

APPELLANT'S PETITION FOR REHEARING

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

JAN 03 2017

SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

CAROLYN C. MATTHEWS, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

LOWER COURT CASE NO. 2014-ALJ-04-0771-AR.

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2015-000183

GEORGE CLEVELAND ~~III~~ #35770, . . . APPELLANT,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, (S.C.D.C.), . . . RESPONDENT.

S.C.D.C.; OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

CHRISTINA CATOE BIGELOW, ESQUIRE

P.O. BOX 21787

COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221-1787

ATTORNEY FOR THE RESPONDENT

George Cleveland ~~III~~ #35770

TYGER RIVER CORRECTIONAL INST.

200 PRISON ROAD

ENOREE, S.C. 29335

PRO SE APPELLANT

1.
APPELLANT'S REHEARING PETITION:

MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT; George Cleveland,
III, proceeding pro se respectfully submits this
Rehearing petition under. Rule 221(A) S.C.A.C.R.
AND UNDER ARNOLD V. CAROLINA POWER + LIGHT CO.
168 S.C. 163, 167 S.E. 234 (1933) ON THE FOLLOWING
GROUNDS:

AN LEGAL PRINCIPLE OF LAW HAS BEEN
OVERLOOKED UNDER. AL-SHABAZZ V. STATE
338 S.C. 338 S.C. 354, 527 S.E. 2D. 742,
(2000); SULLIVAN V. S.C.D.C. 355 2D. 437, 586
S.E. 2D. 124 (2003); i.e. MIS-CALCULATION OF GOOD-
TIME CREDITS UNDER. S.C. CODE ANN. § 24-13-210(A)
IS AN STATE-CREATED LIBERTY INTEREST.

2.
ARGUMENT
SULLIVAN V. S.C. DEPT. OF CORR.
LEGAL-PRINCIPLE WAS OVERLOOKED

THIS COURT OVERLOOKED THE LEGAL PRINCIPLE IN SULLIVAN

* see R.p.p. 12. FRONT/BACK OF COURT ORDER.

V. S.C. Dep't of Corr., 355 S.C. 437, 443, 586 S.E. 2d. 124, 127 (2003) (HEARIN ~~WATER~~ SULLIVAN) by stating: "the only way the A.L.C. can obtain subject-matter-jurisdiction over an inmate's grievance is when it 'implicates a [state-created] liberty interest sufficient to trigger procedural due process guarantees.'" R.p. 1.

≠ explicitly argued SULLIVAN, AL-SHABAZZ v. STATE 338 S.C. 338 S.C. 354, 527 S.E. 2d. 742 (2005) AND STEZAK v. S.C. Dep't of Corr., 361 S.C. 327, 331, 605 S.E. 2d. 506, 508 (2004)² required the A.L.C. to determine if the S.C.D.C. mis-calculated my good behavior credits under S.C. Code Ann. § 24-13-216(A) because under the

² these cases' legal reasoning derived from the foundational case of: AL-SHABAZZ v. STATE. IBID. Hence, for clarity, I will argue SULLIVAN ~~and~~ respectively, collectively.

fourteenth Amendment Due process clause
liberty interest of the U.S. Const. R.p. 3-4.
Page of Appellant's Final Brief.

By the S.C.D.C.'s own Admission, the Argued:

"It cannot be true that the Department is failing to credit Appellant with the 20-days of Good-time per month to which he is entitled". R.p. 6. Page 8 of Respondent's Final Brief. Also:

"An inmate serving a 'probable' sentence will serve approximately 65% of the actual incarceration." R.p. 8. Page 6. IBID.

Furthermore, this court mis-understood the legal principle under Sullivan by concluding the ALC did not have "subject-matter-jurisdiction" over the mis-calculation of my sentence because I did not fail to earn good-time credit for the forfeiture of good-time credits,

OR the withholding of unearned good-time credits. Sullivan broadly requires me to argue an implication of a state created liberty interest, I submit my state created liberty interest was argued under S.C. Code Ann. § 24-13-210(A) which requires the S.C.D.C. to reduce my freedom in their custody for following the rules, this statute, is my state-created-liberty interest, and Sullivan required the A.L.C. to determine whether the S.C.D.C. is following the intent of the statute under the Fourteenth Amendment (due process clause; liberty interest) of the U.S. Const.

I argued this specific statute:

S.C. Code Ann. § 24-13-210) in Step-1 AND Step 2 Grievances. R.P.P. 810 ;
AND the A.L.C. understood;

"Appellant is not specifically arguing that his sentence is improperly calculated," R.p. 12, page -2 of ALC's order of dismissal; however, the A.L.C. Applied flawed ambiguity by also stating in the same order;

"Appellant Appeals the decision of S.C.D.C. in a dispute raised by Appellant regarding the calculation of his sentence related good time credits. . ." R.p. 11, page 1 IBID

3.

CONCLUSION:


Based on the foregoing facts, specific supporting documents, this court overlooked the legal principal of LAW under SULLIVAN which holds the ALC. HAS subject-matter-jurisdiction to determine if the S.C.D.C. HAS mis-calculated my good time credits under S.C. code ANN § 24-13-210 (A) because this

5.

STATE-STATUTE § 101 triggers my due process (Liberty interest) FEDERAL right under the U.S. CONST. Accordingly, this court overlooked this legal principle of LAW, id, under SULLIVAN.

3-1. WHEREFORE; GRANT MY PETITION FOR REHEARING AND determine whether the A.L.C. had subject-MATTER-jurisdiction under SULLIVAN to interpret the intent of good-behavior credits under S.C. code ANN. § 24-13-210(A), AND whether the S.C.D.C. correctly calculated my good-behavior-credits under § 24-13-210(A) IBID.

3-2. Any other relief this court deems just proper, AND/OR IMPARTIAL.

Respectfully submitted,

George Cleveland III #35770
TIGER RIVER CORRECTIONAL INST.
200 PRISON ROAD
ENOREE, S.C. 29335

DATED: DECEMBER 28, 2016
6.

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX IN SUPPORT
OF REHEARING PETITION

RECEIVED THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

JAN 03 2017

SC Court of Appeals

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

LOWER COURT CASE NO. 2014-ALJ-077-AP.

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2015-000183

GEORGE CLEVELAND, ~~##~~ #35770, . . . APPELLANT,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT

OF CORRECTIONS (S.C.D.C.), . . . RESPONDENT,

INDEX TO APPENDICES

PAGE NO(S)

THIS COURT'S ORDER AFFIRMING LOWER
JUDGMENT. . . . 1-2

APPELLANT'S FINAL BRIEF OF PAGE - 8 . . . 3

OF PAGE - 9 . . . 4

OF PAGE - 10 . . . 5

RESPONDENT'S FINAL BRIEF OF PAGE - 8 . . . 6


OF PAGE - 6 . . . 7

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2015-000183

INDEX TO APPENDICES

CONTINUED

	PAGE NO(S)
S.I.C.D.C. STEP-1 GRIEVANCE; FRONT/BACK	8-9
S.I.C.D.C. STEP-2 GRIEVANCE; FRONT	10
ALC'S ORDER OF DISMISSAL	11/12



THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

George Cleveland, III, #35770,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2015-000183

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court
Carolyn C. Matthews, Administrative Law Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2016-UP-506
Submitted November 1, 2016 – Filed December 7, 2016

AFFIRMED

George Cleveland, III, pro se.

Christina Catoe Bigelow, of the South Carolina
Department of Corrections, of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Sullivan v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 355 S.C. 437, 443, 586 S.E.2d 124, 127 (2003) (finding the only way the ALC can obtain subject matter jurisdiction over an inmate's grievance is when it "implicates a [state-created] liberty interest sufficient to trigger procedural due process guarantees"); *Howard v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 399 S.C. 618, 629, 733 S.E.2d 211, 217 (2012) ("[A]n inmate's loss of the

opportunity to earn sentence-related credits does not implicate a state-created liberty interest."); *id.* ("[T]here is a difference between an inmate's *forfeiture of accrued* sentence-related credits versus the *withholding of unearned, potentially available* sentence-related credits. Clearly, an inmate does not acquire an interest in sentence-related credits until he or she earns them."); *Slezak v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 361 S.C. 327, 331, 605 S.E.2d 506, 508 (2004) ("[T]he [ALC] is not required to hold a hearing in every matter. Summary dismissal may be appropriate where the inmate's grievance does not implicate a state-created liberty or property interest.").

AFFIRMED.¹

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.

¹ We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.

opportunity to earn sentence-related credits does not implicate a state-created liberty interest."); *id.* ("[T]here is a difference between an inmate's *forfeiture of accrued* sentence-related credits versus the *withholding of unearned, potentially available* sentence-related credits. Clearly, an inmate does not acquire an interest in sentence-related credits until he or she earns them."); *Slezak v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 361 S.C. 327, 331, 605 S.E.2d 506, 508 (2004) ("[T]he [ALC] is not required to hold a hearing in every matter. Summary dismissal may be appropriate where the inmate's grievance does not implicate a state-created liberty or property interest.").

AFFIRMED.¹

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.

¹ We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals**

George Cleveland, III, #35770,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2015-000183

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court
Carolyn C. Matthews, Administrative Law Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2016-UP-506
Submitted November 1, 2016 – Filed December 7, 2016

AFFIRMED

George Cleveland, III, pro se.

Christina Catoe Bigelow, of the South Carolina
Department of Corrections, of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Sullivan v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 355 S.C. 437, 443, 586 S.E.2d 124, 127 (2003) (finding the only way the ALC can obtain subject matter jurisdiction over an inmate's grievance is when it "implicates a [state-created] liberty interest sufficient to trigger procedural due process guarantees"); *Howard v. S.C. Dep't of Corr.*, 399 S.C. 618, 629, 733 S.E.2d 211, 217 (2012) ("[A]n inmate's loss of the

I submit, these issues ARE one of the same because if the method the S.C.D.C. is using is CONTRARY to the LAW, then my sentence calculations reflects A sentence method of JUNK-MATH,

As I stated above, the § 24-13-210 (A), id, requires the S.C.D.C. to credit me 20 DAYS A MONTH for good behavior. THAT'S NOT BEING DONE.

~~IN~~ SLEZAK v. S.C.D.C. 361 S.C. 327, 605 S.C. 20, 506 S.C. (2004) the Supreme Court of South CAROLINA clarified the JURISDICTION of the ALJ.D. to ALL FINAL DECISIONS of the S.C.D.C. IN A NON COLLATERAL OR ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER,

The SLEZAK COURT further REASONED

The A.L.J.D. has Appellate Jurisdiction over. Any matter where the procedural prerequisites for perfecting such an Appeal have been met.

The A.L.J.D. took what the SLEZAK COURT REASONED in the conclusion of the opinion of:

"We hold that the A.L.J.D. has jurisdiction over. All properly perfected inmate appeals," but clarified that it may summarily decide those appeals that do not implicate an inmate's state-created liberty or properly interest and dismissed my appeal based solely on this very confusing closing, but earlier in the opinion, the Supreme Court reasoned that the A.L.J.D. has subject matter jurisdiction.

APPELLANT'S FINAL BRIEF APPELLATE CASE NO. 2015-00083
PAGE 5
to hear. Any procedural prerequisite

for perfecting such a Appeal has been met
since AL-SHABAZZ V. STATE 338 S.C. 338 S.E.


354, 527, S.E. 2d 742 (2000), the ALJID, HAS
HAD DIFFICULTY WITH WHAT THE COURT CAN HEAR.

AND RULE ON. IN SULLIVAN V. S.C.D.C. 355 S.C.

437, 586 S.E. 2d 124 (2003), the Supreme
COURT AGAIN CLARIFIED THE JURISDICTION OF THE ALJID.


The ALJID. IS ONLY FOCUSING ON THE WORD
OF: "STATE LIBERTY INTEREST"; AND IF AN
INMATE'S ARGUMENT IS MISSING THESE THREE (3)
WORDS, THE S.C.D.C. IS FILING MOTIONS LEFT AND
RIGHT SUCCESSFULLY DISMISSING UNDER SLEZAK
BECAUSE OF THE DEPRIVATION OF THE 3-WORDS STATED,

simple mathematical calculations, it cannot be true that the Department is failing to credit Appellant with the 20 days of Good Time Credit per month to which he is entitled. Appellant may not completely understand that the initial projected release date he was given upon entry into the Department of June 14, 2017 *already factored in an estimated 20 days of Good Time Credit from the beginning of his sentence and assuming a disciplinary-free incarcerative period.* Instead, it appears Appellant thinks that the June 14, 2017 initial projected release date was calculated day-for-day and that he is entitled to 20-days a month Good Time Credit beyond that. Of course, that is not the case, nor could it be in light of the explanation given above.



Finally, as the last image below shows, Appellant was convicted of a major disciplinary offense on February 26, 2014, resulting *both* in his failure to earn 20 days of

Without a job, an inmate serving a "parolable" sentence will serve approximately 65% of the actual incarcerative sentence provided that the inmate also remains disciplinary free during the entire period of incarceration. Here, Appellant's longest parolable offense is for the Possession of a Stolen Vehicle conviction listed below, as Appellant was given a total of 6 years of incarcerative time to serve.



The following image proves that Appellant has, indeed, earned Good Time Credit since the beginning of his sentence start date, as it shows he has earned 300 days of such credit. In addition, he has earned 11 days of Earned Education Credit since his incarceration.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INMATE GRIEVANCE FORM

STEP 1

INMATE NAME: George Cleveland
SCDC NUMBER: 357770
INSTITUTION: EVANS CI **RECEIVED**
HOUSING UNIT: MA 131 **MAR 07 2014**
WORK ASSIGNMENT: _____ BY: CP

Office Use Only
Grievance No. ECI-0221-14
Code: General _____
Policy _____
Disc. Hear. _____
Class. _____
Date Received 3/10/14
IGC Initials ALJ
Agg 14

STATE GRIEVANCE (include documentation, and date of incident; if SCDC Policy, indicate which policy)

Mr. Bethea (Case Manager) is unwilling to research a state law that clearly states I can earn 20 days a month for good behavior. The attached request to staff spells out what my total sentence would be if I remain discipline free. I also ask him to talk with a staff lawyer which he did not. SC code Annot. §24-13-210 states my crime meets the criteria for the 20 days a month.

ACTION REQUESTED:
~~order~~ ^{Decrease} order my time to ~~20 days~~ according to the 20 DA. A month of good behavioral credit.

SPECIFY HOW AND WHEN INFORMAL RESOLUTION WAS ATTEMPTED BY GRIEVANT:

I sent Mr. Bethea a staff request form dated: 2-21-14 and it was returned to me on 3-3-14

[Signature] 3-6-14
Grievant Signature Date

ACTION TAKEN BY IGC:

Your grievance along with pertinent documentation has been reviewed, see warden's response

[Signature] 3/25/14
IGC Signature Date

- I accept the action taken by the IGC and consider the matter closed.
- I do not accept the action taken and wish to appeal.

Grievant Signature Date

WARDEN'S DECISION AND REASON:

Inmate Cleveland:

This is in response to grievance # ECI 0221-14

I have reviewed your grievance and pertinent documentation. All sentence-related credits to include (Good Time Credits, and Jail Time Credits) have been applied. Be mindful that your release date changes upon termination of institutional job assignments, disciplinary convictions where you automatically fail to earn the 20 days good time for the month, and losing earned work credits depending upon the seriousness of the convictions. A review of your record shows you have a sentence start date of 10/23/13 with 13 days of jail-time credit. Your disciplinary history beginning February 2014 until present you have lost approximately 60 days of good time and you have failed to earn 20 days. You are housed in general population, not earning work credits, nor assigned to any education programs. Based on the information provided your projective release date is July, 2017, therefore I consider this matter resolved.

If you wish to pursue this matter, please contact your grievance coordinator for the appropriate forms. You have five (5) days from receipt of my response to submit a Step -2 grievance form.

Warden Signature: [Signature] Date: 3-28-14

- I accept the Warden's decision and consider the matter closed.
- I do not accept the Warden's decision and wish to appeal.

Grievant Signature: [Signature] Date: 4/1/14

IGC Signature: [Signature] Date: 4/1/14

I'm signed as his signature

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING STEP 1 GRIEVANCE FORM

1. An informal resolution shall be attempted prior to the filing of Step 1.
2. Complete each section in its entirety, writing only in the space provided for inmate use.
3. Only one (1) issue is to be addressed on each form.
4. Submit the completed form to the Institutional Grievance Coordinator within fifteen (15) days of an alleged incident; policy grievances at any time. Do not write in the space provided for the Warden's response.
5. If you are not satisfied with the Warden's decision, you may appeal to the appropriate responsible official within five (5) days of your receipt of the Warden's decision, via the Institutional Grievance Coordinator.

DATE: 11/15/74
ASSIGNMENT: 3. All 111-4

11/15/74
11/15/74

REASON FOR APPEAL

[Faint, mostly illegible text, possibly containing a signature or handwritten notes]

[Faint, mostly illegible text]

[Faint, mostly illegible text]

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
 INMATE GRIEVANCE FORM
 STEP 2

Page 10
 JEP / J
 Due April 5
 Office Use Only

INMATE NAME: George Cleveland
 SCDC NUMBER: 357770
 INSTITUTION: EVANS CORRECTIONAL
 HOUSING UNIT: S.M.U. 131-A
 WORK ASSIGNMENT: _____ BY: JB

Grievance No. 01221-14
 Code: General _____
 Policy _____
 Disc. Hear. _____
 Class. 4/3/14
 Date Received 4/3/14
 IGC Initials AB

INMATE'S REASON FOR APPEAL (state specific dissatisfaction):

S.C. Code Annot. §24-13-210 clearly states I earn 20 days a month for good behavior which I calculated to be off my 6-year sentence to be: 2,190 days. I asked classification to forward my request to a staff lawyer. If my calculations are wrong, please provide supporting documents i.e.: staff law or policy. I simply want to make sure my time is correct pursuant to staff law or policy.

WNE 4-1-14
 Grievant Signature Date

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL'S DECISION AND REASON:

I have reviewed your complaint and found that the IGC and the Warden have addressed your concerns appropriately. Good time credits are factored into your projected max-out date. When you are convicted of a disciplinary infraction by the Disciplinary Hearing Officer, you will automatically, fail to earn the 20 days good time for the month the disciplinary occurred, and any additional good time credits depending upon the seriousness of the infraction and the circumstances surrounding the infraction. However, SCDC Policy OP-21.11, Loss of Statutory Good Time, inmates are awarded good time based on displaying a positive institutional adjustment. At this time, your projected max-out date is July 23, 2017. This date is subject to change and will increase to a future date if you are convicted of additional rules violations. Any additional classification issues and concerns should be addressed to Mr. Bethea Classification Case Manager at Evans CI.

Therefore, I consider this matter resolved.

You may appeal this decision under the Administrative Procedures Act. In order to appeal, you must fill out the attached Notice of Appeal Form and submit it as instructed on the form within 30 days of receipt.

W. Hester 8-22-14
 Signature Date

The decision rendered by the responsible official exhausts the appeal process of the Inmate Grievance Procedure. I hereby acknowledge receipt of the official's response and understand this is the Agency's final response to this matter.

9/3/14
 Grievant Signature Date

A. Grew 9/3/14
 IGC Signature Date

(SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

George Cleveland, III, #357770,

Appellant,

vs.

South Carolina Department of Corrections,

Respondent.

Docket No. 14-ALJ-04-0771-AP
Grievance No.: ECI 221-14

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

This matter is before the South Carolina Administrative Law Court ("ALC") pursuant to the Notice of Appeal filed September 16, 2014 by George Cleveland, III ("Appellant"), who is incarcerated with the South Carolina Department of Corrections ("SCDC").

Appellant appeals the decision of SCDC in a dispute raised by Appellant regarding the calculation of his sentence-related good time credits and appropriate max out date. Though the Appellant discusses calculation of sentence-related credits, Appellant is not appealing a decision that affected his credits; rather, he is addressing how SCDC is calculating such credits and raising issue with how SCDC staff is trained. SCDC's Step 2 Grievance decision indicates that he was not sanctioned with the loss of any good-time credits, nor does Appellant make a claim for the loss of any other state-created liberty interest. There is no state-created liberty interest in the loss of opportunity to earn additional good-time credits. Howard v. S.C. Dep't of Corr., 399 S.C. 618, 733 S.E.2d 211 (2012); see also S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-600 (D) (2012).

On its face, it appears that Appellant is arguing that his sentence has been calculated incorrectly and, in some way, he may be presenting such an argument. However, upon examining all of his materials presented, Appellant is actually presenting argument that the Department's method of calculation as a whole is incorrect¹, and that their staff is improperly trained² and ignorant of the law³. In his brief, Appellant appears to argue for different methods of calculation of good time credits, and avers that the Department should follow one of the schemes that he has developed⁴. Appellant further alleges that the days that he has lost due to disciplinary actions are not at issue here.⁵

¹ Appellant's Brief p. 18.
² Appellant's Brief p. 15, 17.
³ Appellant's Brief p. 10.
⁴ Appellant's Brief p. 11-13.
⁵ Appellant's Brief p. 16.

FILED


JAN 15 2015

The totality of these arguments present an issue upon which this Court cannot rule. It is not within this Court's jurisdiction to decide how sentences are calculated pursuant to statute and, because the Appellant is not specifically arguing that his sentence is improperly calculated, this issue does not fall under one of the exceptions regarding jurisdiction as found in the canon of cases regarding ALC jurisdiction over inmate cases, including Sullivan vs. S.C. Dep't of Corr., 355 S.C. 437, 586 S.E.2d 124 (2003).

Under Slezak v. S.C. Dep't of Corr., 361 S.C. 327, 605 S.E.2d 506 (2004), the ALC is to have jurisdiction of all properly perfected inmate appeals but "[s]ummary dismissal may be appropriate where the inmate's grievance does not implicate a state created liberty or property interest." Id. at 331, 605 S.E.2d at 508. Such is the case present. It is therefore,

ORDERED that this appeal is **DISMISSED, WITH PREJUDICE.**


AND IT IS SO ORDERED.


CAROLYN C. MATTHEWS
Administrative Law Judge

January 15, 2015
Columbia, South Carolina

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that the undersigned has this date served this order in the above entitled action upon all parties to this cause by depositing a copy hereof, postage paid, in the United States mail addressed to the party(ies) or their attorney(s).



This 15 day of January 15
BY 
Judicial Law Clerk

Cleveland ~~714~~ 35 770, US 5 B
RIVER CORRECTIONAL INST.
RISON ROAD
D.S. C-29335

RECEIVED
JAN 03 2017
SC Court of Appeals

The South CAROLINA Court of APPEALS
Jenny ABBOTT KITCHENESY CLERK OF COURT
PO Box 116279
Columbia, SC 29211

RECEIVED
DEC 28 2016
TRCJ MAIL ROOM



APPELLANT'S PROOF OF SERVICE

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

JAN 03 2017

SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

CAROLYN C. MATTHEWS; ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

LOWER COURT CASE NO. 2014-ALJ-0771-AP

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2015-000183


GEORGE CLEVELAND, III #357770, . . . APPELLANT,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS (S.C.D.C.), . . . RESPONDENT.

I, George Cleveland, III, certifies that on the date below, I inserted in the Tiger River Correctional's Black Mail box in front of the Cafeteria, properly addressed envelope, my petition for rehearing, and supporting appendix to the Respondent's Attorney of Record:

S.C.D.C.
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
CHRISTINA CATOE BIGELOW, ESQUIRE
P.O. Box 21787
COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221-1787
DATED: DECEMBER 28, 2016.

Respectfully Submitted

George Cleveland, III #357770
TYGER RIVER CORRECTIONAL INST
200 PRISON ROAD
ENOREE, S.C. 29335

DECEMBER 28, 2016.

The South Carolina Court of Appeals
JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS, CLERK OF COURT
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, S.C. 29211

RECEIVED

JAN 03 2017

SC Court of Appeals


Re: APPELLANT'S REHEARING PETITION; George Cleveland,
III v. S.C.A.C.'s Appellate Case No. 2015-000183

1. DEAR MS. KITCHINGS,

CAN you please. File the attached rehearing
petition, AND supporting appendix, AND place on
the docket for consideration by the court?

2. CAN you please also kindly stamp the extra
copies, AND MAIL-BACK to me in the S.A.S.E.

Respectfully Requested


George Cleveland III, #357770
TYGER RIVER CORRECTIONAL INST.
200 PRISON ROAD
ENOKEE, S.C. 29335

CC: FILE
CHRISTINA CATOE BIGELOW, ESQUIRE

LEGAL MAIL