

South Carolina
Department of
Corrections

NIKKI R. HALEY, Governor
BRYAN P. STIRLING, Director

September 30, 2014

Ms. Jenny Kitchings
Clerk, South Carolina Court of Appeals
P.O. Box 11629
Columbia, SC 29201

Re: Kevin L. Fowler, #222318 v. SCDC
Case No.: 14-ALJ-04-0335-AP

Ms. Kitchings,

On September 23, 2014, Appellant attempted to serve Respondent with the Notice of Appeal. However, the Notice of Appeal was returned to Appellant indicating the mail service was unable to deliver the correspondence to the street address of Respondent's institution. Appellant is now serving Appellant via the institution's alternate address. Please find enclosed a copy of the following:

- (1) A notice of appeal in the above case.
- (2) Proof of service of the notice of appeal on the respondent.
- (3) A copy of the order which is to be challenged on appeal.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions. We greatly appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Shanika K. Johnson
Attorney for Appellant

cc: File

Kevin Fowler, #222318
Livesay Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 580
Una, SC 29378

RECEIVED

OCT 02 2014

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

S. Phillip Lenski, Administrative Law Judge

Case No.: 14-ALJ-04-0355-AP



Kevin Fowler, #222318,.....Respondent,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections,.....Appellant.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

The South Carolina Department of Corrections appeals the attached August 28, 2014 decision of the Honorable S. Phillip Lenski in the above referenced matter. Appellant received a copy of the decision on September 2, 2014. There is no transcript of the proceedings; hence, no transcript must be ordered by the Appellant and the requirements of Rule 207, SCACR do not apply.

Other Counsel of Record/Pro Se:

Kevin Fowler, #222318
Livesay Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 580
Una, SC 29378

RECEIVED


OCT 02 2014

SC Court of Appeals

Respectfully submitted,

SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS

Attorney for Appellant

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Shanika K. Johnson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent "S" and "J".

Shanika K. Johnson
Staff Attorney
S.C. Dept. of Corrections
P.O. Box 21787
Columbia, SC 29221
(803) 896-8508

Columbia, SC
September 30, 2014

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

S. Phillip Lenski, Administrative Law Judge

Case No.: 14-ALJ-04-0355-AP

Kevin Fowler, #222318,.....Respondent,

v.


South Carolina Department of Corrections,.....Appellant.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Respondent a copy of Appellant's Notice of Appeal by depositing a copy of same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on September 30, 2014, addressed to the Respondent as follows: Kevin Fowler, #222318, P.O. Box 580, Una, SC 29378.

Moreover, I also certify that I have *previously* served Ms. Jana Shealy, Clerk of the Administrative Law Court, with a copy of this Notice of Appeal by depositing a copy of same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on September 23, 2014, addressed to Ms. Jana Shealy, Clerk, South Carolina Administrative Law Court, Edgar A. Brown Building, 1205 Pendleton St., Suite 224, Columbia, SC 29201.

September 30, 2014



Shanika K. Johnson
Staff Attorney
S.C. Dept. of Corrections
P.O. Box 21787
Columbia, SC 29221
(803) 896-8508

RECEIVED

OCT 02 2014

SC Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

SEP - 2 2014

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

GENERAL COUNSEL

Kevin L. Fowler, 222318,

Docket No. 14-ALJ-04-0355-AP

Appellant,

RECEIVED

vs.

OCT 02 2014

South Carolina Department of Corrections,

ORDER

SC Court of Appeals

Respondent.

This matter is before the South Carolina Administrative Law Court ("ALC" or "court") pursuant to the Notice of Appeal filed April 10, 2014 by Kevin L. Fowler ("Appellant"), who is incarcerated with the South Carolina Department of Corrections ("SCDC").

Appellant filed a Step One Grievance on September 11, 2013, claiming his sentence is not subject to the requirement that Appellant serve Eighty-Five percent (85%) of his sentence before he becomes eligible for release. This grievance was denied. Appellant then filed a Step Two Grievance on November 3, 2013. This grievance was investigated and denied. Appellant filed his Notice of Appeal on April 10, 2014 claiming that his offense of Distribution of Heroin, second offense should not be considered a "no parole" offense and therefore, the Appellant's work credits and good conduct credits should be applied to his entire sentence, not just the remainder of his sentence after he has served 85% of his sentence.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The ALC's jurisdiction to hear this matter is derived from the decision of the South Carolina Supreme Court in Al-Shabazz v. State, 338 S.C. 354, 527 S.E.2d 742 (2000). The ALC's appellate jurisdiction in inmate appeals is limited to state-created liberty interests typically involving: (1) cases in which an inmate contends that prison officials have erroneously calculated his/her sentence, sentence-related credits, or custody status; and (2) cases in which an inmate has received punishment in a major disciplinary hearing as a result of a serious rule violation. Id.

When reviewing the SCDC's decisions in inmate grievance matters, the ALC sits in an appellate capacity. Id. at 380, 527 S.E.2d at 756. Consequently, the review in these cases is limited to the record presented. An Administrative Law Judge may not substitute her judgment for that of an agency "as to the weight of the evidence on questions of fact." S.C. Code Ann. § 1

FILED

AUG 28 2014

23-380(5). The ALC will not disturb the findings of an administrative agency if its findings are supported by substantial evidence on record as a whole. Pearson v. JPS Converter & Indus. Corp., 327 S.C. 393, 489 S.E.2d 219 (Ct. App. 1997). "Substantial evidence" is evidence which, considering the record as a whole, would allow a reasonable mind to reach the conclusion reached by the administrative agency. Trimmier v. S.C. Dep't of Labor, Licensing & Regulation, 405 S.C. 239, 246, 746 S.E.2d 491, 494 (Ct. App. 2013) (quoting Porter v. S.C. Pub. Serv. Comm'n, 333 S.C. 12, 20, 507 S.E.2d 328, 332 (1998)). The possibility of drawing two inconsistent conclusions from the evidence does not prevent an administrative agency's finding from being supported by substantial evidence. Grant v. S.C. Coastal Council, 319 S.C. 348, 353, 461 S.E.2d 388, 391 (1995) (quoting Palmetto Alliance, Inc. v. S.C. Pub. Serv. Comm'n, 282 S.C. 430, 432, 319 S.E.2d 695, 696 (1984)).

LAW/ANALYSIS

On October 4, 2012, the Appellant plead guilty to Distribution of Heroin, second offense and was sentenced to a terms of ten years' incarceration. Distribution of Heroin, second offense is in violation of S.C. Code Ann. § 44-53-370(b)(1).

The requirement that an inmate convicted of a "no parole" offense serve 85% of the sentence is found in S.C. Code Ann. § 24-13-150(A), which reads:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except in a case in which the death penalty or a term of life imprisonment is imposed, an inmate convicted of a "no parole offense" as defined in Section 24-13-100 and sentenced to the custody of the Department of Corrections, including an inmate serving time in a local facility pursuant to a designated facility agreement authorized by Section 24-3-20 or Section 24-3-30, is not eligible for early release, discharge, or community supervision as provided in Section 24-21-560, until the inmate has served at least eighty-five percent of the actual term of imprisonment imposed. This percentage must be calculated without the application of earned work credits, education credits, or good conduct credits, and is to be applied to the actual term of imprisonment imposed, not including any portion of the sentence which has been suspended. Nothing in this section may be construed to allow an inmate convicted of murder or an inmate prohibited from participating in work release, early release, discharge, or community supervision by another provision of law to be eligible for work release, early release, discharge, or community supervision.

Under S.C. Code Ann. § 24-13-100, a "no parole" offense is defined as "a class A, B, or C felony or an offense exempt from classification as enumerated in Section 16-1-10(d), which is punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment for twenty years or more." Distribution of

Heroin, second offense is a Class A felony. See S.C. Code. Ann. § 16-1-90(A).

The Appellant contends that his conviction is not subject to the requirement that an inmate serve 85% of the sentence. Appellant relies upon language added to S.C. Code Ann. § 44-53-370(b)(1) by the Omnibus Crime Reduction and Sentencing Reform Act of 2010, which reads:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person convicted and sentenced pursuant to this subsection for a first offense or second offense may have the sentence suspended and probation granted, and is eligible for parole, supervised furlough, community supervision, work release, work credits, education credits, and good conduct credits.

See S.C. Act No. 273 (June 2, 2010). The Appellant contends that with the enactment of the Omnibus Crime Reduction, the General Assembly's intention was to lessen the punishment for drug offenses, and to provide for probation and parole for offenders who were previously ineligible for probation and parole. The court agrees that it appears from the plain language of the statute that the General Assembly intended to allow inmates convicted of drug offenses to be eligible for parole, therefore removing certain drug offenses from the "no parole" category. Based on the language of S.C. Code Ann. § 44-53-370(b)(1), Distribution of Heroin is no longer intended to be a "no parole" offense and work credits and good conduct credits should be applied to the entirety of an inmate's sentence when he is sentenced under § 44-53-370(b)(1).


In this case, the Department has calculated the Appellant's sentence as if he was convicted of a "no parole" offense and is not applying work credits being earned by the Appellant to the initial 85% of his sentence, and is only using them to reduce the portion of his sentence remaining after he has served the initial 85%. If the Appellant had been sentenced prior to the 2010 Omnibus Crime Reduction and Sentencing Reform Act, the Department's calculation of his sentence would be correct. However, as stated above, this court finds that the 2010 amendment to § 44-53-370(b)(1) removed the Appellant's crime from the "no parole" category. Because the Appellant committed his crime and was sentenced subsequent to § 44-53-370(b)(1)'s revision, the Department should calculate the Appellant's sentence by applying his earned work credits and good conduct credits towards the entirety of his sentence.¹

¹ The court finds specious the argument put forth in SCDC's brief that nothing in the 2010 amendment to §44-53-370(b)(1) is incompatible with the Department's interpretation that after 2010, an offender convicted of distribution of a controlled substance pursuant to the subsection must still serve 85% of his sentence before he is eligible for parole, supervised furlough,


Based on the foregoing

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal is **REMANDED** for the Department to calculate the Appellant's sentence without applying the "no parole" offense requirements found in S.C. Code Ann. § 24-13-150(A).

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



S. Phillip Lenski
S.C. Administrative Law Court

August , 2014
Columbia, South Carolina

community supervision, work release, work credits, education credits, and good time credits. Prior to the amendment, inmates convicted of no-parole offenses pursuant to §44-53-370 were eligible for parole, supervised furlough, community supervision, work release, work credits, education credits, and good time credits after they had served the requisite 85% of their sentence. To accept SCDC's interpretation of the §44-53-370(b)(1) amendment would be to hold that the General Assembly amended the statute for no purpose whatsoever. Such an interpretation is unreasonable.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Leah E. Garland, hereby certify that I have this date served this Order upon all parties to this cause by depositing a copy hereof, in the United States mail, postage paid, in the Interagency Mail Service, or by electronic mail to the address provided by the party(ies) and/or their attorney(s).

Leah Garland

Leah E. Garland
Judicial Law Clerk

August 28, 2014
Columbia, South Carolina

FILED

AUG 28 2014

SC ADMIN. LAW COURT