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dashes [--] Intentional or purposeful interruption
[ph] Denotes phonetically written
[sic] Written as said

GARBER REPORTING SERVICE

PROCEEDINGS
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ladies and Gentlemen we are reconvening the Judicial Merit Selection Commission. The staff has several legal matters to take up with us in executive session. May I have a motion to go into executive session.

SENATOR MARTIN: So moved.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We have a motion to go into executive session and it is so ordered. Please lower the veil and close the doors. If there are any non-staff or nonmembers we now ask that they exit the room during executive session. Non-members of the Commission, excuse me.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: So we are back on the record using our courtroom voice. Judge Duffy, it's good to have you with us today.

JUDGE DUFFY: Thank you. It's good to be here.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Can you please raise your right hand and be sworn?
(The judge is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge Duffy is with
us today seeking appointment or, excuse me, seeking election to Family Court, Ninth Judicial Circuit, Seat Three. Judge Duffy, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry is focused on the nine evaluative criteria required by law and 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, study of previous screenings, and a check for economic conflicts of interest. We've received no affidavits in opposition to your election and there's no one present to testify today. You can have a brief opening statement if you'd like to share with the Commission.

JUDGE DUFFY: I do. I thank y'all for y'all's time and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you. I know how important these elections are. Going through it last year, $I$ know the decisions cannot be easy and the candidates all being so qualified, a decision not a simple one. I
would really appreciate an opportunity to be heard today and I hope I'm able to answer your questions, should you have them, as fully as you would like and I hope to make it through screening in order to seek election for this seat because I do believe I would be a very good candidate for it.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much, Judge Duffy. Of course, you are familiar with Ms. Wells. Katherine Wells is your screening attorney. I would ask that you direct your attention to her and respond to her questions. JUDGE DUFFY: Yes, sir. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. I'm sorry. I neglected to ask you about your personal data questionnaire. Have you reviewed your personal data questionnaire, Judge?

JUDGE DUFFY: I have.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is it correct?
JUDGE DUFFY: I had amendments to it and I would ask that those be made part of the record.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Those amendments have been provided to staff and they are included
as an amendment -- as an amendment to your personal data questionnaire.

JUDGE DUFFY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: As amended, would you have any objection to your personal data questionnaire being included in the screen -your sworn -- the record of your sworn testimony?

JUDGE DUFFY: None whatsoever.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Were there any objections?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 1 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE JOHN DUFFY, III, DATED AUGUST 10TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT NO. 2 - AMENDED JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE JOHN DUFFY, III, DATED NOVEMBER 10TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

MS. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Wells)
Q. Judge Duffy, you have been given also a copy of your sworn statement and it has detailed answers to over 30 questions regarding judicial contact, statutory qualifications, office administration and temperament. Do you have any additional amendments at this time to your sworn statement?
A. No, ma'am. I do not.

MS. WELLS: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that Judge Duffy's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 3 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE JOHN DUFFY, III, DATED AUGUST 10, 2015, ADMITTED.]

MS. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Q. Judge Duffy, please state for the record the city and circuit in which you reside.
A. I reside in North Charleston, South Carolina in the Ninth Judicial Circuit.

MS. WELLS: And based on the records and the testimony contained in the candidates amended PDQ, which has been included in the record with the candidate's consent, Judge Duffy meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.
Q. Judge Duffy, would you please explain to the Commission why you want to serve as a Family Court judge at this time and how you feel your legal and professional experience thus far would assist you to be an effective Family Court judge?
A. Well, I truly believe that in our court system, the Family Court is one of the most, if not the most, important courts that we have as a society. Nothing can be more important than that court that affects families and children. I'd love the opportunity to have an impact where I think it matters the most. I think my legal experience with my practice, with the various cases I've done, with the amount of cases I've handled in Family Court, I think make me qualified to serve as a judge in Family Court.
Q. Are there any areas, including subjective areas of law that you feel you would need to prepare for in

## order to serve as a Family Court judge?

A. I can't think of any areas where I would need to prepare greater than $I$ already have practiced in. The difference from my last time being here is the number of adoptions I had participated in, the number of termination of paternal rights I've participated in were not as great. Since the last hearing, my practice has evolved to include a greater number of those. One area that $I$ have not handled in quite a while are Department of Juvenile Justice matters that deal with juvenile's criminal backgrounds, but $I$ think part of my experience as a Municipal Court judge handling criminal matters and my legal practice handling criminal matters would help me -- would assist me in handling those matters in the Family Court.
Q. Thank you. Do you have any suggestions that you could offer for improving the back log of cases that exist in the Family Court at this time?
A. I think it would not be a bad idea to have -- to improve the backlog would be to possibly allow maybe the ADR rules and the arbitration rules to allow for some matters to be arbitrated as opposed to having to be filed in court, such as custody issues, such as child support issues, those matters
that require a judge to rule on. I think that you find people in court so often, for lack of a better term, nitpicking, where it would be easier to have an arbitrator appointed by consent or by court order, much like a mediator is appointed by consent or court order to adjudicate those matters.
Q. Thank you. And you addressed this in your sworn statement, but would you please explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor of a Family Court judge?
A. I think a Family Court judge has to be someone who is decisive, has a fair temperament, is someone who is easy to hear the parties, but quick to make a decision. I think a Family Court judge has to be ready to make those hard decisions. As you deal with children, as you deal with families it sometimes -- in a Family Court case, there is no winner. There's nothing but losers, but there needs to be assurance that Family Court is a court of finality and permanency, especially for the children.
Q. Thank you. Judge Duffy, the Commission received 159 ballot box surveys regarding you with 22 additional comments. The ballot box surveys contained positive comments noting that you were
intelligent, fair, and have good judicial temperament in your position as a part-time Municipal Judge for the City of North Charleston. However, several of the written comments did express concerns. Several comments expressed concerns about your experience in Family Court, describing it as recent and that there were several subject areas in which you had little or no experience. You addressed this a little bit in your earlier response, but what response would you offer, exactly, to these concerns?
A. When I first started practicing law, I had been in the Family Court accepting guardian ad litem and Rule 608 appointments. I've been on the second floor of the Charleston County Courthouse since I was first practicing law and I've been there ever since. I certainly think the focus of my practice has shifted to Family Court in the last number of years, but I think my presence has always been there. And I do have experience, if the Committee will note, that my Department of Juvenile Justice cases are longstanding. Some of my most recent -- my first cases in Family Court was as a guardian ad litem. The focus of my practice has taken on a Family Court shape, but I would not
classify my experience as lacking nor would I consider my presence there recent.
Q. Thank you. Other comments, in conjunction with this, also mention that they thought you might be using the position as Family Court judge as a stepping stone to become a Circuit Court judge. Some of the positive comments suggested that you would be better suited to be a Circuit Court judge instead of a Family Court judge and how do you respond to those?
A. Well, I'm honored that some of my colleagues think I would be a fine Circuit Court judge, but I'd like the Committee to note in this election and the last election, there have been Circuit Courts seats available. I've not applied for them. At this time, I do not intend to seek it. I want to serve in the Family Court. My intention is to serve in the Family Court and to not use it as a stepping stone. If $I$ wanted to apply for Circuit Court, I would've done so and I would've hopefully appeared before y'all yesterday. My intention is to serve as a Family Court judge because that's what I want to do.
Q. And there were some comments that expressed concerns with having another Family Court judge in

## the Ninth Circuit who has a family member who practices exclusively in Family Court in that circuit. What response would you offer to those comments?

A. Well, I don't think that's a unique situation in our society today when couples practice together, couples work together and in the same area of law. I think that's why we have the Judicial Canons and I think that is why there is recusal. I also would inform this Committee that, while my wife's practice is centered in Family Court, her practice, for the most part in many ways, is as a guardian ad litem and most recently, she has been become court certified to be a Family Court mediator. So if I were to take this position, it would become an easier transition for her to take more of a mediation practice than it would be to work as a litigant. Additionally, I would inform the Committee that in Charleston County we generally have three to four to five judges at any given time. We're not a one judge county and if I would not be available to hear any cases, there certainly would be a colleague down the hall that more than likely would.
Q. Thank you. Judge Duffy, in your interview on
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October $12 t h$, you were requested by staff during the interview and in follow-up emails to amend your PDQ and some other documents. However, these amendments were not received by the Commission until last week. Could you explain, please, to the Commission why it took so long for you to send those amendments to the Commission?
A. Yes. Twofold. The first reason was I got so busy in my practice. The second reason was not realizing that $I$ had lost my application in the floods that happened most recently. It was actually in the backseat of our car, which is why I had to amend my financial statement because we had a car that was paid for that we no longer have. So we had to get a new one. My application was in the back. Thinking I had those records, intending to get those records, intending to make the amendments based upon what I previously submitted, I was unable to do so and that was the reason for the tardiness and I do apologize.
Q. Thank you. You also indicated on your application you're a member of the Hibernian Society. Some people may have concerns that this is a discriminatory organization. What response do you have to that?
A. It is true that Hibernian Society does not allow membership to females. However, I believe the Hibernian Society, throughout its history since its founding in -- first meeting in 1799 and charter in 1801 has been and always been the preservation and the assistance to the Irish and the Irish immigrants and the preservation of Irish history.
Q. Thank you.

MS. WELLS: Just a few housekeeping issues, Mr. Chairman.
Q. Judge Duffy, have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. 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. I have not.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf?
A. I have not.
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 this Commission?
A. No, ma'am.
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 am.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have.
Q. And as a follow-up, are you aware that the penalties for violating the pledging rules are, it is a misdemeanor and upon conviction, the violator must be fined not more than $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I am.

MS. WELLS: Members of the Commission, I would note that the Lowcountry Citizens Committee found Judge Duffy to be qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. The committee also found him qualified as to professional and academic ability, experience, and judicial temperament. The committee found him wellqualified as to ethical fitness, character and reputation. I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Duffy were incorporated into
the questioning of him today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you Ms. Wells. Do any Commission members have questions of -hold those questions for just a moment. Staff just reminded me that you have a guest with you today, Mr. Duffy. Would you like to introduce your guest?

JUDGE DUFFY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. My wife is actually supposed to be in a three day trial, she is the guardian, and it settled mid-day Monday and she's here today in the audience and was able to accompany me.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: And her name is?
JUDGE DUFFY: Abigail Duffy.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Welcome, Ms. Duffy. Good to have you with us.

MRS. DUFFY: Thank you, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. And now, members, do you have any questions of Judge Duffy? Dean Wilcox.

DEAN WILCOX: I'm going to ask you a different question than I ask the Circuit Court judges, to the relief of all of my colleagues here. Thank you for being back in
front of us again and for offering for this seat. There are specific statutory provisions regarding the timing of hearings when children are in DSS custody and, certainly in some circuits, those hearings are not held always on the schedule as required by law. What is your experience in the Charleston courts with regard to the timeliness of the various hearings with children who are in temporary DSS custody?

JUDGE DUFFY: In my experience, if you're talking about probable cause hearing, my experience has been that those hearings are held, generally, fairly quickly because most of the clients that retain us come well after that hearing, as opposed to getting us before, for the fact that they haven't had time to come get us. As far as the other hearings you're talking about, perhaps the merits hearing where we may be delayed, a lot of time those are delayed by consent of the parties for the fact that discovery is voluminous, discovery is sensitive. I have a case right now where my client is Spanish speaking. I'm fluent in Spanish so it's no
problem with me, but the co-defendant is a Spanish speaker and requires assistance of an interpreter for that attorney.

DEAN WILCOX: In an abuse and neglect case, how do you as a judge, make certain that a child is not, for lack of a better phrase, lost in foster care for a long time before it gets resolved?

JUDGE DUFFY: I think you make your orders clear. I think you hold DSS to the time line. I think one of the problems that $I$ see in Charleston County is not with the courts. It's with DSS getting orders in, submitting orders on time, and getting parties served. So I think it's incumbent upon judiciary to keep their notebooks, to keep their time lines, to make sure that the orders are submitted, and every thing is done in proper form and fashion.

DEAN WILCOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
JUDGE DUFFY: I'm still waiting on an order from an August hearing that I have not received in a DSS case.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Other questions?
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Yes, Senator Malloy. SENATOR MALLOY: You are fluent in Spanish?

JUDGE DUFFY: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MALLOY: And so was that your major in college? How did that come about?

JUDGE DUFFY: I had a double major at Furman in history and Spanish. While I was at Furman, I lived in Spain with a home study and she, in the four months I was there, said lamp and congratulations were the only two English words she ever spoke. After college, I went to Argentina to live with a friend and work. The economy in Argentina didn't do so well upon my arrival. I don't think it was because of me, but that's what happened and I couldn't find a job.

So I ended up spending about six months down there as a backpacker going through Argentina, Bolivia, Peru, and Chile until the money ran out and then $I$ had to come back and get a real job. So that's where a lot of my Spanish background comes from. A lot of my clientele at this point, especially through my representation of Special Immigrant Juvenile

Status cases where I'm dealing with unaccompanied minors. I use it a considerable amount of time in my practice and I have no one else in my office that -- I have an associate attorney. She can work in Spanish, but only I can really speak Spanish.

SENATOR MALLOY: Have you been in court, called in as an interpreter, before? JUDGE DUFFY: No, sir, but $I$ do do bond hearings in Spanish while I'm the support judge and we have no interpreter.

SENATOR MALLOY: Okay. The mediations that we have, have you been involved with those as a practitioner?

JUDGE DUFFY: As a practitioner, I have -- excuse me, but I'm not a certified mediator. SENATOR MALLOY: Okay. And your thought process on temporary hearings. Some judges still will not allow arguments at temporary hearings. Some will make you just have it on your affidavits. What's your thought process on that?

JUDGE DUFFY: I think if someone has retained counsel -- I think if someone has employed counsel, I think counsel should be
heard. I do also believe, under Rule 21, that if someone's unrepresented, I think the court should hear in some small or large part from the unrepresented litigant, but $I$ don't think it should become a trial. But I do think arguments should be had based upon the pleadings as a temporary hearing is nothing more than a trial by ambush. We're not prejudiced, but in many ways, folks don't get those affidavits.

I have two temporary hearings tomorrow. I have no affidavits from the other side. I probably won't get them until they walk in the courtroom. I think I should be given an opportunity to respond to it.

SENATOR MALLOY: One of the thoughts that goes along with a hearing, obviously, do you use an alimony calculator in your practice?

JUDGE DUFFY: I do not. I have a Macintosh and Traxler's only works on DOS systems.

SENATOR MALLOY: Okay. And we actually have legislation that we continue to look at. I think we represented matters and have given it a name as it relates to alimony cases.

What I'm concerned about now is that, you know, the statute will say that you terminate after 90 days of continued cohabitation. I'm trying to make certain if there's a case now where someone is cohabiting for 80 days and then there's a period of time whenever they are not, you have any thought process on what happens then whenever the law requires you to have 90 days continuing, do you know what you do in that circumstance?

JUDGE DUFFY: Well, based upon the recent decision from the court, it almost seems impossible to get your 90 days; it seems almost impossible to prove. And it's ironic, I actually have a termination of alimony case where it's a 90 day continuous cohabitation. I believe we've got proof of it, but had this decision come out most recently and this person been aware, then I think it would've been easy for the other side to sidestep and hit the technicality that the court found.

SENATOR MALLOY: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: The Chair recognizes Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you. You know, it's real interesting, you know, sometimes you're not going to comment or ask what some people think you might be on the verge to do. Are you aware -- you're not aware, but we always ask that when we're asking questions. One of the toughest things I ever had to do as a dad was put my oldest daughter on an airplane to go to Argentina for foreign study and she did that as a sophomore at Clemson. And was down there in Cordova or Cordova -- I can't even pronounce it right -- for six months, but I'm impressed with your foreign study experience.

The biggest thing that concerns me about Family Court, and I'm probably going to chime in on a lot those candidates today in this regard, is demeanor of a Family Court judge with the litigants. Tell us about your philosophy as it relates to how a Family Court judge should purport himself day in and day out or herself day in and day out to litigants. And also, you know, you deal with a lot of guardian ad litems, DSS employees. There's one continuing theme that we run into,
and I've run into over the years, has been some, you know, judges are just rude or the judge was just impatient, unfair, trying to get these cases through. Tell us a little bit about your philosophy briefly, but respond to that if you would.

JUDGE DUFFY: I don't think anyone should be afraid to go to court for fear that the judge is going to take out their traffic jam or their spilt coffee on the litigant.

Whether or not you come into court with bad facts, you come into court with a bad situation, that's a different issue and some people do need to be scolded, for lack of a better term, especially in Family Court. I don't think, however, that in any way -everyone has bad days, but I don't think bad days or bad attitudes should be transferred to any person simply because they find themselves in the crosshairs.

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, let me ask you this. If there's a judge out there -- you've been practicing about ten years now? JUDGE DUFFY: Yes, sir. SENATOR MARTIN: Is there a judge out
there in Family Court, Circuit Court, or Appellate Court that you would share with this Committee that you would emulate or like to be like and why?

JUDGE DUFFY: Jerry Vinson. I
think Jerry Vinson, in my experience, has the absolute calmest, coolest, collected demeanor. He's one of the smartest judges I've ever appeared in front of and it's apparent when you make your argument to him. It's apparent when you read your affidavit. It's apparent when you read your pleadings. I think he is absolutely someone that I would try to be like and I hope all judges would be.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you.
JUDGE DUFFY: Yes, sir. I will say this, that Jerry Vinson is not of my circuit. So unfortunately, I don't get to practice in front of him, but every time he comes to Charleston.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none. Judge Duffy, thank you so much for being here with us.

JUDGE DUFFY: Thank y'all for hearing me. Thank you for having me.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you for offering. Don't leave quite yet.

JUDGE DUFFY: Sorry.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We need to get a little bit more in on the record.

JUDGE DUFFY: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: This concludes this portion of our screening process. Judge Duffy, 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. I'll remind you of the 48-hour rule. We ask you to be mindful of that. Should anyone inquire whether or not they may advocate on your behalf, we ask that you respond to them with regard to the 48 -hour rule.

JUDGE DUFFY: I will, indeed.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you of offering and we thank you for your service to South Carolina.

JUDGE DUFFY: Thank you so much, everyone.

P R O C E E D I N G S - final
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CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Have a good day, sir. JUDGE DUFFY: Thank you.
(The candidate is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Mr. Ferderigos, good to have you with us.

MR. FERDERIGOS: Thank you, sir. How are you?

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Very well, thanks. Spiros Stavros Ferderigos is seeking election to Family Court, Ninth Judicial Circuit, Seat 3. Good to have you with us today, sir. I understand you might have a guest with you.

MR. FERDERIGOS: I do. I have my -CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Could you introduce us?

MR. FERDERIGOS: Yes, sir, my lovely wife, Laura Ferderigos.

MRS. FERDERIGOS: Nice to meet you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Great to have you with us.

MRS. FERDERIGOS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you for joining us. Mr. Ferderigos, let's start by swearing you in. If you'd raise your right hand, please.

P R O C E E D I N G S - final
(The candidate is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Mr. Ferderigos, have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?

MR. FERDERIGOS: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is it correct and complete?

MR. FERDERIGOS: It is.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: No need for any changes or amendments at this point?

MR. FERDERIGOS: No, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Would you have any objection to making your personal data questionnaire a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

MR. FERDERIGOS: No objection.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there any objection by members of Commission?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 4 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SPIROS STAVROS FERDERIGOS, DATED AUGUST 5TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Mr. Ferderigos, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. That inquiry has focused on the nine statutory evaluative criteria. It has also included a ballot box survey, a verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a thorough study of the application materials that you've provided, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, study of previous screenings, and a check for economic conflicts of interest.

As of today, we've received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election and there's no one present to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement that you'd like to share with us?

MR. FERDERIGOS: Yes, sir. That would be great. Thank you. First of all, thank you for having me here. It's a pleasure to see y'all again. I was humbled to be here last year running for a judicial position and was fortunate enough to be screened out and go to the General Assembly. I'm even more humbled
now having gone through that process to be here today, now that $I$ know a little more of what it entails.

Just very briefly, I want to say that I've been practicing law for 13 years. I've devoted my entire legal career to the practice of Family Court law. That's all I've done. In private practice, we had cases with multi-million dollar estates. They would fly the kids back and forth in private jets. We have cases with nominal estates where the families couldn't come to our office on their own. We had to get a cab for them to come to our office and we were able to help all them and do all that work.

I left the private practice $I$ was in to go to public service with the solicitor's office because the one thing we didn't do was juvenile delinquency. I knew if $I$ wanted to be able to come before y'all that I would need to be a well-rounded candidate. So I've been with Scarlett Wilson in Charleston County, strictly doing juvenile delinquency from ungovernables, to disturbing school, to murders, to finding juveniles that were going
to be charged as adults. I have a murder case I'm working on right now with that. So I've run the gambit on the civil side. I've run the gambit on the criminal side. I did that for the sole reason for one day to hopefully be able to come up and present myself. I clerked for Family Court judges in law school and I fell in love with the Family Court system and knew that's what $I$ wanted to do. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. We would now ask you to turn your attention to Mr. Maldonado and respond to any questions he might have.

MR. MALDONADO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I have a few matters to take up with this candidate. EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Maldonado)
Q. Mr. Ferderigos, you have before you a sworn statement that you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any additional amendments you'd like to make at this time to your sworn statement?
A. No, sir.

MR. MALDONADO: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that Mr. Ferderigos' sworn statement be entered in as an exhibit in the hearing record.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Maldonado. Are there any objections?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 5 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR SPIROS STAVROS FERDERIGOS, DATED AUGUST 5TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Mr. Ferderigos, would you please state for the record the city and circuit in which you reside?
A. Charleston County; Charleston, South Carolina.

MR. MALDONADO: One final procedural matter, I note for the record that based on the testimony contained in the candidates $P D Q$, which has been included in the record with the candidate's consent, Mr. Ferderigos meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.
Q. Mr. Ferderigos, you gave me an explanation, but why
do you want to serve as a Family Court judge and how do you feel your legal and professional experience will assist you in being a family judge?
A. Thank you. When I was in law school, I had the opportunity and privilege to clerk for the Charleston County Family Court judges and I am a firm believer in the judicial process, but especially the Family Court process. Family Court is about building people up, whether it's on the domestic relations side, whether it's on the juvenile delinquency side. For the domestic relations side, it's about the best interest of the child when children come through. You have a horrible situation. You have parents, a lot of times, who come in, they're not thinking straight. They're using children as weapons. They're using the finances against each other and you need to have a judge who is in place who will apply the rule of law.

The judge will apply the rules of evidence and the rules of court. I've been doing family law now for 13 years and all too often, those aren't always applied in Family Court. It depends on the judge, but you do not apply those rules, there's chaos in court. There's too much smoke screen and
the judge is just shooting from the hip making rulings. Every litigant has a right to have a dignified hearing and to have their court date set for them to be able to come in and put everything appropriately before the judge and for the judge to b
e able to adequately look at everything. So that's one reason I want to be a Family Court judge is because it is a place where I feel as though I can make a difference. It's a place where $I$ can give back to the public in public service. I have no intention of going to Circuit Court, Court of Appeals, Supreme Court. Family Court is, if I'm ever blessed to make it that far -- I know this is on the record, by the way. So I hope I'm not saying anything wrong, but really and truly, that's my thing. That's what I've wanted to do and my goal is to be on the family bench and retire, you know, from there.

My experiences doing Family Court, I think, will serve me well if I'm fortunate to move forward because I've done the civil side and I've also done the criminal side. For the civil side, again, I've had clients where they were flying the kids back and forth to Panther's games for visitation on private jets. On the other side, I've had clients
who, the marital estate consisted of the marital home and the marital home was under. It was debt. They were dividing debt.

So I've had numerous trials, week long trials on the domestic side. I'm more than comfortable with that. I know what I'm doing on that end and I purposely left to round myself off for the juvenile delinquency side and again, I'm working right now for a Mother's Day murder that happened in Charleston involving a juvenile. I've been there eight years with Scarlett Wilson and I also run the juvenile Drug Court Program with Judge Condon and Judge Curry down in Charleston County. It's an amazing program, by the way. It's one of the best programs we've had. We literally seen juveniles addicted to drugs turn their lives around and become productive citizens. It's very nice to see.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Ferderigos, were there any areas, including subjective areas of law, that you feel that you need additional preparation in order to serve as a judge and how will you handle that preparation?
A. The one thing that we did not do much of was adoption. That is not statutorily driven. I'm comfortable with that. I know that's been a
question the last two years, I think, for the judicial exam. I would apply the law, plain and simple, and I would do that in every case.
Q. Although you addressed this in a sworn affidavit, can you explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. It is very important, in my belief, for the judge to be sincere, for a judge to make sure that every litigant has their chance to have their day in court. You can't have attorneys yelling on the other side, causing theatrics, throwing chairs across. I've seen some crazy things in the courtroom that the litigants' attorneys were able to get away with and that's a true story, literally a chair flung across. It is absolutely insane.

A judge is there and needs to have a demeanor to make sure that the rules of law are applied, that everybody has a right to speak, that everybody has a right to have their day in court. Being jovial from the bench, $I$ don't think that's appropriate when you have litigants in front of you. Now, of course, we all practice law together. The judges have practiced law with attorneys that
go through. There's a time to be jovial, but in front of a client, that is not the appropriate place to do that.

So I think the judge needs to be candid.
They need to be knowledgeable of the law and make sure to apply the law and make sure everybody has their fair day in court. And to do that, you have to make sure to stick to the rules and that's the demeanor I would have as a judge. I would be forthright. I'd be serious. I'd be kind. I'd be respectful to everybody that comes in the courtroom. That is their day in court and that is their everything for that moment. They have a right to be heard and make sure that they're moved forward accordingly.
Q. Thank you. What suggestions would you offer to improve the backlog of the cases in Family Court.
A. Hard work, really and truly. I apply private work ethic to my public service. Usually -- I don't want to say every single time. There have been one or two times it hasn't happened over eight years, but usually, my desk is clean. I work. I'll work late if I have to work late. I get the job done.

If you just sit around and just, you know, do
the office cooler, walk around, then that's not appropriate. A lot of times, what I've seen with some courts is if a judge has a way to kind of kick the can down the road, that'll happen. I don't think that's appropriate. I think that is the day you're in court. That is the day that you rule on, unless there's a reason for you not to given it that day. Pushing things down so it gets closer to trial then resolving it at that point is not appropriate. It does a disservice to our Bar. It does a disservice to judiciary and it makes people very upset because they have that right to be in court that day and have, at least, a resolution of the issues that are before the judge.
Q. Mr. Ferderigos, the Commission received 118 ballot box surveys regarding you and 20 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. He would make a great addition to the bench. He's intelligent, smart, kind, and very well versed in the law and would make an excellent judge, smart and compassionate. Also, his experience as a juvenile prosecutor in Family Court will serve him well on the bench. Six of the comments expressed concerns. Several comments indicated that you

## lacked the experience to fill the seat. What response would you offer to those concerns?

A. I would imagine those six responses were people who did not have domestic relations cases with me. They may have had criminal law cases with me. I've done both on both ends. I know some attorneys that know me as a criminal attorney. Other attorneys know me as a domestic attorney. I still get calls about alimony cases, to help evaluate cases. I still get those to this day from other colleagues who are in the business and it's very humbling to have that and to get that.

But I can stand before this committee and say that I have experience on both sides, vast experience, and the good thing is when I was in domestic relations, the law firm I was with -- it was Paul Tinkler. It was one of those here's your case. Take it and run with it. It was my case from then on.

One of the last cases I had was with Judge Danny Martin and we had a three day trial for a very large case. We were together and it went well, but I have experience on both of those. My response would be -- little long-winded, I apologize. That those individuals probably don't
know me in my role as a domestic litigator versus a criminal attorney.
Q. Another commentator expressed concerns over your professionalism and in a comment indicated that you might not act always in the best interest of the juveniles acting as a juvenile pipeline to prison. What response would you offer that comment?
A. I would respond, number one, that I have three adorable children. I have an eight year old, a six year old, and a three year old that are the loves of mine and Laura's life. I would imagine that that came from the criminal prosecution area. Being a prosecutor, you get a lot of targets on your back. People get mad when kids are in jail, but that's my job. My job is to prosecute cases. I've prosecuted three murders, arm robberies, down the road a ways and across the board, whatever you have. I've had attorneys look at me and get upset when they would not take the plea offer that I offered. It goes to trial. I tell them what's going to happen in trial. That is what happens and then the juvenile is having to go to detention or placement.

I have one attorney yell at me and storm out the courtroom. I would imagine it's one of those
attorneys, but $I$ will say that being a prosecutor puts a target on your back for certain individuals who don't believe that children should be prosecuted and that's my job. I'm a juvenile prosecutor.
Q. You've been involved in two lawsuits. Both lawsuits were filed in 2015 arising from a dispute about property in Charleston, South Carolina that you co-own. Can you please explain the nature of those?
A. Absolutely. This is a family dispute that is very regrettable and this is how it has come down. My father and my uncle own Old Town Restaurant, which is a building at 229 King Street in Charleston. My brother and I inherited 50 percent of it. My cousin inherited the other 50 percent of it. My cousin wanted to add an additional construction above the building to rent out for rental properties.

Myself and my brother had cash to move forward with the project. We were looking into it, considering, you know, step by step, seeing if we wanted to do, see if we want to do, see if we want to do it, getting closer and closer and closer. As we get closer, low and behold, my cousin did not
have the financing to put up his end of the proposed project. So he demanded that my brother and I basically co-sign his loan, give our financial interest for him to get a mortgage, for us to co-sign and underwrite his mortgage.

We weren't willing to do that. He got mad. He sued us, simple as that. There's a defamation case in there where he says my -- let's see how it all goes down. He says my dad told something to his mom and his mom told him. We just got a letter from his mother saying she never told that to him. This is all about him trying to get leverage on stuff. It's insane. I'm 37 years old. I've lived a good, wholesome life. Nothing like this has ever happened before to me in my life. It's a family dispute where my cousin is trying to get me and my brother to basically underwrite his loan so he can build a building, which we're not comfortable doing. I mean, you know, my money's there for my children. That's what it's there for, not to underwrite his loan.

So what $I$ can say is that, as an officer of the court, I can say that it's frivolous in nature. I do not believe it will go far. Every communication has been in writing. I went out of
my way to attach the written communications in the pleadings because I knew y'all would be looking into it so you can see that it is a frivolous nature and it's a family dispute that, unfortunately, you know, we all have someone like that in our family. It's sad. It's very disheartening.
(Chairman Clemmons exits the conference room.) VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: Senator from Charleston.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: What would be the possible -- I'm trying to envision a cause of action that he could articulate whereby you have an obligation to be a cosigner because they would know he signed. I'd just like to know what is that? What is his plan?

MR. FERDERIGOS: Well, we've been trying to figure out his plan for a while now and it's a little confusing. That's one of those things where I think when you have unusual -SENATOR CAMPSEN: Not the plan, but in the pleading, what cause of action does he plead?

MR. FERDERIGOS: Specific performance.
He wants us to build. He wants us to build
and the only way to build is for us to
mortgage 229 Kings Street and our personal
finances for him to get a loan. He can't get a loan is apparently the issue.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: So he's alleging a prior agreement that you --

MR. FERDERIGOS: Never had.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: -- have not fulfilled and you must specifically perform?

MR. FERDERIGOS: And specifically, again, I put the written communications in a pleading. You will see a December 12th email from me to him saying $I$ will not accumulate debt. It's detrimental to my family. I don't want a $\$ 2$ million loan for somebody else. I'm not going to do that. There's an email from me saying that. And then there's also emails that show that he did not even know what the terms of his proposed loans were, much less us because we weren't involved in it, way after he alleged there was an agreement. I mean, the best way that I can reflect to that is looking at his other case that he filed simultaneously, which in my belief is trying to get an upper hand on the other case. He
says that $I$ told my dad something. My dad told his mom something. His mom told somebody else. There's like four levels of hearsay in there and his mother just gave a written statement saying that never happened as a mother. His own mother.

So this is a lawsuit where he's trying to get us to underwrite his loan so that he can build a project that he thinks is worthwhile and I don't believe it's worthwhile with me going into a loan with him. It's something I never agreed to do. So that's the specific performance to get us to build it. And also if the judge does not specifically perform it to get us to pay the money, you know, expenses.

VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: I appreciate the senator from Charleston asking that question. If you were running for the Circuit Court, I'd ask for your opinion on frivolous lawsuits.

MR. FERDERIGOS: Well, I studied that recently because of this so I could properly give you an answer.

VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: We're going to save that for the circuit races this
afternoon. We're going to talk a little bit more about that. Counsel?

MR. MALDONADO: Thank you. We'll finish up with some housekeeping issues.
Q. Mr. Ferderigos, have you sought or received any pledge of any legislators prior to this date?
A. I have not.
Q. Have you sought or been offered a conditional pledge of support of any legislator pending the outcome of this screening?
A. I have not.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf?
A. I have not.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of the process on your behalf?
A. I didn't catch the last part. I'm sorry?
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of the process on your behalf?
A. I am not -- I have not.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. I have not.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge for commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's
report?
A. I am.
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 --
A. I am. Sorry.
Q. No problem. That is, it's a misdemeanor and upon conviction, the violator must be fined not more than $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I am aware.

MR. MALDONADO: I would note that the Lowcountry Citizens Committee found Mr. Ferderigos to be qualified as to the constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. He was found well qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and economic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicious temperament. The Citizens Committee further noted that Mr . Ferderigos has a great passion for his work and is goal-oriented. I would note for the record that any concerns raised
during the investigation regarding the candidate today were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: Thank you. Any members of the Commission have a question? Senator from Darlington.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ferderigos, we all got a chance to meet you last time and so, you know, we had some contact then and it's good to meet you, good to see that you have come back.

Congratulations on doing well on your test. They said it was really hard. My question, you know, I've been contemplating a lot of things with juvenile justice. Obviously, I think that one of the things that we have concerns about is that we call it the children behind the wire. We're having a lot of conferences around the country. I know that you are a prosecutor now. Just want to get your thought process on what do you think, as a Family Court judge, how would you transition from being a prosecutor into a Family Court judge to make certain that you're
carrying out your duties and functions?
I'll never forget when Judge Byars came in before our committee once. He said, you know, this bomb case is not really a disturbing the school case to get her kid out of school. And I've been advocating to some of my areas is that, you know, to get rid of the alternative school in my area because we don't need to be kicking children out of school.

So what my question to you is that as a prosecutor, $I$ know you said that your duty was to prosecute the cases. I want to see that from a Family Court judge perspective. I know you'd follow the law, but how would you assess that in a Family Court aspect with your experience now and to getting some alternatives and supporting alternatives as it relates to children coming before you?

MR. FERDERIGOS: That's a great question because I can tell you one of the things that I've been thinking about. I said before, I am a member of the Juvenile Drug Court program in Charleston County. It is an amazing program. One of the pitfalls --
many pitfalls in juvenile delinquency -- one of them is you have DJJ, who's so overworked, it's hard to look over the children that are involved and it causes kind of a snowball effect.

In Juvenile Drug Court, that doesn't happen. You're in front of a judge every single week. You have a school representative You have a DJJ representative. You have a public defender. You have a solicitor. I would love to implement something along those lines, but it'd be a school based program. I don't know what it would be called, but the same thing because the first place that we see these issues coming up are in the school and discipline referrals. I get some kids that come in that have 50 discipline referrals while on probation before they come into school and attend school order. But if you have like Drug Court, and I think Drug Court has to be the key, because it works so well where juveniles can come before the court. They're looked after every single week and you have a school representative. And with my eight, six, and even three year old this time,
you have to have immediate consequences for your actions. They don't have to be bad consequences, but you have to let them know I know this is going on.

We're going to give you a chance to fix it. This is how we're going to take care of it. If there's some counseling that needs to be taken into consideration, do it. If there's issues they need for tutoring then go ahead and do that. I would love to spearhead a program that is school-based similar to Drug Court, but school-based to get that done.

I think the answer to basically the school to jail pipeline, if you will, a lot of that can be done through alternative core programs like Drug Court or like a schoolbased program. I know with Scarlett Wilson, one of the things I loved about her when she came in, she goes truancy is a very big deal because most people just write off truancy. They just don't prosecute them. Get them in, see what's going on with the family, and see what's happening. If they need counseling, get it. If they need some kind of services to get back and forth, do it.

For substance abuse, we have a bridge program. They literally pick up the children from home, take them to counseling, and bring them back. Well, a juvenile that doesn't have transportation, that's where they need to be. They need to be in the bridge program. They don't need to be in the Charleston Center that doesn't have that access where there's no transportation.

Turning my role as prosecutor to a judge. I'm a very straightforward guy and I have conversations all the time with defense counsels saying "Listen, we may agree in substance about a trespassing, how horrible it is, but I'm a prosecutor." If an officer brings forward this charge, it's my job to find out what the best interest of the juvenile is, protect community safety, and find that middle ground there to figure out what to recommend and what to prosecute. But my job as a prosecutor, in this role, is ultimately to prosecute cases. That will not be my role as a judge. My role as a judge would be to sit down, listen to what's going on, apply the law, and make sure that the
right ruling comes out because juvenile delinquency is about rehabilitation. That's what it's about.

SENATOR MALLOY: And I won't keep you because I try to ask all of the judges a similar question. I am pre-filing a bill this year that will raise the threshold from 16 to 17 for the juveniles except in violent cases. And so, basically, I sort of claim this to be the year of child. We have all these issues with schools, you know, School Court, Abbeville, all that kind of thing. Just interested in your position as prosecutor and what you contemplate as a judge. From what you see is that it's a threshold level on the cases that you've done and what you can see as a judge. Give us some light as to how you view that judicially because, for purposes of the committee, you know, if there's a case, you got to take it in front of the judge and see if they waive it up to the --

MR. FERDERIGOS: Yes. I'm in the middle of one now. There was a murder on Mother's Day sitting on my desk. That's what I've been working on.

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

SENATOR MALLOY: Murders are different. I think that they would be an exception even if we raise the age.

JUDGE FERDERIGOS: Yes. Under the rules for that 16 year old to be tried automatically as an adult, that's going to be a -- I believe it's an $A, B, C$, or $D$ felony. Burglary used to fall under that. Burglary second. Now it is not. It has to be burglary violent in order to fall into that. A burglary non-violent would no longer be that threshold to go up. There are very few cases that I have had where it's been an automatic up.

SENATOR MALLOY: And you've shown a good knowledge of it. I guess, to shorten it, does it change things from a judge's perspective if the threshold is raised?

MR. FERDERIGOS: It does because from a judge's perspective, they'll never see it. If it's automatic, --

SENATOR MALLOY: Not automatic. You
still have those issues where you take it in front of the judge.

MR. FERDERIGOS: Okay. I'm sorry. I
think I misunderstood that question. There's one way. If you're 16, for certain crimes, you're automatically general sessions and you have the waiver hearings, which is to be bound over. The law's very clear on that, that the basis has to be rehabilitation starting off. You have the Kent factors. There's eight factors. So if you raise it automatically, the difference is that a judge will have the opportunity to look to determine whether or not it is appropriate for it to go up or not.

SENATOR MALLOY: And in my scenario, I was just changing the number from 16 to 17, nothing else except for those violent cases. They would still yet have the ability to be waived up as an adult. So I guess my real question is that do you see any real difference besides the number if you change the number from 16 to 17?

MR. FERDERIGOS: If you change the number from 16 to 17, do I see a difference? And that specifically -- because I want to make sure I understand your question so I want to answer directly -- is that changing the law? So for violent crimes, you have to be 17 years
old versus 16 years old in going up; is that correct?

SENATOR MALLOY: Right.
MR. FERDERIGOS: I do see a difference simply because it takes away. Now, I'm not saying it's a bad difference, but I do see the difference whereas in one way you have the judge analyzing it to see whether or not the juvenile should be waived up or not. For instance, if you just raise it to 17 only, there will be no 16 year olds that go up, but if you're covering it with the violent offenses, and that's really what we see because it's $A, B, C$, and $D$ felony, most of those violent offenses fall under there for it to be automatic. But what $I$ will tell you is the cases that have not been violent in nature that have gone up, I cannot think of one case that I've had that has not been remanded down by the prosecutor.

SENATOR MALLOY: Are you supportive of the Drug Courts?

MR. FERDERIGOS: It's amazing.
SENATOR MALLOY: Something you would work with as a judge?

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

MR. FERDERIGOS: Yes, sir. I would love to be on a Drug Court or do something different like the school initiative. It's an amazing program.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you.
VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: Any other questions? Dean Wilcox.

DEAN WILCOX: Thank you for being with us this morning. You have a good bit of experience with juvenile justice. I think, and correct me if I'm wrong on this, did the law in South Carolina change in the past year or so regarding shackling of juveniles in court?

MR. FERDERIGOS: It did.
DEAN WILCOX: What was your reaction to that practice before the law changed? Was that a good practice or did you look at that as a practice that needed to be changed?

MR. FERDERIGOS: My personal opinion?
DEAN WILCOX: Yes.
MR. FERDERIGOS: My personal opinion is it hasn't made a difference one way or the other because you don't have a jury. You have a judge and the judge is up there seeing a
juvenile in handcuffs versus taking the handcuffs off right after they come into the courtroom. I don't think it's had much of an effect. We have some judges that come down that still do the shackling, regardless of what the law is, because they prefer to do that. I know it caused a disruption with the deputies for safety issues, but again, in juvenile delinquency, it's kind of rare that you get these really horrible crimes that are coming in.

The vast majority of juveniles, they get detained and they're out within the 48 hour detention hearing that they have coming in and they get put on house arrest or home detention and move forward that way. But specifically, to answer your question, from my opinion, I don't think it swayed rulings one way or the other. I don't think just because someone came in in handcuffs meant that they were necessarily going to go back through the detention door.

DEAN WILCOX: Do you think it had an impact on the juvenile to be put into shackling in the courtroom or do you think it
made little difference to them?
MR. FERDERIGOS: I think it made little difference because they're shackled literally right before they come in the courtroom and they always have a chance to speak with their defendants, you know, the public defenders or attorneys beforehand. We always give them an opportunity and they're prepared on pleas, prepared for detention hearings, and prepared to move forward and they already know what's going to go on as it comes in. The only time I've seen it be an issue was a murder case that I had. We had a juvenile that had one hand in a shackle so they could write notes to the attorney, but I don't think it had an effect on the juvenile themselves, specifically because they're literally shackled the second before they walk into that courtroom.

DEAN WILCOX: Let me flip and talk about abuse and neglect real quick. In your practice in Charleston in the Ninth Circuit, there are specific time frames when children enter into the DSS custody system for abuse and neglect. Are the hearings provided on a
relatively timely manner, in terms of ensuring the custody hearing, the findings are made in a timely manner or is there a delay in that process?

MR. FERDERIGOS: It depends on the judge.
DEAN WILCOX: What, as judge, would you do to ensure that those delays were minimized beyond what the statutory requirements are?

MR. FERDERIGOS: I would make sure that the statutory requirements are met and if it means working late at night, I'll work late at night if we have a caseload that goes over. For DSS cases, and I perhaps should not get up on the soap box when I'm in front of the Committee, we have a problem of a lot of DSS case workers not showing up for court when they're ordered to be there. It's a problem. It's a major problem for juvenile delinquency.

So what I would do is I would get on the phone and I would call their supervisor and I would make sure they show up to court because they are supposed to be there and if it means I have to work until seven o'clock at night, well, then, I've got to work until seven
o'clock at night because these children have a right to that hearing. The statutory period is there for a reason, just like with runaways. Runaways -- there's a, you know, three day period that you can only lock people -- keep people locked up in jail for that period of time. I make sure to get them in during that time frame because it's a black letter of the law issue, but $I$ would ensure that that's done.

If a DSS worker doesn't show up, I
would make sure to make the contacts necessary to have them to come to court. We're all in Charleston. We don't live far away and a lot of judges do that and it works. It's amazing what happens when a judge gets on the phone with your supervisor. You show up with a file and you're there to do what you need to do. There are also issues that have come up more recently where if a juvenile's placed in emergency protective custody of DSS, DSS shows up and says we have nothing. We have no placement for them and that's caused a conundrum in the courtroom before. I honestly don't know the answer to that other
than making sure to put everybody's mind together, making sure to make those contacts, and making sure to make the contacts when we're supposed to.

One thing that $I$ do with my orders for
juvenile delinquency, if $I$ know that a juvenile's in DSS custody however, say a burglary happened or something like that, so they go off for a detained evaluation. There's a 45 day period I know that we have to find a placement for that juvenile. So we put in the order that DSS has to do the paperwork. They have to put out the packets and they have to come to court with the dates they put them in and explanation if it has not been founded.

DEAN WILCOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: Anyone else?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: Let me ask you one last thing. You've answered a concern that I have about demeanor. I will not dwell on that. But what about a sitting judge or judge that you've known that you might want to emulate or believe that that judge is -that's the kind of judge $I$ want to be. Do you
have one?
MR. FERDERIGOS: That is a tough question to answer and thank you for asking that. I don't know if I have a specific judge. There are parts of many judges that $I$ want to emulate. I will tell you this that one of the judges that $I$ have been most impressed and I don't know if he's already come before the Committee; $I$ know he's up for re-election. Judge Danny Martin is amazing. He has the best judicial temperament. He has had some crazy cases in front of him. Best judicial temperament, looks after the best interests of the child, and everybody who's in that courtroom knows they got a fair shake. He does not let people talk over each other. He has control of the courtroom.

As a judge, for me, I strongly believe in applying the rules of the evidence and applying the rules of court and applying the law. I cannot stand and I do not believe that judges should be judicial activists. That's what lawmakers are for. We're there to apply the law and that's exactly what $I$ would do. But if I had to name one, I'm very impressed
with Judge Danny Martin.
VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: You might want to consider the Supreme Court at some point and time.

MR. FERDERIGOS: Well, the problem is I just told you I want to do Family Court, so. On the record so that means it's going to follow me.

SENATOR MALLOY: I will say before Mr. Ferderigos parts is that Dean Wilcox was my trusted professor and he didn't tell me this, but another trusted professor did tell me this. He said just keep in mind that blood is thicker than water and money is thicker than blood when you start dealing with legal issues.

MR. FERDERIGOS: Thank you. Thank you for that.

VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: You've answered our questions very generously and we appreciate your appearance here today. This 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 if the need arises. I
will remind you again of what Mr. Maldonado said and ask you to be mindful of that. MR. FERDERIGOS: Yes, sir.

VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: Anyone that
inquires about, you know, soliciting a vote for you, you need to remind them of that, as well. We like to stress that. I thank you for offering and you're willingness to serve in this very important position and we wish you the best.

MR. FERDERIGOS: Thank you, sir.
VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: Good to see your wife.

MRS. FERDERIGOS: Thank you.
MR. FERDERIGOS: Thank you. I promised her lunch at Macaroni Grill so I guess I ought to -- we don't have them in Charleston. Thank y'all so much.
(The candidate is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Good morning, Ms. Forsythe.

MS. FORSYTHE: Good morning. How are you?

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Still barely morning.
MS. FORSYTHE: I know you all have been
working very hard this week.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: It's been a long week, but we're delighted to have you here.

MS. FORSYTHE: Thank you so much.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Let's start by
swearing you in as a witness today. Please raise your right hand.
(The candidate is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Do you have some special guests with you today that you'd like to introduce?

MS. FORSYTHE: I do. Thank you so much. My husband Rob Forsythe is here. My law firm actually had oral argument this morning in the Court of Appeals so my law partners Grady Query and Michael Sautter are here and then my associate Brooke Hurt is here. They all were at the court this morning. I had other matters to attend to.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: What a tremendous support network. Welcome. It's good to have all of you with us today. Thank you. Have you had an opportunity, Ms. Forsythe, to review your personal data questionnaire?

MS. FORSYTHE: Yes, I have.

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: And is it complete and correct?

MS. FORSYTHE: Yes, it is and I believe I submitted some amendments to the personal data questionnaire, as well.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: That information has been received and is made an amendment to your personal data questionnaire. Do you see any need for other amendments or changes?

MS. FORSYTHE: None at this time. No, sir.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Would you have any objection to the Commission making your personal data questionnaire, as amended, part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

MS. FORSYTHE: I have no objection.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there an objection by any Commission member?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 6 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MICHELE PATRAO FORSYTHE, DATED AUGUST 4TH,

2015, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT NO. 7 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR MICHELE PATRAO FORSYTHE, DATED NOVEMBER 10TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ms. Forsythe, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry is focused on the nine statutory evaluative criteria and also includes a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, a 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. I'm pleased to report we've received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election and there are no witnesses here to testify today, of course, other than yourself. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to share with the Commission?

MS. FORSYTHE: Only to say that it's truly an honor to be here today. At the start
of my legal career, I didn't really ever envision going into this venue, but I'm very pleased to be here and thank you so much. I really don't have anything else to say with that regard.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. We ask now that -- yes, Senator Malloy? You're recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Committee, I would first start by assisting the introduction. I guess you all found out who Grady Query was not too long ago. Now, see, Grady's in the audience. I've known Grady for many years. He's back there and I think that someone made reference that he was associated -- not close -- in representation of Pee Wee Gaskins back in the earlier days and has written a book, possibly. I would just say that he obviously has been affiliated with practices that I've been affiliated with for more than 20 years. I know we have a manner currently that we're working on together and I would venture to say, and I didn't do full check, that he and his firm have contributed to my campaign at
least sometime during the last 13 years and we'll make certain to get a chance to verify that. So as a result, we have some communication and contact with their law firm.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you for that, Senator Malloy. And now we would ask that you turn your attention to your screening attorney Mr. Gentry and please respond to any questions he may have.

MS. FORSYTHE: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you.
MR. GENTRY: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I have a procedural manner to take care of with regards to this candidate. EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Gentry)
Q. Mrs. Forsythe, you have before you the sworn statement you provided with details answers to over 30 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? A. No, sir.

MR. GENTRY: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that Ms. Forsythe's sworn
statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 8 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR MICHELE PATRAO FORSYTHE, DATED JUNE 30TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Ms. Forsythe, please state for the record the city and circuit in which you reside.
A. I reside in Charleston in the Ninth Circuit.

MR. GENTRY: 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. Forsythe meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.
Q. Ms. Forsythe, why do you want to serve as a Family Court judge and how do you feel your legal and professional experience this far will assist you in being an effective judge?
A. I really have thought long and hard about this and

I have a variety of reasons for why I want to serve as a Family Court judge. I've been practicing now for 12 years and my experience has been outside of Family Court as well as in detail within the Family Court practice, but my connection has always been for service. Prior to becoming an attorney, I worked for the government and I continue to feel that call. I have to say that I have been very fortunate.

I have a wonderful law firm, a wonderful practice that $I$ truly enjoy every day. I can say that my passion for the law continues to grow and because of that real deep commitment to the law, which I feel is stronger now than when $I$ went to law school, Dean -- is actually what brings me to this place where $I$ feel as if I have the knowledge, the requisite knowledge, have learned the requisite temperament, because $I$ think that's really important, and that I can serve my community and do it with some sense of dignity and some sense of service to the State of South Carolina, which has really given me so much.
Q. Are there any areas of law that you need to additionally prepare for in order to serve as a judge and how would you go about that preparation?
A. I think in family law, the changes and the pace are fast and we have a lot of areas that continue to develop. I think that my weaknesses are in adoptions, which are statutory in nature, but based on the most recent appellate opinions, there needs to be some deeper focus on that area and I do juveniles occasionally. However, I don't feel comfortable enough to say that $I$ don't need any review of the law in that area. And so my plan would be to read, of course, as much as possible, which I'm guilty of doing, my law firm tells me, a lot. And also, continue with my continuing legal education, which I think is so important.
Q. Can you please explain what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. Well, I've been in front of a lot of them, Circuit Court as well as Appellate Court and Family Court. I think the ones that stand out to me are the ones that are firm, but compassionate and listen to the litigants as well as the attorneys in argument. I think it's incredibly important to be mindful of the responsibility that a judge has, to always follow the law, but to give the litigants a stake in the process. Very often, I hear litigants complain that they just didn't feel as if they were
heard. I think that just comes with time to be a patient, listening, and firm judge at the same time.
Q. What suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog cases in Family Court?
A. Well, we're rounding the corner to electronic filing, which I think is going to be useful after the initial hiccups. Because of the 365 day rule, I believe that the backlog has really been minimized to a certain extent. I think one of the key components is probably for judges, at this point, is having a status conference during the course of the 365 days. That is something that we do not have in Family Court at present and I think it's incredibly important to know where the case is in terms of posture because many times we come to the 365 day mark and there's really very little activity in the case. In Circuit Court and in Federal Court, we have scheduling orders in place. I think those are very effective and important in Family Court and we should focus on that in the future.
Q. Ms. Forsythe, the Commission received 124 ballot box surveys regarding you with 22 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example,
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contained the following positive comments. A pleasure to work with, great demeanor, excellent attorney, well-suited for the bench. Five of the written comments expressed concerns. One survey expressed concerns with your contacting members of the Commission. Have you had any contact with members of the Commission?
A. I have seen many of the members of the Commission at various events. Senator Malloy has a case where we are co-counsel. However, I take the oath very seriously. I haven't had any discussions about my judicial candidacy and, in fact, avoid it at all costs possible.
Q. Another survey expressed concerns with your organizational skills, responsiveness, and timeliness. What response would you offer this concern?
A. That puzzled me and I thought back to an experience. I'm guilty of being overprepared at times. I don't really know the context of that. I can certainly say that that is not in my nature. I'm accessible at all times. Attorneys and litigants have access to my cell phone, email. In today's world, technology makes us very accessible and I try at all times to be that way. So I'm not
really sure of the context of it other than to say I wish they had told me their concern.
Q. Another survey expressed concern with your legal knowledge. What response would you offer to that concern?
A. I would say that I've been doing this for 12 years. I study hard. There is nobody that works harder than I do. I understand that I got a pretty decent score on my test and I believe that just working very hard and reading the law is so important. I struggle every day to understand the opinions that come out from the Appellate Court and make sure that my practice follows accordingly and I think that that is all anyone can do.

I don't know what the context was in terms of the limitations of my legal knowledge, but having practiced in Family Court and Circuit Court and the Federal Courts, I feel confident with my knowledge, but I'm also very clear that it's the practice of law for a reason. We have to constantly learn and improve.
Q. One survey expressed concerns with your demeanor. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Also puzzling. It's my practice at all times to be open to attorneys. We have contentious cases in

Family Court. I am always open for discussion, but my practice is to be very warm and open and also concerned for other attorneys. There are very many times where there are heated discussions and we don't take the time to follow up and have conversations with each other. I make it a point, especially in the last few years, to always pick up the phone and say "Are you okay? Are we okay? I know that we had a pretty contentious discussion in the courthouse." But I like to make it so that I can see lawyers outside of the courtroom and still be their friends.
Q. In your PDQ, you indicated that you were sued in 2011, 2013, and 2015 over fee disputes with clients. Can you explain the nature of these lawsuits and dispositions?
A. Yes. I'm a member of the Fee Dispute Resolution Board and by nature of that, all of my fee contracts have a clause for fee disputes. Because of that, there are times in Family Court where clients get upset and are looking for some sort of response. All of the fee disputes were dismissed. The last, most recent dispute of 2015, there was an accounting error. I think we returned $\$ 62.50$. As far as the entire fee, they were all dismissed
after investigation.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Forsythe. 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 on your part in the process?
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 do understand that.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes, 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, the violator must

## be fined not more than $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?

A. Yes.

MR. GENTRY: I would note that the Lowcountry Citizens Committee found Ms. Forsythe qualified in evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. The committee found her well qualified in evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. The committee stated in summary, she has great zeal, good diversity of experience, and as a plus, bilingual. I would just note, for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Gentry. Members of the Commission, do you have questions? Senator Campsen, you are recognized.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: No. No question.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Okay. Ms. Wall, you're recognized.

MS. WALL: Thank you. For purposes of letting the Commission know, Ms. Forsythe and I worked together very briefly, I believe when she was a law clerk at Nexsen Pruet. Many, many years ago, I think she helped me on some legal malpractice. She helped me on some legal malpractice matters so $I$ knew her then. I have not seen her since that time so this is our first time seeing each other.

Ms. Forsythe, I do have a few questions for you. Let me go over to the fee dispute. We know in your materials and you've briefly responded to the question that you've been involved in three fee disputes. How would you respond to a question that -- do these fee disputes indicate problems in your dealing with clients, potentially communication problems?

MS. FORSYTHE: I think that's a very fair question. I would say that perhaps that may be the case. I know that fee disputes are growing in frequency in terms of litigants, but I am very open with my clients and one of
the pitfalls sometimes in domestic litigation is that you tell your clients things that they don't necessarily want to hear in terms of the likelihood of success on the merits of their case. I can only tell you that they've been three in 12 years.

So I feel fortunate, but that is just part of what happens and transpires in domestic litigation. As you all may know, when you're a domestic litigator, many complaints go to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. Largely, litigants feel angry and not necessarily about circumstances, just in general. I can tell you, interestingly enough, in each of those cases, they had a wonderful result and so it's just the nature of the practice.

MS. WALL: Tell us, then, if you were a judge, how would you characterize how you would want to communicate with both litigants before you and their attorneys?

MS. FORSYTHE: Do you mean from the bench, or?

MS. WALL: From the bench.
MS. FORSYTHE: Yes. I think that's
extraordinarily important. I want to hear everything that a litigant has to say, certainly everything that an attorney has to say, and I'm always open to listening and paying close attention to the notes, making sure that $I$ understand what it is that parties are trying to get across.

MS. WALL: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms. Wall. Senator Malloy is recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just one second. I've done sentencing reform in South Carolina and this committee is tired of hearing about it. I'm interested in the juvenile aspect of it. One of the things that we are trying to do and $I$ am interested in is that the children that are behind the fence and what I'm interested in is judges that are interested in alternative sentencing to the extent that they can. And also, even though they may not have a Drug Court down in Charleston, would you be interested in something as it relates to Drug Court to make certain the children get a chance to be able to exist, stay in school, and any alternative
as opposed to they end up going behind the wire. Could you address that?

MS. FORSYTHE: Yes, sir. I think my practice is varied, but my personal experience also gives me a different viewpoint in that. My husband's a police officer and has been for 18 years. Because I do criminal defense, we certainly have the opportunity to have engaging discussions. And one of the things that I have seen in doing juvenile work and even doing criminal defense work with younger adults is there needs to be an opportunity for rehabilitation. I think drug court is incredibly powerful. Of course, I can't sit here as a candidate and tell you how I would intend to rule in any way, shape, or form. But I think that opportunities for children in South Carolina, particularly when they are placing themselves, generally, in situations that they shouldn't be, there should be an opportunity for them to have counseling as needed, which we do have that ability, drug court if needed, and giving them every opportunity to succeed prior to age of majority.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Gentry just mentioned to me that one of our earlier candidates is fluent in Spanish. He said that you speak Spanish?

MS. FORSYTHE: I speak Spanish and Portuguese. I am Spanish, Portuguese, and Brazilian. That makes it very difficult come the World Cup, but my background is varied. I do speak various languages and I utilize them frequently in Family Court. Often, on occasion, magistrates will call me on the weekends and ask me to translate over the telephone. I've been asked to do it by federal judges in Portuguese and Spanish. Portuguese in particular because we simply do not have a certified Portuguese linguist in South Carolina. I do have a lot of contact with a lot of young, Hispanic people, as well, and do a lot of work with them in the community. So I am tri-lingual.

SENATOR MALLOY: One of the things I've asked one of the other candidates, too, is that some Family Court judges don't let folks argue at the temporary hearings. They'll let them submit their affidavits only. So would
it be your desire or would it be your feeling that if counsel would ask for argument, would you allow the arguments notwithstanding or would you be willing to just allow the affidavits?

MS. FORSYTHE: In Charleston -- well, in the tri-county area, we generally allow argument. The court allows us to give a brief argument. I think it's helpful. It gives context. Sometimes the affidavits and -- years ago, we were allowed to submit voluminous affidavits. We have now narrowed it to eight pages. Judges comment to me privately that that's not always the most helpful scenario. So I would encourage oral argument. Particularly, the litigants want to see their attorneys doing their job and the attorneys do have a right to advocate for their client. I think that's extraordinarily powerful for the litigant and the process.

SENATOR MALLOY: And do you participate in mediation as it relates to Family Court?

MS. FORSYTHE: Yes, I do. I'm a certified Family Court mediator. I mediated a case last week in Family Court. I do custody,
equitable distribution, the gamut of issues in Family Court and for a time, I was doing mediations in abuse neglect cases when we were allowed to do so as a volunteer.

SENATOR MALLOY: And any guardian ad litem work?

MS. FORSYTHE: Yes. I have done significant guardian ad litem work. Much of the time, I'm asked to be a guardian ad litem in cases where the participants are Spanish speaking or Portuguese speaking, simply because I can communicate with them. It minimizes the cost for the litigants and I have done cases where I've been appointed by the court and that happens probably every six months. I'm appointed by either the Berkeley County Family Court or the Charleston County Family Court.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator Malloy. Dean Wilcox.

DEAN WILCOX: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I appreciate you being with us now this afternoon.

MS. FORSYTHE: Thank you for having me.
DEAN WILCOX: One question is maybe,
perhaps, informational for me as much as anything, but when a child was removed from the home, there are specific deadlines for years for hearings and dispositions in that child's case. In the Ninth Circuit, are those deadlines generally being complied with or are there delays occurring beyond the statutory expectations?

MS. FORSYTHE: I would say, yes and yes. Well, there have been several appellate opinions that have addressed this issue. They're particularly focused on the Charleston County Family Court. In general, I believe that the Family Court judges have done a really good job of working to make sure those deadlines are met. Most of our DSS defense attorneys, the rule 608 attorneys, and private attorneys such as myself have really worked hard to make sure that those deadlines are complied with. I can tell you from personal experience, I had a case recently where it was clear that the deadline was not going to be met. I approached the department and delicately indicated to them the problem and we came to a resolution, which I think was
extraordinarily powerful.
DEAN WILCOX: What could you do as judge? That was what you did as counsel. What could you do as judge to make sure it's carried out?

MS. FORSYTHE: Well, what happens during what they call a DSS docket is the docket moves very quickly and I think the important thing is to ask the DSS attorneys where they are on the time line. Many times, it's almost as if it's a rubber stamp that whatever DSS declares is actually the facts of the case. And I believe that the more important issue is asking the DSS attorney and the defense attorney where are they on the deadlines, how long has the child been in foster care if the child is in foster care, and is there a treatment plan or a placement plan. The Appellate Court has made it very clear in the last year that we need to focus on the difference between a treatment plan and a placement plan. And I would ask them specifically about that with each and every case because it is important and they do slide.

DEAN WILCOX: Let me move away from the
abuse and neglect side to the juvenile justice for a minute. You mentioned in your PDQ, you mentioned one particular case in 2010. Do you have other experience on the juvenile justice side or is that the primary experience you have on the juvenile justice side?

MS. FORSYTHE: That is one of my primary experiences. There have been a few others. Because of the 608 attorneys, we very rarely get private cases for juvenile. Generally, when I'm appointed, I'm appointed to a general sessions case. So, for example, this year I resolved a murder case that $I$ was appointed to by plea, but that is a particularly striking case, which is why $I$ put it in the PDQ. That young man was 14 years old. He was accused of a pretty significant crime. From the very beginning, he had been declaring his innocence to the North Charleston Police Department and they simply weren't listening. It took motions, as opposed to discussions with the solicitor's office, to really resolve the case and have the North Charleston Police Department conduct a thorough investigation. DEAN WILCOX: And my last question is
purely your personal view on something and that's all I'm asking. The law changed a year or so ago regarding shackling of youths in juvenile justice cases. I think there were two views on that. One was it was a good security measure. The other was that it was some way troubling to have juveniles in shackles in the court. The law is now changed, but what is your personal view on the wisdom of shackling?

MS. FORSYTHE: I have to disclose that I'm on the Lawyers' Committee for Children's Rights. I was personally involved in crafting that legislation and I was personally involved in the House of Delegates when we had a very lengthy debate and I believe that Solicitor Dan Johnson is still a little angry with me. I believe that shackles on juveniles are generally unnecessary. There are always going to be defendants who are violent in nature, but having them come into the courtroom with the shackles, I think from a personal perspective, demeans the process in Family Court.

If we are not looking at their charges as
crimes, then we certainly need to treat them in a different way and that is why I passionately advocated in front of the House of Delegates to pass that and have that go forward to the legislature and it did. I'm particularly proud of that. I had some debate with my husband about it. I think that what we did was give law enforcement the tools that they need to ensure safety and security in the courtroom, which I think is very important and they do an amazing job, but at the same time we need to remember that the defendant is a child and sometimes we do forget that.

DEAN WILCOX: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, those are my questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Yes, Senator Martin, you're recognized.

SENATOR MARTIN: I will be brief. I think you responded to me very adequately and to the Commission very adequately regarding your views on demeanor and that's a big concern of mine about family court judges. But have you had a judge that you've observed over the years or know about by
reading, by reputation, whatever that you most would want to emulate on the bench and in your role as a judge? Who would it be?

MS. FORSYTHE: Well, there are a few, if you'll indulge me. I'd start by saying that this seat has been occupied by Judy McMahon for 33 years. She has done an amazing job and she is always calm, cool, and collected. She gives attorneys and litigants alike the opportunity to speak freely in her courtroom and she takes time to consider issues. She does not hesitate to pick up the phone and have a telephone conference and I think everybody will miss her.

There are other judges, too, that I really admire. One is Michael Duffy, Federal Court judge. His demeanor in the Federal Court is always a delight. He always has a sense of humor. He's very serious when he needs to be and he's also very compassionate. I don't think anybody thinks he's a pushover, but he does show his compassionate side quite frequently and for me he is just beyond par. And then finally I'd say that $I$ had the pleasure of trying what $I$ think is my first
really big jury trial case in front of Clifton Newman. He and I, since that time, just have an amazing rapport. He, too, is a very patient, firm judge. I have seen him in court in Newberry, here in Richland, and of course, in Charleston County and each and every time he is very deliberative and thoughtful in his decisions. I know that he sometimes struggles with those decisions, but he's mindful of that. And that's what $I$ think is so important is from a demeanor perspective, to make the decision carefully and thoughtfully, but make the decision.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: I just have one brief question for you.

MS. FORSYTHE: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: There was a perception by many that there are times when these or those elected to the Family Court bench see that the election to Family Court bench is an opportunity to advance to the next court in Circuit Court or beyond. Can you share your view with regard to what might be a practice for some?

MS. FORSYTHE: Well, for me, probably the hardest thing I ever had to do was tell my law partners that $I$ wanted to run for Family Court, but their response was why not Circuit Court. And the reality for me is that I'm passionate about Family Court, the domestic litigation, children, and the issues are exciting. They're dynamic, they're evolving and there's a lot of change and growth coming in the next few years in Family Court. I don't know the idea of it being a stepping stone. I've certainly heard that before, but for me, I take it very seriously.

I see this as a huge opportunity just to be able to be in front of you, for me, coming from my particular background where my parents were immigrants and they didn't speak English and I did most of the translating as a young kid. This is what I desire. This is truly what I'm passionate about and the legal issues are fascinating. They may make your eyes glaze over, but $I$ find them fascinating.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. We certainly see your passion.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Chair?

MS. FORSYTHE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Yes, Senator Campsen.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you for appearing before us and for offering this position. One question is under our Constitution, the judicial branch is to interpret and apply law, executive to execute, legislative to make law or policy. And as a judge, how would you guard yourself or what are the principles you'd employ to make sure you don't cross the line between interpreting and applying the law with fact and making policy from the bench?

MS. FORSYTHE: I think that is really one of the keys in today's day and age. It is very easy in Family Court to utilize the best interest of the child as a catch-all and forget about the very detailed statutory framework in Family Court and the children's code. And in addition to that, I think you always have to be mindful that the decisions you make have such an impact and because of that, you really need to follow the law and the legislature has worked really hard to respond to the appellate courts.

For example, I know that there is alimony
legislation that is being discussed at present in order to solve some of the issues that were raised in an appellate opinion. And I think that you must follow the law and I have a great balance in my practice where many times, I'm just very realistic about how things will unfold. And I think that that can carry forward if $I$ were to serve on the bench and just be mindful. There are some things you simply cannot do. You don't have the jurisdiction or authority to do so as a Family Court judge. Those powers are enumerated specifically and on an annual basis they may change, but you much follow the law as it is written and you must be mindful of the decisions you make because the Appellate Court is watching.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Seeing no further questions by Commission members, we want to thank you for being with us today, Ms. Forsythe and we observe your passion for the Family Court. That will conclude this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. If that need should arise, you may
be called back at that time. We ask you to be mindful of the 48 -hour rule and if anybody should ask you whether or not they may advocate on your behalf, we would ask you to instruct them on the 48 -hour rule.

MS. FORSYTHE: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We thank you very much for offering and we want to thank you for being here today.

MS. FORSYTHE: Thank you so much. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Also say to your husband thank you for serving in --

MS. FORSYTHE: Thank you. Y'all have a great afternoon.
(The candidate is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Commission members, just to kind of give you an update. You may smell lunch and there's a good reason for that because it is here and I'd like to thank our benefactor of the day. Michael provided lunch and Senator Malloy started this process and it continues. However, we are two candidates behind in the schedule. What I would propose is let's get through those two candidates. We
will then go into executive session and we can eat lunch while we are in executive session. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Good morning, Mr. Keefer. It's good to have you with us today. Thank you for offering for Family Court, Ninth Judicial Circuit, Seat Three. Ladies and gentlemen, we have before us Mr. Sean F. Keefer. Mr. Keefer, would you raise your right hand and be sworn?
(The candidate is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Mr. Keefer, have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?

MR. KEEFER: I have. Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Okay. Is it complete and correct?

MR. KEEFER: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Does it need any
changes or amendments at this time?
MR. KEEFER: It does not.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Would you have any objection to that personal data questionnaire being made a part of the record of your testimony today?

MR. KEEFER: Absolutely not.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there any objection by Commission members?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 9 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SEAN F. KEEFER, DATED AUGUST 6TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Mr. Keefer, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry is focused on the nine statutory evaluative criteria and has also included a ballot box survey, a 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 today other than yourself. Do you have a brief opening statement that you'd like to share
with the Commission today?
MR. KEEFER: I know this has been a busy week for y'all and y'all have had a lot of stuff that y'all were doing. Thank y'all for your service. It's very important to me. I think that the judiciaries are one of the most important things we have in the legal system in South Carolina. I want to thank each and every one of y'all for devoting your time to making sure that the folks that we have on the bench are deserving, qualified to serve the citizens of South Carolina. It's an honor for me to be here today and I think you for your consideration and I'm happy to answer any questions that you have.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Keefer.

MR. KEEFER: Closer to me? I'm sorry. I think that's the first time in eons when $I$ was told that $I$ was not speaking loud enough. Do you need me to repeat any of that?

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: No. I think we're fine. The court reporter just needed to have a little increase.

MR. KEEFER: Certainly and I apologize
for that.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Mr. Keefer, if you would please direct your attention to the screening attorney.

MR. KEEFER: Certainly.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: And respond to his questions. Thank you.

MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you Mr. Chairman EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Davidson)
Q. Mr. Keefer, you have before you the sworn statement you provided with the detailed answers to over 30 questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments you'd like to make at this time?
A. No, sir.

MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that his sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the record.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 10 - JUDICIAL MERIT
SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR SEAN F. KEEFER, DATED AUGUST 6TH, 2015, ADMITTED.] MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you.
Q. Mr. Keefer, please state for the record the city and circuit in which you reside.
A. I reside in Charleston, South Carolina. It's in the Ninth Judicial Circuit.
Q. Thank you.

MR. DAVIDSON: I note for the record that based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the record with the candidate's consent, Mr. Keefer meets the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.
Q. Mr. Keefer, would you please explain to the Commission why you would like to serve as a Family Court judge and how do you feel your legal and professional experience will assist you to be an effective judge?
A. I started practicing law back in 1997. When I went to law school, it had always been a goal of mine to serve as a family court attorney. I started working in a firm that handled a variety of
domestic matters. I was trained as a mediator. Soon after that I began to do work as a guardian ad litem, went to work for a firm that did more of a general practice, including in that family court work, to a firm that did primarily family court work.

That's always been a focus of my legal practice. Done extensive work with DSS representing parties and DSS representing guardians ad litem. I've represented children in the juvenile justice system and through that, coupled with my ADR experience, which includes mediation, arbitration, and as I said, my private guardian ad litem work through the years. My legal career, if you will, has been built in and around family courts.

I am confident that my experience while working with other attorneys has prepared me to take a step to move to the bench and to be a member of the judiciary. And I believe that the skills that I've learned and knowledge that I've gained came from that. I think the temperament that I have to look at cases would make me an asset to the bench and make me an effective family court judge.

From a standpoint of wanting to do it, we
haven't had a lot of openings down in the Charleston County area. It's just been the last couple of years we've had seats opened up that just happened to coincide with a time in my professional career to where I believe I have the requisite experience. And they would take that test and could make a positive benefit not only on the bench, but to the people of Charleston County in South Carolina.
Q. Thank you. Are there any areas of law that you need to additionally prepare for in order to serve as a judge and if so, how would you handle that additional preparation?
A. Not to say that there are not going to be novel areas of law that are going to be developing. For instance, recently the Supreme Court decision that we're going to be seeing over the next number of years of an increase in same sex marriages and couples coming through the court to present issues that have, in part, we've considered before, but never in that context. As that comes along, that's going be something that we're going to have to be -- or the members of judiciary if I am one, being the same, we'd have to mindful of and make sure that information is gained on that.

I've never served as a prosecutor. I've never served as a staff attorney for DSS. While I have had experience in those areas, I think that it may be a little bit of work just to make sure I'm polished through on that. But for the cases that go through Family Court, in a large part I feel that I've had exposure and if I needed to do anything I feel that, one, I'd be able to know when I needed to look at something additional and, two, I would be able to readily find it.
Q. Thank you. Could you please explain what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. I think they need to be attentive. I think they need to be courteous. I think they need to make sure that every party that comes before them understands they are being heard. I think they need to balance the facts of the case against the law as it exists in South Carolina and provide a well-reasoned, timely decision, let folks know that they have been heard and be able to make those difficult decisions.

My goal, if $I$ was on the bench, would be to be able to have people come into the court and just realize simply that, that they have had their opportunity to be heard, that I had not made a rash
decision, that $I$ had not done something that was outside of the bounds of the law in South Carolina, and that they could walk out of that courtroom knowing that they had had their day in court.
Q. What suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the docket?
A. Timely disposition, holding the attorney's feet to the fire on getting attorney's memos, cases moved along, granting continuances only on the most deserving of cases, and making sure that you're doing everything to adjudicate and hear all the cases that are brought before you.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Keefer. The Commission received 122 ballot box surveys regarding your candidacy and nine additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. Sean has one of the best temperaments for this position possible and the knowledge to do an amazing job. Sean is known to be level-headed and competent attorney, mediator, and guardian ad litem. I believe he possesses the patience, empathy, and temperament required of a Family Court judge. I believe he's head and shoulders above others in terms of depth and breadth of Family Court experience. Sean has acted as a guardian ad
litem for a minor child in a case where $I$ was representing the party. He went to extraordinary lengths to investigate and present findings to the court on behalf of the represented minor. Always did what he said he was going to do.

Two of the written comments expressed concerns. One comment stated, as a guardian ad litem, he does not always follow through on what he says he's going to do, but he talks a good game. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. I've never had a situation where its been brought to the court's attention or to even my attention that I've missed something, not done something, or thoroughly investigated a case where $I$ was serving as a guardian ad litem. I will not stand before this Commission and say that in every case where I've been a guardian, I've talked to every possible witness if it exists in a case, but $I$ feel that every case where I've served as a guardian, I've talked to everyone, done everything, done an investigation thorough to the point to where I felt I was able to not only protect the best interest of the minor child or children, but to make sure that the court was well-informed on any issues that were of concern or that $I$ felt relevant or needed to be
addressed regarding the minor child or children or parties.
Q. Thank you. Another comment stated, quote, while Sean has all the makings of a great judge, he lacks the ability to make difficult and unpleasant decisions. He recently has taken up arbitration and the verdicts rendered fail to answer any questions that are weak in their direction. I have serious concerns of Sean's ability to make difficult decisions and render clear verdicts. While I would love to have Sean judge, I do perceive problems with that appointment. What response would you offer to this comment?
A. Every case that I've ever arbitrated, I felt that my decision was very well-reasoned. I have a reputation for writing long arbitration awards because I'm going to make sure that folks know exactly what I'm thinking. And I feel that every arbitration award I've ever done has been factually and legally proper application of the law in South Carolina. Decisions are what Family Court judges make and you're going to have to make those decisions. I will not be afraid to make any decision. I will not be afraid to give the appropriate reason for decisions. I will not be
afraid to make sure the parties and counsel know the reason behind those decisions.

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Do we have a motion?

SENATOR MALLOY: So moved.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We have a motion.
The veil will be lowered. Non-commission members and staff members, we'd ask that you leave the room and security would secure the doors. Thank you.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Can we open the doors, please? We're back on the record.

MR. KEEFER: Should I turn this back on?
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: You may. Please. We're back on the record from executive session with no decisions made or votes taken on to review the matters. Mr. Davidson.
(By Mr. Davidson)
Q. Thank you, Mr. Keefer. I have a few housekeeping issues that I'm going to roll through quickly. 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 any pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Absolutely.
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 $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?

A. Absolutely.

when it's appropriate to have ex parte communications. In there, you say general rules, they should be avoided, but in matters where there are emergent issues, such communications are to be expected at the outset of an action and then you go on to talk about matters such as financial wasting, serious financial consequences, harm or the threat of harm to children, race issues where ex parte communications could be appropriate. MR. KEEFER: Certainly.

DEAN WILCOX: Can you elaborate a little bit on that for me and help me understand what you're --

MR. KEEFER: Sure. Sure. Nutshell, case is beginning and one spouse sees that bank account, investments, assets of liquid form, 401K, retirement, whatever had been at a certain level on this bank statement or this statement and then suddenly, they diminish. I believe that it would be appropriate to file a summons and a complaint and a motion for ex parte relief asking that any of those bank accounts be frozen until defendant could be served, quickly given an opportunity to be
heard.
Children's issues -- and I think children's issues would probably be more -not to minimize financial concern, but I think children's issues are paramount. Two spouses, one of them is out allegedly playing golf with the children, but the other spouse at home gets a call and says raided a drug house, arrested everybody. Your children are here. Can you come get them so we don't have to take them to DSS? That parent goes and gets the children. I think it's appropriate to file a summons and a complaint. An ex parte motion is a part of that saying no contact because of arrest at meth house, drug house, however you want to term it. Serve the defendant. Give them an opportunity to be heard rather than that.

Emergent issues that $I$ think would need some ability to be addressed, obviously giving the defendant in each of those cases an opportunity to be heard in a timely fashion.

DEAN WILCOX: Are there specific statutory provisions that you would act under there where you would be allowed to give that
relief without --
MR. KEEFER: Well, I believe that the rules of Family Court, as they exist, allow for a plaintiff to make an application for ex parte relief supported by the appropriate affidavit. I mean, much the same as when DSS would go through and get an applicable statutory authority to have a child removed pending some emergent issue.

DEAN WILCOX: But you're talking then in terms, though, of when you -- what you're referring to is places where the statute specifically permits ex parte to be granted?

MR. KEEFER: I'm not creating a new body of law. I'm being very surgical under existing law for emergent issues that -- in a large part, I would look at it kind of like injunctive relief. If we don't do something now, financial wasting or in the decision with children, harm to children.

DEAN WILCOX: I think that helps. One other question just about your experience. It looks to me like, particularly regarding abuse and neglect, that since about 2010, if I'm reading it correctly, you've been primarily
representing guardians as opposed to the parties. Is that a correct attribution of what you've been doing the last five years or so or am I just --

MR. KEEFER: So the last five of my practice would be defined as this, representing some folks in contested matters in the Family Court. In full disclosure there, I've been cherry picking my cases. I don't take any case that walks in the door. I was involved for a period of time representing defendants in a contract basis, much the same as the 608 attorneys do now going through the Family Court process.

From 2010 to about 2012, I represented the Berkeley County volunteer guardian ad litems. My wife then took that job and I served as kind of her back-up and I still do from time to time. The rest of my work post 2010 has been structured towards private guardian ad litem work where I serve as the guardian ad litem or alternative dispute resolution in the form of primarily mediations, but half a dozen arbitrations a year.

DEAN WILCOX: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Martin is recognized.

SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Keefer, one major concern is the demeanor of being Family Court judge and you've addressed in the questions of counsel your thoughts on that. I really appreciate and respect the way you view the importance of that in a judicial role. Let me ask you, what judge out there best emulates the type of judge you would like to be?

MR. KEEFER: Judge Daniel Martin in Charleston, South Carolina. I respect him in ways that $I$ can't even put into words. His demeanor on the bench, if I could get into the arena that he embodies when he does that, I would consider it to be a success. He is courteous, he is attentive. I have not heard a -- and as a mediator, I spend a lot of time talking with attorneys and when you're doing mediations, attorneys love to tell you what they think about the other attorneys, the judges, the this, the that. I have never heard a negative thing about Judge Martin. If

I could emulate him, I'd have a smile on my face.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Any other questions? SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy.
SENATOR MALLOY: Briefly moving along. Are you a certified mediator in the Family Court?

MR. KEEFER: I am a certified mediator in the Family Court. I did the training in 1999. I was certified through the Bar certification process. I've maintained that through and through. I also -- alternative dispute resolution is huge to me. I'm currently the head of the Bar's Dispute Resolution Council and I hold a seat in that hot seat on the Supreme Court's ADR Commission.

SENATOR MALLOY: So you did mediation a long time ago?

MR. KEEFER: I've done mediation for 15 years. Yes, sir.

SENATOR MALLOY: And how long have you been practicing?

MR. KEEFER: I've been practicing since -

- you know, we're getting close to it being almost the anniversary of, you know, since 1997. So I was sworn in in November of 1997 so we're --

SENATOR MALLOY: You started right away doing the mediation?

MR. KEEFER: Sir?
SENATOR MALLOY: You started right away doing the mediation?

MR. KEEFER: I was licensed in '97 and then two years later I was certified and it's been a part of my practice through and through.

SENATOR MALLOY: And do you do guardian ad litem work, as well?

MR. KEEFER: Absolutely. At any point in time, I've got anywhere from six to ten guardian cases.

SENATOR MALLOY: And at temporary hearings, do you ever go in front of a judge where they only allow affidavits?

MR. KEEFER: Absolutely. Absolutely.
SENATOR MALLOY: And you go in front of judges that allow arguments?

MR. KEEFER: So before for the temporary
hearing is it's all done by affidavit. The majority of the time, you allow arguments, but every so often, we do get curve balls where the court says let me look over these affidavits and I'll give you my decision. We sit there 15 minutes in silence.

SENATOR MALLOY: As a judge, will you give me your thoughts on letting lawyers, when they appear with their clients, be given the opportunity to make an argument.

MR. KEEFER: My thought is this and I'm going to tie two things, Senator, together that you said. When I've served as a mediator, I have to work very hard to let folks know that I'm not a judge because the average person goes in front of a mediator probably less than they go in front of a judge. They want someone to hear their case. They want to feel that their position has been laid out to someone. I think that rolls over into the temporary hearing aspect, as well. I believe, knowing what it costs to prepare for and go to a temporary hearing in legal fees, knowing how the majority of the attorneys prepare, $I$ believe that if I
am sitting on the bench and I'm having a temporary hearing, I believe the parties deserve to have their attorney, to have their champion, to have the person that they are paying to be their representative in court get up and argue their position because the last thing -- is that sufficient?

SENATOR MALLOY: Fair enough and I want to ask you quickly about the juvenile justice. I'm a fan of alternative sentencing and keeping children from behind the wire, from behind the bars. Are you involved with -well, let me ask you this. As a judge, would you be supportive of drug courts in the family court system?

MR. KEEFER: Through my time working as an attorney, I've worked with not only juvenile drug courts, but adult drug courts. I believe that juvenile offenders -- you have to approach these juvenile offenders with a theory of rehabilitation, of keeping them away from Columbia.

SENATOR MALLOY: Enough said.
MR. KEEFER: No offense on Columbia.
SENATOR MALLOY: You answered my
question.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator Malloy. Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none. Mr.
Keefer, we want to thank you so much for being with us today and offering for this important position on court. 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 would remind you of the 48 -hour rule and then penalties related for breaking that and if anybody should ask you if they could advocate on your behalf, we would ask that you instruct them on the 48 -hour rule and it's penalties. We thank you again for offering. Thank you for your desire to serve the state of South Carolina.

MR. KEEFER: Thank y'all individually and collectively. Thanks. Y'all have a great day.
(The candidate is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We've had a request
to break for thirty minutes for lunch and take our last candidate after lunch. So at this time, we will recede.
(Off the record.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ladies and gentlemen, we are back on the record with regard to nominations for Family Court, Ninth

Judicial Circuit, Seat 3. And we have before us Ms. Rita J. Roache. Ms. Roache, it's a pleasure to have you with us today. Thank you again for your patience. We've gotten behind today and then we had a famished senator that we had to feed. So thank you very much for your patience.

MS. ROACHE: Certainly.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ms. Roache, if you would please raise your right hand and be sworn.
(The candidate is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much.
Ms. Roache, have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire in its present form?

MS. ROACHE: Not this one, but I reviewed it prior to submitting the form.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Prior to submission? MS. ROACHE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Would you take a moment and review it to verify that it is complete and in no need of amendment or change?

MS. ROACHE: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you.
MS. ROACHE: Mr. Chairman, I reviewed it. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Do you find it to be complete?

MS. ROACHE: Yes, sir. I do. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any need for change or amendment?

MS. ROACHE: Not that I am aware of at this time, sir.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Do you have any objection to -- I'm sorry. I failed to turn on my mic, thank you. Do you have any objection to making the summary a part of the record of your sworn testimony today? MS. ROACHE: No, sir. I do not. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Does any Commission member have an objection? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 11 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RITA J. ROACHE, DATED AUGUST 9TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ms. Roache, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine statutory evaluative criteria and 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. I am pleased to report that we have 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?

MS. ROACHE: I do not. I did not prepare one. Since I'm a lawyer, I can always --
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CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: You get no points against you for not having an opening statement for us.

MS. ROACHE: And you're behind. I don't think you want me to elaborate.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Most gracious of you. Your graciousness is noted for the record. Ms. Roache, I would ask now that you turn your attention to your screening attorney, Mr. Goldin. Please respond to any questions he may have for you.

MS. ROACHE: Yes.
MR. GOLDIN: Good afternoon.
EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Goldin)
Q. Ms. Roache, please state for the record the city and circuit in which you reside.
A. I live in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, which is a part of the Ninth Judicial Circuit.

MR. GOLDIN: I just want to note for the record that based on that testimony and your PDQ, which is part of the record, that you meet the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.
Q. Ms. Roache, why do you now want to serve as a Family Court judge?
A. I believe that being a Family Court judge is the highest calling for a judge. It is the place where we see the commonplace and not so commonplace problems of the citizens of South Carolina. I have dedicated my practice to this area and feel that I have an excellent understanding of the law and that I am empathetic, considerate, and well-versed in it and I think that $I$ would be an addition to the bench of the Family Court, in short.
Q. Thank you. Are there any areas, including subjective areas of the law that you would need to additionally prepare for in order to serve as a Family Court judge and how would you go about handling that preparation?
A. Well, I think the one thing that we had discussed before is that I've not done any juvenile matters in quite some time. I've already, in preparation for the examination and this, $I$ did review the statutes and the processes and even sat in on a juvenile hearing or two so I could become more familiar with how those are handled.
Q. Although you addressed this in your sworn affidavit, could you please explain to the members
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of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a Family Court judge?
A. I believe that a judge should be courteous and kind to all litigants. That they should have the ability to listen carefully and not interject their feelings into it until they are called to make a ruling. I believe that a judge is to show courtesy and respect to all litigants at all times. I also do not think that a judge is to get angry with litigants or their attorneys. I think that they should be even tempered and well-mannered toward the persons who appear before them.
Q. Thank you. Touching on your sworn statement, you've been provided with that with detailed answers to over 30 questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments you would like to make to that sworn statement we just discussed at this time?
A. There are none that $I$ know of, sir.

MR. GOLDIN: Chairman Clemmons, I would like to ask that her sworn statement be entered in to the record.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there an objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 12 - JUDICIAL MERIT
SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR RITA
J. ROACHE, DATED AUGUST 10TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. One other question. What suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases on the docket in Family Court?
A. As an attorney who practices in the Family Court, I think that our new requirement of having to complete cases in 365 days is excellent. It's not so hard to comply with sometimes, as an attorney, and the way that the litigation may pan out in cases. I cannot not necessarily think of anything else other than holding attorneys' feet to the fire about it and making certain that continuances aren't granted for no reason. But understanding that there may be circumstances and instances where litigants or their attorney may need the court to consider that they aren't able to appear. It is a problem, and a problem in Charleston, and something that I think I'd have to be more in to the job to know whether or not $I$ had suggestions for improvement.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Roache, the Commission received 81 ballot box surveys regarding you with 15 additional comments. Of those, only one was negative. The overwhelming majority of the other 14 were very positive and included comments that said they had not doubt that you would make an excellent Family Court judge and that you're a dedicated family law attorney who is fully immersed in the practice area of this highly sensitive and critical area of the law. One of those written comments did, however, indicate some concern and I'm just going to read it to you. It says that you lack experience in DSS matters, $D J J$ matters, and have no high conflict, high dollar divorce experience. I believe her lack of experience in these matters will make her catch time substantial and that it will be an unacceptable amount of time per docket load that we have here in Charleston. How do you respond to that?
A. Well, $I$ will respond that it is rare that $I$ do a juvenile matter at this point. I have done them in the past, and as I stated earlier, I've studied the statutes and the processes and sat in on some hearings in order to get more understanding of that area. It is absolutely incorrect that I've never
done a high dollar divorce.
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy. SENATOR MALLOY: I'd like to interject at this point in time. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Pardon me, sir? SENATOR MALLOY: I'd like to interject at this point in time if $I$ may, sir. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Yes.

SENATOR MALLOY: With all due respect to the complaint from the person. I realize that she deserves an opportunity to answer. I will just submit, as far as the courts are concerned in dividing things up into high dollar and low dollar, you divide one dollar the same way you divide $\$ 100$ in the Family Court system. It proportioned so, I mean, that kind of question has not come to any other litigants, to any petitioners that's before us as to who has access to doing cases.

Most of us are in a private practice. We take that cases that come in. So obviously, I think that for the liberty that we have before the Committee, if Ms. Roache desires to answer the question, but I don't think it's necessary
for this Committee, with all due respect. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you,

Senator Malloy. I appreciate your comment. I would like for counsel -- I would suggest that counsel proceed with any area that he feels appropriate unless you prefer taking this matter up in executive session.

SENATOR MALLOY: I just think the question is totally inappropriate. We can take it up any kind of way you want to, but someone who handles a high dollar case as opposed to a low dollar case is not a prerequisite for whether they qualify to being a judge in this state.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: I agree, sir, and every member can take the question and response for whatever value they see appropriate if any. Thank you very much for your input. Mr. Goldin, please proceed.
(By Mr. Goldin)

## Q. Would you like to address it?

A. Certainly. I don't mind addressing the question.
Q. And I would like to say this is not a question, rather than $I$ read a comment out of the ballot box.
A. Yes, the comment. Responding to the comment, I
don't mind at all. I joined South Carolina Legal Services as the attorney for the Department of Justice, working with survivors of domestic violence, and in that capacity, my cases did not have to meet the income guidelines of South Carolina Legal Services and I did handle very many high dollar divorces.

One in particular, I mentioned in my questionnaire and the other information, and that was Gabrish versus Gabrish, where the defendant in the matter, the husband, was the owner of several Fender Menders and there was millions of dollars to be divided by the parties in that case. I did have other cases involved significant assets and significant debts, as well. So it is not true that I have not handled what the person called high dollar divorces.

And insofar as DSS is concerned, my case Loe \#1 and \#2 versus Berkeley County Department of Social Services, Mother and Father, is a reported case in the Southeastern Digest and that involved a case where the mother's children were removed after an alleged injury to a minor, one of her minor twins. Both twins were placed with separate families in the foster care system. And in one of
the families -- and then both of the families filed in order to adopt these children and I represented her in a five, almost six day trial of the matter. At the end of the trial, the judge decided that both children should be adopted by the respective families that they were placed with. After debating and going back and forth on a 26 page order, where I made about eight pages of objections to it, I did file a notice of appeal in the matter and the Court of Appeals found that my take on the case was correct and they did reverse the matter and remand it. The opposing attorney filed for a writ of certiorari with the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court denied that writ and my case stands as good law and something that has been cited in a number of different cases in the area of DSS actions. Especially in regard to requirement of our statute that if a child has been in foster care for 15 of the past 22 months, then the parents' rights can be terminated.

We showed in that matter that there could be just cause or excuse, especially for the lack of diligence on the part of the Department of Social Services. And it's been cited in several cases. So I do have experience in DSS matters, as well.
Q. Thank you. One other concern that we discussed was a tax lien that appeared on your record from the early 2000's. Would you like to explain that?
A. Yes. I was in partnership with Edward Brown many years ago and evidently after I left partnership with him in 1999, 2000, he never took my name off of the records, as far as the South Carolina Tax Commission, I believe. I had no knowledge of this lien or anything about it until Mr. Goldin and the investigator told me about it at that time. Mr. Brown satisfied all the liens and indicated that he would appear here with me today if it was thought necessary and he was told that it was not necessary, that I could certainly explain it to the Commission today.
Q. And there is a letter in here in your binder. It's from Mr. Brown testifying to that.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Thank you. Some general housekeeping issues to ask you. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, sir. I have not.
Q. Have you sought or have been offered a conditional pledge of support of any legislator pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No, sir. I have not.
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. I am not aware of that.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission? A. No, sir. I have not.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. Yes, sir. I do understand that.
Q. And have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes, I have.

MR. GOLDIN: I would note that the Lowcountry Citizens Committee Report Citizens Committee found Ms. Roache to be qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability and the committee found her wellqualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience,
and judicial temperament. I would also note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation were incorporated into my questioning here today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr.
Goldin. Members of the Commission, do you have questions for Ms. Roache? Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Ms. Roache, in
your sworn statement, there was a question about recusal and it specifically said how would you handle the recusal of a lawyer legislator appearing in front of you. And your answer, if any counsel moves for recusal and has reservations regarding my ability to be fair and impartial, then $I$ must recuse myself. Did you mean that based exclusively on the lawyer's argument that because a lawyer legislator was appearing in front of you that should recuse yourself, that you would do that or could you just explain that answer to me?

MS. ROACHE: I think that that is problematic, but if a lawyer were to ask for me to recuse myself in any matter where they
question my ability to be fair and impartial, then I would think it appropriate that I recuse myself.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Thank you.
MS. ROACHE: I don't mean that in any case involving a lawyer legislator, I would recuse myself, but were it asked because they thought I could not be fair or impartial.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: So if
opposing counsel makes that motion based on the fact that the other counsel is a lawyer legislator, you would grant that motion?

MS. ROACHE: No. I think they would have to allege more facts than that in their making of the motion. Just the bare motion, I don't know whether I would do it. It would depend on everything that was involved in the motion, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. ROACHE: Certainly.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you,
Representative Bannister. Senator from Pickens is recognized.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Roache, if you look around the judiciary, who would be the judge that you would most like to emulate in your demeanor and how you act as a judge?

MS. ROACHE: In the Family Court, sir?
SENATOR MARTIN: Yes. Well, any judge, really, that you --

MS. ROACHE: I find that Judge Wayne Creech in Berkeley County has a very wonderful demeanor and treats all parties with dignity and respect and I would seek to be like he is.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator. Other questions? Chair recognizes Representative Mack.

REPRESENTATIVE MACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Great to see you. Ms. Roache, just wanted to let the committee know that our families go back a long way. She's from an incredible family of leaders and integrity. She's been able to carve out her own legacy with regard to the law. So I just wanted to put that on the record and it's good to see
you going after this.
I did have one question. Something that was written in terms of you, I guess, caring too much for the poor and too much, I guess, for blacks and minorities and, you know, of course, being an African American legislator, I get that sometimes. What I tell folks is having empathy means that -- for example, I couldn't help just black folk even if I wanted to, but how would you respond to that? Obviously, people in a small minority making a point that, okay, you're an African American and maybe you'll lean too much toward African Americans and the poor.

MS. ROACHE: I would say that as an advocate, I am a very zealous representative for my clients. I think that once you are a member of the bench, you are no longer an advocate. It is your job to apply the law to the set of facts that are before you and I don't think that because I've been a legal services attorney and have represented persons who can't afford attorneys or are poor would make me ignore the law since I have empathy and concern for them. My job would be to
even-handedly apply the law to every set of facts, no matter who the litigants would be. REPRESENTATIVE MACK: And that's not unusual because we've had many people over the years and you being in law and know judges that have served as both prosecutors and defendants and you have to wear different hats, --

MS. ROACHE: Yes.
REPRESENTATIVE MACK: -- but the bottom line is knowing the law.

MS. ROACHE: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE MACK: Thank you.
MS. ROACHE: Thank you.
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Yes. Senator Malloy is recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you. I have not been able to check, but $I$ think maybe back in my early days, Ms. Roache may have contributed to my campaign. She may be able to verify that or not, but I think so.

MS. ROACHE: And I think so, as well, but I'm sorry, I don't remember when. It's been quite some time ago.

SENATOR MALLOY: I want to note that that's a possibility. I have worked a lot with alternative sentencing matters as it relates to drug court. Do you support those matters as it relates to keeping children from behind the wire?

MS. ROACHE: Yes, I do.
SENATOR MALLOY: And if elected, would you be a willing participate in such programs? MS. ROACHE: Yes, I would. SENATOR MALLOY: Okay. The other thing I see a lot of times, depending on which jurisdiction you go in, as to whether or not a judge lets litigants argue at temporary hearings or whether they just submit affidavits in some courts. And in some courts, they let them prepare affidavits plus argue. What's your general position as a judge? What do you think that would be?

MS. ROACHE: I think that the Family
Court rules should be followed. They say that temporary hearings are conducted by affidavits and arguments of counsel or litigants if they do not have counsel. I think that that is how a temporary hearing should be conducted, both
with the submission of the affidavits and the arguments from either the party or their attorney.

SENATOR MALLOY: Okay. Do you
participate in the mediation process now as an attorney?

MS. ROACHE: Yes, sir. It's mandatory in Charleston County.

SENATOR MALLOY: And are you certified as a mediator?

MS. ROACHE: I am not certified as a mediator. I do have a certification from the National Association of Securities Dealers as an arbitrator, which $I$ do those sometimes.

SENATOR MALLOY: And have you
participated in your career as a guardian ad litem or support or in representation of guardians ad litems?

MS. ROACHE: Yes. I have been a guardian ad litem. It is not something that I can do at this time, being employed by South Carolina Legal Services, but I did a great deal of guardian work in private practice.

SENATOR MALLOY: And I just have to just address the issue that $I$ raised just a
moment ago. I just wanted to make certain that you understand and the Committee because I know it catches the applicant by a little bit of surprise by implication of that question. I just wanted to make certain that it was a fair question as to high dollar cases and I didn't quite get the gist of it. I just wanted to end up knowing that, that I'm concerned about your knowledge overall and that you've had the opportunity to be able to participate in family court in almost every arena, correct?

MS. ROACHE: Yes, sir. I have.
SENATOR MALLOY: You've been in private practice?

MS. ROACHE: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MALLOY: And so in
private practice, you did matters as it relates to equitable distribution?

MS. ROACHE: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MALLOY: Okay. And did you try cases as it relates to the division of property?

MS. ROACHE: Yes, sir. I did.
SENATOR MALLOY: Okay. And obviously, as
it relates to child custody and those types of issues?

MS. ROACHE: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MALLOY: Okay. That's all the questions I have.

MS. ROACHE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator Malloy. Other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none. Ms. Roache, thank you so much for offering for this court.

MS. ROACHE: Thank you very much. Thank all of you very much.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Bear with me just one moment while I close out this portion of the record. That will conclude this portion of the screening process. As you know, Ms. Roache, the record will remain open until the report is published and you may be called back at such a time if that need should arise. We remind you of the 48 -hour rule and would ask that if anybody should inquire as to whether or not they may advocate with any member of the General Assembly on your behalf that you
remind them or educate them with regard to the 48-hour rule. With that, we all would like to jointly thank you for offering for this position and we appreciate your desire to be of service to the state of South Carolina. Thank you very much.

MS. ROACHE: Thank you, sir. Thank you all.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Have a wonderful day.
MS. ROACHE: You, as well.
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Oh, I'm sorry. I believe you might have a guest with you today that hasn't been introduced. Do you or do you not?

MS. ROACHE: No, sir. I don't, not today.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Okay. Thank you. SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MALLOY: I have someone I'd like to introduce --

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Certainly.
SENATOR MALLOY: -- before Ms. Roache is excused. We have a new Senator-elect from

Jasper, Colleton, Beaufort, Charleston, and other counties. Margie Bright Matthews is in the audience and came over to end up spending some time with us. Meet Senator Matthews.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Well, congratulations on your election win, Senator, and it's a pleasure to have you with us.

SENATOR MATTHEWS: Thank you. Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you again, Ms. Roache.

MS. ROACHE: Thank you very much.
(The candidate is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: I'd like to note that we are going into executive session for the purpose of discussing qualification issues. I ask that any non-member of the Commission or non-staff member, if you would excuse us, please, as we go into executive session and we would ask security if you would please secure the doors.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Do we have a motion
to find all the candidates qualified?
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REPRESENTATIVE MACK: So moved.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. I have multiple motions to do so.

SENATOR MALLOY: Second.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: And we have a second by Senator Malloy. All those in favor, say aye.
(Commission members audibly say "aye".)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: It's unanimous. The ayes have it. All candidates are qualified. Now we move to nomination. Each member of the Commission has up to three votes. The first candidate to receive six or more will be considered nominated. After that, if there is a tie, then we'll have to go to a second ballot. If more than three receives six votes, then we go to the highest vote. All right. Are we ready? We're preparing to vote for nominees. The first candidate, the Honorable John Lawrence Duffy. If you wish to find the Honorable John Lawrence Duffy nominated, please raise your hand.
(The Commission members vote.)

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Spiros Stavros
Ferderigos.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Okay, Spiros
Stavros Ferderigos has been qualified and nominated. Michele Patrao Forsythe.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Michele Patrao Forsythe is found nominated. Sean Keefer.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Rita Roache.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: All right. We'll go
to a second round amongst the three candidates: Duffy, Keefer, and Roache.

DEAN WILCOX: How many did Judge Duffy have in the first round?

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Four.
DEAN WILCOX: It was four, three and three?

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: It's four votes. This round ended with four votes for Duffy, three votes for Keefer, and three votes for Roache. Let's see how we do on the second round then we may want to go to some
discussion. All right. Votes for Duffy.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Keefer.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: And Roache.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: All right. The
Honorable John Lawrence Duffy is found
nominated. Strike that. He did not reach six
votes. Strike that. So we will go to another
round. Do any members wish to address any particular candidate? Ms. Wall.

MS. WALL: I move to --
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: On the record or executive session?

MS. WALL: I was going to move to executive session.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there a desire to go to executive session to discuss qualifications?

MS. WALL: Yes. I move to go into executive session to discuss qualifications among the three candidates.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ms. Wall, so moved, so ordered. If security would please secure
the doors.
(Off-the-record executive session.) CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Back on the record.

And we will move directly into the third round of ballots. Thank you. For the record, having risen from executive session, no votes were taken or decisions made. We solely discussed qualifications of candidates. All right. Moving on, we're ready to go to ballot. Again, each member of the Commission has one vote and we're voting between three members, John Duffy, Sean Keefer, and Rita Roache. All those in favor of the Honorable John Lawrence Duffy, raise your hand.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Got one. Sean Keefer, raise your hand.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Rita Roache, raise your hand.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Rita Roache, having reached the threshold of no less than six votes, is found to be the third nominated
candidate for Family Court, Ninth Judicial Circuit, Seat 3. The three complete list is Spiros Stavros Ferderigos, Michele Patrao Forsythe, and Rita J. Roache. Now, we move into candidates for Family Court, Ninth Circuit, Seat 3.

DEAN WILCOX: Eighth Circuit seat. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much, Dean. That was an incorrect lead-in.

MS. WALL: I'd like to move into executive session.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We have a motion to go into executive session. So ordered.

MS. WALL: For legal advice.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: For legal advice. We would ask security to secure the room.
(Off-the-record executive decision.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We are back on the record. The Commission receded into executive session for the purpose of discussing legal matters and we have now exited executive session. We did not make any decisions or cast any votes and now we have before us the Honorable John M. Rucker. Judge Rucker, it's good to have you with us today. Thank you for
joining us.
JUDGE RUCKER: It's good to be here.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Would you
please raise your right hand and be sworn in?
(The judge is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Judge.
Judge, have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire? JUDGE RUCKER: Yes. Not today, but yes. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is it complete and correct?

JUDGE RUCKER: Yes, sir. The one that I turned in is correct.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: All right, sir. Is there any need for any change or amendment to that personal data questionnaire today? JUDGE RUCKER: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Would you have any objection to your personal data questionnaire being included in the record of your sworn testimony today? JUDGE RUCKER: None at all. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Is there any objection by Commission members? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 13 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE JOHN M. RUCKER, DATED JULY 31ST, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry is based upon the statutory nine evaluative criteria and it also has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of the materials that you've provided in the application process, a 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. I'm pleased to report that 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 you'd like to share with us? JUDGE RUCKER: Not really other than I have, of course, been a judge since 1988 and $I$
have thoroughly enjoyed the service. I've enjoyed this year, dealing with the Bar, dealing with the Citizen's Committee. It's been nice and $I$ hope it continues today. I enjoy serving as a judge. At times, it can be quite stressful, but also at times, it can be quite rewarding and I have enjoyed my service through the years.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. We acknowledge your service. We are very grateful for it.

JUDGE RUCKER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Judge. I would like for you to now turn your attention to your screening attorney and if you would, please answer any questions that she may have for you.

MS. ANDERSON: Good afternoon, Judge Rucker.

JUDGE RUCKER: Good afternoon.
MS. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, $I$ have a procedural matter to take care of with this candidate.

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

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 14 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE JOHN M. RUCKER, DATED JULY 31ST, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Rucker, after serving 27 years on the Family Court, why do you want to continue service on the court?
A. I enjoy it. As I said in my opening statement, that while at times it can be probably the worse
position a person could ever be in, but the majority of the time, it is rewarding to be able to help people through problems. I've enjoyed it and, you know, I hope to continue it. You know, I -gosh, I don't know. I've seen changes through the years. The Family Court is getting better. One thing and I'm going to say this to the people that are in the General Assembly, thank goodness for the extra judges. It helped us tremendously and the next thing that helped is mediation. Those are the two greatest things that have happened in the last few years. But you know, it is an enjoyable occupation and rewarding. That's why I want to continue.
Q. Judge Rucker, please explain one or two brief accomplishments that you feel you have completed during your tenure and then a goal that you would like to accomplish if re-elected.
A. What I've accomplished on the Family Court?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Oh, gosh. I guess, I've made it though 27 years and as far as I know, no one's been hurt anywhere. You know, the accomplishments are small, but incremental. The things you do with people with children, you know, we have developed some things
through the years that, you know, are working with children. The guardian program -- see, that's how far I go back. The guardian program in DSS cases is wonderful. I guess seeing families, even after divorce, still get along is probably one of the greatest accomplishments and that is not me. That's mediation doing that. To keep people from having to go at each other tooth and toenail, or whatever phrase you want to use, for them to sit down and work things out and come in in front of the court and the court to approve it, they don't have that lasting animosity. And that's one of the things I, you know, I can't really take credit for that, but it's a joy to see it happen and it didn't happen when I first started. Everything that people couldn't agree, we tried it. Now, what was the second part of your question?
Q. Is there a goal that you would like to accomplish?
A. Goal. Well, $I$ guess my goal is for everybody to leave the courtroom happy. Am I going to accomplish that? Uh-uh. That is not going to happen. But to try to keep people peaceful in the courtroom, to try to keep people living their life after they leave the courtroom in a proper perspective, to try not to add to the -- oh gosh,
what would be the word -- to add to the problems that people have. I believe that you try to keep people calm in a courtroom, that, of course, you treat them respectfully, and you try to make sure they understand what is happening.

We're facing this with pro se now, selfrepresented litigants. A lot of times, they don't understand the legal processes and you have to spend a little time explaining why you do things, but then you have to be real careful of not getting in a position that you're somebody's lawyer. I mean, it's tough, but you try to keep people informed of what's going on. I guess that's my goal. Took a minute and a whole lot of words to say that, but $I$ guess that's my goal.
Q. Judge Rucker, 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. Calm. A judge needs to be calm. A judge needs to work hard to make litigants and attorneys feel comfortable in the courtroom so that they can get their side out. We need to have patience. And oh my goodness, there are times your patience gets tried, but you need to keep a calm demeanor,
patient with people, and move through the case and let everybody get out what they need to say to prove their case.
Q. Judge Rucker, the Commission received 186 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 20 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained some of the following positive comments: fine Family Court judge, one of our best, he's done a wonderful job for many years, he listens closely to litigants and works to try to resolve cases in the best way possible, I tried a particularly difficult custody case that I lost and yet I can still say that he was very even-handed to both parties and gave the litigants respect and the lawyers respect and he rendered a fair decision, he is always professional. None of the written
comments expressed any concerns.
A. That was very kind, very kind.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: And highly unusual.

JUDGE RUCKER: It's just about bringing me to tears.
(By Ms. Anderson)
Q. I have a few housekeeping issues.
A. Okay.
Q. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, ma'am.
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, 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 this 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 are 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.
Q. And 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 $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?

A. Yes, I am.
Q. Thank you, Judge Rucker.

MS. ANDERSON: I would note that the Piedmont Citizens Committee reported that Judge Rucker is 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. The committee stated in summary, from our interview and the comments of others, it is clear that Judge Rucker is a thoughtful jurist with both a good sense of humor and a good common sense. His many years of experience on the bench and his practical, sensible approach to solving complicated domestic problems are a credit to your judiciary. We believe that he continues to be an outstanding judge. I would --

SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman. Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. ANDERSON: I was just going to note
for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Rucker were incorporated in the questioning today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Senator Martin is recognized.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. Judge, it's good to see you. Welcome.

JUDGE RUCKER: Good to see you. Good to be here.

SENATOR MARTIN: In full disclosure to the Commission, I served with Judge Rucker, I guess, for about nine years.

JUDGE RUCKER: Well, we go back to the point where you were sitting beside Sol Blatt.

SENATOR MARTIN: That's exactly right and, you know, $I$ just can't tell y'all how much I enjoyed serving with Judge Rucker, a very, very fine member of the House, is one of those judges that, you know, having served this number of years, has clearly acquitted himself as a judge in the manner in which we find him today with these, I think, just extremely excellent comments. Judge Rucker,
did you know that often times we don't get these kind of comments about a judge, but you're very much a rarity in that regard. JUDGE RUCKER: I guess I'll let out a sigh of relief on that.

SENATOR MARTIN: I'm serious. A lot of times, we're not just blowing smoke. We do some of that sometimes, but, you know, gracious comments, particularly from politicians, but I will tell you that demeanor of a judge is something that I've talked about a good bit because I care a great deal about that and I just can't tell you how proud I am of the outstanding comments that I fully expected that you would receive.

JUDGE RUCKER: You know, the hardest thing, I guess, in being a judge is to make sure that people perceive what's going on as being fair. That is difficult. You know, especially, and I hate to go back to this pro se, but that's a problem we've got and I really don't know how we're going to ever solve it. I mean, they've got a right to be there. They give out packages to them, but a lot of them come in and don't read the
packages.
SENATOR MARTIN: Right. Refresh my memory. Did you get elected in '74?

JUDGE RUCKER: Did I get elected to --
SENATOR MARTIN: The House.
JUDGE RUCKER: -- the House? No. I got elected in '76.

SENATOR MARTIN: '76?
JUDGE RUCKER: Uh-huh.
SENATOR MARTIN: Then you were two years ahead of me. I was thinking you came in that big class of '74.

JUDGE RUCKER: No. I ran in '74, but I didn't make it in '74. I came two years later, but I got further training, I guess.

SENATOR MARTIN: I have very, very fond memories of having served with you and, you know, all those folks back then would be very proud.

JUDGE RUCKER: I've been sitting back here in this room back here at the back and walking around and looking at the pictures of the Rules Committee. You know, we've grown a little older. There's several of them on there that I had trouble remembering how they
looked back then.
SENATOR MARTIN: That's why we don't have a mirror in that room. Well, let me tell you, you remember that picture -- the first picture I have of the House Chamber is a picture of when Raymond Schwartz was Speaker. I didn't get one of Speaker Carter and, of course, we served under him and I've got that one at my house. That's the only picture in my little study. And that picture, when you look at it, you look at the members. Of course, you're in that picture. You look at the members from 1980 and that picture, I bet you, oh, probably half of them have passed on.

JUDGE RUCKER: Yes. That's the scary part. Have you got a copy, and I know I'm taking time and I shouldn't do this. There's the Tuesday night at the Capitol. Have you got that picture?

SENATOR MARTIN: Yes, I do. I do.
JUDGE RUCKER: I don't know if y'all -of course, everybody in here's young except for a couple of them, but you can recognize people around and it is really amazing. I've got it hanging in the den and I'll go and look
at it at times to remember. It was fun. It was an enjoyable experience, a worthwhile experience and then I look at, oh gosh, Ed Saleeby is in there, Jim Arthur from Union, I mean, they're just all around. It was neat. SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you. SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman, briefly. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy. SENATOR MALLOY: Briefly, I'd just like to say that I've had a chance to appear in front of Judge Rucker and have done so recently. And I speak at his conference every year for at least the last decade, I would think, for the Family Court judges and I will say that our state has been well-served by Judge Rucker's tenure. JUDGE RUCKER: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator Malloy. Mr. Bannister, you'd like to add praise.

MR. BANNISTER: Apparently, everyone who would appear in front of you would say the same thing and that's -- I know we were just kind of joking around with you not having negative comments. There aren't any other
ballot box surveys without an anonymous negative comment that I can find. Of all the judges we're screening through the rest of the week, every one of them has got somebody who said something ugly because it's anonymous, except for you. So kudos, kudos.

DEAN WILCOX: You're clearly too soft. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Let the record reflect that the judge is blushing.

MR. HITCHCOCK: Judge, I'm a dirt lawyer and I've never appeared before you and I like your hairstyle.

JUDGE RUCKER: I've found that it does help you in the morning to get moving a lot quicker that way.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Are there any serious questions?

SENATOR MALLOY: Those are serious comments.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Those are serious comments. We truly do thank you for your years of service, Judge.

JUDGE RUCKER: Thank y'all. Thank y'all very much.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: And thank you for
offering again.
JUDGE RUCKER: This is humbling. I mean, I don't know, but we've got a lot of good judges in this state. We've got an awful lot of good judges in this state and I think we're lucky and I appreciate the job y'all do and thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Likewise. Thank you, Judge Rucker. I have just a couple of comments here to close out the record.

JUDGE RUCKER: Okay.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: That will conclude this portion of our screening process. As you know, Judge, the record will remain open until the report is published. 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 it. And to remind anyone that may ask about advocating upon your behalf with the General Assembly that you remind them or instruct them on the 48 -hour rule. With that, we thank you for serving and offering again to serve the state of South Carolina.

JUDGE RUCKER: Thank y'all. Thank you.
(The judge is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Motion to move into executive session has been made by Senator Malloy and such is now ordered. Security, will you please secure the room. (Off-the-record executive session.) CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We're back on the record. If we could, please open the doors. We are receding from executive session after having received clarification on legal matters by counsel. No votes were taken. No decision were made. Do we have a motion to find Judge Rucker qualified and nominated?

SENATOR MALLOY: I so move.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: So moved by Senator Malloy and is there a second?

MR. HITCHCOCK: Second.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Second by Mr. Hitchcock. All those in favor say aye. (Commission members audibly say "aye.") CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Are there any opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: By acclamation, the Honorable John M. Rucker has been qualified
and nominated. Moving along, we have Steven Coleman Kirven. He is now the only candidate vying for the seat that he currently holds as Master-in-Equity for Anderson and Oconee County, Tenth Circuit. I'm sorry. He is not the incumbent. There is no incumbent. It's an open seat.

MS. WALL: May we take a five minute break?

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We may. Yes.
MS. WALL: We're ten minutes early, so.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: A five minute break
is requested and granted. We will come back on the record in five minutes.
(Off the record.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We're going back on the record. If we could have our next candidate, please. Good afternoon, Mr. Kirven.

MR. KIRVEN: Good afternoon.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Good to have you with us today.

MR. KIRVEN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: If you would, sir, would you please raise your right hand to be
sworn?
(The candidate is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much, sir. Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire? MR. KIRVEN: Yes. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is it complete and correct?

MR. KIRVEN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any need to make any changes or amendments at this time?

MR. KIRVEN: The only thing I can think of is I spent probably another five or six dollars in postage since this was done.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: With that oral amendment, would you have any objection to including that personal data questionnaire in the record as a part of your sworn testimony today?

MR. KIRVEN: No, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Is there an objection by any Commission member?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 15 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STEVEN COLEMAN KIRVEN, DATED AUGUST 4TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Mr. Kirven, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the statutory 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 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 candidacy and there are no witnesses here present to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to share with the Commission?

MR. KIRVEN: Not really. I'm just glad to be here and prepared to answer any questions I may need to answer.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much,

Mr. Kirven. With that, will you please turn your attention to your screening attorney and respond to her questions?

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

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT NO. 16 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF STEVEN COLEMAN KIRVEN, DATED AUGUST 4TH, 2015,

## ADMITTED.]

MS. BENSON: One final procedural matter. I would 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. Kirven meets all the statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.
Q. Mr. Kirven, why do you want to serve as a Master-in-Equity and what of your experience do you believe will help you to be a good Master?
A. Well, the why, I guess, is I think I've always had a desire to be a judge, like a lot of lawyers do. It was never the right time or opportunity before. This opportunity presented itself and I felt like it uniquely fits my experience and qualifications. I'm not ready to quit working, but I wouldn't mind the challenge of something different and I think this is perfect.
Q. Thank you.
A. As far as my experience goes, it would be helpful -- two things. Number one, I have a varied experience in the law. I've done a lot of different things. I've actually tried a number of
things in the Master's Court and also, for the last seven years, I've been a sole practitioner and so I have run my office from keeping the books to changing the light bulbs and I think that would help me in the administrative end.
Q. Mr. Kirven, are there any areas that you would need to additionally prepare for to serve as a Master-in-Equity and how would you handle the additional preparation?
A. I think I have a pretty good grasp of most of the substantive issues that would be coming before me, but there's always something that you haven't looked at before and that would require study, but that's probably true of any position. You know, there's been talk of utilizing the Master to do other things, including guilty pleas and General Sessions Court. Now, that's -- I think it's done in some places now, but it's never been done in Anderson and Oconee, but if that were to come to pass, then I would need some schooling, probably, in that area.
Q. Mr. Kirven, what suggestions would you offer -- oh, excuse me. Let me go back a moment. You've addressed this in your materials, but what do you think is the appropriate demeanor for a Master-in-

## Equity?

A. Well, I think a Master-in-Equity, like any judge, should be patient, courteous, dignified, but really, it starts out in my mind with respect. I think that everyone who comes into the courtroom should get respect from the judge, including the witnesses, the attorneys, the parties, and the staff.
Q. What suggestions would you offer for improving the backlog of cases, particularly in the Circuit Court?
A. Well, you know, the Master-in-Equity, I think in Judge Drew has done a pretty good job of keeping his rosters clean. As far as the backlog of other matters, again, I go back to there's been discussion about whether the Master to be utilized to hear motions in common pleas court and, perhaps, help out in the guilty plea areas and those things would be helpful in those backlogs.
Q. Mr. Kirven, currently you are a member of the Anderson City Council and also the Anderson Area Transportation Study Committee. If you were elected to be a Master-in-Equity, would you remain a member of those two entities?
A. No. I don't think that would be appropriate. I
would -- would have to resign from both of those.
Q. And you also belong to a number of organizations in Anderson which are affiliated with commerce and economic development. In any of those organizations, do you actively solicit monies and funds?
A. No.
Q. If you were to become a Master-in-Equity, would you continue to be involved with those organizations?
A. Most likely not. I guess I'd have to look at what, you know, on a case by case basis, but I think probably not because of the potential for some of those issues to come in before court and that sort of thing.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Kirven. Mr. Kirven, the Commission received 50 ballot box surveys regarding you and with three additional comments, only one of which was negative. There were several positive comments: that you are well-respected in your community and an experienced attorney and public servant. The one negative comment indicated that you are combative, unsympathetic, and not humble. How would you respond to this negative comment?
A. First, I would like to say I appreciate all the positive side -- the overwhelming positive side.

As far as the negative comment, you know, I can only assume that it probably came out of a litigation situation. Litigation, by nature, is a little bit friction oriented, but I've always taken my obligation to represent my client zealously, very seriously. I was also taught to always try to be better prepared than my opponent and to never show any lack of confidence.

I guess I had a few dust-ups along the way with my opposing counsel like, probably, every attorney would have, but $I$ never felt it was a personal issue. It's sort of part of the job. At the end of the day, shake hands and go to the next day.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Kirven, you've been involved in three lawsuits. The first matter in 1987 or ' 88 where you were issued a uniform ordinance summons -- actually not a lawsuit, but a uniform ordinance summons and had to appear in Magistrate's Court. Could you please explain the nature and the disposition of that matter?
A. As I refer to it, the great pine tree caper. It was really an unintentional thing. My wife and I decided to build a swimming pool in our backyard. We had planted some pine seedlings several years
before across the back of the lot and they had been grown up to be, maybe, four feet tall. The contractor was showing up on Monday, so Saturday I was working around. I said "Well, I may need to pull out these pines." And so I pulled up about 10 or 12 and I had borrowed my father in law's pickup truck.

So instead of piling them on the street over Sunday and first of the week, I said "Well, I'll just throw them on the pickup and drop them off at the county collection place." Which is not too far out of the way in taking the pickup truck back. So I drove in to the collections site, saw an unmarked car over on the side, didn't think anything about it. I backed the truck up and offloaded the pines. About the time, the car approached and an enforcement officer said "Well, you can't put vegetative matter in here." And I said "Well, I'm sorry. I didn't know that. Should I retrieve it?" And he said "No, I'm going to issue you a summons." And so he charged me with violation of a county ordinance about what material you could put in the landfill.

You know, I went to the Magistrate's office a few days later and, you know, recognized that I had
unintentionally violated the ordinance. I paid the fine. It was about $\$ 50$ and, you know, that was the end of it.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Kirven, the second lawsuit was a divorce action in which you were named a defendant and if you could please explain the background and disposition of that lawsuit.
A. Well, that was almost 25 years ago in 1992 and my marriage came under pressure for several reasons and a divorce action was initiated. Within a month or two, we were fully reconciled. The action was dismissed and we're still married.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Kirven, the third lawsuit was filed in 2007 and it indicated that you were a plaintiff and also the plaintiff's attorney in a foreclosure action. This was through our SLED report. Could you please explain the background and disposition of this lawsuit?
A. Yes. That was evolved from a small rental house that my two brothers and I had inherited from my mother. We really didn't want to rent it so we tried to sell it. We found a buyer and we sold it to him with 100 percent financing. We gave him the deed and took back the mortgage. And he paid pretty well for a while and then he defaulted. So
we had no alternative but to initiate a foreclosure action, after which he did come forward and make good on the payments and thereafter he continued to pay. Ultimately he sold the house and paid off the mortgage.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Kirven. Mr. Kirven, 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 conditional 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. Yes.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware that the penalties for violating the pledging rules are that it would be a misdemeanor, and upon conviction, the violator must be fined not more than $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes. That's why I've been so careful.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Kirven.

MS. BENSON: The Citizens Committee report found you to be qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional requirements, physical health, mental stability, and judicial temperament. The Committee found you to be well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, and experience. In it's summary, the Committee stated that it received several negative comments regarding this candidate's ability to have a judicial temperament as described in the Commission's evaluative criteria. However, the candidate presented himself favorably and was respectful and calm
in the face of very difficult questions. While there were no exact circumstances that those interviews cited, the number of negative responses received by the committee compelled the members to mark this candidate as qualified rather than well-qualified. Mr. Kirven, do you have a response to offer to this concern?
A. First of all, I'll say I appreciate again the overwhelming positive tone of that report. I think the important thing is to put matters into context. I've already spoken earlier about the zealous representation, but $I$ think my litigation practice was only a small part of my body of work, if you will. In addition, I've handled a lot of transactional matters and some in the multimillion dollars economy and development sale of assets and so on. Those were situations where there has to be a lot of give and take, a lot of negotiation, and a lot to get to a meeting of the minds, and then there's got to be a lot of cooperation in actually closing the transaction and putting it into effect.

Outside of my law practice, I'm in a seventh term as an election official. In addition, I have
served on a number of boards and committees in my community. I've chaired most of them. So if you put everything in context, I think that speaks very positively toward my temperament overall.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Kirven.

MS. BENSON: I would just note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding this candidate were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. I beg your pardon. Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, if $I$ can ask that we can have the sworn statement of Mr. Kirven placed in the record at this time if there would be no objections?

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.

MS. BENSON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms. Benson. Are there any questions by any Commission members for Mr. Kirven? Yes. Dean Wilcox.

DEAN WILCOX: We have, generally, your outline of your career, but can you -- how many foreclosure actions have you handled in a rough sense? I mean, I'm not asking for a specific number, but over your career.

MR. KIRVEN: I don't know that I can give you an exact number, but $I$ would say probably 10 or 15, at least, and one as recently as this year. It was a very complex foreclosure that I think I put into my information, but I've done enough of them that I'm comfortable in that area.

DEAN WILCOX: And your frequency, I gather, it's somewhat irregular frequency, but at times it's quite frequent appearances in front of Masters, is that a fair reading of your statement?

MR. KIRVEN: Yes. I would say that its been a steady but -- well, actually, considerable, but not steady. In other words, it comes and goes as -- I mean, I have two or three things here and then I'll go for a while without anything and that's probably because of the nature of the Master's Court and it's jurisdiction.

DEAN WILCOX: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Other questions? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none. Mr.
Kirven we want to thank you for being with us today and offering for this position as Master-in-Equity. That concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published and you may be invited back should that need arise. We remind you of the 48hour rule. We ask you to strictly abide by it and we would ask that you instruct any who may wish to advocate on your behalf to abide by the 48-hour rule. We thank you for offering, sir, and thank you for being with us today. MR. KIRVEN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Okay. May we have a motion for a brief executive session?

MR. HITCHCOCK: So moved.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: So moved by Mr.
Hitchcock. We are in executive session and staff and security, please secure the room. (Off-the-record executive session.) CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We are back on the
record. Do we have a motion to find Mr.
Kirven qualified and nominated?
SENATOR CAMPSEN: So moved.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Master-in-Equity for
Anderson and Oconee Counties, Tenth Circuit. We have a motion by Senator Campsen. Do we have a second?

DEAN WILCOX: Second.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: By Dean Wilcox. All
those in favor say aye.
(Commission members audibly say "aye.")
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Are there any
opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: It is by acclamation that -- I'm sorry. He's a Master-in-Equity. We would find him qualified. Senator Campsen, would you amend your motion as qualified?

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Qualified.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Dean Wilcox, would you accept that amendment?

DEAN WILCOX: I agree. Yes.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: So we are voting on finding Steven Coleman Kirven qualified as Master-in-Equity for Anderson and Oconee

County, Tenth Circuit. All those in favor, say aye.
(Commission members audibly say "aye.")
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Those opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: The ayes have it. He
is found qualified. That concludes the business for which we are assembled today. We would entertain a motion for the Chair that we will stand at ease until nine o'clock in the morning. Perhaps our next schedule that we put together, we'll try to shoot for a later start time. Questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: All right. We stand at ease.
(There being no further questions, the proceedings adjourned at 5:00 p.m.)
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