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## WHEREUPON :

JEROME P. ASKINS, III, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Do you have someone special here with you today --

MR. ASKINS: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- that you'd like to introduce?

MR. ASKINS: Mr. Chairman, it's somebody very special; we've been married for 41 years. This is my wife Donna. And we met in Columbia when we were both in school. She was at Columbia College, and I was at USC, residing down the street a few blocks in the old Honeycombs, at the corner of Sumter and Russell at the time. We have two boys, both of whom are medical doctors. They were both smarter than their old man. And both are at Clemson, unlike their dad.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Well, congratulations. It's good to have you with us today, Mr. Askins. Thank you for joining us. Mr. Askins have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?

MR. ASKINS: Yes, sir. I looked over it, just briefly.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is it correct?

MR. ASKINS: As far as I know, everything's correct. Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
amendment or change that you'd like to make to that?
MR. ASKINS: No, sir. Not that I'm aware of.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Askins, would you have an objection if we were to add that personal data questionnaire to the transcript of your testimony today?

MR. ASKINS: No objection.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
objections by members of the Commission?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire for Jerome P. Askins, III dated July 17th 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: The Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench, Mr. Askins. Our inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria, and it's -there's been a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which
your name appears, a study of previous screenings, and a check for economic conflicts of interest.

We've received no affidavits filed in opposition to your -- to your election. No witnesses are present to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to share with the Commission?

MR. ASKINS: Mr. Chairman, you know, it doesn't seem like that long since $I$ was before this committee -- commission last year, and, yet, for some reason it seems like an eternity. I -- some of the commissioners may recall $I$ ran for a circuit court seat last year, and was fortunate enough to be one of those nominees that went all the way to the election, and lost to a very nice young lady by a difference of two votes. And I'm back again.

I started practicing law with my father, who's a country lawyer in Hemmingway, after I finished law school. And we -- he had a very general practice. And I -- I've practiced in a lot of different areas, in a lot of different courts. We -- I've been in the municipal court, magistrates court, county court, family court, the circuit court in common pleas and in general sessions. I used to go to bankruptcy court a long time ago. I don't do that anymore. I've been in the Court of Appeals, the South Carolina Supreme Court, and the U.S. District Court. And

I've encountered all sorts of judges in that time, and over those years.

I practiced for 39 years. I've encountered all kinds of judges. Most were very good, some were exceptionally good. Some were not so good, and a few were very bad. And I decided, somewhere along the way, I would like to be a judge; I can do that. And I can do that job well. And of course opportunity and timing is everything, and those have to come together.

In my practice, I practiced in a lot of different areas. I've done a little bit of everything, and my clientele is very diverse. We -- we have people from all walks of life. And $I$ think that's a factor that will benefit me as a circuit judge. I've had clients that are corporate clients that are traded on the big board on Wall Street, and I've had the little ma-and-pa operation down the street, that's struggling to pay the bills. I've had individual clients that have more money than I can imagine; they probably spend more in a week then most people make in a -- in a year. And, yet, I've got other clients that have difficulty coming up with fifty dollars, if they had to do it.

I've seen the world through a lot of different eyes. And I think that is a big advantage, having -- having experience in a broad field, in a number
of different areas with -- and dealing with a number of different clients, $I$ think is a very beneficial thing for a circuit judge. So I'm back here. I want this job very much. I just turned 63. I'm in good health, as far as I know, and I didn't have any gray hair until I ran for circuit judge. I can still make it around the track a few times and I can still ride my unicycle. I have no plans to retire. And would like very much to finish my career on the bench serving the State of South Carolina.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: You would have left an indelible mark on this Commission if you brought your unicycle with you. Thank you very much, Mr. Askins. As you know, Dustin Stimson is your assigned screening attorney. We would like to turn the time over to Mr . Stimson. And we'd ask that you respond to his questions. MR. ASKINS: Yes, sir.

MR. STIMSON: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I have a procedural matter to take care of with this candidate.

EXAMINATION BY MR. STIMSON:
Q. Mr. Askins, 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 additional amendments you would like to make

## at this time to your sworn statement?

A. No, sir.

MR. STIMSON: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that Mr. Askins sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr.
Stimson. Is there any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of Jerome P. Askins, III dated July 17th 2015)

BY MR. STIMSON:
Q. Mr. Askins, please state for the record the city and circuit court for which you reside.
A. I reside in Johnsonville, which is in Florence County. That would be the 12th Circuit.

MR. STIMSON: One final procedural matter.
I know 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. Askins meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.

BY MR. STIMSON:
Q. Mr. Askins, why do you now want to serve as a circuit court judge? And how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you being an effective judge?
A. Well, as I alluded earlier, I have practiced for a long time, I have a lot of experience in a lot of areas, and I have -- I feel that having a general practice and dealing with a lot of different type clients is a great advantage to a circuit judge. I have known some judges who have practiced and focused their practice in one area, and it was a disadvantage later on in their career on the bench. I think that my experience as an attorney, and in a general practice in a small town is a -- is a tremendous advantage.

As far as why $I$ want to do it? This is something I've always aspired to do. As I said earlier, it's a -it's a position you don't just apply for any time. You have to have the opportunity, the timing has to be right. A lot of things have to fall into place. And I'm hoping that maybe the time is right this time.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Askins, are there any areas, including subjective areas of law, that you would need to additionally prepare for in order to serve as a circuit court judge? And how would you handle that additional preparation?
A. Well, I'm sure that there will be a lot to learn. I don't think the learning curve would be very long. One thing that $I$ think $I$ would need to -- to beef-up on a little bit would be the sentencing in criminal court. I was an assistant public defender for most of three years, and I tried a lot of criminal cases. And at that time, you know, I could tell you what the -- I hesitate to use the term "going rate," but what the sentence was for a particular offense. And I have not done a lot of criminal recently.

In Williamsburg County, where my office is located, most of the criminal work is done by the Public Defender's office and court-appointed attorneys. We have a lot of indigent criminal defendants. The criminals in Williamsburg County are generally not very successful, financially. And I haven't done a lot of criminal court work recently. And I am no longer on the appointment list, so I don't get appointed.

I used to be on the appointed list for criminal cases. And I got transferred to the civil list, because they needed more attorneys in the family court to handle the DSS cases and the guardians. And so $I$ was on that list for a while, and taken off criminal court. So that would be something that $I$ would have to get back into. It wouldn't take very long at all to do that.

## Page 15

Q. Thank you. Mr. Askins, although you addressed this in your sworn affidavit, could you please explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge.
A. You know, one of the judges that I always thought was ideal as far as his courtroom demeanor, passed away recently, former Chief Justice David Harwell. He was on the circuit bench when $I$ first started practicing. And to me, he was the epitome of a good judge. He -- he was very courteous and respectful to the people around him, the litigants, the attorneys, the jurors, the courtroom personnel. There was never any question who was running the courtroom. Judge Harwell was in charge. But he maintained order and decorum in a way that was not overbearing. He was never rude. He treated people with the kind of respect and courtesy that they would want to be treated with, and that they would remember. I just had the utmost respect for him. And I would -- I would aspire to be like that.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Askins, what suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the docket, be it general sessions or common pleas court?
A. I think the ADR system is working well in the -in the civil court. A lot of cases are being resolved through mediation. I've always felt that, with good
attorneys and reasonable clients -- and that may be a difficult combination sometimes -- that probably 95 percent of the cases could be resolved without having a contested hearing. I think $A D R$ is doing a good job for civil cases. As far as the criminal docket, that's more difficult. And, you know, in my area, it seems that drugs -- illegal drugs are just a tremendous problem. And when I was doing a lot of criminal work, it seemed to me that probably 75 percent of the cases or more were drug-related or drugs; somebody was either selling drugs, somebody was stealing to get money to buy drugs, somebody shot somebody over drugs. And I don't know -- I don't see that slowing down. Unfortunately, I don't see a solution on the horizon. And I'm not sure how you handle the backlog on that. It's a difficult question. I may be better able to answer that at a later date.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Askins, the Commission received 77 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 5 additional comments. The ballot box surveys contained positive comments, including that you had a tremendous amount of experience and that you'd be a great asset to the bench. There was, however, one comment that did express some concern regarding your temperament on the bench. And could you address that for us, and can you address that concern here?
A. Well, the -- and the comment that you're
referring to?
Q. Well, they said that while you were a good attorney, they were concerned that perhaps your demeanor would not be suited for -- for a judgeship.
A. Well, of course, I would take issue with that. But not knowing the source or the circumstances, I really couldn't respond to it in any detail.
Q. Thank you, sir. Now, Mr. Askins, I did notice in your SLED report that there was one lawsuit in which you were the plaintiff, stemming from 2006, which was a lis pendens action. Could you explain the nature -- could you explain the nature and disposition of that lawsuit, please, sir?
A. Well, I don't think we ever got to a lawsuit. I think they just filed a lis pendens. That had nothing to do with a claim. As an attorney, I bought a lot with another guy. He was a developer, he had planned to build a spec house on the lot. And we bought an adjoining lot, which we intended to resell. And at some point, he decided not to build the house, and he was going to convey his interest in the lot to me. And then he said that he would, and I had trouble getting in touch with him. And somebody told me he was about to move out of state, so $I$ filed a lis pendens, just to protect myself with regard to the lot.

And then he came in and signed the deed, as he said he would. And that was the end of it.
Q. Thank you. I have just a few housekeeping issues to wrap you up with, sir.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered a conditional pledge of support of any legislator 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?
A. No, sir.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of the process on your behalf?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. No, sir.
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?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on

## pledging?

A. Yes, sir.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I couldn't have quoted the penalty to you, but I knew it was something I didn't want to have.

MR. STIMSON: I would note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee felt Mr. Askins qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. The Committee felt Mr. Askins well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.
I would note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Mr. Askins, were incorporated into the questioning of him today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Stimson. Thank you, Mr. Askins. For the benefit of the commissioners who are not legislators, I'd just like to
share with you that Mr. Askins was in a contested race for a seat, just recently in the legislature, and he narrowly lost that -- very narrowly lost that election by -- three votes, was it?

MR. ASKINS: It was three votes. Two votes the other way would have made the difference.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for the distinction. And I'd just like to add that my observation was, Mr. Askins, that you -- you ran a very respectful campaign, and you distinguished yourself in that race.

MR. ASKINS: Thank you, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any questions by commissioners? Dean Wilcox. EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. Mr. Askins, first, thank you again for offering again. I appreciate your service to the state.

My question has to do with modern technology, a little bit. Discovery is obviously something that a circuit judge has to deal with on a regular basis. And given the amount of electronically-stored information that's now an issue -- and particularly civil litigation -can you tell the Commission a little bit of what you have -- either your level of experience with e-Discovery issues, or any education that you have undertaken to familiarize yourself with the particular issues regarding e-Discovery?
A. You know, it's -- it's odd that you ask that. At this time, I -- I'm not a techy. And I had to be dragged into the 21st Century, kicking and screaming all the way. I attended a seminar in Manning last Thursday. Chief Justice Toal was there with retired circuit judge Tommy Cooper, and they are implementing the pilot program for filing the documents by e-filing. And the -- I think that starts in Clarendon County in December, and in Sumter and Lee County in January, and in Williamsburg County in February. They already implemented that -- implemented that in the Federal Court, the U.S. District Court.

And that's something that's coming. We had a little overview on that. There's a lot of tutorial information that $I$ still need to review. That's something that -- it's -- it's here. The -- I think Judge Harwell made the comment one time, that we couldn't stay in the days of the pencil and yellow pad forever. And Chief Justice Toal said that this is the next step in that process, that eventually it will be done statewide, and, you know, we will be -- everybody will be filing.

There are exceptions, of course, for parties who are ex parte -- I'm sorry -- pro se parties; they would still have to be served in the traditional ways. And all of that is sort of developing. And -- and it's here.
Q. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Dean
Wilcox. Any other questions?
SENATOR MALLOY: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, Senator
Malloy. You're recognized.
SENATOR MALLOY: Good morning, all.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Good morning.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Mr. Askins, I just got a couple questions to ask you in reference to the criminal arena. You mentioned the sentence reform and the issues that were sort of occurring. I just want to ask you if you had any opinion as it relates to sentencing guidelines for the -- any criminal matters where in -- and the basis of my question is, is that -that guidelines and -- you know, take discretion away from a trial judge. Are you a supporter of sentencing guidelines or not?
A. Well, I think guidelines are fine. You know, when -- when there's no discretion at all, I think that's a problem. Because it's difficult to feed every -- every person out of the same spoon. I think, you know, you have to consider -- the judge has to consider a number of factors in doing that.

You know, years ago, Senator, I wrote a letter to the Chief Justice because I had a defendant in criminal
court who was accused of criminal sexual conduct. And it -- it really amounted to fondling someone who was under age. And he on his own volition sought psychiatrist -psychiatric help. He was -- he was attending sessions, counseling. He was a city councilman, he was -- he was the last person you would expect to be involved in that. But, you know, from the time this thing was exposed, he did all the right things. He went to court and he plead guilty, and -- and he received a sentence of ten years.

And in just a couple of months there was someone who was tried for -- for rape. In that same courtroom, he didn't plead guilty, he was -- he went to trial and he was convicted by the jury. And that person got probation. And my client, who was in prison, saw the newspaper article and clipped it out and he sent it to me. And he said, "How could this happen?"

And I wrote the Chief Justice, and I said, "This is his question, and I don't have a good answer for it. Do you?"

Now, I don't think you can -- you can impose mandatory sentencing to the point that there's no discretion, in -- in most cases. But guidelines, I think, can be very helpful.
Q. And you know that the -- we have a tendency in our state to go against the guidelines. And the Federal

Court pretty much imposes the guidelines. And so to add that to the component of sentence reform, which you say you got to study some on. But the other thing I wanted to take up issue to you is the issue as it relates to -- I call it drug laws and the war on drugs.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. I would say as a premise from the start, that the war on drugs did not work, as stated by many. That's obviously an opinion. But it looks like the State of South Carolina has already done sentencing in the face of trying to do the very same thing. And so the person that you were mentioning about, the drug issues -- one of the things that we've done is that the -- that the -- the drug usage in South Carolina, and across the nation, has overpopulated our prisons. And so I wanted to go to the point to say that for matters as it relates to drug court alternative sentencing, that you are able to end up making an offer -and, if elected, tell me your view on the -- on your alternative sentencing as opposed to incarceration.
A. Sir, I would be in favor of any type of program that could be implemented to reduce the number of people who are incarcerated. Again, you've got to -- you've got to -- it's a relative thing. You know, we've got to do what the prisons were designed to do. And yet --
Q. Just to lock up bad people. You and I are of the
same generation. We were PTI. But right now there -- we were doing PTIs and stuff in our generation.
A. Right. Right.
Q. But now the point I'm making is, is that there's a lot more. And so I just want to make certain that, one, for folks that will go on the bench, that they are in favor of alternatives to incarceration. Which is what I think our state --
A. Sir, I -- I think that we could do a lot more in terms of house arrests. We could do, you know, public service. And in certain situations, I'd like to see more of that done in appropriate cases. Let me -- let me say, I think -- thinking along the lines that you're thinking, the last case that $I$ tried in General Sessions court, was an armed robbery case. The defendant was -- he was a codefendant. The co-defendant was represented by the public defender. This was a 26-year-old African-American male, he had committed a prior armed robbery. If he were -- had been convicted of this -- of this offense, he would have been imprisoned for life with no parole. And a lot of folks say --
Q. Was that a third -- was that a third offense?
A. It was a second offense.
Q. Second offense?
A. Second offense. But his -- a lot of folks would
say, "Yeah, lock him up and throw away the key."
But this was not a typical armed robbery where he would go in and, with a gun, to a store or some -- or a bank or something. This was a situation that involved drugs, involved where people knew each other, and it was not a typical armed robbery. And, yet, technically, he was guilty of armed robbery, technically. But he wasn't going to hurt anything; he never intended to do that.

Now, I don't mean to say that he didn't commit a crime. He did. But did he need to go to prison for life? I don't think he did. Now, I -- I consented to be appointed in that case. And I made some motions and I did some research, and there was a -- there was some questionable procedures, some questionable line-ups. And -- and as a result of all of that, he was able to plead guilty to a common law robbery instead of the armed robbery, which would have sent him to prison
Q. Well, that's a serious -- a serious offense -A. Right.
Q. -- in that category, $I$ think was --
A. That -- that --
Q. -- address those issues.
A. -- that is correct. But that's a good example, though, Senator, of how somebody that, technically, would have gone there for life -- would have gone to prison for
life. And -- and the situation really didn't merit that in that case.
Q. And I -- and I think that there's a -- there's a whole body of law that we have done in this -- in this state. And I appreciate your -- your saying that you needed to get up-to-date on the -- on the new sentence reform matters that we passed in 2010. A lot of those things have changed. Talking to you a little bit more about it, I guess my main consideration is that, one, that you were -- that you were amenable to the alternative sentencing -- and, actually, obviously, the issues that we have with sentencing reform, where we've had a change in the mandatory sentences and there's some flexibility.
A. Yes, sir. Senator, I feel like, if somebody's not a threat to society, I would be -- I would be all out exploring alternatives to incarceration.
Q. And those are the terms we use as it relates to the criminal factors that are related to a person that is coming before court, and obviously things that you -- put it in simpler terms, making certain everybody -- that not necessarily fed out of the same spoon, we got to look at those factors. And as long as you're willing to look at those factors, I think that, that's what we're looking for as it relates to someone that goes on the bench and wouldn't mind be able to take that approach.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator Malloy. Mr. Mack?

REPRESENTATIVE MACK: Mr. Chairman, Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE MACK:
Q. It's great to see you again. I, too, thought that you conducted yourself with a -- with a lot of class during the last -- the last election. I wanted to ask you your viewpoint as it relates to white collar crime versus other crimes. A lot of times we could see difference in the settings and the treatment. I wanted to get your views on that.
A. Well, it's -- I don't want to cross the line, here, of saying that, you know, if elected I will do this or that particular offence, or I will do that or the other particular offense. But just in general --
Q. No, I just want to get your general viewpoint. I wouldn't expect you to --
A. Generally speaking, $I$ think in -- and a lot of the same lines as we were talking earlier about alternatives to incarceration, you know, a lot of white collar crime victims have lost money, but they haven't lost any skin or blood. And I think a lot of times you have to
look at the distinction between a violent and a non-violent offense. Sometimes there would be a way for someone to not necessarily be incarcerated, but to allow somebody to keep working to support himself, with proper restrictions and -and make restitution to victims, would be a possibility.

But, now, as to whether -- as to whether somebody who is more fluent should not pay the penalty of incarceration versus somebody who's not? Then, no, that's not the way it ought to be. A judge has to be fair and impartial. And somebody's financial statement does not determine who goes to jail and who doesn't.
Q. One other point, in terms of -- you know, with regards to being able to stay out to work for restitution, is that mind set -- and I know that this is not -- not a family court seat. But is that -- is that mind set, you think, applicable to someone in a situation going to jail for child support, for example, and if they're in jail, they're not able -- then they're really not able to make their obligations?
A. Obviously, if he's in jail, he's not helping anybody. At the same time, I don't do a lot of family court work anymore, but $I$ used to do an awful lot of it. But sometimes, Representative Mack, it takes -- it takes some jail time to get somebody's attention. You know, the judge can order somebody to pay child support, and if he
doesn't do it, they bring him back in and he still doesn't do it. And, you know, most of the time, in my experience, the judges have not been that quick to put somebody in jail for non-payment of child support. But -- but sometimes that's an appropriate remedy.

And I -- I've known people of all walks of life, not -- not necessarily poor people, but affluent people. But sometimes they just -- they don't see the need to comply until something's done to get their attention. And sometimes that's appropriate. It should be done as a last resort. 'Cause as I said, somebody's sitting in jail is not supporting anybody; he's being supported by the State.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you,
Representative Mack. Any other questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I have just a
couple, Mr. Askins.
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS:
Q. You've been practicing for how long?
A. Thirty-nine years.
Q. Thirty-nine years. You've encountered a lot of judges over those 39 years.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. If you were to pick one judge out of the entire lineup of judges that you've known throughout the years,
who would you say that you would most like to pattern your -- your time on the bench after, if you were to be elected?
A. I've made mention of Judge Harwell, he was former Chief Justice. I always tended to call him Judge Harwell, even after he was Chief Justice, but --
Q. Rest his soul. He just passed away in the last -
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- few weeks.
A. And he -- you know, in our application, we submit reference letters. And a lot of my reference letters was from former Chief Justice Harwell. And it was very flattering to me, to have someone that I have so much respect for write a letter of recommendation for me. But he would be one that $I$ would like to pattern myself after as far as the way he ran the courtroom. I -- I have a five-dollar bill that $I$ won from him on the golf course, that he autographed for me. But he wrote underneath that: "Rommey cheated." So, but I've still got that. But he also got some of my money on different occasions.

But I -- I thought the world of him. In fact, when he -- when he sent the letter to me, he called me up and said, "I feel like I need to go to confession."

But Judge Harwell was a man I respected a lot.
Q. Thank you. You didn't cheat, did you?
A. Absolutely not. Am I still under oath, Mr. Chairman?
Q. Mr. Askins, I'd like to also ask a little bit about your work ethic. What kind of hours do you keep in your practice now?
A. You know, a small-town country lawyer doesn't do nine-to-five. Very often, I will meet with somebody before working hours. I still make house calls on occasion. And today, when I finish up, I've got to go over and get some titles taken care of for a widow, whose husband just passed away, and -- and -- and then combine that with my trip today. Very, very often, I -- I don't get home until, you know, after seven. And depending on what's going on, is -it may be later than that. In fact, my wife says, you know, "Why can't you have more regular hours? Why can't you take two weeks off for vacation? You know, like people at the plant can get two weeks or four weeks for vacation, why can't you do that?"

And I'll say, "Well, you know, I -- I don't want to face what I have to face when I come back, for one thing."

When I was in law school, we had a guy there who did a course of law office management, his name was Jay Fumberg [ph], I believe. And one of the things he said was, "You should eliminate the cases that don't pay. You
need to learn what is profitable and what is not. And you don't take the non-profitable cases."

In the -- in the area where I practice, you can't do that, you know. You know a lot of people -- I have people come, they can't afford to pay somebody, but they need somebody to help. And we do that a lot. It used to upset me to see somebody's name in the -- in the Bar publication that, you know, they gave a day for pro bono work. And, you know, a lot of times, country lawyers do a lot of pro bono work that doesn't get publicized. But so we do -- our hours are not necessarily regular. And we don't bill some of these guys in Columbia, I'm sure.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Askins. And do you work on

## Friday?

A. Yes, sir. We do work on Fridays. I typically have a doctor's appointment --
Q. Your wife is agreeing with you.
A. I typically have a doctor's appointment on Thursday afternoon. My doctor is my golf partner and my hunting and fishing buddy, and he and I play with my brother and my accountant, that grew up across the street. It is a -- an intensely competitive match. If somebody wins five dollars, they have a big day. But if we played for five thousand, it wouldn't be any more competitive than -- than it is.
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So other than that, I'm usually in the office.
And, you know, being located where we are, we have to travel to the courthouses. I travel to Kingstree to Florence to Georgetown to Conway to Marion to Sumter to Manning, and occasionally to Bishopville, and once in a while to Berkeley County. But we do, do a lot of traveling as well, and we try to, you know, combine our trips to make them most efficient.
Q. Would it be your intent to transfer that -- that work ethic to the bench?
A. Yes, sir. Absolutely. I have -- you know, again, you see all kinds of different ways that judges respond. I knew one judge, one time, if he got started by 10:30, that was -- that was pretty good. On the other hand, we had a judge in Florence one time, who shall remain nameless, that started at 8:30. And, you know, at 5:30, he had no intent to stop. And that's a little much to the extreme the other way.
Q. We won't call Judge Anderson's name.
A. Well, I -- you know, I served on a committee that Judge Harwell had, when he was Chief Justice, called the Bench Bar Committee. He appointed a lawyer from every circuit and a judge from every court to be on that committee. And Judge Alex Sanders was on that committee, and he made reference to the same judge. And he said, "I
don't know what to do about him. I've had a number of complaints, but I can't fire him and I can't kill him."

## REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Askins, those

are all the questions I have. Senator Malloy has a followup.

RE-EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Mr. Askins, you know I'm a country lawyer too. Are you closed any other days in your office?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. Are you closed on any days of the week in your office? In my -- in my area, they close on Wednesday and on Fridays.
A. You know, when I was -- when I was a boy, they used to blow the siren at twelve o'clock on Wednesday, and it was like a ghost town after that. Everybody closed on Wednesday. But no, sir, we don't close any -- any weekday. When I first started practicing, no one took off the day after Thanksgiving; everybody worked on Friday. And for Christmas -- we got Christmas, and we tried to close a little early on Christmas Eve.

Now, our employees dictate some changes on that, you know, we're -- and I've only -- you know, usually three days for Christmas. Even if it falls on the weekend, they still want three days, you know. But no, I'm -- we're not closed any weekday.
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Q. Are you familiar with the Indigent Defense Act of 2007, where we have certain defenders now that represents those individuals that you were talking about, that could not afford attorneys? Are you familiar with that?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. Are you familiar with the Indigent Defense Act of 2007, where we have circuit defenders, now --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- who represents those individuals?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So the defender in your area would be --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy, the stenographer's having trouble with you. If you could speak more directly into the microphone.

BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Are you familiar with the Indigent Defense Act?
A. Yeah, I'm familiar with that, somewhat.
Q. And do you have a certain defender in your area --
A. Right.
Q. -- that -- that is -- so I guess the question is -- now, is that do -- do you -- do you, since you're not on the list, do you still take some of those clients in your criminal practice?
A. I have. I mentioned earlier, that the last case

I tried, I agreed to be a party on -- where the public defender had the co-defendant.
Q. Right. But you -- but you're not -- but you don't -- you're not -- you don't -- not required to sign up; you do it as a -- on a voluntary basis?
A. I did on that one, yes, sir.
Q. And the -- the last one I wanted to end up making is, so you routinely have to go into the correction facilities and those kinds of things in your criminal cases?
A. When I did a lot of criminal work, you're in the jail a lot. A lot.
Q. Right.
A. Before hours, after hours, and during the day. SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator Malloy. Any other questions?
(No response.) REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Mr.

Askins, it's a pleasure to have you with us. This will conclude this -- 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 that need should arise. We will remind you of the 48 -hour rule, and ask you to be mindful of that.

Should anyone ask whether or not they may advocate on your behalf, we would ask that you remind them of the 48 -hour rule, as you explained it to us.

We thank you for offering. We thank you for your service to South Carolina.

MR. ASKINS: Thank you, sir. Am I excused for the day?

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: You are -- you are excused. Yes, sir.

MR. ASKINS: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Staff has asked for a five-minute recess. We will take five.
(Off the record from 10:53 a.m. till 11:09 a.m.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Bloom, if you'd please raise your right hand, and be sworn. WHEREUPON:

JEFFREY P. BLOOM, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Bloom, have you had a chance to review your personal data questionnaire?

MR. BLOOM: I have, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is it correct?

P R O C E E D I N G S - final

MR. BLOOM: Yes. I had one -- one
amendment.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Okay. So it's been amended once. Do you have -- need of making any other changes?

MR. BLOOM: No, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: As amended, do you have any objection to making that personal data questionnaire a part of your record of your sworn testimony today?

MR. BLOOM: I have no objection, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any other
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 3 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Personal Data Questionnaire for Jeffrey P. Bloom dated August 3rd, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Bloom, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly involved your qualifications for the bench. I think for the third time, if --

MR. BLOOM: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- I understand?

Our inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria, and it has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspapers articles in which your name appears, a study of your previous screenings, and a check for economic conflicts of interest.

We received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, and there are no witnesses present to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement that you'd like to share with the Commission?

MR. BLOOM: I'd like to say, briefly, my wife, Karen Fryar, could not be here today. She wanted to. She is a solicitor in Chester County for the 6th Circuit, and she's picking a jury this morning to prosecute a drug case. So she regrets she could not attend, but the citizens of Chester County needed her presence elsewhere.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Please let her
know that we missed seeing her.
MR. BLOOM: Thank you, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Bloom, Ms.
Katherine Wells, as you know, is your screening attorney. And we would ask that you direct your attention to her, and respond to any questions she may have.

MR. BLOOM: Yes, sir.

P R O C E E D I N G S - final

## Page 41

MS. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms.
Wells.
MS. WELLS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, $I$ have a procedural matter to take care of. EXAMINATION BY MS. WELLS:
Q. Mr. Bloom, do 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 to your sworn statement?
A. No, ma'am. Other than that -- other than the one I'd previously mentioned.

MS. WELLS: All right. At this time, Mr. Bloom, I would ask that Mr. Bloom's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit to the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms. Wells. Is there any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 4 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of Jeffrey P. Bloom dated August 6th, 2015)

MS. WELLS: Members of the Commission, I
note for the record that based on the testimony contained in the candidate's amended PDQ, which has been included in the record, with the candidate's consent, Mr. Bloom meets the constitutional requirements for disposition regarding age, residence, and years of practice.

BY MS. WELLS:
Q. Mr. Bloom, would you like to explain to the Commission why you want to serve as a circuit court judge, and how you feel your legal and professional experience thus far would assist you in becoming an effective circuit court judge?
A. Thank you, Ma'am. Yes, I would. Quite frankly, I think I would be good at it. And I don't say that out of ego; I say that with all humility and respect.

MR. BLOOM: Mr. Chairman, similar to what you and your colleagues who've run for the House and Senate have done in the past, you felt you have particular skills, life experience and qualities that you could bring that would benefit the citizens of your district and this state. And I feel I have that too.
A. Again, with all humility and respect. I've practiced for 25 years in this state. I have visited every circuit in this state, from Horry County to Abbeville, from Beaufort to Spartanburg, from Marion to Greenville, as well
as the Midlands. I've been in every circuit in this state. And I humbly think, from those experiences in those civil and criminal law, that $I$ would bring in fairness and temperament and a knowledge of the law, that would benefit the citizens of this state. Both lawyers and -- and nonlawyer parties alike. And I -- and I humbly think I would be good at that. And I would have the temperament to do it.

I have focused -- and I'll sum up, because brevity is clarity -- that for the last three to five years, I have put an emphasis on civil practice. And I've associated myself with a number of civil law firms, in a wide variety of cases, negligence cases, personal injury, and some of the run-of-the-mill civil cases we have in our courts. And I've learned a lot from those experiences. And I think that has rounded out my experience. And I would add that both the Bar Committee as well as the Citizen's Committee found me well qualified in both civil and criminal law.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Bloom. Are there any areas, including subjective areas of the law that you would need to additionally prepare for in order to serve as a circuit court judge? And if so, how will you handle that additional preparation?
A. First, I don't think so. As I said, I've handled
over -- in 25 years, a wide variety of criminal and civil cases. In the last three to five years, I've done negligence cases, bankruptcy case, landlord/tenant. I have even done pro bono service. I do over a hundred hours of pro bono service a year. And in 2005, I was the South Carolina Bar Pro Bono Attorney of the Year. So I think I have a well-rounded background. I even served as a special master in a case -- I believe it's in the packet -- in Calhoun County, that was an action for collect of debt.

So I've done a wide range of cases. I think probably the only type $I$ have not had experience in is either complex product liability or class action suits, which -- which tend to be rarer on our civil docket. But if $I$ were tasked with one of those, $I$ would certainly reach out to other circuit judges who've had that experience, and get their guidance.
Q. Thank you. Although, you address this in your sworn affidavit, would you please explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. Temperament. Temperament. Temperament. As I have traveled across the state, as I stated, and visited every circuit. I've been yelled at by some very smart judges. And I've come to understand what -- what lawyers as well as their clients, who for the most part are not
lawyers, want is to be treated fairly and with dignity.
And I think I could do that. I -- you know, in my packet, as you've seen, a number of letters attesting to my character.

I think there are also five solicitors who have been willing to attest to my character, my temperament, and my fairness in this process. And they have supplied their names to staff. And that would be Solicitor Scarlett Wilson, out of the 9th Circuit for Charleston and Berkeley; Solicitor Barry Barnett from the 7th Circuit, out of Spartanburg and Cherokee; Solicitor Jimmy Richardson out of Horry and Georgetown Counties for the 15 th Circuit; Solicitor David Pasco, 1st Circuit for Orangeburg, Calhoun, and Dorchester; and Solicitor Dan Johnson, here in Richland and Kershaw.

So I think one of the obvious criticisms I'll
face up front, that people often say, "Well, Mr. Bloom, you were a public defender for 14 years, and you've done capital cases. How can you be fair?"

And I think with five solicitors attesting to my character, fairness, and temperament, that speaks for itself, I would hope.
Q. Mr. Bloom, regarding the backlog of cases on the docket, what suggestions would you offer for improving that backlog, both for general sessions and for common pleas and
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## circuit court?

A. In a -- in my humble experience, it means simply having court run, often past five o'clock, and through Friday afternoon, like most other folks hold down their Monday through Friday, nine to five jobs. When court breaks down, it doesn't serve anybody. From my experience, it takes, I think, getting all of the stakeholders together and making sure common pleas court or general sessions court runs with a full docket.

In general sessions court, the players are obviously in the Solicitor's office, Public Defender's office, the private bar. And the sheriff's department and the clerk's office, 'cause they're responsible for security and getting prisoner's there as well. And in common pleas court, it means getting both the plaintiff and defendants, civil law firms, small law firms, and large law firms together and fashioning a docket that runs. And we often got dinged for not -- we ran the Public Defender's office here in the '90s, keeping the judges busy right up till five o'clock on Friday, and then -- so it takes hard work. It takes bringing all the stakeholders together and making sure that the docket runs.
Q. Thank you. The Commission received 128 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 17 additional comments. The surveys contained many positive comments noting your
work -- your work ethic, your character, and your willingness to help others.

A few of the written comments, though, expressed
concerns. One comment stated that they felt you were not suited to be a circuit court judge, because you lacked the necessary professional skills to be a circuit court judge. How do you respond to that?
A. You know, I'm a Boy Scout. I'm an Eagle Scout. I'm a volunteer Scoutmaster. And the adult training I've taken, we have a phrase that we're taught in Scouting, and that's "Feedback is a gift." And if I had a hundred positive comments and one negative, I would still seek to strive to accept that feedback as a gift, and overcome and work through that.

I think, as I've said before, I had a number of solicitors who attested to my character and fairness and temperament. In my packet, I think there's one deputy solicitor, Paula Edwards, who works here in Richland County, who wrote a character letter for me.

I have two sheriffs who've attested to my character, in their letters that are in the packet. Sheriff Thomas Summers of Calhoun County, and Sheriff Phillip Thompson from Horry County, who probably knows me better than any sheriff in this state, he and I started together. I was a baby lawyer and he was a baby road
deputy. But I accept that feedback and would strive to overcome any -- any deficiencies, and seek to again have temperament, fairness, and partiality.
Q. As a follow-up to that, do you feel that any criticisms of your lack of civil trial experience are valid? And how do you respond to any of those criticisms about that?
A. Well, you know, feedback is a gift. I have done a number of civil cases in the last five years; most of them have settled. I have done them in association with other law firms. I've done a wide variety of civil cases in magistrates court as well. I am conscious of that. But I've also done a lot of civil cases in the realm of postconviction relief. And, you know, those cases are complex cases, and they operate under the same civil rules that all -- all common pleas cases do. And, again, so I'm very familiar with declaratory judgements, summary judgements, discovery, interrogatories, other applicable civil rules. So I would strive to -- to apply my knowledge and experience to that.

You know, $I$ don't claim to be the best trial lawyer in the courtroom -- I've never said that -- but I do think I have honesty, a fairness and a temperament and a willingness to understand if there is criticism or feedback to correct that.

We -- we have a number of circuit judges in this state who have also served as public defenders or solicitors. And if I thought at any time I had a weakness, in order to have a bountiful experience in civil practice, I would go to those other circuit court judges to mentor me in that area, to make sure I was -- I was competent and effective and fair.
Q. Thank you. What about comments that would say you would be biased in favor of criminal defendants, based on your years as a public defender in some defense for capital punishment cases?
A. And I understand that. And I don't -- I don't bear any criticism for anyone who -- who feels that, based on my public defender experience, that -- that they would be concerned about bias. I would answer that in three ways:

First, as I've alluded to, y'all have elected over 20 circuit judges in this state who served honorably as either solicitors or public defenders, and those 20 judges serve honorably today. Many of them have been mentors to me when I was a young lawyer. Steven John and Larry Hyman, circuit judges in Horry County, served on my board of directors when I was a public defender there. And Frank Addy, the public defender out of Greenwood, now a circuit judge. Tommy Russo from Florence was a public
defender. Daniel Hall, from York County, was a public defender. Jack Early, out of -- out of Aiken, Barnwell, and Bamberg, was on a public defender board. William Keesley, out of Edgefield/Lexington, was a public defender. John Hayes, out of York County, was one of the founding members of the South Carolina Defendant Attorney Association

So I would think I could model myself, as those judges have served, in their objective and fair application of the law, and application of the law of the facts. And if I had any concern, or anyone brought concern to me, I would -- I would be glad to talk to them and -- and ask them to mentor me in that case.

And my -- my door would be open to any solicitor -- and I should say not just solicitor, but any assistant solicitor who'd only been on the job one month, if they thought I had been unfair or -- or biased in any way in a particular case, to come and tell me that. And I would let solicitors and public defenders, as well as private bar know, if -- if I had -- you know, often lawyers are afraid to approach judges.

And I very much try to operate with an openness. And if I felt -- and I would tell those -- those assistant solicitors to please come and tell me if you think I've been unfair, and let's talk about it. And I'll try to be
aware of that in the future.
MS. WELLS: Just a few housekeeping issues,
Mr. Chairman.
BY MS. WELLS:
Q. Mr. Bloom, have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered a condition of pledge or support of any legislator pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of the process on your behalf?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. No, ma'am.
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?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And are you aware that the penalties for violating the pledging rules are a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days? A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. WELLS: I would note for the record, that the Citizen's Committee -- the Midlands Citizens Committee found Mr. Bloom to be overall well qualified, and also well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, character, professional and academic ability, reputation and experience and judicial temperament. The Committee found Mr. Bloom to be qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria for constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability.

I would note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Mr . Bloom, were incorporated into the questioning of him today.

And, Mr. Bloom, I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much, Ms. Wells. Do the Commission members have any questions for Mr. Bloom?

MR. WILCOX: If I may.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Dean Wilcox.
EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. Mr. Bloom, I'm going to ask you to be quick, to keep us on schedule.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. But just a quick question. With regard to technology, there's an increasing reliance on need for an understanding of electronic discovery. What experience do you have, or what education have you undertaken to familiarize yourself with --
A. I can --
Q. -- particular issues related to --
A. I can answer this, briefly. I practice extensively in federal court. And federal court went to electronic filing some years ago; it is a completely
paperless system. And when you have a presentation in court or a jury trial, you have to be familiar with the electronic apparatus in the courtroom for -- everything from showing of documents to a transcript to any records. So I've had training in federal court to do that. And I do, do that on a regular basis.

MR. WILCOX: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Dean Wilcox. Senator Malloy, you're recognized. EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Mr. Bloom, you were a member of the old sentencing guidelines commission, correct?
A. I was, sir. Yes, sir.
Q. And you're familiar with the Sentence Reform Act of 2010?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And give me your position on sentencing guidelines in the state system.
A. In the state system, we use it extensively in the federal system. When $I$ served on that commission, I was a proponent of not -- of us not adapting, quite frankly, the federal system. You know, a federal court judge will do maybe five guilty pleas in one day. Our circuit judges do that in an hour or two. Every sentence in federal court, under the sentencing guidelines, a U.S. probation officer is assigned to do a thirty-plus page pre-sentence report, and recommend where they fall in the guidelines. And we don't have that staff. So I think just by sheer numbers, we cannot adapt the federal system. It would bankrupt us.
Q. Are you a proponent of giving discretion to the state court judge in criminal system, as it relates to sentencing?
A. I think it is a -- yes, sir. I think our judges have good discretion. I think 99 percent of the cases, as you have seen, judges exercise that discretion when they -properly. When they don't, they're accountable to the General Assembly. And in the cases where there -- there
needs to be discretion tightened up, this -- this General Assembly has passed laws settled certain mandatory minimums and maximums and ranges for -- for multiple offense.
Q. And in light of that, are you -- are you in favor of sentencing as it relates to mandatory minimums; i.e., that we were at one point in time giving sentences that you had a mandatory five up to twenty? Or would you rather see it from zero to twenty, and leave it up to the judge?
A. You know, I have to be candid. I don't have a position on that. I think that purely as a legislative prerogative, in terms of where those ranges fall, I fully understand. For example, in repeat offenders such as -- I alluded my wife, Karen Fryar, is in Chester. She is trying a drug case today, where it's a third offender, so he falls with a mandatory minimum. And I understand the Legislator's need in -- in those particular cases.
Q. And you were a member of the Indigent Defense Board up until the mid-2007/2008 --
A. I was, sir. I was one of the --
Q. It was prior to the old --
A. -- founding members --
Q. -- the old system.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Before they had the non-profits.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And have you had a chance to witness and see the new circuit defender system?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And are you a supporter of the new circuit defender system?
A. I think it's one of the best things this General Assembly did. The prosecutors --
Q. You know that's my bill.
A. Pardon me?
Q. It's my bill.
A. Yes, sir. And I was -- I advocated that, you may recall, in the beginning of '90s. So it took us a long time to get there. And I thank you and Representative Smith for all your efforts in that.

You know, the Prosecutor's Office can only prosecute as many cases as the Public Defender's office can keep up with, depending on the percentage the Public Defender's office handles, as well as the Clerk of Court staff's shared staff. So I think that went a long way -quite frankly, a good unintended consequence -- was to help reduce criminal dockets in most circuits, Because -because then you had training and adequate funding on both sides. Even if you have a guilty plea, a guilty plea is -is the -- the defense lawyers have time to prepare that and negotiate it and move forward.
Q. And in your -- in your practice, and in your philosophy that you would take to the bench, when you do have some flexibility, are you in favor of alternative sentencing? When you and I -- when we -- when we first started practicing, we had pretrial intervention, and that was pretty much it. And now we've changed so all scheduled could be a part of it.
A. Right.
Q. And so the question becomes, is that, are you in favor of alternative sentencing? And I tell you before you answer it, is that we have made a mission of getting the amount of violence out of the prison system, so that our prison population is down from 25,000 to slightly over 20,000.

And so my question is: Is that as a person sitting upon the bench, would you look for ways for nonviolence -- for ways to punish other than incarceration?
A. When the General Assembly provides into law programs for a circuit court judge to consider someone for alternative sentencing, and when the person meets that criteria, and the Solicitor's office is in consent, I would look at that program, and -- and if the person qualifies, and they're within the law, and the Prosecutor's office is on board, I would look to place people -- and let me -- and let me answer it this way: My wife, Karen Fryar, besides
being a prosecutor in Chester County, is also a juvenile drug court judge.
Q. Let me ask you a question.
A. I'm sorry.
Q. Why does the solicitor have to consent?
A. Well, for example in PTI, the solicitor has to consent. So I use that, if it's a parameter in the law, the General Assembly has required some alternative sentencing formulations that the Solicitor's office has to consent. If the Solicitor's office doesn't have to consent, then I would -- I would just make sure that the defendant is otherwise qualifying for that program.

And the example I would give is -- is -- as I started to say, my wife also serves as a part-time juvenile drug court judge here in Richland County, with Judge Bruce Williams. And that program affects a small number of juvenile defendants and non-violent defendants in family court, has had remarkable success.

And I want to thank the General Assembly for those types of programs. You're taking juveniles, who are having their first contact with the law, in a non-violent way, but have an underlying substance abuse problem, and the recidivism -- recidivism rate among those juveniles is almost zero. She -- she got a letter, recently, from a juvenile she had in drug court, that she kept in there for
almost two years -- he's now an adult in Georgia, has a successful business and has turned his life around. So that's -- that's a type of alternative program, is one of the parameters there the General Assembly sets out, and the person who qualifies -- to see if the person is eligible for that.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any other
questions? Mr. Hitchcock.
MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION BY MR. HITCHCOCK:
Q. Mr. Bloom, I certainly appreciate you being here today, and offering up your service to be a circuit court judge. And let me just say that when it comes to your experience as a public defender, I tell -- when I have a chance to talk to young lawyers, I tell them that I believe that being a public defender or a solicitor is probably the best incubator that they could ever have to -- to how -really, to gain experience as a young lawyer. And, you know, sometimes even people who have emerged from the Public Defender's office even find themselves on the Judicial Merit Selection Commission. So it's a -- it's a -- it's something that I share with you -- an experience I share with you. And I believe it's a fantastic one.

One of the -- in looking over your materials, one
of the things that I believe that you've been questioned on, or felt that it was necessary to address, was your view on the death penalty. And in your -- in your comments on that, you allude to the tragic incident involving Officer Alia from Forest Acres. And I think you described that you have a personal connection there. And I think that -- I can certainly understand your perception of how that might be a case that would be worthy of the death penalty. And I think that probably we all agree that the -- the horrific acts by Emanuel would also be another instance where it might be worthy of the application. But given -- you know, as a -- given your experience in handling capital cases, and your role as the judge in a potential capital case, if you were called upon to preside over a capital case, and you had a -- an instance where the acts may not be quite as heinous or shocking or -- obviously, not having a personal connection, how would you, I guess, handle, you know, the -- or your role as a -- as a judge in that instance, if the jury did return a verdict imposing the death penalty?
A. If I can give a short answer and then a longer answer, 'cause I think your question deserves both. It's the law, and I can impose it. That's the short answer.

You all may know -- and I think I -- this may be in my materials, Greg Alia was the Forest Acres police officer who was recently killed in the line of duty. I am
very active on Boy Scouts. I'm a volunteer scoutmaster. Greg Alia was an older Scout when my sons were Eagle Scout, and they're young -- were young tenderfoots. And he was a mentor to them. He was one of our Eagle Scouts, Greg Alia. And so I've got a -- I do get a -- I get why we have that law, and why it has to be imposed in some heinous cases.

And I would also respond in -- in three ways:
Again, we have a number of circuit judges in our state who served as prosecutors and public defenders, and they presided over those cases and had imposed it when necessary. And I could do the same. And I -- if I felt I needed to, I would go to them and ask them to mentor me in a particular case, or counsel me. I would not hesitate if -- if the case were, as you've described, Mr. Hitchcock, to impose it. That's why we have the law. And there are some cases that call for it. I would ask not to be judged by the cases I've been appointed to when I was a public defender.

The second: Again, I have had five solicitors in the process, attested -- attest to my character, temperament, and fairness. And every one of those five I've mentioned, Scarlett Wilson, Jimmy Richardson, Gary Barnett, David Pasco, and Dan Johnson, I have been on the opposing side in the case such as you've described, except for Dan Johnson. And every one of them found that I was
civil, unbiased, objective, and I treated them with courtesy and civility. And I would make sure all the participants in such a case were treated the same. And, again, if $I$ could impose it, $I$ would.

And lastly, and I've said this before, but I'm married to a prosecutor. Karen Fryar prosecutes in the 6th Circuit in Chester County. And she comes home every week, she takes those cases to heart. And those deputies, the job they do, she takes that to heart. And I see the challenges all the solicitors face, as well as our public defenders. And I know, firsthand. I lived it. But I see that when she comes home and has those stories, that she takes to heart.

You know, I would add, very briefly, Mr. Hitchcock, she started working for Solicitor Doug Barfield, who is retiring this fall, and Solicitor Randy Newman won the election and took over in January. Mr. Newman did not have a lot of experience as a practicing solicitor -- I'm not telling stories about him. He and I have met and talked about. They have a difficult drug and gang problem in Chester and Lancaster County, 'cause I-77 runs right through it.

Given my experience in federal court, and the contacts I've made there, and the friendships and those colleagues in the Department of Justice, I was able to
introduce Solicitor Johnson to people in the Department of Justice here in the Federal Prosecutor's office, and they are now bringing resources to the state level to help -- to help Solicitor Newman.

And so I get it. I get what our system -citizens need, and the protection they need. And I would be fair and impartial to all parties.

MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr.
Hitchcock. Senator Malloy.
RE-EXAMINATION BY MR. MALLOY:
Q. So and -- and, in fact, I'm going to follow-up on the -- the death penalty discussion. You may not know it, I'll just say I represent some individual that was assassinated down in the Charleston case. And I just think that's an issue that would come up for our state at some point in time. And just to be clear from the Commission, you have been death-penalty certified in this state for how long?
A. You know, I tried my first capital case as a baby public defender, $I$ was there for six months. I think I had been death penalty certified by the South Carolina Supreme Court since about --
Q. A long time.
A. -- 1992 or so. Yes, sir.
Q. And, basically, the people that serve on the jury are people that have not decided, one way or the other.
A. Correct.
Q. They could not be a proponent, or they could not be an opponent --
A. Correct.
Q. -- and so you've got a neutral person, so we can be clear.
A. Correct.
Q. But what you are saying, actually is, is that -is that -- that you will following the law of the land.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And that, basically, if that's what the law is. And so if there -- there are certain cases whenever there's an ultimate crime, you think it deserves an ultimate punishment, as the law in the State of South Carolina --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- says? And if in the event that if you have seen that there have been people that say they forgive, and we decide to abolish the death penalty, you would be the same way, because it's legislative issues, correct?
A. It is very much a legislative issue. And I think you raise a good point, Senator Malloy, on judicial philosophy. I am not, you know, campaigning or running for
a state supreme court position, where they sometimes have to interpret and apply legislation as a matter of policy. A circuit court judge takes the law as you have written it, and has been applied by higher courts, and applies it to the facts in a very careful and concise way. I don't think circuit judges make policy.
Q. But there are conceivable times when one, in a capital case, would plead guilty, obviously, and waive a jury --
A. Correct.
Q. -- that could come before the judge.
A. Correct.
Q. At that point in time, I guess now you're saying that I support or don't, and that kind of thing, and just -- I think that what you are telling us is that, whatever the law of the land is, that you would be able to abide by it.
A. I could apply the law and the facts objectively. I can apply it fairly, in whatever sentence was required.
Q. Thank you.
A. And, again, I think that's -- that's why five solicitors, including four who I've tried cases with, have attested to my fairness, my temperament, and my lack of bias.

## Q. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator
Malloy. Any other questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Mr. Bloom, we want to thank you so much for being here and offering for this judicial position. That concludes this portion of our screening process. And, Mr. Bloom, as you know, the record will remain open until such time that -the record will remain open until the report is published. And you may be called back at such time, if that need should arise.

I'll remind you of the 48 -hour rule and ask if you'd be mindful of it. If anyone should inquire whether or not they may advocate on your behalf, we ask you to educate them on the 48 -hour rule.

MR. BLOOM: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We thank you for offering. And we thank you for your desire to serve the State of South Carolina.

MR. BLOOM: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir.
MR. BLOOM: May $I$ just say in conclusion, very briefly, you know, my father was a World War II veteran, my son has done two tours in Iraq, and is scheduled to go back a third time, I've seen firsthand
their service and sacrifice. I don't claim that being a judge is near -- equivalent to military service. But I think $I$ have qualities and knowledge and skills and a temperament that would serve the citizens of this state well, and make this general assembly proud. And I would strive to make you proud, if you make a wise and judicious choice. Thank you for your time.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr.
Bloom.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Ladies and
gentlemen, I just did a quick calculation. If we take the same kind of time we've taken on the first two candidates, we will be here until eleven o'clock tonight. I want you to be complete and thorough in your investigation, but just be aware that we are running well over time.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: So, Mr. Chairman, you're advising the staff attorneys to speed up the questions?

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I share that, if anyone would like. Good morning, Mr. Epting. MR. EPTING: Good morning. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Good to have you with us.

MR. EPTING: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have before us Joseph M. Epting, Jr, seeking nomination to the Circuit Court, At-Large, Seat 10. Mr. Epting, if you could raise your right hand and be sworn.

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

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Have you had a chance, Mr. Epting, to review your personal data questionnaire?

MR. EPTING: I have, yes.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is it complete and
correct?
MR. EPTING: It is
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
changes that need to be made?
MR. EPTING: There are none.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Okay. Would you
have any objection to us making that personal data questionnaire a part of your sworn testimony today?

MR. EPTING: No.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: So ordered. It will be a part of the record.

EXHIBIT NO. 5 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of Joseph M. Epting, Jr. dated August 17th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Epting, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiries focused in the nine evaluative criteria, and it's also included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, a check for economic conflicts of interest.

And today, we've received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, and there are no witnesses here to testify.

Do you have a brief opening statement that you'd like to share with us?

MR. EPTING: Just pleased to be here. I appreciate you having me in front of -- in front of you, and I'm happy to answer any questions you've got.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Epting. We would ask that you please direct your attention to your screening attorney, and respond to any questions he
may have.
MR. EPTING: Great.
MR. GENTRY: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I have a procedural matter to take care of with this candidate.

MR. GENTRY: Mr. Epting, you have before you the sworn statement you filed with detailed answers to over thirty questioning regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments you'd like to make at this time to your sworn statement?

MR. EPTING: No.
MR. GENTRY: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that Mr. Epting's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Gentry. Is there any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 6 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of Joseph M. Epting, Jr. dated August 5th, 2015)

MR. GENTRY: One final procedural matter, I'd 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. Epting meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. EXAMINATION BY MR. GENTRY:
Q. Mr. Epting, why do you now want to serve as a circuit 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 wanted to be a judge since I was kid. Oftentimes, we grow up and we want to do things we see our parents do, not because of the -- our parents did it, because we see the importance of it. And for me growing up, my dad was, among other things, a little town judge in the Town of Chapin. So as a kid, my trips on Wednesday nights were to the fire station in Chapin, where they would back the fire engines out and they would set up a table, and that's where my dad would hold court. And that's where it started.

And in a small town like that, you know, you can see the importance of that position, the importance of treating people with the respect. And as to now, it takes a while and life experiences under your belt, in my opinion, anyway, to -- to get the experience, just the life experience to be a judge. I'm 45. I don't think at 42, I
had those life experiences. But I do now. And so that brings us to today.
Q. Are there any areas, including subjective areas of the law, that you'd need to do additional preparation in order to serve as a judge? And how would you go about that preparation?
A. I'm fairly well-rounded. But I think I would certainly -- my experience leans towards the civil side. The criminal matters, you know, again, town stuff -- small stuff, I would largely conflict out of, as a young attorney, because my father was a judge. But I've done a lot of court-appointed work, criminal cases, trials. But criminal is definitely where, if you look, that would probably be my weakness.

I also clerked for Judge Kinard, so I've been involved in capital murder cases; we were assigned one of those during the year. So although I think I'm balanced, I think it would be fair to say that criminal is where I would need to focus mostly on.
Q. Could you explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. The appropriate demeanor is one of respect, first and foremost. And, you know, I tell a story that my first day of being a law clerk with Judge Kinard, we went to -- I
think it was Sumter, and it was a pro se guy. And he had taken -- he was getting ready to lose his farm. He had taken one of the tall building firms back and forth to this Supreme Court. And it was clearly over, everybody else had conflicted out. And so we walk in there, and immediately upon hearing -- it was the only hearing that day. And all three of the defense attorneys stood up, ready to tell Judge Kinard what was getting ready -- you know, what they wanted. And he asked them to sit down, and he would tell them when he needed to hear from them. And he let that guy talk for 45 minutes. And at the end of the day, the thing that we all knew was going to happen in the first minute, happened. And the man lost his motion.

And I asked Kinard as we were leaving, I said, "Why did you give that -- we had other things we could have been doing. And you gave that guy 45 minutes, an hour to talk. Why did you do that?"

And he said, "'Cause people need to feel like they've been heard. And the results will take care of themselves, but if they feel like they've heard, the system's working."

And that's what he did that day. And I think that's the most important thing.
Q. What suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the docket, both in the general

## sessions and the common pleas docket?

A. I don't have as much experience in the backlog of general sessions, and I know the solicitor's largely control that docket. But in common pleas, I got to be honest, I like the trial that they're doing with the motions now, where you can submit the motions and they have an opportunity to be heard without a hearing. I think that two-thirds of motions probably don't need a hearing; you can submit a brief and -- and rule on that. You know, a motion to compel, or things like that.

And while it's not as difficult in, say, Richland County, where you've got a lot of terms of court, I can see that would be very problematic to get your motion heard. In a smaller venue that -- you know, Bamberg, Barnwell, something like that where they just don't have that many non-jury terms of court. So I like where that's going. And I think some play off of that would greatly help in reducing the backlog.
Q. The Commission received 107 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 13 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments: "A very good lawyer who would make an excellent judge."

One of the written comments expressed concerns. One comment indicated that you do not possess the requisite
experience, acumen, or professional skills to be a judge.
What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Well, I would respectfully disagree. My
experience is -- you know, I'm not going to go back through
it. I mean, we already went through that. But I've
handled a broad array of civil cases and criminal cases. I
think my teaching CLEs and my law school experience after that -- or before that, excuse me -- show I've got the educational experience. I don't know, one out of only ain't bad, though, I guess.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Epting. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Have you sought, or have you been offered a conditional pledge of support of any legislator 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?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of the process on your behalf?
A. No.
Q. Have you contacted any members of this commission?
A. I think I put in my statement, that $I$ had made one phone call to Senator Malloy's office. And, quite frankly, it was before $I$ even picked up the packet. And I didn't realize those implications. The Senator didn't call me back, as he should have. And so that was -- you know, I immediately called the Counsel and let her know what I had done. But other than that, there's nothing.
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?
A. I do. Yes.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have. They were handed as a part of the packet.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction, the violator must be fined not more than one thousand, or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I am aware of that.

MR. GENTRY: I would note that the Midlands
Citizens Committee found Mr. Epting qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. The committee found
him well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. The committee stated in summary, "Mr. Epting has a good mix of criminal and civil experience. All reports and our observations confirm that he has a good demeanor for a judge. His colleagues think of him as a fair person. Mr. Epting is well qualified to be a circuit court judge, both in experience and demeanor."

I would note that for the record any concerns raised at this point, were raised in this questioning. Mr. Epting, at this time I have no further questions.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr.
Gentry. Any questions by Commission members? Senator Malloy is recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First, let me report to the Committee that Mr. Epting is associated with the Mullis Law Firm now. And I was the clerk for Bo Mullis back in the old, old days. And he was a very close friend of mine, before his passing. I'd also report that his partner and himself, most likely contributed to my campaign in the last $12 / 13$ years, along with his father -- I'm sure he did. And Bo Mullis certainly -- certainly did. And I think we practiced together at that time as well. So I'd like the Committee
to be aware of that.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Mr. Epting, I would -- I'll be brief. One, I know that you are -- that you are a proponent of alternative sentencing.
A. Yes.
Q. And you're familiar with drug courts and those kind of things? Have you been supportive of those in the past?
A. I am. Judge Williams started that. And it's a good idea.
Q. And, also, you are a proponent of guidelines -of sentencing guidelines, that the court should have flexibility in the sentencing.
A. Yeah, I -- I think that over the course the experiments with sentencing guidelines, we've seen that flexibility is really almost necessary to make that work.
Q. And I think that you have -- are you deathpenalty certified?
A. I am not.
Q. Have you been involved in a death penalty case?
A. I was when I clerked with Judge Kinard. We were assigned one, yeah.
Q. But your practice has been largely criminal and Civil?
A. It is. Most of my criminal was court-appointed cases. Some private, but mostly court-appointed. SENATOR MALLOY: All right. That's all the questions I have.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator
Malloy. Other members? Dean Wilcox is recognized. EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. I'm going to ask a question answer to this, to keep us on schedule. But given the likelihood that you'll be asked to resolve disputes involving electronic discovery, and the issues that are particularly related to electronic storage of information, what experience do you have, or what education have you tried to get for yourself regarding that -- those issues in particular?
A. You know, we see that pop up a lot more in my federal litigation. And I tell you, Dean, nine out of ten times, we can set initial parameters in the pretrial scheduling order and the 26(f) conference. It covers most of the electronic discovery. I understand it can get wildy out of hand, but $I$-- we've always been able to work it out in $26(f)$. The couple of times we haven't, it was a quick ruling from a federal district judge.
Q. Thank you.
A. Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Dean.

Representative Bannister is recognized.
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER:
Q. Mr. Epting, in your sworn statement, you answered the question regarding your philosophy on recusal, and asked specifically in situations regarding lawyer legislators, and you said, "Should have an attorney or party to the litigation have a concern, I would recuse myself."

You mean any -- any party -- any lawyer to an action, would that be -- the opposing counsel is a lawyerlegislator should say, "I want you to recuse yourself," you could take that position? Did you intend to answer the question that day?
A. No. I guess my intent would be if I had some prior dealings with the lawyer-legislator, that would fall under the normal judicial guidelines for recusing yourself. Just because they're a lawyer and a legislator, doesn't --
Q. I mean, obviously, every -- let's say you're the only person in the race, and everybody in the General Assembly votes for you --
A. That would be nice.
Q. -- if somebody makes that motion, what is your position on recusing yourself?
A. I don't think I'm required to recuse myself under that.
Q. Okay.
A. I mean, does that answer your question,

Representative?
Q. It does. The way you answered it, it appeared that if a party made the motion, that you would recuse yourself. So I was trying to understand the idea that being a lawyer-legislator would cause you a conflict, that you would need to do that.
A. That was obviously a poorly-answered question on my part.
Q. I'm just making sure I understood your position. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Bannister. Any other questions? Members?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Mr. Epting, thank you so much. Oh, excuse me. We have one matter to take up very briefly in executive session with regard to this candidate. Chair will entertain a motion to go into executive session.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I move.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have a motion. I'll lower the vale and ask that the doors be closed.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Epting, thank you for being here and your offering for public service on
the bench. That concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. You may be called back at such time, if that need should arise.

We remind you of the 48 -hour rule. We ask you to be mindful of it. And should anybody ask whether they can advocate on your behalf, we would ask that you educate them with regard to the 48 -hour rule. We thank you for offering, and we thank you for your desire to serve the State of South Carolina.

MR. EPTING: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir. (Candidate excused.)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Next candidate, please.

Good afternoon, Mr. Frick. It's good to have you with us today.

MR. FRICK: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Would you please raise your right hand, and be sworn?

WHEREUPON:
WILLIAM PATRICK FRICK, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Frick, have
you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?

MR. FRICK: Yes.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is it correct?
MR. FRICK: It is.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Does it need to be
changed in any way?
MR. FRICK: No, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Would you have any objection to making that a part of the record in your sworn testimony today?

MR. FRICK: No objection.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is
there objection by any Commission member?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 7 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of William Patrick Frick dated August 5th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: The Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry is focused in the nine evaluative criteria, and has also included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials,
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verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspapers articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, if any, and a check for economic conflicts of interest.

We've received no affidavits filed in
opposition to your election, and we have no witnesses present to testify today. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to share with us?

MR. FRICK: Just briefly, I'd like to share why I'm seeking judicial election. As you see in my -- one of my packets there, I stated that we have a dire situation in the 6th Judicial Circuit. I certainly understand that this is an At-Large seat. However, it's taken longer for people to find their day in court in the 6th Circuit, than in any other circuit in the state. And this is Chester and Lancaster. And you can look, the criminal backlog is by far the worst in the state.

Progress has been made, county councils have allocated funds so there are new attorneys. But we are the only -- one of the only circuit -- there's two circuits in the state to have one judge. We need an additional judge; that would be the extra piece that would help folks find their day in court. That's litigants who are waiting for their day in court, that's victims of crime who are awaiting for closure, and that's defendants who have had
cases that have been pending over their head for years. And that is -- that is the main reason why $I$ am seeking this office.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much, Mr. Frick. As you know, Mr. Bob Maldonado is your screening attorney. And I would ask that you turn your attention to him, and respond to any questions he has for you. Mr. Maldonado?

MR. MALDONADO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I'll start with a procedural matter. Mr. Frick, you have before you, the sworn statement you provided 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 to your sworn statement?

MR. FRICK: No, sir.
MR. MALDONADO: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that Mr. Frick's sworn statement -- statement be entered into the -- as an exhibit in the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
objections?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 8 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of William Patrick Frick dated August 3rd, 2015)

MR. MALDONADO: One final procedural matter, 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. Frick meets the statutory requirements for this position, regarding age, residence, and years of practice. EXAMINATION BY MR. MALDONADO:
Q. Mr. Frick, you've already explained to the Commission about your -- why you want to be a judge. How do you feel your experience would assist you in being an effective judge?
A. Well, I have 15 years of experience. The vast majority of that is in the courtrooms, quite frankly, as a prosecutor for a couple different circuits, Attorney General's office, and defendant attorney in a couple different circuits. I am in the courtroom every day. In fact, if $I$ were not standing here, $I$ would be standing in a courtroom in Chester, before a judge handling a case. So I know well what it takes to make a court run. And I have the experience to ensure that it does so from the judicial side.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Frick, are there any areas,
including subjective 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 preparation?
A. Of course, if you look at the questionnaire, the question that asked is your last five years of experience. The last five years, all I've done is criminal law. I've been deputy public defender in the 6th Circuit for -- for over the last five years. So while that question indicates that I have absolutely no experience outside the criminal realm, that is not at all correct. I have been in private practice.

I was in a small firm in Winnsboro, a general practice firm. And those who have been in a general practice firm, in a smaller town, understands that you do a little bit of everything. I did from personal injury to workers' comp, all manners of -- of civil litigation, as well as the criminal law. So I would admittedly need to do a little more studying up on -- on the civil side, but I do have the experience there.

I have attended CLEs to -- to make sure I know what's going on in those areas, as you see from my statement, where I -- over the last few years attended Civil law CLEs, just to -- just to keep abreast of what's going on.
Q. Mr. Frick, can you please explain to the members

## of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?

A. A judge needs to have command of the courtroom, and a judge needs to have respect. The judge cannot be demeaning. A judge must be -- the judge controls the courtroom. Obviously, there are many other folks that are involved with it. But a judge also needs to let the attorneys do their job. As an advocate, you -- you have to stand before a judge and ask for things that you might not deserve, or your client does not deserve. But it is your duty to do so.

A judge must understand that an attorney must do his job and must listen, very valid points that need to be taken into consideration. So patience, understanding, and -- an understanding that the folks before you have -that's the important case to them. While you may deal with several cases, that is the most important case in their life.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Frick, how about the backlog in your circuit, how would you suggest to reduce the backlog in general session and common pleas?
A. Common pleas is not as in bad a shape as general sessions by far. We're about the middle of the pack in the 6th Circuit. So there's room for improvement, but it is not the situation that we have with the criminal backlog
with some -- almost 60 percent of the entire docket more than a year old. Your benchmark is to have only 20 percent of your cases that old. We have three times that in our circuit. But of course, as we all know, the statutory is drafted, and there is some question as to where this is going. But the solicitors still control the docket, for the most -- all intent and purposes. So the judge cannot run it by himself, but can be a prod, so to speak, to make sure the court runs effectively and can -- can look at the jail -- and looking who -- whose been there for a very long time, and -- and inquire as to what's going on.

I think it's important to have a judge from that circuit asking those questions. Because it is very easy, when you're sitting there, and you've got a visiting judge who's there for a week to duck and cover and wait till they've kind of moved on. If you've got someone who's sitting there, that you're going to see rather more frequently, it's more difficult to do that duck and cover.

As I said, we do have the one judge. I know that you have heard, over the years, the address by the Chief Justice on the state of the judiciary, and she constantly points out how the judges in South Carolina have more cases per capita than any judges in the country. If that is the case, then the judge for the 6th Judicial Circuit must have the most cases for any judge in the country, because we
have more filings in the 6th Circuit, criminal and civil combined, than any of the other circuits. That's -- that makes it tough. That makes it tough. So having an additional person there, $I$ think would help out in that situation.
Q. Mr. Frick, the Commission received 49 ballot box surveys regarding you, with six additional comments. The ballot box surveys, for example, contained the following positive comments: "Smart and patient, top notch and skilled, willing to listen to all sides, and can see the spirit of the law as well as the letter."

Two of the written comments expressed concerns. One comment indicated that you do not have the temperament to be a circuit court judge. What response would you offer this concern?
A. Well, if you'd been practicing long enough, I suppose you're not going to make friends with everybody. It is an adversarial process, and sometimes you just run into folks that you're not going to get along with. And I do say that, that is an outlier. I think that most folks will tell you that $I$ am a zealous advocate for my clients, and my position.

However, I will tell you that, clearly, it's much different being on this side of the bar versus the judicial side of the bar. You have to handle things not in an
adversarial way, but in a judicial way. And that would be my response.
Q. Mr. Frick, you've been involved in one lawsuit. The lawsuit was filed in 2012, alleging violations of the plaintiff's civil rights under state and federal law. Can you please explain the nature and the circumstances of this lawsuit?
A. Sure. It is still pending litigation, so I don't believe $I$ can get into too many details. But I'll give you a general idea of how we got where we are. I was an assistant attorney general, prosecuting dog-fighting cases. This is the case that arose out of Charleston. It was moved to Greenwood, a change of venue, because of tremendous amount of press it received in the Charleston community. We proceeded to trial, and about halfway through the trial -- in fact, just -- just before the close of the State's case, the defendant plead guilty to 40 counts of animal fighting and one count of assault and battery of a high and aggravated nature. There was some issues with the sentencing sheet, which is what gets into the litigation.

Long story short was, I am named with I think the entirety of the Department of Probation, Pardon and Parole, the Department of Corrections, the Attorney General's office, and the Solicitor's office, all as defendants in
this case, alleging that we conspired to keep the defendant in jail longer than the sentence. That is where the discussion lies. But I'm afraid I can't -- I would love to discuss it further, but $I$ don't think $I$ can at this time.

It is I believe the 1983 action, and many other charges were dismissed at summary judgement in federal court. The remainder of the claims were remanded back to state court, the plaintiff was given leave to amend their complaint. It has now been removed back to federal court, and we are waiting again, I think, additional discovery and another motion for summary judgement. So it is still pending in federal court.
Q. Mr. Frick, are you a member of any board or commission that may pose a potential conflict of interest, if elected? And if so, how do you plan to resolve that conflict?
A. Yes. I am a elected member of the Fairfield County School Board, representing School District 6. And I will -- although you did not ask this, I am quite proud to be a member of that school board. Those of you in the Columbia area may have seen press over the last few years, very negative press about my school district. And I am not taking credit for it, but I am proud to be a member of the board that is somewhat righted the ship. And we're doing much better there. But $I$ do certainly understand that
should I be elected to this, I'd be happy to give up that role.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Frick. I'll finish up with some housekeeping issues. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered a conditional pledge of support of any legislators 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?
A. No, sir.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of the process on your behalf?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. No, sir.
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?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction a violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. MALDONADO: I would note that the Piedmont Citizens Committee found Mr. Frick to be qualified as to the constitutional qualifications of physical health, mental stability, judicial temperament. He was found well qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, and experience. The citizens committee further reported that while Mr. Frick received high marks and numerous references for his ability, intellect, and energy. Responders commented that he is a zealous advocate who vigorously defends the rights of his clients.

There was some concern, however, that occasionally, Mr. Frick's zeal turns into a short temper. He will need to restrain that impulse if he becomes a circuit court judge. But the Committee did not consider the tendency to be disqualifying. I would note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding this candidate, were incorporated in the questioning of him today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Maldonado. Senator Malloy is recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
members of the Committee.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Mr. Frick, I guess you reported to the Committee, that you and I know each other --
A. Yes.
Q. -- before coming here, and you practiced law in my circuit for a few years.
A. Yes, sir. That is correct.
Q. And you were a young -- a young prosecutor during the time.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And, in fact, I think that you had sought out counsel whenever you were looking at some various political offices.
A. That is correct.
Q. And I just wanted to know that -- I'm not certain, I didn't check the list before I came, but if you -- you may have contributed to our campaign at some point in time during the process. I'm not certain, but --
A. It has not been with the last several years.
Q. And you were in the International Business
program.
A. I was. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you have a second language?
A. I speak German. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And that was in the International Business program?
A. Yes, sir. And $I$ had to spend six months in an internship, working in Germany, in German.
Q. And so you -- you have some civil practice whenever you were in private practice?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And so you are -- but the predominant aspect of your career has been in the criminal practice?
A. That's correct. And on both sides of it.
Q. And in doing that, you know I've been involved with the sentencing reform and alternative sentencing and that kind of stuff. Are you a proponent of the alternative sentencing that we have advanced, and the way we've tried to handle non-violent sentences and --
A. I have watched some progress. I have seen that we're not incarcerating folks at the rate that we used to. And we are using the -- the practice methods to get folks help, who need help and deserve help. So, yes, sir, I think it's -- it's working well.
Q. And the -- are you also a supporter of the fact
that we are not using sentencing guidelines, that we have some flexibility that we give to judges in order to accomplish the sentencing aspects that we have?
A. I think it's important for the judge, because the judge is the one in the trenches, so to speak, seeing the case right before them. So I do think it's important that we have the flexibility to give the judge, to do the judge's job, what I think a judge should do, which is to be able to make that decision also.
Q. Are you also a proponent of the fact that we don't have the mass appearances in court that we used to end up having, where you have several hundred people show up on Mondays, that kind of thing?
A. It's getting better. I wouldn't say we're -we're where we need to be. But, yes, sir, it's past those days when $I$ remember being in the Darlington County courthouse, and you have 1200 people show up, it would take three or four hours to get through roll call. Yes, sir, it is improving.
Q. And your practice now -- which office are you with?
A. I'm with the 6th Circuit Public Defender's office. I'm the Deputy Public Defender handling Fairfield and Chester Counties.
Q. And you are the circuit -- the defender of the
system that we are putting together?
A. I think it's brought both -- both sides on better par. And as you all know, under the previous system you relied solely -- the Public Defender's office relied solely on your -- your locality to fund you. And with -- with of course the per capita funding from the State. But what this has done is it gives a level of prestige on par with the solicitor. And folks are starting to understand better, that there are two sides to the equation. You have a prosecutor on one side, and for about 80 percent of our folks who find themselves in the criminal justice system, a public defender. I think it has improved, yes, sir.
Q. And I've asked others on that death penalty certification. But I think a better question is, is that because it depends upon which circuit you're in, and the funding and all that kind of thing, is that you've dealt with a lot of cases that -- that would have both a penalty of life, and life in prison.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And have you tried cases to verdict yourself?
A. At least a dozen murder cases. Yes, sir. SENATOR MALLOY: That's all the questions I have.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator

Malloy. Dean Wilcox is recognized.
EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. I just have a quick technology question for you. If you could --
A. I'll try.
Q. Just that in the position of a circuit judge, you would face a number of discovery issues, many of which may deal with electronic discovery aspects. And my question is simply whether you have had any experience to this point, in dealing with electronic discovery issues yourself, or how you might have educated yourself about the issues that arise in that.
A. Well, as we have no technology capabilities in the Fairfield or Chester County courthouse, we don't deal with it as much there. Lancaster is a little more advanced. As you know, we got a brand new courthouse, so they have used some of the technology in the courtroom, in -- in presentations to juries.

In State? No, not really. We have advantages to the court where we scan in files and e-mail them to each other. That is about as advanced as we have got in the electronic discovery in the criminal area. In Federal? I have handled some federal cases. So I have dealt with the e-filing in federal courts, and understood that process, and dealt with it there. But not really as far as the

State's concerned. But we're getting there.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Martin is
recognized.
SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman and members of
the Commission, I didn't want to ask a question, but I just wanted to thank you for your willingness to serve on the school board. I'm not sure that you might need to have a mental health test.

MR. FRICK: That was the number one question I got when I said I was going to run.

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, let me -- let me just say that, that is a tremendous service to provide, by stepping forward and doing that. And that's -- I admire your willingness to do that. And I just wanted to thank you for it.

MR. FRICK: Thank you. I appreciate it. And I, quite frankly, have enjoyed it a lot more than I ever thought I would.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: How many terms have you served?

MR. FRICK: I'm in my first term, but I'm in my third year of that first term.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: My wife served on the school board for one term, and was so grateful to retire after that one year.

MR. FRICK: I understand.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
other Commission members who might have questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Mr. Frick, we want to thank you for joining us. And thank you so much for offering for this position. And your desire to serve South Carolina is admirable.

MR. FRICK: Thank you. Thank you all very much.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: That concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, Mr. Frick, the record will remain open until the report is published. And you may be called back at such time, if the need should arise. We will remind you of the 48-hour rule, and ask that you be mindful of it. And should anybody inquire whether or not they may advocate with the legislator on your behalf, we would ask you to educate them on the 48 -hour rule.

Again, thank you for offering. And we thank you for your service.

MR. FRICK: Thank you again.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Lunch has arrived. Is
there any objection -- we are scheduled for an hour for
lunch. Would there be any objection if we cut that to 30 minutes?

MS. BELL: No objection.
SENATOR MALLOY: Forty-five minutes.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Forty minutes?
Senator Malloy requests 40 minutes. So ordered. We got 40 minutes, so we will go back on the record at 1:30. Thank you.
(A recess was held from 12:49 p.m. to $1: 37$ p.m.)
(Representative Clemmons leaves the proceedings.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Stand with your right hand and be sworn.

WHEREUPON:
JOCELYN NEWMAN, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Have you had a chance to review your personal data questionnaire?

MS. NEWMAN: I have.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And do you have any changes to make to that?

MS. NEWMAN: I have one change to make to that. My employment at the time of completing the personal data questionnaire, $I$ was employed at Richardson, Plowden \& Robinson. Since November 1st of this year, I've worked at
the DeQuincy Newman Law Firm as a -- along with my brother, who is sitting back there. I say that I'm his new associate; he's my boss. So that would be the one amendment to that.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. And that's here in --

MS. NEWMAN: Columbia.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- Columbia?
MS. NEWMAN: yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Very good. With
that one verbal amendment, and I believe one previous written amendment that's been made, does the -- does that give you your completed and up-to-date personal data questionnaire?

MS. NEWMAN: With the exception of a few CLEs that I've attended, everything else is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Would you have any
objection, Ms. Newman, to -- to submitting your PDQ to -to be made a part of the -- to be made a part of the record of your oral testimony today?

MS. NEWMAN: No. No objection.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Does any member have an objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 11 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of Jocelyn Newman dated August 17th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Ms. Newman, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly reviewed your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry is focused on nine evaluative criteria, and has also included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics law, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, and a check for economic conflicts of interest.

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

Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to share with the Commission?

MS. NEWMAN: I do not. I'm just happy to be here.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And we're happy to have you here. Thank you. Of course, Ms. Dean is your screening attorney, you met with her on several occasions, I believe. Would you please direct your attention to her, and answer any questions she may have.

P R O C E E D I N G S - final

MS. NEWMAN: Okay.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Ms.
Dean?
MS. DEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. I have a procedural matter to take care of, to begin with.

Ms. Newman, 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 to the sworn statement at this time?

MS. NEWMAN: Again, my business address and telephone number have changed. But that is the only amendment.

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

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any

```
objections?
```

(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 12 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of Jocelyn Newman
dated August 17th, 2015)
MS. DEAN: One final procedural matter, 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. Newman meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residency, and years of practice.

EXAMINATION BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Ms. Newman, why do you now want to serve as a circuit court judge? And how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you in being an effective judge?
A. Well, I've wanted to be a circuit court judge for some time, since the beginning of my legal career. I think it's sort of a natural progression in a person's legal career -- maybe not for everyone, but it's something that I've desired to do. And, therefore, I have spent my career trying to sort of diversify my experience and prepare myself for service on the bench, representing both plaintiffs and defendants in criminal and civil law, and trying a number of cases, as many as I have been able to do over the years. And I think I'm prepared and ready.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Newman. Are there any areas, including subjective or substantive areas of law, that you would need to additionally prepare for in order to serve as
a judge? And how would you go about that preparation?
A. I can't think of any specific areas off the top of my head. I'm certain that $I$ don't know everything, and there are some study and preparation that will be necessary. But by, you know, talking to other judges and studying case law, statues, event sheets, other things like that, I will prepare myself.
Q. Thank you. Although you addressed this in your sworn affidavit, could you please explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. The appropriate demeanor is to be open and -- and a good listener, respectful to all parties and to give everyone an opportunity to be heard, and to be fair, impartial, and weigh all issues before you -- in an impartial way.
Q. Thank you. What suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the docket, both for general sessions and common pleas in the circuit court?
A. I think all that can be improved by just getting in there and doing the work. I mean, there has to be cooperation between the judiciary and the clerks of court, court staff. And just by spending time and -- and making an effort to dispose of cases, as appropriate. That will assist in alleviating any backlog.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Newman, the Commission received 142 ballot box surveys regarding you, with ten additional comments. A ballot box survey, for example, conveyed the following positive comments: "Hardworking, honest, intelligent, and capable."

Would you like to respond to any of those descriptions?
A. No, thank you.
Q. Fair enough. The Midlands Citizens Committee report found you to be qualified in the criteria of experience -- experience, and the Committee stated, "Ms. Newman impresses us with her personality and intellect, but question whether she has the necessary experience at this point in her career to be as good a judge as she can be in the future."

Also in note in summary, the Committee stated, "Ms. Newman is smart and has the proper judicial temperament, but has limited experience."

Would you like to respond to these statements?
A. Sure. I think that my experience is not so
limited, in fact. As I said, I've made an effort to diversify my practice throughout the years. I'm not an attorney that confines myself to my office. I'm a lawyer's lawyer, I like to think, that tries cases and -- and argues motions and spends as much time in the courtroom as
possible.
I started my career as a judicial law clerk. And in that role, of course, spent a considerable amount of time in the courtroom as the, you know, sidekick/right arm to the judge, and learned through that experience. But also through my work at the Solicitor's office/Richardson Plowden, doing, as I said, doing both plaintiffs work and defense work, both criminal and civil. I think that I've done a good bit to diversify my experience and -- and have as much experience in a courtroom, as one can.
Q. Thank you. Now I just have some housekeeping issues. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered a condition pledge of support of any legislator 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?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of the process on your behalf?
A. No.
Q. Have you contacted any members of this

Commission?
A. No.
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?
A. I understand.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have.
Q. And as a follow-up to that, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledge rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I understand.

MS. DEAN: Thank you. I would note that the Midlands Citizens Committee found Ms. Newman qualified in the criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, mental stability, and experience. The Committee found her well qualified in the criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, and judicial temperament.

And we've already addressed the statements by the citizens committee. I would just note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation
regarding this candidate, were incorporated into today's questioning.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Questions by the Commission members? Dean Wilcox. EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. Ms. Newman, first of all, thank you for offering for this position. We appreciate your interest in the service to the state. I will forgive you for leaving Duke University early. But that's all right. I'm sure you had good reasons.

My question is a technology question, in many ways. As a judge in the circuit court, you will undoubtedly encounter increasing questions and discovery disputes involving electronic discovery. And there -there are many issues that are peculiar to electronic discovery, because of its nature. And what experience do you have at this point in your career, dealing with electronic discovery issues? Or to what extent have you attempted to educate yourself about that field, in case you do encounter it?
A. I don't have any personal experience. My experience, I guess, wouldn't technically be considered electronic discovery, but there's certainly some investigation of clients, potential witnesses that I've
done in my practice. I've not argued any motions or encountered any sort of adversarial proceeding regarding electronic discovery. But $I$ think that is sort of a hot topic in the legal arena.

And there are certainly lots of articles written by the $A B$-- you know, by members on behalf of the ABA. And, of course, I make every effort to stay abreast of hot topics in the legal arena, including electronic discovery, whether it's blogs, or, you know, other websites, magazines and other things.

MR. WILCOX: I have no other questions.
Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Any other questions? Ms. Wall.

EXAMINATION BY MS. WALL:
Q. Ms. Newman, I want to make sure I've got my dates right. So we understand you've been in practice eleven years?
A. Yes.
Q. And during that time, I note that your overview says that you've tried numerous cases. Have you ever had the opportunity to try -- to be first chair in any cases, either in circuit court -- not magistrates court -- circuit court or any other -- federal court? I don't know if you've done any work in federal courts.
A. I've not tried any cases in federal court, but I've certainly been first chair in a number of cases in circuit court. I would say only one case as first chair, but several civil cases.
Q. Involving what type of matters?
A. Personal injury, premises liability -- I believe that's the extent.

MS. WALL: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy is
recognized.
SENATOR MALLOY: Good afternoon.
MS. NEWMAN: Good afternoon.
SENATOR MALLOY: I'd like the committee to
reflect that $I$ know Ms. Newman and her family. And,
obviously, have had interaction with other members of her family, from time to time.

EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Are you still grading bar exams?
A. I am.
Q. Really? How do you like that?
A. I love it.

MR. WILCOX: Is this an issue of character
we need to take up?
BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. And I know that I've been involved with at least
one case that you had over in Darlington, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And they did real well -- she did real well in that case.
A. Not as well as the opposition.
Q. I would just say ones that -- one of the things that I'm very interested in, and I've asked other folks here, is the flexibility in sentencing as it relates to judges. I would -- I'm sure that you're a proponent of that, as opposed to having guidelines for the judges to end up using. Is that -- is a fair statement?
A. That's a fair statement.
Q. And, obviously, I've been supportive of alternative sentencing for non-violent offenders, and certainly would like for the judges in our state to following the sentence reform. You'd be in favor of that as well?
A. Sure.
Q. And I think that what we are -- need to address is, that you were -- you were found qualified by this committee before.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How long ago was that?
A. Well, two other times. Most recently would have been in the fall of last year. And then also in the fall
of 2012 .
Q. Great. And so you were found qualified in both -- both occasions.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And had a chance to appear before the Committee in the same manner?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you've improved your skills in the time since that time.
A. I believe so.
Q. And we've obviously had some discussions during that time, and you've made improvements in that arena as well.
A. Yes, sir.

SENATOR MALLOY: That's all the questions I
have.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you,
Senator. Are there any other questions? Ms. Bell.
MS. BELL: Thank you. Good morning.
MS. NEWMAN: Good afternoon.
MS. BELL: Or "good afternoon" at this
point. For completeness of the record, I do want to state that I do have a personal relationship with Ms. Newman and her family. Her brother and my husband were law school roommates, and I've known her for quite some time.

EXAMINATION BY MS. BELL:
Q. I did want to ask you a question, and also thank you for your willingness to serve, and continue your family's longtime history of service for the state.

We touched on, a little bit, some of your experience and how you've grown over the last couple of years, since the last time you were in front of us. And I know as a younger lawyer -- I know you've been practicing for eleven years, but obviously it's not the 20/30 years that some of the people on this panel have been practicing. Will you explain, you know, I guess, your involvement and your caseload when you were at Richardson Plowden, the role you took in those cases, and if you were the primary attorney on the majority or your cases or second attorney or anything like that. Can you explain that for us, please?
A. I'd say in recent years, maybe the past three to four years, I have been the primary and really only attorney on most of my cases. A number of those cases in circuit court, I'd say -- actually, probably a 50/50 split between state court and federal court. But I've been the only attorney handling those matters, handling all aspects of that -- those cases.

Except for the billing, there's always someone else handling that. But client contact and, you know, just
all aspect of litigation, whether depositions, discovery, trials, whatever it needed to be.

MS. BELL: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms.
Bell. Any other questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Ms. Newman, thank you so much for being with us today, and for offering for this position on the bench. You have some special guests with you, that we did not -- we'd like for you to recognize today.

MS. NEWMAN: I have with me, today, my mother, Patricia Newman; my father, Clifton Newman; my brother, Brian Dequincey Newman; and a friend, Renee Lipson.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Thank you for introducing everybody. Thank you for being here.

This will conclude this particular 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 that time, if the need should arise. I'll remind you of the 48 -hour rule, and ask that you be mindful of it.

And should anybody inquire whether they can advocate on your behalf with members of the General

Assembly, we would ask you to instruct them on the 48-hour rule.

Again, thank you for offering. And thank you for your desire to serve the State of South Carolina.

MS. NEWMAN: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Patterson, it's a pleasure to have you with us here. Thank you for joining us.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Would you please raise your right hand and be sworn.

WHEREUPON:
GRADY L. PATTERSON, III, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is it correct and complete?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And in need of no further augmentation or changes?

MR. PATTERSON: No further changes.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Do you object to making this summary and amendments, if any, a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

MR. PATTERSON: No objection.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
objection by Commission members?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 13 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of Grady L. Patterson, III, dated August 17th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: The Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry is focused on 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, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, and a check for economic conflicts of interest.

We've received no affidavits in opposition to your election, and there are no witnesses present to testify today.

Do you have a guest with you, today, that
you would like to introduce to us?
MR. PATTERSON: I do, Mr. Chairman.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Please do.
MR. PATTERSON: Thank you. My wife Sally is
here with me.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. It's good to have you with us, Ms. Patterson. Thank you for joining us.

Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to share with the Commission?

MR. PATTERSON: Just briefly. I appreciate the opportunity to be here. And I'm looking forward to answering any questions the Commission members may have.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Ms. Leslie Simpson is your screening attorney, of course. We would ask that you direct your attention to her, and respond to any questions she might have for you.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir.
MS. SIMPSON: Thank you. Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I have a procedural matter to take care of with this candidate, first.

MS. SIMPSON: Mr. Patterson, 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 -- temperament. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?

MR. PATTERSON: No, ma'am.
MS. SIMPSON: Thank you. At this time, Mr.
Chairman, I would like to ask that Mr. Patterson's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
objections?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 14 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of Grady L. Patterson, III, dated August 17th, 2015)

MS. SIMPSON: One follow-up procedural
matter, I note for the record that, based on the testimony contained in Mr. Patterson's PDQ, which has been included in the record, with the candidate's consent, Mr. Patterson meets the statutory requirements for this position, regarding age, residence, and years of practice. EXAMINATION BY MS. SIMPSON:
Q. Mr. Patterson, why do you now want to serve as a candidate for circuit court judge? And how do you feel

## your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be an effective judge?

A. You know, I want to be a circuit court judge for a lot of the same reasons I wanted to be a lawyer. There's an intellectual challenge, problem-solving aspect, and the opportunity to impact people has benefit for the public. I've enjoyed practicing law. It's been very rewarding, and for a whole range of reasons, including self-satisfaction, accomplishing goals, and helping people. It's really rewarding, as -- as you really all know, when you're able to help somebody in a tough situation or a tough spot. They come to you and don't have the slightest idea of what to do, and you're able to give them a hand and give them a good result.

If you look at my record, you'll see that I've been involved in -- well, a number of community activities from the United Way to the Boy Scouts, and, of course, my military service. I look at this as an opportunity to use my experience and training to promote justice, and also faith and confidence in our judicial system.

My experience is spanned -- I've been practicing for a little over 35 years. And, you know, when you ask me about experience, I think of it in two ways: One, there's the experience of knowing how to do things, what I call practical experience, like go to trial, what the rules of
evidence are, what the rules of procedure are, research skill, writing effectively.

But there's also another kind of experience. And that's one that's a little more subtle. That's experience that leads to judgment, to the ability to balance competing interests, to the ability to reach a reasoned decision. I feel like my experience being broad and long has led me to have both of those types of assets.

Briefly, I started practice out of law school in the Attorney General's office where -- I'm not being critical -- but it gave me kind of a free reign to -- to go and try cases, which was a tremendous asset to me. Learning early, and doing it, were big parts. I did a lot of what we call damage cases -- this was before the tort claims act -- damage cases, motor vehicle tort claims. And there were caps on those -- very low caps, actually -which gave me the opportunity to go and try cases.

Workers' comp, I had a section of the state, one of the districts $I$ was assigned to, to handle all state claim cases in that district, from municipalities and counties, and anything that might come up at the State.

Following the -- my tenure with the Attorney General's office, I went into private practice, in mostly a business-type litigation practice, with Quinn, Patterson \& Arndt, which ultimately became the firm of Quinn, Patterson
\& Willard. And we did covenants not to compete, TROs, and mostly defense, as I said. There are all types of business torts, contracts, breach of warranty cases representing car dealerships -- and that was a tough one, by the way, to try to defend. But that's an aside.

After that, I went to another firm, Quinn, Patterson \& Arndt. Montgomery, Patterson, Potts \& Willard, which is a similar kind of practice, but a lot more insurance defense. Mostly, for defense -- third-party insurance coverage defense. But the same general kind of business-type litigation.

In 2008, I formed my own firm, the Patterson Law Offices. And I do essentially the same kind of work there, the business-type litigation -- it's a little broader than that, 'cause I have the freedom to really take what suits me, if it's something I'm interested in -- but condemnations and real estate matters as well, litigation -- not the closing and estate matters, but litigation involving real estate. And so there a number of things that I've expanded beyond those original practices.

Courts I've been in -- I've handled matters in magistrates court, municipal court, probate court. Of course, most of my work's been in the circuit court. I've argued cases in the Court of Appeals. I've argued cases in the Supreme Court. On the federal side, I've done matters
-- mostly adversary proceedings. District court cases, of course. I've tried a number of cases here in Columbia. I've argued in the 4 th Circuit.

I've been involved in two cases in the United States Supreme Court. In the original jurisdiction, I was very much involved in those. I had one -- versus Georgia, a boundary case. And one was a registration of a state bond, the -- and then I had one case in the Federal Court of Claims.

So I feel like, lay all that out and look at it, and the broad experience has -- has given me both the howto experience, and that were similar type of experience in judgement and ability to weigh issues that benefits me and, I think, would be a benefit and lead to an effective circuit judge.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Are there any areas, including subjective areas of 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. Most of my practice has been civil. I have done criminal work -- there's been a DUI recently. But my practice has basically been civil. So that is something that I would like to add to. I was in -- a military JAG officer in the South Carolina Air Guard for 20 -- 22 years. And in that, of course, I had military justice training,
which has been -- that's what the military calls the criminal area of the law, military justice.

And every -- every other year, we do a -- an Air Force base around the country, and have update training. So I've tried summary court martial. But again, you're talking at a lower level. I've done magistrates court criminal cases. So what I've done is -- of course, if you'll -- if you -- and you see my record -- attended criminal CLEs each year. I've also, of course, in advance, getting ready for the test -- outline all the criminal matters, and I actually made a little notebook on how the various -- most recent law on the various issues. And I have been associated with a former assistant solicitor here in Richland County, who has associated with me on a number of cases so that $I$ can learn by doing. And that's been very effective.

I think that, ultimately, however, the guts of what a judge does, applying the rules of evidence, spotting issues, the skills in making decisions, skills in applying rules of law to the facts of a case, those are skills that are developed over time. Those are skills that come with your experience. And those are skills I believe that I have attained and -- equally, in the civil court of common pleas or in general sessions.

## Q. Mr. Patterson, although you addressed this in

## your sworn affidavit, could you please explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor of a judge?

A. I think a judge should be dignified, always courteous, reserved, but not detached. A judge is in control of the courtroom. He or she sets the tone. And that tone can be very important. You know, people -citizens of this state, often that's their one exposure to the courtroom. During a case, you've got the litigants, you've got the jury members, you've got the witnesses and -- you know, the poor witnesses, they get the -- the roughest part of this whole deal when you have trial, because they've got -- I know they feel jerked around.

But I feel that they should leave that courtroom with the firm conviction that we've got a solid, fair, impartial judicial system. And a judge is the one that shows them that. Not without telling them, but by walking the walk. And I think the way that his demeanor -- any judge, his or her demeanor gives that lesson to the citizens, and a very part -- important part of his role.
Q. Mr. Patterson, what suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the docket, both for general sessions and common pleas?
A. Common pleas -- a couple of things. I would intervene earlier in common pleas cases. Of course, you
know, people often refer to the federal system. The federal system's has got the luxury of -- they don't have many big cases and -- it's a whole different way of doing things. But I think about roster meetings. You know, roster meetings are always on Monday morning. And you talk about a mess. It was -- I don't mean it as a mess. It was just -- they weren't as you thought they would turn out, let me put it that way. The people were having trouble. There were all sorts of reasons that a case can't be tried; they got a new witness, the defendant should have been served, there's a deposition that hasn't been taken. And very often there's a motion for summary judgement pending. At any rate, the roster gets moved around.

One suggestion I would have and I would advocate, is that the roster meeting be moved way back. I mean, months. And -- and -- and -- and you wouldn't call it a roster meeting, but you would basically set a week of court for cases, early. At that point, the litigant -- the lawyers would say, "I need to do this. I need to do that. I need a motion heard."

And a judge, through a Rule 16 or -- would call a status conference, would say, "Okay. Here's what we're going to get done. Here's your period of time." It would be like a scheduling order, really, is what it would turn into. And those matters that used to get called up on

Monday morning would get called up several months ahead of time, give them a schedule for those -- those particular lawyers to meet. And I think that would take care of a lot of that. By the time you got the week, all those issues should be gone.

Of course, the mediation has been very successful in this -- in this state. I was one of those who was not -- I didn't know if it would do much. But it's been very successful in this state. And I've become a huge advocate of it. So that is obviously something that helps with the backlog.

On the criminal side, Chief Justice Toal, in her statement to the Judiciary -- her speech earlier this year, spoke about three things that have made a difference in the criminal court, in the -- in the backlog: new judges, which was several years ago; technology, which is -- of course, the Chief Justice has been a great advocate of in collaboration between the judges, defense attorneys, prosecutor, and clerk of court.

Collaboration is a huge area, a great opportunity for a circuit judge. She is -- matter of fact, last year when she gave her State of the Judiciary speech, mentioned several judges by name, and said, "These dockets have gotten shorter because Judge So-and-so and Judge So-and-so collaborated and got the dockets moving."

So there's a huge opportunity there. And that's -- that's where I would see my roll.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Patterson, the Commission received 103 ballot box surveys regarding you, with eight additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments: "Would be an excellent addition to the South Carolina Circuit Court bench, very intelligent, possesses excellent temperament, and would be fair to all lawyers and litigants, extremely high degree of intelligence and legal knowledge."

One of the written comments expressed a concern; it indicated that you may not have the -- have enough experience for the circuit court. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Well, as I indicated, when I started practicing in the Attorney General's office, $I$ went to circuit court. You know, I looked last night, just out of interest, to see what -- where I've tried cases around the state. And I -it just -- to verdict. I mean, not just trying and settling them. They went all the way to verdict. And half of the judicial circuits, I've tried a case in and went to verdict, in this state.

So since the Attorney General's office, most of my work has been in the circuit court. All around the state, actually. Not as much in the Upstate, but around
the state. And -- and so my response to that would be, that the empirical evidence just doesn't support the comment. And with due respect to the commenter, I -- I think he or she just is not adequately familiar with my record.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Patterson. I just have a few housekeeping issues. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered a condition of pledge of support of any legislator 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?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of the process on your behalf?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Have you contacted -- contacted any members of -other members of the Commission?
A. No, ma'am.
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?
A. I do understand.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I understand.

MS. SIMPSON: I would like to note the
Midlands Citizens Committee found Mr. Patterson qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability, and well qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

In summary, the Committee stated that, "It is impossible not to be very impressed with Mr. Patterson in every way. He could be an excellent addition to the bench." The Committee further stated that, "Mr. Patterson has brought experience, although, his criminal law practice has been somewhat limited."

I would just note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigating -- the investigation regarding Mr . Patterson, were incorporated in
the questioning of the candidate today.
Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much, Ms. Simpson. Yeah, Senator Malloy, you're recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Mr. Patterson, you were in the National Guard?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You achieved the rank of Brigadier General?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. In your capacity of going through all those years of service, you had the opportunity to defend many soldiers.
A. I --
Q. Before --
A. -- I
Q. -- boards or whatever.
A. Oh, absolutely. Yes, sir.
Q. And some of those --
A. And many, many --
Q. -- involved the board?
A. And sometimes that goes to the hearing officer, himself, yes, sir.
Q. And some of those involved criminal matters.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And, in fact, in that arena you were -- you were -- as to what comes before you, as it relates to what the -

- the -- the guardsmen and soldiers bring before you, or the boards require you, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And it would be in a number or variety of topics that you would have that would come up before the board -A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- is that right? And you were honorably
discharged when?
A. In 2012 .
Q. 2012 .
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And your status at that -- at that point in time?
A. At that point in time, $I$ was the Assistant

Adjutant General for Air under General Livingston, our current adjutant general.
Q. And as far as this member is concerned, that makes you qualified in my -- in my opinion. I will further to saying that you have been before this board before, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Or this commission.
A. I have.
Q. And you were qualified then?
A. I was found qualified, yes.
Q. And so during your years of experience -- how many years have you been practicing law now?
A. Thirty-five, -six, -seven. Right at -- right over thirty-five.
Q. Over 35 years?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And during that time you've seen the practice of law change.
A. Oh, yes, sir.
Q. And you are aware that you are -- you -- you follow the -- the rules and the statutes and stuff that the Legislator put before you, correct?
A. Oh, absolutely.

SENATOR MALLOY: Okay. All right. That's all the questions I have.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Dean
Wilcox.
MR. WILCOX: First of all, if I may thank General Patterson for -- for all your many years of service to the state, and for offering again to serve the state. Thank you, sir.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Dean.
MR. WILCOX: And I would also like to
commend him on what appears to be excellent taste in neckties. I think that's a --

MR. PATTERSON: Well, I saw you at the CLE last week and I --

MR. WILCOX: There you go.
EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. One of the -- as was mentioned a second ago, that the practice of law has changed a lot since you and I went to law school sometime. I was just a couple of years behind you. And one of the areas that's changed is in technology. And so my question is just that -- to gauge your experience, particularly with the technology as it's come to be with regard to electronic discovery in civil cases. This is certainly one of the issues of today, that you're likely to encounter as a judge, dealing discovery disputes. And I didn't know what experience you may have had dealing with issues of electronic discovery, or, perhaps, just education that you've gotten for yourself in that regard. If you could help us.
A. Well, I'll tell you, from a litigation -litigator's standpoint, electronic -- you know, e-mails are gold. I mean, so what that means is that the person who has the e-mail is less likely to give it up. And to me that's the real problem, is how you police the discovery of electronic records. And which is a very difficult problem,
you know. And what you have to do, from what I've seen in my experience, is you've got to get the original media, you've got to send an expert in there. I mean, I hate it because it costs a lot of money. But if you don't send an expert in who knows what he's looking at, and can tell if something's been deleted, and, you know, can see if things have been moved around.

I -- it's -- it's -- and y'all -- everybody knows this, you can have different levels of trust of the other lawyer, of the -- of the defendant or plaintiff, depending on which side you're on, the other party. And in some cases, I don't do any of that. But in some cases, you've got to get an order that -- that freezes records in their original format and send somebody to look at them. And that -- to me that's the biggest problem with it.
Q. Thank you very much. That's all I have. MR. WILCOX: Mr. Chairman, that's all. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Dean Wilcox. Any other questions?
(No response.)
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS:
Q. General, I'd like to ask, you don't rise to the rank of Brigadier General without knowing the meaning of work. I'd like for you to share with the Commission, how -- give us a glimpse into your work ethic, maybe what your

## typical work week is like, and how you would see yourself in regards to expressing your work ethic on the bench.

A. Well, you're right, $I$ have a job and then another half a job is -- is time-consuming. There are the deployments and the schools and -- but I guess you get used to it, you know, is what it really comes down to. I work -- my son's wife just had a child last week -- our first grandchild, as a matter of fact -- and so he's staying home. It's a different world now. He's staying at home 'cause he's got the -- you know, you get this time off and all. And I was talking to my wife, and I think I went back the next day to --

MR. WILCOX: The records show the look on her face?
A. But the bottom line is, is I -- I have worked -I've enjoyed work. As you're working a problem, and you start seeing a solution or a way to work the problem out, it -- it -- it adds impetus to keep moving. It makes you excited. And working has -- I know they call it "work," but it's not always really work. It's something you enjoy doing.

In the military career, I was a JAG officer for 22 years, then I moved over to the line. They asked me to take command over the unit, and I moved over to the line and was a commander of several units, including the group
out at McEntire outside of Columbia, and then became the Vice Wing Commander, which is the fighting unit, the flying F16s. And then $I$ moved up to the general spot. A lot of time, but enjoyable times. And when you work like that, my experience has been I'm getting more out of what I'm doing than I'm putting into it. I really enjoy it.
Q. As a baby lawyer myself, my first judge I tried a case before was a certain judge by the name of Ralph King Anderson. And he -- he held -- he held court over on Friday night until about nine o'clock at night, and then would call us back in on Saturday, much to the consternation of the clerk. And I might be citing an extreme case, but I -- I look back at that, and I -- I respect Judge Anderson's work ethic. And to me, he's a mentor. So I would ask -- I would ask you, in terms of your work ethic on the bench, would you -- how would you see yourself carrying out your duties in terms of having litigants and attorneys busy in your court throughout the week?
A. I would be available. And I think -- I think that the judge being available to parties that need a motion heard, for example, is very important. You know, we have a problem with motions taking a long time, and holding other things up. Particularly, discovery motions, if somebody's -- has a discovery motion, the case just goes
dead. And the judge being available, I think, is very important. You know, in Greenville, they've got a clerk up there who's got a great system; you file a motion, and written right on there is your hearing date and time. A tremendous system.

But I would be available -- I would be in the office. I'm in my office all the time, anyway. I'd be in the office. And, particularly, for times that are -either the roster falls apart or there's dead time in the courtroom is when I would start getting on the phone -- in the office, start getting on the phone and seeing what we could do to help people move their cases along. So I feel like I would always be available, best I could, based on the schedule. And, definitely, I would be in the office.

Now, can I tell you a quick story about Ralph
King?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. I got the same thing. He tried two cases at once. And you'd go on break and he'd call the other one witness as a rule contest. And he'd call the other witnesses in, and then they'd go on break and he'd call us back in. And he would -- he had the work ethic.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: General Patterson, thank you so much for being with us today.

Last call for any questions.
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, we appreciate your presence. We appreciate your offering for this important position on the bench in South Carolina. We appreciate your service in South Carolina for years past, and your desire to serve in the future.

This concludes this portion of the screening process. As you know, General Patterson, the record will remain open until the report is published. And you may be called back at such time, if the need should arise. I'll remind you of the 48 -hour rule, and ask you to be mindful of it.

And should anybody inquire whether they may advocate on your behalf with members of the General Assembly, we would ask that you educate them on the 48 -hour rule. Again, thank you for offering. And thank you for your service to South Carolina.

MR. PATTERSON: I thank all of you for the opportunity. I appreciate it.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you,
General.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: If we could bring in the last candidate, we'll move right on.

Mr. Reibold, it's good to have you with us
again. Thank you for --
MR. REIBOLD: Thank you very much.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for
offering. Thank you for joining us. Would you please raise your right hand.

WHEREUPON:
ROBERT L. REIBOLD, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Have you had an opportunity to, Mr. Reibold, to review your personal data questionnaire?

MR. REIBOLD: Yes.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is it complete and
correct?
MR. REIBOLD: As far as $I$ can tell, yes, it is.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Okay. So you see
no changes that need to be made at this time.
MR. REIBOLD: Correct.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Do you object to our making this summary, and any amendments, if applicable, a part of your record of your sworn testimony?

MR. REIBOLD: No, I don't.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
objections?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered
(EXHIBIT NO. 15 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of Robert L. Reibold dated August 4th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: The Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry is focused on our guiding nine evaluative criteria, and it has also included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, and a check for economic conflicts of interest.

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

Do you have a brief opening statement that you would like to share with the Commission?

MR. REIBOLD: I have a very brief opening statement.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Please go ahead. MR. REIBOLD: And I don't know -- when it
starts getting to five o'clock, I'm not sure if I'm supposed to say "good evening" or "good afternoon." I'm still about decided I'm going to go with "good afternoon" for now.

I know that you've had screening hearings for two days now. I know that I'm the last, but I hope not the least of the people that you'll see today. This can be a mind-numbness experience, so I'll try to keep the remarks brief, in the interest of getting everyone out of here and keeping everybody sane.

When I stood before you almost a year ago today, asking for your recommendation, that was not the first time I'd been before this commission. And what I hope my perseverance shows is that my interest in a judicial position is sincere. It's genuine. This is not a flavor-of-the-month job for me. This is not a retirement opportunity for me. This is the destination. I believe in the job, and I want to do the work. And I hope that at the end of this hearing, I'll be able to -- to show you that I'm deserving of your recommendation.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr.
Reibold. Mr. Richard Pearce, of course, is your screening attorney; you've met with him. We would ask that you direct your attention to Mr . Pearce, and respond to any questions he may have. Thank you. Mr. Pearce.

MR. PEARCE: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I have a procedural matter that I need to take up with Mr. Reibold at this time.

You have before you a sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions regarding judicial conduct, statement qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any additional -- are there any amendments that you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?

MR. REIBOLD: I'm sure it's fascinating reading, but no amendments that I would like to make at this time.

MR. PEARCE: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that Mr. Reibold's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Pearce. Is there any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 16 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement for Robert L. Reibold dated August 3rd, 2015)

MR. PEARCE: One final procedural matter, I note for the record that, based on the testimony contained
in Mr. Reibold's PDQ, which has been included in the record, with the candidate's consent, that Mr. Reibold meets the statutory requirements for this position, regarding age, residence, and years of practice. EXAMINATION BY MR. PEARCE:
Q. Mr. Reibold, would you please tell the Commission why you want to serve now, as a circuit judge, and how you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you in being an effective judge.
A. I'm happy to do that. Again, when I stood before you last year at this time, $I$ told you that I'm not naive, and I am an idealist. I believe in the system. I know it doesn't work right all the time. And I'm -- I am very concerned about the perception of the system in society. We have a large portion of our population who feels that if they walk into the doors of a criminal court, the deck is stacked against them. We have a similarly large portion of people who believe that if they walk into a civil court, the deck is stacked against them.

We have open disputes between our Supreme Court and the General Assembly. We have people who view the United States Supreme Court as a political body rather than a court. And I think that the perception of a system is important. It has to be fair for everything to work. It has to be fair for justice. It has to be fair for people
to believe in the system. And the only way to do that is to get in there and do it myself.

I'm a big believer in personal responsibility. The way I feel is, that if you're walking down the street and you see something, and you say to yourself, "Somebody ought to do something about that," you're that someone. And everybody's going to see different things. But if you see it, it's your responsibility. And what $I$ see is the court system.

And now on a more personal level, I think I disappointed my father; he wanted me to be an engineer like he was. But ever since I was a little boy, younger than ten, I talked about being a lawyer. That's what I wanted to do. I don't know how it got in my head, but that's what I wanted to do. And when I went to law school, I thought, well, I'm going to be one of these transactional guys that stays up in the, you know, twenty-fifth floor of the tall building, and makes a lot of money, and that's what I'm going to do.

But after going through law school, and after my first position out of law school as a judicial clerk, I took a completely different track. I've stayed in trial work. I've stayed in the courtroom. And I've stayed in the civil system ever since then and not looked back.

And I don't think I realized until recently -- I
worked for Judge Kinard, who recently passed away, and it gave me the opportunity to reflect on that experience as a clerk. I don't think I realized until recently, what an effect that had on me. I got to see what a judge does. I got to see how a judge interacts with the system. I got to see the good that a judge can do. And that, I really believe, has made a lasting impression on me.

And I think the simplest way I can put why do I want to be a judge is to tell you what I told my four-yearold a few weeks ago. She was -- she saw my studying -- we have to take a test as part of this proceeding, and she saw me studying for the test, and asked me what I was doing. And I said, "I'm studying to be a judge."

And she said, "Why do you want to be a judge?" There it is, there's the question.

And I said, "Well, Sadie -- that's her name -- I said, "I believe in right and wrong, and I believe that everybody needs to play fair and by the rules. And that's what a judge does." That's the -- that's the simplest way I can put that into words for you.

Now, why do I believe my experience qualifies me to be a judge? Well, as I mentioned, I served as a law clerk. I don't think there's any better training to be a circuit court judge than to be a law clerk. You're with a judge on a day-to-day basis; you're involved in the trials;
you're involved in the motions' hearings; you get to see how decisions are made; you get to see how the lawyers interact with the judge. I can't think of any better training for a circuit court position than to serve as a clerk of a circuit court judge.

On top of that, I've got down 20 years experience litigation. Like most young lawyers, I started out with a simple car wreck, and my first trial was a $\$ 2,000$ car wreck case here in Richland County. Justice Pleicones, who was then in the Circuit Court bench, tried the case. The jury came back with less than we'd offered to settle, so I considered that a victory. But since then I've progressed cases, and work has gotten increasingly more complex.

I started with the auto wreck to a slip-and-fall, and now to employment discrimination cases. I do products liability cases. I've done procurement code matters. I've been involved in an eight-year massive, multi-plaintiff/multi-defendant class action suit here in Circuit Court. And I've tried a multi-million-dollar class action suit here in the Circuit Court. That doesn't happen very much; most class actions don't make it all the way to trial.

On the appellate front, I have argued the simple appeal a magistrate court's decision in circuit court. I've argued in front of the Court of Appeals. I've
appeared in front of our state's Supreme Court. I've even agreed a patent appeal in front of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. So I've been very fortunate in my -- in the breadth of my experience, and the opportunities that I have had to develop my craft.

And I really believe that, that experience qualifies me to be a circuit court judge. I was found well qualified by the Bar Association in every category. I've been AB-rated by Martindale-Hubbell. I have served as a delegate to the South Carolina House of Delegates to the Bar Association. I serve on the Bar's Practice and Procedure Committee. I do believe I have the education and experience to serve as a circuit court judge.
Q. Are there any reasons, including subjective 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. Well, I made no secret in my materials, and when I've appeared in front of this commission in the past, most of my practice is in civil litigation. So I don't have a large focus on criminal. That is the area where $I$ would need to do some extra work. But I will tell you, I do have some criminal experience.

Obviously, when I worked with the judge, I've been to criminal trials, guilty pleas, expungements. So I
do have criminal experience on that -- on that regard. Post-conviction relief proceedings. So I've done that when I first started out as a lawyer. I've been involved in post-conviction relief proceedings as a -- as an attorney since then. I've handled a smattering of criminal cases. So I'm not completely devoid of criminal experience.

Additionally, though, I do recognize that, that's an area I need to work on. So I have been actively trying to pursue that, and better my knowledge. I read criminal law textbooks as -- I read law -- law articles on criminal law. And I attend criminal law CLEs. Even though that's not the core of my practice, I'm doing that in an effort to get me better -- better educated and better prepared to serve as a circuit court judge.

That being said, $I$ think that my civil experience is valuable and, to some extent, compensates for my lack of criminal experience. Here in Richland County in 2014, there were more terms of civil court than criminal court. And that doesn't count post-conviction relief proceedings, which are technically civil. I didn't count them, 'cause they're quasi. But there's more civil court than criminal court in the bigger cities.

Look at our code, there are 63 titles. Criminal laws found in 16, 17, and a smattering of 56; the rest are civil. We have 86 rules for civil procedure, and we have

40 rules of criminal procedure. So I think that the civil experience is valuable in this case.

But going back to criminal, what $I$ focus on mostly are the constitutional issues. I want to be prepared if I'm fortunate enough to be elected, to handle those issues immediately. I focused on the Jackson v. Denno hearings, Fourth Amendment Search and Seizure, Batson, Confrontation Clause. I want to be sure that I can uphold the rule of law, if I'm fortunate enough to get on the bench.
Q. Although, you addressed this in your sworn affidavit, could you please explain to the commission members what you think the appropriate demeanor is for a judge?
A. I've seen a variety of demeanors in the courtroom. Some of them are very cordial, and some of them are not. What I believe is, is that -- and this goes back to what I said in the beginning -- everybody would walks in that courtroom needs to feel that they were treated fairly and honorable. What that means is, as a judge I don't raise my voice. What that means is, as a judge I don't yell at someone. It has to be calm and courteous and fair. Everybody needs to be able to say what they need to say, to feel like they have been a part of the system and gotten the respect they deserve.
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Q. What suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the docket, both for general sessions and common pleas in the circuit court?
A. I was a finance major in college, and as a part of that curriculum I had to take several classes in logistics. And to me this is a -- that's what this question is about. It's about logistics, you have inputs, how many cases come into the system. And the second thing is how efficiently can the system handle those cases.

On the criminal side, there's not a whole we can do about the number of crimes that are committed. But we do have some avenues to address that issue. And one thing that we're doing here in South Carolina, and I'm proud of it, is we're exploring alternate courts. We have drug courts now. We have homeless courts. And I think all of these avenues not only will produce better results for people that are involved in the proceedings, but will take some of the stress off our general sessions system.

Another thing that we can focus on is that our courts and our jails are dominated by people who are repeat offenders. If we can reduce the rate of recidivism, then we can cut down on the load of cases coming into the system. And based in large part to the legislature, and some of those members of this commission, South Carolina's actually at the forefront of those efforts. That's one
thing I'm proud of. And I think that we need -- anything more that we can do, we should do. And that will affect the number of cases coming into the system, and that will ease the backlog of the criminal system.

On the civil side, again, you've got to look at the first input -- I know this is a friendly discussion -you have to look at the first input, which is the number of cases that come into the system. I often tell guys, one of the great things about this country is that anyone can sue anybody. The smallest, poorest person can sue the largest, richest corporation. But one of the worst things about this country is that anybody can sue anybody. Whether there's merit or not, you can pull somebody into court to make them defend themselves. And so one thing we can look at -- and I would -- to the legislators here, I would suggest we need to look again at the Frivolous Proceedings Act. I know that we've amended it in the recent past, but in its current position, it's ineffective. It's not a good deterrent. It's not designed well. It's not applied well. To the extent that we want that to work, it's not working.

Now, once you get into the system, once you talk about the inefficiencies of the system, there are three ways to dispose of cases. A judge can do it by granting a motion to dismiss, or granting a motion for summary judgement. You can settle a case, or you can try it.

Those are your three options. Our rules of conservator are so strict that it makes it very difficult for circuit court judges to dismiss a case or grant summary judgement; we've pretty much taken that luxury of case resolution off the table. That forces everybody into mediations and settlements or trials.

Our mandatory mediation program has been very effective. Actually, my -- I would estimate roughly 90 percent of the cases I mediate settled. It's rare that I walk out of there and we don't have agreements. One flaw in the mediation program is that it forces everybody to wait until the end of the case to try to talk settlement. No one will make an offer early in the case. Like, we used to -- we used to just pick up the phone and say, "How about \$10,000?" or "How about $\$ 200,000 ?$ " Whatever the value of the case may be. We don't do that now, because making an offer jeopardizes our negotiation strategy at mediation.

And so it does delay things. But it is successful in resolving cases. And of course the third track is trials. And that's where the bottleneck is. One other point I would make in the civil system is the discovery process. You have roughly twelve months from the date a complaint is filed until you're subject to call for trial. The complaint gets served a few weeks after it's filed. As a defendant, you get your answer and you have 30
days to hand-serve. If you serve discovery, which is just basic request for information, on the other side of that time. They've got another 30 days to respond.

I will also tell you that in my practice I have, 90 percent of the time $I$ don't get responses. It's not that $I$ get responses with an objection, I don't get responses. I write a letter and nothing happens. I file a motion to compel. Three, four, five, six months, depending on the county I'm in, that motion comes up for hearing. I finally get responses the day of or the day before the hearing. That's how it works. What that means, though, is I've gone four, five, six, seven -- potentially eight months.

I've got one case that's a year old, right now, and I don't have discovery responses. I can't prepare my case. I can't get ready for trial in that one-year period. And so when the trial judge says, "Mr. Reibold, are you ready for trial?" I have to say, "No." I have to beg for more time. That creates a backlog at that point. And we carry more cases on our -- on our docket than we need to, because we can't resolve them earlier, we can't move them along.

So I think our discovery rules need to be
enforced. I think that needs to be a focus of improving efficiency in the civil system.
Q. Mr. Reibold, the Commission received 61 ballot box surveys regarding you, with four additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following comments. You were described as an exceptional lawyer, that you were fair and impartial and that you were very well qualified to be a judge.

One comment indicated a concern. And, again, that was about whether you were adequately qualified to serve as a circuit court judge. Do you have any additional comments you would like to share with the Committee about that concern from the circuit?
A. No. We talked about it at length, already today. I have 20 years experience in civil litigation. I was found well qualified by the Bar Association and the Midlands Advisory Committee. I have a AB Martindale rating. I have no concerns at all about my qualifications.

MR. PEARCE: Mr. Chairman and Commission
members, I have several other housekeeping issues.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Proceed.
MR. PEARCE: Thank you.
BY MR. PEARCE:
Q. Mr. Reibold, have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. I have not. I know I'm not supposed to talk to anybody. I have not.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered any conditional pledge of support of any legislator 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?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of the process on your behalf?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. No, 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 this commission's report?
A. It's been very -- very, very clear. I understand that.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, I'm aware of those penalties.

MR. PEARCE: I would note that the Midlands
Citizens Committee found Mr. Reibold qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability, and they found Mr. Reibold well qualified regarding ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

The Citizens Committee also shared the following additional comments: "Like several of our candidates for this seat, Mr. Reibold lacks experience in criminal law, but he is already begun to remedy his shortcoming by taking seminars on criminal law, and attending sessions of general sessions court. His hard work and dedication impresses us, as do his temperament and intelligence."

And in their summary statement, they said, "Mr. Reibold has diligently remedied the one area where he had some deficiency, and is a strong candidate for this position." That's all $I$ have.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much. Any questions by members of the Commission? Dean Wilcox.

MR. WILCOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:

## Q. I appreciate your willingness to come before us

again, and to serve in this position, if you get nominated and elected. I have one question that I don't think will require a long answer at all, but it's a technology question, just to see where your knowledge is at this point.

As a circuit judge, you would undoubtedly have a lot of discovery disputes which increasing are going to involve electronic discovery issues, and the efficiencies of -- of conducting electronic discovery. At this point in your career, do you have experience in dealing with electronic discovery issues at all? And, perhaps, if not, have you otherwise attempted to educate yourself as to the issues surrounding electronic discovery?
A. Yes to both. I have experience in dealing with those. It occurs much more often in my federal court cases than it does in my South Carolina circuit court cases. Those that tend to be bigger involve more larger corporations, companies that have electronic documents. In a car wreck case there usually aren't any electronic documents to worry about.

But, yes, I have. What we do is, we would occasionally hire experts to image the harddrives, so you preserve it and put out a letter -- a preservation letter, so that everything is preserved. You run searches. You agree with -- you attempt to agree. Sometimes you can't
agree with other lawyers. And I think everyone here knows that. But you attempt to agree on search terms, and you search a drive. That -- that's how you do it. You do it -- it's easier for e-mail. Those searches are pretty simple. But yes, I have had experience. And it is becoming more prevalent.

MR. WILCOX: That's my only question, Mr.
Chairman.
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you, Dean Wilcox.
Any other questions?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Well, Mr. Reibold, we appreciate your being here. We thank you for your cooperation with our staff, and for all that you've done to help get us this far in the process. And I would only reiterate what Counsel has said about the 48-hour rule. And you've indicated a very thorough awareness of that.

Most importantly, if someone indicates they'd like to advocate on your behalf, you need to remind them of the 48 -hour rule as well.

Again, we thank you for offering. And I just wish you the very best.

MR. REIBOLD: Thank you. It would probably be appropriate to say "good evening" now.
(Candidate excused.)

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman, I would ask that we take a few-minute break, and after we finish the break, then we move -- we go into executive session.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Without
objection, we will take a break. And then we will come back in, in executive session, to discuss where to go from there.
(A recess was taken from 5:22 p.m. till 5:30 p.m.) REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Do we have a motion to go into executive session?

MS. WALL: So moved.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Okay. The veil will be dropped, please. Close the doors. Any non-members/non-staff, please exit the room.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We are back on the record. We have risen from executive session. During executive session, no decisions were made, or votes passed or taken. We discussed legal matters, and qualifications for the record.

We now will proceed to consider whether or not the -- Jerome Askins -- Jerome P. Askins, III, Jeffrey P. Bloom, Joseph M. Epting, Jr., William Patrick Frick, Jocelyn Newman, Grady L. Patterson, III, Robert -- and Robert L. Reibold are qualified with having had

Is there a motion to consider qualifying the list of remaining candidates?

MR. WILCOX: So moved.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Do we have a second?

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Second.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Those in favor,
say "aye."
(Commission members audibly say "aye.") REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any opposed? (No response.)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: The ayes have it. It is unanimous, all the aforementioned candidates have been found qualified.

We will now proceed to nominate three of the qualified candidates. All right. We will vote as we did yesterday. Each member of the commission has three votes. You can -- you can cast no more than three votes. Any candidate that receives six votes or more will be found nominated. More than three receive six votes.

MR. WILCOX: It will be the three highest to be nominated, but you must have at six.

MS. DEAN: Correct.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Well
said, Dean. Thank you so much. All right. We will
proceed to vote. So those in favor of finding Jerome P. Askins, III, nominated, please raise your hand.
(The commission members vote.)
SENATOR MARTIN: And I'll cast proxy for
Senator Campsen.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Jeffrey P. Bloom?
(The commission members vote.)
SENATOR MARTIN: And I'll cast a proxy for
Senator Campsen.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Joseph M. Epting,
Jr.?
(The commission members vote.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: William Patrick
Frick?
(The commission members vote.)
(The commission members vote.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Jocelyn Newman?
(The commission members vote.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Grady L.
Patterson, III?
(The commission members vote.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Robert L. Reibold?
(The commission members vote.)
SENATOR MARTIN: And I'll also cast a vote
for Campsen.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I see eight, I think. We're required to cast three votes. Okay. We came up short, votes. We're going to have to re-vote.

MR. WILCOX: Did we get three from Campsen?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We cannot vote more than three. We cannot cast more than three votes. We can cast less than three, but not more than three.

So Grady L. Patterson, III, and Robert L.
Reibold have been found nominated. Those that received no votes will be striken from voting consideration.

MS. WALL: And who are they?
MR. WILCOX: Epting and Frick.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Leaving Askins,
Bloom, and
MS. DEAN: And Newman.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Askins, Bloom, and
Newman. Now, we each have one vote. And we each, and proxies, have one vote each. So let's -- those in favor of Jerome P. Askins, III? Oh, a question? I'm sorry. A question.

MS. WALL: May I ask one more time for you to read the names of those from whom we are choosing with one vote.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: There are four on the list. They are Jerome P. Askins, III, Jeffery P.

Bloom, and Jocelyn Newman. Are there any other questions? (No response.) REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Those in favor of Jerome P. Askins, III, please raise your hand.

MS. DEAN: The proxy, or not?
SENATOR MARTIN: And the proxy.
(The Commission members vote.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Jeffery P. Bloom? (The Commission members vote.) (The Commission members vote.) REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Jocelyn Newman? (The Commission members vote.) REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Jocelyn Newman is the third nominee. Are there any questions or comments by Commission members?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Before we -before we entertain a motion to recess, some members have expressed an opinion that there may be times when they want to get instructions to those that have been qualified -found qualified, but have not been nominated as to areas where they may wish to focus, if they should ever want to offer again for this process. Now would be the time to instruct the staff as to any such instructions. Does any member have any input?

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I would like to. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Representative

Bannister.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I think on the
comments regarding --
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Please use your microphone.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: On the comments that were made during executive session, related to their lack of experience in certain practice areas, I would like the staff, as you've discussed with them their performance or whether they were qualified or not qualified or nominated, to explain to them sort of their shortcomings in terms of experience, and that, that's going to be a continuing issue from the commission from this point forward -- that, that's going to be in the record.

On those candidates who had a complete lack of experience on a certain practice area, then yes, I think you should -- we should give the candidate the benefit of all time we've spent analyzing their experience and qualifications. I would like to -- I'd like -- I'd like them to know where we found their experience deficient, and that the discussion was that they should make those areas better, if they intend to --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: If there was any
such discussion -- if it arose from executive session, then that would -- the specific would need to be placed on the record.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: If there was?
MS. DEAN: Are you asking staff to make --
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I'm not asking
for any particular way that the message would be delivered, as much as $I$ would like staff to figure out a way.

MS. DEAN: But are you asking staff to inform candidates of the general experience -- general high-level experience that you're looking to see in candidates?

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Let's sleep on it. And we'll figure out exactly what we want to do.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Very good. With that suggestion, the Chair would entertain a motion to recede until -- recede until 9:45 in the morning.
(There being nothing further, the proceedings concluded at 7:33 p.m.)
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