

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT  
Carolyn C. Matthews, Admin. Law Judge

---

Case No.: 2014-002172  
Grievance No.: BRCI-0594-07

---

Joshua Cramer . . . . . Appellant,  
v.  
SEDC . . . . . Respondent.

---

APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF

---

Other Counsel of Record:  
Lake Summers  
339 Heyward St., Suite 200  
Columbia, SC 29201

Joshua Cramer  
#251406  
Lieber C/I, SA-17  
P.O. Box 205  
Ridgeville, SC 29472  
Appellant, Pro Se

**RECEIVED**

FEB 25 2015

**SC Court of Appeals**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARGUMENT	p. 1
CONCLUSION	p. 1-2

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Gains v. SeDC, No. 2014-UP-390, 2014 WL 584048</u>	p. 1
<u>Rishner v. S.C. Dept. of Health &amp; Envtl. Control, 393 S.C.</u> 198, 712 S.E.2d. 428 (2011)	p. 1
S.C. Code § 1-23-610	p. 1

## ARGUMENT

Respondent relied upon Goins v. SCDC, No. 2014-UP-390, 2014 WL 584048 citing Rishner v. S.C. Dept. of Health & Env'tl. Control, 393 S.E. 198, 712 S.E.2d 428 (2011) to support their assertion that Appellant failed to preserve issues one and two of his appeal when the ALC did not rule on the issues raised.

Appellant submits that Respondent's argument fails on three points:

- 1.) Goins is an unpublished opinion with no precedential value,
- 2.) Although Rishner was an ALC case, it was not predicated upon the SC Administrative Law Court Rules, § V Special Appeals, that pertains exclusively to appeals by inmates in the S.C. DOC, and
- 3.) Rule 65 of the above states Rules of Court does not allow an inmate to file a Rule 59(e) (SCRCP) motion to alter or amend the order; thus an inmate can not move the ALC to include findings [which are required by all S.C. court Rules, e.g. Rule 52, SCRCP] upon which an inmate may pursue in the Court of Appeals pursuant to S.C. code § 1-23-610.

## CONCLUSION

Appellant properly raised to the ALC the issues of the statutory violation SCDC committed as it relates to denying Appellant immediate access to his escrowed wages and paying

a fair interest rate on said monies. Subsequently, Appellant properly raised said issues to this Court. Therefore, pursuant to S.C. Administrative Law Court Rules, Rule 65 Respondent's argument concerning Appellant's issues not being preserved should be rejected. Appellant asks this Court to rule on all issues presented by Appellant and reverse and remand the ALC's decision.

Feb. 19, 2015  
Ridgeville, SC 29472

Respectfully submitted,

Joshua Cramer  
Joshua Cramer  
#251406  
Lieber C/I SA-17  
P.O. Box 205  
Ridgeville, SC 29472  
Appellant, Pro Se

**RECEIVED**

FEB 25 2015

**SC Court of Appeals**

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Court of Appeals  
Case No: 2014-002172  
Grievance No. BREJ-0594-07

Joshua Cramer . . . . . Appellant,  
v.  
SEDC . . . . . Respondent.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Joshua Cramer, certify that I have filed the within  
REPLY BRIEF dated Feb 19, 2015 on the below listed address by  
depositing a copy of the same in the SEDC interdepartmental mail  
and/or the US Mail first-class postage affixed thereto on the 19<sup>th</sup>  
day of February 2015.

Kenneth A. Richstad, Clerk  
SC Court of Appeals  
P.O. Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211

Lake Summers  
339 Heyward St., Suite 200  
Columbia, SC 29201

Feb. 19, 2015  
Ridgeville, SC

S/ Joshua Cramer  
Joshua Cramer  
#251406  
Lieber C/I, SA-17  
P.O. Box 205  
Ridgeville, SC 29472  
Appellant, Pro Se

**RECEIVED**

FEB 25 2015

**SC Court of Appeals**

Joshua Cramer  
#251406  
Lieber c/I, SA-17  
P.O. Box 205  
Ridewille, SC 29472

Feb. 19, 2015

Kenneth A. Richstad, Clerk  
SC Court of Appeals  
P.O. Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211

Re: case no: 2014-002172

Dear Mr. Richstad:

Enclosed for filing please find a copy of my REPLY BRIEF,  
dated Feb. 19, 2015. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joshua Cramer

**RECEIVED**

FEB 25 2015

**SC Court of Appeals**

Lieber C/I, SA-17  
P.O. Box 205  
Ridgeville, SC 29472

**RECEIVED**

FEB 20 2015

MAIL ROOM

LIEBER C.I.

Kenneth A. Richstad, Clerk  
SC Court of Appeals  
P.O. Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211

**RECEIVED**

FEB 26 2015

SC Court of Appeals