

1974 S.C. Op. Atty. Gen. 57 (S.C.A.G.), 1974 S.C. Op. Atty. Gen. No. 3704, 1974 WL 21223

Office of the Attorney General

State of South Carolina

Opinion No. 3704

February 6, 1974

**\*1 In Re: Act No. 387, Acts of 1973, Private Security Personnel Employed Directly by Employer**

F. Hall Yarborough, Esquire  
Attorney at Law  
Post Office Box 1265  
Orangeburg, South Carolina 29115

Dear Mr. Yarborough:

Inquiry has been made as to whether or not security personnel working directly for an employer, such as a watchman, plant guard, gatekeeper, parking lot attendant, or one performing similar duties, must be registered with SLED under the subject Act when their duties do not include arrests for detentions that the average citizen is not empowered to effect, and who is not armed in the performance of his duties.

The Act requires that persons engaged in 'private security work', a term not defined by the Act, shall be registered by SLED. The recognized reference works do not provide a substantial, satisfactory definition of the phrase.

In the circumstances, it is my opinion that SLED is empowered under Section 3(3) of the Act to promulgate an enforceable rule to define the term 'private security work' as used in the Act.

Yours very truly,

Joseph C. Coleman  
Deputy Attorney General

1974 S.C. Op. Atty. Gen. 57 (S.C.A.G.), 1974 S.C. Op. Atty. Gen. No. 3704, 1974 WL 21223

---

End of Document

© 2018 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.