

Johnson, McKenzie & Robinson, LLC

Attorneys at Law
16 North Brooks Street
Manning, South Carolina 29102

May 11, 2006

The Honorable Frances P. Segars-Andrews
Judge of the Family Court
Charleston County
Post Office Box 934
Charleston, SC 29402-0934
VIA FACSIMILE (843)-958-4415

Re: W. R. Simpson, Jr. vs. Becky H. Simpson
Docket #: 04-DR-14-243 & 315

Dear Judge Segars-Andrews:

I am in receipt of the transcript from April 14, 2006 and I am attaching a copy for your review.

My specific objections to Mr. McLaren's proposed Order are as follows:

1. The Court denied the Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion for a New Trial. Pages 2, 3, 4, 5 and through the first paragraph on page 6 of the proposed Order address the issue of the Plaintiff's Motion that were not addressed by the Court and should not be in the Order. Procedurally, a motion was made by the Plaintiff and that motion was denied. The remainder of the hearing revolved around the Court's Motion. I would think that is all that the Order needs to contain about the Plaintiff's Motion;
2. Also, The Order needs to reflect that the Court by its own Motion, *Sua Sponte*, recused itself from the case. The reason for the recusal needs to be cited along with the nature and amount of the "large settlement" (I have been repeatedly informed of a large settlement shared by McLaren and the law firm of Andrews and Shull, but no number other than "six figures" has been placed on any documentation. That information is relevant to the factual background of why the Court initially recused itself.).
3. The Order needs to reflect that the Defendant requested a week to brief the issue for the Court. The Court after reviewing the memorandum from the Defendant's attorney reversed the Order of Recusal, *Sua Sponte*.
4. The Order also needs to reflect that the Mr. Shull and Mr. McLaren were involved in the matter of *Wooten vs. Wooten*, 364 S.C. 532, 615 S.E.2d 98 (2005) and that fact was also not disclosed.

11

EXHIBIT

12.2.09 SB

Honorable Frances P. Segars-Andrews
Judge of the Family Court
March 11, 2006

I would direct the Court's attention to page 7, lines 4-25. Mr. McLaren does not mention the *Wooten* case even though he and Mr. Shull were representing the Respondents in that case before the Supreme Court as late as June of 2005. Also, the amount of fees that Andrews and Shull received as a result of their association with Mr. McLaren in the *Wooten* case should be disclosed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Steven S. McKenzie

enclosures

cc:

W. R Simpson, Jr.

Jan Warner, Esq.

James T. McLaren, Esq.