

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

CLERK

\_\_\_\_\_  
Certiorari to Dorchester County

\_\_\_\_\_  
Honorable Maite Murphy, Circuit Court Judge

RECEIVED

APR 24 2017

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Opinion No. 2017-UP-071 (S.C. Ct. App. Filed 2/8/17)

\_\_\_\_\_  
2014-GS-18-0851

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

RALPH MARTIN,

PETITIONER

APPELLATE CASE NO 2015-000311

\_\_\_\_\_  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE COURT OF APPEALS

\_\_\_\_\_  
KATHRINE H. HUDGINS  
Appellate Defender

South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense  
Division of Appellate Defense  
PO Box 11589  
Columbia, SC 29211-1589  
(803) 734-1330

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

**INDEX**

INDEX.....i

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL ..... 1

QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....3

ARGUMENT .....5

CONCLUSION ..... 14

**CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL**

Counsel for petitioner certifies that the Petition for Rehearing was made and finally ruled on by the Court of Appeals on March 23, 2017.

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Did the Court of Appeals err in refusing to find that the trial judge erred in admitting in evidence a recording of statements made by Petitioner's wife when the State failed to lay the proper foundation for admission pursuant to Rule 613(b) SCRE?
  
2. Did the Court of Appeals err in refusing to find that the trial judge erred in admitting in evidence a written statement made by Petitioner's wife when the wife admitted to making the statement but at trial testified that she could not remember the contents of the statement?

### **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

In October of 2014, the Dorchester County Grand Jury indicted Petitioner Martin for criminal domestic violence of a high and aggravated nature, indictment #2014-GS-18-0851. On February 10, 2015, Martin proceeded to jury trial before the Honorable Maite Murphy. Pierce Wehman and John Loy represented Martin at trial. Glenn Justice and Kyle Ward prosecuted the case. The jury returned a verdict of guilty. Judge Murphy sentenced Martin to ten years suspended upon the service of nine years and eleven months with probation to follow for four years. A timely notice of intent to appeal was served on February 12, 2015, and the direct appeal perfected. On February 8, 2017, a three judge panel of the South Carolina Court of Appeals affirmed the conviction. A timely petition for rehearing was filed on February 22, 2017, and denied on March 23, 2017. This petition of writ of certiorari follows asking this Court to review the decision made by the Court of Appeals and reverse the conviction.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS

On July 1, 2014, at approximately 9:15 PM Richard Stevens called 911 to report a domestic disturbance at a neighbor's house. (R. p. 10, line 10 – p. 11, lines 1-6; p. 74, lines 3-24). Deputy Jarrod Powell with the Dorchester County Sheriff's Department responded to the 911 call. When he arrived he heard a woman screaming inside the residence. (R. p. 75, lines 8-17). Deputy Powell testified that when he announced his presence, the woman said, "Come in and help me." (R. p. 75, lines 20-23). Before Deputy Powell had a chance to enter the house, Becky Martin, Petitioner's wife, opened the door. (R. p. 77, lines 1-4). The Petitioner, Ralph Martin, was standing 20 feet behind her. (R. p. 77, lines 7-10). According to Deputy Powell, Becky Martin had a red mark on the side of her neck. (R. p. 77, lines 11-15). Deputy Powell placed Petitioner in handcuffs and put him in the back of the patrol car. (R. p. 77, line 24 – p. 78, lines 1-18). Deputy Powell wore a body microphone on the night in question and portions of the audio were admitted, over objection, in evidence at trial as State's Exhibit #4 and played for the jury.

Deputy Carlin Strickland, also with the Dorchester County Sheriff's Department, arrived at the residence and interviewed Becky Martin. (R. p. 53, lines 4-25). Ms. Martin provided a written statement that was admitted, over objection, in evidence at trial as State's Exhibit #5. (R. p. 63, lines 2-3). Becky Martin was called as a State's witness at trial. Ms. Martin admitted making the statement but testified that she did not remember the content. (R. p. 18, line 2 – p. 19, lines 1-13).

Petitioner, Ralph Martin, is a Vietnam Veteran who suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder. (R. p. 129, lines 2-18). At sentencing Becky Martin asked the judge to order treatment rather than prison time for her husband. (R. p. 132, lines 14-21). Instead, the judge sentenced Petitioner to ten years suspended upon the service of nine years and eleven months with probation to follow for four years.

## ARGUMENTS

### **1. The Court of Appeals erred in refusing to find that the trial judge erred in admitting in evidence a recording of statements made by Petitioner's wife when the State failed to lay the proper foundation for admission pursuant to Rule 613(b) SCRE.**

Deputy Powell was the first officer to arrive at the house. He wore a body microphone on the night in question and at trial the State moved to admit portions of the audio in evidence. (R. p. 44, line 23 – p. 45, 46, line 1-25). The audio includes statements made by Petitioner's wife, Becky Martin, who had already testified at trial. Petitioner objected to the admission of the audio. (R. p. 47, lines 4-23). Petitioner also renewed his previous objection to the admission of a written statement by Ms. Martin and that argument is addressed in issue number two below. Petitioner further argued, "And secondly, extrinsic evidence of a statement that she made is not admissible unless the witness is advised of the substance of the statement, the time and place it was allegedly made and the person to whom it was made. And that's State v. Galloway, which is still good law in South Carolina." (R. p. 47, lines 18-23). The judge, relying on State v. Blalock, 357 S.C. 74, 591 S.E.2d 632, (Ct. App. 2003), overruled the objection. The judge stated, "So based upon that, I think it's clearly – it goes to being offered that the witness told a different story at the time, not for the truth of the matter asserted, so I think the witness's statement does come in, as does the oral statements, because statements can be either oral or written so I think you're free to proceed on those grounds." (R. p. 49, line 25 – p. 50, lines 1-5). The audio was admitted in evidence, over objection, as State's Exhibit #4 and played for the jury. (R. p. 84, line 22 – p. 85, lines 1-16). The trial judge erred in admitting the audio of the body microphone.

Rule 613(b), SCRE, provides, "Extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement by a witness is not admissible unless the witness is advised of the substance of the statement, the time and place it was allegedly made, and the person to whom it was made, and is given the

opportunity to explain or deny the statement. If a witness does not admit that he has made the prior inconsistent statement, extrinsic evidence of such statement is admissible.” The audio from the body microphone worn by Deputy Powell is extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement made by Becky Martin. Pursuant to Rule 613(b), the audio was inadmissible unless the State established the proper foundation. The State failed to lay the proper foundation. The State failed to advise Ms. Martin of the substance of the oral statements heard on the audio, the time and place the statements were allegedly made and the person to whom the statement was made. Additionally, the State did not allow Ms. Martin the opportunity to explain or deny the statements heard on the audio. The State’s argument in regard to showing Ms. Martin the written statement provided to Deputy Strickland and addressed in issue two below does not carry over to the oral statements heard on the audio from the body microphone worn by Deputy Powell. The trial judge erred in admitting the audio without the proper foundation.

Becky Martin was called as a witness by the State. When asked what she told the police when they arrived, Ms. Martin testified, “I don’t remember. I don’t remember anything from that night.” (R. p. 17, lines 22-24). Ms. Martin testified that she remembered Deputy Powell being at the house on the night in question. (R. p. 19, lines 14-23). The prosecutor, however, never asked Ms. Martin about the statements allegedly made to Deputy Powell and heard on the audio.

The trial judge’s reliance on Blalock is misplaced because the issue in Blalock involved whether the witness unequivocally admitted making the prior inconsistent statement. In Blalock the South Carolina Court of Appeals wrote:

In determining whether a witness has admitted making a prior inconsistent statement and thereby obviated the need for extrinsic proof, the courts of our state and other jurisdictions have held that the witness must admit making the prior statement unequivocally and without qualification. See State v. Bottoms, 260 S.C.

187, 194, 195 S.E.2d 116, 118 (1973) (when a witness admits unequivocally that a prior inconsistent statement has been made by him, he has thereby impeached himself and further evidence is unnecessary and inadmissible); 98 C.J.S. Witnesses 727 (2002) (stating admission must be unequivocal).

Blalock, 357 S.C. at 80, 591 S.E.2d at 635. The question in regard to the statements heard on the audio in the present case did not involve whether Ms. Martin unequivocally admitted making the prior statements. Ms. Martin neither admitted nor denied making the statements heard on the audio as she was not asked about these statements. The State failed to lay the proper foundation for admission.

In State v. McLeod, 362 S.C. 73, 606 S.E.2d 215 (Ct. App. 2004), the defense sought to impeach an investigator with a prior inconsistent statement. The investigator in McLeod was specifically asked if he had entered into an agreement with another individual in exchange for information. The investigator denied making any statement that he entered into an agreement.

The South Carolina Court of Appeals wrote:

The South Carolina rule differs from the federal rule in that a proper foundation must be laid before admitting a prior inconsistent statement. It is mandatory that a witness be permitted to admit, deny, or explain a prior inconsistent statement. Under Rule 613(b), extrinsic evidence of the statement is not admissible unless the witness is advised of the substance of the statement, the time and place it was allegedly made, and the person to whom it was made. Rule 613(b) explicates the procedure for impeachment by a prior inconsistent statement and requires laying the foundation. See State v. Sierra, 337 S.C. 368, 523 S.E.2d 187 (Ct.App.1999).

Id., 362 S.C. at 81, 606 S.E.2d at 219.

In contrast to the witness in McLeod, the witness in the present case, Ms. Martin, was not asked about her prior statements heard on the audio and was not given an opportunity to admit or deny those statements. The State failed to lay the proper foundation pursuant to Rule 613(b) for admission of the statements.

Although the witness in McLeod was asked about the prior statement and specifically denied making the statement, the Court of Appeals found that the trial judge properly excluded testimony in regard to the prior inconsistent statement due to the failure to provide a sufficient foundation. The deficiency in the McLeod case involved proof of the prior statement rather than the failure to question the witness about the prior statement. In the present case the trial judge should have excluded the audio due to the State's failure to provide a sufficient foundation by failing to ask Ms. Martin about the statements and failing to allow her the opportunity to admit or deny those statements. The trial judge in the present case abused her discretion in allowing the audio when the State failed to provide a sufficient foundation for admission.

In affirming the conviction the Court of Appeals wrote:

Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: State v. Carmack, 388 S.C. 190, 201, 694 S.E.2d 224, 229 (Ct. App. 2010) ("A decision to admit extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement will not be reversed absent a manifest abuse of discretion that prejudiced the Petitioner."); Rule 613(b), SCRE ("Extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement by a witness is not admissible unless the witness is advised of the substance of the statement, the time and place it was allegedly made, and the person to whom it was made, and is given the opportunity to explain or deny the statement. If a witness does not admit that he has made the prior inconsistent statement, extrinsic evidence of such statement is admissible."); State v. Blalock, 357 S.C. 74, 80, 591 S.E.2d 632, 636 (Ct. App. 2003) ("Generally, where the witness has responded with anything less than an unequivocal admission, trial courts have been granted wide latitude to allow extrinsic evidence proving the statement."); *id.* ("[A] witness's failure to fully recall her prior statement has been found to be a sufficient denial to allow extrinsic evidence.").

The Court of Appeals' reliance on Carmack and Blalock is misplaced. The issue in both Carmack and Blalock involved whether the witness unequivocally admitted making the prior inconsistent statement. The issue in the present case involves the State's failure to question Ms.

Martin about the statements and the State's failure to give her the opportunity to admit or deny those statements.

**2. The Court of Appeals erred in refusing to find that the trial judge erred in admitting in evidence a written statement made by Petitioner's wife when the wife admitted to making the statement but at trial testified that she could not remember the contents of the statement.**

In addition to the recorded statements discussed above in issue one, the State also moved to admit a written statement Becky Martin provided to Deputy Strickland on the night in question. (R. p. 43, lines 8 – p. 44, lines 1-15). The State relied on Rule 613(b) SCRE and State v. Moses, 390 S.C. 502, 702 S.E.2d 395 (Ct. App. 2010). Petitioner objected and argued that Ms. Martin was not given the opportunity to admit or deny the content of the written statement. (R. p. 42, line 8 – p. 43, lines 1-6). The State responded stating, “She [Ms. Martin] looked at the entire statement, both pages; the time and place it was allegedly made, we did cover that with her; and the person to whom it was made, we said Deputy Strickland, given the opportunity to explain or deny it. Her explanation was she didn't remember. She didn't say she didn't make the statement; she didn't say she did. She said, “I don't remember. It's my handwriting, but I don't remember.” (R. p. 43, lines 14-22). The judge overruled the objection stating, “Pursuant to Rule 613, a witness's own out-of-court statement is hearsay if offered for its truth. However, when a witness's prior inconsistent statement is offered for impeachment, however, it's being offered merely to show the witness told a different story at a different time, so it's admissible.” (R. p. 44, lines 16-21).

The trial judge heard further argument in regard to Ms. Martin's written statement and then stated, “The Court's recollection of her testimony was that she was given the statement. She indicated that it was her handwriting on the date in question, which was July 1<sup>st</sup>. She also stated that it was her signature. Her testimony, however, was not unequivocal admission that she

made the statement, said it was her writing, but she doesn't remember making the contents of the statement." (R. p. 49, lines 2-8). The judge, again relying on State v. Blalock, 357 S.C. 74, 591 S.E.2d 632, (Ct. App. 2003), ruled that the written statement was admissible. (R. p. 49, line 9 – p. 50, lines 1-5).

When the State moved to admit the written statement as State's Exhibit #5 (R. p. 63, lines 2-3), Petitioner objected stating, "Your Honor, we would object. I would renew my previous motion. Also, we would argue that foundation hasn't been laid at this point. It's not consistent or inconsistent." (R. p. 63, lines 5-8). The judge overruled the objection, admitted the written statement and the statement was published for the jury. (R. p. 63, lines 9-14). The trial judge erred.

During trial Becky Martin testified as follows:

Q. And what did you tell police when they arrived?

A. I don't remember. I don't remember anything from that night.

Q. Okay. Do you remember giving a written statement to police that evening?

A. No. I mean, I remember writing, but I don't remember what I wrote or why.

Q. So you don't recall giving a written statement to Deputy Strickland that evening?

A. No, sir.

Q. I'm showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 5. Do you recognize it? Please take a moment to look at it. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes, that's my handwriting.

Q. Okay.

A. But I don't remember what these questions were that I answered. I don't remember that.

Q. So you remember making a statement, but you don't remember - -

A. Yes.

Q. - - the content of the statement?

A. No.

Q. Would that be a fair - -

A. Yes.

Q. - - statement to say?

A. Yes.

(R. p. 17, lines 22 - p. 18, lines 1-22). Contrary to the State's argument, Ms. Martin remembered making the statement but simply did not remember the content of the statement. Ms. Martin confirmed that the statement was dated July 1<sup>st</sup>, was in her handwriting and her signature appeared on the bottom. (R. p. 18, lines 23 - p. 19, lines 1-8). When asked if reading the statement would refresh her memory about what she told the police on the night in question, Ms. Martin responded, "No." (R. p. 19, lines 9-13). The State failed to ask any further questions of Ms. Martin in regard to the written statement. Critically, the State never asked her if she made the statement.

The present case is distinguished from Blalock, the case relied upon by the trial judge. In Blalock a State's witness, upon being asked about a prior statement, was declared hostile pursuant to Rule 607, SCRE and then the State attempted to impeach the witness with her prior statement. The State then sought to introduce extrinsic evidence of the prior inconsistent statement pursuant to Rule 613(b) SCRE. As discussed above, the issue in Blalock involved whether the witness unequivocally admitted making the prior inconsistent statement. This Court in Blalock wrote:

In this case, we find Ms. Blalock's response, when confronted with her prior statement, does not meet the standard of a clear and unequivocal admission that the precedent case law demands. We are mindful that, towards the end of the solicitor's examination of Ms. Blalock regarding the statement, she does admit that she said the portion of the statement quoted. She is adamant throughout her testimony, however, that the statement as recorded by the detective was incomplete. As demonstrated in the excerpted testimony above, Ms. Blalock repeatedly insists that she did not merely say she saw her husband's hand on Janes' backside, but that she saw his hand on the back side of her leg. When the solicitor presses her on when and to whom she said back side of her leg, Ms. Blalock testifies that she feel[s] like that is what she told Detective Lindsey at the time he took her statement. Ultimately, she equivocates as to whether the statement was in fact her own words, testifying that she may have been unclear or that Detective Lindsey had paraphrased what she said.

State v. Blalock, 357 S.C. 74, 80-81, 591 S.E.2d 632, 636 (Ct. App. 2003).

In the present case the State failed to declare Ms. Martin hostile pursuant to Rule 607, SCRE and failed to attempt to impeach Ms. Martin with her prior statement. Pursuant to Rule 613(b), if the State had asked Ms. Martin if she made the written statement and Ms. Martin stated that she did not remember **making** the statement, then the State could have properly moved to admit the prior written statement as extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement. The State, however, failed to ask the critical question in order to lay the proper foundation. Unlike the witness in Blalock, Ms. Martin was not confronted with her prior statement. Ms. Martin's statement that she did not remember the content of her statement, standing alone, is not sufficient to establish the foundation required to admit the prior written statement. The State should have confronted her with the content of her statement so that she could either admit or deny. Contrary to the State's argument, simply showing the statement to the witness does not constitute confronting the witness and advising the witness of the substance of the statement as required by Rule 613(b).

The present case is also distinguished from State v. Moses, 390 S.C. 502, 702 S.E.2d 395 (Ct. App. 2010). In Moses the witness did not remember making the prior inconsistent statement

and the State properly introduced extrinsic evidence of the prior inconsistent statement. In contrast, in the present case Ms. Martin did not testify that she did not remember making the statement.

In affirming the conviction the South Carolina Court of Appeals wrote:

Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: State v. Carmack, 388 S.C. 190, 201, 694 S.E.2d 224, 229 (Ct. App. 2010) ("A decision to admit extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement will not be reversed absent a manifest abuse of discretion that prejudiced the Petitioner."); Rule 613(b), SCRE ("Extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement by a witness is not admissible unless the witness is advised of the substance of the statement, the time and place it was allegedly made, and the person to whom it was made, and is given the opportunity to explain or deny the statement. If a witness does not admit that he has made the prior inconsistent statement, extrinsic evidence of such statement is admissible."); State v. Blalock, 357 S.C. 74, 80, 591 S.E.2d 632, 636 (Ct. App. 2003) ("Generally, where the witness has responded with anything less than an unequivocal admission, trial courts have been granted wide latitude to allow extrinsic evidence proving the statement."); *id.* ("[A] witness's failure to fully recall her prior statement has been found to be a sufficient denial to allow extrinsic evidence.").


As discussed above in regard to the recorded statements, the Court of Appeals' reliance on Carmack and Blalock is misplaced. The issue in both Carmack and Blalock involved whether the witness unequivocally admitted making the prior inconsistent statement. The issue in the present case involves the State's failure to question Ms. Martin about the statements and the State's failure to give her the opportunity to admit or deny those statements.

The State failed to lay the proper foundation for admission of both the recorded statement and the written statement pursuant to Rule 613(b) SCRE. The error in admitting the statements is not harmless. As the Court noted in Saltz, "Erroneously admitted corroboration testimony is not harmless merely because it is cumulative. On the contrary, 'it is precisely this cumulative effect which enhances the devastating impact of improper corroboration.'" Jolly v. State, 314 S.C. 17, 21, 443 S.E.2d 566, 569 (1994)." 346 S.C. at 124, 551 S.E.2d at 246.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the above arguments this Court should grant the petition for writ of certiorari to allow further briefing on the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Kathrine H. Hudgins  
Appellate Defender

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

This 24th day of April, 2017.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

---

Certiorari to Dorchester County  
Honorable Maite Murphy, Circuit Court Judge

---

Opinion No. 2017-UP-071 (S.C. Ct. App. filed 2/8/2017)  
2014-GS-18-0851

---

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

RALPH MARTIN,


PETITIONER

---


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

---

I certify that a copy of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari and a copy of the Appendix in this case has been served on Jennifer Ellis Roberts, Esquire, at the Rembert Dennis Building, 1000 Assembly Street, Room 519, Columbia, SC 29201; and Ralph Martin, #298165, at Manning Correctional Institution, 502 Beckman Drive, Columbia, SC 29203, this 24th day of April, 2017.

  
Kathrine H. Hudgins  
Appellate Defender  
ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE  
ME this 24th day of April, 2017.

 (L.S)  
Notary Public for South Carolina  
My Commission Expires: July 3, 2023