

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
Honorable G. Thomas Cooper, Jr.
Circuit Court Case No.: 2007-CP-40-03365
Appellant Case No. 2014-001373

RECEIVED

DEC 09 2014

SC Court of Appeals

Edward Mims, by and through his legal
guardian, Margaret Mims,
Appellant

vs.

Babcock Center, Inc., Judy Johnson, the
South Carolina Department of Disabilities
and Special Needs, Kathi Lacy and Stan
Butkus,
Respondent.

INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Patricia Logan Harrison, Esquire
611 Holly Street
Columbia, Sc 29205
803-256-2017
Attorney for Appellant

Christian Stegmaier, Esquire
Collins & Lacy, P.C.
PO Box 12487
Columbia, SC29211
803-256-2660

Kenneth P. Woodington, Esquire
Davidson & Lindemann, P.A.
PO Box 8568
Columbia, SC 29202-8568
803-806-8222

Attorneys for Respondents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

III.	STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL	1
Issue 1.	The lower court erred in its determination that Mims' claims are barred by the statute of limitations, because (a) Mims was first adjudicated to be incompetent in 2001, not in 2005; (b) South Carolina Code of Laws § 15-3-40 tolls the statute of limitations for five years due to Mims' disability; (c) the 2008 amended complaint relates back to the date the original complaint; (d) Mims alleged wrongful acts which fell within the statute of limitations, even without tolling; (e) the Babcock Center and the individual defendants are not entitled to the protections of the Tort Claims Act; and (f) the doctrine of equitable tolling applies due to the bad acts of the defendants.	
Issue 2.	The lower court erred in failing to consider facts and events which occurred before the start of the time period covered by the tolling statute and the statute of limitations, as the Supreme Court required in <i>Madison v. Babcock Center</i> .	
Issue 3.	The lower court erred in dismissing Mims' complaints for violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983 of the Civil Rights Act, because Mims provided material facts showing that the defendants violated his civil and Constitutional rights.	
Issue 4.	The lower court err as a matter of law in dismissing Mims' claims for negligent supervision, negligence and gross negligence.	
Issue 5.	The lower court erred in dismissing Mims' claims for violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act based on a one year statute of limitations and because Mims met his <i>prima facie</i> burden and the defendants failed to prove that providing the services he needs to live in the least restrictive setting would require a fundamental alteration in the State's system.	
IV.	STANDARD OF REVIEW	1
V.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
VI.	ARGUMENTS	5

Issue 1.	The lower court erred in its determination that Mims' claims are barred by the statute of limitations, because (a) Mims was first adjudicated to be incompetent in 2001, not in 2005; (b) South Carolina Code of Laws § 15-3-40 tolls the statute of limitations for five years due to Mims' disability; (c) the 2008 amended complaint relates back to the date the original complaint; (d) some of the wrongful acts fell within the statute of limitations, even without tolling; (e) the Babcock Center and the individual defendants are not entitled to the protections of the Tort Claims Act; and (f) the doctrine of equitable tolling applies due to the bad acts of the defendants.	5
(a)	Mims was first adjudicated to be incompetent in 2001, not in 2005.	5
(b)	South Carolina Code of Laws § 15-3-40 tolls the statute of limitations for five years due to Mims' disability.	6
(c)	the 2008 amended complaint relates back to the date the original complaint	15
(d)	Mims alleged wrongful acts which fell within the statute of limitations, even without (f) The doctrine of equitable tolling applies due to the bad acts of the defendants	15
(e)	the Babcock Center and the individual defendants are not entitled to the protections of the Tort Claims Act	20
(f)	the doctrine of equitable tolling applies due to the bad acts of the defendants	24
Issue 2.	The lower court erred in failing to consider facts and events which occurred before the start of the time period covered by the tolling statute and the statute of limitations, as required by Madison v. Babcock Center	29
Issue 3.	The lower court erred in dismissing Mims' complaints for violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983 of the Civil Rights Act, because Mims provided material facts showing that the defendants violated his civil and Constitutional rights	29
Issue 4.	The lower court err as a matter of law in dismissing Mims' claims for negligent supervision, negligence and gross negligence.	48

Issue 5.	The lower court erred in dismissing Mims' claims for violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act based on a one year statute of limitations and because Mims met his <i>prima facie</i> burden and the defendants failed to prove that providing the services he needs to live in the least restrictive setting would require a fundamental alteration in the State's system	48
VII.	CONCLUSION	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Mims v. Babcock Center et al

FEDERAL CASES

A Soc'y Without a Name v. Commonwealth of Va., 655 F.3d 342, 25 A.D. Cases 450, 43 NDLR P 273 (4th Cir., 2011) 17

Addington v. Texas, 441 U.S. 418 (1979) 34

Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009) 30

Anthony v. Ward, Case No. 07-1932 (4th Cir. July 7, 2009) 23

Avery v. County of Burke, 660 F.2d 111, 114 (4th Cir.1981) 38

Babcock Center v. U.S., 3:11-cv-01721, 3:11-cv-03155 (D.S.C. 2013) 21, 58

Baynard v. Malone, 268 F.3d 228 (4th Cir.2001) 41

Cockrell v. Lexington Cnty. Sch. Dist. One (S.C.D.C. 2011) 17, 61

Cordova v. University of Notre Dame Du Lac, _F. Supp. 2d_, 2013 WL 1332268, *3 (N.D. Ind. March 29, 2013) 17

Doe v. Kidd I, Case No. 10-1191 (4th Cir. March 24, 2011) 20, 62

Jennings v. University of North Carolina, 482 F.3d 686, 701 (4th Cir. 2007) 41

Lenard v. Argento, 436 U.S. at 691, 98 S.Ct. at 2036, 699 F.2d 874, 886 (7th Cir.1983), cert. denied, --- U.S. ----, 104 S.Ct. 69, 78 L.Ed.2d 84 (1983) 38

Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Company, Inc., 457 U.S. 922, 942 (1982) 48

Margaret Jones v. Tommie C. McKenzie. Case No. 10-cv-152-JL, Opinion No. 2011 DNH 209 10

Moore v. Cook, Case No. 1:07-CV-631-TWT (N.D. Ga., April 19, 2012) 47

Olmstead v. L.C. ex. Rel. Zimring, 527 U.S. 581 (1999) 59, 60, 62

Pashby v. Delia, 709 F.3d. 307 (4th Cir. 2013) 60

<i>People by Abrams v. 11 Cornwell Co.</i> , § 1985(3). 695 F.2d 34, 42 (C.A.2 1982), rev'd on other grounds 1718 F.2d 22 (2d Cir. 1983)	3
<i>Peter B. v. Sanford</i> , Case No. 6:10-00767 R&R (S.C.D.C. Nov. 24, 2011)	17
<i>Peter B. v. Sanford</i> , Case No. 6:10-00767 R&R (S.C.D.C. March 7, 2012)	17, 60
<i>Robert Mestrich v. Clemson University</i> , C/A No. 8:12-2766-TMC (D.S.C. 2013)	61
<i>Shaw v. Stroud</i> , 13 F.3d 791 (4 th Cir. 1994)	41
<i>Slakan v. Porter</i> , 737 F.2d 368 (4 th Cir. 1984)	41
<i>Society for Good Will to Retarded Children, Inc. v. Cuomo</i> , 737 F.2d 1239 (C.A.2 (N.Y.), 1984)	16
<i>Stewart v. Robinson</i> , 115 F. Supp.2d 188,194 (D.N.H. 2000)	9, 10
<i>Stogsdill v. DHHS</i> , Case No. 3:12-cv-00007-JFA (S.C.D.C. November 10, 2014)	17
<i>Terrance v. Northville Reg'l Psychiatric Hosp.</i> , 286 F.3d 834, 848 (6 th Cir. 2002)	16
<i>Thomas S. by Brooks v. Flaherty</i> , 902 F.2d 250, (4 th Cir. 1990)	37
<i>Tobey v. Jones</i> , 706 F.3d 379 (4 th Cir. 2013)	30
<i>United States v. Price</i> , 383 U.S., at 794, 86 S.Ct., at 1157	48
<i>Youngberg v. Romeo</i> , 457 U.S. 307 (1982)	16, 37, 46, 57

FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, STATUES AND REGULATIONS

United States Constitution, Amendment XIV, § 1	16, 29
American with Disabilities Act	<i>passim</i>
Civil Rights Act	1, 29, 37
Medicaid Act	62
Rehabilitation Act	1, 2, 58
28 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(8)	62

28 U.S.C. § 1658	17, 61
42 U.S.C. § 1983	<i>passim</i>
42 U.S.C. § 1985(3)	3
42 C.F.R. § 435.91	62
42 C.F.R. § 435.930	62

STATE CASES

<i>Babcock Center, Inc. v. Office of Audits</i> , 334 S.E.2d 112, 286 S.C. 398 (1985)	22
<i>Baughman v. American Tel. and Tel. Co.</i> 306 S.C. 101, 410 S.E.2d 537 (1991)	2
<i>Fricks v. Lewis</i> , 26 S.C. 237, 1 S.E. 884 (1887)	8
<i>Harrison v. Bevilacqua</i> . 354 S.C. 129, 580 S.E.2d 109 (2003)	8, 9, 14, 16
<i>Health Promotion Specialists, LLC v. S.C. Bd. Of Dentistry</i> 403 S.C. 623, 743 S.E.2d 808, (2013)	20
<i>Hooper v. Ebenezer Senior Services, Inc.</i> , 687 S.E.2d 29, 386 S.C. 108 (2009)	6, 24, 25
<i>Hughes v. Children’s Clinic, P.A.</i> , 269 S.C. 389, 237 S.E.2d 753 (1977)	57
<i>In the Matter of James Lennon McLean</i> , Case No. _____, _____	
<i>Madison ex rel. Bryant v. Babcock Center</i> , 638 S.E.2d 650, 371 S.C. 123 (2006)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Medlin v. South Carolina Farm Bureau Mut. Ins. Co.</i> , 325 S.C. 195, 480 S.E.2d 739 (S.C. 1996)	6
<i>Mims v. Babcock Center</i> , 399 S.C. 341, 732 S.E.2d 395, 396 (2012)	3, 10
<i>Moore v. City of Columbia</i> , 284 S.C. 278, 326 S.E.2d 157, 161 (S.C. App., 1984)	18, 37, 38, 39, 46
<i>Mullis v. DHHS I</i> , 04-ALJ-30-0194-AP (S.C. Admin. Law Cr. 2005)	28
<i>Mullis v. DHHS II</i> , 10-ALJ-08-0775-AP (S.C. Admin. Law Cr. 2012)	28

<i>Plyler v. Burns</i> , 647 S.E.2d 188, 373 S.C. 637 (2007)	20
<i>Pridgen v. Ward</i> , 391 S.C. 238, 705 S.E.2d 58 (S.C. App. 2010)	23, 51
<i>Protection and Advocacy v. DDSN</i> , 2014-000244, Case No. 2007-CP-40-2187	39
<i>Sims v. Amisub of S.C., Inc.</i> (S.C. App. 2014)	13
<i>Sloan v. S.C. Bd. of Physical Therapy Exam'rs</i> , 370 S.C. 452, 636 S.E.2d 598, 605 (2006)	61
<i>State v. Dykes</i> . 403 S.C. 499, 744 S.E.2d 505, 508 (2013)	29
<i>Steinke v. South Carolina Dep't of Labor, Licensing and Regulation</i> , 336 S.C. 373, 520 S.E.2d 142, (1999)	20
<i>Stogsdill v. DHHS</i> , Case No. 2013-000762, Opinion No. 5271 (S.C.Ct.Ap. September 10, 2014), S.C. Sup. Ct. Case No. 2014-002513.	39, 59, 60
<i>Thomas v. Grayson</i> , 318 S.C. 82, 456 S.E.2d 377 (1995)	15
<i>Wiggins v. Edwards</i> , 442 S.E.2d 169, 314 S.C. 126, (1994)	7, 8, 9

SOUTH CAROLINA STATUES and REGULATIONS

South Carolina Omnibus Adult Protection Act.	34
Tort Claims Act [South Carolina]	<i>passim</i>
S.C. Code §15-3-40	<i>passim</i>
S.C. Code §15-3-40(2)	14
S.C. Code §15-13-220	46
S.C. Code §15-78-30(c)	20, 22
S.C. Code §15-78-30(d)	20
S.C. Code §15-78-40	20
S.C. Code §15-78-60(20)	22

S.C. Code §15-78-70(b)	23
S.C. Code §15-78-110	9
S.C. Code §43-35-5	34
S.C. Code §43-35-55(C)	34
S.C. Code §44-20-20	21
S.C. Code §44-20-375	21
S.C. Code §44-20-420	18
S.C. Code §44-20-430	18
S.C. Code §44-20-480	18
S.C. Code §44-26-90	7
S.C. Code §62-5-300 and 400	11
S.C. Code §62-5-424(B)	11
S.C.R.C.P, Rule 15	4
S.C.R.C.P. Rule 15(c)	15

OTHER STATES

<i>Butler v. Circulus, Inc.</i> , 557 So. 2d 469 (Mo. App. 1997)	56
<i>Carrasquillo v. Holliswood Hospital</i> , 37 A.D.3d 509, 829 N.Y.S.2d 693, 2007 NY Slip Op 1234 (N.Y. App. Div., 2007)	13
<i>Coffey v. Bresnahan</i> , 127 N.H. 687, 506 A.2d 310 (1986)	10
<i>Costello v North Shore Univ. Hosp. Ctr. for Extended Care & Rehabilitation</i> , 273 AD2d 190, 191 (2000)	13
<i>Ferreira v. Maimonides Medical Center</i> , 43 A.D.3d 856, 841, 858 N.Y.S.2d 678, 2007 NY Slip Op 6627 (N.Y. App. Div., 2007)	13

<i>Fox v. Health Force, Inc.</i> , 143 N.C. App. 501, 547 S.E.2d 83, 84 (2001)	10
<i>Henry v. City of New York</i> ,. 94 N.y.2d 275, 724 N.E.2d 372, 702 N.Y.S.2d 580 (1999)	12
<i>Hernandez v. New York City Health & Hosps. Corp.</i> , 78 N.Y.2d 687, 585 N.E.2d 822 (1991)	12
<i>Kaplan v. Morgan Stanley & Co</i> , ___ Vt. ___, ___, ___ A.2d ___, ___ (2009) (2009 WL 2401952)	25
<i>Kiley v. Jennings</i> , 927 P.2d 796, 187 Ariz. 136, 141 (1996)	14
<i>Lee v. Dept. of Health and Rehab. Svcs.</i> , 698 So.2d 1194 (Fla. 1997)	56
<i>Rodriguez v. Superior Court</i> , 176 Cal.App.4th 1461, 98 Cal.Rptr.3d 728 (2009)	24
<i>Sanchez v. Wolkoff</i> . 669 N.Y.S.2d 337, 247 A.D.2d 529 (N.Y.A.D., 2 Dept. 1998)	12, 13
<i>Sullivan v. Chattanooga Medical Investors, L.P.</i> 221 S.W.3d 506, 513 (2007)	14
N.C. General Statutes §35A-1253	11
N.C.R.C.P. Rule 17(b)(1)	10

OTHER AUTHORITIES

<i>Commentaries on the Laws of England</i> by Sir William Blackstone	30
South Carolina Protection and Advocacy, Inc. <i>Unequal Justice for South Carolinians with Disabilities: Abuse and Neglect</i>	55
<i>Wright & Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure</i> § 1496 (1990)	15
51 Am. Jur. 2d Limitation of Actions § 169 (2000)	7
54 C.J.S. Limitations of Actions § 115	8, 24
54 C.J.S. Limitations of Actions § 117 at 159-169	6, 9

III.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

- Issue 1.** The lower court erred in its determination that Mims' claims are barred by the statute of limitations, because (a) Mims was first adjudicated to be incompetent in 2001, not in 2005; (b) South Carolina Code of Laws § 15-3-40 tolls the statute of limitations for five years due to Mims' disability; (c) the 2008 amended complaint relates back to the date the original complaint; (d) Mims alleged wrongful acts which fell within the statute of limitations, even without tolling; (e) the Babcock Center and the individual defendants are not entitled to the protections of the Tort Claims Act; and (f) the doctrine of equitable tolling applies due to the bad acts of the defendants.
- Issue 2.** The lower court erred in failing to consider facts and events which occurred before the start of the time period covered by the tolling statute and the statute of limitations, as the Supreme Court required in *Madison v. Babcock Center*.
- Issue 3.** The lower court erred in dismissing Mims' complaints for violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983 of the Civil Rights Act, because Mims provided material facts showing that the defendants violated his civil and Constitutional rights.
- Issue 4.** The lower court err as a matter of law in dismissing Mims' claims for negligent supervision, negligence and gross negligence.
- Issue 5.** The lower court erred in dismissing Mims' claims for violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act based on a one year statute of limitations and because Mims met his *prima facie* burden and the defendants failed to prove that providing the services he needs to live in the least restrictive setting would require a fundamental alteration in the State's system.

IV.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

A trial court may grant a motion for summary judgment when "the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." Rule 56(c), *Madison ex rel. Bryant v. Babcock Center*, 638 S.E.2d 650, 655, 371 S.C. 123 (S.C., 2006). The trial court must view the evidence and all reasonable

inferences that may be drawn from the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Id. Summary judgment is a drastic remedy which should not be invoked without caution to improperly deny a litigant a trial. Id. The party seeking summary judgment has the burden of clearly establishing the absence of a genuine issue of material fact. *Baughman v. American Tel. and Tel. Co.*, 306 S.C. 101, 410 S.E.2d 537 (1991). Where a case raises novel questions of law, the appellate court is free to decide those questions with no particular deference to the lower court. *Madison* at 656.

V.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Plaintiff's claims. This is an appeal of the lower court's May 29, 2014 order granting defendants' motions for summary judgment and dismissing Mims' lawsuit for the second time, without providing a hearing on Mims' pending motions. Mims has alleged in Count One that the individual defendants violated Mims' rights under § 1983; in Count Three, Mims alleged that defendants were negligent, negligent in failing to (1) provide supervision and to monitor Mims' treatment needs, (2) provide adequate staffing, (3) investigate reports of abuse, neglect and exploitation, and (4) to discharge Appellant from an unsafe and highly restrictive institution. Mims alleged that defendants violated his rights by intentionally obstructing his discharge from the Babcock Center and obstructing the proceedings in the Probate Court for improper personal reasons. In Count Four, Mims complained that defendants violated the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Rehabilitation Act and that these violations are ongoing, they are subject to repetition and they have evaded review.¹

¹ Mims has elected not to pursue the cause of action for conspiracy and unjust enrichment in this appeal, in order to better focus on the § 1983, negligence/negligent supervision, statute of

The lower court's decision. In relevant part, the lower court found that Mims's § 1983 claims were barred by the statute of limitations, that the defendants had no personal involvement in the alleged wrongful acts and that Mims has suffered no injury. The trial court ruled that claims for negligent supervision are barred by a two year statute of limitations under the Tort Claims Act, which also protect the Babcock Center defendants. The lower court ruled that claims for violation of the Americans with Disabilities (ADA) became moot in 2006 and that those claims are barred by a one year statute of limitations. Finally, the court held that claims against the DDSN defendants went "beyond the scope of the pleadings" and were "vaguely asserted."

History of the case. This case was commenced by the filing of the original complaint on May 29, 2007, naming the Babcock Center, Judy Johnson and other Babcock defendants, Stanley Butkus, and the South Carolina Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) as defendants. On May 7, 2008, Mims filed an Amended Complaint, substituting the Associate State Director of DDSN, Kathi Lacy, as a defendant for other individuals who were named in the original complaint and substituting DDSN for DHHS. R. ____.

The Richland County Court of Common Pleas first denied, then later granted defendants' motions to dismiss, as set forth in *Mims v. Babcock Center*, 399 S.C. 341, 732 S.E.2d 395 (2012). On appeal, the South Carolina Supreme Court certified Mims' case to be heard under

limitations and ADA issues. Mims is a member of a class of persons who have experienced discrimination due to their disabilities, thus meeting the discriminatory animus test. In *People by Abrams v. 11 Cornwell Co*, the State contended, without opposition, that the mentally retarded are a class protected by § 1985(3). 695 F.2d 34, 42 (C.A.2 1982), rev'd on other grounds 1718 F.2d 22 (2d Cir. 1983). The term "mentally retarded" has been replaced in federal and state statutes with "intellectually disabled," however, it is used in this brief for consistency with the prior proceedings and the language used in references cited herein. It has the same meaning as the term "intellectually disabled."

Rule 204 of the South Carolina Rules of Appellate Procedure. The Supreme Court ruled that the amended complaint was properly filed pursuant to Rule 15, SCRPC, because the 120 day period applies only when the service occurs outside of the statute of limitations,”² and remanded Mims’s case back to the Richland County Court of Common Pleas for trial. Id.

On remand, the defendants filed motions for summary judgment, on April 12 and 23, 2013. R. _____. Mims filed a motion for summary judgment on May 24, 2013. But, Judge Manning, the Administrative Judge for Richland County, only scheduled the defendants’ motions to be heard, and no hearing has been granted on any of plaintiff’s motions.³ When Mims’ counsel asked at the hearing on June 4, 2013 that his motions be heard (T. 3:2), the Court was not even aware that Mims had filed a motion for summary judgment, yet it still failed to consider or rule upon Mims’ motion - although it required Mims counsel to spend time preparing a proposed order. T. at 32, line 17, Order directing counsel to prepare proposed orders. (Mims

² Judge Kittredge ruled in his concurring opinion that: “Because that complaint was filed and served within the statute of limitations, dismissal is not warranted.” Id. at 398. Even the one dissenting Justice found that Mims’ amended complaint was served before the expiration of the statute of limitations. (Emphasis added.) Id. at 399.

³ Judge Manning formerly worked at the Babcock Center and the record contains evidence of his fondness for the private corporation. Mims’ Motion to Recuse with Attachments and Mims 2258. Mims filed a motion requesting recusal of Judge Manning, but no hearing was scheduled on his motion. At the first hearing scheduled on defendants’ motion to dismiss, Mims’ counsel asked Judge Manning to recuse himself, based on his relationship with the Babcock Center. R. _____. Motion to Recuse with attachments and transcript of hearing where Judge Manning recused himself from the bench. Judge Manning agreed from the bench to recuse himself, but, when the order was filed with the Clerk of Court, the word “recusal” was whited out, and overwritten with the word “continuance.” R. _____. Plaintiff had not filed a motion or requested a continuance when this order was issued. After remand, despite having recused himself from the bench Judge Manning “put pressure” on Mims’ counsel to withdraw his motion requesting his recusal. T. 5:16. As the Administrative Judge for Richland County, Judge Manning had continued to control the course of Mims’ lawsuit in violation of his due process rights.

incorporated by reference in his motion opposing defendants' motions for summary judgment the six volumes of evidence discussed at the June 4, 2014 hearing. T. 20:2. DDSN's counsel, Ken Woodington, informed the court at the hearing held on June 4, 2013, that he had asked Judge Manning, a former employee of the Babcock Center who has expressed his fondness in open court for that corporation, not to schedule a hearing on Mims' motion for summary judgment. T. at 32:25. (Mims' counsel was not a part of and was not informed of this communication with Judge Manning prior to the hearing.) As directed by the trial judge, all parties filed proposed orders on July 19, 2013, after the June 4, 2014 hearing. R. _____. On January 21, 2014, the trial court signed the orders that had been prepared by the defendants, verbatim, granting summary judgment to defendants and dismissing Mims' case for the second time, without hearing or considering Mims' timely filed motion for summary judgment or, apparently reading Mims' proposed order. R. _____. Appellant filed a motion to alter or amend on February 4, 2014, which was denied by the trial court on May 29, 2014. R. _____. This appeal was timely filed by Appellant in the Court of Appeals on June 24, 2014.

VI.

ARGUMENTS

Issue 1. The lower court erred in its determination that Mims' claims are barred by the statute of limitations, because (a) Mims was first adjudicated to be incompetent in 2001, not in 2005; (b) South Carolina Code of Laws § 15-3-40 tolls the statute of limitations for five years due to Mims' disability; (c) the 2008 amended complaint relates back to the date the original complaint; (d) some of the wrongful acts fell within the statute of limitations, even without tolling; (e) the Babcock Center and the individual defendants are not entitled to the protections of the Tort Claims Act; and (f) the doctrine of equitable tolling applies due to the bad acts of the defendants.

(a) Mims was first adjudicated to be incompetent in 2001, not in 2005. The lower court erred in its determination that "while the Plaintiff may have been profoundly mentally retarded, it

is clear that he was not actually adjudicated to be incapacitated until the Probate Court order of June 14, 2005.” DDSN Order at 25. The defendants themselves caused Mims to be adjudicated to be incapacitated in 2001, for the express purpose of preventing his release from the Babcock Center. DDSN Order at 25 and Babcock Center Order at 20. The lower court erred as a matter of law in ignoring the Probate Court’s 2001 determination of incapacity, which defendants themselves procured in bad faith, by falsely accusing Mims’ mother of abusing him to cover up their own horrific abuses, which continued even after defendant Buttkus became the sole individual for determining his placement. Mims 2047 and 2050. Plaintiff’s Objection to Summary Judgment and Motion to Strike at page 30.

(b) South Carolina Code of Laws § 15-3-40 tolls the statute of limitations for five years due to Mims’ disability. The only question remaining that is related to the tolling statute is how far back the period covered by the statute of limitations extends pursuant to South Carolina Code of Laws § 15-3-40 (the state “tolling statute”). The lower court erred in finding that the lawsuit was not timely filed, because the statute of limitations is extended for five years due to the state tolling statute. In *Hooper v. Ebenezer Senior Services, Inc.*, the South Carolina Supreme Court recognized that: “‘Tolling’ refers to suspending or stopping the running of a statute of limitations; it is analogous to a clock stopping, then restarting.” 51 Am. Jur. 2d Limitation of Actions § 169 (2000). 687 S.E.2d 29, 32, 386 S.C. 108 (2009). “Tolling may either temporarily suspend the running of the limitations period or delay the start of the limitations period.” *Id.* There is nothing in South Carolina’s tolling statute that requires an adjudication of incompetence to start of the tolling period under South Carolina Code § 15-3-40. A party must be able to demonstrate that he qualifies for the exemption, which Mims has done. *Medlin v. South Carolina Farm Bureau Mut.*

Ins. Co., 325 S.C. 195, 196, 480 S.E.2d 739 (1996). The lower court's finding that Mims was not adjudicated to be incompetent until 2005, thus he not entitled to tolling prior to that date, is simply not supported by even a scintilla of evidence in the record or by any controlling legal authority, and the defendant's petition and the 2001 Probate Court order prove that he is entitled to tolling under the statute. Mims 28 and 32, 2047, 2050.

The trial court also erred in its ruling that Mims was not "insane" based on its adoption of the defendants' interpretation of "the mentally retarded person bill of rights (which) says that a mentally disabled person has all the rights a citizen to do anything until he's declared incompetent." In *Madison v. Babcock Center*,⁴ the Supreme Court flatly rejected the same argument made by these same defendants in another case where a Babcock Center client alleged that DDSN and the Babcock Center failed to protect her from sexual assault:

We further agree with Appellant that the circuit court erred in reasoning she was competent to make her own decisions — such as leaving the Babcock Center home — because she was not adjudicated incompetent to handle her personal and financial affairs until some two years after the events of August 1995. The circuit court relied on S.C.Code Ann. § 44-26-90 (2002), which provides that unless a client has been adjudicated incompetent, she must not be denied the right to, among other things, execute instruments, enter into contractual relationships, and exercise rights of citizenship in the same manner as a non-disabled person.

Id. at 287. Judicial resources have been wasted by these arguments that have already been decided by South Carolina's highest court. At all times since his birth, Mims has been "insane," as defined by the South Carolina Supreme Court in *Wiggins v. Edwards*:

⁴ In *Madison*, Judge Manning dismissed Madison's lawsuit brought against Judge Manning's former employer, the Babcock Center. (*R. ___*, *Madison v. Babcock Center*, Richland County Court of Common Pleas Order granting summary judgment to defendants). Then Madison's case was settled on remand by a guardian ad litem appointed on motion of defendants, over the objections of Madison's court-appointed guardian. (*R. ___*, *___ and ___ Madison v. Babcock Center* orders appointing GAL and orders settling lawsuit.)

Insanity or mental incompetency that tolls the statute of limitations consists of a mental condition which precludes understanding the nature or effects of one's acts, an incapacity to manage one's affairs, an inability to understand or protect one's rights, because of an over-all inability to function in society, or the mental condition is such as to require care in a hospital. 54 C.J.S. Limitations of Actions § 117 at 159-169 (internal footnotes omitted).

442 S.E.2d 169, 170, 314 S.C. 126 (1994). DDSN took affirmative steps in 2001 to have Mims adjudicated incompetent, informing the Probate Court during those proceedings that "Mr. Mims is 29 years old and profoundly retarded." Mims 2047. The DDSN psychologist reported to the Probate Court that Mims could not be left alone and that "he is on one-on-one care at Clusters." Mims 2107 and 2088. See also Mims 2076. DDSN informed the Probate Court that Mims was nonverbal and that he had the mental age of a two year old child. Mims 2107. The lower court's finding that Mims was not "insane" is not supported by any facts in the record and it should be reversed, because Mims meets the *Wiggins* criteria.

The lower court also erred as a matter of law in failing to recognize that the South Carolina Supreme Court found in *Harrison v. Bevilacqua* that:

...an insane plaintiff would apparently have seven years from discovery to bring a negligence action under the Tort Claims Act. See §§ 15-78-110, 15-3-40; see also *Fricks v. Lewis*, 26 S.C. 237, 1 S.E. 884 (1887).

354 S.C. 129, 134, 580 S.E.2d 109 (S.C. 2003). Representing the South Carolina Department of Mental Health, in *Harrison*, Attorney Davidson⁵ moved for summary judgment prior to trial, arguing that McLean's lawsuit was time-barred, because the alleged violations began in 1983 (when McLean had been determined to be incompetent and involuntarily committed), but his

⁵ Attorney Woodington informed the trial judge that Attorney Davidson appeared at the hearing in the lower court on June 4, 2005 (at taxpayer expense) as "Window dressing. Just simply for appearance."

lawsuit was not filed until 1995. *Id.* at 132. The trial court erroneously ruled that the tolling provisions of South Carolina Code § 15-3-40 provided McLean five years to bring his claims under the Tort Claims Act. The Supreme Court corrected this error. S.C. Code of Laws § 15-3-40. In footnote 5 in that case, the South Carolina Supreme Court found that:

We disagree with the Court of Appeals' interpretation of section 15-3-40. The express language of the statute allows the time for commencement of an action to be "extended" by a maximum of five years.

Id. Thus, Mims is entitled to an additional five years under the state tolling statute, due to his inability to understand and to protect his own rights and his over-all inability to function in society. *Harrison, supra* and *Wiggins v. Edwards*, 442 S.E.2d 169, 170, 314 S.C. 126 (1994), citing 54 C.J.S. Limitations of Actions § 117 at 159-169. Affirming the lower Court's adoption of the minority ruling on tolling would contradict the "express language of the statute" and the "clear legislative intent" of the General Assembly.

This Court should not affirm the lower court's ruling in this case, because even the out-of-state cases provided by defendants in their proposed order (which were signed by the trial judge without any changes. R. ___ Proposed orders presented by defendants. do not support the termination of the tolling period upon the appointment of a guardian in a case such as Mims'. Those cases from New Hampshire, North Carolina and New York are clearly distinguishable. *Stewart v. Robinson* is a federal district court case from New Hampshire in which Judge Steven McAuliffe recognized that the Supreme Court of New Hampshire "has yet to confront the issue" of whether the appointment of a guardian terminates the tolling statute. 115 F. Supp.2d 188, 194 (D.N.H. 2000). Federal district court Judge McAuliffe presumed, without certifying the question to his state's highest court, that the New Hampshire Supreme Court "would interpret the statute

in a manner consistent with what is currently the minority, but the more sensible view.” Taking a “predictive approach” to how he believed the State’s highest court should rule, Judge McAuliffe ruled that because a court-appointed guardian “was vested not only with the right, but the obligation to bring the present civil action” the appointment of a guardian ended the tolling of the statute of limitations. *Id.* at 195. This ruling, placing such obligation on a court-appointed guardian, contradicts prior rulings of New Hampshire’s highest court.⁶ In *Coffey v. Bresnahan*, the New Hampshire Supreme Court ruled that equity and justice require the extension of the statute in cases involving persons under a disability. 127 N.H. 687, 506 A.2d 310 (1986).

The lower court in *Mims* also erred in its reliance on the North Carolina Court of Appeals decision in *Fox v. Health Force, Inc.* In that case, the intermediate court considered a case in which a guardian ad litem had been appointed for an adult who was incapacitated and was injured in 1993. Unlike *Mims*’ case, the competency of the plaintiff had not been adjudicated when a lawsuit was first filed in 1996 or when a second lawsuit was filed in 1997. 143 N.C. App. 501, 547 S.E.2d 83, 84, 85 (2001). The court found that the appointments of the guardian ad litem were “riddled with deficiencies.” *Id.* In 1998, Fox was adjudicated to be incompetent and a guardian was appointed who moved for relief from a 1997 court order dismissing Fox’s lawsuit.

North Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 17(b)(1) requires that incompetent persons “must appear by general or testamentary guardian, if they have any within the State or by guardian ad litem appointed as hereinafter provided...” It is important to note that the North

⁶ *Stewart* appears to have been cited only once in the fourteen years since it was issued, by another federal district court judge in an unreported case. *Margaret Jones v. Tommie C. McKenzie*. Case No. 10-cv-152-JL, Opinion No. 2011 DNH 209. In the fourteen years since *Stewart* was issued by the federal court, it has never been cited by the Supreme Court of New Hampshire.

Carolina Probate Code contains provisions for the appointment of a guardian of the person who serves a separate and distinct role from the “general guardian,” who has duties related to the property of the ward. A “guardian” in North Carolina is responsible only for providing care for the person, but not the property the ward. This statute is similar to the South Carolina statute, which provides for the appointment of a “guardian” distinct from the appointment of a “conservator” who has a duty to manage the ward’s assets. South Carolina Code of Laws § 62-5-300 and § 62-5-400. Mims’ mother was appointed as his temporary guardian on June 9, 2005 (an amended order was issued on June 14, 2005. Mims 2183⁷) and she was not appointed as his permanent guardian until December 19, 2005. Mims 2195 and 2188.

As in South Carolina, a North Carolina, a guardian of the person has no obligation to file a lawsuit. Only a “general guardian” or a “testamentary guardian” has that obligation in North Carolina. North Carolina General Statutes § 35A-1253. The “guardian of estate” or the “general guardian” in North Carolina has obligations to take possession of all his estate and to “diligently endeavor to collect, by all lawful means, all bonds, notes, obligations, or moneys due his ward.” A “general guardian” has duties comparable, but not identical, to a conservator. But, in South Carolina, a conservator does not have an affirmative obligation to file a lawsuit. S.C. Code 62-5-424(B) provides that:

A conservator, acting reasonably in efforts to accomplish the purpose for which he was appointed, may act without court authorization or confirmation, to: (17) prosecute or defend actions, claims, or proceedings in any jurisdiction for the protection of estate assets and of the conservator in the performance of his duties.

No conservator has ever been appointed for Mims. Thus, the obligation on Mims’ guardian was

⁷ Page 2 of this order is missing, but the entire order is attached to the affidavit of Mrs. Mims previously filed with the Court. R. ____, P. 119 of attachment to Affidavit.

and is quite different from those imposed by the legislatures in New Hampshire and North Carolina. The lower court erred in applying the laws of those States by imposing a duty to file a lawsuit on a guardian that has not been imposed by the South Carolina General Assembly.

Finally, the lower court also supported his decision to adopt the minority rule with a decision of the New York Court of Appeals that was clearly inapplicable to Mims' case and, in any event, that case appears to have been overruled in New York. *Hernandez v. New York City Health & Hosps. Corp.*, 78 N.Y.2d 687, 578 N.Y.S.2d 510, 585 N.E.2d 822 (1991). The issue in *Hernandez* was the application of tolling on a minor who was a distributee, not the plaintiff, in a wrongful death action. *Hernandez* was not a personal injury claim brought by the disabled person and the court did not address whether the statute of limitations is tolled in an action brought by an adult plaintiff who is under a disability. In fact, the New York court ruled in *Hernandez* in favor of tolling in order to protect the rights of the minor and it was careful to limit its analysis to wrongful death actions. *Hernandez* is clearly distinguished from Mims' case and the lower court failed to recognize that the New York case actually favored tolling.

Seven years later, in *Sanchez v. Wolkoff*, the lower court (the New York Supreme Court) ruled that an adult plaintiff's disability "ceased" when his wife filed a lawsuit on his behalf, ending the tolling of the statute of limitations. 669 N.Y.S.2d 337, 247 A.D.2d 529 (N.Y.A.D., 2 Dept. 1998). But then, a year later, in *Henry v. City of New York*, the highest court in that State addressed the issue of whether an infant's claim was time-barred when a parent or guardian filed a timely notice of claim, but then failed to commence the action within the statute of limitations. 94 N.Y.2d 275, 724 N.E.2d 372, 702 N.Y.S.2d 580 (1999). The appellate court reversed, finding that the statute of limitations was tolled, rather than being terminated when a parent or guardian

took actions to pursue the infant's claim, because the infant, not the guardian or the parent, is the real party to the action. The court found that representation by the infant's parent or guardian does not bar the infant from later filing a lawsuit during infancy and that its outcome supports the strong public policy of protecting those who are under a disability.

The next year, *Sanchez* was expressly overruled in *Costello v North Shore Univ. Hosp. Ctr. for Extended Care & Rehabilitation*, 273 AD2d 190, 191 (2000). The *Costello* court found that the rationale of *Henry* should be applied to prevent the termination of tolling, even though a fiduciary who had been appointed to protect a disabled adult failed to file a lawsuit within the statute of limitations. Finally, in *Carrasquillo v. Holliswood Hospital*, the New York court also ruled that the plaintiff was entitled to tolling of the statute of limitations where a guardian ad litem had been appointed years before and a lawsuit against other providers had actually been commenced six years before. 37 A.D.3d 509, 829 N.Y.S.2d 693, 2007 NY Slip Op 1234 (N.Y. App. Div., 2007). The New York court held in *Carrasquillo* that the appointment of a guardian ad litem did not terminate tolling, and, that same year, in *Ferreira v. Maimonides Medical Center*, a unanimous New York court found that the insanity toll is intended for "those individuals who are unable to protect their legal rights because of an over-all inability to function in society." 43 A.D.3d 856, 841, 858 N.Y.S.2d 678 (N.Y. App. Div., 2007).

What is significantly more important than what North Carolina, New Hampshire and New York think about the tolling statute is that this court recently decided about tolling in *Sims v. Amisub of S.C., Inc.*, refusing to adopt the minority rule:

While the Respondents cite persuasive authority ... supporting their position that the appointment of a conservator affects the viability of a person's insanity for tolling purposes, we need not address this issue.... **We also note we are hesitant to adopt a rule**

that has not previously been adopted by our courts. (Emphasis added.)
Appellate Case No. 2012-212956, Opinion No. 5197 (S.C. App. Feb. 12, 2014).

In reliance on the interpretations of defendants' counsel, the lower court in *Mims* signed their proposed orders, erroneously relying upon three out-of-state cases, without determining if they actually represented the current rule of law on tolling in those states. The trial court also erred in adopting defendants' argument that "no South Carolina case has decided the issue of whether an appointment of a guardian terminates the disability period under provisions of (sic) statute similar to § 15-3-40(2)." As discussed above, this finding ignores the Supreme Court's findings in *Harrison*, where the highest Court in South Carolina found that the tolling statute extends the statute of limitations by five years in a case where the plaintiff, like Mims, had been adjudicated incapacitated years before. *Supra*.

The majority rule provides that: "the tolling of the statute of limitations continues until the disabled person's mind becomes 'sound,' or the person dies." *Sullivan v. Chattanooga Medical Investors, L.P.* 221 S.W.3d 506, 513 (2007). Adopting the majority rule in *Kiley v. Jennings*, the Supreme Court of Arizona found that the absence of clear legislative intent, it was inappropriate for the lower court here to "graft such an exception to the statute." 927 P.2d 796, 187 Ariz. 136, 141 (1996) (finding that neither the appointment of a guardian or a conservator ceases the tolling of the statute of limitations for persons "of unsound mind.") Defendants' arguments and the lower court's order effectively render the tolling statute a nullity and contradict the clear intent of the South Carolina General Assembly to extend the statute of limitations for persons like Mims for five years and those orders should be reversed.

This is a matter of tremendous public importance, because if this Court should rule that a

guardian or a conservator becomes obligated to file a lawsuit (or lawsuits) upon acceptance of the role as guardian or conservator, then, to protect himself from liability, the fiduciary may be pressured, to expend the ward's limited funds on lawyers and associated costs, instead of preserving those funds to provide care and support for the ward. Also, adopting such a rule would invite mischief, because persons or agencies who have harmed a disabled person through negligent supervision would have incentive to cause a "friendly" guardian or conservator to be appointed simply to terminate tolling.

(c) **Mims' amended complaint relates back to the filing of the original complaint.** Rule 15(c), SCRCF, provides that: "[w]henver the claim ... asserted in the amended pleading arose out of the conduct, transaction or occurrence set forth or attempted to be set forth in the original pleadings, the amendment relates back to the date of the original pleading." Mims' claims in the amended complaint arose out of the conduct, transactions and occurrences previously set forth in the original complaint. In *Thomas v. Grayson*, the South Carolina Supreme Court held that:

Rule 15(c) is based on the concept that once litigation involving particular conduct or a given transaction or occurrence has been instituted, the parties are not entitled to the protection of the statute of limitations against the later assertion by amendment of defenses or claims that arise out of the same conduct, transaction, or occurrence as set forth in the original pleading. Wright & Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1496 (1990).

318 S.C. 82, 456 S.E.2d 377, 380 (1995). The purpose of Rule 15(c) is to salvage causes of action otherwise barred by the statute of limitations. *Id.* Mims' amended complaint relates back to the date of the filing of the original complaint under Rule 15(c). *Id.*

(d) **Mims alleged wrongful acts which fell within the statute of limitations, even without tolling.** The lower court erred in dismissing Mims' lawsuit because Mims alleged and provided

the lower court with material facts showing violations occurring within the time period covered by the statute of limitations, even without consideration of the tolling statute. The lower court erred as a matter of law in failing to recognize Mims' claims, even without tolling, for violation of his rights on or after May 29, 2004. These violations include the unconstitutional treatment and confinement he suffered until June of 2005 and the violation of defendants' duty of care during that period.⁸ States are prohibited from depriving "the mentally retarded residents of their liberty interest in a humane and decent existence." *Society for Good Will to Retarded Children, Inc. v. Cuomo*, 737 F.2d 1239 (C.A.2 (N.Y.), 1984). As the United States Supreme Court held in *Youngberg v. Romeo* the State violates a disabled person's civil rights when it fails to provide a "professionally devised program to help ... maintain the fundamental self-care skills with which they entered..." Id. 1246. *Youngberg v. Romeo*, 457 U.S. 307, 314 and 327 (1982). The lower court erred by failing to recognize that citizens like Mims, who have committed no crime, but are involuntarily incarcerated in DDSN funded facilities by the State, have important substantive rights that must be protected under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution" Id. and *Terrance v. Northville Reg'l Psychiatric Hosp.*, 286 F.3d 834, 848 (6th Cir. 2002). These inalienable rights are greater than those due to criminals under the Eighth Amendment and they "must ...survive involuntary commitment." *Youngberg*, 457 U.S. at 316.

The lower court also erred as a matter of law in failing to recognize the constitutional

⁸ Mims acknowledges that occurrences predating May 29, 2000, for claims not covered by the Tort Claims Act are barred by the statute of limitations, as extended by the tolling statute. Violations that predate May 29, 2001 are barred as to DDSN, but not the individual defendants or the Babcock Center. *Harrison, supra*. However, facts dating back to Mims' admission to the Babcock Center may be considered by the jury and the courts in deliberating Mims' claims. *Madison, supra*.

violations associated with defendants' attempts to obstruct the appointment of Mims' mother as his guardian in 2005 and defendants' ongoing efforts to force him back into the Babcock Center by denying requested services, in violation of the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act. DDSN placed a cap on personal care attendant services for persons living at home. *Peter B. v. Sanford*, R&R of then Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks dated November 24, 2011 adopted *in toto* by order of Judge Michelle Childs on March 7, 2012, Case No. 6:10-cv-00767 (S.C.D.C.). The federal district court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction, finding that those reductions violated the ADA. Then, on September 10, 2014, this Court held that the imposition of those caps violated the ADA where the plaintiff was, like Mims, at risk of institutionalization. *Stogsdill v. DHHS*, Appellate Case No. 2013-000762, Opinion No. 5271. Mims clearly set forth in Count Four of his Amended Complaint claims for violations of the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act and he alleged that those violations have continued and they are subject to repetition, yet violation of his rights under the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act have evaded review.

According to the lower court's limited analysis, only one incident occurred less than three years before Mims' amended complaint was filed on May 7, 2008. But, the lower court's ruling, dismissing defendants from liability for this claim ignores the undisputed fact that on May 27, 2005, within two years of the filing of Mims' original complaint, Mims was left unattended and he suffered a four centimeter "gaping laceration" on his penis that required seven stitches to repair. Mims 2164. This injury occurred just three weeks after defendant Johnson sent out a letter to families informing them that DHHS and DHEC had ordered the Babcock Center to relocate residents from Kensington after Immediate Jeopardy was declared there again. Mims 2163, 2162, 0250, 0252. Defendant Johnson wrote to families that "We did not expect this DHEC finding nor

the DHHS decision.” Mims 2163, yet DHEC had notified her of its intent to terminate Kensington’s ICF/MR license on April 29, 2005. Mims 0253. All three of the individual defendants were aware not only of the repeated citations described in federal, state and private surveys, investigations and audits of understaffing and lack of training of staff in Babcock Center facilities, and those, in particular, at Kensington, where defendant Butkus had placed Mims.⁹ Mims 0046, 0194, 0149, 0198, 0208, 0250, 0252. While ignoring the injuries to Mims at Clusters, then at Kensington, DDSN had repeatedly refused the pleas of Mims’ mother to allow him to return home to live with her, because DDSN and the Babcock Center had determined he could not be left unattended and required awake staff around him at all times. Mims 2075, 2083-2097, 2112, 2117, 2104 and 2083. The injury to Mims was a natural consequence of defendants’ failure to provide supervision, it was foreseeable, and liability may arise under § 1983 from a “single sufficiently brutal incident.” *Moore v. City of Columbia*. 284 S.C. 278, 326 S.E.2d 157, 161 (S.C. App., 1984).

The July 27, 2004 infestation of Mims’ bed with ants also occurred within three years of Mims filing of his original complaint. The lower court erred in its decision that this infestation was a “one-of-a-kind” unforeseen event for which defendants had no liability. DDSN Order at 12.

⁹ Defendant Butkus admitted in his deposition that he had responsibility for determining placement. Mims 1420: 17 and 0811:11. S.C. Code of Laws § 44-20-420 provides that “The director or his designee may designate the service or program in which a client is placed. The appropriate services and programs must be determined by the evaluation and assessment of the needs, interests, and goals of the client.” Code § 44-20-430 provides that “The director or his designee has the final authority over applicant eligibility, determination, or services and admission order, subject to policies adopted by the commission.” Code § 44-20-480 provides that: “When the department determines that the welfare of a client would be facilitated by his placement out of the home, the client must be evaluated by the department, and the least restrictive level of care possible for the client must be recommended and provided when available.

Appellant provided the lower court with the report of the USC School of Public Health that reported in 2004: “Problems with cleanliness and maintenance, homes lacking basic necessities like soap, pests such as lice, cockroaches and ants as hazards to client safety and welfare.”(Emphasis added.) Mims 0416. Obviously, the infestation of Mims’ bed with insects was not a “one-of-a-kind” incident. Also, Appellant provided the lower court with evidence that the surveyors of Kensington, in 2004, found that sanitation was lacking in Babcock Center ICF/MR facilities and that its ICF/MR facilities did not meet standards for federal funding. CMR Review at Mims 0208, 0213. When ICF/MR surveyors visited Mims’ facility, Kensington, they found buckets with standing mop water, no toilet paper and trash observed in the hallways. Mims 0247. When Carolina Medical Review conducted its investigation of Babcock Center ICF/MR facilities in 2004, it found that Babcock Center’s “infection control manual” had not been updated since 1993, while federal policies require annual review. Mims 0247. Mims provided many other investigations of DDSN and Babcock Center facilities showing the widespread nature of the violations of federal and state standards of care. Mims 0017 to 0255. DDSN reported to DHHS that the rate of substantiated cases of abuse, neglect and exploitation in 2003 at the Babcock Center was double the statewide average, and that by 2004, this rate had increased to four times the statewide average:

Q. Now, a 2006 audit by HHS of your agency said that the substantiated rate of abuse and neglect was double the statewide average, I believe it was in 2003, and was quadruple the statewide average in 2004. Are you familiar with that audit?

A. Well, not only am I familiar with that, it’s stated that we provided them because we did the analysis. Those are documents that we gave HHS, so we generated them.

Mims 1420:9.

This Court should reverse the lower court because Mims demonstrated that genuine

issues of facts exists, even without consideration of the tolling statute.

(e) the Babcock Center and the individual defendants are not entitled to the protections of the Tort Claims Act. The lower court erred in granting protections of the Tort Claims Act to the Babcock Center and to the individual defendants sued in their individual capacities. The burden of establishing entitlement to protection under the Tort Claims Act is upon the governmental entity asserting exemption from liability. *Steinke v. South Carolina Dep't of Labor, Licensing and Regulation*, 336 S.C. 373, 393, 520 S.E.2d 142, 152 (1999); *Plyler v. Burns*, 647 S.E.2d 188, 196, 373 S.C. 637 (S.C., 2007). The Tort Claims Act provides limited protection from liability to "[t]he State, an agency, a political subdivision, and a governmental entity..." S.C. Code Ann. § 15-78-40 (2005). "Governmental entity" is defined by the Act as "the State and its political subdivisions." *Id.* § 15-78-30(d). The Act specifically excludes "independent contractors doing business with the State or a political subdivision of the State," such as the Babcock Center. S.C. Code 15-78-30(c).

The Supreme Court established four factors to determine whether an entity is entitled to the protections of the Tort Claims Act: (1) does it function statewide, (2) does it perform the work of the state, (3) was it created by the legislature, and (4) is it subject to local control? *Health Promotion Specialists, LLC v. S.C. Bd. of Dentistry*, 403 S.C. 623, 743 S.E.2d 808, 814 (2013). The Babcock Center was not created by an act of the General Assembly.¹⁰ Its board members are not appointed by the Governor or any governmental entity, and its funds are not

¹⁰ The General Assembly did carve out two counties as exceptions to the general rule, Dorchester and Georgetown. Had the General Assembly intended to treat the Babcock Center as a local DSN Board, it would have specifically made an exception by statute, as it did for these two counties.

controlled by the State Treasurer.¹¹ In an attachment to a letter defendant Johnson wrote to Senator Jake Knotts on December 20, 2004 (just a few months before Mims suffered the injury to his penis), Johnson wrote:

SCDDSN fails to note that so long as Babcock Center remains a private, non-profit 501(c)(3) organization, no public body may approve or disapprove its board members. This is another reason to support Babcock Center's initiative to become a public entity and accountable to the respective County Councils of Lexington and Richland Counties.

R. ____ (Mims 1880). In the letter, defendant Johnson goes on to state:

The Babcock Center Board of Directors voted unanimously to step down if the respective County Councils of Lexington and Richland Counties approve the official establishment of the Babcock Center as a disabilities and special needs board. The Board of Directors is convince that Babcock's becoming a public agency ...is in the best interest of the people it supports...

R. ____ Mims 1878. South Carolina Code of Laws § 44-20-375 requires that local boards "must be created within a county or within a combination of counties by ordinance of the governing bodies of the counties concerned." Furthermore, the ordinance must establish the number, terms, appointment, and removal of board members. But defendants failed to present a scintilla of evidence that the counties had approved the establishment of the Babcock Center as a county DSN board and the private corporation does not meet the statutory requirements to be a DSN county board. South Carolina Code of Laws Sections 44-20-20 and 44-20-375. Indeed, the South Carolina General Assembly has repeatedly declined to pass bills proposing to treat Babcock Center employees as state employees for purposes of participating in the State Health and Insurance Plans. S. 216, Session 119 (2011-2012), S. 25, Session 118 (2009-2010), S. 685 and

¹¹ Indeed, in *Babcock Center v. U.S.*, the court found that the Babcock Center was collecting the employees' share of employment taxes (fica), but not paying either the employees' share nor the employer's share to the Internal Revenue Service. Case No. 3:11-cv-01721, 3:11-cv-03155 (D.S.C. 2013).

House 3794, Session 117 (2007-2008). Those bills have never made it out of Committee to the floor of the House or the Senate. Also, when Mrs. Mims wrote to the South Carolina Attorney General in December of 2001, that office informed her that "The Attorney General does not have any authority over the Babcock Center" Mims 2116.

Babcock Center has repeatedly been found by the South Carolina Supreme Court to be a private, non-profit organization. *Babcock Center, Inc. v. Office of Audits*, 334 S.E.2d 112, 113, 286 S.C. 398 (1985), *Madison v. Babcock Center*, 638 S.E.2d 650, 371 S.C. 123 (2006). In its analysis of the application of the Tort Claims Act in *Madison*, the Supreme Court only discussed the Act as applying to DDSN, not to the Babcock Center. *Id.* at 286. This Court should take notice that in *Madison v. Babcock Center*, DDSN argued that it had no responsibility for acts of the Babcock Center, because that private corporation was an independent contractor:

Department asserts it is not liable for the torts of its **independent contractor**, Babcock Center, pursuant to S.C.Code Ann. § 15-78-60(20) (2005), which provides that a governmental entity is not liable for an "act or omission of a person other than an employee including but not limited to the criminal actions of third persons." Department also has asserted and the circuit court relied on S.C. Code Ann. § 15-78-30(c) (2005), which provides that the term "employee" "does not include an independent contractor doing business with the State." (Emphasis added.)

Supra, 285. In discussing DDSN's independent common law duty of care to protect the plaintiff in *Madison*, the Supreme Court noted that: "The fact an independent contractor provided services to Appellant or the fact a third party may have committed a criminal act in harming Appellant does not affect the existence of Department's duty." *Id.* The evidence in this case shows that the Babcock Center is not entitled to protection under the Tort Claims Act. Thus, as a private corporation, the Babcock Center cannot legally claim entitlement under the Tort Claims Act, so that the statute of limitations for claims against Judy Johnson and the Babcock Center is three

years, extended by the five year tolling statute to eight years.

Plaintiffs' claims against the individual Defendants are also not covered by the Tort Claims Act. As to the individual defendants, Mims has alleged that they have all acted with evil motives and intent and that they have shown reckless and callous indifference to Plaintiff's Constitutionally protected rights. The Tort Claims Act does not protect an employee who acts outside of the scope of his official duties, or where the employee's acts constituted fraud, malice, intent to harm or a crime of moral turpitude. *Pridgen v. Ward*, 391 S.C. 238, 705 S.E.2d 58 (S.C. App. 2010). S.C. Code Ann. § 15-78-70(b) (2005). In *Pridgen*, the South Carolina Court of Appeals found that the plaintiff may even establish by circumstantial evidence that state employees acted outside of the scope of their employment with an intent to harm the plaintiff, based on personal motives. All that is necessary is sufficient evidence for a jury to infer from the relationship of the Appellants and the nature of their actions, that they intended to harm the plaintiff and that they joined together for personal reasons, wholly disconnected from the furtherance of the state agency's business. As in *Pridgen*, Mims has shown that the defendants are not entitled to immunity under the Tort Claims Act.

The record shows that the defendants maliciously violated Mims' due process rights by knowingly providing false information to the court in order to prevent him from leaving the Babcock Center not once, but twice. Mims 2079 and 2188. The deceitful actions of these defendants were not within the scope of their official duties and a jury could reasonably determine that the alleged violations constituted actual fraud, actual malice, intent to harm, or a crime involving moral turpitude. *Pridgen v. Ward*, 391 S.C. 238, 705 S.E.2d 58, 64 (S.C. App., 2011). Likewise, in *Anthony v. Ward*, the Fourth Circuit held that defendants were not covered by

the Tort Claims Act, because their retaliatory acts were intentional and outside of the scope of their employment. Case No. 07-1932 (4th Cir. July 7, 2009).

The Babcock Center and the individual defendants failed to meet their burden of proving that they are entitled to protection under the Tort Claims Act. Mims provided evidence, which must be viewed in the most favorable light to him, that the individual defendants are not covered by the Act, because they acted outside of the scope of their employment and the Babcock Center is not a local DSN Board, but has repeatedly been found to be a private corporation.

(f) The doctrine of equitable tolling applies due to the bad acts of the defendants. The South Carolina tolling statute applies to extend the statute of limitations five additional years. But, even if the statutory tolling was not available, the doctrine of equitable tolling would prevent these defendants from avoiding liability due to their bad faith and malicious acts in this case. In *Hooper v. Ebenezer Sr. Services*, the South Carolina Supreme Court established that equitable tolling is available “in addition to statutory tolling mechanisms,” where it is necessary “[i]n order to serve the ends of justice where technical forfeitures would unjustifiably prevent a trial on the merits...” 54 C.J.S. Limitations of Actions § 115 (2005). 687 S.E.2d 29, 34, 386 S.C. 108 (2009). The equitable tolling doctrine was judicially created and “it stems from the judiciary’s inherent power to formulate rules of procedure where justice demands it.” *Id.*, citing *Rodriguez v. Superior Court*, 176 Cal.App.4th 1461, 98 Cal.Rptr.3d 728 (2009). As the South Carolina Supreme Court recognized in *Hooper*: “Where a statute sets a limitation period for action, courts have invoked the equitable tolling doctrine to suspend or extend the statutory period to ensure fundamental practicality and fairness.” *Id.* at 736 (citation omitted). In that case, the Supreme Court noted that “jurisdictions have considered tolling in a variety of contexts and have

developed differing parameters for its application.” *Id.* In a case where the defendant actively misled or prevented the plaintiff in an extraordinary way from pursuing a lawsuit or where the plaintiff timely raised the same claims in the wrong forum, the doctrine has been applied. *Kaplan v. Morgan Stanley & Co.*, 987 A.2d 258, 2009 VT 78 (2009) (2009 WL 2401952). The South Carolina Supreme Court in *Hooper* refused to limit its equitable powers “by cast-iron rules,” ruling that the doctrine should be applied “to do fairness,” taking into account “all the circumstances” where denying equitable tolling “would permit one party to suffer a gross wrong at the hands of the other.” *Id.* As in *Hooper*, this Court should apply equitable tolling, so as to prevent defendants from being “the beneficiary of the drastic consequence of a dismissal.” *Id.*

Mims provided material evidence that the delay in serving his complaint resulted from Mrs. Mims’ fear of retaliation after his sole respite caregiver was placed on administrative leave without pay when Babcock Center claimed that someone at the Governor’s Office contacted them to report that his respite caregiver was neglecting him in the spring of 2007, just as they had done to Mrs. Mims prior to DDSN involuntarily committing him in 2001. Letter to Dorothy Moore dated March 19, 2007 attached to Mims Rule 59(e) motion. In her affidavit, Mrs. Mims stated: “The Babcock Center and DDSN have made false accusations against me and Edward’s caregiver and I have been fearful that his services will again be terminated in attempts to force me to return him to the Babcock Center.” Mims 2079, paragraph 50. Mrs. Mims was dependent upon services from DDSN to keep her son at home and, when the respite caregiver was placed on leave, she was unable to work while these allegations were being investigated. In 2007, Mims’ mother was left without the support services she needed to help take care of Edward in the event that DDSN further reduced his services. *Id.* As with the allegations defendants and their agents

made against Mrs. Mims in 2001, this allegation of abuse or neglect after Mims' discharge was never substantiated. Nor was it, to Mrs. Mims' knowledge, even reported by the Governor's Office, as required by law, to the South Carolina Department of Social Services (DSS), the agency that has statutory authority to investigate allegations of abuse or neglect outside of DDSN facilities. Id. A reasonable juror could consider these facts and determine that defendants acted with malice, fraud and ill will to incarcerate Mims, to benefit financially from his incarceration and to prevent anyone from suing them.

It was reasonable that Mrs. Mims was fearful of retaliation if the complaint she filed in 2007 was served before these allegations of neglect by her son's caregiver were fully resolved. Mrs. Mims relied in good faith upon the "relation back" rule and the tolling statute to preserve her son's rights. Defendants should be prevented from benefitting from their bullying and retaliatory conduct. The record in this case documents that Mrs. Mims' fears of retaliation were justified. The guardian ad litem who was appointed by the Richland County Probate Court signed a sworn statement and testified in the probate court that she met with Babcock Center employees and legal counsel for DDSN to discuss Mims' "situation and his medical needs" when DDSN filed a petition to involuntarily commit Mims in 2001. Mims 2039. Attorney Flynn's affidavit states that: "Clusters employees intentionally withheld information from me about the conditions at Clusters in 2001 and about many incidents in which Edward had been injured at the facility so that I would recommend that he be involuntarily committed to the facility."¹² Mims 2040. Babcock Center employees told the GAL that Mims was being abused or neglected at home by

¹² A list of injuries sustained prior to the court involuntarily commitment, when defendants informed the probate court that Mims' mother was abusing him at home, is attached to the affidavit of Mrs. Mims, with medical records to document the injuries.

his mother, but the Record does not contain a scintilla of evidence to support those allegations. Id. While falsely accusing Mims' mother of abusing and neglecting him, defendants and their agents kept from the GAL the fact that Mims had been beaten by a Babcock Center employee. Id. The GAL made a recommendation to the probate court to involuntarily commit Mims "based on this false information..." Id. Attorney Flynn had "represented a number of residents of the Babcock Center who had been abused or neglected by Babcock Center employees" and it was her opinion that "Edward is not safe there." Mims 2041. She was "provided with evidence showing that Babcock Center employees had intentionally provided false information...in 2001 in order to prevent Edward from returning to the custody of his mother." Id.

Other witnesses shared their personal experiences related to the pervasive culture of retaliation at DDSN. Senator David Thomas swore that his office had been "flooded with phone calls" from DDSN constituents and their families, as well as employees and former employees of DDSN who were "fearful of retaliation by DDSN." Mims 2017. Mims also presented affidavits from two parents of DDSN consumers describing patterns of retaliatory acts by DDSN after they filed lawsuits on behalf of their children. Rob Pruitt stated that defendant Lacy retaliated against his daughter by attempting to terminate her eligibility for services and by refusing to provide residential habilitation services because she filed a lawsuit against Kathi Lacy and DDSN. Mims 2215-2216. He stated that: "I have talked with other parents who receive services from DDSN and there is a general fear of retaliation amongst parents, especially a fear of retaliation by Dr. Lacy." Mims 2217. Mr. Pruitt also described the retaliatory termination of Lennie Mullis, one of the providers of services to his daughter, who also provided an affidavit of Mims after she was appointed by the Probate Court to examine Mims and defendant Johnson refused to give her

access to him, despite a court order to do so. Id. and 2078. Twice DDSN terminated Ms. Mullis' certification to provide DDSN services, and twice the South Carolina Administrative Law Court reinstated her certification, finding that DDSN denied her right to due process. *Mullis v. DHHS I*, 04-ALJ-0194-AP (SCALC 2005) and *Mullis v. DHHS II*, 10-ALJ-08-0775-AP (SCALJ 2012).

Mims presented another affidavit signed by a parent, Amy Davenport, describing the retaliation she experienced when she sued DDSN: "After I filed a lawsuit against DDSN and the local DSN Board, DDSN refused to provide the hours as Kathi Lacy had promised me." Mims 2259. She found defendant Lacy to be "retaliatory and untrustworthy." Id. According to this parent: "Other parents I have spoken with have a fear of retaliation if they advocate for their child and Kathi Lacy's name comes up frequently in conversations between parents as instigating this retaliatory conduct." Mims 2260.

Ms. Mims stated in her sworn affidavit that: "As a reprisal, Dr. Kathi Lacy and the South Carolina Department of Disabilities and Special Needs determined that Edward did not qualify for adult day nursing services in an attempt to force me to send him back to the Babcock Center." Mims 2079. She also stated that:

Like a lot of other parents, I have been fearful of reprisals and have experienced reprisals when I have attempted to enforce the rights of my son, Edward Mims. I am always fearful of what Judy Johnson and the officials at the Babcock Center will do to me and to Edward to get back at me for getting Edward out of an abusive situation and reporting them to law enforcement and other regulatory agencies. Other families and employees have experienced similar reprisals for reporting abuse and have reported these fears to me and to legislators. Mims 2080.

Defendants should be equitably estopped because the delay in serving this lawsuit was caused by fear of retaliation and loss of services needed to keep Mims at home.

Issue 2. The lower court erred in failing to consider facts and events which occurred before the start of the time period covered by the tolling statute and the statute of limitations, as required by *Madison v. Babcock Center*.

The South Carolina Supreme Court has ruled in another case brought by a Babcock Center resident who was allegedly sexually assaulted that facts dating back before the time period covered by the statute of limitations should be considered in determining whether DDSN and Babcock Center violated their duty of care. *Madison v. Babcock Center, supra*. In that case, the plaintiff was admitted to the Babcock Center in 1994. *Id.* at 654. Madison alleged that she was sexually assaulted on August 30, 1995 and the statute of limitations for her lawsuit against DDSN was two years, under the Tort Claims Act. *Id.* at 663. She filed her lawsuit on August 29, 2007 alleging that Babcock Center and DDSN had been negligent in providing supervision. Her admission to the Babcock Center occurred outside of the period covered by the statute of limitations, yet the South Carolina Supreme Court ruled that “allegations relating to Department's alleged negligence in connection with Appellant's initial evaluation and admission in 1994 are not time-barred.”

Issue 3. The lower court erred in dismissing Mims' complaints for violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983 of the Civil Rights Act, because Mims provided material facts showing that the defendants violated his civil and Constitutional rights.

The Fourteenth Amendment guarantees that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property in the United States without due process of law. U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1. The South Carolina Supreme Court recently addressed the requirement that there must be a rational basis that is not arbitrary before a person may be deprived of a life, liberty or property interest in *State v. Dykes*. 403 S.C. 499, 744 S.E.2d 505, 508 (2013). As the Supreme Court noted in *Dykes* “A person's interest in freedom from bodily restraint is ‘at the core of the liberty protected by the

Due Process Clause from arbitrary governmental actions.” Although the majority of the Supreme Court held in *Dykes* that the Petitioner’s rights were not violated by having to register as a sex offender, Justice Hearn wrote a brilliant dissent in that case recognizing the awesome importance of citizens’ rights to be free from unnecessary governmental interference in their lives. As Justice Hearn noted:

Sir William Blackstone, in his landmark Commentaries on the Laws of England, noted the government's right to restrict an individual's free will is not immutable and any greater restriction than necessary threatens liberty in general: We may collect that the law, which restrains a man from doing mischief to his fellow citizens, though it diminishes the natural, increases the civil liberty of mankind: but every wanton and causeless restraint on the will of the subject, whether practiced by a monarch, a nobility, or a popular assembly, is a degree of tyranny. William Blackstone, Commentaries * 121 122.

Blackstone's commentary reflects our substantive due process milieu, where the core rights of freedom and liberty can only be limited when sufficiently necessary to advance the public good.

Id. at 513. Mims has shown that defendants’ violations of law and their tactics in this case have been tyrannical and that DDSN’s involuntary commitment constitute the kind of “mischief” Blackstone described. There is no evidence of any public or private good being accomplished by the involuntary incarceration of Edward Mims from 2001 to 2007. Much suffering occurred as a result of this fraudulent and illegal action by DDSN. Throughout Mims’ confinement, defendants failed to demonstrate any just cause for taking away his liberty interest and removing him from his home. The lower court’s reliance on the dissent in *Ashcroft v. Iqbal* was misguided. 556 U.S. 662 (2009). As the Fourth Circuit recently held in *Tobey v. Jones*, the Supreme Court has held that § 1983 “anticipates that a government official will be responsible for the natural consequences of his actions.” 706 F.3d 379 (4th Cir. 2013). DDSN’s experts and Mims’ physician determined that he should not be left unattended and that he required one-on-one

supervision. Mims 2107, 4502-4512. A pre-admission screening at Clusters found Mims to require "one-one accountability 24 hrs per day." Mims 004502-4512 attached to Plaintiff's Memorandum in Support of Summary Judgment filed May 29, 2013 (hereinafter "SJ 004512"). That was the reason for involuntarily committing him. Yet, where was Mims' one-on-one when he was being repeatedly beaten and suffering "unexplained injuries" at Clusters and why did defendant Butkus not once in four years monitor his placement?

Mims and his mother lived alone in her home prior to his admission to the Babcock Center in 1999. There were no other persons lurking around in his home who were larger and more aggressive than he, as there were at Clusters and Kensington. Upon admission to Clusters, Mims was supposed to have a one-on-one caregiver. But, almost immediately, he began suffering from unexplained injuries that should have been noticed by his one-on-one caregiver.¹³ Mims 2083. The injuries Mims sustained at Clusters and Kensington were the natural consequences of

¹³ The failure to actually provide one-on-one care funded by Medicaid was investigated by DHHS. Mims 0113. DHHS asked "Were these consumers, in fact, receiving the one-on-one care?" Id. DHHS found incomplete documentation on this issue and that "DDSN should not pay extra funds for one-on-one care unless medical and/or behavioral need is documented by a physician or qualified professional...and approved by DDSN." Id. The practice of billing Medicaid for one-on-one services that were not being provided appears to have been a systemic problem. DHHS charged DDSN to work with Babcock Center to develop and implement an adequate system of accountability for one-on-one services. Mims 0114. Related to the issues in Mims' case, this investigation found:

Intensive supervision is needed by some DDSN consumers whose safety (or when the safety of others) would be at risk if not supervised appropriately. DDSN consumers who are funded to receive one-on-one supervision should be supervised as specified in their plans of service. Mims 0121.

During a three day period in 2003, even with federal surveyors in the house, surveyors documented repeated assaults of clients who had one-on-one caregivers at Clusters. Mims 0166. The supervisor informed surveyors that Clusters was often "running on bare minimum and the one-on-one requirement for two clients residing in that house could not always be maintained." Mims 0167. During three days in November 2002, federal surveyors documented 29 incidents of "client-to-client" aggression in that house. Id.

removing an individual as medically fragile and defenseless as he, and then repeatedly leaving him unsupervised and confined with stronger, aggressive individuals who could hurt him. This was a recipe for disaster, and disaster occurred frequently in Babcock Center ICF/MR facilities. Mims 2083. It was just as foreseeable that when Mims was left alone in an understaffed facility with stronger, aggressive, cognitively disabled adults, where staff was insufficiently trained that he would suffer injuries of the types alleged in his complaint as it would be to place a child in the middle of an interstate at rush hour. It does not take a quality assurance data gatherer to determine that the natural consequence of doing so is that the child will get hurt. Mims repeatedly got hurt, requiring treatment in the emergency room. But no one could explain how most of these injuries occurred. When looking at Mims' amended complaint and drawing all reasonable inferences in his favor, it is logical to assume that defendants "had a hand" in the resulting injuries because they failed to provide safe and constitutionally adequate placement for Mims. *Id.* During Johnson's first year at Babcock the rate of abuse was double the state wide average, but a year later it had rocketed to four times the statewide average. Mims 1421-1422. Butkus and Lacy were both well aware of this rise in injuries and they did not to protect Mims from being injured or move him to a smaller, less restrictive setting, where he would not be victimized by more aggressive clients. *Id.*

Mims was not capable of harming anyone else, and there is nothing in the record to suggest that he ever did. The record is equally bare of any evidence that Mims was protected by being forced to remain in the custody of DDSN at the Babcock Center. On the contrary, Mims provided the lower court with reams of evidence documenting that he was taken out of a safe placement and placed in facilities where defendants were not meeting basic federal and state

standards of care. It was the South Carolina Department of Social Services, not DDSN, that had the authority to investigate allegations that Mims was abused or neglected in the home. But the fact that DDSN never even filed a report with DSS, even though anyone with knowledge of him being harmed at home had a legal obligation to report, supports Mims' claims that defendants fabricated those allegations of his being neglected or abused at home in order to cover up the abuse he was suffering at Clusters and to protect themselves from their own liability for damages after Mims was beaten by a Babcock Center employee and defendants, particularly defendants Butkus and Johnson, could have been sued for negligent supervision and violating their duty of care to Mims. *Madison, supra*. These same defendants later schemed to protect themselves by arranging to have DDSN's medical "expert" Grame Johnson investigate Mims' injury, instead of reporting the sexual assault to law enforcement. Mims 1899. In furtherance of defendants' last gasp attempt to protect themselves from being sued after Mrs. Mims successfully removed her son from the decertified facility, DDSN filed a document titled "Objections" with the Probate Court arguing that there was no need to appoint a guardian to protect him:

There has been no showing that Edward has gone lacking for care and supervision by not having a guardian. Very few people with Edward's condition have a guardian...It is not enough to want to be the guardian of an incapacitated person; there must be a direct, realistic need for care and supervision that would otherwise be lacking without the appointment of a guardian.

Mims 2192. The reader should compare the chronology, based on Babcock Center's own records with the sworn affidavit at Mims 2079 to determine whether he needed a guardian. Between June 2005 and March 6, 2009, the date the affidavit was signed, he sustained no serious injury in the care of his mother. During the three decades that Mims lived at home prior to his mother becoming ill in 1999, there were never any allegations that she even once failed to provide for

her son's needs safely at home. The allegations only arose after Mims was beaten by Babcock Center employee, Carl Anthony, and Mrs. Mims attempted to remove her son from the facility. Despite defendants' best efforts to fraudulently paint her as an abuser, and even to deceive the GAL and the Probate Court, defendants totally failed to prove any of their allegations against Mrs. Mims, but they succeeded through their bullying to neutralize her powers to sue them. It was the defendants who violated the law that required them to report any allegations of abuse at home to DSS pursuant to the South Carolina Omnibus Adult Protection Act. Act No. 110, § 1, 1993 S.C. Acts 257, S.C. Code Ann. § 43-35-5. S.C. Code Ann. § 43-35-55(C) designates the Adult Protective Services Program in the Department of Social Services as the investigative entity for abuse or neglect occurring in the home. Section (A) and (B) give SLED and the State Ombudsman authority to investigate abuse or neglect in facilities.

The Amended Complaint provided material facts, which have been supported by credible evidence filed in response to motions before the lower court, showing violation of Mims' civil rights during three phases: (1) violation of Mims' due process and equal protection rights during the commitment proceedings; (2) violation of Mims right to liberty and freedom from bodily restraint and right to appropriate care and treatment; and (3) violation of Mims' rights to be free from governmental interference during the 2005 guardianship proceedings. Mims' allegations are supported by extensive evidence during each phase which was not considered by the lower court.

Instead of reporting their "concerns" that Mims was being abused in the home to the appropriate authority, DSS, DDSN filed a petition in the Probate Court to have him involuntarily committed to the custody of DDSN. The United States Supreme Court established in *Addington v. Texas* the requirement under the Due Process Clause that the State must prove by clear and

convincing evidence two preconditions before committing an individual to a mental institution in a civil proceeding. 441 U.S. 418 (1979). First, the state must prove that the person sought to be committed is mentally ill. The mental deficiency of Mims from birth has been well established. But, the second prong of the *Addington* test was never met in Mims' case. The State failed to prove that Mims required that he required institutional care "for his own welfare and protection of others." *Id.* Mims presented evidence, which was not considered by the lower court, that the real reason for committing him was to protect the defendants and their agencies and agents from liability for injury to Mims after he was assaulted by a Babcock Center employee and his mother insisted on prosecuting the employee. Mims 2076. Mrs. Mims stated in her affidavit that:

When I tried to remove Edward and reported that he was being beaten, the South Carolina Department of Disabilities and the Babcock Center joined together to prevent Edward from being discharged from Clusters by filing a petition to have Edward involuntarily committed to their custody.

Mims 2076. There is not a scintilla of evidence that Mims ever harmed anyone. But the chronology at Mims 2083 documents how many injuries he suffered from November 6, 1999, just a month after his voluntary admission to Babcock Center, until his release from the facility in 2005. R. _____. Mims 2083 to 2097.

In dismissing Mims' § 1983 claims, the lower court ignored the affidavit of Attorney Flynn, who testified that information was withheld from her by Babcock Center employees and that false information was provided to her about the care being provided by Mims' mother. Mims 2039. She testified that Babcock Center employees "intentionally withheld information" about the conditions at Clusters and the "many incidents in which Edward had been injured at the facility" so that she would recommend that he be involuntarily committed. Mims 2040. Her

recommendation to commit Mims was based on “false information” that had been provided to her by Babcock Center and DDSN. Id. When she later learned of the injuries Mims suffered at the Babcock Center, which were similar to those other persons she represented experienced, Attorney Flynn informed the Probate Court that Mims was not safe there. Mims 2041. But the interference by the DDSN state actors did not stop once the temporary guardianship was established.

Mims presented credible evidence that DDSN bullied his mother into consenting to the involuntary commitment through threats that her son’s weekend home visits would be permanently terminated unless she consented to the order so that she could at least provide care for her son on the weekends. Mims 2076, paragraphs 10 and 14. She provided the Court with an affidavit which states that defendants had terminated her weekend visits with Edward at the time of the hearing in 2001 and that these visits would not be restored unless she agreed to the involuntary commitment. Mims 2076. Indeed, she tried to take him home on the day of the hearing, June 26, 2001. Mims 2088. She provided a chronology, supported by Babcock Center’s own records, of the long history of abuse Mims suffered at Clusters and Kensington. Mims 2083. Her statement that “Employees of the Department of Disabilities and Special Needs told lies about me to the Probate Judge at the 2001 hearing” was supported by Attorney Flynn’s affidavit. Mims 2076. As discussed above, Mims documented the pervasive culture of retaliation at DDSN and the Babcock Center with affidavits. Mims 2015, 2214 and 2258.

The lower court erred as a matter of law in ignoring Mims’ allegations that defendants failed to monitor his condition and to provide safe and effective treatment after involuntarily committing him to the custody of DDSN, where the State Director had total control over

placement decisions. Mims 1420. Defendants' involuntary commitment of Mims did not abolish his liberty interests to safe conditions and adequate habilitation. *Youngberg* at 314 and 327 and *Thomas S. by Brooks v. Flaherty*, 902 F.2d 250, 252 (4th Cir. 1990). 42 U.S.C. § 1983 of the Civil Rights Act provides that:

Every person who, under the color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding to redress.

In order to succeed in a § 1983 action, "a plaintiff is required to plead three elements: (1) an official policy or custom (2) that causes the plaintiff to be subjected to (3) a denial of a constitutional right." *Moore v. City of Columbia*, 284 S.C. 278, 326 S.E.2d 157 (Ct.App. 1985).

As this Court held in *Moore v. City of Columbia*, in South Carolina "the complaint is sufficient if it informs the defendant of the ultimate facts supporting each element of the cause of action; there is no necessity that the complaint state all the evidence to be presented upon the trial of the case" Id. at 160. Mims clearly set forth the grounds for his claims that Lacy, Butkus and Johnson violated his Constitutional, federal and common law rights in paragraphs 14, 37, 43, 49, 51, 52, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 80 and 86 of the Amended Complaint. He pled how each supervisory defendant through his or her own individual actions violated his rights by failing to protect him from abuse and sexual assault, failing to provide supervision and protection from injury, failing to monitor his condition and treatment needs, failing to provide adequate staffing, failing to investigate reports of abuse, failing to discharge him to the care and custody of his mother, failing to report abuse and neglect to proper authorities, obstructing the appointment of his mother as guardian and providing false and misleading information to the court for the purpose

of preventing him from leaving the Babcock Center. Amended Complaint at paragraph 80.

It is not necessary for the policy Mims complains of to be “officially adopted and promulgated” by the state actors to recover for damages under § 1983. *Id.* The policy may be *de facto* or *de jure* and it may be one that is “visited pursuant to governmental ‘custom’ even though such custom has not received formal approval through the body’s official decision-making channels.” 436 U.S. at 691, 98 S.Ct. at 2036. *Lenard v. Argento*, 699 F.2d 874, 886 (7th Cir.1983), cert. denied, --- U.S. ----, 104 S.Ct. 69, 78 L.Ed.2d 84 (1983). *De facto* policies may be “established by the omissions of a municipality or supervisory officials where their unreasonable failure to make rules causes the unconstitutional conduct practiced by their employees.” *Moore* at 161, citing *Avery v. County of Burke*, 660 F.2d 111, 114 (4th Cir.1981). An official policy may be established by the acts and omissions of supervisory officials if the evidence shows that the act in fact represents official policy.

The Fourth Circuit has held that omissions by officials are actionable when they constitute “tacit authorization” of or “deliberate indifference” to constitutional violations, as was present in Mims’ case. *Avery*, 660 F.2d at 114. It is not necessary to prove, however, that members of the officials personally participated in, or expressly authorized, the wrongful act. *Avery* at 114. (“Official policy may be established by the omissions of supervisory officials as well as from their affirmative acts.” *Id.*) Supervisory officials who have been “charged with the responsibility of making rules” may be liable under § 1983 “where their unreasonable failure to make rules causes their employees’ unconstitutional practices.” *Id.* Thus, the conduct of officials may be actionable “if their failure to promulgate policies and regulations rose to the level of deliberate indifference...” or “constituted tacit authorization” of the wrongful acts that violated

Mims' rights.¹⁴ Id.

Importantly, a “pattern of official negligence gives rise to an inference that the attendant constitutional deprivations represent official policy.” *Moore* at 161. Mims has demonstrated such a pattern in this case, by providing the lower court with uncontradicted evidence demonstrating that both DDSN and the Babcock Center failed to provide care and treatment in accordance with federal and state standards. Mims 0046 to 0666. In *Moore*, the South Carolina Supreme Court found that liability may result from “official knowledge of employee conduct which causes constitutional violations” or even from “a violation occurring from a single sufficiently brutal incident.” Id. at 285. Where, as here, “an official has final authority in a matter involving the selection of goals, his choices represent policy.” Id. Butkus and Johnson clearly had the authority to select goals of compliance with federal and state standards, or to continue to operate Babcock Center facilities in complete disregard for Mims’ right to receive appropriate care in a safe environment. It is uncontradicted that Butkus held the key to Mims’ release from the dangerous conditions and unconstitutional conditions at the Babcock Center. Mims 1420. Mims has demonstrated that the proximate causes to his injuries were the defendants’ repeated refusals to grant his mother’s request to release him from confinement at the Babcock Center and the utter failure to provide appropriate care and treatment in the least restrictive setting. But for Butkus’

¹⁴ This Court may take judicial notice of its own docket and the appeal of Protection and Advocacy of the dismissal of its lawsuit requesting simply that the court require DDSN to promulgate regulations, also filed in 2007 and languishing in that court for more than seven years. *Protection and Advocacy v. DDSN*, 2014-000244, lower court Case No. 2007-CP-40-2187.. In another appeal pending in the South Carolina Supreme Court, Richard Stogsdill alleges that DHHHS and its agent, DDSN are in violation of the South Carolina Administrative Procedures Act due to its refusal to promulgate regulations. *Stogsdill v. DHHS*, Case No. 2014-002513.

refusal to release Mims, none of the injuries would have occurred that he suffered after DDSN petitioned the Probate Court to have him involuntarily committed.

The lower court erred in its determination that Mims failed to show that defendants had personal liability for the harms he suffered. In their depositions, defendants admitted that they had knowledge of the alleged sexual injury and other injuries to Mims and others at the Babcock Center. Mims 0954, 0955, 0962, 1030, 1033, 1387, 1391, 1396, 1422, . Butkus testified that judicial admissions were “very, very, very rare” and that Mims’ was the only one he remembered during his 12 years at DDSN. Mims 1392. This is simply not a case where the named defendants were totally removed from the alleged wrongful acts. Butkus voluntarily assumed responsibility through the involuntary commitment in 2001 to take the authority away from Mims’ mother who had protected him all of his life. Having refused for years to allow Mims to return home, based on information provided to the Probate Court that he required constant supervision that his mother could not provide, Mims was unattended long in a facility where Immediate Jeopardy had been repeatedly declared long enough for him to be sexually assaulted, suffering a 4 centimeter laceration to his penis, which required surgical repair. The lower court found that this was just a “factually unique incident” that was not foreseeable or preventable. But the uncontradicted records Mims provided to the lower court documented that Mims and other Babcock Center residents being regularly assaulted was more the norm than an exception to the rule. Mims 150 and 2083.

The lower court erred in its analysis of the liability of supervisory state actors. In *Baynard v. Malone*, the Fourth Circuit affirmed the district court’s denial of a principal’s motion for summary judgment where the court held that he could be liable under § 1983 for a student being

sexually assaulted by a sixth grade teacher:

It is well settled that "supervisory officials may be held liable in certain circumstances for the constitutional injuries inflicted by their subordinates." *Shaw v. Stroud*, 13 F.3d 791, 798 (4th Cir. 1994). Such liability is not based on ordinary principles of respondeat superior, but rather is premised on "a recognition that supervisory indifference or tacit authorization of subordinates' misconduct may be a causative factor in the constitutional injuries they inflict on those committed to their care." *Slakan v. Porter*, 737 F.2d 368, 372 (4th Cir. 1984). In order to establish supervisory liability under S 1983, a plaintiff must demonstrate:

(1) that the supervisor had actual or constructive knowledge that his subordinate was engaged in conduct that posed a pervasive and unreasonable risk of constitutional injury to citizens like the plaintiff; (2) that the supervisor's response to that knowledge was so inadequate as to show deliberate indifference to or tacit authorization of the alleged offensive practices[]; and (3) that there was an affirmative causal link between the supervisor's inaction and the particular constitutional injury suffered by the plaintiff. *Shaw*, 13 F.3d at 799 (internal quotation marks omitted).

268 F.3d 228, 235 (4th Cir.2001), quoting *Shaw v. Stroud*, 13 F.3d 791, 798 (4th Cir.1994)).

Mims has documented the knowledge of the defendants of his injuries and the widespread and systemic nature of abuse and neglect at the Babcock Center, the deliberate indifference of these officials is proven, not only from the number of injuries Mims sustained without intervention, but by the actions defendants took to prevent a guardian from being appointed, finally the causal link is demonstrated by the fact that Butkus held the key to Mims' release and he failed to use it, joining together with Lacy and Johnson instead to perpetuate the cycle of abuse. The requirements set forth in *Shaw* and *Madison* have been met.

Subsequent to *Baynard*, in *Jennings v. University of North Carolina*, the Fourth Circuit found that the University's Attorney Ehringhaus, was not entitled to summary judgment where she had the authority to take action to prevent a coach from sexually harassing Jennings, but she failed to take action, thereby allowing the harassment to "continue unchecked." 482 F.3d 686, 701 (4th Cir. 2007). Jennings' claims that were based on the theory of supervisory liability were

allowed to proceed to trial, because the attorney's response was "so inadequate as to show deliberate indifference or tacit authorization of the offensive practices." Id. The court found that Jennings was entitled to show that individual defendant Ehringhaus had "actual knowledge" of the misconduct, as did defendants in this case. Id. As in this case, there existed "an affirmative causal link" between the state actor's inaction and the constitutional injury. Id. at 702. Certainly, there can be no doubt, given the record Mims has gathered, but that defendants had knowledge of the failure to protect Mims and they allowed violations of his civil rights to continue unchecked.

Mims provided material facts to show that the defendants had not just constructive knowledge that their subordinates were engaging in conduct that posed a pervasive and unreasonable risk of constitutional injury, but the individual defendants each had actual knowledge of the injuries Mims had suffered over a long course of time, as well as the persistent failure of Babcock Center to meet federal and state standards of care in their ICF/MR facilities and to protect its residents from harm. Mims demonstrated that defendants' response showed deliberate indifference, as well as tacit authorization of the illicit conduct. The causal links have been demonstrated by the defendants' efforts to prevent his release from unsafe facilities and their failure to require their subordinates to comply with federal and state standards. Even after Butkus was informed that Mims suffered injuries from his bed being infested by ants, after Kensington was decertified and after Mims was beaten by a Babcock Center employee and other residents, once with a belt, leaving welts all over his face and body (Mims 2056-2057), defendants Butkus and Lacy continued to obstruct the efforts of his mother to be appointed as his permanent guardian. Butkus testified in his deposition that he decided to keep Mims at Kensington because "circumstances were still operating that led to the original involuntary

admission.” Mims 1409. Butkus testified that his decision was based on “our professional assessment” of the “mom and the overall environment.” Mims 1415. But, he could not even remember whether a home study had been done. Mims 1411. He determined Mims should stay in the decertified facility because his mother was working and she did not have a “lot of resources, income was limited...” Mims 1411. Butkus testified that Mims was in the facility that “we felt was best for him.” Mims 1413. These justifications were obviously a pretext, as there is no evidence that Mims was ever injured at home. The record shows that Butkus was right about one thing - that the circumstances that led to Mims involuntary admission had not changed. But this was not because Mims’ mother was unable to care for him. The circumstances - the threat - that still existed was that Butkus and the other defendants could be sued if his mother was appointed as his guardian.

This is not a case where defendants were far removed from the abuse, Butkus testified that he was paying close attention to Babcock Center’s data on abuse and neglect of clients during 2004, at first ordering them to downsize by 25%. Mims 1421. But, he testified that in the fall of 2004 he and Lacy recognized that “the trend line still was not good for the agency as a whole on quality.”¹⁵ He testified that it was defendant Lacy who kept track of abuse and neglect data and kept him informed when Mims was injured. Mims 1422.

Lacy was the state official in charge of policies related to service delivery and she ran the “risk management..piece of the agency, getting the reports of abuse and neglect.” Mims 0739 and 810. She wrote at least half of the DDSN Directives, which the agency prefers to use instead of

¹⁵ Butkus testified that it was defendant Lacy who was responsible for tracking abuse and neglect at the Babcock Center and was responsible for “quality assurance.” Mims 1376, 1377, 1424. Lacy kept Butkus informed of every significant injury to a DDSN client. Id. and 1378.

promulgating regulations. Id. In 2009, Lacy had worked as an official at DDSN for thirteen years, but she was not aware of the DDSN Commission ever discussing the promulgation of regulations. Mims 0862. According to Lacy, since she arrived at DDSN “there had been the understanding that the promulgation of regulations was not something that we did because we used other vehicles - to issue directives and to hold people accountable to what our expectations were. Mims 0862. Lacy’s responsibility was to “provide oversight” to the process of abuse and neglect investigations and to analyze trends. Mims 0794. Every complaint filed with SLED related to a DDSN provider is sent to DDSN and Lacy performs a “concurrent” review and a “post-review,” looking at trends. Mims 0880. Lacy made recommendations to the director on sanctions against providers and was responsible for assuring compliance with Medicaid standards and regulations. Mims 0742. She was the official who informed Butkus when Mrs. Mims appeared with a court order to remove her son from Kensington. Mims 0752. Lacy attended the emergency meeting at the Probate Court on a Sunday afternoon, having discussed the agency’s intentions with Butkus. Mims 0759-0760. She informed that Mims would not qualify for adult day health care services, so that the only day program option for him would be to return to the Babcock Center. Mims 0768.

As discussed above, Johnson admitted in her deposition that she communicated directly with Dr. Butkus about serious injuries to Babcock Center clients after she became director in 2002. She had been at the helm of the Babcock Center for one year when Butkus and Lacy’s data showed that the substantiated rate of abuse and neglect was double the statewide average there. Mims 1420. But just a year later, under Johnson’s leadership, the rate of abuse and neglect had grown to four times the statewide average. Id.

When one client was allegedly sexually assaulted by another resident at the Babcock Center, Johnson and Butkus discussed the case and Butkus told Johnson that it was not necessary to report the alleged rape to law enforcement, because the perpetrator had been another Babcock Center resident. Mims 954-955. Johnson admitted that in the fall of 2004, after Mims' roommate died at Kensington, federal surveyors cited Babcock Center for the facility where Butkus placed Mims being understaffed. Mims 0958. See also Immediate Jeopardy findings at Mims 0046, 0063, 0198, 0250 and 0252. Johnson testified that "Immediate Jeopardy means that they (referring to surveyors) feel that folks are in imminent harm and there needs to be changes put in place prior to their (referring to surveyors) departure." Mims 0962. Johnson admitted in her deposition that as director, she was responsible for the "day-to-day operations" of the Babcock Center. Mims 0978,

Mims has pled and provided credible evidence showing that the individual defendants were consciously indifferent to his condition and his needs and in leaving him without adequate supervision in a dangerous facility. He has demonstrated that defendants acted maliciously and wantonly by obstructing the appointment of a permanent guardian, by filing "Objections" and appearing at hearings for the purpose of challenging Mrs. Mims' ability to care for her son. Mims 2188. The maliciousness of this decision is demonstrated by the fact that there has been not even one substantiated allegation that Mims was ever injured at home - indeed, defendants repeatedly failed to file reports with the South Carolina Department of Social Services or law enforcement when they made allegations that he was being injured at home. Mims' GAL provided a sworn statement that she was provided false and misleading information by defendants in order to involuntarily commit Mims to DDSN, and that other clients she had represented who received

services from the Babcock Center had been injured by neglect and/or abuse while admitted to their facilities. Mims 2038.

The Amended Complaint contains the required "plain and concise statement of the facts constituting [the] cause of action," S.C.Code Ann. § 15-13-220 (1976). Although Mims was not required to set out the facts in detail, the complaint and the affidavits, surveys, investigations and reports filed by Mims clearly set forth facts that demonstrate material facts that support his § 1983 claim. Mims is entitled to "all reasonable factual inferences arising thereon with a view to doing substantial justice between the parties..." Moore at 162. The long history of violations of both federal and state standards of care, defendants' personal involvement in Mims' incarceration in a dangerous facility and their persistent failure to correct deficiencies "constituted tacit authorization of or deliberate indifference" to Mims' rights. Mims has not sued under a theory of *respondent superior*, but he has alleged that defendants had independent liability to protect him from harm and to provide care and treatment in a safe manner. As in *Moore*, where this court held that since the Chief of Police was responsible for the choice and implementation of police department practices and procedures, "his acts and omissions reflect government policy," the individual defendants' omissions reflect the policy to consciously ignore danger to Mims and other residents. *Id.* 287. Johnson and Butkus were responsible for the choices and implementation of agency practices and procedures and they are liable for acts and omissions of their subordinates pursuant to those policies.

The lower court also erred in failing to rule that Mims had constitutionally protected liberty interests entitling him to reasonably safe conditions of confinement and training.

Youngberg v. Romeo, 457 U.S. 307, 313 (1982). Defendants did not base their judgment to keep

Mims at Kensington on “professional judgment” that was “acceptable in light of present medical or other scientific knowledge.” *Id.* Instead, defendants Butkus and Judy Johnson joined together to cause DDSN’s medical consultant, Dr. Grame Johnson, who was not an “independent” professional, to investigate Mims’ injury. Mims 1866 and 1899. Dr. Johnson marched right past the signs on the doors notifying the public that Kensington had been cited for Immediate Jeopardy and was decertified, without even mentioning in his report any of the many recent findings of substandard care and conditions at Kensington. Mims 2168. He did not mention the federal and state survey findings of deficiencies or that the Babcock Center had failed to make the necessary improvements required by surveyors and he failed to contact Mims’ treating physician. Johnson he made no reference in his report to the fact that the Babcock Center had totally failed to preserve evidence or to cause rape protocol to be performed. Mims 1866. He did not mention in his report the October 2004 findings by CMS that Babcock Center failed to properly investigate the death of Mims’ roommate just a few months earlier. A reasonable juror could determine from these facts that Dr. Johnson’s assessment consisted of nothing more than “bureaucratic gobbledegook having no relation to her (his) actual condition or needs.” *Moore v. Cook*, Case No. 1:07-CV-631-TWT (N.D. Ga., April 19, 2012). It is material that it appears that Grame Johnson’s evaluation was intended to protect the facility, not to identify the true cause of Mims’ injury or to protect him or persons other than state actors from future harm. Dr. Johnson’s assessment substantially departed from accepted professional judgment, practice, or standards so as to demonstrate that he did not base his judgment on correct standards.

DDSN, Babcock Center, Johnson, Butkus and Lacy were all well aware of the seriousness of the problems and the risk of harm to Babcock Center residents. Mims 1873 to 1889. Butkus

ordered Babcock Center to “downsize” by 50%, in order to give the appearance that he was acting to protect vulnerable adults receiving services there, in order to satisfy politicians who had begun to demand changes. Mims 1873, 1876. But, the record demonstrates that these changes were illusory. Butkus continued to justify his decision to prevent Mims’ return home solely to protect himself and his co-defendants.

Although defendant Johnson is not a state employee, she may still be held liable, along with defendants Lacy and Butkus, for violation of Mims’ rights under § 1983. This is because private individuals who act jointly with state officials, who perform state functions and private persons or corporations who contract with the government may be sued under the statute. As the United States Supreme Court held in *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Company, Inc.*:

Private persons, jointly engaged with state officials in the prohibited action, are acting "under color" of law for purposes of the statute. To act "under color" of law does not require that the accused be an officer of the State. It is enough that he is a willful participant in joint activity with the State or its agents,' " quoting United States v. Price, 383 U.S., at 794, 86 S.Ct., at 1157. 457 U.S. 922, 942 (1982).

Issue 4. The lower court err as a matter of law in dismissing Mims’ claims for negligent supervision, negligence and gross negligence.

The South Carolina Supreme Court established in *Madison v. Babcock Center* that DDSN and Babcock Center have a common law duty of care to protect Babcock Center residents from harm. *Supra*. The lower court erred in its finding that Mims’ claims for neglect, negligent supervision and gross neglect were “conclusory.” Mims provided that court with specific details, including dates and supporting medical records supporting his allegations. Butkus and Lacy both testified that it was the practice for Lacy to inform him of serious incidents that occurred in DDSN funded facilities and to analyze data and trends. R. Mims 1360:12, 1361:3,

1362:5,1401:7. Indeed, Butkus ordered 50% of the resident population at the Babcock Center to be released, he left Mims - the only person he claimed to have been involuntarily committed in the DDSN system, in a facility where federal and state surveyors had repeatedly declared that Kensington's residents were at risk of Immediate Jeopardy. Mims 1392. Mims has shown that "but for" Butkus' decision not to release Mims from confinement at Babcock Center, Mims would not have suffered the many, many injuries, both physical and psychological, he suffered between 2001 and 2005. Mims claims are supported by a DHHS audit that reported the failure of Babcock Center to resolve problems with abuse, neglect and exploitation, reporting of critical incidents, inadequate staffing and supervision, following up with responsible parties (families) and following corrective action plans at the Babcock Center which raised "serious questions about Babcock Center's ability to provide for the day-to-day safety and welfare of its clients." Mims 0119. In particular, the State Medicaid Agency, DHHS, found that Babcock Center had failed to report and prevent resident-to-resident abuse and that State agency admitted that resident-to-resident abuse "could be an indication of **negligent supervision.**"¹⁶ (Emphasis added.) Mims 0119. The audit found that Babcock Center staff failed to follow up on corrective action plans where recommendations were made to "provide for the safety and welfare of the consumer and to help prevent future occurrences of another incident." Mims 0122.

Mims has clearly established through not only the evidence of injuries suffered by Mims, but the widespread systemic problems that went uncorrected for years, the necessary "causal connection" between defendants' violations and the harm he suffered. Mims 044 to 582, 2083.

¹⁶ Insufficient staffing was substantiated in two of the five incidents involving abuse and neglect that DHHS reviewed. Mims 0124.

It is undisputed that on May 27, 2005, Mims was left unsupervised and was found to have a “gaping laceration” that was 4 cm long on his penis that required seven stitches to repair.

Exhibit 4 to Affidavit. If defendants had released Mims to his mother’s care when she repeatedly begged for him to be removed from danger at Babcock Center, none of these injuries would have occurred. But, instead of fixing the problems, Defendants made illusory promises to politicians and regulators, leaving Mims and hundreds of other vulnerable adults at risk of harm. Mims 0490, 1873 to 1898. The lower court’s finding that there were no “widespread systemic problems” at the Babcock Center is hogwash. The Director of DHHS wrote to defendant Johnson on January 19, 2005 that “Based on the findings of this limited scope review, I am concerned that the deficiencies noted may be indicative of more pervasive problems at Babcock.” Mims 2153. An audit by Carolina Medical Review found that Babcock Center ICF/MR facilities were not in compliance with federal standards for participation in the Medicaid program. Mims 0208. did not end their violations when Mims was discharged from Kensington.

Yet, when Butkus, Johnson and Lacy should have been concentrating on fixing these problems, they spent their energies instead attempting to obstruct his mother’s attempts to be appointed as guardian to prevent her from asserting her son’s rights and to hold them accountable for their irresponsible and malicious acts. Defendant Lacy personally attended the 2005 probate proceedings, attempting to obstruct his mother from being appointed as his guardian. Mims 1517. Defendant Butkus, in his own deposition, admitted that he personally made the decision to keep Mims at Kensington and to prevent his return home to the care of his mother. Given the lack of monitoring by defendants between 2001 and 2005, a reasonable juror could determine that the sudden interest in Mims’ well being was motivated for personal, not professional reasons, i.e. to

prevent Mims from filing this lawsuit. *Pridgen, supra*. The trial court clearly erred in failing to recognize that the proximate cause of the injury was defendants' negligent failure to supervise and to require their subordinates to meet federal standards for quality of care. *Madison* at 287. The injury to Mims' penis would not have occurred "but for" Butkus, Lacy and Johnson banding together to prevent Mims from leaving the Babcock Center when his mother begged for his discharge home. *Id.* Given the findings of surveyors, federal, state and private investigators, the injuries to Mims were not only a natural consequence of defendants' actions, but they were quite foreseeable. Mims 0046, 0194, 0198, 0208, 0250, 0252, 0283, 0359, 0416, 0490 Mims 2083. The chronology attached to Mrs. Mims' affidavit documents ongoing, mostly unexplained, assaults throughout the time Mims was at Clusters and Kensington. Mims 2075. But, not a single injury was substantiated on Mims' weekend visits home. But, Mims was beaten by Babcock Center employee, Carl Anthony, on August 13, 2000. BC 3191 and 3356. On September 4, 2000, Mrs. Mims attempted to remove her son from the Babcock Center. BC 2368. Nine days after Mrs. Mims attempted to remove her son from the facility, exactly a month after Anthony beat him, Anthony was terminated on August 13, 2001. Mims 2102. Mims' records suggest another serious "unexplained" altercation occurred on the same evening Anthony was terminated. The very next morning after Anthony was terminated, on September 14, 2000, Mims was found to have extensive unexplained injuries, including "multiple purple elongated lesion bilateral chest wall, neck, posterior ear, right eye lids and wrist and chest wall." BC 3356. Although the cause of the injury is not mentioned in his records, Mims' one-on-one caregiver at Clusters wrote that "Edward has scratches and bruises wrote it up in accident/injury form also nurse looked at it when she did am meds." BC 3356. This reaction to a serious unexplained beating is indicative of

the conscious indifference that existed at the Babcock Center. But no one knew how these injuries happened. On October 13, 2000, Mims still had an “old bruise” on his back, right upper thigh and on his knees from the assault. BC 965. An arrest warrant for Carl Anthony’s arrest was not signed until October 3, 2001. Mims 2099. The State Ombudsman did not issue her report on this beating until July 28, 2003, more than two years after it happened. Mims 2102. The Ombudsman substantiated that in 2001 there was a lack of supervision when Mims was beaten. Mims 2103.

In November, 2001, Mrs. Mims wrote to the Attorney General, begging him to help her bring her son home. Mims 2012. She pleaded “I don’t understand why he can’t come back home!” After Mims was committed to the custody of DDSN, Mims continued to have multiple “unexplained injuries” during 2001 at Clusters. Mims 2089. On December 6, 2001, the Attorney General’s Office responded to Mrs. Mims’ letter, informing her that they had no control over the Babcock Center, but they referred her letter on to DDSN. Mims 2116. Mims was assaulted by another client on December 16, 2001, just ten days after Mrs. Mims begged the AG to remove him, and he was treated at the emergency room again. Mims 2090. It is not explained how this injury happened with Mims having a one-on-one caregiver. During 2002, Mims continued to have unexplained injuries and on January 24, 2002, he was beaten at Clusters with a belt by another resident. Mims 3273, 1644, 1665. (Color photograph Mims 2056-2057). Mims was treated at the emergency room again, due to the “severity of bruises.” Id. In February, Mims was again treated at the emergency room for injuries. BC 3275, 3185 and 3275. Mims 2091.

Mims was moved to Kensington in March of 2002, where he continued to be assaulted by other residents and have unexplained injuries, but the written reports were not as frequent as at

Clusters. Mims 2093. Kensington was cited on February 23, 2003 for medication errors, excessive use of drugs as restraints and mistreatment due to unexplained injuries. Mims 00045. Three other Babcock Center ICF/MR facilities were cited with Immediate Jeopardy in 2003. Mims 0063, 0074 and 0087. Then, Mims' roommate died unexpectedly at Kensington on September 25, 2004. Mims 0198. After this death, Immediate Jeopardy to the health and safety of clients was declared at Kensington, in October 13, 2004. Mims 0199. The federal Medicaid agency, CMS, investigated and determined that his death was not thoroughly investigated, Kensington was not adequately staffed and that staff was not properly trained. Mims 0198. See also Mims 1982. On November 19, 2004, Kensington was again cited for failing to "ensure that the governing body exercised sufficient operating direction..." Mims 0206.

On January 18, 2005, Carolina Medical Review (CMR) released its review of Babcock Center ICF/MR facilities. Mims 0209. DHHS contracted with this independent organization to follow up on CMS surveys that had cited Babcock Center ICF/MR facilities for Immediate Jeopardy. Id. CMR conducted its survey in the last quarter of 2004. CMR reported to DHHS and DDSN that: "There is no comprehensive set of policies and procedures for the administration of programs and other aspects of business." DDSN reported to CMR that it has not "felt the need" for a comprehensive set of administrative policies and procedures. Mims 0120. CMR reported that Babcock Center employees who received excellent employee evaluations had "multiple disciplinary actions," including one with thirteen write ups who was later convicted of exploiting clients. Id. Potentially harmful chemicals were found to be unlocked and accessible to residents, buckets of standing water and bags were left unattended and facilities were found to be in disrepair. Mims 0212. Residents with widely disparate care needs were observed at Babcock

Center ICF/MR facilities, including Kensington. Mims 0213. Clients with “severe behavioral aggression” were housed with vulnerable clients. Id. CMR concluded that it could not “provide assurance to DHHS that Babcock Center, Inc. is meeting the minimal conditions of participation in the Medicaid program as required by federal regulations.” Mims 0214. Direct care and administrative staff were unable to demonstrate a clear understanding of their roles, responsibilities and accountability. CMR found a lack of the required “active treatment” required by federal regulations and the failure to document appropriate level of care assessments. Id.

Immediate Jeopardy was once again declared at Mims’ ICF/MR just five months later, in March of 2005. 0250. Surveyors found that the facility failed to ensure that the governing body exercised sufficient operating direction over the day program...” Mims 0251. Kensington was still in disrepair, according to the survey report. Id. On April 27, 2005, surveyors returned to Kensington for a follow up and DHEC found that problems had not been corrected “nor had sufficient progress been made in correcting these deficiencies.” Mims 0253. On April 29, 2005, defendant Judy Johnson was notified that Kensington’s certification was being terminated and that plans must be made immediately to transfer all residents to other facilities. Mims 0252. On May 3, 2005, defendant Johnson wrote to families informing them that DHEC recommended termination of Babcock Center’s funding for Kensington and that families should plan to relocate their family members who lived there. Mims 0254.

At that point, both Butkus and Johnson had an affirmative duty to protect Mims from further harm by taking action to remove him from danger and to cause him to be placed in a less restrictive setting. He knew in the fall of 2004 that Babcock Center’s “trend line still was not good for the agency as a whole on quality.” Mims 1421-1422. But, Butkus and his co-defendants

made no effort to move Mims to a safe place, despite his personal knowledge of Mims' sufferings at Kensington and the repeated findings of Immediate Jeopardy there.

Again on May 20, 2005 another Babcock Center ICF/MR was "again found to be out of substantial compliance with the requirements for participation in the Medicaid program." Mims 0256. Protection & Advocacy, Inc., the federally mandated advocacy organization in South Carolina, conducted an investigation between 2003 and 2005. Mims 0304. Fifty files were reviewed, representing a cross-section of situations involving abuse and neglect. As stated in the director's cover letter: "This report includes one homicide, two deaths from choking, physical injuries with excruciating pain, and other shocking examples of abuse and neglect." Mims 0284. Some of the injured people were like Mims - nonverbal - and they were "unable to tell their own stories." Id. P&A found that:

Some of South Carolina's most vulnerable citizens are needlessly suffering, even dying. They will continue to do so until South Carolina has the will, backed by the funds, to protect persons with disabilities by demanding an effective, independent investigation system to address these often criminal activities. Those least able to speak for themselves deserve no less. Mims 0285.

P&A described its investigation as "an in-depth review of the entities that respond, or fail to respond, to allegations of abuse, neglect and exploitation" in the DDSN system. Mims0288.

Their Report found in the DDSN system:

Physical Abuse. Sexual Abuse. Neglect. Misuse of medications. Few incidents are reported. Fewer are properly investigated. Rarely are offenders held accountable. Those who should protect people with disabilities often fail to do so. Mims. 0287. P&A discovered during this investigation that "DDSN exercises little control over the delivery of services by boards or contract providers" and that it has "created policies and

procedures that are inadequate in some places and not followed in others”¹⁷ Mims 0287 and 0288. P&A also reported that “Investigations conducted by contract agencies were seriously flawed.” Mims 0289. In one case reported by P&A, DDSN failed to investigate sexual abuse and failed to protect the victim. Mims 0289. Less than one month after the director of DHHS notified defendant Johnson and DDSN that Kensington was being decertified, on May 27, 2005, Mims was left unattended in his room and he was found sitting in a chair without pants on with a serious “unexplained” injury to his penis. Babcock Center assessments had repeatedly found that Mims should not be left unattended. Mims 2075, 2083-2097, 2112, 2117, 2104 and 2083.

The South Carolina Supreme Court has ruled that whether an injury is foreseeable in an action for negligent supervision is determined by looking to the natural and probable consequences of the complained of act, although it is not necessary to prove that a particular event or injury was foreseeable. *Madison* at 287. In *Madison*, the Supreme Court held “that, under the common law, a private person or business entity which accepts the responsibility of providing care, treatment, or services to a mentally retarded or disabled client has a duty to exercise reasonable care in supervising the client and providing appropriate care and treatment to the client.” Id. 281. Citing *Lee v. Dept. of Health and Rehabilitative Servs.*, 698 So.2d 1194, 1199 (Fla.1997) (mentally retarded woman who became pregnant while in custody of state agency stated cause of action for negligence against agency employees who allegedly failed to follow agency's rules and carry out their assigned duties in supervising patients); *Butler v.*

¹⁷ P&A noted in this report that DDSN Directive 534-02-DD, titled “Acts of Assault Between People Receiving Services” provides that “Failure to provide proper supervision to prevent people receiving services from assaulting each other could be a form of neglect if the employee fails to intervene or provide proper supervision when they have a duty to do so.” Mims 0349.

Circulus, Inc., 557 S.W.2d 469, 475 (Mo.App.1977) (mentally retarded minor plaintiff who was resident and student at defendant's licensed institution stated cause of action for negligence against defendant for failing to supervise employees who allegedly physically and mentally abused plaintiff as part of a behavior modification program); Restatement (Second) of Torts §§ 323-324; *Youngberg v. Romeo*, 457 U.S. 307, 319 (1982).

Mims has provided large amounts of evidence which show that his injuries were a “natural and probable consequence” of leaving him unattended in a decertified facility with aggressive persons and inadequately trained staff. The South Carolina Supreme Court held in *Madison* that “The defendant's negligence does not have to be the sole proximate cause of the plaintiff's injury; instead, the plaintiff must prove the defendant's negligence was at least one of the proximate causes of the injury.” *Madison* at 287, citing *Hughes v. Children's Clinic, P.A.*, 269 S.C. 389, 398, 237 S.E.2d 753, 757 (1977). Proximate cause can be determined “either by direct or circumstantial evidence.” *Madison*, supra. Given the lengthy history of abuse and neglect at the DDSN, Babcock Center, and at Babcock Center particularly, the jury would not have difficulty reaching the conclusion that the defendants proximately caused Mims’ injuries, because those injuries resulted from the natural and probable consequence of defendants’ failure to exercise reasonable care in supervising and providing care and treatment to Appellant.” *Madison*, Id. Federal and State surveyors repeatedly found that the Babcock Center failed to provide care and treatment meeting the clearly established standards required of ICF/MR facilities. Mims Reports at 0046, 0198, 0208, 0250, 0252, 0283, 0359, 0416, 0390. Butkus was well aware of the high rate of abuse, neglect and exploitation at the Babcock Center in 2004 and that these problems were so extensive that he ordered the provider to move half of its residential

clients. Mims 1421, 1422, 1873, 1876. Mims' injury occurred during a time when the Babcock Center was reducing staffing due to financial mismanagement and its high rate of abuse and neglect. *Babcock Center v. U.S., supra*. Johnson was under orders from Butkus to move more than 300 persons out of beds at the Babcock Center, due to the rate of substantiated cases of abuse, neglect and exploitation increasing from double the statewide average in 2003, to four times the statewide average in 2004. Butkus deposition at 85, Mims 1420.

Fixing Babcock Center's problems to protect hundreds of its residents from abuse would have taken a major effort. But, all Butkus had to do to prevent further harm to Mims - the only client he testified had been involuntarily committed - was to simply release him to the less restrictive setting of his mother's home. Four years had passed since the allegations had been made that he was not safe there. Mims had been spending weekends at home since his involuntary commitment in 2001, with no evidence of ever being injured at home. In fact, his mother insisted that Kensington staff conduct a body audit when he was returned. Mims 2077. The inspection of Mrs. Mims' home, conducted by the GAL in 2001, unlike the inspections of Babcock Center facilities, did not reveal the deficiencies DDSN had claimed to be present in order to involuntarily commit him.

The lower court erred in its finding that Mims failed to present evidence of negligence, negligent supervision and gross negligence and the Court should grant Mims' motion for summary judgment on this issue, remanding Mims case for a speedy trial by a jury to determine damages.

Issue 5. The lower court erred in dismissing Mims' claims for violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act based on a one year statute of limitations and because Mims met his *prima facie* burden and

the defendants failed to prove that providing the services he needs to live in the least restrictive setting would require a fundamental alteration in the State's system.

The United States Supreme Court ruled in *Olmstead v. L.C. ex rel. Zimring*, that “unjustified institutional isolation of persons with disabilities is a form of discrimination.” 527 U.S. 581 (1999). Indeed, the South Carolina Court of Appeals recently held that DDSN’s imposition of caps on home based services and the failure to provide home-based services to persons who are, like Mims, at risk of institutionalization without them, violates the ADA. *Stogsdill v. DHHS*, Case No. 2013-000762, Opinion No. 5271 (S.C.Ct.Ap. September 10, 2014). Thus, with or without the five year extension of the tolling statute, Mims’ claims for violation of the ADA were brought within the statute of limitations. The lower court erred in finding that Mims’ ADA claims were somehow mooted in 2006. But, Mims’ ADA claims are not moot, because those violations continue to this very day.

Mims clearly stated in his amended complaint that the ADA violations he complained of were subject to repetition, yet they have evaded review. AC at 88. He complained that (1) DDSN has operated its programs in such a way as to prevent Mims from remaining in his home by failing to provide payment to home-based caregivers commensurate with funding institutional services (AC 84); (2) DDSN’s official practices have caused Mims to be unnecessarily segregated and at risk of returning to an institution operated by DDSN, where he suffered serious injury and that defendants have operated their programs so as to keep their institutions full. (AC 85-86). Mims’ requests for prospective relief on his ADA claims have been ignored and his services were actually reduced during this litigation, in violation of the Act. His ADA and Rehabilitation Act claims are live.

Mims has demonstrated that he has met his *prima facie* test under the ADA of demonstrating that he is a disabled person, that the State has determined that his needs may be met in the community and he does not object to receiving services in the community. *Olmstead v. L.C.*, The burden then shifted to the State to prove that it would require a fundamental alteration in the state's system to provide the services Mims has requested, which defendants have failed to do. As the federal and state courts found in *Peter B. v. Sanford*, *supra* and *Richard Stogsdill v. DHHS*, *supra*, the State has failed to prove its fundamental alteration defense. It is not necessary for ADA litigants to wait until they are institutionalized to enforce their rights under the ADA. *Id.* Citing *Pashby v. Delia*, 709 F.3d 307 (4th Cir., 2013). While this lawsuit was pending DDSN drastically reduced services based solely on claims of budget reductions. *Peter B.*, *supra* and *Stogsdill*, *supra*. But, in *Stogsdill*, this Court ruled that the State failed to meet its burden of proving that providing the requested services would present "a fundamental alteration to its program." *Id.* citing *Olmstead*, 527 U.S. at 603-04: The *Stogsdill* joined the Third, Ninth, and Tenth Circuits in holding that "financial constraints alone cannot sustain a fundamental alteration defense." *Id.* Citing *Pashby*, 709 F.3d at 323-24 (internal quotation marks omitted). The Court of Appeals held that the State of South Carolina presented "no argument other than a general budgetary reduction and financial constraints" in its fundamental alteration defense and that DDSN must assess *Stogsdill* "without reference to the caps in the Waiver." Justice Kennedy ruled in his concurring opinion in *Olmstead* that it is of "central importance" that the States apply its ADA decision "with great deference to the medical decisions of the responsible, treating physicians..." *Id.* at 601. This is critically important, because DDSN and DHHS have refused to promulgate regulations for the operation of the Medicaid waiver programs.

The lower court also erred as a matter of law in ruling that the statute of limitations for a claim brought under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is one year in the state courts of South Carolina. This is an important and novel issue for this Court to decide, as no appellate court in South Carolina has addressed the issue of the applicable statute of limitations for non-employment related ADA cases that are not brought under Title I of the Act. As the Supreme Court recognized in *Sloan v. S.C. Bd. of Physical Therapy Exam'rs*: "The appellate court is free to decide the question based on its assessment of which interpretation and reasoning would best comport with the law and public policies of this state and the Court's sense of law, justice, and right." 636 S.E.2d 598, 605 (2006). The ADA provides that for non-employment related claims like that of Mims, that are brought under Titles II or III of the ADA, the applicable statute of limitations should be the state's personal injury statute of limitations.¹⁸ The two South Carolina federal district court decisions that have held that the statute of limitations for non-employment claims brought under the ADA is one year, without certifying the issue to the South Carolina Supreme Court, are certainly not controlling law in this case. *Cockrell v. Lexington Cnty. Sch. Dist. One* (D.S.C., 2011) and *Robert Mestrich v. Clemson University*, C/A No. 8:12-2766-TMC (D.S.C. 2013). Neither of these cases was appealed to the Fourth Circuit, and they are not binding on this Court's decision in Mims' case.

In any event, Mims has alleged that the ADA violations in this case result from unconstitutional and illegal acts which were in existence at the time the lawsuit was filed and

¹⁸ However, an argument could be made that, in some cases statute of limitations would be a four-year federal statute of limitations. § 28 U.S.C. § 1658 contains a catchall four-year statute of limitations for actions arising under federal statutes enacted after December 1, 1990. The ADA was signed in July 1990, but amendments to the ADA went into effect in January, 2009, arguably making the Act subject to this catchall provision.


have continued through to this very day. He met his *prima facie* test of demonstrating that he is a disabled person, the State has determined that his needs may be met in the community and he does not object to receiving services in the community. *Olmstead v. L.C., supra*. Mims prays for an order requiring DDSN to provide those services ordered by his physician as being necessary for him to avoid isolation and to live in the least restrictive setting. Mims respectfully requests that this Court will order DDSN to provide those services with reasonable promptness, defined by federal courts as within 90 days, as required by 42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(8) of the Medicaid Act.¹⁹

VII.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Mims prays that this Court will reverse the decision of the lower court and grant Mims' motion for partial summary judgment, and remand his case to the circuit court for a speedy trial. He prays that the Court will assign this case to a judge who has no prior connection with the Babcock Center or DDSN, certainly one who has never worked for either defendant. Mims prays for an award of interim fees and costs and such other relief as this Court shall determine to be just and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,


Patricia Logan Harrison
611 Holly Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29205
803 256 2017
plh.cola@att.net
Attorney for Edward Mims

December 4, 2014

¹⁹ In *Doe v. Kidd I*, the Fourth Circuit ruled that "Federal regulations direct state agencies to determine an applicant's eligibility for Medicaid within ninety days of the date of application and to "[f]urnish Medicaid promptly to recipients without any delay caused by the agency's administrative procedures." 42 C.F.R. §§ 435.911, 435.930 (2002). 501 F.3d 354.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
Honorable G. Thomas Cooper, Jr.
Circuit Court Case No.: 2007-CP-40-03365
Appellant Case No. 2014-001373


Edward Mims, by and through his legal
guardian, Margaret Mims,
Appellant

vs.

Babcock Center, Inc., Judy Johnson, the
South Carolina Department of Disabilities
and Special Needs, Kathi Lacy and Stan
Butkus,
Respondent.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, John N. Harrison, certify that I have served Appellant's *Initial Brief* as well as *Motion to Exceed Page Limit and to File the Designation of Matter out of Time* by U.S. Mail on December 4, 2014, to the attorneys at the addresses shown below.


John N. Harrison
Law Office of Patricia L. Harrison
611 Holly Street
Columbia, Sc 29205

Christian Stegmaier, Esq.
Collins & Lacy, P.C.
PO Box 12487
Columbia, SC 29211

Kenneth P. Woodington, Esq.
Davidson & Lindemann, P.A.
PO Box 8568
Columbia, SC 29202-8568

RECEIVED

DEC 09 2014

SC Court of Appeals

PATRICIA L. HARRISON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
611 HOLLY STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29205

TELEPHONE (803) 256-2017

FAX (803) 256-2213

December 4, 2014

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk, South Carolina Court of Appeals
1015 Sumter Street
PO Box 11629
Columbia, South Carolina 29211 734-1890


Re: **Edward Mims v. Babcock Center, Inc.**
Appellate Case No. 2014-001373

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed is Appellant's *Initial Brief* in the above-referenced case along with a *Motion to Exceed Page Limit and to File the Designation of Matter out of Time*. Also enclosed is a check for \$25.00 for the *Motion* as well as a Certificate of Service. Please clock the copies and return in the envelope provided.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Cordially,



Patricia Logan Harrison

Enclosures

c: Christian Stegmaier, Esq.
Kenneth P. Woodington, Esq.

PLH:jnh

RECEIVED

DEC 09 2014

SC Court of Appeals