

ORIGINAL

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED  
JUN 25 2017

S.C. SUPREME COURT

On Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals  
Op. No. 5492 (S.C. Ct. App. Filed June 14, 2017)  
Appeal from Lancaster County  
The Honorable Brian M. Gibbons, Circuit Court Judge  
Appellate Case No. 2017-001992

THE STATE,

Respondent,

v.

DEMARIO MONTE THOMPSON,

Petitioner.

---

**BRIEF OF RESPONDENT**

---

ALAN WILSON  
Attorney General

DEBORAH R.J. SHUPE  
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
SC Bar No. 5098

Office of Attorney General  
Post Office Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
(803) 734-3727

DOUGLAS A. BARFIELD, JR.  
Solicitor, Sixth Judicial Circuit

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

---

RECEIVED  
APR 25 2018  
S.C. SUPREME COURT

On Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals  
Op. No. 5492 (S.C. Ct. App. Filed June 14, 2017)  
Appeal from Lancaster County  
The Honorable Brian M. Gibbons, Circuit Court Judge  
Appellate Case No. 2017-001992

---

THE STATE,

Respondent,

v.

DEMARIO MONTE THOMPSON,

Petitioner.

---

**BRIEF OF RESPONDENT**

---

ALAN WILSON  
Attorney General

DEBORAH R.J. SHUPE  
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
SC Bar No. 5098

Office of Attorney General  
Post Office Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
(803) 734-3727

DOUGLAS A. BARFIELD, JR.  
Solicitor, Sixth Judicial Circuit

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 2

ARGUMENT ..... 6

    I. The Court of Appeals properly affirmed the circuit court’s admission of the trespass notice letter because it was directly relevant to an element of first degree burglary, the probative value far outweighed any potential prejudice to Petitioner, it was admissible as a business record prepared in the ordinary course of business, and it was not prior bad act evidence..... 6

    II. The Court of Appeals properly affirmed the circuit court’s admission of the 911 recording, which was authenticated by the Director of Public Communications and the dispatcher who took the call, and its contents did not violate Petitioner’s rights under the Confrontation Clause..... 10

CONCLUSION.....16

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases:

<u>Crawford v. Washington</u> , 541 U.S. 36 (2004) .....	11
<u>Davis v. Washington</u> , 547 U.S. 813 (2006) .....	11, 15
<u>Johnson v. State</u> , 699 N.E.2d 746 (Ind. Ct. App. 1998) .....	12
<u>Rodriguez-Nova v. State</u> , 295 Ga. 868, 763 S.E.2d 698 (2014) .....	13
<u>State v. Black</u> , 400 S.C. 10, 732 S.E.2d 880 (2012) .....	6
<u>State v. Bratschi</u> , 413 S.C. 97, 775 S.E.2d 39 (Ct. App. 2015) .....	15, 16
<u>State v. C.D.L.</u> , 250 P.3d 69 (Utah 2011) .....	12, 13
<u>State v. Crocker</u> , 366 S.C. 394, 621 S.E.2d 890 (Ct. App. 2005) .....	10
<u>State v. Jennings</u> , 394 S.C. 473, 716 S.E.2d 91 (2011) .....	6
<u>State v. Keenon</u> , 356 S.C. 457, 590 S.E.2d 34 (2003) .....	9
<u>State v. Rushton</u> , 2003 UT App 25U, para. 4, 2003 WL 21299576 .....	12
<u>State v. Saltz</u> , 346 S.C. 114, 551 S.E.2d 240 (2001) .....	6
<u>State v. Williams</u> , 136 Wash. App. 486, 150 P.3d 111 (2007) .....	12
<u>United States v. Orozco–Santillan</u> , 903 F.2d 1262 (9th Cir.1990) .....	12
<u>United States v. Puerta Restrepo</u> , 814 F.2d 1236 (7th Cir.1987) .....	12

### Statutes:

S.C. Code Ann. § 16-11-311 (2015) .....	7
---	---

**Rules:**

Rule 220(c), SCACR ..... 13

Rule 404(B), SCRE..... 2

Rule 901, SCRE..... 12

## **STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED**

I. The Court of Appeals properly affirmed the circuit court's admission of the trespass notice letter because it was relevant to an element of first degree burglary, the probative value far outweighed any potential prejudice to Petitioner, it was admissible as a business record prepared in the ordinary course of business, and it was not prior bad act evidence.

II. The Court of Appeals properly affirmed the circuit court's admission of the 911 recording, which was authenticated by the Director of Public Communications and the dispatcher who took the call, and its contents did not violate Petitioner's rights under the Confrontation Clause.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In October 2014, the Lancaster County Grand Jury indicted Petitioner Demario Monte Thompson on one count of attempted murder, one count of first degree burglary, one count of possession or display of a firearm during a violent crime, and two counts of pointing and presenting a firearm. The case was called for a jury trial on January 5, 2015, before the Honorable Brian Gibbons, Circuit Court Judge.

During pre-trial motions, Petitioner moved to suppress testimony from the apartment complex manager regarding a trespass notice indicating Petitioner was banned from coming on the complex property. The State argued the testimony and letter went directly to the first degree burglary charge because it established Petitioner was not a resident of the complex, and could not have had consent to enter the victim's apartment. The court denied Petitioner's motion, finding the fact the victim received the trespass notice as the apartment occupant went to the manager's credibility, and Petitioner could cross-examine her about whether she sent a copy of the letter to him personally. (Record on Appeal [R.], pp. 6-13).

Petitioner then moved to suppress the testimony and notice under Rule 404(B), SCRE, arguing it was inadmissible character evidence. The State indicated it did not intend to ask the manager about why the notice was issued, but was presenting the notice to show Petitioner was not a resident at the complex, and the victim could not give him consent to be there. The court denied the motion to suppress under Rule 404(B), finding the State was not offering the letter as character evidence, but to prove a specific element of the crime. (R., pp. 13-15).

Petitioner then moved to suppress the testimony and notice as unduly prejudicial. The court denied the motion, finding the evidence's probative value on the issue of Petitioner's right to be in the victim's apartment outweighed any prejudicial value. (R., pp. 17-18).

Deputy Rueben Silberman of the Lancaster County Sheriff's Office testified he responded to a disturbance call at an apartment complex between 4:00 a.m. and 5:00 a.m. on the morning of July 2, 2014. When he arrived at the complex, he spoke with the victim, who was very upset, had wounds on her head and neck, torn clothes, and appeared like she had been in a physical altercation. He saw the victim's apartment door had been kicked in, and was hanging off the hinges. The apartment living room looked like a disturbance and physical altercation had occurred there. Petitioner was not present, but Deputy Silberman spoke with the victim's neighbors. (R., pp. 35-44).<sup>1</sup>

Dominique Huff testified he lived across the hallway from the victim's apartment, and he was in his apartment the morning of July 2, 2014, when he heard a disturbance coming from the victim's apartment. He went outside and saw the victim's apartment door hanging off the hinges. It was dark inside the apartment, but he heard "just a whole bunch of commotion" inside. He returned to his apartment, but then heard someone yell "he had a gun," so he grabbed his gun and went back outside. At that time, he saw Petitioner downstairs in a verbal altercation with another neighbor. He also saw the victim come out of her apartment wearing a shirt and underwear, and crying hysterically. (R., pp. 45-53).

Jamie Hunt testified she lived with Dominique Huff and their three children, and they woke up early on the morning of July 2, 2014, when they "heard the disturbance and someone

---

<sup>1</sup>State's Exhibit #1 is on file with the Court.

kicking in doors and stuff like that.” After Mr. Huff went outside to check on it, he came back in and told her to call 911, which she did. (R., pp. 54-56).

The apartment complex manager testified, over Petitioner’s objection, she had been the manager at the victim’s apartment complex for seven years, and Petitioner had never been a resident at the complex. She further testified she prepared a letter dated March 18, 2014, advising the victim Petitioner was banned from the complex. She personally presented the letter to the victim, and had the victim sign at the bottom of the letter acknowledging she received and understood the letter’s contents. (R., pp. 56-59).

The letter stated Petitioner was banned from the complex and would be charged with trespassing if he came back on the property. It also advised the victim the complex would take legal action to terminate her lease if she, or a guest of hers, allowed Petitioner to enter her apartment, or if she was found in Petitioner’s presence on the property. (R., p. 123).

Petitioner then objected to introduction of the recording of the victim’s 911 call, arguing it violated the Confrontation Clause because the victim’s statements during the call were testimonial in nature, and he did not have an opportunity to cross-examine the declarant (victim), who was not present to testify at trial. The State argued the call was non-testimonial because it was not the result of an interrogation, and all the dispatcher’s questions were aimed at obtaining as much information as possible for the responding officers. (R., pp. 60-65). After listening to the recording, the court overruled Petitioner’s objection. (R., pp. 65-66).<sup>2</sup>

The Deputy Director for Lancaster County Public Communications testified about the recording and maintenance process for 911 calls, and identified the recordings associated with

---

<sup>2</sup>The Audio Recording of the 911 call is on file with the Court.

the July 2, 2014, incident. The 911 dispatcher on duty that night verified she handled the call in question, and identified her own voice in the recording. (R., pp. 67-73).

The circuit court granted Petitioner's directed verdict motion on both pointing and presenting charges, but submitted the remaining charges to the jury. The court also submitted multiple lesser included offenses as to the attempted murder charge. (R., pp. 74-81, 86).

The jury convicted Petitioner on the first degree burglary charge and the lesser-included offense of assault and battery third degree on the attempted murder charge, and acquitted him on the possession or display of a firearm during a violent crime charge. The circuit court sentenced him to fifteen years incarceration on the first degree burglary conviction, and time served on the assault and battery third degree conviction. This appeal followed.

The Court of Appeals affirmed the circuit court's findings and Petitioner's commitment in an unpublished opinion filed June 28, 2017. (Appendix, pp. 1-12). The Court denied Petitioner's Petition for Rehearing by Order filed August 16, 2017. (Appendix pp. 13-23). Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals on October 17, 2017, which this Court granted by Order filed March 7, 2018.

## ARGUMENT

**I. The Court of Appeals properly affirmed the circuit court's admission of the trespass notice letter because it was directly relevant to an element of first degree burglary, the probative value far outweighed any potential prejudice to Petitioner, it was admissible as a business record prepared in the ordinary course of business, and it was not prior bad act evidence.**

Petitioner contends the Court of Appeals erred in affirming the admission of the trespass notice letter because it was irrelevant, unduly prejudicial, impermissible hearsay, and inadmissible prior bad act evidence. To the contrary, the record amply supports the Court of Appeals' conclusion that the circuit court acted well within its discretion in determining the apartment manager's testimony and the trespass notice letter were directly relevant to the first degree burglary charge, the probative value outweighed any prejudicial effect, the apartment manager's testimony the victim signed it in her presence was not inadmissible hearsay, and the evidence presented did not contain anything about purported prior bad acts.

“The admission or exclusion of evidence is left to the sound discretion of the trial judge, whose decision will not be reversed on appeal absent an abuse of discretion.” State v. Black, 400 S.C. 10, 732 S.E.2d 880, 884 (2012) (quoting State v. Saltz, 346 S.C. 114, 551 S.E.2d 240, 244 [2001]). “An abuse of discretion occurs when the [circuit] court's ruling is based on an error of law or, when grounded in factual conclusions, is without evidentiary support.” *Id.* (quoting State v. Jennings, 394 S.C. 473, 716 S.E.2d 91, 93 [2011]). “To warrant reversal, an error must result in prejudice to the appealing party.” *Id.*

A) A person is guilty of burglary in the first degree if the person enters a dwelling without consent and with intent to commit a crime in the dwelling, and either:

(1) when, in effecting entry or while in the dwelling or in immediate flight, he or another participant in the crime:

(a) is armed with a deadly weapon or explosive; or

- (b) causes physical injury to a person who is not a participant in the crime; or
- (c) uses or threatens the use of a dangerous instrument; or
- (d) displays what is or appears to be a knife, pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun, machine gun, or other firearm; or
- (2) the burglary is committed by a person with a prior record of two or more convictions for burglary or housebreaking or a combination of both; or
- (3) the entering or remaining occurs in the nighttime.

S.C. Code Ann. § 16-11-311 (2015). In this case, it is undisputed Petitioner entered the victim's apartment during the early morning hours of July 2, 2014, and the primary issue in dispute at trial was whether he entered without consent.

**A. Relevancy**

Petitioner contends the circuit court erred in admitting the trespass notice because it was irrelevant to any issue at trial, and was unduly prejudicial. As the Court of Appeals and the circuit court found, however, it is readily apparent the trespass notice was directly relevant to the issue of consent by establishing Petitioner was not a resident, and he had no possessory or legal interest in the apartment giving him implicit consent to enter it.

While the victim did have a possessory interest in the apartment, the extent of her interest was governed by the terms of the lease agreement between her and the property owner. After the victim acknowledged receipt of the trespass notice, it effectively became a part of the lease agreement, the victim's possessory interest was subject to its terms, and she could not legally give consent for Petitioner to enter the apartment for any purpose without violating the lease.

The State never alleged Petitioner knew about the trespass notice. Rather, the notice was offered to show Petitioner was not a resident of the apartment on July 2, 2014, and the victim

risked eviction if she allowed him to enter the apartment.<sup>3</sup> Nor did the State “repeatedly” stress the trespass notice during closing argument as Petitioner alleges, but mentioned it **once** as only **one** piece of evidence on the consent issue. (R., pp. 92-93).

### **B. Prior Bad Acts**

Petitioner also asserts the notice constituted prior bad act evidence. The notice did not allege, and the property manager did not testify, it was premised on any bad act committed by Petitioner. As the Court of Appeals noted, there are a myriad of reasons a property owner may issue a trespass notice, most of which do not involve criminal activity. (Appendix, p. 6). For instance, Petitioner could have been banned simply because the property manager did not like his looks, other tenants complained about him playing loud music, or his car muffler was too loud, none of which constitute criminal acts.<sup>4</sup>

Finally, the State never inferred or argued the notice was evidence of a prior bad act. Rather, the State told the jury exactly what the notice showed in connection with the burglary charge - Petitioner was not a resident of the apartment complex, and did not have consent to be on the property on July 2, 2014.

### **C. Probative/Prejudice**

Petitioner contends the notice, even if relevant, was unduly prejudicial in that it potentially misled the jury to erroneously determine he had the required intent to commit a crime inside the apartment because he knew he was trespassing. To the contrary, even assuming he did not know he was trespassing, the kicked in door physically demonstrated Petitioner’s lack of

---

<sup>3</sup>Unfortunately, as frequently happens in cases involving domestic violence, the victim would not testify against her assailant at trial.

<sup>4</sup>Petitioner’s assertions regarding potential jury speculation are themselves rank speculation.

consent to enter the apartment, and the injuries Petitioner inflicted on the victim after he entered amply demonstrated his intent to commit a crime inside the apartment.

**D. Harmless Error**

Finally, any error in admitting the notice was harmless beyond any reasonable doubt in light of the overwhelming evidence of Petitioner's guilt. *See State v. Keenon*, 356 S.C. 457, 590 S.E.2d 34, 35 (2003) (evidentiary error was harmless error in light of the overwhelming evidence of the defendant's guilt).

As discussed above, the assailant's identity was not disputed, and consent was the primary issue at trial. The fact Petitioner kicked in the apartment door to gain entry, as shown by the photographs entered as evidence without objection, the victim's 911 call (discussed below in Issue II), combined with the extent of the victim's injuries shown in the photographs, fairly conclusively established Petitioner did not have consent to enter the apartment, and he not only intended to commit a crime, he did commit a crime therein. If the victim willingly invited Petitioner into the apartment, it is highly unlikely he just kicked in the door for no reason. It is also highly unlikely the victim invited him inside to beat her.

The circuit court properly considered the relevance and probative value of the trespass notice, as well as the prejudice to Petitioner, and did not abuse its discretion in admitting the notice into the evidence. The Court of Appeals fully analyzed the applicable law, and properly affirmed the circuit court's rulings. Accordingly, the Court of Appeals should be affirmed on

this issue.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Petitioner asserted in the Court of Appeals that the letter was inadmissible hearsay evidence, an issue raised in the Court of Appeals and analyzed in the Court's opinion. (Appendix, pp. 5-6). The hearsay issue is not raised in the Brief of Petitioner, and therefore, therefore, is deemed abandoned. State v. Crocker, 366 S.C. 394, 621 S.E.2d 890, 893 n. 1 (Ct. App. 2005) (holding that conclusory statements unaccompanied by argument and citation to authority are insufficient to preserve an issue for appellate review and noting that failure to provide such argument and citation renders an issue abandoned).

**II. The Court of Appeals properly affirmed the circuit court’s admission of the 911 recording, which was authenticated by the Department of Public Communications and the dispatcher who took the call, and its contents did not violate Petitioner’s rights under the Confrontation Clause.**

Petitioner asserts the Court of Appeals erred in affirming the admission of the victim’s 911 call recording, because the State failed to establish a proper foundation showing the victim was the actual caller, and admitting the recordings violated his Sixth and Fourteenth confrontation rights as discussed in Crawford v. Washington, 541 U.S. 36 (2004), and Davis v. Washington, 547 U.S. 813 (2006). The Court of Appeals extensively analyzed both contentions, and properly affirmed the circuit court’s ruling.

**A. Foundation**

The Director of Lancaster County Public Communications testified the County’s 911 calls are automatically recorded on County servers, and maintained on the servers for three years. She identified the 911 calls involving the incident on July 2, 2014, and the victim’s 911 call recording was published to the jury over Petitioner’s objection.<sup>6</sup>

The 911 dispatcher who took the victim’s call identified her own voice on the recording. She further testified the recording contained the entire conversation, and dispatchers have to rely on information they receive from the caller in order to dispatch necessary services. She could not testify with certainty the woman who called was the victim.

The Court of Appeals thoroughly and correctly analyzed this issue. While Petitioner correctly notes that prior to the Court of Appeals opinion in this case, there were no South Carolina cases addressing the particular foundational situation at issue in this case, other

---

<sup>6</sup>The State indicated there were seven related recordings, and it intended to introduce several of the recordings, but it is unclear from the record whether any recordings other than the victim’s recording were published to the jury.

jurisdictions have addressed it. In State v. Williams, 136 Wash. App. 486, 150 P.3d 111, 118 (2007), the court held a sound recording need not be authenticated by a witness with personal knowledge of the events recorded, but the proponent can authenticate a recording with conversation on it by **any method that produces evidence sufficient to support basic findings of identification and authentication**. See also Johnson v. State, 699 N.E.2d 746, 749 (Ind. Ct. App. 1998) (voices on a recording may be identified by circumstantial evidence).

In State v. C.D.L., 250 P.3d 69 (Utah 2011), the court interpreted Rule 901 of the Utah Rules of Evidence, which is virtually identical to Rule 901, SCRE, and sets forth authentication requirements for evidence. The court stated:

Rule 901 of the Utah Rules of Evidence requires authentication by “evidence sufficient to support a finding that the matter in question is what its proponent claims.” Utah R. Evid. 901. To this end, the rule provides a nonexhaustive list of examples illustrating how authentication can be satisfied, noting, for example, that a voice may be identified “by opinion based upon hearing the voice at any time under circumstances connecting it with the alleged speaker” or where “circumstances, including self-identification, show the person answering to be the one called.” *Id.* R. 901(b)(5), (6). Proper authentication does not require conclusive proof but, instead, requires only that the trial court determine that there is “evidence sufficient to support a finding of the fulfillment of [a] condition” of fact

**Authentication of a telephone caller's identity can be accomplished by combining that caller's self-identification during the call with circumstances surrounding the call. Particularly, “[t]he identity of a telephone caller may be established by self-identification of the caller coupled with additional evidence such as the context and timing of the telephone call, the contents of the statement challenged, internal patterns or other distinctive characteristics, and disclosure of knowledge of facts known peculiarly to the caller.”** United States v. Orozco–Santillan, 903 F.2d 1262, 1266 (9th Cir.1990), overruled in part on other grounds by United States v. Hanna, 293 F.3d 1080, 1088 n. 5 (9th Cir.2002); see also State v. Rushton, 2003 UT App 25U, para. 4, 2003 WL 21299576 (mem.) (looking to self-identification and other contextual evidence to authenticate a caller's identity); United States v. Puerta Restrepo, 814 F.2d 1236, 1239 (7th Cir.1987) (“[I]t is not necessary that someone familiar with the speaker's voice identify it. The authentication may be established by

**circumstantial evidence such as the similarity between what was discussed by the speakers and what each subsequently did.”** (citation omitted))

*Id.* at 69, 78 (emphasis added); *see also* Rodriguez-Nova v. State, 295 Ga. 868, 763 S.E.2d 698, 701 (2014) (proper foundation established by the 911 operator who received the call verifying the 911 recording’s accuracy, and the employee who made the recording verifying the authenticity of the copy; an audio recording can be authenticated by testimony of one party to the recorded conversation).

In this case, the Director and dispatcher verified the authenticity of the recording, and the dispatcher identified her voice on the recording of the victim’s call. During the call, the victim identified herself and Petitioner, gave the 911 dispatcher her specific address, and said Petitioner kicked in her apartment door while she was sleeping, pointed a gun at her and beat her. When they arrived at the apartment, law enforcement verified all of the information provided to 911, except for Petitioner’s possession of a gun, by observing the damaged door, indications of a struggle inside the apartment, and the victim’s injuries, and by interviewing neighbors about the incident. Considered in totality, there was substantial circumstantial evidence from which the jury could find the victim was the caller on the recording, and the Court of Appeals properly affirmed the circuit court’s ruling on the issue.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>Petitioner asserts the State did not argue there was sufficient circumstantial evidence to identify the victim as the caller on the 911 call. (Brief of Petitioner, pp. 18-19). To the extent Petitioner’s assertion refers to the solicitor at trial, even if true, the appellate courts can affirm on any ground appearing in the record. Rule 220(c), SCACR. Further, the sufficiency of the circumstantial evidence presented at trial was argued at length in the State’s brief before the Court of Appeals. (Amended Final Brief of Respondent, pp. 12-14).

## **B. Confrontation Clause**

Citing Crawford and Davis, Petitioner contends admitting the recording of the victim's 911 call violated the Confrontation Clause because "large portions" of the recording contained testimonial statements he never had an opportunity to cross-examine. Neither Crawford nor Davis support Petitioner's contention.

Petitioner engages in the same misapprehension and mischaracterization regarding the 911 call he accuses the State of engaging in before the circuit court. In his attempt to make the victim's 911 call testimonial, it is clear Petitioner has no understanding of police and 911 procedures because he insists the emergency was over when the victim called, and therefore, the dispatcher interrogated the victim for purposes of a subsequent prosecution. When considered in light of the existing circumstances surrounding the victim's call, the fallacy of Petitioner's argument becomes clear.

Two of the seven 911 calls received that night (including the victim's) mentioned the assailant had a gun, and he was injuring the victim.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, the officers were responding to a violent situation, with the potential for an active shooter, and the dispatcher's job was to provide

---

<sup>8</sup>Petitioner attempts to draw some distinction between the one call reporting someone said he had a gun and the victim's call stating he had a gun and pointed it at her, and argues the distinction "is important when prosecuting a case, but immaterial when responding to an emergency." (Brief of Petitioner, p. 22). This attempt further illustrates Petitioner's complete lack of knowledge regarding law enforcement procedures when responding to an emergency. The distinction Petitioner makes is truly "immaterial" to responding officers because they have to proceed as if a gun is involved, and take the necessary precautions to protect themselves and the public. Likewise, contrary to Petitioner's contention there was no evidence the dispatcher relayed the information she got from the victim to the officers, she testified the times she was not talking during the call, she was typing the information provided by the victim. (R., pp, 72). Modern emergency notification systems send the information the dispatcher types directly to computers in the officers' patrol cars in real time. If the officers' cars are not equipped with computers, the dispatcher's information is immediately relayed to the officers by radio.

the officers with as much information as possible for safety reasons. When the victim stated Petitioner was no longer at the apartment, contrary to Petitioner's contention, the emergency situation was **not** over. Rather, the potentially armed assailant could still be in the area, and possibly return to the apartment, and it was important for the dispatcher to get as much information regarding Petitioner's appearance and clothing so the responding officers could distinguish him from other people who might be in the area.

As the Court of Appeals concluded, Davis is almost on point with the facts of this case, and clearly establishes Crawford does not apply to the recording at issue. (Appendix, pp. 9-10). Davis also involved a domestic dispute, and the victim, who did not testify at trial, called 911.

In Davis, the 911 dispatcher asked the victim multiple questions regarding the assailant's identity, the presence of any weapons in the house, and whether the assailant had been drinking. 547 U.S. at 817-818. The Supreme Court found the questions and responses were about events as they were actually happening, rather than information about past events. "A 911 call ... and at least the initial interrogation conducted in connection with a 911 call, is ordinarily not designed primarily to 'establis[h] or prov[e]' some past fact, but to describe current circumstances requiring police assistance." *Id.* at 827-828. The Court concluded from all the circumstances the primary purpose of the questions and responses was to enable police assistance to meet an ongoing emergency, and the victim was not acting as a witness or testifying at that time. *Id.* at 828.

In State v. Bratschi, 413 S.C. 97, 775 S.E.2d 39 (Ct. App. 2015), the South Carolina Court of Appeals acknowledged the distinction between the testimonial statements at issue in Crawford, and the non-testimonial statements in Davis, and held the circuit court did not err in

admitting the victim's 911 call.<sup>9</sup> The Court stated the 911 call at issue fell "between those in Crawford and Davis," but was "closer to Davis." Id. at 48-50. Significantly, the 911 recording in Bratschi was much longer, with substantially more substance, than the call at issue in this case.

Under the holdings in Davis and Bratschi, the circuit court properly determined the victim's statements were non-testimonial and admitted the 911 recording into evidence. Accordingly, the Court of Appeals properly determined there was no Confrontation Clause violation, and its affirmance of the circuit court's ruling should be affirmed.

---

<sup>9</sup>The victim in Bratschi could not testify at trial because the defendant (his wife) murdered him at some point after the 911 call, and the Court's opinion does not indicate whether someone was able to identify the victim's voice on the recording.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing and the arguments set forth in the Final Brief of Respondent, the State submits the Court of Appeals findings and conclusions should be affirmed.


Respectfully submitted,

ALAN WILSON  
Attorney General

DEBORAH R.J. SHUPE  
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
SC Bar No. 5098

DOUGLAS A. BARFIELD, JR.  
Solicitor, Sixth Judicial Circuit

By:



DEBORAH R.J. SHUPE  
Office of Attorney General  
Post Office Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
(803) 734-3727

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

April 25, 2018

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED  
APR 25 2018  
S.C. SUPREME COURT

On Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals  
Op. No. 5492 (S.C. Ct. App. Filed June 14, 2017)  
Appeal from Lancaster County  
The Honorable Brian M. Gibbons, Circuit Court Judge  
Appellate Case No. 2017-001992

THE STATE,

Respondent,

v.

DEMARIO MONTE THOMPSON,

Petitioner.


**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Sally B. Ellison, certify I served the Brief of Respondent on Petitioner by depositing three copies in the United States mail, postage prepaid, addressed to:

LaNelle Cantey DuRant  
Assistant Appellate Defender  
South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense  
Division of Appellate Defense  
PO Box 11589  
Columbia, SC 29211-1589

I further certify all parties required by Rule to be served have been served.

This 25<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2018

  
SALLY B. ELLISON  
Administrative Assistant

Office of Attorney General  
Post Office Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
(803) 734-3727