

1226 Pickens Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
info@garberreporting.com
Telephone: (803) 256-4500 | Fax (803) 256-1999

## **SCREENING HEARINGS**

November 06, 2023

2023 Judicial Merit Selection Commission

REPORTER: Patricia Bachand

1	STATE OF SOUTH	CAROLINA )
2	COUNTY OF RICH	ILAND )
3		
4		* * * *
5	JU	DICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION
6		TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS
7		* * * *
8	BEFORE: REPR	ESENTATIVE "MICAH" CASKEY, IV, CHAIRMAN
9	SENA	TOR LUKE A. RANKIN, VICE CHAIRMAN
10	SENA	TOR RONNIE A. SABB
11	SENA	TOR SCOTT TALLEY
12	REPR	ESENTATIVE J. TODD RUTHERFORD
13	REPR	ESENTATIVE WALLACE H. "JAY" JORDAN, JR.
14	HOPE	BLACKLEY
15	LUCY	GREY MCIVER
16	ANDR	EW N. SAFRAN
17	ERIN	B. CRAWFORD, CHIEF COUNSEL
18		* * * *
19	DATE:	November 6, 2023
20	TIME:	9:00 a.m.
21	LOCATION:	Gressette Building, Room 105
22		1101 Pendleton Street
23		Columbia, South Carolina 29201
24		
25	REPORTED BY:	PATRICIA G. BACHAND, COURT REPORTER

1	INDEX
2	PAGE:
3	OVERVIEW OF SCREENING PROCESS/QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 8
4	THE HONORABLE JOHN W. KITTREDGE
5	- Examination by Mr. Dennis
6	- Examination by Senator Rankin 50
7	GRAYSON LAMBERT 61
8	- Examination by Mr. Maldonado64
9	- Examination by Senator Rankin
10	- Examination by Chairman Caskey
11	- Examination by Senator Talley
12	JASON P. LUTHER 85
13	- Examination by Ms. Symmes89
14	- Examination by Representative Jordan 98
15	- Examination by Chairman Rankin
16	THE HONORABLE MATTHEW PRICE TURNER
17	- Examination by Mr. Hinson
18	- Examination by Mr. Safran113
19	- Examination by Senator Sabb
20	WILLIAM KEEFER BRUMBACH (COMPLAINANT)
21	WHITNEY B. HARRISON
22	- Examination by Mr. Dennis
23	- Examination by Senator Rankin
24	- Examination by Mr. Safran149
25	

1	
1	INDEX (CONTINUED)
2	PAGE:
3	SHANDA NICOL (COMPLAINANT)
4	KARON MITCHELL (COMPLAINANT)
5	TUCKER PLAYER (COMPLAINANT)
6	JOHN GALLMAN (COMPLAINANT)
7	IRIS BULLARD (COMPLAINANT)
8	THE HONORABLE JAN B. BROMELL HOLMES
9	- Examination by Ms. Foster
10	- Examination by Senator Rankin 244
11	- Examination by Senator Sabb
12	- Examination by Chairman Caskey
13	Certificate of Reporter
14	Word Index
15	
16	* * * *
17	EXHIBIT INDEX
18	EXHIBITS: PAGE:
19	EXHIBIT NO. 1
20	- 2023 CITIZENS COMMITTEE REPORT
21	EXHIBIT NO. 2
22	- 2023 SOUTH CAROLINA BAR JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS
23	COMMITTEE REPORT
24	
25	

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (CONTINUED):
2	EXHIBITS: PAGE:
3	EXHIBIT NO. 3
4	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
5	QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE JOHN W. KITTREDGE EXHIBIT
6	NO. 4 32
7	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT
8	OF THE HONORABLE JOHN W. KITTREDGE
9	EXHIBIT NO. 5 62
10	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
11	QUESTIONNAIRE OF WILLIAM GRAYSON LAMBERT
12	EXHIBIT NO. 6 62
13	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL SWORN
14	STATEMENT OF WILLIAM GRAYSON LAMBERT
15	EXHIBIT NO. 7 86
16	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
17	QUESTIONNAIRE OF JASON PHILLIP LUTHER
18	EXHIBIT NO. 8 86
19	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION AMENDED PERSONAL
20	DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF JASON PHILLIP LUTHER
21	EXHIBIT NO. 9 86
22	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL SWORN
23	STATEMENT OF JASON PHILLIP LUTHER
24	
25	

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (CONTINUED):
2	EXHIBITS: PAGE:
3	EXHIBIT NO. 10
4	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
5	QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE MATTHEW PRICE TURNER
6	EXHIBIT NO. 11 105
7	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL SWORN
8	STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MATTHEW PRICE TURNER
9	EXHIBIT NO. 12 125
10	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
11	QUESTIONNAIRE OF WHITNEY BOYKIN HARRISON
12	EXHIBIT NO. 13 125
13	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL SWORN
14	STATEMENT OF WHITNEY BOYKIN HARRISON
15	EXHIBIT NO. 14 126
16	- AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM KEEFER BRUMBACH
17	EXHIBIT NO. 15
18	- WRITTEN RESPONSE OF WHITNEY BOYKIN HARRISON
19	EXHIBIT NO. 16
20	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
21	QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE JAN B. BROMELL HOLMES
22	EXHIBIT NO. 17 159
23	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION AMENDED PERSONAL
24	DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE JAN B. BROMELL
25	HOLMES

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (CONTINUED):
2	EXHIBITS: PAGE:
3	EXHIBIT NO. 18 159
4	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL SWORN
5	STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JAN B. BROMELL HOLMES
6	EXHIBIT NO. 19 161
7	- AFFIDAVIT OF SHANDA NICOL
8	EXHIBIT NO. 20 169
9	- AFFIDAVIT OF KARON MITCHELL
10	EXHIBIT NO. 21
11	- AFFIDAVIT OF TUCKER S. PLAYER
12	EXHIBIT NO. 22 208
13	- AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN H. GALLMAN
14	EXHIBIT NO. 23
15	- AFFIDAVIT OF IRIS B. BULLARD
16	EXHIBIT NO. 24 230
17	- WRITTEN RESPONSE OF THE HONORABLE JAN B. BROMELL
18	HOLMES
19	
20	
21	
22	* * * *
23	REQUESTED INFORMATION INDEX
24	(No Information Requested.)
25	

1	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Good morning. I'd like to
2	go ahead and call today's meeting to order. And I
3	recognize Representative Jay Jordan.
4	REPRESENTATIVE JORDAN: Thank you. It's my
5	understanding, the first statute, we are required to choose
6	a chairman at this time. And I can't think of anyone
7	better than my friend, Micah Caskey, to serve this time
8	around. So per South Carolina Law 2-19-10, I nominate
9	Micah Caskey.
10	SENATOR TALLEY: Second.
11	MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Senator Talley.
12	Pending questions as to the election of the Chair, I've
13	been nominated by Representative Jay Jordan. All in favor
14	signify by saying "aye."
15	(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
16	MR. CHAIRMAN: All opposed "nay"?
17	(Hearing none.)
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The "ayes" have it. At
19	this point, I will go ahead and take lead of the chair to
20	nominate a vice chairman, and pursuant to South Carolina
21	law, that member must be a senator. And on that account, I
22	will nominate Senator Luke Rankin as vice chairman of the
23	Commission.
24	SENATOR TALLEY: Second.
25	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Seconded by Mr. Talley.

1 Pending question to this election, I will nominate Senator 2 Luke Rankin as vice chairman of the Commission. All in 3 favor signify by saying "aye." 4 (At this time the members audibly say "aye.") 5 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All opposed "nay"? 6 (Hearing none.) 7 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The "ayes" have it. And 8 Senator Rankin will be designated as the Vice Chairman for 9 the Commission this year. 10 The Judicial Merit Selection Commission is 11 called pursuant to Chapter 19 of Title 2, South Carolina 12 Code of Laws, requiring the review of candidates for 13 The function of the Commission is not to judicial office. 14 choose between candidates, but rather to declare whether 15 the candidates who offer for positions on the bench, in our 16 judgment, are qualified to fill the positions they seek. 17 The inquiry we undertake is a thorough one. 18 It is centered around the Commission's nine evaluative 19 criteria, and it involves a complete personal and 20 professional background check on each candidate. 21 The public hearings are convened for the 22 purpose of screening candidates. This year we will screen 23 one open seat on the Supreme Court, one seat for reelection 24 and one open seat on the Court of Appeals, eleven seats for 25 reelection, and thirteen seats that are open on the circuit

1	court bench, seven open seats on the family court bench,
2	one open seat for reelection excuse me one seat for
3	reelection on the administrative law court, one seat for
4	reelection and one open seat for appointment for Master-in-
5	Equity, and one retired justice.
6	At this point, I would recognize our Chief
7	Counsel, Ms. Erin Crawford, for her comments/instructions.
8	MS. CRAWFORD: Good morning, Commission
9	members. I just want to briefly let's see, we've got a
10	lot here to introduce the screening attorneys and the
11	staff that we have involved. It takes a village and a lot
12	of us to run this.
13	For Senate screening attorneys, we have Andy
14	Fiffick, Paula Benson, Bob Maldonado, Maura Baker, Madison
15	Faulk, Sharon Wilkinson, Breeden John, Brian Cohl, and J.J.
16	Gentry.
17	The House screening attorneys are Patrick
18	Dennis, Kate Crater, Haley Symmes, Steve Davidson, Jimmy
19	Hinson, Julia Foster, Emma Hall, Lauren Trask, Erica
20	Starnes, Macey Webb, Brian Triplett, Trey Walpole, and
21	Meredith Ross.
22	And the Senate staff that helps: Maxine
23	Henry, Elizabeth Harrell, Susan Gibson, Marie Waller, and
24	of course, Lindi Putnam.
25	Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like to

1	request a vote on the cover page for the draft report. It
2	shows that the report will be delivered on Thursday,
3	January 11th, 2024. The 48-hour period ends at noon on
4	Tuesday, January 16th, 2024. And the election is currently
5	scheduled for or we hope to have it scheduled for noon,
6	Wednesday, February 7th, 2024.
7	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Great. Thank you, Ms.
8	Crawford. The pending question is the adoption of the
9	cover page for the report. Is there Senator Rankin
10	moves for adoption. So that is the question. Is there a
11	second? Mr. Jordan seconds.
12	All in favor signify by saying "aye."
13	(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All opposed "nay"?
15	(Hearing none.)
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The "ayes" have it. And
17	the cover page of the report is adopted.
18	MS. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, at this time,
19	if I can please distribute the signature page to the
20	Commission members for the for the draft report.
21	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Make it so.
22	MS. CRAWFORD: Lindi will do that.
23	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, Lindi.
24	MS. CRAWFORD: And at this time, Mr.
25	Chairman, I would like to suggest that we move into

1	executive session to discuss matters related to legal
2	advice.
3	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Jordan moves that we
4	move into executive session. Seconded by Senator Rankin.
5	All in favor can signify by saying "aye".
6	(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
7	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All opposed "nay"?
8	(Hearing none.)
9	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The "ayes" have it. And
10	we will move into executive session. So if you are not
11	supposed to be here, be gone.
12	(Executive session from 9:21 a.m. to 9:51 a.m.)
13	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Good morning, we are back
14	on the record. We've come out of executive session. I
15	would just note for the record, we were joined by the
16	Senator from Horry, Luke Rankin, during that time.
17	A quorum was present, but there was no
18	actions taken during the executive session. So we're back
19	on the record, and I'll just recognize Ms. Crawford again.
20	MS. CRAWFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr.
21	Chairman, at this time I would like to point out to the
22	Commission members, that under Tab 4 in your notebooks, I
23	just have a list of the seats that we expect to screen next
24	year.
25	I'd like to offer, and at this time have

1	made exhibits to the records, the following:
2	The 2023 Citizens Committee Reports from the
3	Lowcountry, Midlands, Pee Dee, Piedmont, and Upstate, as
4	well as the 2023 Judicial South Carolina Bar's Judicial
5	Qualifications Committee Report.
6	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: So are there any
7	objections to entering that into the record those into
8	the record?
9	(Hearing none.)
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Seeing no objections, I
11	would ask that the 2023 Citizens Committee Report and the
12	South Carolina Bar Report be marked as exhibits and entered
13	into the public hearing record.
14	(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - 2023 CITIZENS COMMITTEE
15	REPORTS)
16	(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - 2023 SOUTH CAROLINA BAR
17	JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT)
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I just want to take one
19	second to welcome everybody here. We sort of jumped into
20	things quickly this morning. But this is, obviously, the
21	last step in our Judicial Merit Selection screening
22	process. And our and I'm glad that we have so many
23	folks here to watch and observe what's going on here.
24	As you may well know, at the end of every
25	screening process the Commission releases a report,

1 oftentimes approaching three-hundred-and-some-odd pages. 2 But we want to be mindful of the fact that we want to make 3 our process here as open and as transparent as is possible. 4 And to that end this year, in a change from what 5 we've done in the past, all of these proceedings are 6 recorded. They will be released to the public on-line at 7 Scstatehouse.gov, when the final report of the Commission 8 is released. 9 We timed it that way -- and we don't broadcast these live, because these are in some sense a job 10 11 interview, and it is inherently unfair for earlier 12 screening candidates -- or excuse me -- later screening 13 candidates to have benefitted from watching, directly, the 14 proceedings of earlier candidates. 15 So again for people who don't want to read 16 words on paper, we're going to make video available for you 17 as well. 18 So again we are at the end of what is a long 19 process, and a process that I have asked staff to prepare a brief presentation on, so that members of the public who 20 21 are genuinely interested in this process can learn more 22 about it. 23 And so I hope that this serves some function 24 for people, again, who are good faith actors who are 25 curious about how this process goes.

1	And to that end, that is all the business we
2	have at this stage. And I would proceed to the overview of
3	the screening process presentation by Erin Crawford, Chief
4	Counsel of the JMSC, and Emma I didn't see Emma.
5	MS. CRAWFORD: She'll be here soon.
6	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Emma will be here soon,
7	the Executive Director of the South Carolina Bar. Erin
8	Crawford will go first. And also, I do want to clarify one
9	quick thing, lest I be draw into a never-ending debate with
10	my colleagues here.
11	It may have been the case when Senator
12	Rankin was here before in executive session, and I simply
13	did not see him because I don't have my glasses on. I
14	don't recall hearing him, though, which is typically a
15	distinguishing characteristic. Unless I stand ready to be
16	corrected if that was you are here now.
17	Are you ready?
18	MS. CRAWFORD: I'm ready.
19	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Crawford.
20	MS. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this in an
21	abbreviated presentation of what the JMSC does. I've cut
22	it back, significantly, from when I go out in public and
23	talk about it.
24	Just for your information, the JMSC does
25	screen and nominate all judges for the Supreme Court, Court

1 of Appeals, circuit court, family court, administrative law 2 court, Master-in-Equity. And we do also -- that's not on 3 there -- screen any judges that want to serve in active 4 retired capacity. 5 All of the candidates, no matter what 6 judicial office sought, must be a citizen of the United 7 States and South Carolina, at least 32 years old, licensed 8 attorney at law for at least eight years, a resident of 9 South Carolina for five years preceding his or her 10 election. 11 What are the evaluative criteria that each 12 judicial candidate must meet? These are the nine 13 evaluative -- the nine evaluative criteria that we use, the 14 Citizens Committee use, the Bar uses: 15 Constitutional qualifications, ethical 16 fitness, professional and academic ability, character, 17 reputation, physical health, mental stability, experience, 18 and judicial temperament. 19 That is just a brief overview of the 20 screening process, to show you all the work and all the 21 materials. And I'm going to go through it, briefly, in the 22 screening process from our end. 23 Application materials. These are things 24 that the candidates, whether you're a sitting judge or a 25 candidate running for an open seat, a minimum of eight

1 application documents includes a PDQ personal data 2 questionnaire, a sworn statement, a JMSC economic interest 3 form, a state ethics -- a State Ethics Commission form, a 4 confidential financial statement. 5 They submit five letters of recommendation, 6 CLE reports for the past five years, and writing samples as 7 well, if it is an open seat. 8 It is a lot of material. They must be -- it 9 must be turned in, no later than a published deadline, to 10 be considered a judicial candidate. And that deadline is a 11 set deadline. And if you're fifteen minutes late, we do 12 not accept it. 13 From outside sources we also gather, and the 14 Commission uses in its investigations, Citizens Committee 15 reports, grievance reports from the Bar -- I mean, from the 16 court -- credit reports, the ballot box survey results, 17 SLED reports, the Bar reports, and any complaints from 18 outside sources. 19 The citizens committee are -- we have five different citizens committees. They are appointed by the 20 21 The members of these committees are up to ten chair. 22 members; they are appointed by the Chair and Vice Chair. 23 We've got a citizens committee from each 24 area of the state -- that is Pee Dee, Lowcountry, Upstate, 25 Piedmont, and the Midlands region.

1 The committees do the reports as well, based 2 on nine evaluative criteria. The screening attorneys do 3 let the candidates know if they're -- what the reports find 4 at that point, and they are made a part of the record at 5 the hearing which we have just done. 6 The Bar reports -- and Emma is going to go into this. 7 Emma Dean from the Bar, is going to go into 8 this in more detail, momentarily. They do a very similar But we'll get into that, shortly. And that is 9 10 made a part of the record as well, which we just did. 11 Grievance reports. The candidates and judges sign a waiver, that we can get any information from 12 13 the Commission on Lawyer Conduct and the Commission on 14 Judicial Conduct, stating whether there is a record of 15 discipline from the Supreme Court in the areas of 16 misconduct. This is a question on the PDO. So we look to 17 make sure those are in compliance with each other. 18 The ballot box survey. We send the e-mail -19 - ballot box survey to all members of the Bar that are on 20 file with the Supreme Court. It also goes to clerks of 21 The company we use is not in state, it is out of court. 22 state. It's in Texas. Everything is confidential. The 23 results are anonymous. 24 I do not know -- the Commission does not 25 know who filled out a ballot -- I mean, which ballot box

was filled out by whom. The only way I can usually tell is if somebody in the comments writes their name, or mentions that a candidate is a familial relative.

The candidate is informed at the interview with the screening attorney, they are told about the general concerns and themes raised, as well as positive themes raised in the ballot box. And we address these at the public hearing.

We received SLED reports -- credit reports and SLED reports. SLED does a thorough investigation of any cases that the candidate or judge is involved in, if there are any crimes, any investigatory background.

A lot of times these are cases that are filed by pro se litigants, that they were never served.

But we have access to all of that, including their criminal report, traffic -- drivers license check, etc.

A credit report is run by the clerk's office for each candidate, that's in the confidential financial file that we keep, and the staff does compare that to the confidential financial statement that is given to us by the candidate, to make sure that everything matches up there as well.

Complaints. If a person wishes to file a complaint, and testify before the -- about a candidate, they have to file a sworn affidavit. A complaint form has

to be in by a certain deadline. It's supposed to include any supporting documents, and it has to be in hard copy per the rule. And for the complaint to be accepted by the Commission, it must state allegations regarding the candidate's character, competency, or ethics.

And as a side note, letters in support of

and as a side note, letters in support of candidates — or letters in support of candidates are also prohibited by the rules. So in order for something to come before the Commission, it has to be a sworn affidavit filed by somebody, and they have to be willing to testify at the hearing about the candidate for it to be before the Commission.

The screening attorneys, using all the application documents, all of the information we receive from outside sources and any other investigations, such as looking at social media, appellate review -- you know, appellate record, the screening attorneys conduct interviews with their assigned candidates, let them know about the process, what to expect, gives them any potential issues.

It is not -- the screening attorney does not serve as an advocate or as a -- it's more of a "go to" person for the candidate. They're not out there pushing this candidate, and it's more of a preparation for the hearings.

1 2-19-50 of the Code provides that all 2 records and any information that the Judicial Merit 3 Selection Commission receives to make findings must be kept 4 strictly confidential, and are not subject to FOIA. 5 Once these documents are presented under 6 oath at the public hearing, they're obviously not 7 confidential, and open for dissemination. And after our 8 report is issued, any confidential materials we have are 9 destroyed. 10 Public hearing. The candidates appear 11 before the ten members of the JMSC at the public hearing. 12 Any complaints are heard. The screening attorney asks any 13 -- some housekeeping questions, general information, issues 14 that need to be put on the record. Then the members of the 15 Commission can ask candidates anything they want, any 16 positive or negative things, any questions that they may 17 have. If the members to want to ask them about a 18 19 private matter, such as anything on their finances, or any confidential or cautionary rules they -- letters they have 20 21 received from the courts, we must go into executive 22 session, where the public is escorted out and these matters 23 are discussed at that point. 24 Candidates can withdraw from any -- from 25 consideration at any time. And at that time, or soon

1 thereafter, all of their records are destroyed per the 2 statute. 3 The JMSC votes on whether a candidate is 4 qualified, and of those candidates can nominate up to three 5 best qualified for each seat. 6 The exceptions are -- the Master-in-Equity 7 statute just says we just let the delegation know the 8 qualified candidates. And then retired judges, they're not 9 -- their names are -- they're found qualified or 10 unqualified. 11 And then once they -- if they are found 12 qualified, we submit their names to the Chief Justice for 13 possible use. And so those are not -- the retired judges 14 are not included in the report and they are not voted on. 15 Note: If an incumbent judge is found not 16 qualified, or dies, withdraws, or becomes otherwise disqualified between the time they file for the -- their 17 18 application and the date of the election, then the election 19 for that position will not be held, and we start all over 20 at the next screening cycle, listed as a vacancy. 21 The draft report. After all the hearings, 22 everything is compiled and there is a draft report based --23 done for each candidate, all compiled into one document. In 24 2024, it should be published by Thursday, January 11th. 25 And then 48 hours -- at 48 hours later per

1	statute, the draft report becomes final. The anticipated
2	date would be 12 o'clock noon, Tuesday, January 16th, 2024.
3	And only at that point can the candidates seek and judges -
4	- or members can give votes or pledges to vote at the
5	election time. The statute does provide at least two weeks
6	has to occur between the date of the report and the date of
7	the election.
8	A concurrent resolution is drafted and
9	presented to the General Assembly, and it must be passed by
10	both bodies setting the screening date. It's typically
11	been held, the election, the first or second week of
12	February.
13	And that was just a very brief overview of
14	our process and what we go what the Commission looks at,
15	studies. And Emma Dean is here to discuss more in-depth,
16	the Bar process.
17	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you very much. Ms.
18	Dean, we'd be happy to hear from you. I don't know if you
19	have any materials that we need to put up or anything?
20	MS. DEAN: No.
21	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: No? A straight lecture.
22	Love it. Thank you, Ms. Dean. We'd be happy to hear from
23	you.
24	MS. DEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank
25	you, members of the Judicial Merit Selection Commission. I

1 appreciate you all having us, today, and hearing about what 2 the Bar does. It's a process I'm learning a little bit 3 now, as we go around. 4 But watching it for the first time, I was 5 really struck by the professionalism and hard work that 6 surrounds it. And that professionalism -- or hard work is 7 thanks to our staff, thanks to our many, many volunteers, 8 and thanks to our Chairs who are here today, Scott Moise 9 from Nelson Mullins and Jared Libet from the Attorney 10 General's Office. 11 Talking about the many, many volunteers, 12 that's 110 attorney volunteers served for JQC this year. 13 Sometimes it's higher, sometimes it's lower. But this 14 probably is our highest one, because, honestly, there were 15 so many candidates this year. 16 So these volunteers included two law 17 professors, two recognized ethics experts, a former circuit 18 court judge, a assistant solicitor, an attorney from the 19 public defender's side, two former presidents of the SCAJ 20 ABOTA members, plaintiffs lawyers, defense lawyers, lawyers 21 from small firms and large firms. 22 We had lawyers from large circuits and small 23 circuits. We have senior lawyers and we have lawyers that 24 are on the Young Lawyers Division, which is under 35 -- and

much younger than me -- and all ages in-between.

25

1 So we've got attorneys that are giving up 2 their time, from various different backgrounds. Some of 3 these committee members have served for many, many years, 4 volunteering lots of hours. And some are new to the 5 process. 6 So let's talk about the work that those 7 volunteers do. First, the volunteers divide into a 8 subcommittee that are based on kind of the regions that 9 they're in, looking at the judgeships that are open in 10 those regions, the number of candidates in that region, and 11 how we can get all these calls out. 12 And then these volunteers go to work. They 13 start calling their colleagues. And so these are -- each 14 candidate is allowed to submit five names. So they call 15 those five names, and then they also call others that they 16 find that are in that region, or in that area of practice 17 that the candidate's in, and they get thirty calls at least 18 for each new candidate. 19 And in those calls they ask them questions, 20 investigate the nine evaluative screening process -- nine 21 evaluative criteria. One day I'll be able to say the word 22 "evaluative," but it won't be today. 23 But those nine evaluative criteria that we all know so well, that's what these volunteer attorneys are 24

calling about and asking the attorneys that they -- that

25

1 they reach to ask them about the candidate, right? 2 So these anonymous phone calls that are 3 selected either by the five, or going through more 4 anonymously -- randomly, finding those thirty people and 5 asking them questions about the candidate and their 6 judicial temperament, for example, their ethics, those nine 7 evaluative criteria. 8 After all those calls are made -- and 9 realize how many calls that is, if that's thirty for each 10 new candidate, those subcommittees then all meet and they 11 interview these candidates, right? 12 So the interviews happen. Usually it's the 13 people that have been doing the calls are the committee 14 members that are then interviewing the candidates, and they 15 ask them about their personal data questionnaire, their 16 background, their experience. 17 They also ask them about any concerns that 18 have come up in these calls. Again, these calls are 19 anonymous. And they're going to other attorneys, so any 20 concerns that have come up in those calls, the candidates 21 are given an opportunity to address any of those concerns. 22 They are then asked five procedural and 23 evidentiary questions about the law. So it's like a little 24 mini law school exam. It's the things you wish you knew at 25 your fingertips, not the substantive "I've got to look this

1 up, "but "when I'm sitting on the bench and I've got to 2 rule quickly," those sorts of questions. And we have 3 attorneys and judges help us develop those questions. 4 So during that interview process, they're 5 asked about their background, address any questions that 6 have come up in those calls that have already been made, 7 and then ask five procedural legal questions. 8 The candidate then leaves, the subcommittee 9 meets, and then there's one giant call with all 110 of the 10 volunteer attorneys. So kind of a converging of all the 11 subcommittees, one giant committee then meets and talks 12 through the candidates. And that's how the report is 13 generated. 14 So checks and balances in the system. If 15 there are more -- if there are negative trends in the 16 calls, these volunteers make more calls. You've got a 17 subcommittee going to a committee process, you've got 110 18 lawyers on a phone call, that's a lot of questioning and a 19 lot of checks and balances just by the very nature of who 20 we all are. 21 I want to make sure I hit all the highlights here. As I was saying, this process is very deliberative 22 23 and requires a lot of commitment from those volunteers. 24 The nine evaluative criteria are explored here by the

candidate's colleagues. And I think that's an important

25

1 point. 2 Again, these are the colleagues asking those 3 Nothing like getting law school questions -questions. 4 instead of from the law school professor, you get them from 5 your colleagues and having to answer those, and also 6 getting to answer any questions that are raised by your 7 colleagues in those phone calls, getting an opportunity to 8 address those. 9 So that is how a report is formulated. 10 That's the deliberation and the professionalism and the 11 many hours of commitment that these volunteers make. 12 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, Ms. Dean. Ι 13 appreciate that. And what I hope folks -- I know the 14 members of the Commission are intimately familiar with this 15 process, so I recognize that it may have been dutiful to 16 listen to it all. 17 But given the recent discussion, and the 18 body politics from some elected officials who are paid to 19 care about this process, I thought it important that we 20 have Ms. Crawford and Ms. Dean elucidate this for those who 21 are now interested in this process. 22 One of the things that struck me is -- I 23 joined the Commission last year, is just how thorough and 24 deliberative it is from top to bottom. And while everyone 25 may not make themselves go through all the information that

1 is available on our website "Scstatehouse.gov," if you go 2 to Citizens Interest, you'll find all this information 3 there -- oftentimes, in great volume. 4 And so I hope that the presentation that Ms. 5 Crawford gave, which will be uploaded to our website soon, 6 and the comments from Ms. Dean, will help those who are 7 genuinely interested in this process will then have a more substantive background for the conversations that follow. 8 9 Because it is the charge of this Commission, 10 as it exists today, to do what the law requires. 11 or not this commission should ever look differently, or 12 whether it should exist at all, is a question for another 13 forum, another day, and another time. 14 Everything that we do here is guided by the 15 South Carolina constitution and the code of laws that has 16 been enacted by general assemblies of the past. 17 thought it important that we do that. 18 At this point, if any members have questions 19 for Ms. Dean or Ms. Crawford, I will volunteer them to take those questions from any member. 20 21 REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Not after your 22 patriotic speech. 23 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: And, Ms. Dean, if there's 24 anybody you brought with you, that you think it would be 25 useful for those who are watching to hear from, we'd be

1	happy to hear from them. But no pressure.
2	MS. DEAN: No, sir.
3	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: That's a firm head-shaking
4	
5	MS. DEAN: We're good. Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: and a negative. All
7	right. Thank you for making the time. Mr. Chairman.
8	SENATOR RANKIN: I do want to compliment
9	you, Emma. Obviously, you've sat on this side of the
10	podium. You have participated in the JMSC process for
11	years, so you bring to the Bar, a unique perspective to see
12	and know and be able to educate those who would be
13	applying, and who are interested in this process, what goes
14	on.
15	And to the members of the and y'all
16	please stand, if you will, the Attorney General's Office.
17	Ms. Moise, if you will, please. The others who again,
18	Kali, all the volunteers that are with y'all. Thank you
19	for your time.
20	You don't get paid to do this. And you are
21	doing it to make the judiciary a better body. And our goal
22	here is for independence of that third branch of
23	government. And so to those of you who are giving of your
24	time now, this process, and before, thank you.
25	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you. With that, I

1	think we can take a quick break and then move into our
2	first screening. So we'll be back in five minutes or so.
3	Thank you.
4	(A recess was taken from 10:20 a.m. to 10:31 a.m.)
5	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ladies and gentlemen, we
6	are we're going to get started here. I don't have a
7	certainly, not a gavel but no artificial noise-maker.
8	So unfortunately, you'll just have to hear my voice.
9	Our break is concluded. At this point we'll
10	begin our screening. And the first candidate we have
11	before us is Justice John Kittredge, who's an applicant to
12	the Supreme Court Chief Justice position.
13	Mr. Justice Kittredge, would you please
14	raise your right hand.
15	WHEREUPON,
16	THE HONORABLE JOHN W. KITTREDGE, being duly
17	sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and
18	nothing but the truth.
19	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Are the personal data
20	question you may need to turn on your microphone there.
21	It's on. Let me start again.
22	Are the personal data questionnaire and the
23	sworn statement before you those documents that you've
24	submitted to the Commission are those, those documents?
25	JUSTICE KITTREDGE: Yes, sir.

1	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Are they both correct?
2	JUSTICE KITTREDGE: They are correct. No
3	material changes.
4	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: And there's nothing that
5	needs to be updated at this time.
6	JUSTICE KITTREDGE: No, sir.
7	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Do you object to our
8	making these documents and any amendments, if applicable, a
9	part of the record of your sworn testimony?
10	JUSTICE KITTREDGE: No objection, sir.
11	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: It will be done at this
12	point in the transcript. If the staff would now please
13	give the PDQ and the sworn statement to the court reporter.
14	(EXHIBIT NO. 3 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
15	COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE
16	HONORABLE JOHN W. KITTREDGE)
17	(EXHIBIT NO. 4 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
18	COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN
19	W. KITTREDGE)
20	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: That has been done. The
21	Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly
22	investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our
23	inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria, and
24	has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your
25	application materials, verification of your compliance with

1 state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which 2 your name appears, a study of previous screenings, and a 3 check for economic conflicts of interest. 4 We have received one affidavit filed in 5 opposition to your election. However, it was dismissed. 6 No witnesses are present to testify. Do you have a brief 7 opening statement you would like to make at this time? 8 JUSTICE KITTREDGE: Mr. Chairman, I have no 9 opening statement per se. But I would like to simply 10 reference and commend the staff of JMSC. I've been through 11 this process many times in my thirty-plus year career. 12 It's a very daunting field to navigate, to go through this 13 vetting process, even though I've been through it before, 14 and even though I'm running for the current seat without 15 opposition. 16 And I think I would be remiss if I did not commend not only the JMSC staff, but those who work behind 17 18 the scenes, the Citizens Committees who contact so many 19 people in your home community. Not just the legal 20 community, but throughout the community -- school friends, 21 workplace friends, community friends of all kinds. And the 22 vetting they do is very substantial. 23 Independent of that, I think you've heard 24 earlier today from the Bar, and the vetting they do, where 25 lawyers give of their time vet candidates. It's quite an

1 undertaking. And when you meet with the panel from the 2 Bar, it's really breathtaking to hear the depth of their 3 investigation and the number of people they contact. And 4 all of that information is funneled here to the JMSC. 5 The documents that I completed for this 6 application, as I have completed in years past, is 7 voluminous. It's my personal background, it's my 8 professional background, it's community involvement, it's a 9 review of my financial situation, mental and physical 10 fitness to serve on the bench. 11 But the vetting process is much more arduous 12 and deep than I think most people realize. And to Ms. 13 Crawford, to Mr. Dennis, Ms. Putnam -- I'm sure others 14 behind the scene -- who have to go through all that 15 material, not just for me, but for the many other 16 candidates. 17 And I know I speak for all the candidates 18 when I express my appreciation to the staff in helping us 19 navigate this very expansive vetting process. 20 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you very much for 21 those comments, Mr. Justice. I certainly join you in your commendation of the staff and the folks who spend so much 22 23 time to get us to this point in the process. So I thank 24 you for those comments. 25 At this point, I would recognize Mr. Dennis,

1 the staff attorney who's handled your application, and ask 2 that you please respond to any questions he has for you. 3 Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. JUSTICE KITTREDGE: 4 MR. DENNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 begin with, I'd like to note for the record, that based on 6 the testimony contained in Justice Kittredge's personal 7 data questionnaire, which has been included in the record, 8 with his consent, Justice Kittredge meets the 9 constitutional and statutory requirements for this position 10 regarding age, residence, and years of practice. 11 EXAMINATION BY MR. DENNIS: 12 0. Good morning, Justice Kittredge. A couple of 13 questions for you, if you don't mind, sir. Could you 14 please, for the benefit of the Commission, describe your 15 judicial experience up to this point. 16 Α. Yes, sir. I completed, this past summer, thirty-17 two years of service on the state court bench. 18 served on every major court in South Carolina, and the only 19 person ever to have done so. 20 I've served as a family court judge, a circuit 21 court judge, a Court of Appeals judge, and the last fifteen 22 years on the State Supreme Court. So I do believe I have a 23 good sense of what happens on the front lines, because I've

Garber Reporting info@garberreporting.com

Thank you, sir. For the benefit of the

been there and I've experienced it.

24

25

0.

Commission, would you describe what you consider to be your general judicial philosophy. Please offer an example or two of how you've applied that philosophy in your time on the bench. And, specifically, if you could, speak to the concept of separation of powers under the South Carolina constitution.

A. My judicial philosophy is one of restraint. My judicial philosophy arises primarily from Federalist Paper 78 written by Hamilton, and is one of restraint. Judges adjudicate. Judges do not legislate. Judges should respect the policy-making role and the policy-making prerogative of the legislature. That is, in my judgment, the proper role of a judge. And it's also embedded in the concept of separation of powers.

My approach is consistent. I am not political in any sense. When a Republican majority legislature passes a law, that in most instances will reflect a Republican or a conservative policy judgment, a court then upholds that legislation.

Some attribute or impute to the court, the underlying political and policy motivations of the legislature. But what the court is doing is simply upholding the rule of law and respecting the policy-making role of the legislature.

And if I may, Mr. Dennis, share an example. I

believe that my judicial philosophy is consistent across the board. And I can share many examples, but for time constraints, I'll just select one.

It's a case that probably would paint me on the liberal side of the political spectrum. It's a case called Smith v. Tiffany. I think it was 2015, the court issued companion cases, Smith v. Tiffany, and Machin v. Carus Corporation.

It resulted from a legislative enactment from 2005 Contribution Among Joint Tortfeasers Act. The idea that flowed from that legislation was an attempt by South Carolina, to make a policy judgment to move away from joint and several liability, that responsibility should mirror the degree of fault of the tortfeaser, the person in the wrong. Fault should correspond to the liability, and not exceed it.

Well, the case comes before us, Smith v.

Tiffany. And we had, had Amicus briefs from all comers. I believe the Chamber of Commerce submitted a brief. And there was an opinion -- and, indeed, an opinion on the Court -- that took the pro-business, quote, conservative approach, and read it in a way that favored the defendant's position, because the narrative that emerged from the legislation was that a deep-pocket defendant should only be responsible for the degree of its fault, and not in excess

of it.

We studied the case very carefully. And I became convinced that the actual language in the statute was at odds with the narrative that had emerged of abolishing several liability, and the actual language of the statute, in my firm judgment, would not support the defendant's position, or from the political standpoint, the conservative or pro-business position.

I wrote the majority opinion. The plaintiff's Bar was thrilled with the result. Now, was it promoting or advocating an agenda for plaintiff's or a liberal disposition? Absolutely not. Just as when I uphold other statutory schemes as being within the prerogative of the legislature, I'm not acting in a political manner.

I'm acting respectful of separation of powers and upholding the rule of law. And that's what I endeavor to do in every case that's presented before me. And I have tried to do that for thirty-two years.

- Q. Thank you, Justice. Would you please identify some of the key challenges you believe are facing the state's judicial system, and as Chief Justice, what you might do to address some of those challenges.
- A. I will. But I'm respectful that I serve under a very fine Chief Justice, Don Beatty, who will serve as Chief Justice until next summer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I also want to bring to the committee's attention and perspective, that in my thirty-two years, I've served under seven Chief Justices. I have deep respect for all Chief Justices. Each has contributed significantly to the system. So the fact that I may have suggestions, or what I view as improvements, please don't take it as some kind of criticism of any of the prior Chief Justices or the current Chief Justice. But doing this for thirty-two years, I have been a faithful servant. I have served under seven Chief Justices and I have supported each Chief Justice. But along that journey, I've seen things. And I have ideas and things that I would like to improve. But

please remember, I'm not being critical of any Chief Justice.

I'll try to answer it just briefly in sort of a global way, administratively, and then look to operations of the courts. And then we can do a deeper dive, Mr. Dennis, if you have more particular questions.

From an administrative standpoint, under our constitution, the Chief Justice position is referred to as a strong Chief Justice position. And there is a tendency for Chief Justice to act unilaterally without input from other members of the court. I don't think there's any

untoward about that. I don't think there's anything nefarious motive. I just think because of the nature of how it's presented to the Chief, that it's only presented on his or her radar, and not to the other members of the court.

And what I want to do is change that culture, change that dynamic, so when matters come to our attention, they're on all five radars and not just one. Because I'm confident that if I make a decision in isolation, it's probably going to be a better ultimate result if I make that decision in collaboration, in good faith with my colleagues on the court.

Now, some decisions have to be made unilaterally. But I think that's the exception and not the rule. So from a broad-speaking administrative standpoint, I want to engage the court more collaboratively, that we are a court of five and not a court of one.

As far as actual court operations, I do believe that we can make improvement on every court. And the first example I would give you would be our court: We can do better.

The time for processing an appeal -- and we typically get the cert petitions from the Court of Appeals. We do have original jurisdiction, we do other things, but our bread and butter is certiorari petitions to the Court

of Appeals.

Once a rehearing is denied at the Court of Appeals, that allows the grieved party to file a petition for cert in our court. Quite frankly, it sometimes takes a year for that petition to work its way to our agenda for us to vote on.

In my judgment, that's inexcusable. A cert petition ought to be more timely disposed of. And I think with existing resources, we can accomplish that.

There are also in the works some changes to the appellate court rules that will facilitate those changes. So that's sort of the front bookend of how cases come into the system.

On the back end in how we process opinions, sometimes we'll have an original jurisdiction matter and we tell the attorneys, "You've got to get your brief in, in ten days or fifteen days." It's a fire alarm fire. We hear the case then we wait months to issue an opinion.

Why aren't we held to the same standard? We force them to come to us, quickly, because it's a matter of public importance, and we wait months before we issue an opinion.

So on the back end -- on that bookend, I think we can do better in terms of a more expeditious resolution of cases that come before us, and do all of that without

1 sacrificing the quality of our work. 2 I will say the same thing applies for the Court 3 It takes too long for a case to process of Appeals. 4 through the Court of Appeals. I know Chief Judge Williams, 5 who's only been at the helm for a short period of time, is 6 very aware of that and is working diligently on it, but at 7 the appellate level, expediting cases, narrowing the time. 8 Because the citizens and the people, the 9 litigants in these cases, they need finality. And it's no 10 different at the trial court. 11 If you want, I can make some suggestions in what 12 we're doing -- that I envision for circuit court, common 13 pleas, general sessions. I have thoughts for family court, 14 and on and on. But I'll let you hit the bulls eye with 15 your questions, and I'll respond accordingly, sir. 16 0. Well, thank you. I was going to stop with the 17 appellate courts today. And you answered, actually, my 18 next two or three questions all at one time. 19 appreciate it. I'm going to skip ahead. 20 In your materials, you mentioned a need for --21 your words -- transparency and accountability at the lawyer 22 discipline -- rather with the Office of Disciplinary 23 Council. Can you please discuss how you would achieve 24 these things at ODC?

Let me make an overarching comment. We need

25

Α.

increased transparency and accountability across the board in the judicial branch, not simply ODC. There's a feature of that, that's of critical importance, and that is the public's confidence in the integrity of our justice system.

We can have a wonderful system. But if the public doesn't believe it's there, it's not. Perception is a reality. And I'm convinced that enhanced, increased transparency and accountability on all fronts in the judicial branch will help promote public confidence in the integrity of our system.

Now more to your point regarding the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. We've had tremendous leaders at Disciplinary Counsel -- Lee Coggiola, John Nichols, and most recently, William Blitch, who on the court we know because I worked with him at the Court of Appeals, one of the best advocates that ever appeared before us as a representative at the Attorney General's Office. Very capable. Very bright. And he has just in the last few months taken on this new role. As with his predecessors, I'm confident he will do a fine job.

One of the impediments that ODC has faced is a lack of resources. And when complaints are filed, and there's not a quick and a timely response to what may be misconduct, then it calls into question is something really being done. It puts a question mark in the eyes of the

public.

So expediency is of critical importance in disciplinary matters, that they're handled quickly and fairly, for the benefit of the public and those who are accused of wrongdoing.

Now, in terms of the transparency, Mr. Blitch, his predecessors, they operated under a set of rules that are, quite frankly, I think need amending. Ad it needs to be opened up to achieve that increased accountability and transparency.

Just one example very quickly. When a person offers for a judgeship, what may have been private in terms of disposition of a disciplinary matter as an attorney, when that person, he or she, offers to become a judge for the people of South Carolina, I think this commission and I think the people are entitled to know everything about that candidate. That's one example.

Q. Thank you, Justice. As you know, the Commission received 1,395 ballot box surveys regarding you. Of those, 160 additional comments were included. The vast majority of these comments were positive and spoke to various strengths of intellect, experience, temporary, character.

Of that 160, twelve written comments expressed some measure of concern. And these fell into two buckets. And though you've responded to some of this a little bit,

1 already, I'll ask you to respond again. 2 Specifically, one suggested that you are too 3 conservative -- their word -- in your judicial philosophy. 4 Could you respond to that criticism, please? 5 Α. I believe my prior response goes a long way to 6 addressing that. We practice in a system -- the legal 7 system that is, by design, adversarial. You know, 8 everyone's pulling for the physician to heal the patient. 9 Everyone's pulling for the architect to design the 10 structure in a way that achieves safety. 11 Everyone's pulling for the pilot to land the plan 12 -- the plane safely. Not everyone's pulling for the judge. 13 Not everyone's pulling for the lawyer. Our system is, by 14 design, adversarial. And in an adversarial system, people 15 lose case -- or cases and they respond in a negative way. 16 That's human nature. 17 Quite frankly, after thirty-two years, I'm 18 surprised you didn't get more negative responses. 19 have tried, diligently, to apply the law fairly. And I am 20 apolitical. And I believe that with every fiber of my 21 being. 22 I've tried to treat everyone that I deal with --23 both in and out of court, with the utmost respect, 24 kindness, and professionalism. And I have tried to devote 25 myself to applying the law fairly to everyone.

And I would just segue back to a comment I made earlier. When a legislature is of a particular political party, it should not be a mystery that the legislation they produce reflects that majority view.

And when a court upholds that expression of a policy judgment enacted in statutes, that underlying political motivation, I don't think it's fair to attribute it to the court or an individual judge.

Q. And much of that answer is applicable to the second set of comments, which suggests that some of your opinions have offered too much deference to the General Assembly.

In light of responding directly to that, I would ask you to discuss what you think the appropriate amount of deference to a general assembly and our constitutional system is.

A. Well, in our constitutional system -- and I'll do it in a -- two different levels. When we're presented with a case of a statutory construction, our duty is to discern and effectuate legislative intent.

If there's an accompanying constitutional challenge, there's an additional framework at play. The law deals in frameworks. And with a constitutional challenge, we begin with the premise that the authority of the General Assembly is plenary.

1 Does that mean it's without limit? Absolutely 2 But deference is given to the legislative enactment. not. 3 In fact, in law -- not just in South Carolina, 4 but black letter law, legislative enactments, are presumed 5 to be constitutional. The law further requires that every 6 presumption be made in finding the law constitutional. 7 And the party challenging the constitutionality 8 of a statutory carries the burden of proving unconstitutionality beyond a reasonable doubt. 9 10 I have written many opinions that have found 11 legislative enactments unconstitutional, where I was not 12 deferring to the legislature because I was convinced they 13 had crossed a line. I can give an example, if you'd like. 14 I think just a general discussion of where the 15 deference level is, is probably sufficient. That's all the 16 questions I've got for right now. 17 Justice Kittredge, I've got a couple of housekeeping things I'm going to run through with you, real 18 19 quick, and then I'm going to turn you back over to the 20 commissioners. 21 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chairman, I would note that 22 the Upstate Citizens Committee reported that Justice 23 Kittredge is well qualified as to the criteria of ethical 24 fitness, professional and academic ability, character, 25 reputation, experience, and temperament.

1 They also found him to be at the highest 2 level of qualified for constitutional qualifications, 3 physical health and mental stability. They made no further 4 comments. 5 BY MR. DENNIS: Justice Kittredge, quickly. Since submitting 6 0. 7 your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you 8 contacted any members of this commission about your 9 candidacy? 10 Α. I have not. 11 Are you familiar with Code Section 2-19-70, 0. 12 including the limitations on contacting members of the 13 General Assembly regarding your screening? 14 I don't know the statute off the top of my head. Α. 15 But if that's the rule about you can't members of this 16 commission and you can't seek votes --17 Q. Yes, sir. 18 -- prior to the 48-Hour Rule. Α. 19 Yes, sir. Q. 20 I'm very familiar with it. And I have abided by Α. 21 it --22 Q. Thank you. 23 Α. -- and will continue to abide by it. 24 Since submitting your letter of intent, have you Q. 25 sought or received the pledge of any legislature either

prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?

A. No, sir.

Have you asked any third parties to contain the contained by the co

- Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact any members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
- A. No, in terms of my instigating any contact. But I want to be honest with you, this has taken on a life of its own since I have filed. I've had probably hundreds of people, either a phone call or run into them at church or at the grocery store, "Hey, John, I heard you're running. I talked to So-and-so" or "I'm going to put in a good word."

So I hear that kind of banter about -- maybe it's the nature of the Chief Justice position, but it's nothing that I have instigated in any way. I wouldn't be surprised if some of you folks had been contacted. And I can tell you, my fingerprints are not on it. And I would never ask anyone to contact a member of JMSC on my behalf.

MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chairman, I'd note for the record that any concerns contained in Justice Kittredge's materials were raised -- that were raised during the investigation have been included in my questioning today. And I don't have anything further for him.

1	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, Mr. Dennis. I
2	appreciate that. Do any commissioners have any questions
3	for Justice Kittredge?
4	SENATOR RANKIN: Mr. Chairman.
5	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Chairman Rankin.
6	SENATOR RANKIN: Thank you.
7	EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN:
8	Q. Justice Kittredge, welcome. You can almost smile
9	
10	SENATOR RANKIN: For the record, he is now
11	smiling.
12	Q because you're almost there. And I want to
13	compliment you for your willingness to do this. You have
14	appeared before this body before. I have got to the table
15	and had the ability to ask questions of you or other
16	candidates, and I want to thank you for your comments.
17	Not self-serving for this vetting process in its
18	current iteration, but I do want to invite you to comment
19	about this process not Chairman Caskey's or any other
20	member of this body, but this versus any other state that
21	you have encountered other justices of their highest courts
22	across the country.
23	A. Well, I want to walk a fine line on that one,
24	Senator. Because of my belief in separation of powers, the
25	judicial branch is not going to dictate to the legislative

branch or this body on how best to select judges.

But I will share this with you: One of the things that I enjoy doing is speaking to civic groups, speaking to schools. A couple weeks ago, I was in Berkeley and spoke to the Rotary Club. I spoke to the Injured Workers Conference this past Friday. I'm speaking tomorrow to a middle school group.

I'm speaking to a class for Judge Clary, my friend, who some of you may remember, at Clemson next Thursday. So I'm regularly speaking to civic groups, and one of the things I do is a question-and-answer. And the very issue you brought up, Senator, always comes up.

And I'm so impressed with the quality and maturity of our citizens, and how they respond to this issue about judicial election. I don't run into the flamethrowers that say we need public election. I'm speaking to my cohorts in other states.

I go back to rule -- Federalist Paper 78, that lamented about the political entrenchment that occurs when judges are publicly elected, and the states that have gotten into such difficulties when lawyers have to solicit money and then hear cases with those lawyers and the parties who gave money, and the havoc that's wreaked in that situation.

And when I travel the state and speak to chamber

groups, Kawanis, Rotaries, and students. I'm impressed by their recognition that we have a pretty good system, that our judges for the most part are good.

And if I could give you one sort of anecdotal story that I think illustrates the point of the benefit of our system. Each week, we get a report of cases of judicial misconduct from around the country.

And, unfortunately, it's a pretty long list. And what you don't see in that list -- or very, very rarely -- is a judge from South Carolina being disciplined.

And our disciplinary rules mirror the ABA standards. We don't have some specific rule that favors judges. We have a rule that I helped rewrite in 2008, as chair of the Commission on the profession, where we adopted and mirrored the ABA standards for judicial discipline.

Yet, there are very few complaints against judges in South Carolina. And why is that? I harken back to my original comments to you: It's the vetting that goes on here; that the people that you elect, the men and women, to the bench of this state are, for the overwhelming majority, good and decent people of high ethics, who abide by the judicial code of conduct.

But there's a footnote to that. There is an area where we do have to discipline judges. It's magistrates and municipal judges, most of whom do an outstanding job.

And maybe it's driven because there's so many numbers of magistrates and municipal judges. But I would point out to you, they don't go through the vetting that we go through in the state court system, that you put all candidates through.

So is there room for improvement? I'm going to leave that to the decision-makers. But overall, this system has produced some very fine judges. Me, notwithstanding.

- Q. You have been through this current composition of JMSC, how many times? If it's been thirty-two years --
- A. When I got elected in '91, it was just a transition. And that was the first effort. And it was sort of a hybrid between the old way and the new way. But every time -- when I got reelected to family court, when I ran for circuit court, when I got reelected to circuit court, it was under this iteration of the JMSC where the rules were in place about no commitments beforehand, you had to wait until the report is issued, etc. So I've been through this many times.
- Q. Have you seen -- and, again, this is -- I'm going to ask you to take your hat off of the candidate, but the participant of other races, have you seen the ability to game this system?
  - A. To game the system?

1 Q. Game it. And not in a pejorative sense. 2 Α. No. If it goes on, I'm not aware of it. And, 3 quite frankly, logistically, I don't know how you would 4 game it, given the political and the public spotlight 5 that's on the process. 6 Everyone knows about the citizens committee, 7 everyone knows the work they do. It's not done in secret. 8 People volunteer for the Bar and go through that process. 9 This is a public hearing. 10 The documents I file, except for certain 11 documents such as of a financial nature, will see the light 12 of day; they're very public. I don't know, given those 13 circumstances, how you game the system. 14 A couple more then I'm going to hush. Q. 15 Effectively -- not you if you're successful -- but you as 16 one of five will effectively have under your control and 17 responsibility, the discipline of an errant job. 18 Effectively, now, your ability to -- or your after -- soon 19 hereafter to suspend a magistrate or send a -- suspend a 20 city municipal court judge, correct? 21 Α. Correct. In terms of your ability to take a sitting member 22 23 of the circuit court, who may run afoul of any number of 24 things -- ethics or the law or their continued ability to 25 service -- that is the Supreme Court's ability to reassign,

## correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

21

22

23

24

- A. Well, I'd begin with the premise -- and I don't know this, definitively, and I would have to research it. I would think the Chief Justice has, perhaps, the authority to suspend a state-level judge.
- Q. I wouldn't disagree with you. But that may be up for -- with that answer my --
  - A. Assuming -- assuming I can't.
  - Q. Correct.
- A. Assuming the Chief can't. Let me tell you there are ways to handle that. The judge could be unassigned --
- 12 Q. Solely within that authority now --
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. -- at the Supreme Court.
- A. That authority exists now. If there's a -- I don't know what the situation would be, but say there's something nefarious going on and the Chief Justice -- and this is an example, and if I could just tie this to one component of the court of one approach versus what I hope to be a collaborative court of five approach.
  - We suspend lawyers through the office of the Chief Justice. The rest of the court usually does not know anything about it. I think that should be done collaboratively.
- 25 Because when you suspend a lawyer, oftentimes

- when the dust settles, you realize there was not as much to the allegation as appeared, ostensibly, in the first instance. You've not only impacted the livelihood of that lawyer, for him or her to make a living, you've impacted his or her clients who now have to pick up a file and go elsewhere. That's a traumatic experience for our -- for
  - So be it the suspension of a lawyer or the judges coming together to deal with a state court-level judge, in terms of discipline, I think that's something we would do together.
  - Q. The point that I'm raising there, whether you do or you don't, there are checks and balances within the system itself --
    - A. Absolutely.
  - Q. -- to cure and/or correct abhorrent behavior --
- A. Absolutely.

our litigants.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. -- on the bench. Which again is not a common thing. But the perception by some, effectively, that the system has been gamed, that judge has been bought off, that judge is deferential because that's a lawyer who happens to be in the House of Representatives or the Senate, there are checks and balances within the system to cure and correct.
- A. There absolutely are, Senator.
  - Q. Finally this -- and I say "finally." I may get

one more. You mentioned Smith and Tiffany and the Manchin case, which effectively you've answered the question posed by the federal court -- a question to y'all, effectively, to say whether or not the jury could be asked to consider the fault of a non -- a non-partied litigant, correct? Am I distilling that correctly? And I'm mashing Manchin and the Smith --

- A. Manchin was a workers' comp question certified, I believe --
  - Q. Correct.

- A. -- by Joe Anderson. It's been a long time since I've read those cases. But the case came to me, and I thought it was appropriate for me to respond, to show an evenhanded approach in how I view my judicial philosophy. The judicial restraints cuts both ways.
- Q. Well, and I'm -- and those were both 2017 cases, 'cause I looked --
- A. Okay.
  - Q. -- in your list of 43,016.2 cases that you have reported in the thirty-two years. To look at that -- and that is -- I want to tip my hat to you. Effectively, the Solomon's answer to the comp case, at least on deferring.

But effectively, perhaps, confusing and offering to some judges some way to pose that question which, and this is rhetorical, we now will be dealing with in this empty-chair defendant-type posture of litigation. So a heavier time, perhaps.

A. The statute is ambiguous. And so there was a dissenting opinion in Smith v. Tiffany, that went the other way, and we're trying to discern what the legislature meant.

And you're correct. It's what can be submitted to the jury. And the legislature specifically stated, if I recall correctly -- it's been a while since I've actually read the opinion. I know the big picture. -- but that a defendant liability would be apportioned by the jury.

So what if there's a settlement to an at-fault party on the front end who signs a covenant? Well, they're no longer a party. They're not a defendant. And that brings up the empty chair.

But if -- as far as the jury's consideration of allocating fault, it has to be among the defendants. The result was that South Carolina, if you read that language the way it's written, retained a remnant of joint and several liability in that limited context.

Are there unanswered questions going forward?

Yes. And I would conclude with this, because it's not of a constitutional import: The ball is in the court of the legislature, the legislature can change that law however it wishes.

1 Q. John Brearley, a preacher at the First 2 Presbyterian Church of Myrtle Beach -- do you know him? 3 I do not. Α. 4 He knows you. You impressed him, years and years 0. ago, with no fanfare and no robe -- heavy robeitis behavior 5 6 on your part, in a most complimentary fashion to you, and 7 so won a compliment from him. 8 Well, he's my new best friend. 9 The last question. Of the nine qualifications 0. 10 that we hold each candidate to, is there one more 11 preeminent than the other? Or do we take them -- the nine 12 equally? 13 Well, that's a great question. And I'm going to Α. 14 respond to that. I do a lot of swearing-in of new judges. 15 And when I first became a judge, I probably was given a 16 hundred different pointers how to be a good judge, what are 17 the best pointers for a judge. 18 Well, I've distilled those to five, and I share 19 those with new judges when I administer the oath to 20 whatever bench they're assuming. And they're basically 21 common sense, treating people with respect, being a good 22 listener. 23 People today don't listen. When people come to 24 court, they want to be heard. They don't want to be talked 25 They want to be heard. And it's often said that a over.

1 lawyer with some common sense and a good temporary makes a 2 far better judge than an ill-tempered genius. Those to me 3 are the fine qualities of a good judge. 4 So I think all nine of the above are important in 5 a holistic approach to your evaluation of these candidates. 6 0. Thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Any other members of the 8 Commission have questions for Justice Kittredge? 9 (Hearing none.) 10 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Seeing none. Justice 11 Kittredge, we certainly appreciate you being here today. 12 This concludes this portion of the screening process. 13 I do want to take this opportunity to remind 14 you, that pursuant to the Commission's evaluative criteria, 15 the Commission expects candidates to follow the spirit as 16 well as the letter of the ethics laws, and we will view 17 violations or the appearance of impropriety as serious and potentially deserving of heavy weight in the screening 18 19 deliberations. 20 On that note, and as you know, the record 21 will remain open until the formal release of the report of 22 qualifications, and you may be called back at such time of 23 that need arises. 24 But I do want to thank you, again, for your 25 leadership and your service to the state. I appreciate

1	your offering for this position. And I wish you all the
2	best. Thank you for your time, today, sir.
3	JUSTICE KITTREDGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4	And I thank all members of the Commission. Thank you.
5	(Candidate excused.)
6	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: For those who want to
7	stick around for the other 84 screenings that we'll be
8	entertaining this month, we certainly invite you to do
9	that. If you'd like to stay, you're sure welcome to.
10	Otherwise, we'll move into the next
11	screening. And so if we could invite the candidate in, as
12	well as his screening attorney.
13	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Good morning, Mr. Lambert.
14	Thank you for
15	MR. LAMBERT: Good morning.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: being here today. Of
17	course we have Mr. Grayson Lambert, who is applying for the
18	judicial position of Seat 9 on the South Carolina Court of
19	Appeals. Mr. Lambert, if you would please raise your right
20	hand.
21	WHEREUPON,
22	GRAYSON LAMBERT, being duly sworn and
23	cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing
24	but the truth.
25	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: You should have some

1	documents there before you. Are the personal data
2	questionnaire and the sworn statement before you, documents
3	that you submitted to the Commission?
4	MR. LAMBERT: They are.
5	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Are they both correct?
6	MR. LAMBERT: They are.
7	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Does anything need to be
8	changed or updated at this time?
9	MR. LAMBERT: It does not.
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Do you object to our
11	making these documents and any amendments, if applicable, a
12	part of the record of your sworn testimony?
13	MR. LAMBERT: I do not.
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: We will go ahead and do
15	that.
16	(EXHIBIT NO. 5 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
17	COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF WILLIAM
18	GRAYSON LAMBERT)
19	(EXHIBIT NO. 6 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
20	COMMISSION PERSONAL SWORN STATEMENT OF WILLIAM
21	GRAYSON LAMBERT)
22	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The Judicial Merit
23	Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your
24	qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on
25	the nine evaluative criteria and has included a ballot box

1	survey, a thorough study of your application materials,
2	verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a
3	search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a
4	study of previous screenings, a check for economic
5	conflicts of interest.
6	We have received no affidavits filed in
7	opposition to your election. No witnesses are present to
8	testify.
9	You'll certainly be invited to give a brief
10	opening statement. But I see you have some folks with you
11	today. If you'd like to introduce them to the Commission.
12	MR. LAMBERT: I do. I have my wife, Mary
13	Beth Lambert, who is a pediatrician here in town at
14	Sandhills. My father, Lanny Lambert, who's a lawyer and
15	former president of the Bar. And then my colleagues in the
16	Governor's Office, Thomas Limehouse and Erica Shedd.
17	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you all for being
18	here today. I certainly appreciate that.
19	If you have an opening statement you'd like
20	to give the Commission, we'd certainly like to hear from
21	you. Otherwise, we'll proceed with questions from the
22	screening attorney.
23	MR. LAMBERT: Thank you for the opportunity
24	to be here. I look forward to the possibility of serving
25	our state in this new way. I'm mindful that y'all have a

1 full day and weeks of hearings, so I'm happy to answer your 2 questions. 3 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Great. At this point, 4 then, I'd recognize Mr. Maldonado, staff attorney. 5 MR. MALDONADO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Τ would note for the record that based on the testimony 6 7 contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included 8 in the record, with the candidate's consent, William 9 Grayson Lambert meets the constitutional and/or statutory 10 requirements for this position regarding age, residence, 11 and years of practice. 12 EXAMINATION BY MR. MALDONADO: 13 Mr. Lambert, first of all, good morning. 0. 14 Good morning. Α. 15 Why do you now want to serve as a judge on the Q. 16 Court of Appeals? 17 I believe public service is incredibly important. 18 That's why I left being a partner in one of the state's 19 biggest law firms, to come to the Governor's Office. 20 began thinking about how I would continue serving through 21 the rest of my career, I thought the being a judge on the 22 appellate bench made the most sense. 23 One, being a judge generally matters because 24 courts preserve the rule of law in our society. It ensures 25 an orderly and peaceful place in which we all can live and

settle our disputes. And given my experience through practice, in more than eighty appeals, I thought the appellate bench was where my skills were best suited.

So I look forward to being able to serve our state in this way.

- Q. How do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be an effective judge on the Court of Appeals?
- A. I graduated from law school at Duke, and then went to clerk on the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals for Judge Shedd. I then was in private practice for the better part of a decade, developing through that time, on almost exclusively appellate practice.

I joined the Governor's Office about two and a half years ago, where I serve now as his senior litigation counsel. And my primary responsibility is handling litigation in which the Governor is a party.

In all of these experiences, between private practice and the Governor's Office, I've been counsel in more than eighty appeals now. I've developed the research, the analytical and the writing skills that are essential to serving on the appellate bench, to thinking thoroughly through the issues and to being able to careful analyze the issues a case presents, and resolve them based on the law and the facts before you.

## Q. Thank you. How would you describe your general judicial philosophy?

A. Our courts are charged under the constitution to decide cases. Cases are a concrete, live dispute between adverse parties. The judge's job is to decide the case before him, or her, based on the law that's there and the facts that have been found, and the job to say what the law is and not what the law should be.

How to determine what the law is should be based on what the words and the statute of the constitution mean to the people who enacted that law. Because they were the law-giver, not the judge.

And thus, a court -- like as our Chief Judge Sanders said once, appellate courts in this state are like well-behaved school children; they speak when spoken to, and do not answer questions they are not asked.

Court's frequently said, to be a super-legislature, to secondguess the General Assembly's wisdom, nor are they out there to say what they think the law should be. They say what the law is, they decide the case before them, and then they move to the next case.

I think that ensures that the constitutional separation of powers is protected, and that the peoples' representatives get to determine what the law is. And

courts simply say what the law -- excuse me -- what the law should be, and therefore, courts simply interpret the law as it's been given to them.

- Q. Mr. Lambert, what is your vision of the future of our judicial system? And what changes would you advocate, and why?
- A. The most important thing facing the Court of Appeals right now is ensuring that cases are timely decided and disposed of. I recall from private practice, that cases often could sit for years. And that's a detriment not to the lawyers, but particular to the parties.

The Court of Appeals needs to look for ways to ensure that its docket moves quickly. I know the Chief Judge is working hard on that. I would welcome the opportunity to work with him, whether that means ensuring cases were to move through my chambers quickly, to ensure that there is a -- and advocate for sufficient funding for staff attorneys, that they -- there's less turnover in that office, and generally, making sure the court's docket progresses in a speedy enough way that courts and litigants aren't waiting on cases for four or more years to be decided for potential remand or for a final resolution.

Q. Thank you. Mr. Lambert, the Commission received 243 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 63 additional comments. The surveys, for example, contained the

1 following positive comments: Quote, "Would be an excellent addition to the 2 3 court. Head and shoulders above any other candidate 4 listed." 5 Also, quote, "Brilliant intellect. Loves the 6 law, especially the academic side of it. Would make an 7 outstanding appellate judge." 8 Seventeen of the written comments expressed 9 concerns, including concerns about your experience, 10 including both the lack of judicial experience and the lack 11 of criminal law experience. How would you respond to these 12 concerns? 13 I'll take the criminal law part first. I've done Α. 14 a couple of criminal appeals, but I also, as a law clerk, 15 handled countless criminal appeals in Judge Shedd's 16 chambers. So I'm not unfamiliar of the criminal law from 17 that perspective. 18 I also, in the Governor's Office, touch any 19 number of issues, including in Title 16, that come from --20 into the office through various ways, including from 21 legislation that's been passed and presented to the 22 Governor for his signature or veto. 23 So while I may not have tried a lot of criminal 24 cases, or done a lot of criminal appeals as lead appellate 25 counsel, I have an experience with criminal law that's not

going to show up in the public record. So I think I do
have a background in criminal law that I -- that gives me a
starting point for sitting on the bench.

As for the lack of judicial experience. I have not been a judge before. But I don't know that I'm qualified to be a circuit court judge in this state. That's not the practice I've had in my career. It's not the skill set I've developed.

But I think a diversity of experience on the appellate bench is a beneficial thing to analyze the issues and decide the cases that are there. And I pledge, both to this commission and to all the members of the Bar, that I will bring the same energy and effort to deciding cases as a judge, that I brought to private practice and in the Governor's Office when I've been litigating them.

- Q. Thank you. A second type of concern mentioned in the ballot box comments offered that you might have a political or a ideological bias. What would you offer as a response regarding this concern?
- A. I recognize that I have been a lawyer in some high profile and some controversial cases in my career.

  But I have been just that, a lawyer.

Even with the Governor's Office, I work in a legal office not in a political one, and my job is to be a lawyer, even if often the folks around us in the statehouse

are focused on the political side of it.

If you take the two writing samples that I submitted with my application, those were in the Methods of Execution cases and the Second Planned Parenthood case, and read them, the arguments there are legal. They are the exact way you would go about analyzing a tort case or a statutory claim, or any other lawsuit that's before you.

It's not political arguments. And I think if you go back and listen to the arguments in the Supreme Court, you'll hear the arguments I was advancing from the podium there were legal ones, not political ones. So I appreciate there's politically-charged cases I've worked on.

But the arguments and the job I've done is to have been a lawyer there. So I don't think we would want to discourage, generally, lawyers from going into government service and then later wanting to seek the bench because of the work that government service put on their desks.

- Q. Thank you. Finally, another type of comment expressed concerns regarding your temperament to be a judge. What response would you offer to that concern?
- A. I don't want anyone to think I wouldn't be thoughtful, reflective, fair to everyone. Certainly, I'm disappointed that anything I've done in my career would have left someone with the thought that my temperament

wasn't suited for the bench, or to carefully think through the issues and treat the litigants before me, respectfully and fairly.

And I vow that if I am fortunate enough to serve on the Court of Appeals, I will seek to treat everyone well and to have a judicial temporary that makes both the court and this state proud.

Q. Thank you. Mr. Lambert, you've indicated in your PDQ, there was a lawsuit filed against you in 2013 in the federal court by a David Willis, who was a federal inmate at the time, while you were working as a law clerk for Judge Shedd at the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals.

Can you please explain the nature and the disposition of the lawsuit?

A. Certainly. The plaintiff there was a -- an inmate in federal prison, who was dissatisfied with the result of his criminal appeal. He recognized he could not sue the judges from his panel, because they have judicial immunity, so he somehow found the names of the twelve law clerks that worked for those three judges, and sued us as well as the district court's judges. DOJ represented us, and the case was promptly dismissed.

## Q. And were you ever served with that?

A. I was never served with it. I don't recall seeing about it, other than the fact the DOJ later told us

1 the case was over. 2 MR. MALDONADO: I would note that the Midlands Citizens Committee reported Mr. Lambert to be 3 4 qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, 5 professional and academic ability, character, reputation, 6 experience, and judicial temperament, and qualified in the 7 criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health 8 and mental stability. 9 The Commission also noted, quote, "Will be a 10 great asset to the Court of Appeals." 11 BY MR. MALDONADO: 12 0. I'll finish up with some housekeeping questions, 13 Mr. Lambert. Since submitting your letter of intent to run 14 for this seat -- have you been -- have you contacted any 15 members of the Commission about your candidacy? 16 Α. I have not. Are you familiar with Section 2-19-70, including 17 0. 18 the limitations on contacting members of the General 19 Assembly regarding your screening? 20 Α. I am. 21 Since submitting your letter of intent, have you 0. 22 sought or received a pledge of any legislature either prior 23 to this date or pending the outcome of your screening? 24 Α. I have not.

25

0.

Have you asked any third parties to contact

1	members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you
2	aware of anyone attempting the intervene in this process on
3	your behalf?
4	A. I have not and I am not.
5	MR. MALDONADO: I would note for the record
6	that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding
7	the candidate were incorporated into the questioning of the
8	candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further
9	questions.
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir. Do any of
11	the Commission members have questions for the candidate?
12	Senator Rankin.
13	EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN:
14	Q. Welcome.
15	A. Thank you.
16	Q. Your dad
17	A. Yes, sir.
18	Q a well known, well respected lawyer.
19	A. Thank you. I agree.
20	Q. And your wife should be tending to sick babies
21	right now, or children. But thank you for being here as
22	well.
23	SENATOR RANKIN: I'm curious, what is the
24	strain that you need to alert folks to be more aware of
25	DR. LAMBERT: RSV.

1	SENATOR RANKIN: RSV.
2	DR. LAMBERT: RSV. It's everywhere right
3	now.
4	SENATOR RANKIN: Adults can get a an
5	inoculation for that. Can children
6	DR. LAMBERT: Yes. I do not take care of
7	adults, but I think greater than age 6.
8	SENATOR RANKIN: I'm a child. I need one of
9	those. Great answer, judge-want-to-be Lambert.
10	MR. LAMBERT: Thank you.
11	BY SENATOR RANKIN:
12	Q. I am curious and just a couple of questions.
13	Forgive my aside there.
14	A. Not at all.
15	Q. You are very young. But so are two of your other
16	opponents in this same race, within a year of your birth,
17	and within months. Another three, or at least four or
18	five, are very young.
19	I can't help but think of the line that Reagan
20	
	used against Mondale in that debate, but I think that was
21	used against Mondale in that debate, but I think that was it, youth is an impediment or an asset for you as you look
21 22	
	it, youth is an impediment or an asset for you as you look
22	it, youth is an impediment or an asset for you as you look to this potential service?

certainly -- I hope I'm still on the younger side of life,
Lord willing.

I have through my career, done a body of appellate work that I think belies my age. As I mentioned at the beginning, I've done -- been counsel in more than eighty appeals. I've argued some fairly significant cases in our Supreme Court and in the 4th Circuit.

So I think even though I may be young in the sense of I don't have as much gray hair, yet, as I might soon -- although, my children, I'm sure, are going to help me get there -- I think I've got a set of experience that prepares me for this job, even given my age.

But my age will ensure that I get into this, ready to go and to work hard and to do the job well, effectively and efficiently.

- Q. You're not running for a circuit court spot. So perhaps, the question of trials that you've conducted -- and your PDQ says one to verdict -- that would not necessarily be a detriment. And I'm curious, though, what was that case?
- A. If it says one, then I need to go back and check it. I've done two -- one to a jury verdict and one to a non-jury verdict. The jury verdict was the case in Berkeley County, where the football coach had been fired after he didn't punt and lost a bunch of games.

It was a defamation case; the jury came back for the plaintiff. The Court of Appeals reversed, saying he was a public figure, which was the argument we had raised in post-trial in J -- in JML motions. It's in the Supreme Court right now. They've heard argument in that one.

The non-jury trial was in Richland County, last August, before Judge Jocelyn Newman. It was the Methods of Executive case in which she held that the firing squad and electrocution bill from May 2021 was unconstitutional.

We'll be back in the Supreme Court, arguing that one again.

- Q. Both under your current employer in the Governor's Office.
- A. No, Senator. The first one was when I was in private practice with, what's now Burr & Forman, but was then McNair. The second one was with the Governor's Office.
- Q. And then, finally again, a question asked about I think -- or I've heard it so many years, that I have to
  hear it again, criminal experience. There were some
  questions in exchange with you, about the Court of Appeals
  PCR role.

Is that a short, flat learning curve? Or a steep learning curve that awaits you, if you were successful, in terms of -- again, PCR -- it's a body of law, and you don't have to have tried cases to --

A. Sure. I want to be careful. I don't know that it's particularly steep. I don't want to be brash enough to say that it's flat. I think there's certainly learning to do on that process. I've read enough PCR opinions, that I'm generally familiar with the framework.

But I think it's one of the things about this job that really excites me, is that there are always going to be issues you haven't dealt with and you haven't learned before, so you get to dig into them and learn them.

And the academic side of me, the nerdy side finds that really, really exciting. And the benefit of being on the Court of Appeals as compared to the circuit court is when these new issues come up, you don't have to make a ruling on something quickly because a trial needs to go. You have the time to research and talk with clerks and think through the issues to try and get it as right as you can the first time it comes up.

- Q. Blake Hewitt, who sits on that panel now -- I don't recall the number -- but had argued -- both briefed and argued, to my knowledge, more cases at the appellate level of -- again, in my short stint here, than any other candidate ever. How about you? Not just briefed, but argued. How many for you?
- A. Argued? I believe I'm at eight right now. Five in the State Supreme Court, three in the 4th Circuit.

1 Actually, none, ironically, in the Court of Appeals. 2 think I've probably briefed more cases there than any, but 3 either they didn't receive argument or were still awaiting 4 argument at that time I left private practice to come to 5 the Governor's Office. Although, I'm -- we still have some stuff over 6 7 there. I was briefing a Court of Appeals case this 8 morning, actually. 9 SENATOR RANKIN: Thank you. 10 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Any other Commission 11 members have questions for the candidate? 12 EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN CASKEY: 13 Mr. Lambert, I did want to ask -- it may be there 14 and I just missed it -- but your experience in the family 15 court. What, if any, experience there? And if not, 16 anything of substantial weight? How would that -- how 17 would you approach issues that arise out of the family 18 court, given it's somewhat dissimilar quality from our 19 other courts? 20 Α. Certainly. I have no experience in family court 21 itself. My family court background consists at this point 22 of the number of times I've talked to two other lawyers on 23 often procedural questions in family court, thinking as 24 they were going towards appeal. None of those actually --

was never engaged as counsel for any of those appeals

1 before I left private practice. 2 I think it goes back to my answer to Senator 3 I mean, I'm excited about the challenge of 4 learning new things. I mean, I'm generally familiar with 5 the family court system, the different standards of reviews 6 that it receives compared to some cases in general sessions 7 or in common pleas. 8 But while I don't have a large family law 9 background, I don't think any judge could know and have 10 seen everything. I think, particularly, that's true of 11 lawyers who've been in larger cities and larger firms, your 12 practice is not going to be a large general one where you 13 see a little bit of everything. 14 But I do think the civil experience I have is not 15 in one particular area of law. It's covered the waterfront 16 of constitutional, statutory, common law, contract, claims. 17 So the skill set you develop there is effect for 18 whatever the next issue is for learning the law, reading 19 the record, and being prepared to analyze the issues. 20 Q. Thank you. I appreciate that. 21 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Are there any other 22 questions? Senator Talley. 23 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR TALLEY: 24 Good morning, Mr. Lambert. Q. 25 Good morning, Senator. Α.

Q. Thank you for being here. Thank you for offering. This is the third time, I believe, that I've participated in this process. And I can't recall a candidate for an appellate court that didn't stand before us and say, "We've got to move cases through the appellate system quicker."

A. Uh-huh.

Q. As a practicing lawyer, I agree with that. I heard you say, earlier, that there were some staff issues - and not issues as much as just a number problem. But take the "lawyer hat" off, I think one of the things as a legislator I hear most about frustration with the court system is the amount of time it's taking to move the case through the system, and, obviously, the cost that, that brings about. And at times, the leverage that the appeals process is used to try to drive a resolution of the case.

So can you dive a little deeper on that? What do you -- how do we address that, beyond we need more people, to try to move these cases a little bit quicker?

A. Sure. And I think from a people perspective, it's just, you know, getting people in the right places. I think just saying people, generally, is not sufficient. I mean, you could create three more judges and have a whole another panel, but I don't think that's going to deal with the backlog.

I think you're looking at, you know, getting good people in the staff attorney's office, and paying them well enough that they stay there, so that you have the experience for those folks to review and brief cases more quickly, which will help speed it up.

And I do think more people there is one important answer, in the sense that if you have how many more staff attorneys, and each staff attorney can do "X" cases in a week or a month, that's that many more cases you can move through.

You know, I'm hesistant to say that there needs to be some time limit by which courts should be deciding cases on appeal. I think when you -- when you present an arbitrary rule like that, you could rush decisions that may not need to be rushed.

Some of it may frankly be is looking at it as, okay, there's a long-term answer to avoid a backlog, but what's the short-term answer to get rid of it and to sort of catch up and be ready to go.

From that perspective, I don't know that there is a -- an alternative to having the work hours there, whether that's for the people who are there now or for more people.

But at a certain point, I think the only way to dispose of cases is for the court and staff to read the briefs, read the record, research the law, and then draft

1 an opinion so that you get the answer right. 2 And anything that would rush that, and result, 3 potentially, in cases not receiving the review that every 4 case warrants, or potentially being rushed such that an issue was overlooked and the answer -- the ultimate outcome 5 6 affirmed, reversed, vacated is incorrect -- we don't want 7 to do. 8 But I think, fundamentally, it's those work 9 And I don't know -- there are probably different 10 solutions from more hours from the judges in chambers who 11 are there, and staff attorneys, to getting more bodies in 12 the building. 13 But someone's got to do the work. I don't think 14 we're going to give it to AI or to ChatGPT to start, you 15 know, drafting opinions and reviewing records. 16 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Any further questions? 17 (Hearing none.) 18 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Lambert, I'm going to 19 ask you this question, because this is not in a serious 20 category, but I'd be remiss if I did not recognize it. You 21 have on the same bow tie, today, as you did in your drivers 22 license picture. So I didn't want you to go out of here 23 thinking that this commission does not pay attention to 24 details. 25 I hope I don't --MR. LAMBERT:

1	SENATOR RANKIN: Frugality. That's your
2	answer.
3	MR. LAMBERT: That's it. And I just hope I
4	don't look as bad here, as I did in the drivers license
5	picture, I'm sure.
6	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Well, I'll leave others to
7	make that decision.
8	MR. LAMBERT: Both are probably helpless.
9	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Lambert, I do
10	appreciate you being here. And this concludes this portion
11	of our screening process.
12	I do want to take this opportunity to remind
13	you, that pursuant to the Commission's evaluative criteria,
14	the Commission expects candidates to follow the spirit as
15	well as the letter of the ethics laws, and we will review -
16	- we will view violations or the appearance of impropriety
17	as serious and potentially deserving of heavy weight in
18	screening deliberations.
19	On that note, and as you know, the record
20	will remain open will the formal release of the report of
21	qualifications, and you may be called back at such time if
22	that need were to arise.
23	Again, thank you for offering to the State
24	of South Carolina. Thank you for your service. And I
25	appreciate you all being here today.

1	MR. LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you very much.
3	MR. LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4	Thank y'all very much.
5	(Candidate excused.)
6	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: So at this point, we are
7	going to take a break for lunch. We will go into executive
8	session, though, as we eat that lunch.
9	So on motion of Senator Sabb, the question -
10	- seconded by Senator Talley, we'll be going into executive
11	session. All in favor signify by saying "aye".
12	(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
13	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All opposed "nay"?
14	(Hearing none.)
15	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The "ayes" have it. The
16	JMSC will now move into executive session, and I anticipate
17	that being about 45 minutes to an hour.
18	(Executive session from 11:42 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.)
19	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you. Good
20	afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. The Judicial Merit
21	Selection Commission is now back. And we are back on the
22	record.
23	For the record, I'd like to state that we
24	had while we'd been in executive session, no decisions
25	were made and no votes were taken during that point or

1	during that executive session. And we are now back in the
2	screening process No. 83 or I guess we start with number
3	3 of 83 to go, something like that.
4	Mr. Luther, thank you for being here.
5	MR. LUTHER: Thank you for having me.
6	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: And our understanding is
7	that you are here applying for Seat 9 on the Court of
8	Appeals; is that correct?
9	MR. LUTHER: Correct.
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: If you would please, sir,
11	raise your right hand.
12	WHEREUPON,
13	JASON P. LUTHER, being duly sworn and
14	cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing
15	but the truth.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Before you are some
17	documents. If you'd just take a look at those, please.
18	Are the personal data questionnaire and the sworn statement
19	before you, the documents that you submitted to the
20	Commission?
21	MR. LUTHER: They appear to be.
22	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Are they both correct?
23	MR. LUTHER: They are with the amendment
24	that I submitted about two weeks ago. And that's up here,
25	too, as Exhibit 8.

1	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Do you object to our
2	making these documents and any amendments a part of the
3	record of your sworn testimony?
4	MR. LUTHER: I do not.
5	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you. We will go
6	ahead and do that.
7	(EXHIBIT NO. 7 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
8	COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF JASON
9	PHILLIP LUTHER)
10	(EXHIBIT NO. 8 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
11	COMMISSION AMENDED PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF
12	JASON PHILLIP LUTHER)
13	(EXHIBIT NO. 9 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
14	COMMISSION PERSONAL SWORN STATEMENT OF JASON
15	PHILLIP LUTHER)
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The Judicial Merit
17	Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your
18	qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on
19	the nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box
20	survey, a thorough study of your application materials,
21	verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a
22	search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a
23	study of previous screenings, and a check for economic
24	conflicts of interest.
25	We have received no affidavits filed in

1	opposition to your election. No witnesses are present to
2	testify. And we will invite you, certainly, to make a
3	brief opening statement, if you would like to.
4	But before that, I see you've brought
5	someone with you. If you want to introduce her, or him.
6	MR. LUTHER: It looks like I've got several
7	folks. So my wife, Emily Luther, here on the front row.
8	And then long friend, Matt Bogan, sitting behind her.
9	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you both for being
10	here.
11	MR. LUTHER: And I was told there may be two
12	other folks that were on the way, but
13	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Well, we'll certainly
14	if they make it here, we'll give you a chance to recognize
15	them. Our commission has seemingly found an
16	uncharacteristic ability to go more quickly this morning
17	than anticipated. So we certainly appreciate your
18	flexibility in getting here with that.
19	But, anyway, we'd be happy to hear from you,
20	if you have any brief opening remarks.
21	MR. LUTHER: I will be brief, recognizing
22	that you're ahead of schedule and I don't want to be the
23	one that puts you behind. But I would just say I have
24	wanted to be an appellate judge since I was as teenager.
25	It's why I went to law school. That's why I worked hard to

1 get a -- an appellate clerkship after law school, and it's 2 why I have chosen to pursue a lot of opportunities that 3 I've had since law school, in the hopes that it would 4 prepare me, and give me the experience and skills to be the 5 best judge I could be one day. 6 And so in that sense, I'm very happy to be 7 here. Because I'm living out a dream, in a sense, just 8 being part of this process. 9 So thank you for having me and letting me be 10 And if this is the appropriate time, I'd also like 11 to just thank the staff. Ms. Crawford, Ms. Putnam, Ms. 12 Symmes, they have been really great to work with. And 13 they've made this process very easy. And I appreciate 14 that. 15 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you for those kind 16 words. We appreciate the opportunities to recognize all of 17 the hard work that staff has made. And we'll do that more 18 thoroughly, perhaps, at the end. But we've got a long way 19 to go till we get there. But your comments are nonetheless 20 appreciated. 21 At this point I'd ask you to respond to the 22 questions from Ms. Symmes. 23 MS. SYMMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 24 note for the record that based on the testimony contained 25 in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the

record with the candidate's consent, Jason Philip Luther 1 2 meets the constitutional and statutory requirements for 3 this position regarding age, residence, and years of 4 practice. 5 EXAMINATION BY MS. SYMMES: 6 0. Mr. Luther, I know you spoke to this already in 7 your opening comment, but if there are any additional 8 comments for the Commission, why do you want to now serve 9 as a judge on the Court of Appeals? 10 Α. You know, as I alluded to, I had a couple of 11 experiences as a teenager that sort of set me on a path 12 towards law. And part of that was not just a career in 13 law, but it put it in the context of public service. 14 To me, a career in law represented a couple 15 One, the law itself as an ideal that provides the 16 framework for our society to function and flourish; and 17 then, also, a career in a way that you could serve the 18 community for the greater good. 19 As I progressed in my interest in law, I found a 20 real sweet spot in appellate practice and appellate work. 21 I think it probably is a good intersection of my personality and interest and skill set. 22 23 And so to me, being on the Court of Appeals is a

upholding as the gatekeeper of the rule of law, and then

great place and a great way to marry those two interests of

24

also serving the public. So it would be a tremendous honor 1 2 to do that as part of our Court of Appeals. 3 Mr. Luther, how do you feel your legal and 4 professional experience thus far will assist you to be an 5 effective judge on the Court of Appeals? 6 Α. I've spent a good bit of my practice doing 7 appellate work. So I think that's a unique skill set, 8 obviously, that is important for someone on the Court of 9 Appeals. 10 I've done it on both sides, both as a clerk, and 11 seeing what it is for a judge to prepare and to wrestle 12 with questions before him, or her. And then on the other 13 side, as an advocate, and how you have to put together your 14 argument, knowing what the Court of Appeals is looking for. 15 I've tried in my practice to have as much 16 exposure to different areas of law as well. I've done a 17 lot of trial work, bench trials and jury trials, federal 18 and state court, circuit court, administrative law court. 19 And then working at the Department of Revenue in

And then working at the Department of Revenue in the last six years, I think, has given me another skill set in that it's exposed me to a lot of areas of law within our state, that often you might not get in private practice.

20

21

22

23

24

25

We deal with a lot of constitutional issues. We deal with matters that we're trying to resolve in the context of our own precedent and the state court precedent.

And so when you come to a matter at the Court of Appeals that's before us, we're not just resolving that one case, but I'm thinking about what does this mean down the road, how does it fit within the bigger context of, again, our longstanding administrative practice and court precedent. So I think all of those things have prepared me.

And one other element is, I was just a part-owner in a small business before law school. And that's a whole other unique perspective on what the court system provides. And I think that would come into my role as a judge as well.

- Q. Thank you. Mr. Luther, how would you describe your general judicial philosophy?
- A. Probably three words. The first would be "textualist." I think the text is the law and it is the best expression of the General Assembly's intent. I would say an originalist, in that as you're looking at the text, you're trying to understand what it meant to the original drafters.

And I've thought a lot about this, you know.

Originalism is one of the few things that, even at the

Supreme Court now, you find consensus on, on both sides of
the aisle. So I feel like that's a good place to be, if
the likes of a Scalia and a Kagan and a Ginsberg and such

are all in accord with that.

And then the third thing, which is something I learned from Judge Shedd when I clerked for him, was you decide a case only on the grounds necessary to resolve it. So perhaps, a minimalist would be the best way to describe that.

- Q. Thank you. What is your vision for the future our judicial system? And what changes would you advocate, and why?
- A. Well, when I think about the judicial system, I think the vision for the future would be to maintain, preserve, and build on the core values. So the rule of law, accountability, transparency, service. I think those are some of the core values of the court.

And you do that, obviously, because it's a -it's a very important role. And you do it because you want
to build public confidence in the system. That's an
important thing.

And I think at times we've seen, particularly in the federal system, that, that is an issue right now. And so I would want to build on that, obviously, approaching each case as a very important case. Not just for the court but for each of the litigants.

And so I think a lot of -- you asked about how to improve on that, or what I would do. I think some of it is

1 educational. We want citizens to understand the role of 2 the court. Sometimes the view or perspective of the 3 court's legitimacy, for example, is because they 4 misunderstand its role. 5 So that's what I would -- that would be my answer 6 to that. 7 0. Thank you. Mr. Luther, to what extent do you 8 believe that a judge should or should not defer to the 9 actions of the General Assembly? 10 Well, as I said earlier, I think the General Α. 11 Assembly is charged with making policy. If you look at our 12 constitution, Article 1, Section 1, right out the gate, 13 power -- political power is vested in and derived from the 14 They are, through their elected representatives, 15 the ones who set policy. 16 So it is the providence of the court to say what the law is and not what it should be. And so deference to 17 18 the General Assembly, again, is expressed in the text is 19 the role of the judge. 20 Thank you. Mr. Luther, the Commission received Q. 21 175 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 46 additional 22 The ballot box survey, for example, contained comments. 23 the following positive comments: 24 "Jason would make an excellent judge.

listens. He is thoughtful, reasonable. A sharp thinker.

Highest caliber of ethics and integrity. And he would bring the right temperament and a level of respect and dignity to the court."

"Jason has a wide array of experience that would make him well suited to serve on the bench. Having clerked for a judge, practiced in private practice, and served as general counsel at a state agency, Jason is extremely equipped to handle any matter that would come before him on the Court of Appeals."

Four of the written comments expressed concerns.

Two of those comments indicated that you do not have the relevant trial experience. What would you like to offer to the Commission as a response to that concern?

- A. Trial experience generally, or was that specific to any particular area?
  - O. Civil and criminal.
- A. Civil and criminal. Certainly, it's humbling to hear some of the positive comments. And I also appreciate the questions about, you know, perhaps, trial experience. You would expect folks to have a judge that has certainly tried cases.

I have tried to go back -- at one point, I kept a list of jury trials to verdict that I had in private practice. I have not found the list. But if I had to guess, it's about thirty-plus. So I've tried a number of

1 cases to verdict.

Certainly in the last six years at the court of - I mean, at the Department of Revenue, most of what we do
is ALC practice, and I can't count the number of trials
that we've had there. Of course those are all bench
trials. So I do think I have a great bit of trial
experience.

- Q. Mr. Luther, the second concern, as was stated in one comment, indicated that due to your political ideology, that you may demonstrate bias to attorneys or litigants. What response would you offer to this concern regarding that comment?
- A. I think I asked you what was the political bias, and I'm not sure if we know. But I would say, again, as I expressed earlier, I think we all have political preferences that we bring to the table. You can't divorce yourself from that.

A judge, obviously, is to set aside whatever political preferences there are. My political persuasion, though, feeds right into what I said is the role of the judge, is that I see separation of powers as central to our constitutional framework.

And so in that case the judge has a certain lane that he or she is in, and that lane is that they apply the text of the law to a particular controversy before it, and

1 again, not to inject my personal preferences into the 2 process and replace those of the General Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Luther. 3 0. 4 MS. SYMMES: I would note that the Midlands 5 Citizens Committee found Mr. Luther to be qualified in the 6 criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health 7 and mental stability, and well qualified in the evaluative 8 criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic 9 ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial 10 temperament. 11 The committee noted, "Past experience makes 12 him well qualified." 13 BY MS. SYMMES: 14 I have just a few housekeeping issues. Q. 15 submitting your letter of intent for this seat, have you 16 contacted any members of the Commission about your 17 candidacy? 18 Α. No. 19 0. Are you familiar with Section 2-19-70, including 20 the limitations on contacting members of the General 21 Assembly regarding your screening? 22 Α. Yes. 23 0. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you 24 sought or received the pledge or any legislator either 25 prior to this date or pending the outcome of your

## 1 screening? 2 Α. No. 3 Have you asked any third parties to contact 0. 4 members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you 5 aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on 6 your behalf? 7 Α. And I'm not aware of anyone. No. 8 MS. SYMMES: I would just note for the 9 record that any concerns raised during the investigation 10 regarding Mr. Luther were incorporated into the questioning 11 of the candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further 12 questions. 13 Thank you, Ms. Symmes. CHAIRMAN CASKEY: 14 Mr. Luther, before we turn to any questions that may come 15 from any Commission members, we've had some folks join us 16 behind you. I didn't know if you wanted to recognize those 17 people, who didn't want to be on time to your hearing, or 18 not. 19 We moved the schedule up. It's not your fault -- not his fault. It's our fault, my fault. It's 20 21 really Erin's fault. But if you'd like to, or if you want 22 to disavow knowledge of them, you're welcome to do that as 23 well. 24 I mean, with that introduction, MR. LUTHER:

they may not want to be on the record. Behind my wife is

1 Ray Jones -- that's my wife's partner and a long-time 2 friend. And then Adam Neil, who is a longtime friend and 3 colleaque. 4 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Gentlemen, we thank you 5 both for being here. Again, I make light in a moment of --6 it feels like there's constant tension. So I certainly 7 appreciate you guys making the time to be here to support 8 Mr. Luther in this effort. 9 At this point are there any members of the 10 Commission who have questions of Mr. Luther? Mr. Jordan. 11 REPRESENTATIVE JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. 12 Chairman. 13 EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE JORDAN: 14 Mr. Luther, thank you for putting forward to be 15 here today and going through this process with us. I guess 16 as I look at the Court of Appeals, what do you -- I mean, 17 you obviously -- we talk a lot about the -- what I call the 18 -- sort of higher level constitutional issues. 19 How do you see the Court of Appeals connecting with those type issues, but also dealing with the -- you're 20 21 the last -- you would be the last court of guaranteed 22 opportunity for litigants and the day-to-day operations? 23 How do those two things connect or intersect? 24 So I don't know if this is quite responsive, but Α.

with the aspect of your question about constitutional

issues, obviously, those factor into many of the decisions.

It's been said that the Supreme Court is a court of law -issuing law and making law, and the Court of Appeals is an
error-correcting court. And so it's somewhat different,
obviously. If the Supreme Court has weighed in on a

constitutional issue, we're bound to follow it.

But to your point, understanding that we may be the last stop on the appellate process for my litigants, I think that makes it all the more important to approach each case with vigor and zeal, and studying the issues, making sure you understand them, and then working hard with your colleagues to build a consensus and find the right decision.

- Q. And to that end, I think you testified your primary experience has been in the appellate field. Is that fair to say?
- A. I don't know that I would describe it as primary, but it's been a significant aspect of my practice.
- Q. Do you think you missed something that maybe you did, or maybe you didn't, or maybe you missed something that you think is taken care of in another way, so to speak, by focusing -- or missing in certain other areas of the practice of law?
- A. I would say that there are some areas that I would feel the need to prepare extra for. So I would not

1 hold myself to be a criminal lawyer. I have done a good bit of supervising on a criminal -- we have a criminal 2 3 prosecutor at the department, who handles all of our 4 criminal prosecutions, we work day-to-day on strategy, 5 discussing cases. And as I've prepared to go through this 6 process, I've really tried to be even more involved in 7 that, you know, appearing for pleas. And if we can get 8 some trials, we'll do those together as well. That would 9 be one area. 10 I do think my experience, particularly on the 11 administrative side of practice, and understanding how state government works, is something that I would bring as 12 13 a judge. 14 And again, I spent a number of years in private 15 practice doing civil litigation, so it was not exclusively 16 appellate work. 17 And, perhaps, early on, I wish I had more 18 appellate work. But I think at one point -- at some point, 19 you've got to just kind of put in the effort to try cases 20 and be a litigator. 21 Thank you. Q. 22 SENATOR RANKIN: Mr. Chairman. 23 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Senator Rankin. 24 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN: 25 What is it about Judge Shedd that seems to foster 0.

- folks that want to be court judges? And that's a slight
  joke. You worked with him a year after your -- one of your
  would-be candidates or opponents, Mr. Lambert, who clerked
  with Dennis Shedd. Is that right?

  A. We both clerked for Dennis Shedd. I actually
  - A. We both clerked for Dennis Shedd. I actually think I was a couple of years ahead of him.
  - Q. Yeah, you were -- you were '10 through '12. He was '12 through '13.
  - A. I think that -- that's correct for me. I can't remember exactly --
    - Q. Have you ever met Mr. Lambert?
    - A. Yes. I know him very well.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. Obviously. And a sincere question there is he, Judge Shedd, apparently, instilled in at least two of his clerks, the desire to serve on the bench. And so kudos to you for that, if for no other reason, with respect to the many other qualifications you have. That's it.
- A. Well, Judge Shedd was a good mentor. And he was a fun judge to work for too. So perhaps, seeing how much he enjoyed the job has given us reason to pursue it as well.
- 22 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Fun. Define that word.
  23 I've only met Judge Shedd in passing. "Fun" was not the
  24 word that immediately came to mind. But I can appreciate
  25 your comments.

1	MD INTUED: Cortainly a different
	MR. LUTHER: Certainly, a different
2	perspective, if you're sitting in a place like this, and
3	he's sitting where you are. Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Any other questions from
5	members of the Commission?
6	(Hearing none.)
7	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All right. Seeing none.
8	Mr. Luther, thank you again for being here, today, and
9	taking the time away from your practice and your family to
10	spend some time with us.
11	This concludes this portion of our screening
12	process. I do want to take this opportunity to remind you
13	that pursuant to the Commission's evaluative criteria, the
14	Commission expects candidates to follow the spirit as well
15	as the letter of the ethics laws, and we will view
16	violations or the appearance of impropriety as serious and
17	potentially deserving of heavy weight in the screening
18	deliberations.
19	On that note, and as you may know, the
20	record will remain open until the formal release of the
21	report of qualifications, and you may be called back at
22	such time if that need were to arise.
23	So again, I thank you for offering. And I
24	wish you all the best as you leave out of here today.
25	Thank you.

1	MR. LUTHER: Thank you.
2	(Candidate excused.)
3	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The Commission will now
4	move of course, everybody is welcome to stay for the
5	remaining 82 candidates that we'll be screening this month.
6	But at this point, I think we we're ahead of schedule.
7	Which is atypical. We'll stand at ease for a couple of
8	minutes while we're waiting on the next candidate.
9	(A recess was held from 12:52 p.m. to 1:24 p.m.)
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ladies and gentlemen, the
11	Commission will come to order. We have before us, Judge
12	Matthew Turner. Judge, good to see you. Thank you for
13	being here.
14	JUDGE TURNER: Good to see you.
15	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: We certainly appreciate
16	your flexibility in getting here, recognizing the
17	accelerated, and admittedly, new position we find ourselves
18	in where we're ahead of schedule. So we
19	JUDGE TURNER: Well, that's nice. I'm sure
20	I know you guys are glad to be ahead.
21	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you for that. You
22	are here in application for the Court of Appeals, Seat 9.
23	That's correct?
24	JUDGE TURNER: Yes, sir.
25	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: If you would please raise

_	
1	your right hand.
2	WHEREUPON,
3	THE HONORABLE MATTHEW PRICE TURNER, being
4	duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole
5	truth and nothing but the truth.
6	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir. There are
7	some documents in front of you. If you would take a moment
8	to review those. Is that the personal data questionnaire
9	and sworn statement before you, that you have submitted to
10	the Commission?
11	JUDGE TURNER: Yes, it is.
12	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Are they correct? And
13	does anything need to be changed or amended at this time?
14	JUDGE TURNER: No. I made one supplement
15	before, and that should have already been turned in.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: So that is included in our
17	packets. Do you object to our making these documents,
18	including the amendment, a part of the record of your sworn
19	testimony?
20	JUDGE TURNER: No objection.
21	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: We'll go ahead and do
22	that.
23	(EXHIBIT NO. 10 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
24	COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE
25	HONORABLE MATTHEW PRICE TURNER)

1 (EXHIBIT NO. 11 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION 2 COMMISSION PERSONAL SWORN STATEMENT OF THE 3 HONORABLE MATTHEW PRICE TURNER) 4 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The Judicial Merit 5 Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your 6 qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on 7 nine evaluative criteria, it has included a ballot box 8 survey, a thorough study of your application materials, 9 verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a 10 search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a 11 study of previous screenings, and a check for economic 12 conflicts of interest. 13 We've received no affidavits filed in 14 opposition to your election. And no witnesses are present 15 to testify. 16 We'll afford you, certainly, the opportunity to make a brief opening statement in just a minute. But if 17 18 you want to recognize the folks who've come with you, 19 today, and introduce us to them. We'd be happy to --20 JUDGE TURNER: This is Meg, my lovely bride 21 of twenty-one years. And then my father, Mike Tuner, who 22 was also my law partner for fifteen years. 23 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you both for being 24 And, again, our apologies, with an asterisk, on 25 starting a little bit early. So we're certainly glad that

1 you were able to make the trip down here. 2 With that, Judge Turner, we'd be happy to 3 hear from you, with any brief remarks you have, or we can 4 go right into questioning. 5 JUDGE TURNER: I know you guys have a busy 6 couple of weeks. So I appreciate the time, and thank you 7 for what you do. 8 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: At this point, I'd 9 recognize Mr. Hinson to ask some questions on behalf of the 10 Commission. 11 MR. HINSON: Good afternoon, Judge Turner. 12 JUDGE TURNER: Good afternoon. 13 Mr. Chairman, I note for the MR. HINSON: 14 record that based on the testimony contained in the 15 candidate's PDO, which has been included in the record, 16 with the candidate's consent, Judge Turner meets the 17 constitution and/or statutory requirements for this 18 position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. 19 EXAMINATION BY MR. HINSON: 20 0. Judge Turner, why do you now want to serve as a 21 judge on the Court of Appeals? 22 Let me just first take the opportunity to say Α. 23 I've thoroughly enjoyed my time as a family court judge for 24 the past five-plus years. It's been a rewarding, even 25 though difficult at times, experience for me.

And if you guys, or the General Assembly as a whole, doesn't see fit for me to go to the Court of Appeals, I will happily continue to serve as a family court judge for as long as you guys will have me.

But when I was in private practice, I had the chance to do some appellate work. I actually enjoyed getting in to doing the research, writing the briefs, doing the arguments.

As you know, as a trial judge, I don't often have a lot of time to dig into the cases and to really get into them, the way I would like to, and have to sometimes make a lot of quick decisions. But I would like that aspect. And it's just a different way for me to serve this state.

- Q. Thank you, Judge. How do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be an effect judge on the Court of Appeals?
- A. I went straight from law school to private practice in a small town. We had a general litigation firm, I did that for fifteen years. I represented people in probate court, magistrate's court, family court, circuit court, civil and general sessions.

I also did some appeals. And so I have a varied experience in many different courts. I believe I have good writing ability. I take pride in my orders when I was an attorney, writing orders and doing the briefs.

So I believe the experience in private practice in many different areas of law, combined with my experience as a family court judge, have equipped me to be a good Court of Appeals judge.

- Q. Thank you. Judge Turner, how would you describe your general judicial philosophy?
- A. Well, I treat everyone with respect. And I rule after -- or try to make a fair and impartial ruling after everybody has a full opportunity to be heard. That's a big thing for me.

A lot of times, you know, these cases take a long time before they come to me. And these people want to have their day in court, and I think the worst thing I could do as a judge would be to run them out and feel like they didn't have a chance to be fully heard.

And so I really try to make sure everybody has a full opportunity to present their case, so they don't feel like the judge shut them out or didn't get a chance to be heard. And once I have allowed everybody to be fully heard, then I take the law and apply it to the facts of that case.

- Q. Judge Turner, what is your vision for the future of our judicial system? And what changes would you advocate for, and why?
  - A. Well, as everybody knows, the judiciary's been

under attack here, most recently and for a while, but really recently. And I would like somehow to make that better.

I don't know the perfect way to do that. I don't know if that's more community involvement, or whether that would be educating the community more on what we do and the things that we try to focus on, and to show that we are trying to do our best in each case, and it's not as bad as what they make it seem to be.

I know we all went to a mental health seminar, all the judges went last week, and somebody told me they saw that on the news. And so I think that's a -- that's a good thing.

And maybe more of that would be better to educate people to know that we are actually focusing on what's going on in the world, and that we are trying to do things to make it better.

And so I would like to improve the perception of the judiciary, but also to help try to speed along, moving these cases through. I know that's a -- backlog is a problem not just on the trial court, but at the appeals court as well.

And so I've actually talked to Chief Judge Bruce Williams on multiple occasions, and he's explained to me what he's been doing in terms of trying to move cases

through a little bit fast. And so far it sounds like it's working. And so that would be another thing I'd like to do.

And of course, I'd be happy to jump on board with whatever he's doing, and to help out in any way that I can to try to get things moved through quicker.

- Q. Thank you. Judge Turner, what extent do you believe that a judge should or should not defer to the actions of the General Assembly?
- A. Well, the General Assembly has the job of creating the law. And it's my belief that it's my job to take that law and to apply it to the facts of each case.
- Q. Judge Turner, the Commission received 343 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 71 additional comments.

  The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments.

One stated you would be a welcomed addition to the Court of Appeals. Another said you had great temperament on the bench. And yet another said you know the law well and run your courtroom well.

Of the 71 written comments, only a couple had raised any concerns, and you kind of touched on this a little while ago, and it has to do with experience.

Anything else you'd like to add in response to those concerns?

A. I don't think so. I think I'm -- as I outlined,
I have a wide variety of experience. And to add on top of
that, my time now as a family court and having to make the
-- those decisions. And so I think that has equipped me to
do the job.

- Q. Thank you. Judge, you mentioned in your PDQ, you were named in a lawsuit Thomas v. South Carolina Department of Social Services. Can you explain the nature of the suit and the disposition of it?
- A. Sure. I was actually never served with that suit. I found out about it 'cause another one of my colleagues was also named as a defendant. It stemmed from a DSS case where I presided over one, or maybe multiple hearings in that case.

And the plaintiff brought a lawsuit in federal court, seeking monetary damages against me, one of my colleagues, DSS, and several DSS employees. It was a pro se action from what I could tell. And so what I -- it's a very long, rambling complaint.

From what I can gather from it, the concern -- or what I did wrong was when I didn't overrule one of my colleague's prior orders, and that I didn't dismiss the DSS action, is what I can gather the complaint was about me.

Again, I was never served. It was dismissed shortly after it was filed.

## 1 Q. Thank you. 2 MR. HINSON: I would note that the Piedmont 3 Citizens Committee reported that Judge Turner is qualified 4 in the area of constitutional qualifications, physical 5 health and mental stability, and well qualified in the 6 areas of ethical fitness, professional and academic 7 ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial 8 temperament. 9 They included a note that -- the Piedmont 10 committee offered -- the Piedmont committee offered this 11 additional comment: 12 "The judge has a fine record as a family 13 court judge, and was an experienced and well regarded 14 practitioner before he ascended to the bench. 15 committee is confident that his experience, ability, and 16 character would make him a fine candidate for the Court of 17 Appeals." 18 BY MR. HINSON: 19 0. And with that, I just have a few housekeeping questions for you. Since submitting your letter of intent 20 21 to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the 22 Commission about your candidacy? 23 Α. I have not. 24 Are you familiar with Section 2-19-70, including Q. 25 the limitations on contacting members of the General

## 1 Assembly regarding your screening? 2 Α. I am. 3 Since submitting your letter of intent, have you 0. 4 sought or received the pledge of any legislature either 5 prior to this date or pending the outcome of your 6 screening? 7 Α. I have not. 8 Have you asked any third parties to contact 9 members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you 10 aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on 11 your behalf? 12 Α. I have not. And I'm not aware of any. 13 MR. HINSON: I would just note for the 14 record that any concerns raised during the investigation 15 regarding this candidate were incorporated into the 16 questioning of the candidate today. And with that, I have 17 no further questions. 18 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir. Do any 19 members of the Commission have questions for Judge Turner? 20 Mr. Safran. 21 EXAMINATION BY MR. SAFRAN: 22 0. Judge Turner, thank you for being here. 23 Α. Yes, sir. 24 I think what really struck me, in looking at Q. 25 these ballot box comments, was something that somebody said

that really kind of captures it all: "I can't think of 1 2 anyone more qualified, humble, or human for the job." 3 I think that the common theme throughout 4 everything that I've read, is that you maintain a level of 5 humility, that you are always even-keeled, fair-minded. 6 The other thing that I find to be kind of -- well, more 7 than kind of -- impressive is this: You were in a general 8 practice for a lot of years; is that fair? 9 Yes, sir. That's correct. Α. 10 And it looks like you handled kind of the gamut -0. 11 - civil, workers' comp, domestic, probate -- kind of 12 anything that came in the door, I guess. 13 You have to in a small town. Α. 14 I've been there. Q. 15 Α. Yes. 16 0. I understand completely. I know that, earlier 17 today, Representative Jordan asked the question about 18 trying to recognize that the Court of Appeals is often that 19 last stop for somebody who has a grievance, that wants to 20 use our judicial system. And I don't know that, 21 necessarily, the answer came back understanding what he was 22 meaning. 23 Is it fair to say that the vast majority of cases 24 that end up at the Court of Appeals are going to be in the

very areas that you used to practice in for all those

years?

- A. That is correct. Most of them are.
- Q. And I'm assuming that just because you focused on family court as a judge, doesn't mean you've forgotten everything you learned during all those experiences.
- A. I hope I haven't forgotten it. I don't think I have.
  - Q. Well, and I guess my point is, is that is it -is it fair to say that, basically, the Court of Appeals has
    been left with the obligation to really handle the cases
    that pretty much, you know, the man on the street's going
    to bring in, the ones that are going to impact daily lives
    on that level, individually, probably more so than any?
    - A. Absolutely, yes.
  - Q. I mean, and you're dealing with that every day in family court, aren't you?
- 17 | A. I am, yes.
  - Q. And so I guess my question is this -- we've heard some outstanding candidates, great backgrounds, you know, who it seems like have been involved in some high-level, complex-type of litigation, that think that -- they think that makes them uniquely qualified for the Court of Appeals.
  - But really, isn't the Court of Appeals a place that handles so much more than those few complex cases that

## come down the pike?

- A. It does. I mean, there's all kind of cases that come through there, like you said, just from the regular people off the street to the high complex, big-dollar cases.
- Q. Well, and I guess the thing is, you have actually handled appellate work and have gone to both the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals.
  - A. I have.
- Q. And I guess my question is, is that just being a judge there doesn't necessarily mean that you've done fifty of them over the course of time, but you've dealt with those very subjects that are going to be in front of you on a regular basis.
- A. Correct. Yeah. And a lot of the cases that come on appeal are from a family court, where I've been the last five and years.
- Q. And I understand that you've enjoyed family court.
- 20 A. I have. I really do enjoy it. It's tough, but I 21 like it.
  - Q. But I guess, again, this is something, I guess, that you say you've thinking about for a while?
  - A. I have. And it took a long time to make the decision on whether or not to offer myself for this

1 position now. So it took a lot of prayer and thought, but I'm here now. 2 3 And do you think you're up to it? 0. 4 Yes, sir, I do. Α. You know, I didn't check, but how did you -- how 5 Q. 6 did you weather on those -- or how did you fare on those 7 cases that you did go up on? 8 Where I was appealed? Or the ones --Α. 9 Q. Yeah. 10 Α. -- that I took as a lawyer? 11 Both of them. 0. 12 Α. Well, somebody asked me -- I think it was in the 13 citizens committee, they were referencing published 14 opinions versus unpublished opinions. And I said, "Well, I 15 think the only time they published my opinions or my 16 decisions is when they reversed me." 17 So I've been reversed on the Supreme Court, and I 18 was partially-affirmed and partially-reversed by Justice 19 Hill, when he was on the Court of Appeals, but I've had -the vast majority of mine have been affirmed in unpublished 20 21 opinions. Well --22 0. 23 Α. And then I had -- oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead. 24 No, you right ahead. Q. 25 I was going to say when I was in practice, a few Α.

- of the cases that I had were -- went in our favor. One of them was -- we disagreed with the trial court. And we had that reversed. And the other one was we agreed with the trial court, but we were able to maintain that. And it was affirmed all the way up.
  - Q. Nobody bats a thousand, okay?
  - A. That's right.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

- Q. But I guess just along those lines, you know, I can tell you -- I mean, I used to take some up. And it seemed like when I was with a particular law firm, that every time we got reversed, my name got on it. Every time that it got affirmed, somebody else's name got on it.
- A. I understand.
- Q. So, you know, at some point you just take your licks.
- 16 A. That's right.
  - Q. I mean, that's just how it works. But again -- I mean, is this something in terms of a stop that you think you want to kind of make for the rest of your career for the most part?
    - A. As of now, yes, sir.
- 22 Q. Thank you very much.
- CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Any other members of the
  Commission have questions for Judge Turner? Senator
  Talley.

1	SENATOR TALLEY: Not so much a question as a
2	comment. Judge, good to see you.
3	JUDGE TURNER: Good to see you.
4	SENATOR TALLEY: And it's nice to read the
5	ballot box comments. I don't know if I'm the only one on
6	this panel that has been in your courtroom, but well
7	well said by members of the Bar who have appeared in front
8	of you, as to your demeanor, your conduct of hearings
9	which have not always gone my way, but that's okay. I'm
10	not always right. And I just wanted to kind of on the
11	vast majority of these comments being so favorable for the
12	job that you have done.
13	JUDGE TURNER: Well, thank you. I
14	appreciate that.
15	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Senator Sabb.
16	SENATOR SABB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17	EXAMINATION BY SENATOR SABB:
18	Q. And thank you, Judge. As some of my colleagues
19	have said, we appreciate good, qualified folks offering.
20	And certainly, I think you fall within that realm.
21	I really have a series of questions that I want
22	to ask a number of our sitting judges, and so you're the
23	first. And, really, I'm curious because of some of what
24	I've read in the media as it relates to lawyer legislators,
25	not only serving as a part of this body, but as serving in

the General Assembly, period.

And it appears that one of the issues that's raised is that lawyer-legislators, and including members of this body, are essentially clogging up the dockets. And I'm curious, based on your experience, what impact, if any, does the fact that you have lawyer-legislators that are a part of the cases that you see, what impact is it having on clogged dockets?

A. Well, the dockets are clogged whether you had a - lawyer-legislators involved or not. They're going to be
-- they're going to be backlogged. That's just the way it
is.

I think it makes scheduling more difficult when you have a lawyer-legislator involved, because they obviously are afforded protection for, you know, so many months out of each year. It may take longer to get a lawyer-legislator's trial schedule. But I wouldn't say it's necessarily clogging up the docket. 'Cause it usually taking so long, it's getting pushed down anyway.

I know just for example, though, even though the legislators may have protection, if they are available and willing, they can come on a Monday or a Friday. Senator Talley was in my courtroom last week, and I don't remember the -- what came up, but he made the reference that I'd be -- "I could be available on a Monday or a Friday."

1 So I don't think that it's as bad as it sounds. 2 I do think that, you know, it does sometimes pose some 3 scheduling difficulties. 4 I've been chief admin for my circuit, for going 5 on a year and a half now, and so I've been able to 6 negotiate around that. And I don't -- and I'm primarily in 7 the 8th Circuit, and we don't have many lawyer-legislators. 8 And so I don't -- I don't see a lot, honestly. 9 Representative Bannister from Greenville every now and 10 then. 11 And I was in Spartanburg last week when I saw Senator Talley, so it may not be as much for me as it would 12 13 be for other judges, just because I don't have them in my 14 courtroom as often. 15 And quite frankly, Your Honor, that's why I Q. intend to ask the question of more persons then you. 16 17 Because for some, perception is their reality. And so it's 18 important for me, particularly during this period, that we 19 flesh out some of it, publically, because I want to know 20 when I think in terms of lawyers and having conflicts. 21 And so I was a part-time assistant solicitor, so 22 I had a private practice doing everything other than criminal law, because I was -- I was an assistant 23 24 solicitor. And so when I was trying cases as an assistant

solicitor when we were in general sessions, then it was a

higher court. And so I could not go to those other trials and things that were scheduled. And so it's the same thing in terms of working around a schedule.

And so would you agree with me, that it's a -it's just something that we do -- I mean, in -- and
clearly, when we're in session -- I mean, you can't be two
places at one time. But just in terms of conflicts in
general, it's something that our system has embraced, I
would think since the system was created.

A. Right. And you always are going to work around scheduling. I mean, there's -- you know somebody may be on vacation, or somebody may be in a trial in another county or another circuit. And so there's always that issue.

And to me, the biggest issue is just if you had a trial. And of course family court's different, so we often have temporary hearings or motion hearings which are fifteen to thirty minutes. And those don't -- aren't that big of a deal to schedule. It's just when you have a multi-day trial is where I've had the issue when there's a lawyer legislator involved.

CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I'd like to just add my own experience with scheduling a trial in the family court context. I had a two-week trial with Mr. Bannister, that we had to split over -- actually, there was a two-week gap in the middle of it.

1	Anyway, Judge Turner, we certainly
2	appreciate you being here and you offering for service.
3	Are there any more questions from the Commission?
4	(Hearing none.)
5	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I don't have any more
6	questions for you, Judge Turner. So this concludes this
7	portion of our screening process.
8	I do want to this opportunity to remind you
9	that pursuant to the Commission's evaluative criteria, the
10	Commission expects candidates to follow the spirit as well
11	as the letter of the ethics laws. And know that we will
12	view violations or the appearance of impropriety as serious
13	and potentially deserving of heavy weight in the screening
14	deliberations.
15	On that note, and as you know, the record
16	will remain open until the formal release of the report of
17	qualifications, and you may be called back at such time if
18	that need were to arise.
19	Again, I thank you for being here. I
20	appreciate your flexibility in scheduling. Thank you to
21	Megan, and Mr. Turner, for you guys being here. It's much
22	appreciated. And I wish you the best of the rest of your
23	day.
24	JUDGE TURNER: Thank you. I appreciate it.
25	Good to see you guys.

1	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir.
2	JUDGE TURNER: Thank you all.
3	(Candidate excused.)
4	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Senator Talley moves, and
5	Representative Jordan seconds, that we go into executive
6	session for a legal briefly. So without any questions, all
7	in favor signify by saying "aye".
8	(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
9	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All opposed "any"?
10	(Hearing none.)
11	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The "ayes" have it. The
12	Commission will go into executive session for a legal
13	briefing. And when we are done with that, we will resume
14	with the screening process.
15	(Executive session from 1:47 p.m. to 2:12 p.m.)
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Good afternoon, ladies and
17	gentlemen. We are back on the record. For the record,
18	while we were in executive session, no decisions were taken
19	and no votes were made. We only received a legal briefing.
20	We have now concluded that, and resume with our screening
21	process.
22	Next we have Ms. Whitney Harrison, who is
23	applying for Court of Appeals, Seat 9. Is that correct?
24	MS. HARRISON: That's correct.
25	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: If you would please raise

1	your right hand.
2	WHEREUPON,
3	WHITNEY B. HARRISON, being duly sworn and
4	cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing
5	but the truth.
6	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you. You should
7	have some documents there with you.
8	MS. HARRISON: Yes, sir.
9	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Are the personal data
10	questionnaire and the sworn statement before you, documents
11	that you have submitted to the Commission?
12	MS. HARRISON: Yes, sir.
13	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: And are they both correct,
14	or do they need any sort of updating?
15	MS. HARRISON: They are correct.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Do you object to our
17	making these documents a part of the record of your sworn
18	testimony?
19	MS. HARRISON: No, sir. No objection.
20	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: We'll go ahead and do
21	that. We'll mark those.
22	(EXHIBIT NO. 12 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
23	COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF WHITNEY
24	BOYKIN HARRISON)
25	(EXHIBIT NO. 13 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION

1 COMMISSION PERSONAL SWORN STATEMENT OF WHITNEY 2 BOYKIN HARRISON) 3 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The Judicial Merit 4 Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on 5 6 the nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box 7 survey, a thorough study of your application materials, 8 verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a 9 search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a 10 study of previous screenings, and a check for economic 11 conflicts of interest. We have received one affidavit filed in 12 13 opposition to your election. And one witness is present to 14 testify. At this point, we are going to entertain that 15 complainant, to hear that person now. And so I will 16 recognize Mr. Dennis for riding herd over that process. 17 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Brumbach, if you wouldn't 18 mind coming forward, please. And, Mr. Chairman, if you 19 wouldn't mind swearing him, when he comes to the podium. 20 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Brumbach, if you would 21 please raise your right hand. 22 WHEREUPON, 23 WILLIAM BRUMBACH, being duly sworn and 24 cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing 25 but the truth.

1	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir.
2	MR. DENNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And
3	for everybody else's information, Mr. Brumbach's affidavit,
4	and the documents that were submitted with it, as well as
5	Ms. Harrison's written response, have been provided to all
6	members of the Commission, and are going to be made a part
7	of the record at this point in the transcript.
8	(EXHIBIT NO. 14 - AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM
9	KEEFER BRUMBACH)
LO	MR. DENNIS: So as the chairman said,
11	there's a single affidavit filed in opposition to Ms.
12	Harrison's candidacy by Mr. William Brumbach. A copy of
13	the affidavit, as well as the attachments, has been
L4	provided to the Commission members ahead of time.
15	In summary, Mr. Brumbach's allegations arise
L6	from domestic litigation in which Harrison represented Mr.
17	Brumbach's ex-wife, for the purposes of matters either
18	appealed from the trial court or brought separately in the
19	Supreme Court.
20	Both Mr. Brumbach and Ms. Harrison
21	acknowledge that Ms. Harrison had no involvement in the
22	trial aspects of this litigation.
23	In this instance, Mr. Brumbach filed a writ,
24	asking the State Supreme Court to review the issuance of a
25	temporary order made by the family court. Ms. Harrison

1 responded to Mr. Brumbach's writ with a return motion to 2 dismiss and motion for sanctions on behalf of her client. 3 Mr. Brumbach's writ was filed pro se. 4 Ultimately, Ms. Harrison's motion to dismiss 5 prevailed at the Supreme Court, based on the fact that Mr. 6 Brumbach was otherwise represented in the matter, and, 7 therefore, could not proceed pro se at the Supreme Court. 8 It is the content of Ms. Harrison's filing 9 that gives rise to the complaint before the Commission, 10 However, Mr. Brumbach alleges that Ms. Harrison's 11 use of language and disputed facts in her filing amounted 12 to in his words, ladies and gentlemen, a character 13 assassination; that the use of this information was 14 unnecessary for the representation of her client, on a 15 discreet point of law, and served only to inflame passions 16 rather than settle a discreet legal question before the 17 court. 18 As he's going to explain further, Mr. 19 Brumbach alleges that these tactics indicate that Ms. 20 Harrison is not a suitable choice to be judge of a Court of 21 Appeals. Mr. Brumbach, does that fairly summarize the 22 facts around this matter? 23 MR. BRUMBACH: I think there's one 24 correction -- but you did an excellent job. But the one 25 correction I'd like the make, the motion to dismiss was

1 denied. The court denied my request to issue a writ, but 2 also denied the motion to dismiss. 3 MR. DENNIS: Yes, sir. I appreciate that 4 clarification. And I probably missed that somewhere in a myriad of work I'm not used to doing. 5 6 MR. BRUMBACH: Certainly. 7 MR. DENNIS: So, Mr. Brumbach, I'm going to 8 ask you, in a narrative form, if you'll just please explain 9 to the Commission why you're here, what it is about this that gives rise to concern, and how it's related to Ms. 10 11 Harrison's candidacy. 12 MR. BRUMBACH: Absolutely. Thank you. And 13 does this microphone work okay? I feel like I can't hear 14 myself very well. But, hopefully, it's projecting. 15 Thank you for taking a few minutes. 16 I'll be very brief here. And Mr. Dennis did an excellent 17 job of what occurred. But, yes, I -- my ex-wife and I got 18 a divorce in 2019, and she filed a petition to modify the 19 custody order. 20 She had a series of temporary hearings, and 21 in late -- or in the summer of 2022, she prevailed on a motion to have a temporary modification of our custody 22 23 So the litigation was still pending in the family 24 court, because the order was merely a temporary order. 25 But I wanted to challenge that temporary

1 order through the appellate process. And I did so, 2 pursuant to the way that the Supreme Court had said in 3 Terry v. Terry, to challenge temporary orders. 4 Because I am an attorney, myself, and 5 because my resources were running low, I wanted to proceed 6 pro se in the appellate courts. So I -- actually, I was 7 represented at the Court of Appeals. And when I went to 8 the Supreme Court, and asked the Supreme Court to issue a writ of certiorari, I represented myself. 9 10 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Brumbach, I don't want 11 to be -- I want to certainly afford you the latitude to 12 share your thoughts with the Commission because -- again, 13 we are charged with the evaluation of the candidate against 14 the nine criteria. We have the benefit of the documents 15 you've filed, and so I would ask you to jump to the part in 16 the story that is additive from what you've -- what you've 17 submitted so far. 18 Certainly. MR. BRUMBACH: 19 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: And I don't want to be 20 I just want to be equal in our administration of 21 process. 22 MR. BRUMBACH: Yes, sir. And I just wanted 23 to make sure that it was clear that, yeah, there was 24 litigation proceeding in the family court, which is where I 25 was represented, and I wished to proceed pro se before the

1 South Carolina Supreme Court. 2 So Ms. Harrison raised what I think was a 3 perfectly appropriate issue to raise. She raised the issue 4 of whether a litigant can be represented in the family 5 court and proceed pro se at the Supreme Court level. And 6 that was perfectly appropriate for her to raise that issue. 7 But if you look at the brief that she submitted, it's an 8 eight-page brief, and she gave two paragraphs to that 9 issue. 10 Again, the issue was can a candidate -- can 11 a litigant be represented in the family court while proceeding pro se in the Supreme Court. A very cerebral, 12 13 unemotional issue, and she gave two paragraphs of treatment 14 -- it was the first and second paragraph on the fourth page 15 of her brief, were the only two paragraphs where she gave 16 any treatment to that issue. And she -- again, it was a 17 valid issue to raise. She missed some complexities --18 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Again, what is the 19 evaluative criteria that you think we should assess her in 20 lacking, given your experience? 21 MR. BRUMBACH: And I'm not even sure what the evaluative criteria are. But what she did was she 22 23 showed that she does not understand that the appellate 24 process is for sober, disinterested legal analysis. And

she proceeded to make a jury argument, you know, which

1	again shows just a lack of understanding of what the
2	appellate process is about.
3	She also included in her jury argument,
4	facts that her own client had admitted, under oath, were
5	untrue. So she represented facts to the South Carolina
6	Supreme Court, that her own client had acknowledged, under
7	oath, were untrue.
8	So what she did, again, was she took what
9	should have been a very legal academic issue, devoted only
10	two paragraphs to the academic issue which is, you know,
11	the type of issue that appellate courts
12	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: So Mr. Brumbach, let me
13	ask you of the these are the nine criteria.
14	MR. BRUMBACH: Yes, sir.
15	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Again, I don't want to,
16	you know, impose my judgment
17	MR. BRUMBACH: Certainly.
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: on what you're
19	asserting here. The nine are: constitutional
20	qualifications or statutory requirements, ethical fitness,
21	professional and academic ability, character, reputation,
22	physical health, mental stability, experience, and judicial
23	temperament.
24	And in your view, your experience with Ms.
25	Harrison is that she lacks in which of these?

1	MR. BRUMBACH: Well, it's the could you
2	read those again? I'm sorry.
3	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, sir. Happy to.
4	Constitutional qualifications or statutory requirements
5	qualifications or requirements that's that you had to
6	been a lawyer for eight years
7	MR. BRUMBACH: Yes, sir.
8	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: ethical fitness,
9	professional and academic ability, character, reputation,
10	physical health
11	MR. BRUMBACH: There we go. It's the
12	professional and academic ability, and that and the
13	character.
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you.
15	MR. BRUMBACH: The professional and academic
16	ability, because she misunderstood that appellate courts
17	care about sober, academic legal issues, and not jury
18	arguments and personal attacks.
19	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, sir.
20	MR. BRUMBACH: And it's the character,
21	because she represented
22	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you.
23	MR. BRUMBACH: facts to the
24	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Again, I don't want to be
25	

1	MR. BRUMBACH: Okay.
2	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: rude in any sense.
3	But, you know, we have 82 more candidates we have to get
4	to. We do have the benefit of the documents you've
5	submitted, so the Commission has the ability to review
6	those. I think you've made a point of where your
7	objections are.
8	And, Mr. Dennis, I'll turn it back over to
9	you for anything further.
10	MR. DENNIS: I was going to let him if
11	there are any more questions of anybody else on the
12	Commission, I do think we probably ought to allow Mr.
13	Brumbach closing
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Certainly.
15	MR. DENNIS: and wrap it up.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Certainly.
17	MR. BRUMBACH: Yeah. I mean, I think the
18	apparently, you've read the documents. I don't have much
19	to add to the documents, other than what I've said, today,
20	and the fact that Ms. Harrison, when afforded the chance to
21	file a reply brief, after I had pointed out that she had
22	misrepresented facts to the South Carolina Supreme Court,
23	she chose not to file a reply brief.
24	Which I don't understand how any attorney
25	who's been who has had it pointed out, that she

1	misrepresented facts to the Supreme Court, would not file a
2	reply brief to correct that.
3	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir. I
4	appreciate it. Any further questions from members of the
5	Commission?
6	SENATOR RANKIN: And, Mr. Brumbach, I've
7	never met you before. And I an certainly not skilled in
8	the field of appellate law beyond the basics. Do you
9	practice in the appellate courts, yourself?
10	MR. BRUMBACH: Not regularly. I have
11	clerked in the appellate courts, and I consider myself
12	knowledgeable of the appellate process.
13	SENATOR RANKIN: And not that it should be
14	so arcane that you shouldn't get it readily but and I'm
15	sure we're going to hear an explanation of that. In terms
16	of the prejudice to you, that you are hanging your hat on
17	with these two this now, I would say, recognized of the
18	nine evaluative criteria how have you or were you
19	prejudiced in this process?
20	MR. BRUMBACH: You know, I'm not even here
21	to talk about how I was prejudiced. I mean, the idea
22	why I want to be here is because I want the South Carolina
23	Court of Appeals to have the absolute best judges it can
24	possibly have.
25	And somebody who has misunderstood what the

1	appellate process is about, and has called her moral
2	character into question by misrepresenting facts to the
3	Supreme Court, I don't think is somebody who should be on
4	the South Carolina Court of Appeals.
5	So it's not about whether I was prejudiced
6	at all. It's just about trying to give this committee the
7	information to select the best candidates for the Court of
8	Appeals.
9	SENATOR RANKIN: And, again, we've got the
10	complaint, and prejudice is not the end all be all. But
11	what I'm curious about is and I think you've exhausted
12	this, so I appreciate your
13	MR. BRUMBACH: Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir. We really
15	appreciate you making time in being here today. I know
16	it's not easy, so thank you.
17	MR. BRUMBACH: Yes, sir. Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Harrison, if you would
19	come back to podium.
20	Ms. Harrison, if you would raise your hand -
21	- your right hand.
22	WHEREUPON,
23	WHITNEY B. HARRISON, being duly sworn and
24	cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing
25	but the truth.

1	MR. DENNIS: Ms. Harrison, you've heard what
2	Mr. Brumbach's had to say to the Commission, today, and the
3	questions that they have asked. You've also been provided
4	the affidavit and the supporting documentation. And of
5	course you're familiar with the litigant, having been a
6	lawyer in the matter.
7	(EXHIBIT NO. 15 - WRITTEN RESPONSE OF
8	WHITNEY BOYKIN HARRISON)
9	MR. DENNIS: I know that you have also
10	provided a written reply to the Commission that they have.
11	Do you have anything that you need to add in response to
12	what you've heard, today, or what you've read in the
13	documents?
14	MS. HARRISON: Yes, please. I'll be brief.
15	Relocation is one of the hardest issues that I have dealt
16	with in practice, and that's because it's not just that Mom
17	and Dad are getting a divorce and kids are going to live in
18	two households.
19	Everything is changing. The norm, the way
20	this family will function. There's going to be a lot of
21	distance in the travel. And it's hard and it's
22	heartbreaking. And the way that people handle hard things
23	and grief need to be honored.
24	But it is somebody's life. And that's
25	something that we deal with every single day. As lawyers,

1 you as JMSC, me as a candidate to be a judge, what we all 2 have in common is that we have to recognize that it's 3 people, and the way that they feel about things is always 4 going to be paramount. 5 And that space can exist, while also I can 6 be in a space where I acted in character and in 7 professionalism and in integrity. And while I did provide 8 a writeup of the legal analysis on the four emergency 9 appeals that were filed on a temporary order, in under nine 10 months, I do what to squarely address why I didn't file a 11 reply. 12 And it's simply because it's understood in 13 the South Carolina appellate practice, and a motions 14 practice, specifically, we don't engage in a he said/she 15 said narrative. 16 It's also well settled law in South Carolina, that when you have conflicting testimony, which 17 18 inevitably in family law it's always conflicting, you can 19 submit two affidavits on one side, two can be submitted on the other. You simply provide those materials to the 20 21 court. 22 Whether it's the family court or the appellate

that, you leave it to the fact-finder and the rule-maker to

court, sitting in the de novo posture, and when they do

23

24

25

make that decision.

1	But at the end of the day, I stand by the
2	fact that I filed a motion to dismiss. It was proper. And
3	I believe it was proper to also file for sanctions, given
4	the number of filings and the abuse of the appellate
5	process.
6	And I think that if I had not filed, it
7	would have been malpractice not to be an advocate for my
8	client in that setting. I'm happy to answer any other
9	questions.
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Are there any questions
11	from members of the Commission with respect to this issue?
12	(Hearing none.)
13	MR. DENNIS: Thank you, Ms. Harrison. At
14	this point, Mr. Chairman, if it suits you, we'll head to
15	the remainder of the hearing.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Just before we do, I want
17	to give Ms. Harrison an opportunity to make a brief
18	statement, if you'd like to. And before you do that, even,
19	I see some folks who've come with you today. If you want
20	to introduce them, we'd be happy to hear from them.
21	MS. HARRISON: Sure. Thank you. Today, I
22	have my brother and sister-in-law, Trey and Helen Harrison,
23	along with one of my law partners, Erin Stuckey.
24	I have no opening remarks, other than to say
25	it's great to be here with all of you again, and just what

an outstanding staff you have; they are just a pleasure to 1 2 work with. And so I'm ready if y'all are ready. CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Great. Thank you very 3 4 And thank you all, to, for being here. Mr. Dennis. 5 MR. DENNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 note for the record that based on the testimony contained 7 in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the 8 record with the candidate's consent, Ms. Harrison meets the 9 constitutional or statutory requirements for this position 10 regarding age, residence, and years of practice. 11 EXAMINATION BY MR. DENNIS: 12 0. Ms. Harrison, could you explain to the Commission 13 why it is that you'd like to be a judge on the Court of 14 Appeals? 15 Α. So I love the law. Especially appellate 16 practice. For me, there is nothing better than finding 17 something that you're passionate about and getting to do 18 that every single day. And for me, I delight in nuance and 19 complexity and the idea of helping people. 20 And so when I think about what it is that I want 21 to do for the next twenty to forty years in practice, I 22 want to serve, and I want to make a difference for people. 23 And I see that serving on the Court of Appeals would allow 24 me to help people in a broader way.

And so I want to serve because I love it and I

1 | love our court system.

- Q. Ms. Harrison, can you describe for the Commission how you feel your legal and professional experience up to this point will assist you to be effective on the Court of Appeals?
- A. So I've had the privilege of clerking at both of South Carolina's appellate courts. And in private practice, I've handled more than sixty appeals as lead counsel. Through that process I have worked on every type of issue and case that will come before both the Court of Appeals and in the Supreme Court.

I've also handled extraordinary writs supersedeas, which are either emergency appeals, novel issues in just everyday cases. Outside of the appellate context, I have tried multiple cases to verdict, most of those being medication malpractice cases.

I've also worked on more than three class actions, and also in complex cases that involved multi-district litigation. And all in all, I've had the ability to arbitrate, mediate, try and appeal.

And because of that, I think I've had a wide variety of experiences that will give me context to better understand not only where the lawyers are arguing from, understanding the difficulties that sometimes when you make motions and deal with preservation issues, but also where

the judge is coming from. And I think that, overall, that gives me a really well rounded experience.

## Q. Ms. Harrison, would you describe your general judicial philosophy?

A. Sure. So I believe that I am a textualist and a minimalist. And what I mean by that is that I firmly believe in the cardinal rules of statutory construction. I think that a court can only go as far as what the General Assembly has said. And that's based on public policy, as well as expressed law by the General Assembly.

I also think it's important to be a minimalist. Because oftentimes, when you have an issue before you, if you have one, two, three of those issues, they can be kind of complex, and we only need to get to the issue as far as that one case will go.

And my reasoning behind that is while we can sit here all day and talk about hypotheticals, we could brainstorm for hours, and the reality is we still wouldn't always squarely be able to align what the issue was.

And so if we make that sure we're only ruling on issues that are actually needing to be addressed, we're going to make sure that the law is tight and we're going to make sure that we're actually addressing what's before us and not stepping too far outside the line.

Q. Thank you, Ms. Harrison. And can you explain to

what extent you believe a judge should or should not defer to an active general assembly?

- A. I think it's a requirement that there is deference. It is the express law of our state. And so the role of the judiciary is simply to interpret the law and follow the rule of laws written by the General Assembly.
- Q. Thank you. Ms. Harrison, the Commission received 353 ballot box surveys regarding you, and 96 of those contained individualized written comments. The majority of these comments spoke positively of your ability and integrity.

However, nine of these comments expressed concerns. Primarily, the concerns that were raised were about your experience and your relative youth, indicating that you were not yet prepared for a seat on the Court of Appeals. How would you respond to these criticisms?

A. At the outset, let me say that I think there should always be pause if a candidate is under the age of 40, and applying for the Court of Appeals. I think those concerns are especially valid if you don't know me. And I'm grateful for the opportunity to address it.

I think -- oftentimes, we think that age equates to wisdom. And we think that because oftentimes this wisdom represents that you've had a certain number of experiences, as well as emotional maturity that oftentimes

1 | you can only get with life.

For me, I think that my -- both my personal and my professional experience allows me to be an outlier. I talked a little bit, today, about the highlights of my professional experience. And while those are so important to me, and I'm proud to have had these variety of experiences, what I'm most proud about is the fact that lawyers from across the state hire me and invite me into their cases because they trust me.

And certainly, I think it's because of my intellect, but I also think it's because of who I am and the character that I have. They know that when I argue on their behalf, that I'm going to have it squarely before the court.

I'm never going to use inflammatory language.

I'm going to use reason. I'm going to push back and have a backbone when it's necessary. And if they disagree with me -- and my trial counsel can certainly tell you, we get into some heated discussions at times.

But they know that we're going to get to the end result. And I think that my ability to do that is in a lot of ways based on my personal experiences.

I've shared in the PDQ, and even when I was here last year, a little bit about my health experiences, and the fact that at 24, I learned a lot about what it looks

1 like to decide what you're going to do with a year of your 2 life. 3 I've looked death squarely in they eye. And what 4 I can tell you is that forever changed me. And I look at 5 it now, sixteen years later, stronger and healthier than 6 ever before. 7 And I will tell you it's the best thing that ever 8 happened to me, because it changed my perspective. I know 9 what it's like to hear things you don't want to hear. Ι 10 know what it's like to be in a room where people are 11 talking about you and not to you. 12 And what I've learned from all of that, it's the 13 dignity and the authenticity that you show people. 14 really what matters. 15 So whether we're in a medical context or we're 16 sitting in a courtroom, I know what it's like to be scared. 17 I know what it's like to feel like you don't have a voice 18 and you need someone to be there to hear you. 19 And I think that through all of those 20 experiences, it allows me to be just a bit of an outlier 21 when it comes to what we think is our norm of age. 22 Thank you, Ms. Harrison. I've got just a couple 0. 23 more things to run through with you. 24 MR. DENNIS: First, I'd like to note that 25 the Midlands Citizens Committee reported that Ms. Harrison

- was qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability, and well qualified as to the remaining criteria. The committee noted that Ms. Harrison is, quote, exceptionally qualified in their opinion.

  BY MR. DENNIS:

  O. And, Ms. Harrison, some quick housekeeping to run
  - Q. And, Ms. Harrison, some quick housekeeping to run through with you. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
- 10 A. No, sir. I have not.
  - Q. Are you familiar with Section 2-19-70, including the limitations on contacting members of the General Assembly regarding your screening?
- 14 A. I am.

7

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

- Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you sought or received the pledge or any legislature either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
- 19 A. I have not.
  - Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
- A. No, sir, I have not asked. And I'm unaware of anyone doing that.

## 1 Q. Thank you. 2 MR. DENNIS: Mr. Chairman, I would note for 3 the record that any concerns raised during the 4 investigation regarding the candidate were included into 5 the questioning of the today. 6 And I have no more questions and will turn it back over to you. 7 8 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir. 9 appreciate that. Do any members of the Commission have 10 questions for Ms. Harrison? Senator Rankin. 11 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN: 12 0. Ms. Harrison, we've met before in your last 13 candidacy and run for this office. And I have asked --14 earlier today, there were a couple of other young 15 candidates, all very similarly aged that -- about youth. 16 And that is a attribute versus a detraction from your 17 candidacy. 18 The last -- next to the last candidate I asked, I 19 think, had five full arguments in private practice, three 20 since his job change, eight total if I'm correct. You said 21 you had argued sixty cases before the Supremes or the Court 22 of Appeals, or who? 23 I've handled more than sixty appeals. argued more than twenty times. And that's a combined 24 25

number between the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals.

1 I'm not exactly sure how many times I've argued at the 2 Supreme Court. I feel confident it's more than five, but I 3 don't want to lead you astray and give you a wrong number. 4 So the sixty -- and I misheard you. 5 participated in a briefing of --6 Α. The briefing -- a lot of times, cases will be 7 decided merely on the briefs, or if it's a situation 8 whether we file a motion. And so in those sixty, I served 9 as lead counsel. It just kind of varies whether or not 10 they give argument to those cases. 11 In my other questioning of the candidate, I cited 0. 12 Blake Hewitt, who is on the bench that you hope to ascend 13 to, who at that point -- and you may know the number -- had 14 participated, argued, or briefed more cases than anyone 15 I've ever heard. Do you know what his number is? 16 I think his number is more than a hundred. Α. 17 Q. Not those now that he is sitting on the --18 Correct. I remember at his investiture, they Α. 19 said the number. And it was quite impressive, but it does 20 not surprise me. Blake is a standout in everything that he 21 does. 22 So between now and this election, you hope to get 0.

Q. So between now and this election, you hope to get forty more?

23

24

25

A. I sure hope not. I enjoy sleeping and a little bit of a personal life. But if called to do it, I'm ready

1 to do it. 2 Q. Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. McIver. It's been a 4 long day, already. I apologize. 5 MS. MCIVER: No worries. I understand. 6 Thank you very much. Part of what Senator Rankin just 7 touched on were some issues that I wanted to point out too. 8 I noticed, too, Senator Rankin, her age and 9 -- the age of some of the other candidates that are hoping 10 to ascend to this position. And I did want to point out 11 some of the letters that you have in your letters of 12 reference, because they do come from such a varied group of 13 people. 14 You've got a former president of one of our 15 independent university, Presbyterian College, a general counsel for one of our major corporations here, a lawyer on 16 17 the plaintiff's side, a lawyer on the defense side, and all 18 of them sing your praises for your leadership, your 19 intellect, your service, your work ethic, your legal mind, 20 creative arguments. 21 And I think the number of appeals that 22 you've handled, as well as the number that you've actually 23 argued at oral argument, show that you have the experience 24 that it takes to put yourself up for this. And so I want

to thank you for putting yourself up to do this.

1 I know that this process can be daunting. 2 know that you've been through this process before. But I 3 just want to thank you for coming forward and being willing 4 to serve. 5 MS. HARRISON: Thank you. 6 Any other members of the CHAIRMAN CASKEY: 7 Commission have questions? Mr. Safran. 8 MR. SAFRAN: Just briefly. 9 EXAMINATION BY MR. SAFRAN: 10 0. We appreciate you being here. Just for 11 clarification, what I think we're all understanding is, is 12 that a bunch of cases may get briefed at the appellate 13 courts, but not all of them get to the argument stage. 14 And so when you're saying the sixty, those are 15 cases that you've at least been involved in trying to get 16 the paperwork and the briefing done, and then some 17 percentage of those actually get heard as far as oral 18 argument. 19 Α. Yes, sir. That's correct. And so the twenty 20 that I named, those would be the twenty that I argued. 21 the reason why that number stands out is, as a young 22 lawyer, Chief Justice Toal shared with me, that you know you've really made it if you've argued at least twenty 23 24 times before the South Carolina appellate courts, because 25 you represented less than one percent of the South Carolina Bar.

And so, candidly, I stopped counting once I hit twenty, because I was a little bit of a -- competitive with myself on that. And so for me, I felt comfortable, once I hit twenty, I needed to not worry so much about getting to that point. But I have argued at least twenty times.

- Q. Right. And I guess, basically, you've kind of followed the same pattern, I guess, that Mr. Nicols had done, and Mr. Hewitt, where you've kind of somebody that people look to, to basically help out when the case gets to the appellate level.
- A. Yes, sir. And I would say the only variation that I have between John and Blake, is that I've gotten actually brought in earlier than most appellate lawyers. And so I'm actually part of the litigant in some of the bigger cases, like Santee Cooper and SCE&G. And as a result, I don't have as high of numbers.

But I think it's because I can really identify segments of time where I was working for two to three years at a portion where I wasn't taking on any other appeals.

But I think that's honestly given me a lot more flexibility and a better appreciation of the law, and in a lot of ways, what trial lawsuits are up to every day.

And it means a lot to me, that I've been in the trenches, so that I can better understand their issues as

 $1 \mid \text{well.}$ 

- Q. Well, and I guess, basically, if you were at that level involved, you can help more or less create the records you're ultimately going to have to defend at some point.
- A. That's right. It's a lot easier when you feel good about the record versus being handed the record.
- Q. Well, that's tough. Let me ask you this -- and I -- you know, I guess this is the old \$64,000 question -- and, obviously, I should have maybe brought it up earlier to others.

In my point of reference, it's very unusual and unique to see the number of people who are offering on the Court of Appeals, and they're not 40 yet, or they're right at or in their early 40s. That's not how it used to be.

I think over the course of years, you usually had people that had a greater degree of years in. What's now, I guess, the reason why everybody wants to start out so early?

A. Well, I would say I think there's been a really big shift, nationally, as far as how appellate practice is treated. It's no longer something that you just aspire to. Instead, it's an entire practice group.

And so when you look at what is a great appellate practitioner, it's not that you know all the areas of law,

it's that you have the skill set to come in and say I'm not afraid that I haven't dealt with this particular issue. I know that I have of the experiences to be able to jump in, read as much case law as I need to and become adapted into whatever that issue is. And so I think there's a preference with that.

I'm grateful to know the other two candidates in my race. And they're just outstanding gentlemen, and they also clerked at appellate courts, and so I think there's probably a level of fondness and appreciation that this has become a practice area, and it's something that people have fallen in love with.

I'll say for myself, when I look at how you really make a difference in South Carolina, and I look at it from the judiciary standpoint, I think that the bench and Bar deserve a long period of time from a jurist.

And so to be able to say I'm committed to thirty years of writing strong opinions, that's beneficial to any side of the Bar that you want to look through. And that's because it let's business know these are -- these are how the rulings are going to be, it let's plaintiff's lawyers make the assessment.

And so I see it as a real benefit, if you get the right people in there, and people who are passionate and care about the area, it doesn't get much better than that.

- Q. Well, I think -- I guess the flip side of what
  you just said is, is that -- you know, in going through
  this process now, as long as you don't do anything that
  would be untoward or beyond what would be the appropriate
  behavior, you're basically asking for a commitment from the
  state of thirty years-plus. I mean, that's a big jump,
  isn't it?
  - A. It is a big jump. And I think that's the import of this very system that we have. I think that we have -- y'all are our third interview, and that's because you recognize the gravity of what our ask is of hoping to service, as well as what the expectation is.
  - Q. Let me just ask one last thing. We had Judge
    Turner here, earlier, and something that we touched on that
    was important to me is this: Would you agree that the Court
    of Appeals ultimately is really kind of the last guaranteed
    stop for, basically, the common man litigant in South
    Carolina?
    - A. Absolutely.

- Q. I mean, this is where -- whether it be family court, probate court, workers' comp, just tort actions -- I mean, this is what really -- those are the areas that impact every man, correct?
- 24 A. That's correct.
  - Q. And so, really, that is a place where I'm

assuming that people need to be very cognizant of kind of how important those cases are in terms of how they affect the general public, correct?

A. Oh, I completely agree. I think it's your last chance to be heard. It's rare to get certiorari granted at the Supreme Court, if you're not a big name or you don't have some type of novel issue. It's the last time someone will get their due.

The Court of Appeals has a song that was written by judges, many years ago, called The Wonderful Court of Appeals. And in it there's a discussion of how it's the mule court and its purpose is -- they're there to do the work, they don't have the fancy titles, they don't -- don't sit on high with mule ultra, but what they do, do is they do the work of every type of area of law.

And I just -- I've always loved that -- that it's nine people there, knowing that their job is to show up and grind and make sure that everyone has their chance to be heard that they feel good about the fairness of that ruling.

Q. Well, and just along those lines, do you feel like you've had enough of the hands-on as it relates to those areas of practice, that, you know, you first that it be not just a matter of going and looking in a book, but actually having been there, to be able to see what

## oftentimes is the practical side of ruling in these cases?

A. I do. I mean, I certainly will acknowledge that I haven't been seated as a lower court judge. But that being said, I've handled almost every type of area of law you can think of from death penalty to business litigant to medical malpractice to nursing home.

I've fought arbitration and won arbitration.

I've lost arbitration. I think so much about being good lawyer is knowing when you're going to lose, and losing with grace, and recognizing where you need to improve.

I've fallen on my face, but I've also been successful. And I think it's that entire experience and being willing to stand up and argue at a podium, I think, matters more now than ever.

If you look at the number of people that are actually going into trial, it's very few. And so for me, it really matters -- and it mattered -- even last year, before I came to apply, I didn't want to come see y'all before I had tried more than five cases to verdict.

And I wanted those to be complex cases, because I wanted to be able to fully understand the good parts of trial, the bad parts of trial, and what the judge is thinking, and what it's like to sit there and wait with your client.

Also, just the difficulties of how do you sustain

for two and a half weeks. That's a lot of Cliff bars and a whole lot of diet Coke. And I think there's something to be said for understanding that and living that before asking to ever be able to call balls or strikes at the Court of Appeals.

- Q. And, lastly, I think that -- when I first has the privilege of being here, I heard Mr. Nichols testify. And particularly in just terms of having prior judicial experience, I think what he said was is that at an appellate level, it's really a different skill set than what you're going to need at a trial level. So the fact is -- because you haven't sat as a circuit court judge before, I don't think that's necessarily a detriment. Do you?
- A. I don't. And I agree with Mr. Nichols' viewpoint. And it's just the reality is just it's very different inquiry; we're operating under a standard of review.

And that's actually what I've had extensive training in, having clerked at both appellate courts. I've spent more than three years, growing up in the appellate court system here in South Carolina. And I've also stood before them, and having to write bench memos as a law clerk, and certainly writing briefs; it's understanding the posture and it's understanding the lense upon which the court can actually rule upon.

1 And so I would hope that, that experience would 2 actually ensure that I was efficient and able to get to 3 those rulings even faster because that's where kind of 4 where my brain has been taught to work. 5 Q. Well, understanding the practical implications of 6 how rulings may end up more or less changing things. 7 Α. Absolutely. 8 0. Thank you. 9 Α. Thank you. CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Other members of the 10 11 Commission? 12 (Hearing none.) 13 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Harrison, thank you so 14 much for being here today, for making yourself available as 15 you've gone through this entire process. It's a lot. 16 we thank you for offering for service. 17 So let me just take this last opportunity to remind you that pursuant to the Commission's evaluative 18 19 criteria, the Commission expects candidates to follow the 20 spirit as well as the letter of the ethics laws, and we 21 will view violations or the appearance of impropriety as 22 serious and potentially deserving of heavy weight in the 23 screening deliberations. 24 On that note, and as you may know, the 25 record will remain open until the formal release of the

report of qualifications, and you may be called back at
such time if that need were to arise.
And thank you for offering for service to
the state. And I appreciate your time today.
MS. HARRISON: Thank you so much. Y'all
have a great day.
CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All right. Ladies and
gentleman, the Commission will stand at ease for about two
minutes, so we can reshuffle some of these papers. You
don't need to leave the room or anything. Just a couple
quick minutes before we get set to go again.
(A recess was taken from 2:49 p.m. to 2:56 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Judge Bromell Holmes, good
afternoon. Thank you
JUDGE HOLMES: Good afternoon.
CHAIRMAN CASKEY: for being here. If you
would please raise your right hand.
WHEREUPON,
THE HONORABLE JAN B. BROMELL HOLMES, being
duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole
truth and nothing but the truth.
CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, ma'am. There
should be some documents there in front of you. If you

1	would take a gander at those. Are the personal data
2	questionnaire and the sworn statement before you, the
3	documents that you submitted to the Commission?
4	JUDGE HOLMES: They are.
5	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Are they both correct? Or
6	does there need to be any amendments?
7	JUDGE HOLMES: They are correct.
8	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Do I understand object to
9	our making these documents a part of your a part of the
10	record of your sworn testimony?
11	JUDGE HOLMES: I do not.
12	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: We'll go ahead and do that
13	now, mark those.
14	(EXHIBIT NO. 16 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
15	COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE
16	HONORABLE JAN B. BROMELL HOLMES)
17	(EXHIBIT NO. 17 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
18	COMMISSION AMENDED PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF
19	THE HONORABLE JAN B. BROMELL HOLMES)
20	(EXHIBIT NO. 18 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
21	COMMISSION PERSONAL SWORN STATEMENT OF THE
22	HONORABLE JAN B. BROMELL HOLMES)
23	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The Judicial Merit
24	Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your
25	qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on

1	the nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box
2	survey, a thorough study of your application materials,
3	verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a
4	search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a
5	study of previous screenings, and a check for economic
6	conflicts of interest.
7	We have received five affidavits filed in
8	opposition to your election. And there are five witnesses
9	present here, today, to testify. At this point I'm going
10	to recognize Ms. Foster to bring those folks forward, so we
11	can hear those out at this time.
12	You're welcome to have a seat just behind
13	you. Ms. Foster.
14	MS. FOSTER: Ms. Nicol, I would ask you to
15	approach.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Nicol, if you would
17	please raise your right hand.
18	WHEREUPON,
19	SHANDA NICOL, being duly sworn and cautioned
20	to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the
21	truth.
22	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, ma'am.
23	MS. FOSTER: Ms. Nicol, the Commission has
24	before it, your affidavit of complaint, which I
25	respectfully request be made part of the record at this

1	time.
2	(EXHIBIT NO. 19 - AFFIDAVIT OF SHANDA NICOL)
3	MS. FOSTER: The purpose of today's hearing
4	is for the Commission to review the qualifications of the
5	candidates, to determine whether Judge Bromell Holmes is
6	qualified to be on the Court of Appeals. The Commission is
7	not here to re-litigate a case. They do not have the
8	ability to change the result of your case.
9	Ms. Nicol, you submitted your affidavit,
	· ·
10	which the Commission is reviewing. Is there anything else
11	you wish to testify to specifically regarding Judge
12	Bromell Holmes' ethics, competency, or character that
13	has not already been covered in the documents before the
14	Commission?
15	MS. NICOL: There may be a few items that
16	I've prepared, that may not be specific in my affidavit.
17	But it is very similar.
18	MS. FOSTER: Would you like to offer that
19	testimony now?
20	MS. NICOL: Sure. Do you want me to just go
21	ahead with what I was prepared with today or
22	MS. FOSTER: Yes, ma'am.
23	MS. NICOL: Okay. Thank you again for
24	having me here today. This will actually be my second time
25	petitioning and appealing to the JMSC regarding Judge

1 Bromell Holmes. 2 I believe there's a difference in desiring 3 to be promoted, which is one thing. There's also deserving 4 to be promoted, which is quite another. And today I am 5 going to be speaking on ethical fitness and professional 6 and academic ability, character, and reputation. 7 Under the ethical fitness category, it would 8 be the responsibility of Judge Bromell Holmes, you know, 9 obviously, to see cases objectively and without bias, and 10 to comply with the code of judicial conduct. 11 Specifically, Canon 3 cites that a judge 12 should be patient, dignified, respectful, and act according 13 to the law. Under the professional and academic ability, a 14 judge should be well versed in the legal principles, 15 procedural, and evidentiary rules. 16 Under character, I have ethic -- ethical standards and work habits should be scrutinized. And Judge 17 18 Bromell Holmes' reputation in Horry County, South Carolina, 19 is that Holmes is a home wrecker. And as awful as that may 20 sound, and I hate to have to say that out loud, on 21 September 15th, 2021, Judge Bromell Holmes oversaw my case. 22 She has lived up to her reputation, at least

Garber Reporting info@garberreporting.com

in my particular situation. Sadly, her decisions in court

on this particular day effected the lives of two innocent

children; they were both under the age of 5 years old.

23

24

1 Her temperament in court has changed the 2 entire trajectory of my life, my children's lives, my 3 husband, my entire family negatively. I sought the courts 4 for protection day when Judge Bromell Holmes was overseeing 5 my case. Due to her short temper, her disregard for 6 7 the evidence that was submitted, the lack of her critical 8 thinking skills, she has disrupted the status quo in a 9 nanosecond, in a fifteen-minute hearing. The entire status 10 quo for my children's lives were completely disrupted. 11 She did not apply the law, the South 12 Carolina Code 63-15-240, which could have been applied in 13 my situation. There were seventeen criteria that could 14 have been used to protect our children in a domestic 15 violence situation. 16 Judge Bromell Holmes, unfortunately, did not deliberate the facts of my case. She did not discern the 17 18 matters, and she made some very irrational decisions. 19 was obvious --20 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Nicol. 21 MS. NICOL: Yes. 22 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Let me just pause there. 23 I appreciate the gravity of the issue that we're dealing 24 with, and certainly want to empathize and afford some 25 latitude for your testimony.

1 Our rules require that the testimony be 2 additive to the matters that have already been submitted, 3 meaning that we -- we have the allegations, we have the 4 complaint. And so what we need at this stage in these 5 proceedings are things that we don't have in the complaint. 6 And at this point -- again, I don't want to be rude or 7 disrespectful. I'm happy to hear out what else -- and I 8 9 think I speak for the rest of the commissioners, who say 10 we'd like to hear what you have in addition to the written 11 matters that have been entered into the record. 12 And so we'll take a couple of minutes here 13 to get where we got to get, but I think it's important that 14 we not just re-verbalize what we already have in the 15 record. 16 MS. NICOL: I didn't believe that I had put 17 all of those things into my affidavit, specifically. 18 apologize if that's not the case. I was speaking 19 specifically to Judge Bromell Holmes' reputation and her character at this point, which is part of the criteria 20 21 today. So I can kind of --22 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, ma'am. We appreciate 23 And I -- we had a matter earlier where I 24 specifically made a request to -- a direction. 25 appreciate that.

1 MS. NICOL: Yeah. CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I'm just asking you to 2 3 jump to the part about -- that will provide some additional 4 information to the committee with specificity, if you 5 could. 6 MS. NICOL: I believe Judge Bromell Holmes 7 relied on the sway of the lawyers in the court hearing versus relying upon the facts of evidence that were 8 9 presented. 10 I believe if we're talking about Judge 11 Bromell Holmes moving up to the appellate court, my 12 understanding would be that the appellate court doesn't 13 always have live testimony. So we're relying heavily on 14 facts and evidence and we're relying on documentation. 15 In the lower courts, I provided all of those 16 things to Judge Bromell Holmes. And it was disregarded. 17 So my concern would be that if Judge Bromell Holmes is not 18 reviewing evidence appropriately in the lower courts, can 19 she do that in a higher court situation where we're heavily 20 relying on that. 21 I understand in my situation she became very 22 frazzled in court, and she kind of threw her hands up and 23 just cut the baby in half. But these are real peoples' lives. And when documentation of significant value is 24 25 placed before a judge in the appellate court, from someone

1 in the lower courts who are seeking advocacy or justice or 2 mercy, can Judge Bromell Holmes do that? Can she do that? 3 I don't know. She certainly didn't do that at the lower 4 courts. 5 Typically, when we promote somebody, we're 6 promoting them based on meeting criteria, being able to 7 advance to the next level. So if we're talking about 8 giving Judge Bromell Holmes a promotion and advancement, we 9 should heavily weigh what did not occur in the lower 10 courts. 11 Perhaps, Judge Bromell Holmes needs more 12 time. Maybe she needs more time in the lower courts to 13 rectify the things that have gone on unaccounted for, so 14 that we don't have people like myself looking to a higher 15 court situation and already having the reputation of Holmes 16 as a home-wrecker. 17 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you. 18 MS. NICOL: That doesn't give me a lot of --19 that doesn't give me a lot of confidence. 20 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, ma'am. Do any 21 members of the Commission have questions for Ms. Nicol? 22 Senator Sabb. 23 SENATOR SABB: Thank you, moving. And thank 24 you, ma'am, for coming. What I heard -- or some of what I 25 heard was that you believe that there were errors of law

1	committed.
2	MS. NICOL: Yes.
3	SENATOR SABB: And you were represented by
4	counsel?
5	MS. NICOL: I was at the time.
6	SENATOR SABB: Yeah. And so, typically, the
7	way the system works is where the judge rules and the
8	litigants believe that there was an error of law committed,
9	then certainly not in the temporary realm, but for
10	extraordinary circumstances.
11	But ultimately at the outcome that's
12	determined by a judge inconsistent with the law, the
13	litigants have a right of appeal. You're aware of that,
14	right?
15	MS. NICOL: Yes, sir.
16	SENATOR SABB: And in your case, did you all
17	appeal the order?
18	MS. NICOL: My case is it's kind of an
19	anomaly, actually. So there was not an appeal that was
20	done. It would have been wonderful to have correct legal
21	proceedings in my case, from lawyers, from judges. I'm not
22	here to litigate my case, but I can certainly tell you that
23	did not happen.
24	SENATOR SABB: Yes, ma'am. And that's kind
25	of what I wanted to just zero in on. Because I mean, you

1	know, the way our system works and I've been practicing
2	law now for thirty-six years, and I've not always agreed
3	with the rulings of a particular jurist. And in some
4	instances we've appealed, and in other instances we've not.
5	I've not always agreed with the rulings of
6	our juries. But we give deference to them as fact-finders,
7	and then sometimes we appeal. Sometimes the appeals are
8	successful and sometimes they're not.
9	But I guess just on the issue of errors of
10	law being committed, you know, I just wanted to make sure
11	that the record was clear on the issue of whether or not
12	there were appeals.
13	SENATOR SABB: So thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14	That's the extent of my inquiry right now.
15	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, Senator Sabb.
16	Other questions from members of the Commission?
17	(Hearing none.)
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you very much, Ms.
19	Nicol. We appreciating you making the time
20	MS. NICOL: Thank you so much.
21	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: to be here and sharing
22	your input.
23	MS. NICOL: I appreciate it.
24	MS. FOSTER: Judge, would you like to share
25	a response?

1	JUDGE HOLMES: I did provide a written
2	statement. And I'm going to stand on my written statement.
3	This is a pending case. And I stand on the order that I
4	issued. I cannot make public comments concerning opinion
5	case.
6	MS. FOSTER: Thank you. Is Ms. Karon
7	Mitchell present?
8	MS. MITCHELL: Yes, ma'am, that's me. How
9	are you all?
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Good afternoon. Ms.
11	Mitchell, if you would raise your right hands.
12	WHEREUPON,
13	KARON MITCHELL, being duly sworn and
14	cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing
15	but the truth.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you very much. Ms.
17	Foster.
18	MS. FOSTER: Ms. Mitchell, the Commission
19	has before it, your affidavit of complaint, which I
20	respectfully request be made part of the record at this
21	time.
22	(EXHIBIT NO. 20 - AFFIDAVIT OF KARON
23	MITCHELL)
24	MS. FOSTER: The purpose of today's hearing
25	is for the Commission to review the qualifications of the

1	candidate, to determine whether Judge Bromell Holmes is
2	qualified to be on the Court of Appeals. The Commission is
3	not here to re-litigate a case, and they do not have the
4	ability to change the result of the case.
5	MS. MITCHELL: Yes, ma'am.
6	MS. FOSTER: Ms. Mitchell, you submitted
7	your affidavit, which the Commission is reviewing. Is
8	there anything else you wish to testify to, specifically
9	regarding Judge Bromell Holmes' ethics, competency,
10	character, that has not already been covered in the
11	documents before the Commission?
12	MS. MITCHELL: Yes, ma'am. I do for just a
13	few minutes. I'll try to be brief.
14	My name is Karon Mitchell. I'm a school
15	teacher, business person in Myrtle Beach. I am not a
16	lawyer, but I have always been a child advocate. And I had
17	something really bad to happen to me. I've never been in
18	court and everything before. It made me very it made me
19	very aware of how the court system worked.
20	I thought our system was honest. So from
21	there, I started having different people contact me about,
22	"Would you just go and sit with me? Would you help me?
23	Would you do this? Would you just help me to go through
24	this process?"
25	So I started going into family court,

1	sitting in the family courts, just stopping in to different
2	ones, or if somebody requested me go there me go there.
3	I don't do anything but sit, listen, take notes.
4	I am not there as a lawyer. I am not there
5	for representation or anything. I am just there to support
6	who is in there and who is I look at everything that is
7	going on.
8	From there it got so overwhelming that I
9	started a courtroom watchdog group. So this group is we
10	go in to sit, listen. And if we if something comes up,
11	or we notice that something is not right in the courtroom,
12	then we try to help we try to help that person.
13	We don't do any type of judicial legal
14	advice or anything. It's just, "We noticed this. You
15	check on it."
16	So it's overwhelming, the problems in family
17	court.
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Mitchell, I'm going to
19	give you plenty of chance to talk. I think you've done a
20	great job of, how you say, laying the foundation
21	MS. MITCHELL: Yes, sir.
22	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: for your perspective.
23	If you could take us to your observations of Judge Bromell
24	Holmes'
25	MS. MITCHELL: I'm going to so exactly like

```
1
    you said.
 2
                    CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All right. Thank you,
 3
    ma'am.
 4
                    MS. MITCHELL: All right. So here we go.
 5
     So when you go -- this is my opinion. When you go to
 6
     ethical, I believe that -- and I did not know Judge Holmes
 7
    before I started this process. I had no contact with her.
 8
    Didn't know her, didn't know her family, nothing about her.
 9
                    But what I have noticed in being in the
10
     courtroom is that, in my personal opinion as a -- as an
11
     observer, a teacher, and everything, is I don't think she's
12
    prepared. I don't think she's read the file. And that
13
     comes under ethical.
14
                    But I don't see impartiality. Because I
15
    know the players in Horry County, I know all the lawyers.
16
     I know which ones are the power ones, which ones aren't.
17
    And many times the case goes to who that attorney is. And
18
     I just started keeping count.
19
                    And so -- and so the second part is
20
    professional. I was in the courtroom one day, and she
21
     stated that a counselor's affidavit -- the affidavit had
22
     stated that the person in the courtroom had made a
23
     complaint to LLR. Judge Holmes referenced that complaint.
24
                    That complaint was from Roberta -- Roberta
25
    Vogle -- excuse me -- Bogle. I've got dry mouth.
```

1 sorry. And that is a counselor. The counselor broke the 2 law by putting LLR in her affidavit to go to the judge, and 3 then Judge Holmes referenced it in the courtroom against 4 the -- against the plaintiff. 5 And so that goes to professionalism. 6 need to know the law before you hold something against 7 someone. I mean, LLR is supposed to be -- you can't use it 8 It's supposed to be anonymous. It's a court of 9 your peers looking over it. And it's should not be ever 10 used against someone. If somebody feels so competent to 11 write in to LLR, that you -- you know, and that -- they 12 should be protected. 13 The last part is temperament and -- judicial 14 temperament. And so I'm in the courtroom that day, and I'm 15 -- Judge Bromell Holmes is this way, I'm to the right in 16 the courtroom just like this, and all of a sudden her 17 demeanor and her speech was -- you could just kind of tell 18 the a harshness of it. 19 And the lady to the right of me, she did 20 like this. And all of a sudden Judge Holmes flipped and 21 turned to the right and said something like, "See?" 22 And that is not the temperament of a judge 23 in the courtroom. She didn't -- I think she thought it was 24 me, but I don't know the woman -- I mean, I didn't know her 25 from anywhere other than just helping people who were

	contacting me.
2	I continued to go back, many times into her
3	courtroom, to sit. Sometimes called, not. And I just see
4	the three things and I will go back to her point. I see
5	ethical, I see maybe I see not prepared, impartial.
6	This is my this is my opinion. I see
7	professionalism, knowing the law, and I see judicial
8	temperament in how to treat these people that are going
9	to the courts are upset, their lives are being turned
10	upside down.
11	And you should show grace. You should
12	follow the law. I'm not saying to let people get in there
13	you should follow the law, but
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, ma'am. I do
15	appreciate that. Are there members that have questions for
16	Ms. Nichol?
17	MS. MITCHELL: I'm Ms. Mitchell.
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I'm so sorry. What did I
19	say?
20	MS. CRAWFORD: Nichol.
21	MS. MITCHELL: Yeah, that's okay.
2.2	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I apologize, Ms. Mitchell.
22	
23	MS. MITCHELL: No, you're good.
	MS. MITCHELL: No, you're good. CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Safran.

1	you a few things, okay? I think you said that, basically,
2	because of, I guess, concern, your passion, you started
3	watching these courtroom proceedings. And you're not
4	invested
5	MS. MITCHELL: Yes, sir. That is correct.
6	MR. SAFRAN: Do you go to any courtrooms in
7	the family court, other than ones that Judge Holmes
8	occupies?
9	MS. MITCHELL: Oh, absolutely.
10	MR. SAFRAN: All right. And have you found
11	other proceedings to be to your satisfaction?
12	MS. MITCHELL: You know what, I've found
13	that there's hiccups in every one of them. I found one
14	other judge, that it was very blatant. But you know what,
15	that judge is doing better now.
16	And, yes, I see it in every one of them. I
17	see it in the family court, period, the abuse. And I'm
18	going to tell you what it comes down to: It's the almighty
19	greed of the dollar.
20	MR. SAFRAN: Well, let me ask another thing.
21	Aren't the family courts the ones that really handle the
22	most emotional and high-charged type of situations?
23	MS. MITCHELL: They do.
24	MR. SAFRAN: And by its very nature, people
25	are upset, aren't they? I mean, that's why they're there.

1	They're disputing something that goes to the base of their
2	lives, don't they?
3	MS. MITCHELL: You are correct. But
4	understand that it is an emotional time, and it is a it
5	is for you know, one side might do it either but when
6	you are in family court, you need the very best judge up
7	before you.
8	And I'm telling you witnessing for the last
9	months and months and since COVID kind of came up. And
10	so I'm just telling you what I see as a teacher, as a
11	business person, as a community person. Luke knows me.
12	And I've always I've always stood up for my community.
13	And that's what I'm doing now today.
14	MR. SAFRAN: Well, and I guess you'd agree
15	with me, that in light there really isn't a lot of
16	perfection in terms of
17	MS. MITCHELL: Yes. Yes, sir. You know,
18	what I put on the record, again today, which is the
19	testimony from 2018. Who do I give it to? This is the
20	transcript from 2018. This is when you questioned Judge
21	Holmes.
22	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, ma'am. So we can
23	take legislative notice, to coin a phrase, of a previous
24	transcript of this body.
25	MS. MITCHELL: Right.

1	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: In fact, everybody
2	watching can obtain a copy of that on Scstatehouse.gov. I
3	love to sell our state's website. It looks like the least
4	sexy website that's ever been designed, but it's very
5	informative.
6	And so if you go to Scstatehouse.gov, then
7	Citizen's Interest, Judicial Merit Selection Commission,
8	there is a treasure trove of things like transcripts from
9	2018.
10	MS. MITCHELL: Yes, sir.
11	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Anyway, so part of my
12	contract required me to highlight that.
13	MS. MITCHELL: Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: But anyway
15	MS. MITCHELL: I'm not a lawyer.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The floor is yours.
17	MS. MITCHELL: So you questioned her in
18	2018, and Mr. Young did too. And now I'm telling you, I'm
19	in court in 2019, and I knew nothing of this until just
20	recently that this transcript.
21	And because I'm I don't do things just
22	off the cuff. I'm very calculated. Because you don't mess
23	with peoples' lives, and you don't do things like that.
24	And so I'm I'm very calculated and I'm very concerned
25	about it, and that's my reason for being here.

1	And if you had concerns in 2018, I'm telling
2	you, you should have concerns in 2023.
3	MR. SAFRAN: No, and I'll tell you that I've
4	always got that level of concern no matter who it is
5	MS. MITCHELL: Yes, sir.
6	MR. SAFRAN: no matter what the situation
7	is. I think there's a certain level of decorum that any
8	judge tries to pursue.
9	MS. MITCHELL: Yes. And I've said it, and I
10	say it now.
11	MS. MITCHELL: Yes.
12	MR. SAFRAN: But I guess my question is this
13	we as a as a group, or this state for that matter, I
14	don't think we we can in any way promise you perfect
15	judges. That's why we have an appellate process.
16	Because people are necessarily inclined to
17	make mistakes and do things that aren't necessarily always
18	going to be correct. I mean, you agree with me on that,
19	though, don't you?
20	MS. MITCHELL: Not necessarily. I believe
21	that whenever you're in that position, and you're making
22	decisions on other peoples' lives, that it is elevated to -
23	- it's elevated and you need to be on point.
24	MR. SAFRAN: Sure. But I guess my point is,
25	I guess we wouldn't have any need for appellate courts if

1	everybody got it right every time.
2	MS. MITCHELL: Correct.
3	MR. SAFRAN: But, no, I appreciate your
4	concern. And, obviously, you're here for, you know
5	MS. MITCHELL: Yes, sir.
6	MR. SAFRAN: a reason that's obviously
7	close to your heart.
8	MS. MITCHELL: It is.
9	MR. SAFRAN: I get that. Well, thank you
10	very much.
11	MS. MITCHELL: Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Blackley.
13	MS. BLACKLEY: Ms. Mitchell, thank you for
14	being here.
15	MS. MITCHELL: Thank you.
16	MS. BLACKLEY: I want to give a little bit
17	of background. I think we have some commonality.
18	MS. MITCHELL: Okay.
19	MS. BLACKLEY: I'm the only non-attorney
20	sitting right here.
21	MS. MITCHELL: Yay.
22	MS. BLACKLEY: And I am a former child
23	victim's advocate, a former clerk of court. I understand
24	the process. I've worked with numerous judges as a
25	MS. MITCHELL: I testified many times.

1	MS. BLACKLEY: lay-person and not as a
2	not as a I was a sworn officer of the court, but not an
3	attorney. So I get what you're saying.
4	And I have often seen differences in how
5	judges rule from the bench. And I can tell you, the
6	understanding of a family court judge having to rule in
7	some of the most highly emotional cases that probably any
8	judge has to deal with, may sometimes come across as not
9	let me finish not as understandable, especially when
10	someone you know, because you always have two sides, and
11	each side wants their side to be the right side
12	MS. MITCHELL: Right.
13	MS. BLACKLEY: where the verdict comes.
14	And so I just wanted to go on the record, to tell you that
15	there is a there is an understanding of a lay-person
16	MS. MITCHELL: Yes, ma'am.
17	MS. BLACKLEY: who is not who doesn't
18	have that full legal background of having gone to law
19	school
20	MS. MITCHELL: Right.
21	MS. BLACKLEY: up here. And I thank you
22	for your comments. But I also wanted to let you know that
23	we all understand that we want that the outcome
24	sometimes may not render what everybody wants.
25	And that's on any level of court, whether

1	it's criminal, civil, or family court, or whatever level it
2	is. But I appreciate your comments thank you.
3	MS. MITCHELL: Well, thank you. But, you
4	know, my my position on this is not the outcome or who
5	won. My position on this is that is how the judge
6	it's not whether I like the person on either side or
7	anything like that.
8	We need to know that we have somebody in
9	there that has gone over the records, that's impartial,
10	that's got a temperament, and that knows the law. And
11	that's what I'm saying, and that's what I've witnessed over
12	and over, and that's my big concern.
13	MS. BLACKLEY: And I understand that.
14	MS. MITCHELL: Yes, ma'am.
15	MS. BLACKLEY: So thank you.
16	MS. MITCHELL: Thank you. I thank all of
17	you. Thank you very much for your time.
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Is there any other
19	questions for Ms. Mitchell?
20	(Hearing none.)
21	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I didn't want you to
22	MS. MITCHELL: Oh, I'm sorry.
23	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: But it doesn't appear that
24	there are any other questions. I would just thank you for
25	your time and effort

1	MS. MITCHELL: Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: and your diligence in
3	this matter. Also, the ladies responding to, to my probing
4	to get us focused on the issues before this
5	MS. MITCHELL: A school teacher.
6	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, ma'am. And so I
7	appreciate that very much as a poor student. I thank you
8	for
9	MS. MITCHELL: You would have done fine in
10	my class.
11	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you.
12	MS. MITCHELL: I didn't I didn't send one
13	kid to the office. I would probably be in jail now, 'cause
14	all I do is snap my finger and say, "Sit down."
15	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Well, thank you very much
16	again. Thank you for making the trip here.
17	MS. MITCHELL: Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Foster.
19	MS. FOSTER: Judge Holmes.
20	JUDGE HOLMES: To respond in brevity, I
21	wasn't given any specific dates and times. All of our
22	court hearings are transcribed by a court by a court
23	reporter, as well as a recording. I believe that the
24	record would reflect that I have always acted
25	appropriately. And I deny that I have acted

1	inappropriately in any of the instances she has referenced.
2	Thank you.
3	MS. FOSTER: Thank you. We have three
4	complaints remaining. It's Ms. Bullard, Mr. Gallman, and
5	Mr. Player. All three of these are have one underlying
6	matter related to it. Mr. Player, would like to come
7	first?
8	MR. PLAYER: Good afternoon.
9	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I'm sorry, your name, sir?
10	MR. PLAYER: Tucker Player.
11	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Player, would you
12	raise your right hand.
13	WHEREUPON,
14	TUCKER PLAYER, being duly sworn and
15	cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing
16	but the truth.
17	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir.
18	MR. PLAYER: I provided a summary of my
19	testimony
20	MS. FOSTER: Sir.
21	MR. PLAYER: Oh, I'm sorry.
22	MS. FOSTER: If I may begin. Mr. Player,
23	the Commission has before it, your affidavit of complaint,
24	which respectfully which I respectfully request be made
25	part of the record at this time.

1	(EXHIBIT NO. 21 - AFFIDAVIT OF TUCKER S.
2	PLAYER)
3	MS. FOSTER: The purpose of today's hearing
4	is for the Commission to review the qualifications of the
5	candidates, to determine whether Judge Bromell Holmes is
6	qualified to be on the Court of Appeals.
7	The Commission is not here to re-litigate a
8	case, and they do not have the ability to change the result
9	of the case.
10	Mr. Player, you submitted your affidavit,
11	which the Commission is reviewing. Is there anything else
12	you wish to testify to, specifically regarding Judge
13	Bromell Holmes' ethic, competency, or character, that has
14	not already been covered in the documents before the
15	Commission?
16	MR. PLAYER: Just a few things. I won't go
17	through the entire summary of testimony. I'm here on
18	behalf of myself not I represented John Gallman in civil
19	matters. I did not represent him in family court. I don't
20	do family court.
21	I've never seen Judge Holmes until today.
22	My concern, and the reason I'm here, is the order that I
23	attached. Because to me, an order like that can't be
24	issued by a judge that sits on a Court of Appeals.
25	Primarily, I'm focusing on two things. It's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

either temperament or professional and academic ability because of three things. The number one is real simple. She ordered that the father of a 9- and 10-year-old could not communicate with his children for a year. For a year. If any of you can extrapolate that or justify that as in the best interest of any child, I'm all But that is the primary focus of why that order disqualifies her from servicing on the Court of Appeals. The other two issues borderline between knowing the statutes, and her temperament. Because one of the -- one of her findings for issuing the order, which prohibited these children from speaking to their father for a year, was that he took her to MUSC for a physical 14 evaluation after finding bruises on her thighs. The reports that came from MUSC were mandatory, statutory reports from the providers that are covered under the statute. So Judge Holmes either didn't understand the law, or she didn't care what it said, when she said, "When you took them to MUSC, that was wrong and I'm taking your kids." So --CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Senator Sabb. SENATOR SABB: Attorney Player, if you don't mind, let me just -- I hate to interrupt. But I was curious about your first point regarding no contact for a Was there a condition precedent of some sort of the year.

1 evaluation or test that the defendant was supposed to avail 2 himself to and he didn't? Or did I misread that? 3 MR. PLAYER: No, that was there. It was 4 during the pandemic and it went on for a year, during which 5 he twice went back and requested that he be able to speak 6 to his children, you know, wish them a Happy Birthday, 7 Merry Christmas, and stuff like that. 8 SENATOR SABB: But was there something that 9 the judge required, that he was supposed to comply with, 10 and then once that's complied with then the issue of 11 visitation and those kinds of thing would have been 12 revisited? 13 Right. But, see, using the MR. PLAYER: 14 father's failures to punish the children is my problem with 15 her ruling. 16 SENATOR SABB: Well, but stay with me a second. Just stay with me a second. I'm not casting 17 18 judgment. I understand you've got an opinion based on the 19 relationship that you have with a client. And I guess for 20 me -- and I wanted to just address that issue. 21 Because there are condition precedents, 22 oftentimes, in several of our jurisprudential --23 jurisprudence as it relates to a lot of areas, where one 24 thing has to be done before something else. 25 And, typically, my approach has been even if

1	we disagree with it, let's get it out of the way and then
2	let's focus. Because not only should the judge be
3	interested in a parent having access to the child, the
4	parent also would be interested in having access to the
5	child.
6	And so if there is a condition present to
7	the extent that it can be met. If it can't be met, then
8	that's a different issue with me. But if it's just a
9	condition precedent, so that I can have access to my
10	children and that's of paramount importance to me,
11	because it irreparably harms me and my children then to
12	the extent that, that's something that is within my power
13	to do, I simply do it whether I disagree or not. I mean,
14	do you think that's a reasonable approach or not?
15	MR. PLAYER: Not when there are a 9- and 10-
16	year-old involved and they're
17	SENATOR SABB: Come on. Let's not focus on
18	how old the children are. I'm specifically interested in
19	the condition precedent.
20	MR. PLAYER: Right. And that would be a
21	legal technicality that I think has absolutely nothing to
22	do with the best interest of
23	SENATOR SABB: Well, when you say it has
24	nothing to do with it
25	MR. PLAYER: Because it's not in the order.

1 Show me in the order where she gives -- what is her 2 justification for saying no communication with the 3 children? That's what I'm asking for. If somebody can 4 give it, then vote her into office. 5 SENATOR SABB: So I -- my point was very 6 narrow. And I was just trying to get you to address that 7 narrow issue, not the global thing. Because I intend to 8 hear you out. 9 MR. PLAYER: Sure. 10 SENATOR SABB: But on that particular issue 11 relating to the condition precedent, that's what I wanted 12 to drill down on. 13 MR. PLAYER: And I quess it's a -- it's an -14 - it's a -- it's an issue of balancing. Because you're 15 right, if the court orders you to do something, you have to 16 go back that. 17 SENATOR SABB: Right. 18 MR. PLAYER: A condition precedent, yes. 19 But in this situation, to me, from reading the order and 20 the lack -- the lack of what I see as a legitimate basis 21 for that harsh of a restriction, at some point --22 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Let me intervene, if I 23 could. Mr. Rutherford, do you have questions? 24 REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Yeah. I mean, 25 Mr. Player said that if we could point it out. In No. 7 on

1	whatever page page 3 of 5, Jan Holmes I assume her
2	initials: "The court is concerned that the minor daughter
3	has been subjected to ridicule by paternal relative for not
4	substantiating the alleged abuse as stated by the father.
5	The court is further concerned about the minor daughter's
6	alleged supplement statement by the father. The minor
7	daughter has expressed discontent with the father as to his
8	action. The minor son needs counseling for anxiety and
9	stress."
10	No. 8, "That defendant father is to have no
11	visitation with the minor children or telephonic contact or
12	electronic contact with the children and are not
13	participate or attend any of the children's extracurricular
14	activities or events."
15	So No. 7 precedes No. 8, and No. 7 seems to
16	be her rationale for ordering No. 8. And then the goes on
17	to No. 9, that they participate in psychological custodial
18	evaluation, which is what Senator Sabb was asking about.
19	So while we may disagree as to whether she
20	should have done it or not, No. 7 is her rationale for
21	doing it, is it not?
22	MR. PLAYER: That's exactly what
23	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Whether is
24	legitimate or not, is that not what she stated was her
25	reason for doing it?

MR. PLAYER: Right. And it goes directly
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: And wait. I'm
sorry. Hold on. Hold on. You seem to come for Senator
Sabb, and state that she did this without any basis
whatsoever. But you knew that No. 7 existed on page 3 of
5, did you not?
MR. PLAYER: I don't consider that to be a
legitimate
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Whether you
consider to be
MR. PLAYER: excuse
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: legitimate or
not
MR. PLAYER: No, you're either going to
I'm not under cross-examination.
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Wait a minute.
Let me let me let me finish. Whether you consider it
to be legitimate or not, you stated that she did not do
exactly what she did in No. 7. You didn't say, "She did it
and I disagree." You said she didn't do it, and it's right
there.
MR. PLAYER: You're twisting my words. And
it's not going to work, Mr. Rutherford.
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Listen, I'm
CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Gentlemen. Gentlemen.

1 Gentlemen, please. The purpose of our inquiry today is the 2 evaluation of the candidate with respect to the nine 3 constitutionally, statutorily-mandated criteria that we are 4 charged with the responsibility of evaluating. 5 MR. PLAYER: Correct. 6 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Now, we're not here to re-7 litigate the case. I think you made your point, sir, that 8 you think she made these decisions without sufficient 9 I think Mr. Rutherford has raised concern about 10 your allegation. That's -- that's what we're here to --11 we've now hashed that out. What I'd like to do, though, is 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Wait a minute. 14 I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Hold on. Let me disagree with 15 you for one second. Because I stopped reading, and I 16 should not have. 17 'Cause No. 9 says that, "The parties shall 18 participate in a psychological and custodial evaluation 19 that will be submitted to the court prior to the defendant father having any visitation addressed with the minor 20 21 children." 22 Now, again, I don't know -- I don't do 23 family court, but that sounds like a condition precedent 24 that Senator Sabb was asking about. And I'm just sitting 25 here, perusing this stuff. I'm not saying that I don't

1	agree with the testimony, but I am saying that what he is
2	saying doesn't seem to mesh with what is right in front of
3	us, in the information that he was told that we have.
4	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, sir. I think you've
5	now that made very clear.
6	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: I'm not taking a
7	point. I'm just reading what's here. So I'm just this
8	is not my opinion.
9	MR. PLAYER: Well, at least he's reading it.
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: So we have what you've
11	submitted in the record now. We have the benefit of your
12	testimony. Is there anything else you'd like to add?
13	MR. PLAYER: I just wanted to continue,
14	'cause I was talking to Senator Sabb about the you know,
15	the weighing of the issues.
16	But there's there's a give and take. And
17	there was no give here. It was he went back twice. He
18	I'm not sure what he testified to getting this evaluation.
19	But the entire time, these two children, 9- and 10-year-
20	olds, don't have any communication
21	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, sir.
22	MR. PLAYER: with their father.
23	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: And, again, not
24	MR. PLAYER: Okay. Okay.
25	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: here to re-litigate

1	that.
2	MR. PLAYER: Sorry.
3	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: We've made it clear that
4	you have concerns about this litigation. We have the
5	information in your affidavit and in the record now. What
6	else
7	MR. PLAYER: Just the last issue is, of
8	course, the whistle blower. I mean, you're trying to
9	promote Judge Holmes to the Court of Appeals, and she
10	doesn't know the law. She allowed a counselor to come into
11	a court and violate the statutory law of South Carolina.
12	And then she did it herself when she repeated it in her
13	order.
14	An LLR complaint is confidential. Period.
15	And she didn't know that, or she ignored it. And what I
16	argue is the same manner in which she ignored the mandatory
17	reporting. She blames John for everything that arose out
18	of a mandatory report by a provider, that, if you
19	understand the law, you can't place blame with the father.
20	SENATOR SABB: Mr. Chairman.
21	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, sir. Senator Sabb.
22	SENATOR SABB: I just want to put a pin
23	there just for a second.
24	MR. PLAYER: Sure.
25	SENATOR SABB: Now, typically, when the

1	court rules, you assign one of the lawyers to draft the
2	order. Typically, the lawyer that drafts the order is
3	required to share the order with the opposing party. Do
4	you agree with me on all of that?
5	MR. PLAYER: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
6	SENATOR RANKIN: Do you know in this
7	instance which lawyer was asked to draft the order?
8	MR. PLAYER: I believe it was his exwife's.
9	but I do not know for sure.
10	SENATOR SABB: Okay. So then you had a
11	lawyer to draft the order, to place that language in the
12	order. You had another lawyer on the opposing side, that
13	read the order and as far as I know, and you can help me
14	if I'm wrong did not put anything on the record in terms
15	of any objections to anything in the order.
16	MR. PLAYER: I don't think that's correct.
17	But I don't have those documents before the court. And
18	that quite I'm not trying to be rude or dismissive but -
19	-
20	SENATOR SABB: No, no. You're fine.
21	MR. PLAYER: I mean, my point is, the
22	original order. I just don't understand how that
23	SENATOR SABB: I'm with you.
24	MR. PLAYER: order can be issued.
25	SENATOR SABB: I'm with you. But what I'm

1	seeing is an issue that you're raising, that's not only
2	missed by the judge, assuming what we're saying is correct.
3	But it's missed by the court, it's missed by the
4	plaintiff's lawyer, and it's missed by the defense lawyer.
5	Because come on, you and I are officers of
6	the court, right? We have a responsibility, if we know
7	that something is violative of the law, we have a
8	responsibility to bring that to the judge's attention. You
9	agree with me on that, right?
10	MR. PLAYER: Yes, sir. I would have
11	probably been in jail if I'd represented John in this
12	particular situation.
13	SENATOR SABB: I'm with you. But both
14	lawyers would have had, essentially, a responsibility to
15	make sure that, that issue was protected.
16	MR. PLAYER: I would agree in most
17	circumstances. But in the family court setting, it just
18	doesn't work that way. Because if he would have appealed
19	her order
20	SENATOR SABB: No, I'm not
21	MR. PLAYER: saying you can't see the
22	kids, he would have missed he'd have had two years of no
23	contact.
24	SENATOR RANKIN: No, no. And I'm not going
25	to go there.

1	MR. PLAYER: Okay.
2	SENATOR SABB: I'm on your third issue now,
3	relative to the violation associated with the disclosure.
4	MR. PLAYER: Yes, sir.
5	SENATOR SABB: My point is, that you would
6	have had the lawyer drafting the order that missed it my
7	words, not necessarily somebody else's but included it
8	in there, then you've got the reviewing lawyer that, as far
9	as we know, allowed it to be included in there, and then
10	you've got the court ultimately signing the order that's
11	proposed to her.
12	MR. PLAYER: Yes.
13	SENATOR SABB: That's the typical way. I
14	wasn't there and you weren't there.
15	MR. PLAYER: I'm assuming, with your
16	assumption, that, that's what was done here.
17	SENATOR SABB: Yeah. Because that's what
18	typically occurs. And so I guess I just wanted the record
19	to reflect, that, that's the process by which these orders
20	are typically generated.
21	MR. PLAYER: Yes, sir.
22	SENATOR SABB: I'm finished with that, Mr.
23	Chairman.
24	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir.
25	MR. PLAYER: I'm making you nervous, so I'll

1 be quite now. 2 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: No, no, no. In fact, if 3 anything, I was going to quibble with the introductory 4 clause of your last colloguy, which was that we are trying 5 to promote her or trying to give -- our charge is simply to 6 evaluate the constitutional and statutory --7 MR. PLAYER: A poor choice of words on my 8 I apologize. part. 9 I just want to make CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Okay. 10 sure that you, and anybody else who shares your view, as I 11 understand the other two complainants might, we're just 12 here to do our jobs, to thoroughly investigate it here, 13 obviously. 14 And so if anything else, I'm grateful to you 15 and others who've taken the time and effort to submit 16 information to this commission, so that we can then 17 ultimately, hopefully, with the grace of God, arrive at the 18 best decisions available. 19 MR. PLAYER: And going back to Todd and Senator Sabb. There is a process, and sometimes things get 20 21 lost in that process. But, you know, the 362 days -- you know, they tried to intervene twice. And that restriction 22 23 was never lifted. 24 To me, I just can't understand a judge that 25 sees that as the best interest of the children. And we're

1	going to put her in charge of telling other judges what
2	they should do on both the family court and the circuit
3	court?
4	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, sir. I hear you.
5	Are there any other commission the senator from Horry.
6	SENATOR RANKIN: Mr. Player, Luke Rankin.
7	MR. PLAYER: Yes, sir.
8	SENATOR RANKIN: We know each other, but we
9	don't.
10	MR. PLAYER: Yes. Do we need Jay to be
11	here?
12	SENATOR RANKIN: No, no, no. We'll let the
13	court decide that, I guess. But my quick question to you:
14	You don't practice in the family court
15	MR. PLAYER: No.
16	SENATOR RANKIN: arena.
17	MR. PLAYER: No. No. And I don't know what
18	Judge Holmes has said in defense. And she's probably going
19	to say, "It was a temporary hearing, I had what was in
20	front of me."
21	And quite frankly, that's a bigger problem
22	with her system than anything else. If the judges are put
23	in that position to make I mean, twice we've heard
24	today, two situations, a fifteen and twenty-minute hearing
25	and the children are taken away.

1	SENATOR RANKIN: You'd never appeared before
2	her in court.
3	MR. PLAYER: No. That's the first time I've
4	seen her today.
5	SENATOR RANKIN: And you said at the outset,
6	you're not here on behalf of and being paid today by Mr.
7	Gallman
8	MR. PLAYER: No, sir.
9	SENATOR RANKIN: are you?
10	MR. PLAYER: I am not.
11	SENATOR RANKIN: That's all. Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir.
13	Representative Rutherford.
14	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Mr.
15	Chairman. Tell me about the LLR thing again. How did that
16	come about?
17	MR. PLAYER: A counselor that I'm not even
18	sure my client made the complaint against, put an affidavit
19	in court, saying that John Gallman complained against her
20	to the LLR, and then that was cited in an affidavit which
21	she then cited in her order.
22	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: And you are
23	relying on the fact that the counselor mentioned the
24	complaint as a reason that judge Holmes should have ignored
25	that and not mentioned it? Is that

1	MR. PLAYER: Well, considering it was
2	confidential, statutory-protected information, she
3	shouldn't have used it to as a reasoning for taking his
4	children away. She should not have mentioned it at all,
5	since it's confidential.
6	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: And let me
7	let me get back to that. Because you know the Supreme
8	Court has weighed in well, the court federal court,
9	particularly, as weighed in on what is now confidential in
10	these complaints, and what used to be confidential is held
11	in confidence by the agency, but is not necessarily
12	confidential as to the parties that are involved.
13	Similar to an ODC complaint which used to be
14	confidential, but now the party that has had the complaint
15	filed against them can talk about the complaint, no
16	different than an ethics complaint, because you can't
17	restrain the party that filed the complaint.
18	And so restraining the party that has the
19	complaint filed against them has been held to be
20	unconstitutional. You're aware of that, right?
21	MR. PLAYER: What year was I'm not sure
22	of the opinion.
23	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Okay. So if
24	we're not sure of the opinion, and we're saying now that a
25	party in front of the judge mentioned that an LLR complaint

1	had been filed against her, you're submitting that the
2	judge should have ignored that?
3	MR. PLAYER: Yes. It has nothing to do with
4	the situation. You don't punish the children by punishing
5	by taking them away from the father. If he if he
6	somehow, you know, acted inappropriately through make a
7	statutorily-provided for complaint that's the other
8	thing.
9	It doesn't matter if it was confidential.
10	He has a right to go make an LLR complaint. And he doesn't
11	get punished for it by a judge who's trying to establish
12	her power.
13	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: So, Mr. Player,
14	I'm not I'm not getting into the merits of it.
15	MR. PLAYER: You're not?
16	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: I'm saying
17	no, sir. I'm suggesting that if you're alleging that she
18	committed a clear violation of the law, I'm suggesting that
19	it is not as clear anymore. Because the courts have said
20	that you cannot restrain speech.
21	And, in fact, even as it relates to lawyers,
22	you can't restrain speech. Even as it relates to ethics
23	complaints against members of the House and Senator, you
24	can't restrain speech.
25	And so I would submit that your assertion

_	
1	that Judge Holmes had to ignore that is not proper, given
2	the fact that one of the parties to the LLR complaint spoke
3	on that in court.
4	There's nothing that I see that bars the
5	judge for hearing that and reacting to it. What she did
6	with it, how that impacted the case? I'm not here to deal
7	with that.
8	MR. PLAYER: Yes, you are.
9	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Simply as to
10	well, we may disagree on that.
11	MR. PLAYER: No, you're here to judge her
12	character
13	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: But it's not
14	what I'm
15	MR. PLAYER: and fitness.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Player. Mr. Player.
17	One at a time, or we're going to stop.
18	MR. PLAYER: He's interrupting me, pretty
19	consistently.
20	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Okay. Well, we're going
21	to start over now. And I'm going to say Mr. Rutherford
22	gets to talk until he's done, and then you're going to get
23	to talk until I think you're done.
24	MR. PLAYER: Okay.
25	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: And then we're going to

1	move onto the next candidate. 'Cause we still have another
2	79 candidates to evaluate.
3	MR. PLAYER: I understand.
4	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: So Mr. Rutherford.
5	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chairman, I
6	don't have any other questions. Just simply, the comment
7	that before we assert the things are black letter law, we
8	ought to know what black letter law is at the current time,
9	and how it relates to what it is the allegations we're
10	making. Period.
11	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, sir.
12	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: That's it.
13	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Player, you disagree
14	with that assertion?
15	MR. PLAYER: Yes, I do.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All right. Thank you. Is
17	there anything else members of the Commission want to ask
18	about, that is probative to the question of whether or not
19	this candidate has satisfied the statutory and
20	constitutional requirements for office?
21	Mr. Sabb asserts that he has. And as we
22	wait on bated breath, Mr. Sabb, you're recognized.
23	SENATOR SABB: No, no. Just on the narrow
24	issue now of as I was observing the exchange between Mr.
25	Player and Mr. Rutherford, it just dawned on me, from the

1 standpoint of the hearing itself. 2 So you've got evidence being presented, 3 let's assume hypothetical that the evidence is violative of 4 the law in its presentation, such that they don't allow it into the record at all, then the proper thing would have 5 6 been for somebody to do what? 7 MR. PLAYER: Object. 8 SENATOR SABB: Object to it coming into 9 evidence, and then it's not a part of the record. So then 10 the fundamental question now is: Did anybody object to it 11 coming in the record? Because we have a waiver in our law 12 al the time, right? 13 MR. PLAYER: Sure. 14 SENATOR SABB: And then you don't object to 15 something, you waive it. Things that are otherwise not 16 admissible into evidence now becoming admissible because 17 there was no objection. It was waived and it's now part of 18 the record. And so what frankly concerns me now, just on 19 the ultimate issue of competence as it relates to being 20 21 able to know the law and all of those kinds of things, is 22 if you've got something that's not objected to, and it's 23 now a part of the record, I'm not so sure --24 MR. PLAYER: I understand. And that is all 25 of your prerogatives in making your evaluations.

1	SENATOR SABB: But do you disagree in terms
2	of
3	MR. PLAYER: Yeah.
4	SENATOR SABB: the fact that oh, so
5	you do disagree that the hold on you disagree that if
6	something is being offered into evidence that is
7	objectionable, and if a party fails to object to it and it
8	becomes a part of the evidentiary record, that's somehow
9	the judge's fault if a lawyer didn't object to it? And you
10	and I both agree, I believe, that if evidence is
11	objectionable, then it's our job to do what?
12	MR. PLAYER: I agree.
13	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I think I think what
14	Mr. Player would say, if I've understood his position
15	correctly, is that notwithstanding the lack of objection,
16	the judge should not then still relied on that in making
17	her order? Or do I misunderstand your position?
18	MR. PLAYER: The fundamental the most
19	fundamental is no communication with a 9- and 10-year-old
20	for a year. That, I don't understand. And what Mr.
21	Rutherford misunderstood earlier is, I said if you can
22	justify that
23	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Sure.
24	MR. PLAYER: It's not that she didn't give a
25	justification. The other two were two statutory schemes

	$\mathbf{I}$
1	which I provided the statute. The statute doesn't say what
2	Todd says it says. It hasn't been overruled as far as I
3	know. I have no idea of what year the opinion was I
4	mean, I don't know.
5	I'm not saying he's wrong. But I haven't
6	seen it. But regardless, the statute says it was
7	confidential. And she blamed him for the mandatory report
8	for over which he had no you know, he had no control.
9	So that was the misunderstanding
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I think I've I think
11	I'm tracking with you. And I think we've done ample
12	service
13	MR. PLAYER: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: to the Commission and
15	to the General Assembly as a whole. We will have the
16	benefit of our what will surely be a voluminous report,
17	such that they can then give way to this discussion however
18	the members of the General Assembly see it.
19	And I appreciate the Commissioners, and
20	yourself, Mr. Player, for digging through that so that
21	would could proceed.
22	MR. PLAYER: Certainly.
23	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I'm not going to ask if
24	there are any more questions, but I will give you the last
25	word, Mr. Player. Is there anything else you think we need

1	to hit on?
2	MR. PLAYER: No. I would just ask the
3	Commission to review the order, and my comments, and take
4	it into consideration.
5	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir.
6	SENATOR SABB: Mr. Chairman, I would be I
7	would be remiss, though. I want to thank you
8	MR. PLAYER: Well, thank you.
9	SENATOR RANKIN: for allowing us to
10	engage in the exchange we did.
11	MR. PLAYER: Absolutely. And I'm sorry if I
12	got out of
13	SENATOR SABB: You were not.
14	MR. PLAYER: out of turn. Todd's I've
15	been around Todd a long time, so
16	SENATOR SABB: So have the rest of us.
17	MR. PLAYER: He might be off by five. I
18	think it's thirty-five.
19	SENATOR SABB: But, no, I just wanted to
20	thank the gentleman for allowing us to engage in the
21	exchange.
22	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Absolutely. I appreciate
23	that. And then thank you for your comments.
24	MR. PLAYER: Thank you.
25	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, Mr. Player.

1	MS. FOSTER: Mr. Gallman.
2	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Gallman, if you would
3	please raise your right hand.
4	WHEREUPON,
5	JOHN GALLMAN, being duly sworn and cautioned
6	to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the
7	truth.
8	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir.
9	MS. FOSTER: Mr. Gallman, the Commission has
10	before it, your affidavit of complaint, which I
11	respectfully request be made part of the record at this
12	time.
13	(EXHIBIT NO. 22 - AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN H.
14	GALLMAN)
15	MS. FOSTER: The purpose of today's hearing
16	is for the Commission to review the qualifications of the
17	candidates, to determine whether Judge Bromell Holmes is
18	qualified to be on the Court of Appeals. The Commission is
19	not here to re-litigate a case, and they do not have the
20	ability to change the result of the case.
21	Mr. Gallman, you've submitted your
22	affidavit, which the Commission is reviewing. Is there
23	anything else you wish to testify to, specifically
24	regarding Judge Bromell Holmes' ethics, competency, or
25	character, that has not already been covered by the

1	Commission?
2	MR. GALLMAN: Yes. And I would begin by
3	stating for a point of clarification. And then I'll read
4	my statement, very brief, perhaps three minutes at most.
5	But I'd like to start with a point of clarification. We
6	completed a psychological evaluation that was completed in
7	December of two thousand
8	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Gallman.
9	MR. GALLMAN: I know. I hear you.
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I just
11	MR. GALLMAN: I understand
12	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I'm going to
13	MR. GALLMAN: Micah, I understand.
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I don't think you need to
15	
16	MR. GALLMAN: I do.
17	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The goal here is to
18	MR. GALLMAN: I understand.
19	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: provide additional
20	evidence into the record.
21	MR. GALLMAN: And it's important that I
22	establish for the record.
23	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All right. Briefly, then,
24	if you will. And then
25	MR. GALLMAN: And then I'll read a brief

1	statement.
2	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Well, we'll talk about
3	that. Let's do this one first.
4	MR. GALLMAN: Okay. I want to make sure as
5	a point of clarification, prior to the final divorce order,
6	we completed a psychological evaluation. The guardian that
7	was involved in that case is sitting in this room. That
8	psychological evaluation was not put on the record.
9	And I settled via consent order for 50/50
10	equal time and agreed, in a no-fault divorce, to pay
11	\$6,888.88 month, okay? So a psychological evaluation was
12	completed. It was kept off the record because the
13	plaintiff's attorney did not want that on the record.
14	Subsequently, she got another attorney and
15	filed to take the children away from me. And the judge was
16	unaware of that. So I will grant her the benefit of the
17	doubt. But there was a psychological that was completed.
18	And in that 362 days and nights, I went to two other
19	providers.
20	I was completely exonerated. And I could
21	put that psychological evaluation out on my ex-wife today,
22	and could have put it out at any point in history. But
23	that would have hurt my children.
24	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Gallman.
25	MR. GALLMAN: And it would not have been in

1 the best interest of my children. So I want to clarify And there's one other point of clarification --2 that. 3 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Gallman, hold on. 4 It's a weird system we got here. But, you know, when I 5 press the button and need your attention, I need your 6 attention so that we can stay focused on what we have to do 7 here. And that is evaluate the candidate as related to the 8 nine statutory and constitutional qualifications. 9 To that end, you, I think, have made clear 10 that there were additional evidentiary factors that 11 mattered, and therefore had a consequential effect with 12 respect to your analysis of her satisfaction of those 13 So I think you've made that point, and now qualifications. 14 I understand you wanted to make an additional point that's 15 relative to your statement. 16 I'm not going to allow a reading of the 17 statement that has been submitted to the Commission 18 already, 'cause we have it in the record. And our purpose 19 and our focus is on adding additional information, both for 20 the benefit of the commissioners here, but also for the 21 members of the General Assembly who will have to rely on 22 this commission's report in making their decisions with 23 respect to the election of judge -- judges and justices. 24 So to that end, if you have additional 25 things that you'd like to add, I'd be happy to hear from

1 But again, I want to emphasize that this is not a 2 forum to re-litigate the merits of the case. 3 And I empathize with you. I get it. I've 4 been there. I haven't been in your shoes, but I can feel 5 the passion. And so I want to be fair to you and to 6 everybody involved in this process, and we'd kindly ask you 7 to focus comments, again, on the information that we don't 8 have somewhere in a written form. 9 Thank you, Chairman Caskey. MR. GALLMAN: 10 If I may. 11 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, sir. Please. 12 MR. GALLMAN: Thank you. The other point of 13 clarification that I would like to make is that the 14 assertion that it could have been objected on the record 15 was not possible, as this occurred at a temporary hearing 16 where no one spoke. The judge took the information, called 17 a recess, came back. And I will start with my statements. 18 I want to make sure that the record reflects 19 that it could have not have been objected in a fifteen-20 minute temporary hearing. I digress. 21 On September 23rd, 2019, my children were 22 taken from me by Judge Jan Bromell Holmes. They were not 23 just removed from me. Far worse, I was forbidden from 24 seeing, speaking, or any form of communication for 362 days 25 and nights.

1 This was beyond court-ordered parental 2 alienation. It was court-ordered erasing of an entire side 3 In essence, my children's family was erased of a family. 4 from their life. Half of their family was erased from 5 their life for an entire year. 6 At the time, my little girl was 10 and my 7 little boy was 9. Up to that point in their life, I had 8 been a constant fixture in their lives. They both lived 9 with me, every day of for most of their lives. Only after 10 my recent divorce in the 50/50 consent custody agreement 11 did that change. 12 But even after the divorce, my children 13 lived with me half of the time, and were able to 14 communicate with me on a daily basis. I am still baffled 15 at the reasoning for my children being taken from me. 16 As my attorney has addressed, Judge Holmes 17 took my children because she believed I made a complaint 18 against a counselor with the South Carolina's LLR. I 19 thought that complaints were supposed to be confidential 20 and statutory-protected. 21 The other reason Judge Holmes took my 22 children from me is because I took my daughter to MUSC to 23 be examined. I found bruises on the inner thighs and the 24 crotch area of my daughter on five consecutive weeks in a

row when she came to me in the summer of 2019.

25

_	
1	And thank God, I had moved into a new home
2	with a swimming pool, and every time she came, I would ask
3	her to
4	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chairman.
5	MR. GALLMAN: get into the swimming pool.
6	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: I'm sorry. At
7	some point and, Mr. Gallman, I talk to him all the time.
8	He and I agree on a lot of things, but he is at this point
9	re-litigating the case. And the other party that he has
10	just accused of abuse is not here to say that, that's not
11	true.
12	MR. GALLMAN: I've not accused anyone of
13	abuse, Mr. Rutherford. Never once in the record have I
14	ever
15	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Gallman.
16	MR. GALLMAN: pointed a finger.
17	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Gallman, one at a
18	time. One at a time.
19	MR. GALLMAN: Don't put on the record I've
20	accused someone of abuse. I have never
21	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Gallman. Mr. Gallman.
22	MR. GALLMAN: Okay. Let's just
23	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: One at a time.
24	MR. GALLMAN: Okay.
25	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: And, Mr. Rutherford, I've

1	heard your complaint, and I've taken notice of that.
2	Mr. Gallman, I'm affording you some latitude
3	here, given the gravity of this moment and the seriousness
4	with which we have to evaluate all of this, but I need you
5	to get to your point of new information for this
6	commission.
7	Because we've heard a lot now, several
8	times, and I want us to get to the finish line smoothly.
9	So being mindful of Mr. Rutherford's comments with respect
10	to the repetitious nature of some of what you're offering,
11	I just want you to land this plane in the next minute or
12	so, okay?
13	MR. GALLMAN: I can land this plane in three
14	minutes, if I'm not interrupted.
15	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All right. You've got
16	we've got about one minute.
17	MR. GALLMAN: Okay. Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: So let's do it that way.
19	MR. GALLMAN: Because of the location of the
20	bruises, I sought counsel from multiple from
21	professionals including my lawyer and a licensed
22	professional counselor. The counselor advised me to take
23	my daughter to MUSC Children's Hospital.
24	MUSC documented the bruises in my daughter's
25	inner thighs, while the MUS social worker and a member of

1 law enforcement made mandatory, statutory reports to DSS. 2 Judge Holmes accused me of trying to use a false complaint 3 of child abuse to gain advantage in a custody matter, where 4 I already had 50/50 custody. That is absolutely, 5 unequivocally untrue. 6 MUSC's pediatric crash team social worker 7 made the mandatory complaint to DSS. I was trying to 8 protect my daughter. I called two different professionals prior to taking her to MUSC. Both advised me to do this. 9 10 How could my attempt to protect my daughter 11 be used to take her away from me? But that is exactly what 12 happened to me. To me, the law utterly failed my children. 13 If Judge Holmes wanted to punish me, there were ways she 14 could do so without hurting my children. 15 I spent well over a half a million dollars 16 in the divorce and custody battle, trying to establish my 17 children's right to have a dad, and to be a dad. And I would spend ten million more dollars if that's what it took 18 19 in order for my beautiful, wonderful, precious children to 20 have a father. 21 Before she took my children, I volunteered 22 for everything that my children did. I was the homeroom 23 parent for both of their classes at the time. I chaired 24 the Homeroom Parents Committee. I was the vice president

of the PTO. I was a member of the School Improvement

1	Council at a local public elementary school. I chaired the
2	school dance committee. And I was coaching my son's
3	twenty-fourth youth sports team.
4	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Gallman. One second,
5	if you would. You know I've tried several times to help
6	focus the conversation against our mission here. I
7	certainly understand your grievance and your frustrations
8	and your hurt. There's no question that everyone one of
9	your words is dripping with that emotion and deserves its
10	full and due respect.
11	I would be remiss in my duties, though, if I
12	did not give you one last chance to get us to something
13	that is going to tell us about Judge Bromell Holmes'
14	qualifications for the Court of Appeals. Now, so pause
15	right there. We'll go to Senator Sabb, and ask the senator
16	if he has a question for me for you, and what that might
17	be.
18	SENATOR SABB: Mr. Chairman, I did have a
19	question for the gentleman.
20	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir.
21	MR. GALLMAN: If I may
22	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Well, wait a minute.
23	MR. GALLMAN: I can finish in one minute.
24	If you would
25	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: We don't need a minute.

1 Let's call it twenty seconds. 2 MR. GALLMAN: Okay. With all due respect, 3 Chairman Caskey, I've waited for four years. So I'm going to take my two minutes to finish, with all due respect. 4 5 SENATOR SABB: Let me ask my questions, 6 then, if we're going to go that way. CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Well, we're not -- Senator 7 8 Sabb, we're not going to go -- I understand your 9 frustration. Our complaint process is very clear. And you 10 have submitted documents, you have submitted a complaint, 11 and we take those under advisement. 12 I understand that this isn't the forum you 13 maybe hoped it was. But we're giving you time to explain 14 to us, where she fails to meet these criteria. You've told 15 us a story that is -- "story" is not the right word for it. 16 You've explained your situation, I think, and brought 17 lucidity to this episode. 18 We're now looking for, again, things that we 19 don't have in the record. Admittedly, I don't have your 20 service as a PTO officer in the record. And I appreciate 21 that, but I need to know things that help us and the 22 General Assembly make decisions about the election of 23 judges. 24 So with respect, if you can get this done in 25 thirty seconds, I'll be happy to hear from you. If you

1 can't do that, then I'm going to ask you to sit down. 2 MR. GALLMAN: Okay. Thank you so much. 3 as I was stating at that time, I was a partner in a Fortune 4 400 company, four times over a partner, an entire -- and 5 over sixty branch offices of a -- of a firm here in South 6 Carolina. 7 I'm going to end with this, and I'll state 8 two things for the record. Removing children via an abrupt 9 emotional cutoff in a fifteen-minute hearing with no evidence is cruel. It's unjust. It's inhumane. And it's 10 11 evil. 12 I want you to consider, and this will be my 13 final statement, that for a 9-year-old little boy who's dad 14 was coaching his twenty-fourth sports team, and a 10-year-15 old little girl to be removed from their father for 362 16 days and nights, literally ten percent of the life, with no 17 phone call, no text message, no Christmas card, no Happy 18 Thanksgiving, no birthday present, no nothing. 19 near killed me. And it was cruel and unjust. 20 And anyone that does that should not be 21 promoted to the academic ability. And with that, I 22 conclude my testimony. 23 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, Mr. Gallman. 24 And I appreciate your time and I appreciate you coming 25 here. Mr. Rutherford.

1	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: The person that
2	the LLR complaint was filed against, what was the name of
3	that person?
4	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I don't know that, that's
5	relevant here.
6	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Yes, it is.
7	Yes, it is. And I'll tell you why. I just need
8	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Well, tell me why it's
9	relevant, first, before we go down this avenue.
10	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Because No. 4 on
11	page 2 of 5, "The defendant father has filed, slash, made a
12	complaint against the minor child's third party counselor,
13	comma, Roberta Bogle. That has been dismissed."
14	Once a complaint is dismissed with any
15	agency, you are free to talk about it. And so the
16	substance that they have talked about, in now two
17	testimonies going to this LLR complaint, at that point was
18	dismissed.
19	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Right. But, Mr.
20	Rutherford, you're talking about the affidavit of Mr.
21	Player. That's not
22	REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: No, sir. I'm
23	talking about the judge's order. This is the judge's
24	order.
25	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Which was submitted with

1	Mr. Player. I think your point stands. And I think the
2	Commission can consider your point as in its evaluation on
3	the totality. I don't think that requires a response from
4	you, Mr. Gallman.
5	MR. GALLMAN: Well, Chairman Caskey, if I
6	may respond to this statement, please.
7	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I don't think it's
8	necessary
9	MR. GALLMAN: It is to establish the record.
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Sir, I respectfully
11	MR. GALLMAN: It absolutely is.
12	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Mr. Gallman. Mr. Gallman.
13	MR. GALLMAN: For the record
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Let's go one at a time.
15	MR. GALLMAN: Okay.
16	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: One at a time.
17	MR. GALLMAN: Okay. Well, please.
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Hold on. Hold on. What
19	we're going to do is I'm going to give you just a last
20	little bit here. We've got other folks that want to be
21	heard, okay? But I don't think the issue of whether or not
22	the legal propriety or the inclusion or not inclusion of
23	this LLR complaint is one that we need arrive at a
24	conclusion on here.
25	I understand there are differences of

1	opinion here. That not our chore here. Our task is to
2	evaluate the candidate. So if you have something else you
3	want to say, I'll hear you.
4	MR. GALLMAN: One sentence.
5	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All right. Shoot.
6	MR. GALLMAN: Please. Thank you. To Mr.
7	Rutherford's point to Representative Rutherford's point,
8	I gave no documents to LLR. Not one single document.
9	Never have I given a document to LLR.
10	As it relates to Roberta Bogle, I cannot
11	talk about it because I signed an agreement that I could
12	not talk about it. But we settled a lawsuit that will
13	stand on its own merit.
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, sir. Again, I
15	appreciate your time. Thank you for being here. That's
16	all, sir.
17	MR. GALLMAN: Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you.
19	MS. FOSTER: Ms. Bullard.
20	MS. BULLARD: Good afternoon.
21	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Bullard, if you would
22	please raise your right hand.
23	MS. BULLARD: I will.
24	WHEREUPON,
25	IRIS BULLARD, being duly sworn and cautioned

1 to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the 2 truth. 3 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Bullard, I know you've 4 been sitting here for guite a while. And you've heard me, a couple times, revisit the question about what it is that 5 6 we're here to do. We have the benefit of your affidavit 7 that was here. We've obviously heard testimony from Mr. 8 Player and Mr. Gallman. 9 My understanding is that the nature of your 10 complaint is related to the same case, same episode, same 11 course of conduct. And I would ask you, unless we extend these proceedings much longer than they need be to be 12 13 extended, that you focus your comments again on the 14 question of the evaluative criteria that we're using here. 15 Okay. If I may say, briefly, MS. BULLARD: 16 that my husband and I have advocated for thousands of 17 children over our careers. My husband, a licensed master 18 social worker, was over children services for Beckman 19 Mental Health, which is part of the South Carolina mental 20 health. 21 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Bullard. 22 MS. BULLARD: For forty-three years --23 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I made a procedural 24 mistake. You'll have to forgive me, this is my first time 25 sitting in this seat. And I have made the mistake of not

1 recognizing that your complaint was not fully in the 2 record. 3 Luckily, we have these fine lawyers next to 4 me, who have stopped us all now. And, again, I apologize 5 for interrupting you for my mistake. But Ms. Foster needs 6 to put this on the record so it's a formal part of our 7 record. So, Ms. Foster, please continue with saving me. 8 MS. FOSTER: Ms. Bullard, the Commission has 9 before it, your affidavit of complaint, which I 10 respectfully request be made a part of the record at this 11 time. 12 (EXHIBIT NO. 23 - IRIS B. BULLARD) 13 The purpose to today's hearing MS. FOSTER: 14 is for the Commission to review the qualifications of the 15 candidate, to determine whether Judge Bromell Holmes is 16 qualified to be on the Court of Appeals. The Commission is 17 not here to re-litigate a case, and they do not have the 18 ability to change the result of the case. 19 Ms. Bullard, you've submitted your 20 affidavit, which the Commission is reviewing. Is there 21 anything else you wish to testify to, specifically 22 regarding Judge Bromell Holmes' ethics, competency, or 23 character, that is not already been covered by the 24 Commission? 25 MS. BULLARD: Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Again, I'm sorry. But
2	that was my fault.
3	MS. BULLARD: That's okay.
4	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: And I know it derails your
5	chain of thought. So please continue.
6	MS. BULLARD: I just want to say this, and I
7	think you will understand why I want to say it. For forty-
8	three years, my husband was director of children's mental
9	health. For thirty-three years, I was the campus
10	administrator at Connie Maxwell Children's Home, which if
11	you don't know, is a ministry of South Carolina Baptist.
12	And since 1892, the ministry each and every
13	year has ministered to over one hundred families, providing
14	hope and healing, and trying to provide family
15	reunification. I say that because we have both, as
16	advocates, known about situations when children were
17	separated from their parents.
18	And I ask you, do you think it's in the best
19	interest of children to have a loving parent removed from
20	their life for a year? I submit to you, I do not think
21	that it is.
22	I also say to you, that if you ever had a
23	10-year-old daughter, and she put on a bathing suit to go
24	swimming and you saw horrific bruises in the area of her
25	crotch, you would be deeply concerned.

1	Those bruises were seen by several people.
2	The child went to MUSC. And Judge Bromell Holmes, in
3	court, stated, quote, "The defendant father made
4	allegations at MUSC, that RGG may have been physically and
5	sexually abused."
6	The court order further stated, quote, "This
7	court finds that it is convenient to allege abuse in a
8	custody order in a custody action."
9	The father already had joint custody. And I
10	understand what Judge Bromell Holmes said. And,
11	apparently, she assumed that what may be true in some cases
12	must be true in all cases. It was not true in this case.
13	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Bullard, thank you for
14	making the time to come here and
15	MS. BULLARD: I would like to continue for a
16	for a moment.
17	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Okay. I'm happy to have
18	you continue, but what we can't do is focus on what is
19	already in the record. So as you heard us discuss out
20	loud, there are the order is already in the record, the
21	allegations are in the record, the judge's decision is in
22	the record, Mr. Player and Mr. Gallman
23	MS. BULLARD: I'm his mother.
24	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Okay. Well, nice to meet
25	you. You've heard all you've heard the various points

1	of view. What can you tell us that's new?
2	MS. BULLARD: Okay. I can tell you this,
3	that our family was traumatized for a year. That time was
4	stolen from our husband and me, from cousins, aunts and
5	uncles, and certainly from my son who was their father, and
6	a good father. And then the court order stated, quote
7	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Let me pause right there.
8	MS. BULLARD: No. No.
9	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am.
10	MS. BULLARD: This regards character and
11	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ma'am, one at a time.
12	MS. BULLARD: and me.
13	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: It's going to be one at a
14	time. That's the only way this can work. One of the
15	things that we have to do here is have a an official
16	transcript of it. The lady to your left there is taking
17	down all of our words. Try as she might, she can't write
18	down both of us talking about the same time.
19	And in the interest of keeping things moving
20	in a progressive and helpful direction, my responsibility
21	is to make sure that we refocus on that goal.
22	MS. BULLARD: I'm sorry.
23	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: I feel the frustration and
24	the hurt and the anguish. It's inescapable. And so I hope
25	you don't intuit from my interventions here, any lack of

1 compassion or empathy. It's certainly not. It is simply 2 that I have a responsibility to keep us focused on what is 3 mandated by law. And that again is the evaluation of the 4 candidates, constitutional, statutory fitness to serve. And to that end, we cannot simply reread 5 6 what is already in the order. And we cannot reread what is 7 already in the record. And so I'm going to give you one 8 last shot at this. Is there anything you want to add that 9 we haven't already heard? 10 Well, I would like to say that MS. BULLARD: 11 my character and my husband's character were assaulted in the order. We had no chance to discuss this with anyone. 12 13 I know you don't want to hear it, but it said the court is 14 concerned that the minor daughter has been subjected to 15 ridicule by a paternal relative for not substantiating the 16 alleged abuse as stated by the father. 17 Judge Bromell Holmes knows nothing about me. 18 She knows nothing about my husband. She knows nothing 19 about our lives, which has been spent advocating for 20 children. She did not ask anyone other than the mother and 21 her attorney. She accepted everything they said. 22 I do not think that unjustly assaulting the 23 character of loving grandparent is very professional. 24 was not asked a question. I was not allowed a comment. 25 Therefore, I could have nothing to do, my husband could

1	have nothing to do but sit for a year, praying every
2	morning and every night, that this injustice would be
3	fixed.
4	As you exercise your political prerogative,
5	I would urge you to consider Judge Bromell Holmes
6	reputation for lacking professionalism and the temperament
7	required to be a judge.
8	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you very much, Ms.
9	Bullard. I appreciate you making the time. I know it's
10	not easy to revisit what is clearly, you know, and
11	undeniably and very difficult episode. So thank you for
12	again making your way here and time today before the
13	Commission.
14	Do any of the commissioners have any
15	questions for Ms. Bullard?
16	(Hearing none.)
17	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Seeing none. Thank you
18	very much for you time and your testimony here today.
19	MS. BULLARD: I appreciate the opportunity
20	to address this committee.
21	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you. So it's come
22	to my attention that we need to go into executive session
23	for a briefing on some legal issues. And so to that end,
24	on a motion of Representative Jordan, seconded by Ms.
25	Blackley, the pending question is moving into executive

1	session. All in favor signify by saying "aye".
2	(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
3	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: All opposed "nay"?
4	(Hearing none.)
5	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: The "ayes" have it.
6	Ladies and gentlemen, we'll kindly ask for everyone to step
7	out of the room while we have a discussion on some legal
8	issues that have arisen.
9	(Executive session from 4:20 p.m. to 4:38 p.m.)
10	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ladies and gentlemen,
11	thank you for indulging us in that brief respite. We are
12	not coming out of executive session, and resuming our
13	screening process.
14	For the record, while we were in executive
15	session, no votes were taken and no decisions were made.
16	For your edification there was a procedural question
17	raised, and we had to discuss that with our lawyers.
18	Having had resolved that question, we are able to proceed.
19	And I would again recognize Ms. Foster for the resumption
20	of our screening.
21	EXHIBIT NO. 24 - WRITTEN RESPONSE OF THE
22	HONORABLE JAN B. BROMELL HOLMES)
23	MS. FOSTER: The Commission has before it,
24	your written response to the complaints, which I
25	respectfully request be made a part of the record at this.

1	Would you like to add any more testimony or response?
2	JUDGE HOLMES: Other than denying the
3	allegations. Since my written response will be made a part
4	of the record, I certainly stand on my written response. I
5	deny the allegations that I have acted unprofessional, that
6	I have improper temperament, that I ever made a ruling
7	based on any type of contempt.
8	All of my rulings have been based on the
9	information presented to me, properly presented to me,
10	after I gave it deliberate considerate deliberation. And
11	I've always heard from all parties in all matters. And
12	that's pretty much my statement in addition to what's
13	written.
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Any questions from
15	Commission members with respect to the complaints we've
16	heard?
17	(Hearing none.)
18	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Judge, thank you for the -
19	- sorry, ladies and gentlemen. This is my first time being
20	in this chair. And so I need correction, even sometimes
21	when I had it right to start with.
22	(Off-the-record discussion.)
23	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Judge, we did not give you
24	an opportunity, earlier, to introduce the gentleman that
25	came in with you, or any of the other folks that have

1	joined you today. If you want to introduce them, we'd
2	recognize that, certainly, this is not a standard part of
3	their day. And we want to give you an opportunity to
4	recognize them, nor not.
5	JUDGE HOLMES: My husband is here with me,
6	and four other very experienced jurists in Horry County are
7	also present in support and Georgetown County. George
8	Hearn, Martha Hammel, Debra Dansler, and Carolyn Hills.
9	SENATOR RANKIN: What about your husband?
10	What's his name?
11	JUDGE HOLMES: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't
12	Cleveland Holmes. As in the State of Ohio, Cleveland
13	Holmes.
14	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Well, thank you all for
15	being here today. No doubt this is a important moment.
16	And thank you for making time to do that.
17	Judge, at this point I would I would
18	recognize you for any brief opening remarks you may want to
19	make. And if you don't want to, then we'll proceed
20	directly with questions from Ms. Foster.
21	JUDGE HOLMES: I just want to thank you all
22	for what you do. I know it's very tedious. And I
23	appreciate the time and effort that you devote in your
24	duties. I am also thankful to your staff, who has always
25	been very, very gracious to deal with.

1 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Ms. Foster. 2 MS. FOSTER: I note for the record that 3 based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, 4 which has been included in the record with the candidate's 5 consent, Judge Bromell Holmes meets the constitutional 6 and/or statutory requirements for this position regarding 7 age, residence, and years of practice. 8 EXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: 9 Judge, why do you want to serve on -- as a judge on the Court of Appeals? 10 11 I started my family court trial experience at the Α. 12 tender at of 36, in 2007, when I was elected. So I have 13 served continuously for sixteen and a half years. 14 that -- I've done that position with purpose and passion. 15 And I feel that I have worked to the point where 16 I can be acclimated. I have the necessary skills, the 17 experience required for a judge on the Court of Appeals. 18 Judge, you noted in your PDQ, several instances 0. 19 of your serving as acting Justice on the Supreme Court, no 20 November 15th, 2017, December 14th, 2022, and April 20th, 21 2023. And you also note that you were appointed to sit as 22 an acting justice on the Court of Appeals in July of 2023, 23 and you'll serve until December 31st, 2023. 24 How do you feel your legal and professional

experience, and specifically your appellate experience,

serving on the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals, will assist you to be an effective judge on the Court of Appeals?

A. Actually -- it actually begins with my family court trial experience. I thought I would retire as a family court judge, but when extended the opportunity in November of 2017, to sit on the Supreme Court, I realized that I had the requisite skills to do appellate work; that the skills that I acquired in family court in terms of reading the plaintiff's submission, defendant's submission, and the entire record were the same skills; and also knowing the rules of evidence, and knowing the appellate court rules are the same skills that served me quite well at the Supreme Court level.

I received many compliments from justices, encouraging me to offer my service at the appellate level, whether at the Supreme Court or the Court of Appeals. I certainly believe that the proper court for me at this particular point is the Court of Appeals.

And I can tell you, I'm so grateful for my experience at the family court level, because that experience is certainly helping me as I fulfill the role at -- and fulfill the role and assist with the backlog of cases at the Court of Appeals, presently.

In terms of not relying solely on what the

1 appellant states in the brief, what the respondents states 2 in the brief. But I must consider the appellant, the 3 response brief, as well as the entire record as a whole. 4 'Cause you can't really rely on one particular side, who is 5 representing their side only, to give you the facts as 6 actually what took place at the trial. 7 So because of my experience as a family court 8 trial judge, I am handling that job guite remarkably. I am 9 appreciative of the fact that oral arguments are on the 10 video portal. 11 So everything that I've done in terms of work at 12 the Court of Appeals, the oral arguments are on video 13 portal for anyone to watch. 14 Also -- I'm going to stop talking. I'll let you 15 go to your next question. 16 0. Thank you, Judge. How would you describe your 17 general judicial philosophy? To rule after careful consideration of all the 18 Α. 19 facts presented to the court. Also, to have patience, be diligent, be meticulous, and to make sure that all parties 20 21 are heard. 22 Judge, what is your vision for the future of our 0. 23 judicial system? And what changes would you advocate, and 24 why?

In terms of the vision that I have for the

25

Α.

1 judicial system, I would advocate in terms of -- because 2 I'm working at the Court of Appeals now, and I see that as 3 -- see this issue as being a problem. During COVID we 4 ventured into technology -- all the courts did, in terms of 5 Webex. 6 And so I was chief administrative judge at the 7 time for the 15th Circuit. But we did not venture into 8 trying to have a contested trial by Webex. And so, 9 actually, we are seeing that problem now at the Court of 10 Appeals. 11 And I actually sat on the panel that heard the 12 first case that was appealed as a result of COVID. And so 13 when individuals -- when the judge is where the judge is, 14 and you have lawyers in their locations and they're saying, 15 "Well, see, Judge. There it is right there." 16 Well, we don't see it because it wasn't in the 17 So that was very difficult. But I do advocate --18 we're on the right track in terms of Webex. 19 certainly don't advocate that for contested trials. Never 20 And we've only used it in family court for 21 uncontested matters. 22 The other thing I would like to see -- and I 23 don't know I should venture and say this because -- in one 24 of the cases I sat -- we have rules of discovery in family

court. And I know you have rules of discovery as well in

general sessions.

But I was troubled by a trial that proceeded, and on day three of the trial, GPS evidence was allowed into the record. And that was the first time the defendant knew of it. That troubled me, because in family court we have rules of discovery where you can't have trial by ambush.

You have a certain amount of time to turn over what is discovery, what is -- what you will -- what you plan to use at trial. Well, that didn't happen in this particular case.

And I do know that the solicitor does have to turn over everything that the solicitor plans to use in discovery, if it's in the solicitor's possession. However, this particular document was not in the solicitor's possession, so they didn't have an obligation to turn it on — to turn it over.

Well, one question that I had was certainly you knew that you were going to use it. So that is one change I would like to see if that is not -- I haven't had an opportunity to dive any -- deeply into it.

But I think that, certainly, if we can -- that needs to be taken more seriously when you're talking about a person that can go to prison for "X" amount of years, and to spring something -- a document on them, the third day of trial.

And then the trial not -- it not -- it not be a mistrial and -- or even taken up -- given a continuance for the defendant to have an opportunity to do proper discovery.

## Q. Thank you.

A. And we are also moving -- and I'm appreciative of us being -- being more considerate of mental health issues. I can tell you since COVID, we have dealt a lot of people coming into family court with mental health issues.

And so we are moving in that direction. And I would like for us to continue to give the judges resources in terms of how to deal with individuals that present themselves with mental issues in our courts.

- Q. Thank you. Judge, to what extend do you believe that a judge should or should not defer to the actions of the General Assembly?
- A. I believe that a judge should always defer to the actions of the General Assembly. I was asked a question by Chairman Caskey last year, and this question bothered me the entire time. And I want to give an example of me actually deferring to the General Assembly.

I was about two years a judge at -- on the family court level, when I actually faced the issue of deferring to the General Assembly. And this question concern -- concerned me being harsh on a juvenile rape defendant.

1 And what happened there, the juvenile pled guilty 2 to criminal sexual conduct first degree. The state -- the 3 statute says an individual that pleads quilty to that, or 4 is found quilty, must register as a sex offender 5 biannually. 6 The juvenile's attorney objected to me ordering 7 that, and indicated that my doing so is cruel and unusual 8 punishment because of it being a juvenile. And my position 9 was I -- I understand your argument, but the statute does 10 not differentiate whether it's a juvenile or an adult. 11 I am required to follow the law. And I did. The 12 case, because it was a constitutional issue, was appealed 13 directly to the Supreme Court. I was affirmed. 14 But the Supreme Court did give the juvenile an 15 opportunity to request a review. But I deferred to the 16 General Assembly. And I believe that was the right thing 17 for me to do. Judge, the Commission received 334 ballot box 18 0. 19 surveys regarding you, with 74 additional comments. 20 ballot box survey, for example, contained the following 21 positive comments: 22 Quote, "Judge Holmes is an excellent jurist, has 23 tremendous knowledge of the law, unquestioned ethics, and 24 sterling judicial temperament."

Another noted, quote, "Judge Holmes is an

excellent family court judge and has significant experience on the appellate bench. She's a hard worker and plays no favorites."

Nineteen of the written comments expressed concern. Some of these concerns related to your level of experience, as well as your ability to serve on the Court of Appeals. How would you respond to such concerns?

A. The concerns in terms of my level of experience, I certainly don't think -- and I realize that these are ballot box survey, so they are anonymous. I don't believe that they came from individuals that regularly appear in front of me.

Because individuals that regularly appear in front of me, certainly know that I have the requisite experience and the requirements to serve as a judge on the Court of Appeals.

And the other issue -- what was the last part of the question?

- Q. It was related to level of experience as well as ability to serve on the Court of Appeals.
- A. And when I served as an acting justice on the Supreme Court, all of those oral arguments are also on the video portal. And in terms of my service on the Court of Appeals -- actually, I stated all of the oral arguments are on video portal.

1 And so I wouldn't offer for this service if I 2 felt like I was not qualified to do so. 3 Thank you, Judge. Another concern raised was 0. 4 regarding your impartiality. What response would you offer 5 any concern about that? 6 Α. Well, I would say impartiality -- and I don't 7 know what context that is made in. But I -- I am not 8 partial towards women or men. I mean, as you saw here today, I had a female and a male litigant complain 9 10 concerning my orders. 11 As a family court judge, I have presided over 12 19,745 cases. 19,745 cases. If I had any problems 13 concerning impartiality, I think we would have had probably 14 way more complaints filed on today. 15 I call it as I see it. I call a spade a spade. 16 And sometimes that is hard for individuals to accept. 17 Family court is an emotionally-charged court. People come 18 in at their worst. And I don't have a magic wand to fix 19 the situation. All I can do is make the best out of a 20 broken situation that I'm dealt. 21 But I do not show impartiality. If I'm impartial 22 to anyone, it would be to the children. 'Cause I'm going 23 to do what's in the best interest of the children. 24 Thank you, Judge. Another concern raised was 0.

regarding your judicial temperament. How would you respond

## to such concerns? And what do you believe is proper temperament for a judge?

A. A judge should be patient at all times, dignified. And I've -- I was always raised with these Christian principles: Do unto others and you expect them to do unto you. You reap what you sow. You know, treat others as you expect to be treated.

So I treat all litigants that come in my courtroom with the utmost respect. Now, there are times, and you probably witness -- witnessed some on today where individuals will talk over each other.

And I -- as the judge, I have to maintain proper decorum in my courtroom. And, yes, I may have to raise my voice -- such as this -- and say, "I asked you not to interrupt."

I have done that because that was the proper tone for me to have to control the situation. And so -- and, perhaps, maybe the individuals that experienced that saw that as improper temperament. I didn't.

Part of my -- the code of judicial conduct -- I have to maintain decorum in my courtroom, so there are times when judges -- we have to raise our voice. Not yell. But we have to speak with authority. And it is not always accepted. So I do not have a -- an issue with my judicial temperament.

1 Q. Thank you, Judge. 2 MS. FOSTER: I would note that the Pee Dee 3 Citizens Committee reported that Judge Bromell Holmes was 4 well qualified as to evaluative criteria and ethical 5 fitness, experience, professional and academic ability, 6 character, reputation, and judicial temperament, and 7 qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional 8 qualifications, physical health and mental stability. 9 BY MS. FOSTER: 10 Just moving to some housekeeping issues. 0. 11 submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have 12 you contacted any members of the Commission about your 13 candidacy? 14 Α. I have not. 15 Are you familiar with Section 2-19-70, including Q. 16 the limitations on contacting members of the General 17 Assembly regarding your screening? 18 What was the question again? Α. 19 If you need me to repeat. Are you aware with 0. 20 South Carolina Code Section 2-19-70, including the 21 limitations on contacting members of the General Assembly 22 regarding your screening? 23 Α. I am. 24 Since submitting your letter of intent, have you Q. 25 sought or received the pledge of any legislature either

1 prior to this date or pending the outcome of your 2 screening? 3 I have not. Α. 4 Have you asked any third parties to contact 5 members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you 6 aware of anyone attempting to intervene in the process on 7 your behalf? 8 I have not -- or I am not. Α. 9 MS. FOSTER: I would just note for the 10 record that any concerns raised during the investigation 11 regarding the candidate were incorporated into the 12 questioning of the candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I have 13 no further questions. 14 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, Ms. Foster. 15 members of the Commission have any questions for the judge? 16 SENATOR RANKIN: Mr. Chairman. 17 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Senator from Horry. EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN: 18 19 Judge Holmes, welcome. And I remember screening 0. 20 you last year, again, for reelection to the family court, 21 at which you were not opposed in that race. And you have 22 served in that role since 2007? 23 Α. That is correct. 24 A unique day for us, and all the people who have Q. 25 come to make their statements about you public, and so I do want to ask, aside from the complaints that we have now moved beyond in terms of the -- your desire to be on the family court no longer, but the Court of Appeals for the first time. It doesn't mean that you're not qualified, but I want to ask you about your interest in that and your experience in that.

Harkening back -- and the record will reflect your previous candidates, each of whom have, based on short years of practice, or longer, had some engagement with the appellate courts. Your only real engagement is just of late, correct, with your appointment and service -- I think was it to the Court of Appeals? Is that correct?

- A. That is correct. Beginning July 1st through the end of the year, and it's just to help with the backlog of cases. The court of appeal sits in panels of three judges. And, certainly, there is a shortage there.
- Q. And I don't say that to diminish your ability to serve. But in terms of your making any oral arguments, appearing before any Court of Appeals, or Supreme Court, oral arguments, motions, or preparing and participating in any briefs, what experience have you had in that prior to this recent appointment serving on the bench?
- A. Okay. In terms of preparing briefs, whenever I prepare orders in family court, I include my orders the plaintiff's position and the defendant's position, and of

course, the ruling of the court.

The Court of Appeals requires more than -- at the Court of Appeals level, the judge is actually judging or making a determination as to whether a judge has made an error. The briefs are prepared by the lawyers who appear for the court.

So in terms of if I'm just as qualified or more qualified to serve than individuals that have been appellate lawyers, my response to that would be this is a position for a judge.

And I believe that because I sat as a judge, I made rulings as a judge, I'm in the position to critique a judge. And I can certainly do that by the review of plaintiff's briefs or defendant's briefs, and certainly, a review of the record, the rules of evidence, and determining whether any issues before the court are proper before the court or whether those issues were preserved for appeal.

So I believe from standpoint it's more important to have judicial experience. I recognize that there are lawyers that choose to appellate work. But in terms of a judge being a judge, we consider submissions by plaintiff's attorney, defendant's attorney. And at the appellate level it would be appellate's attorney and the respondent's attorney.

1 Q. And I don't disagree with you in that, that you 2 are one type judge does not foreclose your being another 3 This state's history of the judiciary is full type judge. 4 of judges -- in fact, the very first one today, Justice 5 Kittredge -- Chief Justice-to-be Kittredge, who served in 6 the family court at his first stop along this thirty-two 7 year career. 8 So I don't hold that against you for not having 9 done it before. You have -- we've heard, again, a number

done it before. You have -- we've heard, again, a number of comments about you, today, and again, your defense of those comments. And I'm moving beyond that.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I don't want the record to go without reference to the folks who have taken the time to speak on your behalf -- the sheriff of Horry County, Phillip Thompson, Clerk of Court of Horry County, who appeared before you in 2017, as a bailiff, and makes comments about your temperament and your reputation.

And then an attorney who the Horry practitioner are familiar with, Dorsey Strickland, who wrote about you - again, though in the family court context, effectively giving you praise for calling balls and strikes.

And whether male or female litigant, gender notwithstanding, he, along with many anonymous folks, say that you have the right judicial temperament for this.

So again, I'm going to ask it -- it was asked

1 earlier, but why in the world would you want to go from 2 those day in/day out, making a life better or worse, 3 calling it as you deem, with what you have before you, to 4 the ivory tower of a appellate practice, where surely 5 you've heard some don't like it because they are removed 6 from the human touch? 7 Α. I can just tell you, based on my experience there 8 when -- I couldn't believe that individuals actually said 9 I think those who may feel that way, choose to work 10 in their chambers in their -- at their local residences. 11 I have made it a point to be here in Columbia. 12 So I'm interacting with the staff's attorneys office. 13 office that I'm using is across the hall from the staff 14 attorney office, so I have human contact all day. 15 I am assigned a law clerk that is there, and I 16 have contact with her every day. And by -- by the token of 17 me being there as well, I'm hearing more motions. 18 I mean, in fact -- and this also goes to why I 19 would want to do it. I'm considering motions as a family court judge. Well, those same motions also come to the 20 21 Court of Appeals, where a judge is asked to provide an 22 extension of time for an appellate or a respondent to file 23 their final brief. 24 Well, I understand that family situations happen, 25 and so -- because I sat as a judge, and I had made rulings

1 as a judge concerning extensions of time, I'm able to grant 2 those. 3 I've also have motions filed where -- where 4 individuals would ask for their appeal to be reinstated 5 because somehow they missed the deadline. And so I have 6 graciously granted those -- granted those, too, because I 7 realize we're all human. 8 We all have things that happen in our lives that 9 we have no control over. And, certainly, we need a judge 10 sitting in -- in that seat, that understands that -- that 11 has actually been there, that has been asked as a judge to 12 grant the extensions. 13 So I'm loving it there. And I have lots of 14 communication with wonderful people. 15 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Senator Sabb. 16 SENATOR RANKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR SABB: 18 I quess I'd just like to make a comment. 0. 19 course, I don't do family court any more. I had my 20 druthers of it some twelve, fourteen years ago. I've been 21 practicing for about thirty-six years now, and I realize 22 before too long, that the family court wasn't for me. 23 And so I don't -- I don't practice there. 24 would like to say that I practice, primarily in 25 Williamsburg and Georgetown County, and over in Horry from

time to time, and so I come into contact with lawyers and courtroom personnel and all of those kinds of things.

And of course, I sort of make it my business to talk to people about various things. And I've never heard any negative comments about judge Holmes, and how she carries herself, in and around the courthouse. I think she's well respected and I think she -- she's served us well.

I would like to -- in Chairman Rankin's comments, he kind of inferred, I thought -- and, perhaps, I misunderstood him -- that you were going to leave the family court.

And I want to make sure that I understand -- my understanding is that you are offering for this position, but that you also have an appreciation for the position that you currently hold. Is that right?

- A. I love what I do as a family court judge. But after sixteen and a half years -- I'm 53 years old, and so sometimes --
  - Q. Or years young.

A. Well, yeah, young. I'm still young. Fifty-three years young. And I just think that there is a higher calling for me. I think, certainly, if it doesn't work out, I will continue to be a family court judge, to serve in that compassion -- in that capacity with the passion and

1 purpose that I have done so for the past sixteen and a half 2 years. 3 But I think at a particular point in one's life, 4 when you believe that your services are needed elsewhere, 5 that you offer your services. And I do have some appellate 6 lawyer experience, because I did handle appeals when 7 practiced law. I practiced law for twelve years. But I --8 I certainly have been away from that, but I just still make 9 the point. 10 And I know you're making a point of clarification 11 -- but I just want to clarify that the Court of Appeals judges writes the orders. And I am accustomed to writing 12 13 orders. 14 And of course I'm familiar with the law firm that Q. 15 you initially worked with, Morant and Morant. 16 Α. Absolutely. Johnny and Louis, the practiced -- well, of 17 0.

- Q. Johnny and Louis, the practiced -- well, of course we lost Louis. He's been called from -- we lost Johnny. Thank you. He was called -- but I am very familiar with Morant and Morant. And was familiar with the law offices of --
- A. B. Bromell, PA.

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Q. Yeah, that's how it works. Yeah. So I'm very familiar with them and -- you know, and I -- I appreciate your offering. I understand callings and all of those

1 kinds of -- sorts of things. I just wanted to clarify the 2 other point. Thank you. 3 Α. Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Further questions from members of the Commission? 5 6 EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN CASKEY: 7 0. Judge, if I may -- as people contemplate whether 8 or not they want to ask any questions. And forgive me for 9 my faulty memory here, but during your comments earlier, 10 you referenced the GPS monitoring of a defendant and --11 could you repeat that story and help me understand what you 12 were talking about? 13 Actually, what I was talking about is dealing 14 with a case at the Court of Appeals. Just in reading where 15 -- it wasn't a GPS monitor of the defendant's. 16 apologize there. The defendant was charged with receiving 17 stolen goods. 18 And so the equipment that was stolen and placed 19 on the defendant's property had a GPS -- had GPS record. 20 And that GPS record certainly placed the equipment at the 21 defendant's -- on the defendant's property. The defendant 22 denies that he was aware that -- that the equipment was on 23 his property. 24 And so the third day of trial, of course that was 25 used to infer that because it was on his property, he had

- 1 reason to know that it was on his property. And that just 2 goes to a greater issue of where the Supreme Court, in 3 State v. Stewart, now says that jury charges can't be given 4 concerning inferences. And so that's the rest of the 5 story. But that's what bothered me, that if that 6 7 happened -- it just bothered me that evidence such as GPS 8 could come in and it not be disclosed to the defendant
  - Q. When you were considering this case as a sitting member of the panel? Or this was just a case that you --
    - A. A case that I reviewed, yes.
  - Q. Okay. So you weren't -- you weren't actively a member of a panel as a sitting judge?
    - A. Oh, yeah.

prior to beginning of trial.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. So you were a member of the panel that heard that case.
  - A. I'm reviewing it. Yes. It's --
- Q. Let me clear my lack of knowledge. When you say "reviewing," what do you -- what do you mean by that?
- A. Well, it's -- there are -- there are other case law that we are looking at and considering. And I was just saying being at the Court of Appeals, that is something -- if that -- if that is the law, then that's concerning that you would not have proper disclosure prior to trial.

1 Okay. Well, just off the top of my head -- I Q. 2 mean, that sounds like a pretty egregious violation of 3 Brady v. Maryland, if the solicitor had knowledge of that 4 information and didn't disclose it. 5 And what triggered my concern was that -- not 6 understanding that you were just reviewing this case, and 7 you weren't, in fact, sitting there. But I think your 8 comment was that you had not had an opportunity to dive 9 into that. 10 And I was wondering, well, if not -- when sitting 11 on a panel, when would one dive in. So I appreciate that 12 clarification. That resolves my concern in that I held 13 onto. CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Other members of the 14 15 Commission have any other questions? 16 (Hearing none.) CHAIRMAN CASKEY: 17 Seeing none. Judge, thank 18 you again for your service to the state. Thank you for 19 offering for this position and being here today. 20 I do want to take this opportunity to remind 21 you, that pursuant to the Commission's evaluative criteria, 22 the Commission expects candidates to follow the spirit as 23 well as the letter of the ethics laws, and we will review -24 - we will view violations or the appearance of impropriety 25 as serious and potentially deserving of heavy weight in

1	
1	screening deliberations.
2	On that note, and as you know, the record
3	will remain open until the formal release of the report of
4	qualifications, and you may be called back at such time if
5	that need arises.
6	Again, I thank you for being there today.
7	Thank you for your patience and thank you for your service
8	to the State of South Carolina.
9	JUDGE HOLMES: And thank you all as well for
10	what you do. It's greatly appreciated.
11	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: Thank you, ma'am.
12	JUDGE HOLMES: Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN CASKEY: With no further comments
14	on today's screening agenda, the Commission will stand
15	recessed until we begin again tomorrow at 9:30 a.m.
16	(OFF THE RECORD AT 5:13 P.M.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	I, PATRICIA G. BACHAND, COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY
4	PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AT LARGE, DO
5	HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT CONSISTING OF
6	256 PAGES IS A TRUE, ACCURATE, AND COMPLETE RECORD TO THE
7	BEST OF MY SKILL AND ABILITY.
8	I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I AM NEITHER ATTORNEY NOR
9	COUNSEL FOR, NOR RELATED TO OR EMPLOYED BY ANY OF THE
10	PARTIES CONNECTED WITH THIS ACTION, NOR AM I FINANCIALLY
11	INTERESTED IN SAID CAUSE.
12	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE SET MY HAND AND SEAL THIS
13	13TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2023.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Latricia Habrahand
23	Talace Conchanol
24	PATRICIA G. BACHAND, COURT REPORTER
25	MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MARCH 8, 2027

	12:52	8:11 12:16	10:3,4,6 21:24	36
\$	102:9	220:11	22:2	233:12
	13	2-19-10	20th	362
\$6,888.88	100:8 124:25	7:8	233:20	197:21 210:18
210:11	14	2-19-50	21	212:24 219:15
\$64,000	126:8	20:1	184:1	
151:9	14th	2-19-70	22	4
	233:20	47:11 71:17	208:13	
1	15	95:19 111:24	23	4
	136:7	145:11 243:15,	224:12	11:22 31:17
	15th	20	23rd	220:10
12:14 92:12	162:21 233:20	20	212:21	40
1,395	236:7	169:22	24	142:19 151:14
43:19	16	2005	143:25 230:21	400
10	67:19 159:14	36:10	243	219:4
100:7 103:23	160	2007	66:24	40s
213:6	43:20,23	233:12 244:22		151:15
10-	16th	2008	2:12	43,016.2
187:15	10:4 22:2	51:13	123:15	56:19
10-year-			2:49	45
192:19 219:14	17	2013	158:14	83:17
10-year-old	159:17	70:9	2:56	46
185:3 205:19	175	2015	158:14	92:21
225:23	92:21	36:6		48
10:20	18	2017	3	21:25
30:4	159:20	56:16 233:20		
10:31	1892	234:7 247:16	3	48-hour
30:4	225:12	2018	31:14 84:3	10:3 47:18
	19	176:19,20	162:11 189:1	4:20
104.1	8:11 161:2	177:9,18 178:1	190:5	230:9
104:1	19,745	2019	31st	4:38
110	241:12	128:18 177:19	233:23	230:9
23:12 26:9,17	1:24	212:21 213:25	32	4th
11:42	102:9	2021	15:7	64:10 70:12
83:18	1:47	75:9 162:21	334	74:7 76:25
l1th	123:15	2022	239:18	
10:3 21:24	1st	128:21 233:20	343	5
12	245:13	2023	109:13	
22:2 100:7,8	273.13	12:2,4,11,14,16	35	5
124:22		178:2 233:21,	23:24	61:16 162:25
12:30	2	22,23	353	189:1 190:6
83:18	2	2024	142:8	220:11

50/50	83	abide	academic	acknowledged
210:9 213:10	84:2,3	47:23 51:21	15:16 46:24	131:6
216:4	84	abided	67:6 71:5 76:10	acquired
53	60:7	47:20	95:8 111:6	234:9
250:18	8th	ability	131:9,10,21	act
5:13	120:7	15:16 46:24	132:9,12,15,17	36:10 38:24
255:16		49:15 52:23	162:6,13 185:1	162:12
	9	53:18,22,24,25	219:21 243:5	acted
6		71:5 86:16 95:9	accelerated	137:6 182:24,25
	. 9	106:24 111:7,15	102:17	201:6 231:5
6	60:18 84:7	131:21 132:9,	accept	acting
61:19 73:7	85:13 102:22	12,16 133:5	16:12 241:16	37:14,15
63	123:23 189:17	140:19 142:10	accepted	233:19,22
66:24	191:17 213:7	143:21 161:8	19:3 228:21	240:21
63-15-240	9-	162:6,13 170:4	242:24	action
163:12	185:3 187:15	184:8 185:1	access	110:18,23 189:8
	192:19 205:19	208:20 219:21	18:15 187:3,4,9	226:8
7	9-year-old	224:18 240:6,20	acclimated	actions
	219:13	243:5 245:17	233:16	11:18 92:9
7	91	abolishing	accompanying	109:9 140:18
85:7 188:25	52:12	37:4	45:21	153:21 238:15,
189:15,20	96	ABOTA	accomplish	18
190:5,19	142:8	23:20	40:9	active
71	9:21	abrupt	accord	15:3 142:2
109:14,21	11:12	219:8	91:1	actively
74	9:30	absolute	account	253:13
239:19	255:15	134:23	7:21	activities
78	9:51	absolutely	accountability	189:14
35:9 50:18	11:12	37:12 46:1	41:21 42:1,8	actors
79	11.12	55:15,17,24	43:9 91:13	13:24
203:2		114:14 128:12	accused	actual
7th	A	153:19 157:7	43:5 214:10,12,	37:3,5 39:18
10:6	a.m.	175:9 187:21	20 216:2	Ad
	11:12 30:4	207:11,22 216:4	accustomed	43:8
8	83:18 255:15	221:11 251:16	251:12	Adam
	ABA	abuse	achieve	97:2
8	51:11,15	138:4 175:17	41:23 43:9	
84:25 85:10	abbreviated	189:4 214:10,	achieves	adapted 152:4
189:10,15,16	14:21	13,20 216:3	44:10	
82	abhorrent	226:7 228:16		add
102:5 133:3	55:16	abused	acknowledge	109:24 110:2
		226:5	126:21 155:2	121:21 133:19 136:11 192:12
	i i			130:11 19/1/

211 25 220 0		225 22 226 1	P.	24.124.20
211:25 228:8	administrator	235:23 236:1,	afternoon	24 124:20
231:1	225:10	17,19	83:20 105:11,12	126:14 159:12
adding	admissible	advocated	123:16 158:16,	161:21
211:19	204:16	223:16	17 169:10 183:8	AI
addition	admitted	advocates	222:20	81:14
67:2 109:17	131:4	42:16 225:16	age	aisle
164:10 231:12	admittedly	advocating	34:10 63:10	90:24
additional	102:17 218:19	37:11 228:19	73:7 74:4,12,13	alarm
43:20 45:22	adopted	affect	88:3 105:18	40:17
66:24 88:7	10:17 51:14	154:2	139:10 142:18,	ALC
92:21 109:14	adoption	affidavit	22 144:21	94:4
111:11 165:3	10:8,10	18:25 19:9 32:4	148:8,9 162:25	alert
209:19 211:10,	adult	125:12 126:3,8,	233:7	72:24
14,19,24 239:19	239:10	11,13 136:4	aged	alienation
additive	adults	160:24 161:2,9,	146:15	213:2
129:16 164:2	73:4,7	16 164:17	agency	align
address	advance	169:19,22 170:7	93:7 200:11	141:19
18:7 25:21 26:5	166:7	172:21 173:2	220:15	allegation
27:8 37:22	advancement	183:23 184:1,10	agenda	55:2 191:10
79:18 137:10	166:8	193:5 199:18,20	37:11 40:5	allegations
142:21 186:20	advancing	208:10,13,22	255:14	19:4 126:15
188:6 229:20	69:10	220:20 223:6	ages	164:3 203:9
addressed		224:9,20	23:25	226:4,21 231:3,
141:21 191:20	advantage 216:3	affidavits	agree	5
213:16		62:6 85:25	72:19 79:8	allege
addressing	adversarial	104:13 137:19	121:4 153:15	226:7
44:6 141:23	44:7,14	160:7	154:4 156:14	
adjudicate	adverse	affirmed	176:14 178:18	<b>alleged</b> 189:4,6 228:16
35:10	65:5	81:6 116:20	192:1 194:4	<u>'</u>
admin	advice	117:5,12 239:13	195:9,16	alleges
120:4	11:2 171:14	afford	205:10,12 214:8	127:10,19
administer	advised	104:16 129:11	agreed	alleging
58:19	215:22 216:9	163:24	117:3 168:2,5	201:17
administration	advisement	afforded	210:10	allocating
129:20	218:11	119:15 133:20	agreement	57:17
administrative	advocacy	affording	213:10 222:11	allowed
9:3 15:1 38:21	166:1	215:2	ahead	24:14 107:19
39:15 89:18	advocate	afoul	7:2,19 41:19	193:10 196:9
90:5 99:11	19:22 66:5,17	53:23	61:14 85:6	228:24 237:3
236:6	89:13 91:8	afraid	86:22 100:6	allowing
	107:24 138:7	152:2	102:6,18,20	207:9,20
administratively	170:16 179:23	134.4	103:21 116:23,	alluded
38:18			,	

	1		1	1
88:10	Anderson	appealed	17,19,24 235:12	156:10,19,20
almighty	56:11	116:8 126:18	236:2,10 240:7,	165:11,12,25
175:18	Andy	168:4 195:18	16,20,24 245:3,	178:15,25
alternative	9:13	236:12 239:12	12,19 246:2,3	233:25 234:8,
80:21	anecdotal	appealing	248:21 251:6,11	12,16 240:2
ambiguous	51:4	161:25	252:14 253:23	245:10 246:9,
57:3	anguish	appeals	appearance	21,23 248:4,22
ambush	227:24	8:24 15:1 34:21	59:17 82:16	251:5
237:6	anomaly	39:23 40:1,3	101:16 122:12	appellate's
amended	167:19	41:3,4 42:15	157:21 254:24	246:24
85:11 103:13	anonymous	60:19 63:16	appeared	applicable
159:18	17:23 25:2,19	64:2,8,10,20	42:16 49:14	31:8 45:9 61:11
amending	173:8 240:10	66:8,12 67:14,	55:2 118:7	applicant
43:8	247:23	15,24 70:5,12	199:1 247:15	30:11
amendment	anonymously	71:10 74:6 75:2,	appearing	application
84:23 103:18	25:4	20 76:12 77:1,7,	99:7 245:19	15:23 16:1
amendments	anticipate	25 79:15 84:8	appears	19:14 21:18
31:8 61:11 85:2	83:16	88:9,23 89:2,5,	32:2 62:3 85:22	31:25 33:6 34:1
159:6		9,14 90:2 93:9	104:10 119:2	62:1 69:3 85:20
	anticipated 22:1 86:17	97:16,19 98:3	125:9 160:4	102:22 104:8
<b>Amicus</b> 36:18		102:22 105:21	appellant	125:7 160:2
	anxiety 189:8	106:3,16,22	235:1,2	applied
amount		107:4 108:21	appellate	35:3 163:12
45:14 79:13	anymore	109:18 111:17	19:16,17 40:11	applies
237:7,23	201:19	113:18,24	41:7,17 63:22	41:2
amounted	apolitical	114:9,23,24	64:3,13,22	apply
127:11	44:20	115:8 116:19	65:14 67:7,24	44:19 94:24
ample	apologies	123:23 127:21	68:10 74:4	107:20 109:12
206:11	104:24	129:7 134:23	76:20 79:4,5	155:18 163:11
analysis	apologize	135:4,8 137:9	86:24 87:1	applying
130:24 137:8	148:4 164:18	139:14,23	88:20 89:7 98:8,	29:13 44:25
211:12	174:22 197:8	140:5,8,11,13	15 99:16,18	60:17 84:7
analytical	224:4 252:16	142:16,19	106:6 115:7	123:23 142:19
64:21	apparently	146:22,23,25	129:1,6 130:23	appointed
analyze	100:14 133:18	148:21 150:20	131:2,11 132:16	16:20,22 233:21
64:23 68:10	226:11	151:14 153:16	134:8,9,11,12	appointment
78:19	appeal	154:9,11 156:5 161:6 168:7,12	135:1 137:13,22	9:4 245:11,22
analyzing	39:22 70:17	170:2 184:6,24	138:4 139:15	apportioned
69:6	77:24 80:13	185:8 193:9	140:7,14	57:11
and/or	115:16 140:20	208:18 217:14	149:12,24	appreciated
55:16 63:9	167:13,17,19	224:16 233:10,	150:11,14	87:20 122:22
105:17 233:6	168:7 245:15	17,22 234:1,3,	151:21,24 152:9	255:10
	246:18 249:4	11,22 234.1,3,		233.10

appreciating	151:25 153:22	Article	239:16 243:17,	104:24
168:19	154:23 186:23	92:12	21 244:5	astray
appreciation	arena	articles	Assembly's	147:3
33:18 150:22	198:16	32:1 62:3 85:22	65:19 90:17	at-fault
152:10 250:15	argue	104:10 125:9	assert	57:12
appreciative	143:12 155:13	160:4	203:7	attached
235:9 238:6	193:16	artificial	asserting	184:23
approach	argued	30:7	131:19	attachments
35:15 36:22	74:6 76:19,20,	ascend	assertion	126:13
54:19,20 56:14	23,24 146:21,24	147:12 148:10	201:25 203:14	attack
59:5 77:17 98:9	147:1,14 148:23	ascended	212:14	108:1
160:15 186:25	149:20,23 150:6	111:14	asserts	attacks
187:14	arguing	asks	203:21	132:18
approaching	75:10 140:23	20:12	assess	attempt
13:1 91:21	argument	aspect	130:19	36:11 216:10
appropriately	75:3,5 77:3,4	97:25 98:18	assessment	attempting
165:18 182:25	89:14 130:25	106:12	152:22	48:6 72:2 96:5
April	131:3 147:10	aspects	asset	112:10 145:22
233:20	148:23 149:13,	126:22	71:10 73:21,23	244:6
arbitrary	18 239:9	aspire	assign	attend
80:14	arguments	151:22	194:1	189:13
arbitrate	69:5,8,9,10,13	assassination	assigned	attention
140:20	106:8 132:18	127:13	19:18 248:15	38:1 39:7 81:23
arbitration	146:19 148:20	assaulted	assist	195:8 211:5,6
155:7,8	235:9,12	228:11	64:7 89:4	229:22
arcane	240:22,24	assaulting	106:15 140:4	attorney
134:14	245:18,20	228:22	234:2,23	15:8 18:5 19:21
architect	arise	assemblies	assistant	20:12 23:9,12,
44:9	77:17 82:22	28:16	23:18 120:21,	18 29:16 34:1
arduous	101:22 122:18	assembly	23,24	42:17 43:13
33:11	126:15 158:2	22:9 45:12,15,	assume	60:12 62:22
area	arisen	25 47:13 48:5	189:1 204:3	63:4 80:8
16:24 24:16	230:8	71:19 72:1 92:9,	assumed	106:25 129:4
51:23 78:15	arises	11,18 95:2,21	226:11	133:24 172:17
93:15 99:9	35:8 59:23	96:4 106:1	assuming	180:3 185:22
111:4 152:11,25	255:5	109:9,10 112:1,	54:8,10 58:20	210:13,14
154:15 155:4	arose	9 119:1 141:9,	114:3 154:1	213:16 228:21
213:24 225:24	193:17	10 142:2,6	195:2 196:15	239:6 246:23,
areas	array	145:13,21	assumption	24,25 247:18
17:15 89:16,21	93:4	206:15,18	196:16	248:14
98:22,24 107:2	arrive	211:21 218:22	asterisk	attorney's
111:6 113:25	197:17 221:23	238:16,18,21,24	asici isk	80:2
	•	· 	•	<u> </u>

attorneys	243:19 244:6	8:20 18:12	balls	190:4 191:9
9:10,13,17 17:2	252:22	25:16 26:5 28:8	156:4 247:21	213:14
19:13,17 24:1,	awful	33:7,8 68:2	Bannister	bated
24,25 25:19	162:19	77:21 78:9	120:9 121:23	203:22
26:3,10 40:16	aye	179:17 180:18	banter	bathing
66:18 80:8	7:14,15 8:3,4	backgrounds	48:15	225:23
81:11 94:10	10:12,13 11:5,6	24:2 114:19	Baptist	bats
248:12	83:11,12 123:7,	backlog	225:11	117:6
attribute	8 230:1,2	79:25 80:17	Bar	battle
35:20 45:7	ayes	108:20 234:23	12:12,16 14:7	216:16
146:16	7:18 8:7 10:16	245:14	15:14 16:15,17	Beach
atypical	11:9 83:15	backlogged	17:6,7,19 22:16	58:2 170:15
102:7	123:11 230:5	119:11	23:2 29:11	Beatty
audibly		bad	32:24 33:2	37:24
7:15 8:4 10:13	В	82:4 108:8	37:10 53:8	beautiful
11:6 83:12		120:1 155:22	62:15 68:12	216:19
123:8 230:2	babies	170:17	118:7 150:1	Beckman
August	72:20	baffled	152:16,19	223:18
75:7	baby	213:14	Bar's	
aunts	165:23	bailiff	12:4	<b>began</b> 63:20
227:4	back	247:16	bars	
authenticity	11:13,18 14:22	Baker	156:1 202:4	<b>begin</b> 30:10 34:5
144:13	30:2 40:14,23	9:14	base	45:24 54:2
authority	45:1 46:19	balances	176:1	183:22 209:2
45:24 54:4,12,	50:18 51:17	26:14,19 55:13,	based	255:15
15 242:23	59:22 69:9	23	17:1 21:22 24:8	beginning
avail	74:21 75:1,10	balancing	34:5 63:6 64:24	74:5 245:13
186:1	78:2 82:21	188:14	65:6,9 87:24	253:9
avenue	83:21 84:1	ball	105:14 119:5	begins
220:9	93:22 101:21	57:23	127:5 139:6	234:4
avoid	113:21 122:17	ballot	141:9 143:22	behalf
80:17	123:17 133:8	16:16 17:18,19,	166:6 186:18	48:5,7,20 72:1,3
awaiting	135:19 143:16	25 18:7 31:24	231:7,8 233:3	96:4,6 105:9
77:3	146:7 158:1	43:19 61:25	245:8 248:7	112:9,11 127:2
awaits	174:2,4 186:5	66:24 68:17	basically	143:13 145:21,
75:23	188:16 192:17 197:19 200:7	85:19 92:21,22	58:20 114:9	23 184:18 199:6
aware	212:17 245:7	104:7 109:13,15	150:7,10 151:2	244:5,7 247:14
41:6 48:6 53:2	255:4	112:25 118:5	153:5,17 175:1	behavior
72:2,24 96:5,7	backbone	125:6 142:8	basics	55:16 58:5
112:10,12	143:17	160:1 239:18,20	134:8	153:5
145:22 167:13		240:10	basis	belief
170:19 200:20	background		115:14 188:20	49:24 109:11
				.,.2110,.11
	T.	1	1	1

halias	h:-	blotont	25 19.7 21.24	huida
belies 74:4	<b>big</b> 57:10 107:9	<b>blatant</b> 175:14	25 18:7 31:24 43:19 61:25	<b>bride</b> 104:20
	121:18 151:21		66:24 68:17	briefed
believed 213:17	153:6,8 154:6	Blitch	85:19 92:21,22	
	181:12	42:14 43:6	104:7 109:14,15	76:19,22 77:2 147:14 149:12
bench		blower	112:25 118:5	
8:15 9:1 26:1	big-dollar 115:4	193:8	125:6 142:8	briefing
31:22 33:10		board	160:1 239:18,20	77:7 123:13,19
34:17 35:4	bigger	36:2 42:1 109:4	240:10	147:5,6 149:16
51:20 55:18	90:4 150:16	Bob	<b>boy</b>	229:23
58:20 61:24	198:21	9:14	213:7 219:13	briefly
63:22 64:3,22	biggest	bodies		9:9 15:21 38:17
68:3,10 69:16	63:19 121:14	22:10 81:11	BOYKIN	123:6 149:8
70:1 85:18	bill	body	124:24 125:2	209:23 223:15
89:17 93:5 94:5	75:9	27:18 29:21	136:8	briefs
100:15 104:6	birth	49:14,20 50:1	Brady	36:18 80:25
109:19 111:14	73:16	74:3 75:24	254:3	106:7,25 147:7
125:5 147:12	birthday	118:25 119:4	brain	156:23 245:21,
152:15 156:22	186:6 219:18	176:24	157:4	23 246:5,14
159:25 180:5	bit	Bogan	brainstorm	bright
240:2 245:22	23:2 43:25	86:8	141:18	42:18
beneficial	78:13 79:19	Bogle	branch	Brilliant
68:10 152:18	89:6 94:6 99:2	172:25 220:13	29:22 42:2,9	67:5
benefit	104:25 109:1	222:10	49:25 50:1	bring
34:14,25 43:4	143:4,24 144:20	book	219:5	29:11 38:1
51:5 76:11	147:25 150:3	154:24	brash	68:13 93:2
129:14 133:4	179:16 221:20	bookend	76:2	94:16 99:12
152:23 192:11	black	40:12,23	bread	114:12 160:10
206:16 210:16	46:4 203:7,8	borderline	39:25	195:8
211:20 223:6	Blackley	185:9	break	brings
benefitted	179:12,13,16,	bothered	30:1,9 83:7	57:15 79:15
13:13	19,22 180:1,13,	238:19 253:6,7	Brearley	broad-speaking
Benson	17,21 181:13,15	·	58:1	39:15
9:14	229:25	bottom	breath	broadcast
Berkeley	Blake	27:24	203:22	13:10
50:4 74:24	76:18 147:12,20	bought	breathtaking	broader
Beth	150:13	55:20	33:2	139:24
62:13	blame	bound	Breeden	broke
biannually	193:19	98:6	9:15	173:1
239:5	blamed	bow		broken
bias	206:7	81:21	brevity	241:20
68:18 94:10,13	blames	box	182:20	
162:9	193:17	16:16 17:18,19,	Brian	Bromell
	1/3.1/		9:15,20	158:15,21

	1		1	1
159:16,19,22	126:3,15,17	caliber	58:10 60:5,11	Canon
161:5,12 162:1,	127:1,3 136:2	93:1	67:3 72:7,8,11	162:11
8,18,21 163:4,	buckets	call	76:22 77:11	capable
16 164:19	43:24	7:2 24:14,15	79:4 83:5 96:11	42:18
165:6,11,16,17	build	26:9,18 48:11	102:2,8 111:16	capacity
166:2,8,11	91:12,17,21	97:17 156:4	112:15,16 123:3	15:4 250:25
170:1,9 171:23	98:12	218:1 219:17	129:13 130:10	captures
173:15 184:5,13	building	241:15	137:1 142:18	113:1
208:17,24	81:12	called	146:4,18 147:11	card
212:22 217:13	Bullard	8:11 36:5 59:22	158:8 170:1	219:17
224:15,22	183:4 222:19,	82:21 101:21	191:2 203:1,19	cardinal
226:2,10 228:17	20,21,23,25	122:17 135:1	211:7 222:2	141:7
229:5 230:22	223:3,15,21,22	147:25 154:10	224:15 244:11,	care
233:5 243:3	224:8,12,19,25	158:1 174:3	12	27:19 73:6
251:22	225:3,6 226:13,	212:16 216:8	candidate's	98:21 132:17
brother	15,23 227:2,8,	251:18,19 255:4	19:5 24:17	152:25 185:18
138:22	10,12,22 228:10	calling	26:25 63:7,8	
brought	229:9,15,19	24:13,25 247:21	87:25 88:1	<b>career</b> 32:11 63:21
28:24 50:12	bulls	248:3 250:23	105:15,16	68:7,21 69:24
68:14 86:4	41:14	callings	139:7,8 233:3,4	74:3 88:12,14,
110:15 126:18	bunch	251:25	candidates	17 117:19 247:7
150:14 151:10	74:25 149:12	calls	8:12,14,15,22	
218:16	burden	24:11,17,19	13:12,13,14	careers
Bruce	46:8	25:2,8,9,13,18,	15:5,24 17:3,11	223:17
108:23	Burr	20 26:6,16 27:7	19:7,18 20:10,	careful
bruises	75:14	42:24	15,24 21:4,8	64:23 76:1
185:14 213:23		campus	22:3 23:15	235:18
215:20,24	business	225:9	24:10 25:11,14,	carefully
225:24 226:1	14:1 90:9 152:20 155:5	candidacy	20 26:12 32:25	37:2 70:1
Brumbach	170:15 176:11	47:9 71:15	33:16,17 49:16	Carolina
125:17,20,23	250:3	95:17 111:22	52:4 59:5,15	7:8,20 8:11
126:9,12,20,23		126:12 128:11	82:14 100:3	12:4,12,16 14:7
127:6,10,19,21,	busy	145:9 146:13,17	101:14 102:5	15:7,9 28:15
23 128:6,7,12	105:5	243:13	114:19 122:10	34:18 35:5
129:10,18,22	butter	candidate	133:3 135:7	36:12 43:15
130:21 131:12,	39:25	8:20 15:12,25	146:15 148:9	46:3 51:10,17
14,17 132:1,7,	button	16:10 18:3,4,11,	152:7 157:19	57:18 60:18
11,15,20,23	211:5	18,21,24 19:11,	161:5 184:5	82:24 110:7
133:1,13,17		23,24 21:3,23	203:2 208:17	130:1 131:5
134:6,10,20	C	24:14,18 25:1,5,	228:4 245:8	133:22 134:22
135:13,17		10 26:8 30:10	254:22	135:4 137:13,17
Brumbach's	calculated	43:17 52:22	candidly	149:24,25
	177:22,24		150:2	152:14 153:18

156:21 162:18	17,21 254:6	14,22 62:17	185:21 188:22	cautionary
163:12 193:11	cases	63:3 72:10	190:25 191:6	20:20
219:6 223:19	18:11,13 36:7	77:10,12 78:21	192:4,10,21,23,	cautioned
225:11 243:20	40:12,25 41:7,9	81:16,18 82:6,9	25 193:3,21	30:17 60:23
255:8	44:15 50:22	83:2,6,13,15,19	196:24 197:2,9	84:14 103:4
Carolina's	51:6 56:12,16,	84:6,10,16,22	198:4 199:12	124:4 125:24
140:7 213:18	19 65:4 66:8,10,	85:1,5,16 86:9,	202:16,20,25	135:24 158:22
Carolyn	16,21 67:24	13 87:15 96:13	203:4,11,13,16	160:19 169:14
232:8	68:11,13,21	97:4 99:23	205:13,23	183:15 208:5
carries	69:4,12 74:6	100:22 101:4,7	206:10,14,23	222:25
46:8 250:6	75:25 76:20	102:3,10,15,21,	207:5,22,25	centered
Carus	77:2 78:6 79:5,	25 103:6,12,16,	208:2,8 209:8,	8:18
36:7	19 80:4,8,9,13,	21 104:4,23	10,12,14,17,19,	central
case	24 81:3 93:21	105:8 112:18	23 210:2,24	94:21
14:11 36:4,5,17	94:1 99:5,19	117:23 118:15	211:3 212:9,11	cerebral
37:2,17 40:18	106:10 107:11	121:21 122:5	214:15,17,21,	130:12
41:3 44:15	108:20,25	123:1,4,9,11,16,	23,25 215:15,18	cert
45:19 56:2,12,	113:23 114:10,	25 124:6,9,13,	217:4,20,22,25	39:23 40:4,7
22 64:24 65:5,	25 115:2,5,15	16,20 125:3,20	218:3,7 219:23	certified
21,22 69:4,6	116:7 117:1	126:1 129:10,19	220:4,8,19,25	56:8
70:22 71:1	119:7 120:24	130:18 131:12,	221:5,7,10,12,	
74:20,23 75:1,8	140:14,15,16,18	15,18 132:3,8,	14,16,18 222:5,	certiorari
77:7 79:13,16	143:9 146:21	14,19,22,24	14,18,21 223:3,	39:25 129:9
81:4 90:3 91:4,	147:6,10,14	133:2,14,16	21,23 225:1,4	154:5
22 94:23 98:10	149:12,15	134:3 135:14,18	226:13,17,24	chain
107:17,21 108:8	150:16 154:2	138:10,16 139:3	227:7,9,11,13,	225:5
109:12 110:13,	155:1,19,20	146:8 148:3	23 229:8,17,21	chair
14 140:10	162:9 180:7	149:6 157:10,13	230:3,5,10	7:12,19 16:21,
141:15 150:10	226:11,12	158:7,9,15,18,	231:14,18,23	22 51:14 57:15
152:4 161:7,8	234:24 236:24	24 159:5,8,12,	232:14 233:1	231:20
162:21 163:5,17	241:12 245:15	23 160:16,22	238:19 244:14,	chaired
164:18 167:16,	Caskey	163:20,22	17 249:15	216:23 217:1
18,21,22 169:3,	7:1,7,9,18,25	164:22 165:2	252:4,6 254:14,	chairman
5 170:3,4	8:5,7 10:7,14,	166:17,20	17 255:11,13	7:1,6,11,16,18,
172:17 184:8,9	16,21,23 11:3,7,	168:15,18,21	Caskey's	20,22,25 8:2,5,
191:7 202:6	9,13 12:6,10,18	169:10,16	49:19	7,8 9:25 10:7,
208:19,20 210:7	14:6,19 22:17,	171:18,22 172:2	casting	14,16,18,21,23,
212:2 214:9	21 27:12 28:23	174:14,18,22,24	186:17	25 11:3,7,9,13,
223:10 224:17,	29:3,6,25 30:5,	176:22 177:1,	catch	20,21 12:6,10,
18 226:12	19 31:1,4,7,11,	11,14,16 179:12	80:19	18 14:6,19,20
236:12 237:10	20 33:20 49:1,5	181:18,21,23	category	22:17,21,24
239:12 252:14	59:7,10 60:6,13,	182:2,6,11,15,	81:20 162:7	27:12 28:23
253:10,11,12,	16,25 61:5,7,10,	18 183:9,11,17		29:3,6,7,25
	· '		•	•

30:5,19 31:1,4,	164:22 165:2	14,16,17	16 127:12	247:5
7,11,20 32:8	166:17,20	249:15,16 250:9	131:21 132:9,	child
33:20 34:3,4	168:13,15,18,21	252:4,6 254:14,	13,20 135:2	73:8 170:16
46:21 48:21	169:10,16	17 255:11,13	137:6 143:12	179:22 185:6
49:1,4,5,19	171:18,22 172:2	Chairs	161:12 162:6,16	187:3,5 216:3
59:7,10 60:3,6,	174:14,18,22,24	23:8	164:20 170:10	226:2
13,16,25 61:5,7,	176:22 177:1,	challenge	184:13 202:12	child's
10,14,22 62:17	11,14,16 179:12	45:22,24 78:3	208:25 224:23	220:12
63:3,5 72:8,10	181:18,21,23	128:25 129:3	227:10 228:11,	children
77:10,12 78:21	182:2,6,11,15,	challenges	23 243:6	65:15 72:21
81:16,18 82:6,9	18 183:9,11,17	37:20,22	characteristic	73:5 74:10
83:1,2,3,6,13,	185:21 188:22	challenging	14:15	162:25 163:14
15,19 84:6,10,	190:25 191:6,14	46:7	charge	185:4,12 186:6,
16,22 85:1,5,16	192:4,10,21,23,	chamber	28:9 197:5	14 187:10,11,18
86:9,13 87:15,	25 193:3,20,21	36:19 50:25	198:1	188:3 189:11,12
23 96:11,13	196:23,24	chambers	charged	191:21 192:19
97:4,12 99:22,	197:2,9 198:4	66:16 67:16	65:3 92:11	197:25 198:25
23 100:22	199:12,15	81:10 248:10	129:13 191:4	200:4 201:4
101:4,7 102:3,	202:16,20,25	chance	252:16	210:15,23 211:1
10,15,21,25	203:4,5,11,13,	86:14 106:6	charges	212:21 213:12,
103:6,12,16,21	16 205:13,23	107:15,18	253:3	15,17,22
104:4,23 105:8,	206:10,14,23	133:20 154:5,18	Chatgpt	216:12,14,19,
13 112:18	207:5,6,22,25	171:19 217:12	81:14	21,22 219:8
117:23 118:15,	208:2,8 209:8,	228:12	check	223:17,18
16 121:21 122:5	10,12,14,17,19,	change	8:20 18:16 32:3	225:16,19
123:1,4,9,11,16,	23 210:2,24	13:4 39:6,7	62:4 74:21	228:20 241:22,
25 124:6,9,13,	211:3 212:9,11	57:24 146:20	85:23 104:11	23
16,20 125:3,18,	214:4,15,17,21,	161:8 170:4	116:5 125:10	children's
20 126:1,2,10	23,25 215:15,18	184:8 208:20	160:5 171:15	163:2,10 189:13
129:10,19 130:18 131:12,	217:4,18,20,22,	213:11 224:18	checks	213:3 215:23
15,18 132:3,8,	25 218:3,7 219:23 220:4,8,	237:18	26:14,19 55:13,	216:17 225:8,10
13,18 132.3,8,	19,25 221:5,7,	changed	23	choice
133:2,14,16	19,23 221.3,7,	61:8 103:13	chief	127:20 197:7
133.2,14,10	222:5,14,18,21	144:4,8 163:1	9:6 14:3 21:12	choose
134.3 133.14,16	223:3,21,23	changing	30:12 37:21,24,	7:5 8:14 246:21
139:3,5 146:2,8	225:1,4 226:13,	136:19 157:6	25 38:3,4,8,9,	248:9
148:3 149:6	17,24 227:7,9,	Chapter	11,15,22,23,24	chore
157:10,13	11,13,23 229:8,	8:11	39:3 41:4 48:16	222:1
157.10,13	17,21 230:3,5,		54:4,10,17,22	chose
24 159:5,8,12,	10 231:14,18,23	character	65:13 66:13	133:23
23 160:16,22	232:14 233:1	15:16 19:5 43:22 46:24	108:23 120:4	chosen
163:20,22	238:19 244:12,	71:5 95:9 111:7,	149:22 236:6	87:2
	,,	11.3 33.3 111./,		

				1
Christian	city	156:23 179:23	47:11 51:22	comfortable
242:5	53:20	247:15 248:15	162:10 163:12	150:4
Christmas	civic	clerk's	242:20 243:20	comma
186:7 219:17	50:3,10	18:17	Coggiola	220:13
church	civil	clerked	42:13	commend
48:11 58:2	78:14 93:16,17	91:3 93:5 100:3,	cognizant	32:10,17
circuit	99:15 106:21	5 134:11 152:9	154:1	commendation
8:25 15:1 23:17	113:11 181:1	156:19	Cohl	33:22
34:20 41:12	184:18	clerking	9:15	comment
52:16 53:23	claim	140:6	cohorts	41:25 45:1
64:10 68:6	69:7	clerks	50:17	49:18 69:19
70:12 74:7,16	claims	17:20 70:20	coin	88:7 94:9,12
76:12,25 89:18	78:16	76:15 100:15	176:23	111:11 118:2
106:20 120:4,7	clarification	clerkship	Coke	203:6 228:24
121:13 156:12	128:4 149:11	87:1	156:2	249:18 254:8
198:2 236:7	209:3,5 210:5	Cleveland	collaboration	comments
circuits	211:2 212:13	232:12	39:11	18:2 28:6 33:21,
23:22,23	251:10 254:12	client	collaborative	24 43:20,21,23
circumstances	clarify	127:2,14 131:4,	54:20	45:10 47:4
53:13 167:10	14:8 211:1	6 138:8 155:24	collaboratively	49:16 51:18
195:17	251:11 252:1	186:19 199:18	39:16 54:24	66:25 67:1,8
cited	Clary	clients	colleague	68:17 87:19
147:11 199:20,	50:8	55:5	97:3	88:8 92:22,23
21	class	Cliff	colleague's	93:10,11,18
cites	50:8 140:17	156:1	110:22	100:25 109:14,
162:11	182:10	clogged	colleagues	16,21 112:25
cities	classes	119:8,9	14:10 24:13	118:5,11 142:9,
78:11	216:23	clogging	26:25 27:2,5,7	10,12 169:4 180:22 181:2
citizen	clause	119:4,18	39:12 62:15	207:3,23 212:7
15:6	197:4	close	98:12 110:12,17	215:9 223:13
Citizen's	CLE	179:7	118:18	239:19,21 240:4
177:7	16:6	closing	College	247:10,11,16
citizens	clear	133:13	148:15	250:5,9 252:9
12:2,11,14	129:23 168:11	Club	colloquy	255:13
15:14 16:14,19,	192:5 193:3	50:5	197:4	comments/
20,23 28:2	201:18,19 211:9	coach	Columbia	instructions
32:18 41:8	218:9 253:19	74:24	248:11	9:7
46:22 50:14	Clemson	coaching	combined	Commerce
53:6 71:3 92:1	50:9	217:2 219:14	107:2 146:24	36:19
95:5 111:3	clerk	code	comers	commission
116:13 144:25	64:10 67:14	8:12 20:1 28:15	36:18	7:23 8:2,9,10,13
243:3	70:11 89:10			7.23 0.2,7,10,13

	1	1	1	1
9:8 10:20 11:22	177:7 183:23	243:3	208:24 224:22	completed
12:25 13:7 16:3,	184:4,7,11,15	committee's	competent	33:5,6 34:16
14 17:13,24	197:16 198:5	38:1	173:10	209:6 210:6,12,
19:4,9,12 20:3,	203:17 206:14	committees	competitive	17
15 22:14,25	207:3 208:9,16,	16:20,21 17:1	150:3	completely
27:14,23 28:9,	18,22 209:1	32:18	compiled	113:16 154:4
11 30:24 31:15,	211:17 215:6	common	21:22,23	163:10 210:20
18,21 34:14	221:2 224:8,14,	41:12 55:18	complain	complex
35:1 43:15,18	16,20,24 229:13	58:21 59:1 78:7,	241:9	114:25 115:4
47:8,16 51:14	230:23 231:15	16 113:3 137:2	complainant	140:18 141:14
59:8,15 60:4	239:18 243:12	153:17	125:15	155:20
61:3,17,20,23	244:15 252:5	commonality	complainants	complex-type
62:11,20 66:23	254:15,22	179:17	197:11	114:21
68:12 71:9,15	255:14	communicate		complexities
72:11 77:10	commission's	185:4 213:14	complained	130:17
81:23 82:14	8:18 59:14		199:19	complexity
83:21 84:20	82:13 101:13	communication 188:2 192:20	complaint	139:19
85:8,11,14,17	122:9 157:18		18:24,25 19:3	
86:15 88:8	211:22 254:21	205:19 212:24	110:19,23 127:9	compliance
92:20 93:13	commissioners	249:14	135:10 160:24	17:17 31:25
95:16 96:15	46:20 49:2	community	164:4,5 169:19	62:2 85:21
97:10 101:5,14	164:9 206:19	32:19,20,21	172:23,24	104:9 125:8
102:3,11	211:20 229:14	33:8 88:18	183:23 193:14	160:3
103:10,24	commitment	108:5,6 176:11,	199:18,24	complied
104:2,5 105:10	26:23 27:11	12	200:13,14,15,	186:10
109:13 111:22	153:5	comp	16,17,19,25	compliment
112:19 117:24	commitments	56:8,22 113:11	201:7,10 202:2	29:8 49:13 58:7
122:3,10 123:12	52:18	153:21	208:10 213:17	complimentary
124:11,23		companion	215:1 216:2,7	58:6
125:1,4 126:6,	committed	36:7	218:9,10 220:2,	compliments
14 127:9 128:9	152:17 167:1,8	company	12,14,17 221:23	234:15
129:12 133:5,12	168:10 201:18	17:21 219:4	223:10 224:1,9	comply
134:5 136:2,10	committee	compare	complaints	162:10 186:9
138:11 139:12	12:2,5,11,14,17	18:19	16:17 18:23	component
140:2 142:7	15:14 16:14,19,	compared	20:12 42:22	54:19
145:9 146:9	23 24:3 25:13	76:12 78:6	51:16 183:4	composition
149:7 157:11,19	26:11,17 46:22	compassion	200:10 201:23	52:10
158:10 159:3,	53:6 71:3 95:5,	228:1 250:25	213:19 230:24	
15,18,21,24	11 111:3,10,15		231:15 241:14	concept
160:23 161:4,6,	116:13 135:6	competence	245:1	35:5,14
10,14 166:21	144:25 145:3	204:20	complete	concern
168:16 169:18,	165:4 216:24	competency	8:19	43:24 68:16,19
25 170:2,7,11	217:2 229:20	19:5 161:12		69:21 93:13
20 170.2,7,11		170:9 184:13		94:8,11 110:20

128:10 165:17	51:22 118:8	210:9 213:10	constitutionality	context
175:2 178:4	162:10 223:11	233:5	46:7	57:20 88:13
179:4 181:12	239:2 242:20	consequential	constitutionally	89:25 90:4
184:22 191:9	conducted	211:11	191:3	121:23 140:15,
238:24 240:5	74:17	conservative	constraints	22 144:15 241:7
241:3,5,24	Conference	35:18 36:21	36:3	247:20
254:5,12	50:6	37:8 44:3	construction	continuance
concerned	confidence	considerate	45:19 141:7	238:2
177:24 189:2,5	42:4,9 91:17	231:10 238:7	contact	continue
225:25 228:14	166:19 200:11	consideration	32:18 33:3 48:4,	47:23 63:20
238:25	confident	20:25 57:16	8,20 71:25 96:3	106:3 192:13
concerns	39:9 42:20	207:4 235:18	112:8 145:20	224:7 225:5
18:6 25:17,20,	111:15 147:2	considered	170:21 172:7	226:15,18
21 48:22 67:9,	confidential	16:10	185:24 189:11,	238:11 250:24
12 69:20 72:6	16:4 17:22	consistent	12 195:23 244:4	continued
93:10 96:9	18:18,20 20:4,7,	35:15 36:1	248:14,16 250:1	53:24 174:2
109:22,25	8,20 193:14	consistently	contacted	continuously
112:14 142:13,	200:2,5,9,10,12,	202:19	47:8 48:18	233:13
20 146:3 178:1,	14 201:9 206:7	consists	71:14 95:16	contract
2 193:4 204:19	213:19	77:21	111:21 145:8	78:16 177:12
240:5,7,8 242:1	conflicting		243:12	contributed
244:10	137:17,18	constant	contacting	38:4
conclude	conflicts	97:6 213:8	47:12 71:18	Contribution
57:22 219:22	32:3 62:5 85:24	constitution	95:20 111:25	36:10
concluded	104:12 120:20	28:15 35:6	145:12 174:1	control
30:9 123:20	121:7 125:11	38:22 65:3,10	243:16,21	53:16 206:8
concludes	160:6	92:12 105:17	contained	242:17 249:9
59:12 82:10	confusing	constitutional	34:6 48:22 63:7	controversial
101:11 122:6	56:23	15:15 34:9	66:25 87:24	68:21
conclusion	connect	45:15,17,21,23	92:22 105:14	controversy
221:24	97:23	46:5,6 47:2	109:15 139:6	94:25
concrete	connecting	57:23 63:9 65:23 71:7	142:9 233:3	convened
65:4	97:19	78:16 88:2	239:20	8:21
concurrent	Connie	89:23 94:22	contemplate	
22:8	225:10	95:6 97:18,25	252:7	convenient
condition	consecutive	98:6 111:4	contempt	226:7
185:25 186:21	213:24	131:19 132:4	231:7	converging
187:6,9,19		139:9 145:1	content	26:10
188:11,18	consensus	197:6 203:20	127:8	conversation
191:23	90:23 98:12	211:8 228:4	contested	217:6
conduct	consent	233:5 239:12	236:8,19	conversations
17:13,14 19:17	34:8 63:8 88:1	243:7	250.0,17	28:8
	105:16 139:8	2.5.7		
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1

	 		110 10 01	1 220 12 222 12
convinced	cost	146:14 158:12	113:18,24	228:13 233:10,
37:3 42:7 46:12	79:14	164:12 223:5	114:4,9,16,22,	11,17,19,22
Cooper	Council	court	24 115:8,16,19	234:1,2,5,6,7,9,
150:16	41:23 217:1	8:23,24 9:1,3	116:17,19	13,14,17,18,19,
сору	counsel	14:25 15:1,2	117:2,4 121:1,	21,24 235:7,12,
19:2 126:12	9:7 14:4 42:12,	16:16 17:15,20,	22 123:23	19 236:2,9,20,
177:2	13 64:16,19	21 23:18 30:12	126:18,19,24,25	25 237:5 238:9,
core	67:25 74:5	31:13 34:17,18,	127:5,7,17,20	23 239:13,14
91:12,14	77:25 93:7	20,21,22 35:18,	128:1,24 129:2,	240:1,6,16,20,
Corporation	140:9 143:18	20,22 36:6,21	7,8,24 130:1,5,	22,23 241:11,17
36:8	147:9 148:16	38:25 39:5,12,	11,12 131:6	244:20 245:3,
corporations	167:4 215:20	16,17,18,19,20,	133:22 134:1,23	12,15,19,24
148:16	counseling	23,25 40:2,4,11	135:3,4,7	246:1,2,3,6,16,
correct	189:8	41:2,4,10,12,13	137:21,22,23	17 247:6,15,20
31:1,2 53:20,21	counselor	42:14,15 44:23	139:13,23	248:20,21
54:1,9 55:16,23	173:1 193:10	45:5,8 52:4,15,	140:1,4,10,11	249:19,22
56:5,10 57:7	199:17,23	16,17 53:20,23	141:8 142:15,19	250:12,17,24
61:5 84:8,9,22	213:18 215:22	54:14,19,20,22	143:14 146:21,	251:11 252:14
100:9 102:23	220:12	56:3 57:23	25 147:2 151:14	253:2,23
100.9 102.23	counselor's	58:24 60:18	153:15,21	court's
114:2 115:15	172:21	63:16 64:8,10	154:6,9,10,12	53:25 65:18
123:23,24	count	65:13 66:7,12	155:3 156:5,12,	66:19 70:21
123:23,24	94:4 172:18	67:3 68:6 69:9	21,25 161:6	92:3 121:15
146:20 147:18		70:5,6,10,12	162:23 163:1	court-level
140:20 147:18	counting	71:10 74:7,16	165:7,11,12,19,	55:9
24 154:3 159:5,	150:2	75:2,5,10,20	22,25 166:15	court-ordered
7 167:20 175:5	countless	76:12,25 77:1,7,	170:2,18,19,25	213:1,2
176:3 178:18	67:15	15,18,20,21,23	171:17 173:8	courthouse
179:2 191:5	country	78:5 79:4,12	175:7,17 176:6	250:6
194:16 195:2	49:22 51:7	80:24 84:7 88:9,	177:19 179:23	courtroom
244:23 245:11,	county	23 89:2,5,8,14,	180:2,6,25	109:20 118:6
12,13	74:24 75:6	18,25 90:1,5,10,	181:1 182:22	119:23 120:14
, in the second	121:12 162:18	23 91:14,22	184:6,19,20,24	144:16 171:9,11
corrected	172:15 232:6,7	92:2,16 93:3,9	185:8 188:15	172:10,20,22
14:16	247:14,15	94:2 97:16,19,	189:2,5 191:19,	172.10,20,22
correction	249:25	21 98:2,3,4,5	23 193:9,11	173.3,14,10,23
127:24,25	couple	100:1 102:22	194:1,17 195:3,	242:9,13,21
231:20	34:12 46:17	105:21,23	6,17 196:10	250:2
correctly	50:4 53:14	106:2,3,16,20,	198:2,3,13,14	
56:6 57:9	67:14 73:12	21 107:3,4,13	199:2,19 200:8	courtrooms
205:15	88:10,14 100:6	108:21,22	202:3 208:18	175:6
correspond	102:7 105:6	109:18 110:3,16	217:14 224:16	courts
36:15	109:21 144:22	111:13,16	226:3,6,7 227:6	20:21 38:19
	I			I

41:17 49:21	created	critique	21:20	Davidson
63:24 65:3,14,	121:9	246:12		9:18
17 66:1,2,20	creating	cross-	D	dawned
77:19 80:12	109:11	examination		203:25
106:23 129:6	creative	190:15	dad	day
131:11 132:16	148:20	crossed	72:16 136:17	24:21 28:13
134:9,11 140:7	credit	46:13	216:17 219:13	53:12 63:1 87:5
149:13,24 152:9	16:16 18:9,17	crotch	daily	107:13 114:15
156:19 163:3	crimes	213:24 225:25	114:12 213:14	122:23 136:25
165:15,18	18:12	cruel	damages	138:1 139:18
166:1,4,10,12	criminal	219:10,19 239:7	110:16	141:17 148:4
171:1 174:9	18:15 67:11,13,	cuff	damn	150:23 158:6
175:21 178:25	14,15,16,23,24,	177:22	219:18	162:24 163:4
201:19 236:4	25 68:2 70:17	culture	dance	172:20 173:14
238:13 245:10	75:19 93:16,17	39:6	217:2	213:9 232:3
cousins	99:1,2,4 120:23	cure	Dansler	237:3,24 244:24
227:4	181:1 239:2	55:16,23	232:8	248:2,14,16
covenant	criteria	curious	data	252:24
57:13	8:19 15:11,13	13:25 72:23	16:1 25:15	day-to-day
cover	17:2 24:21,23	73:12 74:19	30:19,22 31:15	97:22 99:4
10:1,9,17	25:7 26:24	118:23 119:5	34:7 61:1,17	days
covered	31:23 46:23	135:11 185:24	84:18 85:8,11	40:17 197:21
78:15 161:13	59:14 61:25		103:8,24 124:9,	210:18 212:24
170:10 184:14	71:4,7 82:13	current 32:14 38:9	23 159:1,15,18	219:16
185:17 208:25	85:19 95:6,8	49:18 52:10	date	de
224:23	101:13 104:7	75:11 203:8	21:18 22:2,6,10	137:23
COVID	122:9 125:6		48:1 71:23	deadline
176:9 236:3,12	129:14 130:19,	curve	95:25 112:5	16:9,10,11 19:1
238:8	22 131:13	75:22,23	145:17 244:1	249:5
crash	134:18 145:3	custodial	dates	deal
216:6	157:19 160:1	189:17 191:18	182:21	44:22 55:9
Crater	163:13 164:20	custody	daughter	79:24 89:23,24
9:18	166:6 191:3	128:19,22	189:2,7 213:22,	121:18 136:25
Crawford	218:14 223:14	213:10 216:3,4,	24 215:23	140:25 180:8
9:7,8 10:8,18,	243:4,7 254:21	16 226:8,9	216:8,10 225:23	202:6 232:25
22,24 11:19,20	critical	cut	228:14	238:12
14:3,5,8,18,19,	38:15 42:3 43:2	14:21 165:23	daughter's	dealing
20 27:20 28:5,	163:7	cutoff	189:5 215:24	56:25 97:20
19 33:13 87:11	criticism	219:9	daunting	114:15 163:23
174:20	38:8 44:4	cuts	32:12 149:1	252:13
create	criticisms	56:15		deals
79:23 151:3	142:16	cycle	<b>David</b> 70:10	45:23
			70.10	

dool4	107.19.211.22	d of one of	1	Jagarraa
dealt	197:18 211:22	defense	<b>demeanor</b> 118:8 173:17	deserves
76:8 115:12	218:22 230:15	23:20 148:17		217:9
136:15 152:2	declare	195:4 198:18	demonstrate	deserving
238:8 241:20	8:14	247:10	94:10	59:18 82:17
Dean 15.5.22.15.10	decorum	defer	denied	101:17 122:13
17:7 22:15,18,	178:7 242:13,21	92:8 109:8	40:2 128:1,2	157:22 162:3
20,22,24 27:12,	Dee	142:1 238:15,17	denies	254:25
20 28:6,19,23	12:3 16:24	deference	252:22	design
29:2,5	243:2	45:11,15 46:2,	Dennis	44:7,9,14
death	deem	15 92:17 142:4	9:18 33:13,25	designated
144:3 155:5	248:3	168:6	34:4,11 35:25	8:8
debate	deep	deferential	38:20 46:21	designed
14:9 73:20	33:12 38:3	55:21	47:5 48:21 49:1	177:4
Debra	deep-pocket	deferred	100:4,5 125:16,	desire
232:8	36:24	239:15	17 126:2,10	100:15 245:2
decade	deeper	deferring	128:3,7,16	desiring
64:12	38:19 79:17	46:12 56:22	133:8,10,15	162:2
December	deeply	238:21,23	136:1,9 138:13	desks
209:7 233:20,23	225:25 237:20	Define	139:4,5,11	69:18
decent	defamation	100:22	144:24 145:5	destroyed
51:21	75:1	definitively	146:2	20:9 21:1
decide	defend	54:3	deny	detail
65:4,5,21 68:11	151:4	degree	182:25 231:5	17:8
91:4 144:1	defendant	36:14,25 151:17	denying	details
198:13	36:24 57:11,14	239:2	231:2	81:24
decided	110:12 186:1	delegation	department	determination
66:8,22 147:7	189:10 191:19	21:7	89:19 94:3 99:3	246:4
deciding	220:11 226:3	deliberate	110:7	determine
68:13 80:12	237:4 238:3,25	163:17 231:10	depth	65:9,25 161:5
decision	252:10,16,21	deliberation	33:2	170:1 184:5
39:9,11 82:7	253:8	27:10 231:10	derails	208:17 224:15
98:13 115:25	defendant's	deliberations	225:4	determined
137:25 226:21	36:22 37:6	59:19 82:18	derived	167:12
decision-makers	234:10 245:25	101:18 122:14	92:13	
52:7	246:14,23	157:23 255:1	describe	determining 246:16
decisions	252:15,19,21	deliberative	34:14 35:1 65:1	
39:13 80:14	defendant-type	26:22 27:24	90:13 91:5	detraction
83:24 98:1	57:1	delight	98:17 107:5	146:16
106:12 110:4	defendants	139:18	140:2 141:3	detriment
116:16 123:18	57:17	delivered	235:16	66:10 74:19
162:23 163:18	defender's	10:2	deserve	156:13
178:22 191:8	23:19	10.2	152:16	develop
1,0.22 1,1.0	23.19			
	I	I	I	I

26:3 78:17	diligence	disclose	dispose	distinguishing
developed	182:2	254:4	80:24	14:15
64:20 68:8	diligent	disclosed	disposed	distribute
developing	235:20	253:8	40:8 66:9	10:19
64:12	diligently	disclosure	disposition	district
devote	41:6 44:19	196:3 253:25	37:12 43:13	70:21 140:19
44:24 232:23	diminish	discontent	70:14 110:9	dive
devoted	245:17	189:7	dispute	38:19 79:17
131:9	direction	discourage	65:4	237:20 254:8,11
dictate	164:24 227:20	69:15	disputed	diversity
49:25	238:10	discovery	127:11	68:9
dies	directly	236:24,25	disputes	divide
21:16	13:13 45:13	237:6,8,13	64:1	24:7
diet	190:1 232:20	238:4	disputing	Division
156:2	239:13	discreet	176:1	23:24
difference	director	127:15,16	disqualified	divorce
139:22 152:14	14:7 225:8	discuss	21:17	94:16 128:18
162:2	disagree	11:1 22:15	disqualifies	136:17 210:5,10
differences	54:6 143:17	41:23 45:14	185:8	213:10,12
180:4 221:25	187:1,13 189:19	226:19 228:12	disregard	216:16
differentiate	190:20 191:14	230:17	163:6	docket
239:10	202:10 203:13	discussed	disregarded	66:13,19 119:18
differently	205:1,5 247:1	20:23	165:16	dockets
28:11	disagreed	discussing	disrespectful	119:4,8,9
difficult	117:2	99:5	164:7	document
105:25 119:13	disappointed	discussion	disrupted	21:23 222:8,9
229:11 236:17	69:24	27:17 46:14	163:8,10	237:14,24
difficulties	disavow	154:11 206:17	dissatisfied	documentation
50:21 120:3	96:22	230:7 231:22	70:16	136:4 165:14,24
140:24 155:25	discern	discussions	dissemination	documented
dig	45:19 57:5	143:19	20:7	215:24
76:9 106:10	163:17	disinterested	dissenting	documents
digging	disciplinary	130:24	57:4	16:1 19:2,14
206:20	41:22 42:12,13	dismiss	dissimilar	20:5 30:23,24
dignified	43:3,13 51:11	110:22 127:2,4,	77:18	31:8 33:5 53:10,
162:12 242:4	discipline	25 128:2 138:2	distance	11 61:1,2,11
dignity	17:15 41:22	dismissed	136:21	84:17,19 85:2
93:3 144:13	51:15,24 53:17	32:5 70:22	distilled	103:7,17 124:7,
digress	55:10	110:24 220:13,	58:18	10,17 126:4
212:20	disciplined	14,18	distilling	129:14 133:4,
	51:10	dismissive	56:6	18,19 136:13
		194:18		158:25 159:3,9

161:13 170:11	drive		effect	160:8 211:23
184:14 194:17	79:16	$oldsymbol{\mathbb{E}}$	78:17 106:16	218:22
218:10 222:8	driven		211:11	electrocution
DOJ	52:1	e-mail	effected	75:9
70:21,25	drivers	17:18	162:24	electronic
dollar	18:16 81:21	eager	effective	189:12
175:19	82:4	73:24	64:7 89:5 140:4	element
dollars	druthers	earlier	234:2	90:8
216:15,18	249:20	13:11,14 32:24	effectively	elementary
domestic	dry	45:2 79:9 92:10	53:15,16,18	217:1
113:11 126:16	172:25	94:15 113:16	55:19 56:2,3,21,	elevated
163:14	DSS	146:14 150:14	23 74:15 247:20	178:22,23
Don	110:13,17,22	151:10 153:14	effectuate	eleven
37:24	216:1,7	164:23 205:21	45:20	
	· ·	231:24 248:1	efficient	8:24
door	due	252:9	157:2	Elizabeth
113:12	94:9 154:8	early		9:23
Dorsey	163:6 217:10	99:17 104:25	efficiently	else's
247:19	218:2,4	151:15,19	74:15	117:12 126:3
doubt	Duke	ears	effort	196:7
46:9 210:17	64:9	185:7	52:13 68:13	elucidate
232:15	duly		97:8 99:19	27:20
draft	30:16 60:22	ease 102:7 158:10	181:25 197:15	embedded
10:1,20 21:21,	84:13 103:4		232:23	35:13
22 22:1 80:25	124:3 125:23	easier	egregious	embraced
194:1,7,11	135:23 158:22	151:6	254:2	121:8
drafted	160:19 169:13	easy	eight-page	emerged
22:8	183:14 208:5	87:13 135:16	130:8	36:23 37:4
drafters	222:25	229:10	eighty	
90:20	dust	eat	64:2,20 74:6	<b>emergency</b> 137:8 140:13
drafting	55:1	83:8	elect	
81:15 196:6	duties	economic	51:19	Emily
	217:11 232:24	16:2 32:3 62:4	elected	86:7
drafts	dutiful	85:23 104:11	27:18 50:20	Emma
194:2	27:15	125:10 160:5	52:12 92:14	9:19 14:4,6
draw		edification	233:12	17:6,7 22:15
14:9	<b>duty</b> 45:19	230:16		29:9
dream		educate	election	emotion
87:7	dynamic	29:12 108:14	7:12 8:1 10:4	217:9
drill	39:7	educating	15:10 21:18	emotional
188:12		108:6	22:5,7,11 32:5	142:25 175:22
dripping			50:15,16 62:7	176:4 180:7
217:9		educational	86:1 104:14	219:9
		92:1	125:13 147:22	

			1	1
emotionally-	energy	entitled	escorted	185:14 186:1
charged	68:13 73:24	43:16	20:22	189:18 191:2,18
241:17	enforcement	entrenchment	essence	192:18 209:6
empathize	216:1	50:19	213:3	210:6,8,11,21
163:24 212:3	engage	envision	essential	221:2 228:3
empathy	39:16 137:14	41:12	64:21	evaluations
228:1	207:10,20	episode	essentially	204:25
emphasize	engaged	218:17 223:10	119:4 195:14	evaluative
212:1	77:25	229:11	establish	8:18 15:11,13
employees	engagement	equal	201:11 209:22	17:2 24:20,21,
110:17	245:9,10	129:20 210:10	216:16 221:9	22,23 25:7
employer	enhanced	equally	ethic	26:24 31:23
75:11	42:7	58:12	148:19 162:16	59:14 61:25
empty	enjoy	equates	184:13	71:4 82:13
57:15	50:3 115:20	142:22	ethical	85:19 95:7
empty-chair	147:24	equipment	15:15 46:23	101:13 104:7
57:1	enjoyed	252:18,20,22	71:4 95:8 111:6	122:9 125:6
enacted	100:20 105:23	equipped	131:20 132:8	130:19,22
28:16 45:6	106:6 115:18	93:8 107:3	162:5,7,16	134:18 157:18
65:11	ensure	110:4	172:6,13 174:5	160:1 223:14
enactment	66:13,16 74:13	Equity	243:4	243:4,7 254:21
36:9 46:2	157:2	9:5	ethics	even-keeled
enactments	ensures	erased	16:3 19:5 23:17	113:5
46:4,11	63:24 65:23	213:3,4	25:6 32:1 51:21	evenhanded
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ensuring	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	53:24 59:16	56:14
encountered 49:21	66:8,15	erasing 213:2	62:2 82:15	events
	entered		85:21 93:1	189:14
encouraging 234:16	12:12 164:11	Erica	101:15 104:9	everyday
		9:19 62:16	122:11 125:8	140:14
end	entering 12:7	Erin	157:20 160:3	everyone's
12:24 13:4,18		9:7 14:3,7	161:12 170:9	44:8,9,11,12,13
14:1 15:22	entertain 125:14	138:23	200:16 201:22	evidence
40:14,23 57:13 87:18 98:14		Erin's	208:24 224:22	163:7 165:8,14,
113:24 135:10	entertaining	96:21	239:23 254:23	18 204:2,3,9,16
138:1 143:20	60:8	errant	evaluate	205:6,10 209:20
157:6 211:9,24	entire	53:17	197:6 203:2	219:10 234:12
219:7 228:5	151:23 155:12	error	211:7 215:4	237:3 246:15
229:23 245:14	157:15 163:2,3,	167:8 246:5	222:2	253:7
endeavor	9 184:17 192:19	error-correcting	evaluating	evidentiary
37:16	213:2,5 219:4 234:11 235:3	98:4	191:4	25:23 162:15
ends	234:11 235:3	errors	evaluation	205:8 211:10
10:3	230.20	166:25 168:9	59:5 129:13	
10.5				
	I	I	I	I

	1	1	1	1
evil	excited	exist	111:7,15 119:5	69:20 92:18
219:11	73:24 78:3	28:12 137:5	121:22 130:20	93:10 94:15
ex-wife	excites	existed	131:22,24 140:3	141:10 142:12
126:17 128:17	76:7	190:5	141:2 142:14	189:7 240:4
210:21	exciting	existing	143:3,5 148:23	expression
exact	76:11	40:9	155:12 156:9	45:5 90:17
69:6	exclusively	exists	157:1 233:11,	extend
exam	64:13 99:15	28:10 54:15	17,25 234:5,21,	223:11 238:14
25:24	excuse	exonerated	22 235:7 240:1,	extended
EXAMINATIO	9:2 13:12 66:1	210:20	6,8,15,19 243:5	223:13 234:6
N	172:25 190:11	expansive	245:6,21 246:20	extension
34:11 49:7	excused	33:19	248:7 251:6	248:22
63:12 72:13	60:5 83:5 102:2	expect	experienced	extensions
77:12 78:23	123:3 158:8	11:23 19:19	34:24 111:13	249:1,12
88:5 97:13	Execution	93:20 242:5,7	232:6 242:18	extensive
99:24 105:19	69:4	expectation	experiences	156:18
112:21 118:17	executive	153:12	64:18 88:11	extent
139:11 146:11	11:1,4,10,12,14,	expects	114:5 140:22	92:7 109:7
149:9 233:8	18 14:7,12	59:15 82:14	142:25 143:7,	142:1 168:14
244:18 249:17	20:21 75:8 83:7,	101:14 122:10	22,24 144:20	187:7,12
252:6	10,16,18,24	157:19 254:22	152:3	extra
examined	84:1 123:5,12,	expediency	experts	98:25
213:23	15,18 229:22,25	43:2	23:17	extracurricular
examples	230:9,12,14		explain	189:13
36:2	exercise	expediting 41:7	70:13 110:8	extraordinary
exceed	229:4		127:18 128:8	140:12 167:10
36:16	exhausted	expeditious 40:24	139:12 141:25	extrapolate
excellent	135:11	experience	218:13	185:5
67:2 92:24	exhibit	15:17 25:16	explained	
127:24 128:16	12:14,16 31:14,	34:15 43:22	108:24 218:16	extremely 93:7
239:22 240:1	17 61:16,19	46:25 55:6 64:1,	explanation	
exception	84:25 85:7,10,	7 67:9,10,11,25	134:15	exwife's 194:8
39:14	13 103:23 104:1	68:4,9 71:6	explored	
exceptionally	124:22,25 126:8	74:11 75:19	26:24	eye
145:4	136:7 159:14,	77:14,15,20	exposed	41:14 144:3
exceptions	17,20 161:2	78:14 80:4 87:4	89:21	eyes
21:6	169:22 184:1	89:4 93:4,12,14,	exposure	42:25
excess	208:13 224:12	19 94:7 95:9,11	89:16	
36:25	230:21	98:15 99:10	express	F
exchange	exhibits	105:25 106:15,	33:18 142:4	food
75:20 203:24	12:1,12	23 107:1,2	expressed	<b>face</b> 155:11
207:10,21	,	109:23 110:2	43:23 67:8	155.11
	T .	I	I	I

			1	1
faced	98:16 107:8	126:25 128:23	father's	147:2 151:6
42:21 238:23	113:8,23 114:9	129:24 130:4,11	186:14	154:19,21 212:4
facilitate	212:5	136:20 137:18,	Faulk	227:23 233:13,
40:11	fair-minded	22 153:20 163:3	9:15	15,24 248:9
facing	113:5	170:25 171:1,16	fault	feels
37:20 66:7	fairly	172:8 175:7,17,	36:14,15,25	97:6 173:10
fact	43:4 44:19,25	21 176:6 180:6	56:5 57:17	fell
13:2 38:6 46:3	70:3 74:6	181:1 184:19,20	96:20,21 205:9	43:24
70:25 119:6	127:21	191:23 195:17	225:2	felt
127:5 133:20	fairness	198:2,14 213:3,	faulty	150:4 241:2
138:2 143:7,25	154:19	4 225:14 227:3	252:9	female
156:11 177:1	faith	233:11 234:4,6,	favor	241:9 247:22
197:2 199:23	13:24 39:11	9,21 235:7	7:13 8:3 10:12	fiber
201:21 202:2	faithful	236:20,24 237:5	11:5 83:11	44:20
205:4 235:9	38:10	238:9,22 240:1	117:1 123:7	field
247:4 248:18	fall	241:11,17	230:1	32:12 98:15
254:7	118:20	244:20 245:3,24	favorable	134:8
fact-finder	fallen	247:6,20	118:11	Fiffick
137:24	152:12 155:11	248:19,24	favored	9:14
fact-finders	false	249:19,22	36:22	fifteen
168:6	216:2	250:12,17,24	favorites	16:11 34:21
factor		fancy	240:3	40:17 104:22
98:1	familial	154:13	favors	106:19 121:17
factors	18:3	fanfare	51:12	198:24
211:10	familiar	58:5	feature	fifteen-
facts	27:14 47:11,20	fare	42:2	212:19
64:25 65:7	71:17 76:5 78:4	116:6		
107:20 109:12	95:19 111:24	fashion	February	fifteen-minute
127:11,22	136:5 145:11	58:6	10:6 22:12	163:9 219:9
131:4,5 132:23	243:15 247:19	fast	federal	fifty
133:22 134:1	251:14,20,24	109:1	56:3 70:10,16	115:11
135:2 163:17	families	faster	89:17 91:20	Fifty-three
165:8,14 235:5,	225:13	157:3	110:15 200:8	250:21
19	family	father	Federalist	figure
failed	9:1 15:1 34:20	62:14 104:21	35:8 50:18	75:3
216:12	41:13 52:15	185:3,12 189:4,	feeds	file
fails	77:14,17,20,21,	6,7,10 191:20	94:20	17:20 18:19,23,
205:7 218:14	23 78:5,8 101:9	192:22 193:19	feel	25 21:17 40:3
	105:23 106:3,20	201:5 216:20	64:6 89:3 90:24	53:10 55:5
failures	107:3 110:3	219:15 220:11	98:25 106:14	133:21,23 134:1
186:14	111:12 114:4,16	226:3,9 227:5,6	107:14,17	137:10 138:3
fair	115:16,18	228:16	128:13 137:3	147:8 172:12
45:7 69:23	121:15,22		140:3 144:17	248:22

filed	findings	132:8 162:5,7	focusing	form
18:14 19:9 32:4	20:3 185:11	202:15 228:4	98:22 108:15	16:3 18:25
42:22 48:10		243:5	184:25	128:8 212:8,24
62:6 70:9 85:25	finds			formal
104:13 110:25	76:10 226:7	five-plus 105:24	FOIA 20:4	
125:12 126:11,	fine			59:21 82:20
23 127:3 128:18	37:24 42:20	fix	folks	101:20 122:16 157:25 224:6
129:15 137:9	49:23 52:8 59:3	241:18	12:23 27:13	255:3
138:2,6 160:7	111:12,16 182:9	fixed	33:22 48:18	
200:15,17,19	194:20 224:3	229:3	62:10 68:25	Forman
201:1 210:15	finger	fixture	72:24 80:4 86:7,	75:14
220:2,11 241:14	182:14 214:16	213:8	12 93:20 96:15	formulated
249:3	fingerprints	flame-	100:1 104:18	27:9
filing	48:19	50:15	118:19 138:19	fortunate
127:8,11	fingertips	flat	160:10 221:20	70:4
<b>'</b>	25:25	75:22 76:3	231:25 247:13, 23	Fortune
filings	finish	flesh		219:3
138:4	71:12 180:9	120:19	follow	forty
fill	190:17 215:8	flexibility	28:8 59:15	139:21 147:23
8:16	217:23 218:4	86:18 102:16	82:14 98:6	forty-
filled	finished	122:20 150:21	101:14 122:10	225:7
17:25 18:1	196:22	flip	142:6 157:19	forty-three
final	fire	153:1	174:12,13	223:22
13:7 22:1 66:22	40:17	flipped	239:11 254:22	forum
210:5 219:13	fired	173:20	fondness	28:13 212:2
248:23	74:24	floor	152:10	218:12
finality	firing	177:16	football	forward
41:9	75:8	flourish	74:24	57:21 62:24
finally	firm	88:16	footnote	64:4 97:14
55:25 69:19	29:3 37:6		51:23	125:18 149:3
75:17	106:19 117:10	flowed	forbidden	160:10
finances	219:5 251:14	36:11	212:23	foster
20:19	firmly	focus	force	9:19 99:25
financial	141:6	108:7 185:7	40:20	160:10,13,14,23
16:4 18:18,20	firms	187:2,17 211:19	foreclose	161:3,18,22
33:9 53:11	23:21 63:19	212:7 217:6	247:2	168:24 169:6,
find	78:11	223:13 226:18	forever	17,18,24 170:6
17:3 24:16 28:2		focused	144:4	182:18,19
90:23 98:12	fit 00.4 106.2	31:23 61:24	forgive	183:3,20,22
102:17 113:6	90:4 106:2	69:1 85:18	73:13 223:24	184:3 208:1,9,
finding	fitness	104:6 114:3	252:8	15 222:19
25:4 46:6	15:16 33:10	125:5 159:25	forgotten	224:5,7,8,13
139:16 185:14	46:24 71:4 95:8	182:4 211:6	114:4,6	230:19,23
	111:6 131:20	228:2	11,0	
	l			1

232:20 233:1,2,	front	107:22 235:22	govo	59:2
8 243:2,9 244:9,	34:23 40:12	107.22 255.22	gave 28:5 50:23	
14	57:13 86:7		130:8,13,15	gentleman
	103:7 115:13	G	222:8 231:10	158:10 207:20
fought	118:7 158:25	gain		217:19 231:24
155:7	192:2 198:20	216:3	gavel	gentlemen
found	200:25 240:12,	Gallman	30:7	30:5 83:20 97:4
21:9,11,15	14	183:4 184:18	gender	102:10 123:17
46:10 47:1 65:7			247:22	127:12 152:8
70:19 86:15	<b>fronts</b> 42:8	199:7,19 208:1,	general	190:25 191:1
88:19 93:24		2,5,9,14,21	18:6 20:13 22:9	230:6,10 231:19
95:5 110:11	Frugality	209:2,8,9,11,13,	28:16 35:2	Gentry
175:10,12,13	82:1	16,18,21,25	41:13 45:11,15,	9:16
213:23 239:4	frustration	210:4,24,25	25 46:14 47:13	genuinely
foundation	79:12 218:9	211:3 212:9,12	48:5 65:1,19	13:21 28:7
171:20	227:23	214:5,7,12,15,	71:18 72:1 78:6,	George
fourteen	frustrations	16,17,19,21,22,	12 90:14,17	232:7
249:20	217:7	24 215:2,13,17,	92:9,10,18 93:7	Georgetown
fourth	fulfill	19 217:4,21,23	95:2,20 96:4	232:7 249:25
130:14	234:22,23	218:2 219:2,23	106:1,18,21	get all
framework	full	221:4,5,9,11,12,	107:6 109:9,10	24:11
45:22 76:5	63:1 107:9,17	13,15,17 222:4,	111:25 112:9	giant
88:16 94:22	146:19 180:18	6,17 223:8 226:22	113:7 119:1	26:9,11
frameworks	217:10 247:3		120:25 121:8	Gibson
45:23	fully	game	141:3,8,10	9:23
frankly	107:15,19	52:24,25 53:1,4,	142:2,6 145:12,	Ginsberg
40:4 43:8 44:17	155:21 224:1	13	21 148:15 154:3	90:25
53:3 80:16	fun	gamed	206:15,18	girl
120:15 198:21	100:19,22,23	55:20	211:21 218:22	213:6 219:15
204:19	function	games	235:17 237:1	
frazzled	8:13 13:23	74:25	238:16,18,21,24	give
165:22	88:16 136:20	gamut	239:16 243:16,	22:4 31:13
free	fundamental	113:10	21 244:5	32:25 39:20
220:15	204:10 205:18,	gander	General's	46:13 51:4 62:9, 20 81:14 86:14
frequently	19	159:1	23:10 29:16	87:4 135:6
65:18	fundamentally	gap	42:17	138:17 140:22
Friday	81:8	121:24	generally	138:17 140:22
50:6 119:22,25	funding	gate	63:23 66:19	166:18,19 168:6
· ·	66:17	92:12	69:15 76:5 78:4	171:19 176:19
friend		gatekeeper	79:22 93:14	179:16 188:4
7:7 50:9 58:8	funneled	88:25	generated	192:16,17 197:5
86:8 97:2	33:4	gather	26:13 196:20	205:24 206:17,
friends	future	16:13 110:20,23	genius	24 217:12
32:20,21	66:4 91:7,11	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		27 21 / . 1 2

221:19 228:7	goods	great	guess	hand
231:23 232:3	252:17	10:7 28:3 58:13	84:2 93:25	30:14 60:20
235:5 238:11,20	government	63:3 71:10 73:9	97:15 113:12	84:11 103:1
239:14	29:23 69:16,17	87:12 88:24	114:8,18 115:6,	124:1 125:21
giving	99:12	94:6 109:18	10,22 117:8	135:20,21
24:1 29:23	Governor	114:19 138:25	150:7,8 151:2,9,	158:19 160:17
166:8 218:13	64:17 67:22	139:3 151:24	18 153:1 168:9	183:12 208:3
247:21	Governor's	158:6 171:20	175:2 176:14	222:22
glad	62:16 63:19	greater	178:12,24,25	handed
12:22 102:20	64:14,19 67:18	73:7 88:18	186:19 188:13	151:7
104:25	68:15,23 75:12,	151:17 253:2	196:18 198:13	handle
glasses	15 77:5	greatly	249:18	54:11 93:8
14:13	GPS	255:10	guided	114:10 136:22
global	237:3 252:10,	greed	28:14	175:21 251:6
38:18 188:7	15,19,20 253:7	175:19	guilty	handled
goal	grace	Greenville	239:1,3,4	34:1 43:3 67:15
29:21 209:17	155:10 174:11	120:9	guys	113:10 115:7
227:21	197:17	grief	97:7 102:20	140:8,12 146:23
God	gracious	136:23	105:5 106:1,4	148:22 155:4
197:17 214:1	232:25	grievance	122:21,25	handles
good	graciously	16:15 17:11		99:3 114:25
7:1 9:8 11:13	249:6	113:19 217:7	H	handling
13:24 29:5	graduated	grieved		64:16 235:8
34:12,23 39:11	64:9	40:3	habits	hands
48:13 51:2,3,21	grandparent	grind	162:17	165:22 169:11
58:16,21 59:1,3	228:23	154:18	hair	hands-on
60:13,15 63:13,	grant	grocery	74:9	154:22
14 78:24,25	210:16 249:1,12	48:12	Haley	hanging
80:1 83:19	,	grounds	9:18	134:16
88:18,21 89:6	granted 154:5 249:6	91:4	half	happen
90:24 99:1			64:15 120:5	25:12 167:23
100:18 102:12,	grateful 142:21 152:7	<b>group</b> 50:7 148:12	156:1 165:23	170:17 237:9
14 105:11,12		151:23 171:9	213:4,13 216:15	248:24 249:8
106:23 107:3	197:14 234:20	178:13	233:13 250:18	happened
108:13 118:2,3,	gravity		251:1	144:8 216:12
19 122:25	153:11 163:23 215:3	groups 50:3,10 51:1	hall	239:1 253:7
123:16 151:7		,	9:19 248:13	happily
154:19 155:8,21	gray	growing 156:20	Hamilton	106:3
158:15,17	74:9		35:9	happy
169:10 174:23	Grayson	<b>guaranteed</b> 97:21 153:16	Hammel	22:18,22 29:1
183:8 222:20	60:17,22 61:18,		232:8	63:1 86:19 87:6
227:6	21 63:9	guardian 210:6		104:19 105:2
		210.0		
	1	1	1	I .

109:4 132:3	harsh	144:9,18 160:11	21:21 63:1	Henry
138:8,20 164:8	188:21 238:25	164:8,10 188:8	110:14 118:8	9:23
186:6 211:25	harshness	198:4 209:9	121:16 128:20	herd
218:25 219:17	173:18	211:25 218:25	182:22	125:16
226:17	hashed	222:3 228:13	Hearn	hesistant
hard	191:11	heard	232:8	80:11
19:2 23:5,6	hat	20:12 32:23	heart	Hewitt
66:14 73:25	52:22 56:21	48:12 58:24,25	179:7	76:18 147:12
74:14 86:25	79:11 134:16	75:5,18 79:9	heartbreaking	150:9
87:17 98:11	hate	107:9,15,19,20	136:22	Hey
136:21,22 240:2	162:20 185:23	114:18 136:1,12	heated	48:12
241:16	havoc	147:15 149:17	143:19	hiccups
hardest	50:23	154:5,19 156:7	heavier	175:13
136:15	head	166:24,25	57:2	high
harken	47:14 67:3	198:23 215:1,7	heavily	51:21 68:21
51:17	138:14 254:1	221:21 223:4,7	165:13,19 166:9	115:4 150:17
Harkening		226:19,25 228:9	· ·	154:14
245:7	head-shaking	231:11,16	heavy	
harms	29:3	235:21 236:11	58:5 59:18	high-charged
187:11	heal	247:9 248:5	82:17 101:17	175:22
Harrell	44:8	250:4 253:16	122:13 157:22	high-level
9:23	healing	hearing	254:25	114:20
	225:14	7:17 8:6 10:15	held	higher
Harrison	health	11:8 12:9,13	21:19 22:11	23:13 97:18
123:22,24	15:17 47:3 71:7	14:14 17:5 18:8	40:19 75:8	121:1 165:19
124:3,8,12,15,	95:6 108:10	19:11 20:6,10,	102:9 200:10,19	166:14 250:22
19,24 125:2	111:5 131:22	11 23:1 53:9	254:12	highest
126:16,20,21,25	132:10 143:24	59:9 81:17	Helen	23:14 47:1
127:20 130:2	145:2 223:19,20	83:14 96:17	138:22	49:21 93:1
131:25 133:20	225:9 238:7,9	101:6 122:4	helm	highlight
135:18,20,23	243:8	123:10 138:12,	41:5	177:12
136:1,8,14	healthier	15 157:12 161:3	helped	highlights
138:13,17,21,22	144:5	163:9 165:7	51:13	26:21 143:4
139:8,12 140:2	hear	168:17 169:24	helpful	highly
141:3,25 142:7	22:18,22 28:25	181:20 184:3	227:20	180:7
144:22,25	29:1 30:8 33:2	198:19,24 202:5	helping	Hill
145:3,6 146:10,	40:18 48:15	204:1 208:15	33:18 139:19	116:19
12 149:5 157:13	50:22 62:20	212:15,20 219:9	173:25 234:22	Hills
158:5	69:10 75:19	224:13 229:16	helpless	232:8
Harrison's	79:12 86:19	230:4 231:17	82:8	Hinson
126:5,12 127:4,	93:18 105:3	248:17 254:16	helps	9:19 105:9,11,
8,10 128:11	125:15 128:13	hearings	9:22	13,19 111:2,18
	134:15 138:20	8:21 19:25	7.22	13,17 111.4,10
	I	1	1	I

110.10				10001
112:13	Holmes'	horrific	227:24	100:24
hire	161:12 162:18	225:24	hurting	immunity
143:8	164:19 170:9	Horry	216:14	70:19
history	171:24 184:13	11:16 162:18	husband	impact
210:22 247:3	208:24 217:13	172:15 198:5	163:3 223:16,17	114:12 119:5,7
hit	224:22	232:6 244:17	225:8 227:4	153:23
26:21 41:14	home	247:14,15,18	228:18,25	impacted
150:2,5 207:1	32:19 155:6	249:25	232:5,9	55:3,4 202:6
hold	162:19 214:1	Hospital	husband's	impartial
58:10 99:1	225:10	215:23	228:11	107:8 174:5
173:6 190:3	home-wrecker	hour	hush	181:9 241:21
191:14 205:5	166:16	83:17	53:14	impartiality
211:3 221:18	homeroom	hours	hybrid	172:14 241:4,6,
247:8 250:16	216:22,24	21:25 24:4	52:14	13,21
holistic	honest	27:11 80:21	hypothetical	impediment
59:5	48:9 170:20	81:9,10 141:18	204:3	73:21
Holmes	honestly	House	hypotheticals	impediments
158:15,17,21	23:14 120:8	9:17 55:22	141:17	42:21
159:4,7,11,16,	150:21	201:23		implications
19,22 161:5	honor	households	I	157:5
162:1,8,19,21	89:1 120:15	136:18		import
163:4,16 165:6,	HONORABLE	housekeeping	idea	57:23 153:8
11,16,17 166:2,	30:16 31:16,18	20:13 46:18	36:10 134:21	importance
8,11,15 169:1	103:3,25 104:3	71:12 95:14	139:19 206:3	40:21 42:3 43:2
170:1 172:6,23	158:21 159:16,	111:19 145:6	ideal	187:10
173:3,15,20	19,22 230:22	243:10	88:15	important
175:7 176:21	honored	human	ideas	26:25 27:19
182:19,20	136:23	44:16 113:2	38:14	28:17 59:4
184:5,21 185:17	hope	248:6,14 249:7	identify	63:17 66:7 80:6
189:1 193:9	10:5 13:23	humble	37:19 150:18	89:8 91:16,18,
198:18 199:24	27:13 28:4	113:2	ideological	22 98:9 120:18
202:1 208:17	54:19 74:1	humbling	68:18	141:11 143:5
212:22 213:16,	81:25 82:3	93:17	ideology	153:15 154:2
21 216:2,13	114:6 147:12,	humility	94:9	164:13 209:21
224:15 226:2,10	22,24 157:1	113:5		232:15 246:19
228:17 229:5	225:14 227:24	hundred	<b>ignore</b> 202:1	impose
230:22 231:2	hoped	58:16 147:16		131:16
232:5,11,12,13,	218:13	225:13	ill-tempered	
21 233:5	hopes	hundreds	59:2	impressed 50:13 51:1 58:4
239:22,25 243:3	87:3	48:10	illustrates	
244:19 250:5	hoping		51:5	impressive
255:9,12	148:9 153:11	hurt	immediately	113:7 147:19
	1.0.7 100.11	210:23 217:8		
	I		1	1

•	: al di a	indulaina	::	45.20 47.7 24
improper 231:6 242:19	including 18:15 47:12	indulging 230:11	inject 95:1	45:20 47:7,24 71:13,21 90:17
	67:9,10,19,20			95:15,23 111:20
impropriety 59:17 82:16	71:17 95:19	inescapable 227:24	Injured 50:5	112:3 145:7,15
	103:18 111:24			243:11,24
101:16 122:12 157:21 254:24	119:3 145:11	inevitably	injustice	1
	215:21 243:15,	137:18	229:2	interacting 248:12
improve	213.21 243.13,	inexcusable	inmate	
38:14 91:25	inclusion	40:7	70:10,16	interest
108:18 155:10	221:22	infer	innocent	16:2 28:2 32:3
improvement	inconsistent	252:25	162:24	62:5 85:24
39:19 52:6	167:12	inferences	inoculation	88:19,22 104:12 125:11 160:6
216:25		253:4	73:5	177:7 185:6
improvements	incorporated	inferred	input	187:22 197:25
38:7	72:7 96:10	250:10	38:24 168:22	
impute	112:15 244:11	inflame	inquiry	211:1 225:19 227:19 241:23
35:20	incorrect	127:15	8:17 31:23	245:5
in-between	81:6	inflammatory	61:24 85:18	
23:25	increased	143:15	104:6 125:5	interested
in-depth	42:1,7 43:9	information	156:16 159:25	13:21 27:21
22:15	incredibly	14:24 17:12	168:14 191:1	28:7 29:13
in/day	63:17	19:14 20:2,13	instance	187:3,4,18
248:2	incumbent	27:25 28:2 33:4	55:3 126:23	interests
inappropriately	21:15	126:3 127:13	194:7	88:24
183:1 201:6	independence	135:7 165:4	instances	interpret
inclined	29:22	192:3 193:5	35:17 168:4	66:2 142:5
178:16	independent	197:16 200:2	183:1 233:18	interrupt
include	32:23 148:15	211:19 212:7,16	instigated	185:23 242:15
19:1 245:24	indicating	215:5 231:9	48:17	interrupted
included	142:14	254:4	instigating	215:14
21:14 23:16	individual	informative	48:8	interrupting
31:24 34:7	45:8 239:3	177:5	instilled	202:18 224:5
43:20 48:24	individualized	informed	100:14	intersect
61:25 63:7	142:9	18:4	integrity	97:23
85:19 87:25	individually	inherently	42:4,10 93:1	intersection
103:16 104:7	114:13	13:11	137:7 142:11	88:21
105:15 111:9	individuals	inhumane	intellect	intervene
125:6 131:3	236:13 238:12	219:10	43:22 67:5	48:6 72:2 96:5
139:7 146:4	240:11,13	initially	143:11 148:19	112:10 145:22
160:1 196:7,9	241:16 242:11,	251:15	intend	188:22 197:22
233:4	18 246:8 248:8	initials	120:16 188:7	244:6
includes	249:4	189:2	intent	interventions
16:1		107.2	IIICIIC	227:25
		•		

		1 100 - 107 1 17		
interview	invited	193:7 195:1,15	Jan 150 21 150 16	Joe
13:11 18:4	62:9	196:2 203:24	158:21 159:16,	56:11
25:11 26:4	involved	204:20 221:21	19,22 189:1	John
153:10	9:11 18:11 99:6	236:3 238:23	212:22 230:22	9:15 30:11,16
interviewing	114:20 119:10,	239:12 240:17	January	31:16,18 42:13
25:14	14 121:20	242:24 253:2	10:3,4 21:24	48:12 58:1
interviews	140:18 149:15	issued	22:2	150:13 184:18
19:18 25:12	151:3 187:16	20:8 36:6 52:19	Jared	193:17 195:11
intimately	200:12 210:7	169:4 184:24	23:9	199:19 208:5,13
27:14	212:6	194:24	Jason	Johnny
introduce	involvement	issues	84:13 85:8,12,	251:17,19
9:10 62:11 86:5	33:8 108:5	19:20 20:13	14 88:1 92:24	join
104:19 138:20	126:21	64:23,24 67:19	93:4,7	33:21 96:15
231:24 232:1	involves	68:10 70:2 76:8,	Jay	joined
introduction	8:19	13,16 77:17	7:3,13 198:10	11:15 27:23
96:24	IRIS	78:19 79:9,10	Jimmy	64:14 232:1
introductory	222:25 224:12	89:23 95:14	9:18	joint
197:3	ironically	97:18,20 98:1,	JML	36:10,12 57:19
intuit	77:1	10 119:2 132:17	75:4	226:9
227:25	irrational	136:15 140:14,	JMSC	joke
	163:18	25 141:13,21	14:4,21,24 16:2	100:2
invested	irreparably	148:7 150:25	20:11 21:3	Jones
175:4	187:11	182:4 185:9	29:10 32:10,17	97:1
investigate		192:15 229:23	33:4 48:20	
24:20 197:12	isolation	230:8 238:7,9,	52:11,17 83:16	Jordan 7.2 4 12 10.11
investigated	39:9	13 243:10	137:1 161:25	7:3,4,13 10:11
31:22 61:23	issuance	246:16,17		11:3 97:10,11,
85:17 104:5	126:24	issuing	<b>job</b>	13 113:17 123:5
125:4 159:24	issue	98:3 185:11	13:10 42:20	229:24
investigation	40:18,21 50:12,	items	51:25 53:17	journey
18:10 33:3	15 78:18 81:5	161:15	65:5,7 68:24	38:13
48:24 72:6 96:9	91:20 98:6	iteration	69:13 74:12,14	JQC
112:14 146:4	121:13,14,19	49:18 52:17	76:6 100:20	23:12
244:10	128:1 129:8	ivory	109:10,11 110:5	judge
investigations	130:3,6,9,10,13,	248:4	113:2 118:12	15:24 18:11
16:14 19:15	16,17 131:9,10,	240.4	127:24 128:17	21:15 23:18
investigatory	11 138:11		146:20 154:17	34:20,21 35:13
18:12	140:10 141:12,	J	171:20 205:11	41:4 43:14
investiture	14,19 152:2,5	J.J.	235:8	44:12 45:8 50:8
147:18	154:7 163:23	9:15	jobs	51:10 53:20
invite	168:9,11		197:12	54:5,11 55:9,20,
49:18 60:8,11	186:10,20 187:8	jail	Jocelyn	21 58:15,16,17
86:2 143:8	188:7,10,14	182:13 195:11	75:7	59:2,3 63:15,21,
00.4 143.0				
	l	1	l	<u> </u>

23 64:8,10	180:6,8 181:5	judges	67:10 68:4 70:6,	jurist
65:12,13 66:14	182:19,20	14:25 15:3	18 71:6 83:20	152:16 168:3
67:7,15 68:5,6,	184:5,12,21,24	17:12 21:8,13	85:7,10,13,16	239:22
14 69:21 70:12	185:17 186:9	22:3 26:3 35:9,	90:14 91:8,10	jurists
75:7 78:9 86:24	187:2 193:9	10 50:1,20 51:3,	95:9 103:23	232:6
87:5 88:9 89:5,	195:2 197:24	13,16,24,25	104:1,4 107:6,	jury
11 90:11 91:3	198:18 199:24	52:2,8 55:8	23 111:7 113:20	56:4 57:8,11
92:8,19,24 93:6,	200:25 201:2,11	56:24 58:14,19	124:22,25 125:3	74:22,23 75:1
20 94:18,21,23	202:1,5,11	70:18,20,21	131:22 141:4	89:17 93:23
99:13,25	205:16 208:17,	79:23 81:10	156:8 159:14,	130:25 131:3
100:14,18,19,23	24 210:15	100:1 108:11	17,20,23 162:10	132:17 253:3
102:11,12,14,	211:23 212:16,	118:22 120:13	171:13 173:13	jury's
19,24 103:11,	22 213:16,21	134:23 154:10	174:7 177:7	57:16
14,20 104:20	216:2,13 217:13	167:21 178:15	235:17,23 236:1	justice
105:2,5,11,12,	224:15,22	179:24 180:5	239:24 241:25	9:5 21:12 30:11,
16,20,21,23	226:2,10 228:17	198:1,22 211:23	242:20,24 243:6	12,13,25 31:2,6,
106:4,9,14,16	229:5,7 231:2,	218:23 238:11	246:20 247:24	10 32:8 33:21
107:3,4,5,14,18,	18,23 232:5,11,	242:22 245:15	judiciary	34:3,6,8,12
22 108:23	17,21 233:5,9,	247:4 251:12	29:21 108:19	37:19,21,24,25
109:7,8,13	17,18 234:2,6	judgeship	142:5 152:15	38:9,12,16,22,
110:6 111:3,12,	235:8,16,22	43:12	247:3	23,24 42:4
13 112:19,22	236:6,13,15	judgeships	judiciary's	43:18 46:17,22
114:4 115:11	238:14,15,17,22	24:9	107:25	47:6 48:16,22
117:24 118:2,3,	239:18,22,25	judging	Julia	49:3,8 54:4,17,
13,18 122:1,6,	240:1,15 241:3,	246:3	9:19	22 59:8,10 60:3
24 123:2 127:20	11,24 242:2,3,	judgment	July	116:18 149:22
137:1 139:13	12 243:1,3	8:16 35:12,18	233:22 245:13	166:1 233:19,22
141:1 142:1	244:15,19	36:12 37:6 40:7	jump	240:21 247:4
153:13 155:3,22	246:3,4,10,11,	45:6 131:16	109:4 129:15	Justice-to-be
156:12 158:15,	12,13,22 247:2,	186:18	152:3 153:6,8	247:5
17 159:4,7,11	3 248:20,21,25	judicial	165:3	justices
161:5,11,25	249:1,9,11	8:10,13 12:4,17,	jumped	38:3,4,8,11
162:8,11,14,17,	250:5,17,24	21 15:6,12,18	12:19	49:21 211:23
21 163:4,16	252:7 253:14	16:10 17:14	juries	234:15
164:19 165:6,	254:17 255:9,12	20:2 22:25 25:6	168:6	justification
10,16,17,25	judge's	31:14,17,21	jurisdiction	188:2 205:25
166:2,8,11	65:5 195:8	34:15 35:2,7,8	39:24 40:15	justify
167:7,12 168:24	205:9 220:23	36:1 37:21 42:2,		185:6 205:22
169:1 170:1,9	226:21	9 44:3 49:25	jurisprudence 186:23	
171:23 172:6,23	judge-want-to-	50:15 51:7,15,		juvenile
173:2,3,15,20,	be	22 56:14,15	jurisprudential	238:25 239:1,8,
22 175:7,14,15	73:9	60:18 61:16,19,	186:22	10,14
176:6,20 178:8		22 65:2 66:5		

juvenile's	kindly	lacking	lastly	163:11 166:25
239:6	212:6 230:6	130:20 229:6	156:6	167:8,12 168:2,
	kindness	lacks	late	10 173:2,6
K	44:24	131:25	16:11 128:21	174:7,12,13
	kinds	ladies	245:11	180:18 181:10
Kagan	32:21 186:11	30:5 83:20	latitude	185:18 193:10,
90:25	204:21 250:2	102:10 123:16	129:11 163:25	11,19 195:7
Kali	252:1	127:12 158:9	215:2	201:18 203:7,8
29:18	Kittredge	182:3 230:6,10	Lauren	204:4,11,21
Karon	30:11,13,16,25	231:19	9:19	216:1,12 228:3
169:6,13,22	31:2,6,10,16,19	lady	law	239:11,23
170:14	32:8 34:3,8,12	173:19 227:16	7:8,21 9:3 15:1,	248:15 251:7,
Kate	46:17,23 47:6	Lambert	8 23:16 25:23,	14,21 253:22,24
9:18	49:3,8 59:8,11	60:13,15,17,19,	24 27:3,4 28:10	law-giver
Kawanis	60:3 247:5	22 61:4,6,9,13,	35:17,23 37:16	65:12
51:1	Kittredge's	18,21 62:12,13,	44:19,25 45:23	laws
KEEFER	34:6 48:22	14,23 63:9,13	46:3,4,5,6 53:24	8:12 28:15 32:1
126:9	knew	66:4,23 70:8	57:24 63:19,24	59:16 62:2
keeping	25:24 177:19	71:3,13 72:25	64:9,24 65:6,7,	82:15 85:21
172:18 227:19	190:5 237:4,18	73:2,6,9,10	8,9,11,20,21,25	101:15 104:9
key	knowing	77:13 78:24	66:1,2 67:6,11,	122:11 125:8
37:20	89:14 154:17	81:18,25 82:3,8,	13,14,16,25	142:6 157:20
kid	155:9 174:7	9 83:1,3 100:3,	68:2 70:11,19	160:3 254:23
182:13	185:10 234:12	11	75:24 78:8,15,	lawsuit
kids	knowledge	lamented	16,18 80:25	69:7 70:9,14
136:17 185:20	76:20 96:22	50:19	86:25 87:1,3	110:7,15 222:12
195:22	239:23 253:19	land	88:12,13,14,15,	lawsuits
killed	254:3	44:11 215:11,13	19,25 89:16,18,	150:23
	knowledgeable	lane	21 90:9,16	lawyer
219:19	134:12	94:23,24	91:13 92:17	17:13 41:21
<b>kind</b>	kudos	language	94:25 98:2,3,23	44:13 54:25
24:8 26:10 38:7	100:15	37:3,5 57:18	104:22 106:17	55:4,8,21 59:1
48:15 87:15	100.13	127:11 143:15	107:2,20	62:14 68:20,22,
99:19 109:22		194:11	109:11,12,20	25 69:14 72:18
113:1,6,7,10,11	L	Lanny	117:10 120:23	79:8,11 99:1
115:2 117:19	lack	62:14	127:15 134:8	116:10 118:24
118:10 141:13	42:22 67:10	large	137:16,18	121:20 132:6
147:9 150:7,9	68:4 131:1	23:21,22 78:8,	138:23 139:15	136:6 148:16,17
153:16 154:1 157:3 164:21	163:7 188:20	12	141:10,22	149:22 155:9
157:3 164:21 165:22 167:18,	205:15 227:25		142:4,5 150:22	170:16 171:4
165:22 167:18, 24 173:17 176:9	253:19	larger 78:11	151:25 152:4	177:15 194:2,7,
250:10	200.17	/0.11	154:15 155:4	11,12 195:4
<i>43</i> 0.10			156:22 162:13	196:6,8 205:9

215:21 251:6	learning	121:20	19 246:3,23	21
lawyer-legislator	23:2 75:22,23	legislators	levels	limited
119:14	76:3 78:4,18	118:24 119:21	45:18	57:20
lawyer-	leave	legislature	leverage	Lindi
legislator's	52:7 82:6	35:12,16,22,24	79:15	9:24 10:22,23
119:17	101:24 137:24	37:14 45:2	liability	lines
lawyer-	158:12 250:11	46:12 47:25	36:13,15 37:5	34:23 117:8
legislators	leaves	57:5,8,24 71:22	57:11,20	154:21
119:3,6,10	26:8	112:4 145:16	liberal	list
120:7	lecture	243:25	36:5 37:11	11:23 51:8,9
lawyers	22:21	legitimacy	Libet	56:19 93:23,24
23:20,22,23,24	Lee	92:3	23:9	listed
26:18 32:25	42:13	legitimate		21:20 67:4
50:21,22 54:21	left	188:20 189:24	license	
66:11 69:15	63:18 69:25	190:8,12,18	18:16 81:22 82:4	listen 27:16 58:23
77:22 78:11	77:4 78:1	lense		69:9 171:3,10
120:20 136:25	114:10 227:16	156:24	licensed	190:24
140:23 143:8	legal	letter	15:7 215:21	
150:14 152:21	11:1 26:7 32:19	46:4 47:7,24	223:17	listener
165:7 167:21	44:6 64:6 68:24	59:16 71:13,21	licks	58:22
172:15 194:1	69:5,11 89:3	82:15 95:15,23	117:15	listens
195:14 201:21	106:14 123:6,	101:15 111:20	life	92:25
224:3 230:17	12,19 127:16	112:3 122:11	48:9 74:1	literally
236:14 246:5,9,	130:24 131:9	145:7,15 157:20	136:24 143:1	219:16
21 250:1	132:17 137:8	203:7,8 243:11,	144:2 147:25	litigant
lay-person	140:3 148:19	24 254:23	163:2 213:4,5,7	56:5 130:4,11
180:1,15	162:14 167:20	letters	219:16 225:20 248:2 251:3	136:5 150:15
laying	171:13 180:18	16:5 19:6,7		153:17 155:5
171:20	187:21 221:22	20:20 148:11	lifted	241:9 247:22
lead	229:23 230:7	letting	197:23	litigants
7:19 67:24	233:24	87:9	light	18:14 41:9 55:7
140:8 147:3,9	legislate	level	45:13 53:11	66:20 70:2
leaders	35:10	41:7 46:15 47:2	97:5 176:15	91:23 94:10
42:12	legislation	76:21 93:2	likes	97:22 98:8
leadership	35:19 36:11,24	97:18 113:4	90:25	167:8,13 242:8
59:25 148:18	45:3 67:21	114:13 130:5	Limehouse	litigate
learn	legislative	150:11 151:3	62:16	167:22 191:7
13:21 76:9	36:9 45:20 46:2,	152:10 156:10,	limit	litigating
learned	4,11 49:25	11 166:7 178:4,	46:1 80:12	68:15
76:8 91:3 114:5	176:23	7 180:25 181:1	limitations	litigation
143:25 144:12	legislator	234:14,16,21	47:12 71:18	57:1 64:15,17
173,23 177,12	79:12 95:24	238:23 240:5,8,	95:20 111:25	99:15 106:18
	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		145:12 243:16,	114:21 126:16,
				1

22 128:23	107:11 110:19	157:15 166:18,	84:4,5,9,13,21,	magistrate
129:24 140:19	115:24 119:19	19 176:15	23 85:4,9,12,15	53:19
193:4	148:4 152:16	186:23 214:8	86:6,7,11,21	magistrate's
litigator	153:3 207:15	215:7 238:8	88:1,6 89:3	106:20
99:20	249:22	lots	90:13 92:7,20	magistrates
live	long-term	24:4 249:13	94:8 95:3,5	51:24 52:2
13:10 63:25	80:17	loud	96:10,14,24	maintain
65:4 136:17	long-time	162:20 226:20	97:8,10,14	91:11 113:4
165:13	97:1	Louis	101:1,8 102:1	117:4 242:12,21
lived	longer	251:17,18		major
162:22 213:8,13	57:14 119:16	love	M	34:18 148:16
livelihood	151:22 223:12	22:22 139:15,25		majority
55:3	245:3,9	140:1 152:12	Macey	35:16 37:9
lives	longstanding	177:3 250:17	9:20	43:20 45:4
114:12 162:24	90:5	loved	Machin	51:20 113:23
163:2,10 165:24	longtime	154:16	36:7	116:20 118:11
174:9 176:2	97:2	lovely	made	142:9
177:23 178:22	looked	104:20	12:1 17:4,10	make
213:8,9 228:19	56:17 144:3	Loves	25:8 26:6 39:13	10:21 13:2,16
249:8	Lord	67:5	45:1 46:6 47:3	17:17 18:21
living	74:2	loving	63:22 83:25	20:3 26:16,21
55:4 87:7 156:3	lose	225:19 228:23	87:13,17 103:14	27:11,25 29:21
LLR	44:15 155:9	249:13	119:24 123:19	32:7 36:12 39:9,
172:23 173:2,7,	losing	low	126:6,25 133:6 149:23 160:25	10,19 41:11,25
11 193:14	155:9	129:5	163:18 164:24	55:4 67:6 76:13
199:15,20	lost	Lowcountry	169:20 170:18	82:7 86:2,14
200:25 201:10	74:25 155:8	12:3 16:24	172:22 183:24	92:24 93:5 97:5
202:2 213:18	197:21 251:18	lower	191:7,8 192:5	104:17 105:1
220:2,17 221:23	lot	23:13 155:3	193:3 199:18	106:11 107:8,16
222:8,9	9:10,11 16:8	165:15,18	208:11 211:9,13	108:2,9,17
local	18:13 26:18,19,	166:1,3,9,12	213:17 216:1,7	110:3 111:16
217:1 248:10	23 58:14 67:23,	lucidity	220:11 223:23,	115:24 117:19
location	24 87:2 89:17,	218:17	25 224:10 226:3	127:25 129:23
215:19	21,23 90:21	Luckily	230:15,25	130:25 137:25
locations	91:24 97:17	224:3	231:3,6 241:7	138:17 139:22
236:14	106:10,12	Luke	246:4,12	140:24 141:20, 22,23 152:14,22
logistically	107:11 113:8	7:22 8:2 11:16	248:11,25	154:18 168:10
53:3	115:15 116:1	176:11 198:6	Madison	169:4 178:17
long	120:8 136:20	lunch	9:14	195:15 197:9
13:18 41:3 44:5	143:21,25 147:6	83:7,8	magic	198:23 201:6,10
51:8 56:11 86:8	150:21,22,24	Luther	241:18	210:4 211:14
87:18 106:4	151:6 156:1,2			210.1211.11

	1	1	1	1
212:13,18	18 206:7 216:1,	matter	media	11 77:11 83:12
218:22 227:21	7	15:5 20:19	19:16 118:24	95:16,20 96:4,
232:19 235:20	manner	40:15,20 43:13	mediate	15 97:9 101:5
241:19 244:25	37:14 193:16	90:1 93:8 127:6,	140:20	111:21,25
249:18 250:3,13	Marie	22 136:6 154:24	medical	112:9,19 117:23
251:8	9:23	164:23 178:4,6,	144:15 155:6	118:7 119:3
makes	mark	13 182:3 183:6	medication	123:8 126:6,14
59:1 70:6 95:11	42:25 124:21	201:9 216:3	140:16	134:4 138:11
98:9 114:22	159:13	mattered	meet	145:8,12,21
119:13 247:16	marked	155:17 211:11	15:12 25:10	146:9 149:6
making	12:12	matters	33:1 218:14	157:10 166:21
29:7 31:8 61:11	marry	11:1 20:22 39:7	226:24	168:16 174:15
66:19 85:2	88:24	43:3 63:23	meeting	201:23 203:17
92:11 97:7 98:3,	Martha	89:24 126:17	7:2 166:6	206:18 211:21
10 103:17	232:8	144:14 155:14,	meets	230:2 231:15
124:17 135:15	Mary	17 163:18	26:9,11 34:8	243:12,16,21
157:14 159:9	62:12	164:2,11 184:19	63:9 88:2	244:5,15 252:5
168:19 178:21		231:11 236:21	105:16 139:8	254:14
182:16 196:25	Maryland	Matthew	233:5	memory
203:10 204:25	254:3	102:12 103:3,25	Meg	252:9
205:16 211:22	mashing	104:3	104:20	memos
226:14 229:9,12	56:6	maturity		156:22
232:16 245:18	master	50:14 142:25	Megan 122:21	men
246:4 248:2	223:17	Maura		51:19 241:8
251:10	Master-in-	9:14	member	mental
Maldonado	9:4	Maxine	7:21 28:20	15:17 33:9 47:3
9:14 63:4,5,12	Master-in-	9:22	48:20 49:20 53:22 215:25	71:8 95:7
71:2,11 72:5	equity	Maxwell	216:25 253:11,	108:10 111:5
male	15:2 21:6	225:10	14,16	131:22 145:2
241:9 247:22	matches	Mciver	· ·	223:19 225:8
malpractice	18:21	148:3,5	members	238:7,9,13
138:7 140:16	material	Mcnair	7:15 8:4 9:9	243:8
155:6	16:8 31:3 33:15	75:15	10:13,20 11:6, 22 13:20 16:21,	mentioned
man	materials	meaning	22 17:19 20:11,	41:20 56:1
114:11 153:17,	15:21,23 20:8	113:22 164:3	14,18 22:4,25	68:16 74:4
23	22:19 31:25		23:20 24:3	110:6 199:23,25
Manchin	41:20 48:23	means	25:14 27:14	200:4,25
56:1,6,8	62:1 85:20	66:15 150:24	28:18 29:15	mentions
mandated	104:8 125:7	meant	38:25 39:4 47:8,	18:2
228:3	137:20 160:2	57:6 90:19	12,15 48:5 59:7	mentor
mandatory	Matt	measure	60:4 68:12	100:18
185:16 193:16,	86:8	43:24	71:15,18 72:1,	mercy
			, 1.15,10 /2.1,	
		1		

166:2	million	misconduct	25 177:10,13,	moral
Meredith	216:15,18	17:16 42:24	15,17 178:5,9,	135:1
9:21	mind	51:7	11,20 179:2,5,8,	Morant
merit	34:13 100:24	misheard	11,13,15,18,21,	251:15,20
8:10 12:21 20:2	125:18,19	147:4	25 180:12,16,20	morning
22:25 31:14,17,	148:19 185:23	misread	181:3,14,16,19,	7:1 9:8 11:13
21 61:16,19,22	mindful	186:2	22 182:1,5,9,12,	12:20 34:12
83:20 85:7,10,	13:2 62:25	misrepresented	17	60:13,15 63:13,
13,16 103:23	215:9	133:22 134:1	modification	14 77:8 78:24,
104:1,4 124:22,	mine	misrepresenting	128:22	25 86:16 229:2
25 125:3	116:20	135:2	modify	mother
159:14,17,20,23	mini	missed	128:18	226:23 228:20
177:7 222:13	25:24	77:14 98:19,20	Moise	motion
merits	minimalist	128:4 130:17	23:8 29:17	83:9 121:16
201:14 212:2	91:5 141:6,11	195:2,3,4,22	Mom	127:1,2,4,25
Merry	minimum	196:6 249:5	136:16	128:2,22 138:2
186:7	15:25	missing	moment	147:8 229:24
mesh	ministered	98:22	97:5 103:7	motions
192:2	225:13	mission	215:3 226:16	75:4 137:13
mess	ministry	217:6	232:15	140:25 245:20
177:22	225:11,12	mistake	momentarily	248:17,19,20
message	minor	223:24,25 224:5	17:8	249:3
219:17	189:2,5,6,8,11	mistakes	Mondale	motivation
met	191:20 220:12	178:17	73:20	45:7
100:11,23 134:7	228:14	mistrial	Monday	motivations
146:12 187:7	minute	238:2	119:22,25	35:21
Methods	104:17 190:16	misunderstand	monetary	motive
69:3 75:7	191:13 212:20	92:4 205:17	110:16	39:2
meticulous	215:11,16	misunderstandi	money	mouth
235:20	217:22,23,25	ng	50:22,23	172:25
Micah	minutes	206:9	monitor	move
7:7,9 209:13	16:11 30:2	misunderstood	252:15	10:25 11:4,10
microphone	83:17 102:8	132:16 134:25	monitoring	30:1 36:12
30:20 128:13	121:17 128:15	205:21 250:11	252:10	60:10 65:22
middle	158:11,13	Mitchell	month	66:16 79:5,13,
50:7 121:25	164:12 170:13	169:7,8,11,13,	60:8 80:9 102:5	19 80:9 83:16
Midlands	209:4 215:14	18,23 170:5,6,	210:11	102:4 108:25
12:3 16:25 71:3	218:4	12,14 171:18,	months	203:1
95:4 144:25	mirror	21,25 172:4	40:18,21 42:19	moved
Mike	36:13 51:11	174:17,21,22,	73:17 119:16	96:19 109:6
104:21	mirrored	23,25 175:5,9,	137:10 176:9	214:1 245:2
1021	51:15	12,23 176:3,17,		
		, ,		
	•	•	•	•

moves	names	negatively	night	notebooks
10:10 11:3	21:9,12 24:14,	163:3	229:2	11:22
66:13 123:4	15 70:19	negotiate	nights	noted
moving	nanosecond	120:6	210:18 212:25	71:9 95:11
108:19 165:11	163:9	Neil	219:16	145:3 233:18
166:23 227:19	narrative	97:2	Nineteen	239:25
229:25 238:6,10	36:23 37:4	Nelson	240:4	notes
243:10 247:11	128:8 137:15	23:9	no-fault	171:3
mule	narrow	nerdy	210:10	notice
154:12,14	188:6,7 203:23	76:10	noise-maker	171:11 176:23
Mullins	narrowing		30:7	215:1
23:9	41:7	nervous 196:25	nominate	noticed
multi-	nationally		7:8,20,22 8:1	148:8 171:14
140:18	151:21	never-ending	14:25 21:4	172:9
multi-day	nature	14:9	nominated	notwithstanding
121:19	26:19 39:2	Newman	7:13	52:9 205:15
multiple	44:16 48:16	75:7		247:23
108:24 110:13	53:11 70:13	news	non-attorney 179:19	November
140:15 215:20	110:8 175:24	108:12		233:20 234:7
municipal	215:10 223:9	newspaper	non-jury	
51:25 52:2	navigate	32:1 62:3 85:22	74:23 75:6	novo 137:23
53:20	32:12 33:19	104:10 125:9	non-partied	
		160:4	56:5	nuance
MUS 215:25	nay 7:16 8:5 10:14	nice	nonetheless	139:18
	11:7 83:13	102:19 118:4	87:19	number
MUSC	230:3	226:24	noon	24:10 33:3 53:23 67:19
185:13,15,19		Nichol	10:3,5 22:2	
213:22 215:23, 24 216:9 226:2,	necessarily 74:19 113:21	174:16,20	norm	76:19 77:22 79:10 84:2
24 210.9 220.2, 4	115:11 119:18	Nichols	136:19 144:21	93:25 94:4
-	156:13 178:16,	42:13 156:7	note	99:14 118:22
MUSC's 216:6	17,20 196:7	Nichols'	11:15 19:6	138:4 142:24
	200:11	156:14	21:15 34:5	146:25 147:3,
myriad 128:5	needed	Nicol	46:21 48:21	13,15,16,19
	150:5 251:4	160:14,16,19,23	59:20 63:6 71:2	148:21,22
Myrtle 59.2 170.15	needing	161:2,9,15,20,	72:5 82:19	149:21 151:13
58:2 170:15	141:21	23 163:20,21	87:24 95:4 96:8	155:15 185:2
mystery	nefarious	164:16 165:1,6	101:19 105:13	247:9
45:3	39:2 54:17	166:18,21	111:2,9 112:13	numbers
		167:2,5,15,18	122:15 139:6	52:1 150:17
N	negative	168:19,20,23	144:24 146:2	numerous
namad	20:16 26:15	Nicols	157:24 233:2,21	179:24
named	29:6 44:15,18	150:8	243:2 244:9	117.21
110:7,12 149:20	250:5		255:2	
				1

nursing	occasions	41:22 42:11,17	opening	opposed
155:6	108:24	54:21 62:16	32:7,9 62:10,19	7:16 8:5 10:14
	occupies	63:19 64:14,19	86:3,20 88:7	11:7 83:13
0	175:8	66:19 67:18,20	104:17 138:24	123:9 230:3
	occur	68:15,23,24	232:18	244:21
oath	22:6 166:9	75:12,16 77:5	operated	opposing
20:6 58:19	occurred	80:2 146:13	43:7	194:3,12
131:4,7	128:17 212:15	182:13 188:4	operating	opposition
object	occurs	203:20 248:12,	156:16	32:5,15 62:7
31:7 61:10 85:1	50:19 196:18	13,14	operations	86:1 104:14
103:17 124:16	ODC	officer	38:18 39:18	125:13 126:11
159:8 204:7,8,	41:24 42:2,21	180:2 218:20	97:22	160:8
10,14 205:7,9	200:13	officers	opinion	oral
objected	odds	195:5	36:20 37:9	148:23 149:17
204:22 212:14,	37:4	offices	40:18,22 57:4,	235:9,12
19 239:6		219:5 251:21	10 81:1 145:4	240:22,24
objection	off-the-record	official	169:4 172:5,10	245:18,20
31:10 103:20	231:22	227:15	174:6 186:18	order
124:19 204:17	offender	officials	192:8 200:22,24	7:2 19:8 102:11
205:15	239:4	27:18	206:3 222:1	126:25 128:19,
objectionable	offer	oftentimes	opinions	23,24 129:1
205:7,11	8:15 11:25 35:2	13:1 28:3 54:25	40:14 45:11	137:9 167:17
objections	68:18 69:21	141:12 142:22,	46:10 76:4	169:3 184:22,23
12:7,10 133:7	93:12 94:11	23,25 155:1	81:15 116:14,	185:7,11 187:25
194:15	115:25 161:18	186:22	15,21 152:18	188:1,19 193:13
objectively	234:16 241:1,4		opponents	194:2,3,7,11,12,
162:9	251:5	Ohio	73:16 100:3	13,15,22,24
	offered	232:12		195:19 196:6,10
<b>obligation</b> 114:10 237:15	45:11 68:17	olds	opportunities 87:2,16	199:21 205:17
	111:10 205:6	192:20	<b>,</b>	207:3 210:5,9
observations	offering	on-line	opportunity	216:19 220:23,
171:23	56:23 60:1 79:2	13:6	25:21 27:7	24 226:6,8,20
observe	82:23 101:23	one's	59:13 62:23	227:6 228:6,12
12:23	118:19 122:2	251:3	66:15 82:12	ordered
observer	151:13 157:16	open	97:22 101:12	185:3
172:11	158:3 215:10	8:23,24,25 9:1,	104:16 105:22	ordering
observing	250:14 251:25	2,4 13:3 15:25	107:9,17 122:8	189:16 239:6
203:24	254:19	16:7 20:7 24:9	138:17 142:21	
obtain	offers	59:21 82:20	157:17 229:19	orderly
177:2	43:12,14	101:20 122:16	231:24 232:3	63:25
obvious	office	157:25 255:3	234:6 237:20	orders
163:19	8:13 15:6 18:17	opened	238:3 239:15	106:24,25
	23:10 29:16	43:9	254:8,20	110:22 129:3

188:15 196:19	overview	paragraphs	partially-	passing
241:10 245:24	14:2 15:19	130:8,13,15	affirmed	100:23
251:12,13	22:13	131:10	116:18	passion
original	overwhelming	paramount	partially-	175:2 212:5
39:24 40:15	51:20 171:8,16	137:4 187:10	reversed	233:14 250:25
51:18 90:19		parent	116:18	passionate
194:22	P	187:3,4 216:23	participant	139:17 152:24
Originalism		225:19	52:23	passions
90:22	p.m.	parental	participate	127:15
originalist	83:18 102:9	213:1	189:13,17	past
90:18	123:15 158:14	Parenthood	191:18	13:5 16:6 28:16
ostensibly	230:9 255:16	69:4	participated	33:6 34:16 50:6
55:2	PA	parents	29:10 79:3	95:11 105:24
outcome	251:22	216:24 225:17	147:5,14	251:1
48:1 71:23 81:5	packets	part	participating	paternal
95:25 112:5	103:17	17:4,10 31:9	245:20	189:3 228:15
145:17 167:11	pages	51:3 58:6 61:12	parties	path
180:23 181:4	13:1	64:11 67:13	48:4 50:23 65:5	88:11
244:1	paid	85:2 87:8 88:12	66:11 71:25	patience
outlier	27:18 29:20	89:2 103:18	96:3 112:8	235:19 255:7
143:3 144:20	199:6	117:20 118:25	145:20 191:17	
outlined	paint	119:7 124:17	200:12 202:2	patient
110:1	36:4	126:6 129:15	231:11 235:20	44:8 162:12 242:3
outset	pandemic	148:6 150:15	244:4	
142:17 199:5	186:4	159:9 160:25	partner	Patrick
	panel	164:20 165:3	63:18 97:1	9:17
outstanding 51:25 67:7	33:1 70:18	169:20 172:19	104:22 219:3,4	patriotic
114:19 139:1	76:18 79:24	173:13 177:11	partners	28:22
152:8	118:6 236:11	183:25 197:8	138:23	pattern
	253:11,14,16	204:9,17,23		150:8
overarching	254:11	205:8 208:11	parts 155:21,22	Paula
41:25	panels	223:19 224:6,10		9:14
overlooked	245:15	230:25 231:3	<b>party</b> 40:3 45:3 46:7	pause
81:5		232:2 240:17		142:18 163:22
overrule	<b>paper</b> 13:16 35:8	242:20	57:13,14 64:17	217:14 227:7
110:21	50:18	part-owner	194:3 200:14, 17,18,25 205:7	pay
overruled		90:8	214:9 220:12	81:23 210:10
206:2	papers	part-time		paying
oversaw	158:11	120:21	passed	80:2
162:21	paperwork	partial	22:9 67:21	PCR
overseeing	149:16	241:8	passes	75:21,24 76:4
163:4	paragraph	211.0	35:16	PDQ
	130:14			

16:1 17:16	148:13 150:10	30:19,22 31:15	phone	152:21 195:4
31:13 63:7 70:9	151:13,17	33:7 34:6 61:1,	25:2 26:18 27:7	210:13 234:10
74:18 87:25	152:11,24	17,20 84:18	48:11 219:17	245:25 246:14,
105:15 110:6	154:1,17 155:15	85:8,11,14 95:1	phrase	22
139:7 143:23	166:14 170:21	103:8,24 104:2	176:23	plaintiffs
233:3,18	173:25 174:8,12	124:9,23 125:1	physical	23:20
peaceful	175:24 178:16	132:18 143:2,22	15:17 33:9 47:3	plan
63:25	226:1 238:8	147:25 159:1,	71:7 95:6 111:4	44:11 237:9
pediatric	241:17 244:24	15,18,21 172:10	131:22 132:10	plane
216:6	249:14 250:4	personality	145:1 185:13	44:12 215:11,13
pediatrician	252:7	88:22	243:8	Planned
62:13	peoples'	personnel	physically	69:4
Pee	65:24 165:23	250:2	226:4	plans
12:3 16:24	177:23 178:22	persons	physician	237:12
243:2	percent	120:16	44:8	play
peers	149:25 219:16	perspective	pick	45:22
173:9	percentage	29:11 38:2	55:5	Player
pejorative	149:17	67:17 79:20	picture	183:5,6,8,10,11,
53:1	perception	80:20 90:10	57:10 81:22	14,18,21,22
penalty	42:6 55:19	92:2 101:2	82:5	184:2,10,16
155:5	108:18 120:17	144:8 171:22	Piedmont	185:22 186:3,13
pending	perfect	persuasion	12:3 16:25	187:15,20,25
7:12 8:1 10:8	108:4 178:14	94:19	111:2,9,10	188:9,13,18,25
48:1 71:23	perfection	perusing	pike	189:22 190:1,7,
95:25 112:5	176:16	191:25	115:1	11,14,22 191:5
128:23 145:17	perfectly	petition	pilot	192:9,13,22,24
169:3 229:25	130:3,6	40:3,5,8 128:18	44:11	193:2,7,24
244:1	period	petitioning	pin	194:5,8,16,21,
people	10:3 41:5 119:1	161:25	193:22	24 195:10,16,21
13:15,24 25:4,	120:18 152:16	petitions		196:1,4,12,15,
13 32:19 33:3,	175:17 193:14	39:23,25	<b>place</b> 52:18 63:25	21,25 197:7,19
12 41:8 43:15,	203:10	Philip	88:24 90:24	198:6,7,10,15,
16 44:14 48:11	person	88:1	101:2 114:24	17 199:3,8,10,
51:19,21 53:8	18:23 19:23	Phillip	153:25 193:19	17 200:1,21
58:21,23 65:11	34:19 36:14	85:9,12,15	194:11 235:6	201:3,13,15
79:18,20,21,22	43:11,14 125:15	247:14	places	202:8,11,15,16,
80:2,6,22 92:14	170:15 171:12	philosophy	79:21 121:7	18,24 203:3,13,
96:17 106:19	172:22 176:11	35:2,3,7,8 36:1	plaintiff	15,25 204:7,13,
107:12 108:15	181:6 220:1,3	44:3 56:14 65:2	70:15 75:2	24 205:3,12,14,
115:4 136:22	237:23	90:14 107:6	110:15 173:4	18,24 206:13,
137:3 139:19,	personal	141:4 235:17	plaintiff's	20,22,25 207:2,
22,24 144:10,13	8:19 16:1 25:15	2.2 255.17	37:9,11 148:17	8,11,14,17,24,
			31.7,11 140.17	
	l	l	l	1

25 220:21 221:1	125:14 126:7	69:12	possession	137:13,14
223:8 226:22	127:15 133:6	politics	237:13,15	139:10,16,21
players	138:14 140:4	27:18	possibility	140:8 146:19
172:15	147:13 148:7,10	pool	62:24	151:21,23
plays	150:6 151:5,12	214:2,5	possibly	152:11 154:23
240:2	160:9 164:6,20	poor	134:24	198:14 233:7
pleads	174:4 178:23,24	182:7 197:7	post-trial	245:9 248:4
239:3	185:24 188:5,	portal	75:4	249:23,24
pleas	21,25 191:7	235:10,13	posture	practiced
41:13 78:7 99:7	192:7 194:21	240:23,25	57:1 137:23	93:6 251:7,17
pleasure	196:5 209:3,5	portion	156:24	practicing
139:1	210:5,22 211:2,	59:12 82:10	potential	79:8 168:1
pled	13,14 212:12	101:11 122:7	19:19 66:22	249:21
239:1	213:7 214:7,8	150:20	73:22	practitioner
	215:5 220:17	pose	potentially	111:14 151:25
<b>pledge</b> 47:25 68:11	221:1,2 222:7	56:24 120:2	59:18 81:3,4	247:18
71:22 95:24	232:17 233:15		82:17 101:17	praise
112:4 145:16	234:19 248:11	posed 56:2	122:13 157:22	247:21
243:25	251:3,9,10		254:25	praises
	252:2	position		148:18
pledges	pointed	21:19 30:12	<b>power</b> 92:13 172:16	prayer
22:4	133:21,25	34:9 36:23 37:7,	187:12 201:12	116:1
plenary	214:16	8 38:22,23		praying
45:25	pointers	48:16 60:1,18 63:10 88:3	powers	229:1
plenty	58:16,17	102:17 105:18	35:5,14 37:15 49:24 65:24	
171:19	points	116:1 139:9	94:21	preacher 58:1
podium	226:25	148:10 178:21		
29:10 69:10	policy	181:4,5 198:23	practical	precedent
125:19 135:19	35:18,21 36:12	205:14,17	155:1 157:5	89:25 90:6
155:13	45:6 92:11,15	233:6,14 239:8	practice	185:25 187:9,19
point	141:9	245:25 246:10,	24:16 34:10	188:11,18
7:19 9:6 11:21	policy-making	12 250:14,15	44:6 63:11 64:2,	191:23
17:4 20:23 22:3	35:11,23	254:19	11,13,19 66:9	precedents
27:1 28:18 30:9	political		68:7,14 75:14	186:21
31:12 33:23,25	35:15,21 36:5	<b>positions</b> 8:15,16	77:4 78:1,12	precedes
34:15 42:11	37:7,14 45:2,7	ĺ	88:4,20 89:6,15,	189:15
51:5 52:2 55:12	50:19 53:4	positive	22 90:5 93:6,24	preceding
63:3 68:3 77:21	68:18,24 69:1,8,	18:6 20:16	94:4 98:18,23	15:9
80:23 83:6,25	11 92:13 94:9,	43:21 67:1	99:11,15 101:9	precious
87:21 93:22	13,15,19 229:4	92:23 93:18	105:18 106:5,18	216:19
97:9 98:7 99:18	politically-	109:16 239:21	107:1 113:8,25 116:25 120:22	predecessors
102:6 105:8	charged	positively	134:9 136:16	42:19 43:7
114:8 117:14		142:10	134.7 130.10	

preeminent	presentation	32:2 62:4 85:23	25 130:5,12	24 32:11,13
58:11	13:20 14:3,21	104:11 125:10	pro-business	33:11,19,23
preference	28:4 204:4	160:5 176:23	36:21 37:8	40:14 41:3 48:6
152:6	presented	245:8	probate	49:17,19 53:5,8
preferences	20:5 22:9 37:17	PRICE	106:20 113:11	59:12 72:2 76:4
94:16,19 95:1	39:3 45:18	103:3,25 104:3	153:21	79:3,16 82:11
prejudice	67:21 165:9	pride	probative	84:2 87:8,13
134:16 135:10	204:2 231:9	106:24	203:18	95:2 96:5 97:15
prejudiced	235:19	primarily	probing	98:8 99:6
134:19,21 135:5	presently	35:8 120:6	182:3	101:12 112:10
premise	234:24	142:13 184:25	problem	122:7 123:14,21
45:24 54:2	presents	249:24	79:10 108:21	125:16 129:1,21
preparation	64:24	primary	186:14 198:21	130:24 131:2
19:24	preservation	64:16 98:15,17	236:3,9	134:12,19 135:1
prepare	140:25	185:7	problems	138:5 140:9 145:22 149:1,2
13:19 87:4	preserve	principles	171:16 241:12	153:3 157:15
89:11 98:25	63:24 91:12	162:14 242:5	procedural	170:24 172:7
245:24	preserved	prior	25:22 26:7	178:15 179:24
prepared	246:17	38:8 44:5 47:18	77:23 162:15	196:19 197:20,
78:19 90:6 99:5	presided	48:1 71:22	223:23 230:16	21 212:6 218:9
142:15 161:16,	110:13 241:11	95:25 110:22	proceed	230:13 244:6
21 172:12 174:5	president	112:5 145:17	14:2 62:21	processing
246:5	62:15 148:14	156:8 191:19	127:7 129:5,25	39:22
prepares	216:24	210:5 216:9	130:5 206:21	produce
74:12	presidents	244:1 245:21	230:18 232:19	45:4
preparing	23:19	253:9,25	proceeded	produced
245:20,23	press	prison	130:25 237:2	52:8
prerogative	211:5	70:16 237:23	proceeding	profession
35:12 37:13	pressure	private	129:24 130:12	51:14
229:4	29:1	20:19 43:12	proceedings	professional
prerogatives	presumed	64:11,18 66:9	13:5,14 164:5	8:20 15:16 33:8
204:25	46:4	68:14 75:14	167:21 175:3,11	46:24 64:6 71:5
Presbyterian	presumption	77:4 78:1 89:22	223:12	89:4 95:8
58:2 148:15	46:6	93:6,23 99:14	process	106:15 111:6
present	pretty	106:5,17 107:1	12:22,25 13:3,	131:21 132:9,
11:17 32:6 62:7	51:2,8 114:11	120:22 140:7	19,21,25 14:3	12,15 140:3
80:13 86:1	202:18 231:12	146:19	15:20,22 17:9	143:3,5 162:5,
104:14 107:17	254:2	privilege	19:19 22:14,16	13 172:20 185:1
125:13 160:9	prevailed	140:6 156:7	23:2 24:5,20	215:22 228:23
169:7 187:6	127:5 128:21	pro	26:4,17,22	233:24 243:5
219:18 232:7	previous	18:14 110:17	27:15,19,21	professionalism
238:12	_	127:3,7 129:6,	28:7 29:10,13,	
L				

23:5,6 27:10	properly	psychological	161:3 169:24	
44:24 137:7	231:9	189:17 191:18	184:3 191:1	
173:5 174:7		209:6 210:6,8,	208:15 211:18	Q
229:6	property	11,17,21	224:13 233:14	qualifications
	252:19,21,23,25 253:1	PTO	251:1	12:5,17 15:15
professionals 215:21 216:8		216:25 218:20		31:22 47:2 58:9
	proposed 196:11		purposes 126:17	59:22 61:24
professor 27:4		<b>public</b> 8:21 12:13 13:6,		71:7 82:21
	propriety	20 14:22 18:8	pursuant 7:20 8:11 59:14	85:18 95:6
professors	221:22	20:6,10,11,22	82:13 101:13	100:17 101:21
23:17	prosecutions	23:19 40:21	122:9 129:2	104:6 111:4
profile	99:4	42:6,9 43:1,4	157:18 254:21	122:17 125:5
68:21	prosecutor	50:16 53:4,9,12		131:20 132:4,5
progressed	99:3	63:17 68:1 75:3	<b>pursue</b> 87:2 100:20	145:1 158:1
88:19	protect	88:13 89:1	178:8	159:25 161:4
progresses	163:14 216:8,10	91:17 141:9		169:25 184:4
66:20	protected	154:3 169:4	<b>push</b> 143:16	208:16 211:8,13
progressive	65:24 173:12	217:1 244:25		217:14 224:14
227:20	195:15	public's	pushed	243:8 255:4
prohibited	protection	42:4	119:19	qualified
19:8 185:12	119:15,21 163:4	publically	pushing	8:16 21:4,5,8,9,
projecting	proud	120:19	19:23	12,16 46:23
128:14	70:7 143:6,7	publicly	put	47:2 68:6 71:4,6
promise	provide	50:20	20:14 22:19	95:5,7,12 111:3,
178:14	22:5 137:7,20		48:13 52:4	5 113:2 114:22
promote	165:3 169:1	<b>published</b> 16:9 21:24	69:17 88:13	118:19 145:1,2,
42:9 166:5	209:19 225:14	116:13,15	89:13 99:19	4 161:6 170:2
193:9 197:5	248:21	, ,	148:24 164:16 176:18 193:22	184:6 208:18
promoted	provided	<b>pulling</b> 44:8,9,11,12,13	194:14 198:1,22	224:16 241:2
162:3,4 219:21	126:5,14 136:3,		194.14 198.1,22	243:4,7 245:4
promoting	10 165:15	punish	21,22 214:19	246:7,8
37:10 166:6	183:18 206:1	186:14 201:4 216:13	224:6 225:23	qualities
promotion	providence		Putnam	59:3
166:8	92:16	punished	9:24 33:13	quality
promptly	provider	201:11	87:11	41:1 50:13
70:22	193:18	punishing		77:18
proper	providers	201:4	<b>puts</b> 42:25 86:23	question
35:13 138:2,3	185:16 210:19	punishment		8:1 10:8,10
202:1 204:5	providing	239:8	<b>putting</b> 97:14 148:25	17:16 28:12
234:18 238:3	225:13	punt	173:2	30:20 42:24,25
242:1,12,16	proving	74:25	1/3.4	56:2,3,8,24
246:16 253:25	46:8	purpose		58:9,13 74:17
		8:22 154:12		75:17 81:19

83:9 97:25	72:9,11 73:12	71:9 145:4	Rankin	read
100:13 113:17	75:20 77:11,23	226:3,6 227:6	7:22 8:2,8 10:9	13:15 36:22
114:18 115:10	78:22 81:16	239:22,25	11:4,16 14:12	56:12 57:10,18
118:1 120:16	87:22 89:12		29:8 49:4,5,6,7,	69:5 76:4 80:24,
127:16 135:2	93:19 96:12,14	R	10 72:12,13,23	25 113:4 118:4,
151:9 178:12	97:10 101:4		73:1,4,8,11 77:9	24 132:2 133:18
198:13 203:18	105:9 111:20	race	78:3 82:1 99:22,	136:12 152:4
204:10 217:8,	112:17,19	73:16 152:8	23,24 134:6,13	172:12 194:13
16,19 223:5,14	117:24 118:21	244:21	135:9 146:10,11	209:3,25
228:24 229:25	122:3,6 123:6	races	148:6,8 194:6	readily
230:16,18	133:11 134:4	52:23	195:24 198:6,8,	134:14
235:15 237:17	136:3 138:9,10	radar	12,16 199:1,5,9,	reading
238:18,19,24	146:6,10 149:7	39:4	11 207:9 232:9	78:18 188:19
240:18 243:18	166:21 168:16	radars	244:16,18	191:15 192:7,9
question-and-	174:15 181:19,	39:8	249:16	211:16 234:10
answer	24 188:23 203:6	raise	Rankin's	252:14
50:11	206:24 218:5	30:14 60:19	250:9	ready
questioned	229:15 231:14	84:11 102:25	rape	14:15,17,18
176:20 177:17	232:20 244:13,	123:25 125:21	238:25	74:14 80:19
questioning	15 252:4,8	130:3,6,17	rare	139:2 147:25
26:18 48:24	254:15	135:20 158:19	154:5	Reagan
72:7 96:10	quibble	160:17 169:11	rarely	73:19
105:4 112:16	197:3	183:12 208:3	51:9	real
146:5 147:11	quick	222:22 242:13,	rationale	46:18 88:20
244:12	14:9 30:1 42:23	22	189:16,20	152:23 165:23
questionnaire	46:19 106:12	raised	Ray	185:2 245:10
16:2 25:15	145:6 158:13	18:6,7 27:6	97:1	reality
30:22 31:15	198:13	48:23 72:6 75:3	re-	42:7 120:17
34:7 61:2,17	quicker	96:9 109:22	191:6	141:18 156:15
84:18 85:8,11	79:6,19 109:6	112:14 119:3	re-litigate	realize
103:8,24	quickly	130:2,3 142:13	161:7 170:3	25:9 33:12 55:1
124:10,23	12:20 26:2	146:3 191:9	184:7 192:25	240:9 249:7,21
159:2,15,18	40:20 43:3,11	230:17 241:3,24	208:19 212:2	realized
questions	47:6 66:13,16	242:4 244:10	224:17	234:7
7:12 20:13,16	76:14 80:5	raising	re-litigating	realm
24:19 25:5,23	86:16	55:12 195:1	214:9	118:20 167:9
26:2,3,5,7 27:3,	quo	rambling	re-verbalize	reap
6 28:18,20 34:2,	163:8,10	110:19	164:14	242:6
13 38:20 41:15,	quorum	ran	reach	reason
18 46:16 49:2,	11:17	52:16	25:1	100:16,20
15 57:21 59:8	quote	randomly	reacting	143:16 149:21
62:21 63:2	36:21 67:2,5	25:4	202:5	151:18 177:25
65:16 71:12				
	1	<u> </u>	I	I

179:6 184:22	recessed	146:3 151:7	148:12 151:12	186:23 201:21,
189:25 199:24	255:15	157:25 159:10	247:13	22 203:9 204:20
213:21 253:1		160:25 164:11,		22 203.9 204.20
	recognition	15 168:11	referenced	
reasonable	51:2	169:20 176:18	172:23 173:3	relating
46:9 92:25	recognize	180:14 182:24	183:1 252:10	188:11
187:14	7:3 9:6 11:19	183:25 192:11	referencing	relationship
reasoning	27:15 33:25	193:5 194:14	116:13	186:19
141:16 200:3	63:4 68:20	195.3 194.14	referred	relative
213:15	81:20 86:14	11,18,23 205:8	38:22	18:3 142:14
reassign	87:16 96:16	208:11 209:20,	reflect	189:3 196:3
53:25	104:18 105:9	22 210:8,12,13	35:17 182:24	211:15 228:15
recall	113:18 125:16	211:18 212:14,	196:19 245:7	release
14:14 57:9 66:9	137:2 153:11	18 214:13,19	reflective	59:21 82:20
70:24 76:19	160:10 230:19	218:19,20 219:8	69:23	101:20 122:16
79:3	232:2,4,18	221:9,13 224:2,	reflects	157:25 255:3
receive	246:20	6,7,10 226:19,	45:4 212:18	released
19:14 77:3	recognized	20,21,22 228:7	refocus	13:6,8
received	23:17 70:17	230:14,25 231:4	227:21	releases
18:9 20:21 32:4	134:17 203:22	233:2,4 234:11	regarded	12:25
43:19 47:25	recognizing	235:3 236:17	111:13	relevant
62:6 66:23	86:21 102:16	237:4 244:10	region	93:12 220:5,9
71:22 85:25	155:10 224:1	245:7 246:15	16:25 24:10,16	relied
92:20 95:24	recommendatio	247:12 252:19,	regions	165:7 205:16
104:13 109:13	n	20 255:2,16	24:8,10	Relocation
112:4 123:19	16:5	,	, ,	136:15
125:12 142:7	record	recorded	register 239:4	rely
145:16 160:7	11:14,15,19	13:6		211:21 235:4
234:15 239:18	12:7,8,13 17:4,	recording	regular	
243:25	10,14 19:17	182:23	115:3,14	relying
receives	20:14 31:9 34:5,	records	regularly	165:8,13,14,20
20:3 78:6	7 48:22 49:10	12:1 20:2 21:1	50:10 134:10	199:23 234:25
receiving	59:20 61:12	81:15 151:4	240:11,13	remain
81:3 252:16	63:6,8 68:1 72:5	181:9	rehearing	59:21 82:20
recent	78:19 80:25	rectify	40:2	101:20 122:16
27:17 213:10	82:19 83:22,23	166:13	reinstated	157:25 255:3
245:22	85:3 87:24 88:1	reelected	249:4	remainder
recently	96:9,25 101:20	52:15,16	related	138:15
42:14 108:1,2	103:18 105:14,	reelection	11:1 128:10	remaining
42:14 108:1,2 177:20	15 111:12	8:23,25 9:2,3,4	183:6 211:7	102:5 145:3
	112:14 122:15	244:20	223:10 240:5,19	183:4
recess	123:17 124:17	reference	relates	remand
30:4 102:9	126:7 139:6,8	32:10 119:24	118:24 154:22	66:22
158:14 212:17				

remarkably	26:12 27:9 51:6	106:19 126:16	240:15	35:11 38:3
235:8	52:19 59:21	127:6 129:7,9,	requires	44:23 58:21
remarks	82:20 101:21	25 130:4,11	26:23 28:10	93:2 100:16
86:20 105:3	122:16 158:1	131:5 132:21	46:5 221:3	107:7 138:11
138:24 232:18	193:18 206:7,16	149:25 167:3	246:2	191:2 211:12,23
remember	211:22 255:3	184:18 195:11	requiring	215:9 217:10
38:15 50:9	reported	representing	8:12	218:2,4,24
100:10 119:23	46:22 56:20	235:5	requisite	231:15 242:9
147:18 244:19	71:3 111:3	represents	234:8 240:14	respected
remind	144:25 243:3	142:24	reread	72:18 250:7
59:13 82:12	reporter	Republican	228:5,6	respectful
101:12 122:8	31:13 182:23	35:16,17	research	37:15,23 162:12
157:18 254:20	reporting	reputation	54:3 64:20	respectfully
remiss	193:17	15:17 46:25	76:15 80:25	70:2 160:25
32:16 81:20	reports	71:5 95:9 111:7	106:7	169:20 183:24
207:7 217:11	12:2,15 16:6,15,	131:21 132:9	reshuffle	208:11 221:10
remnant	16,17 17:1,3,6,	162:6,18,22	158:11	224:10 230:25
57:19	11 18:9,10	164:19 166:15	residence	respecting
removed	185:15,16 216:1	229:6 243:6	34:10 63:10	35:23
212:23 219:15	represent	247:17	88:3 105:18	respite
225:19 248:5	184:19	request	139:10 233:7	230:11
Removing	representation	10:1 128:1	residences	respond
219:8	127:14 171:5	160:25 164:24	248:10	34:2 41:15 44:1,
render	representative	169:20 183:24	resident	4,15 50:14
180:24	7:3,4,13 28:21	208:11 224:10	15:8	56:13 58:14
repeat	42:17 97:11,13	230:25 239:15	resolution	67:11 87:21
243:19 252:11	113:17 120:9	requested	22:8 40:24	142:16 182:20
repeated	123:5 188:24	171:2 186:5	66:22 79:16	221:6 240:7
193:12	189:23 190:2,9,	require		241:25
repetitious	12,16,24 191:13	164:1	resolve 64:24 89:24	responded
215:10	192:6 199:13,	required	91:4	43:25 127:1
replace	14,22 200:6,23	7:5 177:12	resolved	respondent
95:2	201:13,16	186:9 194:3	230:18	248:22
	202:9,13 203:5,	229:7 233:17		respondent's
reply	12 214:4,6	239:11	resolves 254:12	246:24
133:21,23 134:2 136:10 137:11	220:1,6,10,22	requirement		respondents
	222:7 229:24	142:3	resolving	235:1
report 10:1,2,9,17,20	representatives	requirements	90:2	responding
12:5,11,12,17,	55:22 65:25	34:9 63:10 88:2	resources	45:13 182:3
25 13:7 18:16,	92:14	105:17 131:20	40:9 42:22	response
23 13.7 18.16, 17 20:8 21:14,	represented	132:4,5 139:9	129:5 238:11	42:23 44:5
21,22 22:1,6	70:21 88:14	203:20 233:6	respect	68:19 69:21
21,22 22.1,U				
	I	I	I	I

93:13 94:11	resulted	208:22 224:20	244:22	141:20 154:20
109:24 126:5	36:9	253:18,20 254:6	room	155:1 186:15
136:7,11 168:25	results	reviews	52:6 144:10	231:6 246:1
221:3 230:21,24	16:16 17:23	78:5	158:12 210:7	rulings
231:1,3,4 235:3	resume	revisit	230:7	152:21 157:3,6
241:4 246:9	123:13,20	223:5 229:10	Ross	168:3,5 231:8
responses	resuming	revisited	9:21	246:12 248:25
44:18	230:12	186:12	Rotaries	run
responsibility	resumption	rewarding	51:1	9:12 18:17
36:13 53:17	230:19	105:24	Rotary	46:18 47:7
64:16 162:8	retained	rewrite	50:5	48:11 50:15
191:4 195:6,8,	57:19	51:13	rounded	53:23 71:13
14 227:20 228:2	retire	RGG	141:2	107:14 109:20
responsible	234:5	226:4	row	111:21 144:23
36:25	retired	rhetorical	86:7 213:25	145:6,8 146:13
responsive			RSV	243:11
97:24	9:5 15:4 21:8,13	56:25	72:25 73:1,2	running
rest	return	Richland	,	15:25 32:14
54:22 63:21	127:1	75:6	rude	48:12 74:16
117:19 122:22	reunification	rid	129:20 133:2	129:5
164:9 207:16	225:15	80:18	164:6 194:18	rush
253:4	Revenue	ridicule	rule	80:14 81:2
restrain	89:19 94:3	189:3 228:15	19:3 26:2 35:23	rushed
200:17 201:20,	reversed	riding	37:16 39:14	80:15 81:4
22,24	75:2 81:6	125:16	47:15,18 50:18	Rutherford
restraining	116:16,17	rise	51:12,13 63:24	28:21 188:23,24
200:18	117:3,11	127:9 128:10	80:14 88:25	189:23 190:2,9,
restraint	review	road	91:12 107:7	12,16,23,24
	8:12 19:16 33:9	90:4	142:6 156:25	191:9,13 192:6
35:7,9	80:4 81:3 82:15	robe	180:5,6 235:18	199:13,14,22
restraints	103:8 126:24	58:5	rule-maker	200:6,23
56:15	133:5 156:17	robeitis	137:24	201:13,16
restriction	161:4 169:25	58:5	rules	202:9,13,21
188:21 197:22	184:4 207:3	Roberta	19:8 20:20	203:4,5,12,25
result	208:16 224:14	172:24 220:13	40:11 43:7	205:21 214:4,6,
37:10 39:10	239:15 246:13,	222:10	51:11 52:18	13,25 219:25
57:18 70:17	15 254:23	role	141:7 162:15	220:1,6,10,20,
81:2 143:21	reviewed	35:11,13,24	164:1 167:7	22
150:17 161:8	253:12	42:19 75:21	194:1 234:12,13	Rutherford's
170:4 184:8	reviewing	90:11 91:16	236:24,25 237:6	215:9 222:7
208:20 224:18	81:15 161:10	92:1,4,19 94:20	246:15	
236:12	165:18 170:7	142:5 234:22,23	ruling	
	184:11 196:8	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	76:14 107:8	

	samples	122:20	125:10 160:5	243:15,20
S	16:6 69:2	schemes	scrutinized	seek
	sanctions	37:13 205:25	162:17	8:16 22:3 47:16
Sabb	127:2 138:3	school	Scstatehouse.gov	69:16 70:5
83:9 118:15,16,	Sanders	25:24 27:3,4	13:7 28:1 177:6	seeking
17 166:22,23	65:14	32:20 50:7 64:9	Scstatehouse.	110:16 166:1
167:3,6,16,24	Sandhills	65:15 86:25	gov.	seemingly
168:13,15	62:14	87:1,3 90:9	177:2	86:15
185:21,22	Santee	106:17 170:14	search	sees
186:8,16	150:16	180:19 182:5	32:1 62:3 85:22	197:25
187:17,23	sat	216:25 217:1,2	104:10 125:9	segments
188:5,10,17	29:9 156:12	schools	160:4	150:19
189:18 190:4	236:11,24	50:4	seat	segue
191:24 192:14	246:11 248:25	Scott	8:23,24 9:2,3,4	45:1
193:20,21,22,25	satisfaction	23:8	15:25 16:7 21:5	
194:10,20,23,25	175:11 211:12	screen	32:14 47:7	select
195:13,20	satisfied	8:22 11:23	60:18 71:14	36:3 50:1 135:7
196:2,5,13,17,	203:19	14:25 15:3	84:7 95:15	selected
22 197:20		screening	102:22 111:21	25:3
203:21,22,23	saving	8:22 9:10,13,17	123:23 142:15	Selection
204:8,14 205:1,	224:7	12:21,25 13:12	145:8 160:12	8:10 12:21 20:3
4 207:6,13,16,	SCAJ	14:3 15:20,22	223:25 243:11	22:25 31:14,17,
19 217:15,18	23:19	17:2 18:5 19:13,	249:10	21 61:16,19,23
218:5,8 249:15,	Scalia	17.2 10.3 17.13,	seated	83:21 85:7,10,
17	90:25	21:20 22:10	155:3	13,17 103:23
sacrificing	scared	24:20 30:2,10	seats	104:1,5 124:22,
41:1	144:16	47:13 48:2	8:24,25 9:1	25 125:4
Sadly	SCE&G	59:12,18 60:11,	11:23	159:14,17,20,24
162:23	150:16	12 62:22 71:19,		177:7
safely	scene	23 82:11,18	seconded 7:11,25 11:4	self-serving
44:12	33:14	84:2 95:21 96:1	83:10 229:24	49:17
safety	scenes	101:11,17 102:5		sell
44:10	32:18	112:1,6 122:7,	secondguess	177:3
Safran	schedule	13 123:14,20	65:19	seminar
112:20,21	86:22 96:19	145:13,18	seconds	108:10
149:7,8,9	102:6,18 119:17	157:23 230:13,	10:11 123:5	Senate
174:24,25	121:3,18	20 243:17,22	218:1,25	9:13,22 55:22
175:6,10,20,24	scheduled	244:2,19 255:1,	secret	senator
176:14 178:3,6,	10:5 121:2	14	53:7	7:10,11,21,22,
12,24 179:3,6,9	scheduling	screenings	Section	24 8:1,8 10:9
said/she	119:13 120:3	32:2 60:7 62:4	47:11 71:17	11:4,16 14:11
137:14	121:11,22	85:23 104:11	92:12 95:19	29:8 49:4,6,7,
		00.20 1011	111:24 145:11	10,24 50:12

55:24 72:12,13,	63:22 74:9 80:7	serves	20 92:15 94:18	She'll
23 73:1,4,8,11,	87:6,7 133:2	13:23	152:1 156:10	14:5
23 75:13 77:9	sentence	service	158:13	Shedd
78:2,22,23,25	222:4	34:17 53:25	setting	62:16 64:11
82:1 83:9,10	separated	59:25 63:17	22:10 138:8	70:12 91:3
99:22,23,24	225:17	69:16,17 73:22	195:17	99:25 100:4,5,
117:24 118:1,4,	separately	82:24 88:13	settle	14,18,23
15,16,17 119:22	126:18	91:13 122:2	64:1 127:16	Shedd's
120:12 123:4	separation	148:19 153:12	settled	67:15
134:6,13 135:9	35:5,14 37:15	157:16 158:3	137:16 210:9	sheriff
146:10,11	49:24 65:24	206:12 218:20	222:12	247:14
148:6,8 166:22,	94:21	234:16 240:23	settlement	shift
23 167:3,6,16,	September	241:1 245:11	57:12	151:21
24 168:13,15	162:21 212:21	254:18 255:7	settles	shoes
185:21,22	series	services	55:1	212:4
186:8,16	118:21 128:20	110:8 223:18	seventeen	Shoot
187:17,23	seriousness	251:4,5	67:8 163:13	222:5
188:5,10,17	215:3	servicing	sex	short
189:18 190:3	servant	185:8	239:4	41:5 75:22
191:24 192:14	38:10	serving	sexual	76:21 163:6
193:20,21,22,25		62:24 63:20	239:2	245:8
194:6,10,20,23,	serve 7:7 15:3 19:22	64:22 89:1		short-term
25 195:13,20,24	33:10 37:23,24	118:25 139:23	sexually 226:5	80:18
196:2,5,13,17,	63:15 64:4,15	233:19 234:1		shortage
22 197:20	70:4 88:8,17	245:22	sexy	245:16
198:5,6,8,12,16	93:5 100:15	session	177:4	
199:1,5,9,11	105:20 106:3,13	11:1,4,10,12,14,	SHANDA	shortly
201:23 203:23	139:22,25 149:4	18 14:12 20:22	160:19 161:2	17:9 110:25
204:8,14 205:1,	228:4 233:9,23	83:8,11,16,18,	share	shot
4 207:6,9,13,16,	240:6,15,20	24 84:1 121:6	35:25 36:2 50:2	228:8
19 217:15,18 218:5,7 232:9	245:18 246:8	123:6,12,15,18	58:18 129:12	shoulders
244:16,17,18	250:24	229:22 230:1,9,	168:24 194:3	67:3
249:15,16,17	served	12,15	shared	show
	18:14 23:12	sessions	143:23 149:22	15:20 56:13
send 17:18 53:19	24:3 34:18,20	41:13 78:6	shares	68:1 108:7
182:12	38:2,10 70:23,	106:21 120:25	197:10	144:13 148:23
	24 93:6 110:10,	237:1	sharing	154:17 174:11
senior 23:23 64:15	24 127:15 147:8	set	168:21	188:1 241:21
	233:13 234:13	16:11 43:7	Sharon	showed
sense	240:21 244:22	45:10 68:8	9:15	130:23
13:10 34:23	247:5 250:7	74:11 78:17	sharp	shows
35:16 53:1		88:11,22 89:7,	92:25	10:2 131:1
58:21 59:1				
				1

		<u> </u>		I
shut	simple	217:20 220:22	140:8 146:21,23	social
107:18	185:2	221:10 222:14,	147:4,8 149:14	19:16 110:8
sick	simply	16	219:5	215:25 216:6
72:20	14:12 32:9	sister-in-law	skill	223:18
side	35:22 42:2 66:1,	138:22	68:8 78:17	society
19:6 23:19 29:9	2 137:12,20	sit	88:22 89:7,20	63:24 88:16
36:5 67:6 69:1	142:5 187:13	66:10 141:16	152:1 156:10	solely
74:1 76:10	197:5 202:9	154:14 155:23	skilled	54:12 234:25
89:13 99:11	203:6 228:1,5	170:22 171:3,10	134:7	solicit
137:19 148:17	sincere	174:3 182:14	skills	50:21
152:19 153:1	100:13	219:1 229:1	64:3,21 87:4	solicitor
155:1 176:5	sing	233:21 234:7	163:8 233:16	23:18 120:21,
180:11 181:6	148:18	sits	234:8,9,11,13	24,25 237:11,12
194:12 213:2	single	76:18 184:24	skip	254:3
235:4,5	126:11 136:25	245:15	41:19	solicitor's
sides	139:18 222:8	sitting	slash	237:13,14
89:10 90:23	sir	15:24 26:1	220:11	Solomon's
180:10	29:2 30:25 31:6,	53:22 68:3 86:8	SLED	56:22
sign	10 34:3,13,16,	101:2,3 118:22	16:17 18:9,10	solutions
17:12	25 41:15 47:17,	137:23 144:16	sleeping	81:10
signature	19 48:3 60:2	147:17 171:1	147:24	somebody's
10:19 67:22	72:10,17 84:10	179:20 191:24	slight	136:24
signed	102:24 103:6	210:7 223:4,25	100:1	someone's
222:11	112:18,23 113:9	249:10 253:10,	small	81:13
significant	116:4 117:21	14 254:7,10	23:21,22 90:9	son
74:6 98:18	123:1 124:8,12,	situation	106:18 113:13	189:8 227:5
165:24 240:1	19 126:1 128:3	33:9 50:24	smile	son's
significantly	129:22 131:14	54:16 147:7	49:8	217:2
14:22 38:4	132:3,7,19	162:23 163:13,	smiling	
signify	134:3 135:14,17	15 165:19,21	49:11	<b>song</b> 154:9
7:14 8:3 10:12	145:10,24 146:8	166:15 178:6	Smith	
11:5 83:11	149:19 150:12	188:19 195:12	36:6,7,17 56:1,7	sort
123:7 230:1	167:15 171:21	201:4 218:16	57:4	12:19 38:17
signing	175:5 176:17	241:19,20		40:12 51:4 52:14 80:18
196:10	177:10 178:5	242:17	smoothly 215:8	88:11 97:18
signs	179:5 183:9,17,	situations		124:14 185:25
57:13	20 191:7 192:4,	175:22 198:24	snap	250:3
similar	21 193:21 194:5	225:16 248:24	182:14	sorts
17:8 161:17	195:10 196:4,	sixteen	So-and-so	26:2 252:1
200:13	21,24 198:4,7	144:5 233:13	48:13	
similarly	199:8,12 201:17	250:18 251:1	sober	sought
146:15	203:11 207:5	sixty	130:24 132:17	15:6 47:25
110.15	208:8 212:11			71:22 95:24
	l			

112:4 145:16	103:4 124:4	101:14 122:10	164:4	62:2,25 64:5
163:3 215:20	125:24 135:24	157:20 254:22	stand	65:14 68:6 70:7
243:25	158:22 160:20	split	14:15 29:16	76:25 82:23
sound	164:9 169:14	121:24	79:4 102:7	83:23 85:21
162:20	183:15 186:5	spoke	138:1 155:13	89:18,22,25
sounds	208:6 223:1	43:21 50:4,5	158:10 169:2,3	93:7 99:12
109:1 120:1	242:23 247:13	88:6 142:10	222:13 231:4	104:9 106:13
191:23 254:2	speaking	202:2 212:16	255:14	125:8 126:24
sources	50:3,6,8,10,16	spoken	standard	142:4 143:8
16:13,18 19:15	162:5 164:18	65:15	40:19 156:16	153:6 158:4
South	185:12 212:24	sports	232:2	160:3 178:13
7:8,20 8:11	specific	217:3 219:14	standards	190:4 219:7
12:4,12,16 14:7	51:12 93:14	spot	51:12,15 78:5	232:12 239:2
15:7,9 28:15	161:16 182:21	74:16 88:20	162:17	253:3 254:18
34:18 35:5	specifically		standout	255:8
36:11 43:15	35:4 44:2 57:8	spotlight 53:4	147:20	state's
46:3 51:10,17	137:14 161:11		standpoint	37:21 63:18
57:18 60:18	162:11 164:17,	<b>spring</b> 237:24	37:7 38:21	177:3 247:3
82:24 110:7	19,24 170:8		39:15 152:15	state-level
130:1 131:5	184:12 187:18	squad	204:1 246:19	54:5
133:22 134:22	208:23 224:21	75:8	stands	stated
135:4 137:13,16	233:25	squarely	149:21 221:1	57:8 94:8
140:7 149:24,25	specificity	137:10 141:19		109:17 172:21,
152:14 153:17	165:4	143:13 144:3	Starnes 9:20	22 189:4,24
156:21 162:18	spectrum	stability		190:18 226:3,6
163:11 193:11	36:5	15:17 47:3 71:8	start	227:6 228:16
213:18 219:5	speech	95:7 111:5	21:19 24:13	240:24
223:19 225:11	28:22 173:17	131:22 145:2	30:21 81:14	statehouse
243:20 255:8	201:20,22,24	243:8	84:2 151:18	68:25
sow	speed	staff	202:21 209:5	statement
242:6	80:5 108:19	9:11,22 13:19	212:17 231:21	16:2,4 18:20
space		18:19 23:7	started	30:23 31:13,18
137:5,6	speedy 66:20	31:12 32:10,17	30:6 170:21,25	32:7,9 61:2,20
spade		33:18,22 34:1	171:9 172:7,18	62:10,19 84:18
241:15	spend	63:4 66:18 79:9	175:2 233:11	85:14 86:3
	33:22 101:10	80:2,7,8,24	starting	103:9 104:2,17
Spartanburg 120:11	216:18	81:11 87:11,17	68:3 104:25	124:10 125:1
	spent	139:1 232:24	state	138:18 159:2,21
speak	89:6 99:14	248:13	16:3,24 17:21,	169:2 189:6
30:17 33:17	156:20 216:15	staff's	22 19:4 32:1	209:4 210:1
35:4 50:25	228:19	248:12	34:17,22 49:20	211:15,17
60:23 65:15	spirit	stage	50:25 51:20	219:13 221:6
84:14 98:22	59:15 82:14	14:2 149:13	52:4 55:9 59:25	231:12
L				

-4-4		72.24		145.7.15.201.1
statements	steep	72:24	studying 98:10	145:7,15 201:1
212:17 244:25	75:22 76:2	strategy		243:11,24
states	stemmed	99:4	stuff	Subsequently
15:7 50:17,20	110:12	street	77:6 186:7	210:14
235:1	step	115:4	191:25	substance
stating	12:21 230:6	street's	subcommittee	220:16
17:14 209:3	stepping	114:11	24:8 26:8,17	substantial
219:3	141:24	strengths	subcommittees	32:22 77:16
status	sterling	43:22	25:10 26:11	substantiating
163:8,9	239:24	stress	subject	189:4 228:15
statute	Steve	189:9	20:4	substantive
7:5 21:2,7 22:1,	9:18	Strickland	subjected	25:25 28:8
5 37:3,5 47:14	Stewart	247:19	189:3 228:14	successful
57:3 65:10	253:3	strictly	subjects	53:15 75:23
185:17 206:1,6	stick	20:4	115:13	155:12 168:8
239:3,9	60:7	strikes	submission	sudden
statutes	stint	156:4 247:21	234:10	173:16,20
45:6 185:10	76:21	strong	submissions	sue
statutorily-	stolen	38:23 152:18	246:22	70:18
mandated	227:4 252:17,18	stronger	submit	sued
191:3	stood	144:5	16:5 21:12	70:20
statutorily-	156:21 176:12	struck	24:14 137:19	sufficient
provided	stop	23:5 27:22	197:15 201:25	46:15 66:17
201:7	41:16 98:8	112:24	225:20	79:22 191:8
statutory	113:19 117:18	structure	submitted	suggest
34:9 37:13	153:17 202:17	44:10	30:24 36:19	10:25
45:19 46:8 63:9	235:14 247:6	Stuckey	57:7 61:3 69:3	suggested
69:7 78:16 88:2	stopped	138:23	84:19,24 103:9	44:2
105:17 131:20	150:2 191:15		124:11 126:4	suggesting
132:4 139:9	224:4	student 182:7	129:17 130:7	201:17,18
141:7 185:16	stopping		133:5 137:19	suggestions
193:11 197:6	171:1	students	159:3 161:9	38:6 41:11
203:19 205:25	store	51:1	163:7 164:2	
211:8 216:1	48:12	studied	170:6 184:10	suggests
228:4 233:6		37:2	191:19 192:11	45:10
statutory-	<b>story</b> 51:5 129:16	studies	208:21 211:17	suit
protected	218:15 252:11	22:15	218:10 220:25	110:8,11 225:23
200:2 213:20	253:5	study	224:19	suitable
stay		31:24 32:2 62:1,	submitting	127:20
60:9 80:3 102:4	straight	4 85:20,23	47:6,24 71:13,	suited
186:16,17 211:6	22:21 106:17	104:8,11 125:7,	21 95:15,23	64:3 70:1 93:5
	strain	10 160:2,5	111:20 112:3	
	1	1	1	I

		1		1
suits	140:11 146:25	swearing-in		7:10,11,24,25
138:14	147:2 154:6	58:14	T	78:22,23 83:10
summarize	200:7 233:19	sweet		117:25 118:1,4
127:21	234:1,7,14,17	88:20	Tab	119:23 120:12
summary	239:13,14	swimming	11:22	123:4
126:15 183:18	240:22 245:19	214:2,5 225:24	table	task
184:17	253:2	sworn	49:14 94:16	222:1
summer	Supremes	16:2 18:25 19:9	tactics	taught
34:16 37:25	146:21	30:17,23 31:9,	127:19	157:4
128:21 213:25	surely	13,18 60:22	takes	teacher
super-legislature	206:16 248:4	61:2,12,20	9:11 40:4 41:3	170:15 172:11
65:18	surprise	84:13,18 85:3,	148:24	176:10 182:5
supersedeas	147:20	14 103:4,9,18	taking	team
140:13	surprised	104:2 124:3,10,	79:13 101:9	216:6 217:3
supervising	44:18 48:17	17 125:1,23	119:19 128:15	219:14
99:2	surrounds	135:23 158:22	150:20 185:20	technicality
supplement	23:6	159:2,10,21	192:6 200:3	187:21
103:14 189:6	survey	160:19 169:13	201:5 216:9	technology
support	16:16 17:18,19	180:2 183:14	227:16	236:4
19:6,7 37:6 97:7	31:24 62:1	208:5 222:25	talk	tedious
171:5 232:7	85:20 92:22	Symmes	14:23 24:6	232:22
supported	104:8 109:15	9:18 87:12,22,	76:15 97:17	teenager
38:11	125:7 160:2	23 88:5 95:4,13	134:21 141:17	86:24 88:11
supporting	239:20 240:10	96:8,13	171:19 200:15	telephonic
19:2 136:4	surveys	system	202:22,23 210:2	189:11
	43:19 66:24,25	26:14 37:21	214:7 220:15	telling
<b>supposed</b> 11:11 19:1	92:21 109:14	38:5 40:13 42:4,	222:11,12	176:8,10 177:18
65:17 173:7,8	142:8 239:19	5,10 44:6,7,13,	242:11 250:4	178:1 198:1
186:1,9 213:19	Susan	14 45:16,17	talked	temper
Supreme	9:23	51:2,6 52:4,8,	48:13 58:24	163:6
8:23 14:25	suspend	24,25 53:13	77:22 108:23	temperament
17:15,20 30:12	53:19 54:5,21,	55:14,20,23	143:4 220:16	15:18 25:6
34:22 53:25	25	66:5 78:5 79:6,	talking	46:25 69:20,25
54:14 65:17	suspension	13,14 90:10	23:11 144:11	71:6 93:2 95:10
69:9 74:7 75:4,	55:8	91:8,10,17,20	165:10 166:7	109:19 111:8
10 76:25 90:23	sustain	107:23 113:20	192:14 220:20,	131:23 163:1
98:2,5 115:7	155:25	121:8,9 140:1	23 227:18	173:13,14,22
116:17 126:19,	sway	153:9 156:21	235:14 237:22	174:8 181:10
24 127:5,7	165:7	167:7 168:1	252:12,13	185:1,10 229:6
129:2,8 130:1,5,	swearing	170:19,20	talks	231:6 239:24
12 131:6 133:22	125:19	198:22 211:4 235:23 236:1	26:11	241:25 242:2,
134:1 135:3	120.17	255.25 250:1	Talley	19,25 243:6
				,
	I	I	l	I

247:17,24	testify	thing	thirteen	three-hundred-
temporary	18:24 19:10	14:9 41:2 55:19	8:25	and-some-odd
43:22 59:1 70:6	32:6 62:8 86:2	66:7 68:10 91:2,	thirty	13:1
121:16 126:25	104:15 125:14	18 107:10,13	24:17 25:4,9	threw
128:20,22,24,25	156:7 160:9	108:13 109:2	121:17 152:17	165:22
129:3 137:9	161:11 170:8	113:6 115:6	153:6 218:25	thrilled
167:9 198:19	184:12 208:23	121:2 144:7	thirty-	37:10
212:15,20	224:21	153:13 162:3	34:16	throwers
ten	testimonies	175:20 186:11,	thirty-five	50:16
16:21 20:11	220:17	24 188:7 199:15	207:18	Thursday
40:17 216:18	testimony	201:8 204:5	thirty-plus	10:2 21:24
219:16	31:9 34:6 61:12	236:22 239:16	32:11 93:25	50:10
tendency	63:6 85:3 87:24	things	thirty-six	tie
38:23	103:19 105:14	12:20 15:23	168:2 249:21	54:18 81:21
tender	124:18 137:17	20:16 25:24	thirty-three	Tiffany
233:12	139:6 159:10	27:22 38:13,14	225:9	36:6,7,18 56:1
tending	161:19 163:25	39:24 41:24	thirty-two	57:4
72:20	164:1 165:13	46:18 50:2,11	37:18 38:2,9	tight
tension	176:19 183:19	53:24 76:6 78:4	44:17 52:11	141:22
97:6	184:17 192:1,12	79:11 88:15	56:20 247:6	till
terms	219:22 223:7	90:6,22 97:23	Thomas	87:19
40:24 43:6,12	229:18 231:1	108:7,16 109:6	62:16 110:7	time
48:8 53:22	233:3	121:2 136:22		
55:10 75:24	Texas	137:3 144:9,23	<b>Thompson</b> 247:15	7:6,7,15 8:4 9:25 10:13,18,
108:25 117:18	17:22	157:6 164:5,17		24 11:6,16,21,
120:20 121:3,7	text	165:16 166:13	thought	25 20:25 21:17
134:15 154:2	90:16,18 92:18	174:4 175:1	27:19 28:17	22:5 23:4 24:2
156:8 176:16	94:25 219:17	177:8,21,23	56:13 63:21 64:2 69:25	28:13 29:7,19,
194:14 205:1	textualist	178:17 184:16,		24 31:5 32:7,25
234:9,25	90:16 141:5	25 185:2 197:20	90:21 116:1 170:20 173:23	33:23 35:3 36:2
235:11,25	thankful	203:7 204:15,21	213:19 225:5	39:22 41:5,7,18
236:1,4,18	232:24	211:25 214:8	234:5 250:10	52:15 56:11
238:12 240:8,23	Thanksgiving	218:18,21 219:8		57:2 59:22 60:2
245:2,18,23	219:18	227:15,19 249:8	thoughtful 69:23 92:25	61:8 64:12
246:7,21	theme	250:2,4 252:1		70:11 76:15,17
Terry	113:3	thinker	thoughts	77:4 79:2,13
129:3	themes	92:25	41:13 129:12	80:12 82:21
test	18:6,7	thinking	thousand	83:12 87:10
186:1	thighs	63:20 64:22	117:6 209:7	96:17 97:7
testified	185:14 213:23	77:23 81:23	thousands	101:9,10,22
98:14 179:25	215:25	90:3 115:23	223:16	103:13 105:6,23
192:18		155:23 163:8		106:10 107:12

110:3 115:12,24	182:21 215:8	Todd	236:18	58:21
116:15 117:11	217:5 219:4	197:19 206:2	tracking	treatment
121:7 122:17	223:5 242:3,9,	207:15	206:11	130:13,16
123:8 126:14	22	Todd's	traffic	tremendous
135:15 150:19	tip	207:14	18:16	42:12 89:1
152:16 154:7	56:21	token	training	239:23
158:2,4 160:11	Title	248:16	156:19	trenches
161:1,24 166:12	8:11 67:19	told	trajectory	150:25
167:5 168:19	titles	18:5 70:25	163:2	trends
169:21 176:4	154:13	86:11 108:11	transcribed	26:15
179:1 181:17,25	Toal	192:3 218:14	182:22	Trey
183:25 192:19	149:22	tomorrow	transcript	9:20 138:22
197:15 199:3	today	50:6 255:15	31:12 126:7	trial
202:17 203:8	23:1,8 24:22	tone	176:20,24	41:10 75:6
204:12 207:15	28:10 32:24	242:16	177:20 227:16	76:14 89:17
208:12 210:10	41:17 48:24	top	transcripts	93:12,14,19
213:6,13 214:2,	58:23 59:11	27:24 47:14	177:8	94:6 106:9
7,18,23 216:23	60:2,16 62:11,	110:2 254:1	transition	108:21 117:2,4
218:13 219:3,24	18 72:8 81:21	tort	52:13	119:17 121:12,
221:14,16	82:25 96:11	69:6 153:21		15,19,22,23
222:15 223:24	97:15 101:8,24	tortfeaser	transparency	126:18,22
224:11 226:14	104:19 112:16	36:14	41:21 42:1,8	143:18 150:23
227:3,11,14,18	113:17 127:10	Tortfeasers	43:6,10 91:13	155:16,22
229:9,12,18	133:19 135:15	36:10	transparent	156:11 233:11
230:2 231:19	136:2,12		13:3	234:5 235:6,8
232:16,23 236:7	138:19,21 143:4	total	Trask	236:8 237:2,3,6,
237:4,7 238:20 245:4 247:13	146:5,14 157:14	146:20	9:19	9,25 238:1
248:22 249:1	158:4 160:9	totality	traumatic	252:24 253:9,25
250:1 255:4	161:21,24 162:4	221:3	55:6	trials
	164:21 176:13,	touch	traumatized	74:17 89:17
<b>timed</b> 13:9	18 184:21 191:1	67:18 248:6	227:3	93:23 94:4,6
	198:24 199:4,6	touched	travel	99:8 121:1
timely	210:21 229:12,	109:22 148:7	50:25 136:21	236:19
40:8 42:23 66:8	18 232:1,15	153:14	treasure	triggered
times	241:9,14 242:10	tough	177:8	254:5
18:13 32:11	244:12 247:4,10	115:20 151:8	treat	trip
52:11,20 77:22	254:19 255:6	tower	44:22 70:2,5	105:1 182:16
79:15 91:19 105:25 107:11	today's	248:4	107:7 174:8	Triplett
143:19 146:24	7:2 161:3	town	242:6,8	9:20
147:1,6 149:24	169:24 184:3	62:13 106:18	treated	troubled
150:6 172:17	208:15 224:13	113:13	151:22 242:7	237:2,5
174:2 179:25	255:14	track	treating	
117.2117.23				
		I	1	

	 I	1	1	 
trove	123:2 153:14	204:20	185:18 186:18	90:10 151:13
177:8	turnover	ultimately	193:19 194:22	244:24
true	66:18	127:4 151:4	197:11,24 203:3	uniquely
78:10 214:11	twelve	153:16 167:11	204:24 205:20	114:22
226:11,12	43:23 70:19	196:10 197:17	209:11,13,18	United
trust	249:20 251:7	ultra	211:14 217:7	15:6
143:9	twenty	154:14	218:8,12 221:25	university
truth	139:21 146:24	unaccounted	225:7 226:10	148:15
30:17,18 60:23,	149:19,20,23	166:13	239:9 248:24	unjust
24 84:14,15	150:3,5,6 218:1	unanswered	250:13 251:25	219:10,19
103:4,5 124:4,5	twenty-fourth	57:21	252:11	unjustly
125:24,25	217:3 219:14	unassigned	understandable	228:22
135:24,25	twenty-minute	54:11	180:9	unnecessary
158:22,23	198:24	unaware	understanding	127:14
160:20,21	twenty-one	145:24 210:16	7:5 84:6 98:7	unprofessional
169:14,15	104:21	uncharacteristic	99:11 113:21	231:5
183:15,16	twisting	86:16	131:1 140:24	unpublished
208:6,7 223:1,2	190:22	uncles	149:11 156:3,	116:14,20
Tucker	two-week	227:5	23,24 157:5	unqualified
183:10,14 184:1	121:23,24	unconstitutional	165:12 180:6,15	21:10
Tuesday	type	46:11 75:9	223:9 250:14	unquestioned
10:4 22:2	68:16 69:19	200:20	254:6	239:23
Tuner	97:20 131:11	unconstitutional	understands	untoward
104:21	140:9 154:7,15	ity	249:10	39:1 153:4
turn	155:4 171:13	46:9	understood	
30:20 46:19	175:22 231:7	uncontested	137:12 205:14	untrue 131:5,7 216:5
96:14 133:8	247:2,3	236:21	undertake	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
146:6 207:14	typical	undeniably	8:17	unusual 151:12 239:7
237:7,12,15,16	196:13	229:11	undertaking	
turned	typically		33:1	updated
16:9 103:15	14:14 22:10	underlying 35:21 45:6	unemotional	31:5 61:8
173:21 174:9	39:23 166:5	183:5	130:13	updating
Turner	167:6 186:25	understand	unequivocally	124:14
102:12,14,19,24	193:25 194:2	90:19 92:1	216:5	uphold
103:3,11,14,20,	196:18,20	98:11 113:16	unfair	37:12
25 104:3,20	, -	115:18 117:13	13:11	upholding
105:2,5,11,12,		130:23 133:24	unfamiliar	35:23 37:16
16,20 107:5,22		140:23 148:5	67:16	88:25
109:7,13 111:3	Uh-huh	150:25 155:21	unilaterally	upholds
112:19,22	79:7	159:8 165:21	38:24 39:13	35:18 45:5
117:24 118:3,13	ultimate	176:4 179:23	unique	uploaded
122:1,6,21,24	39:10 81:5	180:23 181:13	29:11 89:7	28:5
		100.23 101.13		
	1	I .	1	I .

upset	236:4	viewpoint	24:4	wanted
174:9 175:25	verdict	156:15	volunteers	86:24 96:16
upside	74:18,22,23	vigor	23:7,11,12,16	118:10 128:25
174:10	93:23 94:1	98:10	24:7,12 26:16,	129:5,22 148:7
Upstate	140:15 155:19	village	23 27:11 29:18	155:20,21
12:3 16:24	180:13	9:11	vote	167:25 168:10
46:22	verification	violate	10:1 22:4 40:6	180:14,22
urge	31:25 62:2	193:11	188:4	186:20 188:11
229:5	85:21 104:9	violation	voted	192:13 196:18
utmost	125:8 160:3	196:3 201:18	21:14	207:19 211:14
44:23 242:9	versed	254:2	votes	216:13 252:1
utterly	162:14	violations	21:3 22:4 47:16	wanting
216:12	versus	59:17 82:16	83:25 123:19	69:16
	49:20 54:19	101:16 122:12	230:15	warrants
f v	116:14 146:16	157:21 254:24	vow	81:4
	151:7 165:8	violative	70:4	watch
vacancy	vested	195:7 204:3		12:23 235:13
21:20	92:13	violence	$\mathbf{W}$	watchdog
vacated	vet	163:15		171:9
81:6	32:25	vision	wait	watching
vacation	veto	66:4 91:7,11	40:18,21 52:19	13:13 23:4
121:12	67:22	107:22 235:22,	155:23 190:2,16	28:25 175:3
valid	vetting	25	191:13 203:22	177:2
130:17 142:20	32:13,22,24	visitation	217:22	waterfront
values	33:11,19 49:17	186:11 189:11	waited	78:15
91:12,14	51:18 52:3	191:20	218:3	ways
variation	vice	Vogle	waiting	54:11 56:15
150:12	7:20,22 8:2,8	172:25	66:21 102:8	66:12 67:20
varied	16:22 216:24	voice	waive	143:22 150:22
106:22 148:12	victim's	30:8 144:17	204:15	216:13
varies	179:23	242:14,22	waived	weather
147:9	video	volume	204:17	116:6
variety	13:16 235:10,12	28:3	waiver	Webb
110:2 140:22	240:23,25	voluminous	17:12 204:11	9:20
143:6	view	33:7 206:16	walk	Webex
vast	38:7 45:4 56:14	volunteer	49:23	236:5,8,18
43:20 113:23	59:16 82:16	24:24 26:10	Waller	website
116:20 118:11	92:2 101:15	28:19 53:8	9:23	28:1,5 177:3,4
venture	122:12 131:24	volunteered	Walpole	Wednesday
236:7,23	157:21 197:10	216:21	9:20	10:6
ventured	227:1 254:24	volunteering	wand	week
ventureu		volunteering	241:18	22:11 51:6 80:9
	1		1 4 <del>1</del> 1.10	22.11 21.0 00.7

108:11 119:23	Wilkinson	249:14	Workers	156:22 173:11
120:11	9:15	wondering	50:5	227:17
weeks	William	254:10	workers'	writes
22:5 50:4 63:1	42:14 61:17,20	word	56:8 113:11	18:2 251:12
84:24 105:6	63:8 125:23	24:21 44:3	153:21	writeup
156:1 213:24	126:8,12	48:14 100:22,24	working	137:8
weigh	Williams	206:25 218:15	41:6 66:14	writing
166:9	41:4 108:24	words	70:11 89:19	16:6 64:21 69:2
weighed	Williamsburg	13:16 41:21	98:11 109:2	106:7,24,25
98:5 200:8,9	249:25	65:10 87:16	121:3 150:19	152:18 156:23
weighing	willingness	90:15 127:12	236:2	251:12
192:15	49:13	190:22 196:7	workplace	writs
weight	Willis	197:7 217:9	32:21	140:12
59:18 77:16	70:10	227:17	works	written
82:17 101:17	wisdom	work	40:10 99:12	35:9 43:23
122:13 157:22	65:19 142:23,24	15:20 23:5,6	117:17 167:7	46:10 57:19
254:25	wished	24:6,12 32:17	168:1 251:23	67:8 93:10
weird	129:25	40:5 41:1 53:7	world	109:21 126:5
211:4	wishes	66:15 68:23	108:16 248:1	136:7,10 142:6,
welcomed	18:23 57:25	69:17 73:25	worries	9 154:9 164:10
109:17	withdraw	74:4,14 80:21	148:5	169:1,2 212:8
well-behaved	20:24	81:8,13 87:12,	worry	230:21,24
65:15	withdraws	17 88:20 89:7,	150:5	231:3,4,13
whatsoever	21:16	17 99:4,16,18	worse	240:4
190:5	witnessed	100:19 106:6	212:23 248:2	wrong
whistle	181:11 242:10	115:7 121:10 128:5,13 139:2	worst	36:15 110:21
193:8	witnesses	148:19 154:13,	107:13 241:18	147:3 185:19
Whitney	32:6 62:7 86:1	15 157:4 162:17	would-be	194:14 206:5
123:22 124:3,23	104:14 160:8	190:23 195:18	100:3	wrongdoing
125:1 135:23	witnessing	227:14 234:8	wrap	43:5
136:8	176:8	235:11 246:21	133:15	wrote
who've	woman	248:9 250:23	wreaked	37:9 247:19
78:11 104:18	173:24	worked	50:23	
138:19 197:15	women	42:15 69:12	wrecker	Y
wide	51:19 241:8	70:20 86:25	162:19	w'all
93:4 110:2	won	100:2 140:9,17	wrestle	y'all 29:15,18 56:3
140:21	58:7 155:7	170:19 179:24	89:11	62:25 83:4
wife	181:5	233:15 251:15	writ	139:2 153:10
62:12 72:20	wonderful	worker	126:23 127:1,3	155:18 158:5
86:7 96:25	42:5 154:10	215:25 216:6	128:1 129:9	Yay
wife's	167:20 216:19	223:18 240:2	write	179:21
97:1				117.21

year	250:18,20,22	
8:9,22 11:24	251:2,7	
13:4 23:12,15	years-plus	
27:23 32:11	153:6	
40:5 73:16		
100:2 119:16	yell	
120:5 143:24	242:22	
144:1 155:17	young	
185:4,13,25	23:24 73:15,18	
186:4 200:21	74:8 146:14	
205:20 206:3	149:21 177:18	
213:5 225:13,20	250:20,21,22	
	younger	
227:3 229:1	23:25 74:1	
238:19 244:20	youth	
245:14 247:7	73:21 142:14	
year-old	146:15 217:3	
187:16		
years	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	
15:7,8,9 16:6		
24:3 29:11 33:6	zeal	
34:10,17,22	98:10	
37:18 38:2,10		
44:17 52:11		
56:20 58:4		
63:11 64:15		
66:10,21 75:18		
88:3 89:20 94:2		
99:14 100:6		
104:21,22		
105:18,24		
106:19 113:8		
114:1 115:17		
132:6 139:10,21		
144:5 150:19		
151:16,17		
152:18 154:10		
156:20 162:25		
168:2 195:22		
218:3 223:22		
225:8,9 233:7,		
13 237:23		
238:22 245:9		
249:20,21		
- · · - <b>,</b>		
	I	