

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM BEAUFORT COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
The Honorable Carmen Mullen, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2014-001862

THEOPHILUS HAMILTLTON.....Appellant

v.

BEAUFORT COUNTY SHERIFF.....Respondent

INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Eric J. Erickson, Esq.
S.C. Bar Number 8232
ERICKSON LAW FIRM, LLC
One Beaufort Town Center
2015 Boundary Street, #309
Beaufort, SC 29902
Attorney for Appellant

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM BEAUFORT COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
The Honorable Carmen Mullen, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2014-001862

THEOPHILUS HAMILTLTON.....Appellant

v.

BEAUFORT COUNTY SHERIFF.....Respondent

INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Eric J. Erickson, Esq.
S.C. Bar Number 8232
ERICKSON LAW FIRM, LLC
One Beaufort Town Center
2015 Boundary Street, #309
Beaufort, SC 29902
Attorney for Appellant

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:

Bennett v. Investors Title Co. 370 S.C.578, 635 S.E.2nd 649 (Ct App 2006).....

Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194 (1963)

Doe v. Greenville Hospital System 323 S.C. 33, 448 S.E.2nd 564 (Ct. App 1994)

Ellis v. Davidson, 358 S.C. 509, 595 S.E. 2d 817 (Ct. App 2004).

Kreutner v. David, 320 S.C. 283, 465 S.E.2nd 88, (1995)..... ..

Riddle v. Ozmint, 369 S.C. 39, 631 S.E. 2nd 70, (2006)..... ..

Strong v. University of South Carolina Scholl of Medicine 316 S.C. 189, 447 S.E. 2nd (1994)..

CODES and RULES:

- SC Tort Claims Act- S.C. Code Ann. Section15-78-1- to Section 15-78-190 Supp. 1991).
- S.C. Code Ann. Section 15-78-60 (17)
- Rule 56 of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure

Statement of the Issues on Appeal

1. WHETHER PLAINTIFF'S CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENT SUPERVISION AND RETENTION IS BARRED BY THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND DEFENDANT IS ENTITLED TO SUMMARY JUDGMENT ?

Statement of the Case

On July 29, 2014 Circuit Judge Carmen Mullen granted Defendant's motion for summary judgment regarding the negligent supervision and retention claim by Plaintiff. The Judge ruled that the Statute of Limitations had run on August 1, 2011 which was one year after the Plaintiff had turned age 18. The amended lawsuit which included that claim was not filed until October 31, 2011 by the previous attorney Greg Galvin. This Appeal follows with a Notice of Appeal filed by Plaintiff's attorney Eric J. Erickson on August 29, 2014, within thirty (30) days of Judge Mullen's written decision on August 4, 2014.

Statement of the Facts

On October 30, 2008 Jeffery Wooten, his wife, Brian Lanese and his wife were enjoying a BBQ at the Lanese residence located at 8 Sugaree Drive, Bluffton, South Carolina.

All of a sudden, three (3) individuals attacked both Wooten and Lanese in their yard, severely injuring Lanese. On November 25, 2008 Theophilus Hamilton (Plaintiff) was arrested at his high school through information gained by Beaufort County Sheriff's Deputy Louis Novak by the interrogation of Kuwan Fields, among others. The Plaintiff was indicted by the Beaufort Grand Jury on December 18, 2008 on charges of assault and battery with intent to kill, conspiracy and burglary.

Plaintiff was a minor at the time of indictment, with his 18th birthday not until August 1, 2010. Plaintiff stood trial in the Beaufort County Family Court on August 3rd and 4th 2010. Judge Armstrong made a written decision of Not Guilty of all three (3) charges on August 10th, 2010.

The civil case was filed on October 31, 2011 by the previous attorney Greg Galvin who alleged in his complaint that the Defendants Maliciously prosecuted the Plaintiff and that the Defendants negligently supervised and retained Officer Novak.

Defendant's attorney Mary Lohr filed a motion for summary judgment on the two (2) claims and on July 29, 2014 Circuit Judge Carman Mullen denied the summary judgment on the malicious prosecution, which eventually went to trial, but granted the summary judgment on the negligent supervision and retention based upon the Statute of Limitations running one (1) year after the Plaintiff's 18th birthday on August 1, 2010, which fell on August 1, 2011.

Standard of Review

Summary Judgment is proper when there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Rule 56 (c) SCRPC. To determine whether any triable issues of fact exist, the court must consider the evidence and all reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Law v. S.C. Dept. of Corrections, 368 S.C. 424, 629 S.E.2d 642 (2006). "When plain, palpable and indisputable facts exist on which reasonable minds cannot differ, summary judgment should be granted." Ellis v. Davidson, 358 S.C. 509, 595 S.E.2d 817 (Ct. App 2004). However, summary judgment is not appropriate where further inquiry into the facts of the case is desirable to clarify the application of law." Bennett v. Investors Title Ins. Co., 370 S.C. 578, 635 S.E.2d 649, (Ct. App. 2006). "Even when there is no dispute as to evidentiary facts, but only as to the conclusions or inferences to be drawn from them, summary judgment should be denied." Nelson v. Charleston County Parks & Recreation Comm'n, 362 S.C.1, 605 S.E.2nd 744 (Ct. App. 2004).

Argument

Defendant argues in it's motion for summary judgment that since Plaintiff was indicted on December 18, 2008 on the three (3) charges that he was aware of Deputy Novak's involvement and was on notice that he may have a claim against the Sheriff's office for negligent supervision and retention and that Novak's file was available. The Defendant also argues that an exception tolled the statute of limitations because the Plaintiff was a minor at the time of the indictments, as Plaintiff did not turn eighteen (18) until August 1, 2010. According to the exception, Plaintiff than had another year (until August 1, 2011) to file his

Summons and Complaint; it was not filed until October 31, 2011 by attorney Greg Galvin, beyond the one (1) year.

However, Plaintiff argues that the statute of limitations should have been tolled even longer. “ The statute of limitations on a negligence claim accrues at the time of the negligence or when facts and circumstances would put a person of common knowledge on notice that he might have a claim against another party.” Kreutner v. David, 320 S.C. 283, 465 S.E.2nd 88, (1995). “Deliberate acts of deception by a defendant calculated to conceal from a potential plaintiff that he has a cause of action toll the statute of limitations.” Strong v. University of South Carolina School of Medicine, 316 S.C. 189, 447 S.E. 2nd 850, (1994). “Historically, a cause of action accrued at the time of the negligence. But South Carolina has altered this rule adopting the ‘discovery rule.’ Under the discovery rule, an action accrues when the injury is discovered or ‘reasonably ought to have been discovered. The reasonably ought to have discovered requirement is the ‘reasonable diligence’ requirement, which means simply that an injured party must act with some promptness where the facts and circumstances of the injury would put a person of common knowledge on notice that some right has been invaded or that some claim against another party might exist.” Strong, supra.

It is Plaintiff’s position that the Defendant concealed their knowledge of Deputy Novak’s Criminal Domestic Violence (CDV) incident by not turning over these documents to Plaintiff pursuant to Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed. 215 (1963). Thus, by not disclosing and turning over these documents at the time it handed over the police file was evidence of willful concealment by Defendant. In South Carolina, a ‘Brady violation’ is asserted by the fact that the evidence was (1) favorable to the accused, (2) in the possession of or known

by the prosecution, (3) suppressed by the State, and (4) material to the accused's guilt or innocence or was impeaching. Riddle v. Ozmint, 369 S.C. 39, 631 S.E.2nd 70, (2006). None of Deputy Novak's employment records of the CDV were turned over prior to the trial on August 3-4 2010. The only reason the CDV was discovered was by coincidence when the prior attorney Greg Galvin requested records in another case. Thus, Plaintiff could not have known about this incident to file the amended cause of action of negligent supervision/retention until he received this CDV evidence on or about March 27th, 2011. [P exhibit C-Sheriff Tanner deposition p 16, 17,18,21,26,27,34 35, 36] Also, [Theophilus Hamilton affidavit]. The CDV incident was never prosecuted and was hidden from public knowledge. Nothing in the family court transcript contained any information about Deputy Novak's discipline problems. [P Exhibit C-Transcript of Record]. [Record on Appeal p.____]

Indeed it is "the employer's knowledge of an employee's dangerousness which is an element of the tort of negligent supervision. Doe by Doe v. Greenville Hospital Systems, 323 S.C. 33, 448 S.E.2nd 564 (Ct. App 1994).

Conclusion

Defendant failed to comply with the Brady Rule in turning over the CDV documents in a timely manner by concealing them which would of aided the Plaintiff in filing the negligent supervision and retention claim sooner. Otherwise, there would have been no other reason to file that claim against Deputy Novak any earlier than when Plaintiff's attorney found out about the CDV in March of 2011 and the 2 years should of started to run then. Therefore, Judge Mullen's granting of Defendant's summary judgment motion should have been denied and this

cause of action be allowed to go to trial.

Respectfully submitted,

ERICKSON LAW FIRM, LLC

By: 

Eric J. Erickson, Esquire

One Beaufort Town Center

2015 Boundary Street, #309

Beaufort, South Carolina 29902

Attorney for the Plaintiff

Theophilus Hamilton

Beaufort, South Carolina

Dated: November 3, 2014

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FORM BEAUFORT COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
The Honorable Carmen Mullen, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2014-001862

THEOPHILUS HAMILTON ... Appellant

v.

BEAUFORT COUNTY SHERIFF Respondent

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the **INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT** and **DESIGNATION OF MATTER** on Respondent, by depositing a copy of the same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on November ____, 2014 addressed to his counsel of record as follows.

Mary Lohr, Esquire
Howell Gibson & Hughes
P.O. Box 40
Beaufort, SC 29901

ERICKSON LAW FIRM, LLC
Attorneys & Counselors at Law

Main Office - Beaufort
One Beaufort Town Center
2015 Boundary Street, # 309
Beaufort, SC 29902
O 843 522 9164
F 888 522 8108

Website: www.ericj Ericksonlaw.com
Email Norsck@aol.com

Hilton Head Office
105 Watersedge at
Sheltercove Harbor
Hilton Head Island, SC 29928
O 843 785 5184
F 843 842.3326

November 3, 2014

The Honorable Tanya A. Gee
Clerk of the South Carolina Court of Appeals
1015 Sumter Street
Columbia, SC 29201

Re: Theophilus Hamilton v. Beaufort County Sheriff
Case No. 2014-001862

Dear Ms. Gee:

Please find enclosed for filing the original one (1) and two (2) copies of the **Initial Brief of Appellant and Designation of Matter, with Proof of Service**, in the above referenced matter.

Please return a clocked copy of these documents in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided.

By copy of this letter to counsel for Respondent, I am serving a copy of the same upon her via First Class Mail. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

ERICKSON LAW FIRM, LLC




Eric J. Erickson, Esquire

EJE/tbe
Enclosures
Cc: Mary Lohr, Esq.

**PRIORITY[®]
MAIL**

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

**Envelope
International Use**



From


Erickson Law Firm, LLC
One Beaufort Town Center
2015 Boundary Street, Suite 309
Beaufort, SC 29902
O 843-522-9164
F 1-888-522-8108

Honorable Tanya A. Gee
Clerk of SC Court of Appeals
1015 Sumter Street
Columbia, SC 29201

Country of Destination: / Pays de destination:

**UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE[®]**

USPS TRACKING #



9114 9999 4423 8535 6757 91

LAB400R Aug 2013
7680-17-000-0669



EP-14

DuPont™ Tyvek[®]
Protect What's Inside.™

This packaging is the property of the U.S. Postal Service[®] and is provided solely for use in sending Priority Mail[®] shipments. Misuse may be a violation of federal law. This packaging is not for resale.

040708/EP-14 OCT 2008
© 2008 USPS