| STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA    | ) IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                            | ) SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT       |
| COUNTY OF LANCASTER.       | )                              |
|                            | ) CASE NO: 2025 CP-29-         |
| JIMMY GARISON,             | ,<br>)                         |
|                            | )                              |
|                            | )                              |
| PLAINTIFF,                 | )                              |
| VS.                        | SUMMONS                        |
|                            | )                              |
|                            | )                              |
| ARAMARK, LANCASTER COUNTY, | )                              |
| & DARLENE BROWN            |                                |
|                            |                                |
| DEFENDANTS.                |                                |
|                            | _)                             |
|                            |                                |

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to answer the complaint herein, a copy of which is herewith served upon you, and to serve a copy of your answer to this complaint upon the subscriber, at the address shown below, within thirty (30) days after service hereof, exclusive of the day of such service, and it you fail to answer the complaint, judgment by default will be rendered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

August 19, 2025

TO: THE ABOVE-NAMED DEFENDANTS:

s/ Brett Perry
Brett Perry, Esq.
Perry Law Firm
PO BOX 1
Camden, SC 29021

s/ M. Ryan Payne
M. Ryan Payne, Esq.
The Law Office of M. Ryan Payne, LLC
PO BOX 575
Heath Springs, SC 29058

Attorneys for Plaintif

| STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA    | ) IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                            | ) SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT       |
| COUNTY OF LANCASTER        | )                              |
|                            | ) CASE NO: 2025-CP-29-         |
| JIMMY GARRISON,            | )                              |
|                            | )                              |
|                            | )                              |
| PLAINTIFF,                 | )                              |
| VS.                        | ) COMPLAINT                    |
|                            |                                |
| ARAMARK, LANCASTER COUNTY, | )                              |
| & DARLENE BROWN,           | )                              |
|                            |                                |
| DEFENDANTS.                | )                              |
|                            | _)                             |

The Plaintiff named herein, complaining of the Defendants, would respectfully show unto this Honorable Court and allege as follows:

### **PARTIES**

- The Plaintiff, Jimmy Garrison, (hereinafter "Plaintiff") is a citizen and resident of Lancaster County, South Carolina.
- Upon information and belief, Defendant Aramark (hereinafter "Aramark") is a
  corporation domiciled in Delaware who regularly conducts business in the State of South
  Carolina and Lancaster County.
- 3. Upon information and belief, Defendant Lancaster County (hereinafter "County") is a political subdivision as defined by S.C. Code 15-78-30(h) and is being sued pursuant to the South Carolina State Tort Claims Act.
- Upon information and belief, Defendant Darlene Brown is a resident and citizen of Lancaster County.
- 5. This suit is brought in Lancaster County, South Carolina where Plaintiff resided at the time of the tortuous acts occurred and where the tortuous acts committed by Defendants

- occurred. Additionally, upon information and belief, a majority of the parties to this action and witnesses are residents of Lancaster County, South Carolina.
- 6. The allegations included herein are under the jurisdiction of this Court.
- 7. Venue is proper in Lancaster County as the acts and/or omissions giving rise to these causes of action substantially occurred in Lancaster County, South Carolina.

#### **FACTS**

- 8. On or about August 25, 2023, Plaintiff was an inmate at the Lancaster County Detention Center in Lancaster, South Carolina.
- 9. Despite Plaintiff being an inmate, he was selected to work in the kitchen as a trustee while awaiting trial for his charges.
- 10. Upon information and belief, at the time of the incident, Defendant Brown was an employee and/or agent of Defendant Aramark assigned to supervise inmates in the kitchen area of the Lancaster County Detention Center.
- 11. Upon information and belief, Defendant Aramark is a contractual provider of food services to Defendant Lancaster County for the Lancaster County Detention Center.
- 12. On or about August 25, 2023, Plaintiff was preparing for lunch service for the inmates while in his role as a trustee.
- 13. As part of his duties in preparation, he went to the cooler area to retrieve Kool-Aid for the inmates to drink.
- 14. After Plaintiff closed the cooler door, he noticed that Defendant Brown had opened the door to the cooler and followed him inside.
- 15. While Plaintiff had a box of Kool-Aid in his hands and was unable to defend himself,

  Defendant Brown then told Plaintiff that she wanted to "see what [Plaintiff] was

  working with."

- 16. After making this statement Defendant Brown grabbed Plaintiff's penis.
- 17. After grabbing Plaintiff's penis, Defendant Brown then laughed and walked out of the cooler.
- 18. Defendant Brown then began to tell other employees and inmates that Plaintiff had a small penis and that Defendant Brown did not know why Plaintiff's wife was still married to Plaintiff.
- 19. Additionally, upon information and belief, Defendant Brown made multiple admissions to grabbing Plaintiff's penis to other inmates throughout the jail.
- 20. As a result of the sexual assault on Plaintiff committed by Defendant Brown and her subsequent publishing of the assault to other Aramark employees and inmates, Plaintiff suffered damages to include, but not be limited to: physical harm, emotional harm, alteration of his lifestyle, humiliation, apprehension, anxiety, stress, depression, embarrassment, shame, fear, and/or a loss of enjoyment of life in addition to expenses for which Plaintiff is entitled to recover in an amount to be determined by a jury at the trial in this action.

# FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION Negligence and Gross Negligence State Tort Claims Act (As to Defendant Lancaster County)

- 21. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs above as if repeated herein.
- 22. Defendant Lancaster County, its employees, agents, and contractors departed from the duties of care owed to the Plaintiff in that it was negligent, careless, grossly negligent, and reckless and acted in violation of the duties owed to Plaintiff in that they committed one or more of the following acts or omissions, any and all of which were a departure from the prevailing duties of care:
  - a. Failing to ensure the safety, security, freedom, and well-being of Plaintiff;

- Failing to appreciate the conditions that existed on the dates in question through their employees and/or agents;
- c. Failing to adhere to proper law enforcement procedure through their employees and/or agents including, but not limited to: (1)failing to ensure that Plaintiff was safe from unwanted and unjustified physical assaults by employees of Aramark within the Lancaster County Detention Center, (2) failing to properly supervise persons within the Lancaster County Detention Center and (3) placing Plaintiff at an unreasonable risk of physical and/or emotional harm by providing Plaintiff as a trustee under the supervision of Defendant Aramark's employees and/or agents;
- d. Failing to intervene and prevent employees, and/or agents of Defendant Aramark from unlawfully detaining, assaulting, and/or molesting Plaintiff unlawfully;
- e. Failing to properly hire, train, and supervise their officers and/or agents; and
- f. And other such particulars as may be learned through discovery.
- 23. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence, gross negligence, reckless disregard for the truth, and departure from the standards of care owed by Defendant Lancaster County, its employees, agents, and contractors, Plaintiff suffered physical harm, emotional harm, alteration of his lifestyle, humiliation, apprehension, anxiety, stress, depression, embarrassment, shame, fear, and/or a loss of enjoyment of life in addition to expenses for which Plaintiff is entitled to recover in an amount to be determined by a jury at the trial in this action.
- 24. Defendant is entitled to an award of damages pursuant to the South Carolina State Tort Claims Act.

25. Plaintiff asks the Court to award damages and costs, to include, but not be limited to, attorney's fees.

### FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligence/Gross Negligence (As to Defendants Aramark & Brown)

- 26. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs above as if repeated herein.
- 27. During all times relevant, the Defendants' acts and omissions accounted to negligence, recklessness and a willful and wanton disregard for the health and well-being of Plaintiff.
- 28. As a direct and proximate result of the willful, wanton and reckless acts, as well as the gross negligence of Defendants Brown and Aramark, Plaintiff sustained severe and permanent injuries, suffering, both physical and emotional, and required and will require future medical treatment.
- 29. Plaintiff is entitled to recover compensatory damages from Defendants Aramark and Brown in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 30. Plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from the Defendants Aramark and Brown in an amount as to be determined by a jury.
- 31. Defendants Aramark and Brown deviated from the standard of care and/or were negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, and careless at the time and place hereinabove mentioned in, at least, the following particulars:

#### (As to Defendant Aramark)

- a. In failing to investigate adequately the background of its employees and/or agents before allowing them to provide care, training, and supervision of inmates such as Plaintiff.
- b. In failing to train employees in the care, standards and procedures of the Lancaster County Detention laws of the state of South Carolina prior to allowing them to supervise inmates, such as Plaintiff;

- c. In failing to provide a safe environment and safe supervision for Plaintiff and the other inmates at the Lancaster County Detention Center;
- d. In failing to investigate the injury sustained;
- e. In failing to properly supervise Defendant's employees/agents;
- f. In failing to use the degree of care as would have been used by other food service providers of reasonable skill and prudence under the prevailing standards of care;
- g. In such other particulars as may be ascertained through discovery.

### (As to Defendant Brown)

- a. In failing to provide care consistent with the standard of care to Plaintiff;
- b. In failing to ask to be relieved of her duties when she knew or should have known she was unable to perform those duties;
- c. In failing to appreciate the dangers of spreading information about Plaintiff's penis to other inmates within the Lancaster County Detention Center;
- d. In failing to use the degree of care as would have been used by supervisors of reasonable skill and prudence under the prevailing standards of care; and
- e. In such other particulars as may be ascertained through discovery.
- 32. All of the above actions were within the scope and course of Defendant Aramark and/or individuals affiliations and/or employment as a care provider, for the purposes of carrying on their business as a food service provider for the Lancaster County Detention Center and therefore, Defendant Aramark is liable for the negligent acts and omissions of Defendant Brown, and other staff, respectively, under the theories of nondelegable duty and *respondeat superior*.
- 33. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence, recklessness, and gross negligence of Defendants Aramark and Brown, as set forth above, Plaintiff suffered emotional and physical pain, mental pain, mental anguish and emotional distress.

34. Plaintiff is entitled to recover actual and punitive damages, as set forth herein, along with costs to include attorney's fees from Defendants Aramark and Brown in an amount as to be determined by a jury.

### FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION Negligent Supervision

Negligent Supervision
(As To Defendant Aramark)

- 35. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs above as if repeated herein.
- 36. Defendant Aramark knew or had reason to know of the ability to control Defendant Brown and the care she was rendering as an employee and/or agent of Defendant Aramark.
- 37. Defendant Aramark knew or had reason to know of the necessity and opportunity for exercising control over Defendant Brown.
- 38. Defendant Brown was, at all times relevant, an employee and/or agent of Defendant Aramark and/or was utilizing the chattel of Defendant Aramark.
- 39. Defendant Aramark was negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, and careless in their duty to supervise Defendant Brown and prevent foreseeable injuries to patrons under her care and supervision.
- 40. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence, recklessness, and gross negligence of Defendant Aramark, as set forth above, Plaintiffs suffered emotional and physical pain, mental pain, mental anguish, and emotional distress.
- 41. Plaintiff is entitled to recover actual and punitive damages, as set forth herein, along with costs to include attorney's fees from Defendant Aramark in an amount as to be determined by a jury.

#### FOR A FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## Negligent Retention (As To Defendant Aramark)

- 42. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs above as if repeated herein.
- 43. Defendant Aramark is charged with the duty of using reasonable care to police the employment premises which the employer has the privilege of entering in order to prevent an employee from doing harm to others.
- 44. That Defendant Aramark knew or had reason to know of the ability to control Defendant Brown and the care that she was rendering on behalf of Defendant Aramark.
- 45. Defendant Aramark knew or had reason to know of the necessity and opportunity for exercising control over Defendant Brown.
- 46. Defendant Aramark knew or had reason to know of foreseeable risk of injury to inmates under the care and supervision of Defendant Brown.
- 47. Defendant Brown was, at all times relevant, on the premises of Defendant Aramark, was an agent and/or employee of Defendant Aramark, and/or was using the chattel of Defendant Aramark.
- 48. Defendant Aramark was negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, and careless in their duty to terminate Defendant Brown before injury occurred to an inmate.
- 49. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence, recklessness, and gross negligence of Defendant Aramark, as set forth above, Plaintiffs suffered emotional and physical pain, mental pain, mental anguish, and emotional distress.
- 50. Plaintiff is entitled to recover actual and punitive damages, as set forth herein, and costs to include attorney's fees, from Defendant Aramark in an amount as to be determined by this Court.

#### **FOR A FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (As To Defendant Brown)

- 51. Defendant Brown intentionally and/or recklessly inflicted emotional distress upon Plaintiff by grabbing Plaintiff's penis and then telling other inmates that Plaintiff had a small penis.
- 52. By spreading this false statement, Defendant Brown inflicted emotional distress upon Plaintiff and also placed his safety within the detention center at risk.
- 53. As a result of the actions of Defendant Brown, Plaintiff suffered emotional distress.
- 54. As a direct and proximate result of the intentional act by Defendant Brown, Plaintiff suffered physical harm, emotional harm, alteration of his lifestyle, humiliation, apprehension, anxiety, stress, depression, embarrassment, shame, fear, and/or a loss of enjoyment of life in addition to expenses for which Plaintiff is entitled to recover in an amount to be determined by a jury at the trial in this action and punitive damages.
- 55. Plaintiff seeks damages and punitive damages as well as costs including, but not limited to, attorney's fees.

### FOR A SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## Assault and Battery (Against Defendant Brown)

- 56. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs above as if repeated herein.
- 57. Defendant Brown physically assaulted and battered Plaintiff by grabbing his penis without Plaintiff's consent.
- 58. Additionally, Plaintiff could not consent to sexual activity under South Carolina law as he was an inmate at the time of the assault and battery.

- 59. Defendant Brown's actions placed Plaintiff in reasonable fear of bodily harm.
- 60. Defendant Brown's actions caused the Plaintiff to suffer injuries and bodily harm.
- 61. Plaintiff seeks actual damages and punitive damages for this assault and costs to include, but not be limited to, attorney's fees.

# FOR A SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION Defamation (Against Defendant Brown)

- 62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs above as if repeated herein.
- 63. Defendant Brown made false statements to other inmates and workers in the Lancaster County Detention Center that she knew were false.
- 64. Specifically, she informed individuals that Plaintiff had a small penis.
- 65. As a direct and proximate result of the false statements by Defendant Brown, Plaintiff suffered physical harm, emotional harm, alteration of his lifestyle, humiliation, apprehension, anxiety, stress, depression, embarrassment, shame, fear, and/or a loss of enjoyment of life including expenses for which Plaintiff is entitled to recover in an amount to be determined by a jury at the trial in this action and punitive damages.
- 66. Plaintiff seeks an award of damages to include, but not be limited to, compensatory and punitive damages along with costs to include, but not be limited to, attorney's fees.

### WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays for the following relief:

- A. For judgment against Defendants for actual, compensatory and punitive damages, and future damages to be determined by the Court and a jury;
- B. For attorney's fees and costs where applicable;
- C. For the costs and disbursements in the pursuit of this action; and
- D. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

| Respectfully | Submitted |
|--------------|-----------|
|--------------|-----------|

August 19, 2025

s/ Brett Perry
Brett Perry, Esq.
Perry Law Firm
PO BOX 1
Camden, SC 29021

s/ M. Ryan Payne
M. Ryan Payne, Esq.
The Law Office of M. Ryan Payne, LLC
PO BOX 575
Heath Springs, SC 29058
Attorneys for Plaintiff

| STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA                     | ) IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS |
|---|--------------------------------|
| COUNTY OF LANCASTER                         | ) SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT<br>)  |
|   | ) CASE NO: 2025-CP-29-         |
| JIMMY GARRISON,                             | )<br>)                         |
| PLAINTIFF,                                  | )                              |
| VS.   | ) VERIFICATION                 |
| ARAMARK, LANCASTER COUNTY, & DARLENE BROWN, |                                |
| DEFENDANTS.                                 |                                |
|   | <del></del>                    |

I, Jimmy Garrison, appearing first before the Notary Public, state that I am the Plaintiff in this matter. I have read the attached Complaint and know or believe that the contents and allegations are true to the best of my knowledge, except for those matters stated which are alleged on information and belief.

Notary Public for South Carolina )
My Commission Expires: 11(1/2032)