

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT
Shirley C. Robinson, Administrative Law Judge

Case No. 17-ALJ-22-0224-AP

Ross Buchanan

Appellant

v.

South Carolina Dept. of Employment and Workforce and
Upstate Machine and Manufacturing

Respondents

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

RECEIVED
DEC 13 2017
SC Court of Appeals

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	1
STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL.....	2
STATEMENT OF CASE.....	3
FACTS.....	4 - 6
ARGUMENTS.....	7 - 8
CONCLUSION.....	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Lark v. Bi-Lo, Inc. 276 S.C. 130, 135, 276 S.E.2d 304, 306 (1981)

S.C. Code Ann. 41-35-120(2)(a)

S.C. Code Ann. 41-10-30, 41-10-40, 41-10-50

Mathis v. Brown & Brown of South Carolina

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

**IS IT CAUSE FOR TERMINATION TO ASK FOR YOUR BACK WAGES?
OR IS THAT CONSIDERED "MISCONDUCT" BY THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA?**

**IS IT REASONABLE TO HEAR A WITNESS' TESTIMONY CONFIRMED AND DOUBT
HIS CREDIBILITY?**

**IS IT "ARBITRARY OR CAPRICIOUS OR CHARACTERIZED BY ABUSE OF
DISCRETION OR CLEARLY UNWARRANTED EXERCISE OF DISCRETION" TO HAVE
THE COUNSEL FOR THE SCDEW ARGUE THAT I "MARCHED INTO EMPLOYER'S
OFFICE AND DEMANDED THAT THEY TALK ABOUT MONEY", WHEN NO SUCH
TESTIMONY WAS EVER GIVEN?**

**AND IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, IS RECEIVING WAGES THAT ARE OWED
TO YOU CONSIDERED A PAY INCREASE?**

STATEMENT OF CASE

Appellant Ross Buchanan filed an initial claim for unemployment with SCDEW on 2/10/2017.

Both employer and he furnished fact finding statements to SCDEW. The claim adjudicator determined appellant was fired for misconduct and disqualified from benefits. He timely appealed to the Appeal Tribunal.

On 3/22/2017 the tribunal conducted a hearing and affirmed the initial determination.

Appellant appealed to the Appellate Panel on 3/28/2017.

On 5/12 2017 the Panel affirmed the Tribunal's decision.

Appellant sought judicial review from South Carolina Administrative Law Court on 6/12/2017.

That decision affirmed previous ones and was sent to Appellant on 10/12/2017.

He now seeks justice from the Appeals Court of South Carolina.

FACTS

Appellant worked for employer from June 2015 until February 2017. He was recruited by employer to leave his job at another company in Greenville SC, where he ran the 2nd shift production facility and take the position of production manager for Upstate Machine in Campobello SC.

The agreed upon salary was \$1,000 a week. I received exactly that amount until about a month later when the owner, Stan Cannon said we had actually agreed on \$50,000 a year, reducing my pay to approximately \$961 a week.

Then about a month later on September 8, 2015 the Tuesday after Labor Day I arrived at 8 am. to find my supposed replacement, Craig Travis was hired. When Stan finally got around to talking to the appellant about the situation at noon, excuses were offered and that his pay was reduced to \$20 an hour. He had been making \$21.50 an hour at his previous job.

Several times over the next year the appellant not only continued to run the shop under Stan's direction, but twice moved to 2nd shift to run a crew to increase production.

This is a direct contradiction to the employer's statement that the appellant lacked "people skills and couldn't get along with the employees" on page 72 of transcript. Contrary to the false statement presented as "fact" by Counsel for SCDEW Sandra Groom, the appellant was responsible for EVERY machine in the shop, production, maintenance and training of employees.

The appellant had permission to alter, add or delete any program on any machine at any time and did so for the length of his employment.

The reason for this was given inadvertently on page 67 of the transcript by Craig Travis, a subpoenaed witness.

Mr. Travis, in his own words, isn't a programmer.

On at least half a dozen occasions the appellant approached the employer about his continuing to be responsible for the shop's production and yet not receiving the wages promised and agreed to at hiring.

More than once it was submitted in writing and is in the record of appeal.

During December of 2016, the employer approached the appellant with several new parts for a new customer to make that required precise tolerances. In order to achieve this the appellant had to realign and repair a machine that was to be used for these jobs as it was operating out of tolerance.

This machine was only available because the appellant had moved a production part onto that machine and reduced the production time from 20 minutes down to 3.

Hence the parts were done months ahead of schedule.

This machine is the Takisawa CNC lathe with live tooling, the one I was on the day I was fired.

The very same machine that just recently had its back up batteries replaced (page 54 of transcript) as testified by the employer.

The employer also testified about not having any problems with his machines in this area and more than adequate memory (pages 50 – 54) as the appellant is cut off his questioning by the hearing officer (pages 51 – 52).

Fortunately there is enough testimony to see that the appellant is correcting the statements made by the employer and there is documentation of it elsewhere. from power for over a month. This is when the machine relies totally upon the back up power of the batteries.

A couple of points here.

(1) Yes, the batteries can last longer than a month, but why take the chance of losing the programs AND the parameters which are much more valuable and harder to replace?

(2) In the front of every CNC manual ever made, there is section that tells you NOT to use the machine as a device to store programs. The more you store the more battery you use. They advise you to keep it to a minimum and store them with an alternative method. Since the day the appellant was hired he tried to do this and the employer and his nephew resisted and blocked this attempt to store it on the central computer system.

As a matter of fact, when Mr. Travis was hired, the computer was taken out of his office and transferred to the front offices and passwords changed.

This was what the appellant was trying to explain, along with the electrical problems the other machines were having when he was cut off by the hearing officer as asking "irrelevant" questions.

On the day the appellant returned to work from his earned vacation, he noticed that none of the 3 machines he had been running before he left had been used at all. Not only had they not been used, the chips were still in the chip bin on one of them where he had trained an operator to finish running the job he had set up for her to run. The other one was sitting unused as normal and the Takisawa still had no tools attached to the turret as he had just reassembled it prior to his vacation after performing the realignment.

This contradicts several of the statement made by employer in the transcript.

The reason this is included in these facts is to again show the credibility of the witnesses as a whole.

On this day February 8, 2017 the appellant spent the first few hours of the day cleaning one machine and assembling the tooling necessary to set up the Takisawa as instructed by the employer.

Right around lunch time the appellant asked if he could speak to the employer for a few minutes and that was all the time it took.

He asked, "Can we discuss this unresolved financial situation?"

The employer replied, "If that's the way you feel about it, get your stuff and get out!"

The appellant replied, "Are firing me for asking a question?"

The employer answered, "Yes, now pack your **** and get out now!"

Afterwards the appellant left immediately and came back for his tools a few days later, giving the employer a chance to change his mind. This didn't happen and he filed for unemployment benefits and has been appealing those decisions by the SCDEW ever since.

The dates and filings are in the record of appeal.

ARGUMENTS

It is the determination of the SCDEW that the appellant was guilty of misconduct and therefore caused his own termination.

We refute that.

As asked in the ISSUES STATEMENT, this is only valid if asking an employer for wages that are owed and/or disputed is a reason for termination.

We do not believe that there are any such statutes in the State of South Carolina.

Moreover there are statutes that cover this and no where is termination for cause listed.

We think it is the intent of everyone to try and resolve these conflicts without going thru civil action whenever possible, which is what the appellant did for over a year.

When he was terminated, we believe it was the duty of the SCDEW to fairly determine if this was the case.

It did not. Instead they affirmed the employer's false accusation that he had blackmailed the employer for a "pay increase".

Even after testimony that the previous production manager (Rusty on page 70) used the exact same method of recording programs that the appellant used, it was characterized as surreptitious and private, which it was not.

We will note at this point that the subpoenaed witnesses would not testify that they knew of the appellant's notebook of programs. It is our view that even if every employee were subpoenaed and put under oath, they would all say the same thing.

The reason for this has also been made clear and despite providing the name and telephone number to the legal counsel in the SC Dept. of Labor who could verify at least one instance of the employer's abuse and intimidation, this has been termed as irrelevant.

We again disagree.

When interviewing an employee of the employer who has witnessed other employees being threatened and fired in the presence of that employer, we doubt that their testimony will be completely honest. It's not their fault, they are afraid for their jobs as well.

This is why it is imperative that the review and appeals process be unbiased and we do not think that is the case here.

One only needs to read the transcript to conclude that the employer's testimony is not credible and not substantiated by facts.

We also point to SC Code Title 41 regarding wages and *Mathis v. Brown and Brown*. The appellant had a verbal contract for his pay and duties that is supported by wage statements going back to 2015.

We do not think it reasonable to believe that an employee would voluntarily leave a job for less money and a lesser position.

The fact that the appellant was still the production manager de facto at the time of his termination also disputes the employer's testimony that all of this was done without knowledge and permission.

We do not agree that a reasonable person would come to that conclusion.

We do find it more than reasonable that the appellant continued in good service to the employer while trying to resolve this pay discrepancy without resorting to filing a claim with the Dept. of Labor nor a civil suit.

In fact had he filed a complaint, the very same question he asked the employer on February 8, 2017 would have been asked by the State of South Carolina employees sent to investigate that claim.

Would they also be guilty of misconduct and disregard for the employer's interests?

CONCLUSION

This incident has caused the appellant great financial harm and he would ask the court to review this matter and find in his favor, reversing the SCDEW's decision. We also ask that the court please accept his attempts at complying with the rules of this court as best he can, given his limited financial resources.

Hiring an attorney to file these documents and paying all of the costs for transcription is beyond his means.

Since a transcript was already available in previous appeals, that is the only one he can afford to copy from. The State agency already has its own copy as well as the Record on Appeal and the appellant would be more than happy to furnish as many copies to the Court as they deem necessary.

Thank you.

Ross E. Buchanan

PROOF OF SERVICE OF INITIAL APPEAL

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM SOUTH CAROLINA ADMINSTRATIVE LAW COURT

Shirley C. Robinson, SCALC Judge

Docket No. 17-ALJ-22-0224-AP

Ross E. Buchanan
v.
Stan Cannon
and
SCDEW

Appellant

Respondent

RECEIVED

DEC 13 2017

SC Court of Appeals

PROOF OF SERVICE

SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

I certify that I have served the Initial Appellate Brief to ~~Thomas A. Belenchia~~ by depositing a copy of it in the United States mail postage prepaid on December 11th 2017 addressed to ~~P.O. Box 3421 Spartanburg SC 29304~~ 1220 SENATE ST.

*And letter about transcript and Record on Appeal


COLUMBIA SC 29201

December 11th 2017
Ross E. Buchanan
73 Doris Lisa view drive
Hendersonville NC 28792

RE BUCHANAN
73 DORIS LISA VIEW DR
HENDERSONVILLE NC 28792



7014 2870 0000 6614 8682



U.S. OFFICIAL MAIL US POSTAGE
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$ 07.01
S300
FP ***
Mailed From 28792
12/11/2017
031A 0004190884

SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS
1220 SENATE ST
COLUMBIA SC 29201

RECEIVED
DEC 13 2017
SC Court of Appeals

