



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

ADVANCE SHEET NO. 51
December 4, 2013
Daniel E. Shearouse, Clerk
Columbia, South Carolina
www.sccourts.org

CONTENTS

THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

PUBLISHED OPINIONS AND ORDERS

27334 - The State v. Robert Watkins	14
27335 - The State v. James Curry	18

UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS AND ORDERS

None

PETITIONS – UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

27252 - Town of Hollywood v. William Floyd	Pending
2013-MO-013 - In the Interest of David L.	Pending

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

27317 - Ira Banks v. St. Matthew Baptist Church	Pending
27322 - The State v. Steven Barnes	Pending
27328 - The State v. Wesley Smith	Pending

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

PUBLISHED OPINIONS

None

UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS

2013-UP-446-State v. Ronald Jeffery Shows
(Lexington, Judge Howard P. King)

PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

5171-Carolyn Nicholson v. SCDSS	Pending
5177-State v. Leo David Lemire	Pending
5178-State v. Michael J. Hilton	Pending
5181-Henry Frampton v. S.C. Dep't of Transportation	Pending
2013-UP-296-Parsons v. John Wieland Homes	Pending
2013-UP-358-Marion L. Driggers v. Daniel Shearouse	Pending
2013-UP-380-Regina Johnson Taylor v. William Taylor	Pending
2013-UP-381-L. G. Elrod v. Berkeley Cty. Sheriff's Dep't	Pending
2013-UP-403-State v. Kerwin Parker	Pending

PETITIONS-SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

4750-Cullen v. McNeal	Pending
4764-Walterboro Hospital v. Meacher	Pending
4779-AJG Holdings v. Dunn	Pending
4832-Crystal Pines v. Phillips	Pending
4851-Davis v. KB Home of S.C.	Pending

4872-State v. Kenneth Morris	Pending
4888-Pope v. Heritage Communities	Pending
4895-King v. International Knife	Pending
4898-Purser v. Owens	Pending
4909-North American Rescue v. Richardson	Pending
4923-Price v. Peachtree Electrical	Pending
4947-Ferguson Fire and Fabrication v. Preferred Fire Protection	Pending
4956-State v. Diamon D. Fripp	Pending
4960-Justin O'Toole Lucey et al. v. Amy Meyer	Pending
4970-Carolina Convenience Stores et al. v. City of Spartanburg	Pending
4973-Byrd v. Livingston	Pending
4975-Greeneagle Inc. v. SCDHEC	Pending
4979-Major v. City of Hartsville	Pending
4992-Gregory Ford v. Beaufort County Assessor	Pending
4995-Keeter v. Alpine Towers International and Sexton	Pending
4997-Allegro v. Emmett J. Scully	Pending
5001-State v. Alonzo Craig Hawes	Pending
5008-Willie H. Stephens v. CSX Transportation	Pending
5010-S.C. Dep't of Transportation v. Janell P. Revels et al.	Pending
5011-SCDHEC v. Ann Dreher	Pending
5013-Geneva Watson v. Xtra Mile Driver Training	Pending

5016-The S.C. Public Interest Foundation v. Greenville Cty. et al.	Pending
5017-State v. Christopher Manning	Pending
5019-John Christopher Johnson v. Reginald C. Lloyd et al.	Pending
5020-Ricky Rhame v. Charleston Cty. School District	Pending
5022-Gregory Collins v. Seko Charlotte and Nationwide Mutual	Pending
5025-State v. Randy Vickery	Pending
5031-State v. Demetrius Price	Pending
5032-LeAndra Lewis v. L.B. Dynasty	Pending
5033-State v. Derrick McDonald	Pending
5034-State v. Richard Bill Niles, Jr.	Pending
5035-David R. Martin and Patricia F. Martin v. Ann P. Bay et al.	Pending
5041-Carolina First Bank v. BADD	Pending
5044-State v. Gene Howard Vinson	Pending
5052-State v. Michael Donahue	Pending
5053-State v. Thomas E. Gilliland	Pending
5055-Hazel Rivera v. Warren Newton	Pending
5059-Kellie N. Burnette v. City of Greenville et al.	Pending
5060-State v. Larry Bradley Brayboy	Pending
5061-William Walde v. Association Ins. Co.	Pending
5062-Duke Energy v. SCDHEC	Pending
5065-Curiel v. Hampton Co. EMS	Pending

5071-State v. Christopher Broadnax	Pending
5072-Michael Cunningham v. Anderson County	Pending
5074-Kevin Baugh v. Columbia Heart Clinic	Pending
5077-Kirby L. Bishop et al. v. City of Columbia	Pending
5078-Estate of Livingston v. Clyde Livingston	Pending
5081-The Spriggs Group, P.C. v. Gene R. Slivka	Pending
5082-Thomas Brown v. Peoplease Corp.	Pending
5084-State v. Kendrick Taylor	Pending
5087-Willie Simmons v. SC Strong and Hartford	Pending
5090-Independence National v. Buncombe Professional	Pending
5092-Mark Edward Vail v. State	Pending
5093-Diane Bass v. SCDSS	Pending
5095-Town of Arcadia Lakes v. SCDHEC	Pending
5097-State v. Francis Larmand	Pending
5099-Roosevelt Simmons v. Berkeley Electric	Pending
5101-James Judy v. Ronnie Judy	Pending
5110-State v. Roger Bruce	Pending
5111-State v. Alonza Dennis	Pending
5112-Roger Walker v. Catherine Brooks	Pending
5113-Regions Bank v. Williams Owens	Pending
5116-Charles A. Hawkins v. Angela D. Hawkins	Pending

5117-Loida Colonna v. Marlboro Park (2)	Pending
5118-Gregory Smith v. D.R. Horton	Pending
5119-State v. Brian Spears	Pending
5121-State v. Jo Pradubsri	Pending
5122-Ammie McNeil v. SCDC	Pending
5125-State v. Anthony Marquese Martin	Pending
5126-A. Chakrabarti v. City of Orangeburg	Pending
5127-Jenean Gibson v. Christopher C. Wright, M.D.	Pending
5130-Brian Pulliam v. Travelers Indemnity	Pending
5131-Lauren Proctor v. Whitlark & Whitlark	Pending
5132-State v. Richard Brandon Lewis	Pending
5135-Microclean Tec. Inc. v. Envirofix, Inc.	Pending
5137-Ritter and Associates v. Buchanan Volkswagen	Pending
5139-H&H Johnson, LLC v. Old Republic National Title	Pending
5140-Bank of America v. Todd Draper	Pending
5144-Emma Hamilton v. Martin Color Fi	Pending
5148-State v. Henry Jermaine Dukes	Pending
5151-Daisy Simpson v. William Simpson	Pending
5152-Effie Turpin v. E. Lowther	Pending
5154-Edward Trimmier v. SCDLLR	Pending
5156-State v. Manuel Marin	Pending

5157-State v. Lexie Dial	Pending
5159-State v. Gregg Henkel	Pending
5160-State v. Ashley Eugene Moore	Pending
5161-State v. Lance Williams	Pending
2011-UP-052-Williamson v. Orangeburg	Pending
2011-UP-108-Dippel v. Horry County	Pending
2011-UP-109-Dippel v. Fowler	Pending
2011-UP-400-McKinnedy v. SCDC	Pending
2011-UP-495-State v. Arthur Rivers	Pending
2011-UP-502-Heath Hill v. SCDHEC and SCE&G	Pending
2011-UP-562-State v. Tarus Henry	Pending
2012-UP-030-Babae v. Moisture Warranty Corp.	Pending
2012-UP-058-State v. Andra Byron Jamison	Pending
2012-UP-078-Seyed Tahaei v. Sherri Tahaei	Pending
2012-UP-081-Hueble v. Vaughn	Pending
2012-UP-152-State v. Kevin Shane Epting	Pending
2012-UP-153-McCall v. Sandvik, Inc.	Pending
2012-UP-203-State v. Dominic Leggette	Pending
2012-UP-218-State v. Adrian Eaglin	Pending
2012-UP-219-Dale Hill et al. v. Deertrack Golf and Country Club	Pending
2012-UP-267-State v. James Craig White	Pending

2012-UP-270-National Grange Ins. Co. v. Phoenix Contract Glass, LLC, et al.	Pending
2012-UP-274-Passaloukas v. Bensch	Pending
2012-UP-276-Regions Bank v. Stonebridge Development et al.	Pending
2012-UP-278-State v. Hazard Cameron	Pending
2012-UP-285-State v. Jacob M. Breda	Pending
2012-UP-286-Diane K. Rainwater v. Fred A. Rainwater	Pending
2012-UP-292-Demetrius Ladson v. Harvest Hope	Pending
2012-UP-295-Larry Edward Hendricks v. SCDC	Pending
2012-UP-293-Clegg v. Lambrecht	Pending
2012-UP-302-Maple v. Heritage Healthcare	Pending
2012-UP-312-State v. Edward Twyman	Pending
2012-UP-314-Grand Bees Development v. SCDHEC et al.	Pending
2012-UP-321-James Tinsley v. State	Pending
2012-UP-330-State v. Doyle Marion Garrett	Pending
2012-UP-332-George Tomlin v. SCDPPPS	Pending
2012-UP-348-State v. Jack Harrison, Jr.	Pending
2012-UP-351-State v. Kevin J. Gilliard	Pending
2012-UP-365-Patricia E. King v. Margie B. King	Pending
2012-UP-404-McDonnell and Assoc v. First Citizens Bank	Pending
2012-UP-432-State v. Bryant Kinloch	Pending

2012-UP-433-Jeffrey D. Allen v. S.C. Budget and Control Bd. Employee Insurance Plan et al.	Pending
2012-UP-460-Figueroa v. CBI/Columbia Place Mall et al.	Pending
2012-UP-462-J. Tennant v. Board of Zoning Appeals	Pending
2012-UP-479-Elkachbendi v. Elkachbendi	Pending
2012-UP-502-Hurst v. Board of Dentistry	Pending
2012-UP-552-Virginia A. Miles v. Waffle House	Pending
2012-UP-561-State v. Joseph Lathan Kelly	Pending
2012-UP-563-State v. Marion Bonds	Pending
2012-UP-569-Vennie Taylor Hudson v. Caregivers of SC	Pending
2012-UP-573-State v. Kenneth S. Williams	Pending
2012-UP-576-State v. Trevee J. Gethers	Pending
2012-UP-577-State v. Marcus Addison	Pending
2012-UP-579-Andrea Beth Campbell v. Ronnie A. Brockway	Pending
2012-UP-580-State v. Kendrick Dennis	Pending
2012-UP-585-State v. Rushan Counts	Pending
2012-UP-600-Karen Irby v. Augusta Lawson	Pending
2012-UP-603-Fidelity Bank v. Cox Investment Group et al.	Pending
2012-UP-608-SunTrust Mortgage v. Ostendorff	Pending
2012-UP-616-State v. Jamel Dwayne Good	Pending
2012-UP-623-L. Paul Trask, Jr., v. S.C. Dep't of Public Safety	Pending
2012-UP-647-State v. Danny Ryant	Pending

2012-UP-654-State v. Marion Stewart	Pending
2012-UP-658-Palmetto Citizens v. Butch Johnson	Pending
2012-UP-663-Carlton Cantrell v. Aiken County	Pending
2013-UP-007-Hoang Berry v. Stokes Import	Pending
2013-UP-010-Neshen Mitchell v. Juan Marruffo	Pending
2013-UP-014-Keller v. ING Financial Partners	Pending
2013-UP-015-Travelers Property Casualty Co. v. Senn Freight	Pending
2013-UP-020-State v. Jason Ray Franks	Pending
2013-UP-034-Cark D. Thomas v. Bolus & Bolus	Pending
2013-UP-037-Cary Graham v. Malcolm Babb	Pending
2013-UP-056-Lippincott v. SCDEW	Pending
2013-UP-058-State v. Bobby J. Barton	Pending
2013-UP-062-State v. Christopher Stephens	Pending
2013-UP-063-State v. Jimmy Lee Sessions	Pending
2013-UP-066-Dudley Carpenter v. Charles Measter	Pending
2013-UP-069-I. Lehr Brisbin v. Aiken Electric Coop.	Pending
2013-UP-070-Loretta Springs v. Clemson University	Pending
2013-UP-071-Maria McGaha v. Honeywell International	Pending
2013-UP-078-Leon P. Butler, Jr. v. William L. Wilson	Pending
2013-UP-081-Ruth Sturkie LeClair v. Palmetto Health	Pending
2013-UP-082-Roosevelt Simmons v. Hattie Bailum	Pending

2013-UP-084-Denise Bowen v. State Farm	Pending
2013-UP-085-Brenda Peterson v. Hughie Peterson	Pending
2013-UP-090-JP Morgan Chase Bank v. Vanessa Bradley	Pending
2013-UP-095-Midlands Math v. Richland County School Dt. 1	Pending
2013-UP-110-State v. Demetrius Goodwin	Pending
2013-UP-115-SCDSS v. Joy J.	Pending
2013-UP-120-Jerome Wagner v. Robin Wagner	Pending
2013-UP-125-Caroline LeGrande v. SCE&G	Pending
2013-UP-127-Osmanski v. Watkins & Shepard Trucking	Pending
2013-UP-133-James Dator v. State	Pending
2013-UP-147-State v. Anthony Hackshaw	Pending
2013-UP-154-State v. Eugene D. Patterson	Pending
2013-UP-158-CitiFinancial v. Squire	Pending
2013-UP-162-Martha Lynne Angradi v. Edgar Jack Lail, et al.	Pending
2013-UP-183-R. Russell v. DHEC and State Accident Fund	Pending
2013-UP-188-State v. Jeffrey A. Michaelson	Pending
2013-UP-189-Thomas J. Torrence v. SCDC	Pending
2013-UP-199-Wheeler Tillman v. Samuel Tillman	Pending
2013-UP-206-Adam Hill v. Henrietta Norman	Pending
2013-UP-224-Katheryna Mulholland-Mertz v. Corie Crest	Pending
2013-UP-232-Theresa Brown v. Janet Butcher	Pending

2013-UP-236-State v. Timothy E. Young	Pending
2013-UP-241-Shirley Johnson v. Angela Lampley	Pending
2013-UP-247-Joseph N. Grate v. Waccamaw E. O. C. Inc.	Pending
2013-UP-251-Betty Jo Floyd v. Ken Baker Used Cars	Pending
2013-UP-256-Woods v. Breakfield	Pending
2013-UP-257-Matter of Henson (Woods) v. Breakfield	Pending
2013-UP-267-State v. William Sosebee	Pending
2013-UP-272-James Bowers v. State	Pending
2013-UP-279-MRR Sandhills v, Marlboro County	Pending
2013-UP-286-State v. David Tyre	Pending
2013-UP-288-State v. Brittany Johnson	Pending
2013-UP-290-Mary Ruff v. Samuel Nunez	Pending
2013-UP-294-State v. Jason Thomas Husted	Pending
2013-UP-297-Greene Homeowners v. W.G.R.Q.	Pending
2013-UP-310-Westside Meshekoff Family v. SCDOT	Pending
2013-UP-322-A.M. Kelly Grove v. SCDHEC	Pending
2013-UP-323-In the interest of Brandon M.	Pending
2013-UP-326-State v. Gregory Wright	Pending
2013-UP-327-Roper LLC v. Harris Teeter	Pending
2013-UP-340-Randy Griswold v. Kathryn Griswold	Pending

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

The State, Petitioner,

v.

Robert Watkins, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2011-195272

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Greenville County
Larry R. Patterson, Circuit Court Judge

Opinion No. 27334
Heard October 16, 2013 – Filed December 4, 2013

REVERSED

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

Appellate Defender David Alexander of Columbia, for
Respondent.

JUSTICE PLEICONES: We granted certiorari to review a Court of Appeals decision that reversed respondent's convictions for armed robbery and possession

of a weapon during a violent crime. *State v. Watkins*, Op. No. 2011-UP-091 (S.C. Ct. App. filed March 8, 2011). The Court of Appeals purported to adopt a rule¹ requiring that a trial "judge must grant a recusal motion made during a new trial arising from a [post-conviction relief] hearing in which the judge also sat." *Id.* We reverse the holding that creates this rule, find no error in the trial judge's denial of respondent's recusal request, determine there is no merit to respondent's *Faretta*² issue under Rule 220(C)(1), SCACR, and reverse the decision of the Court of Appeals.

ISSUE

Did the Court of Appeals err in creating a rule mandating that a trial judge recuse himself upon motion if he heard the post-conviction relief (PCR) matter that led to the new proceeding?

ANALYSIS

Respondent was first convicted of armed robbery and weapons possession in a trial held in 2002. Following the Court of Appeals' dismissal of respondent's *Anders*³ direct appeal in 2004,⁴ respondent file an application for PCR. Judge Patterson denied the application, finding (1) that respondent was not credible and (2) that trial counsel's belief that he had complied with the alibi notice requirement of Rule 5(e)(1), SCRCrimP, while erroneous, was "well founded." This Court granted certiorari and reversed, holding that trial counsel was ineffective in failing to preserve respondent's right to an alibi charge. *Watkins v. State*, Memo. Op. 2008-MO-001 (S.C. Sup. Ct. filed January 14, 2008).

After remand, the matter came before Judge Patterson in March 2008 on cross-motions by the Public Defender's Office to be relieved from representing respondent and respondent's motion that it be relieved. Ultimately, the judge relieved counsel and informed respondent, who was hoping to hire a private

¹ Since this rule was announced in an unpublished memorandum opinion, it had no precedential value. Rule 220(a), SCACR.

² *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975).

³ *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 73 (1963).

⁴ *State v. Watkins*, Op. No. 2004-UP-406 (S.C. Ct. App. filed June 22, 2004).

attorney, that he would appoint counsel for respondent if he made a timely request before the case was scheduled to be tried in July 2008. At a subsequent hearing before Judge Patterson in April 2008, the State announced that respondent wanted a bench trial, and that the State wished to set it for June 2 before Judge Patterson, given his familiarity with respondent's request to proceed pro se and the fear that once the case was called for trial that respondent would then seek to delay by asking for representation. Respondent's request that Judge Patterson recuse himself for the retrial because he had presided at respondent's PCR hearing was denied.

At a hearing in May 2008, respondent, appearing pro se, made numerous motions. As the situation deteriorated, Judge Patterson ordered the attorney he had appointed as stand-by counsel to take over representation. When the case was called for trial in September 2008, respondent again asked that appointed counsel be relieved. After the *Faretta* hearing, however, respondent changed his mind and asked that the attorney continue to represent him. Respondent, however, renewed his motion to proceed pro se following an in camera suppression hearing. The motion was granted and respondent represented himself at the trial. Respondent was convicted, sentenced, and appealed.

On appeal, the Court of Appeals held it was reversible error for Judge Patterson to deny respondent's request that he recuse himself, analogizing this case to *Floyd v. State*, 303 S.C. 298, 400 S.E.2d 145 (1991). *Floyd* adopted a *per se* rule that a judge scheduled to hear a PCR matter must, upon request, recuse himself if he presided over the guilty plea, criminal trial, or probation revocation for which PCR is sought.⁵ The State contends the Court of Appeals' extension of *Floyd's* rationale to this situation was error. We agree.

First, it is questionable whether respondent's request that Judge Patterson recuse himself, made only at the April 2008 hearing preserved the recusal issue for appeal when it was not renewed either at the May 2008 hearing or at the September 2008 trial. Second, a retrial judge is in a different posture than the PCR judge. A PCR judge is frequently asked to review his own conduct in the trial, plea, or probation revocation proceeding, albeit most often through a claim of ineffective assistance

⁵ We granted the State's petition to argue against the *Floyd* precedent. Since *Floyd*, which establishes a rule for PCR, is not before the Court in this direct appeal, we decline to reconsider *Floyd* at this juncture.

of counsel. On the other hand, a PCR judge tasked with retrying the case is not being asked to judge his own prior rulings. Moreover, the trial judge is often required in effect to pass upon the guilt of the defendant, while guilt or innocence is not at issue in a PCR hearing. *Compare State v. Atterberry*, 134 S.C. 392, 133 S.E. 101 (1926) (where trial judge expressed opinion that defendant was guilty when sentencing defendant, must recuse at retrial upon objection) *with State v. Hayes*, 272 S.C. 256, 250 S.E.2d 342 (1979) (no recusal necessary where trial judge had already adjudicated defendant's younger brother delinquent based upon the same offense).

While we disagree with the rule announced by the Court of Appeals, we emphasize that a criminal defendant may ask the judge who heard his PCR to recuse herself from the retrial of the matter for any of the reasons for which recusal may be sought. Here, we find no evidence of judicial bias warranting Judge Patterson's recusal. Canon 3(E)(1)(a), SCACR.

CONCLUSION

The decision of the Court of Appeals is

REVERSED.

TOAL, C.J., BEATTY, HEARN, JJ., and Acting Justice James E. Moore, concur.

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

The State, Respondent,

v.

James J. Curry, Jr., Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2010-153826

Appeal from Lancaster County
Brooks P. Goldsmith, Circuit Court Judge

Opinion No. 27335
Heard September 19, 2012 – Filed December 4, 2013

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender LaNelle Cantey DuRant, of
Columbia, for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan M. Wilson, Chief Deputy
Attorney General John W. McIntosh, Senior Assistant
Deputy Attorney General Salley W. Elliott, and Assistant
Attorney General Julie K. Keeney, all of Columbia, and
Solicitor Douglas A. Barfield, Jr., of Lancaster, for
Respondent.

JUSTICE KITTREDGE: This is a direct appeal in a criminal case. Appellant James J. Curry, Jr., was convicted and sentenced for the offenses of voluntary manslaughter and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime. We affirm.

I.

FACTS/PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On New Year's Eve 2008, Appellant and his fiancée traveled from Rock Hill, South Carolina, to Appellant's hometown of Lancaster, South Carolina, to visit friends and family. Appellant traveled with a .22 caliber pistol. Once they arrived in Lancaster, Appellant and his fiancée visited his cousin Devion Collins and his fiancée at their home. After socializing and drinking alcohol for several hours, Appellant invited Collins and his fiancée to go to Appellant's mother's apartment.

The group then drove to the apartment. Appellant and Collins dropped off their fiancées, picked up a friend, and went to the store for more alcohol and cigarettes. Upon returning to the apartment, Appellant testified he retrieved his pistol from the trunk, went upstairs, and placed the pistol and bullets under his mother's mattress.¹

Later in the evening, after some disturbances in the complex parking lot, Appellant's fiancée left the complex, but Appellant remained in the apartment with Collins and others. Thereafter, Appellant and Collins got into an argument, apparently over Appellant speaking to Collins' fiancée. A brief scuffle ensued, and the two were quickly separated by bystanders. By all accounts, Collins was considerably bigger and stronger than Appellant.

Shortly thereafter, the two men began fighting again. Once again, the two men were separated. According to one witness, Jermaine Harris, there was no blood or injury, and the fight appeared to be over. Harris then led Collins to the kitchen to separate the two combatants.

At this point, the testimony of Appellant and the State's witnesses varies substantially. Several of the State's witnesses testified that after the second altercation ended, Appellant ran upstairs, came back downstairs, faced the kitchen, and began shooting at Collins, whose back was to Appellant. Appellant, on the other hand, testified he had retrieved and loaded the gun earlier in the night, and had placed it in his pocket in anticipation of firing the weapon at midnight to celebrate the New Year. Appellant testified he pulled the gun from his pocket because he believed Collins was lunging toward him. Appellant shot Collins six times in the back, killing him. It is undisputed that Collins was unarmed.

¹ There is a conflict in the evidence as to the point in time Appellant retrieved his gun from under the mattress. Resolving this evidentiary conflict has no bearing on resolving the challenge asserted by Appellant on appeal.

Appellant was charged with murder and possession of a firearm during the commission of a violent crime. Appellant confessed to killing Collins, although he told investigating officers that he "blacked out" during the shooting. At the close of the State's evidence, defense counsel moved for a directed verdict of acquittal pursuant to the Protection of Persons and Property Act (Act), which purports to codify the common law Castle Doctrine. *See* S.C. Code §§ 16-11-410, 16-11-440(C), and 16-11-450 (Supp. 2011). The trial court denied the motion. Thereafter, the trial court instructed the jury on murder, voluntary manslaughter, and self-defense. Appellant's counsel further challenged the trial court's self-defense instructions. The jury returned a verdict of guilty on the offense of voluntary manslaughter and the weapons charge. Appellant was sentenced to eighteen years' imprisonment.

II.

LAW/ANALYSIS

A.

Protection of Persons and Property Act

When applicable, the Act provides immunity from prosecution.² Claiming self-defense, Appellant sought to invoke section 16-11-440(C) of the Act at the directed verdict stage. The trial court denied the motion, finding that Appellant failed to establish his entitlement to immunity under section 16-11-440(C). Because there is evidence to support the decision of the trial court, we affirm.

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 § 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.

² That provision states: "A person who uses deadly force as permitted by the provisions of [the Act] . . . is justified in using deadly force and is immune from criminal prosecution and civil action for the use of deadly force" S.C. Code § 16-11-450(A).

A claim of immunity under the Act requires a pretrial determination using a preponderance of the evidence standard, which this court reviews under an abuse of discretion standard of review. *State v. Duncan*, 392 S.C. 404, 709 S.E.2d 662 (2011).³

In *Duncan*, we set forth the pretrial procedure, burden of proof and appellate standard of review under the Act. Because Appellant misapprehends the reach of the Act, we take this opportunity to interpret what we believe to be the legislative intent regarding a trial court's authority to weigh the underlying claim of self-defense in determining an accused's entitlement to immunity.

Section 16-11-450 provides immunity from prosecution *if* a person is found to be justified in using deadly force under the Act. Section 16-11-440(C), the pertinent "force" section, states:

A person who is not engaged in an unlawful activity and who is attacked in another place where he has a right to be, including, but not limited to, his place of business, 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

Appellant appears to argue the Act should be construed to require a trial court to accept the accused's version of the underlying facts. As a result, the trial court could only determine if the accused is "not engaged in an unlawful activity" and is in a "place he has a right to be." We find that the General Assembly did not intend such an application. Consistent with the Castle Doctrine and the text of the Act, a valid case of self-defense must exist, and the trial court must necessarily consider

³ Appellant moved for immunity under the Act at the directed verdict stage, calling it a "slightly unusual" procedure. We note that our decision in *Duncan* was published after this case was tried. In fairness to the parties and the trial court, the Act is silent on the procedure to follow when an accused seeks immunity. While *Duncan* interprets the Act to require a pretrial determination by the trial court, because Appellant and the trial court here did not have the benefit of *Duncan*, we elect to treat the matter as preserved through the directed verdict motion. *See also State v. Isaac*, 405 S.C. 177, 185, 747 S.E.2d 677, 681 (2013) (holding the denial of a request for immunity under the Act is interlocutory and therefore is not immediately appealable).

the elements of self-defense in determining a defendant's entitlement to the Act's immunity. This includes all elements of self-defense, save the duty to retreat.⁴

As the General Assembly stated its intent to codify the common law Castle Doctrine, we believe it appropriate to consider case law in the area. In *State v. Grantham*, we stated that "the [Castle Doctrine] rule is predicated on the absence of aggression or fault on [the defendant's] part in bringing on the difficulty; the doctrine is for defensive, and not offensive purposes." 224 S.C. 41, 45, 77 S.C. 291, 292 (1953). While the Act may be considered "offensive" in the sense that the immunity operates as a bar to prosecution, such immunity is predicated on an accused demonstrating the elements of self-defense to the satisfaction of the trial court by the preponderance of the evidence.

Given the facts as presented above, we conclude there is evidence to support the trial court's denial of immunity under the Act. Appellant's claim of self-defense presents a quintessential jury question, which, most assuredly, is not a situation warranting immunity from prosecution. Accordingly, we find the case was properly submitted to the jury, with the claim of self-defense being fully presented,

⁴ There are four elements required by law to establish a case of self-defense:

First, the defendant must be without fault in bringing on the difficulty. Second, the defendant must have actually believed he was in imminent danger of losing his life or sustaining serious bodily injury, or he actually was in such imminent danger. Third, if his defense is based upon his belief of imminent danger, a reasonably prudent man of ordinary firmness and courage would have entertained the same belief. If the defendant actually was in imminent danger, the circumstances were such as would warrant a man of ordinary prudence, firmness and courage to strike the fatal blow in order to save himself from serious bodily harm or losing his own life. Fourth, the defendant had no other probable means of avoiding the danger of losing his own life or sustaining serious bodily injury than to act as he did in this particular instance.

State v. Davis, 282 S.C. 45, 46, 317 S.E.2d 452, 453 (1984). It is the fourth element—the duty to retreat—that is excused under the Act and the Castle Doctrine.

and the State having the burden to disprove at least one element of self-defense beyond a reasonable doubt.

B.

Jury Instruction

Appellant next contends the trial court erred in charging the jury on both the provisions of the Act and the standard self-defense charge because they are inherently inconsistent and confusing to the jury. We reject Appellant's claim of prejudicial error.

"In reviewing jury charges for error, we must consider the court's jury charge as a whole in light of the evidence and issues presented at trial." *State v. Brandt*, 393 S.C. 526, 549, 713 S.E.2d 591, 603 (2011) (citation omitted). "Generally, an alleged error in a portion of a charge must be considered in light of the whole charge, and must be prejudicial to the appellant to warrant a new trial." *Priest v. Scott*, 266 S.C. 321, 324, 223 S.E.2d 36, 38 (1976).

The jury was instructed on section 16-11-440(C) of the Act, specifically:

I tell you that if the defendant was not engaged in an unlawful activity and was attacked in any place where he had a right to be, he had no duty to retreat and had the right to stand his ground and meet force with force, even to the extent of using deadly force or great bodily injury if it was necessary to prevent death or great bodily injury to himself or others.

The trial court further charged the jury on the elements of self-defense, including the requirement that "the defendant had no other probable way to avoid the danger or death or serious bodily injury than to act as the defendant did in this particular instance."

Appellant claims the charge is a "purposeful ambiguity," which confused the jury. The charge under the Act was indeed error, but one that inured to Appellant's benefit. Specifically, the trial court had denied Appellant immunity, and section 16-11-440(C) should not have been charged to the jury. The full reach of the Act and whether the statutory provisions in the Act extend beyond the common law Castle Doctrine are questions for another day. Yet, in this context, the error in the jury charge, and any resulting ambiguity, caused no prejudice to Appellant. Under

the Castle Doctrine, one is not required to retreat from *his dwelling place*. See *State v. Gordon*, 128 S.C. 422, 425, 122 S.E. 501, 502 (1924) ("One attacked, without fault on his part, *on his own premises*, has the right, in establishing his plea of self-defense, to claim immunity from the law of retreat, which is ordinarily an essential element of that defense." (emphasis added)).

Under the Castle Doctrine, the absence of a duty to retreat does not extend to a visitor or social guest in the home of another unless "the attacker is an intruder." See *State v. Brown*, 321 S.C. 184, 467 S.E.2d 922 (1996) (applying the common law and holding that "a lawful guest attacked in the owner's home has no duty to retreat where the attacker is an intruder" but "where the attacker is the homeowner, a lawful guest has a duty to retreat"); see also *Gilchrist v. State*, 364 S.C. 173, 612 S.E.2d 702 (2005) (overruling precedent that elevated a "club" to the possessory status of a home or place of business with regards to the absence of a duty to retreat and stating that "this expansion of the immunity-from-retreat doctrine is not good public policy, especially in the contemporary context of private clubs"). We agree with other courts that have found such a broad extension would encourage the use of deadly force. See, e.g., *State v. James*, 867 So.2d 414, 417 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2003) (stating an overly broad extension of the castle doctrine would vitiate the retreat rule. . . . [G]ranting castle doctrine protection to a social guest or visitor would necessarily grant the guest or visitor innumerable castles wherever he or she is authorized to visit. That, in turn, would extend the privilege of non-retreat and encourage the use of deadly force.").

III.

CONCLUSION

Because the trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying Appellant immunity under the Act and Appellant was not prejudiced by the section 16-11-440(C) jury instruction, Appellant's convictions and sentence are affirmed.⁵

⁵ Appellant additionally claims error in the trial court's failure to grant a new trial pursuant to the thirteenth juror doctrine. The assignment of error is manifestly without merit, and we affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b)(1), SCACR. See *State v. Prince*, 316 S.C. 57, 64, 447 S.E.2d 177, 181 (1993) ("Where there is competent evidence to sustain the jury's verdict, the judge may not substitute his judgment for that of the jury.").

AFFIRMED.

TOAL, C.J., BEATTY and HEARN, JJ., concur. PLEICONES, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part in a separate opinion.

JUSTICE PLEICONES: I concur in part and dissent in part. I agree with the majority that the Protection of Persons and Property Act (Act) creates a statutory immunity but leaves intact the common law defenses of habitation, of others, and of self-defense. While a criminal defendant is entitled to have the issue of statutory immunity decided prior to trial by a judge, once the case goes to trial a defendant's right to a jury charge on these defenses is determined under common law principles. I therefore agree that appellant was not entitled to a jury charge on the presumption created by S.C. Code Ann. § 16-11-440(C) (Supp. 2012). However, since that charge was given, and since it was hopelessly confusing when viewed in light of the charge on common law self-defense, and since the trial judge, acting without benefit of our decision in *State v. Duncan*, 392 S.C. 404, 709 S.E.2d 662 (2011), denied appellant's immunity request under an incorrect standard,⁶ I would reverse his convictions and remand for a new trial.

⁶ The trial judge held that appellant was not entitled to immunity using the directed verdict standard of "any evidence" to deny the request rather than asking whether appellant had proven immunity by a preponderance of the evidence.