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REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Good morning, Judge.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: So good to have you with us today.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: It's good to be here.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I don't know if I could call you Judge, General, or General Judge. Which should it be?

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Just call me a boy scout. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, sir.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: 'Cause you've been so much involved in that great, great endeavor for many years.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Judge, it's wonderful to have you with us today. Thank you for your service on the bench.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: I'm very, very honored to be here -- to be in a position to be here as a judge for the great State of South Carolina.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. And thank you for offering again, for serving the state. Would you please raise your right hand, and be sworn.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE JAMES EDWARD LOCKEMY, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole
truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows: REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Lockemy, we have -- have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Well, I haven't seen it in a couple weeks, but I think I remember most everything. If something comes up, I need to look, I've got it in front of me here. I filled it out, so...

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: When you completed the personal data questionnaire, was it complete and correct?

JUDGE LOCKEMY: To the best of my knowledge. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is it in need of any amendment today?

JUDGE LOCKEMY: I must have -- the financial
thing, I got a tax refund due to me buying a condo high and selling low and --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I'm sorry, the
financials are not part of the personal data questionnaire. JUDGE LOCKEMY: Okay. I paid off a credit card when I got a tax refund.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Do you --
JUDGE LOCKEMY: But other than that --
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- do you need to
make any changes to your --

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

JUDGE LOCKEMY: The only change --
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- to your
questionnaire?
JUDGE LOCKEMY: -- is during the course, I
was made aware of a lawsuit that $I$ had forgotten. But I think with her hard work, that Elizabeth has put that in there. I forgot about a lawsuit from a prisoner that had sued me. Should I comment on that? Or is that --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Not at this time. With that amendment, then shall -- is the personal data questionnaire complete?

JUDGE LOCKEMY: To the best of my knowledge, yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir. Would you have any objection to that being made a part of the record of your testimony today?

JUDGE LOCKEMY: No, I do not.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Does any
Commission member have an objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of James Edward Lockemy dated August 5th, 2015)
(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - Addendum to Personal Data Questionnaire of James E. Lockemy)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Lockemy, we've thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuing on the bench. Our inquiry has been based on the nine evaluative criteria. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to share with the Commission today?

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Very brief, Mr. Chairman. And once again, as I said when I came in, I never thought when I was growing that $I$ would have this opportunity and this honor to serve. And I do realize, and I have realized ever since the people of this state, in some capacity -the Legislator gave me an opportunity to serve. But I do know that it is a great, great, great honor. And I'm very, very fortunate to have that honor.

But I also realize that with that honor on one shoulder, and on the other shoulder is a burden. And that burden is to act responsibly, to do your duty to be open to the public, and to do everything you can to serve. And so with those two tenets, the honor and the burden, I'm glad to answer any questions.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you so much, Judge. In that vein, would you please turn your attention to your screening attorney Ms. Dean -- Ms. Crawford. I'm sorry.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Crawford. Former -- former law clerk to the Honorable A.B. Chandler of Darlington, South Carolina, then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, sir. Ms. Crawford, please proceed.

MS. CRAWFORD: Judge Lockemy, you have before you, your sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions. Are there any amendments you'd like to make to the sworn statement at this time?

JUDGE LOCKEMY: No, I think everything is...
MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. And at this time, Mr.
Chairman, I'd like to ask that his sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 3 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of James Edward Lockemy dated August 5th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MS. CRAWFORD:
Q. Judge Lockemy, after serving seven years on the Court of Appeals, and previously serving nine years as a circuit court judge, why do you want to continue serving as
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## a judge on the Court of Appeals?

A. Because I feel that $I$ am one that would apply the one that should be applied. I think that I have thoroughly kept myself up-to-date with the law. I feel that I am fair, in the sense that I look at all sides of an issue and try and make a decision that is within the law -- and I realize the limitations of the bench. And I am physically able to continue to serve and would like to do so.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge, please explain one or two brief accomplishments that you feel you've completed during your tenure on the bench, and then a goal you may want to try and accomplish.
A. Well, as far as goals, I have become very much involved in networking with other judges around the nation. I am right now the secretary of the Appellate Judges Association of the American Bar Association, and one day may very well be chair.

This past weekend in Washington, I was the chair of a committee with lawyers from around the nation and a professor of law from UCLA, regarding the ethics of our -I was the one who presented to over 300 people, with appellate judges and appellate lawyers around the nation, on ethics in the movies -- some of you might know I really enjoy old movies -- and to get movies that comment on lawyers and ethics.

And some things that you should be aware of, I have authored several articles about the law. One entitled "Marbury versus Madison" -- a bumper sticker to be proud of -- and that's because a judge, who was not retained in Iowa, said one reason he didn't campaign is that Marbury versus Madison would not be a good bumper sticker. And I took exception. I think that it would be, because it would ask -- cause people to see how in this country you can have issues like the election of a president in 2000, questions about the Affordable Care Act, whichever -- whichever way you feel about it, resolved by a court, and everybody accept that is the law, that is the judicial review in our nation, as it has been adopted with a tradition set.

And so I've written articles on several -- on that publication, among others. I am on the editorial board of the Judges Journal for the American Bar Association. My colleagues, that I have grown to respect and have an affection, are on the Court of Appeals; we work together on many cases. I have dissented on several cases, as have others, but each time it's always been a dissent of respect.

And I feel that I have contributed to the law -and I listen to them, also. As so many of you know me, and know how much I love history, it does -- sometimes when you think about it, give you a little bit of a chill to know
that when you author an opinion, that it is going in a book to be part of the history of this state. Of course, that chill is somewhat chillier when it gets reversed on you and you know the reversal is also there. But those, I feel, are some of my accomplishments.
Q. Yes, sir. Judge, the Commission received 522 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 34 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, primarily had positive comments.

Six of the written comments expressed concerns,
and judicial temperament seemed to be the primary concern. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Now, that's amazing. I'm not sure -- some of you've been in a court with me before, and I don't -- I don't -- I've done my best to be as fair and let everyone have their say, and make sure everyone is not leaving that courtroom without the feeling they had the full opportunity to present their case.

Maybe people may think that I'm too friendly, and then they have the opinion that maybe he isn't on the side they should you be, they -- they think I was being sarcastic. But $I$ do my best to be as friendly as I can. And I -- and I very -- I am one that realized that -- that robe is an honor to wear on the bench, that you don't wear it outside of the bench. And when you do wear it on the
bench, you wear it to be fair to everyone, not to have any magic power. And, in fact, when I was a trial judge, I made a point of, at the end of each week, to go out into the audience or the jurors and thank them, and shake their hand, personally, for serving.

So I -- I would say that I am surprised that anyone would say anything about my judicial temperament. But, you know, we're all human. We're all human. As the Bible says, "He who has not sinned cast the first stone." I'm sure there's been a day or so, that anyone who should count to ten, first, maybe counted to eight. And so if that ever happened in my regard -- and I don't deny that it may have -- I'm sincerely sorry in that regard. But I just can't remember a time that it has, but I know it probably has at one time or another.
Q. Okay. Judge, thank you. I'd just ask that --
A. I hope there wasn't many who said that.
Q. No, sir. It was only six -- six out of --
A. Out of five hundred?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Oh, okay.
Q. Very few.
A. I counted to eight, six times.
Q. Very good.
A. In about twenty years -- or twenty-something
years.
Q. Yeah, we just have a few brief housekeeping issues. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator prior to this day?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Have you sought or been offered a conditional pledge of support?
A. No.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of this processing on your behalf?
A. No. No, ma'am.
Q. Have you contacted any members of this Commission?
A. No.
Q. And you understand that you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. Yes, I'm very much aware of that.
Q. And you've reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes.
Q. And as a follow-up, are you aware of the
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## penalties for violating the pledging; it's a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand or imprisoned not more than 90 days?

A. I've been made aware of that. And I could set an appropriate bond, if I got arrested.
Q. Yes, sir.
A. I won't do that. I promise. MS. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee reported that Judge Lockemy is qualified as to the constitutional qualifications, mental stability and physical health. The Committee found Judge Lockemy well qualified in the remaining criteria. The Committee concluded that Judge Lockemy is perceived to be a highly intelligent, charismatic, and perceptive jurist.

I would just note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate, were incorporated into the questionings today.

I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms. Crawford. Does any commissioner have a question? Senator Malloy, you're recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Commission members.

SENATOR MALLOY: Judge Lockemy -- I have the
honor and pleasure of probably being one of the only people in this room that had probably had helped try one of his cases, and one of his last cases while on the trial bench. I've had a chance to be in front of him on the Court of Appeals. I would be surprised at any of those comments.

As y'all have seen Judge Lockemy, through all his careers, in his history as a bag boy in a grocery store, and growing up in the Dillon County area. He -- I would say he's very humble on the bench. He lets lawyers try their cases. He is a great jurist, a great historian, a great South Carolinian.

I've witnessed that in courtroom, many times, whenever he would go out and speak to all the jurors, the folks, even after the questioning of the jury. And I appreciate that. I know that he has worked really hard in representing our country, and being in the bench. And also making sure that he's learning all the Hank William songs.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: And good-looking.
SENATOR MALLOY: So I -- I have no
reservations as it relates to Judge Lockemy. And I also want to say he gave the other lawsuits in that case some good advice, and said, "Here's things that y'all should be doing as a group."

And so he was -- continues to be a teacher
on the bench.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Before I go to Mr.
Mack, did you just call Senator Malloy good-looking?
SENATOR MALLOY: No. No. He mentioned Hank
Williams. Do y'all know Hank Williams?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
Excellent.
SENATOR MALLOY: I would be offended with --
with that -- they would call me good-looking.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Mack?
SENATOR CAMPSEN: So would the rest of the
Commission.
SENATOR MALLOY: Well, I wasn't going to say the reason why.

SENATOR MARTIN: We would definitely
question his judgement.
SENATOR MALLOY: Exactly. And eyesight.
Not judgement, eyesight.
REPRESENTATIVE MACK: Mr. Mack, you're
recognized.
REPRESENTATIVE MACK: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. Judge, great to see you. I just wanted to just chime in that, getting to know you over the last few years, it's been a pleasure. I've never seen you in a courtroom, but you get to know a person in terms of interaction. And
you've always been connected to the General Assembly, never saying anything inappropriate, but just being there in case we had any questions. And I appreciate that. I appreciate your service. And I appreciate your personality and your temperament.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: I've never seen you on the radio, either, but I've heard you.

REPRESENTATIVE MACK: Okay.
JUDGE LOCKEMY: Thank you very much,
Representative Mack.
SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, Senator
Martin.
SENATOR MARTIN: Judge, it's good to see you.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Good to see you, my former colleague.

SENATOR MARTIN: Yeah. Yeah, I -- I was looking back to try to figure out exactly -- you got elected in '89 --

JUDGE LOCKEMY: '89.
SENATOR MARTIN: -- to the circuit?
JUDGE LOCKEMY: The only judge elected that
year.
SENATOR MARTIN: How about that.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Yeah. And I had to go to school with Judge Bubba Ness as my teacher.

SENATOR MARTIN: But I just wanted to share with the Commission, our service together, and how much I enjoyed that. And just have great respect and admiration for your service, both in the House and -- and later on the bench. And I'm just thrilled that you're continuing there. And just wish you the very best.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Thank you, Senator. And I've always enjoyed my time. I've served several times in Pickens County, and I really had a wonderful experience up there with the people of Pickens County -- those I didn't send away for a while.

SENATOR MARTIN: Right. Right. We -- they were imports, by the way. Thank you for -- thank you for your service.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator Martin. Ms. Bell?

MS. BELL: Good morning, Judge Lockemy.
JUDGE LOCKEMY: Good morning.
MS. BELL: I know we're on a tight schedule, so I'll be brief. I wanted to thank you for your service. And I've personally witnessed your wonderful demeanor on the bench. I know you won't remember, but --

JUDGE LOCKEMY: At least you're not one of
those six I --
MS. BELL: I tried my first case in front of
you. I was fifth chair, but I did do my first --
JUDGE LOCKEMY: Fifth chair? A small law
firm.
MS. BELL: I know. It was with --
Marguerite Willis with Nexsen Pruit --
JUDGE LOCKEMY: Oh, yes.
MS. BELL: -- the Bristo [sic] case. And
Senator Malloy, yes, was there as well.
JUDGE LOCKEMY: Excellent.
MS. BELL: Yes. So I did my first direct examination and cross-examination of a witness, and you were very, very patient. And I appreciate that. And you were wonderful to be with. So thank you very much for your service.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Well, thank you very much. SENATOR MALLOY: They didn't take my advice. But, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any other questions or comments?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Well, Judge, when
it comes to --
JUDGE LOCKEMY: Can I ask something of Dean

Wilcox? I'm hoping when you-all get that building built, you have a place that judges can park. When you go to -it only just seems fair that when you go to research, you have a place to park.

MR. WILCOX: Judge, I hope we have a place where deans can park.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, when it comes to the nine evaluative criteria, in my book you -you score at the top, you always make us proud, and we appreciate your service to the bench.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much. This concludes this portion of the -- of our screening process. Judge, we would ask you to keep in mind the 48 -hour rule. And we would also ask that if anybody should ask you about advocating on your behalf, that you remind them of the 48 -hour rule.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: I shall.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: With that, again, thank you for your service to South Carolina, and all that you do. Thank you, sir.

JUDGE LOCKEMY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank everyone. I would shake hands, but that thing has barred me. Thank you so much. I appreciate it. And I mean what $I$ said about the honor. It is an honor. And I
won't forget the responsibility. Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Judge. (Candidate excused.) REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for being with us today, sir.

JUDGE DICKSON: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Would you please raise your -- would you please raise your right hand and be sworn.

## WHEREUPON:

THE HONORABLE EDGAR WARREN DICKSON, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows: REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission -- before -- before I get to that statement, let me ask have you reviewed your personal data questionnaire?

JUDGE DICKSON: Yeah. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is it complete and correct?

JUDGE DICKSON: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Would you have any objection to it being entered into the record as a part of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE DICKSON: Not at all.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir.
Any objection by Commission members?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 4 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of Edgar Warren Dickson dated August 6th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the
Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly reviewed your qualifications for the bench.

JUDGE DICKSON: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And our
evaluation, of course, is focused on the statutory nine evaluative criteria. We've received no affidavits filed in opposition to your -- to your election. And there are also no other -- no witnesses here to testify, today, other than yourself.

With that, sir, do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to share with the Commission?

JUDGE DICKSON: Just that I've enjoyed my -I appreciate getting elected the first time. I've enjoyed my service. And this is -- this is my last go-around. After this, I'll be 72. And so I can't run again. And but, I've enjoyed it. It's -- we're actually blessed in
the state to have a lot of good attorneys. And, of course, I find that when good attorneys appear in front of me, I'm a much better judge. But we are -- we are blessed with a lot of good attorneys in the state. And so that makes my job a lot easier. But $I$ have enjoyed that.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. And I heard a comment from my other folliclychallenged -- how did you -- how has he kept all his hair?

Judge, thank you very much. With that, we will turn the time over to your screening attorney. If you'd please respond to his questions.

JUDGE DICKSON: Okay. Thank you. MR. PEARCE: Hello again, Judge. It's good to see you.

JUDGE DICKSON: Yes, sir. Good to see you. MR. PEARCE: You have before you a sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to that sworn statement?

JUDGE DICKSON: None.
MR. PEARCE: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd
like to ask that, that sworn statement be entered as an exhibit to the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Are
there any objections?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 5 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of Edgar Warren Dickson dated August 6th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. PEARCE:
Q. Judge, after serving since 2009 on the circuit court bench, why do you want to continue serving?
A. Well, as I mentioned already, I have enjoyed it. Sometimes I feel like I'm actually being helpful. I know when I was practicing law, it was -- it was -- sometimes I didn't feel like the judges, you know, had time like that. But I enjoy, you know, working the attorneys and doing what I can to help them, and do what I can to help the people that appear in front of me, realizing that when I make a decision, it affects both sides and has an impact on families of the people involved. But basically, it's a good job, and I've enjoyed doing it.
Q. Could you briefly explain one or two accomplishments you feel you have completed during your tenure, and then a goal you'd like to accomplish if reelected and reappointed?
A. Goals that I've accomplished? You mean, like, cases? I don't know exactly --
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Q. It could be that. Any accomplishment that you would like to share with the Commission.
A. Well, you know, with the new computer tracking methods, we -- we're doing a better job of making sure that cases don't get lost. And we're moving them along. I know in Orangeburg, as soon as a case turns nine months old in the civil docket, we put it on the trial docket, even though it can't be tried until a year. But that way, when it comes up three months later, everybody knows we're ready to go.

As far as dealing with the criminal docket, what I try and do, and what we've done in the 1st Circuit, that I feel is effective is whenever, you know, attorneys -- you know, the solicitor, traditionally, has had -- has controlled the docket. But we can -- if the defense is ready to go, they can file a motion for a speedy trial; they come in front of me, and we try and get the trial scheduled as soon as we can. So what we're trying to do is speed up the docket, and make -- make sure everything is heard in a -- in a timely fashion.
Q. Judge, the Commission received 469 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 33 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained several positive comments, and they included that you were a fine gentleman, an excellent judge, fair, even-keeled, with great
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temperament, and a very pleasant judge to try a case with. One comment indicated that you were not timely in returning orders. Do you have a response to offer to that concern?
A. Well, I -- 'cause I can't deal with specifics, I do mull things over. Because realizing the impact it has, I want to try and make the best decision that I can make. I can tell you-all a brief war story.

I was in -- had two attorneys appear in front of me in Aiken, in a -- in a -- in a matter that -- you know, a non-jury contested matter. It was a motion. And they said -- they said it didn't matter how I ruled, each one of them was going to appeal whatever I did. And I took that kind of as a challenge. So I actually came up with an order that neither one of them appealed, and they ended up settling as a result of it.

So I do realize that it -- that I mull things over. But I think -- you know, when you come to court, you want individual attention. This is the only time the world stops and gives you a chance to be heard. A lot of times it's like we do this many this way, or this many that way. And we can -- when you come to court, it is your chance in court, whatever it is, and it -- you deserve a full fair hearing; you need somebody to think about it. And that's what I try and do.

So I don't think I take too long, but I -- I understand how somebody could complain about it.
Q. You indicated in your PDQ, that since your last screening a lawsuit was file by Anthony Darnell Glover in 2013. Could you just explain to the Commission, briefly, how you handled that lawsuit? I think we discussed it, and you turned it over to the Attorney General and --
A. Oh, yeah. Oh, that -- yeah, I'm sorry. Yeah. I just turned it over to the Attorney General, because I -- I don't know what else do you --
Q. I believe when we discussed it before, you mentioned that the Attorney General said there was not a response required.
A. Yeah. I mean, when I turned it over to them, they said just to leave it alone and have nothing to do with it. And so I did.
Q. And you also provided the information about a traffic ticket in 2008, that you received in Turbeville, and a --
A. That's right.
Q. -- in a 1993 tax lien for $\$ 495$.
A. That's right.
Q. Are those matters paid?
A. Oh, yeah, they were paid -- they were paid at -at the time. Well, the ticket wasn't paid until about --
whenever I had to send it in.
MR. PEARCE: And I do have some housekeeping
matters, Mr. Chairman.
EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MR. PEARCE:
Q. Judge, have you sought or received a pledge or any legislator prior to this day?
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 this process on your behalf?
A. I'm not aware of anyone.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. No.
Q. And you're familiar with the 48-hour rule, and will comply with its requirements?
A. I will.

MR. PEARCE: I would note that the Low
Country Citizens Committee reported that Judge Dickson qualified in areas of constitutional qualifications,
physical health and mental stability, and he was well qualified on all remaining criteria.

And I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation, regarding Judge Dickson, were incorporated into the questioning that I did of the candidate today.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have any further questions.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Judge Dickson, we -- would you respond to any questions that members of the Commission might have?

JUDGE DICKSON: I'd be happy to.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Members?
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I have just a quick -- a quick comment. On behalf of all the Committee members, we appreciate your coming and answering the questions and going through the process. We think it's important. We know it's a day out of your working life, which probably would be better used in court, helping folks solve their conflicts. But at the same time, it gives the public some confidence that we're looking at everybody that seeks reelection.

You should have answered your -- one of your best accomplishments was having three hundred responses, and the worst thing they could say about you was you were a
little slow on issuing a ruling.
JUDGE DICKSON: Well, I'm glad --
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: That's a pretty
good negative.
JUDGE DICKSON: It just sound a little slow, and stop there. That would be my biggest concern.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Thank goodness
for that.
JUDGE DICKSON: That's all right. That's all right.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Thank you, Judge.
Thank you for being here.
JUDGE DICKSON: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Martin is recognized.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MARTIN:
Q. We had a candidate yesterday or the day before -the days are running together -- that mentioned during the course of his screening -- and we're not going to be able to ask this of everyone in this. In your particular case, one of the comments has to do with you were -- you appear more favorable to plaintiffs than defendants. That's in the -- I think that's the right one.

In any event, that gave rise to my thought about
the Frivolous Proceedings Act that we have, he -- 'cause he mentioned that. Have you ever sanctioned a defendant or a plaintiff for a frivolous proceeding, a frivolous motion?
A. I have sanctioned a -- I believe a plaintiff's attorney for failing to provide some discovery. But it was a very egregious situation. And, actually, I ended up withdrawing that because $I$ found out that it was actually after a -- and I can't go -- found out that there was some -- you know, as an attorney, if people believe somebody has a problem with alcohol or drugs or something like that, you have a duty to report that. And I -- I had a conversation with the Bar, and they checked and -- and -- and that attorney went in to some treatment. So --
Q. But I guess what the -- the heart of the question is -- and, of course -- I mean, as you mentioned earlier, everybody deserves their day in court.
A. Right.
Q. And when they come to court, they -- they -that's the most important to them in the world.
A. Exactly.
Q. But -- but it's also assumed that not every filing is -- is going to be meritorious.
A. Absolutely true. I've dismissed cases --
Q. Right.
A. -- at the summary judgement level, which had
absolutely no bearing.
Q. I'm just curious as to what your general views were on the Frivolous Proceedings Act, and whether or not you'd ever invoked that.
A. Well, actually, $I$-- the only time I've actually had it come before me, was just this past -- this week during non-jury, and somebody had filed a counterclaim as a frivolous proceeding under the Frivolous Proceedings Act. And he can't bring that until after the case is over. So the only thing we did is, I -- I just issued an order saying that it's preserved, and that after the case is -is over with, he can go forward with the Frivolous Proceedings Act.
Q. All right. Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any other
questions? Thank you. Ms. Wall?
MS. WALL: Judge Dickson, I've had the pleasure of appearing --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Ms. Wall, would you use your microphone, please.

MS. WALL: Yes. I've had the pleasure of appearing in front of you. And I would -- I take it as a very -- these are positive comments, you were -- I had a summary judgement motion in front of you, and you certainly allowed the attorneys to fully explore and provide you with
the information. You were very thoughtful and very courteous. And as a practicing attorney, I can assure you the attorneys appreciate that. So thank you for your service.

JUDGE DICKSON: Appreciate it. Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms.

Wall. Other questions or comment?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, thank you very much. Judge, it's good to have you here today. We appreciate your service to South Carolina. And your appearing before us.

JUDGE DICKSON: I appreciate what y'all got to go through, too. So thank y'all.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Goodstein,
it's so good to see you with us today.
JUDGE GOODSTEIN: Thank you so much. Thank
you very much --
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for
joining us. I was just -- we were just reminded by Representative Bannister, that we are -- we are certain that you could probably have a more productive day, today,
being on the bench rather than being with us. But we are grateful that you are here with us. And your being here with us gives the public some degree of comfort -JUDGE GOODSTEIN: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- that we -- we are interviewing all of our judges.

JUDGE GOODSTEIN: Absolutely. And thank you-all for doing this. And thank you for the time that you're spending doing this.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I see at least one special guest in the audience, that you have with you. Would you introduce your guest?

JUDGE GOODSTEIN: Oh, thank you very much. My beloved husband Arnold Goodstein, and our wonderful daughter, Eve Goodstein, that just finished her clerkship with Judge Manning, and is now practicing law. Yay, we got a raise.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And she's just as lovely as her mom.

JUDGE DICKSON: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you so much. Good to have both of you here with us -- all three of you here with us.

JUDGE DICKSON: Thank you. Thank you very much.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman, and if you would allow us, former Senator Arnie Goodstein. We got to make sure that we honor the Senate.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Former Senator Arnold Goodstein, absolutely.
(Off-the-record discussion.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: It is good to have all of you with us today. Judge Goodstein, would you raise your right hand and be sworn.

JUDGE DICKSON: I will.
WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE DIANE SCHAFER GOODSTEIN, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Goodstein, this Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continued service on the bench.

JUDGE GOODSTEIN: Yes.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Our inquiry and investigation has been focused on the nine evaluative criteria dictated by statute. In that regard, and as a result of the investigation, you've come to meet your screening attorney, Ms. Dean. We would ask that you please direct your attention to her, and respond to her questions.

JUDGE DICKSON: Thank you so much.

MS. DEAN: Judge Goodstein.
JUDGE GOODSTEIN: Good morning.
EXAMINATION BY MS. DEAN:
Q. You have before you the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers of thirty questions. Are there any amendments you'd like to make to your sworn statement at this time?
A. There are two. I just -- I wanted the Commission to know that a week ago, I learned that there was an assessment to a piece of property that I own, and paid it. And that's not on here, because at that point that it was -- that it was owed, that it was owed and paid. The only other item was that, yesterday -- there is a pending -- and it's very recent -- a DSS case involving my son and my grandchildren in -- in a private action that has been filed to go along with that. But that involves my son. But I have participated and agreed to help, by keeping the children on a very temporary basis. And because of that, I'm having interaction with the family court. And I thought it was important to just disclose that as well. And then I couldn't think of anything else.
Q. Thank you, Judge. And I believe you also have your PDQ in front of you.
A. Yes.
Q. Are there any amendments you'd like to make to
that, outside of what you just disclosed?
A. No.

MS. DEAN: Okay. At this time, Mr.
Chairman, I'd like to suggest having both the PDQ and sworn statement made part of the record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms.
Dean. Is there any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 6 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of Diane Schafer Goodstein dated August 6th, 2015)
(EXHIBIT NO. 7 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of Diane Schafer Goodstein dated August 6th, 2015)

EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Judge Goodstein, after 17 years on the circuit court bench, why do you want to continue to serve as the circuit court judge?
A. My goodness, it's hard to believe that it has been 17 years. First and foremost, it is my hope -- it is my sincere hope that I still am able to be helpful, and that $I$ can still serve this state. I still love it no less today than the very first day that I arrived on the bench.

And it is my hope that $I$ can continue to serve and continue to bring dignity and honor to the bench. And as long as I'm able to do that and be productive, I would like to do that. And at this moment, it's still my hope -- still my passion in my life.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge Goodstein, the Commission received 593 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 60 additional comments. The ballot box survey received lots of comments related to your demeanor and ability. Seventeen of the written comments expressed concerned. Chief among those concerns, were plaintifforiented in your rulings or judicial temperament. Would you please react to those concerns.
A. Absolutely. And I would say this to -- to this whole process that -- that is, I think, the beauty of this process, quite frankly. Because while you're mindful every day that demeanor and respect -- demeanor and respect are so important, when we go through this process every six years, we have an opportunity, in an anonymous fashion, to have people share what they think about you.

And you can look at those two different ways.
You can say, well, those are disgruntled litigants and let it go at that, or you can look at that as an opportunity to have that feedback. I choose to look at that as an opportunity for that feedback. And what that says to me is

I need to reassess, sit down with myself and understand that there are 17 people that have been in my court that have concern that I'm plaintiff-oriented, and that $I$ need to be mindful of my demeanor. And that's the way that I choose to look at that, that $I$ need to be mindful of that. Because every single, solitary person that comes into my court ought to feel respected, they ought to feel as though that I am impartial. So to me it is simply an opportunity for me to recommit, to be sure that, that's occurring.
Q. Thank you, Judge. You were named in a lawsuit dealing with Sealoflex, and also a lawsuit dealing with First Palmetto. Could you please, briefly, address those two?
A. I can. With regards to the First Palmetto lawsuit, and I think that order of dismissal speaks quite well to that, it should have never been brought. It was never served. There was no obligation. That arose out of a business transaction that did not involve me, personally. And I think that the order is pretty clear in that regard. I owed nothing. I shouldn't have been sued. And, again, I think that dismissal speaks to that.

With regards to the Sealoflex, that was my roof. And I -- we tried every way, shape or form to resolve it before litigation. But it is my roof, and the material
that was put on the roof, unfortunately, was defective.
That litigation has ended. They've paid the money. And my roof is almost finished.
Q. Thank you, Judge. I just have some housekeeping issues now. Have you sought or received a 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. No.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of this 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 -prohibited from seeking a pledge of -- or a commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of this 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 of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes.

MS. DEAN: I would note that the Low Country Citizens Committee reported that Judge Goodstein is qualified as to the areas of constitutional qualification, mental health and physical criteria. They found her well qualified in the remaining criteria.

I would just note for the record, any concerns raised during this investigation regarding the candidate, were incorporated into today's questioning.

I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much, Ms. Dean. Does any member of the Commission have a question? Mr. Mack?

REPRESENTATIVE MACK: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
Judge Goodstein, very good to see you -JUDGE DICKSON: You too.

REPRESENTATIVE MACK: -- this morning. I have to say I appreciate your service. And you have a very good reputation from -- from what I've heard over the years, and knowing you. And I just appreciate your service. I just wanted to say that you are -- your husband was a mentor of mine in the late '70s, when I got out of -out of college. So I'm very fond of the Goodstein name. So --

JUDGE GOODSTEIN: Thank you so much for that. That means so much. And he was my mentor too.
(Off-the-record discussion.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Mack. Yes, Ms. Wall.

MS. WALL: Judge Goodstein, I've had the pleasure and opportunity to appear before you many, many times. And I wanted to thank you not only for your service, but also for your service showing great enthusiasm for the law. And as a practicing attorney, your listening skills, your always allowing attorneys and litigants to fully have their say. And, but again, your positive attitude and your -- and your enthusiasm for the law is greatly appreciated.

JUDGE DICKSON: And coming from you, Ms.
Wall, is a --
MS. WALL: Thank you.

JUDGE DICKSON: -- is a -- is a wonderful
compliment. Thank you so much.
MS. WALL: Thank you for your service.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms.
Wall. Any other comments or questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Well, Judge
Goodstein, we thank you so much. This concludes this portion of the screening process. You may be called back at a later time, inasmuch as the report will remain open, until it is published. We doubt that will be the case, but it could happen.

With that, we thank you so much for your service to South Carolina by serving on the bench. And we appreciate you being here today.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, Senator
Malloy.
SENATOR MALLOY: And before we vote, I will put on the record that Judge Goodstein did hear a case at least about ten years ago, that involved me, which was a frivolous proceeding that was filed against me.

SENATOR MARTIN: Did she sanction the other party?

SENATOR MALLOY: She did. And --
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SENATOR MARTIN: Good.
SENATOR MALLOY: And needed to.
SENATOR MARTIN: Good.
SENATOR MALLOY: And it was affirmed by the Supreme Court. And so I just say that just before we end up voting.

SENATOR MARTIN: Good.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for that
disclosure, Senator Malloy.
Thank you so much, Judge Goodstein.
JUDGE GOODSTEIN: Thank you-all so much as
well --
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And thank you to

```
your family --
```

JUDGE GOODSTEIN: -- thank you for your
service --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- for being here with you today.

JUDGE GOODSTEIN: Thank you. Thank you, kindly.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Early, thank
you so much for being with us today.
JUDGE EARLY: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for your
patience.
JUDGE EARLY: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And thank you for your service on the bench.

JUDGE EARLY: Almost 12 years now. Seems like it was yesterday.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We've been reminded that we're sure that you could be accomplishing a great deal more today by being on the bench than being here with us. But we appreciate your presence, as do the public, as we go through this process.

JUDGE EARLY: Well, we'll be back in Aiken by 1:30. We've got a full afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I'm sure you'll take advantage of every moment of it. Thank you, sir.

You have a guest with you today, I believe. Would you please introduce your guest.

JUDGE EARLY: This is Marty Dennis. And she is Senator Rembert Dennis' niece, and she's my law partner. She's done a wonderful job. She drove up from Bamberg with me, today, so we can go back. Marty?

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Welcome, Ms.
Dennis. It's good to have you --
JUDGE EARLY: I told them they named the
Dennis building after her, and she said, "No, I think that
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was my uncle."
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: He certainly left
a large impression --
JUDGE EARLY: He did.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- upon the
history of South Carolina.
JUDGE EARLY: Her dad was Senator Dennis' brother, Dr. Billy Dennis, who was with the Medical University up here in Columbia.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Wonderful. Judge Early, would you raise your right hand and be sworn.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE DOYET A. EARLY, III, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Early, you provided this Commission with a personal data questionnaire. Are your responses to the personal data questionnaire is -- are those responses complete and correct?

JUDGE EARLY: They are.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is it in need of any amendment at this time?

JUDGE EARLY: Not that I'm aware of.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Do you have any objection to that personal data questionnaire being included in the record as a part of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE EARLY: I do not.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 8 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire for Doyet A. Early, III dated August 14th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Early, this -- this Commission has thoroughly investigated your -- your qualifications for continuing -- for continuation on the bench. And our inquiry and investigation has focused on the nine evaluative criteria dictated by statute in South Carolina.

We've received no affidavits in opposition to your election. Congratulations. And there are not witnesses to testify, other than yourself.

You have met your screening attorney, previously. And we would ask that you direct to her. And please respond to her questions.

JUDGE EARLY: And she has been wonderful. She's been so helpful. And she's easy to work with. And I thank her for all she's done for me.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: She is a great credit to the General Assembly.

JUDGE EARLY: She certainly is.
MS. BENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Judge. I appreciate that.

Judge Early, you have before you the sworn statement that you provided, with detailed answer to over thirty questions, as well as the PDQ which was previously introduced. And that included an amended answer that you had to Question No. 33, about a youthful indiscretion that I'm going to question you about a little bit later. But this matter has been disclosed in previous screenings.

You have no additional amendments to add to any of these documents at this time?

JUDGE EARLY: No, I do not.
MS. BENSON: Thank you. And, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that these be included in the record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Ms. Benson, if this is a matter -- you mentioned a matter that we would go back through again, if it's been covered in a previous screening, I don't think we need to go back through that again.

MS. BENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
(EXHIBIT NO. 9 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of Doyet A. Early, III, dated July 31st, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MS. BENSON:
Q. Judge Early.
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. After serving almost 12 years, now, in the circuit court, why do you want to continue in serving as a circuit court judge?
A. Well, I've enjoyed it. It's probably the greatest job you can have if you're a lawyer. And I feel like I'm doing a good job in the circuit and throughout the state. And I want to continue at least until I'm 72, which is just four more years. I'm getting close.

But I just don't think I can sit at home, either. I have to be doing something. And I truly have a great personnel in the 2nd Circuit. Our solicitor does a wonderful job. And we've got our dockets in super shape. So I enjoy serving. It's been a wonderful change from practicing law over 30 years. And I like being around all the young people, too, all the lawyers and being -- having interaction with them is just -- is just a good job. It's a good position, a good -- I like it.
Q. Judge, could you tell us about -- tell us,
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briefly, about one of your accomplishments during your tenure, and any goal that you might have upon reelection.
A. I suspect that my biggest accomplishment on being on the bench was the handling of the derailment case in Graniteville. I'd just been on the bench about six months when the train derailed on January the 6th of my second year. And out of that, some five, six, seven, eight hundred cases came out of it -- some in a class action, which went to the federal courts, but a lot in my court. And we were able to resolve all of them, with only one trial. And we worked very hard to accomplish that. And I think that's my biggest accomplishment of -- as a trial judge.

What I would like to accomplish before I get off the bench? I would like to finish James Brown. We -we've been working on James Brown a long time. We had it settled -- all parties had it settled, and the Supreme Court said, no, it shouldn't be settled. So it has come back to me, full-blown. But we've now moved it along in a posture. We've got a -- the main trial now set for the middle of next year. And, hopefully, that will get it down the road again so it can go back to the Supreme Court. But if $I$ could get that done, that would be a great accomplishment.
Q. Judge, you received 558 ballot box surveys, 22
with additional comments. They contained many positive comments, saying that you were an excellent judge, with a wonderful demeanor who is fair, no-nonsense, and applies rules evenhandedly.

There were six comments that expressed some negative concerns, and those fall into two different categories. The first category was concerning display of temper in the courtroom, and acting as a bully. What response would you offer to this comment?
A. I have -- I have no idea how that comes about. I try to be even-tempered. I try to be -- treat everyone fairly. You know, somebody may have caught me on a bad day, maybe somebody had a bad ruling. I just don't know. It's anonymous. I have really no idea how to respond to it.

But like I told you, if I was going to anger management, maybe that will help. No, seriously, I just -I don't know how -- I've never had anybody complain. But only five out of all that's I guess a pretty good average.
Q. Yes, sir. The other -- the other category was that you displayed bias in favor of plaintiffs.
A. Well, when you make rulings, I assume some people think you're biased towards one side or the other. I was practicing in Bamberg for 30 years, and I did lot of plaintiffs work. I also did a lot of defense work. And
maybe, perhaps, some people perceive rulings that go adverse to me being biased. I certainly try not to be. I hope I'm not. And I'm conscious of that as I move along. But we do a --
Q. Judge --
A. We do a lot civil work. We have our civil docket in good shape. And I haven't had anybody complain to me, other than that anonymous.
Q. Judge, there were a couple of matters that you disclosed on your PDQ, about lawyers. One of which, you were sued by a former client. Could you please explain the nature and the disposition of those lawyers?
A. I reported a man named Willie Carver, who was -who had killed his wife, or alleged to have killed his wife. He was found guilty in Barnwell County. He after the fact filed a case against me -- or a suit against me alleging that $I$ did not perfect his appeal, didn't file a notice of appeal. That case was dismissed with prejudice, and an affidavit from the Supreme Court that I had timely filed a notice of appeal.
Q. Judge, there also was a record that came back from SLED, listing you as a plaintiff in a securities commodities lawsuit. If you could please explain the nature and the disposition of that suit.
A. That's interesting. The only gift I ever got
from my father-in-law was about $\$ 10,000$. And my wife and I, at my suggestion, we invested in PMS-Policy Management Systems. And in just a short period of time after that, PMS stock went from whatever it was to zero and they went out of business. So we lost all of our money. There was a class action case filed, alleging a certain security clause, and we were the representing plaintiff in that case. It was resolved later on. I don't think I got very much out of it.
Q. Thank you, Judge. A few housekeeping rules --
A. That was before $I$ went on the bench.
Q. Yes, sir. A few housekeeping issues.
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Have you sought or received a pledge or any legislator prior to this date?
A. I have not.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered a condition pledge of support of any legislator -legislator, pending the outcome of this hearing?
A. I have not.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly?
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. Are you familiar with the 48 -hour rule?
A. I certainly am.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have.
Q. And are you aware of the violation being a misdemeanor, to violate the pledging rules, punishable by up to a hundred dollar -- up to a thousand dollar fine and imprisonment of not more than 90 days?
A. I am.

MS. BENSON: I would note that the Midlands Citizens Committee found Judge Early well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience and judicial temperament. They found him qualified in the criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability.

In a comment, the Committee stated they felt Judge Early was a hardworking, fair and dedicated jurist, his people skills and his intelligence also make him an outstanding circuit court judge. In summary, the Committee stated, "Judge Early is a credit to the South Carolina
circuit court, possessing all of the traits most sought after for that position."

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

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much, Ms. Benson. Do any Commission members have any
questions?
SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chair?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, Senator
Martin, you're recognized.
JUDGE EARLY: Hello, Senator.
SENATOR MARTIN: Hey, Judge. Thank you for being here today. We appreciate your service.

JUDGE EARLY: Well, $I$ thank you for all
y'all do for us too.
SENATOR MARTIN: Delighted.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MARTIN:
Q. Let me just ask you. We -- I've asked -- we have been in this part of the screening just this morning, but $I$ am current as to what your views are on our Frivolous Proceedings statute. Have you ever had occasion to sanction someone for --
A. No, sir. I have been -- eleven and a half years, and I've never had a frivolous proceeding brought in my courtroom. Anybody's ever tried to move that it was a frivolous case, I've -- we've just never had it -- I've never had it. And I assume it's got its place. And, obviously, sometimes I think these cases are frivolous. But to the litigants, it's the biggest thing in their lives, mostly -- most of the time.
Q. Sure.
A. And I have not had the opportunity to have to employ that statute. But if it serves its purpose, in certain situations. But maybe that's where that temper came in that day; I thought it was frivolous.
Q. Well, agreed. And, you know, my view of it is, is that there's -- there's a huge number of filings.
A. There are.
Q. And you just got to wonder if all of them meet the standard --
A. They don't, Senator. But you'd be surprised at the number of them that we get rid of by way of pretrial matters, you know, "That case just really doesn't have any merit. You know, you may ought to spend your time doing something else."

Just a comment like that can oftentimes make the lawyers realize, you know, "This is not much to this. We
need to move it out and go do something else."
Q. Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator
Martin. Any other questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none,
Judge Early, we want to thank you very much for being here today.

JUDGE EARLY: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for service on the bench.

JUDGE EARLY: Y'all have a wonderful day.
Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: That will conclude this portion of the -- of our screening process. Judge, we -- as you know, the record will remain open. And there is a possibility you could be called back until such time --

JUDGE EARLY: I'm available.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you so much for your service and for being here with us today.

JUDGE EARLY: Thank you very much. Thank y'all.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Have a good day. (Candidate excused.)
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REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Good morning, Judge Cothran.

JUDGE COTHRAN: Good morning.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Good to have you with us here today.

JUDGE COTHRAN: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: First of all, let me apologize on behalf of the Commission, that we are distracting you from your busy and demanding responsibility on the bench. We know you could be accomplishing a lot here today, but we appreciate you being here so that we can go through this process, formally, with all of our judges and give some increased level of confidence to -- to the citizens of South Carolina, that we're all keeping our eye on the ball.

Have you -- as you will recall, you produced answers to the personal data questionnaire sometime ago. Is that personal data questionnaire complete and correct -correct and up-to-date?

JUDGE COTHRAN: Yes, as far as I know.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: It is in no need of amendment at this time?

JUDGE COTHRAN: Not that I'm aware of.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Judge, would you have any objection to it being included as a part
of the record of your sworn testimony today?
JUDGE COTHRAN: No, I do not.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Are there any objections?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's
so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 10 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of Ralph
Ferrell Cothran, Jr. dated July 31st, 2015)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the
Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuing to serve on the bench. We have been guided in that process by the nine evaluative criteria that are dictated by statute.

We've received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election. Congratulations. And there are no witnesses here to testify today, other than yourself.

You have previously met your screening attorney, and we would ask that you respond to his questions.

JUDGE COTHRAN: Okay.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
MR. DAVIDSON: Judge Cothran, you should
have before you the sworn statement you provided to the Commission. Are there any amendments you'd like to make at this time?

JUDGE COTHRAN: No.
MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask
the Judge Cothran's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 11 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of Ralph Ferrell Cothran, Jr. dated July 31st, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON:
Q. Judge Cothran, after serving for nine years as a circuit court judge, could you please explain to the Commission why you'd like to continue to serve?
A. Okay. I have enjoyed serving the citizens of South Carolina, the last ten years. It's been a pleasure and an honor. I have tried to create an environment in my courtroom, where the citizens have a fair and unbiased opportunity to resolve their differences. And I spent many years on the other side of the bench, trying cases. And
any time you come to court, it's stressful. And it's stressful for the litigants, it's stressful to everyone there.

And so I've done everything I can as a judge to not to increase that stress. It is -- it's easy for this job to go to your head. It is not about me. It is about the citizens of this state. And so I've done everything I can as a judge to be sure that my mood, my personality doesn't enter in to the equation whatsoever. It's created an environment where they feel comfortable in litigating. And for me to do my job fairly, and know the rules of evidence, and try to present a forum that they can resolve their differences.

And I've traveled throughout the state. I've enjoyed it. I've met a lot of great people. And we have an incredible state, and we've got an incredible bunch of lawyers and clerks of courts and staff. And I have really enjoyed the job. And, hopefully, I can serve the citizens in the future.
Q. Thank you.
A. It's a great job.
Q. Judge Cothran, as you know, the Commission
received 326 ballot box surveys regarding your candidacy, with nine additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"A true giant of a judge. Fairest, most professional, most efficient, most experienced and most well regarded judge in the state."

MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to
report that zero of the written comments expressed concerns.

EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MR. DAVIDSON:
Q. Judge Cothran, at this time I have just a few housekeeping questions to roll through, quickly. Have you sought or received a 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 a commitment till 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes, I do -- 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 one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes.

MR. DAVIDSON: I would also note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee reported Judge Cothran was qualified in the criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. The Committee found him well qualified in all of the remaining criteria. I would also note that any concerns raised regarding the candidate during the investigation were incorporated into my questioning today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. And do any members of the Commission have any questions? Yes, Dean?

MR. WILCOX: I don't have a question. I just -- I think it is wonderful to have a candidate -- or a judge -- sitting judge come before us with the -- the comments that they got in the -- the clear sense you have of not adding to the pressure of being in the courtroom and instead resolving that. I just thank you very much for bringing that record to us.

JUDGE COTHRAN: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Martin,
you're recognized.
SENATOR MARTIN: Judge, I wanted to echo
that. Demeanor is very, very important, and temperament in a judge. You've obviously demonstrated your understanding of that, since there were no anonymous comments. Which I sometimes wonder about, just how unfair that can be, 'cause you don't even know what the circumstances were, or anything like that. But I just appreciate your service and your willingness to continue to serve. You're obviously putting yourself very admirably. And we appreciate your service.

JUDGE COTHRAN: Thank you so much.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy?
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman, I'd just
echo. And I've worked with him before -- before he was a
judge and since he's been a judge, and I echo the comments.
JUDGE COTHRAN: Thank you, Senator.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Cothran, thank you so much. That concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report's published. And you may be called back at such time, if that need should arise.

Again, we thank you for your service to South Carolina on the bench, and we look forward to many years more. Thank you, sir.

JUDGE COTHRAN: Thank you so much.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We're going to take a five-minute break.
(Off the record.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Good morning,
Judge Gibbons.
JUDGE GIBBONS: Good morning.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: It's good to have you with us today.

JUDGE GIBBONS: I'm glad to be here. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We know that you can be doing great things on the bench today. And we appreciate you taking the time to be with us.
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JUDGE GIBBONS: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Gibbons, if you'd please raise your right hand and be sworn.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE BRIAN M. GIBBONS, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: If you will recall, you provided rather detailed list boxes to your personal data questionnaire. Are those responses correct today? Or is it in need of any amendment or change?

JUDGE GIBBONS: It is correct as of today.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Do you have any
objection to it being made a part of the record of your testimony?

JUDGE GIBBONS: I do not.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any objection by any Commission member?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 12 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of Brian
M. Gibbons dated August 5th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the

Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our investigation and inquiry has been focused on nine statutory evaluative criteria.

At this point in time, we would like to turn
the time over to your screening attorney, and ask that you respond to his questions.

JUDGE GIBBONS: Okay.
MR. STIMSON: Good morning, Judge Gibbons.
JUDGE GIBBONS: Good morning.
MR. STIMSON: You have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over thirty questions.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that Judge Gibbons sworn statement -- are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement, Judge Gibbons?

JUDGE GIBBONS: No, sir.
MR. STIMSON: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that Judge Gibbons sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered
(EXHIBIT NO. 13 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire for Brian M. Gibbons dated August 3rd, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. STIMSON:
Q. Judge Gibbons, after serving two years on the circuit court, why do you want to continue serving as a circuit court judge?
A. Well, I love my job. I love the -- what -- the ability that the job gives me to help others, to help the state of South Carolina, and our local community. I enjoy what I do. I think I am good at it. And it's just -- it's been a blessing to serve my state in this capacity. And I wish to continue to do so.
Q. Thank you, sir. Judge Gibbons, the Commission received 329 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 21 additional comments. The ballot box survey contained the following positive comments:
"Poster child for what a circuit court judge should be. Top notch. Judge Gibbons is an asset to the judiciary in the state of South Carolina."

One of the written comments expressed concerns. It indicated that you issued an illegal sentence, which was house arrest over mandatory minimum time, for the client of the legislator. What response would you offer to this

## concern?

A. I recall that sentence well, because it's come up several times when I've been residing in criminal court, is dealing with a nonviolent adult -- a low-risk adult offender charged with trafficking in marijuana. As I recall that case, it was just over the threshold to make it trafficking. The offender had no prior record. And, you know, I used my discretion -- which I believe I'm allowed under the ambiguity in the statute of legislative intent -to order house arrest.

I believe the sentence on that case, I maxed him out at ten years. I suspended it upon a one-year mandatory minimum. I just allow him to serve it on house arrest, and I gave him -- if I -- if I'm correct, five years of probation on top of that.

That issue's come up numerous times, not just in front of me, but other judges. It's my understanding that, that issue is being addressed by the Legislature. I hope it's addressed, because there's a difference between what's classified as a violent crime under the drug statutes versus a nonviolent, low-risk offender. And that's the ambiguity upon which $I$ relied in sentencing the way I did.
Q. Thank you. I just have a few housekeeping issues to finish up with, Judge Gibbons. Have you sought or received a 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 this process on your behalf?
A. No.
Q. Have you contacted any members of this

Commission?
A. No.
Q. Do 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 of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more

## than 90 days?

A. Yes.
Q. Thank you, Judge Gibbons.

MR. STIMSON: At this time, I would note
that the Piedmont Citizens Committee found Judge Gibbons qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. The Piedmont Citizens Committee found Judge Gibbons well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

I would note that the Piedmont Citizens Committee reported that Judge Gibbons is a hardworking and enthusiastic judge, who combines a great deal of thoughtfulness and common sense. The Committee was struck by his evident diligence and conscientiousness, and considers him a fine circuit court judge.

I would note for the Committee, and for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Gibbons were incorporated into the questioning of him today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: thank you very much. Do any commission members have questions of Judge Gibbons? Senator Malloy is recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: I just will say that he is very practical. I've seen the response to the question on physical health. And as a plus-guy, I appreciate it. I've had a chance to witness him over the years, and he does take his personality with him. He's a practical judge. He plays a guitar okay. And he entertains the judges at all the conferences. And I think that, that's a real testament as to a -- that they have to take their personalities with them. And I appreciate the comments that they made as to his service on the bench. He's made the transition from the family court to the circuit court, since.

So thank you for that, Judge.
JUDGE GIBBONS: Thank you, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Other questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none,
Judge Gibbons, thank you so much for being with us today. Thank you for your service to South Carolina, by being on the bench.

As you know, the record will remain open until your report is published. And you could be called back at such time, if that need should arise. Until then, thank you so much. Again, we appreciate it.

JUDGE GIBBONS: I thank all of you-all. (Candidate excused.)
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REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Addy, it's good to have you with us today.

JUDGE ADDY: Good to see you, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. We know you could be accomplishing a great deal by being on the bench today. But we appreciate you taking the time to be with us.

JUDGE ADDY: I appreciate you having me.
Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Addy, if we could start by swearing you in.

JUDGE ADDY: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Would you raise your right hand.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE FRANK ROBERT ADDY, JR., being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Before we get into the meat of the matter, I think you have a special guest with you.

JUDGE ADDY: I do. This is my son. Some of y'all know Robert. But he is in -- he's 17 and in the 11th grade. And my wife could not make it today, so he volunteered last night to miss school and come up here.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Well, you've got a good support team. Robert, it's good to have you with us today.

Judge, thank you so much for taking the time to be with us. If you will recall, you provided responses to the personal data questionnaire that was provided to you. Is that correct today? Or is it in need of any change or amendment?

JUDGE ADDY: I did have one amendment. And it just relates to CLEs that I have attended since I filed it. I don't know if you necessarily want that amended, but that's the --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Okay. We will be happy to take that. We'll have staff come up and receive it from you.

JUDGE ADDY: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: With regard to personal data questionnaire as now amended, would you have any objection to having it included as a part of the record --

JUDGE ADDY: No.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- of your sworn testimony today? Is there any objection by Commission member?
(No response.)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 14 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of Frank Robert Addy, Jr. dated August 4th, 2014)
(EXHIBIT NO. 15 - Requested Amendment to Personal Data Questionnaire of Frank Robert Addy, Jr. dated November 18th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Addy, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. As a part of that investigation, we have focused on the nine statutory evaluative criteria. There are no witnesses present to testify today against you, and there have been no affidavit filed in opposition to your election. Congratulations.

JUDGE ADDY: Good.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: At this point we would like to turn it over to your screening attorney, and we'd ask you to respond to these questions.

JUDGE ADDY: Certainly.
MR. STIMSON: Good morning, Judge Addy. JUDGE ADDY: Good morning.

MR. STIMSON: You have before you the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over
thirty questions. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?

JUDGE ADDY: No, sir. That's accurate.
MR. STIMSON: Thank you. At this time, Mr.
Chairman, I'd like to ask that Judge Addy's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 16 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Sworn Statement of Frank Robert Addy, Jr. dated August 5th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. STIMSON:
Q. Judge Addy, after serving five years on the circuit court, why do you want to continue serving as a circuit court judge?
A. Well, as I put in the -- in the paperwork that I filed earlier, I do enjoy the job. I feel like I'm pretty good at it. I feel like I'm making a difference on the court and in peoples' lives and in the system. And I would love to be able to continue doing it.
Q. Thank you. Judge Addy, the Commission received 353 ballot boxes surveys regarding you, with 28 additional
comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained some of the following comments -- positive comments, excuse me.
"The bench needs more judges like Judge Addy. Judge Addy is an excellent judge to appear front of. He is very open, honest, and engaged in the process. He has been a remarkable judge. Excellent."

One of the comments we received did express a concern. It indicated that you can sometimes be a bit heavy-handed with your sentencing. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. I imagine that, that, at times, perhaps, could be true -- or at least that perception could be true. There are times where, in all honesty, a maximum sentence is appropriate in my opinion. And very often -- you know, you may not like having to impose the maximum, or a hefty sentence, but its simply necessary, for whatever reason. Perhaps the person has a bad criminal history, maybe it's simply a matter of societal self-defense. A number of factors.

But I imagine that at times, certainly, I could see where someone would get that perception. I don't always, of course, give the maximum. Quite often, especially on pleas -- if were talking about a plea of guilty, more often than not the person gets a great deal of
credit for admitting their guilt and coming forward in doing that. And even more so, if they're doing it promptly, as opposed to delaying the proceedings unnecessarily. So I suppose it's a little bit of both. But I always try to give a sentence that $I$ think is appropriate.
Q. Thank you, Judge Addy. At this time we just have a few housekeeping issues to take care of. 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 a 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 this 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, sir.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. STIMSON: I would note that the Piedmont Citizens Committee found Judge Addy qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. The Committee found Judge Addy well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

I would also note that the Piedmont Citizens Committee reported Judge Addy as polite -- "Judge Addy's polite, humble demeanor complements his enormous energy for his job, and razor-sharp mind." The Committee unanimously considers him to be an excellent circuit court judge.

I would note for the Committee, and for the
record, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Addy were incorporated into the questioning of him today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Are there questions binding Commission member?

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I just have a quick comment for the -- for the Committee. I have not had the opportunity to try a case in front of Judge Addy, but one of my law partners tried a murder case for several days -- I think maybe a week. And as an anecdote, when the trial was over, whatever the result was -- I don't remember -- maybe I do -- but he -- what he wanted to talk about was what a good trial he ran, and how fair and down the middle you were on some of the really contentious legal issues, that he just felt like you gave the defendant a very fair shake in terms of considering the law, what was on the books, where it was in the process in the Supreme Court, and everything else on that particular issue.

And he had a lot of very positive things to say about the way you ran your courtroom. And for the Committee, when you get feedback like that on a -- from a judge -- from someone that you trust, it's important and very good. I appreciate the job you're doing.

JUDGE ADDY: Well, thank you. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr.
Bannister. Senator Martin.
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Judge, welcome. Good to -- good to have you with us. I appreciate your service on the bench. But I noticed Counsel didn't mention this comment about being too old for the position.

JUDGE ADDY: We had a laugh about that, actually. Yes, I think there was a comment that I was -that I had to have been approaching retirement age. And they're either confusing me with my father, who has been dead for almost twenty years now, or my grandfather who would be 110 now. So I really don't think that person made a connection there.

SENATOR MARTIN: I've had that -- I had that said about me, too, in my last election.
(Off-the-record discussion.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Let me ask you this.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MARTIN:
Q. In your time on the bench -- and we've got this Committee -- we had a comment that sort of provoked this line of thought about the idea of frivolous proceedings. We had a Frivolous Proceedings act where we spell out how that is to be invoked when it's needed. Have you ever had occasion to see that applied in your court?
A. Not that $I$ can recall. Quite honestly, in most of my tenure, they have been keeping it pretty close to home in the 8th Circuit. And, quite honestly, we -because we don't have -- were not running common pleas all the time, and so we tend to use -- the lawyers there are pretty good and fairly professional about not bringing garbage cases, for lack of the better phrase. Because, quite honestly, the last thing that you want to devote time to is a case that has no merit. And those end up getting resolved, in some way short of trial, either through a 40(j), or they'll voluntarily admit that it's not going anywhere and they'll dismiss it.

I have not experienced that, or really had much in the way to do with frivolous proceedings. Because I do move around within the circuit a great deal, the common pleas side of things, I very often leave to my assistant, and she will make sure that we have things to try, date certains, everything lined up. Because she's to work in the clerk of court's office, that's why I hired her, is to try to help manage the docket when I am not in the office. And she is very good at that.

But we have not had much contact, really -- or I've not had much contact. And I think the other judges in the Eighth really haven't had much experience with frivolous proceedings.
Q. I think it one gets -- one gets made, it pretty well gets through the discussion process, it gets withdrawn?
A. That once going away, yes, sir. It's not going to -- we're not going to squander time to try that. In Abbeville County, we only get two terms of court per year for common pleas. Greenwood, maybe six. Laurens gets more. Newberry doesn't get a lot. So we don't have a lot of time to waste.
Q. Well, obviously, the concern I have is, you know, you don't see a lot of it. And the fact that they are filed to begin with, causes the other party to have to respond --
A. Sure.
Q. -- and bear the expense of responding and that type of thing. And that was just a concern that $I$ felt like needed to be asked about.
A. So much stuff happens, as you're well aware, on the -- on the common pleas side, that does not involve judicial intervention, a lot of things get resolved or kicked or what have you. So there's -- when you're riding the bench, I don't maybe get exposed to a lot of the behind-the-scenes things that take place. Unless it's a CPNJ, and I'm actually having to deal with some aspect that case. At which point, you can usually take older people
aside and say, "Look, here's the result is going to end up happening."

And then you just -- you do it. But I've never really had much exposure, at least on the $C P$ side. It may be different -- it may be different up your way or in Greenville or Columbia. But I've only had one common pleas term in Greenville in the last five years, a CPNJ in Charleston one time. And that was it as far as the larger circuits.
Q. Thank you very much. And thank you again for your service.
A. I appreciate it. It's a pleasure to see you-all again.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy is recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair, I would just ask Judge Addy -EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Judge Addy, number one, first of all, I noticed you say "CPNJ." We only have -- everybody on here is a lawyer, except for maybe one and a half. My chairman is a -- plays a lawyer most of the time. We call him Judge Martin a lot of times. I'm speaking to the non-lawyers in here, I said there's really maybe one and half. Mr. Mack doesn't practice law, and Judge Martin doesn't practice law

SENATOR MARTIN: Justice Martin.
Q. Justice Martin doesn't practice law, but he oversees lawyers. Whenever you're talking about CPNJ, you are speaking of --
A. Common pleas non-jury.
Q. Yeah. Common -- common pleas non-jury. And the justice had asked you about frivolous proceedings. Is it your experience that these cases are normally resolved to during motions to dismiss and summary judgment matters and that kind of thing? And a lot of times, folks that are employing defense counsel, since it's a case after the case, they don't want to spend more money to pursue. Just like my daddy says, "Why did throw good money after bad money?"
A. Right.
Q. And so a lot of times you don't see that. And so as we continue to go down that road, we'll probably need to -- we want to address that issue, address it in another procedural way. Would you -- would you sort of agree with that?
A. I would generally agree with that. And also understand, a lot of times a client will come in and sell a lawyer a bill of goods. And then after a little bit of discovery, the lawyer realized, "Well, I was -- I was
hooted, somewhat. You know, my client wasn't exactly shooting straight with me."

And at that point in time, most of the lawyers I know, they'll fire the client, or $40(j)$ the case, and say, "Look, you're just going to have to take the file somewhere else. You weren't straight with me."

And so I can see where a lot of cases, perhaps, do get filed. But as far as those cases coming to my attention -- I mean, we try some -- I tried two medical malpractice cases in Laurens County, I've got another one coming up shortly. We try these cases, that in other places they would take two weeks to try, and I tell the lawyers we got to do it in five days, because I got out of here and I'm trying something else next week. I've got a murder case in Greenwood that I've got a do. And so we -you know, we try serious cases.
Q. Right. And I appreciate the transition that you have made from being a probate judge, several years ago, to the circuit court bench to get the respect that you've earned.

One of the comments that they had mentioned -- as you know, I've been a person that has been doing sentence reform for a period of time. And one of the comments was that the you're heavy-handed on sentencing. I would assume that they are talking about violent crimes.
A. That is correct. Most of the time, yes, I mean, you -- you're dealing with a body, you're dealing with someone who has been brutally raped or -- and very often, it's a repeat offender. And that's where --
Q. Right.
A. -- it becomes a function of societal self-defense more than anything else sometimes.
Q. Right. And I know that we have increased our incarceration of those who are violent criminals up to about 68 percent. And I just want to just make certain as we go forward, that we are cautious that our nonviolents, that we are seeking alternative sentencing for them. And I hope that you would consider that.
A. And I do. And that's something that we were actually commenting on earlier, while we were in the holding room -- it was myself and Judge -- I believe Judge Gibbons. And we were talking about the most expensive real estate in South Carolina is not oceanfront, it's the cells that we put people in, and those have to be reserved for folks that are dangerous.
Q. Right. And I would like to report to you that we have closed three and a half prisons in South Carolina in the last five years.
A. Probably moving in the right direction.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator

Malloy. Any other questions or comments?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none,
Judge Addy, thank you so much for being here with us today. 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 called back at such time, if that need should arise.

Until that time, thank you so much for all that you do. And thank you for your service to South Carolina. Thanks for being here.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We're going to take a five-minute break.
(Off the record.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Let's bring the next candidate in, please. Judge Hill, it's good to have you with us today. Thank you for joining us.

JUDGE HILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We apologize for dragging you away from the business of the court today. Thank you for being here.

JUDGE HILL: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Would you please raise your right hand and be sworn.
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## WHEREUPON:

THE HONORABLE DAVID GARRISON HILL, III, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Hill, you were -- you provided answers to the personal data questionnaire, some time ago. Is -- are those responses still correct? Or are they in need of any amendment at this time?

JUDGE HILL: They are correct. I know of no amendment necessary.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Would you have any objection to responses to your personal data questionnaire being made a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE HILL: No, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Does any Commission member have any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 17 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of David Garrison Hill dated August 4, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: The Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly reviewed your qualifications for the bench. That inquiry has focused on the nine statutory evaluative criteria. We have received no opposition -- no affidavits filed in opposition to your election. And there are no witnesses here to testify, except for yourself, Judge.

Would you now please turn your attention to your screening attorney, and respond to any questions he may have.

JUDGE HILL: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Real quick before we begin, for the committee members that are here. Judge Hill and I were partners -- actually, I was not a partner. You were a partner and I was an associate back then, but we were in the same firm for a period of time a while back. I believe Judge Hill asked somebody in my firm if we had somebody -- a courier or somebody going to Columbia. When he asked that question about original signatures being delivered, I talked to Elizabeth Brogdon, just because I didn't understand why an original signature versus a fax copy was part of our rules, which apparently it is. But the deadline and the original delivery got me curious about what that issue -- I know we had another candidate asking
about the original signature. But $I$ was also confused by that.

So just for the committee members, we do require original signatures now. I was curious about handdelivering documents when we do you, you know, have electronic filing and other stuff. So go ahead. The two of us never had a conversation, but it was -- I was just curious what original signatures needed to be delivered down here by a particular time.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And I think that was with regard to the letters of recommendation they had to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Yeah, and I was -

- is that what -- I just knew that you had to have the original signatures on something, and $I$ was curious why a copy --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Ms. Brogdon has that --

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: -- wouldn't suffice.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Ms. Brogdon says that's okay. Please proceed. MR. ODOM: Good morning, Judge Hill. JUDGE HILL: Good morning. MR. ODOM: You have before you the sworn
statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions.

JUDGE HILL: Yes, sir.
MR. ODOM: Are there any amendments you
would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?
JUDGE HILL: No, sir.
MR. ODOM: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask
that Judge Hill's sworn statement be entered into --
entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 18 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of David Garrison Hill dated August 4th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. ODOM:
Q. Judge Hill, after serving nearly 12 years on the circuit court, why do you desire to continue serving as a circuit court judge?
A. Well, I think my perspective is broad, like most peoples, when you get a little bit older, and so you become more interested in things that are bigger than yourself. And two things that are bigger than I am -- or anybody --
is a community, your state.
And the second is principles. And the principle that I'm fashioned by is the rule of law. And this -- this position gives me the very rare and fortunate privilege to work with the rule of law and in furtherance of our community. So it's a -- something that $I$ truly enjoy and hope to continue doing.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge, the Commission received 340 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 37 additional comments. The ballot box surveys, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"Judge Hill is the embodiment of justice."
Another said that, "Judge Hill is maybe the best I have known in every category. Integrity, intellect, fairness, judicial temperament, sense of humor. About all we could ask for."

Only one of the written comments expressed any concerns, and that was about your demeanor. Judge Hill, could you tell the Commission what do you think the appropriate demeanor for a judge should be?
A. Well, the appropriate demeanor ought to include patience, first of all. It ought to include a very evenkeeled temperament and it ought to include a temperament that is consistent. I think there are few things worse than going into a courtroom and not knowing what kind of
mood the person up on the bench is going to be that day. So I think allowing people to be heard is a -one of the most important things that we do. So that is something that is a product of patience, and letting people -- and sometimes that's all they really want is to be heard. So I try to be engaged. I don't try to interrupt lawyers or -- or parties, or try their cases for them. I let them do it. I try to ask questions that are not only important to me, but important to them, to know that they're being listened to by some semi-reasoning creature. And so I think I also talked about temperament and demeanor in my questions -- or answers to the questions. But that's essentially my belief.
Q. Thank you, Judge. And only just a few more procedural questions. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you sought -- have you been offered a condition of 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 this 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're prohibited from seeking a pledge or a commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. I do.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have.
Q. And as a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules --
A. I am.
Q. -- that is, it is a --
A. I'm sorry.
Q. That's okay. -- it's a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. (Nods head.)

MR. ODOM: And, Mr. Chairman, I note that the Upstate Citizens Committee reported that Judge Hill was 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 found that, based on the evaluative criteria, Judge Hill meets and exceeds the requirements of each area.

I further note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation, regarding Judge Hill, were incorporated into the questioning today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you so much.
Are there any questions by Commission members?
SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, Senator
Martin is recognized.
SENATOR MARTIN: I just have a brief comment.

Judge Hill, it's good to see you today. We appreciate your service. Obviously, I reside in your circuit, and have very great admiration for you and the outstanding job you've done on the bench. I just want to share with the members of the Commission, that everything I've heard about Judge Hill has been very, very positive. And we appreciate his -- appreciate his outstanding service.

JUDGE HILL: Well, thank you, Senator. I'm very grateful for those remarks.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator
Martin. Other questions or comments?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge Hill, thank you so much for being with us today.

This concludes this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. And you could be called back at such time if that need should arise.

Well, with that, we want to thank you for your service to South Carolina, and for being with us today.

JUDGE HILL: Thank you very much. And thank you for serving on the Commission. I would like to thank Mr. Odom and Ms. Brogdon and Ms. Crawford for all -- help and assistance they gave throughout this process.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much, sir. Have a good day. (Candidate excused.)
(Off-the-record discussion.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Members of the Commission, Steve John has -- is my resident judge. It's good to have him here today.

SENATOR MALLOY: And I would add that Steve -- Judge John and I have done several things together in
the last year --
JUDGE JOHN: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MALLOY: -- including breaking bread
in the Hartsville area. And I had a chance to appear in front of him, before, as well.

JUDGE JOHN: Thank you, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge John, it's great to have you here today. We apologize for pulling you away from the bench, today, and making you drive through storm conditions to get here.

JUDGE JOHN: That's all right. I appreciate it.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We know you could be accomplishing a great deal on moving the docket forward. And are you in Horry County this week?

JUDGE JOHN: I'm actually in Georgetown this week, in criminal court in Georgetown.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We know you could be accomplishing a great deal there today. So thank you for being here --

JUDGE JOHN: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- and part of the process. Judge John, would you -- usually you're swearing me in.

JUDGE JOHN: That's all right.
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REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I get to swear you
in today.
JUDGE JOHN: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Would you please raise your hand and be sworn.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE STEVEN H. JOHN, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge John, as you will recall, you provided responses to the personal data questionnaire that this Commission provided. Are those answers still correct as of today? Or are the answers in need of any amendment to bring them up-to-date?

JUDGE JOHN: No, sir. I'm aware of no amendments that need to be -- need to be made, other than the one that $I$ sent in after the questionnaire was finished. But that's part of the questionnaire that's here today. And I'm fine with everything that's in there.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Very well. Would you have any objection to your personal data questionnaire, as amended, being included as a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE JOHN: No, sir. I'd be glad for it to be so.
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REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Said any Commission member have an objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 19 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable Steven H. John dated August 3rd, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge John, this Commission has thoroughly involved your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the nine evaluated -- evaluative criteria that are dictated to us by statute. This proceeding of -- proceeding arises as somewhat as a culmination of that process.

We received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, and there are no witnesses here to testify, today, other than yourself.

We would ask, now, if you would kindly turn your attention to Ms. Simpson, your screening attorney, and respond to her questions.

JUDGE JOHN: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
MS. SIMPSON: Good morning, Judge John. You have before you the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions. Are there any
amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?

JUDGE JOHN: No, ma'am. I do not.
MS. SIMPSON: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I
would like to ask that Judge John's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 20 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Steven H. John dated July 30th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MS. SIMPSON:
Q. Judge John, after serving nearly 14 years on the circuit court bench, why do you want to continue to serve as a circuit court -- a circuit court judge?
A. The first thing I would say is, I mean, I -- I truly love my job. I'm one of the fortunate people in this world that I love going to work. I will tell you that I was asked a question by the attorneys in the screening to -- if I have a bad day -- and I told them I don't really have bad days. I've got challenging days. But I really don't think I have bad days going to work, 'cause I love
going -- going to work.
That aside, I believe I do a good job for the citizens of this state. I do my best to be prepared all the time, and to work hard at my job. And I think with that dedication I put into it, I -- I do a good job. And I appreciate having the ability to continue on doing it.
Q. Thank you. The Commission received 440 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 33 additional comments. The ballot box surveys, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"Honorable and hardworking. I go in front of many judges, and Judge John is the most efficient judge that I go in front of. Also, he is the picture of professionalism and a great judge. He gives each litigant the opportunity to present their position, and applies the law to the facts as well as any circuit court judge I have observed or appeared before. Pleasant and well prepared."

Seventeen of the written comments expressed
concerns. Several comments indicated you lack patience with lawyers and litigants. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. There is a expression in -- that's going around in football now, it's called self-evaluation or selfscouting. And over the years, I've tried to do that. By nature, I am a direct person. And looking back on it, I
know that $I$ am a much better judge now than $I$ was when $I$ started. When I started, frankly, I was too direct and too much to the point. And if you get that reputation, it is hard to change. I have made it a point to work on that, and to, you know, not have that be a concern of anyone. I think those concerns, honestly, I believe are in the past. I think that I've, best I can, tried to address those.

And, again, understanding $I$, you know, try to get to the point of things. You know, in non-jury court, we have so many matters that come up, that we're trying to go maybe towards the federal system where they send all the stuff to you ahead of time. I've tried to get lawyers to do that, because if lawyers will do that -- I read every single page, every sentence, every period that's in everything that they send to me. But if they come to you, and you've got 25 summary motions, and they drop this mound of things in front of you, we've got to get to a point where we get to the point of why we're there. And that -I think, in the past I've been more direct than I probably needed to be. But that's my statement to that.
Q. Other concerns indicated that you have a poor judicial temperament and that you're often discourteous toward attorneys and litigants. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. I would not agree with that. I do my best to
give everybody a full and complete opportunity to make their presentation. I think if you ask anyone, when we have jury court, I go out of my way to make sure that the people that are there, the jurors are taken care of. We do not waste their time. You know, I try -- you know, when you say court starts at 9:30, we're going to start at 9:30 because we've got people there that we have drug out of their homes to do our business. And so I'm going to take care of them.

Ever since I've been a judge, every time I've had a jury trial, I've sent a letter out to every single juror that has been on that jury, and given them a questionnaire and a return-stamped envelope to send back to me their comments. And I've kept them all. There are enumerable ones in there, saying they appreciate the concern that the court has given to them, paid attention to the time, and informed them of what's going on.

You know, I -- you know, I expect people to -something that does get me upset, you have got people there that are expecting and demanding their lawyer to do a job for them. They need help. That's why they're there. And when I see a lawyer who is lazy, has not done his work, is not prepared to represent that person and give them the help they need, that bothers me. You know, and in -- and, again, in the past, I've probably been more direct about
that, than I should have been. And I don't do that anymore. If $I$ feel a concern, I'll take them to the office, and say, "You've got to fix this."

But, you know, that -- if anything -- if any of those come from that, that's probably where it comes from. Because I'm expecting that lawyer to be there to help their client, to help that person that's there. And that's why they're there.
Q. Thank you. In your interview, we discussed a lawsuit that was filed against you in 2001, that just recently appeared on your SLED report. It regarded a situation with Desa Ballard. Could you please explain this lawsuit?
A. Don't have any information $I$ can give to you. It didn't come up when I got elected in 2001. It didn't come up in the 2003/2004. It didn't come up in the 2009/2010 review. I got a phone call from a SLED agent, said that they got some computer index from a magistrate's office, said that action was filed, $I$ think they said, like in November, judicially dismissed within a month. Never served.

The only information $I$ got is from the SLED agent, called me and told me. And that's all I can tell you. Don't know anything about it. Never had it. Apparently, it was from a -- from what the SLED agent told
me, the files were destroyed by the magistrate's office. So I wish I could, but I don't know.
Q. Thank you. Just a few housekeeping issues. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered a 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, 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, ma'am, I do.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, ma'am, I am.

MR. STIMSON: I would like to note that the
Pees Dee Citizens Committee report reported that Judge John is qualified. In summary, the Committee stated feedback from multiple sources indicating Judge John is an excellent and fair judge who could be more patient as well as more kind in his comments.

I would just note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigating -- investigation regarding the candidate, were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms.
Simpson. Do any members of the Commission have any questions?

SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Martin is
recognized.
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MARTIN:
Q. Judge John, thank you for your service.
A. Thank you, sir.
Q. I appreciate it. I've known you for a long time, and have always enjoyed seeing you here around the halls of the Capitol.

Let me ask you, you mentioned about your courtroom management --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- desire to keep things -- keep the train on the tracks. What has been your experience in regards to possibly the frivolous proceedings? Have you encountered any of that?
A. Well, in looking at the rules, it's -- again, we're not the federal system. It would be difficult to characterize hardly any lawsuit as frivolous. There is -there is always -- you could always find some glimmer of an action that, if you look at the -- look at the pleadings and look at what is stated, I -- you see things that -- you know, you kind of shake your head and say I'm -- you know, if $I$ was lawyer, $I$ wouldn't have taken that case.
Q. Right.
A. But there's -- still, there are things to it. And, again, we not being the federal system, the state system and summary judgement motions, it's very difficult when you have the scintilla of evidence standard that our

Supreme Court has set forth in many cases. It is hard for the state court to step in and end lawsuits that might necessarily should be ended before they go to a trial process. But if you do so, you're -- and it's appealed, you are certain that they'll send it back and said there was that scintilla of evidence, and for it to proceed on.

So until that changes, I think, you know, you're not really going to have much of a change in that regard.
Q. I have -- we had one previous response, along the lines of pre-trial conferencing that can oftentimes, you know, move some of the less desire -- not less desired -the less worthy or meritorious cases out of the way. Do you find that to be the case?
A. It's -- it depends on the lawsuit. Again, if you -- you know, honestly, if it was a strong lawyer, a very capable lawyer, the case would either have been settled or not been brought.
Q. Right.
A. So, again, I'm -- my experience has not been such, as a pretrial conference would -- with a case such as that, is going to do much other than just $g o$ in there and you try the case, and have --
Q. So basically, what you're telling us, if you can verbalize a cause of action, even if it's not likely to withstand even a summary judgement motion, then --
A. It's hard to impose the rule of that -- it really is, the way -- the way it's worded. You know, if there is -- you know, if there is any basis to is, then you just let the process --
Q. -- play itself out.
A. Play itself out. And how -- however it ended, would end.
Q. All right. Thank you very much.
A. Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator
Martin. Dean Wilcox?
EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. Judge, appreciate your service to the state. And thank you for being with us today.
A. Thank you, Dean.
Q. When we see the number of concerns that are expressed, it just requires, I think, a little bit of a look, just to make sure there's not a problem there.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And I just -- and I think all of us share, probably, the frustration you share when you really can't figure out where they come from. It's very hard to know. And there are a lot of explanations from a -- just a unhappy litigant who is unhappy 'cause they lost, to more serious concerns. But there's probably some in-between
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ground of a learning experience, at least, in saying there may be something there.

And you mentioned that you've changed a little bit of how you address the -- the lawyer who is unprepared in your courtroom. Can you just give me a little bit better sense of how that may have changed? 'Cause that could be where some of the perception could have arisen over the years.
A. And as I said -- and a lot of this will -- will come up in a non-jury setting -- not really in a trial setting -- when they're responding to a summary judgement motion. And it's obvious that the lawyer hadn't put much work into the response. You know, as you know, there has to be some kind of filing when the other -- the other party has made a filing and presented evidence, presented affidavits, you can't just rely on pleadings. You've got to put something in there.

And, honestly, I can't tell you the number of times I've had the lawyer just come in, and say, "Well, it's in my pleadings, and, you know, it's -- there's this evidence," and haven't filed anything. And that's -that's frustrating to the court, in that you don't know that basic rule. And I don't want to hurt the litigant. So you end up, honestly, continuing the matter for another time, or that could have been resolved, and we're using up
judicial resources.
And at the beginning of my career, I probably would have said something at that point in time, rather than calling them back in the office and saying, "You just can't do this, okay? You've got to do better than this.
'Cause the next time it happens, I might not be so lenient," and continue it on. So that would be a change.
Q. Essentially, it may be explaining to the lawyer in chambers or something, as opposed to an open court --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- and in the transcript.
A. Yes, sir.

MR. WILCOX: Thank you. That's all, Mr.
Chairman.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any other
questions? Representative Bannister?
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I just have a --
one quick question.
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER:
Q. So Desa --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Desa Ballard never represented you?
A. In -- in an action? No, sir. We had it -- and I'm trying to recall --
Q. I mean, I understand you didn't --
A. -- sixteen --
Q. -- you weren't served with -- you weren't served with a lawsuit, which makes sense you wouldn't know what was in the lawsuit. But it says Desa Ballard filed suit, seeking legal fees.
A. We had -- there was something we had in the past, some time ago. And, again, I'm sorry I just can't -- I know it was there, but, you know, I don't have my files anymore. And, unfortunately, the magistrate's file is -you know, no longer in existence.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm sorry, I wish I could. You know, and if it had come up, you know, in 2001 or 2003 or ' 4 , or 2010 or '11 -- or '9 and '10, you know, it would have been more recent, maybe $I$ would have. But I --
Q. Sure.
A. At this point in time, I just don't have any explanation for you. I'm sorry.
Q. It seemed to coincide with your -- the -- one of the cases regarding professional conduct that was -- I guess it was dismissed or maybe a letter of caution or something was issued in 2000. That's why I asked, 'cause I know she does a lot of that work, and I just --
A. And, again, I -- I'm sorry. I mean, just because of the length of time, I'm -- I really do wish -- and I
wish, you know, the file existed in the magistrate's office, and then I'd be able to -- better able to give you an answer. Like I said it just came like a -- you know, came out of the blue when the SLED agent called. And, you know, I just don't have any memory or recollection. I'm sorry.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Just for the record, I just did a quick search of "Steven John," and there's like 22. And there's about that same number of "John Steven."
(Off-the-record discussion.)
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Thank you. JUDGE JOHN: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any other
questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge John, thank you so much for being with us today. And this will conclude this portion of the screening process.

As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. There is a possibility you could be called back at that time if the -- that need should arise. Until that time, we want to thank you for being with us today. Thank you for your service to South Carolina, by serving on the bench. We appreciate it.
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JUDGE JOHN: Thank y'all very much. I appreciate it.
(Candidate excused.)
(Off-the-record discussion.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Ladies and
gentlemen of the Commission, we have before us the Honorable John Calvin Hayes, III, who is serving on the Circuit Court 16 th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1.

Judge Hayes, it's a pleasure to have you with us today. Thank you for joining us. We recognize you could be accomplishing much on the bench, today, and we apologize for pulling you away, but appreciate you being a part of this important process.

Judge, if you could kindly raise your right hand and be sworn.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE JOHN CALVIN HAYES, III, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, you have -you responded to the personal data questionnaire that this -- this committee provided -- this Commission provided you some time ago. Are your responses still current and correct? Or are they in need of any amendment at this time?
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JUDGE HAYES: I have to admit that I have not reread it, but remembering what I put down, and remembering what's happened in the last few months, nothing of any significance. I have had a birthday, so I'm a little bit older when $I$ filled this out. But other than that, I think it's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Happy birthday, Judge.

JUDGE HAYES: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I thank you. And in that event, would you have any objection to having your responses to the personal data questionnaire included as a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE HAYES: I would not.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much. Is there an objection by any Commission member?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 21 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable John Calvin Hayes, III dated July 31st, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Hayes, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly
investigated your qualifications for continued service on the bench. Our inquiry is focused on the nine statutory evaluative criteria. Today, we've -- as of today, we've received no affidavits in opposition to your election. And there are no witnesses present to testify, other than yourself.

We would ask that you now kindly turn your attention to your screening attorney, and respond to any questions he may have.

JUDGE HAYES: Thank you.
MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Judge Hayes, you should also have before you, the sworn statement that you provided to the Commission.

JUDGE HAYES: I do.
MR. DAVIDSON: Are there any additional -or any amendments that you'd like to make at this time?

JUDGE HAYES: No.
MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask
that Judge Hayes' sworn statement be included in the record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's
so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 22 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable John Calvin Hayes, III dated July 31st, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON:
Q. Judge Hayes, after serving for 24 years as a circuit court judge, could you please explain to the Commission why you'd like to continue to serve?
A. Probably for a variety of reasons. The first is, it's something I truly enjoy. I enjoy working with people, and I enjoy the law. I enjoy -- I'm probably one of the few judges that actually enjoy non-jury week, 'cause -what I call "mental gymnastics," that you go through in trying to out-guess at the Calhoun Building and the Supreme Court building across the street. But sometimes I've been successful, but not every time.

But it's a -- it's been my career after 20 years of practicing law in the legislature, and I chose to become a judge. And that was my swan song. And -- and I enjoy doing it. I'd like to consider -- my wife tells me I'm sort of a people person, so I enjoy the comradery with the other judges and the interaction with the members of the Bar.

Those of you who are not judges probably think that we are -- I hate to call it "aloof," but above
intermingling with those who are going to appear before us. But we have a lot of status conferences, and during trial we have a lot of chamber conferences, so we do get to work very close with the attorneys. And I enjoy it.
Q. Thank you, Judge Hayes. The Commission received 442 ballot box surveys regarding your candidacy, with 29 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"Judge Hayes is an extremely intelligent jurist. He is truly a man of honor and character. A perfect blend of scholar and effective judge."

Judge Hayes, of the 29 comments, one expressed a concern. One comment stated, "Who the litigants are matter greatly to him. Often results-oriented and disinclined to listen."

What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Well, I would -- that would be one I would debate. Because I do not believe there's any credible evidence to support that, other than that comment, quite frankly. Because I work very hard, not only on the bench -- of course, great judges very hardly notice it -- and I decided that as far as my rapport with those who appear before me -- not the litigants, but the other people before me -- that I do not want to be treated like some judges have treated me. And so $I$ use the -- maybe not try it, but
to do unto others as you would have then do unto you.
So that has been my approach in dealing with
litigants and lawyers. As far as impartiality, I work very, very hard to apply the law and make sure that I do not show any favoritism to any side. I don't have, as they say, any dog in any fight that's ever come before me. And as I think $I$ disclosed in my sworn statement, if $I$ do believe there is the appearance of impropriety, I would put it on the record up-front.
Q. Thank you, Judge Hayes. At this time, I just have a few quick questions to go through. Have you sought or received any 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. I know of none.
Q. Have you contacted any members of this

Commission?
A. I have not.
Q. Have you reviewed --
A. Other than you. And you're not --
Q. Correct.
A. -- on the Commission.
Q. Correct.
A. You require me to contact you.
Q. Yes, sir. That's correct.
A. And I might want to put it on the record.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have.
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.
Q. And, lastly, as a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars and imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I understand that.

MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you. I'd also note
that the Piedmont Citizens Committee reported that Judge

Hayes is qualified in the criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. They found him well qualified in all the remaining criteria.

Any issues or concerns that were discovered during the investigation were incorporated during into my questioning today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much. Senator Martin is recognized.
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
members of the Commission.
Judge Hayes, it's good to see you.
JUDGE HAYES: Good to see you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Delighted you're here
today. And just for the benefit of the Commission, I've had -- we've had several of your peers come through here over the last few days, that I've had the privilege to serve with. And I've pointed that out each time, and you were one of those that were among the finest.

JUDGE HAYES: Well, we thank you. We served in the House and I was gone from the Senate before you moved over to --

SENATOR MARTIN: Right. And you -- I think Wes Hayes has about six months on me over there. And I also shared that during that era, before the screening
process developed, there were several members of the Legislature that were elected, like Judge Hayes, very capable, very outstanding members. And we felt like they've become outstanding members of the judiciary, and he has. There are other members that we elected just to get rid of them.

JUDGE HAYES: I'm glad I don't fall into
that --
SENATOR MARTIN: You didn't fall into that category.

EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MARTIN:
Q. Let me -- let me ask you, Judge Hayes, one question that I've been asking -- we have just a brief moment -- in regards to the -- you know, the types of cases that are filed. A lot of litigation, a lot of civil filings, one thing that we attempted to address -- and I'm not sure how it's worked out -- is the frivolous proceedings statute. And from what I gather, it's very rarely, if ever, invoked. Have you ever had an occasion to invoke that?
A. I think I've had one or two where it's been raised.
Q. Right.
A. I had one recently, that was raised in a default matter. And I ruled it had been properly raised, because
the statute has to be by motion after a verdict in favor of the party who says it's frivolous. When this case, there was -- it was a default, and I determined that it didn't apply, that they did not, procedurally get into the ball game. And so I'm familiar with the statute and -- but I've not -- I can't recall ever having to -- had to actually apply it to its fullest extent; that is, to make a ruling or determine -- or deny it other than on that procedural matter.
Q. Sure. Sure. Well, again, I appreciate your service and longstanding career that have benefitted South Carolina. And so we just appreciate your friendship.
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A. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator
Martin. Any other questions or comments?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, I see you have a guest with you today. I don't know if he's your guest or your body guard. Tommy Pope is --

JUDGE HAYES: I didn't see you there. I would accept him as both.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: It's good to have you with us, Representative Speaker Pretend Governor.
(Off-the-record discussion.)

JUDGE HAYES: And I can't take sides into politics, but $I$ did get to -- when Judge Alford retired, at the Christmas party -- I was at a Christmas party, and they set aside part of that to honor, and roast a little bit, Judge Alford. And Representative Pope could not attend, so I was asked to present the flag that he gave to Judge Alford on his behalf. And so I introduced that I was appearing on behalf of Governor Pope.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Good for you, Judg.

JUDGE HAYES: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, thank you so much for being with us today. Thank you for your service on the bench. This concludes this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until such time as the report is published. You could be called back at such time, if that need should arise.

Thank you again for offering, and for your service to South Carolina.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Welcome Judge
Hall.
JUDGE HALL: Good morning -- or afternoon. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Barely afternoon. Ladies and gentlemen, we have before us the Honestly Daniel

Dewitt Hall. He is serving on the Circuit Court 16th Judicial Circuit, Seat 2.

Judge Hall, we are honored to have you with
us. Thank you for joining us.
JUDGE HALL: It's an honor to be here.
Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Judge
Hall, to start things off, if you wouldn't mind, may $I$ swear you in? If you would raise your right hand.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE DANIEL DEWITT HALL, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, if you will recall, you provided detailed responses to a number of questions that were provided in your personal data questionnaire. Could you please inform the Commission whether or not those responses are still current and correct? Or are they in need of any amendment at this time?

JUDGE HALL: They are current and correct.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Would
you have any objection to having that personal data questionnaire included as a part of the record of your testimony today?
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JUDGE HALL: No, I do not.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
objections?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 23 -- Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of Daniel Dewitt Hall dated August 3rd, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Hall, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has been focused on the nine evaluative criteria dictated by statute. As a result of that process, you are with us today.

And there have been no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, and there are no witnesses present to testify other than yourself.

If now you would kindly turn your attention to your screening attorney, and respond to any questions he may have.

JUDGE HALL: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
MR. PEARCE: Good afternoon, Judge. You have before you a sworn statement you provided, with
detailed answers to over thirty questions. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time?

JUDGE HALL: No amendments.
MR. PEARCE: Mr. Chairman, at this time I would ask that, that sworn statement be made an exhibit of the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 24 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Sworn Statement of Daniel Dewitt Hall dated August 3rd, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. PEARCE:
Q. Judge, after serving since January of this year on the circuit court, why do you want to continue serving as a judge?
A. Well, after an extensive time as a judge, a total of about eleven months, I have thoroughly enjoyed it. It's been the -- if you look at my background, it's -- I've had a lot of jobs. It's the -- it is the best job I've ever had.
Q. Judge, the Commission has received 177 ballot box surveys regarding you, with additional comment -- with four
additional comments to it. In the survey there were a number of positive comments, including comments that stated you were an excellent jurist, and an even better man. You had ideal patience that you were -- had all the qualifications to make an outstanding judge, and that you certainly should be reelected.

There was one comment that could be taken as a concern -- or it may just be a comment -- and that comment stated that the jury was still out, but they felt that you would be a good judge. Do you have any response to offer to that statement?
A. I think that's probably a pretty honest assessment of any judge who's only been a judge for eleven months: The jury is probably still out.
Q. I do have some housekeeping questions I need to ask you today, Judge, as well. 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 this process on your behalf?
A. No.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. No.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or a commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of this Commission's report?
A. I understand that.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines regarding pledging?
A. I have.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that it's a misdemeanor, and upon conviction any violator must be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned for not more than 90 days?
A. I'm aware of the penalty.

MR. PEARCE: I would like to note, Mr.
Chairman and members of the Commission, that the Piedmont Citizens Committee reported that Judge Hall is qualified regarding constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability, and was well qualified in all other categories.

And they did provide in their report, the
additional comment that, quote, "We have received a number of reports attesting to Judge Hall's diligence, courtesy, and ability during his relatively brief time on the bench so far. By all accounts, he is a fine circuit court judge."

I would just note for the record, too, Mr . Chairman, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding this candidate, have been incorporated into my questions today. And I don't have any further questions.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much. Are there any questions by any member of the Commission? Ms. Wall?

JUDGE HALL: Yes, ma'am.
EXAMINATION BY MS. WALL:
Q. Judge Hall, as a new judge, how would you describe for us what you think is the appropriate judicial temperament? And do you attempt to apply that as a judge?
A. Well, as a practicing attorney in the court of law, I've often just wanted a judge to be nice to me and listen to my argument, and not embarrass me in front of my clients. And so I try to carry that same demeanor with the attorneys and parties that are in front of me.
Q. Thank you.

MS. WALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms.

Wall.
SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Martin is
recognized.
SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman and members of
the Commission. Judge Hall, we thank you for your service. I just wanted to point out -- of course, I couldn't remember, 'cause we have so many judicial elections, and I haven't been on this commission but maybe three years now, four years --

JUDGE HALL: And there were some before you were on it.

SENATOR MARTIN: Yeah. Yeah. I mean, it goes way back. I just want to commend you for your persistence, and obvious desire to serve on the bench. And I know you're taking that very seriously, as evidence by the efforts you've made. I truly regret that you have come up this quickly after having been elected. I mean, that's just part of the process of you having to go through it again. But we do appreciate and recognize your dedication, and, again, your persistence in desiring to be on the bench. And I just wish you continued -- all the best. JUDGE HALL: Well, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to serve. And I do deeply appreciate the -when this Commission nominated me in the past, to put me in
the position where I could seek election. So I appreciate the work that y'all do. And -- and I think I'm probably a better judge for having to go through the process many, many times. I'm sure y'all particularly care about candidates who repeatedly come in front you. But on the other hand, that's part of the process as well.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Representative
Bannister.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: One quick
comment. There's some of them we don't like and there's some of them we do. It's good -- it's good to see you again --

JUDGE HALL: I'll remember that if you're

```
ever --
```

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: -- six years. JUDGE HALL: -- front of me.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: While it may be readily apparent from the investigative matters before you that he is an excellent jurist, what might not be apparent to you is that he is also a cowboy that can ride, rope, and brand with the best cowboys out there.

JUDGE HALL: I don't do that anymore. A
horse fell on my foot about two years ago, so $I$ had to quit that.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Oh, I see. You
just ride the bench now.
JUDGE HALL: Well, you get to -- at a certain point and state in your life, you're not as quick and as nimble as you used to be. And I've reached that point.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I'm sorry to hear that. Judge, it's a pleasure to have you with us. Thank you for being here today. This will conclude this portion of our screening process.

As you know, the record will remain open until the report's published. And you could be called back at such time, if that need should arise.

Again, we are grateful for your service to South Carolina, by serving on the bench. Thank you for being with us today.

JUDGE HALL: Thank you. Thank you all.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Judge Hall.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Ladies and
gentlemen, that last candidate -- I don't know whether he realized it or not, but he was standing between Senator Martin and lunch. Lunch is here. It is served. So we are going to adjourn and stand at ease for lunch. We will come back at 1:15, at which time we will immediately go into
executive session. So I would ask, if you would, kindly be here promptly at 1:15. Thank you.
(A recess was taken from 12:20 p.m. to $1: 18 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Ladies and
Gentlemen, we are arising out of executive session. We discussed the issue of qualifications of the candidates that have so far been screened today. No votes were taken, no decisions were made. And we're are back on the -- on the record now for the purpose of finding candidates qualified and nominated.

Do we have a motion with regard to the candidates that we have -- we have screened today in terms of -- let me read the names of the candidates that we screened today:

The Honorable James Edward Lockemy, Court of Appeals, Seat 9; The Honorable Edgar Warren Dickson, Circuit Court, 1st Judicial Circuit, Seat 1; The Honorable Diane Schafer Goodstein, Circuit Court, 1st Judicial Circuit, Seat 2; The Honorable Doyet A. Early, III, Circuit Court, 2nd Judicial Circuit, Seat 1; The Honorable Ralph Ferrell Cothran, Jr., Circuit Court, 3rd Judicial Circuit, Seat 1; The Honorable Brian M. Gibbons, Circuit Court, 6th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1; The Honorable Frank Robert Addy, Jr., Circuit Court, 8th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1; The Honorable David Garrison Hill, Circuit Court, 13th Judicial

Circuit, Seat 4; The Honorable Steven H. John, Circuit Court, 15th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1; The Honorable John Calvin Hayes, III, Circuit Court, 16th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1; and The Honorable Daniel Dewitt Hall, Circuit Court, 16th Judicial Circuit, Seat 2.

Do we have a motion? Senator Malloy?
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman, in light of
the appearances that we had today, I have a unanimous consent request. And the unanimous consent request would be that the names that you have listed, that we would find them all qualified and nominated by unanimous consent.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much. And --
REPRESENTATIVE MACK: Second.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And we have a second by Mr. Mack. All those in favor, please raise your hand.

SENATOR MALLOY: You can tell, we don't do unanimous consent --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We can't do unanimous consent. We have to do votes. Okay. Thank you. SENATOR MALLOY: I so move.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: It is by
acclamation. The list of candidates just entered into the record are all found qualified and nominated.

We will now proceed with our screening -MR. WILCOX: All our ballots would we mark them as qualified and nominated?

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, sir.
MR. WILCOX: There was some question
yesterday.
(Off-the-record discussion.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I'm told by staff that, being a unanimous decision, we don't need a ballot.

All right. Proceeding with our screenings. Please bring in The Honorable William J. Wylie, Jr., Family Court, 1st Judicial Circuit, Seat 2.

We have before us, The Honorable William J. Wylie, Jr., Family Court, 1st Judicial Circuit, Seat 2. Judge, it's good to have you with us today. Thank you for joining us.

JUDGE WYLIE: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, if you would please raise your right hand and be sworn.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. WYLIE, JR., being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, you have providing this Commission with responses to the personal
data questionnaire that was given to you early on in this process, and you provided answers to those questions. Are those answers still current and correct? Or is there any need for amendment?

JUDGE WYLIE: They are correct.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much. Do you have any objection to those responses being entered into the record as a part of your sworn testimony?

JUDGE WYLIE: None whatsoever.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much. Is there any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 25 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of William J. Wylie, Jr. dated August 3rd, 2015) REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the statutory nine evaluative criteria. As a result of that process, we have had no applications filed in opposition to your election, and there are no witnesses present to testify except yourself today.

We would ask that if you turn your attention
to Ms. Simpson, and respond to any questions she may have.
JUDGE WYLIE: Certainly.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
MS. SIMPSON: Good afternoon, Judge Wylie.
You have before you the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?

JUDGE WYLIE: No.
MS. SIMPSON: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like that Judge Wylie's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any objections?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 26 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of William J. Wylie, Jr., dated August 4th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MS. SIMPSON:
Q. Judge Wylie, after serving 17 years on the family court bench, why do you want to continue to serve as a family court judge?
A. I continue to feel that this is just a tremendous responsibility, and I -- and I have a -- and a great privilege, as well an honor. And I do have a strong sense of being where $I$ feel like $I$ am well suited. And, quite frankly, I still enjoy this job very much.
Q. Thank you. Judge Wylie, the Commission received 304 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 26 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"An excellent judge of great character, ability, and demeanor. He has an excellent courtroom demeanor and deep understanding of family law. He is a pleasure to appear before. Well respected among many."

Five of the written comments expressed concerns. Similar to a matter discussed in previous screenings, some comments indicated that you've made inappropriate or disparaging comments in the courtroom about witness testimony and lawyers. What response would you offer to these concerns?
A. Well, I would say, first of all, that I'm encouraged by -- you know, I've been in family court over 17 years, but I've been a judge in one capacity or another since 1989. So I guess that's over 25 years. So out of the many, many hundreds of lawyers who've appeared before me, that there would just be a few negative comments is
encouraging.
But at the same time, I take it to heart.
Because I don't want anyone to ever leave my courtroom feeling that they were in any way treated inappropriately. That's not who $I$ am as a judge, it's not who $I$ am as a person. And I do take that to heart and take it to mean that, certainly, there is room for improvement.
Q. Thank you. Some other concerns indicated that you had either failed to make rulings, or your rulings had been delayed, placing the parties in difficult financial circumstances and children in jeopardy. What response would you offer to these concerns?
A. I know of no time where $I$ have failed to rule. I would say that there have been a few times where decisions have been delayed. Sometimes those were inadvertent. I think part of my disclosures was a grievance where a person believed that I had taken an inordinate amount of time to make a ruling, complaining that six months was just simply too long. Well, in reality, I had made that decision, and the ruling -- the order had been filed with the Clerk of Court, but that litigant had apparently dismissed their lawyer and never got a copy of the ruling. So there had been a ruling in place. I am one who occasionally will -takes things under advisement.
I think, typically, at the end of a long trial,
there may be some complicated financial exhibits that have been entered, and things that I do want to be able to take time to reflect over and consider. And things have gotten in the way, at times, of getting a prompt decision. I would say it is my practice to try to have a decision made during the week, in which I take a case under advisement. That hasn't always been the case.

And there are probably have been a few that have gone beyond that. Maybe a very few that have actually fallen through the cracks. And certainly, that is unfortunate. It's one of the reasons why I'm taking matters under advisement, $I$ even invite the attorneys or the self-represented litigants to contact my office if they have not had a decision with two weeks and expect it sooner than that. But I certainly would encourage them to contact me if they have not heard.

My secretary keeps a running list of the matters I've taken under advisement; I mark the docket daily. But I would not stand before you and tell you that there hadn't been a few times that things have fallen through the cracks.
Q. Thank you. Lastly, other concerns indicated that you have -- that you give no guidance for proposed orders, and require unnecessary work by lawyers. What response would you offer to these concerns?
A. Well, I hadn't heard that concern before expressed. I do give guidance by way of a written memorandum -- some more detailed than others. But it has been a tradition, as I grew up as an attorney, the judges announcing their decisions, it was the lawyer's role to prepare the detailed order that was supported by the record.

I always felt as an attorney, that, that, quite frankly, gave me some leeway to craft an order that I believed fully supported my client's position from the record. And have always preferred a sort of general outline of the ruling, as opposed to -- to many details. But I will certainly keep that in mind.

I don't know how else to respond. I don't know the -- I certainly didn't realize that anyone had a complaint that my ruling was not detailed enough and it created difficulty for them. I have had some detailed memorandums go out that came back with just a caption attached to the top of it by the attorney, which was entirely inappropriate, and not a good order. So maybe that's a little bit on the attorney as well, who's making that claim.
Q. Thank you, Judge Wylie. Just a few housekeeping issues. Have you sought or received a 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. 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 this process on your behalf?
A. No.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. No.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or a commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes.

MS. SIMPSON: I would like to note that the Lowcountry Citizens Committee reported that Judge Wylie is qualified as to the constitutional qualifications, physical health, mental stability, and well qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience and judicial temperament.

I would just note for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate, were incorporated into the questioning of the Commission today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms.
Simpson. Representative Bannister is recognized.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to comment on a couple things. Number one, a lot of times at the end of a very contested trial, taking the matter under advisement, even if you know how you're going to rule, is a much better idea; it helps everyone go home and to relax a little bit and not feel like if you rule immediately.

There's -- the cases I've been in, the
litigants would feel like you did not consider their position. So that would be a disservice. Please don't change that. That's a good thing to do. Even if you issue
instructions an hour later, the clients feel like they -you've given it some consideration. When you say, "I'm going to go read all the documents," it makes them feel good. So despite the criticism, don't -- don't change that. That's a good thing.

JUDGE WYLIE: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I had a -- in Greenville, the Clerk of Court, if they get a motion after three o'clock, they don't file it till the next day. So on the tenth day of a motion we consider, the clerk just takes the position you didn't file it in time, despite it being five o'clock at the end of the day. So I'm in touch with -- sometimes, as hard as they work, the clerks don't always get everything done right on time. So I appreciate, perhaps, one of your orders didn't get mailed out. I've had some run-ins with how they operate as well.

And then on the -- there are cases in family court where you have a particular -- I don't know if you do this or not, where there's a real technical issue, and both sides are making a sort of nuanced argument about why they're writing. And on those, sometimes I request that both sides get to send proposed orders. Frankly, 'cause the testimony gets convoluted. And if I can put it in an order so you can read it, I feel like if you have both sides arguments, it's almost like a brief -- it's like a
post-trial brief in the form of an order. So I -- some lawyers might not like that.

But in family court, on some cases, that's a good thing. So of the complaints that people complain about, all those things are good. I like them, so don't stop doing them. That's a positive. It's not a negative.

JUDGE WYLIE: I think that's good advice.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: From one member of this committee who does a lot of family court work, all those things are -- are good. And we're asking -- we're asking the judges that are coming, if there are complaints that are legitimate, that you take those and sort of incorporate them --

JUDGE WYLIE: In a highly effective way.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: -- in how you be a judge. But only if they're legitimate. And I'm just pointing out, a lot of those aren't. So --

JUDGE WYLIE: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Thank you, Judge.
Appreciate you being here.
(Off-the-record discussion.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any other
questions or comments for the judge?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none,

Judge Wylie, thank you so much for being here with us today.

JUDGE WYLIE: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: This -- that
concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. And you could be called back at that time, if such need should arise.

Again, we want to thank you for your service to South Carolina. Thank you for offering again. We appreciate your service and look forward to seeing you again.

JUDGE WYLIE: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Good afternoon.
JUDGE MCLIN: Hello.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: It's good to have you with us today.

JUDGE MCLIN: Thank you for having me. Glad to be here.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for joining us. We have before us The Honorable Nancy Chapman McLin. She is serving on the family court bench, 1st Judicial Circuit, Seat 3.
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JUDGE MCLIN: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Let's start by swearing you in. If you'd raise your right hand, please. WHEREUPON:

THE HONORABLE NANCY CHAPMAN MCLIN, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: As you may recall, we provided you -- the Commission provided you, some time ago, with a personal data questionnaire, which you completed with very thorough answers. Are those responses correct and current as of today? Or is there any need of amendment?

JUDGE MCLIN: No, sir. They're correct. I stand by those responses.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Would you have any objection to those responses being including in -- included in the record today as part of your sworn testimony?

JUDGE MCLIN: Not at all.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Are there any objections?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
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(EXHIBIT NO. 27 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable Nancy Chapman McLin dated August 5th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the
Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our inquiry has focused on your service and the nine evaluative criteria. And we -- as a result of that process, we have received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, and there is no one here to testify in this matter other than yourself.

We would ask that you turn your attention to your screening attorney, and respond to any questions that she may have.

JUDGE MCLIN: Yes, ma'am.
MS. ANDERSON: Good afternoon, Judge McLin. JUDGE MCLIN: Hello.

MS. ANDERSON: You have before you, the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions. Are there any amendments that you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?

JUDGE MCLIN: No, ma'am.
MS. ANDERSON: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that Judge McLin's sworn statement be
entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 28 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Nancy Chapman McLin dated August 7th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MS. ANDERSON:
Q. Judge McLin, after serving 17 years on the family court, why do you want to continue serving as a family court judge?
A. I love doing my job. I've enjoyed it thoroughly over the last 17 years. It's always something different every day. I like helping the children. The cases are interesting, the work is challenging. I enjoy the job very much.
Q. Judge McLin, the Commission received 152 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 23 additional comments. The ballot box survey contained some of the following positive comments:
"An excellent judge of great character, ability, and demeanor. Great judge. Empathetic. Listens. She is quite perceptive on the bench, and really wants to make sure she does the right thing. Even writes her own orders
on occasion."
Seven of the written comments expressed concerns.
One of the concerns dealt with judicial temperament. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Well, I'm sad that anyone would have anything negative to say about judicial temperament. Because I know that family court is so sensitive and so emotionally charged, I try to be very mindful of the people that come in the courtroom, to make sure that everyone's comfortable, and follow the rules of evidence, rules of procedure and applicable laws, strictly. I really don't know why they would say that, other than there are occasions where a judge has to be firm, if the litigants are getting too out of hand in a situation.

There are occasions, sometimes, when lawyers come in and they want to be overly friendly as they enter the courtroom, and I'm mindful about the perception of the litigants on whether or not there might be a relationship with the lawyers, just by the general hospitality that lawyers want to come in and speak to you. So the only thing I can think of is perhaps on those occasions when I don't act overfly friendly with lawyers as they enter the courtroom, they might perceive that to be the demeanor I'm exhibiting, when really I'm just trying to keep it -- to make sure the litigants understand that there's no
impartiality, or there's no favoritism towards the attorneys, just by speaking to them or seemingly overly friendly. So that's the only thing I can think of on that issue.
Q. A second concern deals with the issuance of orders. Two related concerns were raised, one regarding the length of time it takes to receive signed orders; and the second, the substance of an order, implying, for example, that sometimes you would write an order. What response would you offer to these concerns?
A. I take great pride in my orders. I do on occasions draft orders if I don't feel like the orders that were submitted were appropriate or supported as well as I thought they should be. So there are occasions when it does take a little extra time. When we have dockets that run from nine to five every day, it doesn't afford as much time. So I oftentimes have to work after hours, or come in on the weekends. It's almost every Saturday, I'm in the office -- and sometimes on Sundays too -- trying to keep up with all the orders that come in.

So there is a -- there are occasions when it takes a little bit longer than $I$ would like for the order to get out, but it's because I'm spending the time that I think it requires to have it well supported. And I think that's the reason my orders haven't been reversed.
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Q. And a third concern raised is the perception of being indecisive. For example, you would conflict yourself out of a case to avoid a complicated matter. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. I have no problem whatsoever dealing with complicated cases. I've tried many complicated cases with multi-million-dollar estates. I actually like the challenge of doing a complicated case. The conflicts -you know, we have to follow the rules of ethics in our canons, and I take those seriously. And if there's a conflict, I always make sure I make appropriate disclosure.

There are occasions -- I had a neighbor, for instance, that practices in the family courts, and I try not to hear his cases, because $I$ don't want clients to feel like he somehow got an unfair advantage because $I$ have a social relationship or see him on occasions with him living next door. So that's the only time that $I$ would typically recuse myself, or have a conflict that would require that $I$ not hear a case. But it's absolutely not because of the complexity of the case.
Q. You indicated in your personal data questionnaire that, since your last screening, two lawsuits were filed against you; one in 2011, and the other in 2014. The lawsuit in 2011 was filed against you as well as others, by Robert Cox. Please explain the nature and disposition of

## the lawsuit.

A. Mr. Cox filed his lawsuit, I think, about a week before his child support rule was scheduled to be heard in the 1st Circuit. And he filed it against all the 1st Circuit judges. It was -- I don't know that I had ever even met Mr. Cox until the rule to show cause, when he appeared in front of me and he presented the papers. We were never served -- I was never served with the lawsuit, it never went anyway. It was dismissed. But it appeared to me, at least, that it was clear -- even looking at the pleading that he filed, it appeared clear that he filed that in an effort to have all the judges in the 1st Circuit recused from his child support enforcement action. He wasn't paying his child support, and it was clear that he was trying to have it where none of the judges could hear it.
Q. And the second lawsuit in 2014 was filed against you, as well as others, by Lori Lee Perry. Can you please explain the nature and disposition of this lawsuit?
A. I think that was a similar case. Ms. Perry had some contempt actions that were pending in the family court. I think she actually sued the magistrate and the sheriff and everybody else in the country as well. But it also is another case that appeared that it was clear there was an effort to try to stall the litigation that involved
enforcement of a family court order. I think both of those cases, too, they also asked for jury trials. Which, of course, we don't have that option.
Q. I have a few housekeeping issues.
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Have you sought or received the pledge of any
legislator prior to this date?
A. Absolutely 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.
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 on 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, ma'am.
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 a thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. ANDERSON: I would note for the record that the Lowcountry Citizens Committee reported that Judge McLin 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.

I would note for the record that any concern raised during the investigation regarding Judge McLin, were incorporated into today's questioning.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Members of the Commission, do you have questions? Dean Wilcox?

EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. Judge, I first would like you to know I am Robert Wilcox, not Robert Cox. One of the values of coming before
the commission every so often is not so much that necessarily we find things which are disqualifying, but you do get a little feedback from the people appearing in front of you.
A. Absolutely.
Q. And when I look at the comments about -particularly preparing orders and things like that, it strikes me that for the most part, they don't talk about the things being done wrong in the court, but maybe to some extent lawyers not fully understanding what you want from them. Have you given any thought, in light of those comments, to things you might do --
A. Absolutely.
Q. -- and the way you'd deal with that?
A. I appreciate the criticism in reference to the demeanor. I mean, it's made me take a step back and think about that, as people enter the courtroom, and be a little more mindful about that stuff. I do think that, that is definitely an advantage of coming through here and getting some of that feedback.

You know, and I do have thought -- I do have memos and things I send out when -- for instance, when I make a ruling in that nature. And so $I$ have given that some thought about improving that, offering a little more detail to assist lawyers in getting those orders.
Q. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Representative
Bannister.
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER:
Q. I just have one quick question.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. One of the comments, and it was talking about demeanor -- and I think you've addressed that, so I'm not interested in that. I am interested it said that the practitioners who were here before you when you were a visiting judge are not familiar with your practices. Do you require lawyers to do anything differently at your temporary hearing or trials, than would be called for by the family court rules? Do you have any of your own?
A. I'm just a stickler for the rules, is probably it. 'Cause I do strictly follow the rules, I'm going to check on the service and things like that. I'm pretty strict. Sometimes lawyers will ask you to kind of fudge a little bit on what the rules were if they didn't quite send out proper notice. So probably, if anything, Representative, I would say that it's probably I'm a stickler for the rules.
Q. Okay. I just heard it through the grape -- not about you.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. But that just jogged my memory, that there were some folks -- some family court judges who were issuing their own rules about how to conduct a temporary hearing, and putting their own limitations on what lawyers could do in their --
A. No.
Q. -- courtroom. That's not you.
A. Absolutely not.
Q. And you would --
A. And, you know, the chief justice -- I think we got to get permission from the chief if we do anything special like that. But I don't have any particular rules. And it's the same -- it's the same practice that I followed when I was practicing law --
Q. Right.
A. -- as a family practitioner. And so I know what it's like to be in the trenches. And I certainly appreciate what the lawyers do, very much.
Q. Thank you.
A. Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any other
questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none,

Judge McLin, thank you so much for being here --
JUDGE MCLIN: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- with us today.
And thank you for your service --
JUDGE MCLIN: I appreciate --
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- to South
Carolina.
JUDGE MCLIN: -- what y'all do. Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: This concludes this particular portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. And it's possible you could be called back at that time, if that need should arise.

Again, we thank you for your service to
South Carolina.
JUDGE MCLIN: Thank you very much. Thank y'all for having me. Have a good day.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: You too. (Candidate excused.)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have before us, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Commission, The Honorable Vicki J. Snelgrove, Family Court, 2nd Judicial Circuit, Seat 1. We appreciate you being with us this afternoon.

JUDGE SNELGROVE: Thank you. I appreciate
you giving me the opportunity.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Judge Snelgrove, as you will recall, we provided you with a personal data questionnaire, early on in this process, to which you gave a very thorough reply. Is there -- is that -- are those responses current and correct today? Or is it in need of any change or amendment?

JUDGE SNELGROVE: The only thing that would be current -- I'm not sure it's in the personal data questionnaire -- was about a -- the Feinman [sic] case. This one case has been ruled upon by the Supreme Court: The Moore versus Moore case.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. With regard to that one amendment, would you have any objection to us entering the responses to the personal data questionnaire into the record of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE SNELGROVE: No, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there any objection from the Commission?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 29 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The

Honorable Vicki J. Snelgrove dated July 28th, 2015)
(EXHIBIT NO. 30 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire Amendment of The Honorable Vicki J. Snelgrove dated July 28th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the
Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly
investigated your qualifications for continue -- for
continued service on the bench. That process has focused on the nine statutory evaluative criteria. And the process has resulted in no --

SENATOR MARTIN: Hang on a second. We've got a technical difficulty.
(Off the record.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: If you would please raise your right hand.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE VICKI J. SNELGROVE, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: With regard to the responses you have just given to the Commission, are they all correct?

JUDGE SNELGROVE: Yes, sir. I already
affirmed those earlier answers.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much. And $I$ was just getting ready to say there have been no affidavits filed in opposition to your election for -or reelection to the bench, nor are there any witnesses here present to testify today other than yourself.

At this point in the process, we ask you to direct your attention to your screening attorney, and respond to any questions she may have.

JUDGE SNELGROVE: Sure.
MS. ANDERSON: Good afternoon, Judge
Snelgrove.
JUDGE SNELGROVE: Good afternoon.
MS. ANDERSON: You have before you, the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions. Are there any amendments that you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?

JUDGE SNELGROVE: No, ma'am.
MS. ANDERSON: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that Judge Snelgrove's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 31 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Vicki J. Snelgrove dated July 28th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MS. ANDERSON:
Q. Judge Snelgrove, after serving five years on the family court, why do you want to continue serving as a family court judge?
A. I enjoy the work. I enjoy doing what I do. I think I make a difference in what comes in front of me. I think I bring -- I think I'm a very well prepared judge. I work a file before I have a hearing, just as much as I did when I was a lawyer. My preparation -- I enjoy preparing for trial, and $I$ enjoy preparing for a hearing. So I think I could bring something to it, and it brings a whole lot to me. I enjoy -- I like lawyers. I find family law absolutely fascinating. And I tell people -- been telling them for years -- family court lawyers have the best stories in the whole world.
Q. Judge Snelgrove, the Commission received 133 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 28 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"Excellent jurist. Her rulings are consistent. Bright. No-nonsense. Good judge. She is diligent, humble,
and extremely intelligent. Very fair and hardworking." Only one of the written comments expressed a concern regarding judicial temperament. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Well, if the -- I believe in my earlier
conversation, it was that on one occasion I appeared to be impatient and might have raised my voice. And that could very well be possible. When -- I think one of our biggest challenges is dealing with pro se litigants who don't understand the rules and, "When I ask you for the fourth time, 'Ma'am, right now just answer my question. And I'm going to give you every opportunity to explain your answer. I don't need to know what time it is. I don't need to know where you got your watch. I don't need to know how Aunt Mary bought it for you, and where else it came. Let's start with the time and then we'll do explanations.'"
"Well, I'll tell you one time..."
Inevitably, about the third or fourth time, you're a little frustrated. And I may have raised my voice a tad.
Q. Thank you, Judge Snelgrove. I have a few housekeeping issues.
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered a 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 a commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And as a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. ANDERSON: I would note that the
Midlands Citizens Committee reported that Judge Snelgrove 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, "Judge Snelgrove is very well qualified and is an outstanding family court judge."

For the record, any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Snelgrove were incorporated into today's questioning. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much, Ms. Anderson. Any comment or question from members of the Commission?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none, we thank you very much, Judge Snelgrove, for being here today. This concludes this portion of our screening process. You know about the 48 rule -- which for the candidate really doesn't apply all that much, but literally it does. JUDGE SNELGROVE: Yes, sir.
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SENATOR MARTIN: And we thank you for offering, and for your continued service of the people of South Carolina.

JUDGE SNELGROVE: Thank you. And thank you of your service.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you, Judge. (Candidate excused.)

SENATOR MARTIN: Judge, welcome.
JUDGE MCFADDIN: How are you, sir?
SENATOR MARTIN: I'm fine. Thank you for being here today.

JUDGE MCFADDIN: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: It's a pleasure to have you before the judicial screening commission. Would you mind raising your hand and taking the oath?

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE GEORGE MARION MCFADDIN, JR., being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

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

JUDGE MCFADDIN: Yes, sir, I do remember them. Yes, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN: You do? Everything's in
order? No amendments necessary?
JUDGE MCFADDIN: I may be facing a lawsuit, soon, due to an automobile accident $I$ was in. I don't think I will be, but he's threatening to do that. So I -that would --

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, my sympathies on that. Do you object as to making your PDQ part of the record of your testimony?

JUDGE MCFADDIN: No, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. It will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 32 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable George Marion McFaddin, Jr. dated August 7th, 2015)

SENATOR MARTIN: The Judicial Merit
Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continued service on the bench. Our inquiry, of course, focuses on the nine evaluative criteria, ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application, verification and compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, check for economic conflicts of interest.

We've received no affidavits in opposition
to your reelection. No witnesses are present to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to make? My predecessor always --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: He's been skipping that question.

SENATOR MARTIN: Yeah. Well, I'm filling in
for the Chairman today -- or at this point. But Former
Senator McConnell used to always say, "Brevity is clarity."
SENATOR MALLOY: Brevity is appreciated.
SENATOR MARTIN: Yeah. But if you would
kindly answer the -- Counsel's questions for us.
JUDGE MCFADDIN: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you.
MR. PEARCE: Hello again, Judge.
JUDGE MCFADDIN: Hey, sir.
MR. PEARCE: You have before you the sworn
statement you provided, with detailed answers to over
thirty questions. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?

JUDGE MCFADDIN: The only one being to -- I think lawsuits were mentioned in here, and there's a possible lawsuit I might face. It was a head-on collision with a driver who didn't have his headlights on one night. No, sir. Nothing. No, sir.

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

SENATOR MARTIN: Without objection, it will be so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 33 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable George Marion McFaddin, Jr. dated August 7th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. PEARCE:
Q. Judge, after serving since 2002 as a family court judge, why do you want to continue serving?
A. Sir, I have endeavored to do some things which I think are helpful to a lot of people. One of those being the twice-a-year adoption day we hold in Sumter, to expedite adoption hearings for placed children in DSS foster care. We will soon, if I'm reelected, hit the 500 mark regarding adopted children. I take a lot of pride in that. But I get a lot of credit to my staff -- our staff. I don't know why I used the "I" as a pronoun. I want to finish that. And I want to get better at what I do, because $I$ can be better than $I$ am.
Q. The Commission received 243 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 23 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained several positive comments that have included:
"The nicest jurist we have. Wonderful person and judge. Excellent. Good temperament and patient. Good teacher. Goes above and beyond to research issues. One of the best." And another comment that said that we needed to clone you.

In addition to those comments, there were some concerns. Six of the 23 talked about the time you take to make a decision, or to issue an order, and that taking a long period of time -- months in some cases.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you have any response to offer to this -- to these concerns that were raised?
A. Sir, you've said good things about me, that $I$ wasn't aware of until you told me that. But I'll stand here in all honestly and tell you that those, what $I$ could call complaints, to me personally obliterate and negate anything good said about me.

I can do better. Perhaps I do take too much time to do -- or to go above and beyond, regarding research. Sometimes orders and rulings are very complicated. But, sir, litigants and lawyers deserve results and not excuses. And I will strive to do better. And if I'm back here in six years, $I$ promise this won't be voiced. That's not -- I can do better, sir.
Q. You indicated in your PDQ, that a lawsuit was
filed against you in 2006 by a sovereign citizen member, Larry A. Hill. Could you tell us briefly about the nature of the lawsuit?
A. Yes, sir. It was a divorce action. He was represented -- I'm sorry -- he was pro se. Judge Ruben Gray -- or ex-Judge Ruben Gray represented his wife. It was a 32-year marriage. I split the assets 50/50. She was working at a real good job, so I didn't order alimony. The case was not appealed. And then he sued me in state court, which was moved to federal court, and essentially saying I had violated his Constitutional rights; number one being, I had jurisdiction over him because he was a sovereign citizen; and, number two, she wasn't simply entitled to anything. It was finally dismissed by Judge Perry.
Q. In addition to the questions we already asked, Judge, I do have some housekeeping matters to review with you at this time. 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 this 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're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. As a follow-up question, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it's a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned for not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. PEARCE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to
share that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee reported that Judge McFaddin was qualified as to Constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. He was found well qualified in all other categories. And the Citizens Committee also added these comments in the report
that they sent to the Commission:
"High level of dedication and sincere love of the people he served as a family court judge. We are especially impressed with adoption days over which he presides."

And I would just want to note for the record at this time, Mr. Chairman, that any concerns raised during the investigation process regarding Judge McFaddin were incorporated into the questioning that $I$ have done of the candidate today.

I have no further questions at this time.
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much. Any questions of members of the Commission? Dean Wilcox?

MR. WILCOX: I think it's important for the record to show, also, that Judge McFaddin has served for a number of years on the South Carolina Judicial Conduct Commission. I had the honor of serving on that with him. And we were on the same panel together, many times before I got onto this commission. And so I've had the chance to see him having to decide matters from the inside, working with him, and -- and he was always extraordinarily fair to the judges who were complained of, but also appropriately willing to stand up and discipline those who needed to be disciplined. And I was always very impressed by his leadership. 'Cause I believe you were Vice Chairman --

JUDGE MCFADDIN: Yes, sir.
MR. WILCOX: -- for a while of that
commission. And I just wanted that to be in the record also.

JUDGE MCFADDIN: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Not at all surprised about
those comments from Dean Wilcox. I've known Judge McFaddin from way back. Judge, I've shared with them, today, with several of my former colleagues who have come through, but you and I first met when you were a page for the South Carolina House back in the day.

JUDGE MCFADDIN: You and I were both brand new in 1979 or '8.

SENATOR MARTIN: Yeah.
JUDGE MCFADDIN: I think.
SENATOR MARTIN: Yeah. We were very brand
new.
JUDGE MCFADDIN: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: Yeah. And it's awful good to see you again.

JUDGE MCFADDIN: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: It sure is. And you did a great job here in era. Of course, that was a different era; we didn't have the staff then, that we later came to have -- or today have. So a page -- a chief page, I might
add, really stepped up and did a lot of things for us. So we -- I remember that very well.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman?
SENATOR MARTIN: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MALLOY: I did cases in front of the judge -- Judge McFaddin, and know -- and know him and the things he's accomplished during the year. And I just want to let the committee know. And I look forward to
supporting his -- his nomination.
SENATOR MARTIN: Great. Any other comments or questions?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Well, hearing none, Judge
McFaddin we appreciate so much your service. This concludes this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will be kept open until the report's published. You could be called back --

JUDGE MCFADDIN: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: -- that most likely won't
occur. I hope that suit doesn't materialize, you were talking about. But we thank you for your service and for your longtime dedication to the people of South Carolina. And best wishes for much continued success.

JUDGE MCFADDIN: I thank all of you for
taking the time to see me today. I am bothered by the
negative comments, and I will own my own mistakes and I will do better.

SENATOR MARTIN: Well, you don't worry about
that. You do fine. Thank you so much.
JUDGE MCFADDIN: Thank you all.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Judge Cely Anne Brigman?
JUDGE BRIGMAN: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: Welcome.
JUDGE BRIGMAN: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Delighted to have you.
Would you kindly raise your hand and take the oath.
WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE CELY ANNE BRIGMAN, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

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

JUDGE BRIGMAN: I have.
SENATOR MARTIN: Everything's accurate? No amendments needed?

JUDGE BRIGMAN: No, everything's accurate.
SENATOR MARTIN: Would you object to our making this summary, and any amendments, if applicable, part of the record for your sworn testimony?
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JUDGE BRIGMAN: No objection.
SENATOR MARTIN: It will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 34 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable Cely Anne Brigman dated August 11th, 2015)

SENATOR MARTIN: We have focused, of course, on nine evaluative criteria -- you know what they are. For the record, a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application matters, verification of compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper article in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, check for economic conflict of interest.

We have no affidavits filed in opposition to your election. No witnesses are here to testify. Do you have a brief opening statement?

JUDGE BRIGMAN: Just briefly, I would just tell this committee that I have never enjoyed doing anything as much as I do serving on the family court. And I really appreciate the opportunity that you have given me to do this.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much. Would you kindly answer the -- Counsel's questions for the Commission.

MS. SIMPSON: Good afternoon, Judge Brigman. You have been before -- you have before you the sworn statement you provided, with the detailed answers to over thirty questions. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?

JUDGE BRIGMAN: No.
MS. SIMPSON: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that Judge Brigman's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

SENATOR MARTIN: Yeah, it would be ordered at this -- it will be ordered at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 35 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Cely Anne Brigman dated August 5th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MS. SIMPSON:
Q. Judge Brigman, after serving for about six months on the family court bench, why do you want to continue serving as a family court judge?
A. I love it. I mean, every day is something different. You get to meet the kindest, nicest people in the not-so-best of circumstances, a lot of them. But it's just really given me an opportunity to use my education and my training in what $I$-- in developing, I hope, to be a very beneficial way.
Q. Thank you, Judge Brigman. The Commission received 162 ballot box surveys regarding you, with nine additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"An asset to the bench. New but promising judge. Recently elected and already making her mark. A very good family court judge."

One of the written comments expressed a concern. The comment indicated that you do not have enough meaningful experience. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. You and I talked about that when we met. I've practiced law almost 30 years. I have been in family court, exclusively, for the last ten. I've been ten years a magistrate. I don't know how much more experience I could have. Now, there are -- the one area that I'm in family court that $I$ do -- I'm still in a kind of a learning curve is the DJJ, the criminal -- the juvenile criminal. So that would be the area that I have the least experience. But I feel like I have experience. I don't -- I mean, I just -- I would just have to disagree with that comment.
Q. Thank you, Judge Brigman. I just have a few housekeeping issues. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator before -- 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 this process on your behalf?
A. No.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. No.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or a commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. I understand that, yes.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?

```
    A. I'm aware of that, yes.
```

MS. SIMPSON: I would like to note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee reported that Judge Brigman 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.

In summary, the Committee stated that they were excited to see Judge Brigman in her new capacity as a family court judge. She has been a favorite of this committee for some time, which corresponds with the feedback we have received from the Bar and community, of her qualifications and her temperament.

I would like to note that the record -- I would like to note for the record that any concerns raised during this investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much. Any question or comment by the member -- by members of the Commission? Any question or comment by members of the Commission?

SENATOR MALLOY: Just as a -- Mr. Chair?
SENATOR MARTIN: Yes.

SENATOR MALLOY: Just as a comment as a -- I
think it was the same Commission, beforehand, I am -nominated Judge Brigman to the magistrate's court bench, I guess, back in 2003. Is that about right?

JUDGE BRIGMAN: About right.
SENATOR MALLOY: And we've done cases together, beforehand. She practiced law in Darlington County. I'm very familiar with her family, her father, all the way down. And she's done a wonderful job, particularly getting my magistrate's office straightened out when their -- in difficult times. And I'm glad to have her on the bench.

JUDGE BRIGMAN: I'm glad to be here. Thank you.

SENATOR MALLOY: She is glad to be here. She really means it.

SENATOR MARTIN: I saw, Judge, the issue about your colon cancer. Is everything going well?

JUDGE BRIGMAN: Oh, I'm five years out. SENATOR MARTIN: Oh, great.

JUDGE BRIGMAN: So, yeah.
SENATOR MARTIN: But I've got to tell you, I
could -- I could see from a personal experience -- and I want this on the record. I can see from a personal experience, how bills can -- with all the -- just doing a colonoscopy. And I had a screening done, but it was a
five-year screening, it wasn't the three deal. And bills just kept coming, and they were massive. I mean, I couldn't believe what it -- what it costs to have that done. And --

JUDGE BRIGMAN: I was in the hospital about ten days. And so it --

SENATOR MARTIN: Yeah, I can't imagine having a -- you know, that type of experience. And all the massive number of bills you would have gotten on that. So my sympathies on that -- on that point. But I'm so glad you're doing better. I just can't -- that's a -- that's scary stuff when it happens to you.

JUDGE BRIGMAN: Well, I thank you. And I'm doing great.

SENATOR MARTIN: Good. Good. Any other question or comments?

MS. BELL: Hi, Judge Brigman.
JUDGE BRIGMAN: Hi.
MS. BELL: Just for the -- the benefit of
the record and completeness. Judge Brigman was my husband's boss for about three or four years before he opened his own law practice; he was a Darlington County magistrate.

JUDGE BRIGMAN: Reported by the Senator? MS. BELL: Yes, reported by the Senator.

And I know he thoroughly enjoyed working with you, and sees you as an example of how he wants to have his practice. And I am so glad that you're serving on the family court. And --

JUDGE BRIGMAN: Thank you.
MS. BELL: -- I thank you for your service.
JUDGE BRIGMAN: Thank you. Senator Martin,
I'm heading your way the week after Thanksgiving. I'm
going to be in Pickens County for a week.
SENATOR MARTIN: Are you?
JUDGE BRIGMAN: I am.
SENATOR MARTIN: Great. Well, we'll just be delighted to have you there.

JUDGE BRIGMAN: I can't wait.
SENATOR MARTIN: If there's anything I can do for you while you're there, you don't hesitate to call. JUDGE BRIGMAN: I sure will. Thank you. (Off-the-record discussion.) SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you so much.

JUDGE BRIGMAN: Thank you all for having me. SENATOR MARTIN: And as you know, this will -- this completes this part of the process. You could be called back -- that is mostly likely not the case -- as long as the report is unpublished. We just want to thank you for your willingness to serve, and for your dedication.

And, particularly, coming to Pickens, we'll be delighted to have you there.

JUDGE BRIGMAN: I'm looking forward to it. SENATOR MARTIN: Great.

JUDGE BRIGMAN: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Great.
JUDGE BRIGMAN: Y'all take care. Have a good Thanksgiving.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Gwendlyne Young Jones,
welcome.
JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Delighted to have you with
us. Would you please raise your hand and take the oath.
WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE GWENDLYNE YOUNG JONES, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR MARTIN: And I understand it's your birthday today.

JUDGE JONES: It is.
SENATOR MARTIN: Happy birthday.
(Off-the-record discussion.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Have you had the
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire?
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JUDGE JONES: I'm sorry?
SENATOR MARTIN: Have you had the
opportunity to review --
JUDGE JONES: I have.
SENATOR MARTIN: -- your personal --
everything in order? No amendments necessary?
JUDGE JONES: No changes.
SENATOR MARTIN: Okay. Do you object at
this point to us making that part of the permanent record? JUDGE JONES: I do not.

SENATOR MARTIN: Okay. It will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 36 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The
Honorable Gwendlyne Young Jones dated July 31st, 2015)
(Off-the-record discussion.)
SENATOR MARTIN: We've got no affidavits filed in opposition to your election. Nobody's here to testify. Do you have a brief statement you'd like to make? JUDGE JONES: Sure. I appreciate the opportunity to address you. It feels as if my job just started yesterday. Five years have gone by quite quickly. And I deem it an honor and privilege to actually get to serve the citizens of the State of South Carolina. Every
morning I wake up with a job in my heart, knowing that $I$ have such a profound effect on the decisions that I make. And for that, I'm quite grateful. And I would appreciate the opportunity to continue to serve in that capacity.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Would you
please answer the questions of our able counsel, Ms. Benson.

MS. BENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Judge Jones, you have before you the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions. Do you have anything to add to that at this time?

JUDGE JONES: I do not.
MS. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, I would ask that this be added to the exhibit, and included on the hearing record.

SENATOR MARTIN: Without objection, it will be so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 37 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Gwendlyne Young Jones dated July 31st, 2015) EXAMINATION BY MS. BENSON:
Q. Judge Jones, would you please state for the record, the city and the circuit in which you reside.
A. Richland County.
Q. In Columbia?
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A. Columbia, South Carolina, 5th Circuit.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge, after serving for five years, why do you want to continue serving as a family court judge?
A. Well, I guess, primarily, it's because it feels like my job is incomplete. During the five-year time period, I feel like I've learned and I've grown. And each day is different. And because of that, I feel like I continue to take those learning experiences with me into court, to continue to impact a lot to the citizens and the families, that we actually have such a great effect on the State of South Carolina.
Q. Judge, the Commission received 213 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 13 having additional comments. And there were many positive comments, including that -one of the commenters saying, even though that you'd ruled against -- against them, they felt like that you had been fair, and listened. And that you have an excellent temperament, are smart, and control the courtroom well.

There was one negative concern expressed; and that is, that you are unable to make tough decisions and rely too much upon the Department of Social Services' recommendations. I wonder if you would respond to that concern.
A. Sure. Actually, I find that to be quite shocking
in that if $I$ took a survey, more likely than not, I probably ruled against the Department of Social Services more often than $I$ do the other litigants. When I took that oath in 2010, I vowed to make sure that I actually rendered my decisions in a fair and impartial manner. I can only take that comment to mean, perhaps, I did not rule in that person's favor.

However, in taking the oath, I vowed to make sure that I have no enemies to punish, and no friends to reward. I take the cases they have given to me, and I apply the law as it is in making a fair decision.
Q. Judge, in your PDQ, you had mentioned four matters where you had been involved in litigation.

MS. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, all of these have been dealt with in previous screenings, so I will not go back over these at this time.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you.
EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MS. BENSON:
Q. Judge Jones, there are a few housekeeping issues, please. 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 prior -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 this process on your behalf?
A. No.
Q. Have you contacted any members of this Commission?
A. I have not.
Q. Do you understand the 48 -hour rule?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines?
A. I have.
Q. And are you also aware of the penalties for violation of the rule, which would be one -- up to a one thousand dollar fine and imprisonment for not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, ma'am. MS. BENSON: I would note that the Midlands Citizens Committee found Judge Jones well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. Judge Jones was found qualified in the evaluative criteria of Constitutional qualifications,
physical health, and mental stability.
In related comments, the Commission -- the Committee stated, "Judge Jones strikes us as a good, young judge who is growing with the job. She now has experience as a family court judge to go along with her fine judicial temperament. There is some concern about her work ethic." In summary, the Committee stated, "Judge Jones has the respect of the family court for trying hard and improving constantly."

EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MS. BENSON:
Q. Judge Jones, would you have any further comments about this -- the expression made?
A. Actually, the concerns about my work ethic kind of leaves me dumbfounded. When $I$ think of "work ethic," I think of an individual with a poor work ethic, they're lazy, they do not arrive to work on time, or they try to leave early, or they're derelict in their responsibilities. I firmly believe I'm quite the opposite. Not only do I work -- I'm at work on time, oftentimes if parties enter into an agreement, they call my office because they know I'm one of the judges that, regardless of whether or not there's any time available to the scheduling, they entered into an agreement, I'm more than happy to work them into my schedule, such that they could put that agreement on the record before it --

I respect the -- the anonymous ability for persons to make their comments. But without further information, that would be my only response to that question.

## Q. Thank you. Thank you, Judge.

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.

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

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you very much, Ms. Benson. Any comment or question by members of the Commission?

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I do have a real quick one. I have had the pleasure of appearing in front of Judge Jones. We had a very contentious issue. My client wanted something he wasn't entitled to, the other lady wanted something she wasn't entitled to. The one thing that $I$ kind of feel like a good judge does is figure out how to make both people not be prejudiced while the case was pending. But she did. And it wasn't something that either lawyer asked for, but it turned out to be a very good order, because everybody left and said, "Well, that's probably the best that could have possibly
happened," at a contested family court temporary hearing, where everybody was fussing about something that they weren't entitled to.

So for what that's worth, I have some personal experience. And Judge Jones has done a -- you were there working, and you were on time. So that's better than most of the folks coming to Greenville and hitting our 15-minute docket. Thank you, Judge.

SENATOR MARTIN: The senator from
Darlington.
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I've never appeared before Judge Jones, but I've known her for 35 years. And she was a youngster --(Off-the-record discussion.)

SENATOR MALLOY: -- she was a young person -- a younger person over at USC. And I would -- I would say that she does have a good work ethic. And she's been a great part of her children's lives -- Taylor and Justice, I think it was. And she's worked hard -- worked hard in law school, Dean, to -- under difficult circumstances back in those days. And she is a -- stayed on the bench. And I -I travel in these circles a lot, and if there were problems going on in the Richland County courthouse, I would know about them. And I've never heard a negative thing about Gwen -- about Judge Jones.

SENATOR MARTIN: All right. Thank you very much. Well, Judge Jones, we want to thank you very much for your service. This concludes this portion of our screening process.

As you know, the report will remain open until it's published. So we could call you back, although, I don't think that will occur. We just want to thank you for your willingness to serve, and for your dedication to the people of South Carolina.

JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you. And, again, happy birthday.

JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Welcome, judge.
JUDGE BRIDGES: Hello.
SENATOR MARTIN: Good to have you with us.
JUDGE BRIDGES: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Would you mind taking the oath, and raise your hand and repeat.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE USHA J. BRIDGES, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR MARTIN: Have you had the
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire? JUDGE BRIDGES: Yes, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN: Everything okay? You need to make any changes or anything?

JUDGE BRIDGES: No, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: Do you have any objection
to us making it part of your current record of this proceeding?

JUDGE BRIDGES: I have none.
SENATOR MARTIN: All right. It will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 38 -- Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable Usha J. Bridges dated August 3rd, 1015) SENATOR MARTIN: Of course, you know we've focused on the nine evaluative criteria that you're familiar with regarding your qualifications. We've received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election. No witnesses are here to testify.

Do you have a brief opening comment you'd like to make?

JUDGE BRIDGES: I do not.
SENATOR MARTIN: Okay. Would you please answer Counsel Gentry's questions for us.

MR. GENTRY: Judge Bridges, you have before
you a sworn statement you provided to the Commission. Are there any amendments you'd like to make to your sworn statement?

JUDGE BRIDGES: No, not at this time. MR. GENTRY: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that Judge Bridges' sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

SENATOR MARTIN: Without objection, it will
be so done.
(EXHIBIT NO. 39 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Usha
J. Bridges dated August 3rd, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. GENTRY:
Q. Judge Bridges, after serving five years in the family court, why do you want to continue serving as a judge?
A. I enjoy my job. I feel that in this capacity, I'm able to make an impact on others. And this is something -- this was a goal that $I$ set for myself many years ago. It's fulfilling a vision that $I$ had by doing this.
Q. The Commission received 172 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 13 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"Judge Bridges does a great job. Is courteous and upholds the ideals we expect of our judges."

Seven of the written comments expressed concerns.
Some of the comments indicated concerns with your demeanor and temperament. What response would you offer to these concerns?
A. As far as my demeanor and temperament, not being becoming of a judge? Or --
Q. That's correct, Judge. They had --
A. And I have a strict --
Q. -- concerns about --
A. -- or do I run a tight ship? Then I would have to say that's true, if that's what they're referring to. I feel that if docketed for two o'clock, recognizing that sometimes things happen, if you set it for 15 minutes, I feel that if you come into court, you should be prepared to do your 15 minutes and be courteous of the person that's coming behind you. So I know that sometimes people get aggravated because they'll ask for 15 minutes, and that shouldn't mean 30 or 45 minutes. And sometimes I'll accommodate them, depending on what's going on. But most of the time I try to keep the docket moving, because the family court is docket-driven.
Q. Have you ever said anything derogatory or demeaning towards anyone in the courtroom?
A. No. That's not me.
Q. Some of the comments also indicated concerns with bias and favoritism towards certain attorney and clients. What response would you offer to those concerns?
A. Well, people are entitled to their opinion. But I just really don't think that, that's something that $I$ buy into. I make it my job to treat everybody equally, and to make my rulings based on what's presented before me, not who's before me.

So I just -- I just kind of find that kind of odd that people -- you know, have their own beliefs. If you rule against them, there has to be a reason. And the reason is probably not that they were not in the position, or didn't have the facts to support their arguments. But, you know, that's part of our job.
Q. You indicated in your PDQ that since your last screening, a lawsuit was filed against you in 2011 by Russell D. Moore. Can you explain the nature and disposition of that lawsuit?
A. Russell Moore -- I have never met Russell Moore. But Russell Moore is in prison here in the South Carolina Department of Corrections, doing a 40-year sentence for ten to 15 armed robberies. Earlier on, I worked in the Public Defender's office, I was a juvenile court defender. Sometimes I would get appointed to represent some of the
people in General Sessions.
In 2010, Russell Moore sent to the Clerk of Court Brandy McBee, in Cherokee County, to get a copy of his file. In his file was a sheet from clerk of court at that time, wherein I had been appointed to represent him on one of his armed robbery charges. Of course, I never met him; he never met me. The chief public defender represented him on all of his cases. He did a plea -- I'm not sure which ones were dismissed. Some were dismissed. And he got like a 40-year sentence.

Well, Russell Moore thought that because there was a -- he had paid $\$ 25$ to the Clerk of Court in Cherokee County for me to represent him, I was appointed to represent him -- that $I$ had breached a contract with him. He felt that, that created a contract. He also had the opportunity to see a copy of the Gaffney Ledger, which is our local newspaper. And I think -- I'm not sure if everybody even knows, but some of you know that shortly after being appointed a judge, I won the Power Ball for a million dollars. So it was on the front pages of the newspaper.

So Russell Moore saw this as an opportunity to get some monies. So he sued me for two hundred and fifty thousand something-something and twenty-five dollars -- and I mean, that was the nature of the lawsuit. And we had to
-- I had to have someone defend me against him. And it was -- he lost. Fortunately, he lost. I no longer have to deal with Russell Moore.
Q. You also indicated in your PDQ, a lawsuit was filed against you in 2012 -- 2012 by Jeff -- and I'm going
 disposition of that lawsuit.
A. Well, now, that wasn't a lawsuit by Jeff Buice. Jeff Buice is a local realtor in Gaffney. And the -- many of the lawsuits that had my name on them were -- were foreclosure actions, wherein the defendants -- I had judgements against the defendants that owed me monies. So foreclosure actions came, I was named as a defendant because I had a judgement. But that's -- that's on there. Jeff didn't sue me. I don't know how the lawsuit is titled, but Jeff was probably the realtor that was involved in that case.
Q. In this -- and you indicated in your PDQ, that since the last screening, a complaint was filed against you in 2011 by Joey Howard. A complaint was also filed in 2015 by a Johnnie Lynn Mather, and then in 2015 by Mrs. Jackson. Do you recall those three filings of complaints --
A. I do.
Q. -- and the dispositions?
A. I do. They were all unfounded. And needless to
say, those were -- except for Ms. Mathers, they were people that didn't win their cases in court.

Mr. Howard's dealt with a contempt action -- I held him in contempt. I didn't put him in jail. But it was a visitation contempt action, wherein he was not allowing the wife to visit the child, because she decided she was going to date a person of the opposite race. And I pointed out to Mr. Howard, that if you teach the children to judge people by the color of the skin as opposed to their character, then you're doing a disservice to the children.

So Mr. Howard didn't like that. And so he filed a grievance on me, and said that I called him a -- that I called him a racist, and that $I$ was the biggest racist on the bench. Well, thank the Lord we have the court reporters that record everything that's going on in there. And that wasn't true. That wasn't founded.

Ms. Mathers filed the grievance. It was a child support case, where she came into court and she did not want the father to have to go to jail, so she wanted to -him of the child support so he wouldn't go to jail. Rather than me dismissing the child support, I set him on a payment plan and told him he was going to pay the child support. Well, he didn't pay the child support. And Ms. Mathers became angry and filed a grievance and said I let
that deadbeat down.
But when the court -- the transcript came, it shows that she was the one that wanted him to be off -and I was the one that insisted that the child support belonged to the child, and wouldn't let him off.

And then the -- what was the last one?
Q. It was Ms. Jackson.
A. Ms. Jackson. Yeah. Ms. Jackson -- that was also a contempt case. And it was a situation where Ms. Jackson wouldn't allow the son to go to the father's wedding. She got the police involved. She was very upset. And he filed a -- he filed a rule against her. And because he filed a rule against her, two weeks later she filed a rule against him. And I told her she was being spiteful and vindictive. And she didn't like that. So she filed a grievance. But, of course, her grievances were unfounded.

MR. GENTRY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to request the Commission go into executive session. SENATOR MARTIN: Any objection?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: So ordered. We'll proceed
to executive session.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Any housekeeping?
EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MR. GENTRY:
Q. Judge Bridges, have you sought or received a 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 party 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're prohibited from seeking a pledge or a 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. Are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it's a misdemeanor, and upon

## conviction the violator must be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?

 A. Yes.MR. GENTRY: I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee reported that Judge Bridges is well qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament, and qualified as to Constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
SENATOR MARTIN: Any further questions by
members of the Commission?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Hearing none --
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: I have a question.
SENATOR MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS:
Q. Judge, do you have any specific court rules that attorneys are required to comply with before they appear before you in the matter?
A. Specifically my rule? Or do I make sure they
comply with the rules that the state --
Q. No, no. Do you have any rules that you promulgate yourself?
A. No, I don't.
Q. That, of course, would be improper.
A. Right.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much.
SENATOR MARTIN: Representative Bannister. REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I have appeared in front of Judge Bridges on bunch of different occasions, where we've all been ready to try the cases or have hearings, and have court reporters, and we've had some entertaining conversations. Some of them included Doug Brannon.

Anyway, but I -- the times that I've been in front of Judge Bridges, she's always working very diligently to move cases. And I appreciate your work and all the stuff that you're doing in Spartanburg and all over the state. I appreciate your service on the bench. JUDGE BRIDGES: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE BRIDGES: Thank you. SENATOR MARTIN: Well, Judge Bridges, thank you so much. This will conclude this portion of the
screening process. As you know, the record may -- will remain open until the record is published. And you could be called back, but I doubt, very seriously, if that will happen.

We want to thank you for your willingness to continuing serving the people of South Carolina. And we wish you the very best. But most especially good health. JUDGE BRIDGES: Thank you so very much. (Candidate excused.)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have before us The Honorable Dorothy Mobley Jones, a judge of Family Court, 5th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1. Judge Jones, it's great to have you with us today. Thank you for joining us. JUDGE JONES: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: If you'll please raise your right hand and be sworn.

## WHEREUPON:

THE HONORABLE DOROTHY MOBLEY JONES, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Some time ago, we forward -- we sent you a personal data questionnaire, which you completed rather extensively. And we would inquire, now, whether those responses you provided are current -are current and correct? Are they in need of amendment in
any way at this time?
JUDGE JONES: I cannot think of any
amendment or changes.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Would
you have any objection to this Commission receiving those responses as a part of your sworn testimony -- as a record -- part of the record of your sworn statement today?

JUDGE JONES: I have no objection. That's fine.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Does any
Commission member have an objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 40 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable Dorothy Mobley Jones dated August 10th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the
Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly
investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria, and the process has resulted in today. And you are a witness, for which we are grateful.

There have been no affidavits filed in
opposition to your election, nor are there any other witnesses present to testify.

Now if you would turn your attention to your screening attorney; he has a few questions to ask you. JUDGE JONES: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
MR. ODOM: Good afternoon, Judge Jones.
JUDGE JONES: Good afternoon.

MR. ODOM: You have before you the sworn
statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions. Are there any amendments you would like to make to your sworn statement?

JUDGE JONES: I cannot think of any at this time.

MR. ODOM: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that Judge Jones' sworn statement be entered in as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there any objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 41 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Dorothy Mobley Jones dated August 10th, 32015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. ODOM:
Q. Judge Jones, after serving over ten years on the family court, why do you desire to continue serving as a family court judge?
A. Well, thank you for asking that. It has really been a privilege. I always enjoyed practicing law 27 years, before $I$ went on the bench. But being on the bench, you certainly are able to work with a more diverse group. And on many days, we spend time for children. And I thoroughly enjoy that, our juveniles, our DSS cases where we have protective issues for the children.

But I also enjoy just our standard private docket as well, 'cause I did complex litigation when I practiced domestic law. So I just enjoy it because I feel like I'm giving back. I really feel like it is an opportunity to take what you've gained and learned over the years -- in my case, over 25 years -- and then apply it on the bench to cases, help people through this. In divorce court -- until you've been there, you really can't explain it. They were asking me some questions about that the other day at the -and I said, "I can't even make this stuff up." I mean, you know, it's -- and you really have to be able to handle people and get them through it and get it -- get them through it well. So I feel like I do that extremely well.
Q. Well, Judge, the Commission received 237 ballot
box surveys regarding you, with 27 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"Judge Jones has all -- in all caps -- the attributes we would want in a family court judge. As difficult of a job as it is, she is inspiration in the handling of all of the situations that come before her."

Another comment said that, "Judge Jones is an exceptional family court judge who combines a thorough knowledge of the law with an incredible sense of compassion for those appearing in her courtroom."

MR. ODOM: None of the written comments expressed any concerns about Judge Jones.

EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MR. ODOM:
Q. Judge Jones, there's just a few more procedural questions that $I$ have. 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. 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. And are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of this process on your behalf?
A. No, I am not.
Q. And have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I did whatever you told me to do.
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 a thousand dollars or imprisoned for not more than 90 days?
A. Yes.

MR. ODOM: I would note that the Midlands
Citizens Committee reported that Judge Jones is qualified in the evaluative criteria of Constitutional
qualifications, physical health and mental stability. The Committee found -- found Judge Jones to be well qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria of ethical fitness,
professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

The Committee stated that, "Judge Jones is impressive on all levels, she is a high-energy person who also happens to be blessed with a first class intellect and willing personality. She is very well suited for her job."

I further note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Jones has been incorporated into today's questions.

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

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Do any members of the Commission have questions? Dean Wilcox is recognized.

MR. WILCOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
As a resident of the 5 th Circuit, $I$ will
tell you that we are all very much aware of how fortunate we are to have Judge Jones on the court here. And we do not like to lend her to other circuits, because she really is a superb judge to have. And that --

JUDGE JONES: Well, I appreciate that.
MR. WILCOX: And I just -- I want to comment
you on the comments about your temperament, particularly. We are very concerned as a Commission, that we have judges with the appropriate temperament. And to have no negative
comments in a family court situation is a remarkable achievement. And I just ask you that you keep going the next six years the way you've been going. And thank you very much.

JUDGE JONES: Oh, thank you so much. I'm
not sure Lee County's asking me to come back. It may not be a contest, once I beef up on my chicken coup knowledge. MR. WILCOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Dean. Any other questions? Senator Malloy?

SENATOR MALLOY: I think I know Judge Jones, and I would echo my Dean, and say that I don't -- I don't think I've ever appeared in front of her, though. But I do know that she gets great reviews from all of our colleagues.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you,
Senator.
JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Senator Malloy. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any other comments or questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And I'll have to say, we're very proud of our judges in the $16 t h$-- in the 16th Judicial Circuit, but if we could have another one, we'd want it to be Judge Jones.

JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much, all. And, Judge Jones, thank you very much for taking the time out of your busy court calendar to be with us, today, and to take part in this important process.

That concludes this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. And you could be called back at such time, if that need should arise.

And with that, we want to thank you very much for being with us. And thank you for what you do for the State of South Carolina.

JUDGE JONES: Well, thank you so much, Mr. Chairman and all the members here. I do enjoy my job. It's a great job. I wouldn't want to be on any other court. And I mean that sincerely. So when I leave, I'll leave from this court. It's really the place to be. Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Good afternoon.
JUDGE MARTIN: Good afternoon.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, it's good to have you with us. Thank you for joining us.

JUDGE MARTIN: I'm glad to be here.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Ladies and
Gentlemen of the Commission, we have before us The Honorable Daniel E. Martin, Jr., of the Family Court, 9th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1. Judge Martin, let's start by swearing you in, if we may.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE DANIEL E. MARTIN, JR., being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Martin, at the beginning of this process, you responded to a number of questions in the personal data questionnaire. Are those responses current and correct today? Or are they in need of any amendment at this time?

JUDGE MARTIN: They are correct.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Would you have any objection to making those responses a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE MARTIN: No objection at all.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is
there any objection to the Commission?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 42 - Judicial Merit Selection

Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable Daniel E. Martin, Jr. dated July 30th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Martin, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the statutory criteria, the nine evaluative criteria, and it has resulted in the process here today.

During that time we've received no
affidavits filed in opposition to your election -- your reelection, nor are there any witnesses present to testify other than yourself.

At this point, we'd like you to turn your attention to Ms. Dean, your screening attorney, and respond to any questions she may have.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman, before we go on.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes. Senator Malloy is recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Before we start answering the questions, $I$ just would report on the record that Judge Martin and I are classmates from law school, and we actually married roommates. I met my wife, first, but he got married first. And I introduced them. So I been
knowing him and his family for a long period of time. And, obviously, we've heard what happened here yesterday, so as we go forward, I want to have the Commission keep -- keep that in mind.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you so much for that disclosure on the record, Senator Malloy. JUDGE MARTIN: Can I make just one comment about that?

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, sir.
JUDGE MARTIN: Gerald introduced me to my wife, and he takes a lot of credit for that, but he won't take any of the blame.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Careful, we are on the record. We are on the record.

JUDGE MARTIN: Twenty-six years. We've been married 26 years.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Congratulations,
sir. Ms. Dean?
MS. DEAN: Thank you. Judge Martin, you
have before you, your sworn statement, where you answered over thirty detailed questions. Are there amendments you'd like to make to the sworn statement at this time?

JUDGE MARTIN: No.
MS. DEAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask
that Judge Martin's sworn statement be entered as an
exhibit into the hearing record.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 43 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Daniel E. Martin, Jr. dated July 30th, 2015) EXAMINATION BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Judge Martin, after serving four years on the family court bench, why would you like to continue to serve?
A. It's a job I enjoy, and I think it's a job that $I$ am getting better at. It's a job where I can actually serve my community and be of service, I think, to the public at large. And I'd like the opportunity to continue doing that.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge Martin, the Commission received 277 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 34 additional comments, which included many positive comments stating, "A proven, exceptionally able judge. Temperament and professionalism are exceptional."

Five of the 34 written comments expressed some concerns. A concern appeared -- appeared to be related to
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your process of reaching conclusions in a case. And can you just please briefly describe to the Commission, your process when you're evaluating a case.
A. Well, if it's a case that $I$ think merits some time that needs some study, I will take time to do that. Generally, most cases I can make the determination after the conclusion of all of the evidence and testimonies comes in. But there are issues, sometimes, that require some further investigation of deliverance. And when that happens, I will let the parties know that I'm going to take the matter under advisement, and then I write out a very detailed -- what I call letter of instruction to the lawyers or the litigants, and produce an order from that. So sometimes that takes a while. But normally, I try to get that done within 24 to 48 hours.
Q. Thank you, Judge. In your personal data questionnaire, you listed three lawsuits where you were named as a co-defendant: Georgetown Greenhouse versus Lawrence Smith; Palmetto Mortgage versus Lawrence Smith; and Wells Fargo versus Lawrence Smith. Can you briefly explain the nature of these cases?
A. Yes, absolutely. Mr. Smith owed a debt to me. I had a judgement against Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith was sued because he had some real estate in two or three foreclosure actions by lenders who also had judgements against him.

And whenever that happened, any other judgement-holder or lien-holder has to be named as a party to the action. So I was named as not co-defendant, but interested party. Unfortunately, I was never able to be satisfied, because Mr. Lawrence was overextended in all of his other obligations.
Q. Thank you, Judge. And, similarly, there were also lawsuits filed naming you as a defendant by City Finance -- City Financial and EquiFund. Could you please explain the nature of those lawsuits?
A. Certainly. In probate court, sometimes if there is not a personal representative that can be appointed from the family, the court will appoint a specific personal representative to serve in that capacity. And in this particular case, it was a married couple who owned some real estate; it was heavily mortgaged. When they died, they had no money to pay the mortgage, so the court directed that the property be sold. And so the property was listed for sale. There was no one who wanted to buy the property before. The lienholders filed a foreclosure action against the property, and it ended in a foreclosure. But the foreclosure actually happened after I'd been relieved as the personal representative.
Q. Thank you, Judge. And finally, dealing with lawyers, you were named -- in your PDQ, you mentioned being
-- excuse me -- named in a lawsuit dealing with -- that arose from the "Baby Veronica" case.
A. That is correct. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Could you briefly describe that? Or, I have it in front of me in the PDQ. But you also have --
A. Yes, ma'am. I was assigned the case to act -after it came back from the Supreme Court back to Charleston County, to preside over the adoption hearing. And the Cherokee Nation did not want me to go forward with the hearing. So they -- I think either an hour -- maybe with a day -- I think it was the same day that the hearing was scheduled, they filed with the National Federal Court to try to get a temporary restraining order to prevent me from having the hearing. That went in front of Judge Norton, who is a United States District Court Judge in Charleston; he denied their motion. And so the hearing still took place.

The Attorney General of the state then hired a lawyer, or assigned one of the other lawyers to represent me in the action. And the action was dismissed shortly thereafter.

## Q. Thank you, Judge.

MS. DEAN: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that we go into executive session. SENATOR MARTIN: So move.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have a motion.
So ordered. Please secure the room.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We are back on the
record, Judge Martin.
JUDGE MARTIN: Yes, sir.
EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Thank you, Judge Martin. I just have a few housekeeping issues at this time. 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 haven't.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene
in any part of this process on your behalf?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Have you contacted any members of this

Commission?
A. No, I haven't.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from
seeking a pledge or a commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. I understand that.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I am aware.

MS. DEAN: I would note that the Lowcountry Citizens Committee reported that Judge Martin is qualified for Constitutional qualifications, mental stability and physical health. The Committee found him qualified in the remaining categories.

Any concerns raised during the investigated regarding the candidate today, were incorporated in today's questioning.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms.

Dean. Do any members of the Commission have questions for Judge Martin? Representative Mack, you're recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE MACK: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE MACK:
Q. Judge Martin, where did you go to undergrad?
A. I went to Howard University.
Q. Howard University?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. That was a phenomenal school, wasn't it?
A. I would agree.

REPRESENTATIVE MACK: I just want to get that on the record. No, but seriously, I wanted to just also say for the record, our families are very close. His father served with distinction in the House of Representative and State Legislature here in the State Legislature, and served with distinction as a judge. Well respected in the Charleston community. And Judge Martin is ten years younger than me. And for years, in my early life, I've called him "Little Danny."

JUDGE MARTIN: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE MACK: Until one day he was taller than me, so I couldn't call him that anymore. But I think what -- but I wanted to say on the record, that he serves with integrity. He serves with a great deal of passion, well respected in the community. And when he ran the first time, as close as we are, he never said a word to me. Which I respect. I found out when I looked over the
documents, that he was running. And so I just wanted to --(Off-the-record discussion.)

REPRESENTATIVE MACK: But I just wanted to say how much I respect him, and he's well thought of in the Charleston community.

JUDGE MARTIN: I appreciate those comments. SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Martin? SENATOR MARTIN: I asked yesterday, several questions about candidates who were running in contested races, what judge on the bench would they indicate most typifies or -- the type of judge -- qualities in a judge they'd like to emulate, and you were named by several of those candidates.

JUDGE MARTIN: Wow.
SENATOR MARTIN: So --
JUDGE MARTIN: That's great to hear.
SENATOR MARTIN: -- people are watching you and observing you, and want to be like you. So that's a -that speaks very highly of you. Let me also say that I served with your father in the House, he's just a great gentleman.

JUDGE MARTIN: Thank you, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: And I have very fond
memories of our service together, and $I$ can $--I$ can see why you're doing so well.

JUDGE MARTIN: Thank you, sir. I appreciate those comments.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair, if you -- if you go down to Mother Emanuel, Judge Martin and his family are lifelong members of Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston. And for those that are wondering how his father is doing, they see that he is very gracefully -- the choir is over the background in the back in the balcony, and the distinguished guy with still a lot of hair, and it's gray, normally with his jacket off, singing, that's -- that's Judge Martin's daddy. And he still -- he's still a patriarch in that church, and still a patriarch down in the community.

SENATOR MARTIN: I used to call him "Cousin
Danny."
SENATOR MALLOY: He and I been to -- been Milwaukee many times.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
other comments or questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Well, with regard to your church family, please accept the condolences of the Commission.

JUDGE MARTIN: Yes, sir. And I extend the same, 'cause my pastor was a friend and a colleague of yours. So I extend my condolences to you as well.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We all miss him. Thank you very much.

JUDGE MARTIN: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for your distinguished service.

JUDGE MARTIN: Thank you for your time.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Martin, that will conclude this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until such time that the report is published. And you may be called back at such time, if that need should arise.

And with that, thank you again for all you do for South Carolina.

JUDGE MARTIN: All right. Thank you too.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir.
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, thank you so much for being with us today, Judge.

JUDGE LANDIS: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: we have before us The Honorable Jack Alan Landis, of the Family Court, 9th Judicial Circuit, Seat 6. Judge, it's an honor to have you
with us today.
Would you please raise your right hand and
be sworn.

## WHEREUPON:

THE HONORABLE JACK ALAN LANDIS, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, you
responded to the personal data questionnaire that this Commission sent -- the Commission sent you some time ago. With regard to those answers, that response, are they current and correct today? Or are they in need of any amendment?

JUDGE LANDIS: They're not in need of any amendments, as far as $I$ know.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir.
Would you have any objection to your response -- to the personal data questionnaire being made a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE LANDIS: Not at all.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there any objection by the Commission?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it is so ordered.

P R O C E E D I N G S - final
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(EXHIBIT NO. 44 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable Jack Alan Landis dated August 9th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the
Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for reelection to the bench. As a part of that process, we -- our investigation has been focused on the nine evaluative criteria. And as a result of that process, there have been no witnesses -there are no witnesses present to testify, and there have been no affidavits filed in opposition to your election.

We would ask that you turn your attention to Mr. Gentry, your screening attorney, and respond to any questions he may have.

JUDGE LANDIS: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
MR. GENTRY: Judge Landis, you have before you the sworn statement you provided to the Commission. Are there any amendments you would like to make to your sworn statement?

JUDGE LANDIS: No.
MR. GENTRY: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that Judge Landis' sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

P R O C E E D I N G S - final
Page 242

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 45 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Jack Alan Landis dated August 6th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. GENTRY:
Q. Judge Landis, after serving 17 years on the family court, why do you want to continue to service?
A. Quite frankly, I love this job. It's -- it's where my experience is from practicing law. I did primarily domestic law. Not to toot my own horn, but I think I do a fairly good job at what I do. I think the lawyers, in general, like me. I think I try to give litigants a fair hearing. And I would just like to continue to serve.
Q. The Commission received 329 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 19 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"Judge Landis is a valuable addition to our
family court bench. And in the times I have practiced before him, he has exhibited himself to be well qualified
to continue serving in this capacity."
Six of the written comments expressed concern
with your temperament and demeanor. What response would you offer to these concerns?
A. Well, quite frankly, I'm surprised by those comments. Because I guess it's difficult to judge ourselves, but I feel like I'm extremely patient with people. I do my best to never embarrass anybody that comes in the family court. And there's a great deal of personal information that we learn, that folks would probably prefer not be known. So I do my best not to embarrass folks.

I try to remain patient. I'm sorry if anybody has ever left my court feeling like my demeanor was incorrect, 'cause that's not the judge I want to be. I want to be known as a fair, patient, temperate judge. So I'll be conscious of this and try to do better in the future.
Q. Would you ever say anything mean, rude, derogatory, or defamatory towards anyone in the courtroom?
A. Not intentionally. You know, I might have a slip of the tongue, and say something that comes out and sounds wrong. But $I$ would never intentionally do that to anyone.
Q. The SLED report indicated that since your last screening, a lawsuit was filed against you in 2010 by Nathaniel Green. Can you explain the nature and
disposition of this lawsuit?
A. Yes, sir. When I started through the screening process was the first time I learned of this lawsuit, because I was never served with it. It was a prisoner lawsuit, alleging some civil rights violation that $I$ couldn't discern to be very specific when I did get a copy of the file. I'm not sure that there was even a specific allegation regarding me. I was just simply one of the people that was mentioned somewhere in the body of his complaint, and it was summarily dismissed by the Federal Magistrate.
Q. Also, the SLED report indicated that since your last screening, a lawsuit was filed against you in 2014 by Deutsche Bank Nation Truth Company. Can you explain the nature and disposition of this lawsuit?
A. Yes, sir. That was -- I find myself in the unenviable position of going through a divorce myself. And I don't want to -- it's going to sound like I'm trying to pass blame -- and I'm really not. I'm just trying to explain. Because, ultimately, it was my responsibility. When we separated and I took over the finances again, I learned that my wife had essentially not paid any bills for the last year, and I was unaware of it. I have some lake property, I went and mortgaged the lake property. Fortunately, it was without a mortgage. I mortgaged that
to try to pay up all these things that were in arrears. And I've just been trying to get straight ever since then. Up until recently, I was still learning about accounts that $I$ never knew existed. So it was a foreclosure action. It was dismissed, because we satisfied the -- the requirements of it, and hopefully that's behind me for good.
Q. As well, the SLED report indicated that your driver's license was suspended in 2010 for cancellation of insurance. Can you explain why the driver's license was suspended?
A. Yes, sir. I have an old MGB that I had restored. And I had it on the road for several years, and I took it off the road and cancelled my insurance. And, quite frankly, I didn't even think about the license plates on the car. They notified me, my license was suspended 'cause I hadn't turned in the license plates from the MGB. As soon as those were turned -- I turned those in and the license was reinstated. That was an oversight on my part.

MR. GENTRY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to
request the Commission go into executive session. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Do we have a
motion?
SENATOR MARTIN: So move.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: So ordered.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have risen from
executive session. And we are back on the record, not
having taken any votes or making any decisions. Please, Mr. Gentry.

EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MR. GENTRY:
Q. Judge Landis, have you sought or received a 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, 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 this

## Commission?

A. I've communicated with some, but not for the purpose of the election. I mean, in some of our conferences, I've spoken to, like, Senator Malloy and Representative Bannister. But I've not contacted regarding
the reelection process.
Q. Do you understand that you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I learned that last time with the screening. But, yes, I'm aware of that.

MR. GENTRY: I would note that the Lowountry
Citizens Committee found Judge Landis to be well qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament, and qualified as to Constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability.

I would also note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Members, do you have questions of Judge Landis? (No response.)

EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS:
Q. Judge, if I could ask you a question. With regard to the five negative ballot box survey comments received, they bring into question matters of temperament on the bench. Would you care to expound on that for us?
A. Well, again, I -- I was quite surprised by those. Because I guess nobody's ever going to tell a judge what they're doing wrong; they're reluctant to do so. And I've always strived to be a very patient person, a very compassionate person. I don't have a very short temper. I don't have a short fuse. I'm not easily offended. And I was surprised by those. But I don't want anybody to ever leave my courtroom feeling like they didn't get a fair shake, or that my mood was such that there's no way I could make any rational decisions. I want everybody to feel -to leave the courtroom feeling like they've been in front of a judge who listened, listened carefully, listened patiently, and gave them a fair shot at their position.

So I will take notice of those negative comments, and do my best to improve on them -- on that situation. But again, it's hard for us to judge ourselves. And this is about the only time we get that information, so we don't
know what people are saying about us.
Q. Thank you. I think for that reason -- if for that reason alone, that this -- the opportunity to meet with you, today, was a -- is good for the system, so that we -- we can discuss these difficult matters to discuss, and stress things like judicial temperament and how important it is to maintain. Thank you very much for your response.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair, let me say that

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy?
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair, I'll say one -one thing. We just had Judge Danny Martin in here, and Judge Danny Martin -- if you were to ask him which judge does he admire, he considered Judge Landis a mentor who is the person that absolutely recruited him to end up making him become a family court judge.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for sharing that, Senator. Are there any other comments or questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge Landis, thank you so much for being with us today. JUDGE LANDIS: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We appreciate it.

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

JUDGE LANDIS: Y'all have a good afternoon. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: This will conclude this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. And you could be asked to come back, if that -- with us again, should the need arise.

With that, thank you for your service to South Carolina -- service on the bench.

JUDGE LANDIS: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We do appreciate it.

JUDGE LANDIS: Thank you for your time.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir.
JUDGE LANDIS: Y'all have a nice afternoon. (Candidate excused.)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Good afternoon, Judge.

JUDGE BALLENGER: Good afternoon.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: It's so good to have you with us today.

JUDGE BALLENGER: Thank you so much.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have --
JUDGE BALLENGER: It's good to be here.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have before us, The Honorable Karen F. Ballenger of the Family Court, 10th

Judicial Circuit, Seat 2. It's an honor to have you with us, Judge.

Would you please raise your right hand and
be sworn.
WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE KAREN F. BALLENGER, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Have you had an opportunity -- well, actually, you prepared the personal data questionnaire responses that we have on file. Are those responses current and correct today? Or are they in need of any amendment?

JUDGE BALLENGER: No, they're correct.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Do you have any objection to us including your responses in the record of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE BALLENGER: No objection.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much. Is there an objection by any Commission member?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so it's so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 46 - Judicial Merit Selection
Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The

Honorable Karen F. Ballenger dated July 30th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the
Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. That inquiry has been focused on the nine evaluative criteria, and it has resulted in your being with us today, and this hearing today.

During that time, we've received no affidavits filed in opposition to your reelection, and there are no witnesses present to testify today other than yourself.

With that introduction, we would ask that you turn your attention to your screening attorney, and respond to his questions. Thank you.

MR. STIMSON: Good afternoon, Judge
Ballenger.
JUDGE BALLENGER: Good afternoon.
MR. STIMSON: You have before you, the sworn statement you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?

JUDGE BALLENGER: No.
MR. STIMSON: Thank you. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that Judge Ballenger's sworn
statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Without objection, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 47 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Karen F. Ballenger dated August 5th, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. STIMSON:
Q. Judge Ballenger, after serving three years on the family court, why do you want to continue serving as a family court judge?
A. Being a family court judge has allowed me to continue serving my community in an area that $I$ really enjoy. I love the work. I'm very fortunate to be able to wake up every morning and be happy to go to work. And I want to continue that for another six years. As I've indicated, $I$ just enjoy my job and $I$ enjoy getting up and going to work every day, and I want to be able to continue doing that and serving my community.
Q. Thank you. Judge Ballenger, the Commission received 189 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 13 additional comments. The ballot box survey comments contained positive things, such as:
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"Probably the best judge on the family court bench. We are lucky to have her here. Outstanding judge. She has made contributing her talents to the citizens of South Carolina her life's work. Excellent knowledge of South Carolina family law."

## Three of the written comments did express some

 concerns. Two comments specifically indicated that you can be slow in handling your cases, and, thus, cause a delay with your docket. Do you care to address that concern?A. I'm sure they're talking about temporary hearings. And in most counties, they schedule temporary hearings at a specific time -- like, a Monday morning in Oconee County. And, you know, sometimes you can get behind because you can have a 15-minute hearing where you're having to make decisions concerning custody, alimony, child support, attorney fees, who gets the marital home. You can get behind.

And, you know, I am one of those judges, I take affidavits, I read every word in that affidavit before I made a decision. And sometimes I take the time to ask very pointed questions, and so I can get behind. But there are also 15-minute hearings that are -- are temporary hearings where there may be one point that we have to address. So by the end of whatever time period -- I don't -- I can't remember a day where $I$ didn't give my staff -- we didn't
get through at lunchtime and at five o'clock. So it all kind of works out when you look at it from the time in the morning.

But, yes, there are times that I do get behind. And there are some cases that just need more than 15 minutes. And, unfortunately, there's some cases where lawyers ask for 15 minutes when they need thirty. But, you know, again, I try to make sure that $I$ give whatever time $I$ need to, to that particular case.
Q. Thank you. Another comment expressed a concern that you can be unpredictable, and sometimes make up your mind early rather than following the evidence. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. I'm not really sure how to address that. In hearing the comment, the first time that we discussed that, again, $I$ think it's going back to the temporary hearings. And if $I$ am running behind, I'll read the affidavits, I'll ask questions, and I always try to let -- letting the attorneys give a statement. But sometimes it's impossible. Sometimes I'm just running too far behind and I've gotten all the -- what I need to make a decision, then I just go ahead and have a ruling. But $I$ have heard some attorneys indicate that they would -- they like to be able to give statements. And I always try to accommodate them. I always try to accommodate them.

But sometimes -- sometimes you just can't, because of the time restrictions. And then sometimes it's just not good because of what may be going on in the courtroom that could -- that could make a situation with the litigants -- would make it harder on them. So I mean, I try to be -- I try to give them time, but I think that's where that comment's coming from. I'm not sure, but I think that's where that's coming from.

## Q. Okay. Thank you, Judge Ballenger.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Stimson, before you leave that. Judge, I want to make sure that when that happens, are you -- are you mindful of whether or not the litigants are feeling like they're -- are you make -- are you assuring that they feel that their position is being represented and heard before the court at that time? JUDGE BALLENGER: When I don't let the attorneys -REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, ma'am. JUDGE BALLENGER: And please let me -- let me just -- probably 95 percent of the time, I always let the attorneys have the time to make a statement. So it's very rare that $I$ don't. So I think I need to let that -but, you know, the first thing that I tell the litigants when they come in, I tell them that the temporary hearings are based upon affidavits. And I'll recess the hearing,
and I'll say, "I'm going to read the affidavits." And I let them look at me -- look at me while I read every word. And what $I$ do when $I$ read the affidavits, when I'm reading it and something comes up and that attorney's sitting there, you know, I'll look at that attorney and say, "Lawyer One, can you -- can you address this issue for me? I don't quite understand it, basically, in your affidavit."

And so during the process, I ask questions. So I
-- the attorneys have already had a chance to tell me things, and so they've spoken and -- and -- and talked during the hearing. And, but, you know, again -- and I -and I try very hard, you know, when I do give the attorney a chance to talk, I tell them, "I've read the affidavits. I don't need for you to tell me what's in the affidavit. Please tell me, you know, basically, what the other side -what their position is," and address their comments.

But again, let me go back to what I said before. I understand. I was an attorney for twenty-plus years. I understand the reason that attorneys want to stand up and tell me and -- and make a statement. And it's not necessarily for me, it's for their litigant. And I understand that. So 95 percent, if not more -- probably 99 percent of the time, I allow them to do it.

You know, to be honest with you, I -- I kind of think I know where that comment may be coming from. And it
was a case where I -- that attorney showed up two and a half hours late, because he was somewhere else, and I kept the -- I worked it in. And -- and then at that time, I just didn't have the time to allow him to -- to make a statement.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thanks.
JUDGE BALLENGER: Ninety-nine percent of the time, I do.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much for that clarification.

Mr. Stimson, I apologize for interrupting. Please continue.

MR. STIMSON: Thank you, Chairman. EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MR. STIMSON:
Q. Just a few housekeeping issues for you, Judge Ballenger. Have you sought or received a 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. 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 of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes.

MR. STIMSON: I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee found Judge Ballenger qualified in the evaluative criteria of Constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. The Upstate Citizens Committee found Judge Ballenger well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

I would just note for the record, that any
concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Ballenger were incorporated into the questioning of her today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for that very thorough line of questioning, Mr. Stimson. Thank you very much, Judge, for your responses. Do any members of the Commission have any -- any further questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge Ballenger, thank you so much for being with us today. This will conclude this particular portion of the screening process. I will remind you that the report will remain open -- or excuse me -- the record will remain open until such time that the report is published. And you may be called back at such time, if that need should arise.

We, again, thank you for your service to South Carolina, and service on the bench. Thank you for being with us today.

JUDGE BALLENGER: Thank you so much.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Too many
(Candidate excused.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Kinlaw, good
to have you with us today.
JUDGE KINLAW: All right.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have before us The Honorable Alex Kinlaw, Jr., of the Family Court, 13th Judicial Circuit, Seat 6.

Judge Kinlaw, if you would please be sworn. Raise your right hand.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE ALEX KINLAW, JR., being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, you provided this Commission with a very thorough response to our personal data questionnaire. And I understand that you have also provided us with an amendment to that questionnaire.

JUDGE KINLAW: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Since the time of that amendment, is there any need for any further amendment to bring the personal data questionnaire current?

JUDGE KINLAW: No, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir.
Would you have any objection to our including those responses as amended to your personal data questionnaire, as a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE KINLAW: No, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is
there an objection by any Commission member?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 48 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable Alex Kinlaw, Jr., dated July 23rd, 2015)
(EXHIBIT NO. 49 - Judicial Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire Amendment of The Honorable Alex Kinlaw, Jr., dated October 26th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly reviewed your qualifications for continuation on the -- on the bench. That investigation and our inquiry has been focused on the nine statutory evaluative criteria. And that process has resulted in us being here today for this screening.

During that process, we have received no affidavits filed in opposition to your reelection, and there are no witnesses outside of yourself here today to testify.

With that clarification, we would ask that you turn your attention to Mr. Maldonado, and respond to
his questions.
JUDGE KINLAW: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
MR. MALDONADO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
members of the Commission.
Judge Kinlaw, you have before you, your sworn statement which provided detailed answers to over thirty questions. Are there any additional amendments you'd like to make to that sworn statement?

JUDGE KINLAW: None.
MR. MALDONADO: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that the judge -- Judge Kinlaw's sworn statement be entered to as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 50 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Alex Kinlaw, Jr., dated July 23rd, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. MALDONADO:
Q. Judge Kinlaw, can you explain to the Commission why would you like to continue to be serve -- continue to serve as a family court judge?
A. Well, I've enjoyed the last seven years that I have been a judge. And I think it's an excellent opportunity for me to continue to focus on families and resolving differences that families have on a day-to-day basis. And I will say this: Since I've been on the bench, I've sort of ventured out on a couple other things that really kind of tie into what we're doing on the juvenile side. I volunteer to be -- for the last three and a half years, I am the juvenile drug court judge. And I took up that because of the interest that $I$ have in juveniles that came before me in my role as family court judge. And I have enjoyed that as well as just representing -- I mean, being -- being the trial judge for families that come before me.
Q. Thank you. Judge Kinlaw, the Commission received 271 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 16 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"An impressive, valued member of the judiciary, and one of the state's best judges."

Two of the written comments expressed concerns, however. One commentator stated that you were lazy, and at times you avoid making decisions when prompt and direct decisions are needed. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Well, let me just say this -- and I'm glad you asked me that. There are three things that are really important to me. And let me just tell this committer what they are: God, my family, and my reputation. In that order. And the reason I say that is because when I heard about that comment about being lazy -- and I brought some information with me that I thought I needed to share with this committee. I -- I'm in Greenville, which is the 13th Judicial Circuit, and we have approximately five judges there. And Greenville has the highest filings of any circuit in this state.

As a matter of fact, to this day, we filed -there has been 4,915 filings in the 13 th Circuit, and 1,026 juvenile filings. We've had five judges. Now we have four. And I would say to this committee that there is not a lazy family court judge in this state. Everybody that works in Greenville -- and Representative Bannister is from Greenville. We're very busy there. Very, very busy.

And it was also important for me to contact Michelle -- and let me tell you what Michelle does. Michelle is the court administration, she is the young lady that all of the judges send reports to every month, telling her what matters are under advisement. I have brought my reports -- I have never, since I have sat on the bench, had any orders that were 30 days past due or -- of any kind.

Reports speak for themselves.
The last thing is, I've developed an idea that when lawyers have cases they have agreements on -- and since I practiced law, I know when you've got a big and you got -- the parties got -- they have an agreement, you want to get that on the record as soon as possible. So I extended to lawyers -- not only in the 13th Circuit, but all -- everywhere I go -- that if you've got a matter that there's an agreement on, you can call me at any time and I will make a -- I will fit you in, some kind of way, to make sure you get your agreement approved. And that moves the docket along. That moves the docket along.

And I have -- since I've been on the bench, I've been in 18 counties since I've been here. I have enjoyed working with all the clerks here. And maybe I'm just talking about some other things that maybe you may ask me, you may not. But one of the things that I've learned in going into a lot of counties, a lot of clerks offices operated differently.

And I just want to say this about the pro se part, because that's a lot of what we do. It's becoming more and more what we do as family court judges. And we're trying to get a grip on it. Some clerks offices really have a grip on it, and some don't. And that's the reality of it. And I was in Jasper the other day -- and it all
just kind of shut that down. I was in Jasper County, I think, about two or three months ago, and I was really impressed with how the clerk's office handled pro se litigants. And let me just tell you what they do.

So when you talk about moving cases along, and judges working hard in what we do, I intend to implement what $I$ saw in Jasper, come next year. This is what it is: Any pro se litigant that comes to court in Jasper County, that pro se litigant meets 30 minutes ahead of time with the clerk's office, they designate a person from the clerk's office, examines all of the requisite documents that we're required to look at -- affidavit service, financial declaration, proof of hearing notice, those type things.

That designated person in the clerk's office then comes to the judge prior to the convening of the hearings on that day, and says, "Judge, here are the matters that you are going to hear today. These litigants have everything in order. These are the matters that you won't hear because we rescheduled these."

And what that does for people who practice -- for lawyers as well as judges, they don't come in court and we as judges got to continue the case. And then that's -that's -- we're leaving the work for another judge to do. So those matters won't come in, so we only hear the matters
that can be heard. And I thought it was just an exemplary program that they had in Jasper. And I think it's something that needs to be done in other circuits.

So this past year, not only have I served as a juvenile drug court judge -- and this is following up on the allegation of Judge Kinlaw being lazy -- not only have I done that, I've mentored two magistrates under the chief's -- the Supreme Court's mentoring program, that I thought was -- was -- that was a good experience for them as well me. So we move a lot of cases, so I was not only disappointed by that remark, I felt insulted by that remark. Because my reputation --

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Judge Kinlaw -A. -- is what it is.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: If I can -- I
don't mean to interrupt you, 'cause you're on a roll. But I'm telling y'all, we have a higher workload for our judges in Greenville County, and we are one of the counties that's remained above. And the Chief Justice has a benchmark of 80 percent. And Don Phillips, who is a very good friend of mine and neighbor, went through heart issues -- ultimately died trying to have a heart transplant -- he's been basically a non-judge -- he was there, but I -- I love y'all for covering for him, but he was not carrying his full load. And these guys in Greenville were doubling down
on their dockets to make sure, number one, Don looked good so he wouldn't have any trouble getting reelected. He did survive the surgery; and two, just without complaint, to go take his docket away from him if he didn't look good, which was most of the time. So there was only one complaint and there's 4,000 cases filed, and you've been on the bench how long?

JUDGE KINLAW: Almost seven years.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Seven years. I appreciate -- I get it, you didn't like being called lazy, 'cause y'all do an incredible amount of work. But that's a whole lot of people that have come through your courtroom, to have one person talk about you is -- frankly, from some of the other comments we've seen the last couple of days, you should not be worried at all. And we're -- Greenville County Family Court is carrying the load.

And just so this committee knows, when trial judges come to Greenville, and they leave on Friday afternoon at five o'clock, 'cause they've had 15-minute hearings every 15 minutes for five days, they call court administration, and say, "Please don't send me back. I don't like all that work. I want to do something else." So, Judge, I feel -- I hear you. But for the extent the committee needs some additional reassurance, I can give it to you.

SENATOR MALLOY: I thought he was
petitioning to the finance committee for a law clerk.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Well, what I was actually going to say is, if you're talking about finances and the judges, you really don't pay enough. And family court judges do more work per judge than any judge in the country. And we keep -- I keep -- I believe we should be increasing their pay. That's not for this committee, but you brought it up.

SENATOR MALLOY: That's right.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I'm telling y'all, they're -- what y'all do, especially in Greenville, you're underpaid for it.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Did I interrupt?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, you did. But
that's okay. All right. Thank you for the input.
I'd also point out, in addition to those comments, we're talking about two negative ballot box surveys. So please continue, Mr. Maldonado.

MR. MALDONADO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
EXAMINATION RESUMED BY MALDONADO:
Q. Judge Kinlaw, in your amendment to your PDQ, you described two lawsuits that were filed against you in magistrate court. Can you briefly describe those?
A. Well, the first one $I$ think was back in 2004, I believe it was. And that's when my wife and I purchased our home that we're currently in. And there was some repairs that needed to be done prior to our entry into the house. And those funds were escrowed by the seller at that time, And we were reluctant to release the funds until the repairs were done to my -- to my wife's satisfaction, you know. And my wife was in charge at that time, and she thought that the person who did the work -- Mr. Reese, I think that's the -- the plaintiff in that case -- he did not do the work satisfactory, so she -- I'm not going to say -- I'm married to her, so we -- we -- we didn't pay him. And, finally --

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Hey, Judge, this is on the record.

JUDGE KINLAW: I understand. I understand.
A. And she -- he finally came and he did probably the work not to our greatest satisfaction, but I convinced her that we needed to go ahead and allow the seller's attorney to release the funds to him. So he was a little anxious; he brought an action against me and my wife for payment of those funds. And he finally was paid, after I convinced her to kind of leave it alone.

And the second one, I think that was an electrical company.
Q. Savage Electric?
A. Yeah. I needed a motion light put on the outside of my house. And every time $I$ went outside, the light wouldn't work. And -- and I kept calling Savage Electrical back, numerous time, to try to fix it. And he just said that it worked when he was there, but it doesn't work when I'm there. And so we kind of went back and forth.

And I -- I just told him, I said, "Well, you really need to fix it before $I$ can pay you."

And before $I$ knew it, he went to magistrate's court and filed suit. I wound up going to magistrate's court, I dropped it, I paid him. And then I paid another electrical company to actually get it done. So I wound up paying twice to get it done. So I just didn't want to fool with it. So that's what -- that's what that was about.
Q. Thank you, Judge. To finish up with some housekeeping issues. Judge, have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No.
Q. Have you sought or have been offered a conditional pledge of support of any legislator, pending the outcome of this screening?
A. No.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf?
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 a 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.
Q. -- that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must not be fined more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. MALDONADO: I would note that the
Upstate Citizens Committee reported Judge Kinlaw as qualified as to the Constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. He was found well qualified
as to the ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

I would note for the record that any concerns raised were -- during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today.

No further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Maldonado. Do any Commission members have questions or comments?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge Kinlaw, thank you for all that you do. Thank you for being here with us today. This -- that will conclude this portion of our screening -- screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. You could be called back at such time, if that need should arise.

Again, we want to thank you for your service on the bench.

JUDGE KINLAW: All right. Thank you. And I hope all of you have a wonderful day.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir. (Candidate excused.)
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REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge Vinson, thank you for joining us today.

JUDGE VINSON: It's my pleasure to be here.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have before us The Honorable Jerry Deese Vinson, Jr., of the Family Court, 12th Judicial Circuit, Seat 3.

Judge Vinson, would you please raise your right hand and be sworn.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE JERRY DEESE VINSON, JR., being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, you may recall that early in this process we sent you a personal data questionnaire, which you responded to promptly. Since you prepared that, and any amendments that you may have prepare since that time, is that personal data questionnaire current in its present form, and correct -JUDGE VINSON: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- or is it in need of any changes?

JUDGE VINSON: Yes, it is.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: It is correct?
JUDGE VINSON: It is correct.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Do you have any
objection to it being entered as a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE VINSON: I'd be happy to have it. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there any objection by any member?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it is so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 51 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable Jerry Deese Vinson, Jr., dated July 23rd, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the
Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria dictated by law in South Carolina. As a result of that evaluation, we are -- we find ourselves here today, with you before us. And we thank you for appearing.

There have been no affidavits received in opposition to your reelection, and there are not witnesses present to testify other than yourself.

With that introduction, we'll turn the time over to your screening attorney. We would ask that you respond to his questions.

JUDGE VINSON: Yes, sir.
MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Judge Vinson, you should have before you, the sworn statement you provided to the Commission.

JUDGE VINSON: I do.
MR. DAVIDSON: Are there any amendments you'd like to make at this time?

JUDGE VINSON: No.
MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask
that Judge Vinson's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 52 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Jerry Deese Vinson, Jr., dated July 23rd, 2015)

EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON:
Q. Judge Vinson, after serving as a family court judge for nearly 12 yours, why would you like to continue to serve as a judge?
A. Well, it is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to serve as a judge in this state. I can tell you that I love
my job, I love what $I$ do, and thoroughly enjoy it. And I'm happy to have the opportunity to do this job. It's a -it's a great job.
Q. Thank you, judge. The Commission received 301 ballot box surveys regarding your candidacy, with 20 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"Always treated with respect and professionalism when appearing in his courtroom. Fair, kind, always reasonable. A real delight to appear in front of. One of the most compassionate and thoughtful judges I've ever appeared before. Treats all who appear before him with respect and courtesy."

However, one of the written comments expressed a concern regarding demeanor and temperament, using a term -using the term "robe-itis." Is there any response you'd have for the Commission?
A. When I first heard that a couple weeks ago when I met with the screening attorney, I said I think I'd rather him call me stupid than tell me I had robe-itis. That to me is a very offensive thing. When I -- when I decided I want to -- I wanted to run for this job, I promised myself that I would treat people the way that I wanted to be treated, whether they were litigants or lawyers. I'm very cautious about how I talk to the litigants in the
courtroom. I'm very cautious about how I talk to the lawyers.

If I have a problem with something the lawyers are doing, I think they're making a mistake, or they have done something that is somehow offensive to the court or -then I don't talk to them in the courtroom, I usually take them outside of the courtroom and not talk to them in front of the clients. Because I've always found that if a client hears a lawyer being criticized by the judge directly, then they lose confidence in their lawyers. And that causes problems in that attorney-client relationship and the ability to carry that case forward.

So I'm very cautious about how I treat people.
So I hope that, that is someone -- maybe was unhappy with me for some reason. But I'm -- that's my -- been my feeling at "robe-itis."
Q. Thank you for your response. I just have a few quick questions --
A. Sure.
Q. -- to ask. 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 any attempting to intervene in part of this process on your behalf?
A. I am not.
Q. Have you contacted any members of this Commission?
A. I have not.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. I do understand that.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that is, it is a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned for not more than 90 days?
A. I most certainly understand that.
Q. Thank you.

MR. DAVIDSON: The Pee Dee Citizens

Committee reported that Judge Vinson is qualified in the criteria of Constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability; they found him well qualified in the remaining criteria. Any concerns raised during the investigation regarding this candidate, were incorporated into my questioning today.

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

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Senator Malloy is recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman. Judge Vinson is my neck of the woods. The negative comment could be nothing further from the truth. He's a very excellent judge. He has a lot experience in the family court, and one of the individuals that has dedicated his life to being in family court prior to working with DSS, did private cases, and dedicated himself to public service.

And I would say I've been in front of him before, and I've seen how he treats litigants, even when litigants are not acting in accordance with the way that they should. We had one situation in court, and he -- he was very calm in handling that matter very judicially.

And so I just want to say that he treats litigants and lawyers very kindly in the -- in the courtroom. And there's no doubt that any time anybody goes
into his courtroom, he's the most versed person in family law of anybody in the -- in the courtroom

JUDGE VINSON: You're very kind. Thank you, Senator.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator
Malloy.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Just one quick comment.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Representative Bannister is recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I had the pleasure of serving on the Bench Bar Committee with Judge Vinson as well, and just -- his engagement in the betterment of the court outside of his job is also commendable. And the amount of time you spend that's yours, that you wouldn't have to, to make it better for everybody is commendable. And I appreciate that and the work that you're doing, above and beyond just what we ask you to do, serving in the court.

JUDGE VINSON: Thank you. I appreciate that. And I think the judicial canons are more than suggestive about that, that we have an obligation to do more than just appear in court; we have an obligation to improve the court system.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you very
much. Any other questions or comments?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And I'll just
point out, that Senator Malloy has been asking the
candidates for open seats who they most look up to in terms of example of the kind of judge they want to be, and your name came up yesterday.

JUDGE VINSON: Thanks.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Martin --
excuse me, Senator Martin -- and I was looking forward to meeting you so I could share that with you.

JUDGE VINSON: Thank you. Thank you. It's very flattering.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. SENATOR MALLOY: And he's married to Flo. JUDGE VINSON: The most important thing. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: That's right. SENATOR MALLOY: A lot of public service. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
other questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none,
Judge Vinson, we appreciate you being with us today. This will conclude this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is
published. You may be called back at such time, if that need should arise.

Again, we thank you for your service to the State of South Carolina, by serving on the family court bench. Thank you for being with us.

JUDGE VINSON: Thank you. It's my pleasure. (Candidate excused.)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: It's a pleasure to have you here with us. We have before us The Honorable Walter H. Sanders, Jr., Master-in-Equity for Allendale County, 14th Circuit. Judge, early in this process we provided you with a personal data questionnaire, which you responded to thoroughly. We would ask whether that response is current and correct today, or is it in need of any amendment?

JUDGE SANDERS: It is current and correct.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Judge.
Would you have any objection to that -- your responses to that personal data questionnaire being included as a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

JUDGE SANDERS: I would not.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. Are there any objections by Commission members?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Without objection,
it's so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 53 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Personal Data Questionnaire of The Honorable Walter H. Sanders, Jr. dated August 4th, 2015)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has -- Judge, if you would raise your right hand and be sworn.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE WALTER H. SANDERS, JR., being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: With regard to the responses you gave to me regarding the personal data questionnaire, are those correct? Would you please affirm that those are correct?

JUDGE SANDERS: They are correct.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. The
Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the statutory evaluative criteria, the nine evaluative criteria. And as a result of that process, the Commission has received one affidavit filed in opposition to your election. There are no witnesses -- I'm sorry, there is one witness present to testify.

With that, will you please turn your attention to your screening attorney, and respond to any questions he may have.

MR. GOLDIN: Judge Sanders, you have before you, your sworn statement that you provided, with detailed answers to over thirty questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualifications, office administration, and temperament. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to that statement?

JUDGE SANDERS: There are none.
MR. GOLDIN: Thank you. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that Judge Sanders sworn statement be entered in as an exhibit into the hearing record.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Is there any
objection?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
(EXHIBIT NO. 54 - Judicial Merit Selection Commission Sworn Statement of The Honorable Walter H. Sanders, Jr. dated August 4th, 2015) EXAMINATION BY MR. GOLDIN:
Q. Judge Sanders, why do you now want to continue to serve as a Master-in-Equity?
A. Well, I enjoy doing it. Of course, with it being Allendale, being a small county, it's very part-time. I've actually been the Master-in-Equity since 1992. But I enjoy doing it, and somebody needs to do it. We don't have a whole bunch of lawyers in Allendale, but $I$ enjoy doing it.
Q. Thank you. Judge Sanders, we received 110 ballot box surveys regarding you, with five additional comments. The majority of those were positive, and they complemented your abilities as being an experienced attorney and an experienced Master.

One negative comment was -- was provided in those, and it indicated that you let your private practice interfere with your duties as a Master-in-Equity. What response would you give to this concern?
A. Well, when you first told me that, that was -that negative response, I really couldn't understand, you know, the nature of it. But after thinking about it, the only thing I can assume is that, you know, Allendale County is -- we've only got ten thousand people. I was raised there, went to school there, I know everybody there. I've been practicing law there for over 35 years. And I have to recuse myself, probably more than I should, because of conflicts. So that could be the basis of that comment.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge Sanders, as the Chairman indicated, that we have received one complaint against you,

## filed by Mr. Mark Morris.

MR. GOLDIN: Mr. Chairman, I would -- I
would suggest that the Commission go ahead and handle that at this time.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, please.
Judge, if you would -- we would excuse you, momentarily. If you would like to find a seat in the back, we will bring the witness forward. Or you could sit --

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair, if we would let him stay here so he can look at the person that's making the complaint against him.

JUDGE SANDERS: I've never met him before.
SENATOR MALLOY: Well, you'll get a chance
now. If you'll go over there and sit down.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yeah, have a seat on one of the black chairs, Judge. The Commission would call Mark Morris to the stand.

Good afternoon, Mr. Morris.
MR. MORRIS: Good afternoon.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: If you would,
please, raise your right hand and be sworn.
WHEREUPON:
MARK MORRIS, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS:
Q. You have filed a complaint with the Commission, with regard to the reelection of Judge Sanders.
A. Right. Well, not reelection, but the ethics violation.
Q. Okay. You understand that the purpose for this gathering is to determine whether or not Judge Sanders is qualified to continue to serve on the bench.
A. Right. Yes, sir.
Q. This really is not a forum within which to challenge the ethics. That will be a --
A. No. No, sir. It's -- it's a -- I realize that it's y'alls duty to -- to do that. I just made the complaint because he filed a lawsuit against my late wife, after she passed away. And she was a client of his before. And he sent me a letter back, saying that he would recuse his self. And I didn't hear anything else. And then I got further correspondence that he was going to be a witness to testify at the hearing.

And I sent him a letter, and he did not respond to that letter. And that's when I contacted y'alls office. Because to my opinion, he should have never involved his self in this matter at all. Because he was her attorney on that case, and a case beforehand.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And, Members, the
complaint itself is on your computer in the "Complaints" file.

SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Martin is
recognized.
SENATOR MARTIN: Could I ask the Council if
he informed you that he filed a complaint with the Office
of Disciplinary Council?
MR. GOLDIN: That's correct.

SENATOR MARTIN: And they rendered an
opinion on it?
MR. GOLDIN: No, sir. It's still -- it's
still open.
SENATOR MARTIN: Do you know when the
complaint was filed?
MR. GOLDIN: I do not.

SENATOR MARTIN: Do you remember when you
filed --
MR. MORRIS: I filed before -- before I
filed one with y'all?
SENATOR MARTIN: Yeah. Do you remember
when?

MR. MORRIS: It was filed -- I don't have it with me. Maybe $I$ have something here.

MR. GOLDIN: And Judge Sanders might.

MR. MORRIS: It would have been right after -- around the 12th of the fifth month. 'Cause this is the letter that I sent him and to -- to the Judiciary Committee, everything else involved.

SENATOR MARTIN: You filed it this year? REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: May 12th of this year?

MR. MORRIS: Yes, of 2015. Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator or the staff has some questions.

SENATOR MARTIN: Yes, please.
MR. GOLDIN: And Senator and members of the
Commission, I do want to point out I think Judge Sanders said that he is a part-time Master-in-Equity, so that's why this does result from his private practice; It's not part of his duties as a Master.

EXAMINATION BY MR. GOLDIN:
Q. Mr. Morris, were you represented by Judge Sanders in the purchase of this piece of property?
A. No, my wife was.
Q. And when did -- when did Judge Sanders file this?
A. The complaint? The statement --
Q. The credit or claim that --
A. He filed it on 4/22/15.
Q. And that was after your wife's death?
A. Yes, sir. On March the 7th, 2015.
Q. Okay. Do you have anything else that you'd like to offer to the Commission?
A. No. But I would just like for him to be more careful in doing these things. I mean, it can cause a lot of damage to people. It caused a lot of damage to me.

## Q. Thank you.

MR. GOLDIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't have anything else.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir. Do you have anything else further you'd like to share with the Commission?

MR. MORRIS: No, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We appreciate --
MR. MORRIS: Like I said, he -- he recused his self, and I heard no more from him. And the only reason I sent y'all a complaint was because when I sent him the letter about a witness that -- with him supposedly being a witness, I never heard nothing else from him. And I just...

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you. If you'll bear with us there for just one moment longer, in case any Commission member has a question for you. Dean Wilcox?

MR. WILCOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. If I -- I'm just trying to clarify exactly when Mr. Sanders -- Judge Sanders represented your wife, that was in connection with her acquiring this property and issuing a mortgage to the lender; is that correct?
A. To the owner, yes, sir.
Q. And was that the mortgage that was being -- the same mortgage being foreclosed on?
A. No, it was not being foreclosed on.
Q. The later action, then, where he was involved against your wife, after her death, what did that involve?
A. Well, that's a long, complicated story there.

The --
Q. Can you give me the quick version of it?
A. The land was put in my wife and her cousin's name. The mobile home was sold to me and my wife over a period of years, in monthly payments. And we gave a ten thousand dollar check pay for the mobile home. The owner signed the mobile home title over to my wife, free and clear. No liens. There's not a lien nowhere in the whole highway department -- Department of Motor Vehicles in South Carolina. So when my wife passed away, I tried to make arrangements with them to make the monthly payments, just like my wife was doing, to uphold her end of the agreement and deal. They refused to do so, so I was -- after she
passed away, the mobile home become mine as personal
property. So I was going to move it off of their property. It was not going to be -- be in there.
Q. But they were then suing because of the money that was allegedly still owed to them from her purchase of the --
A. For the mobile home.
Q. Of the mobile home.
A. The claim was on -- they tried to file a claim that they had a lien on the mobile home.
Q. Did Judge Sanders represent her in connection with the acquisition of the mobile home, or just the land? Do you know?
A. I've seen his name nowhere on the mobile home. On the back of the title, he signed as a witness down here.
Q. Okay.
A. His signature is noted -- I assume that's his. I can't really read this writing or this print. You can ask him, if you want to. That's the onliest [sic] thing I can -- I assume that's his signature and his initials.
Q. But I'll tell you what I'm just trying to clarify, whether or not he represented your wife in -- with regard to the same transaction that was later the subject of the lawsuit.
A. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay.
A. Paid him a thousand dollars. And that was -that money was left over from a case that we were trying to buy a piece of property in Brunson, South Carolina. And Allendale County Bank went bankrupt, something happened with them -- a man and wife died and something happened with that piece of property. So then we went into this one, and he's used the money from that one for this one to pay for it.
Q. And after you contacted him and advised him that he had previously represented your wife in this, there was an indication that he -- from him to you, that he would not continue to --
A. Yes, sir, he did. He sent me -- yes, sir. No, I had no problems after that.
Q. That he would recuse himself.
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And to your knowledge, he -- he appears as a witness, you say, later.
A. Right.
Q. Does he appear as a lawyer in that matter, later?
A. No, he was put on --
Q. -- a witness list. Okay.
A. Yeah.
Q. But not as a lawyer, but as a witness.
A. Right.
Q. Okay. And the best you know, he was -- he did at least honor his commitment not to be the lawyer --
A. Right. Yes, sir.
Q. -- in that -- okay.
A. He did. And that's what I said, I -- I --
Q. I just want to make sure.
A. -- he sent me a letter, and he did. And I sent him a letter concerning the witness -- the witness part. And he didn't respond to me, so I -- that's when I decided to make the complaint to y'all of him. All he had to do was respond to that and tell me he wasn't going to do it. MR. WILCOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Dean Wilcox. Are there other questions by Commission members?

SENATOR MALLOY: Just briefly.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy is
recognized.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. How you doing, Mr. Morris?
A. Pretty good. How you doing?
Q. Doing pretty good. I'm Gerald Malloy from

Darlington County. Mr. Morris, are you trying to stop Judge Sanders from becoming a judge today?
A. No, I have no desire to do that. No.
Q. And were you aware that this process is a process that we have, that we -- he's got over a hundred-and-someodd ballot responses that came back from lawyers and folks in his area and community, and only one -- one negative comment came out of that 110 ballot responses? Were you aware of that?
A. No, sir. I'm not aware of that.
Q. And so is this the first time you've ever seen him today?
A. I might have seen him in town or something.
Q. But you-guys have never had a face-to-face.
A. No.
Q. Okay. All right. And I appreciate you exercising your opportunity to get a chance to do that. I'm my view, 1 think that this -- this is a matter that -that probably is a little bit of a lack of communication. But they'll handle it over at the Disciplinary Council.
A. Right. Another concern I have is how many people has he done this to, that didn't know they had the right to
Q. Do you know any of them?
A. No. No, I --
Q. Okay. Well, we can't -- we can't take -- yeah, we can't take that up if we don't know who it is.
A. I ain't bringing none of that up.
Q. But thank you for taking your time and driving down today. That's part of the process; you exercised your right.
A. I am not trying to stop him from being a judge; that was not my intention at all.
Q. Okay. Well, our job is to see -- make sure that he's -- that he's fit to end up being a --
A. Right.
Q. -- Master-in-Equity.
A. Well, if that's what it is, y'all can proceed.
Q. Okay. All right. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator
Malloy. Are there any other questions?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Morris, we want to thank you for coming before the -- our panel today, our Commission today, to provide the information that you've provided. My view is much like Senator Malloy's. I think your complaints -- the best place for those complaints are probably with the Office of Disciplinary Council, to ferret through the issues and figure it out. We do appreciate your input. And it will be entered into the record for our consideration.

MR. MORRIS: Okay.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And let me ask you
before you sit down, is there anything else further you would like to add about this matter?

MR. MORRIS: No, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Ms. Wall has a question for you.

MS. WALL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to simply ask that the witness continue to be here until we complete our -- in case we have another question for him. If he'll not just leave, just sit in the back.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Please. Thank you.

MS. WALL: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: All right. Judge, if you would please re-take the stand. Judge, would you care to respond to the --

JUDGE SANDERS: Do I need to respond?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, sir.
JUDGE SANDERS: Okay. Well, I did represent
his wife, his estranged wife -- I didn't even know that he existed -- and her nephew in the purchase of a -- some real estate and a mobile home from a gentleman. He actually sold the -- he sold a piece of property for $\$ 40,000$. And they paid $\$ 10,000$ down, and he financed thirty thousand of it, and there was supposed to be a -- well, there was a mortgage. We did not have the title at that time. And on
the title was supposed to be the lien to Mr. Key, who was the seller, and the name of the nephew on the title. After she passed away, it came to light that somehow the title was just in her name and not the nephew's name, also, or a lien of it. But that's all come to light after the fact. And I did actually assist Mr. Key in filing a claim against her estate for the debt, which was something less than twenty thousand. And immediately when he wrote a letter requesting that I recuse myself, because I had, you know, done work for his deceased wife, I immediately notified him that $I$ was recusing myself. And I sent a letter to the probate judge and she removed my name from the record. And I've actually had nothing else to do with that case since that time.

Now, where he got me being a witness was, when he sent interrogatories to Mr . Key, who was the person who sold the property, he listed me as a witness. But Mr. Key has never asked me to be a witness, and I've never considered to be a witness. And I've never been subpoenaed to be a witness. I think they actually had a hearing this week concerning something in the case, but $I$ have not had any involvement since $I$ recused myself.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Judge, were you representing the seller and the buyers in the transaction? JUDGE SANDERS: The sellers and the buyers.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And then you represented the seller in a claim against the estate --

JUDGE SANDERS: Right. The seller and one of the buyers in a -- basically. Because the buyer who did not -- who's name was not on the title, you know.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Do you perceive that as a conflict of interest?

JUDGE SANDERS: Well, in retrospect? Yes. Yes. Of course, he made a complaint to the disciplinary council. And, you know, they're investigating that. Well, it's -- I wouldn't -- I wouldn't do it again, put it -- put it that way. And it probably is a conflict. But, you know, it's a close question whether or not an estate is the person and if it was -- you know, if it falls under that rule of how you treat former clients. But I would say, in retrospect, I shouldn't have done it.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: And do we have the notice from the Office of Disciplinary Council that it's a matter under investigation?

MR. GOLDIN: Mr. Morris has testified and produced that.

## REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any other

questions? Dean Wilcox?
EXAMINATION BY MR. WILCOX:
Q. Not so much about what has happened, but do you
have in place a system to identify conflicts as probate judge and as a lawyer in situations?
A. Yes. I mean, I --
Q. Are you concerned about the adequacy in light of this one getting through?
A. I mean, I knew I had represented -- I mean, I -you know, when $I$ did it, I was not thinking there was a conflict, because it -- it was her estate.
Q. It was the estate that --
A. Right. Which I do -- you know, we -- and we do conflicts checks all the time. When people are referring cases, you know, to my office, they'll check and see if I have a conflict.
Q. And do you do a conflict check for matters in which you were acting as judge, to be sure that it is not a client in some manner?
A. Yes. Yes, sir.
Q. So you run both the -- both things through your conflicts system.
A. And most of the time, when those cases are referred to the Master, before the attorney will refer it, they'll check with my office to see if there's a previous conflict.

MR. WILCOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Dean

Wilcox. Any other questions? Yes.
MS. WALL: I would like to just follow-up on
that.
EXAMINATION BY MS. WALL:
Q. Again, let me kind of re-ask the question. In light of this, and particularly since what I'm hearing is lawyers will contact your office to see if there is a conflict --
A. Right.
Q. -- do you think that your office system of checking conflicts is adequate?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And so here -- 'cause my initial question was, "How did you miss the fact that she was your client?" But as I'm understanding your testimony, there was never any question in your mind that you didn't --
A. I didn't --
Q. -- you didn't miss that she was your client, you had differentiated the woman as an individual client from her estate.
A. And what I told the Disciplinary Council was that as soon as he sent the letter, I recused myself in case my interpretation of this was wrong.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms.
Wall.
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MS. WALL: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any other questions?

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair -- Mr. Chair, I have a couple questions, not related to this, $I$ want to ask him about --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Well, let's finish. We're going to give Mr. Morris an opportunity to respond to this. Judge, if you would please relinquish they stand and take a seat. And, Mr. Morris, we'd ask that you come back forward, please, to give you an opportunity to respond to what you just heard. If you'd care to respond to any of those points by the judge.

MR. MORRIS: Yeah. (To Judge Sanders) I just want to -- why do you call her my estranged wife?

SENATOR MALLOY: You can't --
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: No. Sir, you need to direct your questions to us.

MR. MORRIS: Okay. Well, why did he call my wife "estranged," and not "divorced" or "separated" or anything? There's a big difference in that.

JUDGE SANDERS: (To the witness) Y'all didn't live together.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We really can't engage in exchange, back and forth.
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JUDGE SANDERS: Right.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We really -- we do not have an answer to your question, sir.

MR. MORRIS: We lived together. We most certainly lived together. I have a letter where she wrote me, thanking me for being there and holding up my vow to God and everything in taking care of her while she was sick for the last ten years. And he shouldn't have said that. That was wrong for him to say that.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Morris. And our condolences to you on the loss of your wife.

MR. MORRIS: I appreciate it. But he shouldn't have said that. He has no earthly idea of what --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, sir.
MR. MORRIS: -- of what our life was.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: With regard to the thing -- the matters that he stated, that go directly to your complaint against him, do you have any response to that?

MR. MORRIS: No, sir. Like I said, he sent me a letter, immediately, recusing his self. And the only reason I pursued it was because I got that information of the witness, and I sent him a letter and he did not respond
to that second letter. So I figured I needed to move forward. Other than that, I have nothing personally. I don't even know him, other than talk and hearsay. And I don't associate with that at all.

SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Martin is recognized.

SENATOR MARTIN: Could I ask you a question? MR. MORRIS: Yes, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN: You said he didn't respond to the second letter. Are you suggesting that if he had responded, you wouldn't have filed a complaint?

MR. MORRIS: Probably not. Because he would
have let me know that he was upholding his recusal. I
mean, how was $I$ supposed to know he wasn't --
SENATOR MARTIN: So it was the failure to
respond to that second letter --
MR. MORRIS: Sir?
SENATOR MARTIN: It was the failure to
respond to the second letter that sort of instigated --
MR. MORRIS: Oh, no. I made the complaint
to the Judiciary Committee for lawyer's conduct before.
SENATOR MARTIN: I see.
MR. MORRIS: Right. Yeah. And when he was supposedly, allegedly been called to be a witness, that's
when I came to the judges --
SENATOR MARTIN: I got you.
MR. MORRIS: -- because of the --
SENATOR MARTIN: I got you. Thank you so
much.
MR. MORRIS: Right.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are there any
other questions for Mr. Martin? Do you have anything further to add, Mr. Martin?

MR. MORRIS: "Morris."
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Morris. I'm
sorry. You're Martin, right?
SENATOR MARTIN: Yeah.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Morris, do you have anything further to add, Mr. Morris?

MR. MORRIS: No, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Morris, I
thank you for being here, today, and for sharing this information with us. We will certainly include it in our deliberations.

MR. MORRIS: Thank you very much.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
MR. MORRIS: Do you want me to hang around?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: You certainly have that right, sir, if you'd like.

MR. MORRIS: Okay.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: You may leave if you'd like, sir. But you're welcome to stay, if you'd like.

MR. MORRIS: All right. Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes, sir. Thank you. Mr. Goldin?

MR. GOLDIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
would like to note that the Lowcountry Citizens Committee did find Judge Sanders qualified in the criteria, constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability, and well qualified in the criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

I would also like to note that any concerns raised during his screening were incorporated into today's hearing.

And I have no further questions.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr.
Goldin. Members of the Commission?
SENATOR MARTIN: I just have one question.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Martin.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MARTIN:
Q. Judge, do you ever -- have you ever been assigned to sit as a circuit judge?
A. No, I have not. They usually just do the -- the full-time magistrate's get assigned.
Q. That's right. The part-time, they don't do that.
A. No.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy?
SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Judge, how long have you been a Master-in-Equity now?
A. Since 1992.
Q. '92.
A. '92.
Q. Okay. And this is just going down the line of things of something we're trying to work on over here: Have you -- have you done partition actions and actions to quiet title --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in your -- in your court?
A. Yes. That's a lot of the work we do with foreclosures.
Q. How many times, if you know on a -- sort of a percentage basis, how many times are they being sold to just the highest bidder as opposed to, you know, getting partition? I mean, how many times do they work it out? Or
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how many times are they just sold to the highest bidder?
A. More times than not, they work it out unless it's truly -- the property in the -- and the heirs aren't interested in it. 'Cause, you know, you're familiar with the process where, you know, the defendants can now, you know, purchase the property if they have the money.
Q. And I think that's the -- that's the thing -- one of the things that the former senator from Jasper did here -- and something that I'm interested in too -- is to see how masters-in-equity handle partition cases, and whether or not that they're trying to sort through it and make the stay into the hands of the -- of the -- of the family, if you will, or -- or -- or the heirs from the family. I'm trying to see --
A. Right.
Q. -- make certain that there's not a process that is quick where they -- or partition it and get it -- put it up for sale to the highest bidder. 'Cause we know how those quitclaim deeds and those kind of things work.
A. Right. We -- of course, we following the legislation that y'all have concerning giving the -- the non-petitioning parties the rights to purchase the property. I understand -- I think there is legislation that's revising all of that, pending now, isn't it?
Q. Yes, sir. And that's -- I was going to ask you
about it. Have you been following that? Or have you been --
A. Not --
Q. -- to that proceeding --
A. -- not very closely.
Q. -- as we go along?
A. But $I$ have seen it.
Q. I'm just curious if you think that -- that it would be helpful to have a separate procedure to assist you, as a Master-in-Equity, with a -- these kinds of matters as it relates to heirs' property? Or do you think that, that would make the process more convoluted, make it more confusing. Do you think it would be helpful to end up having that in your court?
A. I don't -- I don't think it would hurt. I don't know if it would help or not.
Q. And your county is Allendale?
A. Yes. Allendale.
Q. It's a pretty rural county?
A. Very rural, yes.
Q. And you see a -- do you see a lot of -- do you see a lot of partition actions, 'cause you have larger tracts of land, it's easier to end up having division?
A. We see it -- a right good bit of it. But the land that -- you know, we're -- we're very rural, but we're
very poor, also. So not like Jasper and Beaufort, where, you know, investors are trying to buy the property, and that's where they run into the problem with the heirs.
Q. And so in doing so, in your activities as a Master -- and there is times for a hearing to occur --
A. Right.
Q. -- do you do that from your office? Or do the clerk assist you for doing that? Or how is it done?
A. I usually will do it from my office, depending on the -- how many people are going to be involved. Most of the things that $I$ hear are default matters. So it's usually not a whole bunch of parties. But if there -- if it's more than a few parties, then if it's very contested, I will use the courthouse.
Q. Now, how often does that happen? If you did it on a percentage basis, do you -- if you went --
A. Five percent.
Q. From using the courthouse, you say five percent.
A. Five percent, yeah.
Q. And about how many matters do you hear on a yearly basis with you being a part-time Master-in-Equity, and -- and part-time lawyer?
A. Probably, in Allendale, fifty cases.
Q. Okay. Now, when you start dealing with people you talk about rural communities and people that are -- are
more impoverished. How often -- do you require them to get an appraiser in matters that were being dealt -- having costs associated with the property?
A. Well, I have not actually had to do that. But there is an appraisal process, but only it's requested, we don't do it.
Q. So, generally, when you're -- you're -- in your activity as a magistrate, you have the parties that normally agree upon the valuation?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you -- so you've never had the parties in your 23 years to -- to request an appraisal on the outside?
A. No.
Q. No? Really?
A. No.
Q. And so -- so what do they use? Do they use the tax assessed value? Or how do they agree upon it? Do you know?
A. Well, they'll -- they'll usually get the independent appraisers that -- you know, if that -- that's an issue.
Q. So I'm asking who -- how many times have you gotten appraisers?
A. Oh, you mean where they've done it? Probably a
handful.
Q. And who -- who pays for the appraisers?
A. The parties.
Q. The parties. And so my concern is, is that for the people that are --
A. Right.
Q. -- challenged financially, they get -- they have -- probably that their families can work for, I just want to make sure that our masters have a compassion and -- and some sensitivity to that. Because, you know, throughout history, we have a little -- a little bit of a history in our state of people that have their forefathers and parents that worked for property, and they lose it --
A. Right. Right.
Q. -- in these situations. And I just want to make certain, do you see a lot of --
A. I don't see a lot of problems. But we do have the authority to -- you know, to charge the appraiser to whoever we want to as far as the parties.
Q. Okay. And how -- and how many times do you think the outside appraiser has been used, percentage-wise? Do you say five percent? Or was that something -- is that a different question?
A. Probably five percent. And that's on the high side.
Q. It's on the high side?
A. Yeah.
Q. How many local appraisers do you got in your area?
A. In our area?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Two or three.
Q. Two or three?
A. We just don't have -- you know, most of the appraise -- you know, would have to come from either -would come from Aiken or Orangeburg or Charleston or --
Q. Well, thank you. And I appreciate you answering the questions, and just let -- let you know that we have a concern for that. Do you -- do you have an opinion, or do you believe that there is a -- in your way of handling things, that you try to lean one way or the other? Do you try to keep the property with the heirs? Or do you -- how do you --
A. No, I -- I'm supposed to be impartial.
Q. I understand.
A. But I don't --
Q. Impartial as to --
A. Yeah, but I do have a sense of -- you know, of the -- these heirs, a lot of them, you know, want to keep their property. And I --
Q. Well, we know that. And sometimes there's someone that comes in, they get a quitclaim deed from somebody that's wherever, they come in and they file a partition --
A. Right.
Q. -- and get the property sold. And I'm trying to make certain that we give these folks time and --
A. Right.
Q. -- the ability and the effort so that we don't end up forcing a quick -- having a quick sale without everybody being advised of their rights --
A. Right.
Q. -- and those kind of things. And we don't continue to end up losing property from poor people that were going out to some people that's -- that are so inclined to end up paying for their property.
A. And most of the time, these parties are not represented. So I do -- I won't say I bend over backwards, but I do give a lot of deference to the fact that they're pro se and don't have an attorney. So I give them a lot more leeway, you know. If they're -- if they're trying to hold onto the property, I'll try to work with them.
Q. So that -- and so that -- that begs my next question: Then if they don't -- if they are pro se, do you -- in these areas, do give them the opportunity to get a
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lawyer? Do you freely grant the things that you do have in your discretion, which is continuances, to end up going and get a lawyer so they don't --
A. Right.
Q. -- lose their family property?
A. Oh, yeah. If they -- if they want a lawyer.

Yeah, and I usually recommend that they do. But most of the time, they don't want to, you know, spend the money for a lawyer. Or they don't have it to. And that's more the case than not wanting to hire a lawyer, that they can't afford to hire a lawyer.
Q. Okay. And that's --
A. And I would, yeah --
Q. Makes it even more of a -- I would encourage you, as we go forward, though, we're going to try to tackle this in the coming years, that heirs property -- that you and other masters-in-equity spread the word that we got some folks that really are sensitive to that area.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator
Malloy. Mr. Hitchcock is recognized.
MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
just have one question.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HITCHCOCK:
Q. Judge, I noticed that whenever Mr. Morris testified, and when you came back up, and the -- and the

Chairman asked you if wanted to respond, you asked, "Do I need to respond?" And I just wanted to -- that kind of stuck with me. I just wanted to give you a little -- an opportunity, if you can give me some context as to why you would ask if you needed to respond. I mean, given the -you know, what was -- given the accusation.
A. Well, because it was a -- it was a matter that's really something that y'all are not concerned with. It was more of a -- in my private practice, you know.
Q. Well, Judge, I mean, it's -- it's our responsibility -- there's a -- to judge your character and fitness for the -- for the bench.
A. Right.
Q. And that encompasses every -- every part of your -- of your legal career, whether the actions -- I mean, most of the -- the -- you know, the folks that come here, that have never been judges, and are applying for seats and they're attorneys -- they're just simply attorneys applying for judicial seats, I mean, we -- we look into -- I mean, everything that they've done has been in their private practice. And that's how we judge their -- their -- their -- you know, whether or not they're qualified. So -- you know, and there's -- I think that the implications of what -- I'm not in any way saying whether or not I -- you know, give weight one way or the other to his accusations. But I
think the -- the accusations or the -- the -- the implication of what he said certainly is something that could be for us to -- to consider, and something that we take very serious, especially, you know, given the -- the effort that Mr. Morris put into appearing before us today.

And a -- so like I said, I just wanted to give you some -- an opportunity to respond. But I would submit that every part of you being an attorney is certainly with the purview of this Commission to investigate, to determine how it reflects on --
A. Right.
Q. -- our perception of whether or not you're qualified to be a judge.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Mr. Hitchcock -JUDGE SANDERS: Do you want me to respond? REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Certainly. JUDGE SANDERS: Well, one reason I didn't want to is because what -- a lot of what he said was just not true. And all that is being tried in the probate court now. The facts as he relayed them are not -- were nowhere near what actually happened.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy?
SENATOR MALLOY: Do you -- yes, sir, Mr.
Chairman.
RE-EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Do you have attorney representation in the disciplinary matter?
A. No.
Q. You're handling it yourself?
A. Well, they -- they -- they're still investigating it. They're not to the point where they --
Q. That's a matter of choice. I understand that. But you -- but you filed your initial response.
A. Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah.
Q. So you don't have an attorney, is my question.
A. No.
Q. Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Any other questions or comments?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge Sanders, thank you for being with us today. That concludes this portion of the screening process.

As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. And you may be called back at such time, if that need should arise.

We thank you, again, for offering and for your service to South Carolina on the bench. Thank you, sir.

THE WITNESS: Thank y'all.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Is that the last one? REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Yes. Motion for executive session?

SENATOR MARTIN: Motion so moved.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: So ordered. We are in executive session. Please secure the room.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Ladies and
Gentleman, we are back on the record, having risen from executive session, wherein, we discussed qualifications. No votes were taken and no decisions were made.

We are now considering what candidates that we've reviewed this afternoon are qualified and nominated. For the record, we have -- we have screened William J. Wylie, Jr., Family Court, 1st Judicial Circuit, Seat 2; Nancy Chapman McLin, Family Court, 1st Judicial Circuit, Seat 3; Vicki J. Snelgrove, Family Court, 2nd Judicial Circuit, Seat 1; George Marion McFadden, Jr., Family Court, 3rd Judicial Circuit, Seat 1; Cely Anne Brigman, Family Court, 4th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1; Dorothy Mobley Jones, Family Court, 5th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1; Gwendlyne Young Jones, Family Court, 5th Judicial Circuit, Seat 4; Usha J. Bridges, Family Court, 7th Judicial Circuit, Seat 3; Daniel E. Martin, Jr., Family Court, 9th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1;

Jack Alan Landis, Family Court, 9th Judicial Circuit, Seat 6; Karen F. Ballenger, Family Court, 10th Judicial Circuit, Seat 2; Alex Kinlaw, Jr., Family Court, 13th Judicial Circuit, Seat 6; and Jerry Deese Vinson, Jr., Family Court, 12th Judicial Circuit, Seat 3. With regard to those -- those judges who would -- who are seeking reelection, do we have a motion? MS. DEAN: The judges that you just named? REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: The judges I just named.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Well, move to find them qualified and nominated.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have a motion MS. WALL: Second. REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: -- to find them qualified and nominated by Senator Campsen, as seconded by Ms. Wall. All those in favor of such, please raise your hand.
(At this time the members raise their hands.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Those opposed, raise your hand.
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: By acclamation, the list, as I just published in the public record, are all
found qualified and -- and are hereby nominated.
We will reopen the hearing of the Honorable Walter H. Sanders, Jr., Master-in-Equity for Allendale County, 14th Judicial Circuit.

SENATOR MALLOY: If we could go into executive session.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Are you making that motion, Senator?

SENATOR MALLOY: Yeah. I move that we go into executive session to address possible financial --

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Upon arrival of the candidate.

SENATOR MALLOY: Upon arrival of the candidate.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you.
(Off the record for Judge Sanders return to the proceedings.)

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Thank you for coming back again, Judge. If you'd please come to the podium. We have just ordered that we go into executive session on the motion of Senator Malloy. And we are in executive session.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have risen from executive session, and are back on the record. We were in
executive session for the purpose of further discussing qualifications of Judge Sanders. And the purpose of that now having been accomplished, we are back on the record with no votes having been taken and no decision made in executive session. Mr. Sanders is excused from the -- from the hearing.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Did we find him nominated
and qualified?
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: What is the
pleasure of the Commission? We -- based upon what staff has researched --

SENATOR MARTIN: He's nominated.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We don't nominate.
We just find him qualified.
SENATOR MARTIN: He's qualified.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: For Masters-in-
Equity -- for Masters-in-Equity, we do not nominate. We just find them qualified.

MR. WILCOX: Mr. Chairman, for purposes of the discussion, $I$ would make a motion to find him qualified for reappointment.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Second.
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: We have a motion by Dean, and a second by Mr. Bannister. Any discussion?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none -MR. WILCOX: Well, let me -- the follow-up, I think that based on the complaint that was presented, there is perhaps an indication that he may have misunderstood the relevant law regarding conflicts. It seems to be a -- we have evidence of one incident of that, and it's one in which he responded immediately by recusing himself from any further participation in the matter. And so based on that, I don't find there to be sufficient grounds to find him disqualified under the purposes of character, if that be the category. So that's the purpose for my motion.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Okay. Any further discussion? Any further discussion?
(No response.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: Hearing none, those in favor of finding Judge Walter H. Sanders, Jr., Master-in-Equity for Allendale County 14th Circuit, qualified, please raise your hand.
(The members raise their hands.)
REPRESENTATIVE CLEMMONS: By acclamation, Judge Sanders is found qualified for reelection as Master-in-Equity for Allendale County -- for reappointment -excuse me -- is found qualified for reappointment as

Master-in-Equity of Allendale -- for Allendale County, 14th Circuit.

And to clarify the record, the executive session that we just arose from was not for the purpose of discussing qualifications, it was for the purpose of asking the candidate with regard to financial matters. Again, no votes were taken, no decisions were made during that executive session.

The purpose for which this meeting was convened today having been accomplished, we have a motion to adjourn by Senator Bannister. And it is so ordered until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

We are off the record.
(There being nothing further, the proceedings concluded at 7:33 p.m.)

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, PATRICIA G. BACHAND, COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AT LARGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT CONSISTING OF 325 PAGES IS A TRUE, ACCURATE, AND COMPLETE RECORD TO THE BEST OF MY SKILL AND ABILITY.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I AM NEITHER ATTORNEY NOR COUNSEL FOR, NOR RELATED TO OR EMPLOYED BY ANY OF THE PARTIES CONNECTED WITH THIS ACTION, NOR AM I FINANCIALLY INTERESTED IN SAID CAUSE.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE SET MY HAND AND SEAL THIS 21ST DAY OF DECEMBER 2015.

PATRICIA G. BACHAND, COURT REPORTER MY COMMISSION EXPIRES APRIL 9, 2017

