

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

---

**RECEIVED**

JUL 30 2019

**SC Court of Appeals**

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court

Honorable Deborah Brooks Durden, Administrative Law Judge

---

Appellate Case No. 2019-000607

---

ANTHONY ENRIQUEZ # 215961 .....APPELLANT,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF  
PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES .....RESPONDENT.

---

**FINAL REPLY  
BRIEF OF APPELLANT**

---

**JOHN H. BLUME**

**AMELIA C. HRITZ**

Cornell Law School  
159 Charles Evans Hughes Hall  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
(607) 255-1030  
jb94@cornell.edu  
ach254@cornell.edu

**HANNAH L. FREEDMAN #103373**

Justice 360  
900 Elmwood Ave, Suite 200  
Columbia, SC 29201  
(803) 765-1044  
hannah@justice360sc.org

COUNSEL FOR APPELLANT

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

ARGUMENT IN REPLY .....1

CONCLUSION.....2

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Statutes and Rules**

S.C. Code Ann. § 1-23-380.....2

SCALC Rule 59 .....1, 2

SCALC Rule 62 .....1, 2

## ARGUMENT IN REPLY

Appellant Anthony Enriquez, through undersigned counsel, files this reply to the Initial Brief of Respondent, the Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (PPP). This reply will be short because PPP fails to join issue with the arguments that Enriquez did make. Instead, PPP's brief responds to the substance of arguments PPP assumes Enriquez might have made, had he been given the opportunity to make them before the Administrative Law Court (ALC). Their brief highlights the problem with the ALC's decision to dismiss the appeal without notice, briefing, or lodging of the record below: nobody knows yet what arguments Enriquez would have made before the ALC. This is set out most clearly in PPP's assertion that Enriquez "never raised a denial of due process, nor a violation of any other Constitutional right," and Enriquez's "only reason for appeal is in his opinion the decision was unfair and he should have been granted parole." Br. of Resp't 9, July 25, 2019. That claim is refuted by even a casual reading of Enriquez's Opening Brief, which focuses on violations of state law, ALC procedure, and constitutional due process that deprived him of the opportunity to meaningfully challenge the manner and context in which PPP rendered its decision to deny him parole.

Additionally, PPP asserts that the ALC *was required* to dismiss Enriquez's appeal under Rule 62 SCALC because, according to PPP, Enriquez failed to comply with Rule 59(B) SCALC. Br. of Resp't 8. Pursuant to Rule 59(B), an appellant must "include a brief factual basis for each expressly and specifically asserted constitutional violation." PPP acknowledges that Enriquez included a factual basis for his asserted constitutional violation, but claims it was deficient because it related to the reason for parole denial—a matter PPP asserts is beyond the ALC's power to review. Br. of Resp't 8. Thus, according to PPP, because the ALC "may not substitute its judgment for the judgment of the agency as to the weight of the evidence on questions of fact," S.C. Code

Ann. § 1-23-380, it was under a legal obligation to dismiss the appeal. However, Enriquez never asked the ALC to “substitute its judgment for the judgment of the agency as to the weight of the evidence on questions of fact.” *See id.* The ALC cut off Enriquez’s access to appellate review before he had an opportunity to even invite the type of second-guessing PPP incorrectly suggests Enriquez requested. Again, PPP’s (erroneous) assumption underscores the error in the ALC’s decision to dismiss the appeal with no record or argument before it: absent that information, the ALC could not and did not know if the factual bases supporting Enriquez’s asserted constitutional violations are inconsistent with the Board’s fact-finding.

**CONCLUSION**

For the reasons set forth above, as well as for the reasons presented in Enriquez’s Initial Brief, this Court should reverse the ALC’s dismissal and remand the case to the ALC to give Enriquez an opportunity to put before the Court a complete record and an initial brief on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,



---

**JOHN H. BLUME**

**AMELIA C. HRITZ**

Cornell Law School  
159 Charles Evans Hughes Hall  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
(607) 255-1030  
jb94@cornell.edu  
ach254@cornell.edu

**HANNAH L. FREEDMAN #103373**

Justice 360  
900 Elmwood Ave, Suite 200  
Columbia, SC 29201  
(803) 765-1044  
hannah@justice360sc.org

July 30, 2019.