

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

Administrative Law Judge S. Phillip Lenski

ALC Case No. 16-ALJ-04-0550-AP

Appellant Case No. 2017-000232

JIMMY D. MEGGS JR., # 277400,

APPELLANT,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

RESPONDENT.

FINAL ~~HEARING~~ BRIEF
OF APPELLANT

RECEIVED

NOV 02 2017

SC Court of Appeals

Jimmy D. Meggs Jr., 277400
TCI SA-227
1573 Clarence Coker Hwy.
Turbeville, SC 29162
(APPELLANT PRO-SE)

S.C. Dept. of Corrections
Christina C. Bigelow
Office of General Counsel
Post Office Box 21787
Columbia, SC 29221
(COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT)

TABLE OF CONTENTS AND CASES

(Refer to Initial Brief)

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

(Refer to Initial Brief)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

(Refer to Initial Brief)

The Department's sole argument is that the Power to grant or deny award House Arrest credit is vested Solely in the Sentencing Judge) is error, Any Judge can award credits and/or The Appellant contends that Title 24 Chapter 13 speaks specifically to "Corrections" as it is outlined in the South Carolina Code Ann. The Appellant would futher set out that § 24-13-40 says the "Computation" of Time Served. Who else but SCDC does this function. When a criminal Defendant is convicted before the Court, and that "Court" Imposes sentence, The Court Remands that Criminal Defendant to South Carolina Department of Corrections (Hereafter referred as "SCDC"), who calculates and computes their sentence. As you look futher in § 24-13-(100-230) which deals with Goodtime, Work, Educational Credits This Calcuation is not conducted by the Courts but by "SCDC".

As it relates to the "SCDC" May Argument to essentially say that the Granting of this time is discretionary is not compelling because the Appelant would point to the similiar language argued in both Fowler and Bolin where is says (May have the sentence suspended and probation granted and is eligible for parole, supervised Furlough, Community Supervision, Work Release, Work Credits, Eduational credits, Good time credits, In all both Fowler and Bolin hingedon the word May. However There, These Offenders did not have to go back and obtain a Court Order, They were awarded their credits by the South Carolina Department of Corrections.

Where "SCDC" already knows that Appellant here was on Monitored House Arrest from April 3 2000 until August 9 2001 (See R.O.A. pg. 2,3,22) and because as § 24-13-100-230) sets out a Month -by-Month award of both Goodtime, Work, and Educational Credits Finality has not attached. Finally, The "SCDC assertion that the only one Authorized to award this Monitored House Arrest credit is the "Sentencing Judge" is not

compelling, as Any judge can grant this credit as it the situation in Shannon Bogan or "Bogan" (See R.O.A. pg. 60-61) "Bogan" was charged/ Arrested on June 27 2011. On August 3 2011 "Bogan" was placed on GPS Monitored House Arrest until trial and released on a \$55,000 surity bond. During this time he served Approx. 483 days in home detention through GPS Monitoring. On February 3 2012 "Bogan" was indicted for this incident. On November 28 2012 "Bogan" entered a guilty plea to (Indictment 2012-GS-42-784) on June 7 2013, some 7 months after Bogan plead and was sentenced. S.C. Legislature amended S.C. Code Ann. § 24-13-40 to reflect (And May be given for any time spent under Monitored House Arrest.)

In 2016, While "Bogan" was on PCR, His Counsel (Leah Moody) obtained an Order granting him (Bogan) credit for this House Arrest he spent in 2011/2012, In all the Department Retroactive argument is Manifestly without merit and would be clearly fraud. It would futher create a Equal Protection, Ex-Post-Facto and Due process violation, Also, because the Court will not at a minimum appoint Counsel ald allow Appellant to be heard in Open Court on this issue it would create a Due Process Violation under the Law.

EQUAL PROTECTION VIOLATION

Appellant here should be treated the same as others for time he spent in a similiarly situated situation. To grant some this credit where § 24-13-40 as a whole reads "Mandatory language" even Interpreted by judges, Attorney General's that "Time served is Mandatory. However, the Appellant here would contend that Title 24 Chapter 13 in it's heading says "Corrections" and this Statute speaks directly to "Corrections" and not the Courts. Under this Argument the Appellant would contend:

1. That Time Served is Mandatory; and
2. Title 24 Chapter 13 is entitled "Corrections" and it would be encumbent upon the entity who "Computes" and "Calculates" an Offenders sentence as relayed in § 24-13-40.

EX-POST-FACTO VIOLATION

In This Argument the Appellant would contend that "SCDC" has essentially misconstrued the "retroactive argument and the Appellant would show case and point of how this argument is not compelling , One an Offenders Calculation/ Computation is not final as defined by South Carolina Code Ann. § 24-13-100-230), The Statute is crystal clear that the application of credit (i.e. Goodtime, Work, Educational Credits) is applied on a Month-by-Month basic.

Remembering that our Founders established "Ex-Post-Facto" to prevent the Government from applying an increased penalty or new penalty to something in the past, i.e. applying a rule/law retroactively to harm a citizen.

In essence the "State" is trying to use this "Ex-Post-Facto" sword by claiming that this Appellant would not be entitled to this new benefit.

Futher, Our Courts, Like in the Varner situation Illustrated by SCDC here, Varner by contrast was a criminal conviction from a Criminal Statute with a Criminal Sentence. The case here is totally dissimilar, § 24-13-40 is procedural/ Remedial in Nature as it does not set out a Crime and Punishment.

DUE PROCESS VIOLATION

Where there is a procedure/ process by which other Offenders have went back to Court and essentially received Retroactive credit and the State to not appoint counsel and allow a hearing before the Court on this matter it would result in a Due Process Violation under the Law, Where essentially, the Appellant here is not receiving a hearing due to his inability to retain counsel and have a hearing on this issue.


Futher, The State here has tried to put up a road Block and even argued after they knew or reasonable should have known other Offenders who could afford Counsel have went back and

received Retroactive Application by judges other than their sentencing judges. Then commit fraud by arguing both that I could not receive this credit because of essentially the same two reasons that those other Offenders overcame to receive their credit, where they (SCDC) was the Respondent in the Matter and should know. Where those others received their Monitored House Arrest for time spent before the enactment of that June 7 2013 Bill, And claiming that only the sentencing judge can award this credit (See. R.O.A. pg. 44 Statement of Issues on Appeal by Respondent) and then know or Reasonable should know that other Offenders have received their credit both Retroactively and by a Judge that was not thier Sentencing Judge like in the "Bogan" cae (R.O.A. pg. 60-61)

CONCLUSION

The Appellant Prays That this Court Reverse the Administative Law Courts Decision that The Appellant is entitled to credit for his Monitored House Arrest. Order SCDC to award Appellant credit for the time spent under Monitored House Arrest from April 3 2000 to August 9 2001 or 17 Months towards Appellant's Sentence, Or any other remedy that this Court deems just and Proper.

RESPECTFULLY, SUBMITTING,


Jimmy D. Meggs Jr.

This 18th Day of October 2017.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT
Administrative Law Judge S. Phillip Lenski
ALC Case No. 16-ALJ-04-0550-AP
Appellant Case No. 2017-000232

RECEIVED
NOV 02 2017
SC Court of Appeals

Jimmy D. Meggs Jr., # 277400,

APPELLANT,

v.


SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

RESPONDENT.

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

~~The Undersigned~~ ***** : ~~2017~~ ~~10~~ ~~30~~ ~~2017~~

The undersigned hereby certifies that the Final Brief of Appellant & Final Reply Brief complies with Rule 211 (b) SCACR, and also complies with the South Carolina Supreme Court's April 15 2014 order entitled "Revised Order Concerning Personal Identifying Information and other Sensitive Information in Appellant Court Filings".


Jimmy D. Meggs Jr., 277400
TCI SA-227
1578 Clarenc Coker Hwy.
Turbeville SC 29162

October 30 2017

(APPELLANT PRO-SE)