

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Laurens County
Frank Addy, Circuit Court Judge

RECEIVED
NOV 15 2018
SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT,

V.

REGINALD SPEARMAN,

APPELLANT.

Appellate Case No. 2018-000969


Petition to File the Initial Brief and Designation of Matter out of time

Counsel would respectfully request a to file the Initial Brief and Designation of Matter in the above-referenced case out of time. In support of this motion, counsel would respectfully show the Court the following:

1. The Initial Brief and Designation of Matter were due to be filed to August 30, 2018.
2. Due to a scheduling mistake this matter was not calendared.
3. Counsel is attaching the initial brief and designation of matter to this petition.
4. This request is made in good faith, and not for purposes of delay.
5. Counsel has spoken with Counsel for the State. Opposing Counsel does not oppose this request.

WHEREFORE, the undersigned counsel would respectfully request to file the Initial Brief and Designation of Matter out of time. Counsel requests that the time limits for filing

the Initial Brief and Designation of Matter be held in abeyance pending a ruling on this motion.



Tristan M. Shaffer (SC Bar # 77565)
P.O. Box 1027
Chapin, SC 29036
Phone: (803) 575-0384
tristan@shafferlawsc.com

November 14, 2018

Other Counsel of Record:
Matthew Buchanan
S.C. Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services
P.O. Box 50666
Columbia, South Carolina 29250
Attorney for Respondent

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Laurens County
Frank R. Addy, Circuit Court Judge

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

ERIC MCCALL,

APPELLANT

Appellate Case 2018-000969

INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

TRISTAN M. SHAFFER

Tristan M. Shaffer
P.O. Box 1027
Chapin, SC 29036
(803) 941-7514
tristan@shafferlawsc.com

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT.

RECEIVED

NOV 15 2018

SC Court of Appeals

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS 1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....2

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL.....3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....4

ARGUMENT.....5

CONCLUSION.....8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Boan v. State, 388 S.C. 272, 695 S.E.2d 850 (2010).....6

State v. DeAngelis, 257 S.C. 44, 183 S.E.2d 906 (1971).....6

State v. Finley, 219 S.C. 278, 282, 64 S.E.2d 881, 882 (1951)6

Tant v. South Carolina Dept. of Corrections, 408 S.C. 334, 759 S.E.2d 398 (2014)6

State v. Warren, 392 S.C. 235, 238, 708 S.E.2d 234, 235 (Ct. App. 2011)7

Statutes

S.C. Code § 24-21-4606, 7

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

When the initial sentencing sheets are silent on whether the suspended time is to run concurrent or consecutive, can the Circuit Court decide to run the sentences consecutive at a probation revocation hearing?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On December 1, 2017 Appellant waived presentment and plead guilty to two counts of Domestic Violence Second Degree before the Honorable Frank Addy, R.* (DV Sentencing Sheets). Appellant was represented by Chelsea McNeill and the State was represented by Margaret Boykin. Plea Tr. 1

On each charge Defendant was sentenced to three years suspended on the service of four years of probation with credit for 54 days. R.* (DV Sentencing Sheets).

On April 26, 2018, Defendant entered a plea of guilty to resisting arrest and was sentenced to 1 year before the Honorable Frank R. Addy, R.* (Resisting Arrest Sentencing Sheet). Appellant was represented by Chelsea McNeill and the State was represented by Margaret Boykin. Probation Tr.1. This conviction was a violation of Defendant's probation. Judge Addy revoked Appellant's probation and sentenced Defendant to 6 years on the probation violation. Probation Tr. 15, ll. 3-5.

On May 3, 2018, Appellant moved for reconsideration of his sentence. R.* (Defendant's Motion).

The Court denied the motion to reconsider in a written order dated May 7, 2018. R.* (Order Denying Reconsideration).

This appeal follows.

ARGUMENT

- I. When the initial sentencing sheets are silent on whether the suspended time is to run concurrent or consecutive, it was error for the Circuit Court to run the sentences consecutive at a probation revocation hearing.

Relevant Facts

At his plea hearing on the domestic violence charges, the court stated the following:

THE COURT: On each of the domestic violence charges 24 what I've done, Mr. Spearman, is I've sentenced you to three 25 years. I have suspended those on the service of 54 days which you've already done. I've put you on probation for four years on each of those charges. Conditions of probation will be substance abuse counseling, random drug testing, and I'm requiring either marriage counseling between you and your wife if she's willing to participate, or if she's not included to participate, I'm requiring batterers treatment of you.

Plea Tr. 5, l. 22—6, l. 7. The sentencing sheets did not have either concurrent or consecutive boxes checked. R*(DV Sentencing Sheets).

In the motion for reconsideration, Appellant argued that the Court did not have the authority to in effect modify the sentences to run consecutive at a probation revocation hearing. R*(Motion to Reconsider, 3).

In the order denying the motion to reconsider, the circuit court found the following:

Accordingly, whether any subsequent revocation resulted in concurrent or consecutive time was at the discretion of the judge who handled the revocation.

R*(Order Denying Reconsideration).

The original sentence was suspended concurrent prison time.

There is longstanding authority that two sentences shall be concurrent unless there is a specific finding to the contrary. *See State v. Finley*, 219 S.C. 278, 282, 64 S.E.2d 881, 882 (1951) (“The rule of law is well settled that two or more sentences of a defendant to the same place of confinement run concurrently, in the absence of specific provisions in the judgment to the contrary, and, where a defendant is already in execution on a former sentence, and the second sentence does not state that the time is to commence at the expiration of the former, the sentences will run concurrently, in the absence of a statute providing for a different rule.”).

Appellant’s suspended sentence should be viewed as concurrent. The sentencing sheets do not indicate that the suspended time was consecutive. R* (DV Sentencing Sheets). Moreover, during the plea hearing the judge never specifically stated that the sentences are to be ran consecutively.

Although Judge Addy does make the comment of “you've got a total of six years over your head”¹, this is the type of ambiguous comment which is insufficient to alter the sentence. *See State v. DeAngelis*, 257 S.C. 44, 49, 183 S.E.2d 906, 909 (“When sentences are vague and indefinite the terms will run concurrent.”). Moreover, the sentencing sheets do not indicate that the sentence shall run consecutive. *Cf. Tant v. South Carolina Dept. of Corrections*, 408 S.C. 334, 759 S.E.2d 398 (2014) (“The Department contends our [*Boan v. State*, 388 S.C. 272, 695 S.E.2d 850 (2010)] decision adopted the majority rule that an oral pronouncement controls. We disagree.”).

Therefore, based on long standing law the sentences are presumed to be concurrent. *See Finley, supra*.

When considering the probation revocation matter, the Court did not have the power to effectively alter the sentence by ordering it to run consecutive.

During a probation revocation hearing, the Court's power is limited to the following:

Upon such arrest the court, or the court within the venue of which the violation occurs, shall cause the defendant to be brought before it and may revoke the probation or suspension of sentence and shall proceed to deal with the case as if there had been no probation or suspension of sentence except that the circuit judge before whom such defendant may be so brought shall have the right, in his discretion, to require the defendant to serve all or a portion only of the sentence imposed...

S.C. Code § 24-21-460 (emphasis added). The circuit court may not modify the sentence rather the circuit court can only revoke part or all of the sentence.

As stated above, the original sentence should be seen as concurrent rather than consecutive. The circuit court clearly² believed it had the authority to alter the sentence from concurrent to consecutive. The statute does not give the judge this authority in a probation revocation hearing. S.C. Code § 24-21-460; *see also, State v. Warren*, 392 S.C. 235, 238, 708 S.E.2d 234, 235 (Ct. App. 2011) ("Generally, a trial judge is without authority to consider a criminal matter once the term of court during which judgment was entered expires.") . Therefore, the judge's sentence for the probation revocation was controlled by an error of law and should be reversed.

¹ Plea Tr. 10, ll. 23-24.

² Judge Addy's order stated, "Accordingly, whether any subsequent revocation resulted in concurrent or consecutive time was at the discretion of the judge who handled the revocation." R*(Order Denying Reconsideration).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons Appellant respectfully requests that this Court remand the case for resentencing.

Respectfully submitted,



Tristan M. Shaffer (SC Bar 77565)
P.O. Box 1027
Chapin, SC 29036
(803) 941-7514
tristan@shafferlawsc.com

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT.

This 13th day of November, 2018.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Laurens County
Frank Addy, Circuit Court Judge

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT,

V.

REGINALD SPEARMAN,

APPELLANT.


Appellate Case No. 2018-000969

Certificate of Service

RECEIVED
NOV 15 2018
SC Court of Appeals

I certify that on this day, I have served a copy of the following on Respondent:

1. Petition to File the Initial Brief and Designation of Matter Out of Time;
2. Initial Brief of Appellant; and
3. Designation of Matter.


Tristan M. Shaffer (SC Bar # 77565)
P.O. Box 1027
Chapin, SC 29036
Phone: (803) 575-0384
tristan@shafferlawsc.com

November 14, 2018

Other Counsel of Record:
Matthew Buchanan
S.C. Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services
P.O. Box 50666
Columbia, South Carolina 29250

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Laurens County
Frank R. Addy, Circuit Court Judge

RECEIVED
NOV 15 2018
SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

REGINALD SPEARMAN,

APPELLANT

Appellate Case 2018-000969

**DESIGNATION OF MATTER TO BE
INCLUDED IN RECORD ON APPEAL**

Appellant proposes the following be included in the Record on Appeal:

- (1) Transcript:
 - (a) Dec. 1, 2017- 1-12
 - (b) Apr. 26, 2018- 1-16
- (2) Sentencing Sheets;
- (3) Motion for Reconsideration;
- (4) Order Denying Motion to Reconsider;

I certify that this designation contains no matter which is irrelevant to this appeal.

Tristan M. Shaffer (SC Bar 77565)
P.O. Box 1027
Chapin, SC 29036
(803) 941-7514
tristan@shafferlawsc.com

November 13, 2018

The Law Office of Tristan M. Shaffer

Litigation • Injury Law • Criminal Defense

November 14, 2018

Jenny Abbott Kitchings
The South Carolina Court of Appeals
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201


RECEIVED
NOV 15 2018
SC Court of Appeals

Re: The State v. Reginald Spearman (Appellate Case 2018-000969)

Dear Ms. Kitchings,

Enclosed please find the Notice of Appearance, Initial Brief, Designation of Matter, and Petition to File the Initial Brief and Designation of Matter Out of Time in the above referenced case.

Sincerely,



Tristan M. Shaffer

CC: Matt Buchanan

P.O. Box 1027
Chapin, SC 29036



1000



29201

PCW LG ENV
CHAPIN, SC
29036
NOV 14, 18
AMOUNT

\$1.42
R2305K140931-17

Jenny Abbott Kitchings
SC Court of Appeals
1220 Senate St.
Columbia, SC 29201

RECEIVED
NOV 15 2018
SC Court of Appeals

