5 AM 10:38
DERRICK LAWSON
C.C.P. & GS
YORK COUNTY, SC

SI Ralph L. Erwin
RALPH L. ERWIN #051231
189 N. Forest St.
Spartanburg, S.C. 29301

Sworn To And Subscribed before
me this 4 day of June,
2012

Derrick Lawson
NOTARY Public For South Carolina
6/22/19
My Commission Expires



CMTI330D SCDC OFFENDER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM 02/15/12
 OMCOMITA RELEASE DATE SCREEN C023981
 SCDC# > 51231 LOC: SPARTANBURG
 ERWIN, RALPH LEROY SCDC CLASSIFICATION..: NON-VIOLENT
 OFFENDER TYPE...: ADULT-STRAIGHT SENTENCE SEXUAL REGISTRY...: N
 SEXUAL PREDATOR...:
 DNA STATUS.....: COMPLETED
 GPS REQUIREMENT...: N
 PREA DECISION.....:
 CURRENT SENTENCE: CONSECUTIVE SENTENCE ...:
 LIFE CURRENT SENT START DATE: 03/24/1961
 PROJECTED COMPLETION DATES
 MAXOUT DATE: 99/99/9999 CURRENT EWC ..:
 YOA SIX YEAR DATE: CURRENT EEC ..:
 INITIAL PAROLE DATE: 01/16/1979 NEXT PAROLE HEARING DATE: 02/07/2008

TOTAL GT DAYS EARNED: 000000 LABOR CREW/WORK PROG DATE: 99/99/9999
 TOTAL EARNED WORK CREDITS ..: 000000 LABOR CREW DISQ REASON:
 TOTAL EDUCATION CREDITS: 000000 CATEGORY 4 OR 5 OFFENSE
 TOTAL EXTRA EARNED CREDITS ..: 000
 TOTAL SERVICE TIME EARNED ..: 000000

PFKEYS: 5: HISTORY OF DATE CHANGES
 4-© 1 Sess-1 167.7.50.33 SCDC1424 3/11

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

RECORD SUMMARY REPORT DATED 02/15/12

00239

ERWIN, RALPH LEROY FBI # 7876930 STD# SC00074575 SCDC # 51331
 OFFENDER TYPE.: ADULT-STRAIGHT SENTENCE
 INSTITUTION .: SPARTANBURG CO NORM.....: 0000
 SECURITY/CUST.: 2 MINIMUM IN RACE.....: B SEX.....: M
 CURR INCARC SENT...: 999 YRS 0 MOS 0 DYS PROJ MAXDIT DATE: 99/99/9999
 CENTRAL MONITORING.: NO PROJ PAROLE DATE: 02/07/2008
 SOCIAL SECURITY #...: 237484099 EDC JOB...: NO CURRENT JOB
 EDC PGM...: NO CURR EDC PROGRAM
 CURRENT PROGRAM...: LONG TERM OFFENDERS GROUP EDC LEVEL: 0 EEC LEVEL:
 AGE...: 68 DATE OF BIRTH...: 8/ 1/43 ASSIGNMENT...: BUILDING #1

PREVIOUS NUMBERS:

** NO PREVIOUS NUMBERS **

CURRENT OFFENSES	SENTENCE			COUNTY	SENTENCE		U/NU	CATEGORY
	YRS	MOS	DYS		START			
ESCAPE	1	0	0	RICHLAND	11/ 1/1978	U		4
MURDER BEFORE 1977, JUNE	999	99	999	YORK	3/24/1961	U		5

PRIOR COMMITMENTS OVER 90 DAYS:

11/13/77	*POSSESS STOLEN PROPERTY	0 YRS	6 MOS	0 DYS
4/ 3/73	*BREAK-ENT W/INTENT-STEAL	7 YRS	0 MOS	0 DYS

DETAINEES (HOLD, WANTED, NOTIFY):

NO DETAINEES
 NO DETAINEES

ESCAPES:

1/12/83	OTHER ESCAPE RELATED CODE NOT IN TABLE
4/ 7/77	ESCAPE CLASS II

CRIMINAL CHARGES:

NO CRIMINAL CHARGES WHILE IN CUSTODY
 NO CRIMINAL CHARGES HISTORY

ASSAULTIVE DISCIPLINARIES:

NO ASSAULTIVE DISCIPLINARY HISTORY

NON-ASSAULTIVE DISCIPLINARIES:

NO NON-ASSAULTIVE DISCIPLINARY HISTORY

HISTORY OF MOVEMENTS:

3/15/ 7	SPARTANBURG CO	PAROLE	PAROLE BOARD ACTION
2/ 7/ 7	ALLENDALE	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
2/ 7/ 7	RIDGELAND	INCARCERATED	COURT/PAROLE HEARING UTA
2/15/ 6	ALLENDALE	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
2/15/ 6	RIDGELAND	INCARCERATED	COURT/PAROLE HEARING UTA
10/ 6/ 5	ALLENDALE	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
6/12/ 3	PERRY	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
8/14/96	ALLENDALE	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
8/31/95	TRENTON	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
10/22/92	TYGER RIVER LOW	INCARCERATED	RETURN FROM COURT
10/19/92	YORK CO	AUTH ABSENCE (AWI)	TO COURT
6/19/92	TYGER RIVER LOW	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
6/12/92	YORK CO	AUTH ABSENCE (AWI)	TO COURT
3/ 7/90	TYGER RIVER LOW	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
3/ 3/89	WATERFEE RIVER	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
5/24/88	BROAD RIVER	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
8/30/85	CENTRAL	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
7/24/85	HIGHLANDS RAE	INCARCERATED	PAROLE VIOLATOR
2/24/85	RICHLAND CO	PAROLE	RETURN FROM ABSCONTION
1/12/83	LINK	DEAD TIME	WARRANT ISSUED
1/20/82	NORTH CAROLINA	PAROLE	PAROLE BOARD ACTION
1/ 6/81	CENTRAL	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
12/ 3/80	HIGHLANDS RAE	INCARCERATED	DISCIPLINARY
3/19/80	FATREFIELD CO OF	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE

CRUITN, RALPH LEROY FBI # 787692D STD# SC00076575 SODC # 51231 (CONTINUED)

6/22/78	CENTRAL	INCARCERATED	RETURN FROM ESCAPE
4/ 7/77	ESCAPES	ESCAPED-AWOL	AWOL-ESCAPE
1/28/74	SOCIA	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
9/ 4/75	KIRKLAND	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
8/22/75	MIDLANDS R&F	INCARCERATED	PAROLE VIOLATOR
6/14/71	LINK	PAROLE	PAROLE BOARD ACTION
1/ 4/71	STEVENSON	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
4/ 9/70	MANNING	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
2/21/70	CENTRAL	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
10/ 2/69	STEVENSON	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
7/20/67	MANNING	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
6/27/67	CENTRAL	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
5/30/67	MACDONOUGH CORR	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
5/18/67	CENTRAL	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
2/10/66	MANNING	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
12/20/65	CENTRAL	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
8/19/63	MANNING	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE
3/25/61	CENTRAL	INCARCERATED	ADMINISTRATIVE

HISTORY OF EARNED WORK CREDIT ASSIGNMENTS:

IDB	START DATE	END DATE	TERMINATION REASON	IDB
CUSTODIAL WORKER	08/24/06	3/15/ 7	RELEASED/PAROLED	YF5
CUSTODIAL WORKER	10/11/05	8/23/ 6	INMATE REQUEST	YF5
FURNITURE ASSEMBLER	05/28/04	10/ 6/ 5	INSTIT TRANSFER	YF5
FURNITURE ASSEMBLER	06/14/02	4/ 7/ 4	INSTIT TRANSFER	YF5
WTF CLERK	06/24/98	6/12/ 2	INSTIT TRANSFER	YF5
CUSTODIAL WORKER	07/10/97	4/23/98	INMATE REQUEST	YF5
CUSTODIAL WORKER	09/19/94	7/ 9/97	REMOVAL FROM 7 DAY CREDIT	YF7
SENIOR CUSTODIAN	09/07/95	8/14/94	INSTIT TRANSFER	YF7
SENIOR CUSTODIAN	06/16/94	8/31/95	INSTIT TRANSFER	YF5
LANDMASTER	10/22/92	6/15/94	LATERAL TRANSFER	YF5
LANDMASTER	06/26/92	10/19/92	COURT	YF5
POD SERVICE AIDE	09/16/89	3/ 7/90	INSTIT TRANSFER	YF7
SENIOR COOK	05/18/89	9/15/89	PROMOTION	YF7
BAKER	04/05/89	5/17/89	PROMOTION	YF7
POD SERVICE AIDE	03/08/89	4/ 4/89	PROMOTION	YF7
SENIOR BAKER	06/17/89	3/ 3/89	INSTIT TRANSFER	YF7
BAKER	05/25/88	6/14/88	PROMOTION	YF7
POD SERVICE AIDE	02/03/88	5/24/88	INSTIT TRANSFER	YF7
GENERAL WORKER	08/12/87	2/ 2/88	INMATE REQUEST	YF7
SENIOR COOK	06/18/84	8/11/87	INMATE REQUEST	YF7
POD SERVICE AIDE	09/13/85	4/17/84	PROMOTION	YF7
CUSTODIAL WORKER	01/16/81	1/20/82	RELEASED/PAROLED	YF7
SENIOR COOK	03/19/80	12/ 3/80	INSTIT TRANSFER	YF7
CUSTODIAL WORKER	05/11/79	3/18/80	INSTIT TRANSFER	YF7
TITLE CHANGED TO 053	10/05/78	5/10/79	TERM CODE CHG TO 13 OR 14	YF7

HISTORY OF EARNED EDUCATION CREDITS:

ID	START DATE	END DATE	TERMINATION REASON
----	------------	----------	--------------------

NO SCHOOL ASSIGNMENTS*

***** END OF REPORT *****