

ORIGINAL

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Horry County

Benjamin H. Culbertson, Circuit Court Judge

RECEIVED

FEB 29 2016

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

JUDSON STANLEY,

APPELLANT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2015-001628

FINAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

ROBERT M. PACHAK
Appellate Defender

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

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....2

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL.....3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE4

ARGUMENT.....5

CONCLUSION.....7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Green v. State, 338 S.C. 428, 527 S.E. 2d 98 (2000) 6

Mitchell v. State, 298 S.C. 186, 379 S.E. 2d 123 (1989) 6

State v. Gore, 283 S.C. 118, 322 S.E.2d 12 (1984)..... 6

State v. Lyle 125 S.C. 406, 118 S.E. 803 (1923) 5, 6

Statutes

S.C. Code § 38-55-170(1)..... 5

Rules

Rule 403, SCORE..... 6

Rule 609, SCORE..... 3, 6

STATEMENT OF ISSUE ON APPEAL

Whether the trial court erred in allowing the State to introduce two prior bad acts under Lyle because they were also convictions for submitting false claims in 2013 which served as improper impeachment under Rule 609, SCRE.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant was convicted of presenting a false claim for payment over \$10,000 after a jury trial held before the Honorable Benjamin H. Culbertson on July 13-16, 2015, in Horry County. Thomas Floyd, Esquire was trial counsel. Melissa Manning, Esquire and Deanene Thornwell, Esquire were the solicitors. Appellant was sentenced to ten (10) years imprisonment.

This appeal follows.

ARGUMENT

The trial court erred in allowing the State to introduce prior bad acts under Lyle because they were also convictions for submitting false claims in 2013 which served as improper impeachment.

Appellant was tried for submitting a false claim of \$18,500 on a 2007 Cadillac Escalade under S.C. Code § 38-55-170(1). At pretrial, the solicitor claimed that the appellant's prior convictions for similar offenses went toward motive, intent, and common scheme or plan. Rule 404(b), SCRE provides:

Evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts is not admissible to prove the character of a person in order to show action in conformity therewith. It may, however be admissible to show motive, identity, the existence of a common scheme or plan, the absence of mistake or accident or intent.

The solicitor said, "we believe that the similarities between those previous convictions and the case at hand are so strong that they fit within these exceptions..." She explained her theory of the case. Appellant met Tracey Holmes who owned the Cadillac Escalade and convinced her to do a deal on the vehicle. He would strip parts off of her vehicle and she would report a car problem and leave the car on the road. When the tow truck arrived she would be notified that her car had been stripped. Per appellant's instructions, she would request that the car be towed to a particular body shop where appellant would reattach the same parts which he had taken off of the vehicle. Appellant would also assist with the insurance claim and get some of the proceeds. The two 2013 convictions were for very similar insurance claims. (R. p.1, line 7 – p.3, line 1).

Defense counsel argued that prior convictions do not make them prior bad acts under State v. Lyle 125 S.C. 406, 118 S.E. 803 (1923).¹ The prior convictions were not related in any way to the charge for which the appellant was being tried. Also, since the prior convictions are so similar the prejudiced effect would outweigh any probative value under Rule 403, SCRE. (R. p.5, ll. 11 – 24).

The trial court took the matter under advisement until after jury selection, (R. p.6, ll. 12 – 16). After jury selection, the trial court decided it was going to allow the prior convictions because it showed a common scheme, motive, intent, and lack of mistake.¹ He then went on to do a prejudicial effect versus probative value analysis by asking the solicitor how much evidence they had against appellant. After determining they had sufficient evidence, he determined the probative value outweighed the prejudicial effect. (R. p.8, l. 16 – p. 11, l.10).

Both the solicitor and the trial court used the wrong analysis under Lyle. If the prior bad acts are strikingly similar the prejudicial effect is enhanced.² State v. Gore, 283 S.C. 118, 322 S.E.2d 12 (1984). The use of prior convictions is also limited under Rule 609 (a)(1), SCRE. Green v. State, 338 S.C. 428, 527 S.E. 2d 98 (2000). Although the prior convictions were not admitted for this purpose, they amounted to impeachment evidence, and they were admitted very early in the trial. (R. p.12, l. 20 – p.13, l. 19). Impeachment is not allowed until a defendant takes the stand. See, Mitchell v. State, 298 S.C. 186, 379 S.E. 2d 123 (1989).


¹ Whenever solicitors and trial judges include most of the Lyle exceptions that usually means they don't know which exception applies.

² The trial court gave a charge on a person having a past criminal record and that it could be used in determining the witness' believability. (R. p.261, ll. 17 – 23). While a state's witness did have a prior record so did appellant. The jury could therefore apply the charge to the appellant.

CONCLUSION

Appellant's conviction should be reversed due to the improper admission of the prior convictions.

Respectfully submitted,


Robert M. Pachak
Appellate Defender


ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

This 29th day of February, 2016.

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

The undersigned certifies that to the best of my ability this Final Brief of Appellant complies with Rule 211(b), SCACR, and the April 15, 2014 order from the South Carolina Supreme Court entitled "Revised Order Concerning Personal Identifying Information and Other Sensitive Information in Appellate Court Filings."

February 29, 2016



Robert M. Pachak
Appellate Defender

S.C. Commission on Indigent Defense
Division of Appellate Defense
1330 Lady Street, Suite 401
Post Office Box 11589
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1589

RECEIVED

FEB 29 2016

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

Appeal from Horry County

FEB 29 2016

Benjamin H. Culbertson, Circuit Court Judge

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.


JUDSON STANLEY,

APPELLANT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2015-001628

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that a true copy of the Final Brief of Appellant in the above referenced case has been served upon William F. Schumacher, IV, Esquire, at Rembert Dennis Building, 1000 Assembly Street, Room 519, Columbia, SC 29201, this 29th of February, 2016.



Robert M. Pachak
Appellate Defender

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me
this 29th of February, 2016.

(L.S.)

Notary Public for South Carolina
My Commission Expires: July 3, 2023.