



# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE  
CLERK OF COURT

BRENDA F. SHEALY  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11330  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1080  
FAX: (803) 734-1499

## NOTICE

### IN THE MATTER OF MARK FELKER DAHLE, PETITIONER

Petitioner was definitely suspended from the practice of law for one (1) year, *In the Matter of Dahle*, 393 S.C. 576, 713 S.E.2d 617 (2011). Petitioner has now filed a petition seeking to be reinstated.

Pursuant to Rule 33(e)(2) of the Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement contained in Rule 413 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules, notice is hereby given that members of the bar and the public may file a notice of their opposition to or concurrence with the petition. Comments should be mailed to:

Committee on Character and Fitness  
P. O. Box 11330  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

These comments should be received within sixty (60) days of the date of this notice.

Columbia, South Carolina  
September 1, 2016



**OPINIONS**  
**OF**  
**THE SUPREME COURT**  
**AND**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**  
**OF**  
**SOUTH CAROLINA**

---

**ADVANCE SHEET NO. 36**  
**September 7, 2016**  
**Daniel E. Shearouse, Clerk**  
**Columbia, South Carolina**  
[www.sccourts.org](http://www.sccourts.org)

**CONTENTS**  
**THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**  
**PUBLISHED OPINIONS AND ORDERS**

27664 - The State v. Theodore Manning	12
Order - In the Matter of Jarrett Skipper Calder	22
Order - RE: Expansion of Electronic Filing Pilot Program	23

**UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS**

None

**PETITIONS - UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT**

25298 - The State v. Sammie Louis	Pending
27601 - Richard Stogsdill v. SCDHHS	Pending

**EXTENSION TO FILE PETITION - UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT**

26770 - The State v. Charles Christopher Williams	Granted until 9/9/2016
---	------------------------

**PETITIONS FOR REHEARING**

27345 - Gregory Smith v. D.R. Horton	Pending
--------------------------------------	---------

## **The South Carolina Court of Appeals**

### **PUBLISHED OPINIONS**

5439-Meenaxi, Inc. v. S.C. Department of Revenue 25

### **UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS**

None

### **PETITIONS FOR REHEARING**

5407-One Belle Hall v. Trammell Crow (TAMKO)	Pending
5414-In the Matter of the Estate of Marion M. Kay	Pending
5415-Timothy McMahan v. S.C. Department of Education	Pending
5416-Allen Patterson v. Herb Witter	Pending
5417-Meredith Huffman v. Sunshine Recycling	Pending
5418-Gary G. Harris v. Tietex International, Ltd.	Pending
5419-Arkay, LLC, v. City of Charleston	Pending
5421-Coastal Federal Credit v. Angel Latoria Brown	Pending
5424-Janette Buchanan v. S.C. Property and Casualty Ins.	Pending
5425-Carolyn Taylor-Cracraft v. Gerald Cracraft	Pending
5430-Wilfred Allen Woods v. Etta Catherine Woods	Pending
5431-Lori Stoney v. Richard Stoney	Pending
5432-Daniel Dorn v. Paul Cohen	Pending
5433-The Winthrop University Trustees v. Pickens Roofing	Pending
5434-The Callawassie Island Members Club v. Ronnie Dennis	Pending

5435-State v. Joshua William Porch	Pending
5436-Lynne Vicary v. Town of Awendaw	Pending
2016-UP-184-D&C Builders v. Richard Buckley	Pending
2016-UP-275-City of North Charleston v. John Barra	Pending
2016-UP-280-Juan Ramirez v. Progressive Northern	Pending
2016-UP-281-James A. Sellers v. SCDC	Pending
2016-UP-316-Helen Marie Douglas v. State	Pending
2016-UP-325-NBSC v. Thaddeus F. Segars	Pending
2016-UP-340-State v. James R. Bartee, Jr.	Pending
2016-UP-348-Basil Akbar v. SCDC	Pending
2016-UP-366-In re Estate of Valerie D'Agostino	Pending
2016-UP-367-State v. Christopher D. Campbell	Pending
2016-UP-368-Overland v. Lara Nance	Pending
2016-UP-373-State v. Francis Larmand	Pending
2016-UP-377-State v. Jennifer Lynn Alexander	Pending
2016-UP-382-Darrell L. Goss v. State	Pending
2016-UP-394-State v. Shawn Patrick White	Pending
2016-UP-395-Darrell Efird v. State	Pending
2016-UP-397-Carlton Cantrell v. Aiken County	Pending
2016-UP-402-Coves Darden v. Francisco Ibanez	Pending
2016-UP-404-George S. Glassmeyer v. City of Columbia (2)	Pending

## PETITIONS-SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

5253-Sierra Club v. Chem-Nuclear	Pending
5254-State v. Leslie Parvin	Pending
5301-State v. Andrew T. Looper	Pending
5326-Denise Wright v. PRG	Pending
5328-Matthew McAlhaney v. Richard McElveen	Pending
5329-State v. Stephen Douglas Berry	Pending
5333-Yancey Roof v. Kenneth A. Steele	Pending
5338-Bobby Lee Tucker v. John Doe	Pending
5342-John Goodwin v. Landquest	Pending
5344-Stoneledge v. IMK Development (Southern Concrete)	Pending
5345-Jacklyn Donevant v. Town of Surfside Beach	Pending
5346-State v. Lamont A. Samuel	Pending
5348-Gretchen A. Rogers v. Kenneth E. Lee	Pending
5355-State v. Lamar Sequan Brown	Pending
5359-Bobby Joe Reeves v. State	Pending
5360-Claude McAlhany v. Kenneth A. Carter	Pending
5365-Thomas Lyons v. Fidelity National	Pending
5366-David Gooldy v. The Storage Center	Pending
5368-SCDOT v. David Powell	Pending
5369-Boisha Wofford v. City of Spartanburg	Pending

5371-Betty Fisher v. Bessie Huckabee	Pending
5373-Robert S. Jones v. Builders Investment Group	Pending
5374-David M. Repko v. County of Georgetown	Pending
5375-Mark Kelley v. David Wren	Pending
5378-Stephen Smalls v. State	Pending
5382-State v. Marc A. Palmer	Pending
5384-Mae Ruth Thompson v. Pruitt Corporation	Pending
5387-Richard Wilson v. Laura B. Willis	Pending
5388-Vivian Atkins v. James R. Wilson, Jr.	Pending
5389-Fred Gatewood v. SCDC (2)	Pending
5390-State v. Tyrone King	Pending
5392-State v. Johnie Allen Devore, Jr.	Pending
5395-State v. Gerald Barrett, Jr.	Pending
5399-State v. Anthony Bailey	Pending
5402-Palmetto Mortuary Transport v. Knight Systems	Pending
2015-UP-010-Latonya Footman v. Johnson Food Services	Pending
2015-UP-091-U.S. Bank v. Kelley Burr	Pending
2015-UP-215-Ex Parte Tara Dawn Shurling (In re: State v. Harley)	Pending
2015-UP-262-State v. Erick Arroyo	Pending
2015-UP-266-State v. Gary Eugene Lott	Pending
2015-UP-303-Charleston County Assessor v. LMP Properties	Pending

2015-UP-304-Robert K. Marshall, Jr. v. City of Rock Hill	Pending
2015-UP-311-State v. Marty Baggett	Pending
2015-UP-330-Bigford Enterprises v. D. C. Development	Pending
2015-UP-350-Ebony Bethea v. Derrick Jones	Pending
2015-UP-357-Linda Rodarte v. USC	Pending
2015-UP-361-JP Morgan Chase Bank v. Leah Sample	Pending
2015-UP-364-Andrew Ballard v. Tim Roberson	Pending
2015-UP-365-State v. Ahmad Jamal Wilkins	Pending
2015-UP-376-Ron Orlosky v. Law Office of Jay Mullinax	Pending
2015-UP-377-Long Grove at Seaside v. Long Grove Property Owners ( James, Harwick & Partners)	Pending
2015-UP-378-State v. James Allen Johnson	Pending
2015-UP-382-State v. Nathaniel B. Beeks	Pending
2015-UP-388-Joann Wright v. William Enos	Pending
2015-UP-391-Cambridge Lakes v. Johnson Koola	Pending
2015-UP-395-Brandon Hodge v. Sumter County	Pending
2015-UP-402-Fritz Timmons v. Browns AS RV and Campers	Pending
2015-UP-403-Angela Parsons v. Jane Smith	Pending
2015-UP-414-Christopher A. Wellborn v. City of Rock Hill	Pending
2015-UP-423-North Pleasant, LLC v. SC Coastal Conservation	Pending
2015-UP-432-Barbara Gaines v. Joyce Ann Campbell	Pending
2015-UP-455-State v. Michael L. Cardwell	Pending



2015-UP-466-State v. Harold Cartwright, III	Pending
2015-UP-477-State v. William D. Bolt	Pending
2015-UP-478-State v. Michael Camp	Pending
2015-UP-485-State v. Alfonzo Alexander	Pending
2015-UP-491-Jacquelin S. Bennett v. T. Heyward Carter, Jr.	Pending
2015-UP-501-State v. Don-Survi Chisolm	Pending
2015-UP-505-Charles Carter v. S.C. Dep't of Corr. (3)	Pending
2015-UP-513-State v. Wayne A. Scott, Jr.	Pending
2015-UP-524-State v. Gary R. Thompson	Pending
2015-UP-540-State v. Michael McCraw	Pending
2015-UP-547-Evalena Catoe v. The City of Columbia	Pending
2015-UP-556-State v. Nathaniel Witherspoon	Pending
2015-UP-557-State v. Andrew A. Clemmons	Pending
2015-UP-564-State v. Tonya Mcalhaney	Pending
2015-UP-568-State v. Damian D. Anderson	Pending
2015-UP-574-State v. Brett D. Parker	Pending
2016-UP-010-State v. James Clyde Dill, Jr.	Pending
2016-UP-013-Ex parte State of South Carolina In re: Cathy J. Swicegood v. Polly A. Thompson	Pending
2016-UP-015-Onrae Williams v. State	Pending
2016-UP-021-State v. Darius Ranson-Williams	Pending

2016-UP-023-Frankie Lee Bryant, III, v. State	Pending
2016-UP-039-State v. Fritz Allen Timmons	Pending
2016-UP-040-State v. Jonathan Xavier Miller	Pending
2016-UP-052-Randall Green v. Wayne Bauerle	Pending
2016-UP-054-Ex Parte: S.C. Coastal Conservation League v. Duke Energy	Pending
2016-UP-055-State v. Ryan P. Deleston	Pending
2016-UP-056-Gwendolyn Sellers v. Cleveland Sellers, Jr.	Pending
2016-UP-061-Charleston Harbor v. Paul Davis	Pending
2016-UP-067-National Security Fire v. Rosemary Jenrette	Pending
2016-UP-068-State v. Marcus Bailey	Pending
2016-UP-069-John Frick v. Keith Fulmer	Pending
2016-UP-070-State v. Deangelo Mitchell (AA Ace Bail)	Pending
2016-UP-073-State v. Mandy L. Smith	Pending
2016-UP-074-State v. Sammy Lee Scarborough	Pending
2016-UP-089-William Breland v. SCDOT	Pending
2016-UP-091-Kyle Pertuis v. Front Roe Restaurants, Inc.	Pending
2016-UP-097-State v. Ricky E. Passmore	Pending
2016-UP-109-Brook Waddle v. SCDHHS	Pending
2016-UP-118-State v. Lywone S. Capers	Pending
2016-UP-119-State v. Bilal Sincere Haynesworth	Pending
2016-UP-127-James Neff v. Lear's Welding	Pending

2016-UP-132-Willis Weary v. State	Pending
2016-UP-137-Glenda R. Couram v. Christopher Hooker	Pending
2016-UP-138-McGuinn Construction v. Saul Espino	Pending
2016-UP-141-Plantation Federal v. J. Charles Gray	Pending
2016-UP-151-Randy Horton v. Jasper County School	Pending
2016-UP-153-Andreas Ganotakis v. City of Columbia Board	Pending
2016-UP-160-Mariam R. Noorai v. School Dist. of Pickens Cty.	Pending
2016-UP-162-State v. Shawn L. Wyatt	Pending
2016-UP-168-Nationwide Mutual v. Eagle Windows	Pending
2016-UP-171-Nakia Jones v. State	Pending
2016-UP-174-Jerome Curtis Buckson v. State	Pending
2016-UP-187-Nationstar Mortgage, LLC v. Rhonda L. Meisner	Pending
2016-UP-189-Jennifer Middleton v. Orangeburg Consolidated	Pending
2016-UP-193-State v. Jeffrey Davis	Pending
2016-UP-198-In the matter of Kenneth Campbell	Pending
2016-UP-199-Ryan Powell v. Amy Boheler	Pending
2016-UP-220-SCDSS v. Allyssa Boulware	Pending

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Supreme Court**

The State, Petitioner,

v.

Theodore Manning, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2015-000204

---

**ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS**

---

Appeal From Richland County  
G. Thomas Cooper, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

---

Opinion No. 27664

Heard November 4, 2015 – Filed September 7, 2016

---

**REVERSED**

---

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant  
Attorney General William M. Blich, Jr., both of  
Columbia, for Petitioner.

Luke Adcock Shealey, of The Shealey Law Firm, LLC,  
and Elizabeth Fielding Pringle, both of Columbia, for  
Respondent.

---

**ACTING JUSTICE TOAL:** We granted the State's petition for writ of certiorari to consider the court of appeals' decision, *State v. Manning*, Op. No. 2014-UP-411 (S.C. Ct. App. filed Nov. 19, 2014), holding the trial court erred in failing to conduct an evidentiary hearing to determine whether the immunity

provision of the Protection of Persons and Property Act (the Act)<sup>1</sup> applied and remanding the case to the trial court to conduct a full hearing. We reverse.

---

<sup>1</sup> Relevant to this appeal, the Act provides:

(A) A person is presumed to have a reasonable fear of imminent peril of death or great bodily injury to himself or another person when using deadly force that is intended or likely to cause death or great bodily injury to another person if the person:

(1) against whom the deadly force is used is in the process of unlawfully and forcefully entering, or has unlawfully and forcibly entered a dwelling, residence, or occupied vehicle, or if he removes or is attempting to remove another person against his will from the dwelling, residence, or occupied vehicle; and

(2) who uses deadly force knows or has reason to believe that an unlawful and forcible entry or unlawful and forcible act is occurring or has occurred.

(B) The presumption provided in subsection (A) does not apply if the person:

(1) against whom the deadly force is used has the right to be in or is a lawful resident of the dwelling, residence, or occupied vehicle including, but not limited to, an owner, lessee, or titleholder . . . .

. . . .

(C) A person who is not engaged in an unlawful activity and who is attacked in another place where he has a right to be . . . has no duty to retreat and has the right to stand his ground and meet force with force, including deadly force, if he reasonably believes it is necessary to prevent death or great bodily injury to himself or another person or to prevent the commission of a violent crime . . . .

S.C. Code Ann. § 16-11-440 (2015).

## FACTS/ PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Theodore Manning (Respondent) was charged with murder following the death of his girlfriend, Mikki McPhatter (the victim). The victim died after being shot in the back of the head in Respondent's home. It is undisputed that the victim was unarmed. Another of Respondent's girlfriends, Kendra Goodman, led police to the victim's abandoned and burned vehicle, where her charred skeletal remains were discovered in the trunk.

Respondent sought immunity from prosecution under Act and in the alternative claimed he shot the victim in self-defense. At a pre-trial hearing, Respondent's counsel relied upon Respondent's statement to police, introduced as an exhibit by the State, to support his immunity claim. In the statement, Respondent maintained he had taken a gun away from the victim during an argument, but ultimately "pulled the trigger to show her to stop playing":

It was a disagreement between the two of us. I was disregarding some of her questions when it came to the relationship . . . which turned into an argument that got heated. [The victim] picked up the firearm, pointed it at me. I asked her what the hell was she thinking. She asked me was I still serious, referring to whether or not I wanted to have kids with her. I told her that it was just friends with benefits, which made her even madder. I told her to stop playing and took the gun from her. I grabbed her hands and just took it from her. Then I pointed it at her and asked her "Are you fucking crazy[.]" I told her that "You can't be mad at me because when I came up to see you last you were asking me if I wanted to be friends with benefits." She was still talking about whether I was serious. The whole time she was crying . . . even when she was pointing the gun at me she was crying. She hit the gun and I asked her again "Are you fucking crazy[?]" She told me "You're just like everybody else. You said that you were going to be there for me and you hurt me just like everybody else." She went to take a step like motioned toward me, but she pivot [sic] when she did it and I pulled the trigger to show her to stop playing. I didn't see where the bullet went.

Based on this statement, and considering it as an undisputed recitation of the facts, the trial judge heard arguments on the immunity motion from both sides. Respondent's counsel argued the statement constituted a "prima facie" showing, rebuttable by the State, that Respondent was entitled to immunity under the Act because the incident occurred in Respondent's home and the victim "pulled a gun on [Respondent]," Respondent "then disarmed her, and she came at him and he pulled the trigger." The State argued that because Respondent's statement indicated that the victim was unarmed when he shot her, Respondent was not in fear of great bodily injury or death at that time. Further, the State argued that the victim was a guest in Respondent's home, and therefore, she did not unlawfully or forcibly enter the residence, which is required to invoke the Act's presumption of reasonable fear of imminent peril.

After considering Respondent's statement to police and hearing arguments from counsel for both sides, the trial court denied Respondent's pretrial motion for immunity. The matter then proceeded to a jury trial. Respondent was convicted of voluntary manslaughter and sentenced to thirty years in prison.

Respondent appealed, and the court of appeals found, *inter alia*, that the trial court was required to grant Respondent a full evidentiary hearing prior to determining whether the immunity provision applied, and therefore the court of appeals remanded the case for a full hearing. *See State v. Manning*, Op. No. 2014-UP-411 (S.C. Ct. App. filed Nov. 19, 2014). We granted the State's petition for a writ of certiorari to decide whether this was in error.

## LAW/ANALYSIS

The State argues that the court of appeals erred in finding the trial court is required to conduct a complete testimonial evidentiary hearing prior to ruling on whether the immunity provision of the Act applies. We agree.

In *State v. Duncan*, this Court interpreted the plain language of section 16-11-450(A) of the South Carolina Code<sup>2</sup> to require that the immunity determination

---

<sup>2</sup> See S.C. Code Ann. § 16-11-450(A) (providing "[a] person who uses deadly force as permitted by the provisions of this article or another applicable provision of law

be made pre-trial. 404, 410, 709 S.E.2d 662, 665 (2011). More specifically, the Court stated:

[By] using the words "immune from criminal prosecution," the legislature intended to create a true immunity, and not simply an affirmative defense. We also look to the language of the statute that provides, "the General Assembly finds that it is proper for law-abiding citizens to protect themselves, their families, and others from intruders and attackers *without fear of prosecution* or civil action for acting in defense of themselves and others." We agree with the circuit court that the legislature intended defendants be shielded from trial if they use deadly force as outlined under the Act. Immunity under the Act is therefore a bar to prosecution and, upon motion of either party, must be decided prior to trial. Accordingly, we find the trial court properly made a pre-trial determination of respondent's immunity.

*Id.* The Court further explained that the appropriate standard of review in pre-trial determination would be a preponderance of the evidence. *Id.* at 411, 709 S.E.2d 662, 665.

Neither the Act, nor *Duncan*, sets forth a specific type of hearing or procedure to be followed when a criminal defendant claims immunity under the Act. *See State v. Curry*, 406 S.C. 364, 375 n.3, 752 S.E.2d 263, 268 n.3 (2013) (noting "the Act is silent on the procedure to follow when an accused seeks immunity and "*Duncan* interprets the Act to require a pretrial determination by the trial court"). Rather, all that is required under the Act and *Duncan* is that the court makes the immunity determination prior to trial.

Respondent urges this Court to add the gloss of a full evidentiary hearing to the statutory language. In considering his request, we find instructive *State v. Wessinger*, 408 S.C. 416, 759 S.E.2d 405 (2014), which interpreted section 44-48-

---

is justified in using deadly force and is immune from criminal prosecution and civil action for the use of deadly force, unless the person against whom deadly force was used is a law enforcement officer acting in the performance of his official duties and he identifies himself in accordance with applicable law or the person using deadly force knows or reasonably should have known that the person is a law enforcement officer.").



30(2) of the Sexually Violent Predator Act (SVP Act).<sup>3</sup> Subsection *o* of that section permits the trial judge to make a determination of whether the crime for which a person is charged qualifies as sexually violent even when it is not specifically enumerated under the SVP Act.<sup>4</sup> In *Wessinger*, this Court considered whether a criminal defendant is entitled to a full evidentiary hearing prior to the judge making this determination, and held "that the scope and necessity of a separate evidentiary hearing is to be determined on a case-by-case basis." 408 S.C. at 420, 759 S.E.2d at 407. Moreover, the Court found "no error in the procedure utilized here where the circuit court's decision was based on the uncontested facts in the record, all of which were specifically acknowledged by appellant under oath." *Id.* at 421, 759 S.E.2d at 407. We agree with the State that this flexible approach is likewise desirable in immunity determinations under the Act. Not only does this approach permit the trial judge to tailor the hearing to the needs of each case, but it serves to save precious judicial resources in cases like this one where an extensive hearing is simply unnecessary.<sup>5</sup>

We review immunity determinations under an abuse of discretion standard. *Curry*, 406 S.C. at 370, 752 S.E.2d at 266; *see also State v. Douglas*, 411 S.C. 307, 316, 768 S.E.2d 232, 237 (Ct. App. 2014) ("An abuse of discretion occurs when the trial court's ruling is based on an error of law or, when grounded in factual conclusions, is without evidentiary support." (quoting *State v. Pittman*, 373 S.C. 527, 570, 647 S.E.2d 144, 166–67 (2007))). Here, the undisputed facts support a

---

<sup>3</sup> *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 44-48-30(2) (Supp. 2013).

<sup>4</sup> *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 44-48-30(2)(*o*).

<sup>5</sup> To this end, we find unpersuasive Respondent's argument that because *Duncan* imposes a preponderance of the evidence standard on the trial court, the immunity determination is distinguishable from determinations made under the SVP Act. As the evidentiary hearing standard is a flexible one, there may be times that a trial court requires more evidence, be it testimonial or otherwise, to make the immunity determination. This is not that case. Here, Respondent's counsel asserted that the evidence submitted to the trial court, in the form of Respondent's statement, set forth a prima facie showing of immunity. Further, counsel did not ask to call any witnesses in support of his position, did not object to the trial court's hearing the motion without the calling of witnesses, and did not ask to proffer additional testimony or indicate to the trial court the additional testimony he would have presented had he been entitled to a full testimonial evidentiary hearing.

denial of immunity under subsections (A) and (C) of section 16-11-440. First, the victim was an invited guest in Respondent's home, meaning Respondent was not entitled to the presumption of immunity under subsection (A). *See Curry*, 406 S.C. at 370, 752 S.E.2d at 266 ("Section 16–11–440(A), the main thrust of the Act, provides a presumption of reasonable fear of imminent peril of death or great bodily injury to a person who uses deadly force if he is attacked by or attempting to remove another from a dwelling, residence, or occupied vehicle. However, the presumption of subsection (A) does not apply if the victim has an equal right to be in the dwelling or residence. S.C. Code Ann. § 16–11–440(B). Because Collins was a social guest and rightfully in the apartment, subsection (A) is inapplicable to Appellant, and he is therefore defaulted into subsection (C), which deals with the use of force by one who is attacked in another place where he has a right to be."). Further, the victim was unarmed at the time she was shot, meaning we cannot say that the trial judge abused his discretion in denying Respondent immunity under subsection (C). *See S.C. Code Ann. § 16-11-440(C)* (providing "[a] person who is not engaged in an unlawful activity and who is attacked in another place where he has a right to be . . . *has no duty to retreat and has the right to stand his ground and meet force with force, including deadly force, if he reasonably believes it is necessary to prevent death or great bodily injury to himself or another person or to prevent the commission of a violent crime . . .*" (emphasis added)). Because these essential facts were undisputed and the trial judge heard legal arguments from both sides on the applicability of these subsections in Respondent's case, we agree with the State that the trial judge heard and considered all that was necessary to make the immunity determination by a preponderance of the evidence. As a result, Respondent received the pre-trial determination he was entitled to under *Duncan*, and the trial court did not abuse its discretion in making that ruling without first conducting a full testimonial evidentiary hearing.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Because we find the hearing here was sufficient, we need not address the State's alternative argument that the court of appeals erred in remanding the case to the trial court instead of reviewing the trial court's determination that Respondent was not entitled to immunity under the Act under a harmless error analysis. *See Futch v. McAllister Towing of Georgetown, Inc.*, 335 S.C. 598, 613, 518 S.E.2d 591, 598 (1999).

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the court of appeals' decision remanding this case to the trial court for a full evidentiary hearing is

**REVERSED.**

**BEATTY, KITTREDGE and HEARN, JJ., concur. PLEICONES, C.J., dissenting in a separate opinion.**

**CHIEF JUSTICE PLEICONES:** I respectfully dissent and would affirm the unpublished decision of the Court of Appeals that remanded this matter to the circuit court for an evidentiary hearing on respondent's claim for immunity pursuant to the Protection of Persons and Property Act (the Act).

A defendant claiming immunity under the Act must establish his entitlement to this relief by a preponderance of the evidence in a pretrial "determination." *State v. Duncan*, 392 S.C. 404, 709 S.E.2d 662 (2011); *see also State v. Curry*, 406 S.C. 364, 752 S.E.2d 263 (2013). The majority holds today that in making this pretrial determination the circuit judge need not always hold a full evidentiary hearing, but rather may limit the defendant's right to present evidence entitling him to immunity in order "to save precious judicial resources."<sup>7</sup> The majority then proceeds to "review" the merits of the trial court's denial of respondent's immunity claim under an abuse of discretion standard. What the majority glosses over, however, is that the trial judge held that the Act did not apply and therefore denied respondent's request for an evidentiary hearing on the merits of his immunity claim, compounding his earlier refusal to allow respondent to call a forensics and ballistics expert to testify in support of respondent's self-defense theory. While the trial judge neither heard evidence<sup>8</sup> nor made a pre-trial determination that respondent was not entitled to immunity under the Act, the majority nonetheless states it is upholding the pre-trial determination under an abuse of discretion

---

<sup>7</sup> The majority's reliance on *State v. Wessinger*, 408 S.C. 416, 759 S.E.2d 405 (2014) and the statutory scheme for determining whether a defendant should be designated a sexually violent predator (SVP) is misplaced. In making this determination, the trial/plea judge is vested with complete discretion to decide whether a crime is sexually violent, without any requirement that the State actually request such a finding, much less that it meet any burden of proof. Since the SVP designation rests completely in the trial judge's discretion, it is not surprising that the decision whether to hold an evidentiary hearing is made on a case-by-case basis. The Act, on the other hand, requires a motion by a party, and places on the defendant the burden of proving entitlement to immunity by a preponderance of the evidence. *Duncan, supra*. In my opinion, the majority errs in relying on the SVP procedure to decide the process due a defendant under the Act.

<sup>8</sup> The trial judge's ruling was based solely on the argument of counsel and the solicitor's reading of excerpts from respondent's statement to the police. It is axiomatic that arguments of counsel are not evidence. *E.g., Sosebee v. Leeke*, 293 S.C. 531, 362 S.E.2d 22 (1987).

standard, finding "the hearing here was sufficient." The record belies the fact that there was any evidentiary hearing afforded to respondent, much less a "sufficient" one.

In my opinion, the Court of Appeals properly remanded this case in order to permit respondent an opportunity to present evidence in support of his claim of immunity under the Act.

# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Jarrett Skipper Calder, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2016-001772

---

## ORDER

---

The Office of Disciplinary Counsel asks this Court to place respondent on interim suspension pursuant to Rule 17 of the Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement (RLDE) contained in Rule 413 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR).

IT IS ORDERED that respondent's license to practice law in this state is suspended until further order of this Court.

Respondent is hereby enjoined from taking any action regarding any trust, escrow, operating, and any other law office account(s) respondent may maintain at any bank or other financial institution, including, but not limited to, making any withdrawal or transfer, or writing any check or other instrument on the account(s).

Within fifteen (15) days of this order, respondent shall serve and file the affidavit required by Rule 30, RLDE. Should respondent fail to timely file the required affidavit, respondent may be held in civil and/or criminal contempt of this Court as provided by Rule 30, RLDE.

s/ Costa M. Pleicones C.J.

Columbia, South Carolina  
August 30, 2016

# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Re: Expansion of Electronic Filing Pilot Program - Court of  
Common Pleas

Appellate Case No. 2015-002439

---

## ORDER

---

Pursuant to the provisions of Article V, Section 4 of the South Carolina Constitution,

IT IS ORDERED that the Pilot Program for the Electronic Filing (E-Filing) of documents in the Court of Common Pleas, which was established by Order dated December 1, 2015, is expanded to include Cherokee County. Effective September 13, 2016, all filings in all common pleas cases commenced or pending in Cherokee County must be E-Filed if the party is represented by an attorney, unless the type of case or the type of filing is excluded from the Pilot Program. The counties currently designated for mandatory E-Filing are as follows:

Clarendon	Lee	Greenville
Sumter	Williamsburg	Pickens
Spartanburg	Cherokee—Effective September 13, 2016	

Attorneys should refer to the South Carolina Electronic Filing Policies and Guidelines, which were adopted by the Supreme Court on October 28, 2015, and the training materials available at <http://www.sccourts.org/efiling/> to determine whether any specific filings are exempted from the requirement that they be E-Filed. Attorneys who have cases pending in Pilot Counties are strongly encouraged to review, and to instruct their staff to review, the training materials available on the E-Filing Portal.

s/Costa M. Pleicones  
Costa M. Pleicones  
Chief Justice of South Carolina

Columbia, South Carolina

August 31, 2016



**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA**  
**In The Court of Appeals**

South Carolina Department of Revenue, Respondent,

v.

Meenaxi, Inc., d/b/a Corner Mart, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2015-000292

---

Appeal From The Administrative Law Court  
Deborah Brooks Durden, Administrative Law Judge

---

Opinion No. Op. 5439  
Heard April 19, 2016 – Filed September 7, 2016

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

S. Jahue Moore and John Calvin Bradley, Jr., both of Moore Taylor Law Firm, P.A., of West Columbia, for Appellant.

Milton Gary Kimpson, Lauren Acquaviva, and Sean Gordon Ryan, all of Columbia, for Respondent.

---

**LOCKEMY, C.J.:** Meenaxi, Inc. d/b/a Corner Mart (Appellant) appeals the administrative law court's (ALC's) order affirming the South Carolina Department of Revenue's (the Department) revocation of an off premises beer and wine permit that allowed alcohol to be sold at the Corner Mart. On appeal, Appellant argues (1) the ALC erred in determining the Department brought and pursued this action against the proper parties; (2) the Department's failure to bring and pursue this case

against the proper parties violated the due process rights of Malkesh Patel—the owner of Meenaxi, Inc. and the Corner Mart; (3) the ALC erred in revoking Appellant's permit pursuant to subsection 61-4-580(5) of the South Carolina Code (2009); (4) the ALC's factual findings and legal conclusions were based upon erroneously admitted testimony and evidence; and (5) the ALC abused its discretion and committed an error of law by determining that revocation of the permit was the appropriate penalty. We affirm.

## **FACTS/PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Meenaxi, Inc. owns the Corner Mart, a convenience store located in Anderson that sold beer and wine pursuant to an off premises beer and wine permit issued by the Department on January 19, 2012. On February 26, 2013, Agent Thomas Bielawski—a special agent in the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division's (SLED's) Video Gambling Unit—conducted a regulatory inspection of the Corner Mart pursuant to section 61-4-230 of the South Carolina Code (2009) and discovered two video gaming machines—a Products Direct machine and a Gift Surplus machine—in the store. Agent Bielawski examined the machines and determined they were illegal video gaming machines, as defined by section 12-21-2710 of the South Carolina Code (2014). Accordingly, he seized the machines pursuant to his authority under section 12-21-2712 of the South Carolina Code (2014).<sup>1</sup> In addition, he issued a citation to "Malkesh Patel Meenaxi, Inc." for violating section 12-21-2710 and subsection 61-4-580(5)<sup>2</sup> because he determined

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 12-21-2712 provides,

Any machine, board, or other device prohibited by [s]ection 12-21-2710 must be seized by any law enforcement officer and at once taken before any magistrate of the county in which the machine, board, or device is seized who shall immediately examine it, and if satisfied that it is in violation of [s]ection 12-21-2710 or any other law of this State, direct that it be immediately destroyed.

<sup>2</sup> Subsection 61-4-580(5) prohibited the holder of a permit authorizing the sale of beer or wine from knowingly allowing a crime to be committed on the licensed premises.

Appellant had knowingly kept illegal video gaming machines inside the Corner Mart.

Agent Bielawski then brought the machines before an Anderson County magistrate. The magistrate examined the machines, determined they were illegal video gaming machines, and issued an Order of Destruction on March 1, 2013.<sup>3</sup> The Order of Destruction stated, "The Defendant has 15 days from the receipt of this Order to request a Post Seizure Hearing to contest the illegality of the machine(s). Otherwise, the machine(s) will be destroyed." The owner of the machines, Encore Entertainment, requested a post-seizure hearing, which was scheduled for December 17, 2013. Encore Entertainment subsequently withdrew its request for a post-seizure hearing, and the magistrate issued a Final Order on December 18, 2013, finding the machines illegal and ordering their destruction.<sup>4</sup>

On March 28, 2013, the Department gave Appellant written notice of its intent to revoke the off premises beer and wine permit. On April 3, 2013, Appellant protested the revocation of the permit. On May 8, 2013, the Department issued a written determination that Appellant violated subsection 61-4-580(5) by knowingly permitting illegal gaming machines to be kept on its premises. The Department determined revocation of the off premises beer and wine permit was the appropriate penalty for violating subsection 61-4-580(5). Appellant appealed the Department's determination to the ALC.

On December 4, 2014, the ALC held a contested case hearing on this matter. In an order issued on January 8, 2015, the ALC affirmed the Department's revocation of the permit. The ALC found the record contained sufficient evidence that the

---

<sup>3</sup> The action before the magistrate was originally captioned "SLED v. Corner Mart." The parties subsequently stipulated that the original caption should be amended to list only the machines as the defendants in the civil forfeiture action and that the store and store owner were not proper parties to the action because the forfeiture action was in rem. Appellant noted at trial that it "brought [this] issue up" to the magistrate and the magistrate "ruled in his final order that we were dismissed because we weren't a proper party to it and should never have been a party to it."

<sup>4</sup> The magistrate's Final Order was captioned "SLED v. One (1) Products Direct Machine and One (1) Gift Surplus Machine."

Department met its burden of showing the two machines contained games of chance in violation of section 12-21-2710, the machines were located on Appellant's premises, and Appellant knowingly permitted the machines to be placed on its premises in violation of subsection 61-4-580(5). Appellant filed a motion for reconsideration, which the ALC denied. This appeal followed.

## STANDARD OF REVIEW

"In an appeal from the decision of an administrative agency, the Administrative Procedures Act [(the APA)] provides the appropriate standard of review." *Original Blue Ribbon Taxi Corp. v. S.C. Dep't of Motor Vehicles*, 380 S.C. 600, 604, 670 S.E.2d 674, 676 (Ct. App. 2008). "Pursuant to the APA, this court may reverse or modify the ALC if the appellant's substantial rights have been prejudiced because the administrative decisions are: (a) in violation of constitutional or statutory provisions; (b) in excess of the statutory authority of the agency; (c) made upon unlawful procedure; (d) affected by an error of law; (e) clearly erroneous in view of the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence on the whole record; or (f) arbitrary or capricious or characterized by abuse of discretion or clearly unwarranted exercise of discretion." *MRI at Belfair, LLC v. S.C. Dep't of Health & Env'tl. Control*, 394 S.C. 567, 572, 716 S.E.2d 111, 113 (Ct. App. 2011).

## LAW/ANALYSIS

### A. Proper Parties

#### 1. *Civil Forfeiture Action in the Magistrate Court*

Appellant argues because neither Patel nor Meenaxi, Inc. was a party to the civil forfeiture action in the magistrate court, the magistrate's orders may not be used against Patel or Meenaxi, Inc. in any way. Thus, Appellant asserts the ALC erred in admitting the magistrate's Order of Destruction and Final Order into evidence. We disagree.

"The government's seizure of alleged contraband may arise in the context of a civil or criminal forfeiture proceeding." *Mims Amusement Co. v. S.C. Law Enf't Div.*, 366 S.C. 141, 150 n.4, 621 S.E.2d 344, 348 n.4 (2005). "The critical difference between civil forfeiture and criminal forfeiture is the identity of the defendant. In civil forfeiture, the Government proceeds against a thing (*rem*). In criminal

forfeiture, it proceeds against a human being (*personam*).” *Id.* (quoting *U.S. v. Croce*, 345 F.Supp.2d 492, 494 (E.D. Pa. 2004)). We find the seized Products Direct and Gift Surplus machines were the only proper defendants in the civil forfeiture action before the magistrate. *See Union Cty. Sheriff’s Office v. Henderson*, 395 S.C. 516, 518 n.1, 719 S.E.2d 665, 666 n.1 (2011) (stating because a civil forfeiture action to determine whether machines are illegal gambling machines subject to destruction is an action in rem, “the proper defendants are only the . . . seized machines which are the subject of the Order of Destruction”).

In addition, we find the magistrate's orders were admissible evidence in this case because they were in rem determinations about the illegal character of the video gaming machines seized from the Corner Mart. *See Ex parte Kenmore Shoe Co.*, 50 S.C. 140, 146, 27 S.E. 682, 684 (1897) (“Where the court has jurisdiction of the res, its decree in rem upon the character or status of the subject-matter is binding, not only on the parties and their privies, but also upon all persons who might have asserted an interest therein.”); *id.* at 147, 27 S.E. at 684 (stating in rem judgments bind third persons and are “conclusive evidence against all the world”); *Fitchette v. Sumter Hardwood Co.*, 145 S.C. 53, 67–68, 142 S.E. 828, 833 (1928) (“A judicial record is always admissible to prove the fact that a judgment has been rendered, the time of its rendition, and the terms and effect of the judgment, for the mere fact that a judgment was given, this being a thing done by public authority, can never be considered as *res inter alios acta*, nor can the legal consequences of the rendition of such judgment be so considered.”).

## 2. *Permit Revocation Action*

Appellant argues the ALC erred in refusing to dismiss this case on the ground that the Department failed to sue the correct parties. Specifically, Appellant argues the permit was issued to Patel and Meenaxi, Inc. but neither was made a party to this action. In addition, Appellant asserts there was no evidence at trial that “Meenaxi, Inc. d/b/a Corner Mart”—the corporate entity designated as the defendant in this action—exists. We disagree.

Patel testified his corporation, Meenaxi, Inc., owned and operated the Corner Mart. Appellant's beer and wine permit listed the following information:

Malkesh Patel  
Meenaxi Inc.  
713 Britton St  
Anderson[,] SC 29621-2614

Corner Mart  
1010 E Shockley Ferry Road  
Anderson, SC 29624

Title 61 of the South Carolina Code governs "Alcohol and Alcoholic Beverages," and section 61-2-100 of the South Carolina Code (2009) describes the "[p]ersons entitled to be licensees or permittees." As used in Title 61 "and unless otherwise required by the context," the term "'[p]erson' includes an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, limited liability company, receiver, association, company, corporation, or any other group." S.C. Code Ann. § 61-2-100(H)(1) (2009). "Licenses and permits may be issued only to the person who is the owner of the business seeking the permit or license." S.C. Code Ann. § 61-2-100(A) (2009).

Based on Patel's testimony and the information listed on the permit, we find it was reasonable for the ALC to conclude that Meenaxi, Inc. owned and operated the Corner Mart—and in effect was doing business as the Corner Mart—even though the permit did not include the words "doing business as" or "d/b/a."

We further find that Appellant was the sole permit holder and Patel—the owner of Appellant—was simply Appellant's principal and designated agent. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 61-2-100(H)(2)(a),(g) (2009) (stating under Title 61, "a person who owns twenty-five percent or more of the value of the business entity" and "an officer of the business or entity which owns the business" are considered "principals" of the business or entity); S.C. Code Ann. § 61-2-100(F) (2009) ("Businesses licensed or permitted by the department under this title must designate with the department an agent and mailing address for service of notices."). Because the permit at issue here was held by a business rather than an individual, section 61-2-100(F) mandated that Appellant designate an agent to receive service of notices. As the Department explained at oral argument, Patel was not the permit holder—he was simply Appellant's contact person. Because Patel was not the permit holder, the Department was not required to add him as a party to this permit revocation action.

## **B. Due Process**

Appellant argues the ALC erred in finding the Department did not violate Patel's due process rights by failing to add him as a party to this action. Appellant also argues the Department's failure to name Patel as a party prejudiced Patel because he had no opportunity to inspect the machines destroyed upon the magistrate's order. We disagree.

"No person shall be finally bound by a judicial or quasi judicial decision of an administrative agency affecting private rights except on due notice and an opportunity [to] be heard . . . and he shall have in all such instances the right to judicial review." *Stono River Env'tl. Prot. Ass'n v. S.C. Dep't of Health & Env'tl. Control*, 305 S.C. 90, 94, 406 S.E.2d 340, 342 (1991) (quoting S.C. Const. art. I, § 22). "[P]roof of a denial of due process in an administrative proceeding requires a showing of substantial prejudice." *Palmetto All., Inc. v. S.C. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 282 S.C. 430, 435, 319 S.E.2d 695, 698 (1984).

As stated previously, Patel was not a proper party to the magistrate court action, and the Department was not required to add him as a party to this permit revocation action because he was not the permit holder. Therefore, Patel cannot complain of prejudice from the fact that he was not a party to those actions.

## **C. Inspection of the Corner Mart**

Appellant argues the ALC erred in failing to rule that Agent Bielawski's inspection of the Corner Mart exceeded his statutory authority under section 61-4-230 of the South Carolina Code (2009) and violated the Fourth Amendment. We disagree.

The Fourth Amendment protects against unreasonable searches and seizures. U.S. Const. amend. IV. "Warrantless searches are per se unreasonable unless an exception to the warrant requirement is presented." *State v. Bailey*, 276 S.C. 32, 35, 274 S.E.2d 913, 915 (1981).

"Searches within the scope of a liquor control statute fall under the so-called 'pervasively regulated industry' doctrine as an exception to the warrant requirement." 48A C.J.S. *Intoxicating Liquors* § 740 (2014); see also *New York v. Burger*, 482 U.S. 691, 702 (1987) ("Because the owner or operator of commercial

premises in a 'closely regulated' industry has a reduced expectation of privacy, the warrant and probable-cause requirements, which fulfill the traditional Fourth Amendment standard of reasonableness for a government search, have lessened application in this context." (citation omitted). "Because liquor license holders have certainty regarding the statutory and regulatory licensing standards and regarding their obligation to permit inspection of the licensed premises for compliance with those standards, a statutory and regulatory scheme authorizing administrative inspections provides an adequate substitute for a warrant to search those premises." 48A C.J.S. *Intoxicating Liquors* § 740 (2014). "However, a liquor inspector's statutory and regulatory authority to conduct an administrative inspection is limited to a search of the licensed premises for violations of the liquor statutes and regulations." *Id.* "Thus, agents may conduct a valid administrative search of a liquor licensee's premises when they enter the premises without a warrant to investigate the possible violation of a regulation prohibiting gambling devices on any premises where liquor is sold because the search covers an administrative, rather than a criminal, violation." *Id.*

SLED has "specific and exclusive jurisdiction and authority statewide" regarding "law enforcement, regulation enforcement, and inspections under Title 61." S.C. Code Ann. § 23-3-15(A)(7) (2007). Under section 61-4-230,

A person who, upon demand of an officer or agent of the division:

- (1) refuses to allow full inspection of the premises or any part of the premises which is licensed to sell beer or wine; or
- (2) refuses to allow full inspection of the stocks and invoices of the licensee; or
- (3) who prevents or in any way hinders an inspection is guilty of a misdemeanor . . . .

Agent Bielawski conducted a regulatory alcoholic beverage license inspection of the Corner Mart on February 26, 2013. Inside the store, Agent Bielawski observed two machines that appeared to be illegal video gambling machines. The machines had been turned off and unplugged. Agent Bielawski testified the store clerk, Ursula Dean, informed him that the store's owner had unplugged the



machines and removed the cash from inside them before Agent Bielawski arrived at the Corner Mart. Agent Bielawski plugged in the machines and observed that they offered numerous illegal games, including poker, blackjack, and keno. After discovering the illegal games on the machines, he and another officer seized the two machines, and he issued a citation to "Malkesh Patel Meenaxi, Inc." for "permitting games that constitute a crime under state law." Agent Bielawski then used keys provided by Dean to open the machines and determine whether they contained money.

We find Agent Bielawski's alcoholic beverage license inspection did not violate the Fourth Amendment because the "pervasively regulated industry" exception to the warrant requirement applied. In addition, we note section 61-4-230 authorized Agent Bielawski to inspect the Corner Mart because that statute states anyone who "refuses to allow full inspection of the premises or any part of the premises which is licensed to sell beer or wine" or "who prevents or in any way hinders an inspection is guilty of a misdemeanor." This right to inspect allowed Agent Bielawski to fully search the machines to determine whether they were illegal gaming machines that might subject Appellant to liability under subsection 61-4-580(5). Specifically, this right to inspect allowed Agent Bielawski to plug in the machines to determine whether they offered illegal games and to open the machines to determine whether they contained money. Accordingly, we find Agent Bielawski's warrantless search of the machines did not violate the Fourth Amendment.

#### **D. Admission of Evidence**

##### *1. Agent Bielawski's Investigative Report*

Appellant argues the ALC erred in admitting Agent Bielawski's investigative report into evidence because the report was generated pursuant to Agent Bielawski's unlawful search<sup>5</sup> and because it included inadmissible hearsay statements from Dean, Agent Bielawski's subjective legal opinion that the machines were illegal, and the magistrate's non-binding conclusions.

---

<sup>5</sup> Because Agent Bielawski's inspection did not violate the Fourth Amendment, this argument has no merit.

The Department introduced the investigative report Agent Bielawski prepared after inspecting the Corner Mart. In the report, Agent Bielawski stated he noticed "two video poker machines" in the store while conducting his inspection. In addition, the report stated Dean informed Agent Bielawski that Patel "had been aware that SLED was in the area" and that Patel emptied the money from the machines, turned off the power switches, and unplugged the machines from the wall before Agent Bielawski arrived at the store. The report also stated a magistrate examined the machines, determined they were illegal video gaming machines prohibited by section 12-21-2710, and ordered their destruction.

Initially, we note, as discussed in Section A of this opinion, the magistrate's findings were admissible evidence in this case. Therefore, we find the ALC did not err in admitting the portions of the report that related to the magistrate's order.

We further note Agent Bielawski's report is generally admissible under the business records exception to the rule against hearsay. *See* Rule 802, SCRE ("Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by [the South Carolina Rules of Evidence] or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court of this State or by statute."); *Ex parte Dep't of Health & Env'tl. Control*, 350 S.C. 243, 249–50, 565 S.E.2d 293, 297 (2002) ("Rule 803(6), SCRE, provides that memorand[a], reports, records, etc. in any form, of acts, events, conditions, or diagnoses, are admissible as long[] as they are (1) prepared near the time of the event recorded; (2) prepared by someone with or from information transmitted by a person with knowledge; (3) prepared in the regular course of business; (4) identified by a qualified witness who can testify regarding the mode of preparation of the record; and (5) found to be trustworthy by the court."). Agent Bielawski testified he documented his inspection of the Corner Mart in a report and he normally kept such reports in the ordinary course of business. The report was stamped "Received" by "SCDOR ABL SECTION" on March 27, 2013, which indicates Agent Bielawski prepared the report sometime within one month after his February 26, 2013 inspection.

We note that much of the content of Agent Bielawski's report is specifically excluded by the business records exception because it is Agent Bielawski's subjective opinion and judgment. *See* Rule 803(6), SCRE (providing business records are admissible but stating "that subjective opinions and judgments found in business records are not admissible"); *S.C. Dep't of Motor Vehicles v. McCarson*, 391 S.C. 136, 147 n.11, 705 S.E.2d 425, 430 n.11 (2011) (finding the business records exception "would appear to support the Department's position [that a police

report is admissible]. However, a closer reading of the [business records exception] reveals that [the officer's] observations in the form of the Incident Report are specifically excluded"). Nevertheless, we find the admission of Agent Bielawski's opinion was a harmless error because there was abundant evidence that the machines were illegal—including Agent Bielawski's testimony about the games the machines offered, the magistrate's order finding the machines illegal, and Patel's testimony that when people "won a hand," he paid them the amount the machine said to pay.

Further, we find the ALC did not err in admitting the portion of the report containing Dean's statements because such employee statements are not hearsay. "A statement is not hearsay if . . . [t]he statement is offered against a party and is . . . a statement by the party's agent or servant concerning a matter within the scope of the agency or employment, made during the existence of the relationship . . . ." Rule 801(d)(2)(D), SCRE. The portion of the SLED report containing references to Dean's statements did not contain Agent Bielawski's subjective opinions or judgments; therefore that portion would be admissible under the business records exception since Dean's statements were admissible as admissions by a party opponent.

We find substantial evidence supported the ALC's finding that Dean was an employee and agent of Patel and Meenaxi, Inc. and made the challenged statements within the scope of her employment. Agent Bielawski testified that when he entered the Corner Mart, he identified himself to Dean, who was the store clerk on duty behind the counter. Agent Bielawski explained he knew Dean was the store clerk "[b]ecause she was behind the counter in a role that a store clerk would have in any other store just like it." In addition, Agent Bielawski testified Dean told him that Patel was her boss. Further, Dean's statements concerned a matter within the scope of her employment because they related to her boss's actions with the machines found in the store where she worked. Therefore, we find Dean's hearsay statements were admissible as statements by a party, and the reference to those statements in Agent Bielawski's report were admissible under the business records exception.

## 2. *Agent Bielawski's Testimony*

Appellant asserts the ALC erred in allowing Agent Bielawski to (1) testify about statements Dean made to him<sup>6</sup>; (2) speculate about the business arrangement between the individuals and entities identified on the permit; and (3) testify about his experience with similar machines, individuals who play such machines, and the coupons issued by the machines because he was never qualified as an expert.

"If the witness is not testifying as an expert, the witness' testimony in the form of opinions or inferences is limited to those opinions or inferences which (a) are rationally based on the perception of the witness, (b) are helpful to a clear understanding of the witness' testimony or the determination of a fact in issue, and (c) do not require special knowledge, skill, experience or training." Rule 701, SCRE.

Agent Bielawski stated the words "doing business as" did not appear on the permit. However, when asked what "doing business as" meant according to the permit, Agent Bielawski responded, "Corner Mart." Agent Bielawski testified his training and experience as an alcoholic beverage inspector taught him to understand alcoholic beverage licenses and identify "what the different things on the license[s] mean." He testified he was "trained to realize that [the] bottom section is for the purpose of identifying the doing business as name[,] and having done thousands of alcoholic beverage license inspections, that is consistent in every case with the doing business license versus the actual corporate name, which is above it."

We find the ALC erred in allowing Agent Bielawski to give his legal conclusion that, based on his interpretation of the permit, Meenaxi, Inc. did business as the Corner Mart. However, we believe this error was harmless because the ALC could

---

<sup>6</sup> During his inspection of the Corner Mart, Agent Bielawski observed the two machines had been turned off and unplugged. Agent Bielawski testified Dean informed him that the store owner had unplugged the machines and removed the cash from inside the machines before he arrived at the Corner Mart. As previously stated, Dean's hearsay statements about Patel's actions with the machines were admissible as statements by a party.

have concluded on its own, based on the other evidence presented, that Meenaxi, Inc. did business as the Corner Mart. Specifically, a photograph of the permit was admitted as an exhibit, so the ALC was able to examine the permit and make its own determination as to whether Meenaxi, Inc. did business as the Corner Mart. In addition, the ALC heard Patel's testimony that his corporation, Meenaxi, Inc., owned and operated the Corner Store.

Agent Bielawski also testified about his experiences with video gaming machines. Agent Bielawski stated he learned Patel unplugged the machines before he arrived at the store and, in his experience, unplugging the machines was "a very common tactic" people used. Further, Agent Bielawski testified that—based on his training, experience, previous inspections, and interviews with people who play such machines—he knew discarding the coupons generated by the machines was "very common" because the coupons had "no value" to the players. We find the ALC did not err in admitting this testimony. Agent Bielawski was simply testifying about his knowledge as a law enforcement officer based on his previous observations. In addition, the ALC was able to draw its own conclusions irrespective of Agent Bielawski's testimony.

#### **E. Section 61-4-580**

##### *1. Subsection 61-4-580(5)*

Appellant argues the ALC erred in finding it violated subsection 61-4-580(5) by knowingly permitting an act on its premises that constituted a crime. We disagree.

Subsection 61-4-580(5) provides that "[n]o holder of a permit authorizing the sale of beer or wine or a servant, agent, or employee of the permittee may knowingly . . . permit any act . . . [that] constitutes a crime under the laws of this State" to be committed on the licensed premises.

Pursuant to section 12-21-2710,

It is unlawful for any person to keep on his premises or operate or permit to be kept on his premises or operated within this State any vending or slot machine, or any video game machine with a free play feature operated by a slot in which is deposited a coin or thing of value, or

other device operated by a slot in which is deposited a coin or thing of value for the play of poker, blackjack, keno, lotto, bingo, or craps, or any machine or device licensed pursuant to [s]ection 12-21-2720 and used for gambling . . . .

We hold substantial evidence supported the ALC's finding that the Department showed the Products Direct and Gift Surplus machines contained games of chance in violation of section 12-21-2710, the machines were located on Appellant's licensed premises, and Appellant knowingly permitted the machines to be placed on its premises.

To show the machines were illegal video gambling machines, the Department presented the magistrate's Order of Destruction and Agent Bielawski's testimony and investigative report. Agent Bielawski's report stated that, while conducting a regulatory inspection of the Corner Mart, he noticed two video gaming machines inside the store—one bearing the name "Products Direct Sweepstakes" and the other bearing the name "Gift Surplus." Agent Bielawski testified the Gift Surplus machine had poker, spinning reel games, and keno; and the Products Direct machine had poker, blackjack, and keno. Agent Bielawski also testified the magistrate examined the machines in his presence, determined the machines were illegal, and ordered their destruction.<sup>7</sup>

To be liable under subsection 61-4-580(5), Appellant had to have actual or constructive knowledge that the machines it allowed to be placed in its store were

---

<sup>7</sup> Appellant argues the destruction of the machines was tantamount to spoliation and violated Appellant's due process rights. We disagree because Appellant failed to show that the State destroyed the machines in bad faith or that the machines possessed an exculpatory value apparent before they were destroyed. *See State v. Breeze*, 379 S.C. 538, 545, 665 S.E.2d 247, 251 (Ct. App. 2008) ("The State does not have an absolute duty to safeguard potentially useful evidence that might vindicate a defendant."); *id.* ("To establish a due process violation, a defendant must demonstrate (1) that the State destroyed the evidence in bad faith, or (2) that the evidence possessed an exculpatory value apparent before the evidence was destroyed and the defendant cannot obtain other evidence of comparable value by other means." (quoting *State v. Cheeseboro*, 346 S.C. 526, 538–39, 552 S.E.2d 300, 307 (2001))).

illegal video gambling machines. The ALC found that Patel knew or should have known the machines were illegal and that Patel's testimony to the contrary was not credible. There was substantial evidence for the ALC to make a finding that Patel knew or should have known the machines were illegal. Specifically, Patel testified if someone "won a hand," he paid the person "whatever the machine said [to] pay." Further, according to the investigative report, Patel explained to Agent Bielawski that the machines' owner, Encore Entertainment, took money from the machines every Monday or Tuesday and split the revenue equally with him. In addition, when the Department asked Patel whether he knew the machines were illegal on the day SLED inspected his store, Patel responded, "Yes, the owner called me and told me to unplug the machines." Further, Agent Bielawski's report stated Dean informed him that Patel "had been aware that SLED was in the area" and that Patel emptied the money from the machines, turned off the power switches, and unplugged the machines from the wall before SLED arrived at the store. Based on the foregoing, we find substantial evidence supported the ALC's finding that Appellant violated subsection 61-4-580(5).

2. *Subsection 61-4-580(3)*

Appellant argues the ALC erred in finding the machines did not fall under the "safe harbor" provision found in subsection 61-4-580(3) of the South Carolina Code (2009). We disagree.

The version of subsection 61-4-580(3) in effect at the time of the inspection provided as follows:

No holder of a permit authorizing the sale of beer or wine or a servant, agent, or employee of the permittee may knowingly commit any of the following acts upon the licensed premises covered by the holder's permit: . . .

- (3) permit gambling or games of chance except game promotions including contests, games of chance, or sweepstakes in which the elements of chance and prize are present and which comply with the following:
  - (a) the game promotion is conducted or offered in connection with the sale, promotion, or

advertisement of a consumer product or service, or to enhance the brand or image of a supplier of consumer products or services;

- (b) no purchase payment, entry fee, or proof of purchase is required as a condition of entering the game promotion or receiving a prize; and
- (c) all materials advertising the game promotion clearly disclose that no purchase or payment is necessary to enter and provide details on the free method of participation.

S.C. Code Ann. § 61-4-580(3) (2009).

The ALC determined the exception outlined in subsection 61-4-580(3) did not apply to the machines at issue here because the machines failed to satisfy subsection (b)'s requirement that "no purchase payment, entry fee, or proof of purchase is required as a condition of entering the game promotion or receiving a prize." The ALC found the machines clearly required payment to play the games because Agent Bielawski could not play any games without inserting money into the machine. The ALC noted Appellant argued the machines required payment for the receipt of coupons—which could be redeemed online for merchandise—and that after the coupons were purchased, the games on the machines were free to play. However, the ALC determined the coupons had no value and "[t]he coupon scheme was a thinly veiled artifice designed to conceal the fact that payment was made solely to play the games."

We find substantial evidence supported the ALC's finding that the exception set forth in subsection 61-4-580(3) did not apply to these machines because a patron could not play a game on the machines without first inserting money into the machines. Agent Bielawski testified although the faces of the machines displayed the words "no purchase necessary," the game promotions were offered in conjunction with the sale of coupons. Agent Bielawski was able to view a display image of the poker game on the screen without paying, but the machine would not allow him to play the game unless he inserted money.



We also find substantial evidence supported the ALC's finding that the coupons had no value. The investigative report stated Agent Bielawski found numerous Products Direct and Gift Surplus sweepstakes coupons discarded in the trash and lying crumpled on the floor near the machines. Agent Bielawski testified that if someone throws a coupon away, he or she cannot use the coupon to make a purchase. He also testified the fact the coupons were on the floor showed they were not being used for their intended purpose. We find the fact the coupons were discarded shows that the people who used the machines did not consider the coupons valuable enough to keep.

In addition, Agent Bielawski testified he personally examined a Products Direct sweepstakes coupon, visited the Products Direct website to determine the coupon's value, and concluded the coupon had no value. He explained that, although the coupons could "potentially" be used to purchase a product, the items on the website were overpriced "and you could easily go to a local store yourself and pick up the same sort of item at a much lower cost than what was this supposed discount that you receive[d] from playing the [P]roducts [D]irect." This evidence further shows the coupons lacked value.

## F. PENALTY

Appellant argues the ALC abused its discretion by determining revocation of Appellant's permit was the appropriate penalty for Appellant's violation of subsection 61-4-580(5). We disagree.

Section 61-4-580 provides, "[A] violation of any provision of [section 61-4-580] is a ground for the revocation or suspension of the holder's permit." "[The Department] has the authority to determine an appropriate administrative penalty, within the statutory limits established by the legislature, after the parties have had an opportunity for a hearing on the issues." *S.C. Dep't of Revenue v. Sandalwood Soc. Club*, 399 S.C. 267, 278–79, 731 S.E.2d 330, 336 (Ct. App. 2012). "[I]n assessing a penalty, [the Department] 'should give effect to the major purpose of a civil penalty,' which is 'deterrence.'" *Id.* at 279, 731 S.E.2d at 336 (quoting *Midlands Util., Inc. v. S.C. Dep't of Health & Envtl. Control*, 313 S.C. 210, 212, 437 S.E.2d 120, 121 (Ct. App. 1993)). "As an administrative agency, [the ALC] is the fact-finder and it is [the ALC's] prerogative . . . to impose an appropriate penalty based on the facts presented." *Id.* at 279–80, 731 S.E.2d at 337 (alterations

in original) (quoting *Walker v. S.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Comm'n*, 305 S.C. 209, 210, 407 S.E.2d 633, 634 (1991)).

South Carolina Revenue Procedure No. 13-2 "provides guidelines to be used by Department employees in assessing penalties for violations of the statutes and regulations governing the sale, distribution, or possession of beer, wine, and distilled spirits."<sup>8</sup> The Procedure is an advisory opinion that sets guidelines but "does not establish a binding norm." Revenue Procedure 13-2 provides revocation of a beer and wine permit is the appropriate penalty for "[p]ermitting any act that constitutes a crime under the laws of South Carolina (61-4-580(5))" or "[p]ermitting games of chance[,] except certain game promotions (61-4-580(3))." However, Revenue Procedure 13-2 states the Department may reduce any penalty outlined in the Procedure when mitigating circumstances exist—specifically, "suspensions may be reduced in duration, and revocations may be reduced to suspensions with monetary penalties." "Mitigating circumstances include, but are not limited to" the following: (1) "[t]he employee committing the violation has completed a training program recognized by the Department"; (2) "[d]ocumented in-house training [is] given to the offending employee on a regular and frequent basis"; (3) "[d]ocumentation that an internal check (*e.g.*, visit to the offending store by a mystery shopper) designed to ensure compliance occurred within a reasonable period of time prior to the offense"; (4) "[a]utomated age verification programs if the violation deals with age"; and (5) "[t]he volume of sales of beer, wine or liquor at a location," given that "a location with a large number of clerks and a high volume of beer sales is more likely to have a problem with violations than a location with a small volume of beer sales." The Procedure provides, "In every case, the determination as to whether mitigating circumstances warrant a reduction in penalties is within the sole discretion of the Department."

The Department revoked Appellant's off premises beer and wine permit because Appellant violated subsection 61-4-580(5). The ALC found that, according to the Department's penalty guidelines, revocation of Appellant's permit was appropriate under the circumstances. The ALC stated that, based on its finding that Appellant knew or should have known the machines were illegal and the lack of mitigating evidence, it found no reason to deviate from the penalty listed in the guidelines and imposed by the Department.

---

<sup>8</sup> See S.C. Revenue Procedure No. 13-2, Department of Revenue (Aug. 25, 2016), <https://dor.sc.gov/resources-site/lawandpolicy/Advisory%20Opinions/RP13-2.pdf>.

Recognizing that it is the ALC's prerogative to impose the appropriate penalty based on the facts presented, we find the ALC did not abuse its discretion by revoking Appellant's beer and wine permit. Section 61-4-580 authorizes the ALC to revoke or suspend a beer and wine permit when the permittee violates section 61-4-580. In addition, Revenue Procedure 13-2 provides revocation of a beer and wine permit is the appropriate penalty for "[p]ermitting any act that constitutes a crime under the laws of South Carolina (61-4-580(5))" or "[p]ermitting games of chance[,] except certain game promotions (61-4-580(3))." Thus, the penalty the ALC imposed was within the range of penalties authorized by section 61-4-580 and was the penalty prescribed by the Department in Revenue Procedure 13-2.

We also find the ALC did not abuse its discretion by declining to deviate from the Department's penalty guidelines and reduce Appellant's penalty to a fine or suspension. We find the mitigating circumstances listed in Revenue Procedure 13-2 were not present here. We recognize, however, that Revenue Procedure 13-2's list of mitigating circumstances is not exhaustive and the Department may consider other circumstances not enumerated in Revenue Procedure 13-2 when deciding whether to reduce a penalty. For example, the Department stated at oral argument that, when deciding whether to reduce a penalty from revocation to a fine or suspension, it considers whether the permittee was misled or genuinely believed the video gaming machines were legal. There was substantial evidence for the ALC to make a finding that Appellant knew or should have known the Products Direct and Gift Surplus machines in the Corner Mart were illegal. Further, there were no other non-enumerated mitigating circumstances that warranted a reduction in Appellant's penalty. We find that, under our standard of review, the revocation of Appellant's beer and wine permit, although a rather severe penalty, was not an abuse of discretion.

## **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the ALC's decision is

**AFFIRMED.**

**WILLIAMS and MCDONALD, JJ., concur.**