

From: Whitsett, Adam <[awhitsett@sled.sc.gov](mailto:awhitsett@sled.sc.gov)>  
To: Pisarik, HollyHollyPisarik@gov.sc.gov  
Date: 5/26/2016 11:50:51 AM  
Subject: RE: Proviso Review

---

Holly:

I have reviewed the provisos in SLED's 2016-2017 Budget. In my opinion, all but one of SLED's provisos meet the "test". Proviso 62.20, which is set forth in its entirety below deals only with the continuing validity of South Carolina CWP's during the time that SLED is processing the CWP renewals. While SLED complies with this provision and certainly has no concern whatsoever about it, it does not appear to meet the "test" in my opinion.

62.20. (SLED: CWP Renewal and Replacement) A concealed weapons permit may not be suspended by a state official, agent, or employee supported by state funds if the permit holder has initiated a renewal or replacement application and the processing and issuance of a renewal or replacement permit is delayed for administrative reasons. A concealed weapons permit remains valid during the pendency of the renewal or replacement process so long as the application for replacement renewal is submitted prior to the expiration of the permit.

Please let me know how you would like for me to proceed in this regard.

Regards,  
Adam

Adam L. Whitsett, Esquire  
General Counsel  
South Carolina Law Enforcement Division  
Post Office Box 21398  
Columbia, South Carolina 29221  
Office: (803) 896-0647  
Cell: (803) 206-4636  
Fax: (803) 896-7588



---

From: Pisarik, Holly [<mailto:HollyPisarik@gov.sc.gov>]  
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 2:20 PM  
To: Toomey, Bob; Karen Manning - Commerce; Boone, Susan; Avant, David; Salley Elliott (C057924); Byron Roberts - HHS; Gwen McGriff - DOI; Elizabeth Hill - DJJ; Melina Mann - LLR; Frank "Val" Valenta - DMV; Emily Johnson - PRT; Matthew Buchanan - PPP; Warren Ganjehsani - DPS; Milton Kimpson - DOR; Tony Catone - DSS; Linda McDonald; Whitsett, Adam  
Cc: Taylor, Richele  
Subject: Proviso Review

Good Afternoon GCs,

As you are likely aware, the SC Supreme Court recently issued a ruling striking down a 2015-2016 budget proviso as unconstitutional. I've attached that case for your review and summarized its holding below.

\*\*\*The "test" for provisos under the one subject rule appears to be whether the proviso reasonably and inherently relates (not directly relates) to the raising and spending of tax monies – it must be a monetary matter, not an

administrative or procedural matter. E.g. reenacting tort claims caps, requiring local governments to remit real estate fees to state, creating a committee to negotiate new contracts and fees, altering definition of machines subject to licensing fees, etc. Examples where content was not germane: permitting referendums in SPDs to decide nature of budget, amending an act creating Court of Appeals, and giving state custody of certain unclaimed property.

In light of this case, please review provisos contained in your 2016-2017 agency budget, and let me know if you think any of them violate the one subject rule. Although the budget is not yet final, we have begun our review, so please reply to me with your analysis by no later than this Thursday (May 26<sup>th</sup>). Even if you find no problems, please respond. Let me know if you have questions.

Thanks, Holly

Holly G. Pisarik  
Chief Legal Counsel  
Office of Governor Nikki R. Haley  
O: 803-734-8465 C: 803-322-6255