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PROCEEDINGS
SENATOR MARTIN: Go ahead and convene this meeting of the Judicial Merit Selection Commission. This meeting is called pursuant to the Chapter 19 and Title 2, South Carolina Code of Law, requiring the review of all judicial candidates for office. The function of the Commission is not to choose between candidates, but rather declare whether or not the candidates who offer for the position on the bench, in our judgment, are qualified to fill the position they seek.

The inquiry that we undertake is a thorough one. It is centered around the Commission's nine evaluative criteria involving complete personal and professional background checks on each candidate. These public hearings are convened for the purpose of screening candidates. Today we will screen one open seat on South Carolina Supreme Court, one seat for reelection on South Carolina Supreme Court, an open seat on the South Carolina Court of Appeals, one seat for reelection on South Carolina Circuit Court and two open seats on the Family Court.

And I'd like to begin by introducing two new members of the Commission. From the South Carolina House we have Representative Murrell Smith, Representative Todd Rutherford. We're delighted to have y'all with us. Know you're going to do a great job, working with you and --

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR MARTIN: -- look forward to our service together. And at this time, I'll recognize Ms. Elizabeth Brogdon, our Chief Counsel who is with us today, to introduce the screening attorneys and staff.

MS. BROGDON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today, Emma Dean, who is Chief Counsel to the House Judiciary Committee is helping to screen. Also, Katherine Wells, who is the staff attorney to Senate Judiciary, and Steve Davidson, who is Assistant Chief Counsel to House, Labor, Commerce, and Industry. All will help in screening candidates today.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to request a vote on a cover page for the draft report. It shows that the report will
be delivered on Thursday, May 5th, 2016, and the 48 -hour period ends at noon on Wednesday, May 11th, 2016. And the election is currently scheduled for noon, Wednesday, May 25th, 2016, according to the published schedule.

SENATOR MARTIN: Okay.
MS. BROGDON: If you look behind Tab E, you'll see the cover page for the draft report that has that information on it.

SENATOR MARTIN: Do you have any questions regarding that suggested motion? REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I have one. SENATOR MARTIN: Representative Bannister.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: There is a chance that the House will be on furlough the week of the 10th. Is it possible to look at the dates? Is that the only conceivable day we can do the report and get it out?

MS. BROGDON: Well, I've looked at backing it up, like you and I had talked about, but it still puts the report coming out on a Thursday, which will be at the end of session, which is going to end up -- that was the only other option.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thursday, the 5th?
MS. BROGDON: No. It would be --
SENATOR MARTIN: Thursday, the 12th?
MS. BROGDON: It would be backing it up two days, to May 3rd, Tuesday, May 3rd. And then the 48 -hour period would end on Thursday, May 5th, but you'd still have -- you'd still run into the same problem with not having session --

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Is it possible to issue the report at 10 a.m., so that first day will be 10 a.m. Thursday, as opposed to 12 Thursday? If you moved it back to --

SENATOR MALLOY: That will be difficult.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Well, it may not -- it may not matter to anybody else. I just know --

SENATOR MARTIN: We need to turn the volume up just a little bit.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Is it possible to do it at 10? Or no?

MS. BROGDON: It is.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: We're going to be all on furlough, so --

SENATOR MARTIN: How are y'all going to
get by?
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: It will be -be done by 12. Now, $I$ was just asking if there was a chance to have it when we're all here.

SENATOR MARTIN: I think the issue -- we can talk about it -- the issue is time. And if we move it to the 5 th, or the report coming out on the 3rd, we can do that and you would be here on the 5th.

SENATOR MALLOY: Why do they need to be here? I mean, I think it's going to be difficult to start trying to schedule around when someone's going to be -- when someone's going to be here, in light of this discussion on when we have session and when we don't. The House will go out when they want to, the Senate will go out when they want to. I think the staff has to end up doing the best possible time and candidates have to adjust. They don't need to adjust; the candidates have to adjust.

SENATOR MARTIN: Do we have a motion to adopt the cover page, as presented by staff?

SENATOR MALLOY: So moved.

SENATOR MARTIN: So moved. Second?
MR. HITCHCOCK: Second.
SENATOR MARTIN: Motion and a second.
Any other discussion?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none we will move the meeting into a vote. All those in favor of adopting the cover page, please say aye.

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
SENATOR MARTIN: Opposed, no.
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: The ayes have it.
MS. BROGDON: Mr. Chair, may we please distribute the signature page to the Commission members for the draft report?

SENATOR MARTIN: Yes. Are there any questions about that? Go ahead and do that. Pass it around. We'll have that in place.

MS. BROGDON: Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like to now suggest that we move into executive session to discuss matters related to legal advice.

SENATOR MARTIN: Motion is, we go into executive session. Is there objection?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing no objection, we will proceed, and then we're going to open the door when we reconvene in open session. We'll consider ourselves in the executive session.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
SENATOR MARTIN: The Judicial Merit
Selection Commission is now back on the record, and $I$ would like to state that we've been in executive session. However, no decisions have been made, no votes were taken during that time. Ms. Brogdon.

MS. BROGDON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to offer and have made exhibits to the record the following reports: the report from the Pee Dee Citizens Committee and the report from the Upstate Citizens Committee for Spring 2016, as well as the South Carolina Bar's Judicial Qualifications Committee Report for Spring 2016.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any objections?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, I'll ask at this time that the Citizens Committee report for the Spring 2016 and the SC Bar

Report be marked as exhibits and entered into the public record.
[MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION AS EXHIBIT NO. 1.]
[MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION AS EXHIBIT NO.
2.]

SENATOR MARTIN: Now we have a proposed Rule that Mrs. Brogdon will explain to us.

MS. BROGDON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose an amendment to Rule 6 of the Judicial Merit Selection Commission Rules, Policies and Procedures. Rule 6 at the time specifies "Candidates must specify the race and seat number in which they are interested in the letter of intent required to receive application materials. Once a candidate has submitted a letter of intent, the candidate may not withdraw and submit a letter of intent for a different seat. However, a candidate may withdraw at any point in the screening process and the candidate will no longer be considered a judicial candidate for that screening."

And I'd like to propose we amend that Rule to add the following language: "Pursuant
to South Carolina Code Section 2-19-20(d), once a person submits his or her letter of intent to the Judicial Merit Selection Commission, the person is considered a candidate for purposes of the applicable statutes and pending rules. Candidates may not contact members of the Judicial Merit Selection Commission regarding their candidacy."

SENATOR MARTIN: Any discussion?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, do we have a motion?

MS. WALL: So moved.
MR. HITCHCOCK: Second.
SENATOR MARTIN: Ms. Wall, second by
Lawyer Hitchcock. Any other discussion?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, we'll move the meeting into a vote. All those in favor of the proposed Rule, please say aye.

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
SENATOR MARTIN: Vote no?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: The ayes have it.

GARBER REPORTING SERVICE

That's all the business we now have. We'll proceed to the candidate portion of our screening. We'll now move to the Supreme Court Chief Justice, Justice Donald Wayne Beatty. Welcome. Good morning.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Good morning.
SENATOR MARTIN: I'm glad to have you this morning. We're ready to go, Justice Beatty. If you would, would you raise your hand to take the oath.
(The Justice is sworn in.)
EXAMINATION
(By Senator Martin)
Q. Thank you very much. Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?
A. Not lately, but I've seen it, yes.
Q. Everything, based on your understanding, everything correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Anything need to be changed?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Do you object to our making this summary and any amendments, if applicable, a part of the record of your sworn testimony?
A. None whatsoever.
Q. It will be done at this point in the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 3, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE DONALD WAYNE BEATTY, ADMITTED.]
Q. The Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria and has included the ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethic's laws, search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, study of previous screenings, check for economic conflicts of interest. We've received one affidavit filed in opposition to your election, which the Commission dismissed pursuit to JMSC Rule 13 for failure on its face to state allegations relating to your character, competency or ethics, as required by JMSC rules. No witnesses are here to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make, Justice Beatty?
A. Nothing other than to thank you -- you-all for allowing me to come before you. I thank you for your time and your effort in this matter and the service you do for the state.
Q. All right, sir. At this time, Ms. Brogdon has some questions, and you'll please respond to counsel. EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Brogdon)
Q. Good morning, Justice Beatty.
A. Good morning.

MS. BROGDON: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, I have a procedural matter to take care of with this candidate.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right.
Q. Justice Beatty, you have before you your sworn statement, where you provided detailed answers to over 30 questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments that you would like to make at this time to that sworn statement.
A. No. Thank you.

MS. BROGDON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that Justice Beatty's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record. SENATOR MARTIN: Is there any objection? (No response.)

SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, the sworn statement will be entered into the record at
this time.
[EXHIBIT 4, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE DONALD WAYNE BEATTY, ADMITTED.]
Q. Justice Beatty, after serving almost nine years on the Supreme Court, why do you now want to serve as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court?
A. Well, to be quite frank with you, I didn't think I'd be around this long. But $I$ am. And the position has traditionally been offered to and held by the most senior person on the court. I've been there now for nine years. I am the most senior person on the court. And I like what I'm doing, to be quite frank with you, and I think my leadership skills will complement the court and I think that we'd be successful.
Q. Thank you, Justice Beatty. Justice Beatty, please explain one or two accomplishments that you have attained during your tenure as a Supreme Court Justice.
A. Well, as you may know, our court in the past has been a court where most things are done by the Chief Justice, and it's -- it's a fact. However, members of the court occasionally get assigned to projects or commissions or committees, that we lend
some leadership to. Since I've been on the court, I think I've worked on two. I think I did the -Justice Task Force. I did the -- of course, the Sentencing Reform. I think that Senator Malloy chaired and Representative Smith was a part of it as well. And there have been other things. Of course, the latest has been the matter involving the -- the docket with criminal courts, and that's on hold, quite frankly.
Q. Justice Beatty, pursuant to Article 5, Section 4 of the South Carolina Constitution, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is the administrative head of the unified judicial system. Please explain what you believe to be the proper role for the Chief Justice to play in administering the court system.
A. The administrative duties of the Chief Justice, the Chief Justice is no more than another member of the court, with one vote. In my opinion, the Chief Justice should not be one who tries to control how the court votes and where the court should go in an opinion. The -- the Chief Justice is an administrator, the CEO, if you will, to make certain that the system is running and run effectively.
Q. Thank you, Justice Beatty. How do you feel your
legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be effective as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court?
A. Well, my life experiences are quite different, I think, than others on the court. I come from a -a different background. I've had a different experience. My military background is very helpful. I was personnel manager initially, then a -- a platoon leader, then a captain, then trained drill sergeants. So I've -- I've done -- I -- I ran the gamut on that. I ran a law practice 15 years before coming to the court. I've been involved in other business -- business ventures, and I -- I think I'm pretty good at leading people.
Q. Thank you, Justice Beatty. You addressed this in your sworn statement, but could you please explain to the Members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge.
A. Demeanor for a judge is someone who should be respectful, is very attentive to -- to his duties, to the job, to the litigants in -- in front of him. Sometime that gets to be a little hard, depending upon the people who -- who are in front of you. But the demeanor should always be respectful.
Q. Thank you. Justice Beatty, the Commission received

946 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 124 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. "I have appeared before Justice Beatty at the Circuit Court, the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court. He has always been engaged and shown great temperament. I believe he will make an exceptional Chief Justice."

Another comment stated, "I have appeared before Justice Beatty when he was a Circuit Court judge and an Appellate judge. He has always been well-prepared, just and fair." A third comment stated, "Justice Beatty has the balance, the experience and the integrity to serve well as Chief Justice." And then another comment said, "Justice Beatty is a distinguished legal scholar and passionate judge, who will be an outstanding representative of our state and leader of the Judicial Department."

Twenty-eight of the written comments expressed concerns, and I'll go over a couple of those with you. One questioned your bias against corporate defendants. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. They're incorrect. Most of our cases involving
corporate defendants, involve actions with one corporation against another. So quite naturally, someone has to lose, and sometimes the -- the news and corporate litigant doesn't like it, but it's corporation on corporation. Now to say I'm biased against corporate defendants, I -- I don't understand that. Someone has to lose, so we make someone unhappy every time we render a decision in that area.

Now, if they're talking about other matters, then I would like them to put one case forward as evidence of my bias, and I don't think they'll find any.
Q. Thank you, Justice Beatty. Several other comments indicated concern with your openly commenting on pending legislation, as well as legislating from the bench and not applying consistent legal principles. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Totally incorrect. I never speak about pending legislation, because that's none of my -- that's not what we do. Now if someone were to ask me about pending legislation, and if I happen to have read it -- and most times I do not read pending legislation, $I$ don't think it's my job and I don't
usually have an opinion about pending legislation. But if someone were to ask me hypothetically "What would this do," if $I$ responded at all, it would be -- with reference to a case that has decided something in that area. But as to whether or not something would do -- what $I$ do on a piece of legislation, $I$ don't offer opinions on legislation.
Q. Thank you. And Justice Beatty, your SLED report indicated that there was a federal lawsuit filed against you since your last screening. It was filed in 2016 by a prisoner named Patrick L. Booker. Although the case is still pending, the SLED report indicates that you were not served with a suit and that the magistrate judge, Mary Gordon Baker, has recommended that the case be summarily dismissed. The matter is still pending. Do you have anything further that you want to add to that?
A. I've never been served. I'm unfamiliar with the lawsuit. I don't recall Mr. Booker. So there's nothing I can offer in that regard.
Q. Thank you, Justice Beatty. A few housekeeping things. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No.
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.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. No.
Q. And finally, do you understand that you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report? And are you aware of the penalties for violation of the pledging rules?
A. I am.

```
                    MS. BROGDON: I would note that the
                Upstate Citizens Committee reported that
                Justice Beatty is Well Qualified in the
                evaluative criteria 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 would just note for the record
```

that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much. Justice Beatty, I wanted to ask you, to begin with, about your presentation to the Solicitor's Conference back in 2013.

JUSTICE BEATTY: I thought you would, yeah.

SENATOR MARTIN: Did Ms. Brogdon give you the statements that were made or written by different individuals at the time of the conference? I wanted to share those with you.

JUSTICE BEATTY: If you're speaking of the summaries supposedly of my comments, yes.

SENATOR MARTIN: Right. Right. Let me ask you a question. In specific regard to that, have you had any thought since that time as to what you might could have done differently, maybe, for that to have been received a bit differently than obviously that it was?

JUSTICE BEATTY: Yes, I have, Senator.

I'm -- I'm glad you asked. Initially my response, or would have been, and -- and my thoughts have been, I should not have accepted the invitation. And if I had to do it again, I probably would not accept the invitation. I -- I accepted the invitation because I was asked more than once, and I was told that I was the person to bring the message that they wanted delivered to the young solicitors. And that is that because you have the power doesn't mean you have to use it, meaning abuse.

Had I -- had I -- if -- if I had to do it over, I think my approach would be a little different. It was delivered in -- in a fashion that $I$ thought was expected and requested, to be quite frank with you, because I did not decide on the topic. The topic was given to me.

SENATOR MARTIN: And what was the topic, Justice Beatty?

JUSTICE BEATTY: I was told by the individual who contacted me -- and I've only talked to one -- that he wanted me to talk about -- I believe it was called then --
actually he said "because you have the power, doesn't mean you have to use it." And I asked him what did he mean. He says "We have a problem with our young solicitors. They are doing things simply because they have the power, things that they shouldn't do." And I said "Well to me that sounds like abuse, prosecutorial abuse, abuse of power." He said "Well, we wouldn't want to put it in those terms, but yes, that's what we're talking about, and we think you're the perfect person to deliver that message."

I declined the invitation initially. I got a second call and I -- and I accepted. And that's what I attempted to do. And I must say that in the delivery, the -- the presentation, it was strong, and it was intended to be strong. I intended to deliver the message I thought was being requested, and that is, if you break the rules, you're going to be -- there's -- there's accountability for breaking the rules. And that's what I did.

And, of course, I -- a few of the solicitors, who are not present in the room, took offense in my referring to two or three
cases that came from their particular circuits. And the cases were matters where this court, my court, suspended assistant solicitors for conduct. I mentioned the Ninth Circuit, I believe. By calling out the Ninth Circuit, hailstorm erupted. But everything I said then, I stand by now. It was absolutely correct, everything I said.

SENATOR MARTIN: Just for the record, I want to read you the summary of what one of the attorneys wrote. "During the entire presentation, Justice Beatty exhibited an extremely arrogant, confrontational, condescending and disrespectful demeanor to the conference, participants and guests. He was very direct in his position, that the power is with the Supreme Court, his three votes and they will determine how business is conducted in the court system. According to Justice Beatty, the landscape is changing and we will be changing and be held accountable." One point was remarked that you were there -- that you said you were there to speak truth to power and you knew that they would not like it, but it was the truth.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Well, I assume that you have those statements. You have -- I believe there were three.

SENATOR MARTIN: There were three.
JUSTICE BEATTY: Now all didn't say that; did they? I don't recall. Although I can't say they were all positive. But let me tell you exactly what I did. When $I$ went in, I said "Good morning. Thank you for inviting me." I thanked Solicitor Barnett for introducing me.

I said "I've been asked to speak to you about" -- I didn't say prosecutorial -- matter of fact, I got a little statement here. I -I -- I know I wrote it down. I say "I've been asked to speak to you-all about matters concerning how you conducted business." I said, "The Supreme Court does not have problems with most of you. In fact, we appreciate what you do and we're thankful. And I believe every citizen in South Carolina is thankful for what you do.

But I've been asked by your conference organizers to deliver a message, so don't shoot the messenger. I was told that some of
you do have a problem with how you've conducted business, and I've been asked to speak to you about it." That's what I said.

Now if your summaries do not reflect that, then -- then I have a problem with the summaries. I've read them, to be quite frank with you, and I've outlined it. And to be quite frank with you they are all slanted, taken out of context. And I will admit that -- I will admit that my -- my approach, my voice, my tone was stern. That's no doubt about that, and it was intended to be so. In hindsight, I probably would do it differently, if I had to do again. But the message, the information I presented, was absolutely correct.

And this thing about three votes, that's not true. This is what happened, the matter came up about a bill I believe you sponsored, Senator Martin, that had to do -- or it might have been a House bill; I'm not certain -that had to do with doing something about the Langford decision. And I was asked about that.

And what I -- I didn't say I got three
votes in my pocket, or something to that effect, I believe what the summary says. I said "Well, look, that was a four-to-one decision. I believe three of those votes are firm. So the best thing that all of us could do is to sit down and see if we can come up with a system that works for all of us." That's what I said.

SENATOR MARTIN: Justice Beatty, I don't want to get too far into the weeds on this, but it is my recollection, and based on the notes that were written at the time, nobody from the audience asked you about Langford. You brought Langford up.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Well, that's -- I don't think that's correct, Senator. And I don't think you have the transcript. You have someone's summary --

SENATOR MARTIN: Right.
JUSTICE BEATTY: -- slanted to make me look bad.

SENATOR MARTIN: So somebody from the audience asked you about Langford and you responded to it?

JUSTICE BEATTY: I responded to Langford.

Now whether or not -- I -- I don't recall how we got onto Langford. I do know this, the night that $I$ got there, the night before $I$ spoke, I was accosted in the elevator by some solicitors, about Langford and having a bill in either the House or the Senate that was going to change it. Now, that's what happened the night before. And the morning before I spoke, similar discussions at breakfast about Langford. So now whether or not I had mentioned Langford first, or it was mentioned as a result of a question during the -- the -the speech, I -- I don't recall, quite frankly. But Langford had been discussed more than once before I ever mentioned it. SENATOR MARTIN: In private, but not in the public session. I guess the thing that struck me about all this -- and I got there that afternoon. I'm on the Prosecution Commission and I couldn't be there for that day's meeting, and I got down to the Solicitor's Conference after you had spoken. And a lot of folks were still, obviously, talking about it, and that's what -- it wasn't the first folks that $I$ ran into, it was a lot
of different people mentioned it to me, and all throughout the evening it kept being brought up. And that was the reason for -and we talked about it -- Justice Beatty, is it not correct, you and I talked about it later that week.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Oh, and I told you then that I might have said things a little differently. My tone was a little harsh --

SENATOR MARTIN: And I'm not trying to -listen, that's been almost two-and-a-half years ago. I'm not trying to nail you down to specifics about what was said. It was my understanding, you brought it up during the course of that presentation to the whole assembly of folks who were there, and brought it up in a way that really, you know, you weren't -- and I'm not sure -- I've been to meetings like that, Justice Beatty, and I'm not sure we always know who we're talking to. Most of the elected solicitors were not in the room.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Absolutely. And they're the ones who complained.

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, it was I think two
of the elected solicitors were actually in the room.

JUSTICE BEATTY: And neither one of those complained.

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, I don't know about that.

JUSTICE BEATTY: I know who was in the room, Senator.

SENATOR MARTIN: But $I$ just will say that what concerned me at the time was the view of what was said and, more importantly, how it was said. And your testimony today is -- and I want to get this right -- is basically, you were asked to talk about prosecutorial abuse?

JUSTICE BEATTY: You know, I -- I took some notes right when this thing blew up, the day following, the morning after. And these are notes I made to myself. The topic of prosecutorial misconduct was not my idea. The topic was given to me by the Solicitor's Conference organizers.

When I was contacted, I was told that the topic was the power of the prosecutor, because you have it doesn't mean you have to use it. I initially declined the invitation to speak.

I explained to the solicitor that I interpreted the topic to mean prosecutorial misconduct and that $I$ didn't feel that $I$ was the right one to talk to them about that.

I was told then, "You're perfect for the job and was specifically chosen because the past experience with prosecutor's conduct in Spartanburg. Our young prosecutors need to hear about that. They will believe you and understand that this is serious." On that note, I finally agreed.

In my opening remarks, I told them that I had noticed that their conference materials listed my topic as simply, "The power of prosecutor -- of a prosecutor." However, that was not the topic $I$ was given when I was contacted. I told them that I was told my topic was "The power of a prosecutor, because you have it, doesn't mean that you have to use it." And that I interpreted that to mean "prosecutorial misconduct." I suggested that the title was changed by the convention planners because prosecutorial misconduct sounds a little harsh. I know your summary says I changed it, but that's not true.

I then stated, "However, some in your conference leadership apparently that there is a problem with some of you. Therefore, I will talk about prosecutorial misconduct, so don't shoot the messenger." That came directly from my speech and my presentation.

I then said "Before I go any further, let me be clear, we do not have a problem with the great majority of you. We appreciate your work and the majority of you do an outstanding job." This sentiment was repeated at least twice during my presentation. The inference that $I$ was critical of all prosecutors is -is ridiculous; that's just not true. And I can go on and on and on about the notes that $I$ took.

SENATOR MARTIN: I think we've probably covered this about all that needs to be covered, but I do want to ask you one followup question.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: You mentioned in your response to Ms. Brogdon that you would never think it appropriate to comment on pending legislation.

JUSTICE BEATTY: That is correct.
SENATOR MARTIN: Did you comment on pending legislation at the Solicitor's Conference?

JUSTICE BEATTY: I commented on the pending bill. I believe I have it in here. H-3247. Is that -- I believe that's what it was.

SENATOR MARTIN: Right.
JUSTICE BEATTY: That was done, the Langford discussion, because what I had been told the night before and the morning before I spoke was that this bill was going to change Langford. And my position was simply this, and what $I$ said was this: Langford changed how the docket was controlled, solely by the solicitor's, now solely by the solicitors, and found that it was unconstitutional. I don't see how any legislation can change a finding that we said is unconstitutional.

SENATOR MARTIN: Did you say at the conference that you had three votes?

JUSTICE BEATTY: No, I did not. I said Langford was a four-to-one decision, and I think three of those votes are affirmed.

SENATOR MARTIN: So you never said you had --

JUSTICE BEATTY: Never said that. Never.
SENATOR MARTIN: Contrary to what these statements --

JUSTICE BEATTY: I don't care what they said, Senator. I know what I said. I said we -- that there were -- that Langford was a four-to-one decision and three of those votes I believe are affirmed.

SENATOR MARTIN: Did you ever use the term that you came loaded for bear?

JUSTICE BEATTY: I did. I said that. In fact, I did. I said "When I walked in here," once they started talking about Langford, I say, "You know, I came loaded for bear," meaning I expected to be attacked about Langford. That's what "loaded for bear" mean.

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, Justice, what I understand was, the context of this. You had had personal discussions in the elevator about --

JUSTICE BEATTY: Elevator and at breakfast.

SENATOR MARTIN: But in front of this
conference, these are young attorneys and staffs of the very solicitors from around the state, many of them wouldn't know too much about Langford or have too much of an opinion about Langford, would you think?

JUSTICE BEATTY: No, I wouldn't think that. In fact, there are lawyers, there are prosecutors, and they control the dockets. So you mean to tell me, they wouldn't have any idea about Langford?

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, but --
JUSTICE BEATTY: Decision that changes
all of that?
SENATOR MARTIN: But my point is, nobody in that meeting had mentioned it to you.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Well, that's what you think. As I indicated, I had had discussion at breakfast and the night before. But now, if you ask me if $I$ got a question from the floor, I told you, I don't recall whether it came from a question from the floor or that I mentioned it myself. No, I don't recall
whether -- how that happened, Senator, if that's what you're getting at.

SENATOR MARTIN: Well the question was,
did you bring it up, and that you came loaded for bear, and that you had three buddies. JUSTICE BEATTY: Well, I indicated to you that I said "loaded for bear." That is absolutely correct. I said that I expected to be attacked; that's what the "loaded for bear" means. Now, having three votes, no. What I said was, Langford was a four-to-one decision and I think three of those votes are affirmed. SENATOR MARTIN: Did anybody in that -talking about asking questions, did anybody attack you in those meetings? Did anybody come prepared -- did you notice anybody asking questions? Did you not have to go down in the audience to try to solicit a response?

JUSTICE BEATTY: I -- I had a question and answer session, Senator. And like all question and answer sessions at any presentation I've ever done or attended, if questions didn't come, the -- the presenter asks, "Are you sure you don't have any questions? What about this? What about things that have come up?" I talk about doing question/answer session. I talked about things that the court was trying to do. I
even talked about a commission that we were putting together to deal with the docket, that was to be comprised of people from the solicitor's association, as well as the public defender's association, and those people will not be chosen until after their individual conventions. And I talked about that during that question and answer session. So if I -I -- maybe I'm missing your point.

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, my point was to
answer the questions about the three votes and comment on pending legislation.

JUSTICE BEATTY: And I think I've answered that three times at least.

SENATOR MARTIN: You said you didn't. JUSTICE BEATTY: I said it.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any other questions?
Dean Wilcox.
MR. WILCOX: Justice Beatty, just to
follow up a little bit along that same line of the process. How much as an associate Justice do you have to become familiar with the whole disciplinary process, the operation of ODC and things like that? Or is that pretty much left to the Chief Justice?

JUSTICE BEATTY: Well, as you know, each term of court, we take up disciplinary matters, and -- and the docket is generally full, unfortunately. And we get into the decision aspect of it, not much more, as to the discipline, of whether or not the discipline's adequate and that kind of a thing, as a court. Now if you mean how does the ODC operate, we don't generally deal with that, as a court.

MR. WILCOX: Specifically, are there ever any situations that you're aware of where the court communicates with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel about matters before they reach you in the normal course of a process?

JUSTICE BEATTY: No. That has not happened in my nine years, at least I'm not aware of that having happened, where there's been contact between the court and ODC about a case.

MR. WILCOX: So the court doesn't have any particular ability to initiate a proceeding or anything, other than as lawyers, they could initiate proceedings if they became aware of something?

JUSTICE BEATTY: Well, you know, that's an interesting question, Dean Wilcox, because that has come up on -- on occasion. And what has been said initially was this, we don't take matters up, unless we get a complaint, and then that comes from ODC. But on occasion, we have referred matters to ODC.

MR. WILCOX: What sort of occasions might that -- is it something you've read in the newspaper, or something like that that causes that?

JUSTICE BEATTY: Something that might have appeared in a record that we might have been reviewing, something like that, that's generally the way it happens.

MR. WILCOX: Are you comfortable that that's the way the process ought to work? Or would you see anything that you would be changing in the process, if you were Chief Justice?

JUSTICE BEATTY: That -- that is a touchy situation because we're trying to keep hands off of the disciplinary matters until it comes before us for a final decision. However, I do believe there is a role for the court to play
in supervising the ODC. Now we -- at this point in time, we are basically a hands-off court. We don't deal with matters until they actually come before us, and that's it. But at times I'm certain that there's been occasion where the Chief Justice has had some dealings with ODC prior to matters coming before -- the -- the extent of their contact, I have no idea what it might have been.

MR. WILCOX: And if I can sort of change the subject entirely on you here a little bit. Chair if that's all right.

SENATOR MARTIN: Yes.
MR. WILCOX: There was a question asked a little bit earlier about sort of the big picture of becoming Chief Justice. Are there particular issues that you see facing the judicial system, the court system, that you see as being front burner issues? If you were Chief Justice, you would take on?

JUSTICE BEATTY: Funding has been an -an issue for this court for quite some time. I believe from 2000 to now, we have gone to where 48 percent of our funding comes from fees and fines. Over that same period of
time, we've experienced a close to five percent decrease in collections of fees and fines. But yet our book of business has increased. The -- the rotation schedule still goes on. And so we have a funding issue, and we need a stable source of funding to operate the court.

I -- I fear that we might get to a point in time where although we are required to rotate our judges, we won't have funding to do so. Not only that, but we -- we need to do something about our courthouses. Either we put on new judges -- I'm told that we might do that -- there's nowhere for them to hold court. The county courthouses don't have enough space. There needs to be some effort made by the legislature to assist counties who can't afford in funding, expansion, renovation, that sort of thing, for the courthouse, if we are going to keep the judicial system up and running properly.

MR. WILCOX: One final question. You had made reference that you had a little bit different background than many who might, that sat on the court and things. Can you
elaborate for me a little bit about how you see your background, giving you a perspective on the law that others may not have?

JUSTICE BEATTY: Well, my background has afforded me an opportunity to see the law up close and personal, and its implications, application. I don't think most of the judges who -- who sat on this court -- or justices, I should say, with kind of experience. I think that most of them read about it, not really seen it. And from where I come from, I've seen it, read it. So I'm -- I'm much more attune, if you will, to -- to what goes on out there. So yes, my -- my background's quite different than the members of the court, and I think that's a plus.

MR. WILCOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you, Dean Wilcox. Senator from Darlington, then Representative Smith.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To add on to Dean Wilcox's question, Justice Beatty, I think you're the only sitting Justice on the Supreme Court now that has previous service in the legislature; is that right?

JUSTICE BEATTY: That is correct, Senator.

SENATOR MALLOY: And so I think that that adds a bit of perspective too, as it relates to a background. You also want to address one of the questions as it relates to a corporate, sort of a slant. And I remember when we were over here in the General Assembly, there were rave reviews that came after the Jade Street decision that Justice Beatty wrote, that -- I think some folks had, they were really jumping up and down from the business community, applauding that decision, also saying that one that -- I think that was one decision, that clearly spelled out when the decision about the deference that was given to the General Assembly, to end up formulating policy, as opposed to trying to get to a necessary result that the other folks wanted. And I think that that -- I know that a bunch of plaintiff lawyers were having a fit because the law was not on their -- was not on the side. And so I just point that out, just the two points, two questions that were raised for a bit of
clarity.
But I think that the issue on funding, I'm not sure that you know this, but we had a -- in Darlington County where I'm from, we have a very difficult time with our courthouse, and I believe that it poses a security risk. We had a driver just last week or so that ran into the courthouse and burned a little bit of the second floor and it was a fatality. And so burned some of the first floor and the second floor. It ran into the car -- ran into the courthouse at a high rate of speed, lost his life in the process. Very sorry for he and his family.

But the thing is is that small counties can't afford to end up building courthouses. And obviously as we go forward with funding, as it relates to the whole judicial system, I hope that that's something that y'all will end up taking a look at, to try to give us some help and support and recommendations, whenever asked. I'll come back with more questions later.

SENATOR MARTIN: Representative Smith.
REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. Justice Beatty -JUSTICE BEATTY: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: -- I don't want to re-plow Langford ground with you. But it's interesting to me to note this is -- I was at the Public Defender's Conference speaking probably about the same time you were speaking at the Solicitor's Conference, and the reception that night, I heard a lot about your speech and about Langford. And I think one thing that was noticeably absent was that you were invited there to speak on the issue of prosecutors. And, you know, I've attended seminars. We had a seminar not too long ago in Sumter where the ODC -- where the assistant ODCs come and tell you what you're supposed to do. And if you don't do this, there will be consequences to those actions.

So if I understand what you're telling us, is you were invited to come and speak about ethical issues with prosecutors and what to be on guard for with these young prosecutors.

JUSTICE BEATTY: You are absolutely right, Representative Smith. That was it. I
talked about cases, specific cases, where we had discipline, prosecutors, government attorneys for misconduct. I listed those. It wasn't something I pulled out the air or anything of that nature. I -- I went through a list of cases and -- and situations. Now, my tone might have been combative. That might have been a holdover from the breakfast discussion when $I$ finally got in there to give the -- the talk. But yes, I -- and you know what else was interesting? Everything I said about Langford, Chief Justice Toal said to the public defenders. Never heard a word about it. Word-for-word, never heard a word about it from any who, anywhere. Senator Martin, no one.

And it's my understanding that Chief Justice Toal informed you that she gave the same talk about Langford to the public defenders, and you had no problem with what she had to say.

SENATOR MARTIN: How do you know what I have a problem with, Justice -JUSTICE BEATTY: Well, well, let me rephrase that, Senator.

SENATOR MARTIN: I think you might need to do that.

JUSTICE BEATTY: I will. Let me put it this way. And I probably shouldn't even mention it. I got that from -- from Toal herself, and I -- and I -- let me -- let me withdraw every comment I've just --

SENATOR MARTIN: That might be advisable.
JUSTICE BEATTY: I will. I withdraw it.
REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: One thing, moving on from Langford, one thing that I'm interested in, you prefaced your comments with the Chief Justice sort of runs the show, so to speak, over there, and you're about to be offering nomination for Chief Justice and maybe be Chief Justice. And that's very important to me, because I see the Chief Justice as directing the court these days, and how the practice of law is administered and how the court system is run.

And one thing I've watched with great interest over the years, as being a member of the General Assembly, is what I would say, the proliferation of administrative orders coming from the court, that sort of cross -- I
wouldn't say cross a line, but blurs a line with legislation. And one of those issues was an order that came from the court a few years ago about expungements and the administration of expungements. And I took the position that that was clearly provided for in the statute, and obviously the court took a different position, and we eventually worked that issue out through a series of legislation and discussions.

But what concerns me is what's your take on administrative orders and how they sort of tweak or may rewrite statutes and/or the practice of law? I certainly respect the judicial, the constitutional provision that puts the Supreme Court over the administration of the court system in South Carolina. But sometimes I've watched that line gets pushed with these administrative orders. I'd be interested in hearing your philosophy on that. JUSTICE BEATTY: Representative Smith, my position on administrative orders, or even our opinion for that matter, should not in any way tweak, as you put it, if you will, legislation, statutes. Statutes are the
statutes. We are free to interpret them, that's our job. But to rewrite them, that is not our job. And I will not do that. And I'll try not to do that.

And if I have a problem with a particular statute that yields a result that I think might be problematic somewhere down the road, I will put in my opinions an invitation to the legislature to take a look at it. And I clearly say, that is not the court's job to rewrite legislation or to legislate from the bench. I've done that numerous times. And that would be my approach. No, the job is to administrate the judiciary, the practice of law. But we have to do that within certain constraints, and I recognize that.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I certainly understand and respect the separation of powers and opinions. It's just the concern, obviously, is with administrative orders I have witnessed over the years. And I think just pointing out that one.

Lastly, one issue that you stated, kind of peaked my interest also is that you're in tune with what's going on with the court
system and all that. And $I$ just would make an observation for the court that, you know, not all of us practice in Columbia and Greenville and Charleston, not all of us specialize these days. But I seem to see more of a push from the court that the disposition of cases, the moving of cases, and it creates conflicts among attorneys who -- I'm sure you engaged in the same type of practice that most of us in small towns engaged in, where you've got to be in Magistrate's Court, you got to do some Family Court, you've got to do some General Sessions, and you've got to do Common Pleas. And I see with the court, the number of terms of court, but the court, the push of attorneys to dispose of cases without the application of how the practicality of it.

And I would certainly ask the court to take that into consideration, especially if you are elected Chief Justice in the administration of court, because I think you are really pushing down on the smaller town lawyers. And I hear from them often, that it's a lot more difficult to make a living practicing law in the Lee Counties and the

Clarendon Counties and the smaller counties than it was ten or fifteen years ago. And I think the Supreme Court in the way that the terms of court are given, it probably plays a large part of that.

One thing I would mention, every time I see Chief Justice Pleicones, I mention this, is, you know, this new rule in the pilot project on motions hearings and having memorandums going along with those, that is very difficult on a lawyer who's got a number of balls up in the air, to do those, and it really precludes them on the motion practice. So I would ask you, if you do become an administration court, you probably practiced law more in line with -- or did practice law not as long as some of the others who have been on there.

So -- but you know, I would ask that you take that in consideration, because I'm real concerned of where this -- where the practice of law is going. I'm concerned that the Monday after New Year's on this year, when New Year's Day was on Saturday and people spending time with their family, there's terms of court
beginning. You know, as quality of life of attorneys that needs to be remembered. And I know you're not as far removed as some from the practice of law, but I think that those -I guess it's difficult sometimes to remember what it's like to have to earn a living as an attorney.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Your comments are welltaken, Representative Smith, and I do share your concern. You know, we're only required to hold, I believe, nine terms of court a year. But we hold somewhere between 18 to 20 terms of court a year, and that puts a lot of pressure on -- on practicing lawyers and put a lot of pressure on the court system in
general. But we -- we have such a volume of business, our book of business is pretty big. And in trying to deal with that requires that sometime.

We have recently started to rethink that approach, having to have court every other week, because it's difficult for us as well to do that. And we know it's difficult for the -- the attorneys out in the field. But what happens in the Circuit Court, if you will, and
the reason for the request for the memo, so that we can handle some of these motions without hearings, because we couldn't schedule enough hearings to take care of all the motions we had in some of the cases. And then a practicing attorney like yourself, getting those memos together, those memorandums together, for a -- a judge on any particular issue, it takes time and it takes a lot out of your schedule and you're trying to do other things as well.

But when you're a circuit judge, you walk into a courtroom -- and our circuit judge is unlike a circuit judges in most places -- you walk into the courtroom cold, with the case placed -- placed before you and you have no idea what it's about. So if you've not gotten a memorandum of -- of some sort about it beforehand, you -- you say, "Well, I'll take that under advisement." Then you go from there. You have, what, 80 cases on your docket. Then next day you got another, then you go to another circuit and you have that just mounting up.

So we have all these matters that are not
finally taken care of by the circuit judge, and then we start to get complaints. This judge has been holding my motion for a year, six month, and has not ruled on it. And -and that's the reason why we try to them without a hearing and hopefully get -- allow us to get more of it done. But that is something that we might need to rethink, maybe. It just started, by the way, so we really don't know how it's going to work out. REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: And unfortunately, you placed it in the third -- y'all placed it in the Third Circuit, which is where I practice. And so that tends to lead to the complaints that I hear. But I certainly understand, listen and hear the judges. But also by the same token, I don't want to get in a long discussion of this is, you know, most terms of court break down quickly. And, you know, and so that is another issue. But, you know, $I$ just bring that to your attention. And I think I'll probably withhold questions. SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Hitchcock and then Representative Rutherford. MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, Justice Beatty.
JUSTICE BEATTY: Good morning, sir.
MR. HITCHCOCK: I just wanted to take a moment. I know that we've talked about a couple of cases -- or a couple cases have come up in particular, and I don't want to re-plow that ground. And in hearing some of your thoughts on, you know, separation of powers and, you know, who gets to set public policy and those types of things. But if I could, I'd like to maybe take you up to about -we're 5-, 10,000 feet, so we're above, you know, individual or particular cases and just really get your thoughts -- you know, I think sometimes -- and I'm probably as much a victim of this, given my current position as anyone else, we forget that we do have three branches of government. And just somewhat get your thoughts on -- or your philosophy on the -you know, when it comes to separation of powers, the interaction of the three branches of government, and your approach because, you know, I know as well as anybody, you know, the Supreme Court's not called on to answer the easy questions. Where the -- really, where
the -- where the powers are distinct, really more of the close-calls. And really your thoughts on how the powers interact and, you know, what is or what is not a, you know, nonjusticiable political question. If you could just give us more of kind of your general view, your general approach on that, I'd like to hear it.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Yes, sir. Let me first say that there is no one on that court that respects the separation of powers more than I do. And I think there's a lane that, yes, we have a three-legged stool government, if you will. And if there is something wrong with one of those legs, that stool is going to fall. I think there's a lane for each branch of the government and we should stay in our lane. Setting public policy is the job of the legislature, not the judiciary. And I firmly believe that and I try to exercise that.

And if by chance there are comes an occasion where someone thinks that we may have overstepped our bounds, or I in particular, stepped out of my lane, well then, bring it to our attention and -- and let's take another
look at it. I have no problem with saying I was wrong. I grew up that way. If I'm wrong, I'm wrong. But if I'm right, I'm right and the chips fall where they may. And I will never intentionally try to offend the legislature in a decision that $I$ render. I would never intentionally try to step out of my lane and set public policy, no. I am one of those who have set, not in this chamber, but in the one across the way there. I understand the difference in the branches of government. I understand civics quite well. And I wished we taught it in schools now. And I don't think most people, including some legislators, quite frankly, do not understand separation of power, do not understand that there are three branches of government. But no, sir, I will not knowingly ever step out of my lane.

SENATOR MARTIN: Representative Rutherford.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Justice Beatty, taking you back to the comments made at the solicitor's office, has anyone ever pointed out to you that anything you said in
those comments was incorrect?
JUSTICE BEATTY: Actually, no. In fact, I've gotten comments from across the nation, even one from Canada, believe it or not, from federal judges, state judges, people in the community, letters stacked this high (witness demonstrates), supporting everything that I said at that solicitor's convention. Only people I've heard complain about it was a few solicitors. And to be quite frank with you, couple of them have called me since that time and say they were wrong. One even called me about two months ago and said that he had -he now knows that was $I$ was saying was correct. He's having problems with four complaints filed against his young solicitors already.

So again, I will say my attitude, my approach, my tone could have been much better. The combative approach that I took, apparently, needed to be re-thought, if you will. And if $I$ had to do it again, I'd change that.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: If I could refresh your memory a little bit, and I don't
know whether this came up with the time frame. But you may or may not remember, but the bill regarding Langford was a House bill. And I know I was a co-sponsor because I disagreed with the course of decision with Langford. And I can't remember who the primary sponsor was. But the Chief Justice Toal actually came to give comments on that bill. Were you aware of that?

JUSTICE BEATTY: Yes, sir. In fact, she told me that in her discussions with me of having talked to Senator Martin. And again, let me apologize to Senator Martin for my combativeness. I mean, that's -- every time this thing come up with the solicitors thing, it kind of rubs me the wrong way, because it's been taken way out of context and people don't fully understand what really happened there. And I've never been able to give my side of the story.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: In addition, the side of the court or the story of the court was solicited, and that's why Chief Justice Toal came to speak on it. But also, following that, I believe a study was done,
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and I don't know whether it was done by you or someone else, that showed that in cases before the court, you had agreed with solicitors 95 percent of the time, or you found with them 95 percent of the time.

JUSTICE BEATTY: The numbers are actually -- during that time, the court had agreed with the solicitors 83 percent of the time. My personal numbers are 84 percent of the time. And that's not including those criminal cases where there was an attempt to appeal and we decided, no, we're not taking that appeal. If we include those numbers, the court and I will be above 95 percent, I would think, in support of the solicitor.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Going back to something that Representative Smith said, there was an administrative order given by Chief Justice Toal several years ago regarding DUIs. After that order was given, hundreds of DUIs, I know in Richland County, were dismissed, because all the old cases were to be brought new and judges were to now push moving cases and moving cases and moving cases.

And so as a follow-up again to Representative Smith, my concern is as a practicing lawyer, that that memorandum or that administrative order has been taken to mean that when $I$ file a continuance on a case for the very first time in some of these smaller counties, I'm getting calls from the magistrate, from the police officer going, "Hey, why did you continue this case? Can we move it? Can we move it?"

And the question becomes, to what end are we going with always putting this emphasis on moving, moving, moving and no quality of life for the lawyers that are having to deal with, when -- because it used to be, if I requested a continuance, if the court had a problem with it, they'd call and say "Hey, can you send us a notice from that other court?"

Now we put three or four notices in, where different appearances have to be in, and still are told by the magistrate, "No, I'm not going to continue the case." Circuit Court judge is saying "You're going to be here and try this case on Monday. I don't care what the posturing is." Y'all are going to be here
and try this case." Scheduled in court the day after New Year's. Scheduled in court the week before Christmas, to what end.

Is there a point at which the court is going to say, "Okay, we've gone far enough down that path of putting this on lawyers to be there, be there, be there," and provide some deal of quality of life, some ability to live, just because you're a lawyer, and not have to worry about every single day -- and I know you and I talked when I first started and you talked about going in on Sundays and going on Saturdays, and now that becomes the order of all of our business. But to what end?

You know, what point is the court going to step back and say -- and I'm not trying to get you to legislate -- but at what point do we reach a conclusion and say, okay, this is probably what we can do. We've maxed out our numbers. Now let's look at how to make sure that we're doing this the right way. Because it just appears to me -- I've had to hire someone to cover my cases while I'm up here, and it still doesn't end. I'm still getting calls on "Well, you need to move this case."

The case is 30 days old.
You know, at what point then will the court issue another order and say have some common sense about this. It doesn't always have to be that we're moving cases in a month, in two months. It doesn't always have to be that lawyers are getting calls from circuit court judges and say "You'd better be here on Monday to try the case, even though there are ten other cases that want to be tried, you'd better be here." At what point do we reach some conclusion?

JUSTICE BEATTY: You know, we have to be practical. And if that is happening, then $I$ don't think we're being practical. If there is something else that is ready to go, your case is not, but we won't do anything because your case is not ready to go.

The problem is, our judiciary, our circuit and trial benches handle more cases per judge than anywhere else in this country, and that is very difficult. We have -- our filings have increased. Our book of business is unbelievable. And when those matters stack up -- the court has traditionally, at least
the time that I've been there, been concerned with optics, if you will, how things look, and especially to you as legislator.

If we have this extremely long list of cases that have not been disposed of that are two or three, four, five years old, we've had them up to ten years old, that have not been disposed of, then the way we see it and way we saw it then was, it makes us look bad, especially to you, when we are coming to you, asking you for things. And you say "Well look, you're not doing anything. You're not working." We have all these cases that are backed up.

So we made an effort to do something about our backlog. And that's why we have all these terms full. Believe me, not only is it hard on the lawyers, it's hard on the judges. And even on -- on my level, it's hard. We work hard. We work all the time. And to try to do cases every other week -- and these are not easy cases that we see now. It is not your -- your run-of-the-mill cases. Takes time and effort. So it's a -- there's a lot of pressure on the system totally. But your
point is, should we take a step back from looking at the numbers? Quite frankly, I think you're right.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Last question is, how do we -- if it is clear that this is a three-legged stool and that the judiciary is one leg of that stool, if the judiciary is constantly underfunded and the salaries are clearly not high enough, we need courthouses, we need money, how is it that the judiciary -and is there a step the judiciary can take -and I don't want to ask you again to legislate from sitting over there, and you can decline to answer; it wouldn't offend me -- but how is it that if we're not paying judges enough, if we're not providing enough money, if courthouses need security, Richland County's courthouse is too small, we couldn't even fit a new judge in if we wanted to, how is it that the court can be a leg of the stool if the legislature constantly under funds it and youall have no voice, besides, I guess, the speech that the Chief Justice comes and gives every year, that nobody goes to. How is it the judiciary is supposed to be this equal leg
if this branch of government treats them like their red-headed stepchild?

JUSTICE BEATTY: Interesting point, Representative Rutherford. It can't go on. And this situation has to be remedied at some point in time, as it's going to crumble. It -- it really is. When you go from one percent of your budget being taken care of by -- by fines and fees to 48 percent of your budget being taken care of by fines and fees, something is wrong. And -- and what you have is people fining people -- and, of course, the federal government is not saying we're fining too much and we're going to have to stop it and start bringing claims and due process violations.

So now, if that should happen, we're already receiving five percent less than we've received four or five years over the last three years anyway, what are we -- what are we to do? If the legislature does not do something about funding for the court, we're not going to have any court system.

Our Chief Justice now makes less than the lowest paid federal judge. The magistrates
makes $\$ 30,000$ more than the Chief Justice do -- does, I should say. But, you know, you look at that kind of situation. We have lawyers that are hired and paid for by the state, make more than the Chief Justice. Something is wrong with that picture.

SENATOR MARTIN: Representative Bannister.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Thank you. Justice Beatty, you mentioned fines and fees. JUSTICE BEATTY: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I want to ask you two questions, and don't let me forget the second one. There was some discussion a couple years ago about doing more collections on the fines and fees, and there was a fairly large outstanding balance. In other words, a defendant comes through, you know, a hundred dollar fine or ten days in jail, you got 30 days to pay, then it was kind of a -- but you don't have to do either one. And then no follow up to see if he could pay the hundred dollars.

I don't know if you were part of those discussions previously -- said we're not
collecting any money from any individuals who are fined by the court and didn't pay. It's just not worth the time. Have you looked at, are you aware of the outstanding balance that's sort of carried by the court system for unpaid fees and fines?

JUSTICE BEATTY: I'm aware that there is an outstanding balance and I understand that balance to be considered significant. But the problem is, the people who owe it can't pay it. And I wouldn't say all of them can't, but quite a few of them couldn't pay, or else they would be paid. Number one, then that goes back to the federal government, the justice department, in their efforts, that started about a month ago, complaining about those same fines and fees. So now, if they're going to come in and stop us from collecting it, claiming that it's a due process violation, then assessing them means nothing.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Well, that was kind of my point. When you're Chief Justice, do you think looking at how we assess fines and how we collect fines would be appropriate? Because if we're -- if we're -- as I
understand it, if you get a hundred dollar ticket, you've got all the assessments, it ends up being about $\$ 300$. I think

Representative Rutherford could say exactly what it is.

But if we're assessing a hundred dollar fine that we know they can't pay and the Department of Justice says it would be a violation of their due process to collect it, you think that's worth looking at? Is that something you'd do as Chief Justice, kind of look into how we handle the fees and fines and whether or not we're --

JUSTICE BEATTY: I think $I$ would have to. I -- I -- I think the court would be forced to, considering the fees and fines are 48 percent of our budget, and we're going to have to see if we can't collect it, or what if we can collect it, I should say, and take a look at that whole process. I don't think we have a choice but to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: So the second question $I$ got is on the getting input from the court system. I understand there was an unspoken rule that the judges who run across
issues from a legislative standpoint, that they might see who could be approved. JUSTICE BEATTY: I'm sorry?

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Maybe some previous administrations in the Supreme Court had suggested that the trial judges should not contact their legislators about things that they might want legislatively. For instance, in Family Court, when there's a complicated statute that's sort of ambiguous from a public policy standpoint, the Family Court judges, as I understand it, were encouraged not to talk to their legislators about policy things like legislative changes.

Number one, $I$ don't know if you -- I don't even know if it's true. But do you think it's appropriate, when you're Chief Justice, are you going to encourage the trial judges who are on the front lines, dealing with the legislation and the trial courts, to talk to their legislators and bring up issues they seek? Or do you think all those communications ought to come through you, as the Chief Justice?

JUSTICE BEATTY: Let me say, the practice
has been --
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Or have you thought about it?

JUSTICE BEATTY: The practice has been that Chief Justice for -- for the judiciary, and only the Chief Justice for the judiciary, from having practiced law, been a judge for quite some time, 20 years, I -- I believe, and a legislator, $I$ know that it's beneficial from time to time to have other people other than myself, if $I$ were the Chief Justice, to talk to legislators. And to forbid that, I think is detrimental to -- to the system, to the process.

I think if someone has a relationship with a legislator and has a concern about a piece of legislation or a situation -- not the legislation itself, but a situation, and they might talk to their legislator about it. But I do think the Chief Justice ought to be apprised, because you don't want to get caught cold when the -- when the legislator calling you and ask you about it, and you have not had an occasion to look at the situation and -and can't respond intelligently. No, it -- it
should happen.
And in fact, I think they' re exchanging now. I do believe our current Chief Justice has made a point of asking members of the judiciary, all levels, to talk to legislators about certain issues.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: And last question. I just thought of this while we were going. When you were talking at the Solicitor's Conference, obviously whatever that was is fine. At the time, there were several pending complaints against solicitors. One of them was -- if I got the facts right, one of them was texting a juror during breaks or had his cousin texting the jurors. Another one didn't produce exculpatory evidence an eyewitness that would have supported the alibi. If it's something like that, where it was just -- if you read the rule, you would know you can't contact the jurors and you can't not tell about witnesses.

And I got four kids, and when I come home, my wife tells me "Go talk to your oldest son and you put him in his place." And I got no idea what's going on, except I know I got
to go fuss at him about something. Have you noticed that the -- if you know, have the number of complaints against the solicitors sort of getting out of line like that, have they decreased? I mean, was that a successful meeting? It certainly, it certainly raised awareness of that issue.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Honestly, $I$ do not know.
As I indicated earlier to Dean Wilcox, we don't necessarily have that kind of a -- a discussion, if you will, with ODC. However, if we were to call, I'm sure they would be able to give us numbers, although they can't tell us about -- we ask them not to tell us about the -- the case itself. We can get those numbers, certainly, if -- if they were needed.

But I -- I will say this, I've gotten an unsolicited call from one of the solicitors who signed the letter against me, indicating that now he sees what I'm talking about, and that he's had to respond to four complaints against his youngest solicitor. So I assume -- hopefully it does do some good. In the case you're talking about is a solicitor texting
his cousin in a murder case on this jury 32 times, 32 times, texting a juror during a murder trial.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I'm not sure if that's specifically addressed in a rule, but something like that.

JUSTICE BEATTY: And another, crossing the Cooper River Bridge, does not like the way a motorist is driving, pulls his badge and his gun and points it at the motorist because they're driving too slow. Now, I -- I mentioned those two cases. Unfortunately, they came out of Charleston and it created a problem.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Thank you, Justice.

SENATOR MARTIN: Ms. Wall.
MS. WALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Justice Beatty.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Yes, ma'am.
MS. WALL: Just very quickly to follow up on that. Has there been any consideration, having additional training -- I do Bridge the Gap and have for 20 years and we are now -we've gone from three days, I think way back
when it was five and went to three and now we're one -- one day. Something --

JUSTICE BEATTY: And there's talk about getting rid of it, unfortunately.

MS. WALL: Okay. Well, but has there been -- has the court given any consideration to additional mandatory training for solicitors to -- because it's sounding as if they don't even know what the rules are. JUSTICE BEATTY: That's why I was told, I was asked to deliver that speech.

MS. WALL: I understand.
JUSTICE BEATTY: And to be stern.
MS. WALL: I understand that. But maybe rather than putting you on the spot to have to do it, to actually have several days before a solicitor, even though he or she has passed the bar, but something in addition to simply Bridge the Gap. It's just a thought there.

JUSTICE BEATTY: It is a thought and it's something that I would think the solicitors in their association need to take up. And be quite frank with you, I think they have considered it. That was the purpose, I do believe, of -- of my appearing. But yes,
there is a problem, there is a problem.
And no matter what anyone would say, solicitors were off-limits. You didn't touch them. You just didn't, unless there was something seriously, seriously, seriously bad. And -- and -- and what -- I -- I gather the whole point of the discussion was, they're going to be treated like every other lawyer in this state and have to abide by the same rules.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any other questions?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: You're done. Thank you very much, Justice Beatty. This will conclude this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. And you may be called back at such time, if the need would arise. Thank you for offering and for being here today and your cooperation with our staff.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Thank you very much for allowing me to come. I -- I would like to say one thing. I would have to apologize for my combative nature when it comes to the solicitor thing. I mean, it's just been a
matter that has just really bothered me since it occurred. So if I've offended any of you with my tone or any comment that I might have made, please forgive me for that. Let's -let's look over it. And I'm -- I'm trying to get past this, that little rough edge. And I'm no shrinking violet, and when attacked, I do respond.

SENATOR MARTIN: Only thing I would say to that is you've had three years almost, two-and-a-half years to deal with it, and you had the opportunity to come in here today and deal with it.

JUSTICE BEATTY: Well, thank you. It's been festering that long. (Justice Beatty exits the room.)

SENATOR MARTIN: Welcome. Come on in, Justice Few.

JUSTICE FEW: Good morning.
SENATOR MARTIN: Good morning. Good to see you. If you would, raise your right hand to take the oath. (The judge is sworn in.) EXAMINATION
(By Senator Martin)
Q. Thank you very much. Justice Few, we're going to expedite this as quickly as we can because you've already been screened before, in the last, what, year, $I$ guess, plus. Yeah, it doesn't seem long. Seemed like yesterday.
A. Twice actually, in the last year.
Q. Have you had an opportunity to review your PDQ and all that? Any changes need to be made?
A. I actually did not review it, but I do not have any changes to make.
Q. Any objection to us making it part of the record?
A. No objection.
Q. We'll do that at this point in the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 5, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE JOHN CANNON FEW, ADMITTED.]
Q. The Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly evaluated your criteria for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, study of previous screenings and check for economic conflicts of interest.

We received one affidavit filed in opposition to your election, which the Commission dismissed pursuant to JMSC Rule 13 for failure on its face to state allegations relating to your character, competency or ethics, as required by the JMSC rules. No witnesses are here to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make at this time?
A. No, sir.
Q. Well, with that, would you kindly answer the questions of our counsel.

MS. DEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the Members of the Commission. I have a procedural matter to take care of with this candidate, to begin with. EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Dean)
Q. Justice Few, you have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration and temperament. Are there any amendments you would like to make to this sworn statement.
A. No.

MS. DEAN: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I
would like to ask that Justice Few's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

SENATOR MARTIN: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, it will be entered into the record at this time.

MS. DEAN: Thank you.
[EXHIBIT 6, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE JOHN CANNON FEW, ADMITTED.]
Q. Justice Few, please explain one or two goals that you would like to accomplish if re-elected to the Supreme Court.
A. Well, I would -- I would like to -- I -- I have laid out in -- in great detail over a long period of time what my philosophy of -- of judging is. And I would like to dedicate myself to holding true to those philosophies, to work hard, to try to make the South Carolina Supreme Court the best servant that it can be to the people of South Carolina.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Justice Few, although you addressed this is your sworn affidavit, could you please further explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate
demeanor for a Supreme Court justice.
A. Well, the appropriate demeanor includes respect, allowing lawyers who appear before the court to have the freedom to argue the points that they would like to argue. But at the same time, engaging with -- with those lawyers in a discussion that is calculated to get the court, and sometimes get the lawyers, but certainly get the justices deeper into the analysis of what's going on before the court, so they can fully understand the issues, which in turn helps the -- the court get to the -the best way to resolve the issues, according to law.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Justice Few, the Commission received 1,064 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 92 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained many very positive statements, including "strongly qualified in all fields, best judge in the state, honest, fair, and thoughtful judge."

Twenty-five of the written comments express at least some level of concern. And some of these regarded judicial temperament during oral argument. Although you already kind of touched on that, would you like to respond to these ballot box concerns?
A. I don't have anything to say in response to that.
Q. Thank you. I now have some housekeeping questions. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. I have not.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
A. No.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. Not about my candidacy.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report? And are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. I do understand and I am aware of the penalties.

MS. DEAN: I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee reported that Justice Few is Qualified in the categories of constitutional qualifications, physical health
and mental stability. Committee found him Well Qualified in the remaining criteria.

I would just note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any questions by members of the Commission? Dean Wilcox.

MR. WILCOX: I don't have a question of the candidate, Mr. Chair. I just would like to on the record, as I have before, that Justice Few has, in the past, taught at the University of South Carolina School of Law, and I believe will continue to teach there next spring. And I hope we've worked that out with you. I have considered that in the past, and believe it has no impact on my ability to consider fairly.

SENATOR MARTIN: Justice Few, we appreciate your cooperation with our staff and just wish you all the best, as you continue to serve on the court. I'm sure it's been quite an experience thus far and hope all goes well. SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR MARTIN: Yes.
SENATOR MALLOY: I'd like to just congratulate Justice Few on his shortest screening ever.

JUSTICE FEW: I'm glad somebody noticed.
SENATOR MALLOY: He's a year or two younger than me, and so it could be a while before he will end up coming back. But just also want to put down about a long history of familiarity with each other and contact, going back to college.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much. This will conclude this portion of the process. As you know, the record will remain open until it's published. You may be called back at such time, if the need arises. I thank you again for offering and for your service to our state.

JUSTICE FEW: Thank you.
(Justice Few exits the room.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Have a seat. Judge it is good to see you.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Good morning.
SENATOR MARTIN: We are here on James
Edward Lockemy, seeking Court of Appeals,

Chief Judge, Seat 5. Will you raise your hand, take the oath.
(The judge is sworn in.)
EXAMINATION
(By Senator Martin)
Q. Thank you very much. Have you had an opportunity to review your PDQ?
A. I have before. I didn't do today, but I'm -- I'm sure it's fine.
Q. Very good. Do you object to us making it part of your sworn testimony?
A. No, I do not.
Q. It will be done at this point in the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 7, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE JAMES EDWARD LOCKEMY, ADMITTED.]
Q. We've received no affidavits in opposition to your election, no witnesses are present to testify. I got blank seating behind you. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make?
A. Only that $I$ guess I'm unique in the candidates, that I have appeared before this Commission, made up by many, many different people every decade of my judicial career, when I first went on in late '89, then twice in the 900 and first decade of
this century, and now here. So I'm very, very, very fortunate in my life to have been allowed to serve by the people of this state through their elected representatives on the bench. And I've done my best to make sure I have carried out justice, carried out the mandate of the law in this state now for 27 years. And I look forward to an opportunity with the approval of the elected representatives of this state to -- to become a -a -- the pinnacle of my career, which would be the chief judge of the Court of Appeals.
Q. All right, sir. Would you answer the questions of our able staff counsel?
A. Yes, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN: Senator from Darlington. SENATOR MALLOY: Before you start, I will say that Judge Lockemy, even though he was an At-Large judge, was the judge largely in my circuit during his early career, in my early career. Think I had one of his first major cases and probably his last major case too on the trial bench, and frequent encounters and contact.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: One reversed, one not. SENATOR MALLOY: That's exactly right.

They both were helpful. Just wanted to make certain of that contact. And I think we appeared recently over at the law school, speaking at the same time.

SENATOR MARTIN: Ms. Dean, will handle our questions.

MS. DEAN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, I have a procedural matter to take care of with this candidate to begin with.

EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Dean)
Q. Judge Lockemy, you have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments that you'd like to make at this time to your sworn statement.
A. No. I think that everything's in there. And I appreciate the opportunity to interview with you and others, to make sure we got everything.

Everything is in there that $I$ know of.
Q. Thank you, Judge.

MS. DEAN: At his time, Mr. Chairman, I'd
like to ask that Judge Lockemy's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any objections?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, it will be ordered.
[EXHIBIT 8, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE JAMES EDWARD LOCKEMY, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Lockemy, after serving seven years on the Court of Appeals, why do you now want to serve as chief judge?
A. As I mentioned earlier, I had served on the bench for 27 years and I have now been on the Court of Appeals for -- for eight years, and -- or elected eight years ago. And I have seen our court operate. I am much in awe of the hard work of all the judges there. I feel that as a chief judge of our court, I can promote collegiality among these hard-working, well-qualified judges. I can serve, as I said, the interest of justice.

I feel that I also, because of my background as being the chief executive of many organizations, including several within the military -- I was the
chief legal advisor, in charge of a staff of over 40 people in a hostile territory of Kosovo for over a year. I was executive -- chief executive of the National Guard Association, of thousands of people and over the board. And I've been the -- honored to be the chief -- or the president of the Circuit Judges' Association of our state.

So I've had varied experiences as being the manager, as being the chief, as being in charge, and I feel like it would benefit our court, work hard on our court and continue the legacy of so many of the ones in the past who have done a great job as chief.
Q. Thank you, Judge. And, Judge, you're kind of going in the direction. And could you please explain several goals that you would like to accomplish as chief judge?
A. Well, one is, I would like to make sure that our court operates collegiately and that the rules of our court are such that all the judges are involved in deciding those procedural rules. And if at some point in time we have a difference of opinion about how we should handle a motion or how we should handle assignment of cases, or this or that, and -and we'd have a vote, I would feel that the
majority of the court should control. And that even if I'm on the losing side, I would then support the choice of the court. And I feel that we need a person to lead us who the judges know will lead us, but also be with us, and I will be that way.

And I think that I also would have a great rapport with the legislature. Many of you I know, many of you I see when I'm not running for anything because I -- I feel that this is three branches -there are three branches of government, that we should be having check and balances and separate branches, but as human beings, all serving one purpose, and that is the interest of the people of our state, that we should be together and know each other and have cordial relations. And I think that I would be a good spokesperson for our court in that regard, as well as be a great representative to our Supreme Court, as 14-8-80, as well as the other sections of the chapter dealing with the responsibility of the chief judge.

I think that working with the Chief Justice, that I would make sure that our court operates efficiently and that we would get cases out, as one of the requirements of all of us as judges is to
make reports and to decide things fairly, but also within a reasonable period of time, and that would be done.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Although you addressed this in your sworn affidavit, could you please explain what you believe is the appropriate demeanor of a judge.
A. Well, I think -- and for those of you who have been in court with me before, $I$ think the demeanor of a judge should be one of -- of amicable control, meaning that you have in our system of justice in England and in America an advocacy system. And therefore you have at least two people, and sometimes more, who are opposing each other.

The role of the judge is to make sure that he or she is in control of the situation, so that each side has a fair opportunity to present their case to the judge or to a jury. And I think the judge is one that makes sure you have an ordered process, but a fair process, and one that doesn't prevent people, as lawyers and advocates, to present a full case within the Rules of Evidence, within the Rules of Procedure, for the fact-finder, for the decision-maker.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge Lockemy, the Commission received 690 ballot box surveys regarding you, with

73 additional comments. The ballot box survey contained comments stating "brilliant jurist and has a great temperament, treating everyone with respect and" --
A. Didn't know my sister was a lawyer.
Q. And the comments also highlighted your leadership skills. Eight of the written comments expressed some concerns, and some of those dealt with perceived favoritism. Just want to give you the opportunity to respond to any concerns about that.
A. No. And you had mentioned before when we interviewed, and I -- I cannot imagine that, because -- and I'm not sure how to respond to it. I -- I've done my best over my years on the bench, and not only on the bench, but as membership and leadership in other organizations to be as fair as I can.

I think human nature is, we all know human nature, that sometimes when you lose or when you're not successful or when things don't come out the way you feel they should, $I$ can only think that maybe some people feel that it must be because there was some favoritism. That's all I can imagine. Other than that, that's all I can respond to. I -- I -- I wish I had a video of every one of
my trials and -- and y'all could judge from that.
Q. Thank you, Judge. And now I just have some housekeeping questions. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No. But in two weeks I hope to, or two-and-a-half, whenever it is.
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, I'm not.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of this Commission about your candidacy?
A. No. I did -- I have said "hello" to many of you, as you know. And I did also stop by to Greenville, not to see Representative Bannister, but left a card saying "hello." But I didn't talk with him.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Did you get card?
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I did.
JUDGE LOCKEMY: Just said "hello."
Q. Do you understand that you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after

## the formal release of the Commission's report? And are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?

A. Yes.

MS. DEAN: I would note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee reported that Judge Lockemy is Qualified for the criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. Committee found him to be Well Qualified in the criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

I would just note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Lockemy were incorporated in the questioning today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any questions by members of the Commission? Dean Wilcox.

MR. WILCOX: Just a couple of quick questions. You are seeking your Ph.D. now in history; is that correct?

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Yes. I was admitted. I was very fortunate. I off the cuff had to
take the GRE exam, they told me, and I didn't know that. So I had to go do it, and I was accepted in the fall in the Ph.D. program in history at Carolina.

MR. WILCOX: Do you foresee that requiring time of you in a way that could interfere at all with your duties as chief judge?

MR. WILCOX: No, Dean. What I plan to do is take one course a semester at night. Right now I'm taking a course on Monday night. And so I would only have one course a night at night. Now as you know, the writing papers is more than that, but $I$ do not think that it will. Plus, if it did -- and I've considered this -- I plan to look at this, if I am fortunate enough to be selected to be chief judge, and if it does, I will stop. But I never take more than one course.

MR. WILCOX: Thank you. One other question, and this is more just to get my insight to the role of various things, and your judicial philosophy a little bit. But you have studied history a lot. I mean, obviously that's a passion of yours. How does
your knowledge and your work as a historian affect your work as a judge in terms of, when you look at cases and things, are the two completely separate ideas? Or would you know as a historian have a role in some manner and if so describe how it fits into your -JUDGE LOCKEMY: Amazingly, I -- I -- I
feel they're not. I mean, our -- our nation, we -- when we first began as a nation with the Declaration of Independence, we began with the law, because we felt we had to have a legal reason as to why we separated from Great Britain. And so I'll repeat Jefferson's words of we all have "certain unalienable rights, among these are" -- but we forget about the rest of it, talks about why we are leaving Great Britain and about the consent of the government and the legal reasons and the basis of why we should be a separate nation.

So as we began as a nation, we began with the issue of law. The problems that our national, whenever we've had major problems, is when the rule of law breaks down, and -and -- and that's also the problems of other nations, where we go and many of our citizens
die trying to incorporate the rule of law.
When I was in Kosovo, I used my -- my knowledge of history of how we argued against various things that help the Muslims and -and the Slavic people try to join together to say, especially the lawyers that were there, the importance of the rule of law in history, how it brought man, and man being the general sense of everybody, out of the wilderness into a society. And as a result of that, when I left Kosovo, I had a Muslim Albanian judge and a Slavic judge with their hands on each other -- each other's hand, and mine with it, saying we need to have a rule of law in Kosovo, and started the Kosovo Juris Society.

So I think the history of our -- of
mankind is so important in the rule of law, plus in our state. Do you know that after the Revolutionary War and as we got through the Articles of Confederation, as the Constitution was adopted, almost every state, except for two or three, elected judges by the legislature, because they felt the legislative body was the closest one to the people. And when the legislative body voted, all the
people were involved in voting.
Some states then, especially as the western states got admitted, went to the general election format, where they thought judges should also be going in popular election. I don't think that's worked well. South Carolina -- and I feel this all over the nation as $I$ speak with the ABA and other places -- we have adhered to the original principles as our country was founded, where when we -- when y'all vote that day when I'm there, if I lose or win, 90 -some percent of the people are going to be involved in the election of this judge through their elected representatives. So I do blend history and the law together.

MR. WILCOX: One final question, and that is --

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Without comment about common law, but we'll do that another time.

MR. WILCOX: One of the things that
lawyers talk about all the time is the need for judges not to forget what it's like to be a lawyer and to understand as you're deciding cases and rules and things, as to what the
realities of law practice are. You've been a judge for 27 years now. How do you keep yourself reminded of what it is that the lawyer is having to do in dealing with the client, and those kind of things?

JUDGE LOCKEMY: The lawyers, and you too, Dean, you never forget some of those things with the clients, especially when they try to take over and manage the case and you're doing your best to present a fair case. And I -- I will never forget some of the experiences I had as a -- as a lawyer. And also the judges who were understanding who had also practiced law and who knew what it was like to be in that -- that well, in the arena.

And plus, I also remember, though, that I'm probably the only judge who almost had a handcuff on me once by a judge because we were about to try a case and the solicitor decided to postpone it and I didn't want it postponed, had my witnesses ready, and they told me to have them all ready. And I asked the judge not to let them postpone it. The judge said the solicitor calls the case, Mr. Lockemy. And I said "But, Judge, got all the witnesses
over there." He said "Sit down, Mr. Lockemy." "But Judge, it's not fair." "Mr. Lockemy, life is not fair. Sit down." And I said, "But Judge, life is not fair, but the court should be." And all of sudden, the jury started applauding and oh, -- because they had been waiting all week for a trial and hadn't had the trial all week. And so he said "Sheriff." And so the Sheriff got the handcuffs and I said "Look, Judge, you've been very fair." And so that was it. But I remember those days, so I don't forget those. MR. WILCOX: Thank you. Mr. Chair. SENATOR MARTIN: Judge, let me add, you noticed that senator from Charleston, Senator Campsen is not with us today. He had to work. And if he were here, with your love of history and your response to Dean Wilcox about the founding and all that, he would ask you about the Federalist Papers. I've got his proxy, so I'm going to have to ask you about the Federalist Papers. JUDGE LOCKEMY: Which one, 10? SENATOR MARTIN: 58.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: There was no -- on 58.
SENATOR MARTIN: That's good. You won the prize. But I had to do that, just in jest, because the senator from Charleston, Senator Campsen, as the senator of Darlington will attest, he can cite the numbers of the Federalist cases. And your love of history, you might want to bone up on that, just before --

JUDGE LOCKEMY: I'm ready to discuss it with him mainly by Madison and by Hamilton and one or two by Jay, but mainly Hamilton and Madison.

SENATOR MARTIN: That's right. That will be good. He will be impressed. Representative Smith.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I will be more impressed if we could discuss the AntiFederalist Papers, Judge Lockemy.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Okay. We can do that too, and Randolph and -- but they weren't Randolph Federalist Papers, that's one of the problems. They themselves went around and tried to generate popular support.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Yes, sir. Let me
just say, I didn't realize in all the years in -- in times we've run across each other, your love of history. And I also was a history major and a government major and share that. I wish I had the time that you have been spending learning history and getting your Ph.D. I tell you, one thing the law has done to us is co-opted a lot of our time and family and --

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Well, Representative Smith, my desire is to get the Ph.D. certificate before I get the death certificate. I'm not sure I'm going to make it, but --

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: My faith is in you, Judge Lockemy.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Any other questions?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, Judge Lockemy, thank you so much. Appreciate your cooperation with our staff and your response to our questions. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Senator Martin, you didn't ask me this, but $I$ did want to make sure you are aware of this, because I've had that question asked of me by so many members of the legislature, are you using this as a stepping stone because it has been the last two have gone to the Supreme Court. And -and I'm letting you know now point blank, no. I want to be chief judge of the Court of Appeals, that is my life's desire and that will be the desire, that if I'm successful, that will be the -- the culmination of my career.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Well, I appreciate you sharing that with us. Thank you again for offering and for your willingness to continue to serve the people of South Carolina.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Thank you, sir. Thank y'all.
(Judge Lockemy exits the room.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Judge Thomas, it's good to see you.

JUDGE THOMAS: Nice to be here.
SENATOR MARTIN: We're here for Judge

Paula H. Thomas, Court of Appeals, Chief
Judge, Seat 5. Would you raise your hand and take the oath.
(The judge is sworn in.)
EXAMINATION
(By Senator Martin)
Q. Have you had the opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?
A. I have.
Q. Everything in order?
A. Everything's in order. There is only one item I wanted to -- to give you, because I realized that I had not submitted to Elizabeth Brogdon the paperwork for cards for $\$ 41.99$, Vistaprint. I just printed up cards that I'm leaving with little notes. So I wanted to go ahead and supplement at this time. And I apologize for not having supplemented earlier.
Q. No problem. Just give it to staff and add that to the record.
[EXHIBITS 9 and $9(A)$, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE PAULA H. THOMAS, ADMITTED.]
Q. The Judicial Merit Selection Commission has
thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria and received no affidavits filed in response to your election, which the Commission -- we received one. Let me go back. We received one affidavit filed in opposition to your election, which the Commission dismissed, pursuant to JMSC Rule 13 for failure on its face to state allegations sufficient, as required by JMSC rules. No witnesses are here to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make?
A. Just having served on this Committee in -- in the past, I thank you for your time and -- and dedication. I know it takes a lot of time. So thank you.
Q. Thank you. Would you answer staff counsel's questions? Ms. Brogdon.

MS. BROGDON: Good morning, Judge Thomas. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, I have a few procedural matters to take care of with this candidate.

EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Brogdon)
Q Judge Thomas, you have before you the sworn
statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement.
A. No.

MS. BROGDON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that Judge Thomas' sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any objections?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, it will be done at this time.
[EXHIBIT 10, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE PAULA H. THOMAS, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Thomas, after serving nine years on the Court of Appeals, why do you now want to serve as chief judge on the Court of Appeals?
A. Well, I'm -- I -- I love this court and I really have no aspirations to go to the Supreme Court. And -- and I feel like the last two chiefs that we have, while I'm flattered that you-all look to the Court of Appeals to -- to -- to rise up to the

Supreme Court level, for a period of time that they're leading the court, they also have their eye on another court. And I think the stability of a chief judge who wants to be a chief judge and no desires to go any further is timely now. I don't think it always has to be that way, but -- but the timing, because of the changes in our court, I could provide that and -- and would be delighted to do so.
Q. Thank you, Judge Thomas. How do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be effective as chief judge of the Court of Appeals?
A. And we're going all the way back to practice, where I was a small firm or an individual lawyer practicing. So I called myself almost like a GP. I did everything that came in the door. From there, I've gone to the Circuit Court bench, which generally has a broad -- broad civil and criminal background. So I've -- I've had experience in the area of Family Court, workers' comp. And then I've had experience in the area of all of criminal and civil.

There are some areas, such as administrative law court, that are newer to me, and -- and those
are areas that -- well, I prepare for all cases and -- and -- and read all cases and read the briefs, but just take a little extra preparation to get ready for those.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge Thomas, please explain several goals that you would like to accomplish if elected chief judge of the Court of Appeals.
A. Well, one of the things that $I$ would like to do is to add another courtroom. We have nine judges and -- and -- and they serve on three judge panels, but we only have two courtrooms. And if we could arrange another courtroom, preferably in the Calhoun Building, what it would basically mean is that there would be times when we are all there holding court, and we can overlap. And that allows for us to consider en banc and to actually sit en banc without having to bring more judges in on a -on a separate day.

It also allows for congeniality, because we -I mean, we are going to be able to get along and -and -- and have time together over lunches and things like that, so we have more social settings, that we're not making a special trip to be there. So I think that would be a great addition to the court.

We -- as far as -- as how we're moving cases, that type of thing, what it -- what we are doing now has maintained, and I would just continue in the process that -- that we're using at this time, because we have no backlog. We are actually bringing in pretty much the amount of cases that -that are coming out. Just want to make sure it doesn't bottleneck anywhere along the line.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge Thomas, you addressed this in your sworn affidavit, but could you please explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge.
A. Well, I think a judge should be courteous and professional at all times, should avoid the appearance of impropriety or -- or -- that -- that they -- that they could not be impartial. And I think that's not only while on the bench, but also off the bench. We're just held to a higher standard.
Q. Judge Thomas, the Commission received 484 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 41 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. "Judge Thomas has an excellent temperament on the Appellate Bench and is fair to all parties."

Another provided, "Judge Thomas has the experience, intelligence and work ethic required for this position. She is consistently courteous and fair to all parties." A third said, "Judge Thomas is the epitome of an Appellate Court judge. She always displays an even judicial temperament, no matter what the case or her personal opinions. She is always thoroughly prepared for each argument and participates in the discussion. She gives both sides the ability to explain their arguments and does not interrupt or act condescending. She generally rules based on the law in front of her and not based on her personal opinions."

Four of the written comments expressed concern. One comment questioned your leadership ability. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. That individual clearly does not know me, but I'll go back in time. I was the president of my senior class. I was on the legislative council when I was in law school. I have served in the House, House Seat 108. I have received awards for leadership. I have started the March of Dimes Walk in Georgetown. I was on the administrative board at my church. I guess I could go on and on. I was
awarded the Order of the Palmetto; mine says for Service and Leadership. Do you want anymore?
Q. Thank you, Judge Thomas. Another comment questioned your demeanor and whether you are fair and impartial. You've addressed that that is a goal of yours. Do you have anything else to add?
A. Nothing more to add.
Q. And finally, a comment mentioned that you look for procedural bars to avoid addressing appeals on the merits. Do you want to comment on that?
A. I would always prefer to rule on the merits. But we do have rules about procedure. In -- in other words, it has to have been -- it has to be preserved. So in order to be preserved, it has to have been raised and ruled on by the lower court. If not, then we really cannot consider it.
Q. Thank you, Judge Thomas. A couple of housekeeping questions. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No.
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. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission regarding your candidacy?
A. No, I haven't.
Q. And finally, do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report? And are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. Yes. Yes, I am.

MS. BROGDON: I would note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee reported that Judge Thomas is Well Qualified in the evaluative criteria 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 would also note that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Thomas were incorporated into the questioning today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any questions by members of the Commission? Dean Thomas.

MR. WILCOX: Judge Thomas, just two things. One is, I think we ought to allow Judge Thomas to correct Questions 12 of her sworn statement which says -- I think Spell Check got you -- "The Judicial Branch applies and interrupts the law."

JUDGE THOMAS: Oh, interrupts?
MR. WILCOX: I'm pretty sure she meant interprets --

JUDGE THOMAS: Oh, my heavens. Yes.
MR. WILCOX: -- and get rid of that. So those involved in judicial activism, and maybe read by others, so I'd suggest that correction.

JUDGE THOMAS: Thank you very much. And -- and -- and yes, I would request that correction, please, and my apology.

MR. WILCOX: A more substantive question: You mentioned in your statement that you agree with textual originalism in terms of doing that. Obviously, as an intermediate Appellate Court, you're going to have rulings where the Supreme Court of the United States has
interpreted a federal constitutional issue that may come before you, or the Supreme Court has interpreted. And I assume that those questions, you follow the precedent that's been set.

JUDGE THOMAS: We're required to follow the precedent that's been set, absolutely, yes, sir.

MR. WILCOX: But in a situation where you don't have a clear interpretation by a higher court, how do you go about determining what the textual, original meaning of the text was when you're faced with an issue like this? JUDGE THOMAS: Well with -- the words are of paramount importance, and -- and the words in their context really lend the meaning to -to whatever it is that I'm reading, whether it's the constitution or whether it's a statute.

And -- but what I believe textualism is, is that we would look at the definition of that word contemplated at the time that it was written. Now that doesn't mean that -- in other words, that word doesn't evolve into something else over time. It means what it
meant at the time it was written.
Now, if that then conveys a right, that right might end up affecting something that wasn't contemplated at the time. But the words and that meaning is what was contemplated at the time it was written. I hope I've made myself clear.

MR. WILCOX: Well, I guess, how do you decide what that was? I mean, I understand the idea that if we can make that determination, then we apply it. But obviously, you can't go back to 1895 and be at the convention, that kind of thing, for the state constitution. So how do you get to that point, where you feel comfortable that you are doing that?

JUDGE THOMAS: Well, because you can see in dictionaries and -- and things like that how words have evolved over time. So I -- I -- I would go as close in time as I possibly could to the meaning of the word at that time.

But it doesn't always -- I mean, we say our cardinal rule of statutory interpretation is that -- that we were going to ascertain and effectuate the meaning of a statute or the
meaning of -- of -- of a clause in a document. I really don't think that should be our cardinal rule. I think our cardinal rule is that we apply a plain meaning, and that's what I mean by textualism. That is our next step. MR. WILCOX: Appreciate it. Thank you. SENATOR MARTIN: Any other questions? (No response.)

SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, Judge Thomas, thank you very much. This concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. And you may, could be called back at such a time if the need arises. I thank you for offering and for your service to the people of the state.

JUDGE THOMAS: Thank you so much.
(Judge Thomas exits the room.)
SENATOR MARTIN: With that, we are going to before lunch -- we'll just stop here, if it suits everybody, and go into executive session and discuss how we want to proceed with the Appeals Court and the Supreme Court and legal issues related thereto. Any objection going into executive session?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, so ordered. We will shut the doors, letting everybody out that doesn't need to be in here.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
SENATOR MARTIN: I want to go back on the record. First will be the Commission's position on Justice Beatty.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair, I move that we find Justice Beatty qualified and nominated for Chief Justice.

MS. WALL: Second.
SENATOR MARTIN: All those in favor, please say aye.

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
SENATOR MARTIN: Opposed, no.
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: The ayes have it. Next will be The Honorable John Cannon Few for Supreme Court, Seat 2.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair, I move that we find Justice Few to be qualified and nominated for a full term for the Supreme Court.

MS. WALL: Second

SENATOR MARTIN: Have a motion and a second. Any discussion?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: All those in favor, please say aye.

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
SENATOR MARTIN: All those opposed.
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Ayes have it. Next will be The Honorable James Edward Lockemy.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair, I move that we find Judge James Lockemy qualified and nominated as chief judge, South Carolina Court of Appeals, Seat 5.

MR. HITCHCOCK: Second
SENATOR MARTIN: Have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Seat 5, chief judge.
Hearing none, moving the meeting into a vote.
All those in favor, please say aye.
COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
SENATOR MARTIN: Opposed, no.
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Ayes have it. Next, The

GARBER REPORTING SERVICE

Honorable Paula H. Thomas, Chief Judge, Seat 5, Court of Appeals.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman, move that we find Judge Paula Thomas qualified and nominated as a candidate for chief judge. SENATOR MARTIN: Have a second?

MR. WILCOX: Second.
SENATOR MARTIN: Have a motion and a second. All those in favor, please say aye. COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

SENATOR MARTIN: All opposed.
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Ayes have it. Thank you very much. We'll stand in recess while we eat lunch.
(Off the record.)
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Court Reporter's Legend:
dashes [--] Intentional or purposeful interruption
... Indicates trailing off
[ph] Denotes phonetically written
[sic] Written as said

SENATOR MARTIN: We're back on the record.
And we'll welcome Ms. Wanda L. Adams, Family Court 13th Judicial, Seat No. 3. Will you raise your hand and take the oath, Ms. Adams?

MS. ADAMS: I will.
WHEREUPON:
WANDA L. ADAMS, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR MARTIN: You've had the opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?

MS. ADAMS: I have.
SENATOR MARTIN: And anything need to be amended or corrected? Everything in order?

MS. ADAMS: Everything's in order.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Do you object to us making the summary of and any -- any amendments, thereto, part of the record of your sworn testimony?

MS. ADAMS: No problem.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. It will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 11 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF WANDA
L. ADAMS DATED MARCH 7, 2016)

SENATOR MARTIN: The Judicial Merit

Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your criteria -- or qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria. And we won't go through those. We received no affidavit in opposition to your election, no witnesses are here to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make at this time?

MS. ADAMS: Yeah. I'd just like to thank you for this opportunity to come before all of you. And I take this process, and I certainly view this position, very seriously. For this -- as you can see from the information you have before you, I have over thirty years of experience. I was just a baby when I started. But I think that I have a unique blend of experience that I -- that would be an asset to the Family Court bench.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. If you would answer our counsel's questions.

MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you. Good afternoon, Ms. Adams.

MS. ADAMS: Good afternoon.
MR. DAVIDSON: You have before you the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments that you would like to make at
this time?
MS. ADAMS: No. Well, there was -- there
was a --
MR. DAVIDSON: Any additional amendments? MS. ADAMS: Yeah, a minor amendment to the financial statement. I added a credit card. And I do have that --

MR. DAVIDSON: Correct. And we have that, thank you.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that Ms. Adams sworn statement be entered as an exhibit.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Without objection, it will be ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 12 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF WANDA L. ADAMS DATED MARCH 7, 2015)

MR. DAVIDSON: Could you please state for the record, the city and circuit in which you reside?

MS. ADAMS: It's Greenville County, in the State of South Carolina.

MR. DAVIDSON: I note that, based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ which has been included in the record, with the candidate's consent, Ms. Adams meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.

EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON:
Q. Ms. Adams, will you please explain to the Commission why you would like to serve as a Family Court judge, and how you feel your legal and professional experience, thus far, would assist you to be an effective judge.
A. Well, as I indicated earlier, my experience goes back over thirty years when $I$ started as a social worker with the Greenville County Department of Social Services. So I have a heart for families and children. And -- and I saw some things, while working as a social worker, that led me to want to further my education, and hopefully, be able to contribute more to the -- to the lives of families and children in our community. Which is why I chose to go to law school after working as a social worker for about eight years.

And I came back to my community, Greenville, opened my practice there, where I continue to practice, primarily in Family Court. And I must say, I've probably handled every kind of case that can be handled in that court. Even an adult adoption, which we weren't sure that could be done. But we did it. And -- and so -- again, I -- my passion is there. And I think that -- again, with my many years of experience, I think I would bring to the bench, the ability to see things that maybe somebody else
wouldn't see, again, because of the social work experience as well as the many years of Family Court practice.

Right now I'm employed by the 13th Circuit Solicitor's Office. And I've been there a little over ten years, now. I started that position as a juvenile prosecutor, and I found myself to be very effective in -in that position as well. Because sometimes, you know, with -- with juveniles, we can't -- we can't deal with them the way we deal with adults, even when criminal offences are involved. So, again, I -- and I -- I think that I also bring a great deal of compassion. I'm soft, but I get the job done. And -- and I -- again, I think that all of these traits would be an asset to -- to the Family Court.
Q. Thank you. Are there any areas of the law that you would need to additionally prepare for in order to service as a judge, and if so, how would you handle that additional preparation?
A. Well, because I'm -- with the past ten years of being with the solicitor's office, I would certainly need to brush up on the area of a divorce -- you know, areas like that. But it certainly would not take me long to do that.
Q. Thank you. Could you please explain what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. I believe the appropriate demeanor is one of
fairness. The Family Court is a peoples' court. A lot of these people come into this court, and they're not represented. And so you -- you know, you have to be careful that you maintain control and a great deal of decorum in the court. But also, people need to feel that their voices are being heard. And in order to do that, again, you must be fair to -- to all parties that appear in that court.
Q. Thank you. What suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the Family Court docket?
A. Well, I -- now, in -- when I was in private practice, I used what I call the "Tickler System" to make sure I stayed on top of what needed to be done. And I've found that to be very effective in moving cases along as quickly as possible. And I -- I think that, right now, we're -- with the backlog, I think a lot of it is just because of maybe poor communication. Lawyers have to -- to get together and talk. And I think that greatly facilitates settlement before contested hearings have to even be scheduled. And I -- and I think that anything we can do to improve that process will greatly decrease the backlog.
Q. Could you please briefly describe your experience in handling complex contested Family Court matters? And, specifically, discuss your experience with the financial

## aspects of Family Court work.

A. Well, again, when $I$-- when $I$ was in private practice, $I$ handled very complex -- a number of very complex cases, particularly in divorce. One case that comes to mind, immediately, is one where there was a marriage of $25-\mathrm{plus}$ years, three children. There was a great disparity of -- in income to these two parties, so it required almost three days of litigation. But, you know, we -- we were able to -- to resolve this; although, it was very contentious, in a way that both parties walked away and at least felt that things were fair. And I --
Q. You would --
A. I'm sorry.
Q. No, please continue.
A. And I -- and I've also handled some very complex adoption cases. As I mentioned the adult adoption, and that one involved an elderly lady who came to me and she had relief -- relinquished a child at birth. Well, she later -- she and this adoptive -- adopted child were reunited, and -- and it was her wish that she not die before they were legally united. And that was some -- of course, some issues involved, but we were able to get that done for her.
Q. Thank you for those responses. Ms. Adams, the Commission received 95 ballot box surveys regarding your
candidacy, with 14 additional comments. The surveys, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"She is an excellent attorney who has great temperament and good judgement. She would make a very good Family Court judge."

Two of the written comments expressed concerns. One comment stated that your only limitation is a lack of domestic relations experience. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Well, of course, not knowing who wrote that, my response would be that -- that this was probably from someone who has -- who did not know me before, maybe, coming to the solicitor's office. So would not -certainly would not be aware of -- of my experience in the Family Court. But other than that, that's --
Q. Thank you.
A. -- about all I can...
Q. At this time, I'm going to run through a number of quick questions. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. I have not.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on

## your behalf?

A. No.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or a commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. I am.
Q. Thank you.

MR. DAVIDSON: I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee found Ms. Adams to be Qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. She was found Well Qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. I note that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporate into my -- incorporated into my questioning today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Thank you very
much. Any questions by members of the Commission?
(No response.)

SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none. Ms. Adams, thank you so much.

MS. ADAMS: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: This concludes this portion
of the screening process. As you know, the record will
remain open as --
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry, I
-- I would like to -- to go down the line that Dean Wilcox did, the last time we had the conference, if he doesn't mind. He's sort of quiet since he -- but we asked questions about whether positions, as it relates to children that came before the court, whether they should be in handcuffs. Maybe the Dean would -- would oblige us, and go down that -- that same line of questioning.

MR. WILCOX: You're asking me to remember I asked --

SENATOR MARTIN: He can't remember what he had for dinner, last.

SENATOR MALLOY: He remembers.
EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. There were other questions raised, and I know there's been legislation efforts and things, but regarding the appearance of juveniles in court. And as a solicitor, you have been on that side. And there was a lot of concern of the -- bringing juveniles into court in shackles and
things. And I just -- real quick, your personal sense of what the appropriate lines there are between safety and -and understanding that these are juveniles that you're presenting, and not wanting to put juveniles into a position that we may put adults in, in the court system.
A. Personally, it has always been very -- very disturbing to see these young people handcuffed, shackled. But I had to come to recognize that, for safety reasons, sometimes it's necessary. Now, I want to also be mindful, that there is a very small fraction of these juvenile offenders who we had to handle in that way. The majority of them come in from the street, so that -- that's not a concern.

But what we're seeing now is -- and these are some things that $I$ never thought that we would see -- but, you know, we're dealing now with some gang activity. But we're also dealing with some mental health issues that some of these young people are -- they don't even yet know how to deal with. And so sometimes, you know, these -- these are the measures we have to take, just for the protection of everyone. I wish it could be done better. But, unfortunately, that's just where we are right now.
Q. Well, I can follow-up. When it comes to whether it's sentencing, or some alternative form of punishment, what is your perspective on determining the appropriate
punishment for a -- particularly when you're dealing with, say, a 14-, 15-year-old who may not be quite in the same age as a seven -- 16, 17. But, you know, sending them to DJJ may be quite a different experience from sending them to a Marine camp, or something, those kind of things, where it can be alternative punishment. So give me -- can you give me a little bit of your thoughts, as to what a judge can do, particularly in that regard?
A. I certainly can. As I indicated earlier, I am of the belief that you cannot deal with juveniles the way you deal with adult offenders. And -- and that's largely because of their maturity, or lack of maturity. Also with young people, you can't deal with them in a isolated situation; families have to be brought in. So, therefore, you -- you have to be creative in some of the sentencing that you come up with, 'cause you -- your focus should be rehabilitation versus punitive.

And I'll give you an example. There was a young man that we were dealing with, his mother was his -- always been a very strong advocate for him. But he continued to act out. And finally, she came to court one day, and she said I -- you know, "I'm done with him. There's nothing else $I$ can do with him. You take him." Meaning, the court system. And I was a little bit taken aback because of my previous experience with her. Like I say, she had always
fought for him, while at the same time holding him accountable.

Well, what $I$ was able to determine is that the family was -- was going through some things, financially, he was acting out as a result of it. The mother felt that placing him in the custody of the State, or the court system, would ensure that he would have a roof over his head. So that was certainly not the situation where punishment was appropriate there, even though he had been acting out at school and given the community a fit. Well, we were able to tailor a plan for this family, where everybody's needs were met. And we never saw him again.

So -- you know, so those are the kinds of things that, you know, we -- we have to look at, in dealing with -- with some of these young people. You just have to go deeper.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman, one last
question.
SENATOR MARTIN: The senator from
Darlington.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. And so as we move forward, I've been involved with sentencing reform for a period of time. And you don't have any objections to alternative sentencing, as it relates to young -- to young people?
A. Not at all.
Q. And I'm particularly interested in raising the age from 17 up -- like 41 other states have -- have done. Do you have experience that you -- in the court where -where you would see -- I guess, in certain situations, in the Family Court, that waive these folks -- waive children up to the adult court? And you -- do you have a viewpoint on -- on how we're handling that now, and how -- how you would like to see that?
A. Well, Senator Malloy, I've seen it from both ends, from being at the solicitor's office, and, of course, from the Family Court.
Q. And I'm not asking you to speak on the --
A. Oh, no.
Q. -- legislation. I'm just asking you --
A. Right.
Q. -- to speak on -- on how -- how you handled it in court, in your role from being a solicitor, and now going on to the Family Court.
A. Well, again, my -- my personal philosophy is -is, you know, each case needs to be looked at, individually. You've got to, again, look at, you know, this -- this -- this young person's history.
Q. Keep going.
A. History with the court, or lack of history;
severity of the crime they've been charged with, and -- and you -- and the -- personally, I also look at the support system. And I've been able to tailor plans that I think work from both sides. I have no problem remanding from the -- from the solicitor's office, down to Family Court, when I feel it's appropriate. And I think that most solicitors would agree with me, that a charge has to be pretty serious to waive it up.

## Q. And the last thing: You've got your sister is the

 one visiting with you?A. Oh, I'm sure she'd appreciate that. This is my mother, Julia Adams, my rock. Thank you for acknowledging her.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you for doing that, senator from Darlington. I was going to ask. And I failed to do that earlier. Everybody good? Anyone have any questions?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Well, thank you very much for your cooperation with our staff --

MS. ADAMS: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: -- and for being as
forthcoming in your response to the Commission today. Know that you could be called back -- I doubt there'd be a need for it -- until the report is issued. I'll remind you of
the 48-hour rule. Thank you for offering. And I thank you for your willingness to serve.

MS. ADAMS: Thank you so much.
SENATOR MARTIN: Best wishes.
MS. ADAMS: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: We have with us, today, Mr.
Thomas Tredway Hodges, in the Family Court, 13th Judicial Circuit, Seat 3. Welcome. Do you have someone you'd like to introduce to us?

MR. HODGES: Yes, sir. This is my wife
Erroll Anne Hodges.
SENATOR MARTIN: Welcome. Glad to have you with us.

MR. HODGES: We celebrated our 28th
anniversary this past Saturday.
SENATOR MARTIN: Well, congratulations.
MR. HODGES: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Congratulations. Would you
please raise your hand and take the oath.
WHEREUPON:
THOMAS TREDWAY HODGES, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR MARTIN: You've had the opportunity
to review your personal data questionnaire?
MR. HODGES: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: Everything in order?
MR. HODGES: Yes. The only amendment, I
would think is, when I filled this out I hadn't spent any money on the campaign. I still haven't spent much, maybe about fifty dollars. But other than that...

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. That's good enough. Do you object to our making this summary part of the written testimony --

MR. HODGES: No, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: -- the testimony in your record? It will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 13 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THOMAS
TREDWAY HODGES DATED MARCH 2, 2016)
SENATOR MARTIN: The Judicial Merit
Selection Commission has thoroughly evaluated -- or investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria. We've received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, no witnesses here to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make?

MR. HODGES: Very briefly. Just thank y'all for the opportunity to be here. I know it's been a long
day, so far, and will probably continue to be a long day. SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much. Would you kindly answer Mr. Davidson's questions.

MR. DAVIDSON: Good afternoon, Mr. Hodges.
You should have before you, the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments that you'd like to make at this time?

MR. HODGES: No.
MR. DAVIDSON: I'd ask that Mr. Hodges sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record at this time, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any objections?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, it will be entered into the record at this time.
(EXHIBIT NO. 14 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
COMMISSION SWORN TESTIMONY OF THOMAS TREDWAY
HODGES DATED MARCH 2, 2016)
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you.
MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Hodges, please state for
the record, the city and circuit in which you reside.
MR. HODGES: I live in Greenville. And
that's the 13th Circuit.

MR. DAVIDSON: 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. Hodges meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.

EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON:
Q. Mr. Hodges, would you please explain to the Commission why you would like to serve as a Family Court judge, and how do you feel your legal and professional experience, thus far, will assist you to be an effective judge.
A. Sure. I believe the Family Court judge is probably the hardest position in the judiciary; people are coming before the court at their most vulnerable times, and, possibly, the most stressful times of their lives. And the judge is making a decision that's going to impact them, potentially, for the rest of their lives, and impact what may be the most important thing to them; and that's their family.

And at the risk of sounding immodest, I think I would be a good judge, and be able to make those decisions for the people. I believe that I have the education, the experience, and demeanor to be a good judge. And from a selfish standpoint, if -- I believe if you're good at
something, you enjoy doing it. And -- and so there would be that motivation as well.

But my experience -- I've practiced in family law, exclusively, for the last 13 years. Before that, I was a labor lawyer; both areas of law, you practice in, with people who are in very stressful situations. I believe I've developed -- maybe not developed, and maybe it's innate -- but an ability to calm people down, to allow them to listen to me, to take my advice, to work them through these situations that are stressful. And I believe I can exemplify that same ability from the court -- from the bench.
Q. Thank you. Are there any areas of the law that you would need to additionally prepare for in order to serve? And how would you handle that additional preparation, if so?
A. Two areas that I -- I don't practice in, and it's been a conscious decision, one is juvenile justice. And that, I believe, is a criminal matter. I don't feel like you should dabble in areas where you don't have expertise. And criminal matters, I believe, are separate than Family Court matters, in the sense of there's different procedural issues, different rights. That, I believe, should be left to a criminal lawyer.

The other area is adoptions. And that, I
believe, is a sub-specialty of Family Court/family law. The people who do adoptions in my neck of the woods, that's what they specialize in. I've had some limited experience in witnessing statements where they release their parental rights. But I don't have people come to me, generally, and asking, you know, "We'd like to adopt a baby."

There are situations where I've had adoptions; I've referred them to one of these professionals that's, you know, specialized in that area. And part of the reason is, again, I don't think I should dabble in something that I'm not that familiar with.

As far as becoming experienced in it, I think in the short period of time before I took the bench, I could associate with somebody, to get an understanding of how that process works, from beginning to end, and then observe court proceedings, or even associate with the lawyer doing that.
Q. Could you please explain what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. Well, I think a judge needs to be firm and fair, open-minded. A judge has to be able to listen and get his attention -- polite -- and a judge has to be decisive. Those situations where people come into court -- as I said, they're under stressful circumstances. The litigants, in my belief and experience, want to know that the judge took
the time to listen to them, and they weren't -- or the judge wasn't distracted by, you know, papers on his desk, or, you know, e-mails or whatever, but they looked the person in the eye and they listened to what they had to say. That person may not like the judge's decision, but they're going to walk out of the courtroom knowing that "this person gave attention to my case, to my situation, you know, considered everything $I$ had to say, and made a fair decision."
Q. What suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the Family Court docket?
A. In Greenville, we've done a pretty good job of taking care of a lot of that backlog. Specifically, I think mediations has helped. And Greenville was one of the first counties -- you know, pilot counties to do mediations. And I understand they're statewide now.

I think in Greenville -- and this isn't to point fingers at anybody -- but we start court at 9:30. You know, it could start earlier, start at 8:30 or nine. And then on Fridays, I know that they typically end court at twelve. But there's always an on-duty judge. And I -- you could have a court reporter there, at least on Friday afternoons, you could take care of a lot of at least uncontested cases, you know, where people could call up, and say, "Hey, can you get me in?" And they could take
care of the case right there.
It used to be the practice that, on Fridays, in docket, they would have a list where you could just sign up for a time. I don't know why they stopped doing that. But that was very convenient for litigants and the lawyers, and, I think, for the court too. You know, you might file a case on Monday, that's an uncontested case, and could complete it by Friday. So it's -- it's really just more of an efficiency approach than anything else.
Q. Lastly, could you please briefly describe your experience in handling complex contested Family Court matters? And, specifically, discuss your experience with the financial aspects of Family Court work.
A. I've handled cases where people have had millions of dollars, to where they've had virtually nothing. It's been my experience that the more somebody has, the more they seem to want to protect what they have. And a lot of times, those high-dollar cases are the ones that you do the last amount of work on, because the parties know what they want to do.

And complex cases, in terms of financial situations, like I say, I've had cases where they've had millions of dollars. I've had cases where someone's inherited millions of dollars. So that's not on the table, but it impacts how you divide the property that is on the
table.
I've tried numerous custody cases. One lasted four or five days, that was, you know, very complex, involving DSS allegations and allegations of sexual abuse and -- you know, some really emotional, bad things. You know, I -- I've handled -- you know, I've had a 15-minute trial to, like I said, a four- or five-day trial.
Q. Thank you for those responses. The Commission received 106 ballot box surveys regarding your candidacy, with 14 additional comments. The surveys, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"A highly intelligent individual with an extraordinary ability to quickly grasp, analyze, and decipher legal issues, no matter now complex. He's an experienced practitioner, and has local ties. Is extremely bright and hardworking."

One of the comments -- one of the written comments expressed concerns. The negative comment questioned your work ethic, stating:
"As a lawyer, he does good work, but never seems to want to expend the effort to do great work."

What offer -- what response would you offer to the Commission?
A. Well, I don't know what standard this person is holding me to. I don't know that they know that I'm a solo
practitioner, and I do more than practice law. I do my own billing. I do my own administrative work -- you know, anything involving the non-legal aspect of it. I don't know, you know, the specifics of what -- what situation they're talking about. It could very well be that someone thought, maybe, I should take a deposition and I decided not to. But if that's the situation, I have to be mindful of my client's resources, you know. And -- and I don't necessarily churn a case and work it, just to work it. You know, I work the case to the benefit of my client, and to get them the best result.

But $I$ can say this: If there's any concern about my work ethic, I'll be the hardest-working Family Court judge you've ever seen.
Q. Thank you. At this time, I'm going to ask a series of quick questions. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No.
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.
Q. Since submitted your letter of intent to run for
this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. No.
Q. Do you understand you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. I do. And I am.
Q. Thank you.

MR. DAVIDSON: I would note that the Upstate
Citizens Committee found Mr. Hodges to be Well Qualified for each of the following evaluative criteria; that is, ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial
temperament, and Qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability.

Mr. Chairman, I would note that any concerns raised during the investigation were incorporated into my questioning today. No further questions.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Any questions by members of the Commission? Senator from Darlington. SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, sir.

EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. I just wanted -- I'm always interested in family -- perspective Family Court judges' positioning on
alternative sentencing as it relates to juveniles. It seems as though that we've addressed sentencing reform here in our state, and I'm always concerned about juvenile justice, and what happens when you have -- which I think is the hardest part of being a Family Court judge is having children. And what's your thoughts on alternative sentencing, and that kind of thing, for -- for children that have been -- that are being sent to DJJ?
A. Well, I think any program that would keep someone out of -- out of jail, or -- or some other -- you know, place or -- or something to that effect, is worthwhile and worth pursuing. You know, kids make mistakes. And I don't know all of the -- all the statistics, but I'm aware that there's some scientific basis to support the fact that maybe males don't develop, emotionally, and maturely until about their mid-twenties.

So there's -- you know, it would -- it would be a huge disservice, I think, to put a kid in jail, and it's going to affect him the rest of his life, unless it was deserved. You know, the specific facts, I guess, would -would determine whether or not that's the case.

But, you know, my political feelings on that, I think -- you know, I'm -- I'm to follow the law. Y'all tell me what the law is. You know, if it's one chance, two chance, three chances that y'all tell the judges that's
what you're supposed to do, then that's what we'll give them. And at some point in time, I guess, those chances run out.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Any other
questions?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, Mr. Hodges,
we thank you. This concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. And you could be called back if -- if there's a question, or the need arose.

Thank you for offering, and for your
willingness to serve.
MR. HODGES: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you.
MR. HODGES: Y'all have a great day.
SENATOR MARTIN: You too.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Welcome.
MS. HOWARD: Hey, good morning -- or good
afternoon.
SENATOR MARTIN: We have Kimberly Boan
Howard with us, Family Court, 13th Judicial Circuit, Seat 3. It's good to have you with us. Do you have someone
you'd like to introduce to us?
MS. HOWARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In the back
is my husband, Billy Howard. He came up from Greenville -or came down from Greenville with me today.

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, we're glad you're
here. Welcome.
Would you raise your hand and take the oath. WHEREUPON:

KIMBERLY BOAN HOWARD, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR MARTIN: Have you had the
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire? MS. HOWARD: Yes, sir. I have.

SENATOR MARTIN: Everything in order?
Anything need to be amended?
MS. HOWARD: No, sir. I have submitted one amendment. But other than that, no, sir, everything has -has already been submitted to the Commission.

SENATOR MARTIN: Do you object to our making this summary, and any amendments, part of the record of your sworn testimony?

MS. HOWARD: I do not.
(EXHIBIT NO. 15 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF

## KIMBERLY BOAN HOWARD DATED MARCH 7, 2016)

(EXHIBIT NO. 16 - AMENDMENT TO PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE DATED APRIL 19, 2016)

SENATOR MARTIN: Okay. The Judicial Merit
Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria, that you are familiar with. We've had no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, no witnesses are present to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make?

MS. HOWARD: Yes, your -- yes, Your Honor. Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right.
MS. HOWARD: I just want to thank y'all for having me here today. It's a pleasure to be before the Commission. I went to law school with the intentions, knowing that $I$ wanted to go into public service, and went in as a prosecutor -- ended up being a prosecutor, and have been for my career. And when I started in my practice, in Family Court, I started practicing there, it was almost the same, immediate knowing that, that's what $I$ wanted to do, one day, would be to pursue a position on the Family Court bench. So I'm thrilled to be here today, and happy for the opportunity. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR MARTIN: If you would answer
questions by Mr. Davidson, our staff counsel.
MS. HOWARD: Thank you.
MR. DAVIDSON: Good afternoon. You should
have before you, the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time?

MS. HOWARD: No, sir.
MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman, I would ask
that Mrs. Howard's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the record.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any object?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, the sworn
statement will be entered into the record at this time.
(EXHIBIT NO. 17 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF KIMBERLY BOAN
HOWARD DATED MARCH 6, 2016)
MR. DAVIDSON: Mrs. Howard, please state for
the record, the city and circuit in which you reside.
MS. HOWARD: I live in Greenville, South
Carolina. And it's the 13th Circuit.
MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you. 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, Mrs. Howard meets the statutory requirements for this position, regarding age, residence, and years of practice.

EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON:
Q. Mrs. Howard, could you please explain to the Commission why you would like to serve as a Family Court judge, and how do you feel your legal and professional experience, thus far, will assist you in being an effective judge?
A. Yes, sir. I think -- and as in my sworn statement, that of all the courts -- all of our courts of law are important. But to me, Family Court is one of the most important. You have your average, everyday person that comes into that court, fighting for, most times, one of the most important things facing them in their life: Either their children, their liberty, or their finances. And for most of us, and for me and everybody else in the room, those are three of the most important things to us.

And upon starting practice in Family Court, I realized right away that you needed -- that there needed to be a judge that had compassion -- the compassion, but also the energy and the -- I guess, the ability to be able to handle the stressful -- the emotionally stress -- straining things that come before the court. And I felt like, and
feel like, I have those characteristics, that it's something I would be able to handle.

And it is -- like I said in my opening statement, I have -- I always felt a calling to serve the community and in doing my capacity as a prosecutor. And I know that being elected to the judicial bench is also a high honor, but it's also a continuation of service to the community, to the state, and, specifically, for this seat to Greenville County. And I feel like it's -- you know, just an intangible thing to say is, that I -- I feel like it's a -- the fit for me. And I knew it, immediately, upon practicing down there. And knew that I would pursue it, one day, when $I$ was, you know, qualified constitutionally and everything.
Q. Thank you. Are there any areas of the law that you would need to additionally prepare for in order to serve as a judge, and if so, how would you handle that additional preparation?
A. Yes, sir. I have spent my time -- my career as a prosecutor. And in that capacity, I also ran our juvenile justice unit, and did that for several years. I've also worked on DSS -- worked on abuse and neglect cases, as well as domestic violence cases. Now, that has been in the capacity as a prosecutor. So most of the private stuff that is handled down in -- that's handled in Family Court
are areas that I would need -- I feel like I would need additional training and continuing education.

I have -- upon thinking that this was the right timing, and putting my name in and preparing to run for this judicial spot, I have started to do some of that. I have met with our local DSS attorneys, making sure that I am up-to-date on their time lines and their procedures and -- and how they do business, as well as, I've attended several CLEs.

I've done the mandatory six-hour training for the guardian ad litem training, as well as started talking with some of the local judges on our bench, about shadowing them or -- and going in and observing the temporary hearings and the different hearings that $I$ have not handled in my time as a -- you know, as a prosecutor and as a lawyer.

So I would continue to do that. I think
continued legal education is important for everyone, and that is something that I would continue to do. And just -you know, I -- I don't feel like your training is ever done, no matter what your background is. So I plan to continue in that.
Q. Could you please explain what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. I think a judge should be compassionate and kind; however, know the time and the place when it's time to be
firm, and when it's time to stand strong in their decision and their ruling. I think fairness a lot of times trumps everything, other than, obviously, staying legally sound.

I think a judge needs to have knowledge of the law, and know -- and be prepared for every case coming before him, or her, that day in the courtroom. I also feel like a judge should be approachable, and should make everyone in the courtroom feel comfortable -- everybody is in there, and it's their day, it's their -- it's their time in court -- and have the patience to hear out -- hear everyone out, hear all the parties, listen to the litigants. But also at the same time, balancing that with able -- with being able to do it efficiently and diligently.
Q. What suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the Family Court docket?
A. Well, this is something I, on a much smaller scale, have a little bit of experience with. When I went to Family Court, my former -- the former solicitor that was my boss at the time, Solicitor Ariail, asked me to go and run our juvenile justice unit. And it was a little backlogged at the time, a little inefficient, and the organization and the communication with some -- with the other agencies -- DJJ, the clerk's office, DSS -- did not run as smoothly as he wanted it to. So I -- I have some --

I have some familiarity with going down and making -taking a docket and the process in a -- and the way that things run within a certain section of the court system, helping it run smoothly, and finding more ways to make it more efficient.

I think that one of the things that has helped so far has been mandatory mediation as well as the 365 Rule. I'm not saying that there's not backlog in Family Court, because there is backlog, probably, across the board; but those things have helped relieve some of the tension that comes with all of the cases coming through there. I know our local DSS, they have policies in place that are -- the timelines are a little more constrained than that -- that are statutorily defined. And they do that to give them some breathing room, in the hopes that it could move the cases along.

But first and foremost, one of the things I think that has to happen, and has to stay ongoing and evolving, is the communication and the cooperation amongst all the parties down there -- or in Family Court. The judicial bench, the private lawyers, the Solicitor's Office, DJJ, DSS -- everyone involved down there has to have an open line of communication, because everybody's vying for court time. And I think one of the most important things to do is occasionally sit those parties down, and sit the
representative -- representatives of those agencies down, and brainstorm.

And as for the -- as for the private docket, I know in Berkeley -- and I believe Charleston is one of the other jurisdictions -- that they do more of a block scheduling. And I'm not suggesting that, that is necessarily the answer for Greenville's scheduling, but it's something that we could sit down with the lawyers and discuss, to see if there's a way to keep that docket rolling so that it might open up more time for DSS, or orders of protection, or some of the other things that get backlogged more frequently.
Q. Thank you. Lastly, please briefly describe your experience in handling complex contested Family Court matters. And specifically, discuss your experience with the financial aspects of Family Court work.
A. I have not handled any -- anything that was -that's financial in nature in the Family Court. With complex matters, I would say with the juvenile justice system, the most complicated thing you handle, other than the volume of cases that come through, would be the waiving -- the times it comes up, where you're attempting to waive a judicial up to General Sessions court. I have handled two of those, and am actually in the process of handling another one right now.
Q. Thank you. The Commission received 140 ballot box surveys regarding your candidacy, with 34 additional comments. The ballot box surveys, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"A superb lawyer who would discharge the demands of a Family Court with great skill, humility, and class. She is an ideal candidate for this position. She has extensive experience in the Family Court, as a prosecutor. And her career as an assistant solicitor has proven that she has the intellect, work ethic, and demeanor to be a wonderful judge."

Thirteen of the written comments expressed concerns. Eight of those comments indicated concerns about a lack of experience in Family Court. What response would you offer to those concerns?
A. Yes, sir. I -- I know there is the -- since I have not handled the private side, I anticipated those comments coming in to the Commission. And one thing I would say is, while that is a good portion of things that are handled in Family Court, you can't discount how much and how important the other cases on the, I guess, public or institutional docket are coming -- that are coming through there.

In eleven years as a prosecutor, every day that I go to court -- that I go to my office, I've seen -- have
thousands of files come across my desk. And every day, I go in there, and I pick a case, and you're evaluating the file. And you're not evaluating it from one side; you have to look at not necessarily what's best for the victim, not necessarily what's best for law enforcement, not necessarily what's best for the state, or even the defendant or what the defense attorney wants. And you have to evaluate that from the front end.

And as a prosecutor, I'm not the final decisionmaker; that is obviously the judge. But ethically, I'm responsible for vetting my case and making sure that -that there's enough legal basis for it to go forward, and that it's the fair and right thing to do, and make a fair and right decision.

And while, you know, there is several legal matters I have not handled, that are handled in Family Court, I believe that the skill learned over the past eleven years of -- of case evaluation and evaluating a case from each side, and from all -- you know, all angles, in trying to come up with a fair and just resolution, is not a skill that can be learned overnight. You know, I -- I think -- I was told I did -- I think I did very well on the test. I think I have the ability to learn the material that comes to Family Court, that I have not handled before. And I, you know, would give it my all in learning that, and
making sure that -- that $I$ am ready every time that something comes before me in the courtroom.

But as for the ability to evaluate and look at a case from all sides and -- you know, sometimes what is right is not what always feels good. And I've learned that over the course of, you know, eleven -- close to eleven years.
Q. Thank you. Two comments questioned your timeliness in addressing matters. Briefly, how would you respond to that -- those concerns?
A. First, I would say that I am always accessible. I give out to the defense bar and -- and anyone in the court, everybody always has my cell phone and my e-mail. I try to be accessible at all times. But it -- you know, like, as of recently, about six months ago, I was carrying a docket of 800 warrants. We are under a docketing system that was in place before Langford and some of the other court rulings, and things that come out, and it keeps us within a certain time frame. I try my best to be timely, to respond to matters, to be professional and diligent. Occasionally, there might be something that is out my control.

When it comes to witness availability, or a codefendant availability, or someone's on bench warrant status, a lot of those. But for the -- for the most part,
and in all matters, $I$ try to be diligent and timely in handling those.
Q. Thank you.

MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman, at this time, I'd like to request that we go into executive session.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Without
objection?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: You need to ask everybody except the candidate. And, of course, Mr. Howard can stay. (Off-the-record executive session.)

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. We'll be back on the record. Mr. Davidson?

RE-EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON:
Q. At this time, I'm going to ask a series of quick questions. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
A. No, sir.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for
this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. No, sir. I have not.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or a commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. I am aware.
Q. Thank you.

MR. DAVIDSON: I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee found Mrs. Howard to be Well Qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, and judicial temperament. She was found Qualified as to experience, constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability.

In summary, the Committee stated, "This candidate has not had experience participating in divorce cases in Family Court. This is the only reason the Committee did not find her Well Qualified."

I note that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding this candidate were incorporated into my questioning today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Any question by members of the Commission? The senator from Darlington.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. And I know that you had indicated that you'd been a solicitor -- a prosecutor, about all your career, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you gave some -- you gave some of your preparation as to how you would be preparing to handle other matters, like divorce, which you said you have not done any divorce cases.
A. Correct.
Q. No adoptions?
A. No, sir.
Q. So you've been in the same solicitor's office the entire time?
A. I have. Yes, sir.
Q. And how many years have you been there?
A. I've been there almost eleven years.
Q. Eleven years. And you also -- I see you've got some extracurricular activities that you do, outside of the Solicitor's Office, correct?
A. Yes, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Any other
questions?
(No response.)

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, thank you very much, Ms. Howard. This concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. You could be called back, but we doubt that will occur. We want to thank you for offering. And thank you for your willingness to serve.

MS. HOWARD: Thank you. I appreciate it.
Thanks for having me.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Welcome. We have Kimaka Nichols-Graham, Family Court, 13th Judicial Circuit, Seat 3. Do you have anyone with you?

MS. NICHOLS-GRAHAM: No, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: You're by yourself.
MS. NICHOLS-GRAHAM: Just me.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Would you raise your hand and take the oath.

WHEREUPON:
KIMAKA NICHOLS-GRAHAM, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR MARTIN: You had the opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?

MS. NICHOLS-GRAHAM: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: Everything appear to be in
order? No changes needed?
MS. NICHOLS-GRAHAM: No, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: Do you object to us making
it part of your -- this summary, and any amendments part of the record of your sworn testimony?

MS. NICHOLS-GRAHAM: No objection.
SENATOR MARTIN: It will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 18 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF KIMAKA NICHOLS-GRAHAM DATED MARCH 3, 2016)

SENATOR MARTIN: The Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria. We received no affidavits in opposition to your election, no witnesses are here to testify.

Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make?
MS. NICHOLS-GRAHAM: No, sir. Well, I will make a brief statement. I have been interested in the administration of justice for quite a while. In addition to the comments that I have shared with you, I think it's quite clear that, to this point, my career has been dedicated to making sure that people who are unrepresented
have access to legal services. I believe that $I$ am prepared for this particular appointment. And I would look forward to continuing to serve the citizens of this state.

SENATOR MARTIN: Okay. Would you please
answer Mr. Davidson's --
MS. WELLS: Not Davidson's.
SENATOR MARTIN: Oh, it's not "mister."
It's Ms. Katherine Wells, our staff counsel, will have some questions for you.

MS. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms.
Nichols-Graham, you have before you, the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time?

MS. NICHOLS-GRAHAM: No, there aren't.
MS. WELLS: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that Mrs. Nichols-Graham's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

SENATOR MARTIN: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, it will be entered into the record at this time.
(EXHIBIT NO. 19 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION

COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF KIMAKA NICHOLSGRAHAM DATED MARCH 2, 2016)

MS. WELLS: Thank you, Ms. Nichols-Graham.
For the record, please state the city and the circuit in which you reside.

MS. NICHOLS-GRAHAM: I live in Greenville, South Carolina, the 13th Judicial Circuit.

MS. WELLS: Thank you. And one final procedural matter, I note for the record that based on the testimony contained in Ms. Nichols-Graham's PDQ which has been included in the record, with the candidate's consent, Ms. Nichols-Graham meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.

EXAMINATION BY MS. WELLS:
Q. Would you please tell the Commission why you now want to serve as a Family Court judge, and how you feel your legal and professional experience, thus far, will assist you to be an effective judge?
A. I believe I am fair. I believe that I am respectful to all. I believe that I am well Qualified to serve as a Family Court judge. I have practiced in Family Court for over 17 years. I have had the privilege of representing many people in Family Court, in many matters -- divorce, custody, adoption, abuse and neglect. I have
had some appearances on the juvenile justice docket. I'm not as direct -- directly representing anyone, but as providing information, because I represented some students on the education side of the case.

I can't think of an area in Family Court that $I$ do not have experience in. I have -- I have been in Family Court for quite some time. In my role as the managing attorney of the Greenville Office of South Carolina Legal Services, I have dealt with the public. I am comfortable communicating with the public. I've had to deal and help people through some of the worst times in their lives. And I believe that has given me another level of experience for this position. Because there are still a lot of people who are unrepresented in Family Court, and we still have some access-to-justice issues in that area of the judiciary.
Q. Thank you. You spoke to this, briefly, but are there any other areas of the law that you would need to additionally prepare for in order to serve as a judge, and how would you handle that additional preparation?
A. I would say I could -- I could -- actually, I could -- I believe that juvenile justice may be my weakest area. But $I$ do have some experience, not as direct -directly providing legal representation, but $I$ do have some experience in that arena. And I have represented students in a lot of administrative matters, and a lot of times the
facts are the same that the school district is addressing that their -- the Family Court judge is addressing at the same time. I would seek additional training, if needed. But I believe that I have a broad range of experience for Family Court.
Q. Thank you. Would you explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor of a judge?
A. I think a judge should be calm and not biased. A judge should not allow any type of display of emotion. They should give every litigant the opportunity to be heard. The judge should not entertain any non-verbal communications -- that would be the public, or any member of the proceeding -- to believe that the judge has already rendered a decision. The judge should give everyone an opportunity to be heard, and be fair.
Q. Do you have any suggestions for improving the backlog of cases on the Family Court docket?
A. I understand that the Justice Department has been looking at the Family Court docket for several years now. If I'm not mistaken, it's been about three years. The Justice Department has a committee for Family Court docketing. And some changes have been made within the last few years, to assist with the Family Court dockets.

Practicing in Greenville, we were aware of some
of those changes before they became statewide. And I believe that continuing to implement those changes throughout the state has helped shorten the amount of time that litigants have to wait before they get a temporary hearing. And I believe just continuing to monitor the dockets of the Department of Social Services, some of the institutional dockets, to make sure that they don't take over the docket, or that there's still enough time for the private matters, should assist with making sure that the docket runs smoothly.

I believe that the attorneys are prepared, and they're moving their cases as efficiently as possible, with implementing the additional rules regarding the 365-Day Rule. As an attorney, I have seen an increase in efficiency in Family Court. But $I$ would be willing to serve -- as a legal services attorney, our salaries are somewhat low. And we have a good amount of paid legal leave -- of paid leave for annual leave. I usually don't use my annual leave. So I am quite dedicated to the administration of justice, and I would continue to be dedicated to the administration of justice, if I were allowed to serve on the bench.
Q. Thank you. Would you briefly describe your experience in handling complex, contested Family Court matters? And, specifically, discuss any experience you've

## had with the financial aspects of Family Court practice.

A. I have had contested Family Court cases in the area of divorce. The ones that I remember most are the ones -- are the cases that involved termination of parental rights and those matters. There has not been a shortage, in my experience, when it comes to representing people who are, you know, involved in contested matters.

Although, I am a Legal Services attorney, I do believe that I would be able to divide large property -large property divisions. I am not a financial advisor. I do not profess to be a financial advisor. I do believe that if the information is provided to me, $I$ would be able to actually assess the value of the property that is before me, and fairly divide it according to South Carolina law.

In South Carolina, the average salary in 2014, for households in South Carolina, was about $\$ 45,000$ a year per household in South Carolina. If you look at it per capita, it was about $\$ 24,000$ per household, not per individual. So in the cases where we were -- where I would see families that have a lot of income, I would -- I believe that I would have the opportunity to observe some of those cases before hearing them, and actually have time to spend with more experienced Family Court judges. But I believe the average income of households in the state indicates that, that would not be a common occurrence in

Family Court.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Nichols-Graham, the Commission received 118 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 13 additional comments.

MS. WELLS: Members of the Commission, all
the comments were positive, several stating that Ms. Nichols-Graham would be an asset to the South Carolina judiciary, and that she has the temperament and knowledge, ethical background, and experience to serve as a Family Court judge. BY MS. WELLS:
Q. Do you have any response?
A. I thank everyone who participated in the judicial survey. That's a great thing to hear.
Q. Thank you. Just a few issues -- or quick questions. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No.
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.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for
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this commission -- excuse me -- to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?


A. No, I have not.
Q. Do you understand that you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules? A. Yes.

MS. WELLS: Members of the Commission, I
would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee found Ms. Nichols-Graham Qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. She was found Well Qualified as to ethical fitness, professional, and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. And I would note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Ms. Nichols-Graham were incorporated into my questioning of her today.

And, Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Any question by
members of the Commission?
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Just one quick
one.

SENATOR MARTIN: Representative Bannister.
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER:
Q. Thanks for being here. On your -- your sworn statement, number 6 asks you about your philosophy on recusal -- or for former associates, law partners, lawyer/legislators, and you wrote, "If the matter cannot be handled without showing fear or favor, then a recusal is necessary."

So if you don't mind, I'd like a little more -be a little more pointed. So if somebody from Legal Services, who you worked with -- how many lawyers y'all got?
A. We have around fifty across the state.
Q. How about the -- working in your office, directly under your supervision?
A. Eight.
Q. Eight. So if one of those eight shows up, and the other side says, "Hey, I think you have a conflict 'cause you worked with that person," what's your philosophy on recusing yourself if that's the case?
A. I believe, in the beginning, there will be a period of time where $I$ wouldn't hear cases that involved Legal Services. I think that is customary when new judges are acclimated to the bench, as we have had judges, before, that have worked at the Department of Social Services. And
then after those cases have resolved, if I am able to fairly hear -- hear the matters and render a fair decision, without bias, I believe that would be allowed.
Q. And you would have law partners. How about lawyer/legislators? If a litigant's lawyer says, "Well, this person appearing in front of you is a lawyer/legislator, and I think you'll have a conflict hearing this case," what would be your position if that was the only reason on recusing yourself?
A. I believe that I would be able to hear the case. I believe you are a lawyer/legislator, and I would be able to hear cases that you present; I would not be biased towards you. I -- I have always had the ability to be an independent thinker. I have not partaken in any kind of favoritism. And I don't anticipate anything about that professional quality changing.
Q. Thank you. That answers my question.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any other question or
comment?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, Ms. NicholsGraham, we thank you so much for your being here today. This concludes this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until such time as the report is published. You could be called back. Until
that time, I don't anticipate that being the case. I want to thank you for offering, and for your willingness to serve the people in this very important position. MS. NICHOLS-GRAHAM: Thank you, Chairman. SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: We have Katherine Hall
Tiffany, Family Court, 13th Judicial Circuit, Seat 3. Ms.
Tiffany, do you have someone with you, you'd like to introduce?

MS. TIFFANY: I do. I have my husband of twenty years, Peter Tiffany, with me today.

SENATOR MARTIN: Glad to have you with us.
Would you raise your hand and take the oath.
WHEREUPON:
KATHERINE HALL TIFFANY, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR MARTIN: Have you had the
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?
MS. TIFFANY: I did.
SENATOR MARTIN: Everything in order?
MS. TIFFANY: Yes. A couple of type-o's,
here and there, that I apologize for.
SENATOR MARTIN: That's fine. That's fine.

Do you object to our making this part of your sworn testimony here today?

MS. TIFFANY: Not at all.
SENATOR MARTIN: It will be done at this
point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 22 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR
KATHERINE HALL TIFFANY DATED FEBRUARY 29, 2016)
(EXHIBIT NO. 23 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF KATHERINE HALL TIFFANY DATED FEBRUARY 29, 2016)

SENATOR MARTIN: The Judicial Merit
Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria. We received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, no witnesses here to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make?

MS. TIFFANY: It's four years ago, I started on this quest. And I'm thrilled to be here again. So thank you for having me.

SENATOR MARTIN: If you'd please answer -would you please answer Mrs. Brogdon's questions for you. MS. TIFFANY: Certainly.

MS. BROGDON: Good afternoon, Ms. Tiffany.

Would you please state for the record, the city and circuit in which you reside.

MS. TIFFANY: I live in Greenville, South
Carolina. And it's the 13th Judicial Circuit.
MS. BROGDON: One final procedural matter.
I note for the record that, based on the testimony contained in the candidate's $P D Q$ which has been included in the record, with the candidate's consent, Katherine Tiffany meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. EXAMINATION BY MS. BROGDON:
Q. Ms. Tiffany, why do you now want to serve as a Family Court judge, and how do you feel your legal and professional experience, thus far, will assist you to be an effective judge?
A. Obviously, I look to the response that I gave in my application materials. But it really isn't complicated at all. I've done this for twenty years. Family Court is what I know, and it's what I love. I have no desire to be anything other than a Family Court judge. I've been with my firm for twenty years, and probably for the last fifteen years, my practice has focused exclusively on Family Court. I have found it at times thrilling, and at times frustrating, but always challenging. And that is what I've always looked for in my professional life, is to what --
what is the next challenge.
I've been lucky enough to be with a firm, while we are all different in our political ideology and our religious backgrounds and our upbringing, we have two or three things in common; and that is, we represent everyone with the same level of service. When we complete a case, we always ask ourselves, "What can we do more and what can we do better?"

So that is what -- how I've guided my career, and that is what -- what I look to this next challenge to be. I feel as though I've given twenty years to practicing law, I have always tried to tackle the hard stuff. I would welcome the challenge as a Family Court judge, to decide the hard stuff. Because, quite frankly, my experience has been, the relatively easy things will settle. It's the judges who are called on to make the difficult decisions where people can't agree. And I think that my background and experience, exclusively in Family Court, gives me the experience that I believe will give me the discretion -- or the tools to operate with discretion that is so important for Family Court judges' decisions.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Tiffany, are there any areas of the law that you would need to additionally prepare for in order to serve as a judge? And how would you handle that additional preparation?
A. There is no area of Family Court that I'm not familiar with. I have extensive experience in grounds for divorce, representing children as a guardian ad litem -all different kinds of children -- representing parents in custody cases. Thankfully, for the first several years of my practice, we were all subject to Rule 608 appointments, where I do get extensive experience in representing parties and children in DSS actions.

The only area of law where $I$ have not acted as counsel of record is juvenile justice -- juvenile justice cases. But fortunately, in the role as a guardian ad litem in the Department of Social Services cases, and as a guardian ad litem in general, I have become familiar with that area of law. But that is definitely an area that $I$ have less experience in.

As I've prepared for two other judicial races, I have -- I've been called on to study, extensively, the Department of Juvenile Justice-related statutes. And so I feel I am intellectually familiar with them. And as a part of the experience of going through judicial screening, I have developed a keen interest in following legislation that affects all areas of Family Court. And so I feel that I have -- I have monitored, in that way, that legislation. But that is something that I would definitely, probably need some more observation with other judges. I would like
to meet with the solicitor in charge of the -- those cases, and the juvenile public defender, before I take the bench, if elected, and just try to get perspectives from both sides, so that I can feel as best prepared as I can.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Tiffany, you addressed this in your sworn affidavit, but could you please explain to members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge.
A. I think, first of all -- and this is -- departs somewhat from what I answered in my application. But I think, first of all, a judge should approach their job with a sense of obligation, not a sense of entitlement. It's a job -- it's a demanding job. And it should be one that you should be prepared to fulfill to the best of your ability. What I am keenly aware of at this point, if $I$ am elected, that I will go from a situation where my time can pretty much be my own, or subject to some restrictions where it will no longer be my own. So I think it's with a sense of obligation that a judge should take the bench. Obviously, I believe that you should have the experience behind you, so that you can see order out of chaos. Because that is what is -- that is what will be before you: high emotions, high conflict. You will have to have that sense of calmness to direct your decision, and to see the patterns of where your decisions should be.

I believe that you should be compassionate. I believe that you should be fair. I believe that you should leave everyone with the sense that they've been heard, but you -- but at the same time, the other side not feel that they have been heard too much. I think it is your job to keep order in the courtroom, and to get the job done.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Tiffany, what suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases in the Family Court system?
A. Fortunately, in Greenville, I believe that we have a fairly current docket. I know in comparison to some other circuits, that is -- that we are much farther ahead. My personal preference when we set contested cases, what I would like to see is -- we tend to do A/B cases. At one point, we did A, B, C cases. And I would like to see some -- some discussion of that continuing. We have moved the start date, in the last several years of court, from nine to 9:30. And I think that can tend to get cases behind, because people show up and they want to have some lastditch effort at settlement. So my concern is that sometimes that ends up meaning that all -- both cases, or all three cases that are set end up getting continued because you run out of time.

My personal preference would be to -- if the -if this would -- would be possible, is to have on the
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contested docket for the all-day hearings, have attorneys report at nine o'clock, so that you could status the cases at nine o'clock, so that you can then begin promptly at 9:30, so that cases can be disposed of and not end up being held over without -- with it being unintentional.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Tiffany, please briefly describe your experience in handling complex, contested Family Court matters. And specifically, discuss your experience with the financial aspects of Family Court work.
A. Okay. Complex Family Court matters. I actually covered a couple of these in my application. The first -what $I$ would call the first, probably, experience with complex Family Court cases was a matter where my partner and I actually represented a man who was going through a divorce, and we dealt with just about every kind of property that there was. We had to divide livestock. We had -- we had to auction livestock. We had to deal with stocks. We had to deal with real estate. We had to deal with transmutation -- or interest acquired by transmutation and special equity.

On the property aspect, most recently, I dealt with a property valuation that dealt with an architectural firm. And it involved a pretty newer -- some pretty complex nuances on the issue of enterprise, or personal goodwill.

In terms of finances, I've dealt with different alimony, which $I$ consider to be one of the most difficult issues for -- to predict for a client. Because not only is it just the assessment of alimony, but what goes into that assessment in terms of trying to capture someone's income; for example, someone being self-employed, trying to arrive at what is their actual income for that.

With custody cases, the complex aspects that I've dealt with -- and, again, $I$ will refer to my application for what $I$ consider to be one of my most significant custody cases. For three years, I represented a father who was seeking custody of a special needs child. The mother was awarded temporary custody, and after three years we were successful in regaining custody of that child on a permanent basis. We were dealing with parents who lived in two different jurisdictions. We were dealing with mental illness on the part of one of the parties. We were dealing with special needs on the part of the child. So that involved me being knowledgeable enough on the child's special needs, and on the issues that we had to deal with in terms of mental illness, to try to navigate that case.

Let's see. Other finances. I have dealt with all aspects of child support. I've been lucky enough to speak before the South Carolina Bar members on issues involving child support, child support of extremes, the --
and I believe the topic was actually "Child Support for the Haves and the Have Nots, or child support that is off the charts." So looking at not only at the type cases that involve child support, but the exceptions to the normal child support cases, those that don't necessarily fall with the guidelines.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Tiffany, the Commission received 215 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 53 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"I regard Katherine as an expert in the field of family law, with the highest moral character. She would be an exceptional judge -- she would be an exception judge and well received by our -- or in the community that we serve. Aside from being an outstanding practitioner, she is an active leader of our state and local Bar, often participating as a speaker, and sharing her vast knowledge and time to educate others."

And another comment says:
"Katherine Tiffany is one of the most experienced and well prepared Family Court trial practitioners ever to offer for Family Court judge. The State of South Carolina will be the winner if she is elected. She is truly a once-in-a-generation leader whose intellectual talents and deep compassion mark her as a top tier candidate."

And then, finally, another comment says:
"Ms. Tiffany is extremely well qualified to be a Family Court judge. She has a wide range of experience on all issues in Family Court, and has handled extremely difficult cases in the past, of which I was opposing counsel. She vigorously represented her clients in those matters, while also maintaining a high level of respect and civility. Not only from me, but also from my clients. She is very knowledgeable in Family Court law."

Of all of your -- of all of the comments, only two of the written comments expressed concerns. One questioned your professionalism in the courtroom, stating that you speak before thinking. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. I wish I knew the context in which that came up. I will tell you sometimes my head does get ahead of my -or my mouth might get ahead of my head. Because I do -- I do get very stimulated by the work that I do. I don't know that I would speak before I think. I think sometimes there's something that I want to say, and I want very much to say it. I do wish I knew the -- and I understand these comments are -- are anonymous. And so, obviously, someone felt it was important enough to say.

I wish I could tell you I'm perfect. I wish I could tell you that I might not sometimes speak out of
turn. But what $I$ do understand is that $I$ understand the obligation that comes with being a Family Court judge, and my job is to listen. And my job is to understand. And I would work very hard to, hopefully, impress upon that person, that $I$ have that ability.
Q. Thank you. And the other comment questioned your judicial temperament. What response would you offer to that?
A. I wasn't aware of -- I wasn't aware of that comment. Again, I guess I would have to say in response I -- again, I would say I'm human. I have been very touched by the support of my Bar. And if there is even one person that has concerns about how I conduct myself, then that's enough to keep me ever mindful of what it is I'm supposed to do as a Family Court judge. In some odd way, it's a good thing to have those comments, because we all need those reminders. We all need to remember that we have a job to do, and that it is -- it is before everyone.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Tiffany. Just a couple of quick housekeeping questions. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or pending the outcome of this screening?
A. No.
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.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. No.
Q. Do you understand that you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules? A. Yes.

MS. BROGDON: And I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee found Mrs. Tiffany is Well Qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, and experience, and Qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. I would just note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding this candidate were incorporated into my questions today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you. Any questions by members of the Commission?

MR. WILCOX: I have one.

SENATOR MARTIN: Dean Wilcox.
MR. WILCOX: I just want to put on the record that Ms. Tiffany had the highest score of all the scores on the Family Law test. And I did have one question for you. You got a 99 from one of the graders; what did you do wrong?

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, she also got -- she also had the highest score the last time too. So she's consistently a good tester, which indicates a very high intellectual capacity for this subject matter. And we appreciate your --

MS. TIFFANY: To answer Dean Wilcox, I think -- I'm not that great of a typist. So in this case, my fingers could not get ahead of what $I$ was thinking.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any other comment or
question?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, Ms. Tiffany, thank you so much.

MS. TIFFANY: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: This concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. You could be called back, but I doubt that will occur. Thank you for offering, and I thank you for your willingness to serve.

MS. TIFFANY: Thank you. Thank you,
everyone.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Is there a problem with
going into executive session?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, we'll
consider ourselves in executive session.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
SENATOR MARTIN: We're out of executive session. The first order of business will be to make a determination as to Qualified. Do I have a motion? Ms. Wall?

MS. WALL: I move that all candidates get --
SENATOR MARTIN: Wait a minute. On the
record, no votes were taken in executive session
So at least five candidates. And we have a motion from Ms. Wall.

MS. WALL: That the five remaining
candidates -- Adams, Hodges, Howard, Nichols-Graham, and Tiffany -- be found Qualified.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right.
MR. WILCOX: Second.
SENATOR MARTIN: I have a motion to second.
All those in favor, please say "aye."
(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
SENATOR MARTIN: Opposed no?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: The ayes have it. So all
are found Qualified. Now we'll need to see -- determine the three who will be nominated. And we'll go in order. Each member of the commission will get three votes. I have a proxy for Senator Campsen, that $I$ will use. Each member will have three votes. And we'll go -- we'll start with Ms. Adams. All the Commission members who would vote for Ms. Adams, please raise your hands.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. All for Mr.
Hodges, please raise your hand. And I'm going to vote for Senator Campsen, proxy.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. DEAN: Hodges got five. Ms. Adams got six.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. And now Ms.
Kimberly Boan Howard.
(Commission members cast their vote.) SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Ms. NicholsGraham.
(Commission members cast their vote.) SENATOR MARTIN: And Ms. Tiffany.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. DEAN: And the proxy?
SENATOR MARTIN: And the proxy. So what are
we at? All right. We have Ms. Adams who's nominated, Ms. Tiffany -- Ms. Tiffany is nominated, and then we have a tie between Mr. Hodges and Ms. Nichols-Graham.

MS. DEAN: All three of these proceed to the next ballot.

SENATOR MARTIN: All three? Okay. All three proceed to the next ballot. All right. All those who would vote for Mr. Hodges, please raise your hand.
(Commission members cast their vote.) SENATOR MALLOY: We only get one vote this time.

SENATOR MARTIN: Only one vote. Right.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. And Howard --
yeah, Ms. Boan Howard. Right. Ms. Boan Howard.
MS. DEAN: Two and the proxy?
SENATOR MARTIN: And the proxy.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
SENATOR MARTIN: And Ms. Nichols -- Nichols-
Graham.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
SENATOR MARTIN: We've got to vote again.

All right. We've got to vote again, 'cause it's two for Mr. Hodges and three for Ms. Howard and five for Nichols. I'm going to get -- consult with the local delegation over here.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I'm going to switch to Hodges.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Let's go with
Mr. Hodges.
(Commission members cast their vote.) MS. DEAN: Four with the proxy? SENATOR MARTIN: And the proxy for -- all right. Ms. Howard.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Ms. Nichols-Graham.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Is that two?
MS. DEAN: That's two. Hodges and Nichols-
Graham. Everybody gets one vote.
(Off-the-record discussion.)
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. We're ready to go. Mr. Hodges.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. DEAN: One, two, three four. And your proxy?

SENATOR MARTIN: The proxy. All right. We
know the outcome. Mr. Nichols -- I mean, Ms. NicholsGraham. We'll pause just for a second, here, as we regroup.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Why don't we take a five-minute break?

SENATOR MARTIN: Do you want to take a fiveminute break?

MS. WALL: I would.
SENATOR MARTIN: Okay. Well, we'll stand in
recess for five minutes, and then we'll come back.
(A recess was taken from 4:49 p.m. to 4:57 p.m.)
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. We're going to go back on the record, and we will try it again. First, we'll -- the first person up will be Mr. Hodges. Those in favor of voting for Mr. Hodges, please raise your hand. And the proxy, right.
(Commission members cast their vote.) SENATOR MARTIN: And Ms. Nichols-Graham.
(Commission members cast their vote.) SENATOR MARTIN: So we have Ms. Adams, Mr. Hodges, and Ms. Tiffany will all be nominated. Thank you very much. So we will move, now -SENATOR MALLOY: Can we take a break before we get to --

SENATOR MARTIN: If you want to. All right.

We'll take a five-minute break. Do you want to take a five-minute break?

SENATOR MALLOY: Yes.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Five-minute -another five-minute break.
(A recess was taken from 4:58 p.m. till 5:09 p.m.) SENATOR MARTIN: We have James C.

Alexander, Family Court, 13th Judicial Circuit, Seat 4. Mr. Alexander, do you have anyone with us, you'd like to introduce?

MR. ALEXANDER: I do. I have my wife with me, Linda, we've been married 45 years as of this month. So she came down here with me.

SENATOR MARTIN: I know both of y'all very well. And we're glad to have you with us. If you would, please, raise your hand and take the oath. WHEREUPON:

JAMES CRAYTON ALEXANDER, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows: SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Alexander, have you had the opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire? MR. ALEXANDER: I have. SENATOR MARTIN: Any changes need to be made? Any amendments?

MR. ALEXANDER: No, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Do you object to our making this summary a part of your sworn testimony?

MR. ALEXANDER: No, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: It will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 24 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JAMES CRAYTON ALEXANDER DATED MARCH 1, 2016)

SENATOR MARTIN: The Judicial Merit
Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. We've received no affidavits in opposition to your election. No witnesses are present to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make?

MR. ALEXANDER: A brief one. I don't know that y'all need a lot. I've been practicing law for a long time, and I still enjoy the practice. My son's a lawyer, so I get to practice with my son. Been practicing with him about thirteen years, now, and it's been good. So I've had a good career. And I've applied for this position because I hope I can make a good contribution to the Family Court.

SENATOR MARTIN: Good enough. Would you please answer Mr. Davidson's questions.

MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Nice to see you, Mr. Alexander. You should have before you, the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments you'd like to make at this time?

MR. ALEXANDER: There is none. MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman, I would ask that Mr. Alexander's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit at this time. SENATOR MARTIN: Is there any objection? (No response.) SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, it will be entered into the record at this time.
(EXHIBIT NO. 25 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF JAMES CRAYTON ALEXANDER DATED MARCH 12, 2016) MR. DAVIDSON: Could you please state, for the record, the city and circuit in which you reside? MR. ALEXANDER: I reside in the 13th Circuit, Pickens County. MR. DAVIDSON: In the city? MR. ALEXANDER: The City of Pickens would be the closest. That's where I practice, the City of Pickens. But I live in Pickens County, outside the city limits.

MR. DAVIDSON: For the record, based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ which has been included in the record, with the candidate's consent, Mr. Alexander meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON:
Q. Mr. Alexander, could you please explain to the Commission why you would like to serve as a Family Court judge, and how do you feel your legal and professional experience, thus far, will assist you to be an effective judge?
A. I've been practicing law since 1974. I spent four years in the Air Force. And I came back home, grew up -- was not born here. My dad was in the Navy. I came back here, back home, at three months from San Diego, California, and have been here since. I came back in 1978, after I got out of the Air Force, and practiced law in Greenville County, first. And since 1987, Pickens County, since that times.

I've had a long career. I feel blessed. I feel I've helped a lot of people through the years. I've had the opportunity -- as I've said, my son went on to become a lawyer, and we practice together. We have a good practice. I think we've helped a lot of people.

I have seen what I consider a lot of good judges,
how -- what is the proper way to do things, and what's not the proper way to do things. I've seen, you know, good judges, mediocre, bad. I mean, since 1978, I've seen a lot of it. And I've practiced extensively in the Family Court. I've always done a general practice -- a general trial practice. And the Family Court's always been a big a part of that practice. So I've had a lot of experience in the Family Court.

I consider Family Court to be important. I mean, our society is formed around our families. I mean, that's the basic core of our society. And when those families break up, I think it's important that if they're not going to live together again, they need to be able to move away in a positive manner; and how their case is handled in the Family Court sets the stage for how they go on about their lives. And, hopefully, in a positive manner. And the trial judge has a lot to do with that. Obviously, he is the one who makes decisions, or helps them get the case settled.

So with the experience I've had -- I've handled, as far as $I$ know, about every kind of case, many times, that can come before the Family Court. And I think my experience would allow me to help people adjudicate disputes, and make the system more friendly for the litigants. The litigants are the ones that are involved,
and they need to be -- get on with their lives. And that's what I would hope to do.
Q. Are there any areas of the law that you would need to additionally prepare for in order to serve, and if so, how would you handle that additional preparation?
A. I would be -- you know, very candidly, it's been about six or seven years since I've handled the juvenile adjudication. That's the one area. As far as the -- I've been able to keep up with DSS. My son has a guardian -represents the guardian in Pickens County. And I will go over there -- and I represent the guardian in a lot of occasions, so I've been able to keep up with DSS. I do a lot of work on the private side of the docket.

I worked for the public defender in Pickens County, back when there was only one. Before you had the circuit court system, I did every juvenile adjudication, literally, that was appointed by the public defender for about eight years. So I've had extensive experience in that area. But I haven't done one in about five or six years, so I would need a little bit. But other than that, I think it would be a short learning curve on that issue. But that would be one area.
Q. Could you explain what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. I think a judge needs to be courteous, respectful
to the litigants, the lawyers, and all court personnel, and has absolutely got to be impartial and fair to everyone. I mean, those are -- if you -- you're courteous, you're respectful, you're fair and impartial, I think those are the things that make a good judge.
Q. What suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the Family Court docket?
A. Mediation has been a wonderful thing, in at least in my practice, and that's gone a long way towards settling things. I will say one thing: It seems like sometimes in mediation, we get pretty close to settling cases, but we don't quite get there sometimes. And I know in Pickens County, we'll settle that case for an all-day case, and then charge the client for the time involved in getting to trial. And then we get there, and a lot of times those cases settle.

If you settle both cases, an $A$ and $B$ case, then $I$ guess the judge goes home; I don't know what he does. But if he settles both of them -- I talked to one lawyer in another county, they do an A, B, C, and a D case. Which to me seems like a pretty good idea; that way, you've got something to do in the afternoon, if you settle both the cases.

But, you know, another way to do it may be -- in Pickens County, this judge will -- this office is Pickens

County residency. You may want to consider doing some status conferences on some of those cases, before they're set for an all-day case. Because if you've got -- come close in mediation, you might be able to settle it at the status conference, rather than set it for a full day.

So there's several different things that we can do to make the system more efficient. One of my biggest complaints from my clients are, "Why does it take so long?" And those are some things we can do to maybe shorten that time a little bit. And there -- you know, there are other things.
Q. Thank you. Lastly, please briefly describe your experience in handling complex, contested Family Court matters. And, specifically, discuss your experience with the financial aspects of Family Court work.
A. Well, I've handled since 1978 -- I do a general practice. I do civil work as well as Family Court work. I've handled equitable distribution of property, alimony factors, custody of children throughout my career. I mean, I -- I do that on a routine basis, dealing with the financial aspects of it. The statutory factors for distribution of property, for alimony, the whole gamut of cases. And that's basically what I've done since 1978.
Q. Moving on to the ballot box surveys. The Commission received 132 ballot box surveys regarding your
candidacy, with 17 additional comments. The surveys, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"He's an excellent attorney. Well knowledgeable. His temperament is well suited for the Family Court, and he is someone who understands that there's a difference between being a zealous advocate for your client, and simply impeding the case."

Eight of the written comments expressed concerns;
four of those eight raised concerns about your age. What response would you offer?
A. You know, I can't get any younger. I mean, that's about the only thing I can say. I wish I could. I told -- somebody was asking me about that, and I said, "Well, I guess I can get a toupee and have some Botox." But I am what I am. I can't do anything about it. I think, age-wise, I've had a lot of experience. And I would just do the best I can. I mean, I -- very candidly, I can serve five years and six months of this term period. I will not be eligible for reelection. I mean, that's a fact. And some people may have some concerns with that, but I can't do anything about it.

I just want -- and I'm not doing -- I'm not looking for a job. That's what I told one person, that's what one person asked me. You know, I practice with my son, I've got a good job right now. You know, so I'm not
looking for something to do.
I really think $I$ can make the system better. And at least I'm -- that's what $I$ want to try to do. I'm on the down end of my career -- obviously, at my age, I am. And I would just like to see if I can't do something to give back to a profession that's been so good to me throughout my life.
Q. Thank you. The four remaining comments indicated concerns about temperament. Do you have any response to those concerns?
A. I can only say I'm sorry some people feel that way. My philosophy -- and I've had a lot of contentious cases. My philosophy has always been, that if -- you can disagree about the issues, but you need to do it in an agreeable manner. And that's what I've always tried to do.

I didn't -- I can't sit here and testify under oath, and say I've never been a little off with some lawyers. I mean, I'm sure it's happened. I mean, anybody says that, I'd like to meet them. But that's not my philosophy in how I normally try to do things. I learned a long time ago, that you can settle any kind of a case -- or you have the potential of settling a case, if you get along with the other lawyer, professionally and personally. If you don't, if the two lawyers are at odds, you're not going to settle anything; you're going to be in a knock-down,
drag-out litigation, even though it may not be in your client's best interest.

So I always try to get along with the other
lawyer. And I've had a lot of cases -- I cited several in my testimony, about some very contentious cases, to where the other lawyer and I, who I'd never met before on that case, we got along well, and we were able to settle the cases. So getting along is important. That's what $I$ will try to do. And I'm sorry if I've made somebody mad along the way; it's not my intent.
Q. Thank you. At this time, I'm going to ask you a series of quick questions. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
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. You know, I am not. And I will -- since I've become a judicial candidate, I have not.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. I have not.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. I do understand.

MR. DAVIDSON: I know that the Upstate Citizens Committee found Mr. Alexander to be Qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. He was found Well Qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

Mr. Chairman, I would note that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding this candidate were incorporated into my questioning today. I have no further questions.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Davidson. Any questions by members of the Commission?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, the Commission -- we have a couple new Commission members with us today. And I'll tell them we've been -- we've been -I've been privileged to know Jim Alexander since they moved back to Pickens, back in the '80s. And he and Linda have been in our church --

SENATOR MALLOY: Teaches Sunday School.
SENATOR MARTIN: And we taught Sunday School
together for a while. You remember well.
SENATOR MALLOY: I do.
SENATOR MARTIN: And he's a much better
teacher. They would come when he -- the Sundays he taught. MR. ALEXANDER: I appreciate that.

SENATOR MARTIN: And he still does.
MR. ALEXANDER: I still teach.
SENATOR MARTIN: You teach a different class
now.
MR. ALEXANDER: That's right. I will teach. SENATOR MARTIN: That's right. But any -any other comments?

SENATOR MALLOY: Well, I'll add one thing. He didn't say it this way, but he did say that -- that -something to the effect, not in these words, that he and his wife had something in common: They were in love with the same man. But what he really said was, he was her better half.

MR. ALEXANDER: I have made that mistake, Senator. And I --

SENATOR MALLOY: And he's sorry he said it now. And I think that he went through a period of time, whenever he was talking about John -- John Bolt, that he
worked for John Bolt, and most of the folks that remember the Civil Rights struggle in the fight, they knew that he would represent any and everybody. We were in law school with his son, Sam.

MR. ALEXANDER: That's right.
SENATOR MALLOY: And so -- but we know that you've been here before, and -- and have done a good job. MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Senator. SENATOR MARTIN: Any other comments? (No response.)

SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, thank you very much. That will completion this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. So we thank you for your offering and for your willingness to serve. And I hope you have a good trip back to Pickens.

MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Senator.
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you.
MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Ladies and
Gentleman.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Welcome.
MS. ROPER: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: We have Karen Sanchez
Roper, Family Court, 13th Judicial Circuit, Seat 4. Do you
have someone with you, you'd like to introduce to us? MS. ROPER: Yes, I do, Senator Martin. I have with me, my husband of almost 22 years, Ken Roper. He is also my law partner, not for quite as long. But I did hire him on a few -- some years ago -- some 15 years ago. SENATOR MARTIN: Does he have a good work ethic?

MS. ROPER: He does. I have to say, in both capacities, he's turned out quite well.

SENATOR MARTIN: You trained him; is that right?

MS. ROPER: Yes. Yes.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Would you
please -- now I'm going to put her under oath.
WHEREUPON:
KAREN SANCHEZ ROPER, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR MARTIN: Ms. Roper, have you had the
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire? MS. ROPER: Yes, I have.

SENATOR MARTIN: Any need for change or amendment, related to it?

MS. ROPER: No, I do not. I have the copy of the amendment, here, that I'd submitted earlier. So it
all appears correct.
SENATOR MARTIN: Oh, okay. Do you object to us making it a part of the sworn testimony?

MS. ROPER: No, I do not.
(EXHIBIT NO. 26 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR KAREN SANCHEZ ROPER DATED MARCH 3, 2016)
(EXHIBIT NO. 27 - AMENDMENT TO PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE DATED APRIL 28, 2016)

SENATOR MARTIN: The Judicial Merit
Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria. We received no affidavits in opposition to your election, no witnesses are present to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make?

MS. ROPER: No, I do not have any opening statement, other than to just thank you for having me here today. I know that y'all have had a long day, so I will keep it brief. And so far, I've thoroughly enjoyed this process of getting to know legislators as well as my fellow candidates. So thank you for letting me be here to speak with you today.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you. If you would, kindly answer the questions of Ms. Brogdon, your screening
attorney.
MS. ROPER: Yes.
MS. BROGDON: Good afternoon, Ms. Roper.
MS. ROPER: Hello.
MS. BROGDON: How are you?
MS. ROPER: Good to see you again.
MS. BROGDON: Ms. Roper, you have before you
the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament.

MS. ROPER: Yes.
MS. BROGDON: Are there any amendments you'd like to make to your sworn statement?

MS. ROPER: No, there are not.
MS. BROGDON: Mr. Chairman, at this time I would ask that Ms. Roper's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

SENATOR MARTIN: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, it will be entered into the record at this time.
(EXHIBIT NO. 28 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF KAREN SANCHEZ ROPER DATED MARCH 3, 2016)

MS. BROGDON: Ms. Roper, please state for
the record, the city and circuit in which you reside.
MS. ROPER: I live in Pickens, South
Carolina, in the 13th Judicial Circuit.
MS. BROGDON: 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, Ms. Roper meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.

EXAMINATION BY MS. BROGDON:
Q. Ms. Roper, why do you now want to serve as a Family Court judge, and how do you feel your legal and professional experience, thus far, will assist you to be an effective judge?
A. Well, answering that question really takes me back to why I wanted to become an attorney to begin with. And I applied to law school with the intention of working in the Family Court system, it's issues involving children and families have always been very important to me. And I've made choices in my career, as well as in my personal life, to focus on those areas, anywhere from starting my family law practice, to volunteering with organizations that focus on the health and welfare of children, such as First Steps or Prevent Child Abuse or the Mental Health Board. And I get a lot of satisfaction from doing that.

And as well as in my practice with Family Court litigants, $I$ know that families are extremely important and the issues involving families are. I have a husband and two sons, as we mentioned before, and they are the most important things in my life. And I do know that my clients feel the same way about their families. So when they are turning over the most personal and private issues to a Family Court to make a decision, I think it's important that a Family Court judge be someone that they know is going to treat them with dignity and respect, and that they are going to have compassion for the situation; they're going to consider the issues very carefully, and render a thoughtful decision based upon what's best for that family.

So I'm hoping that if I -- my life experiences and my education have trained me for that well, that I'll be able to bring that thoughtful approach, hopefully, to the Family Court bench.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Roper, are there any areas of the law that you would need to additionally prepare for in order to serve as a judge, and how would you handle that additional preparation?
A. Okay. Not -- not so much that I think I would have to take a great deal of additional preparation. But as I did indicate in my personal data questionnaire, I do not have a vast array of experience in juvenile matters.
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I've handled a few juvenile matters. But in our area, it seems to be that most of the juvenile cases are pretty quickly taken up by the public defender's office. And I have not had, you know, a large client base in that regard.

So I certainly am familiar with juvenile rules and statutes, and have also worked with some juvenile issues in my capacity for the school district of Pickens County, where I've handled their disciplinary hearings for the last ten years or so. So I do have some familiarity with that process from that end. But that would probably be the area that I'd have the least experience.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Ms. Roper, although you addressed this in your sworn statement, could you please explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. Certainly. I think that a judge should always be patient and kind and respectful to the parties. I know that there are a lot of tough situations and tough cases that come before the Family Court. And I've seen many of those in my years of practice. But my goal would to be -always to be the calmest person in the room.

I have seen, unfortunately, situations, sometimes, where litigants leave the Family Courtroom and they feel like that they haven't been heard, or that they've been disrespected. And I certainly would not want
to have any type of atmosphere like that in a courtroom that I was presiding over. I firmly believe that the Family Court judge does set the tone for the proceedings in the courtroom. So if -- my goal would be to project a calm, pleasant, and polite manner, so that everybody would respond accordingly.

And I think if you go into the hearing, assuring everybody that everyone's going to be heard, and everyone's going to have their turn to speak, and we're all going to abide by the same rules in this process, that no matter what the decision is, when they leave the courtroom, they'll at least not feel like that injustice was served.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Roper, what suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the Family Court docket?
A. Well, fortunately, I believe, in Pickens County, Judge Alvin Johnson has left us in pretty good shape. I know that the last time I checked I believe that we're only at maybe five percent of cases pending, that are over 365 days. So my priority would be, first of all, to do no harm to come to that situation, and not fix something that's not broken.

Where I tend to see more of the backlog is really in the DSS matters in our county. I think our Department of Social Services does a wonderful job getting, maybe, the
first 72 -hour hearing, or the 35 -hour -- 35 -day merits hearing scheduled in a timely manner. But if there are continuances, for one reason or another, sometimes those cases may fall into an abyss and -- and take a long time to get resolved. But I would certainly -- I've already talked with our clerk of court, and would certainly want to work with him to resolve any of those issues. But as for now, I think we may be in pretty good shape in Pickens County.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Ms. Roper, please briefly describe your experience in handling complex, contested Family Court matters. And, specifically, discuss your experience with the financial aspects of Family Court work.
A. Certainly. I have handled many cases involving equitable distribution of assets, including division of retirement accounts. I have prepared QDRO's, or Qualified Domestic Relations Orders, for clients on these division of retirement accounts. I've handled contested alimony cases, seeking alimony and defending against alimony awards. I've handled many cases with division of real property, prepared deeds for transfer of property, pursuant to Family Court orders, as well as have handled division of the family business. And sometimes small family businesses, even though the numbers may not be large behind them, are sometimes some of the most difficult assets to divide, because there's not always great record-keeping or
any experts you can call in, in those matters.
So I -- I believe that I have had, certainly, a fair amount of experience with division of those assets.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Ms. Roper, the Commission received 157 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 12 additional comments. The ballot box surveys contained the following positive comments:
"Karen's legal background and practice in Family Court, along with her experience as a DSS attorney, make her wonderful -- make her a wonderful and qualified candidate for Family Court judge. Ms. Roper has the appropriate temperament for the bench."

And another provided:
"Her honesty, integrity, work ethic, and intelligence were without peer. She will make an excellent jurist."

Two of the written comments expressed concerns.
Both comments questioned your experience handling complicated Family Court matters and contested actions. You just addressed that. But do you have anything to add?
A. Nothing other -- further to say, other than as far as contested matters go, I will say that since the onset of mandatory mediation in my county, that has been very helpful in resolving complex matters. Whereas, we used to have a lot of contested custody, or maybe alimony
cases, now through the benefit of mediation, $I$ am usually pretty successful in being able to resolve those. And I think that's a good thing. When families can make their own decisions on these issues, then $I$ think that, that's a better situation.

And I pretty much advise my clients all the time, that when you go to mediation, it is something where you're going to decide what you can live with and what you can't live with. But if you take it to trial, the Family Court judge is going to decide what you're going to live with. So I think that, that's actually a good thing, the fact that maybe the amount of contested cases has gone down a little bit, in my experience.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Roper. A couple of quick housekeeping questions. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No, 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 in your behalf?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission
about your candidacy?
A. No, I have not.
Q. And do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. Yes, I am.

MS. BROGDON: I would note that the Upstate
Citizens Committee found Mrs. Roper is Well Qualified in the evaluative criteria 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. And I would also note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding this candidate, were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. SENATOR MARTIN: Any question by members of
the Commission? Dean Wilcox?
EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. Ms. Roper, just a quick question. Do you plan to continue to be a member of the Title Company, LLC, if you're elected?
A. No. No, I do not. And I was only a member in
name only; I did not have any responsibilities. So I would divest myself from any ownership in that company.
Q. And does your husband do real estate work? Or does he also practice in Family Courts?
A. No, he used to do real estate work. He doesn't do that any longer. And he has never tried a case in Family Court, I believe, in his life.
Q. That doesn't present any future conflicts in --
A. No, it does not. No, it does not.

MR. WILCOX: Thank you. That's all.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Any other
questions?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Well, thank you very much.
It's a real pleasure to have you today.
MS. ROPER: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: And we appreciate your
cooperation with our staff. This will conclude this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. You may be called back, if the need would arise -- which we doubt, very seriously, if that will happen. But we thank you for offering, and wish you the very best.

MS. ROPER: Well, I really appreciate it, Senator Martin. And everybody's been very kind. And thank
you very much for your time. Thank you for having me. SENATOR MARTIN: Thank y'all. Have a safe trip back.

MS. ROPER: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Okay. If we just stay in
open session, would that suit y'all to take a vote?
SENATOR MALLOY: We find them both
Qualified.
SENATOR MARTIN: Motion to find them both
Qualified and nominated is seconded. Any discussion to not move immediately into a vote. All those in favor, please say "aye."
(At this time the members audibly say "aye.") SENATOR MARTIN: Opposed no.
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: The ayes have it. Now the question will be to find -- do them one at a time -SENATOR MALLOY: Qualified -SENATOR MARTIN: -- qualified and nominated. SENATOR MALLOY: And nominated. Yes, sir. SENATOR MARTIN: Oh, I'm sorry. It's been a long day, y'all. Yeah. That does it. Judge Burch? All right. That takes care of that. We're ready to do Judge Burch.

SENATOR MALLOY: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. I think it -I'm thinking ahead, about all the phone calls I've got to make. We're off the record until he comes in.
(A recess was taken from 5:40 p.m. to 5:43 p.m.) SENATOR MARTIN: Welcome.

THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: Good afternoon. SENATOR MARTIN: We have The Honorable Paul Michael Burch, Circuit Court, 4th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1. Do you have anyone here with you? Wife? Nobody with you? THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: Just me. SENATOR MARTIN: Just you. There you go. Judge, will you raise your hand and take the oath. WHEREUPON:

THE HONORABLE PAUL MICHAEL BURCH, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR MARTIN: Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?

THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: Is everything in order --
THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: -- no need for any changes?
Do you have any objection to making it part of the transcript --

THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: I do not.
SENATOR MARTIN: -- of your testimony?
Hearing none, it will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 29 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE PAUL MICHAEL BURCH DATED MARCH 8, 2016) SENATOR MARTIN: The Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria. We received one affidavit filed in opposition to your election, and one witness is present to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement at this time?

THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: Yes. I want to sincerely thank the Commission and the staff for working with me on the rescheduling of this hearing. As some of you know, we have to schedule our vacations a year ahead of time. And this was originally scheduled for November. Of course, there was no way -- you know, looking at the past hearing, knowing exactly when it was going to be. And I had paid for my family to go on a vacation, and I -- I just want to thank all of you for --

SENATOR MARTIN: You're very welcome.
THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: -- taking that
into consideration, in working with me.
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman.
SENATOR MARTIN: The senator for Darlington.
SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
am -- just want the committee, and for the record, to know that, one, that Judge Burch, I've known him ever since I was a kid in college, when he was in the House of Representatives, and I worked for Jean Harris. And he was in the House, I think, during that time. And he was my resident judge in my area, which I can be a testament to that he is overly fair; sometimes not on my favor.

But also, that his son worked in my office for a period of time, over the years, in the Senate. And so I think probably the last 26, 27 -- 26-plus years, he has been on the bench about -- at least longer than that, ever since I've been practicing law, back in the area. I've had chance to have frequent contact with him.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right, sir. At this point in time, would you please answer the questions of Ms. Wells, our staff counsel.

THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: Yes, sir.
MS. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Judge
Burch, you have before you, the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications,
office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments you'd like to -- you'd like to make at this time?

THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: No.
MS. WELLS: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that Judge Burch's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

SENATOR MARTIN: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, we'll make it part of the record at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 30 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE PAUL
MICHAEL BURCH DATED AUGUST 4TH, 2015)
EXAMINATION BY MS. WELLS:
Q. Judge Burch, after serving 25 years on the circuit court, why do you want to continue serving as a Circuit Court judge?
A. Well, I would like to continue, as long as I could keep my good health. And I -- so far, the Good Lord has blessed me with good health. And after all these years, I really don't have any desire to go back and try to practice law. I've got two immediate family members that are taking care of that.

But I enjoy just meeting people. And,
particularly, going around to the various counties, and at this point being able to see attorneys and court staff that I've known for many years. I just enjoy the job.
Q. Thank you. Would you please explain for the Commission, one or two brief accomplishments that you feel you have completed during your tenure, and then a goal you would like to accomplish if reelected.
A. I think probably the goal that $I$ would like to accomplish is to maintain the stability that we have within the court system, and to make sure that we keep stability. I hope I have served well. And most attorneys will tell you that $I$ am firm but fair. And $I$ just have to close that answer by saying that the way things are going on in particular aspects of our society now, I think it's crucial that we maintain stability. And I feel like that $I$ can be a part of that.
Q. Thank you. You addressed this in your sworn affidavit, and you mentioned it just now, but would you explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a Circuit Court judge.
A. Firm and fair. We've all had to make adjustments over the years. We are now, judges as well as attorneys, have to take the Civility Code. And raising your voice or losing your temper, there's no place for that, especially on the judge's part. And the only time -- the only
instances that $I$ can tell you, that $I$ know that would be justified, is where you're on the verge of losing control of the courtroom, or you have an emergency situation where somebody could get seriously hurt.

You know, if you have a criminal defendant who, in effect, goes berserk and attacks somebody in the courtroom -- about four or five months ago, we had a incident in Dillon, and some of you may have seen it on TV, where a convicted killer attacked the deputy in the courtroom, with a open handcuff that was -- they were attempting to put on him, and then spat on the solicitor and the sheriff. And the family -- some of the family members came over the rail. And to me, that's an appropriate time to raise your voice a little bit, to try and get it stopped.
Q. Okay. Judge Burch, the Commission received 419 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 15 additional comments. The ballot box surveys, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"A fine, thoughtful judge. Excellent, fairminded jurist. One of the best judges on the bench, fair to all parties, and still remembers what it was like to practice law."

However, the following negative comment was
received:
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"Although, I believe Judge Burch is very qualified for this position, I have seen situations where $I$ believe his temper sometimes affected his rulings, or at least his attitude towards litigants or counsel. I do not question his ability or his performance, in general, however, these flashes of temper have resulted in less than maximum ratings for character and temperament on the bench."

What is your response to this one negative comment?
A. If I were allowed to bet, I just about could safely guess where that came from. I've got one attorney who's -- you know, who just doesn't want to listen. And I can assure the Commission of this: When $I$ do have to take someone to the woodshed, as a figure of speech, I always ask them to step back in the chambers, and try to give them some sound advice. And I've got one attorney, over in the Pee Dee, that doesn't want to take advice. And I'm not surprised that, that -- that one came in. It may not be him. There may be -- you know, this day and time, when you have to rule one way or the other, a lot of folks don't like it, and they're going to have something negative to say.
Q. I just have a few housekeeping issues. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator, either prior
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to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
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 have not. And I'm not aware of anything.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. I have not.
Q. Do you understand that you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. I am. And I have not.

MS. WELLS: I would note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee reported that Judge Burch is Qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical -- physical health, and mental stability. And the committee found Judge Burch Well Qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

Mr. Chairman, do you want to proceed, now, with the complaint that has been received? Or go into --

SENATOR MARTIN: Yes.
MS. WELLS: -- executive session, first?
SENATOR MARTIN: Probably go into executive
session.
SENATOR MALLOY: I move to go into executive session.

SENATOR MARTIN: Motion to go into executive session. Any objection?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, so ordered. (Off-the-record executive session.)

SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Brandt, please take a seat. All right. Would you state the name -- your name, for the record.

MR. BRANDT: Donald M. Brandt.
SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Brandt, would you
please raise your hand and take the oath.
MR. BRANDT: You must speak a little louder. I'm very hard of hearing.

SENATOR MARTIN: That's what $I$ was going to do. I apologize. My button had been pushed off.

WHEREUPON:
DONALD M. BRANDT, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR MARTIN: Before we get started, Mr. Brandt, we had a little discussion about the nature of your complaint. You know, we have -- you have supplied the committee with numerous documents and a good bit of information. The Commission has reviewed those, so we're pretty familiar with the nature and the extent of your complaint. What we want to share with you, very briefly -you know, it is getting late, and we want to -- we've heard from you through your written testimony, or your written document that you provided to us. But what we can take a complaint on, under the law, is based on a judge's -- or a candidate's character, competency, ethical fitness, and temperament. We can't re-litigate the outcome of the case, or, you know, somebody's not happy with how a matter came out in court, had it appealed to the Supreme Court back then, or whatever. That's not for us to decide.

What we're here to hear about is character, competency, ethic -- ethical fitness, and temperament. And if you would, we would like to -- for you to take no more than about ten minutes, if you -- if you so like -- would like to do, and give us an overview of what your complaint is in that regard.

MR. BRANDT: Sir, that would be impossible. It would -- it would take a book to tell the wrongs this man did.

SENATOR MARTIN: Well --
MR. BRANDT: A book.
SENATOR MARTIN: We've got all the written
information. But can you summarize it for us? If you can't summarize it for us --

MR. BRANDT: I didn't come prepared -SENATOR MARTIN: -- we don't need to hear from you.

MR. BRANDT: I didn't come prepared to do that. But I'll -- I'll read my closing -- my conclusion, if y'all -- all read all of that. First, though, I'm Donald Brandt. I am from Bamberg County. I have six daughters, five of them well educated, and all of them in professional fields. My wife and I took in three girls, shortly after we got married. We lost one in a accident. And we raised three girls that wasn't ours.

And y'all are familiar about the case.
Okay. You, the Honorable Judicial Committee, must ask your self is Judge Burch honorable or unfit. The evidence presented Judge Burch being unfit and biased against me is overwhelming -- whelming. I've had constitutional and unlawful acts by Judge Burch committed against me. Never did the judge display any integrity. I would try, but not been given a warrant, arrest, arraignment, and notice or read my Constitutional Rights. But most importantly, he
disregarded Judge Diane Goodstein's earlier order given on May 17th, 2001. She dismissed this contempt proceeding against me until Attorney Elizabeth's trial for malpractice.

You must ask yourself, the committee, how is it possible that a American citizen, in South Carolina, be put in prison three times, never have been served with a warrant. Also, I will -- I was never arrested. But I've also been in county jail, probably, four or five times.

Judge Burch's illegal acts have put my family through hell for 16 years, literally. No amount of money could compensate for this anguish. My family and I have spent three -- over $\$ 3,600,000$ for Judge Burch's illegal acts. I also lost my dedicated wife during this process.

I've been accused of introducing a forged letter into the court. And he went on to say that I forged the letter with no proof. The Gooding's law firm at Allendale has been scaring people, for decades, to settle. It's a small county, and it's predominantly black. There has been, and continues to be, multiple lawsuits of which they cater to their mostly-black jury in favor of the Goodings.

Ronald Summers with Edisto Farm Credit, Don Houck, Elizabeth Gooding, here in court, were sued for
conspiracy.
SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Brandt, none of that
has anything to do with Judge --
MR. BRANDT: Okay.
SENATOR MARTIN: -- Burch's --
MR. BRANDT: Okay. Okay. It had to -- it
had to have been a -- it had to -- it's about this -- my thoughts. It has been arranged by Gooding's lawyer to have this letter copied to take out the watermarks. They stole $\$ 968,000$ of family money, and gave Don Houck $\$ 300,000$ at closing, never --

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Mr. Brandt, I'm sorry, but you've got to focus on what you're alleging that Judge Burch did.

MR. BRANDT: Okay. I'll try my best.
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: You're
disparaging Mr. Gooding, but you're not talking about Judge Burch. And Mr. Gooding -- it's not fair, he doesn't have a right to defend himself. It's not his hearing.

MR. BRANDT: I'm pretty sure, it is.
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: It's not his
hearing. It's Judge Burch's hearing.
MR. BRANDT: Okay. Okay.
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: So if you would
focus --

MR. BRANDT: I will. I will. The thing is, Judge Burch believes in kangaroo court. He forced me to be my own attorney at Allendale. Like I said earlier, I've never had a warrant, never been arrested, read my rights or anything. Judge Goodstein -- it boils down to a letter. She was concerned about that letter being tampered with. I had my attorney present a motion, asking the court to appointment an examiner to examine the letter. The other side objected.

All right. Judge -- I had -- I had my attorney present a motion asking the court to appointment an examiner. The Gooding's lawyer objected. I had earlier presented Jack Early, now Judge Early -- he was my attorney for many years -- this letter. He saw it was evident -- he said it was evidence -- evident. There were so many lawyers involved in this. Unbelievable. Several judges.

So -- okay. All of the Gooding's lawyer, Jim Collins and other, never presented Judge Diane -- Diane Goodstein, a motion to reconsider or amend. All of the lawyers -- and that includes Gooding, Speights, Bill Collins -- my attorneys told me they were -- they went judge-shopping. They wanted to find a judge that would negotiate with them, and favor -- favor the Goodings. SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Brandt. MR. BRANDT: That is -- that is just wrong.

SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Brandt, I'm going to have to stop you. We've heard quite enough. We still haven't heard anything about your testimony, specifically to Judge Burch's character, competency, ethical fitness, and temperament.

MR. BRANDT: Just give me about a minute. I could -- I could go back to the court's transcript, in Chesterfield, where he says he did not care anything about the American way. I could tell you the page. And when he was asked to reconsider at Chesterfield, he said he didn't want to hear anything from us -- I mean, my lawyer and me. Then he went on to say he didn't care anything about the American -- American way --

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair.
MR. BRANDT: -- or what one judge did.
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair.
SENATOR MARTIN: The senator from
Darlington.
SENATOR MALLOY: Could I -- could I just ask you when was -- what year was that, that you allege that, that comment was made?

MR. BRANDT: It's in the Chesterfield --
SENATOR MALLOY: I'm from Chesterfield.
MR. BRANDT: -- 2001.
SENATOR MALLOY: 2001.

MR. BRANDT: Yes.
SENATOR MALLOY: And you are -- your
testimony, now, is that -- is that because he said something is not the American way --

MR. BRANDT: You've got to speak a little louder, sir.

SENATOR MALLOY: You said it's -- he said
that he -- that something was not the American way?
MR. BRANDT: He said he didn't care anything about the American way. If you've got a copy of it --

SENATOR MALLOY: He didn't care about the American way --

MR. BRANDT: -- of it in Chesterfield --
SENATOR MALLOY: -- in 2001.
MR. BRANDT: -- on page -- page 5 -- on page 6, from 10 to 21. And I'll read it to you.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Mr. Brandt, we have -- we have that. And we have all of the paperwork from all your cases, so you don't have to read it. We've got it.

MR. BRANDT: Well, it seems like this
gentleman --
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: No, he was just asking whether that was your allegation that the judge said that it was not the American way. So we were just making
sure that, that's what you were focusing on --
MR. BRANDT: Yeah.
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: -- in your
complaint.
MR. BRANDT: There's quite a few --
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: In 2001,
correct?
MR. BRANDT: Yes.
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: All right.
MR. BRANDT: Yes.
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Well, thank you.
Thank you for coming. Oh, there's more? I'm sorry.
MR. BRANDT: I'm the last -- I'm the last
person, right?
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Yes, sir. But the chairman gave you ten minutes. So we're about at the end of the ten minutes. I just want to make sure that you get all of your allegations in before the ten minutes ends.

MR. BRANDT: Well, I hadn't got them all in.
He allowed witness tampering. Professor
John Freeman reported witness tampering by three prominent people. One of them's dead. And one's Miles Loadholt, and one was Jim Anders. But he's passed away. And Richard Breibart, he's in safe-keeping somewhere, I understand. Give me -- give me one more minute.

On that, he testified that -- he said -- he testified that if you -- he was approached by Miles Loadholt as he -- it would be beneficial if he would drop out of the case if Gooding would give money to the University of South Carolina. Richard Breibart also approached it. Of course, Jim Anders is dead now, he can't defend his self.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: At some point, I agree with Mr. Rutherford, that this seems to not be related to the complaint against Judge Burch, as you outlined. And it's really at the point where it's becoming dilatory. And so, you know, I would -- if we are not going to focus on this, then we need to wrap up this testimony and move forward with letting Judge Burch respond to the -MR. BRANDT: Will you let me say one more thing?

SENATOR MARTIN: One more thing and that's it.

MR. BRANDT: He said -- he -- he -- he charged me for a felony. For him to be a longtime judge -the Supreme Court ruled that the letter that you -- that he -- he said dirty hands -- they went so far to say I had filthy hands. You would -- you can be assured I have dirty hands, 'cause I've worked hard all my life, and raised these six girls.

Oh, boy. The only thing I could tell you, there will be a book coming out, a whole book on him, and -- and the other -- the other people as well. I been working on it twelve years. The thing is, my family spent $\$ 3.6$ million for him -- ignored Judge Goodstein's order, that I should not be -- have no contempt charges till after the malpractice. And it's believed that he hadn't read any of the -- any of the transcript of deposition. Many, many hours of depositions to that effect.

SENATOR MARTIN: Okay. Well, thank you very much for coming. I appreciate it. Judge Burch, would you like to respond? Thank you, Mr. Brandt.

MR. BRANDT: The proof is here, his own words.

SENATOR MALLOY: Would you like to respond?
THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: Mr. Chairman, I -

SENATOR MALLOY: Briefly.
THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: I know y'all have been here all day, and I'll just take just a minute. I think I've covered everything in my response to Counsel Wells. Several things were said that completely caught me off guard. I found Mr. Brandt in contempt. There was no felony. I think that concerns the actual trial by jury he had over in Charleston, before Judge Young, where he was
convicted and got a prison sentence. And the witness tampering, I don't -- I don't -- I don't know what that's all about. Attorney Breibart and Miles Loadholt? That's something that's completely new to me.

The two things I would like to comment on concerning Judge Goodstein's order. Mr. Brandt had been ordered to get an attorney, and the reason -- I walked into the Allendale Courthouse, not knowing really, hardly anybody from Allendale, except for a highway patrolman, that was from Chesterfield County, that was assigned there. And I walked into a legal hornet's nest, is the only way I can describe it, after all the years that $I$ went here.

And in order to hear the summary judgement that the clerk of court asked me to hear, that brought into play the letter. And I made it absolutely clear to Mr. Brandt, that no one was accusing him of actually signing the letter, or, you know, forging it, per se. But the problem was, he filed a forged letter, and had to know that it was filed. And I don't know of any way to describe what happened here in pulling such a fraud on the court, except to say that in my opinion it was a direct intent. And the Supreme Court of South Carolina unanimously agreed with me. Now, we've all learned from this. The Court of Appeals in Richmond did not agree that it was direct contempt. And the way I read their order, they rewrote
"direct contempt" for South Carolina, for the 4th Circuit. They did not -- they did not consider that direct contempt. And I think there was a concern there, about maybe a attorney -- Mr. Brandt showed up with special counsel and asked for a continuance. And, obviously, they were having trouble getting judges to hear this. And I was not going to allow a continuance, the way this thing was dragging out. I was not going to allow anybody to take that letter out of the court's possession.

And I did what I had to do. Because to me, other than some kind of physical assault, what Mr. Brandt did here was a pure, calculated fraud pulled on the court. And it deserved immediate action. God only knows the mental stress and anguish that all of this caused to various people.

Yes, I learned from this. I'll know next time, as well as every judge in the 4 th Circuit, to take that extra step about representation. But Mr. Brandt had been ordered to have an attorney, and he defied that. And once again, in order to rule on the summary judgement motion, that letter had to come into play.

And I did what I thought was the best thing to do. I have no other description except to go back to what President Franklin Roosevelt said in December of 1941: What happened here was despicable, as far as the court is
concerned.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Any questions
of Judge Burch?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, thank you so
much. That concludes --
MS. WELLS: I would note for the record, any
concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Burch, were incorporated into the questioning of him today. And I have no further questions.

I do need to put into the evidence, the witness affidavit form, Exhibit 1 of Mr . Brandt's, and also Judge Burch's written response.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right.
(EXHIBIT NO. 31 - LETTER FROM DONALD M. BRANDT TO THE JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION DATED 10/25/2015)
(EXHIBIT NO. 32 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION WITNESS AFFIDAVIT FORM OF DONALD M. BRANDT DATED OCTOBER 28, 2015)
(EXHIBIT NO. 33 - RESPONSE TO JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION REGARDING COMPLAINT FILED BY MR. DONALD BRANDT)

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair.
SENATOR MARTIN: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: I did want to note that Woody Gooding is out there as well, and that disparaging remarks were made about him. And I just want to make sure that he didn't feel compelled to respond today. He certainly doesn't have to, but he --

MR. GOODING: I appreciate it. I thank you. I would like to, but $I$ don't think it's appropriate at this time.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much. With that, Judge Burch, we appreciate you being here. As you know, the record will remain open until such time as the report is published. You could be called back, but I doubt very seriously that will happen. Thank you for offering, and I thank you for your service to South Carolina.

THE HONORABLE PAUL BURCH: Thank you. And I want to take just a second to thank the staff here. They have been wonderful to work with, and they've had a lot of patience with me. And I sure appreciate it.

SENATOR MARTIN: You're very welcome. We think so too. Thank you. All right. With that --

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair.
SENATOR MARTIN: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MALLOY: I move -- I move that Judge Burch be qualified and nominated.

SENATOR MARTIN: A motion --

MS. WALL: Second.
SENATOR MARTIN: -- is to qualify and
nominate. Second. Any other discussion? Move immediately into a vote. All those in favor, please say "aye."
(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
SENATOR MARTIN: Opposed no?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: The ayes have it. Judge
Burch has been found qualified and is nominated. Any other business come before the Commission?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, we'll stand in recess, subject to the next call.
(There being nothing further, the proceedings concluded at 6:27 p.m.)
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