

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM GREENWOOD COUNTY  
Court of General Sessions  
Edward W. Miller, Circuit Court Judge

---

Appellate Case No. 2017-000481

---

**RECEIVED**  
MAY 09 2018  
SC Court of Appeals

The State,..... Respondent

v.

Ontavious Plumer, ..... Appellant.

---

**Initial Brief of Appellant**

---

E. Charles Grose, Jr.  
S.C. Bar Number 66063  
The Grose Law Firm, LLC  
404 Main Street  
Greenwood, SC 29646  
(864) 538-4466  
(864) 538-4405 (fax)  
Email: [charles@groselawfirm.com](mailto:charles@groselawfirm.com)

*Attorney for the Appellant*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents .....	i
Table of Authorities .....	ii
Questions Presented .....	1
Statement of Case.....	2
Statement of Facts.....	3
Standard of Review.....	8
Arguments .....	9
 <i>Question 1</i>	
Did the trial judge err as a matter of law by denying Ontavious Plumer’s request for a jury instruction on self-defense when the jurors acquitted Mr. Plumer of armed robbery and direct and circumstantial evidence established the elements of self-defense?.....	9
 <i>Question 2</i>	
Did the trial judge err as a matter of law by denying Ontavious Plumer’s motion to relieve his trial counsel from representation and allowing Mr. Plumer to represent himself?.....	13
 <i>Question 3</i>	
Did the trial judge err as a matter of law when by not qualifying Dr. Robert Bennett as expert in gunshot residue when the record establishes the witness has the necessary education, training and experience, and the exclusion of this expert testimony denied Ontavious Plumer his constitutional right to present a complete defense? .....	16
 <i>Question 4</i>	
Did the trial judge err as a matter of law by sentencing Ontavious Plumer to five years imprisonment when S.C. Code Ann. § 16-23-490(A) expressly prohibits imposing an additional sentence with the court imposed a life sentence without the possibility of parole? .....	19
Conclusion .....	20

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Ard v. Catoe</i> , 372 S.C. 318, 642 S.E.2d 590 (2007) .....	17
<i>Faretta v. California</i> , 422 U.S. 806 (1975).....	14
<i>Gooding v. St. Francis Xavier Hosp.</i> , 326 S.C. 248, 487 S.E.2d 596 (1997).....	17
<i>Gore v. Leeke</i> , 261 S.C. 308, 199 S.E.2d 755 (1973) .....	10
<i>Harden v. State</i> , 276 S.C. 249, 277 S.E.2d 692 (1981).....	11
<i>Holmes v. South Carolina</i> , 547 U.S. 319, 126 S. Ct. 1727, 164 L. Ed. 2d 503 (2006) ....	17
<i>Hundley ex rel. Hundley v. Rite Aid of S.C., Inc.</i> , 339 S.C. 285, 529 S.E.2d 45 (Ct. App. 2000) .....	18
<i>McDaniel v. State</i> , 271 Ga. 552, 522 S.E.2d 648 (1999) .....	11
<i>Medlin v. State</i> , 276 S.C. 540, 280 S.E.2d 648 (1981) .....	11
<i>State v. Barnes</i> , 407 S.C. 27, 753 S.E.2d 545 (2014) .....	14
<i>State v. Blurton</i> , 352 S.C. 203, 573 S.E.2d 802 (2002).....	9
<i>State v. Council</i> , 335 S.C. 1, 515 S.E.2d 508 (1999) .....	17
<i>State v. Davis</i> , 282 S.C. 45, 317 S.E.2d 452 (1984) .....	10
<i>State v. Day</i> , 341 S.C. 410, 535 S.E.2d 431 (2000).....	9
<i>State v. Dickey</i> , 394 S.C. 491, 716 S.E.2d 97 (2011).....	9
<i>State v. Douglas</i> , 380 S.C. 499, 671 S.E.2d 606 (2009) .....	17
<i>State v. Hill</i> , 315 S.C. 260, 433 S.E.2d 848 (1993) .....	9
<i>State v. Hughes</i> , 346 S.C. 339, 552 S.E.2d 35 (Ct. App. 2001) .....	18, 20
<i>State v. McBride</i> , 416 S.C. 379, 786 S.E.2d 435 (Ct. App. 2016).....	8
<i>State v. Muller</i> , 282 S.C. 10, 316 S.E.2d 409 (1984).....	9
<i>State v. Niles</i> , 400 S.C. 527, 735 S.E.2d 240 (Ct. App. 2012) .....	12

<i>State v. Niles</i> , 412 S.C. 515, 772 S.E.2d 877 (2015) .....	12
<i>State v. Pace</i> , 337 S.C. 407, 523 S.E.2d 466 (Ct. App. 1999).....	10
<i>State v. Palmer</i> , 415 S.C. 502, 783 S.E.2d 823 (Ct. App. 2016).....	19
<i>State v. Rivera</i> , 402 S.C. 225, 741 S.E.2d 694 (2013) .....	12
<i>State v. Starnes</i> , 388 S.C. 590, 698 S.E.2d 604 (2010).....	14
<i>State v. Wiggins</i> , 330 S.C. 538, 500 S.E.2d 489 (1998).....	9, 10
<i>Watson v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 389 S.C. 434, 699 S.E.2d 169 (2010).....	16, 17, 18

**Statutes**

S.C. Code Ann. § 16-1-60 .....	19
S.C. Code Ann. § 16-23-490(A) .....	1, 19, 20
S.C. Code Ann. § 17-25-45 .....	2

**Rules**

Rule 702, SCRE .....	17
Rule 703, SCRE .....	18

**Other**

American Bar Association’s Criminal Justice Standard 13-3.3, Guilty Pleas, Responsibility of the Trial Judge.....	11
--	----

## QUESTION'S PRESENTED

### *Question 1*

Did the trial judge err as a matter of law by denying Ontavious Plumer's request for a jury instruction on self-defense when the jurors acquitted Mr. Plumer of armed robbery and direct and circumstantial evidence established the elements of self-defense?

### *Question 2*

Did the trial judge err as a matter of law by denying Ontavious Plumer's motion to relieve his trial counsel from representation and allowing Mr. Plumer to represent himself?

### *Question 3*

Did the trial judge err as a matter of law when by not qualifying Dr. Robert Bennett as expert in gunshot residue when the record establishes the witness has the necessary education, training and experience, and the exclusion of this expert testimony denied Ontavious Plumer his constitutional right to present a complete defense?

### *Question 4*

Did the trial judge err as a matter of law by sentencing Ontavious Plumer to five years imprisonment when S.C. Code Ann. § 16-23-490(A) expressly prohibits imposing an additional sentence with the court imposed a life sentence without the possibility of parole?

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

For an incident occurring on October 11, 2015, the State charged the appellant, Ontavious Plumer, with armed robbery, attempted murder, and possession of a firearm during the commission of a violent crime. The Greenwood County Grand Jury returned “true bill” indictments for these charges on July 8, 2016. R. \*.

On or about December 21, 2016, the State served its notice of intent to seek life imprisonment without the possibility of parole pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 17-25-45. R. \*.

From February 6 – 8, 2017, the State tried Mr. Plumer before the Honorable Edward Miller and a jury. Elizabeth White and Josh Thomas represented the State. William Yarborough represented Mr. Plumer. The jurors convicted Mr. Plumer of attempted murder and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime. The jurors acquitted Mr. Plumer of armed robbery. Judge Miller sentenced Mr. Plumer to life imprisonment without the possibility of parole for attempted murder and five years for possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime. The sentences are concurrent. R. \*.

This appeal follows.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS

Christopher “Jock” Maggiacomo arranged a drug deal between Oshamar Wells and Jamel Brownlee. On October 11, 2015, Mr. Wells met Mr. Brownlee and Ontavious Plumer at the Mr. Chip convenience store on South Main Street in Greenwood, South Carolina. Mr. Brownlee and Mr. Plumer followed Mr. Wells to Kema Moore’s house on the west side of Greenwood. Ms. Moore is Mr. Wells’ cousin. When they arrived at Ms. Moore’s house, the three men sat at the kitchen table. In a cabinet next to the table, only an arm’s reach away, Mr. Wells had a handgun he planned to use during the drug deal. The three men “smoked a couple of [marijuana] blunts,” as Mr. Wells was letting his buyers try the product. Mr. Wells testified the two men expected him to sell them a pound of marijuana for \$3,600.00. Tr. 44-65, 102-03.

After smoking the blunts, Mr. Wells claims, “instead of pulling out the money,” Mr. Plumer pulled out a gun. Mr. Wells “instantly” grabbed a 40-caliber handgun from the kitchen cabinet.<sup>1</sup> According to Mr. Wells, “everything happened so fast” it was a “blur.” Mr. Wells testified, “I think I was actually getting hit when I reached to grab the gun out of the cabinet.” Mr. Wells fell to the floor. Mr. Plumer “was returning fire” and “stepping back out of the door.”<sup>2</sup> Mr. Wells fired his gun five or six times. Tr. 51-62, 75-77; State’s Exhibits 1, 2.

---

<sup>1</sup> This gun belongs to Mr. Wells’ mother, Wenona Wells. On direct examination, Mr. Wells claimed he saw his mother place the gun in the kitchen cabinet earlier in the day. On cross-examination, Mr. Wells acknowledged he planned for the gun to be in the kitchen cabinet in case he needed it during the drug deal. Mr. Wells is not allowed to possess a gun because of his criminal record. Tr. 52-53, 81, 99, 107-10, 112-14.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Plumer went the Greenville Memorial Hospital in Greenville, South Carolina for treatment of his gunshot wounds. Deputy Andrew Reese of the Greenville

Mr. Wells called an ambulance, his aunt, and his mother, Wenona Wells. Ms. Wells arrived before the ambulance and law enforcement. One of Ms. Wells' grandchildren found the handgun Mr. Wells used to shoot Mr. Plumer. Ms. Wells put that handgun in her purse. She later put it in the trunk of her car, where it remained until her son asked her to deliver it to Investigator Wesley McClinton a couple of days later. Tr. 105-18, 164-65, State's Exhibit 10.

Officer Kerry Cooper of the Greenwood Police Department was the first law enforcement officer to arrive. He tried to get a description of possible suspects from Mr. Wells to provide to other patrol officers in the area. Mr. Wells said he was robbed by "two black males and that one was wearing a white tee shirt," but he did not provide any other specifics. Mr. Wells denied having a firearm, and he did not tell Officer Cooper about the drug deal. EMS arrived and transported Mr. Wells to the hospital. Officer Cooper secured the scene to be processed for evidence. Tr. 118-24, 131-35.

At the hospital, Mr. Wells told Greenwood Police Department Officer Patrick Durkin that two black males entered the residence, "told him to give it up," and began shooting. Mr. Wells continued to conceal his culpability in the confrontation. Officer Durkin photographed Mr. Wells' injuries and collected gunshot residue samples. Tr. 259-66.

Dr. Ricky Ladd, an emergency room physician at Self Regional Hospital, treated Mr. Wells' gunshot wounds. Mr. Wells had three entrance wounds and three exit wounds. Mr. Wells had two fractures in his hip and leg. A bullet transacted the femur neck. The second fracture below that area could have been caused by a bullet or by a fall.

---

County Sheriff's Office interviewed Mr. Plumer, who said he had been shot at a location in Greenville County. Tr. 138-42.

Dr. Ladd explained the bullet traveling through the femoral neck, which is a weight bearing bone, would have caused Mr. Wells to fall down immediately. Tr. 313-28.

Investigators located a black Mercedes Benz at Mr. Moore's residence. According to Department of Motor Vehicle records, the license tag for the black Mercedes Benz is registered to Walter Plumer of Starr, South Carolina, which is in Anderson County. Investigators Wesley McClinton and Mike Dixon spoke to Walter Plumer at this home, and he provided a written statement. Walter Plumer is Ontavious Plumer's grandfather. Walter Plumer initially denied knowing who was driving his Mercedes Benz and reported it stolen. He later acknowledged allowing his grandson, Ontavious Plumer, drive his Mercedes Benz on October 11, 2015. Mr. Plumer acknowledged being at Ms. Moore's residence and being shot. Tr. 159-61, 205-08, 212-14, 225-26.

Investigators Wesley McClinton and William Kay interviewed Mr. Wells at Self Regional Hospital in Greenwood. By his own admission, Mr. Wells did not tell the investigators the truth because he was afraid of getting into trouble. Mr. Wells initially told law enforcement "he was sitting at the kitchen table and two random guys came in the front door and tried to rob him, and that they ended up shooting him when he didn't have anything." Mr. Wells told law enforcement about the drug deal only after law enforcement confronted him about finding the Mercedes Benz driven by Mr. Plumer.

Investigator McClinton testified about Mr. Wells' second statement:

The story was a drug deal was set up. He had met the two individuals at Mr. Chip. They followed him to the house on [redacted]. They were sitting at the table smoking marijuana and talking about the marijuana. [Mr. Wells] produced the marijuana and looked to who he said was Mr. Plumer to get the money and instead of pulling out the money Mr. Plumer pulled out a handgun and began firing at him.

Tr. 161-163.<sup>3</sup> Investigator Kay, however, recalled Mr. Wells admitting he reached for his gun before Mr. Plumer started shooting. Investigator Kay testified Mr. Wells said “he was meeting two guys to sell them a quantity of marijuana and that they ended up trying to rob him, and during the robbery he reached for a gun to defen[d] himself and they began shooting and he returned fire.”<sup>4</sup> Mr. Wells ultimately identified Mr. Plumer in a six-person photograph lineup. Tr. 57-60, 90-91, 146-150, 163-64; State’s Exhibit 8.

Investigator Mike Dixon of the Greenwood Police Department obtained a search warrant to process Kema Moore’s house. Tr. 209-11. Kenya Griffin, who is the crime scene and evidence technician for the Greenwood Police Department, processed Ms. Moore’s house for evidence. After photographing the residence, Officer Griffin collected numerous shell casings and projectiles. Officer Griffin also obtained a DNA sample from Mr. Plumer. Additionally, Officer Kerry collected a projectile from a residence across the street and provided it to Officer Griffin. Investigator McClinton collected a blood sample from the sidewalk in front of the residence and provided it to Sargent Griffin. Sargent Griffin transferred all of this evidence to the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (“SLED”). Tr. 195-96, 231-46.

Tracey Thrower, a firearms examiner at SLED, determined at least two firearms were involved in the confrontation. Ten cartridge cases and two projectiles were fired by the handgun used by Mr. Wells. Agent Thrower determined that two projectiles were not

---

<sup>3</sup> At some point, Mr. Wells told law enforcement that both Mr. Plumer and Mr. Brownlee “produced handguns and commenced shooting him, striking him numerous times.” Tr. 167.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Plumer wanted to play Mr. Wells’ recorded statements for the jurors, but the trial judge sustained the solicitor’s objection. Tr. 185-87.

fired by Mr. Wells gun, but the examination could not determine whether these two projectiles were fired by the same gun. Agent Thrower determined six cartridge casings were fired by a gun other than the one fired by Mr. Wells. These six cartridge casings were fired by the same gun. Agent Thrower's examined an additional projectile but the result was inconclusive whether it was fired by Mr. Wells gun or another gun. Tr. 283-300.

Jennifer Clayton, a DNA analyst at SLED, determined the blood collected by Investigator McClinton from the sidewalk in front of Ms. Moore's residence matched the know DNA standard from Mr. Plumer. Tr. 300-06.

Megan Fletcher, a forensic scientist with SLED with training and experience analyzing gunshot residue, testified the Solicitor's Office requested SLED *not* conduct an analysis of the gunshot residue kit collected from Mr. Wells. She also testified that SLED never received the gunshot residue kit collected from Mr. Plumer. Tr. 267-83. The trial court judge sustained the State's objection to Dr. Robert Bennett testifying as an independent gunshot residue analyst. Tr. 387-97.

## STANDARD OF REVIEW

“In criminal cases, this court reviews errors of law only and is bound by the trial court's factual findings unless they are clearly erroneous.” *State v. McBride*, 416 S.C. 379, 385, 786 S.E.2d 435, 438 (Ct. App. 2016). “Thus, on review, the court is limited to determining whether the trial court abused its discretion.” *Id.* “An abuse of discretion occurs when the court's decision is unsupported by the evidence or controlled by an error of law.” *Id.*

## ARGUMENTS

### *Question 1*

**Did the trial judge err as a matter of law by denying Ontavious Plumer's request for a jury instruction on self-defense when the jurors acquitted Mr. Plumer of armed robbery and direct and circumstantial evidence established the elements of self-defense?**

Mr. Plumer requested the trial judge instruct the jurors about the law of self-defense, but the trial judge declined. Tr. 402-04. "The law to be charged to the jury is determined by the evidence presented at trial. . . . , [and] a trial court commits reversible error if it fails to give a requested charge on an issue raised by the evidence." *State v. Hill*, 315 S.C. 260, 262, 433 S.E.2d 848, 849 (1993). *And see State v. Blurton*, 352 S.C. 203, 207, 573 S.E.2d 802, 804 (2002) ("The evidence presented at trial determines the charged jury instruction. The purpose of a jury instruction is to enlighten the jury and to aid it in arriving at a correct verdict." (internal citations and quotations omitted)). "If there is any evidence in the record from which it could reasonably be inferred that the defendant acted in self-defense, the defendant is entitled to instructions on the defense, and the trial judge's refusal to do so is reversible error." *State v. Day*, 341 S.C. 410, 416-17, 535 S.E.2d 431, 434 (2000) (quoting *State v. Muller*, 282 S.C. 10, 316 S.E.2d 409 (1984)). "[W]hen a defendant claims self-defense, the State is required to disprove the elements of self-defense beyond a reasonable doubt. *State v. Dickey*, 394 S.C. 491, 499, 716 S.E.2d 97, 101 (2011) (citing *State v. Wiggins*, 330 S.C. 538, 544-45, 500 S.E.2d 489, 492-93 (1998)). A person is justified in using deadly force in self-defense when:

- (1) The defendant was without fault in bringing on the difficulty; (2) The defendant . . . actually believed he was in imminent danger of losing his life or sustaining serious bodily injury, or he actually was in

such imminent danger; (3) If the defense is based upon the defendant's actual belief of imminent danger, a reasonable prudent man of ordinary firmness and courage would have entertained the same belief. If the defendant actually was in imminent danger, the circumstances were such as would warrant a man of ordinary prudence, firmness and courage to strike the fatal blow in order to save himself from serious bodily harm or losing his own life; and (4) The defendant had no other probable means of avoiding the danger of losing his own life or sustaining serious bodily injury than to act as he did in this particular instance.

*State v. Wiggins*, 330 S.C. 538, 545, 500 S.E.2d 489, 493 (1998) (citing *State v. Davis*, 282 S.C. 45, 46, 317 S.E.2d 452, 453 (1984)).

Seven facts establish that a self-defense instruction was required in this case. First, Mr. Wells admitted he was prepared to use his handgun during the drug transaction. Second, Mr. Wells placed himself in a location where he could stand up and his gun would be within an arm's reach. Third, Investigator Kay recalls Mr. Wells saying he reached for his gun before any shots were fired by Mr. Plumer. Fourth, according to Dr. Ladd, Mr. Wells would have fallen down when a bullet broke his femoral neck, meaning Mr. Wells had stood up and retrieved his handgun prior to that shot that broke that bone was fired. Fifth, Mr. Wells and his mother conspired to hide the gun and cover up his culpability in this incident, which is circumstantial evidence of a consciousness of guilt. *See, e.g., State v. Pace*, 337 S.C. 407, 415, 523 S.E.2d 466, 470 (Ct. App. 1999) ("As a general rule, any act or conduct on the part of the accused is admissible as some evidence of consciousness of guilt."). Sixth, Mr. Wells testimony provides evidence Mr. Plumer retreated from the confrontation. Seventh, the jurors acquitted Mr. Plumer of armed robbery, thereby removing the prosecution's motive for Mr. Plumer to commit attempted murder, including the inference of malice arising from shooting someone during the commission of another crime. *See, e.g., Gore v. Leeke*, 261 S.C. 308,

315, 199 S.E.2d 755, 757 (1973) (“The law itself implies the malice from proof of the felony.”).

Based on the facts presented in this case, reasonable jurors could infer that Mr. Wells was the first person to introduce a firearm into the encounter, meaning Mr. Wells—not Mr. Plumer—was responsible for bringing on the difficulty. Once Mr. Wells introduced his handgun into the encounter, Mr. Plumer and Mr. Brownlee actually were in imminent danger of sustaining serious bodily harm or death. A reasonable person would have entertained such a belief. Under the circumstances, Mr. Plumer and Mr. Brownlee were justified in returning fire. Finally, it is not disputed that Mr. Plumer and Mr. Brownlee retreated from the incident location.

The trial judge seemingly believed Mr. Plumer was guilty of attempted murder and armed robbery and involved himself in plea negotiations.<sup>5</sup> When Mr. Plumer wanted to continue his trial, the trial judge scolded Mr. Plumer, “Sometimes pride can be a real dangerous asset to have.” Tr. 350. From the record it is not clear whether the trial judge wanted Mr. Plumer to plead guilty because of the trial judge’s personal beliefs about Mr.

---

<sup>5</sup> Our Supreme Court has adopted the American Bar Association’s Criminal Justice Standard 13-3.3, Guilty Pleas, Responsibility of the Trial Judge. *Harden v. State*, 276 S.C. 249, 250, 277 S.E.2d 692 (1981); *Medlin v. State*, 276 S.C. 540, 280 S.E.2d 648 (1981). Under this rule, the trial judge may participate in plea negotiations, but “the judge should never through word or demeanor, either directly or indirectly, communicate to the defendant or defense counsel that a plea agreement should be accepted or that a guilty plea should be entered.” *Medlin*, 276 S.C. at 542, 280 S.E.2d at 649. “The Standard is designed to prevent both the fact and the appearance of the trial judge’s becoming an advocate against the desires of the defendant or the State of a particular resolution.” *Harden*, 276 S.C. at 257, 277 S.E.2d at 695. “Due to the force and majesty of the judiciary, a trial court’s participation in the plea negotiation may skew the defendant’s decision-making and render the plea involuntary because a defendant may disregard proper considerations and waive rights based solely on the trial court’s stated inclination as to sentence.” *McDaniel v. State*, 271 Ga. 552, 553, 522 S.E.2d 648, 650 (1999).

Plumer's guilt or out of a "paternalistic" desire to protect Mr. Plumer from the mandatory life without parole sentence.<sup>6</sup> Tr. 343. Regardless of his intentions, the trial judge never considered the possibility that Mr. Wells was responsible for the difficulty, and Mr. Plumer was innocent of armed robbery. *See, e.g. State v. Niles*, 400 S.C. 527, 532, 735 S.E.2d 240, 243 (Ct. App. 2012) ("The circuit court charged the jury on self-defense. . . . reasoning that 'either the victim started shooting and Mr. Niles was acting in self-defense or Mr. Niles started shooting ... [and] killed the victim during the commission of an armed robbery.'" ) *reversed on other grounds by State v. Niles*, 412 S.C. 515, 772 S.E.2d 877 (2015). This Court, accordingly, should order a new trial.

---

<sup>6</sup> *See, e.g., State v. Rivera*, 402 S.C. 225, 243, 741 S.E.2d 694, 703 (2013) ("It is apparent the trial court, like defense counsel, was operating under the paternalistic belief that it wanted to protect Appellant from potentially undermining his own defense.").

## Question 2

**Did the trial judge err as a matter of law by denying Ontavious Plumer's motion to relieve his trial counsel from representation and allowing Mr. Plumer to represent himself?**

At the close of the second day of trial, the trial judge informed Mr. Plumer, “[T]he consequences of life without parole are just hard to enumerate.” At the beginning of the third day of trial, Mr. Plumer moved the trial judge to relieve his trial counsel. Mr. Plumer explained the last offer from the state was for a term of imprisonment of seven years. Trial counsel had informed Mr. Plumer he “shouldn’t worry about the life sentence because if I get found guilty of attempted murder that they was going to give me a lot of time anyway.” Mr. Plumer further explained he did not understand that the life sentence was mandatory until the trial judge informed him the prior day. The colloquy between the trial judge, prosecutor, and trial counsel, revealed trial counsel’s failure to communicate clearly with Mr. Plumer. The following exchange took place between Mr. Plumer and the trial judge:

THE COURT: “Do you want to go forward with this trial?”

THE DEFENDANT: I want to get me another lawyer.

THE COURT: No, that ain’t happening. The jury is sworn. We are in the middle of your case. I’m not relieving him and we’re not stopping this case so you can get a new lawyer. You want to go forward with this trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. I don’t have no choice.

THE COURT: You do have a choice and you know what it is.

THE DEFENDANT: *I have a constitutional right to relieve my lawyer when I want to relieve him*, but I guess that don’t – that ain’t work like that down here.

THE COURT: So you want to go foreward with this? You know what your options are.

THE DEFENDANT: I don't have a choice.

THE COURT: You know what the options are that were discussed yesterday in the bench conference. The State would be willing to lift the life without parole notice in return for a guilty plea, so – and you – but you want to go forward to the jury; is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't have a choice.

THE COURT: You do have a choice, and it's your choice and yours alone. You said you wanted to talk to your family.

THE DEFENDANT: I talked to more than my family though.

THE COURT: Okay. So you want to go forward; is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. I ain't got no choice. I can't –

THE COURT: Stand up when you talk to me.

THE DEFENDANT: Obviously the Court don't believe nothing I'm saying anyway about me being able to get – my disability. They ain't believing nothing about that. You're going to believe what my lawyer said about it. But it's my life on the line and I know what was told to me= and I know how I took it and I understood. So, I mean, I don't have no choice but to go forward with it. And my constitutional rights being violated the whole time I've been down here. So let's go on with the trial.

Tr. 342-49 (emphasis added).

“A South Carolina criminal defendant has the constitutional right to represent himself under both the federal and state constitutions.” *State v. Barnes*, 407 S.C. 27, 35, 753 S.E.2d 545, 550 (2014) (citing *State v. Starnes*, 388 S.C. 590, 698 S.E.2d 604 (2010)). The trial judge should have treated Mr. Plumer's insistence to relieve his trial counsel as a motion to represent himself. Mr. Plumer, in fact, correctly stated he has the constitutional right to relieve his trial counsel at any time. *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975).

Here, the attorney-client relationship had deteriorated because of the lack of communication. The trial judge incorrectly told Mr. Plumer his only options were to plead guilty or continue the trial. Mr. Plumer correctly informed the trial judge his only choice as to continue trial. Had Mr. Plumer allowed the trial judge to persuade him to plead guilty, then the jurors would not have acquitted Mr. Plumer of armed robbery, and this issue—and the other issues raised in the brief—would not have been preserved for appeal. Continuing the trial presented the trial judge two options. First, trial counsel would continue representing Mr. Plumer through the conclusion of the trial. Second, after giving Mr. Plumer his *Faretta* warnings, the trial could have continued with Mr. Plumer representing himself. The trial judge chose the former option, which denied Mr. Plumer his Sixth Amendment right to represent himself.

This Court, accordingly, should order a new trial.

### *Question 3*

**Did the trial judge err as a matter of law when by not qualifying Dr. Robert Bennett as expert in gunshot residue when the record establishes the witness has the necessary education, training and experience, and the exclusion of this expert testimony denied Ontavious Plumer his constitutional right to present a complete defense?**

Greenville County Sheriff Deputy Spurgeon collected gunshot residue evidence from Mr. Plumer. Tr. 144-46. Wes Smith, legal coordinator for the Greenville County Sheriff's Office, testified this evidence remained secure in the evidence locker at the Greenville County Sheriff's Office until released to Detective McClinton. Tr. 350-59; Defendant's Exhibits 3, 4, 5. Detective McClinton transferred Mr. Plumer's gunshot residue kit to Joseph Best, who is a private investigator retained by Mr. Plumer's trial counsel. Mr. Best transferred this evidence to Dr. Robert Bennett. Tr. 379-86.

Dr. Robert Bennett is a forensic scientist. He has a pharmacy degree and Ph.D in drug sciences and toxicology from the Medical University of South Carolina. He has additional training certifications from the United States Department of Justice involving ballistics, including gunshot residue analysis. "For the past 20 years [gunshot residue analysis] has been a core study" for Dr. Bennett. He works with JR Regrove, which is "an accredited facility" that provides gunshot residue analysis to over 400 laboratories in the United States and Europe. Trial courts have qualified Dr. Bennett in "[m]any different areas of forensic scienc[ce]." The Solicitor objected to Dr. Bennett's qualification as an expert because he was not the technician that actually conducted the test. The trial judge sustained the objection." Tr. 387-96.

In *Watson v. Ford Motor Co.*, our Supreme Court adopted a three-part test for determining the admissibility of expert testimony. "First, the trial court must find that the

subject matter is beyond the ordinary knowledge of the jury, thus requiring an expert to explain the matter to the jury. 389 S.C. 434, 446, 699 S.E.2d 169, 175 (2010) (citing *State v. Douglas*, 380 S.C. 499, 671 S.E.2d 606 (2009)). Second, “while the expert need not be a specialist in the particular branch of the field, the trial court must find that the proffered expert has indeed acquired the requisite knowledge and skill to qualify as an expert in the particular subject matter.” *Id.* (citing *Gooding v. St. Francis Xavier Hosp.*, 326 S.C. 248, 487 S.E.2d 596 (1997)). Third, “the trial court must evaluate the substance of the testimony and determine whether it is reliable.” *Id.* (citing *State v. Council*, 335 S.C. 1, 515 S.E.2d 508 (1999)). *See also* Rule 702, SCRE.

Here, gunshot residue analysis is a subject matter where expert testimony assists jurors. *See Ard v. Catoe*, 372 S.C. 318, 642 S.E.2d 590 (2007) (granting post-conviction relief because trial counsel did not retain independent expert in gunshot residue analysis). Dr. Bennett has a Justice Department certification in gunshot residue analysis and gunshot residue analysis has been a “core study” of his for 20 years. The first two prongs of *Watson*, therefore, are satisfied. The trial judge denied Mr. Plumer’s request for Dr. Bennett to proffer “the results of the test,” which goes to the subject matter of the testimony under the third prong of *Watson*. Tr. 395. The exclusion of this evidence prejudiced Mr. Plumer by denying his constitutional right right to present a complete defense. *Holmes v. South Carolina*, 547 U.S. 319, 319, 126 S. Ct. 1727, 1728, 164 L. Ed. 2d 503 (2006) (“Whether rooted directly in the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment or in the Compulsory Process or Confrontation Clauses of the Sixth Amendment, the Constitution guarantees criminal defendants ‘a meaningful opportunity to present a complete defense.’”).

The State might argue—as it did at trial—that Dr. Bennett not being the technician that ran the machinery is significant. Expert witnesses, however, are allowed to testify based on “facts or data in the particular case upon which an expert bases an opinion or inference may be those perceived by or made known to the expert at or before the hearing” when those facts and data are “of a type reasonably relied upon by experts in the particular field in forming opinions or inferences upon the subject.” Rule 703, SCRE. *And see Hundley ex rel. Hundley v. Rite Aid of S.C., Inc.*, 339 S.C. 285, 295, 529 S.E.2d 45, 50 (Ct. App. 2000) (“An expert witness may state an opinion based on facts not within his firsthand knowledge.”).

This Court, accordingly, should order a new trial. In the alternative, this Court should remand this case for a hearing to determine whether Dr. Bennett’s testimony is admissible under the third prong of *Watson*. *See, e.g., State v. Hughes*, 346 S.C. 339, 343, 552 S.E.2d 35, 37 (Ct. App. 2001) (“remand[ed] for an evidentiary hearing to determine whether Hughes was entitled to access to the notes as outlined in Rule 612,” SCRE.). If the trial court find Dr. Bennett’s testimony admissible and its exclusion impaired Mr. Plumer’s defense, then the trial court should be allowed to grant a new trial. *Hughes*, 346 S.C. at 343-44, 552 S.E.2d at 37.

#### *Question 4*

**Did the trial judge err as a matter of law by sentencing Ontavious Plumer to five years imprisonment when S.C. Code Ann. § 16-23-490(A) expressly prohibits imposing an additional sentence with the court imposed a life sentence without the possibility of parole?**

S.C. Code Ann. § 16-23-490(A) provides:

If a person is in possession of a firearm or visibly displays what appears to be a firearm or visibly displays a knife during the commission of a violent crime and is convicted of committing or attempting to commit a violent crime as defined in Section 16-1-60, he must be imprisoned five years, in addition to the punishment provided for the principal crime. *This five-year sentence does not apply in cases where the death penalty or a life sentence without parole is imposed for the violent crime.*

(emphasis added).

S.C. Code Ann. § 16-1-60, of course, classifies attempted murder as a violent crime. The trial judge sentenced Mr. Plumer to life imprisonment without the possibility of parole for attempted murder. The additional five-year sentence for violating § 16-23-490 is prohibited by the express terms of the statute. This Court, accordingly, should vacate that sentence. *See, e.g., State v. Palmer*, 415 S.C. 502, 783 S.E.2d 823 (Ct. App. 2016) (sentence for possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime was inapplicable, in light of life imprisonment without parole sentence for murder charge).

## CONCLUSION

For the forgoing reasons, this Court should reverse Ontavious Plumer's convictions and sentences and remand this case for a new trial.

In the alternative, this Court should remand this case for an evidentiary hearing to determine whether Dr. Bennett's expert testimony was admissible pursuant to the third prong of *Watson*. If the trial court on remand determines Dr. Bennett's testimony stratifies the third prong of *Watson*, then the trail court should order a new trial. See *Hughes, supra*.

In any event, this Court should vacate the sentence for a violation of section 16-23-490.

Respectfully Submitted,

By 

E. Charles Grose, Jr.  
S.C. Bar Number 66063  
The Grose Law Firm, LLC  
404 Main Street  
Greenwood, SC 29646  
(864) 538-4466  
(864) 538-4405 (fax)  
Email: charles@groselawfirm.com

*Attorney for Appellant Ontavious Plumer*

May 7, 2018  
Greenwood, South Carolina

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM GREENWOOD COUNTY  
Court of General Sessions  
Edward W. Miller, Circuit Court Judge

Appellate Case No. 2017-000481

**RECEIVED**  
MAY 09 2018  
SC Court of Appeals

The State,..... Respondent

v.

Ontavious Plumer, ..... Appellant.

**Certificate of Service**

I certify that I have served the Initial Brief of Appellant and Designation of Matter to be Included in the Record on Appeal on the State of South Carolina by placing a copy in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on the date reflected below, addressed to:

J. Benjamin Aplin, Esquire  
Office of the Attorney General  
P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211



E. Charles Grose, Jr.  
The Grose Law Firm, LLC  
404 Main Street  
Greenwood, SC 29646  
(864) 538-4466

May 7, 2018  
Greenwood, South Carolina

**The Grose Law Firm, LLC**  
404 Main Street, Greenwood, South Carolina 29646

E. Charles Grose, Jr.  
Phone: 864-538-4466 Fax: 864-538-4405  
E-mail: charles@groselawfirm.com  
Web: GroseLawFirm.com

May 7, 2018

The Honorable, Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
Clerk of Court, S.C. Court of Appeals  
P.O. Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211

**RECEIVED**  
MAY 09 2018  
SC Court of Appeals

Re: *State of South Carolina v. Ontavious Plumer*  
Appellate Case Number 2017-000481

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Enclosed please find Mr. Plumer's Initial Brief of Appellant and Designation of Materials to be Included in the Record on Appeal, along with a certificate of service.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please let me know if you have any questions or require additional information.

With kindest regards, I am

Yours very truly,

  
E. Charles Grose, Jr.

cc: Mr. Ontavious Plumer  
J. Benjamin Aplin, Esquire

11-11-1971

11-11-1971

T

404 Main Street  
Greenwood, SC 29646



1000



29211

U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
GREENWOOD, SC  
29646  
MAY 07 18  
AMOUNT  
**\$2.05**  
R2305K141918-03

**RECEIVED**  
MAY 09 2018  
SC Court of Appeals

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
Clerk of Court, S.C. Court of Appeals  
P.O. 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211

