1			
1	STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)		
2	COUNTY OF RICHLAND)		
3			
4		* * * *	
5	JU	UDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION	
6		TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS	
7		* * * *	
8	BEFORE: G. M	MURRELL SMITH, JR., CHAIRMAN	
9	SENA	TOR LUKE A. RANKIN	
10	SENA	ATOR RONNIE A. SABB	
11	SENA	ATOR TOM YOUNG, JR.	
12	ROBE	CRT W. HAYES, JR.	
13	REPF	RESENTATIVE J. TODD RUTHERFORD	
14	REPF	RESENTATIVE CHRIS MURPHY	
15	MICH	AEL HITCHCOCK	
16	JOSE	IUA HOWARD	
17	ANDF	REW N. SAFRAN	
18	ERIN	B. CRAWFORD, CHIEF COUNSEL	
19		* * * *	
20	DATE:	November 15th, 2017	
21	TIME:	10:00 a.m.	
22	LOCATION:	Gressette Building	
23		1101 Pendleton Street	
24		Columbia, South Carolina 29201	
25	REPORTED BY:	PATRICIA G. BACHAND, COURT REPORTER	

1	INDEX
2	PAGE:
3	BRYSON JOHN BARROWCLOUGH4
4	- Examination by Mr. Pearce 5
5	- Examination by Mr. Hayes
6	- Examination by Mr. Hitchcock
7	- Examination by Representative Murphy 25
8	- Examination by Mr. Safran
9	- Comments by Senator Sabb
10	- Examination by Senator Young
11	- Examination by Representative Rutherford 37
12	- Examination by Senator Rankin
13	- Examination by Chairman Smith
14	LISA G. COLLINS
15	- Examination by Ms. Benson
16	- Examination by Mr. Hitchcock
17	- Examination by Mr. Hayes 64
18	- Examination by Senator Rankin 68
19	- Examination by Senator Sabb 70
20	- Examination by Representative Rutherford 73
21	- Examination by Senator Young
22	- Examination by Mr. Safran
23	- Examination by Chairman Smith 80
24	Certificate of Reporter 87
25	Word Index

ĺ			
1	REQUESTED INFORMATION INDEX		
2	(No Information Requested.)		
3	* * * *		
4	EXHIBIT INDEX		
5	EXHIBITS: PAGE:		
6	EXHIBIT NO. 1 5		
7	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL		
8	DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF BRYSON JOHN BARROWCLOUGH		
9	EXHIBIT NO. 2 5		
10	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT		
11	OF BRYSON JOHN BARROWCLOUGH		
12	EXHIBIT NO. 3		
13	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA		
14	QUESTIONNAIRE OF LISA G. COLLINS		
15	EXHIBIT NO. 4		
16	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT		
17	OF LISA G. COLLINS		
18	EXHIBIT NO. 5		
19	- AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF		
20	LISA G. COLLINS		
21	* * * *		
22	Court Reporter's Legend:		
23	dashes [] Intentional or purposeful interruption		
24	Indicates trailing off		
25	[sic] Written as said		

```
1
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: He's been telling every
2
     candidate, so far we're optimistic with our -- we're
3
     optimistic with our executive sessions, and they never turn
 4
     out the way we are. So we appreciate the patience.
                    I see you got someone with you. Would you
5
     like to introduce her to the Commission?
6
 7
                    MR. BARROWCLOUGH: Yes, sir. This is my
8
    wife Kristin Barrowclough.
9
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Kristin, welcome. Nice to
10
     see you.
11
                    Mr. Barrowclough, will you please raise your
12
     right hand for me.
                    BRYSON JOHN BARROWCLOUGH, being duly sworn
13
14
     and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and
15
    nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: You have before you, Mr.
16
17
    Barrowclough, a copy of the -- your personal data
18
     questionnaire and the sworn statement that were submitted
     to -- that were submitted to the Commission. Are those the
19
    documents that you submitted to them -- to the Commission?
2.0
21
                    MR. BARROWCLOUGH: Yes, sir.
22
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are they both correct?
23
                    MR. BARROWCLOUGH: Yes, sir.
24
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: To the best of your
25
    knowledge.
```

1 MR. BARROWCLOUGH: Yes, sir. 2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Let me add that 3 qualification. And does anything need to be changed or 4 updated at this time? 5 No, sir. MR. BARROWCLOUGH: 6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do you have any objection 7 to those documents, and any amendments that may be there as 8 -- to be made a part of your sworn testimony today? 9 MR. BARROWCLOUGH: No objection. 10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Let me get a copy of those. And we'll have those made a part of your --11 of the record. 12 13 (EXHIBIT NO. 1 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION 14 COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF BRYSON 15 JOHN BARROWCLOUGH) (EXHIBIT NO. 2 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION 16 17 COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF BRYSON JOHN 18 BARROWCLOUGH) 19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Barrowclough, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly 2.0 21 investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our 22 inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria, and has 23 included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your 24 application materials, verification of your compliance with 25 state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which

your name appears, a study of previous screenings, and 1 2 checks for economic conflicts of interest. 3 We have received no affidavits today in opposition to your election, and no witnesses are present 4 to testify. Do you wish to make a brief opening statement 5 to the Commission? 6 7 MR. BARROWCLOUGH: I would just wish to just 8 briefly say thank you to all of you. I recognize that every single one of you is an important person, and that 9 10 you-all have a lot going on beyond this. And it is my 11 honor, and also I'm humbled to appear in front of you. 12 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Thank you very much. 13 And answer any questions that counsel may have for you. 14 MR. PEARCE: Mr. Chairman, first, and members of the Commission, I note for the record that, 15 based on the testimony contained in Mr. Barrowclough's PDQ, 16 17 which has been included in the record, with the candidate's 18 consent at this point, that he meets the constitutional and statutory requirements for this position regarding age, 19 residence, and years of practice. 2.0 EXAMINATION BY MR. PEARCE: 21 22 Good morning, Mr. Barrowclough. Q. 23 Good morning, Mr. Pearce. Α. 24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: "Good afternoon," Mr. 25 Pearce.

MR. PEARCE: Well, you know what? It is afternoon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I'm going to correct my watch.

BY MR. PEARCE:

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Barrowclough.

A. Good afternoon, Mr. Pearce.

2.0

- Q. Welcome back to Columbia. How do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far renders you qualified, and will assist you to become an effective circuit court judge?
- A. I believe that I do have the requisite experience. I have been a trial lawyer for all of my 22-plus years. I have worked mainly on the defense side of the courtroom, but I've also worked on the prosecution side of the courtroom. And I feel like I am extremely knowledgeable about anything having to do in the realm of criminal law.

I do acknowledge that I am not experienced in civil law. However, I have spoken to sitting judges, Judge John Hayes and Judge Dan Hall, up in the 16th Circuit, to see if they thought that, that would be a hindrance that would disqualify me.

They both assured me that my knowledge of the rules and evidence to preside over trials, as well as the ability to learn civil law, that they felt like in short

order I would be qualified on the civil side as well. 1 2 I did sit for three separate Bar exams, two of 3 which I studied for on my own. I passed them all on the 4 first try. I did graduate magna cum laude from law school, so I do feel like I have the requisite intellect to climb 5 that learning curve quickly, should I become a circuit 6 7 court judge. 8 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Barrowclough, let me 9 interrupt you for a second. And I have not followed the 10 appropriate procedure, I guess. When we came out of 11 executive session -- and I know we came out, and I don't think it was on the record. And when we came out of 12 13 executive session, when we finished the executive session, 14 Representative Rutherford made a motion to leave -- to lift 15 the veil and leave executive session. Everyone voted in favor of that. 16 17 And I just want place on the record that 18 there was no -- while we were in executive session, no 19 decisions were made, and there were no votes taken during executive session. I apologize. We did all that off the 20 21 record, and I didn't place it on the record. So I 22 apologize for that. I'm sorry to interrupt you. 23 MR. BARROWCLOUGH: Yes, sir. 24 BY MR. PEARCE:

Q. The Commission received 94 ballot box surveys

25

regarding you. Eighteen of those had additional comments.

The ballot box contained the following positive comments:

"Would be a great circuit court judge. Fair and honest. Such a benefit to the legal profession.

Extraordinary knowledge of the Constitution. Extremely conscientious and hard-working attorney. A rare combination of exceptional intellect and commitment to justice. Smart, helpful, even-tempered, and a stellar candidate for resident judge."

Five of the written additional comments expressed concerns, or what could be considered qualified concerns about you. A couple of these concerns or comments related to your legal experience. The first: "I would be concerned -- would be concerned about his lack of civil experience. A talented criminal lawyer."

And an additional one: "This candidate has no civil experience. He will certainly be biased against solicitors in general sessions. He will not follow the law, and lacks a sufficient basis to apply the law. He does not believe in many of the criminal -- that is, drug laws, habitual offender laws -- and will supplant the rule of law with his personal beliefs. He treats law enforcement and solicitor with contempt and does not believe in the Oath of Civility. He may have the intellect and ability to apply the law, but lacks the will to accept

the law as legislated, and certainly will not apply the law as legislated."

What response do you have to offer to these concerns?

A. Well, if I could categorize those concerns, and address them one at a time, I think the first concern deals with my lack of civil experience. Which again, I would work hard to get up to speed on the civil side.

Although, I acknowledge that is a legitimate concern. And, you know, I did again talk with Judge Hall and Judge Hayes about that; they did not feel that, that would be something that would preempt me from being a good circuit court judge.

They did say that, in their experience, that the job of a circuit court judge is 70 to 75 percent general sessions, and only about 25 percent common pleas. So I feel like I would be up to speed in handling that aspect of the job immediately.

The second criticism seems to deal with the fact that I would not be fair to the prosecution side. I heard the comment about I have contempt for police officer or a prosecutor, that I may not apply certain types of laws like the drug laws or the habitual traffic offender laws. And I will say that, that is absolutely false.

I know that if you see my application, you know

2.0

that I have also worked as a prosecutor, albeit in another state. I was assistant district attorney in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania. I prosecuted cases vigorously up there. I had the -- I had the honor of being brought in on a prosecution team on a double-murder case up there that was a national case that was featured on American's Most Wanted.

We ended up trying that case. And as a result of that case, the prosecution team, myself included with two other lawyers and the investigators, was awarded an award by the attorney general of Pennsylvania, that they only give out to one prosecution team in the entire state of Pennsylvania for the year.

And so my thinking is, is that whoever wrote those comments is just not aware of my experience on the prosecution side.

I think that as an advocate, I've been a zealous advocate for whichever side that I have been on. But I understand that, you know, for people who are filling out ballot box surveys, who only know me for my service in York County public defender office, that they may think that I was overly zealous.

I've always treated prosecutors and police officers with respect. There certainly have been over 20-plus years of adversarial proceedings in court, times when

I would get into a cross-examination with a police officer which resulted in a situation where I did not feel that person was telling me the truth, and perhaps things did get heated.

But outside of the courtroom, I've always treated the police officers with respect. I've always treated solicitors with respect. It's ironic I think that, you know, the vast majority of people who work where I work in the Moss Justice Center, would tell you that I, of all the public defenders, and probably most of the private Bar, have better working relationships and friendships with the attorneys in the solicitor's office than anybody.

Oftentimes attorneys will come to me and ask me to intercede or negotiate a case with attorneys in the solicitor's office, because they know that I have those -- developed those good personal relationships with those people.

The third and final concern that I think is encapsulated in those criticisms is whether or not I would apply the law. And I will tell you, of course I'm under oath, I would certainly apply the law. And I think that by analogy, I would say that -- again, in trial there are certain rules that govern what you're supposed to and what you're not supposed to do.

And while I have the benefit of having tried a

lot of cases, and you have a case strategy and you have points you want to make, and how you want to make them, I think that there is no one who would ever say that I did anything outside the bounds of the law to make those points.

2.0

And whatever views I have about the law, I would never go outside the bounds of what the law says to do in governing any type of case or any type of situation. I'd always follow the law, because I'm a lawyer and that's what we're supposed to do. So I think that, that criticism is unfair and untrue.

Q. An additional concern stated, "Mr. Barrowclough does a fine job advocating for his clients. But I am concerned that his ideological commitments will find their way into his rulings as a judge."

What response would you offer to that statement concern?

A. Well, I would say similar to what I just said. A judge has to follow the law, whether they agree with it or not, at a circuit court level. And I think that, you know, most certainly, I would always follow the law.

I do have political beliefs, like anyone else.

And I do enjoy discussing those. And it's, I think, the nature of lawyers in a courthouse during down time, that people do discuss things. And sometimes even argue about

things in a congenial fashion.

2.0

But I would never let anything that was a personal belief or a political belief govern what I decided, in such a way that it would contravene what the law said. I mean, I would never do that.

Q. Another concern stated, "He opposes prosecuting most drug crimes and believes most traffic offenses -excuse me -- most traffic offenses, minus DUI, are
pointless and does not feel they should be prosecuted.

Very strong views that I don't think he could set aside and be impartial. Also very passionate to the point where his proper judgement may go out the window in certain cases."

How would you respond to this stated concern?

A. Well, with regards to the traffic offenses, I mean, certainly that's false. I understand why we have the traffic code and the reason for it. With regards to the drug offenses I think that, that comes about in a larger context of, again, practicing most of my career in York County, where I believe the sentencing structure of York County was a little bit more draconian and out of step with the rest of the state.

I certainly understand the need for the drug laws and I believe in the prosecution of drug crimes. But I do know that over the years, I did have numerous arguments, if you will, or more vehement opposition to the way that drug

crimes were prosecuted in York County as being out of step with the rest of the state.

And I think that, that criticism originates in those types of arguments. I don't -- I mean, certainly, I do believe that drug crimes need to be prosecuted. But, you know, in more recent times in York County, things have moved away from that. So it's not as relevant a criticism as it would have been, say, three, four, five years ago.

But certainly, I think whoever fill -- whoever said that about me, there have been disagreements I've had with the way that drug crimes are prosecuted in York County over the years.

- Q. You indicated in your PDQ, that a pro se lawsuit was filed against you on February 5th, 2009, in the Richland County Common Pleas court, as case number 2009-CP-40-01048 by a former defendant-client of yours who was then an inmate, who had been sentenced in 2002. I believe in 2002, you indicated he had 28 charges made against him, that included burglaries and armed robberies.
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. This lawsuit was based on allegations of malpractice and fraud. Could you explain the nature and disposition of this suit, please?
- A. Yes, sir. I received a written letter from the prison from Mr. Cook -- it was Mr. Jerrod Cook, about --

about the fact that he had filed a suit. I contacted the attorney for York County, who referred it to another attorney who practices in Richland. And I spoke briefly to that attorney on the telephone, and he told me, "Don't worry about this."

And some seven months later it was dismissed.

Mr. Cook did have numerous armed robberies and burglaries,
he did enter a plea and received a 21-year sentence. And
it was about seven years after he'd been in court, that the
lawsuit was filed and dismissed.

- Q. You also noted, and you've spoken this morning, that you worked as a prosecutor. What do you see from your work as a public defender and prosecutor that you believe helps you as you work to learn more about the civil law practice area?
- A. Well, two things that would jump out right away are -- as far as being a judge the rules of evidence are extremely similar, so I think that presiding over a criminal trial and presiding over a civil trial would be pretty easily translatable.

But the other thing is that, you know, being a prosecutor and dealing with victims and witnesses, and being a public defender and dealing with defendants and witnesses, I feel like I've developed very good people skills to not only to be able to read people, but also the

ability to communicate with people. I think it is an extremely important job skill of a judge.

And of course I've been in front very many judges, over 22 years. For a judge to be able to communicate both with -- with the lawyers involved, so the expectations are made known and met, but also with the parties involved so that they feel like the person adjudicating their case understands them and understands the issue.

And even if the judge does not go their way, at least that person feels like they got a fair hearing from a person who understands and cares about whatever concern brought them to that court in the first place.

So I think that my ability to relate to people and communicate with people has been developed and fine-tuned over many years of lawyering on both sides of the criminal court. And I think that would be another skill that would help me as a judge in the court of common pleas.

- Q. Thank you, Mr. Barrowclough. We do have some housekeeping issues. Are you aware that as a judicial candidate, you are bound by the Code of Judicial Conduct found in Rule 501 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules?
 - A. Yes, sir.

Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you

contacted any members of this Commission about your 1 2 candidacy? 3 Α. I have not. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you 4 0. sought or received a pledge of any legislator, either prior 5 6 to this date, or pending the outcome of your hearing? 7 Α. No, sir. 8 Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you 9 10 aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on 11 your behalf? I have not. And I'm not aware of that either. 12 Α. 13 Q. Have you reviewed and do you understand the 14 Commission's guidelines on pledging in South Carolina Code 15 Section 2-19-70(E)? Yes, sir. 16 Α. MR. PEARCE: Mr. Chairman, and Commission 17 18 members, I would note that the Piedmont Citizens Committee 19 found Mr. Barrowclough to be well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and 2.0 21 academic ability, character, reputation, and judicial 22 temperament. They also found him to be qualified in the 23 remaining criteria of constitutional qualifications, 24 physical health, mental stability and experience. 25 They also reported, "The Committee is

impressed by Mr. Barrowclough's energy, thoughtfulness, and 1 2 clear knowledge and ability in the area of his practice." 3 They further reported the Committee's only concern is that "Mr. Barrowclough, like other candidates 4 vying for the 16th Circuit seat, has practiced exclusively 5 in the area of criminal law. The Committee is confident, 6 7 however, that he could acquire the necessary civil 8 experience on the job." 9 Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission, 10 I would note for the record that any concerns raised during 11 the investigation by staff regarding this candidate were incorporated into the questioning of him today. 12 13 Chairman, I have no further questions. 14 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you. Any questions? 15 Senator Hayes. MR. HAYES: 16 Thank you. EXAMINATION BY MR. HAYES: 17 18 Q. I appreciate your willingness to serve people in our area, up there as a circuit judge. Just a couple of 19 I was just looking at your resume, and you 2.0 housekeeping. took the North Carolina and South Carolina Bar in '95, and 21 22 you took the Pennsylvania Bar in 2000. Where did you work 23 between '95 and 2000? 24 I worked at the York County Public Defender Α. Office from 1995 to 2000. 25

Q. Then you went to work in Pennsylvania for a while?

2.0

A. Yes, sir. Our first child was born in July of 1999. And at that time, my wife wanted to relocate closer to her family. So I studied for the Bar after work, took the Bar, passed the Bar, got a job up there working at the district attorney's office.

We moved up there. We lived up there about 18 months. And then it was actually the cold weather, my wife had gotten used to the South, and wanted to return. I called up Harry Dent, my old boss, and asked if there was a position available and could I have my old job back. And he said, "Yes." And so then we returned.

- Q. Very good. I know we've talked -- or you have mentioned already, about your experience on the criminal side, the lack of experience on the civil side. Putting that aside, what do you see, as far as your background, that you feel would make you a good judge? And what possible weaknesses in your background may make -- may be a hindrance to being a good judge?
- A. I think that one of my strengths as a judge is -- as I -- as I already touched upon, is my people skills. I have, as I said, developed relationships with numerous lawyers. Both lawyers on the defense side who I've mentored, or whether it was on prosecution side who I've

worked against.

And not just in the context of a single case.

But as the deputy public defender in York County, whenever there are problems that come up in the York County criminal justice system, whether they be scheduling problems, whether they be problems with juries, whether they be problems with -- one of the issues now, currently, is whether or not a motion's practice is going to start.

I have developed the relationships to act on behalf of the office in dealing with lawyers with the solicitor's office, with Kevin Brackett and with Betty Miller, with the leadership of the Probation and Parole Department, with the Clerk of Courts office, with the jail.

I think that in that capacity, my communication skills and my ability to relate to people has helped to move the ball forward to solve problems. And I think that in the context of being a circuit court judge, that, that would also be a valuable skill, especially since in a -- in a local criminal justice system, as you know, the judge has more power than anybody.

And having a problem-solving judge who can communicate with and has good personal relationships with all the different parties in the system, I think that would be strength that I would have.

As far as a weakness? I think that my 1 2 inexperience in civil court has been the one glaring thing 3 that I've focused on as I've made my way through this 4 process. But I know you said beyond that. Probably, I would say, the fact that -- you know, in addition to having 5 6 practiced, you know, mainly as a -- as a defense attorney, 7 my practice also has been mainly in York County. 8 So while a -- while a strength is that strong relationships with all the stakeholders in the York County 9 10 criminal justice system, I really don't know that many 11 people around the state. And I think that, obviously, 12 circuit court judges also have to travel, so again, that 13 would be an inexperience issue that I could address as I 14 moved around. 15 But I think that my ability, you know, to effectively communicate, and maybe solve problems in other 16 17 circuits, you know, it would take a while to get up to 18 speed in that regard. 19 Thank you. MR. HAYES: 20 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any other -- Mr. Hitchcock, 21 you got questions? 22 MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 23 EXAMINATION BY MR. HITCHCOCK: 24 Mr. Barrowclough, certainly, you know, you've Q. 25 been an advocate for 22 years. And as you look to make

that -- you know, if you were found qualified, nominated, and ultimately elected by the General Assembly, as you look to make that transition from being an advocate for so long, and thinking about transitioning to much more of a -- you know, a neutral party as a judge -- and, you know, also in regards to some of the points that have been brought out about your -- you know, somewhat of a lack of civil experience, who would look to as -- as far as a judge that you hold in high esteem at the -- you know, to go to as one that would serve as an example to you, and two, that you may look to, to serve as a mentor to help you make that transition?

A. Well, the most immediate answer that I would have would be, of course, Judge Dan Hall. Both because he would be readily available as the other sitting circuit court judge, but also because he and I have had a friendship that goes back some 15 years at least.

When he was an assistant solicitor, I was assigned to his case load, where we had cases against each other for a good seven or eight years. And we developed a mutual respect. And I know him to be a man of the highest integrity, so that would be one person.

I did -- when I met with the Bar Committee, they asked me a similar question. And I did also talk about the fact that Judge Michael Nettles is a person who just

carries himself with so much class in the courtroom, and treats all the parties, as I was alluding to earlier, in a way that makes everyone feel as if they've been heard and been respected and had their points of view taken into account.

Also, I thought about a case that I did with Harry Dent. A woman named Janice Clark Smith, who had killed her father, who had abused her his whole life, and abused the whole family -- even the grandchildren. And the last straw for Ms. Smith was that her mother had cancer, and the father, just out of meanness, disposed of her cancer medication.

And we went to court in that case. It got national media attention. And Mr. Dent was on Larry King and Oprah and other shows. But that whole case going in front of Judge King, he treated it with so much deliberation. And, you know, there were so many people in court. And I think to myself, if I was in his shoes, there seemed to be so much pressure on him to make a decision.

And actually, there was a lot of pressure on him to give her probation or something like that. There was not one person who came to court, who asked for her to get any time, even though she took a life. And what Judge King did was, Judge King did not rule at that time. Judge King said, you know, "I really need time to absorb all of this

1 and ruminate on it."

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And so he did not decide. He went home that night and thought about. And the next day, he came back and he sentenced her to seven years. And I can tell you most of the people in the courtroom thought that, that was too much. But there was nobody in that courtroom who could ever say that Judge King did not give that thoughtful consideration and the appropriate deliberation.

So who would I probably go to for advice the most, would be Judge Hall. But an example of a way that a judge is supposed to handle things and be deliberate in consideration and conscientious, I always think back to that case with Judge King.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Representative Murphy.

REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY:

- Q. Mr. Barrowclough, you had mentioned that you were a -- received an award as a district attorney in Pennsylvania, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And I also note that you also received the award for Public Defender of the Year, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And that was selected by your peers?

1 Α. Yes, sir. That was awarded by the Public 2 Defenders Association. 3 And you had mentioned -- then there was a 0. 4 question about, could you set aside your political beliefs or -- to rule fairly, follow the law. And you can assure, 5 6 based on your work experience, whatever political beliefs 7 you have, that you could follow the law and to be fair and 8 impartial to both sides, the state, the defense, plaintiff, defendant in a court of law, correct? 9 10 Α. Absolutely. I would be fair to both sides. 11 Q. And you grew up in Glen Ridge? I grew up in Morristown, New Jersey. I was born 12 Α. 13 in a hospital in Glen Ridge, New Jersey. 14 Okay. How far is Morristown from Glen Ridge? 0. 15 Α. Maybe 40 minutes. The reason I ask is, my roommate from college 16 Q. grew up in Glen Ridge. So I didn't know if you would -- if 17 18 you would know him. Do you know a -- I mean, a Captain Scott Sill, or Colonel Sill? What year did you graduate 19 from high school up there? 2.0 21 Α. 1988. 22 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: All right. 23 you. 24 MR. BARROWCLOUGH: Thank you. 25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Safran.

MR. SAFRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1 2 EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE SAFRAN: 3 Just a couple quick questions. 0. Yes, sir. 4 Α. Obviously, looking at the resume, listening to 5 Q. you, you've got a passion for what you've been doing. 6 7 I know people who have had, you know, the occasional 8 thought, but when did you start seriously considering the -- I guess, running for a judgeship? 9 10 Α. Well, when Judge Hayes', you know, retirement was becoming imminent as he approached his 72nd birthday, it 11 12 was something that other people approached me, and said, 13 you know, "Why don't you think about running for this?" And to be honest I had not really thought about 14 15 it. When I graduated from law school, my goal was to be a trial lawyer. And I was blessed to be able to pursue that 16 17 goal. Now having done it for 22 years, I feel like I have 18 basically fulfilled that dream. 19 And so when other people approached me about it, and I started giving it some thought, you know, there are 20 21 things that deal with the quality of justice that I have, 22 you know, believed in and advocated for as a lawyer, but I 23 also feel like those are things that would also be 24 something I could do as a judge.

I know that, for example, there are legislative

25

committees studying various issues in the criminal justice system, that judges sit on those committees and make recommendations and help, basically, put together -- be it bills or rules of court or anything like that. And I'm extremely interested in that.

And a few years back, as probably some of the legislators know, there were proposed changes to the rules. And Harry Dent, my boss, was a part of the that committee, and he was on a subcommittee that dealt with the rules of discovery. And he came back to our office and he and I and another two lawyers studied the rules of -- not the rules of evidence -- the rules of discovery in other states, like North Carolina and Georgia and Tennessee, I believe.

And so we put in a lot of work and drafted up -all of us worked together to draft up some proposed new
discovery rules, which were adopted as a part of the larger
proposal to amend the rules of criminal procedure. I know
that, ultimately, that did not pass the legislature. But
just that whole process, and being able to be a part of
that process, even though I wasn't on the committee, was
very interesting to me.

And it's something I care about. And I think there are a lot of things -- although, we do have, obviously, a great system, but I do think there are a lot of things that, you know, could be improved upon.

And I think that, you know, I would be a good -I would a hardworking, I would be a conscientious judge on
a case-by-case basis. But also, you know, I want be
involved in this as a stakeholder in the system who really
cares about making it better. And it's really more of
that, that drove me to listen to these people who
approached me, and say, "I think I will -- I think I will
try to do this."

I mean, I have not done this before. I have not been reported out before. I recognize that a lot of the people in this race have, but the reason why I decided to pursue this was out of the desire to try to make the system better.

- Q. Just quickly, to kind of followup with what Senator Hayes asked you about. Was there ever any desire to get into a -- more like civil practice? Go into private practice, maybe do criminal and do civil at the same time?
- A. The short answer is no, and I'll tell you why.

 Because -- well, two reasons. One, is because what I have always liked best about being a public defender was the ability to help individual people.

And I think that all the people I know -- and I have a lot friends in private practice, you know, their case loads are smaller, they help fewer people. But also, they can only help the people who can afford them.

Whereas, I'm able to help anybody who comes in the door.
Which I do like. I mean, that may sound corny but it's
true.

And the other thing is, quite frankly, you know, I like being a lawyer doing lawyer things. I'm not a business person. You know, the idea of the business side of a private practice was never attractive to me, so that was another thing that kind of kept me away from it.

- Q. Do you recognize that, even though we've heard during the course of this week, that obviously the trials on the civil side are decreasing, the volume of cases remains pretty constant, and that the judge maintains a pretty substantial role in making those things shepherd through the system, and ultimately getting them to point where --
 - A. Right.

- Q. And I can tell that, you know, you'd be right there on the criminal stuff. But do you have any apprehension about being able to kind of be the kind of judge that a substantial portion of the Bar would look to in order to be able to facilitate keeping the civil dockets moving?
- A. Well, I mean, I do, again, recognize there will be a learning curve. But I would accept that challenge, as I think some people in my comments said I do have a good

work ethic to learn these things quickly.

When I was meeting with the Bar Committee -because I had asked Judge Hayes and Judge Hall, you know,
to try to get some knowledge, what do -- what are the
perceived problems in the common pleas court or the civil
justice? What are the problems? I don't know. And they
both told me that there really aren't any pressing issues
or big problems.

And I met with a local attorney in Rock Hill, named Jim Boyd, who has a civil practice. And I asked him, trying to educate myself, "What do you perceive to be the problems in common pleas and civil practice?"

And he said, "There really aren't any problems."

And then when I was meeting with the Bar

Committee, and we were discussing these same issues, there
was a lawyer who was a part of that committee who said,

"Well, I'll tell you what problem I have" -- and he was in
civil practice, he said, "There are some judges who won't
decide on motions. The judges will just simply let
everything go to the jury out of an abundance of caution."

And I said, "If I were to become a judge, I would not be that judge. I would do the work it required to understand the law, the issue in they case, and I would make a decision. I'm not the type person who's afraid to make a decision."

So I did tell him that. But beyond that, you 1 2 know, I would just have to get in there and see what other 3 issues there are. But I would work hard to first of all acquire the knowledge, and secondly to solve those 4 problems. 5 6 MR. SAFRAN: Thank you very much. 7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Senator Sabb. 8 SENATOR SABB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. really don't have questions, believe it or not, I just have 9 10 a comment. And the comment would be, that as I listened --11 and of course we've read some of the comments that have 12 been submitted by your peers. And the ones that were 13 actually negative, I just want to compliment you for the 14 fact that they gave those negative comments about you. 15 Because to me that suggested that you believe in right, you believe in wrong, you see it through your own 16 17 eyes, you see it through the eyes of your clients, and 18 you've advocated for those things. Because as I look at some of the manner in which 19 -- and I prosecuted for 20 years. We carry out our jobs, a 20 21 lot of things that we do in my mind, we probably should not 22 have been doing. A lot of the laws and the way that 23 they're written and how they impact people ought to be

And so I just wanted you to know, I have an

24

25

applied differently.

appreciation for the fact that they would view those 1 2 comments as being negative. But for me it sounds more like 3 zealous advocacy. And so I think you are to be commended 4 by that. 5 MR. BARROWCLOUGH: Thank you, Senator. 6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Senator Young. 7 SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. 8 Chairman. EXAMINATION BY SENATOR YOUNG: 9 10 Q. Mr. Barrowclough, thank you for your interest in serving on the circuit court. And thank you for your 20 11 years of service in the -- as a public defender in South 12 13 Carolina. 14 One of the questions that I have is: How would 15 you describe your judicial philosophy, in terms of how would you apply the law to the facts if you are elected to 16 the circuit court? 17 18 Α. The first thing I would do would be make sure that I have a firm understanding of the law that would 19 govern the set of facts. As we discussed, if it were a 2.0 21 criminal matter, I feel like I would have that grasp 22 instantaneously. 23 I think that if it were a civil matter, 24 especially initially, that I would have to put in work,

studying not just the law, but the case law that might

25

surround that law to give it more context.

2.0

And I may have to consult with, you know, other judges, such as Judge Hall or Judge Hayes -- who I understand will back from retired status -- or anyone else to get a firm grasp of not only what it says on paper, but its applicability in various situations.

But I would -- you know, I wouldn't say as a philosophical matter. I would always try to apply the law to the facts right down the middle. Not on edges, not try to shoehorn things and to make things fit to achieve a desired result or anything like that.

My philosophy would be to try to put it right down the middle, so that anybody who was observing a particular hearing, or after the fact heard about a particular result, would know exactly why I did what I did.

- Q. So it sounds like that last explanation that you provided, it sounds like you would avoid judicial activism.
- A. Oh, yeah. I think that judicial activism in the -- in the arena of a particular case in court, particularly for a circuit court judge, it has no place. You know, like I said, I would like to serve on committees that might work to change the law outside of court, you know, in certain ways that I think that it could be improved upon.

But as far as handling a particular case, presiding over a case? No, there would be no judicial

1 activism.

- Q. Let me ask you another question, and that is: How familiar are you with challenges that face lawyers in private practice, who have a litigation practice, especially lawyers who are in smaller firms? Are you -- I know you haven't practiced in private practice at all, so I'm just trying to get how sensitive and familiar you are with the challenges that face lawyers in smaller practice who -- practices, who appear regularly in trial courts.
- A. Well, if you're talking about challenges with regards to scheduling, and the pulls on their time with regards to all the different venues that they might need to go to as part of their practice, I'm familiar with that from just having friends who do that.

But if you're referring to something else with regards to billing or, I don't know, then I'm probably not familiar with it.

- Q. Well, the scheduling and, you know, handling multiple cases in multiple courts and --
- A. I'm very familiar with that. I have a daughter who -- she's in college, but she has worked with an intern with different law firms in Rock Hill, for friends of mine like Attorney Twana Burris and the Elrod Pope firm, and she's constantly telling me about -- whether it's a larger practice or a smaller practice, that the attorneys there

are constantly being called to different venues, be it, you know, common pleas court, be it a magistrate's matter, be it an employment matter before a board. I mean, all kinds of different things.

So I do know and I do recognize that, that is something that private practice attorneys have to deal with, that I've never had to deal with.

Q. Some of the comments did say that they thought that you were obviously slanted -- I shouldn't say "obviously." There were some people who perceive you to be slanted toward the defense side, obviously, because of your background in being a public defender.

But I've gathered from your answers today, so far, that you would be -- you would apply the law and you will be fair to all sides. Is that --

A. That's exactly right, yes. I said to Mr. Pearce, when I met with him, that I have, you know, 20 and a half years as a public defender, and one and a half years as a prosecutor. So if you look at the quantity, then obviously it's well slated towards the defense.

But like I said, I was blessed when I worked in Pennsylvania as a prosecutor, I was blessed to win Public Defender of the Year in 2014, so for -- I would ask people to look at more of the quality of the work that I did for each side, as it would apply to my fairness, as opposed to

1 the quantity. 2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you. Representative 3 Rutherford. REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: 4 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: 6 7 0. The chairman is making me be brief. So I'll be 8 very brief, and just say do you think that some of the negative comments had something to do with what I would 9 10 consider not a hyper-partisan, but certainly an environment in York County that lends itself to people -- 'cause I 11 practice law up there, and I find that it is a very 12 13 abrasive place to practice law. And if you are defending yourself -- simply 14 15 defending yourself and your clients, that some people may look at it as you being overzealous on the defense side, 16 17 when really you're just advocating for the Constitution and 18 the right of law. Do you find that to be case? I think that is one hundred percent true. And 19 Α. like I said, I have developed very good relationships with 20 21 most of the lawyers who work on the other side in the 22 solicitor's office. Good personal relationships. 23 They trust me. I like them and trust them. like me. But when I say "most," that's not all. There are 24

one or two, or maybe three, who I know just do not like me

25

1 for just those reasons. 2 I commend you for only having one or two or 3 three. I think my list is probably about ten long and growing. Which I'm okay with. Well, maybe longer than 4 that. There's only two or three, so I didn't want to list 5 them all out. 6 7 But I mean, I think it's the nature of what we 8 do. I commend you. I think that your personal statement is strong. Everything that we've seen is much stronger 9 10 than I thought. I've known you for years, but you come across very well. So thank you. 11 12 Α. Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Senator Rankin. 14 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN: 15 Q. I want to commend you for marrying well. 16 Α. Thank you. 17 And I want to commend you for having four Q. 18 children. 19 SENATOR RANKIN: Is it Kristin? Christine? MS. BARROWCLOUGH: Kristin. 20 21 SENATOR RANKIN: Kristin. I'm the last of 22 four children in my family, and I particularly appreciate 23 big families. 24 BY SENATOR RANKIN:

Q. So I do also want to comment about your

25

involvement with charity, and particularly the less
fortunate. The Catholic Church, you-all and your family
are members of, and that committee which you fund-raised
for. That's highly commendable -A. Thank you.

Q. -- in terms of your well-rounded qualifications
here, beyond which we've heard. And to kind of echo what

here, beyond which we've heard. And to kind of echo what we've heard, the rap on you, kind of right out of the gate we heard it in terms of no civil experience, you, in fact, don't mince any words: "I have no civil experience."

But anybody who's a magna cum laude has certainly got some educability, and you probably could be trained on that. So anyway, for those -- just those comments. No hard questions to you. Thank you for your willingness to get in this business.

A. Thank you, Senator.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Barrowclough, I wanted to ask you some questions, that's why I was trying to hurry Senator Rankin up. He's my vice chairman and I have to be respectful.

EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN SMITH:

Q. Let me ask you a couple of questions. And I want to start off with an observation, too, is -- is -- you know, I see the lack of civil experience. But I think what you lack in civil experience you make up in a wealth of

criminal experience from what I can see and what I can hear. And I can tell, by listening to your presentation, that you're someone that understands the law, knows the law, and knows application of the law.

And in civil -- and I think part of what we have to do is make determinations if someone's able and has ability to apply criminal law and civil law. It's not that you have to walk in here and be an expert, but do you have the ability to learn it quickly.

And I practiced with someone who's now on the Supreme Court, and he did nothing but civil court work, and never been in the criminal court and he turned out to be one of the finest general sessions judges that we ever had. And the worst thing we had, was to lose him to go to the Supreme Court, and we don't have in the trial bench anymore.

So, you know, I would presume that you would work just as hard as he, and others, who had no experience to make sure that you were accommodated and learned the civil law and were able to handle that docket if you were elected. Is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

2.0

Q. I want to follow up on something Senator Young said. And, you know, this is always a concern of mine when someone is -- had a career in one particular area and not a

Career in private practice. And I think you told Senator
Young you understood the demands of lawyers and things, but
when it comes -- if you are elected as a judge, you're
going to have to sit and make decisions as to a variety
reasons that you hear for a judge, "I'm not available for
this motion" or "I can't be ready for this trial" or "I
want protection so I can take family off."

Or even a little thing as, "Judge, I'd like to leave three o'clock so I can go to my child's soccer game."

And the quality of life of attorneys is not what it -- it seems to be getting worse, and you hear about the higher rates of alcoholism and depression among attorneys. Tell me how you would handle -- especially, 'cause it seems to be on the criminal side to some degree, but more on the civil side with attorneys being all over -- you know, they're getting calls to different courts in magistrate court, civil courts, family courts, general sessions.

How are you going to handle attorneys and their court appearances and their requests for conflicts, or for protection or for continuances, if you were elected judge?

A. I think that in any one of those situations there's always going to be a balance. And on the one side of the balance is the reason for the person not being available, and on the other side of the balance is how old is the particular matter, how pressing is the particular

matter, how many other times has the same attorney asked for this matter to be continued or something of that sort.

But what I can say is, I would always be respectful of all the demands that are on attorneys, particularly in private practice, for a lot of the reasons you've said.

You know, I do think that practice of law has become more stressful, just in the time that I've been practicing law. I do -- I am aware of, you know, the instances of alcoholism in the practice of law. And I do believe that all of us as attorneys -- you know, just because you're an attorney doesn't mean that you give up, you know, your role and responsibility as a husband or as a father or as a member of your community.

And I think that if anything -- you never know till you're there. But I think that I would always emergency room -- I shouldn't say "always." But most of the time, err on the side of respecting an attorney's other commitments.

You know, I myself have, in addition to working with the Social Concerns Committee at Saint Mary's in Rock Hill, but I have coached my child at For Mill High School for three years. I've coached youth soccer, youth basketball, youth flag football in the Fort Mill/Tega Cay area for many years. You know, sometimes that does require

me to leave work a little early to get to practice for kids. And I've always been -- had the benefit of having, you know, either my boss or a judge being respectful of that.

And I think that, you know, as an attorney, I always try to be respectful of the party on the other side, and give them a lot of advance notice if it is a situation like that.

But, I mean, I think those things are important. I don't think anybody gives up, you know, their role as a member of the community or father or husband just because they're a lawyer.

And I think that as a judge I'd be respectful of that. I would always try to be respectful of that. I think my own personal experience would guide my thought processes in those types of situations.

And like I said, I know that there are times when a case might be continued ten times, and then all of sudden I'm the eleventh judge hearing it or something, and it might require some firmness, saying, "No, this has to go."

But I think the vast majority of times, it would be more of a situation of where I would always try to be more respectful of the other commitments that an attorney might have.

Q. And how do you see temperament playing in the --

in the role of a judge and what the importance of judicial temperament is to being a quality or successful judge or a reputable judge?

A. I think it is extremely important. I think that

-- I would like to think that, that would be probably my

greatest strength. Again, referring back to the attorneys
in the solicitor's office, I think the reason why I

developed so many good relationships with them is because,
despite a couple of the comments, I've learned a skill

being able to disagree without being disagreeable.

I think that would translate to being a judge. And it would certainly, certainly be my goal that everybody who appeared in front of me, whether it was a prosecutor or defense attorney, whether it was a civil attorney, whether it was a criminal defendant or victim or witness or party to a case, that each and every one of them would leave that court saying, "That judge treated me well. That judge was not rude. That judge was not short with me. That judge was not impatient with me."

You know, I think judicial temperament is extremely important. I've been doing this long enough, and been in court long enough, to have been in front of some judges who treat all of us magnificently, and, sadly, I've been in front of some judges who were extremely impatient and harsh with people sometimes, in my view, for no reason.

And I think that, you know, if I were a judge, I 1 2 would do all I could do to make everyone who appeared in 3 front of me feel like it was a good experience. Do you think it's ever appropriate for a judge, 4 ο. for lack of a better term, to dress down somebody in the 5 courtroom? 6 7 Α. No. 8 Q. If that needs to occur, where should that occur? 9 If it would -- if there were a time that, that 10 did need to occur, that certainly would be a situation 11 where I might ask to see somebody in my office. And I don't mean dress down, but be reprimanded -12 Q. 13 - if somebody's late to your court, where should you 14 address that issue? 15 Α. In an office. CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Any further 16 17 questions? 18 (Hearing none.) 19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Mr. Barrowclough, thank you so much. This concludes this 20 21 portion of your screening process. I want to take this 22 opportunity to remind you that, pursuant to the 23 Commission's evaluative criteria, the Commission expects 24 candidates to follow the spirit, as well as the letter of 25 the ethics laws, and we will review violations or the

```
appearance of impropriety as serious, and potentially
1
2
     deserving a heavy weight in screening deliberations.
 3
               On that note, and as you know, the record will
     remain open until the formal release of the report of
 4
     qualifications, and you may be called back at such time if
5
     the need arises.
 6
 7
               I thank you for offering. And I thank you for
8
    your service to the state of South Carolina.
9
                    MR. BARROWCLOUGH:
                                       Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10
     And thank you-all for your time in hearing me and asking me
11
     this questions and taking an interest in my candidacy.
12
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH:
                                     Thank you, sir.
13
                        (Candidate excused.)
14
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Off the record.
15
            (Off the record from 12:54 p.m. to 1:02 p.m.)
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Good afternoon, Ms.
16
     Collins.
17
18
                    MS. COLLINS: Good afternoon.
19
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: I know it's supposed to be
     "good morning" for your hearing, so we apologize for the
20
21
    delay. I'm sorry we --
22
                    MS. COLLINS: That's fine.
23
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: I tell everybody we're
24
     optimistic with our scheduling. And I think my optimism is
25
     dwindling now, and we're going to have to start reshuffling
```

1	the schedule. So I apologize for any inconvenience.
2	MS. COLLINS: No apology needed. Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN SMITH: I see you got somebody you
4	brought with you today.
5	MS. COLLINS: I do.
6	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Would you like to introduce
7	him?
8	MS. COLLINS: This is my husband, Harry
9	Collins.
10	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Harry, good to have you. I
11	appreciate you being here today.
12	MR. COLLINS: Glad to be here. Glad to be
13	here.
14	CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think we're going to get
15	started. We're missing Representative Rutherford. We'll
16	go ahead and get started.
17	MS. COLLINS: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Will you please raise your
19	right hand, please, ma'am.
20	MS. COLLINS: Yes, sir.
21	WHEREUPON:
22	LISA G. COLLINS, being duly sworn and
23	cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing
24	but the truth, testifies as follows:
25	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Collins, in front of

```
you is your personal data questionnaire and your sworn
1
2
     statement that you submitted to the Commission.
                                                      Is that a
3
     copy -- is that the documents that you've submitted?
                    MS. COLLINS: Yes, sir. Along with one
 4
     amendment.
5
 6
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH:
                                     Okay. And have you --
7
    you've already made an amendment? Or do you need to make
8
    an oral amendment?
9
                    MS. COLLINS: No, sir. I've already made an
10
     amendment that's labeled Exhibit 5.
11
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. It's already marked
    as an exhibit.
12
13
                    MS. COLLINS: Yes, sir
14
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: I just want to make sure --
15
                    MS. COLLINS: It is.
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are both of these documents
16
17
     correct, with the amendments?
18
                    MS. COLLINS: Yes, sir.
19
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: And does anything need to
    be changed or updated other than the amendment you
20
    referenced earlier?
21
22
                    MS. COLLINS: No, sir.
23
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do you have any objection
24
     to these documents and any amendments becoming a part of
25
     the record of your sworn testimony?
```

1 MS. COLLINS: Not at all. 2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. If you'll hand 3 those to Lindi for me, please, ma'am. And were going to 4 make those a part of the record. (EXHIBIT NO. 3 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION 5 COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF LISA G. 6 7 COLLINS) 8 (EXHIBIT NO. 4 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION 9 COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF LISA G. COLLINS) (EXHIBIT NO. 5 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL 10 11 DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF LISA G. COLLINS) CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Collins, the Judicial 12 13 Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on 14 15 nine evaluated criteria, and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of the application materials, 16 17 verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a 18 search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, if any, and checks for 19 economic conflicts of interest. 2.0 We have received no affidavits filed in 21 opposition to your election, and no witnesses are present 22 23 today to testify. Do you wish to make a brief opening 24 statement to the Commission? 25 MS. COLLINS: I will waive that. I do wish

to make a very brief closing statement, if I may. 1 2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, ma'am. 3 MS. COLLINS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN SMITH: We certainly will. 4 MS. COLLINS: Thank you. 5 6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. And will you 7 answer any questions that counsel may have for you, please, 8 ma'am. 9 MS. COLLINS: Yes, sir. 10 MS. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, I note for the record that based on the testimony contained in the 11 candidate's PDO, which has now been included in the record, 12 along with the amendment, and with the candidate's consent, 13 14 Lisa G. Collins meets the constitutional and statutory 15 requirements for this position regarding age, residence and years of practice. 16 EXAMINATION BY MS. BENSON: 17 18 Q. Mrs. Collins, how do you feel your legal and professional experience, thus far, renders you qualified 19 and will assist you to be an effective circuit court judge? 2.0 21 Α. Well, I believe that, along with my legal 22 experiences, my life experiences have contributed to that 23 because I think that we are all a product of all that we 24 have met. And so I would say not only my legal experiences 25 but my life experiences.

2.0

But as for my legal experiences, I've been an attorney for over 31 years. As you've seen in my application, during that time I have a broad background. I initially practiced insurance defense firm with Rainey, Britton, Gibbes & Clarkson, a law firm from Greenville. I enjoyed that. It didn't call to my public service heart as much, and so I then left that and I've been a public servant ever since.

I have worked in the fields for the Attorney General's office in post-conviction relief hearings throughout the state, which are kind of a hybrid of civil practice and criminal, because it's in the civil arena but the subject matter is as to criminal proceedings as you know. And since that time, have fallen in love with criminal law and have been a prosecutor for many years, as well as a defense attorney.

And I've also served on the bench, albeit in "baby court," as I call it, in terms of the municipal bench for the City of Rock Hill, as an assistant, as well as the chief municipal judge for the City of Fort Mill.

Q. Thank you. Mrs. Collins, the Commission received 130 ballot box surveys regarding you, and 27 had additional comments. Of the positive comments, they indicated:

"Most qualified for this position. Excellent demeanor. An excellent lawyer with great and diverse

experience, great integrity. Lisa is kind, professional, and a perfect candidate for a judicial position. Ms. Collins is probably the smartest attorney I have known in all my years of practice. Lisa Collins would be exceptional rather than well qualified if that were a category above."

There were four -- out of the 27 comments, there were four comments that might have -- might be considered negative. And two of those negative comments questioned your capacity to handle civil matters, as the bulk of your experience has been in criminal law. Both of these responses qualified the observation in a positive light.

One comment noted that after -- saying that you lacked civil experience but could be a quick learner. And the other comment concerning civil experience asserted that, "As long as she is hearing criminal and family court matters, she will perform well."

Is there any response that you would make to those negative comments?

A. Well, I was very flattered about the family court comment, because really, I had not spent very much time in the family courts, other than when I advocated on behalf of foster children for the Foster Care Review Board for three years.

I was not surprised with those comments, in that

the bulk of my career has been in criminal. Particularly, the last 29 years.

But for the first two years, as I stated, I did insurance defense work. I have tried to conclusion, four civil trial -- jury trials; two of those representing the defendant, and two of those representing the plaintiff.

One in the plaintiff, I did on behalf of a partner who had a plaintiff -- a friend who had a slip-and-fall. And of course the other two as defense for insurance defense.

And then I assisted a younger colleague in prosecuting -- well, not prosecuting -- actually, in a civil forfeiture hearing, where a house was seized that was being used as a drug house. And there was a jury trial for that. And I helped her because she'd never done a civil trial before. And we prevailed at that.

- Q. The other two negative comments questioned your judicial temperament. One commenter said, "The arrogant Assistant Solicitor does not begin to describe her." And another comment said, "She lacks the judicial temperament to be a judge." What comment would you respond to those?
- A. Well, thank you for sharing, on the front-end, the positive comments. Because I remember when we had our meeting, that I asked you if any of the positive comments addressed my temperament. And I was very honored that some of them did, and that they had a -- an opposite view.

I deeply regret that anyone would ever feel that about me. I came from a very humble background. I grew up on a farm outside of Lake City, South Carolina, from a wonderful family of teachers. My dad was a farmer and my mother was a nurse. And I really, truly, would hate that I left anybody with that impression of arrogance. 'Cause I - I -- I just can't stand that as a character trait with anyone.

But it is an adversarial process. And I've tried over a hundred criminal trials, and trials that are often emotional in nature. And it might be the attorney I went against, you know, took that personally. And we cannot do that. You know, we cannot take things personally.

But I will say that once we picked the jury, the gloves were off. I was going to advocate for my side and fight hard for my side. But up until that point, in terms of scheduling and everything, I always made a point of saying, whether to witnesses such as law enforcement officers, or other attorneys, you know, "If you have any scheduling issue, please let me know. Even if it's just that, you know, your 3-year-old is having her birthday party, I want you to be there for that. So we'll work around it."

So I truly, truly hate that, that individual felt that way. And I hope that others feel that, that is not

the case. I always strive every day for no one to feel that way about me. Thank you.

- Q. And thank you. Ms. Collins, you listed that you had been involved in a civil lawsuit when your mortgage company failed to timely file satisfaction of your mortgage, and that was back in 2004.
 - A. It was.

- Q. You said that, that case was closed and was settled to your satisfaction.
 - A. It was.
- Q. And you also listed another case that you were involved with, and a post-relief conviction case that was brought in federal court, that was ultimately dismissed as to -- as to all parties.
- A. There are multiple attorneys in the Attorney General's Office, that were sued in their capacity, individually. And I was one of those. And it was dismissed.
- Q. Thank you. Mrs. Collins, you were previously screened ten years ago. Why are you now seeking a judicial position?
- A. Well, at the time that I screened -- in 2000, I believe, actually, so it would be seventeen years ago. -- I did not yet have a child. Harry and I had recently married, and at the time I wanted to explore the process

and learn about the process. And it certainly is a very intriguing process.

2.0

I know that Senator Hayes remembers that time. He was very kind to me, as -- as many of the members of the legislature were. And I did get reported out. I was very honored with that. But it was very clear to me early on, that it was a two-man race, the Honorable Clifton Newman, very deserving, got that seat, and Ned Miller, the later, got the next seat. And they're wonderful judges. And we're so blessed to have them in our state.

Shortly after that, I became pregnant. And had always wanted a child, and God blessed us with a child. and we have a daughter, now, Mia. And for that time period, at that point, I did not run again because I did not want to travel. I wanted to be home with my child, that I had asked God for, and he blessed us with that.

And now I'm at the point that she's a teenager and she really doesn't want me around quite so much. And, hopefully, she'll be spreading her wings and flying off to college soon.

And so at this time where, as I anticipate my empty nest, I think, "What can I do to serve the other people in my life?" Because I truly believe we're here to serve others. And I would like to serve the citizens of South Carolina, if they find I have merit, if the members

of the Legislature feel that way, in the capacity as a circuit court judge.

And if not, I'll continue on my course currently as chief deputy solicitor for the 6th Judicial Circuit in Lancaster, for Solicitor Newman, until he kicks me out the door and says that it's time for me to retire.

- Q. Thank you. In our conversation, you indicated that you felt that you truly understood the people in this circuit. How would this understanding benefit you if you were elected to the circuit court judgeship?
- A. Well, obviously, in South Carolina, since judges round the circuits, we would be serving throughout the state. But in that this is a local seat, I stated to you that I'm very familiar with the personalities and dynamics, in terms of the 16th Circuit, having practiced both as a prosecutor and as a defense attorney in that circuit.

There's some very strong personalties there.

There's some extremely talented attorneys there. And York

County and Union County, they're very blessed to have those individuals. But I do strongly feel that the circuit cries out for someone who is also strong in the role of judge.

I think that they have to be extremely independent and impartial. And having worked on both sides of the table in the criminal arena, I feel that I can bring that to the table. I believe that -- that a judge has to

have impartiality. Independence is critical, as well as the intellect, to apply the law as the Legislature has passed it and as the appellate courts have interpreted it.

But mostly, I believe -- and this is from my closing remarks, so I guess I can skip my closing remark now. I believe, even more important than that, is respect. I believe that if we rise up every morning, and have respect for the position, and come to work fully prepared for the day, and on time, and if we ask each of the parties to have respect for the court and to preside over the court with a firm hand, but a patient hand, and mostly to listen -- 'cause I truly think that our justice system is such that everyone has a voice.

But they want to be heard. And if the judge will just be patient and listen and hear, and let them know that they are listening. Because I'm convinced in the end, when the judge rules, as for all of us, it's not as important what you say, which is certainly critical, but it's how you say it.

And it's how you make the individual feel that you actually weighed and considered their argument and that you explained, fully on the record, the reason for your ruling. I think that is what is beautiful about our system.

And then at the end, respect to go home at the

end of the day, and to reflect back -- and I try to live my
life this way -- but to reflect back on the day and think
how -- what could I have done better, how could I have
improved, and then to get up the next morning and do it
better and try to continue to improve.

- Q. Thank you, Mrs. Collins. Just a few housekeeping items. Mrs. Collins, are you aware that, as a judicial candidate, you are bound by the Code of Judicial Conduct as found in Rule 501 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules?
 - A. Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
 - A. No, I have not.
- Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
 - A. Absolutely not.
- Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone who is doing that?
 - A. No, I'm not.
 - Q. Have you reviewed and do you understand the

Commission's guidelines on pledging and the South Carolina Code Section 2-19-70(E)?

A. I'm very familiar with the 48-hour rule. And if can back up to my answer to the last question. 'Cause you asked if I had asked any -- anyone to contact, or if I was aware of. And I said, "No, I am not." I should also say, "No, I have not." I have not asked, and I am not aware of anyone doing so.

Q. Thank you.

A. But I didn't -- I didn't feel my answer was complete. Thank you.

MS. BENSON: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I would note for the record, that the Piedmont Citizens

Committee reported Mrs. Collins to be well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, and judicial temperament. They found her qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, mental stability, and experience.

The Committee was impressed with her thoughtful consideration of the significant issues at stake in the criminal justice system, and believed her temperament to be especially well suited to a judgeship.

Mr. Chairman, I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding this

candidate were incorporated into the questioning today. 1 2 And I have no further questions. 3 MS. COLLINS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you. 4 Any 5 questions? Mr. Hitchcock. 6 MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman 7 EXAMINATION BY MR. HITCHCOCK: 8 Q. Good morning, Ms. Collins. How are you doing? 9 Α. Good morning. 10 Q. Certainly, you know, we're -- I think it's, like, easy for us to say that we're expressed -- impressed with 11 12 your breath and depth of experience. And, you know, having 13 personally tried cases both with you and against you --14 successfully with you -- the -- you know, I certainly find 15 you to be a formidable advocate for whatever side that 16 you're -- that you're representing. And I know that you 17 have -- have spent some time as a -- as a judge at the 18 municipal court level and magistrate court level. 19 But as you think about making the transition from, you know, being more of an advocate, and zealously 20 21 representing the interest of whatever side that you're on, 22 and moving much more into a neutral role or -- a decider 23 role as a -- as a -- as a judge, how do you feel that 24 you'll make that transition? And are there any judges that

you hold in high esteem, that you would attempt to pattern

25

yourself after, or potentially look to mentor you through that transition process?

A. Well, absolutely, there are judges that I would like to model myself after. And there are two judges in particular I'd like to name. And one is Howard Ballenger, who served in the Seneca/Pickens area. And I often appear in front of Judge Ballenger. And I was very impressed -- in fact, I think he came, Mr. Hitchcock, and did some pleas before he died, if you remember.

And he took a long time to do pleas, because he spoke to people and considered what they said. And he was just wonderful in terms of his demeanor with people. And I would be remiss not to mention his name as someone that I would love to follow in the footsteps of, to just remember how he spoke to people, not as animals, but as people that had concerns and hopes and wishes, and of course were very frightened to be in the courtroom setting, about to have either their lives judged and ruled upon, or -- you know, the defendant, if they were the victims.

In terms of stepping into a role -- I mentioned there was one other judge. When Chief Justice Finney was sworn in, his daughter wrote a poem, "He Never Had It Made." And they published in the South Carolina Bar and Lawyer Magazine.

And having grown up on a tobacco farm outside of

Lake City, on a dirt road, I'll never forget that poem. And I cut it out and I had it on the back of my door for many years. I don't know if you remember, Michael, seeing it. But it spoke about how he never had it made, and how he had to work so hard. And, you know, certainly I hope one day to say I tried to follow in his footsteps.

My dad died when I was 9, leaving six children for my mother to raise. She returned to school and became a nurse. And both of them taught me the value of hard work and integrity. And I also came from a family of teachers. My grandmother, my uncle, aunts, and siblings, many of them are teachers.

And I think that a judge in a way is a teacher, apart from the simplistic comparison in terms of giving jury instructions, and it has to be clear, and educate them on the law to be applied to the case. I think also as I stated, in terms of their written orders, explaining their reasoning and their rulings, and just keeping control of the courtroom, it reminds me of wonderful teachers.

I think that I would transition well, and I'll tell you why. The years I spent in the public defender's office were some of the most important of my life. I wish that every young solicitor would have that opportunity to serve on that side, and to recognize the humanity and that people come from different circumstances.

And when I returned to prosecution, though, what drew me back was that our mandate by the U.S. Supreme Court that prosecutors are to seek justice, not merely convictions. And so in my role as prosecutor, I've often been complimented, and I appreciate those remarks, in saying that I truly try to make plea offers that I think would bring justice. And, generally, those are going to be a cap, so it gives the judge the discretion of doing, obviously, what he wants to do.

But I consider the circumstances of the case, the background of the defendant, and I just think, again, as a prosecutor. And I try to mentor the young attorneys in my office with that, too, that it's not all about just locking someone up. That's not the goal. The goal, is hopefully, ultimately rehabilitation, so that we can all live in a society where everyone honors the law.

And it just goes back to what I said earlier about respect. We have rules for a reason, we have laws for a reason, and that if we can all learn to respect them then maybe one day we can all live in peace and none of us will be needed. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? Senator Hayes.

24 EXAMINATION BY MR. HAYES:

Q. I do recall when you ran before. And I

appreciate your willingness to run again.

A. Thank you.

- Q. And other than, you know, your background -which I think is an impressive resume -- but other than
 your background in criminal or civil, etc., what traits do
 you have -- personal traits that -- probably the one that
 would put you in a good stead as a judge? And I ask what
 weakness do you have, if you had to pick a weakness, in
 your background for becoming a judge?
- A. Well, in terms of a strength, I would state again independence. I learned kind of early in life, I wasn't someone that made decisions because I thought I would be popular. And I was willing to sacrifice friendships to adhere to my values and what I felt was the right thing to do.

But in doing so, I never tried to judge other people for their decisions. But again, I think that a strong judge has to be independent. Because you're not going to make everybody happy.

In fact, I often tell people that during the day, as a prosecutor, I don't make anybody happy. The victim might not like what I did, my boss might not like what I did, and then I go home and I don't make anybody happy. So, you know, I'm kinda use to that. But the bottom line is, I'm not going let the reactions of others influence my

actions and my decisions.

In terms of weaknesses, I think, certainly, I have empathy for people. And I think that we need to have empathy. I think that can be a strength in many ways. I often think, sitting in the courtroom, what it's like for those in the gallery, with their families, because again many people aren't there for happy reasons. They're in a civil suit, they're either being sued or suing someone because they're unhappy with something. Criminal, they've either been charged with something, or allegedly a victim of something.

But when the name of the defendant is called, I often think, you know, at one time someone held a baby in their arms and they thought, "What name should I give this child?" And they gave a lot of thought to them, and they had a lot of hopes for them, and they raised that child and they taught him to walk and they took him to school the first day, and they never thought they would be sitting in a courtroom in that circumstance.

I tend to think about stuff like that a lot. And I think that is what tempers my offer, sometimes, as a criminal prosecutor. And there are those that might say that, that is a weakness for a prosecutor. But I would say to you that I believe it's necessary, that we're not machines.

If it were easy, we could just have a computer that made the decisions. Punch in the prior record, punch in the facts of the case, you know, punch in the various things, punch in, you know, whether or not it's a violent crime or not, and let the computer decide what the sentence should be. I think there's a reason that a live human being is there, that has a background and has a life, to sit and consider what's the best in each case.

I often have people tell me that they don't think that I can be tough enough in the courtroom. But I think, as Mr. Hitchcock stated, that they have found that once the jury's selected, a different side of me comes out -- that my husband might be familiar with at times, in terms of showing a harder side.

But I will say that, in fashioning plea offers as a prosecutor, obviously, I have to consider what should be the appropriate sentence. And I've had to do that hundreds, if not thousands, of times in the course of my career. And I don't take that lightly at all. I don't take that responsibility lightly. But empathy might be something that some people feel is less needed.

- Q. I appreciate it. Thank you.
- A. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any other questions?

Senator Rankin.

EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN:

- Q. And I want to compliment you. Looking through your -- as Mike said earlier, who you know. But you have been around the horn. Two years in private practice, and I was trying to find who it was with. Gallivan, Boyd --
 - A. White.

2.0

- Q. I can't say it, there's so many names. Anyway --
- A. Gallivan, White & Boyd now. It was Rainey, Britton, Gibbes & Clarkson.
- Q. And you were -- you were made to try a plaintiff's case, and that's what got you out of that defense firm, I guess.
 - A. No, I appreciate it.
 - Q. How did that case go, by the way?
- A. I lost. It was so funny. It was a slip-and-fall, and the gentleman was suing Southern Bell. He had a slipped and fall -- slipped and fell. And when I was talking to him about, you know, his injuries -- he didn't have very many medicals. It was actually -- that one was in magistrate court. He would go on and on and on about his aches and pains, etc.

And when we actually had the trial -- and those of us who are attorneys have all experienced that, I know, of where they do it a little differently once they're sworn in and under oath and in front of a jury. And I was like,

```
and how -- you know, "Tell us about your pain and
1
2
     suffering."
               And he was like "Well, I hurt a little bit."
 3
               I'm thinking, You just spent hours and hours
 4
     telling me about it, you know, "Can you describe it a
5
     little more?"
 6
 7
               "Well, that's about it. You know, I hurt a
8
     little bit."
9
               So we won the case. And they came back with
10
     about a hundred dollars, so -- which was a lot less than we
11
    had hoped for. But that's how it went. But my partner was
12
    happy and the plaintiff was happy; he felt vindicated
13
     against the -- the big Southern Bell corporation.
14
               As you commented again about the mostly criminal
15
     and a little civil -- which again that's a trial to
               So you've been there. Your credentials of -- as
16
17
    a student and the activities at law school, certainly show
18
    you were no back-bench player. You are a -- you're a
     starter, it looks like, in the field of law. So I
19
     compliment you for your willingness to do this and your --
2.0
21
          Α.
               Thank you.
               -- your pedigree gets you to this point.
22
          Q.
23
               Thank you so much.
          Α.
24
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH:
                                     Senator Sabb.
25
                    SENATOR SABB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
```

EXAMINATION BY SENATOR SABB: 1 And thank you, Ms. Collins, for offering 2 3 yourself. Following up on what Senator Rankin was 4 mentioning, what I found astonishing was that not only were you on law review, you did moot court. I don't know 5 6 anybody who punishes themselves that way in law school. 7 But congratulations for surviving that. 8 Thank you. I wasn't an editor on law review. Ι was -- you know, they call them spade or checking the 9 10 research. And I did write some articles. But thank you. 11 I loved moot court. I have to say if I were to choose between the two, it was just such a wonderful experience. 12 13 Thank you. 14 Well, I wasn't smart enough for law review, and 0. 15 so I jumped on moot court. I loved it. 16 Α. 17 You're right. It was a great experience. Q.

- A. Thank you.
- 19 Q. Now, you're from Lake City?
- 20 A. I am.

18

23

- 21 Q. Your maiden name Godwin?
- A. Yes. Yes.
 - Q. Related to Charles Godwin and that crowd?
- A. No, I often get asked that. Actually, Charles
 married the sister of one of my aunts. And they're -- in

Lake City, they are like three sets of Godwins. 1 2 Yes. Q. 3 And often throughout the state, you hear "Goodwin" a lot. But there are a lot of Godwins in Lake 4 City, and there are like three sets. But my dad, Jack 5 Godwin, was one of six brothers that were tobacco farmers. 6 7 But you may know my uncle Guy Godwin, he was --8 Q. Absolutely. He was principal at Kingstree High many years. 9 Α. 10 Q. Absolutely, yeah. Yeah. 11 And Aunt Dixie Jo was the librarian there and --Α. Yeah. And Mr. Godwin was an extraordinary man 12 Q. 13 and --14 He was. Α. 15 Q. We all loved him in the area, so --Thank you. Thank you. 16 Α. 17 But thank you. Q. 18 Α. Thank you. 19 I had a couple of questions relating to your Q. judicial philosophy. Tell me a little bit about your 20 21 experience as it relates to sentencing and what you see. 22 Well, I mentioned in my application, that, 23 obviously, you have to consider someone's prior record. 24 And in considering whether or not if they're a repeat 25 offender, if prior sentences were enough to rehabilitate.

But I don't think it's just that simple that you would say, okay, "Well, next time it has to be more, because that didn't rehabilitate."

2.0

Because things in that person's life could have changed. And I think you would need to consider is the repeat offense the same type of offense or is it a different type of offense. But certainly you need to consider someone's background.

But I will say that I'm very concerned about -- I often think, going to empathy, Senator Hayes, that we're just warehousing people. And I'm very concerned that many of the people in our prisons might have mental illnesses, they might come from extremely impoverished or disadvantaged backgrounds.

When I was reading books to my child at night, when she was small, I would often think of the children who didn't have a parent at home, whether they were working two jobs, or just because of other circumstances they didn't have their parent home with them. People come from different backgrounds. And I think that needs to be considered.

And I am -- I am sad that we as a society can't do more to address the issues in terms of mental illness that may lead to crime -- addiction that may lead to crime. I'm worried about that.

You would be one of the ones that would advocate 1 0. 2 for mental health court and that kind of thing? 3 Well, as a judge, I know there are restrictions Α. in terms of me being an advocate. But I certainly will 4 tell you, standing here today as an attorney, that, that 5 is sorely needed. It's sorely needed. And just the 6 7 resources, too, even with the court if they referred 8 someone, we have an extreme lack of resources in terms of service providers. 9 10 And in any event, I had some recent -- in fact just recently, I had two hearings. Two not guilty by 11 12 reason of insanity, one came back before the judge because 13 they were looking to putting him out in the community 14 again, after he'd been an inpatient. He had killed his 15 father. And then I had another one that I actually dealt 16 with, that he had killed his mother, and he's inpatient. 17 18 And again, it is just such tragedy and such sadness. don't know if I've addressed your question, but --19 20 Q. No, you have. 21 Α. Thank you. 22 Thank you. Q. 23 Α. Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Representative Rutherford. 25 EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD:

Tell me -- and this came up yesterday. 1 0. 2 policy that the York County Detention Center has, about 3 lawyers sending in letters of rep, is that still in place? I don't know, because now I'm in Lancaster Α. 4 Now, I serve as the Chief Deputy for Randy 5 County. And I have -- I retired from York, in June of 6 Newman. 7 2013, and it was after that I became municipal judge for 8 Fort Mill. And I'm now in Lancaster. 9 But I'm very concerned about any of those 10 policies. I know that Harry Dest, from time to time, 11 tells me things that I'm extremely concerned about. And I would hope that our chief administrative judge -- I 12 13 believe Judge Hall is going to be that, in January, for 14 York County, would address any concerns about that. 15 We have -- we have an issue in Lancaster County, I'll be the first to say, that Solicitor Newman is working 16 to resolve, and that is, again, issues in terms of 17 18 limitation of access. It's a very small facility, so 19 there is a problem in terms of adequate meeting space. But there's not that ongoing access that an 20 21 attorney sorely needs with his client, that I certainly 22 experienced as a member of the Public Defender's Office. 23 It's just critical that you're able to get in there as 24 often as possible to meet with your client. 25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Ms. Collins --

1 oh, sorry. Senator Young. 2 SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR YOUNG: Ms. Collins, just very quickly. Could you just 4 0. briefly tell us what your judicial philosophy is in terms 5 6 of the application of the law to the facts that are before 7 you? 8 Well, again, I hate coming back to this word, but respect is that -- I have to respect your role in 9 10 fashioning the laws and passing the laws, and making sure 11 that we as judges apply the law as you intended them to be applied; whether it's the statutory laws, or certainly, 12 the Constitution of our forefathers by the state and the 13 14 federal. But, you know, I just believe that, that is the 15 essence of justice, that it's not for me to twist that law 16 17 to what I perhaps think it might be. That would be 18 something for the Legislature to later address down the road, but to apply it as written, and as it has been 19 interpreted by appellate courts. 20 21 Another question I have is: You have never Q. 22 practiced in a smaller firm; is that right? 23 I think that's correct. Α. 24 Could you tell us, just briefly, how sensitive Q.

or how familiar you are with the time challenges on the

25

lawyers who practice in smaller firms who handle cases in multiple courts? And then how will you handle requests for continuances and those types of things, if you are elected to the circuit court?

A. Well, I feel like I would be very generous, in requests for continuances, unless I felt that it was merely for the purpose of delay. But I certainly recognize -- I've often said to attorneys, that practice in the criminal field, that we have the luxury of just being in circuit court.

Although, we now also prosecute in magistrate court, and we have to be cognizant in our circuit -- which is 6th Circuit is a small circuit -- of whenever there's court going on in our sister-counties, I'm based in Lancaster, Fairfield, and Chester, because I might be needed to also go there.

So while I'm aware of the struggle, I would have to multiply that a hundred fold, I'm sure, to what an attorney in a small firm would have to deal with in terms of balancing those requirements.

I've often said, again as a prosecutor, and when we schedule the docket that -- and again that's changed since Langford, for many of the counties -- but I would often say to the attorney, "No, just let me know what's going on."

Whether it's a deposition in a civil court that -- you know, in civil that they had -- had to reschedule numerous times, and like, "Please don't call that case on Thursday," 'cause we've rescheduled it three times and it's very important to make this case move forward in the civil arena.

Or if it's simply in the terms of a magistrate calling and saying again, you know, "We've got this jury trial scheduled, can you work with us?" I always try to work with them.

Again, I think that's going back to what we as human beings need to do with each others, and as processionals, need to do is be cognizant of those struggles, and professional with each other.

Q. Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Safran.

MR. SAFRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

EXAMINATION BY MR. SAFRAN:

Q. Just very briefly, I was actually very surprised, but also very happy, to hear you invoke the name of Judge Ballenger. I know he was to a fault somebody that wanted to always make sure people felt like they were being heard, and also treat lawyers appropriately. Is that basically the standard that you intend to follow if you're elected?

You've been in court a number of times, in a

1

Absolutely. Absolutely. Α.

2 3

number of places. Has, basically, the temperament that you are more or less received with, going to court, always

5

4

been something that, I guess, had a big impact on how you

6

performed?

7

Α.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

I think without question. And I certainly would not want to play a role as judge, in ever having someone shut down their full advocacy on behalf of their client because they're worried about how, first of all, it might appear to the jury if our argument is going on in front of the jury. Which, hopefully, the judge will be professional enough to immediately send the jury out, if he knew that there was going to be any -- or even take it back in chambers and talk privately to the attorney, if he felt that there was something untoward going on.

But absolutely, and that's again why I just so admired Judge Ballenger. And it made for a longer day, sometimes, but it was well worth it. And as I stated, you know, I grew up watching my dad get up early, and then later, my mom get up early to be a nurse and work long hours. And I'm not afraid of hard work.

And I think the people of South Carolina deserve that. They deserve a judge who's there and available all the time.

- Q. Well, and I guess along those same lines, when you would, basically, appear in front of a judge -- hopefully, most often -- that you felt like you were being respected, that you were given the opportunity to do what you felt you needed to do, within the perimeters in order to represent your client, did you really have a gained respect or an increased respect for the system because of it?
- A. I did. I did. Not only for the judge himself, but also for the system. Because again, I think the point is for everyone to fully be heard and have a voice.
- Q. Well, and on the flip side, I'm sure with the career you've had, that there have been a number of times -- hopefully smaller -- where you've run into other situations, maybe, where you had a judge who didn't quite behave that way.
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Did it also leave a lasting impression?
- A. It did. Because I'm smarter not to realize that if the judge, you know, has already made up his mind, and he's ruling and if he's not happy and expressing that, to immediately stop my mouth and listen to him and be attentive to him. And but you're right, it certainly leaves a lasting impression. No question.
 - Q. Just lastly, having been in the courtroom as

much as you have, over time, have you had the opportunity 1 2 to make your own impressions on how that latter type of 3 behavior from a judge impacts the courtroom, impacts the perception of the people in there, and in terms of their 4 feelings about the -- really, the adequacy and the 5 6 reverence that needs to be provided to the judicial 7 system? 8 Α. I have. And, you know, it's of great concern. I had the honor of appearing in front of many judges, as 9 10 you stated, throughout the state. Some of the judges sometimes want to go very, very quickly, whether it's in 11 terms of a probation revocation, and just cut people off, 12 13 "I made my decision and go ahead and rule." 14 And again, you know, they might have had family 15 members out there waiting for hours for that ten-minute hearing, and the opportunity to be heard on behalf of 16 17

their child or their son, and they certainly should be given that opportunity to be heard.

We appreciate your candidacy. And thank you for Q. your responses.

MS. COLLINS: Thank you. Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN SMITH:

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ms. Collins, I think you've sort of answered these questions, but I've been asking all the candidates this, and I want to make sure and ask you this. I'll try to do it as quickly as we can.

The civil portion of this is, I understand from your history, you have had experience in civil court. And I believe I heard you say that you've got enough experience in practicing criminal law, you feel like you would have the fundamentals to learn quickly as in civil law, and how to handle motions and --

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. -- the issues that arise for you in common pleas.
- A. Yes, sir. I've taught numerous CLE classes regarding evidence -- rules of evidence, which of course apply in both courts, in terms of hearsay and impeachment and other matters. I do feel that I could.

And I need to clarify that particular case

Senator Rankin asked me about was in magistrate court, but
the other three were in circuit court that was a full
trial that went to conclusion in front of a jury. One was
products liability, one was -- that was defense trial.

One was an automobile accident, personal injury. And the
other was a civil forfeiture jury trial that I mentioned.

In addition to that, I did numerous depositions, pretrial practice including interrogatories, requests for admission, motions for summary judgement, argued numerous motions for summary judgment. So I'm very familiar with

the pretrial practice in the civil court.

Which, thankfully, many times can work toward the parties having that full discovery, to where they can have a meeting of their minds regarding what the -- the disposition of the case should be.

- Q. And I think you answered it, as it relates to the mental health courts, but if you're elected to the court -- you know, I don't know what y'all have up in the circuit that you prosecute. But, you know, the alternative courts, the drug courts, mental health courts, veterans courts, diversionary type of programs, you know, I know you can't advocate for them, but you certainly can be involved in the creation of them --
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. -- through the judiciary and participate.
- A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Or utilize and make referrals to those. If you're elected, would you embrace that? Or what's your thought on these alternative courts?
- A. I would definitely embrace that. All of them.

 We just -- we're so excited in Lancaster, we just started our first adult drug court. We've had a juvenile drug court program for years. And we hope to expand the veterans court one day, and ultimately to a mental health court. But I would fully embrace that. I think it's so -

1 - so needed.

Q. And then another question I'm interested in is, obviously, you know what it's like with practicing criminal, and to some degree y'all do -- solicitors do have control of the docket. And so I appreciate what I heard you say is, you know, if there's a deposition, let me not call it today and doing that.

But along those lines, when you're a judge, you're going to be called upon from time to time, especially in the civil arena, where somebody may have a motion or a case and have a conflict with that. And, you know, they'll come to you for orders of protection at times about that, and about getting orders of protection.

And more importantly, also, from time to time, they'll come and say, "Look, I got a child's baseball game at three o'clock today, Judge. Can I put this off?"

What's going to be your practice, if you are elected as a judge, as to handling an attorneys' requests and balancing the demands of the court versus the quality of the life of attorneys?

A. Well, I think it certainly is a balancing act.

And I think all attorneys who enter the field of law understand that when they enter it, or they learn it very quickly once they start a family and have a family.

As a judge, I would certainly do everything I

can to consider that and give great consideration to that. But at the same time, we're asking jurors to serve, be away from their families and their jobs. And if we continue to delay things -- like, if they're saying, "I need to leave at three. Can we stop the trial and start back tomorrow?" You know, I would not be inclined to do that.

I would also give consideration to whether or not these are repeated requests by the same individual. And then I might have a private word with him about that, just to say that, you know, "I'm trying to give you as much consideration as I can. I certainly value family, and I want you to have that time with your family, but we also need to focus on moving forward. So what can we do to work together, whether it's starting earlier or staying later one day?"

Q. Judicial temperament -- and I presume you've been on the side of judges who've been wonderful with a temperament, and judges who have been abusive with their temperament, if you've practiced as long as you have. What do you think about -- and you have attorneys who we all -- that we've all seen who are habitually late to court, or do something that they shouldn't. Is there ever an appropriate time for attorneys to be reprimanded in the courtroom in front of jurors and/or the public or their

colleagues?

2.0

A. I would always start with having that private word in chambers. I cannot imagine a circumstance where an attorney should be reprimanded in front of a jury during the course of a jury trial. I think that would impede the administration of justice for the jury to continue to impartially weigh the case, and not be distracted by any diversions of consideration for a judge, indicating that the attorney is doing anything less than fulfilling his duty to his client.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Any further questions?

(Hearing none.)

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Collins, thank you.

Thank you so much. This concludes this portion of our screening process. I want to take this opportunity to remind you that pursuant to the Commission's evaluative criteria, the Commission expects candidates to follow the spirit as well as the letter of the law -- of ethics laws. And we will review violations or the appearance of impropriety as a serious, and potentially deserving a heavy weight in screening deliberations.

On that note, and as you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of qualifications, and you may be called back at such time if

```
1
     the need arises. I thank you for offering. And I thank
2
     you for your service to the state of South Carolina.
3
                    MS. COLLINS: Thank you-all for hearing me
4
     today. Thank you.
5
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH:
                                     Thank you. If we could
6
     tell -- who's got Mr. McKinnon as their -- okay. We'll
7
     let him know. Let's start back at 2:20, do y'all think?
8
    All right. And then we're going to go into executive
9
     session, real quick.
10
                    So Mr. Murphy moves we go into executive
11
     session. All in favor say "aye."
12
            (At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
13
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed?
14
                           (Hearing none.)
15
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: The ayes have it. Let's
16
     clear the room and go into executive session.
17
                    (OFF THE RECORD AT 1:50 P.M.)
18
19
2.0
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	86 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	
LO	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	25TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2017.	
14		
15		
16		
L7		
18		
19	PATRICIA G. BACHAND, COURT REPORTER	
20	MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MARCH 8, 2027	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)	
2	COUNTY OF RICHLAND)	
3		
4	* * * *	
5	JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION	
6	TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS	
7	* * * *	
8	BEFORE: G. MURRELL SMITH, JR., CHAIRMAN	
9	SENATOR LUKE A. RANKIN	
10	SENATOR RONNIE A. SABB	
11	SENATOR TOM YOUNG, JR.	
12	MR. ROBERT W. HAYES, JR.	
13	REPRESENTATIVE J. TODD RUTHERFORD	
14	REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS MURPHY	
15	MICHAEL HITCHCOCK	
16	JOSHUA HOWARD	
17	ANDREW N. SAFRAN	
18	ERIN B. CRAWFORD, CHIEF COUNSEL	
19	* * * *	
20	DATE: November 15th, 2017	
21	TIME: 2:32 p.m.	
22	LOCATION: Gressette Building	
23	1101 Pendleton Street	
24	Columbia, South Carolina 29201	
25	REPORTED BY: JENNIFER NOTTLE, COURT REPORTER	

г

Page 2

1	INDEX
2	PAGE:
3	
4	WILLIAM A. MCKINNON
5	- Examination by Ms. Crawford11
6	- Examination by Mr. Hayes18
7	- Examination by Senator Young19
8	- Examination by Representative Rutherford24
9	- Examination by Chairman Smith43
10	JAMES M. MORTON
11	- Examination by Mr. Maldonado45
12	- Examination by Mr. Safran52
13	- Examination by Mr. Hayes57
14	- Examination by Representative Rutherford60
15	- Examination by Senator Young61
16	LEAH B. MOODY
17	- Examination by Mr. Fiffick74
18	- Examination by Mr. Hayes92
19	- Examination by Senator Rankin92
20	- Examination by Senator Young94
21	- Examination by Senator Rankin80
22	Vote for 3rd Circuit, Seat 2101
23	Vote for 16th Circuit, Seat 1103
24	THE HONORABLE ALEX KINLAW, JR.
25	- Examination by Mr. Cohl108

Page 3

-	
1	- Examination by Mr. Safran125
2	- Examination by Senator Rankin134
3	- Examination by Chairman Smith136
4	- Examination by Senator Young140
5	ANDREW B. MOORMAN, SR.
6	- Examination by Mr. Davidson145
7	- Examination by Mr. Hayes153
8	- Examination by Chairman Smith156
9	- Examination by Senator Rankin160
10	JOHN P. RIORDAN
11	- Examination by Mr. Fiffick168
12	- Examination by Senator Rankin173
13	- Examination by Chairman Smith180
14	- Examination by Senator Rankin184
15	THE HONORABLE JESSICA A. SALVINI
16	- Examination by Mr. Hinson192
17	- Examination by Representative Murphy200
18	- Examination by Mr. Hayes200
19	- Examination by Chairman Smith202
20	Vote for 13th Circuit, Seat 4215
21	Certificate of Reporter219
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	* * * *
2	EXHIBIT INDEX
3	EXHIBITS:
4	PAGE:
5	EXHIBIT NO. 69
6	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
7	QUESTIONNAIRE OF WILLIAM A. MCKINNON
8	EXHIBIT NO. 79
9	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF
10	WILLIAM A. MCKINNON
11	EXHIBIT NO. 845
12	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
13	QUESTIONNAIRE OF JAMES M. MORTON
14	EXHIBIT NO. 945
15	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF
16	JAMES M. MORTON
17	EXHIBIT NO. 1045
18	- AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF JAMES M.
19	MORTON
20	EXHIBIT NO. 1145
21	- AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF JAMES M.
22	MORTON
23	EXHIBIT NO. 1245
24	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
25	QUESTIONNAIRE OF LEAH B. MOODY

1	EXHIBITS (CONTINUED): PAGE:	
2	EXHIBIT NO. 13	
3	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF	
4	LEAH B. MOODY	
5	EXHIBIT NO. 1475	
6	- AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF LEAH B.	
7	MOODY	
8	EXHIBIT NO. 1575	
9	- AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF LEAH B.	
10	MOODY	
11	EXHIBIT NO. 1675	
12	- AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF LEAH B.	
13	MOODY	
14	EXHIBIT NO. 1775	
15	- AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF LEAH B.	
16	MOODY	
17	EXHIBIT NO. 18110	
18	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA	
19	QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE ALEX KINLAW, JR.	
20	EXHIBIT NO. 19110	
21	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF	
22	THE HONORABLE ALEX KINLAW, JR.	
23	EXHIBIT NO. 20110	
24	- AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE	
25	HONORABLE ALEX KINLAW, JR.	

1	EXHIBITS (CONTINUED): PAGE:
2	EXHIBIT NO. 21110
3	- AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE
4	HONORABLE ALEX KINLAW, JR.
5	EXHIBIT NO. 22149
6	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
7	QUESTIONNAIRE OF ANDREW B. MOORMAN, SR.
8	EXHIBIT NO. 23149
9	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF
10	ANDREW B. MOORMAN, SR.
11	EXHIBIT NO. 24149
12	- AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF ANDREW
13	B. MOORMAN, SR.
14	EXHIBIT NO. 25172
15	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
16	QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JOHN P. RIORDAN
17	EXHIBIT NO. 26172
18	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF
19	JOHN P. RIORDAN
20	EXHIBIT NO. 27197
21	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
22	QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE JESSICA A. SALVINI
23	EXHIBIT NO. 28198
24	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF
25	THE HONORABLE JESSICA A. SALVINI

Page 7

1	EXHIBITS (CON	TINUED):	PAGE:
2	EXHIBIT NO. 29		198
3	- AMENDMENT	TO PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE	
4	HONORABLE J	ESSICA A. SALVINI	
5			
6	* * * *		
7			
8			
9	Court Reporte	r's Legend:	
10	dashes []	Intentional or purposeful interruption	1
11		Indicates trailing off	
12	[ph]	Denotes phonetically written	
13	[sic]	Written as said	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Senator Hayes moves that we come out
2	of executive session. See, I remembered this
3	time. And I wanted to thank everyone. The
4	Judicial Merrit Selection Commission is now back
5	on the record. For the record, I would like to
6	state that we've been in executive session
7	however, no decisions were made and no votes were
8	taken during executive session. Mr. McKinnon,
9	welcome. Want to apologize for the delay. I
10	know we're running way behind and sorry about the
11	inconvenience to you for this. I see you got two
12	people with you. Probably your wife would be the
13	most important person. Would you like to
14	introduce them to the Commission?
15	MR. MCKINNON: Thank you, Representative Smith. Yeah.
16	This is my wife Ellen McKinnon, and my good
17	friend Peter Protopapas.
18	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Hey, Peter how are you doing?
19	MR. PROTOPAPAS: All right.
20	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. McKinnon, will you raise you
21	right hand, please, sir?
22	MR. MCKINNON, being duly sworn, testifies as follows:
23	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. McKinnon, before you is your
24	is your personal data questionnaire and your
25	sworn statement. Are these both documents that

you have submitted to the Commission?
MR. MCKINNON: Yes, sir. They are.
CHAIRMAN SMITH: And are they both of them correct?
MR. MCKINNON: I haven't had a chance to review them
but if they're the same ones I submitted, they
are sir.
CHAIRMAN SMITH: Oh, I I need to qualify that. Are
both of them correct to the best of your
knowledge? How about that?
MR. MCKINNON: Yes, sir, they are.
CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. And does anything need to be
changed or updated at this time?
MR. MCKINNON: No, sir. The only amendment I think I
sent in, I have spent postage to mail the
legislature and so there was a
CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Sorry, go ahead.
MR. MCKINNON: I sent the requisite notice saying I've
spent more than \$100 because I I mailed the
letter to the members of the General Assembly.
CHAIRMAN SMITH: So, did you already submit that?
MR. MCKINNON: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN SMITH: Or you need to make okay. So,
you've got a exhibit to that? All right. Do you
any objections to making those documents a part
of your sworn testimony?

No, sir. 1 MR. MCKINNON: 2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. And if you'll hand those 3 to Lindi and we'll make those a part of the record, please, sir. Mr. McKinnon, the Judicial 4 Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly 5 investigated your qualifications for the bench. 6 7 Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative 8 criteria and has included a ballot box survey, a 9 thorough study of your application materials, 10 verification of your compliance with State ethics 11 laws, search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, study of previous screenings, and 12 13 checks for economic conflicts of interest. 14 have received no affidavits today in opposition 15 to your election and no witnesses are present to testify. Do you wish to make a opening statement 16 17 -- a brief opening statement to the Commission? 18 (EXHIBIT 6 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF WILLIAM M. MCKINNON) 19 (EXHIBIT 7- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN 2.0 STATEMENT OF WILLIAM M. MCKINNON) 21 22 MR. MCKINNON: Certainly sir. It's an honor to be 23 here. Again, this has been a life long dream to 24 -- to join the bench in South Carolina. 25 looking forward to another opportunity. You

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

know, I've spent most of my practice in the civil world and because this has -- this has been my -- my life -- since I graduated from law school, this has been my goal. I closed my practice about a year ago and I've been working full-time at the solicitor's office since then in preparation for this race. And so, I look forward to speaking with all of you folks today.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Thank you, Mr. McKinnon. Now, will you answer any questions that counsel may have for you, please sir?

MR. MCKINNON: Certainly.

EXAMINATION BY MS. CRAWFORD:

Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I note for the record that based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the record with the candidate's consent, Mr. McKinnon meets the constitutional and statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. Mr. McKinnon, you touched on it a bit in your opening statement. You were screened last in 2014. How do you feel your legal and professional experience renders you qualified and will assist you to be an effective circuit court judge? And

1 2

then maybe elaborate how your experience has changed since you appeared before the Commission in 2014?

4

5

3

7

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

Yes, ma'am. I -- I feel like I've had a -- a Α. broad range of practice in my career. I started out clerking for two different federal judges. Joe Anderson here in the District of South Carolina. And then Judge Kleinfeld on the 9th Circuit out west. Then I was briefly at a very large firm in Washington, D.C. And I missed South Carolina and decided that was not for me. Came and joined Lewis, Babcock, and Hawkins, here in Columbia. So, I've been at a small -- a small plaintiff's firm but they did defense work as well. We did all the defense work for BellSouth in South Carolina. And we also did Russell and Jeffcoat Realty. So, at -- at the Lewis and Babcock, I did both civil defense side work and plaintiff's work. I mean, we did -- probably about a third of what I did was defense work. Then following that I was a sole practitioner for

a year. Primarily working on one enormous estate

case. Some heirs fighting over money and that --

that lasted about a year. So, I have been a solo

practitioner. I transitioned from there to

McGowan, Hood, and Felder in Rock Hill where I 1 2 was for ten years doing about half medical 3 malpractice, plaintiff's side, and the rest a mix of different civil litigation and some criminal 4 defense as I was on the criminal appointment 5 list. But no -- no criminal defense for pay. 6 7 And also some ethics defense of lawyers as well. 8 And then, so, I have appeared in front of the 9 South Carolina Court of Appeals, the South 10 Carolina Supreme Court, the 4th Circuit Court of 11 Appeals. I've -- you know, I've appeared in Federal District Court in South Carolina. 12 13 the one area I thought I needed to work on prior 14 to running again this time was I had the limited, 15 limited criminal experience. So, two years ago I approached Solicitor Brackett and he allowed me 16 to work part-time as an assistant solicitor 17 18 primarily prosecuting DUI cases because that was 19 something that I could do part-time. And then about a year ago, I closed my private practice in 20 21 anticipation of this race. And I've been a full 22 time assistant solicitor for the past year. I 23 started out doing general felony work and I'm 24 currently a drug prosecutor. Thank you, Mr. McKinnon. The Commission has 25 Q.

received 116 ballot box surveys regarding you, 1 2 with 21 additional comments. The positive 3 comments included -- for example some of the -some of these positives, "smart, even tempered, 4 fair person." And, "he would be an outstanding 5 judge. His temperament and intellectual 6 abilities are what we need more of." Four of the 7 8 written comments expressed concerns. One of 9 these concerns indicated that you may exhibit 10 bias -- excuse me, bias towards others. What response would you offer as to this criticism? 11 It's not true. I mean, I certainly -- I mean, I 12 Α. 13 -- I -- I'm sure that there was something the 14 person thought -- I mean, there was some -- you 15 know, but I -- I certainly -- I mean, I think anyone who would know me well would say I don't -16 17 - don't exhibit bias toward anyone. And I -- I -18 - and would not exhibit bias on the bench if I were elected. 19 Another concern indicates you may have poor 20 Q. 21 judicial temperament. How would you react to 22 that? 23 All I can say is, I must have made one person Α. 24 really mad at some point in my career. Because 25 they -- they sent the same comment in in 2014.

have racked my brain. I -- I don't recall any 1 2 incident. As I think as other comments said, I -3 - I think I have a pretty even keel. But somewhere in my career I have made someone angry. 4 And -- and they have sent the same -- same -- the 5 same comment in three times now. 6 7 Q. Well, I -- I will note, Mr. McKinnon, clarify 8 that -- that concern said in one case you had 9 just gone to far. So, it looks like it was just 10 one case. 11 And I -- I -- I know it's not very helpful to the Α. Committee. I have no recollection of what 12 they're talking about. But I -- I -- I don't 13 14 think it is true in general. And if -- if I knew 15 who it was I would apologize for whatever it is they -- you know, whatever they're talking about. 16 Yes, sir. Thank you. And the third concern, 17 Q. 18 which you have addressed but I want to touch on 19 again discussed your experience. The concern was specifically with your experience handling cases, 2.0 21 general sessions. And I think that concern said 22 you'd only handled minor cases and not many 23 felonies. But can you elaborate on your recent 24 experience? 25 Α. Yes, ma'am. I would say that even prior to

joining the solicitor's office, I -- I did have 1 2 some felony experience. At the time the York 3 County appointment list, I would be appointed about three to four times a year on criminal 4 cases. And typically they were serious felonies 5 where the public defender's office had a 6 7 conflict. And I took a case to trial as a -- you 8 know, an -- a -- a life without parole, 9 possession with intent to distribute drugs, third 10 offense, as a private practice attorney. And 11 then certainly -- and then my first year working part time with the solicitor's office I did DUIs 12 solely because that was what the solicitor was 13 14 willing to let me do part-time, which was 15 extraordinarily generous on his part. some subsequent second or third or fourth offense 16 felony DUIs. Primarily, those were DUI first. 17 18 But since I've been at the solicitor's office 19 full-time, which I said has been about exactly one year now, I've done all felony work, general 2.0 felonies, burglaries, robberies and all. And 21 22 then -- in the last eight weeks I've been 23 switched to the drug team. So, I do felony drug 24 work now. 25 Q. Thank you, Mr. McKinnon. I have a few

1		housekeeping issues. Are you aware that as a
2		judicial candidate, that you are bound by the
3		code of judicial conduct as found in Rule 501 of
4		the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules?
5	Α.	Yes, ma'am, I am.
6	Q.	And since submitting your letter of intent, have
7		you contacted any members of the Commission about
8		your candidacy?
9	Α.	No, ma'am, I have not.
10	Q.	Since submitting your letter of intent, have you
11		sought or received the pledge of any legislator
12		prior either prior to this date or pending the
13		outcome of this screening?
14	Α.	No, ma'am, I have not.
15	Q.	Have you asked any third parties to contact
16		members of the General Assembly on your behalf or
17		or are you aware of anyone attempting to
18		intervene in this process on your behalf?
19	Α.	No, ma'am, I am not or I have not.
20	Q.	And have you reviewed and do you understand the
21		Commission's guidelines on pledging and South
22		Carolina Code Section 2-19-70 subsection E?
23	A.	Yes, ma'am, I do.
24	Q.	Okay. Mr. Chairman, I would note that the
25		Piedmont Citizens Committee found Mr. McKinnon to

He

be well-qualified in the evaluative criteria of 1 2 ethical fitness, professional and academic 3 ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. And qualified in the 4 remaining evaluative criteria of constitutional 5 6 qualifications, physical health, and mental 7 stability. The Citizens Committee noted, "Mr. 8 McKinnon has run for a circuit judgeship and 9 appeared before the committee several times. 10 has diligently worked to improve his qualifications by leaving his civil practice and 11 going to work for the 16th Circuit Solicitor's 12 13 office, a laudable example of conscientiousness and public service." Mr. Chairman, I note for 14 15 the record that any concerns raised during the investigation by myself regarding this candidate 16 17 were incorporated into the questioning of the 18 candidate today and I have no further questions. CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Ms. Crawford. Have any 19 questions of the Commission? Senator Hayes. 20 EXAMINATION BY MR. HAYES: 21 22 Q. 23

24

25

Thank you. I happen to go to church, it'll be a full admission, with Bill and I appreciate your running before and being willing to run again for this office. I noticed you have quite an

impressive resume. You were first in your class at law school?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. We have that in common. I was last in my class and you were first in yours. So -- so, that's about as close as we'll get. And I don't know if I was quite last but I wasn't first, I can tell you that. Tell me this, other than the criminal and civil that you've talked about, what is it in your background that would put you in good stead as a judge? What character trait or what -- what have you done in your past history that would -- and what weakness is in your background or in your character traits as far as becoming a judge?
- A. Yes, sir. I would say I have had a lot of experience dealing with folks in different walks of life. I started out as a teacher. I taught school for three years prior to going to law school. And then primarily through my service at the church, I was a deacon at my church and -- and then elected an elder. And at the Presbyterian Church, a deacon is an office of mercy. So, I was the -- the point person for people who had financial needs or need -- you know, needs for housing and that kind of thing.

So, that obviously I -- I spent a lot of time 1 2 with folks in very difficult situations. And I 3 think that -- that experience will serve me well if -- if I am elected to the bench. I would say 4 that my -- my biggest weakness is -- is something 5 that I said I am working on. Compared to some 6 7 folks who run for the judiciary, my criminal 8 experience was limited and so I'm -- done the 9 best that I can to remedy that for this race. 10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? Senator 11 Young. EXAMINATION BY SENATOR YOUNG: 12 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. McKinnon, thank you 14 so much for your interest in serving the State 15 and the judiciary by running for this circuit 16 court seat. 17 Thank you, sir. Α. 18 Q. The questions I have, one would be, how would you 19 describe your judicial philosophy? If you're elected to circuit court, how would you apply to 20 the facts that are before you? 21

22

23

24

25

A. Well, I guess it's -- it's a bit of a cliché but

I -- I -- I would say that I -- my job as -- as a

judge is an umpire to call balls and strikes. My

job is not to write the law or push the law. I

mean, those of you folks who are on the General 1 2 Assembly, it's -- it's your job to write the 3 laws. And it's my job as a judge to see that they're applied fairly and apply the law as it's 4 written by folks who -- whose job that is. You 5 6 know, my -- it's not -- my job is not to be an 7 activist, to push the law. It -- it's -- you 8 know, it's to apply the law as it's written 9 fairly and impartially. 10 Q. I noticed that you taught at Aiken -- at Aiken 11 Prep School --12 Α. Yes, sir. 13 Q. -- for two years? 14 Yes, sir. Α. 15 Q. Is that right? Two years. Yes, sir. 16 Α. And that was before law school? 17 Q. 18 Α. Yes, sir. What did you teach there? 19 Q. I taught math and Latin. 20 Α. 21 Q. Did you live in Aiken? 22 I did sir. Because at the -- at the -- at the Α. 23 time, it was a boarding school. So, I lived in 24 the -- in a -- in a dorm -- in a -- a faculty 25 apartment in the dorm. We didn't have a lot of - - I mean, you know, with the boarding duty we didn't have a lot of free time. But I did -- I did live there.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. How did you end up clerking for a -- for a judge on the 9th circuit?
- Α. That was -- I met a gentleman named Robert Levy in -- in D.C. through a political event at the time who was involved in a -- he had clerked for a Judge Ginsburg on the D.C. circuit. And he and I hit it off and we had somewhat similar political views. And he gave me sort of a list. And he said, you know, I've clerked on the D.C. circuit. And he was an interesting guy. He had made a lot of money in a -- in a software business and had gone to law school at about 50 years old. And then was a law clerk at 53 on the -- on the D.C. circuit. And so, he took me out to dinner and said, you know, I think you and I have some similar views. And, you know, here are some judges that, you know, you might get along well with. And Judge Kleinfeld was on that list. So, I did some research on Judge Kleinfeld. read a bunch of his opinions and -- and loved his opinions. And I -- I sent my resume in and he -his chambers were in Fairbanks, Alaska and it's

extrodinarly difficult to travel to Fairbanks. 1 2 It's very expensive and I was a law student. So, 3 he met me in Seattle, I think, or San Francisco. Because the courts meets in other places. And 4 so, one court term I flew out there and met he 5 and his wife for dinner an he offered me a job. 6 7 And it was a -- an amazing experience. 8 Q. Where did you live? 9 I lived in North Pole, Alaska. Α. 10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Did you meet Santa Claus? 11 He was always gone. I guess he was out Α. delivering toys. But I did -- I lived -- the 12 13 judge's chambers were in Fairbanks and I lived in 14 a little town about ten miles outside called 15 North Pole. It -- it looks like you have a pretty broad 16 Q. experience in both civil and criminal law. 17 18 Α. I think so, sir. Yes. And you also have worked at a -- in a -- two -- I 19 Q. would -- I would say two smaller, moderate size 20 21 law firm -- private law firms. 22 Yes, sir. Α. 23 And so, you're familiar with -- would you --Q. 24 would you say you're familiar with the challenges 25 that face lawyers who practice in smaller

practices and have multiple cases in multiple courts?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Absolutely, sir. And I -- and especially in Α. comparison I spent a little under a year in Washington, D.C. at a law firm that had more than 300 lawyers. And that was never an issue at that There was always tons of -- you know, if you had a hearing and you couldn't -- you had a conflict, another lawyer would cover it for you. I mean, you had 24-hour secretarial assistance and 24-paralegal assistance. And you know -- and at a small firm it's totally different. And I understand that folks, they may have conflicting court hearings in different parts of the state. Or some of you folks on the General Assembly, I mean, having to practice law and also have your commitments in Columbia. And I have a great sympathy for -- for a small firm lawyers and -and solo practitioners who are just trying to represent their clients and do the best that they can.
- Q. What is your view of -- of -- of what is the appropriate demeanor that a -- a trial judge should demonstrate from the bench?
- A. I think calm, reasoned, respectful would be what

I would say.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Rutherford.

EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD:

- Q. Tell me your -- your -- your first step outside
 of a civil practice was to the solicitor's office
 as opposed to going to work for somebody doing
 criminal defense work. Is there any sentencing
 philosophy behind that or?
- Α. No, sir. It was just -- I knew from my brother who is a public defender that the -- the public defender's office did not have any openings. I also, in York County I knew a lot of the criminal practitioners. One of my good friends is a criminal defense lawyer. And it's -- it's difficult for -- in my -- in my limited experience, difficult for criminal practitioners to bring in another full-time lawyer who is -does not have criminal experience who is not going to attract a lot of clients. It's just tough to go to someone who has a criminal practice and say, can you bring me on as a fulltime lawyer, pay me a full-time salary. I don't have any criminal experience -- little criminal experience. I'm not going to attract clients but

I -- you need to pay me a salary that my family
can live on. That's very tough to do. And
Solicitor Brackett was very gracious and -- and and was -- you know, hired me.

Q. So, tell me about sentencing philosophy after

- Q. So, tell me about sentencing philosophy after having been in the York Solicitor's office? I mentioned earlier about the number of enemies

 I've made there. You aren't on that list. But maybe the answer's yet. But --
- A. I'm glad to hear that.

2.0

- Q. So, yeah. But I mean, tell me about your sentencing philosophy coming out of that solicitor's office?

background, the challenges that they have 1 suffered. You know, why -- you know, 2 3 difficulties -- you know, the schooling they had. And then on the other end I obviously our -- our 4 job's also in part to protect the people of South 5 Carolina. And there -- there are certain folks 6 7 that are extremely dangerous. And -- and who --8 who continue to commit dangerous crimes. And I 9 think those folks sometimes warrant long 10 sentences. How would you -- and I don't want to ask you 11 Q. because I don't know if you're still employed 12 13 there. I assume that you are. But --14 Α. I am, sir. 15 Q. Yeah. I -- I think that the general sentiment amongst most judges and a lot of lawyers that 16 practice in and out of York County is that the 17 18 philosophy of that office is a little bit off 19 kilter. Do you think that you agree with the sentencing policy of -- policies of the office or 20 are you a little bit different? 21 22 Representative Rutherford, I -- I've heard that Α. 23 myself. My experience has been different and all 24 -- all I can say is that Solicitor Brackett has 25 given me basically free reign to handle my cases

as I see appropriate. He does not interfere in -- in -- in cases or he doesn't -- he certainly welcome. He answers questions if I have them and other attorneys in the office are -- have been very -- very free with their time in helping me learn some. But -- but there's no pressure from the office to pushing hard sentences or anything like that. There's no -- there's no numbers pressure. And the only -- the only numbers pressure we get is that Solicitor Brackett does not like cases to hang around a long time. So, he does prompt us that we need to resolve our cases. But there's certainly -- there's no oversight. Anyone going behind me and saying, well you were too light on that guy. Or why did you give this person probation. Or -- my experience has been that we have a great deal of freedom and -- and trust from Solicitor Brackett. But I --

Q. You -- you keep -- you go back and forth between there's no pressure on us or we. You're saying that that's the office policy? That's -- that's not my experience up there. Everybody seems to refer back to what they can't do by what they're being told. Is it just limited to you that you

25

20

21

22

23

have that kind of flexibility or?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Representative Rutherford, I -- I -- I can't Α. speak to what Solicitor Brackett tells other people in private. All -- well, what I can is, with me, I have never felt that pressure. The only office policy I'm aware of is once we have set a case for trial, once the plea offer has been turned down and the case has been scheduled for trial, at that point all plea offers are revoked. And the only option at that point for the Defendant is they must plead straight up. But that's -- you know, after a long plea negotiation period and we've finally said this our -- your last chance. If you turn down this offer we're going to put it on the trial roster. And at that point, if you -- you know, the office policy is if I have a case that's set for trial and I want to re-offer a plea, I have to have the permission of Solicitor Brackett or one of the deputy solicitors. But other than that there are no policies that -- I mean, -- I mean, I've never felt pressure to go a certain way in a case. I -- but I have heard the same thing from lawyers.
 - Q. Again, that's what causes me concern is that, you

15

18

17

20

19

21

22

23 24

25

know, I've been doing this 20 years and I continue to be flummoxed by what I hear from solicitors in York County. And as I'm sure you know, this is on a regular basis. What I'm being told is that, oh, I can't do this because of this reason or I can't do that because of this reason. And it just -- I would be further concerned if you were left the -- you were left believing from your limited time in the solicitor's office that that was the way that things should be in a criminal practice throughout the state. Because I assure you it is not anywhere else like that but in York County. So that concerns me that that's your experience in the criminal world.

Α. I can only say, Representative Rutherford, that I -- I -- I have not felt any kind of pressure like that myself. And I -- I feel like I'm -- there are -- there really are no restrictions on how I handle cases. And I certainly felt no -- no pressure to put people in jail for long terms or anything like that.

EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN SMITH:

Mr. McKinnon, let me follow up with you on a Q. couple of those. Kind of along those lines. You know, we see people who are historically -- the

criminal experience comes from public defender 1 2 sector, then they believe the way the public 3 defenders -- you know, what they ask for and the way they present cases is the way that as judges 4 they should handle this. And -- and we had a 5 6 public defender that was before us earlier. So, 7 there are similar questions. As a solicitor, you 8 know, obviously you know you get up there and you 9 recommend sentences and -- and -- you know, 10 what's going to be your policy as to a 11 recommendation from a solicitor as to a sentence? 12 Are you going to take in to your own 13 consideration those -- those recommendations and 14 weigh what's before you before you pronounce 15 sentence, or are you generally going to follow the recommendation of the solicitor? 16 17 No, sir. I -- I would definitely take in to Α. 18 account my -- my own evaluation of the facts and the background of the defendant. And I -- I 19 would make my own judgment. 20 21 What weight would a recommendation of a solicitor Q. 22 have upon your decision? 23 It would have some weight. But again, I mean, Α. 24 the -- the -- the people of South Carolina and 25 the General Assembly entrust the -- the bench

with the -- with the authority on sentencing. 1 2 And it's the judge who is in the -- the final --3 who is the final arbiter. And my personal philosophy was I would feel comfortable going 4 lower than a recommendation without giving 5 warning to the lawyers. But in a situation where 6 7 I felt like the sentence was too low, I would 8 give the attorneys a chance to withdraw that plea 9 before T --10 Q. You are following right along with my next 11 question. And I -- I know that you're not bound upwards or downwards with -- with a sentence. 12 13 But if a sentence is going to be -- if the 14 recommendations say 10 years and you say that's not -- that's not appropriate, I think this 15 individual deserves more time. Which I -- I 16 17 think that's perfectly well within your

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

A. Absolutely, Chairman Smith. I -- I don't think that's fair to counsel and certainly I -- I would give them a heads up that -- that my -- that I

discretion. Would you allow the attorney to

withdraw that plea or advise that you can not go

forward with it and allow them to withdraw that

plea or -- rather than proceed with sentence and

what I call the blind-siding theory?

would -- that I would tell them that I view the case is more serious than that recommendation.

And would -- do they still want to go forward with myself as the -- the judge.

- Q. Yes, sir. And -- and I'll follow along with what Senator Young was saying. It -- it appears you have a wealth of civil experience. You have a -- now a breadth of criminal experience. So, you know, it looks would you -- if you were elected, you would be well prepared to go to the bench. So, then when you look at certain issues that -- you know, the temperament of a judge. How -- what -- how -- how does that play in to your philosophy of being a judge?
- A. Well, as -- as -- I -- I think that the temperament that you hope that you get from judges on the bench is fair, even tempered, respectful. We've all been in situations where we may be running late because of traffic or something like that. And I just -- you know, I'm -- I would not be the kind of judge who's going to blast at counsel from the bench. I just -- I just don't think that's appropriate. And even with -- with criminal defendants, if they -- if you think the crime is particularly heinous, the

way that you express the judgment of South 1 2 Carolina in that situation is in the sentence. 3 You don't harangue people from the bench or lecture them from the bench. And I -- I -- I 4 think that I would be a judge that would be 5 6 respectful and even -- even keel you know, 7 friendly temperament. 8 Q. And obviously, you've got to control your 9 courtroom at times? 10 Α. Yes, sir. 11 And -- and you've got attorneys that -- we all Q. know attorneys or, you know, unfortunately there 12 13 are attorneys who try to take advantage of the 14 court or don't respect the court and don't 15 respect their position. So, what -- what's the appropriate way when someone is -- is what you 16 17 believe is being disrespectful to the court or 18 running late and causing disruptions in your court -- how would you address those manners? 19 I think barring a truly exceptional situation, a 20 Α. 21 warning first is always appropriate. And then if 22 the behavior or the disruption continues beyond a 23 warning, then depending on what it is -- that --24 I mean, you have the -- the contempt power.

I certainly -- barring truly exceptional

circumstances, I would always give counsel or a 1 2 party warning that they have -- that they've 3 crossed the line and they -- they need to reel it in or there are going to be consequences. 4 Where would that warning occur, in the courtroom? 5 Q. If it was -- it -- if it was a case before a 6 Α. 7 jury, I would certainly not do it in front of the 8 jury because you run the risk of causing a 9 mistrial or having to do -- it would depend on 10 who else was in the courtroom. So I mean, if it 11 was a fairly private hearing I might -- it would -- possible I would do it from the bench but much 12 13 more likely it would be -- we would take a recess 14 and do it privately. 15 Q. Okay. In chambers? Yes, sir. 16 Α. 17 And -- and wouldn't you believe that that's Q. 18 probably the appropriate place to address behavioral issues with --19 Yes, sir. 20 Α. 21 Q. -- attorneys? 22 And that's -- especially when it's out of the --Α. 23 you know out of hearing the court personnel and -24 - and the jury. Yeah. I think it -- it --25 that's the best way to resolve it, sir.

And along the lines with what you're doing now 1 Q. 2 and I -- I'm not familiar. Unlike Mr. 3 Rutherford, I don't go to your county. I'm smart enough to know to stay in my own lane when --4 where I'm supposed to go to court. But in -- in 5 6 regards to alternative sentencing, we -- we --7 we're looking alternative sentencing, alternative 8 courts, mental health courts, drug courts, veterans courts. I know you wouldn't be a part 9 10 of the policy making of those courts. But if you were elected to the bench, you know, obviously 11 you would have a hand in the formulation of those 12 13 courts whether they are working, whether they're not working and, you know, -- and how they are 14 created and whether it's with the solicitor's 15 consent, without the solicitor's consent. What 16 17 role do you think alternative sentencing and 18 alternative courts play in our general sessions arena? 19 20 Α. 21 22

23

24

25

A. I -- I think they play a very positive role,
Chairman Smith. I am personally familiar with
our -- our PTI program. Which I think is an
exceptionally good program. You know, I'm -- as
I'm sure you're aware, it gives first time
offenders a chance to do some community service

25

and do some counseling and keep their record That's a great program. We also have the alcohol education program, which is for certain alcohol offenses. Typically, for people under I -- because we have a traffic program called the TEP, which is similar. It's an intervention program for traffic tickets. I'm not personally familiar with it. I think we -we are most proud of our drug court program in the 16th circuit, which is typically a program for people who are facing significant jail time due to their drug habit. Typically, the candidates are people who maybe keep stealing things or because -- to feed a drug habit. And the way we do is it we -- they plead guilty to a -- a charge with series time. Typically, we won't even take someone in the program unless they're willing to plead guilty and be sentenced to five years or more. And then that is a very, very effective motivator. Because the drug program is very intensive. It's meets with people three times a week when it starts. And you can say, look if -- you know, if you -- if you can't stop smoking marijuana you're going to go to jail for five -- for five years. And it is

1 a great program. We are just starting a mental 2 health court which is really encouraging because 3 I'm sure, you know, with your criminal experience there are some folks who just -- they just have 4 mental problems. And they're not -- they're not 5 6 malicious or evil. But they -- they keep 7 committing crimes because they have serious 8 mental health issues. So, we're -- we're just getting that going and I'm very encouraged. 9

would love to be a part of that.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All right. And you know, I -- I -- pivoting back Q. towards the civil side. Obviously, you -- you have to -- you will have the unfortunate experience if you are elected of being chief administrative judge of those circuits. And always hear that's probably the worst part of being a judge. But time to time you're going to have attorneys call you, write to you for a request for protection. You know, get to called to trial or a motion and say, judge you know I --I've got five lawyers in this deposition and it's scheduled for this afternoon. And -- and you know, I've got this motion. If -- it's going to disrupt everything if we -- if we don't have this deposition or even the things to -- you know, I

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

need to go on vacation. Or we're going out of town this Thursday or this Friday or my kid's got a soccer game at 4:00 o'clock or 5:00 o'clock, can I leave court early. How -- how are you going to handle those issues as opposed to the just disposition of court cases?

- A. Having been a small firm practitioner I guess I would say my -- my sympathy is with the lawyer in those situations. I would do everything that would be reasonable to accommodate those lawyers to the -- just so long as I wasn't prejudicing the other party. Because there -- there is a point where those sort of things can become delay tactics. But I mean, in the great majority of situations I would -- I would bend over backwards to work with the lawyer and not -- because we all have families. We all have children who get sick and things that come up. And you know, I -- I would be as understanding as possible.
- Q. I think we generally -- all of us who make a living doing courtroom work tend to identify those who are abusing the system versus those who are -- have legitimate issues. And -- and what's the quality of life of lawyers? What importance does that weigh in to you as a judge and how

would you consider that?

- A. I -- I think I would do what I could. I'm not sure that I -- as a judge I would have a huge influence on that other than what you just mentioned, Chairman Smith, with reasonable on scheduling, reasonable on deadlines, reasonable on continuances. I think those sort of things can have a very positive impact on a lawyer's quality of life. And I -- I think I would also -- with -- with juries and with lawyers, I would be reluctant to go late in to the evening on a case barring unusual circumstances.
- Q. Right. And you recognize that was going to be my next question. You will recognize when you will have to deal with jurors and you have to deal with clerk personnel and bailiffs and sheriff's deputies and they all have families at home and they have issues, would you be cognizant of their demands and personal demands as opposed to you wanting to get rid of the case and let's let the jury start deliberating at 4:00 or 5:00 o'clock at night?
- A. Yes, sir. I mean, I -- I have a six-year-old step-daughter and she has to be picked up at school at 6:00 o'clock no matter what. And I --

I know what that's like. And I -- I would do the very best I could, sir.

- Q. And I -- I want -- I -- I looked over your -your bench bar survey. Your ballot box
 information. And I -- you know, I -- I make it
 appoint when we see negative comments, I want to
 obviously discuss those with -- with the
 candidates. But I also think it's important to
 recognize when you have a lot of positive
 comments and positive evaluations. And let me
 commend you for having a lot of positive
 evaluations.
- A. Thank you.

2.0

Q. Your negatives, judicial temperament, six, which is very good in these situations. You have -- you're -- you're qualifications are all in -- are all 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent for well qualified. And I think that's -- that's a testament to the type of practice and the type of lawyer you've been. More importantly, what -- you're the third candidate, I believe, we've had over here at York County. All of y'all have either solicitors or public defenders. So you know, we're -- y'all approach -- I was a part-time public defender at some point. And I know

you always approach that -- it's a -- it's a 1 2 adversarial situation. And -- but you always try 3 to approach that with respect to each other and to the process, although you differ on the facts 4 and the way you argue the facts. And so you 5 6 know, one thing I look at this as a -- you see as 7 those who've, as I call it, been in the pit. 8 have adversarial issues in and you know, you tend 9 to make some enemies along the way. 10 apparently, you as a solicitor have been -- have -- have not found that way. And the -- you know, 11 12 the way you see the public defenders and 13 solicitors they butt heads at times. But you 14 know, at the end of the day those who walk away 15 and that they still remain friends and respectful of one another, that's a real testament to the 16 17 way you carry yourself in that manner. 18 Α. Thank you, sir. I think that the fact my brother is a public defender helps keep me grounded, too. 19 Well, then you -- you -- it would make 20 Q. life difficult wouldn't it? 21 Yes, sir. 22 Α. 23 So, we were just -- I -- I just was looking at Q. 24 some of these and -- and the ones who are long

time solicitors or long term public defenders,

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

you see more -- more -- more comments. And you know, their responses, I think rightfully so, were look, you know, I'm advocating for my client and it can create some hostilities. But I don't see that in -- in yours. And so, I'm appreciative of that.

- A. Thank you.
- Q. All right. Mr. McKinnon -- do you have -- okay. Does anyone else have any questions? All right. Mr. McKinnon, thank you. This concludes this portion of your screening process. I want to take this opportunity to remind you that pursuant to the Commission's evaluative criteria, the Commission expects candidates to follow the spirit as well as the letter of the ethics laws. And we will -- we will view violations of -- or the appearance of impropriety as serious and potentially deserving of heavyweight and screening deliberations. On that note, and as you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of qualifications. And you may be called back at such time if the need arises. I thank you for offering for this position. And I thank you for your service to the State of South Carolina.

```
1
         MR. MCKINNON: Thank you, sir. And thank you all for
 2
               your time.
3
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you. Have a safe
               trip back.
 4
                          (Off the Record)
5
6
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: Come on up and we'll get started.
7
               Mr. Morton, will you raise your right hand
8
               please, sir.
    MR. MORTON, being duly sworn, testifies as follows:
9
10
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Mr. Morton, before you,
11
               you have the personal data questionnaire and the
12
               sworn statement. Are these documents that you
               submitted to the Commission? They should be on
13
               the --
14
15
          MR. MORTON: They're -- I don't --
16
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think I'm getting ahead of myself
17
               then if they're not on there. Yeah. Sorry,
18
               we're missing a -- a key component of our
               screening process.
19
              (Documents were retrieved at this time.)
20
21
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are those documents before you, are
22
               those the documents that you've submitted to the
23
               Commission?
          MR. MORTON: Yes, sir, Your Honor.
24
25
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are they both correct?
```

1 MR. MORTON: Sorry. Calling you, Your Honor. 2 sir. 3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Is there anything you need to change or updated at this time? 4 MR. MORTON: No, sir. 5 6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do you have any objection to us 7 making a part -- this a part of your -- of the --8 of the record of your sworn testimony? 9 MR. MORTON: No, sir. 10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Will you please. Jimmy, 11 if you'll just hand those to the court reporter and we'll make those as Exhibit to the record. 12 13 Mr. Morton, the Judicial Merit Selection 14 Commission has thoroughly investigated your 15 qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry is focused on nine evaluative criteria and has 16 included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of 17 18 your application materials, verification of your 19 compliance with state ethics laws, search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, 2.0 21 study of previous screenings, and checks for economic conflicts of interest. We have received 22 23 no affidavits filed in opposition to your 24 election and there are no witnesses present to 25 testify today. Do you wish to make a brief

opening statement to the Commission? 1 2 (EXHIBIT 8 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION 3 PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF JAMES M. MORTON) (EXHIBIT 9 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN 4 STATEMENT OF JAMES M. MORTON) 5 (EXHIBIT 10 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA 6 7 QUESTIONNAIRE OF JAMES M. MORTON) 8 (EXHIBIT 11 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA 9 QUESTIONNAIRE OF JAMES M. MORTON) 10 MR. MORTON: No, sir. 11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Morton. If you'll 12 answer any questions that counsel may have. 13 14 EXAMINATION BY MR. MALDONADO: 15 0. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I note for the record that based on the that based on the testimony 16 contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been 17 18 included in the record with the candidate's 19 consent, James Morton meets the constitutional and statutory requirements for this position 2.0 21 regarding age, residence, and years of practice. 22 Mr. Morton, why do you want to be a circuit court 23 judge? 24 You know, I think being a circuit judge has the Α. 25 unique capability to effect people's lives and

this has a tremendous power in that regard. And that's something that I've wanted to aspire to be able to do most of my life. Not all of my life. I think I can be a -- a fair, qualified, impartial, hard-working, dedicated judge that the people of my circuit and the people of this state can be proud of.

2.0

- Q. Thank you. How do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far renders you qualified and will assist you to be an effective circuit court judge?
- A. Well, I've had the experience on lot -- of course, lots of criminal experience. I've had some civil experience. My civil experience includes handling cases of all types of different situations from unfair trade practices to nuisance to unlawful -- to accident cases, to wrongful deaths, to negligent supervision. I've tried a lot of cases in civil cases. I've handled dozens more in civil court. Most of my experience has been in the criminal arena where I've been a public defender. I've been a prosecutor. I had the wonderful timing to be a prosecutor here in Columbia for about five years where I was able to prosecute a lot of high

3

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

profile cases and a lot of serious cases. And I learned a lot from that. I -- I think being on both sides of the -- of the law, so to speak, has qualified uniquely, to tell you the truth, as well as my experiences outside of the courtroom.

Thank you. Mr. Morton, the Commission received Q. 170 ballot box surveys about you with 28 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments, "He's one of the strongest candidates for a circuit court judgeship that I've ever observed in my 42 years practicing law." Also, "Mr. Morton is, in my opinion, one of the most professional attorneys I've ever encountered. possesses civility that the legal -- that the legal community is looking for. He's experienced in almost ever field of law. What a great asset to our bench should he be elected." Three of the 28 comments expressed concerns. One comment stated, "This candidate is not always trustworthy and disagrees with legislative authority to promulgate the law. He will not apply the law with legislative intent and will be biased toward parties, inserting his personal beliefs instead of the rule of law." Another stated, "I have had

instances where I questioned his integrity and honesty. I do not believe he is qualified and feel that he would not be impartial. He would have his own agenda and would not -- and it would not be to further justice." How do you respond to these concerns?

7

6

4

5

9

8

11

10

1213

1415

16

17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

Q.

Α. I have no idea where some of those negative comments come from. I -- I would -- you know, at the end of the day you have to put your head on the pillow at night. You have to do what you think is right. You have to do what you think is right for the people that are in front of you and that includes the victims. That includes defendants. That includes people on both side of the law. I am probably unfailingly fair, in my opinion. I've been a victim of crime. I've represented victims of crime. I've prosecuted people. Put people in jail for long periods of time. I have no personal ambition. My only job when I retire to judges chambers would be knowing that I have done what I consider to be the right thing. That I have listened to all the parties. I have listened to what they had to say. And that's the only thing that would drive me.

Thank you. Two other comments mentioned your

3

lack of civil experience. I -- I believe you already touched on this but would you like to offer any other response to that question?

5

4

Α.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, my -- no question that -- that most of my experience has been in the criminal realm. After I left the solicitor's office here in Columbia, after about five years, I was in private practice. I've been in private practice since that time. I'm -- I'm at a firm that has 13 lawyers in my firm, or our firm. We practice all types of law, I think, except bankruptcy and -- and maybe a couple of other things. I help manage all my lawyers. I -- again, I've tried numerous civil cases in various types of law from nuisance, to negligent supervision, to unfair trade practices, to wreck cases, to wrongful death cases. So, I -- I think I have more experience than a lot of people that you're going to see in front of you from -- from -- from civil and certainly from criminal.

- Q. Thank you. Mr. Morton, what do you feel is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
- A. Well, you know the -- the judge that this seat is
 -- the vacancy which John Hayes -- I don't always
 agree with Judge Hayes and some of the things

that he does, but his demeanor -- he said that 1 2 when he became a judge that he took an oath to 3 himself to always be -- to never downgrade a lawyer in the courtroom. To always listen. 4 - to -- to be -- have a demeanor that's kind of 5 quiet confidence. To listen to everyone. And 6 7 you know, judges can have lawyers who raise all 8 kinds of different issues and make all kinds of 9 arguments and it gets very heated and a place to 10 be. But Judge Hayes has always taken the 11 position that he is going to listen to lawyers. 12 He's going to listen to litigants. He's going to 13 listen to people in the courtroom. I don't think I've ever heard him raise his voice one time. 14 That's the kind of judge I would aspire to be. 15 Thank you. Are there any areas, including 16 Q. 17 subjective areas of the law, that you would need 18 additional preparation in -- in order to serve as 19 a circuit court judge? And how would you handle the additional preparation? 20 21 Α. Well, yeah, there are plenty of places that I 22 would need some help. There are too many to --23 to name. Fortunately, with the internet and with 24 law clerks, with a network of -- of people that

you can rely on to ask questions of in an

appropriate manner. Yeah, there are lots of 1 2 things that I would do. I would -- I'm never 3 one, I don't think, to make a quick, irrational decision without giving it careful thought and 4 consideration. And I would always do that. And 5 I would have lots of ways -- lots of things to 6 7 learn as a judge. And I don't deny that. 8 Q. Thank you, Mr. Morton. I'll finish up with some 9 housekeeping questions. Mr. Morton, are you 10 aware that as a judicial candidate, you are bound 11 by the code of judicial conduct as found in Rule 501 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules? 12 13 Α. Yes, sir. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you 14 Q. 15 contacted any members of the Commission about 16 your candidacy? 17 Α. No, sir. 18 Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you sought to receive the pledge of any legislator, 19 either prior to this date or pending the outcome 20 21 of your screening? 22 No, sir. Α. 23 Have you -- have you asked any third parties to Q. 24 contact members of the General Assembly on your 25 behalf or are you aware of anyone attempting to

1 intervene in this process on your behalf? 2 No, sir. Α. 3 Have you reviewed and do you understand the Q. Commission's guidelines on pledging and South 4 Carolina Code Section 2-19-70(e)? 5 Yes, sir. 6 Α. I would note that Piedmont Citizens Committee 7 Q. 8 reported Mr. Morton is well qualified in the 9 ethical -- in the -- one of these days I'm going 10 to say that right -- evaluative criteria of 11 ethical fitness, character, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, 12 13 experience, and judicial temperament. And 14 qualified in the criterias of constitution -constitutional qualifications, physical health, 15 and mental stability. Mr. Chairman, I would note 16 17 for the record that any concerns raised during 18 the investigation by staff regarding this 19 candidate were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today. I have no further 2.0 21 questions. 22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you. Any 23 questions? Mr. Safran. 24 EXAMINATION BY MR. SAFRAN: 25 ο. Mr. Morton, good to see you again.

- A. Good to see you, Mr. Safran.
- Q. A couple of questions. And you touched on this and it's something that we obviously, as a group, have -- have found to be something that is a very significant point that we want to try to make and -- and to at the same time glean from the testimony of the folks appearing. You've been practicing a long time. You've been in front of a lot of judges. And I'm sure, like me, you've probably had your moments where it wasn't always the most pleasant situation. Has that -- or have those experiences had an impact on you in terms of how you would want to project as a judge, particularly as it relates to how you treat members of the Bar?
- A. Absolutely. And again, I had the fortunate experience of practicing here in Columbia for a long time. And as a result, I think when you're a Columbia lawyer you -- you go to Lexington.

 You go to different counties. You see -- obviously you see lots of judges come in to Columbia from, you know, Rodney Peebles to -- to -- to Frank Epps to Tony Harris. I've been around for a long time. And I've seen how judges handle themselves and conduct themselves. And

21

22

23

24

25

I've seen how they talk to lawyers and I've seen the impression that that has on -- not only on lawyers but on litigants in -- in the courtroom and on jurors. Sometimes I think that judges who don't think before they speak get it wrong. And I -- I would caution myself to think before you speak because there are lots of competing interests when you're in the courtroom. You have there lots of people that are influenced by everything that you say whether it be the court reporter or the clerk or -- or the jury or the bailiffs. All of those things, you're a leader And I -- I think I've had a lot of experience in watching lots of different judges through the years. Hopefully, I will get it right.

Q. And I guess when you talk about experience, obviously over a period of time you see people come in here who have different degrees, different levels, and -- and certainly different types. You've had experience in a number of courts and a number of years. Granted, you've indicated that it's been predominately criminal. Does that experience, in your estimation, really present itself as -- as a very valuable asset to

how you would be handling yourself on the bench?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Q.

Well, I don't think there's any question in that Α. -- that after 32 years of -- of -- of being primarily a courtroom lawyer that -- you know, that experience will serve anyone well who's -who's done that. And I've been on -- I've been on both sides. I've tried death penalty cases. I've -- I've had people sentenced to the electric chair. I've sentenced people to life in prison. I've handled cases where I've prosecuted people that I later determined I put in jail for life that were innocent. I've handled cases that were -- where people were put in jail that for life that I believe were innocent. I -- I have -- you know, so the experience over all these years, I think, is invaluable. I think it's hard for younger people to have that experience. Everybody that's running for this seat is very fine and capable, qualified, bright. Probably --I'm probably the least smart of this group that we have in here. But as far as experience is concerned, I think I have more experience than --I -- I think I'm uniquely qualified in the -- in the realm of experience.

Just along those same lines. You know, you

talked about having appeared in front of a number of different judges. And obviously people have different styles and different habits. known of some judges that want to keep people there to the late hours of the evening in order to get things done. I've known others that, you know, want to more or less make it clear that there's no way I'm letting you out of here. No continuances. No time to more or less to tend to your personal situations. I think one thing we've discussed in here in the last couple of years is the fact that lawyers have lives like everybody else does. And do you take that and will you take that into consideration? You know, not to a point where somebody's abusing it, but at the same time recognizing that lawyers have other parts of their lives that have to be addressed and that are of some significance and some value to that?

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Well, yeah. Well, having been in private practice for so many years and I know that all to well. I also know well lawyers who -- who do abuse that. And lawyers who don't fulfill their obligations. And lawyers who are always there trying to kick the can down the road. I also

understand that judges have a responsibility to help move the docket along and to help resolve and settle the cases. So, I think I have a healthy balance of -- of knowing when the lawyers have legitimate needs that they need to tend to. And sometimes judges -- you know, frankly they -- they don't -- they don't understand that. They don't understand that if you're in court from 9:00 o'clock in the morning until 6:00 o'clock at night that you then got to back to your office and prepare for the next day, often not counting your family life and not counting your other personal commitments. So, I think I have a healthy understanding of -- of the needs that lawyers have who appear before you.

Q. And I guess in that same vein, if -- if lawyers come to you with something that clearly you know is not to try to kick the can down the road, not to in any way abuse or unnecessarily delay but in fact, kid's got a soccer game. I've got to attend this graduation. I need some time in order to go away for vacation. I mean, are those the kind of things that, based on your own experience, that would be legitimate reasons to work with them?

1	Α.	Yes. Absolutely. And I realize that that
2		that lawyers have those those kinds of
3		conflicts and those situations. It's hard
4		sometimes when you're due in court to to be
5		sometimes you don't feel well. Sometimes in fact
6		you're quite sick. I I don't think I've ever
7		missed a court appearance for for calling in
8		sick. But on the other hand, you do respect and
9		appreciate judges who know that you have a family
10		life and you have a personal life and you have a
11		business life. And you're not there to to be
12		dilatory. You're there you have legitimate
13		concerns and needs and expectations from others.
14		And I think again, I think there's a healthy
15		balance. I think I've seen a lot of that. I
16		think I've seen, you know, on my side and I think
17		it I've seen it on whatever side I've been on.
18		And I've I've seen I've seen it abused.
19		And I've seen where it's a legitimate need. And
20		I think I can recognize for the most part those
21		situations.
22	Q.	We certainly appreciate you being here today and
23		I thank you for answering my questions.
24	CHAI	RMAN SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Safran. Senator
25		Hayes.

EXAMINATION BY MR. HAYES:

- Q. Thank you. Full disclosure, don't hold this against him but he and I did grow up together.

 And I -- I'm going to ask him some questions but you can't -- it's off -- off ground bringing up anything that -- that you have on me.
- A. Okay. All right. Because I've already been telling some stuff outside.
- Q. All right. Well, don't -- don't tell anymore.

 But I -- you have shown an interest in -- in

 serving before now. So I appreciate your

 interest in serving as a judge. What in your

 background -- putting aside your criminal and

 civil experience but other outside of that, what

 in your background really helps equip you to be a

 good judge? And what, if any, weaknesses do you

 have in your background as far as becoming a

 judge?
- A. Well, you know, you've seen my PDQ application.

 I've had a lot of experiences outside of the courtroom and in life. I've had handcuffs put on me and I've been put in jail. And I know how that feels. And I know what it's like to be stopped by the police. Or I know what it's like to -- to -- to feel abused. You know -- I grew

25

up as you well know -- my dad grew up in the depression and in the war and he taught me the -the value of -- of service and of trying to do the right thing. I've always, I think, tried to do the right thing. I've certainly made plenty of mistakes in -- in life. Certainly, I -- I will make plenty more. But I have a wealth of experience outside the courtroom. You know, I was -- as you know, Senator, I was a quarterback on my football team and a pitcher on my baseball I worked in Washington for Senator team. Hollings. I had the wonderful experience of working on the Senate floor back when people like yourselves were called statesmen and not politicians. And I've seen people -- I've seen how they worked and I've seen how they work into the night. I've seen people work on Saturdays and Sundays. And I've seen fight and argue where I thought, well this has become personal. -- these people are never going to speak to each other again and they walk out arm and arm to go get dinner together. I tried to learn from that. That you have to be professional. That there are always other sides of the coin. That you have to understand that there are always two sides to --

There are always two sides to an 1 the coin. 2 argument. There are always different 3 perspectives that people have. Each perspective is not always right but life is not black and 4 white. It's -- it's gray. I know my wife gets 5 tired of hearing me say that when I -- I talk 6 about the kids. You have to -- I think -- I 7 8 think I have a wealth of understanding where 9 people have come from. I want to help people. I 10 want to serve people. I want to do the right 11 thing. But I want to punish people who need to be punished. 12

Q. Thank you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any other questions? Representative Rutherford.

EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD:

- Q. Mr. Morton, I remember prosecuting against you when you were in Richland County. And I was -for the brief time I was in the solicitor's office. Do you think that your time in York has not skewed you to not know or remember what a good sentence looks like?
- A. I think it has. I do. I think it has. And you know, coming from Richland County, where I used to think that Lexington County sentences were the

worst thing in the world, to go to York, where 1 2 the sentences are really hard, I do think it has 3 skewed me. So you know, I think that there -you know, but again and you -- you know that I've 4 -- I've -- I've prosecuted. And I'll give people 5 6 chances where I think people deserve to have 7 chances. And that's -- you know, I'm going to do 8 what I think's right. And I'm going to -- you 9 know, I -- I realize that people get themselves in difficult situations there but for the grace 10 11 of God go I. I have been. And I know that people make mistakes. And I think people deserve 12 13 second chances. But I also think that I realize when people are abusive and -- and -- and need to 14 15 have the heavy hand of the -- of -- of a sentence 16 put on them.

Q. All right.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any other questions? Senator Young. EXAMINATION BY SENATOR YOUNG:

Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Morton, thank you for you interest in serving on the circuit court bench. I have a few -- just a couple of questions. One is, how would you describe your judicial philosophy in terms of were you elected to the circuit bench and the application of the

law to the facts before you? Tell us how you
would apply the law to those facts?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- A. I'm not exactly sure I understand exactly your question.
- Q. Well, in terms of -- are you going to -- what -do you think the role of a judge is to apply the
 law as it is written or do you think the role is
 to expand upon that law somehow beyond what is
 written on it -- on the --
- Α. I think judges have an influence on juries, sometimes, that I don't know whether it's intentional or whether it's unintentional. sometimes I think judges have the power and the influence the way that they handle the courtroom or state the law that can unnecessarily affect what juries decide. I will try not to do that. You know, the law's the law. It's not my job to decide what the law is. My job is to tell people what the law is. In other words, how it's written. I'm not there to try and interpret it one way or another. I don't know if that's a good answer. But -- but I've seen, you know, judges apply the law in what I consider to be a -- a manner that I thought that they were affecting the out -- the -- the jurors' opinions.

And I would try to use my experience not to do 1 that. Be as even handed as I could to be as 2 3 really flat and unemotional as I could in telling jurors what the law is. And then deciding points 4 of law between litigants when you don't have --5 when you -- even when you don't have a jury. 6 7 Q. How do you believe your life experiences would 8 influence this -- influence your -- influence you 9 as a circuit judge? 10 Α. Well, I think my experience as a lawyer would 11 influence me more than anything. I've been a public defender. Again I've told you all this, 12 13 and I've been a -- I've been a prosecutor and 14 I've been in private practice and I've run a law 15 firm. And I've dealt with a lot -- lots of types of situations over the years in many different 16 areas of the law. I think I have as much 17 18 experience as anybody that's going to stand 19 before you when it comes to -- to -- to be a 2.0 judge. 21 Thank you. Q. 22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. -- Senator Rankin. 23 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN: 24 Can we go back to Senator Hayes, please. Q. 25 talk about -- now, you are under oath. I would

like to ask you a couple of things. 1 2 Α. Okay. 3 Tell me about --0. I'll be glad to tell you. I can -- I can be glad 4 Α. to tell you about Senator Hayes and --5 No. No. No. 6 Q. 7 Α. -- what a tough man he is. And what -- how he 8 comes across as meek and mild mannered but I can 9 you tell you he's a tough man. 10 Q. I was curious about your four-year stint in the 11 U.S. Senate which you -- you talked about there. Not in it but serving it. 12 13 Α. Right. I -- I was -- I was a gopher. It was in 14 between college and law school. I was not an administrative assistant. I wasn't up there 15 making law. I was a gopher. But I had the 16 wonderful experience of working of the floor at 17 18 the United States Senate. And I saw all these 19 great Senate minds of the late '70s and '80s from Barry Goldwater to Ted Kennedy to everywhere in 2.0 between. And I watched them make law and I 21 22 watched them argue and I watched them fight into 23 the hours of the night. And I was fascinated 24 with it. And it formed a large part of who I am.

25

I respect their -- their professionalism and

1		their dedication. I've seen them you know,
2	·	they didn't have to be doing what they were
3		doing. I've seen them to come to work on
4		Saturdays and Sundays and work late into the
5		night. And I think that for the most part people
6		who do that are dedicated people that are trying
7		to do what's right. And I think they get a bad
8		rap.
9	Q.	My son had the pleasure of of after his
10		freshman year, he's now in his sophomore, here,
11		to work six or seven weeks in D.C. this past May-
12		June, through that period of time. And had an
13		incredible time. Didn't get to see the floor
14		debates but got to sit in on lots of different
15		cool things. Including the Comey hearings. And
16		so, that bit of history you've enjoyed I've just
17		kind of
18	Α.	Yes, sir. It's a it was an unbelievable
19		experience for me. Something that I I wish
20		everybody could have.
21	Q.	Thank you.
22	CHAI	RMAN SMITH: Any further questions?
23	EXAMINATI	ON BY CHAIRMAN SMITH:
24	Q.	Mr. Morton, let me ask you a few questions and
25		I'll first say your wife and I went to high

school together and I've known her for -- as -- I
guess, since I can far remember. And so, I don't
want you telling --

A. You know how I suffer.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Yes, sir. But I don't want you telling any stories about me either. So, I'll -- will qualify that. Let me ask you a couple of questions. And -- and you -- you've got a wealth of experience. And -- and I listened to it. I know you by reputation. I know you personally. And -- and I know you've got a reputation as an attorney as a fair defender of -- of individuals and -- and their -- their liberties that -- that are constitutionally guaranteed to them. And you've addressed a lot of those issues about -about how you -- that's your job and -- and how you would set that aside. But as we go into -it's -- it's -- if you were elected to the bench and you served in the capacity as a judge, what would -- how would you take recommendations from solicitors and -- and listening to solicitor's side of the story and what they believe a appropriate sentence? How would you take that into consideration in formulating a sentence?
- A. I take it very much in to consideration because I

know that solicitors and the -- and the defense attorneys have a unique ability to tell you about a particular case. I understand what solicitors do. I've -- I've been there and I've done that. And I know how they -- their recommendations -you know, I take with a grain of salt. But it's not to say that I take them lightly by any means. They -- they do their job. They have a job to protect the public and protect the people. respect their recommendations. I would certainly listen. I want to be an impartial judge. I want to hear what everybody has to say. So, you know, there's -- there's no question that the recommendation of a solicitor in a particular case has great influence with judges. And I -- I would certainly respect that.

Q. Okay. And on the flip side of that, as -- as you receive recommendations if you were a judge and you listened to the facts and you felt like you could not follow the recommendations of the solicitor and that you felt it was -- that the person before you deserved a punishment that exceeded that recommendation, would you allow them to -- tell them that you're going to have some difficulty following their recommendation

21

22

23

and allow them to withdraw their recommendation -1 2 - withdraw their plea or would you just sentence 3 them taking into consideration the recommendation? 4 I would in fairness to the attorney who was 5 Α. 6 relying on that recommendation, let them 7 withdraw. 8 Q. Okay. And from time I listened to this and I 9 read some of these evaluations that are -- or 10 some of these ballot box surveys and -- and 11 there's some comment about your civil experience in here. But one issue I think -- I think I 12 13 heard you say you practice with 13 lawyers and --14 who have wealth of -- well, not a wealth but a 15 variety of experiences including civil 16 experiences? 17 Yes, sir. My -- yes, sir. Α. 18 Q. Okay. And you have -- I -- I think I've seen, 19 maybe read somewhere a few years ago where you or your firm got some type of verdict. 20 It may have 21 been the Lawyers Weekly or something. But do you 22 participate in civil cases? 23 I do participate in civil cases. I don't usually Α. 24 but I have great -- what I consider to be great 25 civil lawyers in my firm. But I -- I do

participate in -- in civil cases. Not a great deal. But it's -- you know, just being around those guys and we -- we have meetings where we talk about certain cases and -- and how we're going to proceed or whether to proceed or whether to take them and evaluate cases. I think I bring something to the table in that regard.

- Q. And you argue motions from time to time in --
- A. I don't -- you know, I don't argue too many civil motions anymore. I -- I probably haven't argued a civil motion outside of a PCR court in a number of years. But I go in front of the master -- I've got to in front of the master soon on wrongful taking of a car, seizures, those kinds of things. I do some of that.
- Q. Okay. And along the lines of what Mr. Safran was

 -- was asking. I presume you're going to -- if
 you are elected you'll have the unenviable task
 of being a chief administrative judge one day and
 make decisions in civil as well maybe criminal.

 But when lawyers come to you and -- and say, you
 know, Judge I've got to be an a deposition over
 here or I've got -- already committed to this -to this type of case. And -- and I know your
 court would always take priority. How would you

balance
dispos:
A. Well, 1

you've
think y

you've
this ne
here is
their n

healthy

15

12

13

14

16

17

18

19 20

2122

23

24

25

balance conflicts amongst lawyers with the disposition of cases that are pending before you?

- A. Well, I think -- just like anything else, I think you've just got to get into the weeds. And I think you've got ask questions. And I think you've got to get answers from people about why this needs to be put off or why this deposition here is more important or -- or what's going in their practice of law. I certainly have a healthy respect for the roles -- for the jobs that lawyers do and the fact that they're pulled in many different directions. I -- I understand that and certainly would -- would give great value to lawyers who have heavy schedule.
- Q. Okay. And -- and lastly one thing I've been inquiring from candidates for circuit court is obviously you're not a -- you won't be -- would not be involved if elected to -- to the creation of certain alternative courts. But I -- I've come to learn through screening some of the candidates that have come before that y'all are beginning mental health court. You got maybe a drug court.
- A. Mental health court, veterans court.
- Q. Veterans court and things to that effect. So --

so, I -- I guess that kind of answers a lot of 1 2 the question. But is -- do you believe that's a 3 viable option for the disposition of criminal cases for those who would be eligible in that for 4 those type of courts? 5 I do think that would -- I do think it's a viable 6 Α. 7 option. We have a very tough drug court in York 8 County. Tougher than most. I think it's done a 9 world of good for a lot of people. Veterans 10 court, I think all those are -- are -- you know, 11 they're -- they're great ways to dispose of cases and of -- of people's problems that need an 12 13 alternative resolution. I think, for the most 14 part, they're wonderful inventions that I hadn't 15 always had the benefit of as I was younger. think it's -- I think it's a great thing. 16 17 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. All right. Any other 18 questions? All right. Mr. Morton, thank you for your presentation today. This will conclude this 19 portion of your screening process. I want to 20 21 take this opportunity to remind you that pursuant 22 to the Commission's evaluative criteria, the 23 Commission expects candidates to follow the 24 spirit as well as the letter of the ethics law. And we will view violations of the -- or the 25

appearance of impropriety as serious and 1 2 potentially deserving of heavyweight and 3 screening deliberations. On that note, and as you know, the record will remain open until the 4 formal release of the report of qualifications. 5 And you may be called back at such time if the 6 7 need arises. I thank you for offering for this 8 position. And I thank you for your service to 9 the State of South Carolina. 10 MR. MORTON: Thank you very much for your time. 11 Thank you. 12 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you. Safe travels back. 13 MR. MORTON: Thank you, sir. 14 Tell your wife I said hello. CHAIRMAN SMITH: 15 MR. MORTON: Okay. Thank you so much. (Off the Record) 16 Ms. Moody, if you'll come forth, 17 CHAIRMAN SMITH: 18 please, ma'am. Let me turn on my microphone. Ms. Moody, will you raise your right hand. 19 MS. MOODY, being duly sworn, testifies as follows: 2.0 21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Ms. Moody, before you is 22 your personal data questionnaire and your sworn 23 statement. Are these documents that you have 24 submitted to the Commission? 25 MS. MOODY: I believe they are. Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. And are they both correct? 1 2 MS. MOODY: I believe they are. Yes, sir. 3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Does anything need to be changed or updated at this time? 4 MS. MOODY: Other than a scrivener's error. No, sir. 5 6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. We won't hold scrivener's 7 error against you. How about that? 8 MS. MOODY: Thank you. CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do you object to making -- to us 9 10 making these documents and any amendments a part of the record of your sworn testimony? 11 12 MS. MOODY: No, sir. 13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. If you'll hand those 14 documents to Lindi for me please, ma'am. 15 we'll make that a part of the record. Ms. Moody, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has 16 17 thoroughly investigated your qualifications for 18 the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria and has included a ballot box 19 survey, a thorough study of your application 2.0 21 materials, verification of your compliance with 22 State ethics laws, search of newspaper articles 23 in which your name appears, study of previous 24 screenings, and checks for economic conflicts of interest. We have received one affidavit from 25

Marie Assad Faltis, filed in opposition to your 1 2 election. However, the Commission has dismissed 3 this Complaint. No witnesses are present to testify today. Do you wish to make a brief 4 opening statement to the Commission? 5 (EXHIBIT 12 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION 6 7 PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF LEAH B. MOODY) 8 (EXHIBIT 13 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION 9 SWORN STATEMENT OF LEAH B. MOODY) (EXHIBIT 14 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA 10 11 QUESTIONNAIRE OF LEAH B. MOODY) (EXHIBIT 15 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA 12 13 QUESTIONNAIRE OF LEAH B. MOODY) 14 (EXHIBIT 16 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF LEAH B. MOODY) 15 (EXHIBIT 17 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA 16 17 QUESTIONNAIRE OF LEAH B. MOODY) 18 MS. MOODY: Yes, sir. I would just say thank you for 19 allowing me to appear before you here today. Thank you for your service on this committee and 2.0 21 to your community. I would like to thank Andy 22 for his support throughout this process. He's 23 worked with me probably more than he's wanted to. 24 But he's worked with me and I appreciate him. 25 Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Ms. Moody. Will you answer any questions that counsel may have for you?

EXAMINATION BY MR. FIFFICK:

2.0

- Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I note that for that record based on the testimony contained in the candidates PDQ, which has been included in the record with the candidate's consent, Ms. Moody meets the constitutional and statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. Ms. Moody, how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far renders you qualified and will assist you to be an effective circuit court judge?
- A. Well, I think that I have a very broad range of experience. I started off my career as a prosecutor here in Richland County. And I've moved on back to Rock Hill. But I also was in this chamber as a staff counsel and I worked for the Governor -- Governor Jim Hodges. I think that since being in state government and going in to private practice, I think that I've had a broad range of clients. I've represented clients that are non-profit, for profit, the everyday

2.0

citizen, pro bono cases, mothers, fathers, kids, all kinds of people from all walks of life. I think each one of those experiences have been different. Each one of those experiences have allowed me to see and represent my clients at a level that maybe they probably would not have ever expected to be in that situation. And so, that has given me some insight. As far as like representing towns or non-profit, it's exposed me to different areas of the law. So, I think all of my experiences in total would lend to any experience that I might be given the opportunity to have on the bench.

- Q. Thank you, ma'am. Ms. Moody, how would you describe the ideal courtroom environment and how would you accomplish this?
- A. The ideal courtroom environment starts on time, supportive staff, and order to the process. And what I mean by that, when I first started off as a prosecutor I had the opportunity to run plea court. And one of the things I thought was important in running plea court was having some kind of idea of the order of the day. Because the one thing you don't want to have is the court shut down for two to three hours when you have

24

25

pleas that can go forward. You want to keep it running consistently. You want all clients that are with their attorneys have been -- to have signed up or to be ready to go forward before the court. In a civil context, all parties available and ready to go forward, all pre-trial motions handled, and then an understanding from -- if I'm on the bench, an understanding of how the counsel intends their witnesses and what might come back in terms of rebuttal or what have you. Being able to take care of the jury, making sure the jury is comfortable, not wasting the jury's time because they -- you know, they have jobs and they come. And jury service is a serious aspect. want to people to serve on the jury so you don't want to waste their time. Outside of that on a day-to-day, I just think the function of the court is to be efficient. And so, that will go in to the type of technology, documentation that you may have, to document what happened that day in the courtroom or orders that are necessary to administer justice.

Q. Thank you, ma'am. Ms. Moody, could you please describe your experience with the North Carolina Bar exam?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Torture. I took the bar exam, at that time, Α. because the firm that I moved to from -- in Rock Hill had a practice in North Carolina. And I was asked to take the bar. I wasn't necessarily interested in taking the North Carolina bar. They have a different process in terms of their bar. They have a minority force law so it's quite different. Their family court is totally different from ours because those are trial situations where you might go to full-blown jury trial with the North Carolina Bar. So, I missed it by 48 points and I was asked if I wanted to take it again. I decided not to.

Thank you, ma'am. Ms. Moody, the Commission Q. received 259 ballot box surveys regarding you with 35 additional comments, 11 of which were negative. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments, "Ms. Moody will work hard to know the law. She is experience and experience in civil matters as well. Her background as a solo practitioner is experience and qualifications to do this job." However, 11 of the written comments expressed

fair, objective, and has years of criminal trial critical to serving in this position adds to her

24

25

concerns mostly as to Ms. Moody's temperament and academic ability. 13.5 percent of respondents found her unqualified in the area of professional and academic ability. 11.2 percent found her unqualified in the area of experience, and 11.6 percent found her unqualified in the area of judicial temperament. Ms. Moody, how would you respond to allegations that you're temperamental, short-tempered, flighty and thus unfit for the

- Well, I'll deal with flighty first. I don't think that I'm flighty. I think I try to approach every situation positively. Now, I recognize that people may not agree with my view of evidence or my view of the case. And that's okay. I -- I -- I just don't think that I'm flighty. The second one you said, I'm sorry?
- I've got temperamental.
- Temperamental. Without knowing the specific context, I'm not really sure what they mean. Ι know when I go in to the courtroom, when I go in to any panel or any boardroom, I try to get along with everybody. The reason why I try to get along with everybody is because at the end of the day, if I'm representing a client and I cannot

get along with the opposing party, it may have 1 2 some tremendous impact against my client. And at 3 the -- at the end of the day, I don't want to impact my client negatively or cause them -- for 4 instance, in a criminal situation I don't want to 5 6 have a negative impact and cause them to get a 7 unreasonable plea offer. With my clients in 8 civil cases, I can't think of any context in 9 which I've been flighty or temperamental or lost 10 my temper. Either you're going to trial or 11 you're not going to trial. Either you settle the matter or you don't settle the matter. With my 12 13 clients, I try to give them enough information so 14 that they understand that the costs of going to 15 trial can be quite expensive for them. So, if there's anyway to come to a middle ground as it 16 17 relates to their case it might be in their best 18 interest to settle. So, I don't -- I can't 19 really address the context of where somebody might have felt that I was temperamental. 20 21 Thank you, ma'am. How would you respond to Q. 22 allegations that you lack requisite legal 23

knowledge and experience to serve as a circuit court judge?

24

25

Α. Well, I passed the bar the first time I took it.

23

24

25

I passed the test for this -- not for this particular seat, when I ran the first time. been practicing almost 21-22 years. I've not had any issue in handling a case. Now, the only context that I can think somebody might feel that way is if I choose to take a step for my client and they want to go in that direction, such as a plea. They may decide to plea because there are other consequences that could impact them negatively. And we've talked about their particular case. And we decide to go a different direction. Well now, somebody on the other side, from their perspective, if they only see their side and they see the weaknesses in their case, they may feel that I'm making a big mistake or my client is actually not making the right decision. But given what my client needs and what their desires are and what they've asked me to do and what they think after weighing what their decision may be, that's the best decision. someone thinks that I'm not academically astute, that's their perspective.

Q. And as a follow-up, how would you respond to the allegation that when you perceive your legal knowledge as being challenged, you become hostile

and aggressive?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- I don't. I think I have a strong Α. personality. And I think that comes off as soon as I enter any courtroom, that I'm not shrinking violet. I know how to defend myself and I know how to defend my clients. And I'm going to do that zealously. Because that's my obligation. would say that I'm a trial lawyer. So as a trial lawyer, it's a adversarial situation. So, when I go to court, you know, while I -- I would love to like be friends with everybody in the courtroom. And quite frankly with the clerk of court, I have a good relationship with all the personnel with the clerks of court. Sometimes, you can not -you can not be warm and fuzzy with everybody. So, you have to represent your client. Clients pay attention to that and if they feel that you are working with another, say for instance, a solicitor, that's something for them to grievance you over. I've had comments from clients where they felt like I was being too nice to the opposing side so I have to be careful and -- and balance that. But I don't think that I have a -a negative disposition.
- Q. How would you respond to allegations you come to

court appointed-cases unprepared?

Α.	Court appointed-cases, unprepared. I don't have
	court-appointed cases. I have state contract
	cases. I deal I do PCR cases, post conviction
	relief hearings. And I did handle cases in
	Spartanburg, Cherokee County, Union and York
	County, and then I come to Columbia, Richland
	County. I I think I have a system with my PCR
	cases. Initially, when I start off with my PCR
	cases, they're the clients receive a letter.
	The previous counsel receives a letter. The
	clerk of court receives a letter. And that
	Attorney General's office gets a letter. In
	Columbia, the judge controls the docket. In York
	County the judge does not control the docket.
	The AG determines the docket. So, in those cases
	with those letters initially, those letters go
	out and I request for all documents from all
	parties so that I can fully read that file.
	Because you can not read your client's
	application and find the evidence there in their
	documents because sometimes they misunderstand
	something. So, if you're reading the previous
	file, you read the discovery from the previous
	lawyer, the AG's position, the grounds that the

client presents as grounds for PCR, you can do 1 2 your legal research. After I read all of those documents, I handle those cases as to talking to 3 4 my client and going through all of the allegations and explaining to them the law. 5 6 Sometimes clients have additional information. 7 If we have court and they want to give me the 8 additional information and I feel that it is 9 substantial information, I try not to put their 10 PCR application in jeopardy. I might ask for a 11 continuance. And that's what I would do in any case if I felt there was evidence that needed to 12 be presented or vetted to make sure that it is 13 true and correct, and that it is something that 14 15 will not harm my client. Thank you, ma'am. Now, some questions we've 16 Q. already discussed about some lawsuits but we need 17 18 to get those into the record. 19 Okay. Α. Ms. Moody, you've indicated in your PDQ that a 20 Q. 21 lawsuit was filed against you in 2014 in 22 magistrate's court by Ambrosia Wilson. Please 23 explain the nature and disposition of this 24 lawsuit? 25 Α. That was a case against my law firm for indigent

25

I got a -- well, at that time I did do an appointed case and it was a Hispanic client. had actually three Hispanic clients in that situation where they give you court-appointed Well excuse me, court interpreters names names. for court-appointed cases and you have to file an ex parte request for a translator. So, in that particular case I explained to her -- we sent her letters that I was representing the indigent defense. And so, with that you have to go through filing your fees and expenses with indigent defense. They have a specific process. Those processes are outlined on their outline -excuse me, on their website. We have to electronically enter that information in. So, if you're billing is not in the correct structure for the ladies that go over the billing and review the expenses, they will kick it back to you. And so, I can not change her -- I could not change her billing so my office contacted her and explained to her that her billing was incorrect and that the SCCID (indigent defense) would not accept it. So, with that if they will not accept that billing, they will not pay you. I had not been paid on that case either -- or cases either.

I could not bill until the cases were closed and 1 2 they were not closed. She did not understand 3 that after sending her several emails. you know, gotten her documentation. I explained 4 to her personally how she needed to correct it. 5 She got it to me. I have to then submit it to 6 7 the SCCID. They have a process and I don't 8 control when they cut their checks but it goes to 9 the comptroller general. That case is resolved because her funds -- when I contacted her to come 10 11 meet with me, they were put in a trust account because the SCCID made the check out to my law 12 13 firm. The funds were put in the trust account 14 because those are not my funds. So, that I could 15 disburse to her the funds out of the trust account to pay her. So, once I gave that 16 17 information to the magistrate's court that that's 18 the occurrence -- how it occurred, the case was 19 dismissed. But she received her payment but it was not because I was trying to withhold or not 2.0 21 pay her. And that was because I had no control 22 over the situation. And just as I instructed 23 her, she has to submit her billing the same way I 24 have to do it the same way also. 25 Q. Thank you, Ms. Moody. Ms. Moody, you've

indicated in your PDQ that a lawsuit was filed 1 2 against you in 2001 in Richland County Circuit 3 Court by Carnaby Square Association. Please explain the nature and disposition of this 4 lawsuit? 5 That was when I -- I -- I'd need to look at one 6 Α. 7 document. 8 Q. I believe that's one of the homeowners 9 association cases. Regime fees possibly. 10 Α. Yes. I had a property manager in -- managing my 11 property and she did not pay, from the rent, the 12 regime fees. You have to pay -- at that time it 13 was like \$100 -- \$125. And when I learned of it, 14 I immediately paid it. 15 Q. Similar situation, you've indicated in your PDQ that a lawsuit was filed against you in 2015 in 16 Richland County Circuit Court by Carnaby Square 17 18 Horizontal Property Regime. Please explain the 19 nature and disposition of this lawsuit? Well, I used to own property there but when my 20 Α. 21 mother passed away there was property that she 22 owned there and my brother's property. My brother's regime fees had been normally taken out 23 of my mother's account. And I believe in that 24 25 situation I have to look at the specific one but

it was resolved. It was paid. But I was the PR
of the estate. And so, that's why my name was
named in it.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. Thank you, Ms. Moody. Ms. Moody you've indicated your PTQ -- PDQ that a lawsuit was filed against you in your capacity as a member of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education in 2015 in U.S. District Court by Angelica Rocha Herrera. Please explain the nature and disposition of this lawsuit?
- That was a lawsuit where Ms. Herrera -- I think Α. I'm saying it correctly -- she filed against the Commissioners of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. And I served by virtue of being on the board for the research universities, Clemson, USC, MUSC. She filed under the 14th Amendment and the due -- and substantive due process of the Constitution that the Commissioners in their administration and enforcement of the state law that the Commission somehow violated her constitutional rights. Ms. Herrera was a individual who is a Mexican/American and she applied to USC Upstate and Converse. The tuition was determined by her state residence. She lived in South Carolina.

Her parents were not citizens. And so, the policy, which is issued from the legislature, tells us how, you know, residency is determined and CHE is the regulatory entity that handles that. So, that regulatory entity told the universities how to handle residency. And they classified Ms. Herrera as being a out-of-state citizen/student. So, she had to pay out-of-state tuition which is significantly higher than instate tuition. She decided not to go to Upstate but she went to Converse and she still had to pay the out-of-state tuition. So, she sued us all and our enforcement and administration of the state law. And that case was dismissed, particularly because she could not allege any specific incidents where any Commissioner actually took any action to prevent her from having in-state tuition. She later filed an appeal and that was -- the District Court affirmed that appeal -- the lower court's decision.

23

24

Thank you, ma'am. Ms. Moody, you've -- you've Q. amended your PDQ to reflect the imposition and subsequent satisfaction of a 2015 lien on property at 840 Rock Hill Drive by the Fairway

Woods Homeowner's Association. Could you please 1 2 describe the circumstances surrounding this lien? 3 That's a \$200 yearly charge and our homeowner's Α. association was not within -- well, I'm not -- I 4 don't live there anymore but the homeowner's 5 association was not in the charge of the 6 7 residence. When it was brought to my attention 8 that I had not paid it, I paid it. 9 Thank you, ma'am. Could you please describe the Q. circumstances surrounding a lien filed against 10 11 you by the South Carolina Department of Revenue in 2009? I note that it was satisfied less than 12 13 two months after being filed. 14 Right. So, that had something to do with my Α. 15 I had an accountant filing my taxes and I got a notice. I did a lien with -- not a lien --16 I did an installment and I didn't realize that 17 18 when you do an installment payment with South 19 Carolina, they file a lien against you. So, when I learned that there was a lien, I immediately 2.0 21 paid it off. 22 MR. FIFFICK: Thank you, ma'am. Mr. Chairman, I would 23 like to ask that we now go into executive session 24 to handle a matter. 25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Mr. -- Representative

Murphy moves that we go in Murphy moves that we 1 2 go in executive session. All in favor say aye. 3 (Ayes are heard.) CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed? 4 (No response is heard.) 5 6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ayes have it. We'll go into executive session. We'll close the doors. 7 8 Everyone please turn off their microphones. 9 (Off the record) 10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Senator Hayes moves that 11 we go back on the record. I want to thank everyone for this. The Judicial Merit Selection 12 13 Commission is now back on the record. For the 14 record, I'd like to state that we have been executive session however, no decisions were made 15 and no votes were taken during executive session. 16 Mr. Fiffick, if you will continue, please, sir. 17 18 MR. FIFFICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few housekeeping issues. Ms. Moody, are 19 Q. you aware that as a judicial candidate, you are 20 bound by the code of judicial conduct as found in 21 22 Rule 501 of the South Carolina Appellate Court 23 Rules? 24 Yes, sir. Α. Ms. Moody, since submitting your letter of 25 Q.

1 intent, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy? 2 3 No, sir. Α. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you 4 Q. sought or received the -- the pledge of any 5 6 legislator either prior to this date or pending 7 the outcome of your screening? 8 Α. No, sir. Have you asked any third parties to contact 9 Q. 10 members of the General Assembly on your behalf or 11 are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene 12 in this process on your behalf? 13 Α. No, sir. Have you reviewed and do you understand the 14 Q. 15 Commission's guidelines on pledging and South Carolina Code Section 2-19-70(e)? 16 T do. 17 Α. 18 Q. I would note that the Piedmont Citizens Committee 19 found Ms. Moody to be well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, 20 21 professional and academic ability, character, 22 reputation, experience and judicial temperament. 23 And qualified in the remaining evaluative 24 criteria of constitutional qualifications, 25 physical health, and mental stability.

Committee went on to say that Ms. Moody is an 1 2 experienced lawyer who practices in a wide range 3 of areas. Her enthusiasm and commitment to public service are notable. And the Committee 4 believes that she would be a particularly 5 energetic and diligent circuit court judge. 6 7 Chairman, I note for the record that any concerns 8 raised during the investigation by staff 9 regarding the candidate were incorporated into 10 the questioning of the candidate today. Chairman, I have no further questions. 11 12 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you. Any questions 13 of Ms. Moody? Senator Hayes. 14 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR HAYES: 15 Q. Thank you. Hello, Ms. Moody. I had the honor serving with her mother for many years in General 16 17 Assembly. I have reviewed your background. 18 just like you to -- not talking so much about 19 your criminal or civil experience, but what in your background do you think equips you to be a -2.0 21 - a good judge? And what may be a weakness in 22 your background? 23 Well, I think just having experienced a lot of Α. 24 stuff.

Is that the plus? How about any -- any negatives

25

Q.

1		in your background?
2	Α.	Well, I would say I don't have any negatives.
3	Q.	Okay. All right. Well, that's
4	Α.	I mean, I'm I'm sure I'm not I know I'm not
5		perfect.
6	Q.	Yeah.
7	A.	I think that you mentioned my mother. I
8		apologize.
9	Q.	That's kind of a tough question to answer
10		sometime. But I certainly appreciate your
11		experience. Thank you.
12	A.	I'd say when you have clients situations similar
13		to that or clients that have brothers that are
14		handicapped, I particularly identify with them.
15		When you have families that get broken up, I
16		particularly understand the angst that might go
17		along with a mother or a father or the kid
18		themselves. So, I'm very passionate about my
19		clients. And I will protect them just because
20		sometimes they don't have a voice and I'm that
21		I'm the only voice for them.
22	Q.	Thank you. I appreciate that.
23	CHAI	RMAN SMITH: Senator Rankin.
24	EXAMINATI	ON BY SENATOR RANKIN:
25	Q.	And you are the biggest Clemson fan in the room,

1		correct?
2	Α.	Absolutely not.
3	Q.	You have are you presently on the USC board?
4	Α.	Yes, sir.
5	Q.	And you've been on that for how long now?
6	Α.	Since 2009.
7	Q.	And you single handily have brought us how many
8		national championships? Three? Four?
9	Α.	You just want to go there?
10	Q.	You didn't participate on either of the teams but
11		anyway. I I obviously know you. I appreciate
12		your passion and your optimism. Your your
13		zeal. And so I commend you for offering for this
14		position.
15	Α.	Thank you.
16	CHAI	RMAN SMITH: Any other questions? Senator Young.
17	EXAMINATI	ON BY SENATOR YOUNG:
18	Q.	Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Moody, I have just
19		a couple of questions. One is, first of all I
20		want to thank you for your interest in serving on
21		the circuit court bench. And the second or
22		the first question I have is, how would you
23		describe your judicial philosophy in terms of how
24		you you would apply the law to the facts that
25		are before you if and when you're elected to the

circuit court? 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- As the law states, I will uphold the law. Α. my responsibility to uphold the integrity and the independence of the court. And I will follow the law.
- And you have -- you've been in private practice Q. as a solo practitioner for several years; is that right?
- Thirteen. Α.
- And so, you are -- I mean, is it fair to say that Q. you're familiar with the challenges that face lawyers who practice in smaller firms who have a trial practice and have cases in multiple courts?
- Yes, it's difficult. So, I understand the Α. balance that has to be made because either you're the visionary, the supervisor, the technician at any given point. But the work has to get done. And so, the -- often times your life is not your own because you have an obligation to your clients. And, you know, I take that seriously. It requires you to work on the weekends. Sometimes you have difficult clients. Sometimes those clients may not understand their expectation is not reasonable. On the other

14 15 16 17 18 19 2.0 21 22 23 24 25 side, as having been a prosecutor, I recognize

1		well what the prosecutors have to deal with when
2		they have victims. And the experiences those
3		victims may be having which are new to them. And
4		so, you have to balance that. It it it's -
5		- it's a interesting experience when you are solo
6		and you are your own employer. You have an
7		opportunity to see everything and to have some
8		level of understanding from other people's
9		experiences, what they might be going through.
10	Q.	And so, if you were elected to the bench and
11		you're in a circuit court position, you would be
12		able to relate to attorneys who have to come
13		before you and tell you that they may need a
14		continuance for a reason that might be related to
15		a family trip or a family obligation and they
16		just can't get it all done within the time frame
17		that's expected of them? I mean, you would
18		would you be sensitive to that?
19	A.	Oh, absolutely.
20	Q.	Yeah.
21	Α.	Because I haven't had a vacation this entire year
22		so I'm definitely sensitive to it.
23	Q.	Thank you.
24	CHAI	RMAN SMITH: Any other questions?
25	EXAMINATI	ON BY CHAIRMAN SMITH:

- Q. Ms. Moody, just following up along that -- along that is if you were elected judge, I -- I would presume, you know, you have civil cases and criminal cases and lawyers would come to you and say, you know, I've got depositions where we've got six lawyers have been scheduled for six weeks. And judge if I have to come to court today, it's going to mess up the depositions. We're going to have to start over. Or someone's got a soccer game at 4:00 o'clock or something like that. And that conflicts with the disposition of the cases that you have or maybe scheduled. How would you generally handle that?
- A. Well, I -- actually, I -- I think I would have to look at each situation on a case by case basis. If it's something that is an emergency, say, for instance a family matter, somebody's sick, what have you, obviously, you have to really take that into consideration. When you have someone coming in from Virginia to South Carolina to testify in a matter and it's been scheduled and there's been expenses paid, what have you, there's a balancing there. And I -- I -- I recognize that there may be an expense to one individual versus another.

 And I would just have to look at it from the case

by case basis and make the best decision so that 1 2 it accommodates moving the case docket along, as 3 well as taking in to consideration what that individual lawyer might be experiencing. 4 And you, obviously, would balance the quality of 5 Q. 6 life of an attorney as opposed -- I think you say 7 8 Α. It's important. -- you haven't had a vacation all -- all year. 9 Q. 10 presume you're like the rest of us that have to 11 go in Saturdays and Sundays while all our friends are enjoying football games and doing other 12 13 things. But either you get to the football game then 14 Α. 15 you've got to go back to work. So, there --I -- I'm with you on that. That's one of the 16 Q. 17 only guilty pleasures I have is to be able to go 18 to football games. So, you know, along those 19 lines also you prosecuted before. And I think you've been in -- in -- you said you've done some 2.0 21 defense work now as a -- as a solo practitioner. 22 Have you -- I'm learning through this process 23 today, y'all have got some alternative courts in 24 York County. Drug court, mental health court. 25 think they said it's either starting a mental

3

4

5

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

health court or a veterans court. What -- what's your philosophy on alternative courts and alternative, you know, and -- and diversionary programs as it comes to criminal cases?

Well, I've actually handled cases here in Α. Richland County in the mental health court. that was an eye-opening experience. Because you find more people who commit crimes that have mental issues. Unfortunately they don't know they have a mental health issue. And so, something has happened where there has been a breakdown and they have been brought to the hospital and that's how they get into the hospital. So, I understand that they might go out and commit crime and so that's how they end up in the -- in the system. But as a lawyer -in -- in my practice, when I recognize something like that with my clients, if there's an alternative for them to go to diversionary court, I try to get them in that diversionary court. Because a 26-year-old female who has had a nervous breakdown and realizes all of a sudden now she has a diagnosis. Whatever it may be, schizophrenia, bi-polarism. She has this diagnosis. She lacks insight as to what's going

24

25

on with her. She lacks insight how the medicine makes her chemically balanced and that she has to take that medicine. It changes her life completely. So, when I have a client that's in a situation like that, I make sure that I try to exhaust any alternative. And I think they're good. Because we can't just place them in detention because then in detention, there's going to be a different kind of experience there too. And I can't -- well, my clients I -- they might have some issues or whatever but they're my clients. And so, I can't fathom any of my clients being in custody for the first time and it's -- the basis of it is they committed a crime and they have a mental illness. So, that's very, very important. A lot of things could happen to them in custody. So, I believe in those programs. I think most of my clients that have gone through those programs have done well with the exception of a few that have been back to me. But they've -- most of them have done well. And I think the mental health court is a good thing. CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. All right. Any further questions, guys? All right. Ms. Moody, thank you. This concludes this portion of your

screening process. I want to take this 1 2 opportunity to remind you that pursuant to the 3 Commission's evaluative criteria, the Commission 4 expects candidates to follow the spirit as well as the letter of the ethics laws. And we will 5 view violations or appearances of impropriety as 6 7 serious and potentially deserving of heavyweight 8 and screening deliberations. On that note, and 9 as you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of 10 11 qualifications. And you may be called back at such time if the need arises. I thank you for 12 13 offering. And I thank you for your service to 14 the State of South Carolina. MS. MOODY: Thank you. Thank you so much. 15 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Safe travels back home. 16 17 MS. MOODY: Thank you. 18 (Executive Session) 19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ladies and gentleman, thank y'all. The Judicial Merritt Selection Commission is now 2.0 21 back on the record. For the record, I'd like to 22 say that we've been in executive session however, 23 no decisions were made and no votes were taken. 24 We're going to proceed to vote on two races. The -- the 3rd circuit seat number 2 and the 16th 25

circuit seat number 1. We'll proceed with the 1 2 3rd circuit first. If you'll call the names and 3 if you -- and we're going -- when you vote, I want to make sure everybody raises their hand for 4 a vote and staff will record it. So, don't put 5 your hand down until -- until a -- staff says 6 7 it's okay to put your hand down. All right. 8 Yes, sir. 9 MR. HITCHCOCK: Can I make a -- a motion that -- that 10 as far as the findings that the candidates are 11 qualified, that we take them up as a slate. I would move that they all be qualified. 12 13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Hitchcock moves that we find an 14 all candidates qualified. Mr. Safran seconds it. 15 Any -- for the 3rd circuit seat number 1. there any discussion on that? Seat two. Sorry. 16 I need to read. Seat two. Any discussions? 17 18 in favor raise their hand signifying aye. All 19 opposed raise their hands. Let the record reflect that's a unanimous vote. All candidates 2.0 are filed -- found qualified so we're going to 21 22 move to the candidates that are nominated. 23 MS. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman. 24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes -- yes, ma'am. Go ahead. MS. CRAWFORD: Just a quick reminder. I will call the 25

names of the qualified candidates in alphabetical 1 2 order. Each commission member has three votes. 3 You're asked to find an individual qualified and nominated. Any candidate that receives six or 4 more votes will be considered qualified and 5 nominated at the end of that vote unless there is 6 7 a tie. Any candidate that does not get any votes 8 will be removed from consideration on any 9 subsequent ballot that occurs. Does anyone have 10 any questions? No. May I proceed Mr. Chairman? 11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Proceed. MS. CRAWFORD: The Honorable Kristi Fisher Curtis. 12 13 Okay, ten. Samuel Lanue Floyd. Mr. Floyd 14 received zero. Ryan Kirk Griffin. Ten. Mr. 15 Timothy Ward Murphy. Ten. Okay. Mr. Chairman, the three candidates are found qualified and 16 nominated with ten votes each are The Honorable 17 18 Kristi Fisher Curtis, Ryan Kirk Griffin, and Timothy Ward Murphy. 19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you. Let's proceed 2.0 to circuit court -- 16th circuit seat number one. 21 22 Mr. Hitchcock? 23 MR. HITCHCOCK: Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion 24 that we take the -- the -- that we take the 25 candidates up as a slate for purposes of finding

1	them qualified. And I would move that they all
2	be found qualified.
3	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Mr. Hitchcock moves they
4	be all be found qualified. Mr. Safran
5	seconds. Any discussion on that motion? All
6	right. No discussion. All in favor of all the
7	candidates being found qualified, please raise
8	their hands.
9	MS. CRAWFORD: For circuit court.
10	CHAIRMAN SMITH: For for circuit court the 16th
11	circuit seat number one. All right. All opposed
12	please raise your hands. All right. All
13	candidates are hereby found qualified and let the
14	record reflect that was a unanimous vote. We'll
15	move to the nominated of the candidates.
16	MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. Bryson John Barrowclough. Lisa
17	G. Collins. William Angus McKinnon. James
18	Michael Morton. Nine.
19	SENATOR RANKIN: Ten. Was it ten?
20	MS. CRAWFORD: No. Nine.
21	SENATOR RANKING: Who didn't vote?
22	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ronnie didn't.
23	MR. SABB: I didn't.
24	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. And then Leah Moody.
25	MS. CRAWFORD: Leah B. Moody.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: If y'all -- if you didn't vote for 1 2 Leah B. Moody -- let me make sure this is right -3 - you would still check her as qualified, okay. And -- and same with Sam Floyd. If you did not 4 vote for Sam Floyd, you would check him 5 6 qualified. You want to change your vote -- or 7 you make a motion to reconsider your vote? All 8 right. Mr. Rutherford moves to reconsider his 9 vote. All in favor say aye. 10 (Ayes are heard.) 11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed. Ayes have it. So, the vote has back up for Leah to -- votes back up for 12 13 James Michael Morton. All right. Mr. Rutherford 14 moves that we -- all right. So, let's -- let's -15 - let's back up. Mr. Rutherford moves to reconsider the vote on William Angus McKinnon. 16 17 So, we are back up on the vote of William Angus 18 McKinnon for the 16th circuit, seat number one. 19 All in favor of nominating Mr. McKinnon, please raise your hand. 2.0 21 MS. CRAWFORD: Nine. 22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. All right. All -- well, no. 23 Okay. Then -- then the next vote, we -- we're 24 moving to -- we're moving -- and then Mr. 25 Rutherford moves to reconsider the vote on Leah

1 V. Moody. All in favor say aye. 2 (Ayes are heard.) 3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed. Ayes have it. So, we're going to back up to vote on Leah B. Moody. 4 All in favor of nominating Leah B. Moody, please 5 6 raise your hand. So -- okay. All right. So, 7 with that being said, the -- all candidates are 8 found qualified for the 16th judicial circuit 9 seat number one and -- and Bryson John 10 Barrowclough is -- is -- is nominated. William 11 Angus McKinnon is nominated. And James Michael Morton is nominated. 12 13 MS. CRAWFORD: Yes, sir. 14 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. And so, that concludes 15 the votes on the 3rd judicial circuit, seat number two and the 16th judicial circuit, seat 16 17 number one. And we're going to take a five-18 minute break. And staff, please contact your candidates if you had candidates in this race. 19 (Off the Record) 20 21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. We're back on the record. 22 Judge Kinlaw, appreciate you being here. We --23 yes, you're right. Did we come out of executive 24 session, on -- yeah, we voted on the record. 25 Okay. All right. Long day. All right, Judge

1	Kinlaw, appreciate your patience. I'm sorry.
2	We're we're, as we say optimistic. You've
3	been through this process a couple of times so I
4	think you learn we don't run on time too too
5	much.
6	JUDGE KINLAW: I'm okay.
7	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Will you raise your right hand
8	please, sir?
9	JUDGE KINLAW, being duly sworn, testifies as follows:
10	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Judge Kinlaw, you've got before you
11	your personal data questionnaire and your sworn
12	statement. Are those documents that you
13	submitted to the Commission?
14	JUDGE KINLAW: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are they both correct?
16	JUDGE KINLAW: Yes, they are.
17	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Does anything need to be changed or
18	updated at this time?
19	JUDGE KINLAW: No.
20	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do you object to making these
21	documents and any amendments a part of the record
22	of your sworn testimony?
23	JUDGE KINLAW: No objection.
24	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Without objection, we're
25	going to make those documents if you'll hand them

to Lindi for me, please sir. 1 2 (EXHIBIT 18 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION 3 PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE ALEX KINLAW, JR.) 4 (EXHIBIT 19 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION 5 SWORN STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ALEX KINLAW, JR.) 6 (EXHIBIT 20 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA 7 8 QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE ALEX KINLAW, JR.) 9 (EXHIBIT 21 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE ALEX KINLAW, JR.) 10 11 JUDGE KINLAW: All right. 12 CHAIRMAN SMITH: And we're going to make those 13 documents a part of your sworn testimony. All 14 right. Judge Kinlaw, the Judicial Merit 15 Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry 16 is focused on nine evaluative criteria and has 17 18 included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your 19 compliance with State ethics laws, search of 2.0 21 newspaper articles in which your name appears, 22 study of previous screenings and checks for 23 economic conflicts of interest. We have received 24 no affidavits filed in opposition to your 25 election and no witnesses are present to testify.

Do you wish to make a brief opening statement to 1 2 the Commission? 3 JUDGE KINLAW: Yes. First of all, I'd -- I -- I have had the absolute privilege to serve as family 4 court judge for the last nine years. And during 5 that nine-year period of time, I have had the 6 7 opportunity to hold court in 31 counties. And 8 I've -- I've touched the pulse of everybody that 9 -- that I've met or I've been -- interacted with. 10 And I just hope that the impact that I've had in 11 the last nine years on the individuals that have come before me is as beneficial as the impact 12 13 that they've had upon me. And I -- I've -- I 14 considered serving on the -- on the bench a 15 privilege. I've enjoyed it. And I just want to say thank you. The -- this body and the General 16 Assembly for bestowing confidence in me nine 17 18 years ago -- almost nine years ago, to give me 19 that opportunity. And I just want to say thank you for that. 2.0 21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Judge. Answer any 22 questions that counsel may have. Brian. 23 EXAMINATION BY MR. COHL: 24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good evening, Judge Q. 25 Kinlaw.

1 A. Yes.

2.0

- Q. I note for the record that based on the testimony contained in the candidate's personal data questionnaire, which has been included in the record with the candidate's consent, Judge Alex Kinlaw meets the constitutional and statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. Judge Kinlaw, how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far renders you qualified and will assist you to be an effective circuit court judge?
- A. Well -- and I'll just piggy back on what I said earlier. I've had the opportunity to serve on the family court bench for some nine years.

 Prior to that, I was in private practice for almost 22-23 years. During that period of time, I had the opportunity to handle a matter -- a number of civil matters. And as a matter of fact, I am the only judge on the family court bench that has the unique experience of having served as lead counsel in five death penalty cases that I handled over the last -- the first part of my -- my tenure. And based upon what I've done on the family court -- and the family

court is -- is -- covers a lot of areas. 1 2 And those areas, domestic, criminal, abuse and neglect. I've learned a lot. And I just feel 3 like I'm ready to carry that knowledge that I not 4 only learned in the 20 some odd years I was in 5 6 private practice but also the nine years that 7 I've served on the bench in the family court. 8 And that's -- and, you know, it's -- I want to 9 have the -- the ability to continue to serve. 10 And my knowledge over the years not only in -- in 11 family law was -- was great, but my knowledge in other areas as well. And I -- and that's --12 13 that's why I wanted to be given the opportunity 14 to share that again with this state. 15 Q. Thank you very much, Judge Kinlaw. 16 Α. All right. 17 What do you believe your reputation is among Q. 18 attorneys that practice before you? Well, I'll tell you this. What -- and I'll tell 19 Α. you what I've heard and what -- what lawyers tell 20

A. Well, I'll tell you this. What -- and I'll tell you what I've heard and what -- what lawyers tell me and what I -- what -- you know, one of the unique things about a trial judge is that if you've done what lawyers have done, which means that you have handled cases. You have interviewed clients. You have handled court

21

22

23

24

dockets. If you've done that, you've got a unique perspective as a trial judge. And let me give you an example. I understand when a lawyer calls the court and says, I'm going to -- Judge, I'm going to be about ten minutes late because I'm trying to get from Anderson to Laurens because Anderson is running behind, can you help. And what I try to do because I -- I -- I've been there and I've done that. So, what I try to do is I say, look I'll work you in. We'll get it done. And -- and -- and also -- I also try to -and I understand this is the other part. When you practice law you understand when lawyers have difficult clients. You see that. You're able to gauge that. And since you've got a sense of that since you've done that, you -- you -- you kind of know as a trial judge whether or not how to conduct the court. Because if the -- if the litigant is -- is giving the lawyer some difficulty then you've got to navigate around that. But you only know that if you've done that.

23

24

Thank you, Judge Kinlaw. The Commission received Q. 401 ballot box surveys regarding your candidacy with 40 providing additional comments.

ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. "Judge Kinlaw has a great deal of integrity and is extremely knowledgeable and experienced as a jurist. Judge Kinlaw is always fair to all parties and displays excellent temperament. He has an excellent demeanor and his skill as a family court judge would serve him greatly." Several of the comments, however, address concerns in the areas of work ethic and judicial temperament. As to work ethic, a comment provided that Judge Kinlaw has a reputation for not being a hard worker. What response would you offer to this concern?

A. Well, let me just say this. In the 13th judicial circuit, in the family court, that circuit has more cases than any other circuit in the state.

I served as chief administrative judge on two stints. Two stints. The first time I served as chief administrative judge, I made some changes in the flow of cases. And the reason I did that was because we didn't have a whole lot of -- we had -- we had -- we had some judges but we didn't have a whole lot of judges back then. So, the judges that we had, we had to move the cases.

So, I reduced cases that took the -- the

25

litigants or the lawyers were asking for 30 minutes to the 15 minutes to move the docket There were some -- there were some instances where we made the Department of Social Services not try to negotiate the cases in the hall but -- but come in and put them on the record. So, we -- we navigated around that. That took a lot of work. My second stint as chief administrative judge -- and let me just tell you this. Since I -- since 2008, 2009 when I appeared before this body several times, I don't know if everybody understands the impact of pro se litigants and -- and -- and how that's impacted what we do in family court. And what I'm getting ready to say, Brian, is I'll probably dovetail into your next question about the whole -- the -- the temperament question because I want to talk about that just for a second. Since I have been on the bench, and since 2009, pro se cases have increased at least 35-40 percent. And when I started, the pro se cases were namely defendants. But now we have pro se plaintiffs. Pro se defendants. And a lot of these litigants, some of them could afford an attorney, some could So, in order to move the cases along, I

25

came up with -- you know what -- and I'll always be proud of this no matter what happens. up with a system, a questionnaire, that were given to pro se litigants. I understand they get information off the website and all that. But I came up with a questionnaire that I gave pro se litigants. I came up with it where they have to complete certain things to -- before they could get on the trial docket. In other words, you're not going to waste time where you allow judges to -- to tell the pro se litigant you haven't had service. You -- you haven't sent notice to the other side. So, there was a checklist that -that I got from a -- from a clerk in Jasper County. And you learn some things when you go to these different counties because a lot of these clerks -- you learn from the staff and the clerks too, as judges. I saw what they were doing and I said I'm going to bring back this to the busiest circuit in the state, Greenville, and see if we can do it. And I implemented it and now the pro se litigant when they're -- when they file their pleadings -- file their action with the court, they have to fill out a questionnaire and they attach it to the hearing request saying that

25

they've complied with all of these things. the key thing is, they're attaching the affidavit of service. And that's the main thing that allows cases to be continued. Because of that, we've moved a tremendous amount of cases. So, on the work ethic part -- and I -- I hate to say this but I really take issue with that because we work very hard up in Greenville. And we've moved a lot of cases during my tenure as chief administrative judge. And we've got some fine judges there and that we work extremely hard. We're on the bench 95 percent of the time. We're on the bench -- we sit on the bench more than the circuit court judges that -- if you -- if you do a comparison. And I -- and I'm just saying, we -- we sit on the bench every single day. And so, I don't know if there's a question you're going to ask me about how you can improve flow on the circuit court. I don't know if you're going to get there, but if you get -- if that question comes out, I certainly want to address it. But -- so, that's the kind of work that we do in Greenville all the time. Now, temperament. me just say this and I -- I -- I sort of alluded to that just a minute ago. The role of the -- of

25

the -- of the -- at least family court judge has changed since I -- there a little bit. Let me tell you why. We find ourselves trying to straddle the line between being -- you're going to be the trial judge and you want to be fair. But when you've got pro se litigants in your courtroom who's never been in court before who have no idea about the decorum of the courtroom, a lot of them, things sometimes get out of hand. And you find yourself as a trial judge trying to be a referee and a trial judge at the same time. And you've got to make certain that you keep control of the courtroom but also you've got to be fair litigants as well. So -- and family court is a very emotional stage. We try to navigate around that. And we try to make parties comfortable. But more often then not -- more so know than ever before, we're dealing with -- with conduct issues. Not necessarily with the lawyers. I think lawyers have gotten -- have gotten a lot -- a lot better. I think we had a few years ago a civility oath we all had to -- to abide by. But we're still trying to navigate the pro se litigant and to make sure that the cases move and the -- the pro se litigant and the

conduct that happens in the courtroom delays the 1 2 process. So, sometimes our parties confuse the 3 trial judge trying to restore order and keep things going to -- to some lack of temperament. 4 And I certainly -- I'm not saying that that's 5 what the -- what the person meant. But I 6 7 certainly think that this committee needs to know 8 that the role of the family court judge has 9 changed. And even the trial judge on any level. 10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Judge you bring up a good point. 11 That's very interesting to me and I -- so I'm 12 going to go ahead and jump in here and ask you 13 some questions about this. What -- what's your 14 -- I -- I understand you need to orderly move the 15 court when you have pro se litigants. And I -- I say fortunately, I don't practice in the family 16 court anymore -- any longer. And I know there's 17 18 been proliferation of there and the access of 19 justice is encouraging that. But what's the judge's role as trying to give legal advice 20 21 versus the orderly moving the case? What -- what 22 -- what's your philosophy on that? JUDGE KINLAW: Well, let me -- let me -- let me answer 23 24 it this way. Pro se litigants, a lot of them are 25 of the opinion that the trial judge should show

some deference to them because they appear without benefit of counsel.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN SMITH: You're right about that.

JUDGE KINLAW: And the trial judge -- and what I've done in -- in the -- what I try to do is at the beginning, I have the spiel, for lack of better terminology, that I tell both sides. The pro se litigant I say, ma'am or sir -- I say, I'm going to be fair to both sides. But I want you to clearly understand that I can't assist you in the case and I can't give you legal advice. And I also indicate to them that during the course of this trial, there -- you're going to have some objections made by the other side. And you have the right to make objections. But I have to make a determination whether you have a legal objection or whether it's a factual objection. And it -- and to piggy back and to move on with your question, to move the case along if a pro se litigant jumps up and makes an objection because the litigant -- I mean, the pro se litigant objects to the witness' testimony and that happens a lot. For example, I don't think she's telling the truth. Well, that's a -- that's -that's a -- that's a factual objection.

something that can be handled on cross-1 2 examination. And I would say to the pro se 3 litigant, ma'am or sir, that's not a proper objection. I think that can be handled on cross-4 examination. Now, if you say that's not a proper 5 6 objection and you say that can be handled on 7 cross-examination now there's -- the question is 8 if you say that can be handled on cross-9 examination are you giving legal advice? I think you're -- I think that's administrative. I think 10 11 you're -- you're trying to push -- move the case along and that kind of thing. So, I think it's -12 13 - it's -- it's -- you've got to explain to them -14 - now, sometimes I'll be honest with you, I've 15 had pro se litigants they were as -- were as good as lawyers. And you -- you know that when they 16 come in. And -- and so, I think it's a case by 17 18 case basis. CHAIRMAN SMITH: Now, what -- what I'm interested in 19 is -- is, you know, obviously in family court, 20 21 you see in magistrates court and, you know, when 22 you practice in circuit court, you're going to see some. But -- but the more of the circuit 23 24 court are people who, what I call disrupters of 25 the courtroom. And -- and -- and so, what -- you

know, I'm -- I'm all for access for judgment. 1 Ι 2 mean, access to justice. 3 JUDGE KINLAW: Right. CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'm also -- I'm all for you got a 4 constitutional right to be a pro se but that does 5 6 not turn the judge into the legal advisor of the 7 pro ses. 8 JUDGE KINLAW: Right. CHAIRMAN SMITH: And so, you know, one of -- and one 9 10 thing that I'm always concerned with and when I 11 watch and you know, I sit and I watch motions 12 sometimes. And I watch pro se people argue 13 motions. And I see judges that do exactly what I 14 believe judges ought to do, and that is to hold 15 them to the same standard that they hold 16 attorneys. 17 JUDGE KINLAW: Right. 18 CHAIRMAN SMITH: And then I see judges who assist them 19 in the presentation of their case. And that causes me great concern for the justice system 20 21 for my client or -- or one of these gentleman's 22 clients that have -- that takes the time to pay 23 an attorney and then -- and someone gets the 24 benefit of legal advice from the judge, no less, 25 that does not bother to pay an attorney. And so,

you know, I -- everyone is entitled to the same
access to the courts but they're not entitled to
any assistance --

JUDGE KINLAW: Right.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN SMITH: -- in the courts, especially from a judge who's supposed to be a neutral and detached person -- neutral and detached presider of the -of the cases. And so, you know, I -- I'm -- and that's why I asked this question. Because I'm very interested in how judges are handling that. I have not observed it in family court. And I imagine, you know, there's financial declarations that need to be provided. There's, you know, -you got to ask about the reconciliation. You got to establish the date you testify -- you -- you separated and you live separate and apart for more than a year. And I presume that that requires you to probably have to engage something to lay the record in there. And so, where's that fine line that we draw that, you know -- do you come in here like I saw some judges used to do it before all this access to judge -- to justice that would say, all right present your testimony. And then they would present the testimony and say denied. You did not -- you did not prove that

803-256-4500

y'all lived separate and apart for more than a 1 2 year. And I -- I mean -- and so, you know, I --3 I don't know where that fine line is. But it's got to be somewhere but shouldn't be to the 4 detriment of those who go out and hire lawyers. 5 6 JUDGE KINLAW: Right. I -- I agree and that's why I 7 said at the outset that that's what I do in all 8 cases involving pro se litigants. I tell them 9 that at the front end. And one of the reasons 10 that I -- I think that that's important. If --11 if judges get any complaints at all from pro se litigants, 99 -- 95 percent of them will complain 12 13 that the judge didn't treat them fairly or didn't 14 show them deference. They didn't have an 15 attorney and the judge was unfair to them and a judge this and that. So -- so to eliminate that, 16 17 you tell them on the front end the rules of 18 evidence -- you have to abide by the same way 19 John Doe over here is. And you know, and you -it depends on how you say that. You know, I'm a 20 21 big guy and I say it pretty -- pretty -- pretty 22 sternly and they -- you know, if they -- they --23 they believe what I tell them. 24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: If you're successful in your quest to 25 become a circuit court judge, you're going to be

greeted to a whole new world of pro se litigants.

I assure you of that, Judge. And good luck with
that if you're successful.

JUDGE KINLAW: All right.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Brian. Sorry.

- Q. Thank you, Judge Kinlaw. Are there any areas of the law that you would need additional preparation for prior to serving as a circuit court judge?
- Α. I wouldn't think so. Let me -- let me tell you why that is. Because before I served -- start serving as a family court judge, I was in private practice for 24 years. I tried a number of automobile accident cases. I tried a lot of products cases. I tried some medical malpractice cases. Had a few cases against the late Dewy Oxner. We tried some cases together. Tried some cases with Mike Parm who is -- who is a medical malpractice. So, I did a -- I did everything. The only area that I -- I did not do anything at all in is I did very little in the federal court. And I -- I -- I went to the federal court on a couple of -- a few criminal matters. And I had a -- I think a housing discrimination case one time in the federal court. So, I -- other than that,

I -- that's -- I -- I didn't go to federal court 1 2 that much. 3 Thank you, Judge Kinlaw. Just a few brief Q. housekeeping issues to run through. 4 Yes, sir. 5 Α. Are you aware that as a judicial candidate, you 6 Q. 7 are bound by the code of judicial conduct as 8 found in Rule 501 of the South Carolina Appellate 9 Court Rules? 10 Α. Yes. 11 Since submitting your letter of intent, have you Q. 12 contacted any members of the Commission 13 concerning your candidacy? 14 No, I have not. Α. 15 Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator 16 17 either prior to this date or pending the outcome 18 of your screening? No, I have not. 19 Α. Have you asked any third parties to contact 20 Q. 21 members of the General Assembly on your behalf or 22 are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene 23 in this process on your behalf? 24 No. Α. 25 Q. Have you reviewed and do you understand the

1	Commission's guidelines on pledging and South
2	Carolina Code Section 2-19-70(E)?
3	A. I do.
4	Q. Thank you, Judge Kinlaw. Mr. Chairman, I would
5	note that the Upstate Citizen's Committee
6	reported Judge Kinlaw is qualified in the
7	evaluative criteria of constitutional
8	qualifications, physical health, and mental
9	stability. And well qualified in the evaluative
10	criteria of ethical fitness, professional and
11	academic ability, character, reputation,
12	experience, and judicial temperament. I would
13	just note for the record that any concerns raised
14	during the investigation regarding Judge Kinlaw
15	were incorporated into the questioning today and
16	I have no further questions.
17	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you so much. Any questions for
18	Judge Kinlaw? Mr. Safran.
19	
20	EXAMINATION BY MR. SAFRAN:
21	Q. Judge, we appreciate you being here.
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Particularly at the hour that it's it's
24	kind of transpired to. What I liked and what I
25	was impressed with is the fact that you were

really focused on the idea of the experience you 1 2 brought into the family court position. 3 allowing that to continue to, more or less, enable you to do what has to be done at the next 4 level. Now, I understand you've been focused on 5 6 family court during these last years, but I'm 7 assuming you haven't lost touch of all those 8 other things that you were doing in the circuit court when you were a private practitioner, 9 10 correct? 11 Α. Correct. 12 And so, it's -- it's -- you've still been dealing Q. 13 with the rules of evidence daily. 14 Right. Α. And you know, it's a matter, more or less, kind 15 Q. of assessing the case applying the law. You 16 17 don't think there's going to be any major 18 difference at this point, do you? No, I don't think so at all. 19 Α. Judge, you mentioned that you have a -- a great 20 Q. 21 deal of experience in court. And I think one 22 thing that -- that we hear a lot is, I guess, the 23 idea, what does temperament mean in terms of how 24 the judge presents and the idea of how the

lawyers, more or less, come to, I guess,

3

appreciate particular judges. And how the impact is on the system in -- in general. I mean, is temperament a big thing for you in terms of how you want to handle the job?

4 5

Α. I do. Can -- can I comment on something?

6

Q. Absolutely.

7

8

9

10

Α. You know, I -- I want to say this. I -- when --

11 12

14

13

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

when I'm at home sometimes and I guess -- and I've been married for a long time, about 30 years or better. And I've got two kids. And sometimes when I'm sitting there and I have this expression on my face, and even as my kids were growing up, they felt that that expression meant that I -they shouldn't come ask me for anything but they should go ask their mom. Let me tell you why I say that. I never noticed it but sometimes if I'm sitting on the bench and I'm not smiling but I just have this stoic face, it's not your typical stoic face. And I can't change it. Ι can't -- there's nothing I can do about it. I -- I just notice that sometimes even when I'm in -- sitting there, you could probably get a mis-impression of what my facial expression is. Like someone here if you -- if you smile or if your frown, that's just how you do it. And if

you try to change it, you know, it's -- so, what 1 2 I try to do -- and somebody asked me said, well -3 - well you smile all the time. You know why I do that, when I smile? Because I think if I'm 4 smiling sometimes, I think it puts people at 5 6 ease. But I also think that as a trial judge I 7 can't sit there as -- and there's litigants in 8 the courtroom and I'm smiling, because that sends 9 a wrong message all the time. So, I -- I -- I 10 struggle with my facial expression sometimes. And so -- and I'm better at it. My wife says I'm 11 better. I'm -- I'm better at it than when she 12 13 met me all those years ago. My -- my kids, who 14 are now grown, tell me I'm better at it. But I 15 ask them. And I just ask the question. So, that's why I say -- can I talk about something 16 17 else just for a second?

Q. Sure.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. The -- when I -- when I -- when I practiced in the -- in the -- when I was in private practice and I -- and I practiced in civil court and criminal court and all that, one of the concerns that I have -- and I'm pretty sure you've heard this concern, is the movement of cases in the -- on the circuit court level, on the civil docket

25

and on the criminal docket. Now, Mr. Chief Justice, I think at one of our most recent meetings, he kind of talked about something that I'm in full -- full support of. Let me tell what that is. We in the family court about four or five years ago or maybe longer -- we had cases scheduled for all day. And if a case broke down, we didn't have -- we'd have to scramble to replace it. And a few years ago we went to a ABC docket. Greenville County, matter of fact, was the first county that had a ABC docket. We were doing it before we were mandated to do it by Chief Justice Toal. And what we did was, we put all the attorneys on notice that your case could be called on that day and the cases that were settled and the lawyers wanted to put on the record, we allowed those cases to do, to put on the record. And if you're lucky all of them settled. But if all of them didn't settle, you always had a case to try. And that's worked great. Because of what Greenville did, and the hard work we do there, every single county has done that. Greenville County was one of the first counties that had mandatory mediation in family court. There were circuits like McCormick

21

22

23

24

25

County, Edgefield County, even though these are smaller counties, they weren't going to mediation. But now we have mandatory mediation in all the counties and that's helped. In the circuit court, if -- if I'm blessed enough to be given the opportunity and -- and I use the word blessed because I was blessed to be given this opportunity. But if I'm blessed to be given that opportunity, I think, what the -- the Chief Justice talked about at our last conference, for lack of a better word, an interlocking docket. Let me tell you what we're talking about. And I'm not -- I don't' want to quote him because I'm just -- I'm just going to think what I thought he meant. If there is a calendar and you have a -a trial in criminal court scheduled. If that defendant decides to plead guilty, then the judge is now scrambling for something to do. You know why? Because that same -- that there's a civil court -- civil case that's backing up the criminal case.

Q. Yeah.

A. So, you're -- you're doing both dockets at the same time. In other words, that judge he -- he is -- he is assigned to the criminal case but

25

he's also assigned to non-jury civil cases at the same time. So, he has a day where he's got the criminal trial -- criminal trial goes, non-jury case -- non-jury docket rolls over. Criminal trial doesn't go. He -- court reporter's already there. Then he rolls into the non-jury docket. And I'm just saying non-jury. You could have a civil trial. You could have a -- a civil trial backing up a criminal trial. But my point is -or you could have probation or other cases. You need to have -- this is just me talking, you need to have a backup on the docket so you can keep judges busy at all times. Now, I don't know how that's going to work but it's out there. the -- the new system that's been proposed by the -- by the Chief Justice, which I fully support, is making sure that all courts are covered by court reporters at all times. Right -- this week -- and I'm going to guit talking in a minute. This week I'm in Charleston and I'm in the middle of a five-day case and I came here in the middle of the week. But during that week, I may have three different court reporters because of the -the shortage sometimes that we have. But if you've got court reporters that are there and

you've got a docket in circuit court that breaks 1 2 down, you need to have a rollover docket, whether 3 it's on the criminal side or whether it's on the civil side to keep the judge working. I -- I --4 I know that wasn't -- that wasn't a response to 5 6 your question but that was something that I 7 wanted to share with this committee that I 8 thought it was something that's happened. I've -9 - I've always been a proponent of moving cases. 10 I've done that. I've done that in the family 11 court as I indicated in my -- my unique way of 12 moving pro se cases along. And I think if we do 13 that then it -- it ups our percentage of cases 14 that are filed and cases that are heard on the 15 civil side and cases -- want to move it like we did in the family court. And I -- I don't know 16 17 if that answered your question but I wanted to 18 share that. Well, let me just ask one last thing. 19 Q.

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Could -- has it been your effort during the time you've been on the bench to try to treat the lawyers that appear before you in the same way that you wanted to be treated when you were a -- a practitioner?

20

21

22

23

Α.

I it's interesting you ask me that question.
And I I I could say yes. But I'm a I'm
a person that likes to give you an example of
what I'm talking about. I recall and I for
those of you who practiced law for a long period
of time, you probably remember this situation.
You've got a case that's Monday morning at 9:00
o'clock. You went in your office on Friday to
make sure the file is ready. You probably
stopped by on Saturday. You knew you had to be
in Laurens County at 9:00 o'clock so you ran by
your office early that morning to grab the file
off the end of the desk. And you grabbed it
because you knew that's where you put it at. You
put it in your car, you drove off to Laurens.
And you get to Laurens, you get the file out of
your car and you go into the into the court.
And you sit in the waiting room with your client.
And you look at it and you brought the wrong file
because you got a lot files. You say, oh my God
I brought the wrong file. Why is that important?
A a judge who has practiced law before handles
that differently than someone who has not.
You've got your client there, you made a mistake

25

got the litigants there. And then the judge says, well I'll tell you what you need to do. Why don't you get your secretary to fax me a copy of the -- because you -- you're an officer of the court. You've not have any -- you never any difficulty with this judge before. You fax me a copy of your affidavit of service, a copy of your financial declarations or whatever. And then you submit that to the record tomorrow and we'll go ahead and have the hearing. Now, that's -- if you've practiced before you know that that situation arises, so. And from time to time lawyers come in with a lot of different things that are occurring. They need more time to speak with their client and they're asking the judge to be considerate about that. I'm a stickler about continuances. I try to not to -- when I -- when I was chief admin judge, I never continued a case that was -- it was just me. If it was -- it was 2017, I do not continue 2015 or beginning of 2016 cases unless you had a real, real good reason to do so. So, I -- I sort of treat lawyers like I wanted to be treated when I was out there all those years because I know the -- the -- the things that lawyers go through in terms of

interacting with clients, interacting with the 1 2 court system. And I can tell you this, I always 3 treat the -- the court staff, clerk's office and all, everywhere I go, the same way. Because I 4 interact with all these clerks when I practice 5 and they can be a valuable resource. I don't 6 7 know if that answers your question but. 8 Q. Thank you very much. 9 All right. Α. 10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? 11 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN: 12 Q. Real quick. And I want to echo -- you're 13 originally from where? 14 Georgetown. Α. 15 Q. And are you familiar with a fella by the last name of Sabb? 16 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. A Ronnie Sabb? 19 Yes. Yes, I know him. Α. He speaks very highly of you. I want you to know 20 Q. 21 that. 22 Thank you. Α. 23 If he were here he would speak higher of you but Q. 24 it would be longer for him to say it. 25 Α. Right.

So, I just want to tell you he -- he had to scoot 1 Q. 2 out shortly. But --3 All right Α. -- anyway. Real quick. 4 Q. Yeah. 5 Α. Real quick. Bench bar comments. Do you 6 Q. 7 recognize that as a -- as a valuable tool for us 8 to determine and critique folks that are seeking 9 office? 10 Α. I came in here to be a candidate and I intend to 11 do so. Let me just tell and answer your question this way. I think as -- as the --12 13 Q. And I'm talking about the ballot box. 14 I know. I know what you're talking about, ballot Α. 15 box. When you're -- when you're -- I think it's -- I think it's -- it's -- it's good -- good tool. 16 17 One of the things that's probably come up 18 sometimes as it relates to judges, if you're like me and -- and I've held court in 30 some counties 19 I've -- I've seen lawyers from all across the 2.0 21 state. So, it's highly unusual for an attorney 22 say in the lower part of the state or upstate to 23 send a comment in. But when you're the sitting 24 judge wherever -- this just happens. Not all

lawyers like the judges. Not all -- not all the

23

24

25

lawyers like judges' rulings or things of that nature or -- or -- or -- or the attorney fees. So, sometimes you're getting comments from all over the state and that's if you're a sitting judge. Now, if you are an applicant who never held the judicial position before, then someone from maybe Beaufort wouldn't know the judge in Greenville. And would probably on the -- on the ballot box indicate the -- that they didn't know the judge and couldn't make any comments. they know the applicants so -- the -- the applicant without any judicial experience all the comments really sometime become regionalized -regionalized where the applicant is in terms of where that applicant is either practiced law or has some contact. As a -- as a sitting judge, you're getting comments from all over the state which expands the scope. And I don't know if that answers your question but that's what --

Q. Well and you've heard comments earlier asking very briefly. I mean, you are well recognized on -- in fact every criteria of -- in terms of being well qualified with few complaints. And so, if we're hearing good things should we believe it or these folks just confused?

- A. Senator, I -- Senator, I don't think they're confused. I think you need to believe them.
 - Q. Amen. Thank you.
 - A. All right.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN SMITH:

- Judge Kinlaw, I've been asking every client -- I Q. mean every client, every -- every candidate -sorry you got me in practicing judge -practicing law now. Every candidate this question. Explain to me your philosophy. heard you say if it's a 2015 case you don't continue it if it's 2017. And you know, I -- and you know, you're going to find there's more protracted litigation and I don't think that's all too uncommon. If lawyers agree and they have issues that, you know, that they've got other cases. They don't have one or two cases. got 50 or 60, that's how you make -- make a living these days is by volume. Is -- you know, what -- or how do you balance lawyers' demands of other cases and personal demands and all that against the -- the quick disposition of cases? How would you handle that as a circuit court judge?
 - A. Well, I -- I would say this in the -- on the

23

24

25

family court level I think it'd still be the same thing on the circuit court level. If there was a case that I thought had some age on it, I would ask for a pretrial of the case and where the lawyers would come. And then I'd make inquiry as to what's going on. And I -- I -- I have continued cases that were more than two years old but there were situations where the litigants had a -- had a death in the family, had some sickness in the family or the lawyer was sick or -- or there was issues regarding getting a therapist report or a doctor's report. A lot of things factor into it. So, I -- I -- I would on the circuit court level have a pretrial. Now, I've had -- I'm -- I'm a big proponent of conference calls and inter-conference calls on files where we look at files and we have issues with them and we get all the lawyers, including a guardian, on the phone and we resolve it that way as opposed to having a docketed pretrial. So, I think there are ways to do that.

Q. Yes, sir. And -- and -- and I guess what I'm

leading up to is, you know, you -- if you're

elected to the position you're going to have to

be chief administrative judge at some point. And

I know that's not an easy job. And lawyers are going to write to you and ask for protection for vacations. And lawyers are going to say, Judge, I got this motion coming up this week and, you know, I had plans to go and my child had a soccer game. Are you going to have rigid rules for your court and how that's held as opposed to the quality of life or allowing lawyers to be able to do something outside of their days of -- of work?

- A. Representative Smith, I will tell you that I will sign every request for that no matter what because, you know, life is not around the law.
- Q. Yes, sir.
- A. I mean, there are other things that you do. And the reason I -- I -- I'm probably one of the judges that I rarely want to go past 5:00 o'clock. And you know why? Because the court reporter has a life outside the court room. She has kids. She has things to do. So, and that's -- that's my -- that's important to me. So, no. I think when I was chief administrative judge, if I -- I've signed every single request for a lawyer to have some -- some good mental health time if they needed it. Because you need that. And if there's a, you know, soccer game or

something like that, I'm open to that because I 1 2 had those same issues when I was coming. 3 writing letters to judges asking that I be given those things. So, how dare me to now put this 4 robe on and change what I used to ask the judges 5 6 the same thing that they're asking me. So, no. 7 I -- I -- I -- I wouldn't do that. 8 Q. And don't -- we're -- we're -- I'm asking every 9 candidate that because I want to know the -- you 10 know, the quality of life and what the importance 11 of that is to judges or judicial candidates as 12 opposed to the -- the disposition of cases. So -13 - so, I appreciate that response. I -- I agree with you whole heartedly, I'll tell you that. 14 15 Any other questions of Judge Kinlaw? SENATOR YOUNG: Mr. Chairman. 16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, sir, Mr. Young. 17 18 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR YOUNG: Judge Kinlaw, just one question. First of all, 19 Q. thank you for your service and your -- for your 20 21 interest in continuing your service on the 22 circuit bench. Number 16 in your sworn statement 23 asked a question about what was -- what is your

philosophy on judicial activism. And I want to

ask you to expand on -- on that. You -- your

24

answer was that you thought judges could educate 1 2 the community on the workings of the judicial 3 system and not promote or set public policy. What is your view of how a judge should apply the 4 law to the facts that are before him or her? 5 Well, I -- I -- you know, I don't think that the 6 Α. 7 -- you know, sometimes you're -- you're -- you're 8 placed in -- in difficult situations where cases 9 should never be tried on -- on emotion. 10 should never be tried on -- on what you, as a 11 judge, may be thinking. But you have to apply the law as difficult as it may be. And trust me, 12 13 Senator, it's difficult sometimes to do that. 14 But you've got to do it. And -- but there's a 15 way to do it. And I said -- and the way to do it is, I don't think that you in your ruling if you 16 17 -- if you -- if you read the ruling from the 18 bench -- if you've got to apply the law but explain to the -- to the lawyers why you think 19 this law is applicable in the given set of facts 20 21 that was before you. And -- and that's why I try 22 to do. So, and I think when you stop doing that, 23 then I -- I don't think that this is the arena 24 you need to be in. 25 Q. And -- and is it fair to say that you don't think

that the judge should -- should -- the judge should interpret the law the way it's written and not try to expand the law more than what's written in the actual law itself?

- A. I -- I agree. And I also think, to expand upon that, from time to time litigants through their lawyers would -- there would be orders that prior judges signed and they would bring the orders to the trial judge and try to interpret. Say well, I don't think that judge so and so meant this.

 But I view order on its face. If that's what the order says, that's what it says and -- and -- and that's what I abide by.
- Q. Thank you, sir.
- A. All right.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Any further questions?

Judge Kinlaw, thank you so much for your

testimony today. This concludes this portion of
your screening process. I want to take this
opportunity to remind you that pursuant to the
Commission's evaluative criteria, the Commission
expects candidates to follow the spirit as well
as the letter of the ethics laws. And we will
view violations or the appearance of impropriety
as serious and potentially deserving of heavy

weight in screening deliberations. On that note, 1 2 and as you know, the record will remain open 3 until the formal release of the report of qualifications. And you may be called back at 4 such time if the need arises. 5 JUDGE KINLAW: All right. 6 7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I thank you for offering for this 8 position and I thank you for your service --JUDGE KINLAW: All right. And I -- I want to thank 9 10 you. And -- and I know you're on a tight 11 schedule and I apologize if I talked too much. So, don't hold that against me. 12 13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: We won't hold it against you. 14 you, Judge. We appreciate you -- we appreciate 15 your indulgence and your patience with us. 16 you. JUDGE KINLAW: All right. Thank you. 17 18 (Off the Record) CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Moorman, how you doing today? 19 MR. MOORMAN: I'm well. Thank you for having me. 2.0 21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. You have a quest here 22 you'd like to introduce to the Commission? 23 MR. MOORMAN: I would. Thank you for the opportunity. 24 With me is my wife of 16 years, my best friend, 25 Jayne Moorman.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Hey Jayne, how are you doing?
Welcome. Appreciate you being here today. Mr.
Moorman, if you'll raise your right hand, please
sir.
MR. MOORMAN, being duly sworn, testifies as follows:
CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Moorman, we have before you your
personal data questionnaire and your sworn
statement. Are both of those the documents that
you submitted to the Commission?
MR. MOORMAN: They are.
CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are they both correct?
MR. MOORMAN: They are. And I would mention just with
the amendment, I have the both cover letter
CHAIRMAN SMITH: Amendment with it too?
MR. MOORMAN: There is.
CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. And it's marked as exhibit?
MR. MOORMAN: It is.
CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. All right. And are there any
other changes or anything else that needs to be
updated at this time?
MR. MOORMAN: No other changes.
CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do you have any objection to us
making those documents a part of your sworn
testimony today?
MR. MOORMAN: I do not.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: If you'll hand them to Lindi for us 1 2 please. And we're going to make those a part of 3 your -- the record of your sworn testimony today. MR. MOORMAN: Certainly. 4 (EXHIBIT 22 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION 5 PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF ANDREW B. MOORMAN, SR.) 6 (EXHIBIT 23 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION 7 8 SWORN STATEMENT OF ANDREW B. MOORMAN, SR.) 9 (EXHIBIT 24 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF ANDREW B. MOORMAN, SR.) 10 11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Moorman, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated 12 13 your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry 14 is focused on nine evaluative criteria and has 15 included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your 16 17 compliance with state ethics laws, search of 18 newspaper articles in which your name appears, 19 and study of previous screenings, and check for economic conflicts of interest. We have had no 2.0 21 affidavits filed in opposition to candidacy 22 today. And there are no witness here to testify. 23 Do you wish to make an opening statement to the 24 Commission? 25 MR. MOORMAN: The only thing I would say is that I'm

grateful to the Commission for considering my 1 2 application. 3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. And Mr. Moorman, let me tell me what we were just telling Judge Kinlaw. 4 I know we made you wait today. We're always 5 6 overly optimistic on our time and so I appreciate 7 your patience and I know -- I know it was 8 inconvenient. And I'm sorry about that. 9 MR. MOORMAN: I'm just happy to be here. Thank you. 10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you. Answer any questions 11 counsel will have. Mr. Davidson. EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON: 12 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Based on the testimony 13 Q. 14 contained in the candidates PDQ, which has been included in the record with the candidate's 15 consent, Mr. Moorman meets the constitutional and 16 17 statutory requirements for this position 18 regarding age, residence, and years of practice. 19 Mr. Moorman, how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far renders you 2.0 21 qualified and will assist you to be an affective 22 circuit court judge? 23 Thank you for that question. I think it will Α. 24 assist me in a number of different ways. First, 25 I have had the pleasure of appearing for trials

in practically every trial court in this state. 1 2 In magistrate's court, in circuit court, in 3 federal district court, and in family court. 4 I have a breadth of experience that I bring, having tried cases in those courts. The other 5 6 element of my career that I think is especially 7 useful for this Commission's consideration, is 8 the type of clients I've represented. So, I've 9 represented the State of South Carolina as an 10 assistant solicitor for five years. 11 represented individuals while I was in private practice. Single moms, defendants charged with 12 13 crimes. And most recently I've had the privilege 14 of representing the United States of America. 15 Having those opportunities to represent those different types of clients in different trial 16 17 courts has provided me with a wealth of 18 experience that I would bring as I would preside 19 over trials and other hearings as a circuit 2.0 judge. 21

22

23

24

- Q. Could you describe, in your opinion, the ideal judge. And also, is there a particular judge you would model yourself after?
- A. The judicial canons talk about certain characteristics of a judge. A judge should be

25

courteous. A judge should be dignified. A judge should be patient. In my sworn statement, I also added the quality of humility. And I think humility in a judge is extremely important. I think that's the case because what is the most important part of what goes on in a -- in a courtroom is getting at the truth. And to get at the truth I think you have to go in with an open mind and understand as a judge that you don't know everything. You need to listen to arguments of the lawyers. You need to -- you need to be open to arguments, listen to the evidence. And only then can you make a decision after understanding everything that's happened. of the best judges I've seen -- I've had the privilege of growing up as a lawyer in the 13th circuit. And when I started as a law clerk for Judge Fuge, at that time in the 13th Circuit, you had Judge Fuge, you had Judge Kittredge, and you had Judge Floyd. All of whom have risen to -- to positions of -- of incredible stature based on their excellence as circuit judges and -- and other judges. So, I would -- I would say that the judges that I had the privilege of appearing before when I became a lawyer are among the best

Q.

lawyer -- best judges I've ever been in front of.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

box surveys regarding your candidacy with 23 additional comments. The ballot box surveys, for example, contain the following positive comments, "Is consistently one of the most thorough, prepared, and thoughtful attorneys I've encountered." Another stated, "He is of the highest character. A very hard worker and will be a great judge." Six of the written comments express concerns. Three of those comments raised

Thank you. The Commission received 153 ballot

What response would you offer to those concerns?

a concern regarding a lack of civil experience.

First, I would say that I take criticism to heart Α. because I want to get better everyday as a lawyer. And that also feeds in to the -- the humility component that a judge needs to have. So, I'm grateful for those comments and I think that's a fair question. First thing I would say is I do have civil experience. While I was in private practice, I represented parties in the court of common pleas. While representing those parties, I served interrogatories, I took depositions. Also, I had a lot of -- I had the ability to represent clients in family court.

25

And as many of you know, in family court often times orders are instituted in cases that apply the rules of civil procedure. So while in family court, again, I was able to use discovery devices, for example, contained in the rule for civil procedure, interrogatories, depositions. So, I do have civil experience. The other part of my legal experience that I think is very relevant in this civil context is this, while I've been in the U.S. Attorney's office I had served as an OCDETF prosecutor. That stands for organized crime and drug enforcement task force. Often times in my cases I'll indite 20-30 defendants. These defendants reside in South Carolina, but they also reside in other parts of the country. I've had defendants come as far from Alaska. I deal with lawyers often times outside the State of South Carolina. I mention these types of cases because there's an expectation in federal court that the assistant U.S. attorneys who bring these cases also serve as a case manager. So, I will send discovery. will institute timelines in an effort to make sure the case is progressing at the pace it should. I'll participate in status conferences

to discuss discovery issues. There's a robust motion practice. We have thousands or tens of thousands of pages of discovery. So, I would argue that the types of cases I have prosecuted as an assistant U.S. attorney are very similar to larger, complex cases that courts in -- or circuit judges would preside over in the court of common pleas.

- Q. Thank you. The other three comments were concerned there would be a bias in favor of the prosecution. What response would you offer to those concerns?
- A. First, I would say I was a criminal defense attorney for a period of my career. One thing I learned about being a criminal defense attorney is that lots of times your clients are good people who just make bad decisions. So, I think my time as a criminal defense attorney was very instructive in helping me understand that the law is about people. It affects people. The other comment I would make is, as a prosecutor, my job has not been to win or lose. Any prosecutor who tells you his or her job is to win or lose should not be a prosecutor. The mandate of a prosecutor is to do justice. And in different cases that

means different things. Sometimes it means
people have to go to jail. Sometimes it means
that charges have to be dismissed. Sometimes it
means the person should not be charged at all.
So, I would argue that my mandate as a prosecutor
to do justice is very similar to the oath circuit
judges take. In essence, to do justice.

2.0

- Q. Thank you. Switching pages here for a second.

 You stated in your PDQ that a former client
 initiated a fee dispute against you in 2010.

 Could you explain the nature or disposition of
 that dispute, please?
- A. Happy to. The former client, I'll use her first name, Wendy, was a client who -- who I represented in -- in family court and I also represented her on a criminal case. There were -- during the course of the representation, the -- the relationship broke down. I believe I moved to be relieved as counsel. And after I was relieved as counsel, she had asked for a refund of some of the money that, I believe, that was in our trust account that -- that we had earned. She filed a fee dispute. We had a hearing in Anderson. And ultimately, the -- I guess, the board, or whatever the body was who heard the

dispute, decided we acted -- we being me and the 1 2 Bannister Firm -- Bannister and Wyatt for whom I 3 worked at the time -- we acted appropriately and dismissed her -- her grievance -- her claim. 4 Thank you. Lastly, I have a few questions that 5 Q. 6 I'll run through quickly. Are you aware that as 7 a judicial candidate, you're bound by the code of 8 judicial conduct as found in Rule 501 of the 9 South Carolina Appellate Court Rules? 10 Α. Yes, I am. 11 Since submitting your letter of intent, have you Q. contacted any members of this Commission about 12 13 your candidacy? 14 I have not. Α. 15 Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you sought to receive the pledge of any legislator, 16 17 either prior to this date or pending the outcome 18 of your screening? No, I have not. 19 Α. Have you asked any third parties to contact 20 Q. 21 members of the General Assembly on your behalf or 22 are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene 23 in this process on your behalf? 24 No, I -- no, I have not. Α. 25 Q. And have you reviewed and do you understand the

Commission's guidelines in pledging South 1 2 Carolina Code Section 2-19-70(e)? 3 I have. Α. Thank you. The Upstate Citizens Committee 4 Q. reported Mr. Moorman to be qualified in the 5 evaluative criteria of constitutional 6 7 qualifications, physical health, mental 8 stability. And well qualified in the remaining 9 criteria of ethical fitness, professional and 10 academic ability, character, reputation, 11 experience, and judicial temperament. Mr. 12 Chairman, any concerns raised during the 13 investigation regarding Mr. Moorman are 14 incorporated into my questioning today. No 15 further questions. CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you. Anyone have 16 17 any questions for Mr. Moorman? Senator Hayes. 18 EXAMINATION BY MR. HAYES: I notice that you took the bar and were licenced 19 Q. in Kentucky, but you never worked in Kentucky, 20 21 though, did you? 22 I did not. I'm from Kentucky. My parents still Α. 23 live in Kentucky. I still have family who lives 24 in Kentucky. And I thought that because of all 25 the support my parents gave me, I might as well

be licensed in Kentucky. So, that's why I took
the bar there.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. Just -- and I'm -- I'm aware of your -- your background as far as your work, etcetera. But outside of your legal background, what other traits do you have that would put you in good stead as a judge and perhaps what weakness do you have that might make it difficult to be a judge?
- Thank you for that -- for that question. First, Α. I'm a very hard worker. I get to work on time. I work very hard. And I believe that that is something special. That you have to get to work and you have to work hard. I do that not only professionally but at -- at the house I'm very involved with my kids' activities. I try to -try to bring home to the -- to the kids of importance of -- of doing what you're expected to do and working hard. Another trait is I am a --I -- I do my best to be a good listener. I understand that I don't know everything. That I need to learn as I go. And I think that's very important when you are -- it's an important trait a judge needs to have. Again, I go back to the humility because I make mistakes like everybody else. And the minute I think that I need to stop

25

listening, I need to stop learning, is the minute that I am not going to be effective in whatever career I have. So, I -- I think those are -those are two. The only other thing is that I would say that is important and I think a lot of people take it for granted. But I'm -- I'm --I'm honest. I do what I say. And I follow through on that. And I think that that's very important because if people have trust -- so -so often in our legal system, cases are resolved because of the trust that lawyers have with each That I'm trustworthy. What are some of other. the weaknesses? I think one of my weaknesses is I -- I -- I have faith in my ability to deal with chaos. A lot on my plate. And I -- I typically think I can do that well. Sometimes, I have too much confidence in my ability to deal with chaos. So, I think one -- one weakness would be not being as willing or maybe being too willing or too ambitious in some of the projects that I try to take on. But I'm recently with -- with what's been going on, I'm learning to -- to be a -- my eyes aren't as quite as big as they used to be. Those are the -- those are the traits that come to mind.

1 Thank you. I appreciate it. Q. 2 Α. Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Any further questions? Mr. Moorman, let me -- does anyone have any 4 questions? 5 EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN SMITH: 6 7 Q. Mr. Moorman, let me ask you this question. 8 notice you work at the U.S. Attorney's office in 9 Greenville? 10 Α. Yes, sir. 11 Please tell me you don't work with Lance Crick. Q. I work with Lance Crick. 12 Α. 13 Okay. I hope you don't learn from Lance Crick, Q. 14 then. 15 Α. So, that -- Lance is my boss. So --Well --16 Q. 17 -- that's a tough question. Α. 18 Q. Well, I -- I -- well, when we get through 19 our process one day, I'll -- I'll give you a list of -- my brother roomed with him at 20 21 Wofford and so I'll give you a list of -- of things that you can use on him so you should have 22 23 easy sledding at your job over there. Mr. 24 Moorman, let -- let me ask you just a couple of 25 questions that I -- you know, it seems like you

1

3

5

7

8

10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

have some experience in private practice and now you're mainly working in the federal courts. The -- the alternative courts that -- that are being utilized and proposed, mental health courts, drug courts, veteran courts, what's your philosophy -- if -- if you're elected as a judge -- I mean, I know you don't have any -- any input on the -- on the creation of them but the administration and implementation of them you would. What's your philosophy on those alternative courts?

First, I think there's merit there. I think our Α. -- our criminal justice system is the best in the world. But it is -- it is being stretched in ways that need -- that require us to begin to think of new ways to -- to deal with disposing of cases. So, as a general proposition I think alternative courts have merit and can serve a purpose. What I think is vitally important in pursuing alternative courts is to think very carefully about how those courts mesh with our standard criminal justice system. And let me give you one example. In federal court we have a drug court -- a drug court that's been very successful. And we also -- there's a drug court in Greenville that Judge Simmons has run for

25

That's also been very successful. think the drug court in state court has been around long enough where they've sort of got it Drug court in federal court has been effective in helping addicts get treatment and the recidivism has gone down in light of that. But what is -- what is a challenge is trying to figure out what happens at the end of the day to drug court defendants in federal court once they complete drug court. So, they go to drug court. They've had six months, nine months of treatment. They come out. They're still charged with a crime. So, do they -- what's the expectation there if they've successfully completed? Do they go to jail? That depends on what they've been charged with and -- and what the penalties are. But that's probably a long answer to the question but it's how do you mesh new ideas in alternative courts with our tried and true and proven criminal justice system. So, I think once you're able to determine how those two mesh and -- and engender predictability and -- and some sense of predictability. What's going to happen in the future. I think that that's -- that's critical and that's a good thing.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
- Q. Yes, sir. And -- and as it relates, if -- if you were successful in becoming elected to this position, you -- you're going to have all sorts of attorneys calling you and asking you for orders of protection, you know, got a conflict with this week, I'd like to go off to my kids basketball game that starts at 4:00 o'clock or -- or something like that. How do you balance the quality of life and the -- and -- of attorneys and how they have to -- and the stresses that they have to handle as opposed to the disposition of cases and the movement of dockets?
- A. Thank you for that question. That's a great question. First, quality of life is extremely important. And the first thing you do to balance that is remember when you were a lawyer. And remember when you had vacations scheduled that were cancelled. And remember what that felt like. So, you -- you remember. In -- in federal court, I'm at the mercy -- I -- we don't schedule our cases. So, when a federal judge tells me to be in court, I say yes, sir/yes, ma'am and I'm there regardless of what I have. So, the first thing I would do is remember what it feels like. Second thing, I would do is -- is within the

judicial canons, I would communicate with the 1 2 lawyers and try to determine what the conflicts 3 are. You want a continuance, tell me about that. 4 Tell me where we are in the case. Do you see any prejudice with this -- you know, non-moving party 5 6 do you see any prejudice in the court granting 7 continuance? But -- so, communicate with the 8 lawyers. Understand what the lay of the land is 9 for the cases before you grant it. But bottom 10 line, quality of life for lawyers is extremely 11 important. And I won't forget those vacations that I've had to cancel. 12 Thank you, Mr. Moorman. Any further questions? 13 Q. 14 Senator Rankin. 15 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN: 16 Q. 17

- Q. And I'll be very brief and I -- your wife is smiling so patiently. Supposed to be here at 3:30. You got here at 3:00, probably. You really owe her a lot I'll tell you.
- A. You have no idea. That's --
- Q. This friendship is about to be tested, let me tell you.
- A. Yes, sir.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Quick question. Operation silver -- operation sunset --

1 A. Silver sunset.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. Silver -- tell me about that.
- Okay. Let me see how I -- all right. Α. operation silver sunset, as I said I'm an OCDETF lawyer, organized crime and drug enforcement task force. These cases are typically assigned names so that we can track the progress of the case. Operation silver sunset began in -- right around 2014. And this was all information that -that's public. Began in 2014 and the purpose of operation silver sunset was to target gang members operating in the eastern part of South Carolina. Specifically, United Blood Nation Gang members and a subset of the gang called the Billy Eastsides. The -- this was a gang that was operating in the Myrtle Beach and Florence areas. During the investigation, we received authorization from a federal judge to intercept communications over three phones used by gang members in December through February -- December of 2016 through February of 2017. During those intercepts, we gained a lot of useful intelligence. And ultimately on February the 22nd, the takedown in the case occurred. And on that day -- prior to that day the grand jury

returned an indictment in -- against about 20 1 defendants. And I believe at the end of the day 2 3 we had 18 -- right around 18 in custody. All total, we have roughly -- we've indicted 29-30 4 defendants. It's interesting you mentioned that. 5 6 I was in Florence this morning because there was 7 a -- a hearing in that case and then tomorrow 8 morning we have sentencing. So, it's been a --9 it's been an effective case and I've really had a 10 pleasure working on it. It's kind of interesting 11 that the lead case agent is an FBI agent named Todd Richards who is one of the case agents in 12 13 the Whitey Bulger case. He's from Boston. It's 14 been a pleasure to work with.

Q. And you were awarded by the FBI for your role in prosecuting and developing -- what?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Both. So, in -- in -- as an assistant U.S. attorney, literally how an investigation begins is agents who -- who identify a target will come to the assistant U.S. attorney and say, we're interested in this target, will you help us? And ultimately -- or -- or typically what happens after we sign on there will be electronic surveillance requests that'll come in on a regular basis, trackers on vehicles. There will

be wire taps if necessary. A whole host of -- of 1 2 investigative techniques that we'll work together 3 to get authorization from courts. We'll build 4 the investigation. And sometimes the investigation lasts two or three months. 5 6 Sometimes it last two years. Ultimately, after 7 the investigation, there's a point where we feel 8 like we have the evidence we need and -- and 9 we've got the targets that we think we need to 10 get, then we'll schedule a take down. 11 typically it's a simultaneous effort among multiple agencies to arrest all these individuals 12 13 at the same time. And so, the investigation in -14 - in silver sunset lasted a little over two 15 years. I came in on towards sort of the tail end, late fall of 2016. 16 17 Q. And those indictments were February of `17? 18 Α. They were. And we've gotten multiple indictments 19 in the case. So, the first indictment was February of 2017. 2.0 21 Q. Super. And then last Billy Nettles has called 22 you the go-to guy? 23 So --Α. 24 Spend less time on that because that's less Q. 25 impressive.

- A. So, it was -- it was a --
 - Q. I'm just kidding.

2.0

- A. No, it was a nice one. It was -- we just had an awards ceremony yesterday. But it's -- it's basically an atta-boy in the office for -- for somebody -- that was for somebody who is a resource for other prosecutors, so.
- Q. But you put it on your statement and I don't blame you.
- A. Oh, thank you very much.
- Q. Thank y'all for being here.
- A. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any questions? Any further questions? Mr. Moorman, appreciate you being here today. This will conclude this portion of your screening process. I want to take the opportunity to remind that pursuant to the Commission's evaluative criteria, the Commission expects candidates to follow the spirit as well as the letter of the ethics laws. And we will view violations or the appearance of impropriety as serious and potentially deserving of heavyweight and screening deliberations. On that note, and as you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of

qualifications. And you may be called back at 1 2 such time if the need arises. I thank you for 3 your interest in this position and I thank you for what you do for the State of South Carolina. 4 MR. MOORMAN: Thank you very much. 5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Safe travels back to 6 7 Greenville. 8 (Off the Record) 9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Riordan, appreciate you being 10 here today. Before we get started, do you have 11 someone you want to introduce to the Commission? MR. RIORDAN: Yes. You've mentioned her off the 12 record, my wife Leora is here. Our -- our 16-13 year-old daughter's actually in Columbia. Might 14 15 have been here earlier but she's with the youth and government group. Could have had 60 kids if 16 17 we --18 CHAIRMAN SMITH: MR. RIORDAN: -- gotten in at 4:00. They're all 19 outside. 20 21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: We -- we saw them. We've been over 22 here for all week, most of the week, so. 23 MR. RIORDAN: I wondered if they were the ones that 24 held you up. CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, welcome and sorry that we held 25

y'all up and make sure that Jack takes you out 1 2 for dinner afterwards. How about that. 3 MR. RIORDAN: I invited her at the request but she said let's get this over. 4 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Mr. Riordan, will you 5 6 raise your right hand please, sir. 7 MR. RIORDAN, being duly sworn, testifies as follows: 8 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Mr. Riordan, before you 9 is your personal data questionnaire and the sworn 10 statement. Are these documents that you've submitted to the Commission? 11 MR. RIORDAN: Yes. 12 13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are they -- are they both correct? 14 MR. RIORDAN: To my knowledge, yes. 15 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. And do -- is there anything need to be changed or updated at this time? 16 MR. RIORDAN: I mean, again, these are not the --17 18 these are the not the signed ones but I -- I assume they're the same copies. The only thing I 19 saw on the -- the sworn statement. I think four 2.0 21 and -- no six and eight, to the extent there was 22 any suggestion in my answer I might appear before 23 family. Change that. I -- I wasn't sure just 24 the way it was written and whether that was 25 something that -- either by the way was asked or

the way I responded. Just wanted to make sure 1 everyone understands, I do understand can not 2 3 have family that I would appear in front of. -- I'd be disqualified. I don't think it's 4 necessarily in there and I think I read eight in 5 6 regarding financial interest, like maybe a 7 company we might have something to do with is how 8 I was reading that. But to the extent it could 9 be read otherwise, that would be the only change. 10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. And -- I -- I guess we'll just 11 make oral amendments to that. If -- if to the 12 extent that's necessary. Do you have any 13 objection to making these documents and any 14 amendments a part of the record of your sworn 15 testimony? MR. RIORDAN: I do not. 16 (EXHIBIT 25 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION 17 18 PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF JOHN P. RIORDAN) (EXHIBIT 26 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION 19 SWORN STATEMENT OF JOHN P. RIORDAN) 2.0 21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. If you'll give those 22 documents to Lindi for me please, sir. And we're going to make those a part of the record of your 23 24 sworn testimony. Mr. Riordan, the Judicial Merit 25 Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated

your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry 1 2 has focused on nine evaluative criteria and has 3 included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your 4 compliance with State ethics laws, search of 5 newspaper articles in which your name appears, 6 7 study of previous screenings, check for economic conflicts of interest. We have received no 8 9 affidavits in opposition to your election and no 10 witnesses are present to testify. Do you wish to 11 make a brief opening statement? MR. RIORDAN: Not really, other than to say thanks to 12 13 this entire board and all those involved with the 14 process. I -- I did not realize how thorough the 15 process was. And I certainly thank Erin and Lindi for all their help and Andy as well. But, 16 17 you know, to the extent it gets back to the 18 Community Committee and -- and those folks with 19 the Bar. I've just been impressed a bunch of folks coming up afterwards saying they called me 2.0 21 about you. You know, just wanted to let me know 22 so I was just impressed how thorough it was. 23 I -- I thank you for that. 24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you, Mr. Riordan. 25 Will you answer any questions that counsel may

1 have, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RIORDAN: Absolutely.

EXAMINATION BY MR. FIFFICK:

- Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Riordan, how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far renders you qualified and will assist you in being -- in being an effective circuit court judge?
- I've been involved both in the, you know, as a Α. prosecutor in the -- in the Court of General Sessions and now with common pleas. I think I've got a -- a fairly, you know, wide expanse of experience that I've put forth over 25 years now. It's one of the things I've attempted to do with this potentially in the back of my mind as -- as something that potentially I'd try to do at one point. I think in all those areas I've -- I've at least tried to excel and think for the most part, you know, at least from my peers and my clients that's, you know, been put back to me as -- as reflecting what I've done. But, you know, I -- I think I've got a great background, guite frankly. I'm -- I'm -- I'm 50 years old now. Just turned 50. Twenty-five years experience on both sides. I've been on -- you know, even

22

23

24

25

though I'm -- I'm doing civil practice now and I'm in a firm that's, you know, considered a defense firm. I -- I still get just about anything that smells of a criminal matter will come my way. I do have some plaintiff's work that I do as well. And -- and that's a lot of what I'm doing presently, actually. So you know, at least for this position in circuit court looking at court of general sessions and common pleas, I think I've got a -- a -- you know, the type of background I would want for my clients if I were to appear before a judge. And that -- and that's part of why I'm doing this. I think finally at this point in my career I have all those -- that background experience to fulfill the role as needed.

Q. Thank you, sir. Mr. Riordan, the Commission received 206 ballot box surveys regarding you with 16 additional comments, only one of which was negative. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments, "Jack is a kind and -- is kind and respectful to work with. A great advocate while also being a great adversary. An outstanding lawyer with 25 years and thousands of hours in

the courtroom. An absolute pleasure to work with. Extremely intelligent and competent. Has unparalleled work ethic and will be a fantastic judge. His background as a prosecutor and civil attorney uniquely qualifies him for the bench."

The lone written expressed concerns that you were disrespectful to women and prone to irrational outbursts. What response would you offer to this concern?

- A. I -- I really don't know how to respond without knowing the source and the context. I -- I'm glad to hear the other 205 or so were not of that nature. Concerned though that anyone feels that way. I'll certainly do my best as I always try to -- to make sure everyone feels like they're treated respectfully. And you know, I'll certainly do that in the court.
- Q. Thank you, sir. Mr. Riordan, you note in your PDQ, that like many others, your opportunity for trial experience has decreased over the past decade. Given your breadth of experience, how do you see this trend affecting the civil justice system in South Carolina in the coming years?
- A. Well, I mean, it's -- you know, the taxpayers may think it's a good thing. You know, for attorneys

it's not necessarily. If the cases are moving 1 2 and people are having a -- a just result that 3 they can live with and often with our mediators, we're getting that, then so be it. But if you 4 have to go to trial and maybe your attorney's not 5 6 up to speed, I know it's -- you know, it's 7 certainly not good for your clients and not good 8 for the -- for the judges that have to deal with 9 those that come before them. I know there's some 10 frustration, even expressed this past week at the 11 conference I was at that, you know, we're --12 we're just not trying so many cases. But again, 13 it just depends on the circumstance. You know, 14 it's -- I don't know that it's necessarily 15 troubling if people feel they're getting their disputes heard in a -- in a -- in a way that --16 that ends up being just or -- or resolved in a 17 18 just manner. Thank you, sir. I have a few housekeeping 19 Q. issues. Mr. Riordan, are you aware that as a 20 21 judicial candidate, you are bound by the code of 22 judicial conduct as found in Rule 501 of the 23 South Carolina Appellate Court Rules? 24

Mr. Riordan, since submitting your letter of

Yes.

Α.

Q.

25

intent, have you contacted any member of the 1 Commission about your candidacy? 2 3 Α. No. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you 4 Q. sought to received the -- the pledge of any 5 6 legislator either prior to this date or pending 7 the outcome of your screening? 8 Α. No. 9 Have you asked any third parties to contact Q. 10 members of the General Assembly on your behalf or 11 are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene 12 in this process on your behalf? 13 Α. No. 14 Have you reviewed and do you understand the Q. 15 Commission's guidelines on pledging and South Carolina Code Section 2-19-70(e)? 16 17 Α. Yes. South Carolina Bar Judicial Qualifications 18 Q. Committee found Mr. Riordan to be overall well 19 qualified and well qualified in the evaluative 20 criteria of ethical fitness, character, 21 22 professional and academic ability, reputation, 23 experience, and judicial temperament. 24 qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria of 25 constitutional qualifications, physical health,

1		and mental stability. I would also note that the
2		Upstate Citizens Committee reported that Mr.
3		Riordan was well qualified in the evaluative
4		criteria of ethical fitness, professional and
5		academic ability, character, reputation,
6		experience, and judicial temperament. And
7		qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria of
8		constitutional qualifications, physical health,
9		and mental stability. Mr. Chairman, I would note
10		for the record that any concerns raised during
11		the investigation by staff regarding the
12		candidate were incorporated into the questioning
13		of the candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I have no
14		further questions.
15	CHAI	RMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you. Any do we
16		have any questions for Mr. Riordan? Senator
17		Rankin.
18	EXAMINATI	ON BY SENATOR RANKIN:
19	Q.	Are we pronouncing your name correct?
20	Α.	Riordan is it.
21	Q.	All right. And I keep looking because I know a
22		Jerry Reardon who is in Columbia. His spells his
23		R-E-A versus R-I-O.
24	Α.	Some of them change it to avoid any
25		mispronunciation. But we have not done that.

Okay. And I -- I notice you referenced Vic or 1 Q. 2 Judge Pyles and I -- it was Vic, right? 3 Charlie or Vic. Quite frankly, we've talked Α. about that recently, but. 4 I appeared before him long ago. Kind of 5 Q. Yeah. 6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

- like the very difficult professor who we nicknamed the smiling sea. He was a smiling judge. You just you knew you were in good shape until -- but he was extremely fair, so. Your -- your sense of running for this not -- with that and -- and the Bar comments that you were -- the Greenville Bar, was that the impetus for your running for this?
- A. Well, as I said, I mean, this is something -- my wife's father was a judge. Her mother worked for two of our judges -- soon to be appellate court judges. So, I mean, he was really the one that got me even thinking about the law when I was a Clemson undergrad, I was in finance. And never had attorneys in our -- I'm still the only attorney in the family that's now getting close to 50 people from my parents on down. But I met him. Made me at least think about it. Thought that might be interesting. If nothing else, a great education. Went through. I think you see

25

from my background, I had at least some neat experiences in law school. And got affiliated with 5th Circuit Solicitor's office here. I thought, okay, well let me take it to next step. Let's see about trial work. I mean, if -- that's what I knew about attorneys, from being in court most of the time. And so that's what appealed to And I didn't know how it would be. Still get nervous as I might be right now if every time I get up in front of a jury. But that's the only way to confront it. I did it then and tried, you know, a lot of cases there. I thought, hey let's get more experience. Did some appellate work. This has always been in the back. Like I said, I've always tried to -- to -- to go as far as I could. But with that relationship, I guess part of that, I got to know all those judges from that time frame. And was very comfortable with them and got to know them as persons and wasn't too intimidated. To know, hey this would be neat. And I -- I see the, you know, position of stature they have and -- and how important it is in the system. And so, I always thought it might be something to do. The timing's never great. Don't know if now is the best time. But these

25

were things in my mind as -- as, you know, we've had these little -- I don't know -- sounds like somebody's -- you know, I would say a calling but at least one of your members is in a group that I'm in that we have at least a couple of meetings a year. End of 2015 and both meetings in 2016 we had justices and legislators that came and spoke to that group and -- and invited us, you know, if we want to be part of it to, you know, put your hat in the ring. You've got to -- you've got to step out and do things. So, I felt that was somewhat talking to me. And -- and you're right though. Kind of the tipping point was with Judge Pyles' death. And the -- and the Bar, you know, putting out that little note asking, you know, are you doing the same type of thing. And I enjoyed my service as a prosecutor. You know, try -- try to do a good job for the citizenry -citizenry. Now that I'm not in court as much I do find that I've been missing that for some time. And just being over there and seeing justice on a daily basis kind of gives you a good perspective too. And that's one thing about being a prosecutor, hey, wasn't the best pay. But boy every day you felt thankful. You'd see a

25

-- a tragedy coming in everyday and kind of put things in perspective. And you know, again, I see a bunch of -- you know, bunch of folks that I've known and grown up with have -- have left the bench. And -- and a lot of them great jurists have passed on. And I -- I try to answer with that little bit of a call that might be there. I want to serve. I -- I think with my experience I'm, you know, at least somewhat uniquely qualified in that regard with the experience in -- in both areas. But you know, I -- I know that's a -- that's a selfish portion. It'd be up to you guys to determine whether one I'm even, you know, worthy of being a part of it and -- and the legislature it self will determine whether they really want me to -- to be there. But for the taxpayers, to be a part of my community, to do more and serve like so many of you. I know everybody here today's serving. But so many of you in the legislature. At least one of you I worked with long ago and it's been in the headlines and working and doing service. And he knows a lot of our -- our brethren throughout from that group are doing the same type thing. So, yeah. I look back on occasion and wonder,

2.0

you know, how -- how things could have been a little bit differently. But this is really what I thought was more important to -- to me. And -- and it's something that I feel comfortable doing. And I -- I know I've spoken a good bit about it. But -- but that -- that's really -- it's not as if it just popped up this past year. It's been something that's been in the back of my mind. And I now feel a bit more comfortable that I could fulfil the role quite frankly.

- Q. Couple of quick things. Best lawyer -- best lawyers in America for personal injury litigation. Would that be a -- a defense side or would that be the plaintiff's side or --
- A. I think the best lawyers is probably civil defense. And one of those was an award, again, until I got it I didn't even know you could get it, was, I think, 2012 I got like best lawyer of the year in Greenville or something. So, I had -- I had -- had a nice case another firm got me involved in. And I -- I think having, you know, a lot of other people from a different firm voted for me that year was what pushed that over the top. But I was happy for that. And I -- I mean, we did do a good job in that case. It was a, you

know, very interesting case that ended up, you 1 2 know, with a lot of millions of dollars being 3 talked about before I got in. And we came back with a double defense verdict, so it was --4 It was happy for some --5 Q. 6 Happy for some and not for others. Α. -- and less so for others. 7 Q. 8 Α. Well, that's how it always is. Two things -- two 9 final things and I noticed your wife's last name is Patterson? 10 11 Yes. Q. Your father was --12 Α. 13 Q. Choppy Patterson. 14 Very good. And then last, you and I share a Α. 15 similar stepping stone in -- in your -- your walk to this point at least. At least becoming a 16 17 lawyer. I too worked with Kermit King. 18 Q. Okay. Where I learned an incredible amount of stuff. 19 Α. And on of the biggest take-aways was you don't 2.0 21 want to mess with Kermit King. 22 That's true. Q. So, you learned from a great lawyer there, so 23 Α. 24 that's it. Thank you for your willingness to do 25 this.

Q. All right. Great.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any other questions? All right.

EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN SMITH:

Correct.

Α.

_ _

Q. Mr. Riordan, I -- I've asked everybody that's a judge -- I mean that's a judicial candidate up here. So, let me -- let just be consistent and ask you a couple of these questions. I -- I know you haven't been in general sessions court in a while. Well, I guess you do do some -- you do perform some criminal defense work still, right?

- Q. What -- what's your philosophy on the alternative courts like, you know, mental health court, drug court, the veterans court? I -- I -- I know at some point if you were elected judge and you would be involved in the management of the courts and participation of individuals in those courts. What's your thoughts about those?
- A. I'm all for anything that -- that helps our judicial system. Again, I don't know as much about the funding as you all. But I'm -- I'm all for anything giving it a shot. I mean, we've made some great strides since I was practicing as a prosecutor. You know, all the sentencing reform and all that has made a big change. I

hear all the time there our drug court -- I've 1 2 only assisted peripherally with some of that. 3 -- I know Judge Chuck Simmons up in -- in Greenville has enjoyed that and thinks it's a 4 great program. And I -- I'd have no reason to 5 6 dispute that. I'm pretty close with all the 7 prosecutors as well. They're all for it as well. 8 Anything we can do that's alternative, keeps down 9 the -- the -- the prison population. 10 Saves the taxpayers money, especially for non-11 violent offenders. Give everyone a chance. Ι′m all for it. 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. And -- and lastly I -- if you're elected judge, you're going to have lawyers as -- as you know when you and I had cases together, going to have a host of conflicts, especially when you have a number of lawyers involved. And how do you balance the quality of life of lawyers who may need vacations or going to one of their children's football games, basketball games, or sporting events as opposed to moving a docket and having a just disposition of cases?
- A. You know, it's always a case by case basis. You know -- you know, you -- you try to accommodate everyone if it -- if it can happen and if it's

25

not going to break down court. I mean, that's certainly what we all want to do. We all want to be good members of the Bar together. Nobody wants to be, you know, firm just for the sake of being firm. Some judges may have gotten that reputation in the past. Who knows. But, you know, you -- you try to work within it. But -but again, you -- you can't do it unnecessarily and -- and have the -- you know, you've got to think about the -- the clients themselves that are involved and make sure the -- the attorneys vouch for the fact that their client's are on board with it. That they're well aware of it and this is what they want to happen. And again, it's just a fine balance but you don't want to do it and waste any court time and have court break down because someone -- you know, especially if they come up with the last minute. certainly the type of thing you'd encourage. That's the kind of thing I would do is try to have more interaction with the bar. Just kind of encourage, hey, if you've got issues --Greenville's pretty good anyway. We have these pretrial conferences set far out. I mean, I've got some coming next week. But they invite us to

come in beforehand and say, look, you don't even have to show up. You know, like we used to do with some judges. Come in, the whole group's there all day to speak with the judge personally who's never going to see the case again. We invite them to -- to -- well, they invite the attorney's to -- to send in a scheduling order. Just tell, hey can we put this off? We'll be ready -- you know, no -- no -- as long as we can have the case called no later mid-July, is the one I've got for next week. And they invite us to do that. And so again, you -- you want it -you -- you just don't want anything to come at the last minute. And -- and I think the attorneys that do that know that they're really asking for a lot and maybe most of them wouldn't even do that. I think most of them are cognizant of the court's time as well.

as -- as -- when we look at these ballot box
comments and it's a -- I know some people don't
like them because they're anonymous but also by
the same token they also give us a -- a good
indication of what lawyers who don't fear any

And Mr. Riordan, finally, I -- I want to tell you

retribution or offending anybody tells us. And I

25

22

23

24

Q.

1	I think it's important when we look at these	
2	to tell that tell the candidates that that	
3	when they do well. And I just want to tell you,	
4	when you look at this, you're well qualified over	
5	80 to to 80 to 70 to 90 percent of people	
6	under the criteria finds you well qualified. So,	
7	I think that's a testament	
8	A. Thank you.	
9	Q to your practice and to your good work and	
10	what you've done over the years and that's	
11	something you ought to be proud of.	
12	A. Great.	
13	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Any further questions for	
14	Mr. Riordan?	
15	SENATOR RANKIN: Real quick.	
16	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, sir.	
17	EXAMINATION BY MR. RANKIN:	
18	Q. And to and to just chase a little rabbit here.	
19	We heard from Justice Kittredge earlier this week	
20	or last whatever whatever day.	
21	A. Apparently in Greenville this year thus far, did	
22	he say that they were always at only the 16	
23	common pleas trials conducted?	
24	Q. That's what that's what he had to say. We	
25	heard that same talk this weekend or Friday. So,	

2.0

this is somewhat of a reverse. You have got a 90 percent practice is focused on civil. You've done -- you cite cases that you've been involved on the criminal side. But it's amazing how either we're afraid to try cases or -- or the success of ADR. But -- and we've heard Judge Wooten, I think -- no, Judge Anderson. Federal Court Judge Anderson bemoan the fact that we really don't try cases anymore. And so, if you're --

- A. Didn't mean to interrupt you but I ---
- Q. It's not a real question but an observation from your standpoint about if you're successful, you're not going to be trying as many in Greenville common pleas cases as you are going to be general sessions, it sounds like.
- A. Well and again, I -- I -- you know, the -- the fact that I've mostly been doing civil -- again, I think some of the folks -- my appearances there I think are for good reason. I'm trying -- most of the stuff I get these days, I try my best and thankfully through connections have tried to nip things in the bud. So, they're -- so, they're not making headlines and they're not in court as much as we can be. I think that's the best thing

25

I can do for my -- for my criminal cases. you're right. I did -- and I note in there just -- had a couple of unfortunate scenarios a couple of years ago and because of those, I kind of intentionally said, all right. I'm -- I'm going to peel back on this. I just -- you know -- one of them was a terribly long case just to -- you know -- unfortunate outcome there. And another was with a young man that I just -- the solicitor and I for whatever reason, he and I've gotten along in every other case. Je and I couldn't see eye to eye on this. I still it was -- just a -so I tried to appeal to him as a taxpayer. You know, why would you want to have this young person there. But, you know, with the trials from the defense standpoint and you know others here know, you know, a part of that is just the headlines that are out there. The -- the plaintiff's attorneys do a good job of, you know, putting out headlines whether they're trials or judgments or whatever. And our client's read about them. And they're -- you know, you can't quarantee them a result. All they can do is tell them, hey, you know, we've got a pretty good case. This is -- I'm not afraid to try this.

You know, I've got a lot of clients who do 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 They -- they -- it -- it may be fewer. 19 20 Q. 21

22

23

24

25

listen. But it's just not as many anymore. we've got -- we've got great mediators in the upstate too. So, the other thing about Greenville is, we don't get most of those huge verdicts. And so, when we're able to -- to deliver, you know, a decent resolution, the insurance companies that are doing work and -and the companies that are doing work all over the country and have some bad results on similar facts, they're happy to do it. They think they're getting a bargain. And I think part of that's just from the great jury pool we have in Greenville. But -- but again, I -- you know, I think if you talk to anyone around the state and you know, look at my record I'm -- I'm certainly not one of those that's afraid to try them. you're right, if I'm sitting as a judge, yeah.

And I'm -- I'm not -- it's a odd rabbit that -that I'm chasing here. A rabbit hole but ultimately I grew up with a father who was a lawyer and a judge. And you look back everyone knew Choppy Patterson. That's your dad, correct? Judge Patterson?

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	Sorry. In-law. I'm looking to or at your wife.
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	Yeah. Yeah. So, now I'm looking too or at
5		your wife. My father was firm as well as a
6		judge. And very strict. And but you try your
7		cases that you can't resolve. You try either the
8		bad ones and you settle your good ones. So, I
9		perhaps that's that's your experience. I know
10		got recent experience where we've tried bad
11		ones and good results, bad results. So, anyway.
12		That
13	A.	Yeah. As I say, I'd I'd I'd I'd rather
14		it be less trials and good results all around
15		than having a couple of these I'm up here and I'm
16		saying, boy, I wish we never tried that case.
17		Thankfully, that hasn't happened in in some
18		time.
19	Q.	There won't be a lack of work awaiting you if
20		you're successful. It'll be just different.
21	A.	Sure.
22	Q.	Mr. Chairman, please turn my mic off.
23	CHAI	RMAN SMITH: Thank you. I'll be happy to do that
24		for you. Okay. Mr. Riordan any any
25		further questions of Mr. Riordan? Mr. Riordan,

thank you so much for your testimony today. 1 2 concludes this portion of your screening process. 3 I want to take this opportunity to remind you that pursuant to the Commission's evaluative 4 criteria, the Commission expects candidates to 5 follow the spirit as well as the letter of the 6 ethics laws. And we will view violations or the 7 8 appearance of impropriety as serious and 9 potentially deserving of heavyweight and screening deliberations. On that note, and as 10 11 you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of qualifications. 12 13 And you may be called back at such time if the 14 need arises. I thank you for offering. And I 15 thank you for your service to the State of South Carolina. 16 17 MR. RIORDAN: Thank you all. 18 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Y'all have a safe trip back to Greenville. 19 MR. RIORDAN: 2.0 Thank you. 21 (Off the Record) 22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is it -- is it Ms. -- Ms. Salvini? 23 Is that how you pronounce your name? 24 JUDGE SALVINI: That's correct. 25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right, good. Ms. Salvini, first,

```
let me apologize to you for making you wait.
1
 2
               are overly optimistic on our time and -- and we
 3
               do not mean to be disrespectful of your time. So,
               I appreciate your patience with us.
 4
5
          JUDGE SALVINI:
                          Thank you.
 6
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: Judge -- sorry.
          JUDGE SALVINI: No, that's all right. I appreciate
 7
8
               that but --
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: I do have ---
9
10
         JUDGE SALVINI: No, it's not a problem at all.
11
         CHAIRMAN SMITH: You're getting the benefit of being
12
               the last person before us today, so my -- my eyes
13
               are getting worn out. All right. Judge Salvini,
14
               will you please raise your right hand?
15
     JUDGE SALVINI, being duly sworn, testifies as follows:
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Judge Salvini, you have
16
17
               before you the personal data questionnaire and
18
               the sworn statements. Are those documents that
               you have submitted to the Commission?
19
          JUDGE SALVINI: Yes, they are.
20
21
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are they both correct?
22
          JUDGE SALVINI:
                          They are. And I did provide an
23
               amendment which is Exhibit 29.
24
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. And the amendment's marked as
25
               exhibit. Is there any other changes or any other
```

updates you need to make at this time? 1 2 JUDGE SALVINI: I do not. 3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do you have any objection to us making those documents and your amendment a part 4 of the record of your sworn testimony? 5 JUDGE SALVINI: I do not. 6 7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Let the record reflect. 8 Will -- if you'll hand those to Lindi for me, 9 please. And we'll make those part of your --10 exhibit to your sworn testimony. Judge Salvini, 11 the Judicial Merits Selection Commission has 12 thoroughly investigated your qualifications for 13 the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the nine 14 evaluative criteria and has included a ballot box 15 survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with 16 the state ethics laws, search of newspaper 17 18 articles in which your name appears, study of previous screenings, and checks for economic 19 conflicts of interest. We've received no 2.0 21 affidavits today filed in opposition to your 22 election and there are no witnesses present to 23 testify. Do you wish to make a brief opening 24 statement to the Commission? (EXHIBIT 27 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION 25

1	PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE JESSICA	
2	A. SALVINI)	
3	(EXHIBIT 28 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION	
4	SWORN STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JESSICA A. SALVINI)	
5	(EXHIBIT 29 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA	
6	QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE JESSICA A. SALVINI)	
7	JUDGE SALVINI: Briefly, I would just like to thank	
8	you all for the opportunity to appear before you	
9	here this evening. And to thank the staff for	
10	being so wonderful. They truly have been. They	
11	have been helpful and informative and I	
12	appreciate them very much. With that said, I am	
13	keenly aware that I am the last candidate of this	
14	evening so I am happy to answer any questions	
15	that you all may have.	
16	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you. Will you please answer	
17	questions from counsel?	
18	JUDGE SALVINI: Yes, sir.	
19	EXAMINATION BY MR. HINSON:	
20	Q. Good evening, Judge Salvini. Chairman, I will	
21	begin by noting for the record that based on the	
22	testimony contained into candidate's PDQ, which	
23	has been included in the record, with the	
24	candidate's consent, that Judge Salvini meets the	
25	constitutional and statutory requirements for	

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. Judge Salvini, how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far renders you qualified and will assist you to be an effective circuit court judge?

Α. So, my practice without going over every detail that's in my PDQ has been a very general practice. I've had the benefit of being a general practitioner in private practice and quite frankly a trial attorney my entire legal career. Specifically, I have handled a wide variety of matters in almost every court in this state throughout the past 16 years. I am starting my 17th year of practice. I also have had the pleasure of being for the last ten years a municipal court judge. And I think that that experience specifically aids me in -- in seeking this position in being a circuit court judge. So, I started out being a trial attorney and being in court generally two to three times a week, if not every week. And then once becoming a municipal court judge, I had the honor and pleasure of being trained by the Honorable Rob Stillwell. So, he was my predecessor. And when I was first appointed to an associate judge

25

position, he took me under his wing and I sat with him at -- on the bench for quite some time. I'm sure I drove him probably crazy asking him as many questions as I possibly could in hopes that I could gain from his knowledge and experience before he took the circuit court bench. And he was extremely patient with me and taught me, essentially, how to be a judge, how to preside over matters, how to be effective and control the courtroom, and specifically, how to make my record clear. So, I have spent the last ten years as a municipal court judge. And then when he went up to the circuit court, I became the chief trial judge. That has afforded me the opportunity to preside over matters every single In fact, this morning I was on the bench wearing the black robe. Most of those matters are pro se litigants, people without lawyers. So, they don't really know what to do during the court process. And I believe that that experience in and of itself, being able to deal with those litigants, both attorneys and pro se, just the citizens, and providing them with a fair and impartial process. It has been my goal to make sure that when they walk into that courtroom

they feel like they have been heard. That they understand what the law is and what the process is. And that they were treated fairly and justly. So, that experience, I believe, puts me in a unique position to move to the circuit court. Q. Thank you, Judge Salvini. Judge Salvini, we --we -- the Commission received 171 ballot box

- we -- the Commission received 171 ballot box surveys regarding you with 12 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. One stated you had the highest ethical standards.

 Another stated, "This applicant would make a great addition to the bench." And another said, "Most qualified person I've seen in a long time." I would note for the record that there were no negative concerns expressed in the ballot box survey. Judge Salvini, your SLED report indicates you were named as a defendant in a lawsuit that was filed in 2016 in the Greenville County Court of Common Pleas by RoofRoof Greenville. Can you explain the nature and disposition of this lawsuit?
- A. Yes. So, I, along with my ex-husband, still own a -- what I would consider to be a loft apartment

23

24

25

in Greenville. And that building contains several units. And the homeowner's association contracted with RoofRoof to -- and I don't recall specifically, but either to repair or to replace the roof. After the construction was done there were several of the owners whose roofs were still leaking and objected to the homeowner's association paying the bill in its entirety. That's my understanding. I never had any direct conversations. I wasn't involved in any of the discussions with the homeowner's association or those -- those owners of, what I would consider to be loft apartments. The matter was resolved between the homeowner's association and the -those owners. There was additional repairs made. I was specifically named because I have an interest in that loft apartment. I -- I don't --I don't reside there. My ex-husband resides there currently. But that was the nature of that and it was satisfied after they resolved their dispute.

Q. Thank you. You also indicated in your PDQ that while you were not named, your law firm and your partner were sued by a former client. Can you explain the nature and disposition of that suit?

- So, my -- my law partner was sued by a 1 Α. 2 former client and that client did name my law 3 I wasn't named specifically. It was a client who had an issue with her nursing license. 4 She alleged that my partner had failed in several 5 6 regards in terms of helping her or assisting her 7 or representing her properly in acquiring that 8 license. It was resolved via settlement 9 agreement. I believe that my insurance company 10 or our insurance company for our law firm and my 11 law partner and myself did agree to. Thank you for that. Judge Salvini, should you 12 Q. 13
 - Q. Thank you for that. Judge Salvini, should you ascend to the circuit court bench what do you believe will be the most challenging aspect of the position?

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

A. I think the most challenging aspect of the position will be making sure that the cases -- that there's not a backlog of cases. I believe that that's one of the issues that faces all of our courts. It certainly faces the municipal court. And I believe that it does so at the circuit court level. So, being able to balance the general sessions docket and making sure that those cases are heard in a timely manner.

Especially for those individuals who are

3

5

7

8

10

11 12

13

15

14

16

1718

19

20

2122

23

24

25

incarcerated as well as balancing the court of common pleas and ensuring those cases are heard timely. I believe that they may be the -- the most difficult challenge. Or the -- the challenge that faces all circuit judges in terms of being able to be an effective circuit judge is making sure those cases are heard timely.

- Q. Judge Salvini, what do you believe may be the appropriate temperament of a circuit court judge?
- Α. I believe that for every judge, whether it's a circuit court judge or a family court judge or -or a municipal court judge, that the temperament of the judge should be one who is -- is patient. Who is willing and able to listen to the litigants. Even if there may be a frustrating argument or someone is not abiding by the rules to begin with. For example, pro se litigants appear before me all the time. They become extremely frustrated when they realize that they are making an argument that isn't firmly rooted in the law. It's a matter of being able to listen to those litigants, making sure that they feel and understand that they have been heard by somebody who is listening to their argument and cares about what they're saying. I believe that

a circuit judge or any judge needs to treat 1 2 people with respect and make sure that when they 3 walk out of that courtroom that they feel like they had a fair and just hearing, regardless of 4 whatever the outcome is. 5 6 Thank you, Judge Salvini. I just have a few Q. 7 house keeping issues. Judge Salvini, are you 8 aware that as a judicial candidate you are bound 9 by the code of judicial conduct as found in Rule 10 501 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules? 11 Yes, I am. Α. Judge Salvini, since submitting your letter of 12 Q. 13 intent, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy? 14 15 Α. I have not. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you 16 Q. 17 sought or received the pledge of any legislator 18 either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening? 19 I have not. 20 Α. 21 Have you asked any third parties to contact Q. 22 members of the General Assembly on your behalf or 23 are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene 24 in this process on your behalf? 25 Α. I have not and I am not aware of anyone who has.

1	Q.	Have you reviewed and do you understand the
2		Commission's guidelines on pledging and SC Code
3		2-19-70(e)?
4	А.	Yes.
5	Q.	I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee
6		reported that Judge Salvini to be well qualified
7		in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness,
8		professional and academic ability, character,
9		reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.
LO		And qualified in the evaluative criteria of
11		constitutional qualifications, physical health,
12		and mental stability. Mr. Chairman, I would note
13		for the record that any concerns raised during
14		the investigation by staff regarding the
15		candidate were incorporated in the questioning of
16		the candidate today. And with that, I have no
17		further questions.
18	CHAI	RMAN SMITH: Thank you. Any questions for Judge
19		Salvini?
20	MR.	MURPHY: Mr. Chairman.
21	CHAI	RMAN SMITH: Yes, Mr Representative Murphy.
22	EXAMINATI	ON BY REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY:
23	Q.	Judge Salvini, just curious. I see you're a
24		native Californian?
25	A.	I am.

And went to law school and practiced out there. 1 Q. 2 How did you get to South Carolina? Just --3 I -- I followed a boy. I met my ex-husband in Α. California. He was attending school there. We 4 went to law school together. And shortly after 5 6 we graduated he started clerking for a, I 7 believe, a federal judge. And I started my 8 practice. And his father became sick. He is an 9 -- from Greenville, South Carolina. 10 Q. Yeah. 11 And asked if I would be willing to take another Α. bar exam. Which I was a little reluctant to do 12 13 but asked if I'd be willing to move here. And 14 so, we thought about it. And as soon as he 15 finished that year, we went ahead and made the move. And I've been here ever since. 16 17 Thank you. Q. 18 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Senator Hayes. EXAMINATION BY MR. HAYES: 19 20 Q. 21 22

23

24

25

Q. I know you probably went over this and I just -it's getting late. I may not have been paying
attention. What criminal experience do you have?
I know you do criminal work in -- in -- in your
judge's capacity because you hear crimes that are
coming in to municipal court. But outside of

that, what criminal work have you done?

_

_ _

A. Okay. So, I've had an extensive criminal practice. I've handled cases in my private practice anywhere from a misdemeanor all the way up to a felony. So, I -- recently, for example, just resolved a criminal sexual conduct with a minor case this past winter in general sessions. I have tried cases in federal court. I'm on the criminal justice act panel. Which means, I -- I accept and receive criminal appointments for those that are charged with federal crimes. So, I've had an extensive -- outside of my presiding over those matters, which -- which I do regularly --

- Q. What -- what percentage of your practice would you say was criminal as opposed to civil?
- A. Without going back and looking at my PDQ when I was categorizing the cases looking at my database, I would say that my case load when -- when I compare it to civil versus criminal, if I'm looking at domestic work, I have a -- a strong domestic private practice that I would include in civil. So, that definitely -- that percentage would be higher over my criminal case load. I'd want to go back and look and make sure

I'm not telling you wrong but --

2

Q. Taking out the family, where would you say as far as criminal versus?

4 5 A. I think my criminal is probably more extensive than my civil practice. Maybe it would be more than half of that.

6

7

Q. Okay. Thank you.

8

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? Any other questions for Judge Salvini?

9 10

EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN SMITH:

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

Judge, let me ask you just a couple question I've Q. been asking everybody. And you've got some familiarity with the criminal side I hear you say. What -- what's your -- what's your thoughts on these alternative courts that we're seeing more and more of in -- in regards to mental health courts, veterans courts, drug courts? I understand through this race now that I've been asking these questions is that y'all have all of the above in Greenville. And what -- what's your thoughts on that, if you become elected as a judge, you know, you would have to participate, preside or -- or, you know be involved in. What's your thoughts about the advocacy and -- of those courts that we have in that alternative

fashions?

Α.

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25

1

Okay. So, I -- I do believe that those courts are extremely effective and they can be so in several regards. One, because they will help with the backlog of cases. And number two, I do believe in some instances, for example, like with drug court they can help with rehabilitation so that there's not repeat offenders. I mean, that is the goal. And so, I do believe that those can be extremely effective. As of right now, the penalties become very harsh for those individuals who decide to take advantage of those courts and then don't -- don't successfully complete. So, at -- at this point in time, I do believe they are effective and I think that they should continue to -- to move forward and -- and -- and even -- maybe even consider, for example, something like homeless. Homeless court would be a very, I think, advantageous thing for the -for -- for us to consider as well. And I'm just throwing that out there because that's something that's near and dear to my heart. But there's --I can't tell you how many times I'm in municipal court and the officers in Mauldin are extremely considerate when they make sure that I know that

3

4

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

somebody who appears before me is homeless, has no place to go, and no ability to pay a fine. And so, those alternative courts help address those issues that I think the judges face.

- And Justice Beatty recently issued an opinion Q. about -- about unrepresented defendants and how municipal courts -- and I read some articles in the New York Times that highlighted the -- our justice system on the municipal and magistrate level in South Carolina. What are your thoughts about his order in does it provide you any -- any complications in the way you handle your court?
- Α. Without commenting on something that would put me in a position as a judicial officer of -- of addressing something that hasn't -- that's still in development because I'm -- understand we had a -- we had a meeting here just recently where the municipal and magistrate court judges are -- are give -- given some guidance about what's coming down the pipeline. And -- and certainly it's made national news. At least for my court, I touched based with my administrative judge and my clerk of court and we immediately started taking steps to address that issue. So for example, today, even ,when I presided over matters, every

25

person who came before the court received their Faretta warnings form. Not just myself on the bench explaining to them their right to counsel. But actually listing it out. Having them read it, sign it, indicate that they understood it. And those steps we have started to take immediately. Now, certainly his order has required us to recall bench warrants before my tenure even on the bench. And so, I believe, that at this point we have recalled -- and I -- I won't -- I think it's 2,400 and some change of -of bench warrants that have been recalled in my jurisdiction alone, in my court. And -- and I'm not -- I don't know how we're going to handle that just yet. I had a meeting this morning to try to address it. But certainly, my court -- my clerk and I -- my administrative judge, we are very efficient in terms of trying to make sure our docket moves fast and people are afforded their right to counsel and they're given their right. So, at this point until we receive further direction from the Supreme Court or from Justice Beatty, we are recalling those bench warrants. We are categorizing them to determine whether or not those individuals had counsel.

Again, some of them were before I was even on the bench. But immediately we've taken steps to address any concern that would be going on in our court regarding whether or not someone was given their right to counsel or informed of their right to counsel adequately.

- Q. If somebody would come to your court and been in jail for ten days, eight days, however long it was and they were there and they were guilty, they didn't have the ability to pay a fine were you incarcerating? Was it pay 30 days or a fine of \$500 or were you doing time served? How were you handling that?
- A. So -- so, most of -- most of the cases that I hear, I impose a fine as opposed to jail time. I may impose a suspended sentence depending on the nature of the crime. But in most of my cases I will impose a fine and then the individuals are given either a -- what I would consider to be an extension on payment if they weren't able to pay the fine on that date. But I don't -- I don't generally incarcerate. Now, I do provide victims the opportunity to be heard. And there are some victims that appear that request that someone be incarcerated. For example, if it was domestic

violence or if it was some type of assault and 1 2 battery. But for the most part -- most of my 3 victims even aren't asking for incarceration. How about the -- if somebody doesn't pay the fine 4 Q. that you impose --5 Uh-huh. 6 Α. 7 Q. -- and it's 30 days or \$500 fine and give you 8 time payments and they don't pay, and those time 9 payments, are y'all issuing bench warrants to 10 have those people picked up and serve the time if 11 they can't afford to pay? 12 Α. No. I think that the issue that's coming before, 13 at least my court, is is that these are 14 individuals who did not appear. They were tried 15 in their absence and a sentence was imposed. That -- that is the primary issue before my 16 court. In -- in -- in the instances where 17 18 individuals who have actually appeared before me 19 and received, let's say, a sentence that was a fine and not a sentence of incarceration. 20 21 Although I did have an associate judge that most 22 often would impose, for example, a fine with a 23 30-day suspended sentence. My sentences 24 generally -- I can't think of a -- a -- I -- it would be a small handful that that would occur. 25

Those individuals are given an -- been given an extension on payment. Now, if they fail to reappear to pay that fine, there are some consequences in terms of I may, depending on a case by case basis, hold them in contempt of court, for example, for not reappearing.

Especially, if, for example, there's something attached to it like a restitution order. Or there's a victim that needs to have that paid and that was something that was included in what my sentence was.

- Q. And what -- what I'm interested in is just how your court treats -- you know, you -- you mentioned homeless or --
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- those -- those individuals tend to,
 unfortunately, depending upon what police
 jurisdiction they are in are the ones that tend
 to get arrested at -- for minor crimes, public
 drunk, disorderly conduct. They're -- they're
 creating a nuisance, so to speak, somewhere. And
 that's what happens and they get put on time
 payment plan. I'm just interested, when they -obviously, you know they can't afford a time
 payment plan when you impose it and they're on

Α.

there and I think that's part of the point of what the article that I read in my -- my municipal court was cited in -- in the article. So, you know, and -- and that's why I'm interested. You know, the article in my opinion portrayed it a whole lot differently than what happens. But you know, I guess what I'm trying to figure out is those who don't -- who can't pay and don't pay, is there consequences which would include jail for those people?

It -- it could potentially, yes. Even in my jurisdiction. But for example, when I'm made aware of somebody who can not pay -- Miracle Hill is almost directly across the street from my courthouse. So, generally what I will impose is let's talk about you doing some community service. You can go to the clerk of court's office. They'll provide you with a form. They literally walk across the street to provide that. If it's somebody, for example, who is homeless depending on the nature of the case. It's a case by case basis. Depending on their age, for example, and whether or not they have a place to go. And generally the officers will move for a time served sentence if they spent even a couple

22

23

24

25

of days in jail. Depending on how many times the officer's been involved with them. And likewise, everyone in -- in Mauldin at least in my court and the officers know that, for example, very young -- I'm -- I'm saying, 30 or younger. And actually, if somebody older asks me to do it, I would not be opposed to it. But if they do not have their GED, they do not a job, then we fashion a sentence that will address it. So, I have probably -- I think I have at least half a dozen individuals right now whose cases -- their criminal cases are being held in abeyance until they can obtain their GED. And I will keep them on my court docket. They check in with the officers and they check in with the clerk of court. So, we're fashioning some creative sentences. That's not to say that I don't understand the concern or why Justice Beatty issued his order. It's just that at this point as a municipal court judge I'm still waiting to receive guidance in terms of how we're going to handle it.

Q. And -- and finally the last question is,
obviously I -- I have friends who are municipal
court judges and magistrates. And, you know, I --

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- I understand they're at the bottom of the totem pole as it relates to priority of courts. So, when attorneys have conflicts with the courts and -- how -- how do you handle that generally?

Okay. So, and -- and that is an issue for Α. municipal courts. It's a very serious issue. There's a lot of cases that get continued or rescheduled as a result of a lawyer being called to another court. But having the -- the experience of being a private practitioner, I understand that lawyers -- it is a demanding job. And you've got two or three judges that are asking you to be in one place at the exact same time when you're a solo practitioner. generally what I will do is -- is address with the -- the city prosecutor and the attorney. Especially, attorney who is -- who is lucky enough to have a very successful practice so he or she is -- is going to every court. We work it out to where we address it on the docket itself. I'll continue the case. Because I -- I don't want a lawyer to ever feel like they're in a position that they can not handle enough. somebody's in general sessions trying a felony case and I have a jury trial docket at the exact

24

25

same time, I have never demanded an attorney show up there, start a trial, pick a jury with me or make, you know, a colleague pick a jury just to show up three days later to try to try a case with me. I mean, I -- this profession is stressful. And -- and if we want to avoid lawyers drinking every single day and -- and -and having some very extreme stress placed on So, instead what I've done is usually I'll them. move them to the very next calendar. Try to address it with the other court with the city prosecutor to make sure that we've got a situation where it can be scheduled. And that so far has seem to work out. We've been able -especially for lawyers that do a lot of DUIs. Ιf we can -- generally like on my next jury trial docket what I'll do is try to take all their DUIs that are coming up for trial and say, look, let's set them for let's say the last two days of that jury trial term. Let's make sure that they know that that's when they're going to go so they can request protection from the other court.

Q. Okay. So, you -- you don't schedule courts on Saturdays or days of football games to make sure that the attorneys are in -- are available, do

you?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

- A. I don't but I think my city prosecutor might me shoot me if I asked him to do one more thing.

 Right now, in order to move cases --
- Q. I'm not -- I'm --
- A. -- in the backlog.
- Q. I'm not encouraging any of that. You -- you -you will suffer the same. We had a municipal
 court judge last year that -- that -- that was
 proud of that. And I don't think he was proud of
 it after he left here.
- That is not -- they would probably -- there Α. No. would be -- there would be -- yeah. It would be tyranny in my court. There would be people revolting if I made them show up in -- on a football day. But we do run a very -- I'm going to give my city prosecutors at least the -- at least a little bit of props. I mean, right now on my jury trial term we'll schedule approximately 70 cases. I'll do an ABC, every block of time so I can get as many heard in a five-day period as I can. Most of those cases do settle but it does require the city prosecutor and all the defense attorneys to work extremely hard. And nobody's complained yet. I don't want

to jinx myself but they're -- they work really
hard to move that docket in that five-day period.

Uniformly a period of the peri

- Q. Impressed with what you're doing over there. I congratulate you on that.
- A. Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any other questions for Judge Salvini? All right. Judge Salvini, thank you so much. This concludes this portion of your screening process. I want to take this opportunity to remind you that pursuant to the Commission's evaluative criteria, the Commission expect candidates to follow the spirit as well as the letter of the ethics laws. And we will view violations or appearance of impropriety as seriously -- as serious and potentially deserving of heavyweight and screening deliberations. that note, and as you know, the record will remain open until the former release of the report of qualifications. And you may be called back at such time if the need arises. T thank you for offering for this position and I thank you for your service to the State of South Carolina.

JUDGE SALVINI: All right. Thank you, all.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

1	JUDGE SALVINI: I hope everyone has a good evening.
2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: You too. Have a safe trip back.
3	JUDGE SALVINI: Thank you.
4	(Off the Record)
5	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Safran moves that we go into
6	executive session. All in favor say, aye.
7	(Ayes are heard.)
8	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed? Ayes have it. We'll be
9	in executive session.
10	(Executive Session.)
11	CHAIRMAN SMITH: We're going to lift the veil. All in
12	favor say, aye.
13	(Ayes are heard.)
14	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed? Ayes have it. We're
15	here. We're we're going to take up the we
16	we're going to take up the circuit court
17	13th circuit seat number four. So, Erin's going
18	to
19	MR. HITCHCOCK: Do you want to vote on whether they're
20	all qualified or not?
21	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah. Well yeah. Hold on. Okay.
22	All right. So, Mr. Hitchcock has a motion.
23	MR. HITCHCOCK: Mr. Chairman, I I move we take up
24	the candidates as a slate for purposes for
25	determining qualifications and I would move that

1	all be found qualified.
2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Mr. Hitchcock I'm
3	sorry. Moves that all the candidates be found
4	qualified. Mr. Safran seconds it. Any
5	discussion? All in favor of of finding the
6	candidates qualified all candidates qualified,
7	raise your hands. All opposed? Let the record
8	reflect that I vote the proxy for Representative
9	Rutherford and he votes in the affirmative. And
10	Representative I mean, Senator Rankin, you
11	have the proxy of Senator Sabb and how does he
12	vote?
13	MR. RANKIN: In favor.
14	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. All right. Let's call the
15	roll please.
16	MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. This is for qualified and
17	nominated. First candidate would be the
18	Honorable Alex Kinlaw, Jr.
19	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Mr. Howard moves to find,
20	I presume
21	MR. HOWARD: Mr. Howard moves to find Judge Kinlaw
22	qualified and nominated.
23	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. And moves to nominate
24	MS. CRAWFORD: No. No. We have to vote.
25	CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's that's what I'm saying.

But someone has to -- oh, that's right. We just 1 2 call the vote. All right. Yeah. I'm sorry. 3 All right. All right. So, all in favor of -- of finding Judge Kinlaw nominated -- all in favor of 4 nominating Judge Kinlaw, please raise your hand. 5 6 MS. CRAWFORD: Eight. 7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: We've got eight. And -- and 8 Representative Rutherford votes to nominated 9 Judge Kinlaw and -- and Senator Sabb votes the 10 same. So, let the record reflect that Judge 11 Kinlaw is nominated unanimously. Next is Andrew -- Andrew "Andy" Moorman, Sr. So, all in favor 12 13 of finding him -- to nominate him, please raise 14 your hand. And let the record reflect that -two. And then let the record reflect that 15 Representative Rutherford votes for Mr. Moorman. 16 MS. CRAWFORD: The third candidate is John "Jack" 17 18 Patrick Riordan. CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. So, all in favor of 19 nominating John "Jack" Patrick Riordan please 20 21 raise your hand. And the proxys --22 Representative Rutherford votes to nominate Mr. 23 Riordan and Senator Sabb votes to nominate Mr. 24 Riordan. MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. And then the Honorable Jessica 25

```
Ann Salvini.
1
 2
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Raise your hand if you --
3
               vote --
         MS. CRAWFORD: Seven.
 4
         CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay.
5
6
         MS. CRAWFORD: Is that correct? Seven. Okay.
               three candidates qualified and nominated are
7
8
               Judge Kinlaw, Jack Riordan, and Judge Salvini.
9
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. All right. With that, Senator
10
               Hayes moves that the Committee adjourn. All in
11
               favor say aye.
                          (Ayes are heard.)
12
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed? We stand adjourn to
13
               reconvene Monday, November --
14
         MS. CRAWFORD: 27th.
15
         CHAIRMAN SMITH: -- 27th at 10:00 --
16
17
         MS. CRAWFORD: 10:00 a.m.
18
          CHAIRMAN SMITH: -- 10:00 a.m.
19
     (There being nothing further, the proceeding concluded at
20
     6:45 p.m.)
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	I, JENNIFER NOTTLE, COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC
3	IN AND FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AT LARGE, HEREBY
4	CERTIFY THAT I REPORTED THIS PROCEEDING, ON WEDNESDAY, THE
5	15TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2017, AND THAT THE FOREGOING 218
6	PAGES CONSTITUTE A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPTION OF MY
7	STENOMASK REPORT OF SAID PROCEEDING.
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
13	THIS 27TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2017.
14	
15	JENNIFER NOTTLE, COURT REPORTER
16	MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JULY 11, 2023
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	