

2 While Pro Se complaints are held to less stringent STANDARDS than those drafted by attorney's the Fact remains that The majority of prisoners are lay men not versed in the science of law Appellant Vice's lies in Appellant inability to express himself clearly in describing Respondents Actions

3 This is Further complicated by

A Covid Virus

B The effects of Incarceration

2 In accessibility to Prison classification officers

1 In accessibility to Prison Central Records

: Non Disclosure of Appellant Warden Record Jacket

: The omission of all of the above mention complicate

Appellant to give a meticulous detailed explanation in

order to prevent misconstruct This is the only way

Appellant can try to explain kidnap is not a sex convict

offense in the plain language of the law 16-3-910

S. C. Code 23-3-430-15 only when release from prison

Appellant may have to Registry depends on what the law

is in 2028 when Appellant is released from prison

Appellate filed this Grievance for being labeled and

Convicted Sex offender Meneil v S.C. Dept. of Corr. 9-5-2001.
The Supreme Court held the ALC Jurisdiction was limited to
i cases in which an inmate contends prison officials have
erroneously calculated his sentence, sentence-related credits or
custody status (ALC Ignored Number 1). Appellant challenge
his classification as a convicted sex offender to the
extent the court dismiss this case for the reasons contained in
part 2 and 3 Appellant respectfully request that the Court
Grant Appellant Habeas Pro Tunc because SCDC officials did act
arbitrarily, capriciously or from personal bias or prejudice
when SCDC classified Appellant as a convicted sex offender.
In SCDC system alone See Van Starling v S.C. Dept of Corr.
pocket no: 05-A2J-04-0403-AP. 2-3-2006 (Anderson A.J.J)

The S.C. Supreme Court did not allow SCDC to fabricate
a crime against Appellant that is not down grading

The Court should Grant this motion Habeas Pro Tunc correct

all errors because SCDC official applied no experienced
Judgment no consideration of the circumstances and facts
presented in this motion corrected by a judicial official
and not and executive agency

Petc

5-27-21

Respectfully Submitted

James Anthony Prins 292515

James Anthony Prins 1052

1516 old Gilliard Rd

Ridgeville S.C. 29472

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court

Administrative Law Judge S. Phillip Lenski

ALC Case No. 2020 ALJ-04-0470 - AP

Appellate Case No. 2021 - 000 479

James Anthony Primus # 252315

Appellant

V.

South Carolina Department of Corrections

Respondent

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Undersigned Appellant Pro Se hereby certifies that on Today's date I mailed a copy of the Initial brief of Appellant and Designation of matter to be included in the Record on Appeal to Respondent's addresses - as follows

DATE 5-27-21

S. C. Court of Appeals

Clerk office

P.O. Box 11629

Columbia S.C. 29211

S.C. Admin Law Court

Clerk office

205 Pendleton St. Suite 224

Columbia S.C. 29201

S.C. Dept of Corrections

General Counsel

P.O. Box 21797-9444 Broadview Rd

Columbia S.C. 29221-1787

RECEIVED

JUN 11 2021

SC Court of Appeals

By James Anthony Primus Pro Se
James Anthony Primus 252315
MacDougal Correctional Institution
1516 Old Gilliams Rd
Ridgeville S.C. 29482

FROM James Anthony P. # 252325
MacDonnell Correctional Institution
1516 Old Gilman Road
Ridgeville, S.C. 29912



RECEIVED
JUN 11 2021
SC Court of Appeals

TO:
South Carolina Court of Appeals
Ms. Jenny ABBOTT, Reception Clerk
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, S.C. 29201

