



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

---

**ADVANCE SHEET NO. 42**  
**October 24, 2018**  
**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**

Order - Robin Gray Reese v. State 9

**UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS**

2018-MO-035 - State v. Jimmy Turner  
(Marion County, Judge William H. Seals, Jr)

2018-MO-036 - Travell L. Hill v. State  
(Greenville County, Judge Daniel Dewitt Hall)

**PETITIONS - UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT**

27693 - The State v. Michael V. Beaty, Jr. Pending

27768 - The State v. Lamont Samuel Pending

27814 - The State v. Lamar Sequan Brown Pending

2017-002631 - Juan C. Vasquez v. State Pending

2016-002541 - In the Matter of Marie Therese Assa'ad-Faltas, M.D., MPH Pending

**EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT**

27802 - The State v. Stephanie I. Greene Granted until 11/23/2018

2018-000487 - George Cleveland, III v. State Granted until 11/23/2018

**PETITIONS FOR REHEARING**

27834 - The State v. Shannon Scott Denied 10/17/2018

27835 - The Callawassie Island v. Ronnie Dennis	Pending
27841 - Allen Patterson v. Herb Witter	Pending
2018-MO-029 - Hector Fragosa v. Kade Construction	Pending

# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

## PUBLISHED OPINIONS

None

## UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS

2018-UP-387-SCDSS v. Devin Marie Oakley  
(Filed October 16, 2018)

2018-UP-388-SCDSS v. Sean Alan Robertson  
(Filed October 16, 2018)

2018-UP-389-Gloria Terry v. Robert L. Terry, Sr.

2018-UP-390-SCDSS v. Amy M. Hutto  
(Filed October 18, 2018)

2018-UP-391-State v. Corey Andrew Brown

## PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

5550-Brian Morin v. Innegrity, LLC Denied 10/18/18

5562-Raymond Farmer v. CAGC Insurance Denied 10/18/18

5582-Norwest Properties v. Michael Strebler Denied 10/18-18

5583-Leisel Paradis v. Charleston County Denied 10/18/18

5585-Superior Construction Corp. v. The Muhler Co. Inc. Denied 10/18/18

5587-In the matter of Tynslee Elizabeth Fields Denied 10/18/18

5588-Brad Walbeck v. The I'On Company Pending

5589-State v. Archie M. Hardin Denied 10/19/18

5590-State v. Michael L. Mealor	Pending
5591-State v. Michael Smith	Denied 10/18/18
5593-Lori Stoney v. Richard Stoney	Denied 10/19/18
5596-James B. Williams v. Merle S. Tamsberg	Pending
5598-Emily S. Brown v. Grady C. Odom	Pending
2018-UP-178-Callawassie Island Members Club v. Gregory Martin	Pending
2018-UP-179-Callawassie Island Members Club v. Michael Frey	Pending
2018-UP-180-Callawassie Island Members Club v. Mark Quinn	Pending
2018-UP-327-State v. Joe Ross Worley	Pending
2018-UP-329-John Alden Bauer, III v. Beaufort County Sch. Dist.	Denied 10/18/18
2018-UP-338-John Rakowsky v. Law Office of Adrian Falgione	Pending
2018-UP-340-Madel Rivero v. Sheriff Steve Loftis	Pending
2018-UP-343-State v. Benjamin C. Hernandez	Pending
2018-UP-365-In re Estate of Norman Robert Knight, Jr.	Pending
2018-UP-368-Laurent Britton v. Charleston County	Pending

**PETITIONS-SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT**

5511-State v. Lance L. Miles	Denied 10/18/18
5535-Clair Johnson v. John Roberts (MUSC)	Granted 10/18/18
5554-State v. Antwan J. Jett	Pending
5556-BLH by parents v. SCDSS	Pending
5557-Skywaves v. Branch Banking	Pending

5559-Commissioners v. City of Fountain Inn	Pending
5561-Innovative Waster v. Crest Energy	Pending
5563-Angel Gary v. Lowcountry Medical	Pending
5564-J. Scott Kunst v. David Loree	Pending
5567-Karl Jobst v. Bryan Jobst (Brittany Martin)	Pending
5568-Amisub of South Carolina, Inc. v. SCDHEC	Pending
5572-State v. Steven Otts	Pending
5574-State v. Jeffrey D. Andrews	Pending
2017-UP-338-Clarence Winfrey v. Archway Services, Inc. (3)	Pending
2018-UP-011-Charles Hobbs v. Fairway Oaks	Pending
2018-UP-031-State v. Arthur William Macon	Denied 10/18/18
2018-UP-078-David Wilson v. John Gandis	Pending
2018-UP-080-Kay Paschal v. Leon Lott	Pending
2018-UP-081-State v. Billy Phillips	Pending
2018-UP-083-Cali Emory v. Thag, LLC	Denied 10/18/18
2018-UP-085-Danny B. Crane v. Raber's Discount Tire Rack	Pending
2018-UP-087-David Rose v. SCDOT	Pending
2018-UP-099-Shaul Levy v. Carolinian, LLC	Pending
2018-UP-109-State v. Nakia Johnson	Granted 10/19/18
2018-UP-111-State v. Mark Lorenzo Blake, Jr.	Pending
2018-UP-126-State v. Richard P. Krochmal	Denied 10/18/18
2018-UP-147-State v. Courtney Ray Mitchell	Pending

2018-UP-169-State v. Marquez Glenn	Pending
2018-UP-176-State v. Terry Williams	Granted 10/18/18
2018-UP-182-Bank of America v. Carolyn Deaner	Denied 10/18/18
2018-UP-183-S.C. Community Bank v. Carolina Procurement	Pending
2018-UP-185-Peggy D. Conits v. Spiro E. Conits	Pending
2018-UP-187-State v. Rodney R. Green	Pending
2018-UP-191-Cokers Commons v. Park Investors	Pending
2018-UP-193-Mark Ostendorff v. School Dt .of Pickens Cty.	Pending
2018-UP-201-Knightsbridge Property Owners v. Paul Nadeau	Pending
2018-UP-211-Hamilton Duncan v. Roy Drasites	Pending
2018-UP-214-State v. Tavarious Settles	Pending
2018-UP-216-Nicholas Geer v. SCDPPPS	Pending
2018-UP-231-Cheryl DiMarco v. Brian A. DiMarco	Pending
2018-UP-237-Harold F. Jones v. State Farm Mutual	Pending
2018-UP-242-Linda Estrada v. Andrew Marshall	Pending
2018-UP-250-Morningstar v. York County	Pending
2018-UP-260-Kenneth Shufelt v. Janet Shufelt	Pending
2018-UP-268-Holly Lawrence v. Jennifer Brown	Pending
2018-UP-269-Carleton Cantrell v. Aiken County	Pending
2018-UP-273-State v. Maurice A. Odom	Pending
2018-UP-275-Ronald Jarmuth v. The International Club	Pending

2018-UP-280-Scott Ledford v. Department of Public Safety	Pending
2018-UP-281-Philip Ethier v. Fairfield Memorial	Pending
2018-UP-287-S.C. Farm Bureau v. Michael Harrelson	Pending
2018-UP-318-Theresa Catalano v. Jack Catalano	Pending



# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Robin Gray Reese, Petitioner,

v.

State of South Carolina, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2017-001110

---

## ORDER

---

This matter is before the Court by way of a notice of appeal from an order denying Petitioner Robin Gray Reese's application for post-conviction relief (PCR). At the conclusion of the trial of this PCR case, the circuit court took the decision on the merits under advisement and directed both the State and Reese to prepare proposed orders. The circuit court eventually signed the order prepared by the State and denied all claims for relief. In preparing the order, however, the State did not address each of Reese's claims, and did not include specific findings of fact or conclusions of law on any of Reese's claims. Nevertheless, the circuit court signed the order. As the law requires when a PCR order does not contain specific findings of fact and conclusions of law, Reese's PCR counsel filed a motion pursuant to Rule 59(e) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Marlar v. State*, 375 S.C. 407, 410, 653 S.E.2d 266, 267 (2007) (holding, "a Rule 59(e) motion must be filed if issues are not adequately addressed" in the PCR order). In the motion, PCR counsel explained the "Order of Dismissal does not contain specific findings of fact and conclusions of law regarding each of the claims presented at the evidentiary hearing, as required by S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-80 (2014)." Nevertheless, the circuit court summarily denied the motion, stating only, "Applicant's Motion Pursuant to Rule 59(e) SCRPC to Amend is DENIED."

In her petition for a writ of certiorari, Reese requested a remand to the circuit court and asked this Court to require the circuit court to prepare an order that complies with section 17-27-80 and Rule 52(a) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

Rather than filing a return to Reese's petition, the State filed a motion to remand the case for detailed findings of fact and conclusions of law, conceding a remand would be appropriate in light of the PCR order's patent inadequacies. We grant the State's motion.

This is not the first time this Court has raised concerns over orders prepared by the State that do not comply with section 17-27-80 and Rule 52(a). Twenty-six years ago in *Pruitt v. State*, 310 S.C. 254, 423 S.E.2d 127 (1992), we stated,

We take this opportunity to express our concern with the increasing number of orders in PCR proceedings that fail to address the merits of the issues raised by the applicant. Not only does this deprive the parties of rulings on the issues raised, but it makes review by the appellate court more difficult and ultimately increases the work load of all involved where, as in this case, a new hearing is required to secure the rulings which should have been made initially. Counsel preparing proposed orders should be meticulous in doing so, opposing counsel should call any omissions to the attention of the PCR judge prior to issuance of the order, and the PCR judge should carefully review the order prior to signing it. Even after an order is filed, counsel has an obligation to review the order and file a Rule 59(e), SCRCP, motion to alter or amend if the order fails to set forth the findings and the reasons for those findings as required by § 17-27-80 and Rule 52(a), SCRCP.

310 S.C. at 255-56, 423 S.E.2d at 128; *see also Smalls v. State*, 422 S.C. 174, 195, 810 S.E.2d 836, 847 (2018) (holding "the PCR court . . . did not make specific findings"); *Ramirez v. State*, 419 S.C. 14, 21 n.6, 795 S.E.2d 841, 845 n.6 (2017) (finding error because "there are no findings of fact contained within the PCR court's order to support its conclusion"); *Simmons v. State*, 416 S.C. 584, 592, 788 S.E.2d 220, 225 (2016) (holding, "The PCR court's general denial of all claims not specifically addressed in the PCR court's order 'does not constitute a sufficient ruling on any issues since it does not set forth specific findings of fact and conclusions of law.'" (quoting *Marlar*, 375 S.C. at 409, 653 S.E.2d at 266)); *Tappeiner v. State*, 416 S.C. 239, 249 n.5, 785 S.E.2d 471, 476 n.5 (2016) (reiterating "the PCR court is required to 'make specific findings of fact, and state expressly its conclusions of law, relating to each issue presented'" (quoting section 17-27-80)); *Marlar*, 375 S.C. at 408, 653 S.E.2d at 266 (holding, "Pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-80 . . . , the PCR judge must make specific findings of fact and state expressly the conclusions

of law relating to each issue presented."); *Marlar*, 375 S.C. at 410, 653 S.E.2d at 267 ("reiterat[ing] our admonition" from *Pruitt*); *Hall v. Catoe*, 360 S.C. 353, 364-65, 601 S.E.2d 335, 341 (2004) (repeating our admonition from *Pruitt*); *Bryson v. State*, 328 S.C. 236, 236-37, 493 S.E.2d 500, 500 (1997) ("remand[ing] this matter to the post-conviction relief judge to make specific findings of fact and conclusions of law as to each issue"); *McCullough v. State*, 320 S.C. 270, 272, 464 S.E.2d 340, 341 (1995) (repeating our admonition from *Pruitt*, and finding it "necessary to vacate the order and remand this matter to the circuit court" and further "admonish[ing] all those involved in future PCR matters to be meticulous in preparing and reviewing proposed orders so that the final order sets forth the required findings and reasons for those findings"); *McCray v. State*, 305 S.C. 329, 330, 408 S.E.2d 241, 241 (1991) (finding "[t]he PCR court's conclusions regarding ineffective assistance are insufficient for appellate review and fail to meet the standard set forth in [section 17-27-80]").

We find the circuit court erred by signing the PCR order and in denying Reese's Rule 59(e) motion. We vacate both orders, remand the case to the circuit court for the entry of a new PCR order that complies with the law, and dismiss this appeal. The new PCR order shall be entered within thirty days. The circuit court must notify the Clerk of this Court in writing that it has complied with our directive in a timely manner. Following the issuance of a legally sufficient PCR order and a ruling on any Rule 59(e) motion that may thereafter be filed, the aggrieved party may serve and file a new notice of appeal.

<u>s/ Donald W. Beatty</u>	C.J.
<u>s/ John W. Kittredge</u>	J.
<u>s/ Kaye G. Hearn</u>	J.
<u>s/ John Cannon Few</u>	J.
<u>s/ George C. James, Jr.</u>	J.

Columbia, South Carolina

October 18, 2018