

The State of South Carolina

In The Court of Appeals

---

Appeal From Administrative Law Court

Judge Deborah Brooks Durden, Judge of ALC

---

ALC Case Numbers: 12-ALJ-04-0546-AP2

12-ALJ-04-0547-AP

Appellate Case No. 2013-0007522

2013-000764

---

Billy Lee Lisenby JR, #200273 ..... Appellant

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

---

Final Brief For Appellant

---

Dated: Nov. 12<sup>th</sup> 2013

Billy Lee Lisenby JR.

Billy Lee Lisenby JR, #200273

200 Prison Rd.

Enoree S.C. 29335

Attorney For Respondent

Christopher D. Florian

P.O. Box 21787

Columbia, S.C. 29221

RECEIVED

NOV 18 2013

SC Court of Appeals

# Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
Table of Authorities	ii
Statement of Issues on Appeal	1
Statement of The Case	2
Argument and Citation of Authority	3-7
Conclusion	8
Certificate of Service	9

# Table of Authorities

WolFF v. Mc Donnell, 94 Sct 2963 (1974) .....	4
U.S. v. Morgan 193 F.3d 252 @ 266-67 .....	4
U.S. exrel Accardi v. Shaughnessy, 74 S.Ct 499 (1954) .....	4
U.S. v. HeFFner, 420 F.2d 809 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1969) .....	4
Ponte v. Real, 471 U.S. at 497 .....	4
Bartholome v. Watson 665 F.2d at 918 .....	5
WolFF v. Mc Donnell, 418 U.S. 539, 566, 94 S.Ct 2963, 2978-2982 (1974)* .....	5
U.S. v. Morgan .....	7
U.S. exrel Accardi v. Shaughnessy, 74 S.Ct 499 (1954) .....	7
U.S. v. HeFFner, 420 F.2d 809 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1969) .....	7

## Statement of Issues on Appeal


- I. Did the Administrative Law Judge err in not ruling in Appellant's favor when he was denied his right to call witnesses, and no written nor verbal reasons was given on why the denial was necessary?
- II. Did the Administrative Law Judge err in not ruling in Appellant's favor when they presented no evidence of the marijuana, no Controlled Substance Testing Disposition Form was presented, and the picture they presented for the phones and charges, is not visible, and you cannot tell what it is?

RECEIVED

NOV 18 2013

SC Court of Appeals

## Statement of The Case

The Appellant was found guilty of Trafficking, Use, and/or Possession of Narcotics, Marijuana, or Unauthorized Drugs (903) and Possession of Any Cell Phone or Other Type of Communication Device (893) on February 14<sup>th</sup> 2012. He then appealed to S.C.D.C.'s grievance system Step 1, and  Step 2 and both were denied. There after he appealed to the Administrative Law Court and on March 22, 2013 Judge Deborah Brooks Darden, Judge of The ALC Affirmed each conviction. Now he appeals to the Court of Appeals.

**RECEIVED**

NOV 18 2013

**SC Court of Appeals**

## Argument #1

The Administrative Law Judge ERRED in not ruling in Appellant's favor when Respondent was denied his right to call witnesses. Appellant contends that The Honorable Judge Deborah Brooks Darden didn't understand the case as a whole. She states in her order "One member of the three-person search team had already testified and Inmate did not provide any explanation tending to indicate that the testimony of officers Moore and Lee would not be cumulative." Officer Hunt is a member of Kershaw Corr. Inst. Contraband Staff. The three members of the Agency Search Team was Lee, Moore, and Coit, and neither was allowed to testify. In fact C/O Hunt didn't know the names of the officers from the agency search team. See page 8 where OFC Hunt states as follows:

"Uh, the Search Team was around me, but I couldn't tell you a name of anyone."

OFC Hunt did not find the contraband it was the Agency Search Team who found the contraband MS. Moore, Coit and Lee. The D.H.O stated:

"Okay. That's part of the Agency Search Team. Okay, they won't be contacted."

The D.H.O never gave a reason for denying the (3) witnesses. The ALC stated "It was within the hearing officer's discretion to limit cumulative testimony. This means the D.H.O was only making assumptions, because the D.H.O nor the counsel substitute question these witnesses. Appellant contends that the members of the Agency Search team Lee, and Moore would've testified that he didn't claim ownership. How could the D.H.O determine that the testimony would've been cumulative and the witnesses have yet to testify.

S.C.D.C is violating inmates they send in the Agency Search Team from headquarters in Columbia to search institutions for contraband. These officers have no I.D.'s, name cards or anything. If they find contraband they don't write it up, they let the institutional contraband officer write it up, such as C/O Hunt. Unfortunately, Appellant has served a lot of time, and he knows the members of the Agency Search Team. So he provided their names C/O Lee and Moore. He knew C/O Coit because he has a baby by his daughter. S.C.D.C is now refusing to call the Agency Search Team as witnesses. The D.H.O asked C/O Hunt on Page 7 "DHO: Okay. Was anyone else present when Inmate Lisenby stated that these items belonged to him? He lied on Page 8 when he stated "OFC: Uh, the Search Team was around me, but I couldn't tell you a name of anyone". He just stated he didn't know his employees names. That's not credible because he knows the truth would've come out that Appellant didn't claim ownership. The D.H.O was prepared to call another witness, but she refused to call the Agency Search Team as a witness.

Prior to the hearing Appellant sent the D.H.O and Counsel Substitute a SCDC Form 19-11 Request to Staff Member asking that C/o Cort, C/o Moore, and C/o Lee be called as his witnesses. They never contacted nor question the witnesses prior to the hearing. This is a violation of OP 22.14 Section 15.3 which states;

"The inmate may call witnesses unless the Hearing Officer decides that the testimony of such witnesses, is Repetitive (that is, will simply repeat the testimony of other witnesses), is not relevant to the case, or is likely to jeopardize the life or safety of persons or the security and order of the institution. If witnesses are denied by the Hearing officer, the Hearing Officer must write his/her reasons for this denial on the SCDC Form 19-69 "Disciplinary Report and Hearing Record," in the space provided. If an employee has been called as a witness and has information that is relevant to the case, then he/she is obligated to provide said information".

None of this was done, and the reason for denying his witnesses were not on SCDC Form 19-69. If his witnesses couldn't have been present the D.H.O could've gotten them on speaker phone. See OP 22.14 Section 15.5 which states in part:

"Any witness, including the accusing employee, who is unable to attend the hearing may be interviewed by a speaker telephone during the hearing and the answers of the witnesses must be recorded."

Wolff v. Mc Donnell, 94 Sct 2963 (1974) supports the fact that Appellant has a Constitutional right to have his witnesses called in his behalf. Accordingly once the SCDC established the administrative framework set forth in policy, SCDC personnel are bound to follow it.

U.S. v. Morgan 193 F.3d 252 @ 266-67

U.S. exrel Accardi v. Shaughnessy, 74 S.Ct 499 (1954)

"An agency of the government must scrupulously observe rules, regulations, or procedures which it has established. When it fails to do so, its action cannot stand and courts will strike it down."

U.S. v. HeFFner, 420 F.2d 809 (4th Cir. 1969)

The D.H.O obtained a statement from C/o Cort, but refused to obtain statements from C/o Moore and C/o Lee, which would've been in Appellant's favor.

Judge Dwyer used the case Ponte v. Real, 471 U.S. at 497 to state "Prison officials may choose to explain their decision at the hearing, or they may choose to explain it later." Please note "I Dissent to this," meaning he disagrees, at least one Judge disagreed with this.

Judge Duaden further states that the D.HO now states the testimony would've been cumulative. In Christopher Florian's Respondent's Brief he states as his only defense as follows:

"Appellant claims he was denied the right to examine members of the Agency Search Team at the disciplinary hearing. The Agency Search Team conducts institutional searches as directed by the Director, Division of Security. Each institution assigns an employee to serve in the capacity of an accusing official to ensure the Agency Search Team members can perform their sole duty of conducting searches. With the volume of searches performed, and the volume of contraband found during these searches, the Agency Search Team would become ineffective if they were required to participate in inmate disciplinary hearings. As the Wolff Court acknowledged, the full panoply of due process right does not apply to prison disciplinary proceedings: there must be mutual accommodation between institutional needs and objectives and the provisions of the Constitution that are of general application. Wolff, 418 U.S. at 556."

This brief was dated Oct. 2, 2012 and nowhere does it speak on cumulative testimony. Under no circumstance can it be justified to deny appellant's request for witnesses without giving a reason. The right to call witnesses is a basic to a fair hearing. Wolff and Bartholomew v. Watson 66 S.F.2d at 918. Appellant was deprived of that due process guaranteed by the fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution because no reasons whatsoever were advanced by Respondents in court as to why Appellant was not allowed to call the [redacted] requested witnesses at the hearing.

As the record will show that Christopher Florian made the return on Respondent's [redacted] brief on Oct. 2, 2012 for the 903-Use, Possession of Narcotics, Marijuana. Brad Ford A. Rawlinson prepared the Respondent's Brief on September 28, 2012 for the charge of 898-Possession of Any Communication Device. Both charges occurred on Feb. 4<sup>th</sup> 2012 and both hearings were held together on Feb. 14<sup>th</sup> 2012. MR. Brad Ford A. Rawlinson states:

"It is clear from the record that further testimony from security personnel would have been repetitive to that of Officers Hunt and Cott. It is also clear that the Disciplinary Hearing Officer gave Appellant ample opportunity to present evidence on his behalf and afforded Appellant Due Process as discussed in Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539, 566, 94 S.Ct. 2963, 2978-2982 (1974)."

MR. Florian states " they denied Appellant's witnesses due to security reasons." MR. Rawlinson, states "they denied Appellant's witnesses due to repetitive testimony." There was only one hearing and one D.H.O (MR. Sellers). They have not provided a statement from the D.H.O stating why she denied Appellant's witnesses. So the Judge erred in not ruling in Appellant's favor because MR. Florian and MR. Rawlinson are not being truthful, they have violated Petitioner's constitutional right mandated by Wolff and now they are exaggerating to cover it up.

For all the above reasons the Appellant is entitled to relief.

## Argument #2

The ALC erred in not ruling in Appellant's favor because at the hearing they presented no evidence of marijuana, and the picture they presented for the phone and charger, is not visible, and you cannot tell what it is.

At the hearing the D.H.O never presented any evidence that the alleged marijuana tested positive for THC. Also they never showed a picture of the marijuana, and the alleged picture of the phone and charger was not clear. This is a violation of policy OP-22.14 Section 15.1 which states "At the start of the hearing, the Hearing officer will advise the inmate of the charges against him/her and will advise the inmate to enter a plea to each charge. If one or more of the charges involves a controlled substance, i.e., illegal drugs such as marijuana, the Hearing officer must have available a copy of SCDC Form 1979 "Controlled Substance Testing and Disposition Form," that establishes the exact type of illegal drug found in the possession of the inmate."

The DHO did not have the SCDC Form 19-79 available.

Accordingly once the SCDC established the administrative framework set forth in Policy, S.C.D.C personnel are bound to follow it.

U.S. v. Morgan 193 F.3d 252 @ 266-67

U.S. exrel Accardi v. Shaughnessy, 74 S.C.t 499 (1954)

"An agency of the government must scrupulously observe rules, regulations, or procedures which it has established.

When it fails to do so, its action cannot stand and courts will strike it down". U.S. v. Heffner, 420 F.2d 809 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1969)

Conclusion


Appellant ask that his convictions be overturned.

Dated: Nov. 12<sup>th</sup> 2013

Respectfully Submitted,

Billy Lee Lisenby

Billy Lee Lisenby Jr; #200273



990 Wisacky Hwy.

Bishopville S.C. 29010

The State of South Carolina

In The Court of Appeals

---

Appeal From Administrative Law Court

Judge Deborah Brooks Dunder, Judge of ALC

---

ALC Case Numbers: 12-ALJ-04-0546-AP &

12-ALJ-04-0547-AP

Appellate Case NO. 2013-000852 &

2013-000864

---

Billy Lee Lisenby JR, #200270 ..... Appellant

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections ..... Respondent

---

Certificate of Service

---

I hereby certify that I have served the Respondent's a copy of Appellant's Final Brief by depositing a copy of same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on Nov. 12<sup>th</sup> 2013 addressed to the Respondent's as follows:

Christopher D. Florian

P.O. Box 21787

Columbia, S.C. 29221-1787

Clerk's Office

South Carolina Administrative Law Court

1205 Pendleton St., Suite 224

Columbia, S.C. 29201

Billy Lee Lisenby Jr.

Billy Lee Lisenby JR, #200270

990 Winckley Hwy.

Bishopville S.C. 29010

The State of South Carolina  
In The Court of Appeals  
Appeal From The Administrative Law Judge

---

Case: 2013-000852

---

Billy Lee Lisenby JR. .... Appellant

V.S.

South Carolina Dept. of Corrections ..... Respondent

---

Certificate of Counsel

---

The undersigned hereby certifies that the Record on Appeal and Final Brief contains all material proposed to be included by any of the parties and not any other material.

Dated: Jan 8<sup>th</sup> 2014

1s/ Billy Lee Lisenby JR.  
Billy Lee Lisenby JR. #200273  
990 Wincky Hwy.  
Lee C. I  
Bishopville S.C. 29010