

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM LAURENS COUNTY  
Court of General Sessions

Eugene C. Griffith, Jr., Circuit Judge

Appellate Case No. 2015-002254  
General Sessions Case No. 2013-CR-30-0256 & 0257

RECEIVED

APR 04 2016

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Respondent,

v.

BRAD BERNARD DAWKINS

Appellant.

INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Miller W. Shealy, Jr. (S.C. Bar No.: 5045)  
*Of Counsel*  
Finkel Law Firm, LLC  
4000 Faber Place Drive, Suite 450  
North Charleston, South Carolina 29405  
(843) 577-5460  
[mshealy@finkellaw.com](mailto:mshealy@finkellaw.com)  
[www.MillerShealy.com](http://www.MillerShealy.com)  
*Attorney for Appellant*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... 1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... 2

STATEMENT OF ISSUE ON APPEAL..... 3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE ..... 4

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS.....5

ARGUMENTS .....

1. The trial judge erred in refusing to charge the lesser offense of ABHAN.....7

2. The trial judge erred in refusing to grant the Appellant’s motion for directed verdict because the state failed to established the county in which the offenses occurred.....9

3. The prosecutor’s comments during closing argument alleging that defense counsel did not have a duty to tell the truth violated due process and denied the Appellant a fair trial.....10

CONCLUSION.....11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

**CASES:**

*Brightman v. State*, 520 S.E.2d 614 (1999).....7

*State v. Crocker*, 621 S.E.2d 890 (S.C. Ct. App. 2005).....9

*State v. Elliott*, 552 S.E.2d 727 (S.C. 2001).....7

*State v. Evans*, 415 S.E.2d 816 (S.C. 1992).....9

*State v. Gentry*, 610 S.E.2d 494 (2005).....7, 9

*State v. Linder*, 278 S.E.2d 335 (1981).....10

*State v. McFadden*, 458 S.E.2d 61 (S.C. Ct. App 1995).....11

*State v. Northcutt*, 641 S.E.2d 873 (2007) ..... 10

*State v. Primus*, 564 S.E.2d 103 (S.C. 2002).....7

*State v. Todd*, 349 S.E.2d 339 (S.C. 1986).....7

*Vasquez v. State*, 698 S.E.2d 561(S.C. 2010)..... 10

*Cummings v. Tweed*, 10 S.E.2d 322 (S.C. 1940).....11

*State v. White*, 605 S.E.2d 540 (S.C. 2004).....7

*State v. Williams*, 468 S.E.2d 626 (S.C. 1996).....9

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

Did the trial court err in denying the Appellant's request to charge the lesser offense of ABHAN?

Did the trial court err in denying Appellant's motion for a directed verdict because the state failed to establish the county in which the offense occurred?

Did the prosecutor's comments during closing suggesting that the Appellant's trial counsel did not have duty to be truthful to the jury constitute a violation of due process and deny the Appellant a fair trial?

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On February 19, 2010, the Laurens County Grand Jury indicted Brad Bernard Dawkins for Criminal Sexual Conduct with a Minor and Lewd Act Upon a Child Under 16. (Indictments)

On October 13, 2016, Dawkins proceeded to trial before the Honorable Eugene C. Griffith, Jr. and a jury. (Tr. p. 1) Dawkins was represented by Michael D. Brown. The state was represented by Lance Sheek. (Id.)

On October 14, 2015, the jury returned with a verdict of guilty on both indictments. (Tr. pp. 272-3) The sentencing was held on October 16, 2013. The court imposed a sentence of 7 years for criminal sexual conduct and 10 years suspended on the service of 48 months probation for lewd act. The lewd act sentence was consecutive to the criminal sexual conduct sentence. (Tr. p. 287) The Notice of Appeal was timely filed.

This appeal follows.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS

This case involves an alleged sexual assault and lewd act upon a victim<sup>1</sup> who was age 13 at the time of the incident and who was 19 at the time of the trial. (Tr. p. 77) The victim was the daughter of Appellant's girlfriend (common law wife), Patricia Whitmire, with whom Appellant lived at the time of this incident. (Tr. pp. 65-7, 71, 77-9, 189-90) The Appellant and Patricia Whitmire had lived together for 10 years. (Tr. p. 190)

The victim testified that she lived with her mother, Patricia Whitmire, and the Appellant at the time of the incident. (Tr. pp. 78-9) She testified that on or about November 30, 2009, she was sexually assaulted by the Appellant. (Tr. pp. 83-8) The alleged incident took place late in the evening after the Appellant drove the victim some distance from her home and attempted to sexually assault her in a vehicle. (Id. and video tape of victim) The victim confirmed at trial that the Appellant was never "able to penetrate [her] vagina with anything." (Tr. p. 88) She testified further that on occasions the Appellant would give her sex toys and instruct her on how to use them. (Tr. pp. 80-1, 89)

Captain J. D. Morgan of the Camden Police Department assisted Laurens County with this investigation. (Tr. p. 155) He had occasion to take a statement from the Appellant concerning the lewd act allegation. Morgan alleged that Appellant related to him an occasion when Appellant walked in the bedroom and caught the victim masturbating with a vibrator that the Appellant supposedly provided to her. According to Morgan, Appellant said that the victim asked him if she was doing it properly and if Appellant would show her

---

<sup>1</sup> In an abundance of caution, the victim's name will not be used. Although she had attained her majority at the time of trial, she was a juvenile at the time of this offense. See this Court's "Revised Order Concerning Personal Identifying Information and Other Sensitive Information in Appellate Court Filings" (Appellate Case No.: 2013-002681) dated April 15, 2014.

how to do it. (Tr. p. 156-7) Morgan when on to say that about two weeks after the vibrator incident the Appellant told him he asked the victim if she had learned how to properly use the vibrator and she said she had. (Id.)

The Appellant completely denied that the incidents in question ever occurred. (Tr. pp. 192-6) He denied telling Captain Morgan that he encouraged the victim to use a vibrator. (Tr. pp. 192-4) Appellant testified that he was in charge of disciplining the victim. He spanked her. (Tr. pp. 199-201, 125-6) He also testified that he caught the victim masturbating with a vibrator, but that he reprimanded her about it. (Tr. pp. 200-1) According to Appellant, the victim told him she wanted to “be with a young man.” (Tr. p. 200) However, Appellant told her that “this is not the time to be with a young man.” (Tr. p. 201) Appellant testified that the victim became angry with him about reprimanding her concerning the use of the vibrator. (Tr. p. 201) Appellant also testified that the victim was angry with him because her father was going to get married and would not be reuniting with her mother. (Tr. pp. 197-8)

In addition, the victim seems to have made up a story about the Appellant’s brother, Stanley Dawkins, having touched her inappropriately. She told Appellant it had happened but this does not seem to have borne out. The victim seems to have abandoned this claim. (Tr. pp. 202-3, 91-95, 116-119, 181-4)

## ARGUMENT 1

### The trial judge erred in refusing to charge the lesser offense of ABHAN

It is incumbent on a trial court to charge a lesser included offense if there is any evidence whatsoever that supports it.

ABHAN is a lesser included offense of first degree CSC. *State v. Primus*, 349 S.C. 576, 581, 564 S.E.2d 103, 106 (2002). The law to be charged is determined by the evidence presented at trial. *State v. Todd*, 290 S.C. 212, 349 S.E.2d 339 (1986). A trial judge must charge a lesser included offense if there is **any evidence** from which the jury could infer the defendant committed the lesser rather than the greater offense. *Brightman v. State*, 336 S.C. 348, 350-351, 520 S.E.2d 614, 615 (1999).

*State v. White*, 605 S.E.2d 540, 542 (S.C. 2004) (emphasis added). Thus, the “any evidence” standard applies when reviewing evidence to determine if a lesser included offense should be charged. In addition, there is little doubt that ABHAN would be a lesser offense here under prior legal precedent. The appellate courts of this state have not followed a strict elements test to determine lesser offenses. Rather, considerations of legal policy and common law precedent prevail in determining whether a crime is a lesser offense. *State v. Elliott*, 552 S.E.2d 727 (S.C. 2001), *rev'd on other grounds*, *State v. Gentry*, 610 S.E.2d 494 (2005).

There was evidence from which the jury could have found ABHAN. The victim's credibility as to the incident was challenged in many ways. First, she claimed that she had been molested by Stanley Dawkins, and this does not appear to have occurred. (Tr. pp. 202-3, 91-95, 116-119, 181-4) Second, the Appellant routinely spanked her, and this made her angry with him. (Tr. pp. 199-201, 125-6) Third, the victim was angry with Appellant for reprimanding her regarding her masturbation and her disposition toward other boys. (Tr. pp.

200-1, 124-6) The jury could have inferred that there was inappropriate physical contact between the victim and the Appellant, but that it did not amount to criminal sexual conduct. Rather, it was ABHAN.

The trial court should have charged ABHAN as there was some evidence that would have supported a jury verdict of this crime. The jury should have been given the choice to infer that the crime was ABHAN, rather than criminal sexual conduct.

## ARGUMENT 2

The trial judge erred in refusing to grant the Appellant's motion for directed verdict because the state failed to established the county in which the offenses occurred.

This Court has long recognized the right of a defendant to be tried in the county alleged in the indictment. *State v. Evans*, 415 S.E2d 816, 818 (S.C. 1992) (A criminal defendant is entitled “to a directed verdict when the State fails to present evidence that the offense was committed in the county alleged in the indictment.”), *rev'd on other grounds*, *State v. Gentry*, *supra*. See also *State v. Williams*, 468 S.E.2d 626, 630 (S.C. 1996) and *State v. Crocker*, 621 S.E.2d 890, 895 (S.C. Ct. App. 2005).

At best, there was substantial confusion about whether the alleged act of criminal sexual conduct occurred in Greenville or Laurens County. (Tr. pp. 68-9, 80, 82-4, 105-6, 110, 120-2, 162-5) The record in the case reflects that no one, not even law enforcement made any effort to determine where the alleged act of criminal sexual conduct occurred. No one attempted to locate the scene of the sexual assault. They had six years to do so.

The impact of this on the Appellant was enormous, as indicated in the above Statement of Facts the victim's credibility was the paramount issue in the case from the Appellant's perspective. The bald assertions that the crime occurred in Laurens County are just that, mere assertions, guesses.

The trial court's failure to hold the state to its burden in this instance allowed the Appellant to be convicted when he should not have been.

### ARGUMENT 3

The prosecutor's comments during closing argument alleging that defense counsel did not have a duty to tell the truth violated due process and denied the Appellant a fair trial.

During closing argument, the prosecutor made the following statement:

I appreciate the fact that Mr. Brown comes in here and puts a vigorous defense up for his client, because that's the way our justice system works. **But the only one here that's part of this court system that doesn't have an oath binding him to seek justice is the defense attorney.** The Judge has that job. I have an ethical obligation as a prosecutor to seek justice. **Mr. Brown has an ethical obligation to seek beneficial for his client** and I respect that. I don't have a problem with it. **But don't think for a second his job is to simply shine a light on the truth for your benefit, because it's not. Otherwise, he wouldn't have asked questions about what does provide mean when his client says it didn't happen. He wouldn't wave every red flag over here to the left hoping you don't keep your sights on the one issue that matters.**

(Tr. p. 238) This is a violation of due process. The prosecutor basically told the jury that Appellant's defense counsel had no ethical obligation to be truthful. He even went as far as to suggest that defense counsel was deliberately unethical in his conduct of the case. It is hard to imagine a more prejudicial statement in closing.

In *Vasquez v. State*, 698 S.E.2d 561, 567 (S.C. 2010) this Court once again set forth the rule as to the propriety of closing argument:

While the solicitor should prosecute vigorously, his duty is not to convict a defendant but to see justice done. The solicitor's closing argument must, of course, be based on this principle. The argument therefore must be carefully tailored so as not to appeal to the personal bias of the juror nor be calculated to arouse his passion or prejudice. *State v. Northcutt*, 372 S.C. 207, 222, 641 S.E.2d 873, 881 (2007) (quoting *State v. Linder*, 276 S.C. 304, 312, 278 S.E.2d 335, 339 (1981)).

*Id.* See also *State v. McFadden*, 458 S.E.2d 61, 67 (S.C. Ct. App 1995) (“The supreme court has noted its disapproval of counsel intimating that opposing counsel is trying to conceal something from the jury by objecting to the introduction of evidence.” Citing *Cummings v. Tweed*, 10 S.E.2d 322 (S.C. 1940)).


This Court has admonished prosecutors to avoid comments such as these. This type of argument is and was extremely prejudicial.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above, the convictions and sentences should be reversed and the case remanded for a new trial.

Respectfully submitted,

FINKEL LAW FIRM LLC



---

Miller W. Shealy, Jr. (S.C. Bar No.: 5045)  
*Of Counsel*

Finkel Law Firm, LLC  
4000 Faber Place Drive, Suite 450  
North Charleston, South Carolina 29405  
(843) 577-5460

[mshealy@finkellaw.com](mailto:mshealy@finkellaw.com)

[www.MillerShealy.com](http://www.MillerShealy.com)

*Attorney for Appellant*

March 31, 2016

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from Laurens County

Eugene C. Griffith, Jr.  
\_\_\_\_\_

THE STATE,

V.

BRAD BERNARD DAWKINS,

APPELLANT

Appellate Case No. 2015-002254

General Sessions Case No. 2013-CR-30-0256 & 0257


\_\_\_\_\_  
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE  
\_\_\_\_\_

The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that a true copy of the Initial Brief of Appellant in the above referenced case has been served upon J. Benjamin Aplin, Interim Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General, at Rembert Dennis Building, 1000 Assembly Street, Suite 501, Columbia, SC 29201, this 31th day of March, 2016.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Miller W. Shealy, Jr.

*Attorney for Appellant*

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me  
this 31st day of March, 2016.

  
Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission Expires: January 26, 2020.

RECEIVED  
APR 04 2016  
RESPONDENT,  
SC Court of Appeals



MILLER W. SHEALY, JR.  
OF COUNSEL  
MSHEALY@FINKELLLAW.COM

REPLY TO:  
CHARLESTON LITIGATION

March 31, 2016

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchens  
Clerk, S.C. Court of Appeals  
Post Office Box 11629  
Columbia, S.C. 29211

RECEIVED

APR 04 2016

SC Court of Appeals

Re.: Brad Bernard Dawkins  
Appellate Court No.: 2015-002254

Dear Mr. Brown:

Please find enclosed a copy of the Initial Brief of Appellant and an affidavit of service.

By copy of this letter I am sending copies of same to the Attorney General's Office.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

Sincerely,

FINKEL LAW FIRM, LLC

Miller W. Shealy, Jr.

*Of Counsel*

Post Office Box 41489

Charleston, S.C. 29423

Phone: (843) 576-6320

E-mail: [mshealy@finkellaw.com](mailto:mshealy@finkellaw.com)

Webpage: [www.MillerShealy.com](http://www.MillerShealy.com)

CC:

J. Benjamin Aplin

Interim Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General

**COLUMBIA**


1201 Main Street, Suite 1800  
Post Office Box 1799 (29202)  
Columbia, SC 29201  
Tel: (803) 765-2935  
Fax: (803) 252-0786

**CHARLESTON**


*Litigation, Real Estate &  
REO*  
4000 Faber Place Drive, Suite 450  
Post Office Box 41489 (29423)  
North Charleston, SC 29405

**CHARLESTON**

*Foreclosure*  
4000 Faber Place Drive, Suite 450  
Post Office Box 71727 (29415)  
North Charleston, SC 29405  
Tel: (843) 577-5460



U.S. POSTAGE >> PITNEY BOWES



ZIP 29405 \$ 002.30<sup>0</sup>  
02 1W  
0001399679 MAR 31 2016

**FINKEL**  
LAW FIRM LLC

4000 Faber Place Drive  
Suite 450  
North Charleston, SC 29405

Miller W. Shealy, Jr., Esq.

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchens  
Clerk, S.C. Court of Appeals  
Post Office Box 11629  
Columbia, S.C. 29211

**RECEIVED**

APR 04 2016

SC Court of Appeals