1	STATE OF SOU	TH CAROLINA)
2	COUNTY OF RI	
3		,
4		* * * *
5		JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION
6		
		TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS * * * * *
7		
8		MURRELL SMITH, JR., CHAIRMAN
9	SE:	NATOR LUKE A. RANKIN
10	SE:	NATOR RONNIE A. SABB
11	SE	NATOR TOM YOUNG, JR.
12	RO	BERT W. HAYES, JR.
13	RE	PRESENTATIVE J. TODD RUTHERFORD
14	RE	PRESENTATIVE CHRIS MURPHY
15	MI	CHAEL HITCHCOCK
16	JO	SHUA HOWARD
17	AN	DREW N. SAFRAN
18	ER	IN B. CRAWFORD, CHIEF COUNSEL
19		* * * *
20	DATE:	November 27th, 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	THE HONORABLE THOMAS LESLIE HUGHSTON, JR 5
4	- Examination by Mr. Davidson
5	- Comments by Representative Murphy11
6	- Comments by Senator Young
7	AMY VIRGINIA COFIELD
8	- Examination by Ms. Benson
9	- Examination by Representative Murphy 26
10	- Examination by Senator Young
11	- Examination by Senator Rankin
12	- Examination by Mr. Safran
13	- Examination by Chairman Smith
14	DONNA EARLS ELDER43
15	- Examination by Mr. Hinson48
16	- Examination by Senator Young 57
17	- Examination by Mr. Hayes60
18	- Examination by Representative Rutherford 62
19	- Examination by Senator Rankin
20	- Examination by Representative Murphy 67
21	- Reexamination by Representative Rutherford 68
22	Certificate of Reporter79
23	Word Index
24	REQUESTED INFORMATION INDEX
25	(No Information Requested.)

1	EXHIBIT INDEX
2	EXHIBITS: PAGE:
3	EXHIBIT NO. 1 6
4	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL
5	DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS
6	LESLIE HUGHSTON, JR.
7	EXHIBIT NO. 2 7
8	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT
9	OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS LESLIE HUGHSTON, JR.
10	EXHIBIT NO. 3 15
11	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
12	QUESTIONNAIRE OF AMY VIRGINIA COFIELD
13	EXHIBIT NO. 4
14	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT
15	OF AMY VIRGINIA COFIELD
16	EXHIBIT NO. 5
17	- AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF
18	AMY VIRGINIA COFIELD
19	EXHIBIT NO. 6
20	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
21	QUESTIONNAIRE OF DONNA EARLS ELDER
22	EXHIBIT NO. 7
23	- JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN TESTIMONY
24	OF DONNA EARLS ELDER
25	

Page 4

```
1
    Court Reporter's Legend:
 2
    dashes [--] Intentional or purposeful interruption
 3
            Indicates trailing off
 4
     . . .
 5
     [sic] Written as said
 6
 7
8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. We're back on
2
     the record. And right now, Mr. Safran moves that we go
3
     into executive session. All in favor say "aye."
            (At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
 4
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed?
5
6
                           (Hearing none.)
7
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH:
                                     The ayes have it. We're in
8
     executive session. So turn off your mics, please.
9
             (Off the record from 10 a.m. to 11:19 a.m.)
10
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Good morning, Judge.
11
                    JUDGE HUGHSTON: Good morning.
12
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: First, Representative
13
     Murphy moves that we come out of executive session. All in
14
     favor say "aye."
15
            (At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
16
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH:
                                     Opposed?
17
                           (Hearing none.)
18
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: The ayes have it. I just
    want to state for the record, that while we've been in
19
     executive session there's been -- no decisions were made
2.0
21
    and no votes were taken during executive session.
22
                    Judge Hughston, how are you doing today?
23
                    JUDGE HUGHSTON:
                                     Fine, thank you.
24
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Judge Hughston, will you
25
    please raise your right hand.
```

1	WHEREUPON,
2	THE HONORABLE THOMAS LESLIE HUGHSTON, JR.,
3	being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the
4	whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as
5	follows:
6	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Judge Hughston, are the
7	personal the data questionnaire and the sworn statement
8	that are before you, documents that you have submitted to
9	this commission?
10	JUDGE HUGHSTON: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are they both correct?
12	JUDGE HUGHSTON: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN SMITH: And does anything need to
14	be changed or updated at this time?
15	JUDGE HUGHSTON: No.
16	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Do you object -
17	- if you'll hand those to Lindi for us. Do you have any
18	objection to us making those documents and any amendments
19	as a part of the record of your sworn testimony?
20	JUDGE HUGHSTON: No.
21	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. We'll make that
22	a part of the record.
23	(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
24	COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE
25	HONORABLE THOMAS LESLIE HUGHSTON, JR.)

(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION 1 2 COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE 3 THOMAS LESLIE HUGHSTON, JR.) CHAIRMAN SMITH: Judge Hughston, the 4 Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly 5 6 investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our 7 inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria, and has 8 included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verifications of your compliance 9 10 with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in 11 which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, and checks for economic conflicts of interest. 12 13 We have received no affidavits, today, filed 14 in opposition to your election. No witnesses are here to 15 testify. Do you wish to make a brief opening statement to the Commission? 16 JUDGE HUGHSTON: No, I just appreciate the 17 18 consideration and courtesies extended to me. 19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. If you'll answer the questions of Counsel, please, sir. 20 EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON: 21 22 Good morning, Judge Hughston. Q. 23 Good morning. Α. 24 You're being screened for reappointment as a Q. retired judge on the circuit court. Would you explain to 25

the Commission, please, why you'd like to continue to serve in that capacity.

2.0

A. Well, I learn something new every day. You know, particularly focusing in on the last three weeks that I've held court, and I've done three civil jury trials in the last three weeks that I've held court, and each one was unique.

As I said, I learn something new every time I go to -- I go to court. And so I enjoy that. I enjoy continuing to learn. And as long as I feel like that I'm doing a decent job at it, I'd like to continue doing it.

Q. How much time do you spend per month in your capacity as a retired judge?

A. Well, I hold when I'm -- when I'm working, I hold court three weeks out of every month. And so you could say that I work at least that amount of time. And the weeks that I'm off, I go to the office.

I'm fortunate in that Julie Armstrong, the Clerk of Court in Charleston, has provided me with an office, in the suite of offices with Judge Roger Young. So I go to the office, even during the weeks that I'm off in the morning.

And I always find something to do. I'm kind of like an extra spare tire, or whatever you want to call it, as far as the judges in the judicial business in Charleston

1 is concerned. 2 Would you wish to alter this workload if you were 3 reappointed? Α. 4 No. What do you think your reputation is among 5 Q. 6 attorneys that you practice -- that practice before you? 7 Excuse me. 8 Α. That's a hard question to answer. I hope it's 9 that I'm a fair judge. 10 Q. Thank you. The Commission received 343 ballot box surveys regarding your candidacy, with 34 additional 11 12 comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained 13 the following positive comments, among many others: 14 "Judge Hughston is always fair, picks up on 15 complicated issues quickly, and focuses in on what matters. He's a practical judge. And I'm always pleased with the 16 17 cases assigned to him, knowing we'll get a fair result." 18 Four of the written comments expressed concerns. One comment stated, "He tends to make up the law as he sees 19 it." How would you respond to this comment? 2.0 Well, I hope that I don't do it very often. 21 Α.

Sometimes you -- sometimes you think that this is the way the law is trending, or going, and you think that this should be a case that you should maybe stick your neck out a little bit and try to, you know, move the law along in

22

23

24

25

```
the direction that you think it should be going. You know,
1
2
     I hope I don't do that very often.
 3
               Thank you. The others said, "Interjects his
          0.
     thoughts and opinions of witnesses in front of the jury
 4
5
    panel."
               I don't do that.
 6
          Α.
 7
          Q.
               Thank you.
8
                    MR. DAVIDSON: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I
9
     request that we go into executive session.
10
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Representative Murphy moves
     that we go into executive session. All in favor say "aye."
11
12
            (At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed?
13
14
                           (Hearing none.)
15
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: The ayes have it. We stand
     in executive session.
16
           (Off the record from 11:48 a.m. to 11:54 a.m.)
17
18
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: We've just come out of
     executive session. And just let me -- we're back on the
19
     record. Let me say for the record, that there's been --
20
21
    while we were in executive session, no decisions were made
22
    and no votes were taken. Thank you. Continue, Mr.
23
    Davidson.
24
                    MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you. The Low Country
25
    Citizens Committee found Judge Hughston to be well
```

qualified in the economic conflicts of interest of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience and judicial temperament, and qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability.

I'd also note for the record, that any

I'd also note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Hughston, were incorporated into my questioning today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. Thank you, Judge Hughston.

2.0

CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. And thank you.

Any questions for Judge Hughston?

(Hearing none.)

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Judge Hughston, this will conclude your portion -- oh, I'm sorry. Representative Murphy.

REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: I don't really have a question. But I've known Judge Hughston for a long time, and I want to say that he is one of the most active, active retired judges that we have. He holds court a lot in Charleston. I had the pleasure of -- when I was a young prosecutor in Orangeburg, Judge Hughston held court there a lot. And his daughter and son-in-law live in Summerville, and they are fine, outstanding people. And I consider him

```
to be a friend. And he is an asset to the judiciary.
1
 2
     just want to make that known.
 3
                    JUDGE HUGHSTON:
                                     Thank you.
 4
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right.
                                                 Senator Young.
                    SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5
6
     Judge, I just want to thank you for your interest in
 7
     continuing to serve the state in your capacity as a circuit
8
     judge. And I also want to compliment you on the number of
    ballot box comments that were extremely complimentary, and
9
10
     recognized your judicial acumen and your demeanor on the
11
    bench. I wanted to thank you for that.
12
                    JUDGE HUGHSTON:
                                     Thank you.
13
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions?
14
                           (Hearing none.)
15
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Judge Hughston, this will
     conclude your portion of it. And I appreciate your
16
17
     service.
               Thank you for what you do. I want to kind of say
18
     the same thing, if you're holding court three weeks out of
     the year, I think you're probably the most active, active
19
     retired judge that we've seen so far.
20
                    JUDGE HUGHSTON: Well, I have been doing
21
22
     that -- I have been doing that for ten or 15 years, however
     long it's been now. But actually, the last couple of years
23
24
     I'm now on a three-month-on, three-month-off situation
    where I work three months and I'm off three months, I work
25
```

```
three months and I'm off three months. So I am slowing
1
2
    down a little bit.
3
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, I hope they give you
     the summers off.
 4
5
                    JUDGE HUGHSTON:
                                     That is right. That's
6
    right. That's correct. Thank you.
7
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you,
8
    Judge. I appreciate you coming.
9
                        (Candidate excused.)
10
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Cofield, how are you
11
    doing today?
12
                    MS. COFIELD: I'm good. How are you?
13
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'm well. Will you raise
14
    your right hand, please, ma'am.
15
                    MS. COFIELD: Yes, sir.
16
                    WHEREUPON,
17
                    AMY VIRGINIA COFIELD, being duly sworn and
18
    cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing
    but the truth, testifies as follows:
19
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Cofield, before you is
2.0
21
     the personal data questionnaire and the sworn statement.
22
    Are these documents that you have submitted to the
23
    Commission?
24
                    MS. COFIELD: Yes, sir.
25
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: And are they correct?
```

```
1
                    MS. COFIELD: They are correct. I do need
2
     to add one thing to my PDQ. Number 36 lists any claims or
3
     cases that have been filed against me. There was an
 4
     initial case called "Glenda Couram v. Lora Shortt," in
    magistrates court a few months ago, where Shortt was an
5
    associate at my office. It was dismissed. And then the
 6
7
    pro se claimant filed an appeal to the court -- to the
8
    circuit court, and at the appeal level she added my name to
     the caption.
9
10
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH:
                                     Okay. All right. And so
11
    we're going to make an oral amendment to your -- to your
12
    responses, then, to add that case. Is that okay?
13
                    MS. COFIELD: That's great. Thank you.
14
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. So any other
15
     changes or amendments that need to be made?
                    MS. COFIELD: No, sir.
16
17
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. And so do you
18
    have any objection to making these documents, or any
     amendments, as part of the record of your sworn testimony?
19
                    MS. COFIELD: No, sir, that's great.
20
21
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: If you'll hand that to
22
    Lindi, please, ma'am.
23
                    MS. COFIELD: I sure will.
24
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: And we will make that a
25
    part of the record.
```

1	(EXHIBIT NO. 3 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
2	COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF AMY
3	VIRGINIA COFIELD)
4	(EXHIBIT NO. 4 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
5	COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF AMY VIRGINIA
6	COFIELD)
7	(EXHIBIT NO. 5 - AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL
8	DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF AMY VIRGINIA COFIELD)
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: I see you've got some
10	people here with you today.
11	MS. COFIELD: I do.
12	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Would you like to introduce
13	them to the Commission?
14	MS. COFIELD: I would love to. I have, I
15	say, my two partners in the world. The first is my
16	husband, Jimmy Terrapin. Jimmy is an IT manager at
17	Colonial Life. And we'll be celebrating our tenth
18	anniversary next month. And my other partner is my work
19	partner. And that would be my brother, Tommy Cofield.
20	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Welcome, Tommy.
21	MS. COFIELD: He's been my partner for 16
22	years now. They're my cheerleaders.
23	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, good. Good. Glad to
24	have y'all. Ms. Cofield, the Judicial Merit Selection
25	Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications

for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative 1 2 criteria, and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough 3 study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of nine 4 evaluative criteria in which your name appears, and a study 5 of previous screenings, as well as conflicts -- checks for 6 7 conflicts of interest. 8 We have received no affidavits, today, filed in opposition to your candidacy, and there are no witnesses 9 10 here to testify. Do you wish to make a brief opening 11 statement to the Commission? 12 MS. COFIELD: I just -- I just thank you for 13 having me here. I'm humbled by the process, and I look 14 forward to answering your questions. 15 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you very much. 16 you answer any questions that Ms. Benson may have for you. MS. COFIELD: Sure. 17 18 MS. BENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION BY MS. BENSON: 19 Mrs. Cofield, will you tell us how that you feel 20 Q. 21 your legal and professional experience thus far renders you 22 qualified and will assist you to be an effective circuit 23 court judge? 24 Yes, ma'am. I have a very varied background. Α. 25 have three degrees. In education, I received a bachelor's

and a master's degree. I actually taught elementary school for several years before going to law school. Having an education background, in and of itself, provides you with a lot of good information to take over to the legal field that you would never imagine you could use again. But you certainly do.

In my years of practice, I have been practicing for 26 years. In the first half of my career, I practiced in Anderson, South Carolina, for many years with my dad, a few years before he passed. And after he passed away, I went solo for about seven years before coming to Lexington, South Carolina, and then going into practice with my brother.

My work has been very widespread over my history. I'm very proud that I have uniquely been able to represent both plaintiffs and defendants on both sides. Not all people were able to do that. In addition, because I have been a small practice law firm, I've had the unique opportunity to work in a lot of different areas.

I've actually practiced before ten different tribunals or court systems. And I don't think you can find many lawyers who've actually appeared before ten. I think that's a good experience. So you've got good things to compare and contrast, and always the -- similar legal things that you can take from one to another.

But I think it gives me a widespread background
and ability to serve at the circuit court.

Q. Mrs. Cofield, the Commission received 103 ballot box surveys regarding you, including 14 with additional comments. Six of those 14 were negative. There were many favorable comments, commending you as being a zealous advocate, having impeccable character, being intelligent and hardworking, and being well qualified.

Two of the negative comments expressed concern about your limited experience. What response would you offer to these concerns?

A. I think a lot of people are not aware of my experience. People in the local area are not aware, for instance, that my first 16 years of practice in Anderson County consisted of a whole lot more circuit court work, in varied areas of practice, than maybe they have in the past few years.

But in fact I have done those, maybe, that they just aren't aware of those. More frequently in the past few years, my areas of practice have been primarily in the areas of workers' comp and some probate litigation. And I do still have circuit court cases now.

I think, presently, I have three pending in the circuit court, two settled just in the past couple of weeks. So circuit court work is something I have always

done, just not probably most known for that work.

Q. Thank you. The other negative comments questioned, first, your biased conduct toward others; second, motives for seeking the judgeship; third, knowledge of the civil procedure rules; and fourth, having a tenuous relationship with the truth. How would you respond to these concerns?

A. Well, you know, 26 years of practice -- I think one of the comments said I was difficult. I think I'm okay with that in 26 years. I think we've all had moments where we've had to be difficult. Now, I've never been, that I know, biased towards anybody. I've been -- gone out of my way, really, to see both sides, to represent both claimants and defense -- you know, clients in the workers' comp arena as well as in the circuit court.

So, you know, I think we have to take it with a grain of salt. I don't feel that they're legitimate. But in 26 years, I'm very proud of my history. I'm proud of my record and my reputation. And I feel very comfortable with it, going forward.

- Q. Mrs. Cofield, you've indicated in your PDQ that you were a defendant in a foreclosure lawsuit in 2010. And would you please explain the disposition of that lawsuit?
- A. Yes, ma'am. I was an investor in a -- in a company who had bought a piece of property. And the

investment company kind of went belly-up during the real estate financial crisis, and it ended up going to foreclosure. It eventually was not foreclosed. I think they came up with a seller. But that's what that was.

- Q. Thank you.
- A. Sure.

- Q. Your SLED report also indicated ten other civil suits that we spoke about in our conference. And would you please just explain, briefly, the nature and the disposition of these lawsuits that came back on the SLED report?
- A. Absolutely. You know, it's funny, when we met I couldn't even remember a lot of these things. And I guess that's what happens over 26 years. It also shows some of my experience, though. I've not only experienced the court system as an attorney, I have been in litigation, myself, and have also been a victim in a criminal case. It does give me a bigger variety.

However, to address these cases as I research back, I think four or five, maybe six, of them were eviction actions. When I was in Anderson, in what I call my first life, I had some rental properties and had some evictions with those.

I'm trying to remember the other couple on the list. There were a couple of actions, that I was involved

with, for fee recovery from a law firm. And then the 1 2 foreclosure you mentioned, is that it? Okay. Good. 3 And also our research revealed that you were a plaintiff in an action before the State Ethics Commission, 4 that involved Commissioner Huffstetler. And will you 5 please tell the Commission a little bit about that 6 7 particular action? 8 Yes, ma'am. A very difficult situation arose when I was at a workers' comp hearing, where the 9 commissioner committed some ethical violations. After the 10 11 hearing, there happened to be about six attorneys involved in this case when we were in Charleston. And we all knew, 12 after it was over, that we had the duty to report this 13 14 commissioner to the Ethics Commission. 15 Ultimately, we did. I had to go through a lot of process, really very difficult, with the workers' comp 16 commission with recusals. And then eventually had to 17 18 appear at the -- at the ethics hearing. He was dismissed 19 from the workers' comp commission as a result of that. Thank you, Ms. Cofield. 20 Q. 21 MS. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, at this point I 22 would request that we now go into executive session. 23 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Senator Rankin moves that 24 we go into executive session. All in favor say "aye." 25 (At this time the members audibly say "aye.")

CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed say "no." 1 2 (Hearing none.) 3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: The ayes have it. We're 4 going into executive session. We'll clear the room. 5 (Off the record from 12:10 p.m. to 12:15 p.m.) 6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: We're going back on the 7 record. And let me state that while we've been in 8 executive session, no decisions were made and no votes were 9 taken. So you may proceed. 10 MS. BENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 11 EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MS. BENSON: Ms. Cofield, you've spoken a little bit about 12 Q. 13 your diverse background, and particularly in education. 14 And I note for the record, that at one point you ran for Superintendent of Education. How do you feel that your 15 experiences with your degree and your work in education, 16 17 and also your experience in running for a statewide public 18 office, will be of benefit to you if you were elected to a 19 judicial position? My experiences in education have been 20 21 overwhelmingly helpful. It's funny, I always explain to 22 people who talk about going into law school and things, how 23 my background in education, and learning how to teach 24 elementary school fifth-grade students a lesson, carried 25 over into the courtroom.

You go before your jury and you explain to them,

"This is our lesson today. This is what we're going to do

today," and then you teach it to them. And then at the end

of, you close your lesson out. And that's exactly what we

do in a jury trial. You want to teach your jury what your

case is about, and why you should win.

I am a very strong proponent of, hopefully, doing the right thing. I got in the race for State Superintendent of Education because I saw some very negative things happening in my own school district, as my children were going through schools. I'm sure you heard about the implement -- the implementation of Common Core and issues like that.

And with my background in education, I knew that the way that our children were being taught, was not the way they learned best. And so I -- if I'm going to speak it, I'm going to walk it. And so I made an effort to try to make some changes in that area. And that's why I ran.

- Q. Thank you. Ms. Cofield, a few housekeeping issues. Are you aware that as a judicial candidate, you're bound by the code of judicial conduct as found in Rule 501 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules?
 - A. Absolutely.

Q. And since submitting your letter of intent, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your

candidacy?

- A. No, ma'am.
- Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
 - A. No, ma'am.
- Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
 - A. No, ma'am.
- Q. Have you reviewed and do you the Commission's guidelines on pledging and South Carolina Code Section 2-19-70(E)?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, I would note that the Midlands Citizens Committee reported Ms. Cofield to be unqualified in the evaluative criteria of experience. She was found to be well qualified in the economic conflicts of interest of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation and judicial temperament.

She was found qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. The Committee noted that Ms. Cofield's excellent temperament, experience, and

knowledge of the law, particularly in the -- that she had excellent experience -- temperament, experience, and knowledge of the law, particularly in the field of workers' compensation.

In summary, the Committee stated: "Ms. Cofield has practiced extensively in the field of workers' compensation, but she has practically no experience in the circuit court, which makes her unqualified for this position."

BY MS. BENSON:

Q. Ms. Cofield, would you like to respond to the Midlands Committee?

A. Yes, ma'am. I think I explained a little before, while I -- why I believe some of the local citizens committee is not aware of my experience. I have been more known in the past few years for my workers' comp progress, I guess. But I have maintained for 16 years, work in the circuit court work world.

I wanted to give you an example to show why I feel our citizens, maybe, of the Lexington area are not always aware of what we do. We have this local magazine called Lexington Life Magazine, and they vote for the "best of." I know you've seen that around. There were three categories for an attorney: Best Real Estate Attorney, Best Family Law Attorney, and Best Litigation Attorney.

I was nominated for the best Real Estate 1 2 Attorney, which is great 'cause I do -- I do real estate. 3 And I was also nominated to be the best family law attorney. I don't do family law. I did, some 25 years 4 ago. But, you know, to me that kind of explains that, you 5 6 know, citizens may not be very aware of all the work that 7 we do. 8 And I do have a very varied background in the area, and have proven that I am capable of taking on new 9 10 and complex types of litigation. And I'm not afraid to 11 learn it. I'm certainly capable of learning it. And I will carry that forward if I'm elected. 12 13 MS. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, I would note for 14 the record, that any concerns raised during the 15 investigation by staff regarding this candidate, were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today. 16 And, Mr. Chairman, I have no further 17 18 questions. 19 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Cofield? Representative Murphy. 20 21 REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. 22 Chairman. 23 EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: 24 Ms. Cofield, thank you, first, for offering to Q. 25 serve in this position. I want to kind of follow up with

some of the questions on the experience. Because that was 1 2 highlighted a lot that you don't have, not only any general 3 sessions experience, but any circuit court experience, and 4 you're offering for a circuit court judgeship. Yes, sir. 5 Α. 6 Have you -- I mean, do you have any jury trial Q. 7 experience? Yes, sir. 8 Α. How much? I mean, have you --9 Q. 10 Α. Well, I was --11 -- selected a jury in circuit court? Q. 12 Yes, sir. I was trying --Α. 13 Q. General sessions? 14 -- to find my list of cases I had done, to talk 15 to you about. Of course, I had done jury trials. Early in my practice, I did several jury trials that resulted from 16 17 car accidents, truck accidents. I assisted my father in a 18 survival wrongful death action. Those are the jury trials I have participated in as a --19 Do you have any --2.0 Q. 21 Α. -- as a litigator. 22 -- general sessions experience? Q. 23 No, sir, I do not have any general sessions Α. 24 practice. I've focused my career mostly in the civil area,

and doing a lot of areas in the civil area

25

1	Q. When would be the last time that you as far as
2	any court the court of common pleas, when's the last
3	time that you participated in a contested common pleas
4	civil case?
5	A. That actually went before the jury? Probably
6	seven or eight years ago. There are a lot of cases that I
7	do in circuit court. And if you're aware, the circuit
8	court judge has to do a lot more than jury trials. You
9	have appeals from probate court and you have appeals you
10	used to have appeals from workers' comp that were there.
11	And you do have the criminal, of course. And I
12	have attempted to make effort to start being learn a lot
13	of that on my own. This year I spent my summer vacation,
14	instead of reading fun books on the beach, I read Professor
15	McAninch's study on criminal law in South Carolina.
L6	So I know that I'm capable of learning and
L7	applying the things that I've used in other courts to the
18	criminal court arena.
19	Q. Have you represented anybody in magistrates
20	court/criminal court?
21	A. No, sir, not criminal. Other than to go for a
22	ticket, or something to that effect.
23	Q. Thank you.
24	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions?
25	Senator Young.

1 SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 EXAMINATION BY SENATOR YOUNG: 3 Ms. Cofield, thank you so much for your interest Q. 4 in serving on the circuit bench. 5 Α. Thank you. 6 0. I have two questions. One is, how would you 7 describe your judicial philosophy with respect to the 8 application of the law, to the facts that are -- would be before you if you were elected to the circuit court? 9 I am more of a conservative. I do not believe 10 Α. the judiciary is put in place to make laws. Even though we 11 may not agree with them, sometimes, the law is the law. 12 13 And it's not a judiciary's place to make statements or 14 change them. 15 0. How familiar are you with -- you come from a 16 small practice --17 Α. Yes, sir. 18 Q. -- just you and your brother. Yeah, now. 19 Α. Right. And you've practiced --20 Q. 21 Α. We've had about five -- four or five people. 22 And before that you practiced solo practitioner, Q. 23 and then also with your father in Anderson? 24 That's correct. Α. 25 0. So you've been in a small firm, pretty much your

entire legal career.

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. So is it fair to say that you are very familiar with the challenges that face lawyers from small practices who are pulled from one court to the next?

A. Absolutely. As a matter of fact, it's -- in considering my history with circuit court, and why I began to focus more on workers' comp, was the scheduling. When I was a young lawyer, about 15 or 20 years ago, I had young children. And scheduling in workers' comp was very easy, you knew a month ahead of time when your hearing was going to be.

In circuit court, you didn't. The dockets are difficult. They're difficult for attorneys, they're difficult for our clients, and they're difficult for juries and witnesses. I think my experience in dealing with ten different tribunals, would hopefully bring some new ideas to the circuit court, in how to improve efficiency and improve those docket problems that arise.

Certainly, I hope to be a judge who doesn't forget where I came from, that I know the difficulties that attorneys face in scheduling and getting all those people to where they need to be.

- Q. And you've mentioned the ten tribunals.
- A. Uh-huh.

And I don't know if you've said all -- what they 1 Q. 2 I may have missed that, but do you mind -all are. 3 I don't. Let's see if I can remember. I lost my Α. place. Social Security Administration, the Unemployment 4 Administration, the workers' comp arena, the Ethics 5 Commission, the Circuit Court, the magistrates court, the 6 7 Court of Equity, the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court 8 -- and I think I left one out, but there's one in there somewhere. 9 10 Q. Well, let me --11 I counted ten. Α. 12 Another question I have is: You have a mediation Q. 13 practice? 14 Yes, I do. Α. 15 Q. And do you mediate cases that are workers' comp 16 cases? I do workers' comp, I do probate, and I've done 17 Α. 18 some accident cases as well. Do you have -- you've mediated some cases that 19 Q. are civil cases that would be in the circuit court. 20 21 Α. Yes, sir. 22 And how much time do you think your mediation Q. 23 practice currently takes per month? 24 Oh, probably a percentage? Five to ten percent. Α. 25 Q. Thank you so much.

1	A. Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Senator Rankin.
3	EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN:
4	Q. Ms. Cofield, I likewise want to thank you for
5	offering for this position. I'm current, and you may have
6	answered this earlier: Have you tried a case in circuit
7	court to verdict?
8	A. Yes, sir. In my early career I tried several,
9	both for the plaintiff and the defense in circuit court and
10	magistrates court, too, to a verdict.
11	Q. And what type cases were those?
12	A. Car accident cases. I may have had a breach of
13	contract case as well, that tried to verdict. You know,
14	most of our cases get settled. Like I said, I currently
15	have three pending cases that include two disputes over
16	easements, and two recently were settled. And lease
17	disputes, I had that as well.
18	Q. And then criminal cases to verdict?
19	A. None. I have not handled criminal cases to
20	verdict.
21	Q. You might have been asked that earlier. And
22	we've heard
23	A. I was a victim in a criminal case. That was my
24	only experience, really, in the criminal court.
25	Q. And that's where, more and more, we're hearing

that the trial -- the active trial practice is in terms of cases being tried to -- civil side to verdict. Horry County, only 16 civil cases tried to verdict, as we've heard about Greenville.

So the discussion -- and one of the concerns that I had coming into this, with anyone offering, is are they either experienced in this, or can they learn it?

And you have certainly spoken to some of perhaps the most boring reading by the beach, of anyone I've ever heard. It makes great testimony here. But your family had to look at you, kind of like I'm looking at you in a -- your husband is looking away. For the record, let it reflect. And I would share his --

A. I told him some stuff.

Q. He wasn't interested in that, I can guarantee it. But that is a concern from the practical standpoint, not the book sense alone, but being in the trenches and trying cases. And perhaps the rap the Citizens Committee has made on you in this one area, is that your -- a lack of knowledge of your, one, reading the book, and your earlier -- earlier practice.

How do you respond to the concern, from the practical standpoint, that you would have a steep learning curve, or, perhaps -- or, perhaps, you'd say no learning curve at all?

I'm not going to say I won't have any learning 1 2 I'll say I'm completely capable, and have shown a 3 history of taking on new and complicated legal issues, and 4 being able to move from one subject matter to another. There are things that you would do as a judge in 5 6 a criminal case, that you would always do as a judge in a 7 civil case. You've still got to -- have to deal with 8 evidence, with the submission of evidence, rules of evidence, how to run a hearing, how to poll a jury. 9 That kind of stuff. 10 11 I think there's a lot of learning to take place. I think I'm capable of it. I think, certainly, my book-12 13 reading will be a good start. I will have mentors to help 14 me, and will certainly make all efforts to get involved, 15 immediately, in learning the process. The last question: In terms of your run for 16 Q. Superintendent of Education, that was how long ago? Was 17 18 that against --Three years? Two? Molly Spearman our current --19 Α. That was a primary challenge you had --20 Q. Yes. 21 Α. 22 -- against her. Q. 23 There were eight of us running. Α. 24 In the experience category, what did the -- that Q.

campaign and that -- the loss, perhaps, you might consider

25

it an actual victory? What did that give you, that you 1 2 would apply to the bench if you --3 Well, it certainly gives you hard work. never been a politician before. And I jumped in a race of 4 eight people, and traveled the state, and I learned real 5 6 quickly how to be a politician, I quess. 7 But it made me strong. It made me confident. 8 And I think those are good qualities. It made me not afraid to try new things, else I wouldn't be here today. 9 10 And I think I can carry that forward, in a positive way, to 11 our circuit court. 12 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? 13 Mr. Safran. 14 EXAMINATION BY MR. SAFRAN: I share, I guess, an appreciation for your coming 15 today. I certainly encourage everybody to follow their 16 17 heart, if this is what you choose to do. 18 I think you touched on this a minute ago, but just for the sake of explanation, in workers' comp you 19 obviously will have to do things that are very similar, if 2.0 21 not in many ways the same as what goes on in --22 particularly the civil end of the circuit court. 23 Α. Right. 24 You do depositions. Q.

25

Α.

Yes, sir.

- Q. And have to basically prepare witnesses.

 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. You have to learn how to do examination of witnesses.
 - A. Yes, sir.

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. You have to be -- even though I know there's a body of law that talks about evidence not applying to practical matter, the rules of evidence of what you deal with in every hearing you to go.
 - A. That's exactly right.
- Q. And, you know, beyond that in terms of when you get into the appellate level, with the commission they're the same thing: The research, trying to understand what the law is, applying it to the particular fact. So you've had that experience.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And I think we've all heard that -- again, circuit court seems to be kind of shifting to where the focus is far more on the criminal end. And you recognize that.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And, candidly, I think -- you know, we've all talked about the need for experience in certain areas. I mean, do you feel like based on your background, that at least you have the potential to be able to do those type of

things that would be necessary to run a court, whether it be on the common pleas side or the general --

A. Absolutely. I feel very confident with my history. I've run a business. I've managed the -- my law firm. I've managed it to be a very successful business. That and my history -- I get disappointed, Mr. Safran, I know you do, too, to hear people almost kind of put down workers' comp like it's -- like it's not important.

Clearly, it is. And we do -- although we're before a commissioner and not a jury, you still have all the rules of evidence, all the preparation that you just talked about that you have to deal with.

Not only that, I've established that my ability to argue the law has been very successful through my actions and my reported cases at the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals, that I'm very proud of. And, you know, that's just another -- another place that offers experience in a general area.

No, my past has not been in the criminal court. But I feel very confident that with my background, I can carry over and learn. And I feel like I have the honesty and fairness, and that I'm respected enough to bring a good, positive change to my circuit.

Q. One just last thing I wanted to ask you is: I know in prior hearings, we have certainly found that it was

a very important aspect that candidates be aware of what Mr. Young -- or Senator Young asked you about, recognizing that life involves more than just being at the office, and that lawyers have demands on them that, nowadays, really exceed what they may have been 20 years ago.

Do you bring, maybe because of the experience having worked with the commission, at least in these days, seems to be far more flexible in terms of scheduling --

A. Right.

2.0

- Q. -- a recognition of the need for that at the circuit court level?
- A. Absolutely. I see a lot of need. And from conversations that I've had with people in the criminal area, lately, I think there can be some proactive measures taken to help with that docket situation, and clear out some old cases that, certainly in my circuit, are lingering.

And I think with a proactive judiciary, you know, you can do the kind of things that we do in workers' comp or in other tribunals, with status conferences more frequently, and getting involved in attempting mediations and things to that effect, to bring those cases to court instead of languishing, like they appear to be doing for years.

Q. Thank you, again.

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
		۱

24

25

A. Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN SMITH:

- Q. All right. Ms. Cofield, let me -- let me follow up with some of these questions. I heard you say earlier, to Mr. Safran's question, bring some changes to your circuit. What changes are you talking about, that you would like to see in your circuit?
- A. Primarily, in the criminal area. Because that appears to be where our backlog of cases is. I think what I'm finding is, that our circuit court docket is running very well with the ABC kind of method. But the criminal court is not running quite as effectively because of too much backlog.

I think made some proactivity on behalf of the judiciary, to push these -- you know, more meetings, more gatherings to see where we are, more day certains. A little more push to get this backlog through the system.

- Q. We've been dealing with some of this, we're dealing with sentence reform in the General Assembly now, and ways to deal with reentry and alternative courts and things to that effect. What's your position on alternative courts, such as the mental health court, the drug courts, and veteran's courts, things to that effect?
- A. Well, obviously, I believe that the mediation efforts have helped tremendously in the circuit court, and

workers' comp as well. I think that they are -- they would be, you know, helpful to help get these cases moved so they don't sit there. And, certainly, these kind of cases require a little more knowledge or specific services to take care of them.

- Q. And I think you've been answering this throughout it, you're successful in your pursuits here in -- on the bench, and I think you've talked about how you've been a lawyer for 26 years, I believe, in small firms. And, obviously, you're doing what a lot of us do; you're engaged in multiple areas of the practice, because that's how you've got to make a living in a small firm.
 - A. That's right.

- Q. And when -- you know, lawyers, from time to time, are going to come to you as you're -- as a circuit court judge, and say, you know, "I've got a deposition over here that's been scheduled for months, Judge. And I know I've got a hearing before you," or someone wants a trial or -- you know, even to the issues of, "My child has a baseball game, today, at four o'clock." How are you going to handle those issues as a circuit court judge, if you were successful?
- A. What kind of baseball game? You know, you learn through trial and practice, I can certainly tell you in the workers' comp arena, the attorneys who will make a move to

not show up, who will not answer discovery and that sort of thing. I think you also learn in practice, those attorneys who are going to routinely not be ready for court, who are going to ask for extensions, who are not going to come forth with their discovery and so forth.

You have to be -- you have to be knowledgeable that we are humans and we have things that happen.

However, to do it over and over again, like there are those who do it, you know, that's not appropriate. And sometimes you've got to hold people to the fire, and sometimes you have to be difficult, like I have been called before. But I think that's part of the process.

Q. And when you're talking about the criminal experience and, you know, obviously, judges -- and you've heard this -- is where you're going to see a lot of the criminal trials, or trials that's in the general sessions court. And that's where mostly trials are occurring.

But also you're going to be called upon to take into consideration a whole host of issues; you hear from victims, you hear from solicitors, you hear from defense -- defendants and their families and all that. And, you know, how -- what's going to be your philosophy, as you -- as you hear it, on your sentencing and on your -- on the way you handle yourself in general sessions court?

A. Well, of course, I hope that I will develop, and

continue to develop, philosophy concerning that. You know, 1 2 in the guidelines for sentencing and stuff that I have 3 studied, brings back some of those education thoughts to 4 mind. Because when you're teaching a child, you know 5 that each child comes to you with a different background. 6 7 Some children come to school and they haven't eaten, haven't had food. I've had children who didn't have water 8 -- running water at home. 9 10 The same thing is going to happen in a -- in a circuit court, whether it be criminal or civil, individuals 11 come to you with different backgrounds. And, you know, 12 13 those sometimes have to be taken into consideration. 14 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Any further 15 questions? (Hearing none.) 16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Cofield, thank you. 17 18 This concludes this portion of your screening process. want to take the opportunity to remind you that pursuant to 19 the Commission's evaluative criteria. The Commission 20 21 expects candidates to follow the spirit as well as the 22 letter of the ethics laws. And we will view violations, or 23 the appearance of impropriety, as serious and potentially 24 deserving of heavy weight and screening deliberations. 25 On that note, and as you know, the record

```
will remain open till the formal release of the report of
1
2
     qualifications, and you may be called back at such time if
3
     the need arises. I thank you for offering. And I thank
 4
    you for your service to the state of South Carolina.
5
                    MS. COFIELD: I thank you as well. Y'all
6
    have a nice day.
7
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Y'all have a
    nice day. Good to see y'all.
8
9
                        (Candidate excused.)
10
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Elder, how are you
11
    doing today?
                                I'm good.
12
                                           Thank you.
                    MS. ELDER:
13
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Will you raise your right
14
    hand, please, ma'am.
15
                    WHEREUPON,
                    DONNA EARLS ELDER, being duly sworn and
16
17
     cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing
18
    but the truth, testifies as follows:
19
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Elder, before you is
     the data questionnaire and the sworn statement. Are these
20
21
    documents that you've submitted to the Commission?
22
                    MS. ELDER: Yes, sir.
23
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are they both correct?
24
                    MS. ELDER: Yes, sir.
25
                    CHAIRMAN SMITH: Does anything need to be
```

1 changed or updated at this time? 2 MS. ELDER: No, sir. 3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Do you have any objection to us making those documents and any amendments a 4 part of the record, today, of your sworn testimony? 5 6 MS. ELDER: No, sir. 7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: If you'll hand those to 8 Lindi, please, ma'am. And we're going to make those a part of the record. 9 (EXHIBIT NO. 6 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION 10 11 COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF DONNA EARLS ELDER) 12 13 (EXHIBIT NO. 7 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION 14 COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF DONNA EARLS ELDER) 15 CHAIRMAN SMITH: The Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your 16 qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on 17 18 nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, 19 verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a 2.0 21 search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, 22 and studies of previous screenings, as well as checks for 23 economic conflicts of interest. 24 We've received no affidavits in opposition 25 to your election today. And no one here -- no one has --

no witnesses are present to testify. Do you wish to make a 1 2 brief opening statement to the Commission? 3 MS. ELDER: Yes, sir. Thank you. Chairman, and members of the committee, my name is Donna 4 Elder. And I first want to obviously thank you all for 5 6 serving. This is not an easy job. It's a huge time 7 commitment for you all to be here. And I appreciate that, 8 and what you do. And it's a difficult job to do what you 9 do. 10 I have been practicing law for a little over 11 I started as an associate in Gaffney, South 26 years. Carolina. And I did a little bit of everything at that 12 13 time; primarily personal injury, products liability, 14 anything that the person I worked for asked me to do, 15 pretty much. I went to a solo practice after that. 16 17 that solo practice, I concentrated primarily in common 18 pleas. I didn't do a lot of criminal defense. Because I 19 didn't do a lot of criminal defense, I did get a lot of opportunity to do and represent individuals in PCR 20 21 hearings. 22 During that time period, I did a little bit 23 of domestic work, some probate work. I was the retained 24 attorney for the Cherokee County School District. I served

as a part-time magistrate for a period of time. And I then

went to the parole board -- the juvenile parole board. 1 2 Once I was on the parole board for that 3 period -- for about six years, I could not be reappointed. 4 And I did not want to leave the juvenile system. And at that time, then Solicitor Hembree had a opening for a 5 juvenile prosecutor. So I picked up and moved down to 6 7 Horry County, and stayed there for about 14 years. 8 I did juvenile prosecution for about a year and a half, then moved over to general sessions. And 9 10 that's where I stayed for, the remainder of my time in 11 Horry County. During the time that I was in general 12 13 sessions, I handled approximately 10,000 cases over that period of time when I was there. I focused primarily on 14 15 violent crimes and the trials of those. I supervised about three or four lawyers at any given time, and their 16 17 caseloads. 18 Also during that time period, I was able to initiate a civil forfeiture matter, a civil forfeiture 19 program, in the solicitor's office, which allowed me to 20 21 concentrate on common pleas and general sessions. 22 During the time period that I handled that 23 program in the solicitor's office, I filed approximately, 24 on the average, of about 250 civil cases a year. That did

not include consent orders. Those were all contested

filings, where there was a summons and a complaint. 1 The 2 discovery process, I did that while also maintaining my 3 criminal case load. In 2014, I was offered a job by Rick Reames, 4 who was the director of DOR. I came up here to work for 5 6 him. And then an opportunity came and I got a call from 7 the Senate, and I came to the Senate and have been here 8 since. 9 When Judge McMahon announced his retirement 10 -- retirement, I thought it was a good opportunity for me to take the next step. And I think I've had a unique 11 opportunity to position myself in just about every area of 12 13 the legal professional, and I believe I can contribute in a 14 positive way to the judiciary at this time. 15 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you. Answer any questions that Counsel may have for you, ma'am. 16 MS. ELDER: Yes, sir. 17 18 MR. HINSON: Thank you, Ms. Elder. 19 MS. ELDER: Good afternoon. MR. HINSON: Mr. Chairman, I note for the 20 21 record that based on the testimony contained in the 22 candidate's PDO, which has been included in the report, 23 with the candidate's consent, Ms. Elder meets the 24 constitutional and statutory requirements for this position, regarding age, residence, and years of practice. 25

EXAMINATION BY MR. HINSON:

- Q. Ms. Elder, given your current employment with the South Carolina Senate, please explain how you intend to balance your candidacy with statutory and ethical rules concerning judicial candidates.
- A. When I decided to proceed and to put my name in as a candidate, before I became a candidate, had conversations, of course, with the majority leader, with the clerk of the Senate, and reviewed the rules of what I could do and what I couldn't do during the course of my candidacy. So I am aware that there are limitations that I will not be able to do during this period of time, and will certainly make sure that I comply with all those requirements.
- Q. Thank you. Ms. Elder, the Commission received 67 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 7 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:

"Excellent legal scholar and extremely hard worker." Another stated you were tough and fair and knew the law better than anyone.

Twelve of the written comments expressed concerns. Multiple comments questioned your lack of civil experience, and your ability to remain impartial in criminal cases, given your background as a prosecutor. How

would you address those concerns?

A. Well, I understand that lawyers that maybe didn't

-- I understand that a lot of civil lawyers, or lawyers

that are common pleas, may not be aware of me or have had a

lot of dealings with me, over a significant period of time.

And they may have some issue or some concern about that.

But I believe that I have -- I have a firm grasp of the rules, and the evidentiary rules which will be -- certainly be important in any type of case, whether that's common pleas or general sessions.

I think that I have had a number of years of experience in common pleas, although they may not be recent years of experience. I've had a large number of cases, going through the common pleas system. And that includes from the beginning to the end through trial. That includes discovery. That includes interrogatories and it includes depositions. It includes the pretrial motions. It includes default judges, publication issues,

All of those things, I have certainly dealt with and have had the opportunity to deal with down in Horry County, or in Cherokee County, before that.

As far as impartial, I was a prosecutor for 13 years. And I know that sometimes, although lawyers have an oath of civility, sometimes they don't come out of a courtroom accepting -- accepting that. Especially if

they're not able to do what they think they should do, or have told their clients they could do.

So I think that there's probably been over the course of time, over that period of time, some lawyers who probably don't care for me because of what I do and what I did. But I can assure you that I believe in the judicial system. I believe in being fair and impartial.

And over the years -- over 26-plus years, I've learned that it's all about balance, and trying to find the balance between doing what is right and representing my -- my position in the solicitor's office was to represent the people, to represent the victims to -- to take in the interest of the police departments and the people in general, and to also be fair to the defendant. And I take that very seriously.

So I would certainly apply that on the bench and make sure that I responded appropriately to anyone and everyone who came through the courtroom.

- Q. Thank you. You touched on this briefly, but several of the written comments also questioned your temperament and character in dealing with both opposing counsel and fellow staff. Can you -- would you please offer an explanation as to that?
- A. Sure. When I went to -- although I had practicing for 13 years before I went to the solicitor's

office, going to the solicitor's office was a brand new experience for me. It opened an area of the law that I never had access to, or never participated in. So I kind of felt like I was a first-year lawyer.

And I attacked my cases with zeal, and pursued those with every -- with a hundred percent. I realized a year or so in, after -- actually, a family court judge called me to the bench during a trial one time, and said, "You do realize that everyone doesn't deserve the death penalty."

So he was obviously joking at the time, but it did bring home a point that it wasn't just about prosecution, it was about finding a balance. And it was about having an open mind to what every side said, and not just my side.

So I began a process at that point, of reevaluating how I approached things. And I wasn't so stringent. But as I know many of you probably have seen over your years, that five minutes of being overzealous takes 25 to 30 years to take away from. And once you get that reputation, it's hard to break free from.

But I have focused on that, since that point.

And think I have reached a balance.

Q. Thank you for that. One additional comment questioned whether or not you had been sued by a client.

And I understand your PDQ, you stated that you had not ever been sued by a client. Would you please clarify that for the record.

- A. Yes. I haven't had a client in probably 18 years. But prior to that, I had never been sued by a client. I never had a claim against my malpractice carrier, my title insurance carrier. I never had any of that.
- Q. Thank you. Additional comments questioned your candor in court. How would you address that concern?
- A. I think that, that is probably the most shocking to me, that someone would say that or someone would write that in anonymously. Although, I understand anonymous, there's no accountability for what someone may say.

I have been involved in the Bar, in the Ethics Committee, for a number of years. And I take that ethical approach throughout my career, in my personal life, in my professional life. And I am honest to a -- probably to a fault, some would say.

But I believe in that. And I believe in being forthright with the court. As a matter of fact, I know the Committee cannot and judges cannot give recommendations. I understand that. But it's unfortunate, because I think the judges that we practice in front of could give you a great deal of insight as to the candidates that appear before

you.

And I feel confident in saying that any of the judges that I spent a significant time in front of would tell you there was absolutely no question in their mind about my candor to them in making statements.

- Q. Thank you. One concern stated that in at least one case, you hid evidence and did not provide that evidence to the opposing side, or return it to its rightful owner. Would you clarify that, please.
- A. I've never handled evidence outside of a courtroom. The way we handle the office at the solicitor's office during my time there, we had on-call weeks we were required to go to crime scenes. That was part of it when there was a loss-of-life case.

So I would certainly -- if it was two o'clock in the morning, or eight o'clock Monday morning, we would be at those crime scenes. And as the responding solicitor, I never once touched evidence, held evidence, took evidence.

I was always with a crime scene, I would walk through after they processed the scene. Per our policies, I would -- if I noticed something that I thought would be necessary for the case, or should have been taken, or pictures that needed to be taken that maybe were overlooked, I would ask the appropriate responding law enforcement officer to do those things.

That's the only thing I can think of, that -that, that maybe -- that may refer to. But I've never had
any issue in any of the trials that I've had, where that
handling of evidence by me was even a question raised in a
trial.

2.0

- Q. Thank you. Ms. Elder, you indicated in your PDQ that a lawsuit was filed against you in 2011, by an inmate, for return of property. Can you explain the nature and disposition of this lawsuit?
- A. I didn't -- I wasn't even served. I think it was a -- I think it was a inmate that filed in federal court. It may have been state court. I can't remember. And it was involving a -- I believe, a civil forfeiture.
- Q. Also, you indicated in your PDQ that a lawsuit was filed against you in district court in 2013, by a Greg Eliason. Can you explain the nature and disposition of that lawsuit?
- A. Yes. I was involved in a long-term investigation involving a motorcycle gang, and we brought forth charges. During the course of those charges, the officers were interviewing some of the people who were detained.

During those interviews, there was information that was provided to the inter -- the officers interviewing that. And an officer was involved in providing information about road blocks and things like that.

I informed my boss, the solicitor, that, that had 1 come out in a interview. He then informed the chief of 2 3 police. The chief of police asked that officer to do a 4 polygraph and a drug test. He refused and resigned. He then brought for wrongful termination against 5 myself, several officers, the department, the county --6 7 there was several people involved. I was dismissed out of 8 that, after discovery, after depositions. 9 Thank you. I have just a few housekeeping Q. 10 issues. 11 Sure. Α. 12 Ms. Elder, are you aware that as a judicial Q. 13 candidate, you are bound by the code of judicial conduct as found in Rule 501 of the South Carolina Appellate Court 14 15 Rules? Yes, sir. 16 Α. 17 Ms. Elder, since submitting your letter of Q. 18 intent, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy? 19 No, I have not. 20 Α. 21 Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you 22 sought or received a pledge of any legislator, either prior 23 to this date or pending the outcome of your screening? 24 No, I have not. Α.

Have you asked any third parties to contact

25

Q.

members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you 1 2 aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on 3 your behalf? No, I'm not. 4 Α. Have you reviewed and do you understand the 5 Q. 6 Commission's guidelines on pledging and South Carolina Code 7 2-19-70(E)? 8 Α. I do. 9 MR. HINSON: I would note that the Midlands 10 Citizens Committee reported that Ms. Elder is qualified in 11 the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical and mental health, and well qualified in the 12 13 evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and 14 academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and 15 judicial temperament. The Committee added that Ms. Elder has considerable criminal experience, she has some civil 16 law experience, but it was some time ago. 17 18 Mr. Chairman, I would note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation by staff, 19 regarding the candidate, were incorporated into the 2.0 21 questioning of the candidate today. And with that, I have 22 no further questions. 23 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you. Any

SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24

25

questions? Senator Young.

EXAMINATION BY SENATOR YOUNG:

- Q. Ms. Elder, thank you very much for your interest in serving and being a circuit court judge in South Carolina. I have some questions.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. The first one is: How would you describe your judicial philosophy with respect to the application of the law to the facts that would be before you as a circuit court judge?
- A. I have had the opportunity in the past three years to come back to the basic of reading -- actually reading the law and not assuming what it says. I think as a lawyer you get sometimes -- especially if it's something you do on a regular basis -- you assume that you know what the actual words say.

I think that I've had an opportunity to go back and even learn now, I never knew that's what that statute said. I think that first and foremost, it's important for a judge to do to -- even though -- I think in every case they should review before they try a case, for example, to review the applicable statutes to make sure they know the words there.

I think that judges are responsible for enforcing the law as you all give it to us. And it is not our position as a judge to set public policy. That is the

1 legislator's job. 2 I notice from your PDQ that you were in private 3 practice in Gaffney? 4 Α. Yes. It looks like eight or nine years. 5 Q. It was from '91 to about 2001. 6 Α. 7 Q. Almost ten years? 8 Α. Yes. 9 And you were in a smaller firm during that time? Q. I was -- I started with Ken Holland, and was with 10 Α. him for about a year and a half. And then I went to a solo 11 practice, where it was just me. 12 13 Q. So you had cases that were in multiple courts 14 when you were a solo practitioner; is that right? 15 Α. Yes, sir, that is correct. And so you understood and learned as a solo 16 Q. practitioner how you can be -- your time limitations, in 17 18 terms of being in one court versus being called to court in 19 another court, or having obligations associated with a case in multiple courts, you know firsthand what those 2.0 21 challenges might be. 22 Oh, absolutely. I try to also -- although I was 23 on the other side of that in the prosecutor's office, I 24 certainly was mindful of that with the private lawyers that

came through as well. And I realized that they do have

other obligations than to just sit there in court, or to just wait until their turn, to try to be efficient. And also compassionate when trying to schedule things.

Things are going to come up beyond their control, that we all need to have an understanding for, without completely clogging up the court system, but we've got to make sure that, that's sufficient as well. But we all need to be able to bend a little bit when we schedule things.

- Q. Questions on the -- you were asked some questions about some of the comments that came from the Bar, about, I guess, your demeanor and some of the questions related to your experiences in the solicitor's office. How many years did you practice in the solicitor's office?
- A. I was there from 2001 till two thousand -- the middle of 2014.
- Q. And you handled some very high-profile criminal cases in Horry County?
- A. Yes, sir. I handled a multitude of high-profile cases there. And they ranged from very complex murder cases, that the public took a significant interest in, to public corruption to some police officers. So there was there was always you know, you're never going to please everybody by taking those types of cases.
- Q. So did you have -- I guess there was some high stakes at play with the cases that you handled --

1 Yes, sir. Α. 2 -- with members of the local Bar in the Grand Q. 3 Strand. Is that fair to say? Yes, sir, that is. 4 Α. 5 SENATOR YOUNG: I may have some additional 6 questions in a few minutes. 7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Thank you. Any 8 other questions? Senator Hayes. 9 EXAMINATION BY MR. HAYES: 10 Q. I want to join the others in thanking you for your willingness to serve for a circuit court judge. We've 11 talked a little bit about your background, and I think you 12 13 do have a very -- a varied background. I think having been 14 a solo practitioner, been on the parole board, you must 15 have done some family court work. So I think you ran for family court at one time. 16 17 Α. Yes, sir. 18 Q. And of course you, here recently, have done quite a bit of criminal work as well. Putting aside your 19 experience, what in your personality or background would 20 21 help make you a good judge, and what in your personality 22 and background might detract from your ability to be a good 23 judge? 24 Well, I think that I'm an extremely organized Α.

person. I think that, that is an important characteristic

of a successful and positive judicial experience. I understand the importance of keeping a schedule. I understand and appreciate the importance of protecting your roster, and making sure that it runs efficiently. And I think that I am an efficient person when it comes to those things, and running court.

And I also -- I think I have developed over a period of time, the ability to see that there is more than one side, that there are also -- there's this side, this side, and then there is 15 other sides. And I think that's important to consider the forest, so to speak, for the trees. And I think that, that is also beneficial as a judge.

As far as negative, I tend to -- I'm a very hard worker. I work -- I don't have a problem working long hours, and sometimes I tend to apply my work ethic to those around me. And my expectations are high. And I think sometimes that might be a -- that would be a detriment, as you -- as your question indicated.

And I would have to understand, as Senator Young had asked, there are private lawyers who have so many other commitments and so many other things, that sometimes even if they are -- or have a high work ethic, they can't necessarily be focused in my courtroom.

And so I'm going to have to make sure that I

don't have my expectations for me, and put them on others 1 2 that appear before me. 3 0. Thank you. Representative Rutherford. 4 SENATOR RANKIN: REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: 5 Thank you. 6 EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: 7 Q. Can you tell me -- or tell this body why 30 8 percent of the lawyers that responded to your ballot box found you unqualified as it relates to temperament? 9 10 Α. Representative Rutherford, again, I -- I think 11 that I started in the solicitor's office, I was an 12 aggressive prosecutor. I did -- was not a pushover. And 13 I'm not going -- I'm never going to be that type of 14 personality. 15 I am -- when I decide to prosecute a case, I will bend as far as I can bend. But I'm not going -- there is a 16 17 line that I will not go below. And I think that in any 18 type of situation where you have a prosecutor and a defense attorney, there is going to be those defense attorneys that 19 believe that you're being overzealous, regardless of what 20 21 you do, and regardless of what type of plea offers you 22 make. They're going to believe that their client shouldn't

Q. But you would agree that, while that may make you an effective advocate, that would be troubling when you're

be taken to trial. And some cases have to go.

23

24

1 trying to run for a judgeship, would you not?

- A. I think that makes me an effective advocate, because that was my job as a advocate. I am also experienced enough to know that it's not my job as a judge. My job as a judge is to listen, to give everyone a fair opportunity to be heard and to weigh both sides, and every side, to come up with the proper conclusion.
- Q. But if 20 percent -- if 30 percent of the lawyers who know you, believe that you would not be able to do that, do you think that your self-assessment that you've been able to turn that corner may not be correct?
 - A. No, sir. I think that is correct.
- Q. If, in addition, 30 percent of the lawyers know you said that you were ethically unqualified, will you address that?
- A. I can't address that. I don't -- I don't -- I have no idea what they would refer to, other than it's the same -- I believe he said 12 people that responded. Again, these are anonymous reports. And I would certainly welcome an opportunity to address something specific, but they saw fit not to specify an incident that they were talking about.
- Q. Well, some of them did. And as they may not have spoken to specific instances it is -- as it relates to judicial temperament, you had almost as many find you

unqualified as you did qualified -- or well qualified. The same thing with ethics, and most of them said that you would not be able -- or most of the people that said negative comments, said that you would not be able to set aside the fact that you were once an advocate and you would maintain that posture as a judge. How do you address that?

A. All I can say is, I don't see myself that way. I don't think that my time in the solicitor would indicate that. And I think that people who have responded may feel that way for whatever type of case they were involved in against me, that they have or harbor these feelings from.

But I believe, in general, that my record speaks for itself. And I don't think I have a difficult time in treating people with respect, and treating them in a fair and impartial way.

EXAMINATION BY SENATOR RANKIN:

- Q. Obviously, Donna, I know you. I know you from your work with the Caucus. And back to that earlier question, your role is one of what: Research? Purely policy? Purely politics? Would that be a fair categorization or paraphrasing of your answer?
- A. Yes, sir. That's exactly it. We have someone, as you know, that does all of the communicate and things like that. I don't get involved in that. I do absolutely, basically, what a committee person would do -- a research

person on any committee would do.

If somebody has questions about research of a bill, I do that. If they need some drafting assistance, I help them with that. And just the basic process of the legislation itself. But I do not get involved in anything of the Caucus, outside of the legislative and policy arena.

- Q. In terms of what we have to do -- and you've worked with Senator Hembree for longer than I've known you, I guess or I -- well, that's exactly right. You no longer work for him alone. But he was once in this position. This is my first rodeo at it. And I'm curious to know what you say about the process, and about what we have to judge you as a candidate in this, you know, from the objective and the subjective.
- A. I think that there is -- we tried over the -over the course of my time as a lawyer, we tried different
 things when it referred to the screening and election of
 our judges, and it's difficult to find the sweet spot, so
 to speak.

I think that regardless of what process we do, it's daunting on the committee, it's daunting on the candidates. I think it's necessary. I think that the background and -- that is necessary. I do have some issue with anonymous ballot box surveys. I understand the importance of them and giving everyone a right and an

opportunity to comment.

2.0

However, when you are hiding behind anonymity, you oftentimes have no accountability for what you say or don't say. And whether it's true or not true doesn't matter; you can say it anyway.

Q. Have you ever participated in an anonymous ballot box?

A. I have. I didn't -- I didn't like them twenty-something years ago because of that. And I have responded -- on my ballot boxes, you have the opportunity to put your name. And I've always put my name.

Q. Should we consider the favorable and the unfavorable if they're all anonymous?

A. Well, they go -- the same is true for favorable. You know, what's to say you have a candidate that is not in a practice with 30 other lawyers, as associate and partners, will -- you know, they're going to get everybody in their firm to do positive ones on an anonymous basis, just like there may be out -- people out there from another candidate, or somewhere else, that is going to do negative ones.

So it's difficult to strike a balance when you're all anonymous.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Representative Murphy.

REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you, Mr.

1 Chairman.

EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY:

Q. Ms. Elder, in your testimony, you stated that in your years of practice -- or your time at the solicitor's office, you never touched evidence. One of the concerns I have is that there was an issue that came up in Horry County, regarding a piece of evidence. In particular, a jacket that was owned by a person accused of a crime, and the charges were nol prossed, dismissed. It didn't go into the reason why.

But you were questioned about having knowledge of the jacket, you denied any knowledge of knowing where the jacket was, or having the jacket; yet, after you left the solicitor's office, the jacket was found in a -- in your former office, in a box with a note of -- allegedly written by you, that said, "Call me when you find this jacket," or something to that effect.

Help me get my hands around that. If you didn't touch the evidence, never touched evidence, had no knowledge of this jacket, yet this jacket was found under a desk, in a box in a locked office that you had just vacated, can you help us explain that?

A. Yes, sir. The jacket in question came from a -it was a Hell's Angel member that was not the defendant in
a trial. It was -- the individual that came to seek out

the jacket, the defendant, was not -- it did not belong to 1 2 him, first of all. 3 The trial in question was -- ended up in a hung jury as to the charge. The jacket was placed in a locked 4 vault of the solicitor's office. After the trial resulted 5 6 in a hung jury, I notified Horry County because the clerk handed all the evidence back to us from that case. 7 8 They put it in a -- the vault in the solicitor's 9 When I left, I notified Dave Caraker, who is still office. 10 a solicitor down in Horry County, that, that evidence was 11 still in the locked vault of the solicitor's office, and that the case needed to be reviewed to see if they were 12 13 going to retry it. 14 So the empty locked office --It was not an office when I left. It was in a 15 16 vault. 17 So the vault is not the empty locked office. Q. 18 Α. No, sir, I would think not. Okay. Thank you. 19 Q. Yes, sir. 20 Α. 21 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Representative Rutherford. 22 REEXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: 23 I'm sorry, I thought you said that you all --0. 24 that you did not handle evidence.

I don't.

Α.

So tell me -- you said the clerks handed it back 1 Q. 2 to you all. 3 Α. The officers that were there. The lead detective that was there. 4 So the clerks handed it to the lead detective. 5 Q. Correct. 6 Α. And the lead detective did what with it? 7 Q. 8 Α. Put it downstairs in our vault. 9 In your vault. Q. In the solicitor's office vault. 10 Α. 11 And who had access to the vault? Q. 12 Generally, it was -- we had to go through the Α. 13 solicitor's office investigators. 14 But being more specific, did you have access to 0. 15 the vault? 16 Α. Through them, yes. 17 Q. What do you mean through them? You didn't have 18 the code combination? 19 No, sir. Α. So only the solicitor's office investigators. 20 Q. And this was locked -- it was a locked vault? 21 22 It was locked. They had a key. Α. 23 So when it was handed to the investigator, he 0. then had to hand it to the solicitor's office investigator 24 to be put in there? 25

1 They opened the vault. I think it was a late Α. 2 night, they opened the vault --3 Who is "they"? 0. -- to put it back in there. The detective in the 4 case, and direct who that detective was. 5 So the detective in the case now has a key. 6 0. 7 Α. No, sir. He took it downstairs. And they opened 8 the vault -- "they," meaning the investigators -- opened the vault for him to put it in there. 9 10 Q. But there's no tracking of who opened the vault 11 for him. No, sir. 12 Α. 13 Q. Okay. And --It was not fungible evidence. 14 Α. I didn't ask that. So the point is -- I was a 15 0. solicitor, very briefly. But as I remember it, when the 16 17 clerks hand back evidence they simply give it over to the 18 team. And the team is the prosecutor, the investigator, whoever it is. Why would you not have taken the evidence, 19 if it was in y'alls safe? 2.0 21 Α. Because I had no reason to take it. 22 Q. Okay. 23 I'm sorry, maybe I'm misunderstanding. Α. 24 No, I'm just trying to understand why -- was the Q. 25 invest -- was the investigator in the case interviewed?

Interviewed for --1 Α. 2 Interviewed as to how this jacket, when someone Q. 3 was requesting, wasn't where it was supposed to be. No, they knew where it was. It was in the vault. 4 Α. So at no point was this jacket ever missing? 5 Q. No, sir. 6 Α. 7 Q. Okay. So let me go back to this, because I 8 didn't know -- and I still don't necessarily understand your title. You do what exactly for the Senate Democratic 9 10 Caucus? 11 Α. The Senate Republican --12 Senate Republican Caucus. I'm sorry. Q. 13 Α. I am the research director for the Senate Caucus. 14 And this is your current job? Q. 15 Α. Yes, sir. Did anyone suggest to you -- or did you think 16 Q. 17 that given the canons, that maybe you should, once you put 18 in your application for this, resign from that? No, sir. 19 Α. In reading the canons, you think that it's fine 20 Q. 21 to continue in a partisan job? 22 I have read the canons, and specifically as it 23 related to my job. And I apologize, I can't remember which 24 one, but there is a canon that says that -- that a person 25 in -- and I believe there was an attorney general opinion

on it as well, that they could continue in the position, as long as they took steps that it didn't appear to be partisan.

I don't attend Republican functions. I don't attend fundraisers. I have not done any of that, anything, since I've become a candidate. I am solely there for the purpose of preparing legislation.

- Q. But again, the Senate is different than the House. But I am the minority leader in the House, and I have people on my staff that do what you do, and their preparation of legislation is preparation of what to some would be considered hyper-partisan legislation. Because there is legislative counsel and there are staff members on each committee, are there not?
 - A. That is correct. Yes, sir.
- Q. So in your research, is your research not partisan research? I mean, isn't that the nature of the job?
 - A. I research both sides of any issue.
- Q. But you research both sides in order to find an advantage for the Senate Republican Caucus, otherwise, they would not need you. Isn't that right?
- A. I don't seek an advantage. Someone asks me to do a piece of legislation, I will look at it from a legal perspective and tell them whether I think it is

constitutional, what the benefits of the legislation would
be, what the negatives -- what the ramifications would be.

Q. Well, I struggle with the fact -- and, again,
because I -- this is what I do, I struggle with the fact
that you're either telling us that all you do is look at

that you're either telling us that all you do is look at things across the board in a fair, bipartisan way -- which is what staff does up here -- or y'alls senate staff, your committee staff, and asking you to be good at your job, which would be to look at things and find an advantage for

A. I don't look at finding an advantage. No, sir. I don't look at a bill from that perspective.

those people that you work for.

- Q. Well, do you not see the problem, now, that the next question from me, would be for you to go through the last request -- or the request that you are receiving from your bosses, people that are sitting on either side of me, and tell me how you'd work through that, to not look for an advantage when the Senate has ample staff to do exactly what you say that you're now doing, which is non-partisan?
- A. Well, first, there's not attorneys on every committee that is suited for a judiciary. We have attorneys on, I think, maybe Fish, Game and Forestry. But so not every committee has a attorney on it.
- Q. But not every bill requires an attorney, you would agree?

- A. Absolutely. And I don't review every bill.

And so when I'm asking you these questions, I

privilege, would it not?

- J
- ′

- would -- if I were to ask you about the last request that you got about a bill, it would be attorney-client
- A. I wouldn't -- I would feel uncomfortable sharing anything outside, without their permission.
- Q. As well you should. And I respect that. But isn't that why the canons are set up and this process is set up to be able to talk to you about what it is that you do, and make sure that what you're doing, that you're not doing it for the Senate Republican Caucus as zealously as you did it for the Horry County solicitor's office, when the judge had to call you up and tell you that not every client deserves the death penalty?

Because certainly if you did it that zealously, then if I can hire you for the Democrats, I'd certainly do that because of your zealous advocacy. But because that's the job that you're currently in, do you see how it limits, certainly me, to ask you questions about what you do?

Because it is, by its very nature and definition, partisan.

A. I think that you can ask me questions about what I do. It's the specific particular bill, for example -- you know, the opinion that I gave a senator about a bill is not necessarily my opinion about my personal opinion. And

I think that, that is what the committee is focused on when it -- when it screens a candidate, how they are -- how they personally area. And I don't see how that would limit your ability to question me in that regard.

Q. Well, because if you had resigned your position with the Senate Democratic [sic] Caucus before you started this, I would have no need to ask. But at this point, because you are continuing to be a candidate while still employed with the Senate Republican Caucus, it challenges me to say, how is it that what you're doing is not exactly partisan.

And I can't even ask -- or at least I should not ask you to violate attorney-client privilege and tell me how it's not. Because the people that I employ at the House Democratic Caucus, their job is to be partisan. If they're not, then they should not be there. That would not limit you or stop you from running from a judgeship, but it should stop any one of them from submitting that application if they had not resigned beforehand.

Everybody up here runs as a Democrat or a

Republican as elected officials. We get that. But I don't know how you continue to be employed by these Senate

Republican Caucus, even if it's just to do research, because that research is, by its very nature, to give an advantage to one party over another. You don't agree?

No, sir, I don't. I work for the clerk directly, 1 Α. for Jeff --2 3 The clerk of the Senate, yes. 0. Yes, sir. 4 Α. Yeah. 5 Q. He hires me and he fires me. I am assigned to 6 Α. the -- to the Republican Caucus for -- and directly work 7 8 with Senator Massey, the majority leader. 9 Did you request to be moved to another committee 10 while this process went on? 11 No, sir. I reviewed the canons, and I reviewed Α. the attorney general's opinion surrounding those things. 12 13 And I think that it is clear if I was a judicial -- if I 14 was a judge, obviously, I could not do those things. 15 I cannot be involved in anything that would give an appearance of impropriety as to which, whether I'm a 16 Republican or Democrat, or any political affiliation, 17 18 because that may lead to some appearance. 19 However, I believe the canons provide that a candidate does not have to give up employment, whether that 20 21 be -- I think there was a issue with a solicitor, and there 22 was a couple of other offices that they looked at. And I think that, that -- I did review that and I did discuss 23 24 that, and I researched that prior to becoming a candidate.

And I do not think the canons prevent me from being here

1 today. 2 Do you think that a judge, a part-time judge, a 3 part-time magistrate, could hold your position? I don't think that -- because he's a state --Α. 4 because he's under the state system already, it would be 5 6 two appointments, maybe. I don't know. I think that --7 Q. Not for that reason. 8 Α. I'll have to look at that. But for partisan issues, do you think that a 9 Q. 10 sitting magistrate, a temporary employee, a temporary 11 magistrate, could hold the position doing research for the House Republic -- I mean, for the Senate Republican Caucus? 12 13 Α. If he was a current magistrate? No, sir. 14 think the difference is between when you -- once you become a judge in that position, and when you're a candidate 15 before you get there. 16 17 SENATOR RANKIN: Any other questions? 18 (Hearing none.) 19 SENATOR RANKIN: Thank you, Ms. Elder. concludes this portion of your screening process. And I 20 21 have to read this, verbatim --22 MS. ELDER: Yes, sir. SENATOR RANKIN: -- so that the court 23 24 reporter doesn't ask me what I said. I, on behalf of the 25 Committee, want to thank you for this -- for offering.

I want to take the opportunity to remind you that, pursuant 1 2 to the Commission's evaluative criteria, the Commission 3 expects candidates to follow the spirit as well as the letter of the ethics laws, and that we will view violations 4 or the appearance of impropriety as serious, and 5 6 potentially deserving of heavy weight and screening 7 deliberations. 8 On that note, and as you know, the record 9 will remain open until the formal release of this report of 10 your qualifications, and you may be called back at such 11 time if the need arises. Again, thank you for your offering for this position, and for your service to the 12 13 State Senate. 14 MS. ELDER: Thank you, Senator Rankin. 15 Thank you. 16 SENATOR RANKIN: Folks, we're going to go 17 ahead and break for lunch and try to get it brought in 18 here. And then we're going to be as close to two o'clock 19 with Mr. Graham as we can be. We'll go off the record now. (OFF THE RECORD AT 1:37 P.M.) 20 21 22 23 24

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	78 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	3RD DAY OF DECEMBER 2017.
L4	
15	
16	
L7	
18	
19	
20	
21	PATRICIA G. BACHAND, COURT REPORTER
22	MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MARCH 8, 2027
23	
24	
25	

```
1
    STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )
2
    COUNTY OF RICHLAND
3
4
               JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION
5
                  TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS
6
7
    BEFORE:
             REPRESENTATIVE G. MURRELL SMITH, JR., CHAIRMAN
8
              ERIN B. CRAWFORD, CHIEF COUNSEL
9
              SENATOR LUKE A. RANKIN, VICE-CHAIRMAN
10
              REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS MURPHY
11
              REPRESENTATIVE J. TODD RUTHERFORD
12
              MR. ANDREW N. SAFRAN
              MR. JOSHUA L. HOWARD
13
              SENATOR RONNIE A. SABB
14
15
              SENATOR TOM YOUNG, JR.
16
              MR. MICHAEL HITCHCOCK
17
              MR. ROBERT W. HAYES, JR.
                            * * * * *
18
19
    DATE: November 27th, 2017
20
    TIME:
           2:44 P.M.
    LOCATION: Gressette Building, Room 105
2.1
22
                   1101 Pendleton Street
23
                   Columbia, South Carolina 29201
24
    REPORTED BY: LISA F. HUFFMAN, COURT REPORTER
25
```

Page 2

1	INDEX
2	
3	PAGE
4	DAVID SHAWN GRAHAM
5	Examination by Ms. Crawford 7
6	Examination by Senator Sabb
7	Examination by Senator Young 24
8	Examination by Senator Rankin 27
9	Examination by Mr. Safran
10	Examination by Mr. Howard 40
11	Examination by Chairman Smith 44
12	
13	KYLIENE LEE KEESLEY
14	Examination by Ms. Benson 60
15	Examination by Senator Young 67
16	Examination by Senator Rankin 76
17	Examination by Representative Rutherford 84
18	Examination by Chairman Smith 85
19	
20	WALTON J. MCLEOD, IV
21	Examination by Ms. Benson
22	Examination by Mr. Hayes
23	Examination by Senator Young
24	Examination by Senator Rankin
25	Examination by Chairman Smith

1	INDEX
2	
3	ROBERT MICHAEL MADSEN
4	Examination by Mr. Franklin
5	Examination by Senator Young
6	Examination by Mr. Safran
7	Examination by Senator Rankin
8	Examination by Senator Young 142
9	Examination by Representative Rutherford 145
10	Examination by Senator Sabb
11	* * * *
12	REQUESTED INFORMATION INDEX
13	(No Information Requested.)
14	* * * *
15	EXHIBIT INDEX
16	PAGE
17	EXHIBIT NO. 8
18	- Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data
19	Questionnaire for David Shawn Graham.
20	EXHIBIT NO. 9
21	- Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement
22	for David Shawn Graham.
23	EXHIBIT NO. 10
24	- Amended Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal
25	Data Questionnaire for David Shawn Graham.

1	EXHIBIT INDEX
2	PAGE:
3	EXHIBIT NO. 11
4	- Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data
5	Questionnaire for Kyliene Lee Keesley.
6	EXHIBIT NO. 12
7	- Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement
8	for Kyliene Lee Keesley.
9	EXHIBIT NO. 13
10	- Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data
11	Questionnaire for Walton J. McLeod, IV.
12	EXHIBIT NO. 14
13	- Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement
14	for Walton J. McLeod, IV.
15	EXHIBIT NO. 15
16	- Amended Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal
17	Data Questionnaire for Walton J. McLeod, IV.
18	EXHIBIT NO. 16
19	- Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data
20	Questionnaire for Robert Michael Madsen.
21	EXHIBIT NO. 17
22	- Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement
23	for Robert Michael Madsen.
24	
25	* * * *

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Graham, how are you
3	doing today?
4	MR. GRAHAM: I'm good, Mr. Chairman. How
5	are you?
6	CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'm well. Mr. Graham,
7	will you raise your right, please, sir.
8	(The candidate is sworn in.)
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Graham, before you is
10	your personal data questionnaire and sworn
11	statement. Are these documents that you have
12	submitted to the Commission?
13	MR. GRAHAM: Yes, they are.
14	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any changes that you need
15	to make?
16	MR. GRAHAM: Not that I'm aware of, no,
17	sir.
18	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are both of them correct
19	to the best of your knowledge?
20	MR. GRAHAM: Actually, I have three
21	because of the addendum. Yes, sir.
22	CHAIRMAN SMITH: So those and whatever
23	amendments that are before you. Do you object
24	to making these documents and the amendments a
25	part of the record of your sworn testimony?

1 MR. GRAHAM: No, Mr. Chairman. 2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: If you'll hand those to Lindi for me, please, sir and we're going to 3 4 make those a part of the record of your sworn 5 testimony. 6 [EXHIBIT NO. 8, JUDICIAL MERIT 7 SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA 8 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DAVID SHAWN 9 GRAHAM, ADMITTED.] [EXHIBIT NO. 9, SWORN STATEMENT FOR 10 11 DAVID SHAWN GRAHAM, ADMITTED.] 12 [EXHIBIT NO. 10, AMENDED PERSONAL DATA 13 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DAVID SHAWN GRAHAM, 14 ADMITTED. 1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Graham, the Judicial 15 16 Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly 17 investigated your qualifications for the 18 bench. Our inquiry is focused on nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot 19 2.0 box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your 2.1 22 compliance with state ethics laws, a search of 23 newspaper articles in which your name appears, 24 study of previous screenings and checks for 25 economic conflicts of interest.

We have received no affidavits today
filed in opposition to your election, there
are no witnesses that are present to testify.

Do you wish to make a brief opening statement
to the Commission?

MR. GRAHAM: No, I just appreciate you all

MR. GRAHAM: No, I just appreciate you all having me here today and spending the time to get to know me a little better.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you. And let me apologize to you also. I think we're running about forty-five minutes behind time so we say we're optimistic all the time about this. Will you answer any questions that counsel may have, please, sir?

EXAMINATION

(By Ms. Crawford)

2.0

Q. Hi, Mr. Graham. Bob Maldonado was your screening attorney but he couldn't be here today so I'm going handle this for him. Mr. Chairman, I note for the record that based on the testimony contained in Mr. Graham's PDQ, which has been included in the record with the candidate's consent, David Shawn Graham meets the constitutional and statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence and years of practice. Mr. Graham, why do you want to

be a Circuit Court judge?

Α.	I want to be a Circuit Court judge because I want
	to continue the public service that I've been
	doing. Prior to going to law school, after I
	graduated undergraduate I worked for IBM so I was
	in the business sector for four years. And I'd
	always thought about going to law school. And I
	went to law school to help people just like all us
	attorneys, to make a career out of it, to make a
	living and to help people. Once I started being an
	attorney, I was actually in the civil practice. I
	realized that I wanted to be more of a public
	servant, although all attorneys are public
	servants. And so that's when I became a
	prosecutor. For twenty years, I've been a
	prosecutor and as you all know from reading
	opinions are administers of justice doing the right
	thing for the right reason. I'm at the point of my
	career after doing this for twenty years I've kind
	of reached the pinnacle of a prosecutor other than
	being elected. And at this point when this
	opportunity came up I set this as a goal for myself
	and believe that it's the right thing for me. And
	honestly I believe it's the right thing for the
	citizens of Lexington County and for the state. I

bring that public service mindset and the skills
that I have and I think that I would be a good fit
and I would be honored to be a Circuit Court judge
in South Carolina.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Thank you, Mr. Graham. The Commission received 72 Q. ballot box surveys regarding you with 13 additional comments. Some positive comments that were submitted contained the following. "I worked with Shawn and always found him to be very intelligent and hardworking. Even though he worked at the Solicitor's Office, I felt like he could be fair and impartial. I think he would be a fabulous judge. He has the perfect temperament for the Another comment stated, "I have a lot of iob." respect for him and believe he would do a very good job." A few negative comments indicated that you might have a bias towards prosecution. As you're obviously a strong advocate for the state how would you be able -- how would you react to that comment and how would you be able to transition to the role of a non-biased judicial capacity?
- A. I think when I start the process as a prosecutor

 I'm actually non-biased. So I think it's a bit of
 a jump to say that I'm -- I'm biased. When a case
 comes in, well, even before the cases come in, the

last ten years or so I've worked mainly on murder cases and for the last ten years or so I get telephone calls from law enforcement prior to them even making cases. There have been times where I have told them don't make a case, you need more The standard is not probable cause but evidence. reasonable doubt of conviction. Once a case comes in our office, of course, there's options with what you can do with it. It's not always to try to get the most sentence and see somebody in jail. Obviously, there's cases that need to be dismissed, there's cases that need to be remanded, there's cases that need more investigation, there's cases that need to be reduced, there's cases that need to be sent to diversion programs and there's cases that need to be offered. Of course, once an offer is made, from what I think is fair, that's what we do as an administer of justice. But I go into every case, I quess, as an unbiased, neutral party. Do I work with law enforcement? Of course, I do. Do I work with prosecutors, of course, I do. don't believe that, that in and of itself makes me biased toward them. Every person who comes before the judge deserves an open and honest approach to believe that they're coming before you and telling

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

the truth. I mean, I don't know if there's any transition to be made from where I'm at and who I am and what I am. Of course, as a judge, I would not be biased and I don't believe that, that would be a problem.

- Q. Thank you, Mr. Graham. And you touched on this briefly, but there were some comments that expressed concern about your lack of civil experience. Can you --
- Α. Sure. And I don't know that I'm unusual and you all probably are much better after talking to the candidates for the open offices now. I think in the society that we're in that's going to be more and more. You're either going to have somebody who has some experience in both civil and criminal law on plaintiff and on the defense side or prosecution and defense side, but then the waters of that experience are very shallow where you're going to have people like me who are going to have very deep in a certain area but lacking in another. have exposure to a little bit civil work? Sure, I In law school, I interned at the South Carolina Retirement System. My first job out of law school was with a civil defense firm down in Charleston and I did that for five months.

had my own client but I worked on cases and did
research and went to court. Since that time in
applying and putting in my application for this,
you know, obviously we all read the opinions. The
truth is I've read more criminal because criminal
was more to me. I've been reading more civil since
then. I've also took off time from work and I went
in and watched a week of Common Pleas non-jury so
that I get better exposure to that and have an
understanding more of what happened. Of course, as
a prosecutor I've appeared in Common Pleas non-jury
from appeals of Magistrate Court earlier in my
career. And also in PCR or post DNA testing type
procedures and allegations coming from inmates who
have been convicted. In addition to attending a
week of common pleas non-jury, I've also taken some
civil CLEs. I've taken one on summary judgment and
I've taken one on tort law. And I think that,
that's what I would continue to do to increase my
knowledge. I mean, there is a deficiency and I
recognize that.

Q. Thank you, Mr. Graham. Two comments indicated that you have a win at any cost outlook in the Solicitor's Office and that you and your staff intentionally bend or break the rules, so to speak.

How would you respond to that?

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 guess my first thought was I'm offended. Α. shocked and surprised that I got that. There has been, as far as I know, there's never been an allegation in court where I have been in front of a judge of any kind of conduct like that. I don't believe that there's been any attorneys who filed anything with the Ethics Commission or the South Carolina Supreme Court on that. So I would -- I would deny that. That just, not only as an administer of justice, is it's not right and personally it's not right. It's not me. And I think that's it's probably supported by the fact that I think there was -- was there only one person that made the comment "to win at all cost"?
- Q. I think it -- yes, sir. Or two.
- A. I think it -- I think it was just a single comment.

 I mean, when you look at the type of cases that I prosecuted, especially in the last ten years, which have been almost solely homicide cases, I mean, they're not cases that get remanded back for a lesser charge. By the time they come in and they've been indicted for murder, it's a murder case. So, I mean, they are hard-fought. They're hard-fought cases. I normally make offers. And

2
 3
 4

when that doesn't happen then we go to trial and, you know, when I go to trial I do fight hard to win because I believe in what I'm doing. I wouldn't be there if I didn't believe that it was the right thing to do at that time.

5

6

Q. Mr. Graham, what do you feel is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

Α. The demeanor in my career of going in front of Circuit Court judges, Thomas Cooper from Manning, retired, probably epitomizes a Circuit Court judge's demeanor. It's what I would want to emulate. He -- he treats every person in that courtroom with respect which I think everybody deserves that. The litigants on both sides, whether they're a criminal defendant or a prosecutor or a victim or a defense attorney or in a civil suit somebody who's been hurt or wronged who's bringing the suit or the corporation where the attorneys are representing, everybody deserves their day in court and everybody deserves to be treated with respect. So primarily that would be the main, if I had to pick one word, it would be respect.

212223

Q. Thank you. A few housekeeping issues. Mr. Graham, are you aware that as a judicial candidate you are

1 bound by the Code of Judicial Conduct as found in 2 Rule 501 of the South Carolina Appellate Court 3 rules? 4 Yes. Α. 5 Since submitting your letter of intent, have you Q. 6 contacted any members of the Commission about your 7 candidacy? 8 Α. No. 9 Since submitting your letter of intent, have you Q. 10 sought or received the pledge of any legislator, 11 either prior to this date or pending the outcome of 12 your screening? 13 Α. No. 14 Have you asked any third parties to contact 0. 15 members of the General Assembly on your behalf or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in 16 17 this process on your behalf? 18 Α. I have not, no. I am not -- have -- am not aware 19 of anyone. 2.0 Thank you. Have you reviewed and do you understand Q. the Commission's guidelines on pledging in South 2.1 22 Carolina Code Section 2-19-70(E)? 23 Α. Yes. 24 MS. CRAWFORD: I would like to note that 25 the Midlands Citizens Committee reported that

1 Mr. Graham is qualified in the evaluative 2 criteria of constitutional qualifications, 3 physical health, mental stability, experience and judicial temperament. And was also well 4 5 qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria 6 of ethical fitness, professional and academic 7 ability, character and reputation. The 8 Committee stated in summary, "Mr. Graham is a 9 fine prosecutor but we do have some real 10 concerns about his performance as a Circuit 11 Court judge." Likewise the Committee stated 12 that, "Mr. Graham has been an exemplary 13 prosecutor. Based on the research though 14 there are some concern that he's so much a 15 prosecutor that he is not respecting the 16 defense side of the system or its 17 practitioners. There are also some mild 18 concerns about his temperament. Also he has 19 almost no experience in civil law." Mr. 2.0 Chairman, I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation by 2.1 22 staff regarding Mr. Graham are incorporated 23 into the questions of the candidate today. 24 And I have no further questions. 25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any questions for Mr.

Graham? Senator Sabb.

25

1

SENATOR SABB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Graham, thank you so much for offering for this position. I will tell you that I was moved by a couple of your comments. One was the idea of having reached the pinnacle of your prosecutorial career after doing it for twenty years. I found that interesting because I did it for twenty years and I felt exactly the same way you do. The other comment you made that I thought was significant that sort of struck home was the role of the prosecutor and that is the administration of justice. Quick editorial note real quick. In prosecuting, one of the things was, if you're a defense attorney and you believe that someone is innocent you just fight as hard as you can to get them off. you're a prosecutor and you believe somebody's innocent you have the power of the pen. it appears to me as if that's the way that you approached your role which I have appreciation for. But I'm troubled by the idea that you apparently have not done a whole lot of work in the civil arena. As you and I both know,

1 2

3

5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

both arms, if you will, in the justice system is important. How would you compensate for the lack of experience along those lines?

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Senator. You know, in the position, I guess, the -- all the candidates before you for the Lexington position I think are actually going to fall into -- into one or other. They're going to be criminal or their going to be civil. I've talked to four different Circuit judges who I've appeared before over my career. All of them have said that they believe that I can do it. So the question, I guess, is how I do it. The, you know, the position would start July 1st. I don't know that there's time for me to run off in civil practice and actually gain practical experience between now and then. The only thing that I know to do is to increase my study and knowledge and learning of the law between now and then by continuing to instead of maybe focusing on criminal CLEs is to actually go out and continue to do civil I know on the bench, of course, you CLEs. probably have access to other judges and would be able to call on them as needed just like I

1 would probably be a -- somebody they could call on criminal matters. Obviously, you 2 3 know, during civil litigants that have 4 appeared in front of me at the beginning might 5 it require me to require them to be more 6 briefing than normal. It probably would. But. 7 I do -- I -- I have a passion for learning 8 which has taken me to where I am at. just focused it in a certain area. I think I 9 have the -- the brains and the drive to learn 10 11 what I need to learn and to do a good job. 12 SENATOR SABB: The circuit that you 13 practice criminal law in, are there 14 alternative courts like drug courts? 15 MR. GRAHAM: There are. We have -- the 16 only alternative court that we have right now 17 is adult drug court that I believe. Juvenile 18 Arbitration for juveniles. 19 SENATOR SABB: As a potential jurist, what 2.0 is your view of those type courts? MR. GRAHAM: I think they're great. 2.1 22 think that, you know, practicing criminal law, 23 which I know some of you have and some of you 24 haven't, some of you have done a lot and some 25 of you have done a little. There really are

1 few evil people in this world. There are some 2 out there but most people make bad mistakes. 3 A lot of it goes back to drug or addiction 4 problems. I think the Drug Court, I think Lexington had the first in the state. I think 5 6 it also had the first pretrial intervention 7 program in the state. And I've always been 8 big supporters of all those. Giving people 9 another chance is good for the person and it's 10 also good for society and it's probably what 11 we all want. We want everybody to be, tax --12 you know, don't call the police, don't get in 13 trouble, pay your taxes and work and make --14 make our state a better place. I am hoping, 15 I'm talking with Solicitor Hubbard, the new 16 solicitor, that Lexington may be going toward 17 having a Mental Health Court at some in the 18 future. But obviously, I think -- I think 19 those programs are necessary and I think 2.0 they're important and I'm grateful that we 2.1 have them and I hope we have more. 22 SENATOR SABB: On a scale of one to ten, 23 how would you rank the importance of judicial 24 temperament? 25 MR. GRAHAM: I would say that it's very

high. It's a nine. It probably is the -it's what everybody sees and what everybody
deals with whether, like I said, you're a
litigant or you're an attorney, everybody
deserves to be treated with respect, everybody
deserves to have their day in court. They
don't need to be cut off, in my opinion, up
until some point after they've said what they
need to say.

SENATOR SABB: Give me two examples of your experiences as a prosecutor as it relates to the judge and dressing a lawyer down, tell me about how you view the best experience as having been and how you view the worst experience as having been.

MR. GRAHAM: For what I've seen as how the judge's temperament of dressing an attorney down?

SENATOR SABB: Well, let's assume hypothetically that you have two lawyers in a murder trial, both of whom are zealously advocating their various position. One goes just a wee bit overboard and after having been warned by the judge a couple of times, but just adamant about the issue because it's a

pivotal issue in the trial. You win the issue you might win the trial; you lose the issue you might lose the trial. And so in that situation as you reflect back on your twenty years of having prosecuted give me what you would view as an example of how the judge went wrong in dealing with it and then give me an example of a similar circumstance in terms of how the judge handled it right.

MR. GRAHAM: I want to say one of the --I've only had two cases that have been overturned in my career. One of the first ones I think the judge was an old-time judge and it was myself as a younger prosecutor. was a CDVHAN case. And the defense attorney was a young defense attorney. I think the judge handled that situation wrong. The, if I remember correctly, the case was overturned for failure to give a self-defense charge. And I believe that the attorney was advocating for that and I believe that he got cut off. And it was a judge who, I would say, has a temper and -- and came down and cursed people which I didn't think, you know, as a young attorney I didn't like it, now that I'm older

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

I still don't like it and I don't think it's appropriate. I think what the better response to that would be is, and we all get frustrated, judges are tired at times and they're frustrated, they think they've heard enough. I think the more appropriate remedy would be like -- somebody like Judge Cooper who has -- who I've seen, not necessarily in a case I handled, but know about, I mean, he told the attorneys that they had protected the record for themselves but he made a decision that it was time to move on. And I think that's the better way to do it. If the judge needs to take a break to let passions cool that's probably the appropriate thing to do as well. I do -- the record does need to be protected though and the attorney's, for either side, deserve to have that heard whether, you know, even if that means sending the jury out to protect the record.

SENATOR SABB: Last question. You are managing the civil docket, case has been scheduled for two weeks, everybody's ready to go or so they thought, the weekend before plaintiff's lawyer has a serious problem with

1 getting witnesses for trial on Monday. 2 your knee jerk reaction to the email that you 3 get asking for a continuance? MR. GRAHAM: I'd want to know more. 4 T'd 5 want to know when those -- why -- I mean, what 6 came up, what's the reason why they weren't 7 prepared? I don't think I could grant or deny 8 a continuance without getting more 9 information. SENATOR SABB: Fair enough. Thank you. 10 11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? 12 Senator Young. SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 14 Mr. Graham. 15 MR. GRAHAM: Senator. 16 SENATOR YOUNG: Good afternoon. MR. GRAHAM: Good afternoon. 17 18 SENATOR YOUNG: Good to see you again. 19 appreciate your interest in serving the state 2.0 as a Circuit Court judge. I know that everybody on this Commission does -- echoes 2.1 22 those comments. First question I have for you 23 is how would you describe your judicial 24 philosophy with respect to the application of 25 the law to the facts that would be before you

1	as a Circuit judge?
2	MR. GRAHAM: Are you asking about judicial
3	activism?
4	SENATOR YOUNG: Yes.
5	MR. GRAHAM: My opinion is a Circuit Court
6	judge's job is to take the facts, take the law
7	as it's written and apply it. Changes to the
8	law need to be made by the Legislature.
9	SENATOR YOUNG: You have practiced almost
10	your entire legal career in the Solicitor's
11	Office as we just had a brief exchange with
12	Senator Sabb. You had a brief period, you
13	were in private practice in Charleston; is
14	that right?
15	MR. GRAHAM: Correct.
16	SENATOR YOUNG: Did you do civil practice
17	then?
18	MR. GRAHAM: The firm was Barnwell Whaley
19	Patterson and Helms. It was primarily
20	insurance defense.
21	SENATOR YOUNG: It was a larger firm?
22	MR. GRAHAM: Mid-size I believe it's a
23	mid-size is what they would categorize
24	themselves.
25	SENATOR YOUNG: In your experience as a

24

25

prosecutor in both the 14th Circuit and the 11th Circuit, have you -- you've handled a number of cases with lawyers who come from smaller practices; is that fair to say?

MR. GRAHAM: Oh, yes, sir.

SENATOR YOUNG: Do you recognize the challenges on time and being in multiple places on the same day for lawyers who practice in smaller firms?

MR. GRAHAM: No doubt. I've actually -- I have a case with Representative Rutherford right now and it's amazing -- as a legislator there's protection from January to, I think it's been extended to July now, but Representative Rutherford couldn't appear in court today because he's here. And I know he was on the V.C. Summer's Commission as well. So that takes, as you all as lawyer legislators, but even as, you know, solo practitioners, small firm practitioners, they are in multiple places at multiple times. really think that one of my strongest person -- personal skills is empathy. Although I have never been a solo practitioner on the other side, I really do understand as best I

can and I'm cognizant of that and aware of that and honestly am willing to work with that. As a prosecutor, the first, in my opinion, the first call if -- if a defense attorney needs a continuance in a case that's set for Monday in all honesty the first call should be to me. It shouldn't be to the judge, it should be to the prosecutor and they should be telling you what their problems and issues are and if I can help them, I will. I mean, really at the end of the day the job of the prosecutor and the job of the court is to do justice and do the right thing. But I'm very cognizant of schedules. Yes, sir.

SENATOR YOUNG: Those are all my questions as of right now.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? Senator Rankin.

SENATOR RANKIN: Nice to meet you, sir.

I'm Luke Rankin, Horry County. It would scare some to believe that, and I don't practice in the criminal area much, that we would be selecting, and as you've recognized earlier, there are a number of folks with mostly criminal or mostly civil experience. It might

1	give pause to some to say that we were
2	electing or nominating someone who had very
3	little except perhaps a year of experience in
4	the civil realm. You've answered that
5	somewhat. Criminal is where it's at in terms
6	of cases that are being litigated, you know
7	that in your own district, I guess, your own
8	circuit but so you were a year at Barnwell
9	Whaley, I think, '96 to '97.
10	MR. GRAHAM: Not as much as that but that
11	was my first job out of law school. Yes, sir.
12	SENATOR RANKIN: Did you try any cases
13	there, and that would hard to do as a
14	MR. GRAHAM: As a civil lawyer.
15	SENATOR RANKIN: Yes.
16	MR. GRAHAM: No, sir. I did not.
17	SENATOR RANKIN: Do you keep count of the
18	cases you've tried and prosecuted
19	MR. GRAHAM: How many
20	SENATOR RANKIN: to the verdict? Yeah.
21	MR. GRAHAM: in General Sessions? I
22	think I've near seventy.
23	SENATOR RANKIN: Yeah.
24	MR. GRAHAM: Twenty-six of those have been
25	murder or involuntary manslaughter cases,

25

seven of those have been death penalty cases. SENATOR RANKIN: Ever any goal to actually run for the Solicitor's position in your area? MR. GRAHAM: I'm really not a politician. So no, it really was never on my horizon to SENATOR RANKIN: The ballot box surveys which you got 72, I think you were surprised to hear and happily pointed out that there was only one that apparently painted such a, I'll call it, harsh view of you. Do you think that that is a tool that we should use to solicit input about you and the other candidates MR. GRAHAM: I do. I think it's probably the people that know us best. You know, we submit letters of recommendation. Those are handpicked. And then we also provide, I think, five names of attorneys who have been on the opposite sides. Those are also handpicked. So we're getting to choose people that we honestly believe or think that like us and think we would do a good job. And I would think that the letters that I have would

support that. But I think that the ballot box

is probably a fair cross section of everybody that I've come in contact with in my career who felt, you know, either strongly for me or strongly against me that they should respond. Though I was surprised that were negative comments, you know, when you step back and look at it, it's really not too surprising.

As a -- as a prosecutor I probably have a low number of complaints against me. But I think as a whole that I think it is probably a very useful thing for this Commission to consider.

SENATOR RANKIN: You were asked this at the outset and I'll just touch on it one more time. But the comment by your Midlands
Citizens Committee, you've read their results, their report, correct?

MR. GRAHAM: I was told by my screening attorney. I did not see the report.

SENATOR RANKIN: That, again, favorable but on the other side some concern that there is so much a prosecutor that he does not respect the defense side of the system or its practitioners. There are also some, again, some, mild concerns about his temperament.

And I think Senator Sabb asked you about

1 temperament. That's, you didn't put a number 2 to that, but you would rate that very highly 3 on a scale of one to ten? I'll give you one 4 more shot. 5 MR. GRAHAM: Sure, I think I said, "nine." 6 SENATOR RANKIN: I'm sorry, I didn't hear 7 it. MR. GRAHAM: I said, "nine" Senator. 8 9 SENATOR RANKIN: Okay. My apologies. You 10 haven't served as a judge, you've served as a 11 prosecutor, I guess, or assistant prosecutor. 12 Going forward if you were to make it to the 13 bench and we were to later -- or this group 14 were to later hear about temperament and a 15 negative or poor temperament, again, extreme 16 hypothetical here, what would we do about 17 that? What should we do about that if you 18 have been --19 MR. GRAHAM: I would be shocked if you 2.0 heard that I had a poor temperament. 2.1 really is, anybody who knows me would say 22 that, that's not true. I've -- I've never 23 lost my temper in court, I've never been 24 called down in court for losing my temper. 25 I'm a zealous advocate, you know, I do fight

1 hard and I fight to win once I get into court, 2 but like Senator Sabb said, we get to choose 3 whether we go to court. And in all honesty as a prosecutor, if the facts aren't there, there 4 5 are ways of getting rid of that case. If you 6 heard that I had problems about a demeanor I'd 7 expect to be called on it. SENATOR RANKIN: That's all. Thank you. 8 9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? Mr. Safran. 10 11 MR. SAFRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let 12 me just ask a few things. Obviously, as you 13 pointed out earlier all the candidates seem to 14 kind of have strengths in terms of background 15 and weaknesses in other areas. Not 16 necessarily that they would be weak because of 17 ability but just experience. I mean, you 18 would agree that experience at a Circuit judge 19 level really kind of across the board would be 2.0 the most beneficial scenario, wouldn't it? MR. GRAHAM: I think the perfect candidate 2.1 22 would be somebody who has been practicing for 23 thirty years and has done both sides of everything. Yes, sir. 24 25 MR. SAFRAN: Well, and I guess the

question is this. Certainly, I can understand personally that you may start out in a practice. It may not be kind of exactly what you would envision and I'm assuming that might have happened. I mean, I used to practice in the 14th Circuit years ago and the firm that you were with, nice guys, never had any issue with that. And I think you went to work with Solicitor Burdick (ph.) after that?

MR. GRAHAM: That's correct.

MR. SAFRAN: I'm sure you picked up a lot of good experience there. But, I guess, the question is, is that when you look at kind of the way you've gone as kind of the natural ascension that essentially once you put in your time with the Solicitor's Office and going to the Circuit Court it really kind of the next step or, I mean, do you feel like it there may be some other seasoning that might be helpful before you try to take that leap?

MR. GRAHAM: In a perfect world, yes.

Sure. Would it be time -- would it be nice if it was, let's assume I don't make it through screening, I'm assuming by that point, six years from now when another seat comes open

2.0

2.1

25

again, by that time I would have civil experience and I will. But yes, I mean, I think the problem and the reality is that myself and everybody's going to be in is the there are very few perfect candidates anymore. You know, maybe someday we'll have criminal judges and we'll have civil judges. I don't know that, that's ever on the horizon. some states do it. That would probably be good for most people like myself and most practitioners coming up. It just seems that most people focus on one area of the law now. And even if you, you know, even if there's somebody who is a criminal defense attorney they may do a little bit of civil work, but I don't know if filing one or two lawsuits or defending one or two lawsuits, do they know more than me? I think they do, but does that make them as qualified as an expert like -like this Commission would want? I mean, it doesn't. I do know that if you -- if you look, because I do, I think this Commission and the legislators as a whole are going to have to choose in this race and it's going to be -- and it's going to be very different.

1 don't know that you're going to find anybody 2 that's got both. I really do think that 3 they're going to come down to either just civil or just criminal. And if you -- if 4 5 people starting say they're over, it's going 6 to be like me with five months at Barnwell 7 Whaley Patterson and Helms when I started. Т 8 do know that the number of criminal terms, at 9 least in Lexington is going to go up. 10 needs to go up for the volume. I know the 11 number of civil terms is going down. 12 Chief Justice from my understanding across the 13 state is reducing the number of civil terms. 14 So, you know, there was only, last year for 15 instance, I -- I tried four murder trials to 16 verdict. There were only four civil jury 17 trials in Lexington and I think that's an 18 example across the state. Am I the perfect 19 candidate? No. Am I qualified and well 2.0 qualified? Yes, I believe that I am. number of civil terms are going to be cut, 2.1 22 we've got mandatory arbitration that's coming 23 in. 24 MR. SAFRAN: Mediation you mean? 25 MR. GRAHAM: Arbitration. Mandatory

1 arbitration. If I'm wrong, I'm wrong. MR. SAFRAN: Yeah, I don't know. 2 3 MR. GRAHAM: But the cases are going to have to, before they go in front of the judge, 4 5 they're going to be tried to be worked out. 6 And that would only increase the number of 7 cases that settle prior to a judge coming and 8 looking at it. 9 MR. SAFRAN: Let me ask this. I mean, you 10 brought it up and I'm certainly not trying to 11 put you on the spot, but what's the answer to 12 the question that just came from your, I think, accurate comment that if you're looking 13 14 for somebody that has, kind of, the across the board experience, you're not going to find 15 16 them running anymore. Why is that? 17 MR. GRAHAM: I don't know. The perfect 18 candidate honestly would be somebody that has 19 about thirty years of experience. 2.0 people, and I guess maybe finding those people, because it's not only the experience, 2.1 22 then you got to put in the demeanor and all 23 the other things as well, it's hard to find 24 that person. So I guess you're looking, you 25 know, you would be looking for somebody who

23

24

25

maybe was a prosecutor for a number of years and then went into private practice and was a defense attorney for a number of years and then branched out into civil. But at that point momentarily you've also got to find somebody who's in the position that they're -it's a wash on what they're making or their personal situation is their children, if they have children, are they out of college or in college and they have to pay for those, are they at the end of their career, have they made enough money. Really, in the perfect world, I guess you're looking for the successful lawyer that's made enough money that now wants to give back who for the last six years or twelve years wanted to do public service when they've been making money. But for whatever reason, at least in our race, that didn't happen.

MR. SAFRAN: I got you. Let me ask you, I know I heard earlier that you expressed, based on experience, that you would be certainly aware and to some extent empathetic about the rigors that small practitioners would have as far as trying to be in so many places at one

1 time or more or less being charged in their 2 own office with handling so much by one person 3 that, that kind of flexibility would transfer over. Obviously, you get these comments that 4 come from the ballot box that seem to kind of 5 6 say the opposite. So what do you think led 7 them to possibly believe that, that wouldn't 8 be the case where you sensed that your 9 experience has been outwardly that it has been the case. Where do you think the disconnect 10 11 was? 12 MR. GRAHAM: Well, I'm sorry --13 MR. SAFRAN: Well, let me --14 MR. GRAHAM: -- what ballot box comment 15 are you --16 MR. SAFRAN: Well, these anonymous 17 comments. The, I think, where they were 18 talking about win at all cost. MR. GRAHAM: That -- that was one comment. 19 2.0 MR. SAFRAN: I understand. But talking -not being able to kind of separate the 2.1 22 prosecutorial hat, you know, which necessarily 23 I think there's a, at least whether it's legitimate or not, there is some perception 24 25 that Solicitor's Office is going to hold the

cards a lot of times and they're going to move forward on their agenda. So I kind of glean that from that. But you're telling me your experience, in terms of how you treat people, has been somewhat different. That you are aware, that you are certainly going to give some credence to their own demands when they come to you and say, I have a problem that's come up I need to take a break.

MR. GRAHAM: I've never been -- I've always wanted to look at myself in the mirror after I've done my job. The facts have always been able to support what I've honestly have thought the right thing was in the case. have never hidden evidence. I don't turn over evidence at the last minute. If I get it in the last minute, I turn it over. I'm very, very aware and I have my whole career of what the rules are, the criminal discovery as far as Brady, and I've gone above and beyond what the law requires me to do. I think in all honesty twenty years as a prosecutor and having one comment is really kind of impressive. And I think it does speak to -to me and to my character. I don't have a win

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1 at all cost attitude. I never have and I never will. 2 3 MR. SAFRAN: Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? 5 Mr. Howard. 6 MR. HOWARD. Mr. Graham, thank you for 7 being here once again. As everybody has 8 stated, thank you for putting in your 9 candidacy for this judgeship. And I appreciate how candid your responses have 10 11 been. I am a civil lawyer and I do appreciate 12 how candid your responses have been because 13 I'm not a criminal lawyer. One of the 14 questions I would have for you though is just 15 thinking about what the differences between 16 the two, what do you think, and you said you 17 had sat through a week of non-jury, what do 18 you think you're going to have to sort of develop to sort of bolster the civil side of 19 2.0 what you'd be doing as a Circuit judge? 2.1 MR. GRAHAM: Most everything. I mean, 22 being totally honest, I don't -- I don't want 23 to come in here and claim that I have picked 24 up knowledge reading cases. I mean, I went to 25 law school, like all of us went to law school.

Have I practiced and developed the -- the civil part of that? I mean, no, I haven't.

So I don't want to come in and to try to blow smoke and convince you that I know all about

civil law because I don't.

_

MR. HOWARD: Okay, you know, I appreciate that answer. When I think of the candidate who doesn't have little or really has little to no civil experience the things that I start thinking about are what is the role of the judge often in a civil trial. And you're going to be called upon, if you were elected to the seat, you going to be called upon to sit in equity and in equity you are the judge and the jury. And so in a lot of non-jury situations you're going to be called to be the judge and the jury. What sort of -- those are going to require you to sort of draw on some experiences and, you know, when I think about So what sort of experiences do you think it. you've had, even if they're just life experiences and stuff, like, what have you gone through that you can sit there and say I can draw upon that and help me in these.

6

7

8

5

9

11 12

10

1314

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GRAHAM: You know, I guess, when I

25

didn't grow up from -- I'm not from a family of lawyers. I'm the first lawyer in my family. I didn't go to undergraduate thinking I was going to be a lawyer. I grew up and thought I was going to be an engineer and I got a degree in mathematics. Got out of law school and I worked for IBM for four years as a systems engineer which is kind of technical salesperson for larger mainframe accounts. I have -- I have some real life work experience in addition to just coming straight into law school and straight into practice. Have I been in cases where there have been million dollar verdicts. I mean, I haven't and that's going something -- that's going to be something new to me. I do have a sense of fairness that I think is probably what's drawn me toward being a prosecutor. It's like Senator Sabb said, I really -- you have the ability to -- probably the closest thing, that's why they call it administrator of justice, it's the closest thing you can be to being a judge without being a judge. You go in neutral and you get to evaluate a case that comes on your desk. And it's not a -- it's

25

not a client who says I've -- I've been arrested, I've been sued, I need to sue. You're actually neutral and you get to decide what you think is the right thing to do. Does this case even need to be prosecuted? You go through that step is there enough information to prosecute it, to prove it. Not just beyond, I mean, not just probable cause, because it doesn't take much of your probable cause to get a warrant on somebody but to actually convict somebody. And then what's the appropriate thing to do. So I'd say even though I don't have it in the -- I don't have the civil experience I have all those experiences in -- in my career of evaluating a case neutrally, not as an advocate because until I pick up the role and say this case is worthy of prosecution I'm not an advocate. Just because the police have made an arrest, I'm not bound to prosecute that case. fact, numerous times I've -- I've dismissed cases, I think, as a judge sitting in equity. But I have been in those, not momentarily, I have been in positions to make those kind of decisions before. And I think that what drew

1 me to be a prosecutor of doing the right thing 2 I think would carry over and it would -- it would be there for me in civil court as well. 3 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Graham. 4 5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any questions? 6 (No response.) 7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Graham, let me just 8 follow up with you on a couple of things. 9 When I look at your PDQ and you talk about working at the defense firm in Charleston, 10 11 Barnwell Patterson Whaley, I know that's a 12 very successful firm down there. Why did you 13 just stay five months? Did you find a calling for Solicitor's Office? 14 MR. GRAHAM: I had never -- during law 15 16 school the -- what I did, I never interned or clerked with a civil law firm before. 17 18 Obviously, coming from IBM I was in the business world. I went to law school and 19 2.0 during my time in law school I clerked one time at the Fifth Circuit Solicitor's Office 2.1 and then I clerked for the South Carolina 22 23 Retirement System. And then my third year I 24 was an associate editor for the Real Property, 25 Probate and Trust Journal so I couldn't work.

1 I don't think I knew -- to me at the time, I 2 guess, and is why I -- why I became a 3 prosecutor and probably, honestly continue on 4 why I want to continue my career and believe 5 this is the right next step is it seemed and -6 - and I'm being a candidate so you all know 7 who I am. The civil defense attorneys, I 8 mean, they -- they need to be there and it's 9 important, but it wasn't -- it wasn't what I wanted to do. It seemed too much like 10 11 business and I was looking more, I guess, to 12 serve the public as a whole. So that's why I 13 got in there and as I started working on it 14 realized that they were very good advocates 15 for their clients which is exactly what their 16 clients deserve, but it really wasn't what I 17 was looking for. 18 CHAIRMAN SMITH: And so, and I guess what 19 I'm just wondering is, whether the civil law 2.0 was something that didn't interest you or was 2.1 that just, I guess, what you're saying it's 22 just a higher calling to go and prosecute? 23 MR. GRAHAM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't 24 say it's the law itself didn't interest me. 25 think it's more of a calling. I -- I'm one of

the those people that like to learn to learn things regardless of the subject matter.

3

5

6 7

8

9

11

10

1213

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

25

CHAIRMAN SMITH: I've heard a number of these questions being asked to you and, again, I think some of those -- well, I look at, and I call them isolated comments in your case, I mean, but obviously we all know we've got people who believe wholeheartedly that what you do when you're a solicitor is the absolute correct thing and you got people who I'll call not even public defenders, but what I call the true believers in the criminal defense and their clients are never wrong and the win at all cost is their belief too. So I always take those with a grain of salt when I see them. But I guess what I'm interested in is when people come in here and say you've spent all your time as a solicitor and that's what you know is a solicitor's point of view, how are you going to balance that with the other side? Because you've got to make rulings sometimes that obviously you've seen in some Jackson v. Denno issues where there's the suppression of the evidence or the confessions that sometimes the law requires that and it

1

3

4 5

6

7

9

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

could be detrimental to a case or something like that. So how do you balance the criminal defense point perspective with what you have done as a solicitor and more importantly obviously sometimes you got to temper justice with mercy --

MR. GRAHAM: No question.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: -- and so how do you balance that when you are having to call -when you're being called upon to sentence people because obviously that's -- most of these cases, you've even admitted, I know you try more and more civil cases, but -- I mean, criminal cases, but most of the times those are quilty pleas that you're called in front So what I think some concerns that would be raised, and not in your case, but when I talk to people who are completely solicitor and visa versa they've spent the whole career as a public defender that the problem is their going to lean too far one way and sentence people. If a solicitor sentenced people to jail forever and if it's a public defender then they're going to let everybody have probation. So how do you temper those two if

1 you were successful in this candidacy?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. GRAHAM: I think the, of all the cases I've tried, I've only had two cases that have been overturned. One of those two is still on appeal not counting the death penalty cases that I assisted Solicitor Myers with.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: We won't hold you for Solicitor Myers' appeals, how about that?

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you. The -- I don't think -- I know I'm -- I'm not biased. And I quess I point that out to the fact that when I go -- by the time I've gotten to court I know the -- the evidence I have. I don't want, and the fact that they haven't been appealed, I guess, or successfully appealed, I guess, I point out to the fact that I don't press the bounds of what the law and the facts show. Bv the time I've gotten there the cases that shouldn't have been tried have been weeded I think through my whole career I've out. only had -- I think I've had twenty-six murder, manslaughter cases. I think of those, the murder cases, I think only two of those maybe three have gone down to a voluntary manslaughter verdict. I've looked -- if I

believed -- I never -- I don't overcharge, I
guess, is what I'm saying. I go with what the
facts are. If it's voluntary manslaughter I
indict it as voluntary manslaughter regardless
of what law enforcement did.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: How about the sentencing area, what --

MR. GRAHAM: The sentencing, you know, when I -- I used to routinely put people into PTI, I used to routinely reduce charges, I used to routinely negotiate probation when I could. The cases I've handled the last ten years are just not the kind of cases I can do that. But there are truly -- there are truly few evil, evil people. Most people make mistakes. People who make mistakes, people who have problems, people who come up to the court and like you said most would be guilty pleas and they'd admit their quilt. I don't think that I would have the reputation of being a hammer and just putting people away. It's not -- it isn't the right thing to do. You know, you got -- people should only go away to protect society and you look at what you're protecting them from and what their

24 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

background is and what their history is, they have proved that they can't be trusted. You know, obviously the more times they mess up and the more violent the offense the more than likely they need to go in. But putting -- putting shoplifters and drug users in jail doesn't accomplish anything. And it's not right. It's not right. I really -- I don't think -- I understand the concern of being a prosecutor and of putting a prosecutor out there, I understand the concern of this Commission and every criminal defense attorney. I really believe that I would, given the chance, I think that I would be known as being fair.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: And then, I think Senator Sabb asked you this and I was interested in this is the alternative courts and we're reengaging a sense of reform again and I think when you talk about not making sense to do some things that, we call it evidence-based sentencing is what we need and more realizing people are going to get out of prison and they need to have a skill instead of locking them up in a violent place where they become more

2.1

22

23

24

25

violent and is trying to have some skills.

And one thing that I'm interested in and I've seen success around the state and you referenced it is the alternative courts, the Drug Courts, and you're talking about starting a Mental Health Court. And I think here in the Richland County they have a Veterans Court. What do you see those, how they play a role in the criminal justice system?

MR. GRAHAM: I think they're really important and I'm glad that -- I'm glad that they're there and I hope we expand them. know, the system, you can't lock up everybody. It's not the right thing to do and financially you can't do it. If it's not the right thing for the person, it's not the right thing for society. The people who were screened into those programs, Drug Court for instance, I am very familiar with Drug Court, I've had a lot of people go there. Those are for people whose crimes are committed because of drugs whether it's selling drugs or theft or something like that. If we can help, you know, in a perfect world they would be able to be cured of that addiction but even if we help

on that addiction and spread their time out with law enforcement we've improved society and we've improved their lives. Which is what, if you can graduate from the program, the success rate is very high and even for people who relapse and get back in trouble with the system, the number of times that they've been involved with the -- with law enforcement go down dramatically and the types they have. But I do -- I think all those -- I think the more programs we develop the better -- the better for the defendant and I think the better for our state and for its citizens.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: And lastly, I understand about the concern that there's only someone here that does criminal law or visa versa, there's only someone that's done civil law, but obviously trial attorneys have to try cases and I presume you've tried over seventy cases so you know the rules of evidence, you understand the application of law towards the facts of the case and just a matter of bringing -- do you believe you could be brought up to speed on the civil law if given the opportunity?

25

MR. GRAHAM: I do. And I don't know the exact number. You said over seventy, I say close to seventy. I know it's between sixtysix and seventy. I do. I've talked to four different judges who I've appeared in front of and I do -- I obviously for the rules of evidence, I do know the rules of evidence well. For all those cases I've got to know what rule is going to let a piece of evidence in and what case law, I mean, most case law actually you can look at it, I don't know the numbers, a lot of the case law on evidence seem to be criminally related even if you use it in a civil trial. So once admissible I think I am familiar with and I do have a good grasp of that and that would carry over whether it's a civil jury or a non-jury. four judges that I've talked to each said that they know me well enough, I've done enough, I've appeared enough in front of them, they all believe that I've got the skills to do this. That I'm hardworking enough, prepared enough, smart enough that I can learn what I need to learn. And for me to transition from criminal to civil and be able to do both is

something that I can do.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: And I think you answered this question, but I wanted to ask this one. I promise this will be the last question. When you -- if you were successful with this from time to time you would be called upon to be the Chief Administrative Judge or either have to continue cases. Where does the -- how do you balance the courts need to dispose of cases and move the docket along whether it's a civil, criminal or motions roster to lawyers, conflicts of trying to juggle the different demands that they have with their schedule with being in different courts or different counties and even to the extent that it may have some personal issues you have to, you know, I have a child who has a game this afternoon and I'd like to go see that or a school program. How would you balance that as a Circuit Court judge?

MR. GRAHAM: I would want to balance it.

You know, moving -- moving dockets, whichever court, is important. Seeing that justice is done is more important. But you do have to balance the litigants and the attorneys, their

22

23

24

25

22

23

24

25

I would just ask, I think, as a judge lives. that I get as much notice as possible. wouldn't, you know, if there was a date certain trial, and somebody came up Sunday night and said my son has a baseball game tomorrow, you know, why didn't we talk about this a week ago or two weeks ago. That would be a question I'd ask. And then how much time do you really need to go do that. I do think it's important we do stuff with our families, there's no question. There should be a balance, a healthy balance, for all of us and what we do in our careers in our -- in our personal lives as well. You know, does it mean that the whole trial has to be put off or does it mean that we take a couple hours off in the afternoon one day. Obviously, I would want to know exact -- I mean, details but to the extent that I could work with somebody and could, I would.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: And finally I want to pay you a compliment. I find a couple of people and it's a testament to the judges that we produce over in the Third Circuit but to use Judge Tommy Cooper from Manning as a role

25

model I cannot tell you -- we grew up practicing law over there, he was our judge, and that's the perfect person, the consummate gentleman, I've never seen him lose his temper and he should lose his temper with some of the shenanigans I've seen go on in the courtroom. But he was always -- he was too much of a gentleman to do that and would invite us back in chambers and tell us he had to cool down and that we need to think about our -- the way we're acting in court. But I appreciate those words because I don't -- I think throughout my career I can't think of a judge I've ever appeared in front of that was more of a pleasure to try a case, did not interfere in a case and always made sure that the lawyers were protected during the case. I just always say this is when he would say, "I understand you object to this Mr. Smith, we're doing this in limine or a Jackson Denno and you don't have to renew your objection when it's on the record, we're going to let the record reflect, when it comes up, we're going to let the record reflect that you have a running objection through any testimony if anyone

1 rules against you." So that's a good person 2 to model yourself after. Thank you, Mr. 3 Graham. Any further questions? All right, Mr. Graham, this concludes this portion of 4 5 your screening process. I want to take this 6 opportunity to remind you that pursuant to the 7 Commission's evaluative criteria the 8 Commission expects candidates to follow the 9 spirit as well the letter of the ethics laws, and we will view any violations or the 10 11 appearance of impropriety as serious and 12 potentially deserving of heavy weight and screening deliberations. On that note, and as 13 14 you know, the record will remain open 15 until the formal release of the report 16 of qualifications, and you may be called back 17 at such time if the need arises. I thank you 18 for offering for this position, and I thank 19 you for your service to the State of South Carolina. 2.0 2.1 MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, 22 members. 23 (The candidate is excused.) CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Keesley, if you'll 24 25 raise your right, please, ma'am.

(The candidate is sworn in.) 1 2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Keesley, before you 3 is your personal data questionnaire and the sworn statement. Are these documents that you 4 have submitted to the Commission? 5 6 MS. KEESLEY: They are. 7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are they both correct? 8 MS. KEESLEY: They are. 9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: To the best of your 10 knowledge? 11 MS. KEESLEY: There's one thing I wanted 12 to point out to you. 13 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. 14 MS. KEESLEY: In reading through all these 15 things, I believe, it may not even be in this. 16 Yes, in my personal data questionnaire, when I 17 was reading through these things last night, I said that I've appeared in every county in the 18 state on behalf of a client. And I do not 19 2.0 know that I've ever actually gone to the courthouse in Edgefield or McCormick and stood 2.1 22 up and made any kind of legal argument but I 23 have represented clients in both those 24 counties. 25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. So we will

1 make those oral amendments, if that suits you? 2 MS. KEESLEY: That does. 3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Do you have any objection to us making these documents and 4 5 your oral amendment a part of the record of 6 your sworn testimony? 7 MS. KEESLEY: I do not. 8 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. If you'll 9 hand those to Lindi, please, ma'am and we will make those an exhibit to your sworn testimony. 10 11 [EXHIBIT NO.11, JUDICIAL MERIT 12 SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA 13 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR KYLIENE LEE KEESLEY, 14 ADMITTED. 1 [EXHIBIT NO. 12, SWORN STATEMENT FOR 15 16 KYLIENE LEE KEESLEY, ADMITTED.] 17 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ms. Keesley, the Judicial 18 Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly 19 investigated your qualifications for the 2.0 bench. Our inquiry is focused on nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot 2.1 22 box survey, a thorough study of your 23 application materials, verification of your 24 compliance with state ethics laws, a search of 25 newspaper articles in which your name appears,

1 study of previous screenings and checks for 2 conflicts of interest. We have received no affidavits filed in 3 opposition to your election and no witnesses 4 5 are here to testify. Do you wish to make a 6 brief statement to the Commission? 7 MS. KEESLEY: A brief statement about my 8 qualifications? 9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Anything you want to say but I emphasize the word, brief. 10 11 MS. KEESLEY: I understand. And I know 12 that we're running behind today so I will be 13 glad to answer any questions that you all 14 have. 15 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you very much. 16 Answer any questions that counsel may have, 17 please. 18 EXAMINATION 19 (By Ms. Benson) 2.0 Mr. Chairman, I note for the record that based on Q. the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, 2.1 which has been included in the record with the 22 23 candidate's consent, Ms. Keesley meets the 24 constitutional and statutory requirements for this 25 position regarding age, residence and years of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

practice. Ms. Keesley, 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?

- Well, as you all you know, I assume everybody has Α. seen the application. I was very thorough in my application. Everything should be in there for your consideration. But I have had years of litigation experience and I have appeared in Magistrate Court and Probate Court, Circuit Court and Federal Court in our state and before the Master-in-Equity. And I think that my experience in litigation will help me to be an effective circuit judge. I feel like I can relate to litigators and lawyers and I can help aid the judicial system in moving cases sufficiently, effectively. I can benefit attorneys by being able to relate to them and their plight and scheduling and -- and managing the expectations of their clients.
- Q. Thank you. Ms. Keesley, the Commission received 144 ballot box surveys concerning you and that included 23 with additional comments. There were many positive comments that called you, "fair, reasonable, very intelligent, respectful,

1

courteous, an able trial attorney and one of the best mediators I've ever used." Six of the negative comments questioned your experience. What would your response be to that concern that you do not yet have enough experience?

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

4

Well, if there are questions about my civil Α. experience, I have handled every kind of case that I could handle in my current practice. Hundreds of cases all over the state. I've handled every kind of case that anyone in my firm handles from the youngest associate to the oldest partner with the exception of Workers' Comp. I have not had a Workers' Comp case. But -- so I believe that have the requisite civil experience. As for criminal experience, the majority of my experience does derive from my clerkship. I clerked for a Chief Administrative Judge in Civil Court, but we had many terms of Criminal Court and when I clerked I had to be on the bench when he was on the bench and I had to be in the office when he was meeting with attorneys. So I got to see every aspect of Criminal Court and I think that a lot of my experience in civil will translate over to Criminal Court, you know, the same rules of evidence apply. And like I said earlier my ability to relate to

2.0

litigators that will transfer over to criminal as well. So I'm aware of scheduling issues, I'm aware of pre-trial and post-trial issues and I think that I -- I definitely am confidant that I have the experience that is required for this job and I think I can do a very good job if you all give me the chance.

- Q. Thank you. Two of the negative comments expressed concern about your demeanor and your mental stability. What response would you give to those concerns?
- A. Well, I'm aware of the mental stability comment.

 And I was very taken aback by that when I heard it.

 I have no idea where that could have come from. I

 don't know of any interaction that I've ever had

 with an attorney or a party that would have

 resulted in that kind of an extreme comment. I

 have thought over it and tried to figure out who

 may have had that sort of experience with me

 because based on the nature of the comment it

 sounded like a reportable action and I really am at

 a loss for who could have made that kind of -- kind

 of report. It does strongly concern me that

 someone would. And as far as any other demeanor

 comments, I'm not aware. But I do mediate a lot

2.0

and my practice has grown and attorneys in town and across the state wouldn't use me if they thought that I couldn't communicate well with them and their clients and if I couldn't remain calm and impartial and give the appearance of fairness. So, I guess, I would just defer to the good comments and the letters of reference and my mediation practice to convince you all that I have the requisite demeanor for this job.

- Q. Thank you. And how do you think that your mediation experience would benefit you if you were selected for a judicial position?
- A. I don't want to repeat everything that you all have already read in the application. I know I put in there that I -- I can remain calm when people become very emotional in certain situations and I can remain fair and appear neutral despite whatever personal opinions I may have. In mediation I make sure everybody feels like they're heard and I'm there for them. So I believe that the skills that I have developed through growing my mediation practice will help me in this job. One reason that I'm applying is because I really do enjoy the constant flow of issues and personalties and I have a lot of different attorneys and people with

different causes of action coming through my office on a regular basis and I enjoy that. It's not boring. And I think that's one thing that this job would offer. It would be a constant flow of different parties, attorneys, legal issues and that's one of the reasons I'm applying. And I think that having had this mediation practice has definitely encouraged me to run for this seat.

- Q. Thank you. Ms. Keesley, just a few housekeeping issues. 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?
- 14 A. Yes.

2.0

- Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
- A. 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?
- 23 A. I have not.
 - Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact

 members of the General Assembly on your behalf or

are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?

- A. I am not and as we discussed that was a pretty difficult part of this process for me because I do have so many attorneys coming in my office to mediate and I am out there litigating every week.

 So I go to roster meetings and people say, I'm going to call this person for you and I have to say you cannot do that and I have to tell people it's a misdemeanor because they -- they don't like being told that can't do something. So I have made every effort to make sure that no one did anything on my behalf that they were not supposed to do.
- Q. This is probably redundant but have you reviewed and do you understand the Commission's guidelines on pledging in the South Carolina Code Section 2-19-70(E)?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Thank you.

MS. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, I would note that the Midlands Citizens Committee reported Ms. Keesley to be well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation and judicial temperament. And

2.0

qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria of constitutional qualification, physical health, mental stability and experience. The Committee indicated that they enjoyed their interview with Ms. Keesley and that she is charming and outgoing individual. Despite her being qualified there were some -- despite them finding her as qualified there was some concern as to her maturity and scant experience in criminal law. Mr. Chairman, I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation by staff regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning today. And I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you very much. Any questions for Ms. Keesley? Senator Young.

SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Keesley, thank you so much for your interest in serving as a Circuit judge. You obviously come from a strong pedigree in that regard. And one of the questions I have for you is how would you describe your judicial philosophy with respect to the application of the law to any facts that would be before you

1 if you were elected to serve on the Circuit 2 Court? 3 MS. KEESLEY: Well, to any facts? I'm not 4 sure I understand your question. I just want 5 to --6 SENATOR YOUNG: All right. Let me ask it 7 to you this way. What is your position on 8 how, some people might refer to it as judicial 9 activism. 10 MS. KEESLEY: I -- okay. 11 SENATOR YOUNG: What is your view of the 12 application of the law? How should you view 13 the law? MS. KEESLEY: I will apply the law as --14 15 as it exists now. I have a government major -16 - I was a government major in -- in college 17 and -- so I definitely understand the 18 separation of powers and I would do everything 19 that I could to apply the law as it exists 2.0 I know obviously there's circumstances now. 2.1 that arise where there may be no law or there 22 may be confusion and I would do my best with 23 all the resources that the job would offer to come up with the best answer. I don't like 24 25 being wrong so I would do everything I could

2.1

to come up with the right answer. But I know that you have to apply the law as it -- as it applies today, as it exists now, and it's not the role of judges to change the law or create new law, not Circuit Court judges. So that's how I feel about judicial activism. I definitely would -- would do my part to maintain separation of powers.

SENATOR YOUNG: How much of your current practice is in the Eleventh Circuit?

MS. KEESLEY: Well, it's limited because I can't appear before one of the judges over there. But I have a lot of things that go before Judge Spence and Probate Court over there. We -- my firm does a lot of premises liability and school cases so the majority of my cases in the Eleventh Circuit are either premises liability cases or automobile negligence defense. So that's -- what percentage of my practice has been over there in the past? I've had hundreds and hundreds of cases. Maybe ten percent of my cases are in the Eleventh Circuit.

SENATOR YOUNG: Let me ask you how much of your practice is -- I noticed that you do a

good many mediations.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

MS. KEESLEY: I do.

SENATOR YOUNG: So how much of your time do you think you spend mediating cases on a monthly basis?

MS. KEESLEY: It's the majority of my practice now. And that's because I have less litigation files that people ask me to handle because of my mediation practice. I -- I can tell you that in the past couple of months my litigation practice has been heavy and I haven't had as many mediations. But in the upcoming months between now and the end of January -- well, it's hard to see past next week. I had a case on the trial roster next week in Richland County so I've been building up to that so I haven't really been focusing on what mediations have been schedule but I know that I have a good many scheduled in December. I've been trying to hold off on scheduling things for this so I have a list of potential mediations to handle later on this week. But my litigation practice has definitely dwindled in the past four years. I've been mediating longer but have I answered

1 your question? 2 SENATOR YOUNG: In your civil practice --3 it sounds like it's not as, because of your mediation practice having grown, it's not as 4 5 active as it was. But you've handled a lot of 6 cases in terms of the motions in Circuit Court 7 8 MS. KEESLEY: Oh yes. 9 SENATOR YOUNG: -- non-jury roster --10 MS. KEESLEY: Oh yes. 11 SENATOR YOUNG: -- dealing with all the 12 different rules. You're very familiar with 13 all those on the civil side? 14 MS. KEESLEY: Oh yes. I've had -- I put 15 in the application hundreds, but I may have 16 had thousands of cases. I just -- I didn't 17 take the time to go back and quantify it. But 18 when I first started practicing, we don't have 19 teams in my law firm, everybody works 2.0 together, obviously, and they're there to help everybody out. But I had cases that I handled 2.1 22 on my own start to finish from day one and I 23 had clerked so I think people relied on my 24 experience from that to rely on me to handle

litigation. But I have had car wreck cases

1 and premises liability cases, contract cases, 2 legal malpractice, professional negligence, hundreds and hundreds of cases. And I have 3 gone to hundreds of motion hearings and court 4 appearances. I couldn't -- I couldn't even 5 6 begin to quantify it. I'd have to take out 7 all my calendars from the past and -- and 8 count. But I think I put in my application 9 that it was weekly, now it's probably monthly, 10 maybe a couple times a month, maybe a little 11 bit more than that some months. In the past -12 - the past two months I've been in court weekly. So yes, I'm very familiar with all 13 the -- all of the rules of court and what 14 15 litigation involves. 16 SENATOR YOUNG: How familiar are you with 17 the challenges of lawyers in smaller practices 18 who appear in both civil and criminal or 19 predominantly in one or the other being pulled 2.0 from one court to the next, you know, county to county or Magistrate Court to back to 2.1 22 Circuit Court and visa versa, are you familiar 23 with --24 MS. KEESLEY: I am. 25 SENATOR YOUNG: -- what those lawyers --

25

MS. KEESLEY: We're having the same problem now. My -- my firm, I think I told somebody earlier today, has less attorneys in it than -- than we had since I started. scheduling is -- is an issue and especially when you're on the court schedule in one county and another court schedule in another county, I -- I completely understand. I've been on different rosters in different counties in the same week, same day, so I am very familiar with it. And that's one thing that I was mentioning earlier, I think that my familiarity with the scheduling concerns and the issues that arise with your clients and their demands when you represent people in a multitude of cases at one -- one time when you have a heavy caseload, I think that I could assist attorneys in a beneficial way in getting cases moved and -- and taking care of scheduling because I know it's an issue. I know, I don't know what all you're going to ask me, but I also, as a judge, would try to be accessible because I know that, that is key in making sure that attorneys are able to appear when they need to appear and aren't

25

called for three trials in one week and don't have motion hearings going on while they're supposed to be trying a case, your client isn't always understanding of that, so to help -- help attorneys perform their jobs in a way that is effective for them and accepted by their clients I think I'm very attune to that and I would try to be sensitive to those needs. I know, you mentioned small town attorneys and people in the more rural counties, I'm very familiar with that because of where I'm from, but I do have that experience somewhat now because we don't have that many attorneys in our firm. And we've had some people with some health problems lately so scheduling has been a big issue that I've had to deal with in my practice.

SENATOR YOUNG: Have you always handled just civil defense or have you done any other types of work?

MS. KEESLEY: Now, I have some plaintiff's cases. I have a plaintiff's personal injury case that I have to file next week which is -- may not be the first, and I've had to represent some of my clients on breach of

25

contract cases as a plaintiff. So I would say half of the cases that I have now on my shelf, half of the filed cases that are on my shelf right now are -- I'm representing the plaintiff on. And then I have clients that I have filings on and I've associated attorneys for foreclosure actions because I've been building my mediation practice so I haven't ventured into that so much. But I -- I do have some -- some community association work that's come in that I've been handling. It's a wide variety of cases that I handle. My -my defense practice is general defense. the only thing I don't do really that I know of is medical malpractice. But I handle contract issues for clients and I've done a lot of guardian ad litem work. Because when I first started, I mean, I know this is separate but when I first started our firm, we still don't, we don't farm out the appointments, but when I first started we were pretty heavily inundated with the appointments so I had to serve as guardian ad litem and attorney on a lot Family Court cases. I shouldn't say a lot, but a lot for me. I had -- had to look

1 up the rule because I was appointed three 2 months in a row and I had to go and look up 3 the rule to see exactly how many times you could be appointed because I was -- I was 4 5 thinking they had -- had breached that rule by 6 appointing me three times in a row. But no, 7 they -- they can do that so I have had a lot 8 of that. I've just had a pretty general 9 practice even though it is focused primarily on civil defense but now it's venturing into 10 11 other areas. 12 SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you very much. 13 MS. KEESLEY: Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Senator Rankin. 15 SENATOR RANKIN: Thank you. I'm curious 16 to know about the mediation practice and it 17 looks like you got certified in 2011; is that 18 correct or did I read that --19 MS. KEESLEY: That sounds right. Six 2.0 years. 2.1 SENATOR RANKIN: And that obviously has 22 grown each year? 23 MS. KEESLEY: When I first got into it I -24 - I will tell you all there is an attorney who 25 filed more cases in Richland County than any

other attorney. Some of you know him. And the person that he was using for his mediations quit practicing law altogether.

And so I knew that there was a -- a pocket of business there so I went and took the mediation training and got certified and I started mediating for him. And ever since then it's just seemed to snowball and grow and a lot of the same attorneys use me repeatedly that they -- they -- a lot of them don't have very much patience for the process so that's one hurdle to get over.

SENATOR RANKIN: The mediators don't have patience or the --

MS. KEESLEY: A lot of the attorneys don't have patience for the process because mediation has not been mandatory for the majority of their career so I have to manage that and make people stay there and engage in the process. It's one more aspect of patience that I have learned not just with the parties, it's definitely with the lawyers sometimes. But it has definitely grown. I have -- I have a couple civil defense firms in town that their assistants email me multiple times a

week asking for mediations and then the 1 2 Plaintiff's Bar there's certain attorneys that 3 like to use me. They think I communicate well. 4 5 SENATOR RANKIN: But the subject of these 6 mediations is across the board not --7 MS. KEESLEY: The majority of them are car 8 9 10 issues. 11

wrecks or premises liability cases but then I have had med mal, I have had some contract issues. It's not been incredibly broad because of -- most of the cases I mediate are in Richland and Lexington County. I do mediate cases in other counties, you know, Sumter, Fairfield. I've had some Hampton and Aiken. So I've been -- I have had a variety of attorneys and issues but it's mostly those, just because that's the majority of cases that are filed in this area.

SENATOR RANKIN: Is, and it seems to be counter to, and I'm not trying to get too much in your business, but counter to the idea of being in a firm that has a book of business and you mentioned not having teams, it's almost as if you were on your own doing the mediation side which perhaps is helpful to the

25

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

9

10 11

12

1314

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

defense firm business model, but -- and don't get deep there and don't spend much time, but are they not opposite or counter pursuits?

MS. KEESLEY: Well, I'm still practicing because, you know, you have to keep the firm going but I'm here applying for this job and this seat. I would like to move into this realm. It -- it does get taxing when you have motions hearings to cover, roster meetings, cases on a trial roster and you also have three mediations scheduled that week. it's not come to a head yet for me. I try to keep very good tabs on where I'm supposed to be and when. And you know mediations a lot of times they settle before they get there or they end up on a trial rosters, the attorneys, and so they have to move their mediation and when that happens I'm freed up to cover something for somebody else. We don't have as much -- well, I shouldn't say that. I can't really speak to what all cases are coming in for every attorney in the firm, but I don't have as many car wreck cases as I used to have. I still have a few, but it -- it is -it's just the line I have to walk in that job

1 and that's -- I enjoy the mediation. 2 still like to get out and do some of the 3 litigation activities. I mean, I haven't 4 taken a deposition in a while but I -- if 5 somebody wants me to go to it tomorrow I will. 6 I do enjoy getting out and doing that to have 7 some variety in what I'm doing on a weekly 8 basis. 9 SENATOR RANKIN: And we're up here looking 10 and asking and your father obviously started, 11 was elected to the judgeship perhaps a few 12 years younger than you if I'm doing my math 13 correctly. MS. KEESLEY: If I -- if I am elected I'll 14 15 be older than he was. 16 SENATOR RANKIN: By two years? 17 MS. KEESLEY: That's what I was trying to 18 figure out. I think it's either one or two 19 years. 2.0 SENATOR RANKIN: And to the rap perhaps 2.1 now and would have been the case when he ran though not screened back then, I don't -- or 22 23 maybe they were, I don't recall, at least not 24 screened as aggressively or throughly as we 25 are now, but the rap on you some concern about

your maturity --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

MS. KEESLEY: All I can tell you is -SENATOR RANKIN: -- that might be age
only. Maybe someone's jealous of your age and
your offering for this and they're older and
don't have the fortitude to do it.

MS. KEESLEY: I would hope that it wouldn't be based on age. I think that obviously when my father went through he had a different kind of practice than what I have now. But I feel like I have handled a lot of cases, a lot of different clients, a lot of different parties, I've been exposed to a lot of different judges and a lot of different courts and I think that I have the experience that it takes. If that's from the Citizens Committee I think I told Ms. Benson I was extremely nervous when I went in there that morning. I just could not shake the nerves and I don't know if that may have had some part to play in their opinion. I know a couple of people in the Citizens Committee but they excused themselves from the vote on me so

SENATOR RANKIN: And that process versus

1 this entire process do you believe that this 2 is the best way that we have to vet, to 3 screen, to hear, consider all --MS. KEESLEY: I grew up near Augusta, 4 5 Georgia so I saw the campaign ads for the 6 judges so I'm glad that we have the process 7 that we have instead of that process. 8 not an easy process to go through I'll tell 9 you that. But -- and, you know, I hope that 10 people aren't dissuaded from running that 11 would be good at the job because of the I'm here. I knew that it was not 12 process. 13 going to be so much enjoyable but I definitely 14 think that you have to go through significant 15 vetting to get good judges. And I'm 16 definitely invested in -- in our -- our 17 judicial process and having qualified 18 intelligent, accessible good judges. So I --19 I appreciate the process that we have even 2.0 though it's --2.1 SENATOR RANKIN: The ballot -- and I'm --22 MS. KEESLEY: Go ahead. 23 SENATOR RANKIN: The ballot box anonymous 24 surveys, do you think that they provide a 25 valuable tool?

1 MS. KEESLEY: Well, I never expected the 2 negative comment that I got. I -- I told --3 it's the first thing I told people when I told them I was applying, I said, "At least I don't 4 5 have any enemies." So I don't have to worry 6 about that ballot box survey. And then I -we discussed the negatives. I -- I knew that 7 8 people would question my criminal experience 9 and not everybody -- I know a lot of attorneys 10 but not everybody knows what my practice is. 11 So that didn't surprise me at all. It is 12 concerning that a -- a lawyer, a licensed 13 attorney in South Carolina, got on there and 14 behind the veil of anonymity posted that 15 comment about me. But I think I had enough 16 other positive comments to counter that. 17 don't know what anyone else's experience has 18 been. SENATOR RANKIN: Should we consider those 19 2.0 positive comments, too? 2.1 MS. KEESLEY: Absolutely. You should 22 consider the positives. I -- I would love for 23 you to just throw out the worst and best and 24 then take the rest. 25 SENATOR RANKIN: All right. Thank you.

1 MS. KEESLEY: Thank you. CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? 2 3 Representative Rutherford. 4 REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Kyliene, I've known you for, I think it's decades now, I 5 6 hate to say that. But you come across much 7 more poised than I ever thought and I'm very 8 impressed. I thought I would tell you that. 9 I didn't know what we were going get. 10 read the comments and I only see you socially, 11 but I can tell you professionally you came 12 across very well. I just wanted to tell you 13 that. MS. KEESLEY: Well, I wanted you to know 14 15 it may go back to that Citizens Committee, you 16 know, I do know a lot of attorneys and do interact socially with a lot of attorneys and 17 18 they don't know what my practice is, they 19 don't know how I appear in court unless 2.0 they've been there so I think I may have been 2.1 too friendly, smiled a little too much and 22 maybe that's what resulted that comment. I don't know. But I appreciate it. Thank you. 23 24 REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Thank you. 25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Let me just ask you a couple questions. When I looked through this and I read the comments and we run across each other at docket meetings from time to time so I know your civil experience. The criminal experience, how would you compensate for the lack of criminal experience? I see you say that you clerked with Judge Barber, I believe, and you watched him handle some trials and guilty pleas, some probation violations but that was twelve, thirteen years ago. How would you handle General Sessions?

MS. KEESLEY: Well, he made a big impression.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'm sure he did. He did with everybody. Especially Mr. Rutherford. He always liked to talk about Mr. Rutherford when I came in his courtroom.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: He only threatened to put me in once.

MS. KEESLEY: He only threatened to put me in jail once. I think I did learn a lot in that experience and I talked to some people about what I could do to get some additional

2.0

2.1

criminal experience. I didn't want to do anything that was professionally irresponsible just to be able to come here and tell you all that I had done something. Some opportunities did come open but I do defend professional negligence cases so I -- I -- I kind of shied away from those. But I think that anything that I would need to learn or re-familiarize myself with I would be able to do that quickly. Criminal law is interesting, I don't have any problem reading it, it's a lot more interesting than the civil stuff I end up doing daily. So I think between now and July which is when this job would start, I -- I would do a lot of studying and I think that the resources available to me would be greatly beneficial in helping -- helping me with any gaps in -- in knowledge or information that I need. But I do think that my clerkship definitely was very informative. Now, I do --I do have a little bit of experience with research in criminal matters and in my civil practice we do tort claims act cases and a lot of my tort claims act cases involve crimes committed by employees so I have to consider

how the investigation and how discovery in my civil cases will affect the criminal matter. I have to consider how any settlement document language is going to affect any potential restitution. So I do have to read up on -- on that sometimes but I'm -- I'm confident that anything that I need to learn I will be able to pick up on, read through, re-familiarize myself with very quickly.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: And looking through some of your PDQ answers and I know you learned a lot when you clerked at the House of Representatives, I would presume.

MS. KEESLEY: I was over here.

With all of us over here. When I look at your practice and you're with a reputable law firm, a good law firm and do that and your practice, you've been over there for thirteen years, give or take some, and developing a good mediation practice. At this point while you're on the uptick of your career why make the change to offer for this Circuit Court judge?

MS. KEESLEY: Well, I think I would just

25

continue doing more of what I'm doing now. feel like I've had a lot of experience with litigation, I had a decent experience now with mediation, I enjoy it, but all the aspects of those things that I enjoy would be magnified if I had a judgeship. I would get to see a variety of attorneys and parties, I'd have a lot of different issues come -- come up and I get to travel to circuits and see a lot of different attorneys and different venues. That's one part of my job that I do enjoy that I don't have so much of now that I'm -- I'm a mediator, I don't get to travel as much as I used to. So I would look forward to those things. And I just feel like at this point, I've had people encouraging me to run for several years, so it's a public service job and I had to sit down and weigh the positives and the negatives of -- of what I was going to do and at this point in my life the positives just greatly outweigh the negatives. And I think it's time for me to get invested more in the judicial process than I am now. that's why I'm running.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: When I listened to what

23

24

25

you said earlier and talking about being at docket meetings at the same time, trial rosters and depositions and obviously you understand the conflicts that are created with attorneys and when you are, if you are successful in this candidacy and you become a judge, you're going to obviously be up there having to make decisions about how to handle those conflicts. Conflicts from legal practice to the conflicts of personal conflicts with attorneys who have got health issues as you mentioned or have a doctor's appointment or has a child that has a school program this morning or would like to go to their basketball, baseball game. How are you going to handle that? What would be philosophy on how you balance these conflicts versus the lawyers quality of life or knowing that they have obligations to other besides the practice of law?

MS. KEESLEY: Well, you know, you have to keep control over things and not let people run all over you. But in my practice I encourage people to request protection if they know they're going to have something coming

25

So I think I'd be pretty open to a up. request for protection and granting those. People have vacation. I -- I didn't take a vacation for my first six years of practice so I'm very -- I'm very aware that attorneys need a break and I think I'd be open to request for protection. Obviously, we all have issues with family and health always becomes a problem for people unfortunately so I would be very aware of that. I'm not going to force anybody to be in court when they have a family obligation. I have -- I had also experienced attorneys that, you know, they'll tell you that they have something going on when really it's just a delay tactic. And so I try to be as aware of that fact as I could but because of the years of litigation practice I have had health problems with my family members, I've had health problems with people in my office. I think I'd be very lenient on that, but I do think there are ways to work around people's schedules to make sure that things get set fairly quickly if they're able to be. scheduling orders. I know some judges don't like scheduling orders, but I think I would

1 2

use whatever tools I had to try to work around somebody's scheduling conflict.

3

4

5

CHAIRMAN SMITH: When you look over judges you've been in the courtroom a lot, what's the ideal temperament for a judge and who would you, if any, pattern yourself after or the temperament and the way they handled their courtroom?

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

MS. KEESLEY: Well, I don't know. I think Tommy Cooper from Manning is who I would like to mimic myself after because he seems to be very calm, very fair, very studious. I have been in court a number of times when I thought that what was said to the attorneys was not only going to affect them personally but going to affect their relationship with their client. And so I would be very aware of that. I think that you have to remain calm. that -- that judges sometimes get frustrated with attorneys and delay, but I've very aware of the effect that a negative temperament can have on the attorneys and not only how they feel about their job and doing their job, but how, you know, what business they get and if their client continues to use them if they're

berated in court. So I'm very aware of the issues with temperament and I would be very cautious in expressing any frustration with an attorney especially if they have a client in the courtroom.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: One last thing. We had your father up here. I would be remiss to tell you if your father wouldn't be someone you ought to pattern yourself after. We were very impressed that he served up there since 1991 and he had zero negative comments on his ballot box.

MS. KEESLEY: Really.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: So if you're successful in this candidacy I would urge you to match that reputation he has.

MS. KEESLEY: Well, he -- he works very hard and -- and that's something I'm aware of. That's why I said it's a public service job because I have seen the public service side of it and -- and the work on weekends and the work through vacation and the work on holidays so I am aware of how -- what difficulties I might encounter and I would definitely try to pattern my diligence and my commitment to the

1 job after him, but I don't think that's going to be an issue. We share the genes. 2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions for 3 4 Ms. Keesley? 5 (No response.) 6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right, Ms. Keesley, 7 thank you for your testimony and being here 8 today. This concludes this portion of our 9 screening process. I want to take this opportunity to remind you that pursuant to the 10 11 Commission's evaluative criteria the 12 Commission expects candidates to follow the 13 spirit as well the letter of the ethics laws, 14 and we will view violations or the appearance 15 of impropriety as serious and potentially 16 deserving of heavy weight in the screening 17 deliberations. On that note, and as you know, 18 the record will remain open until the formal 19 release of the report of qualifications, and 2.0 you may be called back at such time if the need arises. I thank you for offering for 2.1 22 this position, and I thank you for your 23 service to the state. MS. KEESLEY: Thank you. 24 25 (The candidate is excused.)

1	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. McLeod, if you will
2	raise your right, please, sir.
3	(The candidate is sworn in.)
4	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. McLeod, you have
5	before you the personal data questionnaire and
6	the sworn statement. Are these both documents
7	that you've submitted to the Commission?
8	MR. MCLEOD: Yes, sir.
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are they both correct?
10	MR. MCLEOD: Yes, sir.
11	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Anything that needs to be
12	changed?
13	MR. MCLEOD: No, sir.
14	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do you have any objection
15	to us making these documents and any
16	amendments a part of the record of your sworn
17	testimony?
18	MR. MCLEOD: I have no objection.
19	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. If you'll
20	hand those to Lindi, please and we'll make
21	those an exhibit to your sworn testimony.
22	[EXHIBIT NO. 13, JUDICIAL MERIT
23	SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA
24	QUESTIONNAIRE FOR WALTON J. MCLEOD IV,
25	ADMITTED.]

1 [EXHIBIT NO. 14, SWORN STATEMENT FOR 2 WALTON J. MCLEOD IV, ADMITTED.] 3 [EXHIBIT NO. 15, AMENDED PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR WALTON J. MCLEOD IV, 4 5 ADMITTED. 1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. McLeod, the Judicial 6 7 Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly 8 investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry is focused on nine 9 evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot 10 11 box survey, a thorough study of your 12 application materials, verification of your 13 compliance with state ethics laws, a search of 14 newspaper articles in which your name appears, 15 study of previous screenings and checks for 16 conflicts of interest. 17 We have received no affidavits today 18 filed in opposition to your election and there 19 are no witnesses here to testify. Do you wish 2.0 to make a brief opening statement to the Commission? 2.1 MR. MCLEOD: Nothing in addition to my 22 23 affidavit, Mr. Chairman, other than I'm 24 honored to be here today and I appreciate the 25 opportunity to appear before this body.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you very much.

Please answer any questions that counsel may have.

EXAMINATION

(By Ms. Benson)

2.0

- Q. 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. McLeod meets the constitutional and statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence and years of practice. Mr. McLeod, 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. I was fortunate after graduating law school to have the opportunity to go clerk for a Circuit Court judge. The value that I -- arose from that year working with the bench serves me well to this day. Being able to be a part of the civil justice system and criminal justice system, trials, jury motion and non-jury hearings, pleas, probation revocations, PCRs, more status conferences than you can count, it really was a wonderful experience to see the total system at work and to be a part of --

of the system. It kind of is a part of the wheel that is our civil justice system and criminal justice system. It was a wonderful experience and back -- even looking back that far I knew then and there that, that was the type of way that I could serve the profession and the state in a way that I thought would -- would be -- would suit me well. It suits my type of personality and my -- my ethics and I -- I never have forgotten that time and that's -- that's why I'm here before you today.

- Q. Thank you. Mr. McLeod, the Commission received 130 ballot box surveys regarding you and among those they included 13 additional comments, three of which were negative and those three indicated that you needed some more experience. It's worth noting that quite a number of the responses directly conflicted with those and they would find you amply qualified. So Mr. McLeod, what response do you give to the negative -- the three negative comments that said you needed more experience?
- A. I think it's fair for anyone to have that opinion, but you know, my -- my practice to this point is I've been exposed to a variety of different areas. If I had to address something specifically, I haven't had as much -- I wouldn't describe myself

as a criminal practitioner. I've certainly handled some criminal cases, but if any -- any -- any of that perceived lack of experience I know that I'm fully capable of immersing myself into criminal law and I know that I would be an effective Circuit Court judge nonetheless, if that answers your question.

- Q. Yes, sir. Thank you. Mr. McLeod, you disclosed that you're the owner of a -- you are an owner of a parcel in Edisto Beach that's currently involved in pending litigation. Newspaper research indicated that you had attended a town hall meeting pertaining to the dispute. You spoke out about the zoning ordinance that might affect your property. In addition you've amended your PDQ concerning this pending litigation. Could you please tell the Commission about the pending litigation with which you're involved and what you might do if you were on the bench and this pending litigation were still in process.
- A. Thank you. And to be clear that pending litigation at Edisto Beach, I'm not a named party but I would describe myself as an interested party. I believe -- I believe the matter will resolve soon. I can assure this body that were any portion of that case

to come before me as a Circuit Court judge I would certainly disqualify myself obviously because I have an interest in it. Regarding your -- the amendment you spoke of the PDQ, that is for a separate matter. That is a -- I'm the named petitioner in a case before the U.S. Court of --U.S. Court of Appeals for Veteran's Claims which is really an administrative body in Article I Court involving really a matter about the way that the Secretary is handling the disbursement of fees. It's -- it's not your typical civil action. not a damages case but I wanted to make sure I disclosed it because it came into life after I submitted my application. But it's not your typical civil or criminal case like we talk about in the PDO but I wanted to make sure I disclosed it

18 | Q. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

2.0

21

22

23

24

- 19 A. -- if that answers your question.
 - Q. I appreciate and I'm sorry for the confusion about that. Is there anything more that you'd like to say about that amendment that you made to the PDQ?

 Any more -- you've stated what the case is about.
 - A. I believe so. If I answered your question, please let me know.

2

- 3
- 4 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- Q. Very good. Thank you. Mr. McLeod, we spoke whenever you were in the office about your Navy background and you've spoken today about your clerking experience. And I wondered if you'd comment further about your background in the Navy and also your clerking experience. How did they prepare you for an election to a judicial position.
- Α. Well, without going through the clerkship and my legal experience to date obviously that has importance but really my service in the Navy after college, the more time goes by the more valuable it gets because you really have the opportunity to look back and you see the opportunities that you had to serve in leadership roles, to be put in some stressful situations at a very young age. I was charged with the safe navigation of a 9,000 ton quided missile destroyer and that was a -- a long tour from the standpoint that there was not as much sleep as the first tour I had. And -- but what I would say is the -- the responsibility that I had as a Naval Officer served me well, but -- and it served me well as an attorney by dealing with those types of scenarios where there's not always a good solution. You have to make some hard decisions and I'm -- I'm -- I'm certain it would serve me well as

- 1 a Circuit Court judge.
 - Q. Thank you. Mr. McLeod, a few housekeeping issues.

 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?
- 7 A. I am.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

17

18

19

2.0

- Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
- 11 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?
- 16 A. No, ma'am. I have not.
 - Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact

 members of the General Assembly on your behalf or

 are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in

 this process on your behalf?
- 21 A. No.
- Q. Have you reviewed and do you understand the
 Commission's guidelines on pledging in the South
 Carolina Code Annotated Section 2-19-70
 subsection(E)?

A. Yes, ma'am.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

Q. Thank you.

MS. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, I would note for the record that the Midlands Citizens Committee reported Mr. McLeod to be well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation and judicial temperament. And qualified in the criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, mental stability and experience. The Committee described Mr. McLeod as "A very impressive individual, he scores very high on intellect and temperament. Despite his relative youth we believe his life experiences, four years a U.S. Navy Officer, have given him a maturity beyond his years. He does however suffer from a lack of criminal law experience." In summary the Committee stated, "Mr. McLeod would make an exceptional Circuit Court judge with some concern for his lack of criminal experience." Mr. Chairman, I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation by staff regarding the candidate were incorporated into

1 the questioning of the candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. 2 3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you very much. 4 Senator Hayes. 5 MR. HAYES: Thank you. Appreciate your 6 willingness to serve. You had four years 7 active duty? 8 MR. MCLEOD: Yes, sir. 9 MR. HAYES: Did you consider the Reserves 10 when you came out? MR. MCLEOD: I did. And the Army Reserve 11 works a little different than Naval Reserve 12 13 these days. I tried several ways to try to 14 get back in the Navy Reserve. My father was a 15 reservist for a lifetime and he enjoyed every 16 minute of it and I -- it just, for example, 17 you couldn't do the JAG Corps, you couldn't do 18 some of things -- I couldn't be a Surface 19 Warfare Officer anymore. I could go and do 2.0 things that really wouldn't have appealed to me much so in the end I -- I finished my four 2.1 22 years in the Individual Ready Reserve and then 23 I was done. 24 MR. HAYES: The Midlands Committee seemed 25 to cite you for lack of criminal experience

but looks -- I was looking at your bio, maybe
I'm looking at the wrong one, but what is your
job now?

MR. MCLEOD: I'm a litigation attorney for McLeod Law Group. My practice consists mainly of civil litigation. I do have some criminal experience. My criminal experience has been representing a few DUI cases, one General Sessions case, maybe two. I worked part-time or I volunteered as a pro bono prosecutor for the Attorney General's CDV program from 2011 to '14, I believe. So the criminal justice system is certainly not foreign to me but I want to be careful not to say that I'm a criminal practitioner. If I, you know, if I were to get a case then ordinarily that might be referred to someone who I know did that on a daily basis.

MR. HAYES: Just one other question. If you, putting aside your experience issue, what part of your character or your experience would put you in good stead as a judge and maybe what part of your character and background might be a hindrance on you being a judge?

1	MR. MCLEOD: Well, Senator, I don't think
2	I have a character hindrance with being a
3	Circuit Court judge.
4	MR. HAYES: For experience in.
5	MR. MCLEOD: Okay. Outside of experience.
6	MR. HAYES: Yeah, and outside of
7	MR. MCLEOD: I understand your question.
8	But if I understand you correctly, my my
9	overall background, when you couple my legal
10	experience with my military experience I think
11	it is a very, very good mix of real life
12	experience that I know will serve help me
13	be a successful Circuit Court judge.
14	MR. HAYES: Any negatives in the
15	background that might be a hindrance from you
16	being a judge or anything?
17	MR. MCLEOD: I want to make sure I
18	understand that. Any negatives?
19	MR. HAYES: Anything that in your, as far
20	as in your background or your character is
21	not a good word, but maybe just in your
22	personality that might be a hindrance for
23	being a judge.
24	MR. MCLEOD: To be to be frank, I think
25	I have a good temperament. I think I would do

very well as a Circuit Court judge. Now, I'm a human being, is -- is it possible that I could get frustrated? That -- that's just not -- that's just really not how I am. I think any person given the right circumstances could have a -- could lose their voice under certain circumstances, but Senator I don't think I'm going to have any issues from a character standpoint or a temperament standpoint doing this job effectively.

MR. HAYES: From that lawsuit that you mentioned you were involved in I take it you represented VA claims?

MR. MCLEOD: Yes, sir. I represent VA
Disability, particularly denials, in the
appellate process. That case is specific in
that it's sort of case within a case. And the
-- if I could describe the suit. It's really
akin to -- imagine a rule, a motion to compel
in the civil system under the rules where you,
it's not equity in a sense but you're -you're asking Secretary you have a procedure
and you're asking the court to say tell them
to follow it. And a lot of times there's
correspondence back and forth between the

1 Secretary and the attorney and there will be 2 months of delays. So the purpose of my 3 petition with the Court of Appeals and Veteran Claims is to essentially A, inform the court 4 5 that, that delay is going on, or B, inform the 6 court it's something that really demands 7 immediate attention if there's not a --8 they're not following their own procedures. 9 So it's -- if that answers your question? MR. HAYES: It does. Thank you. 10 11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions. 12 Senator Young. 13 SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 14 Mr. McLeod. 15 MR. MCLEOD: Senator. 16 SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you so much for your 17 interest in serving as a Circuit Court judge. 18 I have a few questions. One is how would you 19 describe your judicial philosophy with respect 2.0 to the application of the law to any facts that would be before you as a Circuit judge? 2.1 22 MR. MCLEOD: How would I apply the --23 SENATOR YOUNG: How would you describe 24 your judicial philosophy in terms of reading 25 the law and then applying the law to the

facts?

2.0

2.1

MR. MCLEOD: If I -- if I understand you correctly, Senator, my philosophy would be that the law is written clearly and it's, as a judge, I don't think it's the courts -- I don't think it's up to the court to change the clear meaning of the statute if I understand you correctly, Senator. Enforce the law as it is written would be my answer. If I'm understanding you correctly.

SENATOR YOUNG: That's the question.

You've understood it correctly. So another question I would have is you are in a smaller practice; is that right? In your Columbia office?

MR. MCLEOD: In our Columbia office, yes.

Now, we have obviously a Charleston office as

well with five attorneys there so while I have

a -- I manage a small office here we're also

part of a larger -- part of a larger team.

SENATOR YOUNG: In the practices that you've been involved in are you familiar with the challenges that face lawyers who practice in smaller firms, either solo practitioners or smaller firms, with their time covering all

2.1

the different types of cases and demands they have with different courts and be in one place and many times you might have stuff scheduled the same day, same time. Are you familiar with those challenges?

MR. MCLEOD: Very much so, Senator.

SENATOR YOUNG: If you were elected to Circuit Court how would you handle attorneys who appear before you who have scheduling conflicts due to their -- or make a request for a continuance?

MR. MCLEOD: Well, attorneys can't be in two places at once, we know that. So often times attorneys move for protection based upon their schedule and I know as a clerk and years of practice most of the time those are granted, usually no one ever objects. While we want to move the docket, of course, we also need to be considerate of attorneys' schedules. Now, the flip side is as attorneys we also have to make sure that we're not overloading ourselves to the detriment of ourselves or our clients. But I, you know, barring repeated -- I guess it would be a case-by-case basis, Senator. If -- if there's

1 an attorney who has habitually shows up for a 2 roster meetings and has six reasons why we 3 need a continuance, I'm rambling a little bit 4 here, for a request for continuance, I would 5 ask why and I would want to know more about 6 the case. I would take an interest in knowing 7 what do we need the continuance for, how much 8 time do you need, and make a decision that --9 where you try to help the attorney, but you're 10 also keeping the case moving. 11 SENATOR YOUNG: I want to thank you for 12 your service in the military. 13 MR. MCLEOD: Thank you, Senator. 14 SENATOR YOUNG: You served four years 15 before you went to law school; is that right? 16 MR. MCLEOD: That's correct. 17 SENATOR YOUNG: How do you think your 18 service in the military would differentiate 19 you from the other candidates for the Circuit 2.0 Court? 2.1 MR. MCLEOD: Well, for starters, it's an 22 experience that cannot be duplicated. You 23 can't recreate military experience in a 24 civilian world. There's been some times in 25 litigation where schedules have gotten so

25

clogged up that it almost feels somewhat military. But the experience and responsibly of one, being in charge of people at an early age, being in charge of their safety. I was twenty-two years old and I had the first -the first qualification to get on a ship is called the aft-steering. It's not anything that any officer gives a high five when they get the qualification because it means you've got to sit in the bow of the ship and you are coming into a port and you're in charge. Ιf there is a steering casualty, which in light of some recent events in the fleet, it's -looking back even now, that has value. there is some sort of engineering casualty you've got to be ready to go. You got to be ready to take orders, you got to be able to steer that ship, even though you don't know where you're going, you've got to work with your team and do what has to be done. That. type -- and there are many incidences like that. So that type of experience at that young age -- when you're there you don't, you can't possibly appreciate it. But I know as a lawyer it has helped me on numerous occasions

and I think, I know, it would be -- it would help me as a Circuit Court judge.

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

SENATOR YOUNG: I also noticed that you're an Eagle Scout. I saw that in your PDQ. I want to involve that as well. Do you think that -- how would you go about becoming more familiar with the requirements of a Circuit judge in the criminal arena? We've now sat through these, this is, I think, our fourth full day of hearings. What we've heard repeatedly from the judges who are already on the bench who come back before us to be screened is that the number of cases that are on the civil side that are going to trial have -- I think Chief Justice Kittredge said that it's maybe thirty-five percent of what it was twenty years ago, but the criminal cases the volume has increased. And maybe he didn't say that about criminal but somebody else did. How would you go about becoming more familiar with the criminal laws and criminal procedure and the things that you would have to know in the Circuit Court on the criminal side?

MR. MCLEOD: Well, for starters I at least

have some experience of seeing the criminal

1 system work from clerking for the court for a 2 I think the first thing you do is you 3 need to be familiar with the law and that's -that's somebody who has a distinguished career 4 in the criminal law. I would be motivated and 5 6 I would immerse myself reading and studying 7 that law, that body of law. Now, at the end 8 of the day we do still learn the same rules of 9 evidence which I'm fine with and I, you know, the criminal procedure and a lot of the things 10 11 that, you know, civil practitioners don't deal 12 with as often. On the basis, I would just 13 attack that in a very motivated manner to 14 become as knowledgeable as possible as quickly 15 as possible. In the interim between, if 16 elected judge, before taking office I would 17 spend every available moment I could in the 18 courtroom particularly on criminal matters. 19 SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you very much. 2.0 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Senator Rankin. SENATOR RANKIN: Just briefly. I don't 2.1 22 want to repeat everything, every accolade that 23 you've been given and certainly earned but 24 it's been highlighted by Senator Young. But 25 your father, I want to comment about his

24

25

statesmanship. I've been in elective office in the Senate since '92 and he is ever ready, ever informed, ever, I think, statesman-like. Now, there may be some in the House that would say differently but from the Senate my observations of him have been nothing but exemplary. So I'm tickled to see that you're offering to continue public service. You've given to your country, you've given to the Scout service earning the distinction as an Eagle Scout. And the comments that you've gotten. I don't know that there's ever a perfect candidate. Either one or two before you was asked about is there a perfect candidate that could offer one that has experience in all realms of court. Your rap is that you don't have enough criminal experience, but anyway, the comments that folks made and the effectively unblemished negative commentary about you is exemplary.

MR. MCLEOD: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR RANKIN: Anyway, you have no blemishes on you it appears except strong credentials and a lack of criminal experience. So there's no question there.

MR. MCLEOD: Thank you, Senator. 1 2 SENATOR RANKIN: My compliments to your 3 dad. 4 MR. MCLEOD: Thank you, Senator. 5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? 6 (No response.) 7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. McLeod, let me just 8 ask you about a couple issues. Obviously, you 9 mentioned you have some limited criminal 10 experience. Obviously, you would have to gain 11 some more. How would you handle, if you were 12 elected to this position, how would you 13 prepare yourself for General Sessions Court? 14 MR. MCLEOD: Well, I -- Mr. Chairman, if 15 elected I, as I was just explaining, I think, 16 to Senator Young, I'm going to get invested in 17 criminal law. That's -- and to be clear, I've 18 taken measures already to -- to bone up on 19 that but I'll do everything in my ability to 2.0 ensure that the moment I hold court I'm ready 2.1 to go. 22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: In regards to General 23 Sessions as you see more and more alternative 24 courts, is what we call them, the Drug Court, 25 the Mental Health Court, I mean, we've got a

1 veterans court here in Richland County, but 2 what's your philosophy and what would you do 3 to work with those or improve them or how 4 would you handle that? MR. MCLEOD: Well, I'd certainly work with 5 6 the solicitor in any way I could to -- the 7 criminal docket you need to have a trial, a 8 plea or a diversion or a dismissal. solicitor has the call on most of those. 9 anyway that I could assist the solicitor and 10 11 create a more efficient and productive criminal docket that's what I would want to 12 13 do, that would be my goal, Mr. Chairman. 14 my paramount goal would be ready to try 15 criminal cases on day one. 16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: But as it relates to 17 these alternative courts, are you --18 MR. MCLEOD: Oh, I'm sorry. CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah. As it relates to 19 2.0 alternative courts is that something that you feel is beneficial to the criminal justice 2.1 22 system something that could -- that helps with the timely disposition of cases and placing 23 24 people in the appropriate places? 25 MR. MCLEOD: To the extent that we help

2.0

2.1

people get their life together that we -- if there's a way for PTI or if there's some other diversionary program, mental health, Veterans Court, if there's a way that we can -- the criminal justice system can help people and not keep them behind -- not put somebody behind bars, I -- I think that's certainly a laudable thing to do. If that -- if I understand your question correctly, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah.

MR. MCLEOD: The only thing I would -- I have -- I have not had exposure to the Mental Health Court or the Veterans Court specifically, but I would be interested in helping those diversionary programs in any way I could.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'm just looking through your record and same question that asked the candidates that have appeared before us today is it looks like you're starting off your law career and you graduated in 2008 and clerked and you're with a good law firm, and I got to know your law firm and know the attorneys down there. Why offer at this point in your

career?

MR. MCLEOD: Well, it goes back -- it begins with my time as a clerkship. It begins seeing it up close and personal as my career began and frankly when -- when I saw that Judge McMahon was not going to reapply, you know, Lexington County is where I live, it's where my kids go to school, it's where -- it's where I want to be and I thought that was just an optimum way for me to serve the profession and the State of South Carolina. And when I - when I saw the opportunity was there I simply just couldn't not do it.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. McLeod, we've asked a couple of people to look through this and look through your ballot box surveys and it comes back as excellent and well qualified throughout all this and no negative comments so that's obviously a testament. You hear people ask you tough questions but also I think it's part of our job to compliment you when you have practiced law and have been in adversarial positions and you have nobody back here criticizing the way you conduct yourself as an attorney speaks volumes of how you carry

1 yourself and how you practice. So I wanted to 2 compliment you on that and appreciate it. And 3 I would be remiss if I did not say that your father and I always served together and he 4 5 always called me judge and now I have his son 6 appearing before us wanting to be a judge so I 7 find that a little ironic. He always would 8 encourage me to run for the Circuit Court, but 9 as Mr. Rutherford said --10 REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: He was just 11 being kind though. 12 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'm an unpleasant person 13 so that would not serve us well according to 14 Mr. Rutherford. Make sure I never get put on 15 the bench. So but I enjoyed the time served. 16 You dad is probably one of the most 17 intellectual and brilliant people that have 18 ever graced the halls of this Capitol in my 19 service up here. And I tell you I always 2.0 enjoyed serving with him and I know if you're half the lawyer and half the intellect he is 2.1 22 then you're good shape. 23 MR. MCLEOD: Thank you, sir. 24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any other questions? 25 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right, Mr. McLeod, 2 thank you so much. This concludes this 3 portion of our screening process. I want to take this opportunity to remind you that 4 pursuant to the Commission's evaluative 5 6 criteria the Commission expects candidates to 7 follow the spirit as well the letter of the 8 ethics laws, and we will view violations or 9 the appearance of impropriety as serious and potentially deserving of heavy weight in the 10 11 screening deliberations. On that note, and as 12 you know, the record will remain open 13 until the formal release of the report 14 of qualifications, and you may be called back 15 at such time if the need arises. I thank you 16 for offering for this position, and I thank 17 you for your service to the state and to this 18 country. 19 MR. MCLEOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2.0 Thank you all. 2.1 (The candidate is excused.) CHAIRMAN SMITH: You have the distinct 22 23 pleasure of being our last candidate today. 24 MR. MADSEN: Thank you. 25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: You brought someone with

1	you. Would you like to introduce her to the
2	Commission?
3	MR. MADSEN: I would. This is my wife,
4	Jennifer Madsen. We've been married for
5	twenty years. We actually met in the law
6	school library.
7	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Welcome, Jennifer. Nice
8	to see you. Appreciate you being here today.
9	Mr. Madsen, will you raise your right hand,
10	please, sir.
11	(The candidate is sworn in.)
12	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Madsen, before you is
13	your personal data questionnaire and the sworn
14	statement. Are these documents that you
15	submitted to the Commission?
16	MR. MADSEN: Yes, sir.
17	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are they both correct to
18	the best of your knowledge?
19	MR. MADSEN: Yes, sir.
20	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are there any changes or
21	updates that you make at this time?
22	MR. MADSEN: I do not believe so.
23	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do you have any objection
24	to making these documents and any amendments a
25	part of the record of your sworn testimony?

1 MR. MADSEN: No, sir. I do not. 2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: If you'll hand them to 3 Lindi for me, please, sir and we're going to 4 mark those as an exhibit to your testimony. [EXHIBIT NO. 16, JUDICIAL MERIT 5 6 SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA 7 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ROBERT MICHAEL MADSEN, 8 ADMITTED.] 9 [EXHIBIT NO. 17, SWORN STATEMENT FOR ROBERT MICHAEL MADSEN, ADMITTED.] 10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Madsen, the Judicial 11 12 Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly 13 investigated your qualifications for the 14 bench. Our inquiry is focused on nine 15 evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot 16 box survey, a thorough study of your 17 application materials, verification of your 18 compliance with state ethics laws, a search of 19 newspaper articles in which your name appears, 2.0 study of previous screenings, checks for economic conflicts of interest. 2.1 We have received no affidavits filed in 22 23 opposition to your candidacy and no witnesses 24 are present to testify. Do you wish to make a 25 brief statement -- opening statement to the

1 Commission? 2 MR. MADSEN: I appreciate you all having 3 I know that it's certainly been a long me. 4 day. I'm willing to answer any questions. 5 feel that if given the opportunity that I 6 would make South Carolina proud and be a 7 diligent, hardworking, intelligent, Circuit 8 Court judge. 9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you. Will you 10 answer questions that counsel may have, 11 please, sir? 12 EXAMINATION 13 (By Mr. Franklin) 14 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I note for the record that 15 based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the record with the 16 17 candidate's consent, Mr. Madsen meets the 18 constitutional and statutory requirements for this 19 position regarding age, residence and years of 2.0 experience. Good afternoon, Mr. Madsen. Good afternoon. 21 Α. 22 How do you feel your legal and professional Q. 23 experience thus far renders you qualified and will 24 assist you to be an effective Circuit Court judge? 25 Α. During my entire career I have spent the majority

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

of it as a trial lawyer. Mostly as a prosecutor and then for the last nine years as a public defender. So I am certainly aware of all aspects of court. I've tried numerous cases from the highest level down all the way to DUI. I believe that I have the intelligence, a work ethic, and the ability to -- to be a good Circuit Court judge.

- Q. Mr. Madsen, the Commission received 109 ballot box surveys regarding you with 18 additional comments. The ballot box survey for example contained the following positive comments. "Robert Madsen is smart, approachable and of high character and would be a great fit for the bench." "Robert Madsen is well qualified to be a Circuit Court judge. well reasoned and has an excellent demeanor." also, "Mr. Madsen has an excellent blend of background experience that will certainly make him an excellent judge. He has an excellent temperament and has proven himself to be a terrific He would be an asset to any office or worker. practice area." However, two of the written comments expressed concerns indicating that you are easily manipulated and are not fair and impartial. What response would you offer to those concerns?
- A. I've always certainly tried to be fair and

impartial in dealing with individuals. However,

I've always had a job where I've been an advocate

for one side or the other. While you generally end

up differing in that sense I've always tried to

treat the other side -- or other side fairly in my

dealings. And that's it.

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

- Q. Another of the written comments expressed concern about your alleged lack of experience in the area of civil law. How would you respond to that criticism?
- I did civil law initially coming out of law school Α. with a small general practice. That didn't turn out so well because I ended up having to report my boss to the Supreme Court and the FBI. He was later prosecuted for stealing money out of our trust account. I ended up going into the Solicitor's Office in Aiken, mainly in Barnwell and Bamberg, after that. But I did have some experience, it will be twenty years ago, in filing motions, preparing certain things, but I am familiar with all aspects of the rules of evidence. I am an extremely deliberate individual, in other words, if I get a murder case today, I start off, I pull the statutes, I might pull self-defense if that's the defense, I re-review the law. So I'm an

1 extremely deliberate person who likes to be 2 throughly prepared. Within the civil realm because 3 of the fact that I've got the extensive trial experience and have the -- and have experience with 4 the rules of evidence I think that I would be able 5 6 to make a seamless transition to civil law because 7 I am a person that believes in preparation on the front end. 8

- Q. Mr. Madsen, you indicated in your PDQ that in 2017 you were named as a defendant in a lawsuit filed in the District Court entitled Brown v. Lexington County. In that lawsuit you were named in your capacity as Circuit Public Defender for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit of South Carolina; is that correct?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. Is that case still ongoing?
- 18 | A. It is.
- 19 Q. Are there any other comments that you'd like to offer about that case?
 - A. That's -- it's interesting in that, that's five individuals that our office did not -- was never appointed to so we did not represent. I am kind of sued in my capacity as a public defender. Part of their allegations are that I did not ask for enough

1 money from Lexington County in the past which I 2 didn't, but quite honestly, I kind of have an idea 3 what I'm going to get or when I'm going get it. And sometimes it's smarter, you know, not to ask 4 5 for eight hundred thousand dollars when you know 6 you're not going to get it because next year if you 7 need a hundred thousand dollars they're just going 8 to tune you out. And so I am sued because I -- we 9 are underfunded as a county as compared to counties that are the same size from Lexington County but 10 11 that seems to be the capacity that I am being sued in right now. But like I said we did not represent 12 13 any of those five individuals when they were 14 appointed by -- or by the court. 15 Mr. Madsen, just for the record, my understanding Q. 16 is that there was some sort of mixup regarding the 17 scheduling of your interview before the Citizens 18 Committee. Could you comment on that? 19

A. I am someone that always tries to make sure that I am early instead of late. That is one of my pet peeves. I had gotten an email indicating what or the days that we are -- that we were supposed to have an interview. I emailed back and said that I was available at any point in time. I will tell you that I did not realize that there were two

2.0

21

22

23

24

2.0

separate interviews, a Citizens Committee and then a Bar that was going to be on the same dates and the same location. I thought that there was only one. I will tell you when I went back through there was another candidate that I noticed that they had messed up his email so I don't know if he ever got the email. I contacted him to make sure but they were nice enough to reschedule it. But I am someone that it bugs the dickens out of me to be late. I take pride in making sure that I am early instead of late.

- Q. Thank you. And as a Circuit Court judge, what strategies would you utilize to ensure that orders are issued in a timely manner?
- A. I am someone that likes to calendar things. I start on my calendar things a number of different ways. I have a desk calendar that I write on, I then use Outlook to calendar things which flows through to my phone and then I am certainly willing if the judicial department has any kind of calendar and software to utilize that. We just got iPads in our office and we're starting to use those. I am slowly trying to transition to that although having started and doing just paper that transition hasn't been as quick as possible. But I would -- I like

- to stay on top of my work because if you don't stay
 on top of it, it has a tendency to kind of spiral
 on you and put you behind the eight ball and I am
 not that type of person.
 - Q. Thank you. Now, for a few housekeeping issues.

 Mr. Madsen, 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?
- 10 A. Yes, sir. I am.
- Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
- 14 A. I have not.

6

7

8

- 15 Q. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator,
 17 either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
- 19 A. No, sir. I have not.
- Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact
 members of the General Assembly on your behalf or
 are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in
 this process on your behalf?
- 24 A. No, sir.
- 25 Q. Have you reviewed and do you understand the

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

A. Yes, sir. I am.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. FRANKLIN: I would note that the Midlands Citizens Committee reported that Mr. Madsen is qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualification, physical health and mental stability. And well qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, character, professional and academic ability, reputation, experience The Committee and judicial temperament. commented that "Mr. Madsen scores high on temperament and criminal trial experience. has some civil court experience but it was quite a while ago. He has superior intellect and is well liked by the bench and the Bar. He is a well qualified candidate with some concerns about his civil court experience." The Committee notes further that Mr. Madsen, "Was screened by four committee members because he missed his interview due to a mixup", which we explained. Mr. Chairman, I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation by staff

1 regarding the candidate were incorporated into 2 the questioning of the candidate today. 3 Chairman, I have no further questions. CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Thank you. 4 5 Any questions for Mr. Madsen? Senator Young. 6 SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 7 Mr. Madsen, thank you so much for your 8 interest in serving the Circuit Court --9 MR. MADSEN: Thank you. SENATOR YOUNG: -- and the state. And my 10 11 first question to you is how would you 12 describe your judicial philosophy with respect 13 to how would you apply the law to any facts 14 that would be before you in your role as a Circuit judge? 15 16 MR. MADSEN: I am someone who certainly 17 believes that the Legislator is the one who 18 creates the law. It is the judiciary's 19 responsibility to interpret the laws giving 2.0 the legislative intent. And so I -- I would kind of consider myself a constructionist. I 2.1 22 don't believe in legislating from the bench. 23 I believe that you follow the laws as written 24 by the Legislator. 25 SENATOR YOUNG: You have practiced most of

your career either in the Solicitor's Office
or the Public Defender's Office.

MR. MADSEN: Yes, sir.

SENATOR YOUNG: How familiar are you with the challenges that face lawyers who practice either by themselves or solo practitioners or small firms especially as to their time and appearing in multiple courts, handling multiple cases in multiple courts, and they're being pulled, they may have to have a request for a protection or a continuance. Are you sensitive to that?

MR. MADSEN: I am. I clerked for two years with a small practice and then started off in a small practice until about April when kind of the wheels fell off so I am familiar with that because we were a general practice that did Family Court, civil plaintiff work, some criminal and some civil defense and then also real estate and tax. So we could be pulled multiple ways and I helped coordinate that with the attorney.

SENATOR YOUNG: How do you think your experience in the Public Defender's Office could differentiate you from any other

2.0

2.1

candidates in your particular Circuit Court race?

3

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MADSEN: You know, it's a -- it's certainly different being there. You now, while I was at the Solicitor's Office I did enjoy it. And the nice part about it is you do get to kind of schedule what's going on. So I would know what my schedule is four to six months out because I would -- the trials that I would have scheduled I would have them on my board and I could work towards those goals. When you become a public defender it's an entirely different -- I can't tell you ten days from now what I'm going to be doing because I could receive a notice saying you're trying this murder case or you doing this or you doing that. And so it's a lot more trial by ambush because you have a limited amount of time to get ready which means that as the course of the time goes on you're having to prepare those things and be ready to go at a moment's notice because you don't necessarily get the choice of when you're going to try a particular case. I don't know if any of the other candidates have that experience, but I

think that is something that is certainly valuable.

SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Safran.

MR. SAFRAN: I would echo Senator Young's comments about how we do appreciate the fact that it's not an easy thing to come up here and talk to us. I know that necessarily you're assuming you're here to be grilled, but I do think that it's also important to commend folks and some of the responses we got here in terms of things that we value like temperament and industry are certainly telling. It does seem like from what your experience is kind of generated that you have seen both sides of the Just comment for me quickly about, just taking from where you left off, how being someone who saw it from the solicitor's side, you can plan and prepare and really didn't have too many concerns about being caught short on anything versus what you're in now kind of give you a little greater empathy for what these small practitioners particularly on the defense side are going to see when they come into court. And also, you know, how it

23

24

25

3

4

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

would also, I guess, impact you in a civil context where again you've got so many other things going on that people sometimes have a hard time making sure that they're keeping up on all fronts.

MR. MADSEN: Well, it certainly has developed like you said, empathy, for someone that is extremely busy. Now, saying that, obviously you always have work that needs to be done and needs to be done in a timely manner, but you know, especially with being, even my office, I encourage my attorneys to make sure that they don't overwork themselves. We've actually had that happen with an individual. And while our jobs are certainly important and there are certain things that need to get done at the same time there needs to be, you know, a life outside of the office or internally you'll kind of kill yourself. And like I said, we unfortunately had that happen so I'll go into the office sometimes it will be seven-thirty at night and I'll have attorneys still working there. I love that part about the attorneys that we have in our current office but at the same time I tell

25

them go home. You've got families, you don't want to be burned out, but at the same time you want to make sure that you get your work Like I said that's -- I've enjoyed both of the things that I have done as a solicitor and as a public defender. They are entirely different perspectives. You know, as a solicitor I took it extremely seriously to make sure that I was doing my due diligence to try to make the community that I was in safer. At the same time as a public defender I have taken it extremely seriously to make sure that my client's rights are protected and all the way through the process. And even if it ends up being a guilty plea or something like that you are hoping that if it ends up being a guilty plea that the person gets through this and gets their life back on track. And I can tell you from a public defender one of things that has just been wonderful for me is, you know, I was at the football game in Lexington a couple of months ago and a fellow who I represented on some really serious things that could have led to his incarceration for a long period of time, he still got jail, but he came

1 up to me and he's doing well, he had his 2 daughter with him who was seven years of age, 3 he's got a job now, he's got a stable residence, you know, that's a wonderful thing 4 5 to think that you have someone that while they 6 might have veered off the path for a little 7 bit is now productive. And that happens quite 8 a bit whether it's at the bowling alley or 9 something like that. And so you get a little bit of that on the solicitor side, but it's 10 11 more thank you for helping us find justice. 12 You get a lot as a public defender more of the 13 individual about "Hey, I was so worried that 14 this was going to happen to me and that I was 15 never going to come out of prison and you 16 helped me get probation and everything's going 17 well for me now." That's a very rewarding 18 aspect of my current position. 19 MR. SAFRAN: And I'm assuming this same 2.0 type of experience that you've gained in the criminal context is going to be able to be 2.1 able to translate over to the civil side 22 23 because people have the same demands, don't 24 they? 25 MR. MADSEN: Yes. Yes, and having like I

1 said, it's been a while, although quite 2 honestly it doesn't seem like it's been twenty 3 years. But dealing with individuals then that 4 we represented on different types of cases 5 from, like I said, we defended a few people in 6 criminal cases, we defended civil, more 7 plaintiff's worked than civil and a lot of 8 family court law back then is what seemed to 9 walk through our door a lot. As I said, there 10 were some problems with the previous attorney, 11 thank goodness I didn't do any real estate 12 back then and had no access to our trust 13 accounts. 14 MR. SAFRAN: Thank you. 15 MR. MADSEN: Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Senator Rankin. SENATOR RANKIN: I hate to delve back on 17 18 the negative and I -- and that being the 19 experience that you just referenced again not 2.0 having access to the trust accounts. What law 2.1 firm were with at the time and who was the 22 person, the lawyer disbarred and who had to 23 serve time? 24 MR. MADSEN: I was -- I was in Lower 25 Richland with Ben Wofford. It was a sole

25

practitioner. I clerked with him through law school. Like I said, I had come out and he had hired me as a lawyer. I ended up -- one day something just did not seem right. He -in fact we had done a plea from a lewd act to a CDV in Richland County. He didn't come in for the next couple of days. Our runner who would take the money for the trust account, I asked him to go check and see how much money we had in our trust account. There was only four thousand dollars in there. I knew I had a domestic where we had placed a hundred and eighty thousand dollars. I knew that he had recently closed a loan for our secretary and that was about two hundred thousand dollars. I, you know, I immediately -- I was six months out of law school if that. Called the Supreme Court and said, "Okay, I got this." And pretty soon after that the FBI was in there, I believe it was Chicago Title was our title insurance, was in there kind of auditing books. It was a terrible thing to happen straight out of law school but quite honestly it was one of the best things that had happened to me. First of all, I was able to

1 take a lot of those civil clients that I was 2 working for someone and sign them up as my own 3 civil clients and -- and made more money quite honestly then I would have if I would have 4 been with the law firm. But it ended up 5 6 leading me down the path that I have gone 7 since then. I found a job at the Solicitor's 8 Office in Aiken, went there to get that, and 9 they said, "Hey, do you know where Barnwell and Bamberg is?" I did not. My wife's from 10 11 Hampton County and so she said, "well, we 12 drive right through it." Was there for six 13 years. The great part about that is, you 14 know, I was kind of a one man show so I got 15 trial by fire. I tried my first case two days 16 after starting. 17 SENATOR RANKIN: And you finished in '96? 18 MR. MADSEN: Yes, sir. SENATOR RANKIN: Took the Bar in -- would 19 2.0 have been when? 2.1 MR. MADSEN: Well, I was --22 SENATOR RANKIN: Obviously, you would have 23 taken it --24 MR. MADSEN: I took it over the summer. 25 SENATOR RANKIN: You got the results about

1 Halloween, right?

MR. MADSEN: Yes, I took it over the summer and we graduated in '96 so I would have been sworn in, in November of '96, I believe.

SENATOR RANKIN: And then you practiced through April of '97 and the Wofford Law Firm is what your --

MR. MADSEN: Yes, sir.

SENATOR RANKIN: -- PDQ says or -- yeah.

And so you anticipated my question. The

learning experience from the worst of times to

perhaps the best of times.

MR. MADSEN: It was -- it was nerve racking at the time because we're trying to pay law school loans, I can't remember if my wife had gotten her job at the Court of Appeals by that point in time, but yeah, you know, I was looking for a job. We had intended to stay in Columbia at that point in time but once I got the job at the Solicitor's Office in Barnwell and Bamberg we were required to live within the circuit so we drove into Aiken, the first road, found a house about two miles down the road and really enjoyed it. They're really good people to

1	work with there.
2	SENATOR RANKIN: And you're an Ohio State
3	undergrad graduate?
4	MR. MADSEN: Yes, sir.
5	SENATOR RANKIN: So last Ohio State,
6	Clemson game, who were you pulling for?
7	MR. MADSEN: There is no doubt that I was
8	pulling for Ohio State.
9	SENATOR RANKIN: That's not a bad answer.
10	And your wife, she works for the Court of
11	Appeals now?
12	MR. MADSEN: Yes, sir.
13	SENATOR RANKIN: Okay. Very good. Well,
14	thank you for your evolution from the worst of
15	times to both the Solicitor's Office, now, the
16	Public Defender's Office and now running for
17	judgeship.
18	MR. MADSEN: Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions?
20	Senator Young.
21	SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22	One question I have is, how would you become
23	up to speed on civil laws and motions and the
24	civil rules and the application of those to
25	cases that are on the roster if you were

23

24

25

elected to the Circuit Court and you started handling non-jury matters within two months of being sworn in?

MR. MADSEN: Well, you know, I've gotten a few things in the interim taking a look at them trying -- I always read the advance sheets but just going back, looking at publications. Like I said, I'm very much a prep person even on things like a murder or a self-defense case I start by going back to the law because obviously the law always kind of morphs and changes over a period of time. am very much a prep person on the front end. That is what I feel most comfortable when I am prepared and that's how would handle civil also. Pulling it, reviewing cases, any statutory things that need to be taken a look at but I would be taking a look at those on the front end to make sure I was comfortable with every aspect or as comfortable as possible.

SENATOR YOUNG: So you would do a lot of homework a head of time for hearings that you had coming up on non-jury matters?

MR. MADSEN: I always do that. I am not a

fly by the seat of your pants kind of guy.

Now, as a trial attorney, sometimes that has to happen. Curve balls get thrown that you don't expect and you have to do that but I am very much a person that believes in preparation.

SENATOR YOUNG: You were also lauded in the Bar comments for -- a lot of people commented on your demeanor and you have a very good demeanor, at least that's what most of your colleagues that have cases with you that have responded and said. Do you think that having a good demeanor is a significant attribute that a Circuit judge should have?

MR. MADSEN: Yes, sir. You know, I was someone who in Barnwell and Bamberg we had some old-school Circuit Court judges who were down there that were a little bit tougher than some other Circuit Court judges and offices were right across from mine. And so I do think it's a very important attribute because whenever you're dealing with the judiciary or in court you certainly want a judge that has a low-key, easy to get along with demeanor.

Now, there are times that you certainly need

to be stern I think in court. But for the general everybody ought to be treated respectfully.

SENATOR YOUNG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Representative Rutherford.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Robert, it's been a pleasure to work with you both when you were a solicitor in Lexington County and now, as a public defender. There's a lot of concern as you well know when you took the public defender spot that you were just going to be a patsy so to speak for the solicitor. And you have ended up not being that, and I don't think anyone would voice that concern So congratulations and kudos to you for doing a great job where you are. If you were elected to be a judge in the Eleventh Circuit, Solicitor Hubbard has been working to try and change some of things like the, as small as it is for the paper to come from the jail to the Solicitor's Office and the fact that they just seem to say, well, that's just the order of the day and you just have to deal with it. What other things would you change about the

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

1

2

3

5 6

7

9

8

1011

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

way that business is done in Lexington County if you were elected to be judge?

MR. MADSEN: You know, we don't necessarily follow any kind of deferential case management. I certainly think that there are aspects of that. I like the idea, and I tried to kind of talk with him, Rick and I have talked, and he's still quite honestly getting his feet wet. He and I have talked about adjusting the DCM or making some kind of workable situation for everybody. Of course, as a public defender, and I know that they do this at some other circuits, I think thirty days trial notice would be great. Certainly it could be worked out but there are ways that we can make court more efficient. I've asked them a few times to go around maybe to some other circuits because law it's never a one size fits all when you get to any court. I think that you can kind of steal aspects from certain different places that help. I would love to see a day or a point in time where bonds or motions are heard as compared to just hodgepodge. One of the frustrating things about our current position is, you know, I get

25

attorneys, they might do the first plea of the day at 9:30 and they might do the last plea of the day at five o'clock and they can't do anything in-between. And while we encourage them to take work with them and read discovery it kind of runs out pretty quickly or, you know, while you're sitting in court you kind of get sidetracked because every case is different and unique and has issues and you're curious about those issues but I think that there's ways we can move things quicker and more efficiency in Lexington County. I recently had a meeting with our Chief Magistrate who talked about numerous things but one of the suggestions she had is approaching Solicitor Hubbard when you have, say, a burglary 1st that has a petty larceny attached to it. Right now what they do, and Solicitor Myers did this while I was employed with him, but right now one of them is handled in Magistrate Court, one of them is handled in General Sessions. It makes a lot of sense for them all to be handled in General Sessions and so we've talked about that. I've mentioned it to Solicitor Hubbard. The only problem that

you is you have a new solicitor, you know, they never want their docket to increase by a thousand cases because then if you have an opponent they jump up and say, "Hey, look what he's done to the docket." Even though in the end it could be a benefit for everybody so that case can uniformly be taken care of at one point in time which saves times for officers, victims, lawyers. So we're exploring a bunch of different things at least in my current position. And I certainly think as a Circuit Court judge being a resident judge in Lexington that there are ways that we can make that system more efficient.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: One of the things that -- one of the comments in the ballot box was that you would be another solicitor trying to be a judge. How do you address that concern and, I guess, more pointedly, would you be willing to call strikes against solicitors that are your former coworkers when they are doing things that they should not? And again let me preface that. Donnie Myers was a friend of mine, I consider him a friend to this day.

Rick is a friend of mine, Rick is making remarkable changes, but by the same token there are still things that are done that are just out of step with everyone else that Rick is working on and we've talked about it, but would you be willing as a judge to call them down, and I use them, not the Public Defender's Office, not the private Bar because the power typically is vested in the Solicitor's Office. Would you be willing to call strikes against them see it?

MR. MADSEN: Yes, absolutely. You know, I get it kind of from both sides, that comment, I guess that was, the comment was kind of guilt by association since I had worked under Donnie. Donnie was certainly a polarizing figure. At the same time when I was in front of the Citizens Committee I got the, "Hey, would you show favoritism because you were at the Public Defender's Office?" I think as a judge you need to make sure that you follow what the law is and if one side runs afoul then you need to call them on it. Whether it's a prosecutor or whether it's a defense attorney, you certainly need to treat everyone

1 equally.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Well, I've known you long enough to know that you are a very even-keel guy. I have seen you get angry but I can only tell because your face was red but not because you were berating anybody or outwardly showing it. And again, kudos to you for that. So, again, thank you for offering your name up.

MR. MADSEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further questions? Senator Sabb.

SENATOR SABB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just one point of inquiry. I've heard you talk about your pet peeve as it relates to punctuality. And you sort of remind me of folks that say to be early is to be on time, to be on time is to be late and to be late is unacceptable. I need you, though, to square that with the following hypothetical. Assume hypothetically the case is starting after lunch, you take the bench, jurors are in the back, solo practitioner is fifteen minutes late. You're having one of your not necessarily worst days but not one of your

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

better days in terms of it seems like everything that could go wrong is going wrong. The solicitor is ready to try to case, in pops Ronnie Sabb late for court. How do you handle it?

MR. MADSEN: Well, as I said, it's a pet peeve for me. Maybe a little bit OCD. But there are certainly always situations and I'm not saying that I've never been late to anything. What you're saying, Judge Barber, when he was on the bench in Aiken, had gone to lunch when I was a solicitor with the public defender, someone ordered a hamburger which apparently took a little bit longer. about five minutes late for the start of court. Like I said that, me myself, that just drives me nuts. I'm kind of the Bill Parcells' philosophy if you're five minutes early you're still late. I would much rather be there. But in a situation like that, you know, you can't have a hard or fast rule and while I hold myself to certain standards that doesn't mean that if someone's a minute late or two minutes late that they go to jail, that they, you know, a hundred dollar fine or

anything like that. That is just something me personally as far as punctuality. As my wife will tell you, you know, as we're trying to get out to church sometimes I like to say, you know, they don't -- "just because we're not there on time doesn't mean that they stop church and they move it back to 8:10 instead of eight o'clock." But that is something internally with me that I'm kind of OCD about.

SENATOR SABB: I appreciate the response.

Last point, to the extent that a lawyer is out of bounds and needs be chastised by the court, and quite frankly I was a solicitor for twenty years and some of us every once in a while deserve it. How do you address that assuming you become a judge?

MR. MADSEN: Well, and like I said, I am not a yeller and I'm not a screamer, but I think that there are certain times where someone needs to be stern -- that the bench needs to be stern to get their point across.

And I think without yelling and screaming that someone can be told that certain behaviors are unacceptable. Like I said, I am not a yeller and screamer but I -- I'm confident that I am

someone that can get a point across when need be.

SENATOR SABB: Where should that point that needs to be aired, be aired?

MR. MADSEN: To a certain extent I think that, that depends on the context of it. You know, you would hope sometimes that it would be with all parties behind closed doors, but there are times that needs to happen in front of the court of, "Hey, you've done this, I told you, you can't do this and you've done it again, you know, that just needs to quit." Within the time -- I mean, I've had that happen. I've been on that side of it in front of a judge and I've been on the other side and watched someone get chastised by a judge for something that was inappropriate or strayed from the court's rule. So there can be situations where it could be behind closed There are certainly situations where doors. it could be in open court. Like I said even if someone has to be chastised I think it can be handled in appropriate fashion that's not personal, certainly not screaming. You know, it's kind of like disciplining your child.

2324

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

25

There are times that you need to discipline
your child, but you don't do it out of anger.
You do it for an appropriate event and in an appropriate area with an appropriate object.

SENATOR SABB: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Any further questions?

(No response.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right, Mr. Madsen, 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 expects candidates to follow the spirit as well 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 the 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

1	Carolina.
2	MR. MADSEN: Thank you very much.
3	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.
4	(The candidate is excused.)
5	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. With that
6	being said, Mr. Hitchcock moves we go into
7	executive session. All in favor say, "Aye."
8	(The Commission members comply.)
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed?
10	(No response.)
11	CHAIRMAN SMITH: The Ayes have it. We
12	will go into executive session.
13	(Off-the-record executive session.)
14	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Senator Hayes moves we
15	come out of executive session. All in favor
16	say, "Aye."
17	(The Commission members comply.)
18	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. We're now
19	back on the record. And I'd like to state
20	we've been in executive session however no
21	decisions were made and no votes were taken
22	during executive session. We got the two
23	candidates that we have to vote on tonight,
24	Judge Hughston and then the Eleventh Circuit,
25	Seat Number 2. So we'll start with Judge

1	Hughston first and determine this is just a
2	vote on qualifying. We don't nominate here so
3	I'll entertain any motions. Representative
4	Murphy moves that we find Judge Hughston
5	qualified. Any discussion?
6	(No response.)
7	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. All in favor
8	of finding Judge Hughston well somebody
9	needs to second, I guess.
10	SENATOR RANKIN: Second.
11	CHAIRMAN SMITH: So a motion's made by
12	Representative Murphy, second by Senator
13	Rankin. Any discussion?
14	(No response.)
15	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. All in favor
16	of finding Judge Hughston qualified, please,
17	raise your hand.
18	(The Commission members comply.)
19	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Let the record reflect
20	that the vote is unanimous. So he is found
21	qualified. All right. Next will be the Seat
22	Number Eleventh Circuit, Seat Number 2; is
23	that correct?
24	MS. CRAWFORD: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.
25	I'll read them in alphabetical order. Is

1	there a motion?
2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Mr. Hitchcock moves to
3	find all of them qualified. All right. Any
4	seconds to that?
5	SENATOR SABB: Second.
6	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. Senator Sabb
7	seconds it. Any discussion on that?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All in favor of finding
10	all the candidates qualified, please, raise
11	your hand.
12	(The Commission members comply.)
13	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed?
14	(No response.)
15	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Let the record reflect
16	that's unanimous. And now, we'll go down for
17	the nominating process.
18	MS. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll
19	read them in alphabetical order. We have
20	three votes. First candidate is Amy V.
21	Cofield.
22	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. So this is
23	just whether they're nominated. Anyone vote
24	that we nominate Amy Cofield?
25	(The Commission members vote.)

1	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right.
2	MS. CRAWFORD: The next candidate is Donna
3	Elder.
4	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any votes for Donna
5	Elder to be nominated?
6	(The Commission members vote.)
7	MS. CRAWFORD: David Shawn Graham?
8	(The Commission members vote.)
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right.
10	MS. CRAWFORD: Kyliene Lee Keesley.
11	(The Commission members vote.)
12	MS. CRAWFORD: Robert Michael Madsen.
13	(The Commission members vote.)
14	MS. CRAWFORD: Walton "Tad" J. McLeod,
15	IV.
16	(The Commission members vote.)
17	MS. CRAWFORD: The three candidates that
18	are qualified and nominated are Kyliene Lee
19	Keesley with ten votes, Robert Michael Madsen
20	with ten votes and Walton Tad J. McLeod with
21	eight votes.
22	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further business for
23	tonight? Senator Sabb moves we adjourn. All
24	in favor, "Aye."
25	(The Commission members comply.)

1	CITA TEMANI CMITTII • 7] • • • • • • • •
1 2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed.
	(No response.)
3	CHAIRMAN SMITH: The "Ayes" have it. And
4	we stand adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.
5	(Off the record.)
6	(There being no further questions,
7	the proceedings adjourned at 6:02 p.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
ر ہے	