



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

---

**ADVANCE SHEET NO. 5**  
**February 7, 2024**  
**Patricia A. Howard, Clerk**  
**Columbia, South Carolina**  
**[www.sccourts.org](http://www.sccourts.org)**

## **CONTENTS**

### **THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

#### **PUBLISHED OPINIONS AND ORDERS**

28192 – The State v. Stacardo Grissett 10

#### **UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS**

NONE

#### **PETITIONS - UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT**

28145 – State v. Timothy Ray Jones, Jr. Pending

28149 – The State v. Mary Ann German Pending

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

None

#### **PETITIONS FOR REHEARING**

28184 – Applied Building Sciences v. SC Department of Commerce Pending

28186 – Jeffrey Cruce v. Berkeley County School District Pending

**THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS**

**PUBLISHED OPINIONS**

None

**UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS**

2024-UP-042 – SCDSS v. Jhante Robbins  
(Filed February 1, 2024)

2024-UP-043 – SCDSS v. Cassandra Mills  
(Filed February 1, 2024)

2024-UP-044 – Rosa B. Valdez Rosas v. Jorge A. Vega Ortiz  
(Filed February 1, 2024)

2024-UP-045 – SCDSS v. Whinta Nickens  
(Filed February 1, 2024)

2024-UP-046 – The State v. James L. Ginther

2024-UP-047 – Cassandra Selph v. Barbara Boatwright

2024-UP-048 – The State v. Correy T. Brown

2024-UP-049 – ARO-D Enterprises, LLC v. Tiger Enterprises

2024-UP-050 – Shedrick A. Savage v. State

2024-UP-051 – The State v. Claybon L. Atwater, Jr.

**PETITIONS FOR REHEARING**

5994 – Desa Ballard v. Admiral Insurance Company Pending

6017 – Noel Owens v. Mountain Air Heating & Cooling Pending

6027 – Ex Parte: Trustgard Insurance Company	Pending
6034 – The State v. Charles Dent	Pending
6037 – United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company v. Covil Corporation	Pending
6038 – Portrait Homes v. Pennsylvania National Mutual Casualty	Pending
6039 – Anita Chabek v. AnMed Health	Pending
6042 – Renewable Water Resources v. Insurance Reserve Fund	Pending
6044 – Susan Brooks Knott Floyd v. Elizabeth Pope Knott Dross	Pending

#### **EXTENSIONS TO FILE PETITION FOR REHEARING**

None

#### **PETITIONS – SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

5912 – The State v. Lance Antonio Brewton	Pending
5916 – Amanda Huskins v. Mungo Homes, LLC	Pending
5930 – The State v. Kyle M. Robinson	Pending
5933 – The State v. Michael Cliff Eubanks	Pending
5934 – Nicole Lampo v. Amedisys Holding, LLC	Pending
5946 – The State v. Frankie L. Davis, III	Pending
5955 – The State v. Philip Guderyon	Pending
5963 – Solesbee v. Fundamental Clinical	Pending

5965 – National Trust for Historic Preservation v. City of North Charleston	Pending
5972 – McEntire Produce v. SCDOR	Pending
5974 – The State v. Calvin D. Ford	Pending
5975 – Rita Glenn v. 3M Company	Pending
5986 – The State v. James E. Daniels, Jr.	Pending
5987– The State v. Tammy C. Moorner	Pending
5988 – The State v. Sidney S. Moorner (2)	Pending
5992 – Rufus Rivers v. James Smith, Jr.	Pending
5995 – The State v. Kayla M. Cook	Pending
5996 – Palmetto Pointe v. Tri-County Roofing	Pending
5999 – Jerome Campbell v. State	Pending
6000 – Jeffrey Fossett v. Melissa Fossett	Pending
6001 – Shannon P. Green v. Edward C. McGee	Pending
6004 – Joseph Abruzzo v. Bravo Media Productions, LLC	Pending
6007 – Dominic A. Leggette v. State	Pending
6008 – Tekayah Hamilton v. Regional Medical Center	Pending
6009 – John Doe v. Bishop of Charleston	Pending
6011 – James E. Carroll, Jr. v. Isle of Palms Pest Control, Inc.	Pending
6013 – Jamaine Holman v. SCELCC	Pending

6016 – Vista Del Mar v. Vista Del Mar, LLC	Pending
6019 – Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC v. Jennifer Campney	Pending
6020 – Joseph Kelsey, #217218 v. SCDPPPS	Pending
6021 – Stewart Buchanan, #69848 v. SCDPPPS	Pending
6022 – J&H Grading & Paving v. Clayton Construction	Pending
6025 – Gerald Nelson v. Christopher S. Harris	Pending
6028 – James Marlowe v. SCDOT	Pending
6029 – Mark Green v. Wayne B. Bauerle	Pending
6030 – James L. Carrier v. State	Pending
6031 – The State v. Terriel L. Mack	Pending
2022-UP-326 – Wells Fargo Bank v. Michelle Hodges	Pending
2022-UP-380 – Adonis Williams v. State	Pending
2022-UP-415 – J. Morgan Kears v. The Kears Family Education Trust	Pending
2022-UP-425 – Michele Blank v. Patricia Timmons (2)	Pending
2022-UP-429 – Bobby E. Leopard v. Perry W. Barbour	Pending
2022-UP-452 – In the Matter of Kevin Wright	Pending
2022-UP-462 – Karrie Gurwood & Howard Gurwood v. GCA Services Group, Inc.	Pending
2023-UP-005 – David Abdo v. City of Charleston	Pending
2023-UP-037 – Diana Bright v. Craig Bright	Pending

2023-UP-055 – M. Baron Stanton v. Town of Pawleys Island	Pending
2023-UP-062 – Raglins Creek Farms, LLC v. Nancy D. Martin	Pending
2023-UP-070 – James Kincannon v. Ashely Griffith	Pending
2023-UP-087 – The State v. Seth H. Smith	Pending
2023-UP-091 – The State v. Dale E. King	Pending
2023-UP-096 – Viola M. Hackworth v. Bayview Manor LLC	Pending
2023-UP-119 – The State v. Angelita Wright	Pending
2023-UP-121 – Mathew C. Dwyer v. State	Pending
2023-UP-126 – Innovative Waste Management v. Crest Energy Partners	Pending
2023-UP-132 – Monica Brown-Gantt v. Centex Real Estate	Pending
2023-UP-138 – In the Matter of John S. Wells	Pending
2023-UP-143 – John Pendarvis v. SCLD	Pending
2023-UP-151 – Deborah Weeks v. David Weeks	Pending
2023-UP-158 – Herman Holcomb v. City of North Augusta	Pending
2023-UP-161 – The State v. Terrell D. Knighter	Pending
2023-UP-172 – The State v. Gary M. Wirtz	Pending
2023-UP-177 – John Mayers v. Konan Henthorn	Pending
2023-UP-178 – CRM of the Carolinas, LLC v. Trevor W. Steel	Pending
2023-UP-179 – Ronald Mims v. Diane Ray	Pending

2023-UP-180 – The State v. Samuel L. Burnside	Pending
2023-UP-201 – Nancy Morris v. State Fiscal Accountability Authority	Pending
2023-UP-202 – SCE&G v. Pitch Landing, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-206 – Andrew McIntire v. Red Bay Constructors Corp.	Pending
2023-UP-232 – Beachwalk Hotel & Condominiums Association, Inc. v. The Town of Hilton Head Island (2)	Pending
2023-UP-236 – U.S. Bank, NA v. Alyce F. Otto	Pending
2023-UP-239 – Wilmington Savings Fund Society v. Rex A. Field	Pending
2023-UP-241 – John Hine v. Timothy McCrory	Pending
2023-UP-243 – David J. Benjamin v. State	Pending
2023-UP-244 – Logan Wood v. Horry County School District	Pending
2023-UP-246 – Ironwork Productions, LLC v. Bobcat of Greenville, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-249 – Buck Investments, LLC v. ROA, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-254 – In the Matter of Lauren Martel	Pending
2023-UP-258 – The State v. Terry R. McClure	Pending
2023-UP-260 – Thomas C. Skelton v. First Baptist Church	Pending
2023-UP-261 – Mitchell Rivers v. State	Pending
2023-UP-263 – Rory M. Isaac v. Laura Kopchynski	Pending
2023-UP-264 – Kathleen A. Grant v. Nationstar Mortgage, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-272 – Estate of Barbara Owens v. Fundamental Clinical and Operational Services, LLC	Pending



2023-UP-274 – Terrence "Terry" Carroll v. Debra Mowery	Pending
2023-UP-281 – Armando Acevedo v. Hunt Valley Holdings, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-283 – Brigitte Hemming v. Jeffrey Hemming	Pending
2023-UP-289 – R-Anell Housing Group, LLC v. Homemax, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-290 – Family Services Inc. v. Bridget D. Inman	Pending
2023-UP-293 – NCP Pilgrim, LLC v. Mary Lou Cercopely	Pending
2023-UP-295 – Mitchell L. Hinson v. State	Pending
2023-UP-300 – SCDSS v. Kristie Taylor and George Cleveland, III (2)	Pending
2023-UP-301 – Olivia M. Thompson v. College of Charleston	Pending
2023-UP-311 – The State v. Joey C. Reid	Pending
2023-UP-315 – Capital Bank, N.A. v. Rosewood Holdings, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-321 – Gregory Pencille, #312332 v. SCDC (2)	Pending
2023-UP-324 – Marvin Gipson v. Coffey & McKenzie, P.A.	Pending
2023-UP-326 – SCDSS v. Joseph Green (2)	Pending
2023-UP-343 – The State v. Jerome Smith	Pending
2023-UP-352 – The State v. Michael T. Means	Pending
2023-UP-365 – The State v. Levy L. Brown	Pending
2023-UP-366 – Ray D. Fowler v. Pilot Travel Centers, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-398 – The State v. Rashawn M. Little	Pending

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

The State, Respondent,

v.

Stacardo Grissett, Petitioner.

Appellate Case No. 2022-000299

---

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

---

Appeal from Richland County  
Clifton Newman, Circuit Court Judge

---

Opinion No. 28192  
Heard January 9, 2024 – Filed February 7, 2024

---

**REVERSED**

---

Appellate Defender Lara Mary Caudy, of Columbia, for  
Petitioner.

General Counsel Matthew C. Buchanan, of South Carolina  
Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services, of  
Columbia, for Respondent.

---

**JUSTICE KITTREDGE:** This appeal centers around how to calculate the one-year maximum community supervision program<sup>1</sup> (CSP) revocation sentence authorized by statute. The precise question presented is whether an inmate arrested for an alleged violation of the CSP terms is entitled to credit toward the potential CSP revocation sentence for time served in jail awaiting adjudication of the CSP violation charge. We hold that such inmates must be given credit for any time served awaiting their CSP revocation hearing toward their CSP revocation sentence.

## I.

After violating the terms of the CSP, Petitioner Stacardo Grissett was denied credit toward his CSP revocation sentence by the excellent circuit court judge for the approximate six months he served awaiting his CSP revocation hearing. While he appealed that decision, by the time the court of appeals heard his appeal, Petitioner had completed his CSP revocation sentence *and* original sentence. As a result, the court of appeals understandably dismissed his appeal as moot. *State v. Grissett*, Op. No. 2021-UP-351 (S.C. Ct. App. filed Oct. 13, 2021). Petitioner nonetheless sought review from this Court on the basis that while the current dispute is moot, the issue is capable of repetition yet evades review. *See generally* *Byrd v. Irmo High Sch.*, 321 S.C. 426, 431–32, 468 S.E.2d 861, 864 (1996) (explaining the Court recognizes an exception to the mootness doctrine when a matter is capable of repetition yet evades review). Moreover, Petitioner urged the Court to address the question presented because disagreement as to its answer persists among the Bench and Bar. The State joined Petitioner's request for clarification. We granted Petitioner a writ of certiorari.

## II.

Section 24-21-560(C) provides that in the event an inmate released on community supervision commits a violation of the CSP terms, the maximum CSP revocation sentence the circuit court may impose is a term of imprisonment of up to one year.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *See generally* S.C. Code Ann. § 24-13-150 (Supp. 2023) (providing an inmate convicted of a no parole offense and sentenced to the custody of the South Carolina Department of Corrections is eligible for early release, discharge, or community supervision when the inmate has served at least 85% of the actual term of imprisonment imposed).

<sup>2</sup> The statute further grants discretion to the circuit court to return the inmate to community supervision with or without additional terms or conditions. *See* S.C.

*See* S.C. Code Ann. § 24-21-560(C) (flush language) (2007) ("If the court determines that a prisoner has wilfully violated a term or condition of the community supervision program, . . . the court may revoke the prisoner's community supervision and impose a sentence of up to one year for violation of the community supervision program."). However, an inmate released on community supervision continues to receive credit toward his original sentence, so the circuit court must ensure the CSP revocation sentence does not exceed the term of the inmate's original sentence. *State v. Picklesimer*, 388 S.C. 264, 268, 695 S.E.2d 845, 848 (2010) (clarifying that the revocation sentence contemplated in section 24-21-560(C) may not "extend[] beyond the end of the term of the original sentence"); S.C. Code Ann. § 24-21-560(D) (Supp. 2023) (confirming the "prisoner must not be incarcerated for a period longer than the original sentence"). As is relevant to this appeal, the parties agree that, in crafting a CSP revocation sentence, there is a lack of uniformity among our circuit judges, for some give credit for the time served between the date of arrest for alleged CSP violations and the CSP revocation hearing, while others withhold such credit. We therefore turn to the plain language of section 24-21-560(C).

To advance its position that section 24-21-560(C) does not require an inmate receive credit toward a revocation sentence for time served in jail awaiting adjudication of a CSP violation, the Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services (DPPPS) focuses on the statute's last sentence: "A prisoner who is incarcerated for revocation of the community supervision program is not eligible to earn any type of credits which would reduce the sentence for violation of the community supervision program." S.C. Code Ann. § 24-21-560(C) (flush language). In opposition, Petitioner contends the "any type of credits" language refers to credits granted by the Department of Corrections (earned-work credits, good-time credits, and the like), and the statute, when construed in its entirety and in context, requires a CSP inmate to receive credit toward a CSP revocation sentence for time served in jail awaiting adjudication of the CSP violation charge, similar to the pretrial context. *See generally* S.C. Code Ann. § 24-13-40 (Supp. 2023) (stating that in the pretrial context, circuit court judges are required to give credit for the time served between an arrest and sentence).

In construing a statute, it is our duty to determine and effectuate legislative intent. *Bryant v. State*, 384 S.C. 525, 529, 683 S.E.2d 280, 282 (2009) ("The primary rule of statutory construction is to ascertain and give effect to the intent of the

---

Code Ann. § 24-21-560(C) (flush language) (2007).

legislature."). In doing so, we first examine the plain language of the statute. *Odom v. Town of McBee Election Comm'n*, 427 S.C. 305, 310, 831 S.E.2d 429, 432 (2019). When the language of a statute is plain, unambiguous, and conveys a clear and definite meaning, the rules of statutory construction are unnecessary, and a court has no right to impose another meaning. *Hodges v. Rainey*, 341 S.C. 79, 85, 533 S.E.2d 578, 581 (2000).

Here, DPPPS is correct to draw our attention to the final sentence of section 24-21-560(C), for it disposes of the question presented. However, the focus must extend beyond the words "any type of credits." The statutory language following those words is unambiguous and essential to the proper resolution of this appeal. That sentence states an inmate who is incarcerated for an alleged violation of the CSP terms "is not eligible to earn any type of credits which would *reduce*" a CSP revocation sentence. (Emphasis added). Time-served credits do not "reduce" a CSP revocation sentence; rather, they merely affect the date on which that sentence begins to run. In contrast, credits awarded by the Department of Corrections—such as good-time credits and earned-work credits—actually *reduce* a sentence. Thus, the plain language of section 24-21-560(C) indicates a CSP revocation sentence is unaffected only by credits that would change its duration. In no way does the last sentence of section 24-21-560(C) indicate an inmate should not be given credit for time served, particularly since time-served credits do not reduce the length of the revocation sentence. *Cf.* S.C. Code Ann. § 24-13-40 ("In every case in computing the time served by a prisoner, full credit against the sentence *must* be given for time served prior to trial and sentencing . . . ." (emphasis added)).

### III.

In sum, we agree with the court of appeals and the parties that the issue raised is moot as to Petitioner. However, because the issue is one capable of repetition yet evading review, we decline to strictly apply the mootness doctrine and reverse the court of appeals on that basis. On the merits, we find section 24-21-560(C) requires a circuit court judge to credit a CSP inmate who violates a term of his or her community supervision with the length of any time served while in jail on an alleged CSP violation awaiting adjudication of the CSP violation charge.

**REVERSED.**

**BEATTY, C.J., FEW, HILL, JJ., and Acting Justice James Edward Lockemy, concur.**