

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SUPREME COURT

Certiorari to Spartanburg County

J. Derham Cole, Circuit Court Judge

RECEIVED

JUN 22 2015

SC Court of Appeals

Opinion No. 2015-UP-178 (S.C. Ct. App. filed 4/8/2015)

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

ANTWON M. BAKER, JR.,

PETITIONER

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE COURT OF APPEALS

WANDA H. CARTER
Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense
Division of Appellate Defense
PO Box 11589
Columbia, S. C. 29211-1589
(803) 734-1343

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER.

INDEX

INDEX.....	1
CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL.....	2
QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4
ARGUMENT	5
CONCLUSION	12

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

Counsel for petitioner certifies that the petition for rehearing was filed on April 22, 2015, and denied by the Court of Appeals on May 21, 2015.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- 1) The Court of Appeals erred in relying on State v. Butler¹ to support the trial judge's denial of counsel's directed verdict motions after petitioner established proof of self-defense as a matter of law by citing to Butler's holding that a jury's rejection of a self-defense claim is controlling if a case has "inconsistent accounts of the incident" and/or the "evidence is susceptible of more than one reasonable inference," because this case was different in that all accounts and testimony showed evidence that petitioner was not the aggressor here and that his case of self-defense as a matter of law had been proved.

- 2) The Court of Appeals erred in holding that the trial judge properly dismissed petitioners pre-trial motion for immunity under the Castle Doctrine on the ground that the Waffle House did not meet the qualifications of the "possessory status of a home or place of business" per the rational in Gilchrist² because the comparison of a dance club in Gilchrist, where the Castle Doctrine was inapplicable, to a restaurant (the Waffle House), where the Castle Doctrine was applicable, cannot stand as a comparable legal comparison.

¹ State v. Butler, 407 S.C. 376, 755 S.E.2d 457 (2014).

² Gilchrist v. State, 364 S.C. 173, 612 S.E.2d 702 (2005).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner Antwon Michele Baker was found guilty of murder and unlawfully carrying of a pistol per jury trial held during the June 2013 term of the Spartanburg County General Sessions Court before Judge J. Derham Cole. Petitioner was sentenced to imprisonment for an aggregate period of eighteen years. Robert Eugene Ianuario and Matt Canady represented petitioner at trial, and Assistant Solicitors Derrick B. Bulsa and Lindsey Overby appeared on behalf of the State.

Petitioner appealed his convictions and sentences, and on April 8, 2015, the Court of Appeals issued an opinion affirming his convictions and sentences. See State v. Baker, Unpublished Opinion No. 2015-UP-178 (S.C. Ct. App. April 8, 2015). App. 1-3. A petition for rehearing was filed on April 22, 2015. App. 4-12. On May 21, 2015, the Court of Appeals issued an Order denying the petition for rehearing filed in the case. App. 13. This petition follows.

QUESTION I

The Court of Appeals erred in relying on State v. Butler³ to support the trial judge's denial of counsel's directed verdict motions after petitioner established proof of self-defense as a matter of law by citing to Butler's holding that a jury's rejection of a self-defense claim is controlling if a case has "inconsistent accounts of the incident" and/or the "evidence is susceptible of more than one reasonable inference" because this case was different in that all accounts and testimony showed evidence that petitioner was not the aggressor here and that his case of self-defense as a matter of law had been proved.

At trial, state's witness Justin Davis testified that around 2:00 am on June 3, 2012, Brandon Glover drove him (Davis) and Anthony Young to a Waffle House located in Spartanburg County, and that petitioner arrived there at the restaurant later while they were still there. Upon seeing petitioner, Anthony Young declared that petitioner previously pulled a gun on him. Davis testified that Brandon Glover went outside to talk with petitioner and told him (petitioner) that a fight would commence presumably out of loyalty to and revenge for Anthony Young. Petitioner responded by stating that Glover robbed one of his (petitioner's) friends and that Anthony Young attacked him (petitioner) previously with a gun. Then, as petitioner moved to re-enter the Waffle House, Brandon Glover hit petitioner about the head. Thereafter, petitioner pulled out his gun and started shooting. Everyone ran as shots were fired. Anthony Young was shot in the crossfire and died. R. 101, l. 101 – p. 107, l. 25.

State's witness Joshua Hance testified that he was working as a cook at the Waffle House on that same morning and witnessed the events in question. Hance stated that petitioner was ordering his food when another man approached and "had words" with him (petitioner). Hance added that

petitioner made an exit, but that when he (petitioner) re-entered, another man ran up and hit petitioner, and that petitioner responded by pulling out a gun and firing gunshots. R. 210, l. 15 – p. 217, l. 18.

Petitioner did not testify at trial, but note that Brandon Glover testified at trial on behalf of the defense. Defense witness Glover testified that he was there along with Anthony Young and Justin Davis when the shooting at the Waffle House occurred. When petitioner arrived and Young stated that petitioner pulled a gun on him previously then he (Glover) went outside and argued with petitioner. Glover stated that he threw the first punch at Glover at the Waffle house door and the shooting began afterwards. R. 388, l. 1 – p. 395, l. 11.

Shortly after the shooting, petitioner was apprehended by police at the apartment complex nearby where he resided and gave them statements about what happened at the Waffle House. In his first statement, petitioner explained that when he parked in the Waffle House parking lot on that night, he saw “ten to twelve boys” in the parking lot so he retrieved his gun. Then, petitioner stated that as he was ordering and paying for his food and exiting, one male said he had a problem with him and another male said if he (petitioner) didn’t fight they would rob him. Petitioner explained that he pleaded with them to let it go, but that when he turned to re-enter the Waffle House, “two of them hit [him] in the back of the head” and that he “pulled out [his] gun and fired three to eight shots.” Tr. 304, lines 1-25. Petitioner’s second statement was almost identical to his first statement except that he added that after he was approached by the male in the blue shirt who insisted that they fight.

Upon entering a Waffle House Restaurant, petitioner was attacked by Brandon Glover at the entrance door. Petitioner was alone, but Brandon Glover was at the Waffle House with his friends

³ State v. Butler, 407 S.C. 376, 755 S.E.2d 457 (2014)

Anthony Young and Justin Davis. Apparently, Glover took it upon himself to take revenge upon petitioner based on Young's story (a prior misdeed involving petitioner) and hit petitioner on his head as he entered the Waffle House. Petitioner responded in self-defense by firing a weapon. Young was killed when the gunshots were fired. At trial, the jury rejected petitioner's self-defense claim and the judge failed to grant petitioner's directed verdict motion requesting a ruling that the shooting was in self-defense as a matter of law. The Court of Appeals affirmed the trial judge's denial of petitioner's request for a ruling of not guilty as charged due to self-defense as a matter of law via the holding in State v. Butler, 407 S.C. 376, 755 S.E.2d 457 (2014), to the extent that a jury verdict is controlling when there are "inconsistent accounts of an incident" or where the "evidence is susceptible of more than one reasonable inference." However, in the case at bar, all accounts established that petitioner was not the aggressor, i.e., that he (petitioner) was hit first, and all of these accounts are not inconsistent, but rather uncontroverted and thus proved petitioner acted in self-defense as a matter of law based on the life or death situation that followed his assault. Therefore, Butler was inapplicable this case.

Compare the holdings in State v. Dickey, 394 S.C. 491, 716 S.E.2d 97 (2011), and State v. Hendrix, 270 S.C. 653, 244 S.E.2d 503 (1978), where the Court in both cases found self-defense existed as a matter of law, which in effect meant that the state's evidence was insufficient to disprove self-defense. In Dickey, the defendant, i.e. Dickey, who was a security guard in a housing complex, responded to a call regarding a male guest that was angry and drunk and made attempts to assault a resident of the complex. Dickey asked the angry and drunk man to exit the complex and when the man did so, he (Dickey) followed him outside in order to advise police of the man's whereabouts if needed because the police had already been called and notified of the pending event. When the angry man, who had a liquor bottle in his possession, started walking back toward

Dickey, threatening to fight, and asking why he was being followed, Dickey pulled out a gun and fired because the angry and drunk man continued to advance aggressively and reached under his shirt (presumably for a weapon). Thereafter, the man continued to march toward Dickey and did not stop moving forward until the second gunshot slowed him and after the third gunshot made him drop to his knees. The Dickey Court held that Dickey was entitled to a directed verdict of acquittal on the charges on the ground of self-defense as Dickey was not the aggressor as he walked outside to inform police of this man's location, and because Dickey believed he was in danger and had the right to act (shoot) on appearances⁴ due to this angry and drunk man's aggressive behavior, especially where it appeared as though the man was armed. There was no duty to retreat since there was no other means of avoiding the danger (could not turn back) without losing his life or sustaining injuries.

Moreover, in Hendrix, supra, defendant Hendrix, whose relationship with the aggressive intoxicated man who accosted him on the day in question was not good, was approached by this drunk on the day in question threatening to fight him, and thereafter drove to Hendrix's property, pulled out a gun, walked up, pointed the gun, and threatened to kill Hendrix. This occurred despite Hendrix's pleas for him to leave the property. Ultimately, Hendrix shot (four times) and killed the man. The Hendrix Court held that the intoxicated man was the aggressor and that Hendrix acted on appearances in believing he was in danger of losing his life or sustaining serious bodily injury and had no duty to retreat. Likewise, petitioner's case was one of self-defense as a matter of law.

⁴ A person has the right to act on appearances even if the person's belief is ultimately mistaken. State v. Fuller, 297 S.C. 440 443-44, 377 S.E. 2d 328, 331 (1989). "Once the right to fire in self-defense arises, a defendant is not required to wait until his adversary is on equal terms or until he has fired or aimed his weapon in order to act." Dickey v. State citing to State v. Starnes, 340 S.C. 312, 322, 531 S.E.2d 907, 913 (2000) (citing State v. Hendrix, 270 S.C. 653, 244 S.E.2d 503 (1978)).

QUESTION II

The Court of Appeals erred in holding that the trial judge properly dismissed petitioners pre-trial motion for immunity under the Castle Doctrine on the ground that the Waffle House did not meet the qualifications of the “possessory status of a home or place of business” per the rationale in Gilchrist⁵ because the comparison of a dance club in Gilchrist, where the Castle Doctrine was inapplicable, to a restaurant, (the Waffle House), where the Castle Doctrine was applicable, cannot stand as a comparable legal comparison.

Also, this Court’s use of the holding in Gilchrist v. State, 364 S.C. 173, 612 S.E.2d 702 (2005), to support its holding in petitioner’s appeal that the Waffle House did not meet the qualifications of the “possessory status of a home or place of business” that would invoke the protection of the castle doctrine was inapplicable because equating a dance club from the Gilchrist case, which was the place where Gilchrist argued he had a right to protection under the Act, to a restaurant (Waffle House) where petitioner argued he should have been protected under the Act, constituted an unequal legal comparison.

The Gilchrist Court overruled State v. Marlowe, 120 S.C. 205, 112 S.E.921 (1922), which found that a member of an Elk Club enjoyed immunity from retreating, and held contrary to Marlowe that with respect to the issue of immunity from the retreating, a club could not be elevated to the possessory status of a home or place of business. First, the holding in Gilchrist is not squarely on point with the immunity connected to the Castle Doctrine as Gilchrist addresses immunity from the duty to retreat. Next, a restaurant is characterized as a place where one has a right to be inside

⁵ Gilchrist v. State, 364 S.C. 173, 612 S.E.2d 702 (2005)

per the castle doctrine in the same vein as one's home vehicle or business. A restaurant is a place where meals are served to the public⁶. A dance club is the equivalent of a night club, which is a place that stays open late at night and provides food, drink, and entertainment.⁷ The differences in the nature of these two venues cannot be viewed as equivalent to each other. A restaurant involves the activity of feeding, which encompasses a basic human need. One's attendance at a club involves a voluntary decision of a human being to place himself in an environment that does not meet a human need, and where alcohol may be served, and where dancing is a part of the scenery, which in turn most likely would encompass the potential for immoral behavior. Clearly, the Castle Doctrine protection would not apply to a night/dance club, but this protection would certainly apply to a restaurant. The Gilchrist holding was inapplicable in this case.

S.C Code Ann § 16-11-440(c) allows for immunity where one is not engaged in an unlawful activity and is attacked in another place (other than his home, vehicle or bushes) where he had a right to be inside, i.e. in a restaurant such as the Waffle House. In the case at bar, petitioner established by a preponderance of the evidence that he was entitled to immunity under the Protection of Persons and Property Act. S.C. Code Ann §16 -11-450 provides immunity from prosecution if a person is found to be justified in using deadly force under the Act. Similarly, this case involves a right to immunity in a public place where petitioner had a right to be present, i.e., a restaurant known as the Waffle House. Specifically, under 16-11-440 (c) the Act provides that one is justified in using deadly force if:

A person who is not engaged in an unlawful activity and who is attacked in another place where he has a right to be, including, but

⁶The American Heritage Dictionary Second College Edition (1985) p. 1053.

⁷ The American Heritage Dictionary Second College Edition (1985) p. 841.

not limited to, his place of business, has no duty to retreat and has the right to stand his ground and meet force with force, including deadly force, if he reasonably believes it is necessary to prevent death or great bodily injury to himself or another person...

Moreover, unlike the case of Curry, 406 S.C. 364, 752 S.E.2d 263 (2013), where there was no valid self-defense claim; here, petitioner was not engaged in an unlawful activity and also, petitioner's self-defense claim was established as a matter of law. Petitioner was in a public restaurant, i.e., a public accommodation that was a place where he had a right to be and was attacked from behind by Glover. These are the uncontroverted facts. Glover himself admitted that he attacked petitioner from behind at the Waffle House entrance. Also, petitioner was confronted by a gang-like posse waiting to defend and attack; and clearly, petitioner was outmanned and outnumbered. Petitioner lawfully used deadly force to defend himself. Therefore, the trial judge erred in denying petitioner immunity under the Act.


During the pretrial hearing held in the matter, Detective Richie Foster testified that in the course of his investigation into the Waffle House shooting, he learned that words were exchanged between petitioner and a group of men, one of whom petitioner had difficulty with previously, and that after these words were exchanged between the members of the group (including their threat to rob him) and petitioner, one of the members of the group hit petitioner in the back of his head upon his entry into the restaurant. Then, petitioner responded by firing gunshots. R. 26, l. 1 – p. 29, l. 24. Detective Foster added that petitioner was neither trespassing nor banned from the Waffle House and was rightfully at the restaurant, and that petitioner pleaded with the gang to leave it alone. R. 30, lines 4-20. g that the Act was inapplicable to petitioner's case and in not reaching a ruling on the merits via S.C. Code Ann § 16-11-440 (c). Again, petitioner was protected from prosecution

because he defended himself in self-defense after being attacked in a place where he had a right to be at the time of the attack upon him.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing arguments, counsel for petitioner requests that this Court grant the petition and allow full briefing the issues.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Wanda H. Carter', written over a horizontal line.

Wanda H. Carter
Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER.

This 22nd day of June, 2015

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SUPREME COURT

Certiorari to Spartanburg County

J. Derham Cole, Circuit Court Judge

Opinion No. 2015-UP-178 (S.C. Ct. App. filed 4/8/2015)

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

ANTWON M. BAKER, JR.,

PETITIONER

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I certify that a true copy of the petition for writ of certiorari and a copy of the appendix, in this case has been served on Deborah R. J. Shupe, Esquire, at the Rembert Dennis Building, 1000 Assembly Street, Room 519, Columbia, SC 29201, and Mr. Antwon Baker #355673, at Perry Correctional Institution, 430 Oaklawn Road, Pelzer, SC 29669 and the S.C. Court of Appeals this 22nd day of June, 2015.



Wanda H. Carter
Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

SWORN TO BEFORE ME this 22nd day
of June, 2015.



(L.S.)
Notary Public for South Carolina
My Commission Expires: October 30, 2022.



SCCID

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON INDIGENT DEFENSE

Division of Appellate Defense
1330 Lady Street, Suite 401
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-3332
Post Office Box 11589
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1589
Telephone: (803) 734-1330
Facsimile: (803) 734-1397

Robert M. Dudek, Chief Appellate Defender
Wanda H. Carter, Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

June 22, 2015

RECEIVED

JUN 22 2015

SC Court of Appeals

Deborah R. J. Shupe, Esquire
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Re: The State v. Antwon M. Baker, Jr.

Dear Ms. Shupe:

Enclosed are two copies of the petition for writ of certiorari and the appendix in the above case that I filed with the S.C. Supreme Court today.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Wanda H. Carter
Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

WHC/smf

Enclosures

cc: Court of Appeals