

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE SHERLEY C. ROBINSON  
CASE No. : 12-ALJ-04-0377-AP

ANDREW PLUMMER # 299191

APPELLANT

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

RESPONDENT

APPELLANT'S FINAL BRIEF

ANDREW S. PLUMMER  
TIGER RIVER C.I.  
SPECIAL MANAGEMENT UNIT  
Room 5  
200 PRISON RD  
ENOREE SC 29335

**RECEIVED**  
JUL 01 2013  
**SC Court of Appeals**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORIZES	ii
STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
STANDARD OF REVIEW	3
ARGUMENT AND CITATION OF AUTHORITY	4
I. APPELLANT WAS NOT AFFORDED ALL CONSTITUTIONALLY REQUIRED DUE PROCESS	4-5
II. RESPONDENTS FINAL AGENCY DECISION IS NOT SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE	6
CONCLUSION	6
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

I. CASES

FRANCIS V. COUGHLIN, 891 F.2d 43, 46 (2d cir. 1988)	4
KURSCHNER V. CITY OF CAMDEN PLANNING COMM'N 376 S.C. 165, 171, 656 S.E.2d 346, 350 (2008)	5
MORGAN V. FARAZER, 924 F.2d 134, 137 (8th cir. 1991)	6
PONTE V. REAL, 471 U.S. 491, 105 S.Ct. 2192	5
STATE V. BAZLY, 298 S.C. 1	5
STATE V. WILLIAMS, 321 S.C. 455, 469 S.E.2d 49 (1996)	5
WOLFF V. McDONNELL, 418 U.S. 539, 566 (1974)	4-5

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

- I. WAS APPELLANT AFFORDED ALL CONSTITUTIONALLY REQUIRED DUE PROCESS?
- II. IS RESPONDENT'S FINAL AGENCY DECISION SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE?

## STATEMENT OF CASE

THIS MATTER COMES BEFORE THIS HONORABLE COURT PURSUANT TO THE APPEAL OF APPELLANT ANDREW PLUMMER, AN INMATE INCARCERATED WITH THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS. APPELLANT WAS CONVICTED OF ASSAULT AND BATTERY OF AN SCDC EMPLOYEE WITH MEANS OR INTENT TO KILL OR INJURE, OFFENSE 80) UNDER SCDC POLICY OP-22.14 INMATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEM; FOLLOWING HEARING, APPELLANT LOST 80 DAYS OF GOODTIME DUE TO THE DISCIPLINARY CONVICTION.

APPELLANT STATES THAT THE STATEMENT OF THE CASE IN APPELLANT'S INITIAL BRIEF ON APPEAL AND OF RESPONDENT'S INITIAL BRIEF ON APPEAL STATES THE VERY ESSENTIAL SET OF FACTS AND THEREFORE DOES NOT NEED TO BE RESTATED.

RECEIVED

JUL 01 2013

SC Court of Appeals

## STANDARD OF REVIEW

S.C. CODE ANN. SEC. 1-23-610(B) PROVIDES THE APPLICABLE STANDARD REVIEW, WHILE IT IS TRUE THAT A REVIEWING COURT SHALL NOT SUBSTITUTE ITS JUDGMENT FOR THAT OF THE ALC AS TO FINDING OF FACTS, 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

## ARGUMENT AND CITATIONS OF AUTHORITY

APPELLANT WAS NOT AFFORDED ALL CONSTITUTIONALLY REQUIRED DUE PROCESS.

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;
- c) OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD;
- d) 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;
- g) WRITTEN STATEMENT BY THE FACT-FINDER AS TO THE EVIDENCE RELIED UPON.

WOLFF V. MCDONNELL, 418 U.S. 539, 562 (1974)

THE REQUIREMENTS ENUMERATED IN WOLFF WERE NOT COMPLIED WITH IN THIS CASE. APPELLANT SUPPLIED THE APPEALS COURT WITH TWO COPIES OF STAFF REQUEST FORMS DATED JANUARY 19, 2012, FEBRUARY 2, 2012 REQUESTING SEVERAL WITNESSES WHICH WERE NOT ADDRESSED TO INCLUDE MEDICAL RECORDS.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MADE ERRONEOUS FINDINGS IN DETERMINING THAT APPELLANT WAS AFFORDED ALL DUE PROCESS AVAILABLE AS STATED BY RESPONDENTS IN INITIAL BRIEF. IT WAS NEVER ADDRESSED BY RESPONDENTS NOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT WITHIN RESPONDENTS BRIEF OR THE FINAL ORDER THAT APPELLANT WAS AFFORDED WITNESSES NOR WAS IT ADDRESS AS TO WHY THE DISCIPLINARY HEARING OFFICER DENIED APPELLANT INMATE WITNESSES AS REQUESTED WHICH WOULD PROVE THAT APPELLANT NEVER COMMITTED THE INFRACTION OF ASSAULT AND BATTERY WITH INTENT TO KILL ON AN EMPLOYEE. THE HEARING OFFICER WAS NOT IMPARTIAL AS STATED BY THE RESPONDENT AS WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE WAS UNJUSTLY EXCLUDED FROM THE RECORD.

AN INMATE SUBJECT TO A DISCIPLINARY HEARING IS ENTITLED TO, INTER ALIA, AN IMPARTIAL HEARING WOLFF V. MCDONNELL 418 U.S. 539, 570-71, 94 S. CT. 2963; 2981-82; 41 L. ED. 2D 935 (1974) A CONCEPTION OF AN IMPARTIAL DECISION MAKER IS ONE WHO, INTER ALIA, DOES NOT PREJUDICE THE EVIDENCE AND WHO CANNOT SAY, WITH THE UTTER CERTAINTY ADVANCED BY RESPONDENTS HOW HE WOULD ASSESS EVIDENCE THAT WAS EXCLUDED FROM THE RECORD. FRANCIS V. COUGHLIN 891 F.2D 43, 46 (2D CIR. 1988) IT IS IMPROPER FOR PRISON OFFICIALS TO DECIDE THE DISPOSITION OF A CASE BEFORE IT WAS HEARD. THE APPELLANT DID SUBMIT A STEP 1 AND STEP 2 GRIEVANCE APPEALS, WITHIN APPEALS IT WAS CLEARLY ADDRESS THAT THE HEARING WAS PREJUDICED AT THE FACT THAT TWO INMATE WITNESSES WERE REQUESTED TO APPEAR AT HEARING OR WRITTEN STATEMENTS BE AVAILABLE WHICH FAILED TO TAKE PLACE AND SUCH WAS LEFT OUT OF THE WRITTEN RECORD FOR APPEAL BY DISCIPLINARY HEARING OFFICER.

THE WOLFF COURT HELD THAT THE INMATE FACING DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO CALL WITNESSES AND PRESENT DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE WHEN PRESENTING HOW TO DO SO WILL NOT BE DULY HAZARDOUS TO INSTITUTIONAL SAFETY OR CORRECTIONAL GOALS. 418 U.S. AT 516 THUS; THE RIGHT TO CALL WITNESSES AND PRESENT EVIDENCE IS ABSOLUTE. ACCORDING TO WOLFF, PRISON OFFICIALS MUST HAVE NECESSARY DISCRETION TO KEEP THE HEARING WITHIN REASONABLE LIMITS AND MAY REFUSE TO CALL WITNESSES FOR IRRELEVANCE AND LACK OF NECESSITY IN ADDITION TO LEGITIMATE SECURITY CONCERN. ID AT 516.

THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT INMATE WITNESSES REQUESTED PROPERLY BY APPELLANT WOULD HAVE JEOPARDIZED THE OPERATION AND SECURITY OF THE INSTITUTION INSTEAD THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS STATES THE WITNESSES WERE AFFORDED WHICH APPELLANT EXPRESSLY DENIES. FURTHER, AS TO THE DISCIPLINARY ACTION ITSELF, THE PROVISION FOR A WRITTEN RECORD HELPS TO ENSURE THAT ADMINISTRATORS, FACED WITH POSSIBLE SCRUTINY BY STATE OFFICIALS AND THE PUBLIC, AND PERHAPS EVEN THE COURTS, WHERE FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS MAY HAVE BEEN ABRIDGED, WILL ACT FAIRLY. WITHOUT A WRITTEN RECORD OF EXCLUSION OF WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE REQUESTED BY APPELLANT, THE INMATE IS AT A SEVERE DISADVANTAGE IN PROFOUNDING HIS OWN CAUSE TO OR DEFENDING HIMSELF FROM OTHERS. IT MAY BE THAT THERE WILL BE OCCASIONS WHEN PERSONAL OR INSTITUTIONAL SAFETY IS SO IMPLICATED THAT THE STATEMENT MAY PROPERLY EXCLUDE CERTAIN ITEMS OF EVIDENCE, BUT IN THAT EVENT THE STATEMENT SHOULD INDICATE THE FACT OF THE OMISSION.

POINTE VI, REAL 471 U.S. 491, 105 S.Ct. 2192

ON A DUE PROCESS CHALLENGE TO FAILURE OF PRISON AUTHORITIES TO CALL WITNESSES REQUESTED BY A PRISONER AT A DISCIPLINARY HEARING THE COURTS ARE NOT LIMITED TO INQUIRING INTO REASONS FOR DENIAL ONLY WHEN INMATES POINTS TO SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE SHOWING THAT PRISON OFFICIALS IGNORED REQUIREMENTS IN GOVERNMENT WOLFF DECISIONS AND FURTHER, A PRISONER IS NOT REQUIRED TO SHOW A PATTERN OR PRACTICE OF REFUSING WITNESS REQUEST BEFORE HE MAY SUCCESSFULLY CHALLENGE FAILURE TO CALL WITNESSES.

KURSCHNER V. CITY OF CAMDEN PLANNING COMM'N 376 S.C. 165, 171, 656 S.E.2D 346, 350 (2008)

(RECOGNIZING THAT DUE PROCESS REQUIRES A TRIAL-TYPE HEARING FOR FACT SPECIFIC, ADJUDICATORY DECISION BY ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES).

THE APPELLANT SUPPLIED THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS WITH TWO(2) STATE STAFF REQUEST FORM (COPIES) DATED FEBRUARY 2, 2012 AND JANUARY 19, 2012 REQUESTING WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE TO BE AT HEARING.

APPELLANT PROPERLY PRESERVED THE RIGHT TO ARGUE THE DENIAL OF WITNESSES AS SUCH WAS RAISED IN ALL NOTICE OF APPEAL, COURT OF APPEALS INITIAL BRIEF, STEP 1 AND STEP 2 GRIEVANCE APPEALS. ALSO SEE DHO TRANSCRIPT DATED JANUARY 31, 2012 PAGE 2. THE CONTEMPTORIOUS OBJECTION PERTAINS TO CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AND LACK MERIT AS RESPONDENTS ATTEMPT TO ARGUE STATE V. WILLIAMS 321 S.C. 455. IF THIS BEING TRUE EVIDENCE IS PRESENTED THAT APPELLANT RAISED ISSUES OF DENIAL OF WITNESSES IN ALL BRIEFS AND DURING DISCIPLINARY HEARING STATE V. BAZLEY 298 S.C. 1.

THE RESPONDENTS FURTHER MISTATED WOLFF V. MCDONNELL ON PAGE 4 OF THEIR INITIAL BRIEF AS THEY STATED THAT APPELLANT HAS NO RIGHT TO CROSS-EXAMINE ADVERSE WITNESSES. THUS WOLFF V. MCDONNELL STATES THAT AN INMATE FACING A DISCIPLINARY HEARING DOES HAVE RIGHT TO CONFRONT AND CROSS EXAMINE ADVERSE WITNESSES AND CALL WITNESSES AND PRESENT DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE FOR AN DEFENSE.

APPELLANT DID OBJECT TO TRANSCRIPT RESPONDENTS FILED WITH ALL ON DATE SEPTEMBER 21, 2012.

RESPONDENTS FINAL AGENCY DECISION IS NOT SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.

THE RESPONDENTS FINAL AGENCY DECISION WAS NOT SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE BUT OF THE ERRONEOUS ERROR OF LAW BY NOT RULING ON THE FACT THAT THEY DID NOT RULE ON THE ISSUE OF FAILING TO CALL WITNESSES, THE DISCIPLINARY HEARING DENIED APPELLANT THE RIGHT TO SUBSTANTIAL AND PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS IN VIOLATION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONSTITUTION AND THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THUS THE RESPONDENTS FINAL AGENCY DECISION WAS NOT SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, SEE 418 U.S. AT 516

ON THE OTHER HAND, IF THE REFUSAL TO CALL A WITNESS IS NOT LOGICALLY RELATED TO PRISON SECURITY OR OTHER LEGITIMATE CORRECTIONAL GOALS, PRISON OFFICIALS HAVE VIOLATED DUE PROCESS, SEE MORENO V. FAZZER, 924 F.2D 134, 137 (8th Cir. 1991).

#### CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, FOR ALL REASONS STATED ABOVE, THIS COURT SHOULD NOT AFFIRM THE SCDC DECISION IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED CASE.

1/4 Andrew Plummer JUNE 26, 2013

ANDREW PLUMMER

TIGER BEVER C.I.Z.

SPECIAL MANAGEMENT UNIT

Room 5

200 PRISON RD

ENDREE SC 29335

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE SHERLEY C. ROBINSON

CASE NO. 12-ALJ-04-0377-AP

ANDREW PLUMMER, # 299191

APPELLANT,

V.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

RESPONDENT,

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE SERVED RESPONDENTS A COPY OF APPELLANTS FINAL BRIEF BY DEPOSITING A COPY OF SAME IN THE UNITED STATES MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, ADDRESSED TO THE RESPONDENTS AS FOLLOWS:

CHRISTOPHER D. FODREAN  
DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL  
SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS  
POST OFFICE BOX 21787  
COLUMBIA, SC 29221-1787  
ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT

151 Andrew Plummer JUNE 26, 2013

ANDREW PLUMMER # 299191

TIGER RIVER C.I.

SPECIAL MANAGEMENT UNIT

Room 5

200 PRISON RD.

ENDREE SC 29335

APPELLANT

RECEIVED

JUL 01 2013

SC COURT OF APPEALS