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GARBER REPORTING SERVICE

PROCEED N GS
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ladies and gentlemen, we are reconvening the Judiciary Selection Commission and staff has legal matters to discuss with us. Chair will entertain a motion to go into executive session.

REPRESENTATIVE MACK So moved.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We have that motion from Representative Mack and it is so ordered. We would ask all non-staff and nonCommission members, please excuse us while we go into executive session and I'd ask staff security to secure the room.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Good morning, Judge Seigler. Thank you for joining us this morning. We have before us the Honorable William Gregory Seigler, Family Court, 11th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1. Judge Seigler, would you raise your right hand and be sworn?
(The judge is sworn in.)
EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Thank you, Judge Seigler. Judge, you provided this Commission with responses to the personal data
questionnaire that we provided you early on in the process. Are those responses correct as it stands today or is there any need for any amendment to those responses?
A. As far as $I$ know, sir, everything is still correct.
Q. Do you have any objection to them being included in the record of your sworn testimony today?
A. No, sir. I do not.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there any objection by the Commission?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 1, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE WILLIAM GREGORY SEIGLER, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 2, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION AMENDED PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE WILLIAM GREGORY SEIGLER, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our inquiry has focused on the nine statutory evaluative criteria. As a
result of that process, we've received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election and there are no witnesses present to testify today, other than yourself. And I would ask, do you have a brief opening statement you would like to share with us?
A. Representative Clemmons, I'd just like to thank y'all for having me here today and I'd like to apologize in advance. My voice is somewhat impaired. My youngest son's in kindergarten and he seems to bring home some type of cold about once every couple of weeks. I was the unfortunate one to get it and my voice is going to be impaired. So I apologize in advance. I'd like to thank each of you for being here today and allowing me to be here, as well. It seems like yesterday I was here. This is the third time in three years I've been before this Commission and I appreciate everybody's dedication. I know this is a very lengthy process and I look forward to answering any questions you might have of me.
Q. Thank you, Judge, and we certainly understand how children will bring bugs home, but if you would, please speak as loudly as possible for the benefit of the court reporter.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Great. Thank you very much. Judge, if you would now turn your attention to able counsel, Ms. Simpson, and respond to any questions she may have for you.

MS. SIMPSON: Thank you.
EXAMINATION
By Mr. Simpson:
Q. Good morning, Judge Seigler.
A. Good morning.
Q. You have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?
A. No, ma'am, not that I'm aware of.

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Are there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 3, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION

COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE WILLIAM GREGORY SEIGLER, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Seigler, after serving for about one year on the Family Court bench, why do you want to continue serving as a Family Court judge?
A. Well, ma'am, I've thoroughly enjoyed my time thus far, a little over a year. I feel like that I've been able to do a lot of good things for children and also parties who have come before me. This is by far the most fulfilling job that I have ever had. I was a public servant for many years as a public defender in the Tri-County, which was the three counties of McCormick, Saluda, and Edgefield. It was a very demanding job and fulfilling, but not near as fulfilling as this job. I've thoroughly enjoyed it and I appreciate the opportunity to serve thus far.
Q. Thank you. The Commission received 156 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 28 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments: an excellent family court judge, he is exactly the right man for the job. He is fair and courteous to all concerned, attorneys, parties, and witnesses. Judge Seigler is well-respected by the attorneys who appear in
his courtroom. Twenty-one of the written comments expressed concerns. Some comments indicated lack of knowledge. One comment states that you are totally unaware of legal principles or requisite law and has admitted such on certain occasions. What response would you offer to these concerns?
A. Well, ma'am, I'm not certain as far as the context of that comment, but $I$ certainly don't feel that I lack the knowledge. I've done very well on the exam. I believe you indicated I made a 91 or a 92 on the exam given this year. I practiced Family Court law for 15 years and I certainly feel like I have the requisite knowledge, but $I$ would also indicate that any comment that was made is certainly taken seriously. I will certainly reevaluate whatever I need to do to make certain that that type of comment doesn't take place again.
Q. Some comments expressed concerns about disrespect towards women. Comments state that you have referenced female colleagues and litigants as girls. What response would you offer to these concerns?
A. Well, ma'am, I don't recall ever calling anybody a girl or anything of that nature. I know when you told me during our meeting that that comment was
made, that was probably the most hurtful and concerning comment that you indicated. You know, I've got three young sons that I'm raising to be gentleman that I think that I am. I indicated that to my wife and, quite frankly, she like to fainted because I certainly have never intentionally been disrespectful to anyone, female, male, or otherwise, but again, I take it very seriously and if that's the perception, then I certainly need to make adjustments.
Q. Thank you. Some comments expressed concerns about your demeanor and judicial temperament. A comment refers to you as a bully and another refers to you as impatient, demeaning, and unnecessarily aggressive. What response would you offer to these concerns?
A. Again, ma'am, I'm not certain the context of those comments, but if they were made then I certainly need to make adjustments going forward. I never intentionally was impatient, but if that was the perception then $I$ need to do a better job and make adjustments to avoid any type of situation in the future.
Q. And Judge Seigler, what do you believe is the appropriate demeanor for a judge?
A. Well, excuse me. Ma'am, I believe that you can be an excellent attorney, the most superior attorney on the planet, but without the proper and appropriate demeanor, I don't think you can even be a good judge. I've made every effort and will continue to make every effort to have the proper demeanor that $I$ feel like $I$ should have to avoid any comments of this nature going forward.
Q. And lastly, one comment expressed concerns with timeliness by noting you are slow on paperwork and fail to review temporary hearing submissions. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Again, now, I'm not certain what context those comments were made. I hate to be repetitive, but any comments that are made, both positive and negative, I certainly take seriously. We're required to report any orders that are over 30 days old. I have yet to have to report any during my entire year plus. I try to sign the orders immediately, and again, I've never had to report anything to the Supreme Court. So -- but I do review all exhibits. In fact, during temporary hearings, I remove myself from the bench to go to my chambers and read all exhibits.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I would like to request
that we now go into executive session to handle further matters.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: So ordered. If security and staff would secure the room. (Off-the-record executive session.) CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We're rising from executive session after having discussed an issue of concern and made no decisions, took no votes and we're back on the record with Judge Seigler. Ms. Simpson.
(By Ms. Simpson)
Q. Judge Seigler, in your PDQ, you disclosed you've been the subject of three lawsuits. The one in 2012 involved a foreclosure action. Please explain the nature and disposition of this lawsuit.
A. Yes, ma'am. I was a personal representative over an estate in the Savannah Lakes Village, which is a retirement community on Lake Thurmond in McCormick. A gentleman passed away, of course, and had a reverse mortgage and they foreclosed on it. He didn't have any assets to pay it off.

First Citizens, I think, or maybe Wells Fargo foreclosed on it and they named me in my capacity as personal representative. The house was sold. The loan was payed off. No judgements against
anyone.
Q. And there was a lawsuit in 2005 that involved a real estate transaction with the Sides and the Lowes?
A. That is the letter of caution that Ms. Wall referenced. So apparently, there was litigation filed at some point.
Q. And the last action was in 2011 and it involved a past client. This was when you were a public defender. Please explain the nature and disposition of this lawsuit.
A. Yes, ma'am. I represented a gentleman who was charged with murders in Georgia and Edgefield County. He was awaiting his trial for the murders in Edgefield at which time he was charged with throwing bodily fluids on a correctional officer at the Edgefield County Detention Center. I represented him at the trial. He was ultimately found guilty of throwing bodily fluids. However, the case was later overturned for certain issues. Then he went to trial for the murders and received the death penalty and he filed a lawsuit against me as an inmate, claiming that $I$ didn't provide discovery to him. He also sued the sherif's department. That case was dismissed.
Q. Thank you, Judge Seigler.
A. Thank you, ma'am.
Q. Just a few housekeeping issues. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, ma'am. 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, ma'am.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of the process on your behalf?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Do you understand that you 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. I understand that.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes, ma'am.
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 $\$ 1000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. I would like to note that the Midlands Citizens Committee reported that Judge Seigler is qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. And well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

In summary, the committee stated that Judge Seigler has grown in his position nicely. He has the qualities required to be a very good Family Court judge. 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.

MS. SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I have no
further questions.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you,

Ms. Simpson. Ms. Wall?
MS. WALL: Judge.
JUDGE SEIGLER: Yes, ma'am?
MS. WALL: I have some questions for you.
Let me just back up a minute.
EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Wall)
Q. You were asked about three lawsuits. I want to go to the second one because I never did hear what the disposition was going on. Tell us a little bit more about the second lawsuit that she asked you about.
A. Yes, ma'am. Ma'am, apparently from the complaint that you referenced in regards to the real estate transaction, a lawsuit was filed by the Lowes, who were the sellers that we discussed earlier. My understanding is that it was dismissed. I don't recall.
Q. Well, were you served with a lawsuit? Did you hire an attorney to represent you? Did you represent yourself pro se? I mean, what happened?
A. No, ma'am. I never hired anybody. If I recall, I don't recall whether $I$ ever filed an answer or not, but it was dismissed at some point. It was in 2005, I believe, Ms. Simpson said. I've never had
any type of judgment or anything of that nature.
Q. And the people who brought this lawsuit, were they your clients?
A. No, ma'am. The sellers were -- the buyers were. The sellers filed suit claiming they only intended on selling half of the property which is not what the contract indicated.
Q. Were you in that real estate closing representing both the buyers and the sellers?
A. No, ma'am. If I recall correctly, I was just representing the buyers.
Q. Did the seller have an attorney?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. And it was the seller who filed the lawsuit against you?
A. Yes, ma'am, if $I$ recall correctly. Like I say, it was dismissed. There was never any judgement or trial or hearing to my knowledge.
Q. So you recall that they simply withdrew the case or was there a $40(j)$ or did you go to court to ask that the case be dismissed because there's no merit or they weren't your clients or whatever the basis was?
A. No, ma'am. I never appeared in court for that case. My recollection is it was dismissed or
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withdrawn. I apologize, Ms. Wall, I don't remember the details. I hope I'm answering your questions appropriately.
Q. Okay. I'm asking you what you recall and you've certainly answered the question. Let me go to a few other things. Would you tell this Commission, please, describe for us the characteristics of what you consider to be the proper demeanor of a judge in the state of South Carolina.
A. Yes, ma'am. I'd be glad to. I certainly think that all of us, in any capacity, judges need to be fair, serious, and business-like, but always respectful and courteous to the litigants as well at the lawyers. I've certainly made every effort to do so. Obviously, I need to improve, but I do feel like I've been fair. Certainly, in the Family Court arena, being business-like and serious at all times. I believe it's important that every litigant understand that I'm aware, and all Family Court judges are aware, of the seriousness of their case. I try to be as serious as possible, but also professional and courteous. I would hope that they understand that I'm aware of how serious they feel it is. I also would hope that in the event
that something happened to me and my wife, that the Family Court judge hearing my case would treat it as business-like and as serious.
Q. Now, in your answering, you said something about if the perception of you was not that way, then you would try to do -- what is it that you, going forward, what changes, if any, would you make in your current demeanor as a judge?
A. I just would be much more aware of the situation and try to appear more courteous and respectful. Certainly, I never intended to be rude to anyone, but again, those comments were made. I take them seriously and I need to do a better job and I will certainly do so going forward.
Q. And when you say being respectful, what do you mean?
A. I don't know if my mannerisms, facial expressions, or whatever may have been interpreted that way. I certainly have never intentionally been disrespectful. So possibly I need to change my facial expressions if I'm making any unconsciously. I'll certainly pay close attention to that. Since my bar interview, which was quite devastating to me, I'm embarrassed by the comments. I'm shocked, but most of all, I'm disappointed.
Q. And who are you disappointed in?
A. Disappointed in the comments, but I'm also disappointed in myself if that's the perception because I've worked very hard to get here and I've worked very hard to try to be professional. I'm completely embarrassed and devastated by the comments and I'll do anything I can to avoid them in the future.
Q. And so my question for you specifically is what do you intend to do, if anything?
A. Differently, ma'am?
Q. Yes.
A. Again, I'm speculating because I don't know exactly how I was disrespectful, but if they made the comments, then clearly, they felt like they were valid. Possibly my facial expressions, mannerisms. I've never raised my voice. I've never said anything disrespectful, to my knowledge, to anyone, but again, I need to try harder and do a better job if that's the perception.
Q. Well, do you think it's possibly more than just a perception? One of the comments was -- there were two comments, I'm sorry. Two of the comments are that -- and this is a specific incidence -- that you referred to a 44 year old and in your book, is
that an adult?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Forty-four year old pro se -- that means unrepresented, correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. -- litigant before your court. Forty-four year old pro se defendant -- you referred to that pro se defendant as a girl. Is a 44 year old woman, in your opinion, appropriately addressed by anyone as a girl?
A. No, ma'am. Forty-four -- I'm only 41, so she is certainly older than me and that's totally inappropriate.
Q. Do you recall making such a comment?
A. No, ma'am, but if I did, I certainly don't recall it. If I did, it's absolutely inappropriate.
Q. Why would you have made such a comment? Why would you have addressed, as a judge, -- addressed a litigant in your court, a grown woman, as a girl?
A. Again, Ms. Wall, I don't recall doing that and there would've been no reason for me to do that, but if that comment is made, then apparently they thought it was a valid comment. But I don't recall doing that, ma'am, and if $I$ did, that's totally inappropriate. I certainly will never do it again
if it happened. I don't recall it happening. If it was, Ms. Wall, it was totally inadvertent and I certainly will go forward making absolutely certain that it never happens again.
Q. Can you tell us the name of one or more judges who you've had occasion to observe or appear before, before you went on the bench, that you consider to embody the appropriate characteristics, appropriate demeanor of a judge in South Carolina?
A. Yes, ma'am. Family Court judge Gene Morehead is an excellent Family Court judge. I think he embodies the temperament aspect and also knowledge needed in Family Court. Judge Allen, the gentleman that I replaced, was also an absolute gentleman who did a very fine job in Lexington County. Judge Jim Johnson, Billy Tunstall, both of them are 8th Circuit who passed away now. They were both excellent judges with excellent demeanor. There's many of them, ma'am, if you want me to continue.
Q. Have you ever had occasions, since going on the bench, to think about patterning yourself after one of those judges?
A. Yes, ma'am. I mean, there's a number of them that I feel like do a fine job and have an absolutely, in my opinion, excellent demeanor. Again, Judge

Morehead does a very, very good job. Judge Keelsley, out of our circuit as well, has been a circuit judge for many years. I think he does a very good job. I've appeared before him many times. So there's a number of them that $I$ think have excellent qualities that would be a fine candidate to mirror myself going forward.
Q. One of the comments or several of the comments reference your lack of patience in the courtroom. What would be your response to that?
A. Again, ma'am, I don't know the context of that comment, but I certainly have made every effort to be patient. There are times that the volume in our circuit is overwhelming. I try to stay on time in order to avoid to burdening the litigants and lawyers waiting on their turn. Could that possibly interpreted as impatient? Possibly, Ms. Wall, but again, I don't know the context of it. I certainly have tried to be patient. And again, I hate to repetitive, but every comment's taken seriously and I will do everything I can to avoid the appearance of being impatient because I certainly have never attempted to do that. MS. WALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms. Wall.

RE-EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Judge, Ms. Wall made mention and you made mention of the bar report that was provided to this Committee as a result of the investigatory process. That bar report found that you were, overall, -found that, with regard to constitutional qualifications, physical health, mental stability, ethical fitness, and character that you were qualified. And then in four categories found you unqualified. I'd like you to respond as to each of those four categories whether you agree or disagree with regard to the findings of the Bar Committee. And we would be interested in your response to going forward, what your plans are with regard to each of those areas, professional and academic ability, if you'd like to respond to that?
A. Yes, sir, Representative Clemmons. Again, I'm not sure of where the comments are coming from or the context, but I'll respond to your question as well as I can, sir.
Q. Thank you and we'll come back to the overall after I ask about the individuals and I'd like to get your response -- your impressions and response as to why you think that overall was given, but
right now I'd like to focus on the individual components, professional and academic abilities being first.
A. Yes, sir. Again, I practiced law for 15 years and I did an extensive amount of Family Court work -an extensive amount. I've handled cases in every aspect of Family Court from juveniles to DSS to everything basically other than prosecuting juveniles. I represented hundreds and hundreds of juveniles as co-defendants. I have excelled at the test given by the Commission. I'm not certain what I'm lacking in academic ability unless the comments say that I didn't know something specifically. I'm not sure of any situation that I've lacked.
Q. That's a fair.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: If I could ask your
screening attorney Ms. Simpson, what was Judge
Seigler's score on the test?
MS. SIMPSON: The score, I believe, was a
91.2 and 91. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much.
Q. The next area is reputation. Would you comment on that the Bar Committee found you unqualified? Would you please comment as to your reputation?
A. Again, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure what the context
-- you know, how they were made or what part of my reputation is lacking, but again, I keep repeating myself. I take them seriously. I'll reconsider everything and do the best I can to avoid these type of comments in the future, but $I$ understand that I'm in a different position today than $I$ was the last two times, but $I$ was qualified each and every time before and I'm not certain what I've done differently. I've tried very hard to be respectful and maintain a good reputation and again, Representative Clemmons, I'm not sure what context that's in as to what part of my reputation is in question.
Q. Okay. That's fair. And the third is experience in which you were found unqualified.
A. That one in itself, Mr. Chairman, is perplexing as any because I was found qualified two times before and now I've got an additional year on the bench. I'm not sure how to respond to that. My experience, again, $I$ practiced in every facet of Family Court law except prosecuting juveniles for, you know, 15 years and I've got an additional year as a Family Court judge. So I'm not sure how I go from qualified last year and another year experience and now I'm not qualified. I'm
certainly not taking that lightly, but I'm not sure how to respond to that.
Q. Judicial temperament.
A. Yes, sir, and that's the most important one in my opinion, Mr. Chairman. Again, if my actions have been misinterpreted as being disrespectful or rude in any way then I have failed and I'm embarrassed and I am devastated by the comments. I'm shocked and disappointed, but I'll do everything I can to avoid that in the future. I certainly have never intentionally been rude or lacking in temperament intentionally. And again, Representative Clemmons, I've been treated rude by judges before just like every attorney sitting here and when I began this job, I assured myself that I would never be rude or disrespectful to anyone and I'll do a better job to ensure that going forward.
Q. Thank you and I want to come back to that in a minute, but before I do, I'd really like for you to talk to us about the overall finding of unqualified. You are a sitting Family Court judge and the Bar committee has determined that you are unqualified to sit on the bench. Would you please respond to that and in your response, if you believe it's unwarranted, the basis by which it is
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## unwarranted and if you believe there's anything underlying that report, I'd like for you to share that with us.

A. Mr. Chairman, again, at the risk of repeating myself, I don't know the context or who made the comments so speculating would be all I could do as for who made it and why. My understanding is through the Bar process, if they find you not qualified in one category then you're unqualified. I certainly feel like that I'm qualified. I think I've done a very good job, but obviously, not as good as I could have based on the comments. I was in a very contentious race last year. I don't know if that had anything to do with these comments or not. Again, Mr. Chairman, that would be pure speculation on my part because I have no proof. I have no idea who made those comments, but apparently if they sent them, they felt like they were valid. I certainly take them seriously and I'll make every effort to avoid in the future. Again, sir, at the risk of repeating myself, I don't know where they came from or what context.
Q. Has there been any member of the Bar Committee that's reached out to you to discuss those findings?
A. A member of the Bar Committee?
Q. The committee that prepared that report.
A. Ms. Joyce, is it? She was one of the ladies on my panel. She called me to tell me their findings.
Q. Did you inquire as to the not qualified?
A. Yes, sir, I asked her, you know, what does this mean? Because when we went to the interview, I was shocked at the comments that were made. You know, my effort when $I$ started this job was not to get any negative comments and to receive notification at that interview that I had received negative comments, I was shocked. And I asked her, what does this mean? I mean, I've never been found not qualified in any category. So it was news to me. It was totally new ground. I didn't know how to respond.
Q. And based upon her reply, were you enlightened as to the findings?
A. Yes, sir. She told me what they had found. Then they sent it in the form of an email or letter.
Q. Did she describe the process whereby those findings were --
A. The way I understood it, sir, was that the five member committee contacted lawyers in my area mainly that appeared before me and they based their
findings on those responses is my understanding, sir.
Q. Let me go back to judicial temperament. Ms. Wall asked you about the two comments. First of all, let me say when we receive ballot box surveys, personally, a single ballot box survey standing on it's own has little probative value in my mind because it's anonymous and that anonymous ballot box survey could have come from an opponent in a previous race. It could have come from your mother in law and there's no telling where it could've come from. But when I receive two separate ballot box surveys or more that make the same complaint, it raises my level of concern. And when we receive not one, but two, ballot box survey comments that refer to this 44 year old pro se defendant where it alleges that you referred to her as girl and there are -- we have been briefed on your interaction with Ms. Simpson and we understand that you referred to Ms. Simpson on one occasion as "honey." And while you've been with us today you made a comment of the person that answers your phones -SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair? I would submit that any comments that we may have made in executive session --

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: I'll withdraw my comment with regard to that, what I had heard you say.
Q. So let me ask, referring to women as girl or an attorney as honey, is that something common in your parlors?
A. No, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN: Next, please.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Yes, Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Judge, thank you for being here today.

JUDGE SEIGLER: Thank you, Senator. EXAMINATION
(By Senator Martin)
Q. The concern I have, and I think we've sort of been expressing that, is this bar unqualification or disqualified or not qualified. When you met with them, there's five attorneys there?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How long did that meeting take when you met with them?
A. I'm not certain, Senator. I would guess 30 minutes or so.
Q. Thirty minutes?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How did you feel about?
A. Awful. Awful.
Q. How did it start out?
A. How did it start out?
Q. Yes. Did they give you an opportunity to be heard or did they start with what they had heard from other attorneys and said "Judge, we got a problem?"
A. They asked me if I'd like to make an opening statement, sort of like Representative Clemmons did and, I believe, I basically said, you know, recited how I enjoy the job and appreciate the opportunity and so forth and then they indicated the negative comments.
Q. And how did you react to that to them?
A. I was, quite frankly Senator Martin, shocked at the comments. I indicated to them that I felt like I had tried very had to be respectful and courteous to everybody. I think I also indicated to them that I knew I was from a very small county and under the microscope at all times and that I was very conscious and aware of that.
Q. Did you know any of the attorneys on the panel that interviewed you?
A. Yes.
Q. You did?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Had any of them appeared before you?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Had you had any issues with any of those attorneys?
A. Yes, sir. I sure have. If you're asking me specifically, Senator, I'll be glad to address it.
Q. Yes, I'd like to hear it.
A. One of the attorneys who was on my five member panel, who also made most of the comments and asked most of the questions, had appeared before me about two months after I started. That attorney was instructed to get me an order as to the findings. She did not do so. The case was stricken by Judge Gwen Jones for failure to comply with the 365 day rule. The attorney contacted my office. I had my assistant tell the attorney that there was nothing that I could do, that the chief administrative judge had struck the case because an order had not been sent to me to be signed and she struck it. They took efforts to have the case reinstated by the chief administrative judge.
Q. Help me out. When you say struck the case, you mean dismiss the case?
A. Yes, sir. Yes, sir. Chief Justice has implemented
that if the case is filed and not completed or at least scheduled for trial within 365 then it's dismissed or struck. She was extremely disgruntled, made it very evident. And that attorney was the attorney who questioned me at length and that attorney made a disturbing comment during our interview and I remember it vividly because I've never heard the comment, but that attorney said have you ever heard that a teacher should not smile before Thanksgiving. I said "I have not. I'm not certain what that means or what you're referencing." And that particular attorney questioned me at length. She indicated you're not happy with your job. Are you stressed out, various different comments. And I'm not trying to direct any blame on any one. I'm responsible for these comments.
Q. So you felt like it was one attorney that was sort of out to disqualify you?
A. Senator Martin, that's pure speculation on my part. I'm not trying to blame any attorney on that panel, but $I$ didn't know the rest of them.
Q. That was the only one you knew?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And that one asked most of the questions?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. The others didn't seem to interact that much?
A. They did ask questions, but not near as extensive. And again, Senator Martin, I don't want anybody here to think that I'm trying to blame that attorney, but respectfully, Senator Martin, you wanted me to elaborate.
Q. And we needed to know and I appreciate it. You know, my concern is that on top of the pretty significant, as staff already indicated, the Chairman indicated, and Ms. Wall -- the significant number of negative comments gives us concern because you're here today to be considered for a six year term and it's our responsibility and a very awesome responsibility whether to determine if you should go forward for another six year term or not.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And that's what's giving us concern, that in one year on the bench that these kinds of comments, these kinds of concerns for a relatively new judge and a young judge would be this prevalent.
A. It concerns me, too, Senator, that the comments were made.
Q. You can understand the predicament we're in.
A. Yes, sir and $I$ understand -- again, $I$ don't know where they're coming from or the context, but I take all of them seriously.
Q. Well, you knew where those five attorneys were in that room that issued this unqualified report.
A. And my understanding, Senator, is they based that on the calls that they made to the other attorneys.
Q. Right. I appreciate your candor with us and your demeanor here today. I really respect and appreciate that.
A. Thank you, Senator.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Representative Bannister.

EXAMINATION
(By Representative Bannister)
Q. Judge, I just have one quick -- what was the nature of the order that the lady didn't -- the case being stricken? Was it a final order or was it temporary? What -- everybody does it different. In Greenville, if you get your mediation report done, you don't get stricken, you just ask for a trial. So I'm trying to figure out what order was it she didn't submit; if you remember?
A. Representative Bannister, if I remember correctly, it was an order requiring a mental evaluation of
one of the clients and I'm not certain of that, but it was never scheduled for trial, I believe, is why it was ultimately stricken by chief administrative judge.
Q. Okay. Would the order have included language to postpone the strike date, or?
A. No, sir, because I wouldn't have the authority to do that as a visiting judge. Only chief administrative judge would have the authority to disregard 365.
Q. Thank you. I'm just curious, has she blamed not getting the case done in a 365 day time frame on an order not being issued? Just curious. Thanks.
A. Thank you, sir.

FURTHER EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Judge Seigler, who was the attorney that asked those questions that we've have referred to.
A. Ms. Bryson. Emma Bryson.
Q. Bryson? B-r-y-s-o-n?
A. Yes, sir. I think so.
Q. Thank you. Just to briefly follow up on my questions before, do you appreciate that when referring to colleagues or attorneys in the courtroom or litigants or other attorneys outside
of the courtroom or to women in general, that some would object to being referred to as girl or honey or the like?
A. Absolutely.
Q. To follow up on a very important question Ms. Wall asked you, in that specific regard, going forward, what will you do to try to see that this concern never arises again?
A. Would you clarify that for me, Mr. Chairman? Which concern?
Q. Are you going to do anything in your practice with regard to the allegations of referring to women on the bench and in life as girl or honey, or?
A. Yes, sir, and again, if $I$ did that, it was totally inadvertent and totally disrespectful.
Q. Going forward, is there anything that you're going to do in your practice?
A. Yes, sir. I certainly am.
Q. And what will that be?
A. I'm going to be very cognizant not to say anything of that nature and double my efforts to avoid any type of comment like that. Again, if I made those comments, those are inadvertent. I'm responsible for them and I take full responsibility for it and I will certainly never make those type of comments
towards anyone. Again, Representative Clemmons, I've got three young sons. I was raised to be a gentleman. I try to be. That type of comment is not being a gentleman and it's totally inappropriate and I can assure you that my sons, nine, seven, and five have never been exposed to any type of comments like that. I treat my wife like the queen that she is. I love her very much and she knows that and my boys treat her with respect. I've never been disrespectful to females intentionally in any way and I certainly would never do so. Again, when $I$ told my wife about that comment, she literally almost fainted because I've never intentionally been disrespectful to a lady in any fashion. And if I said that, ma'am, I apologize. Again, $I$ never intentionally meant to say that if I did.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Judge. Dean Wilcox is next.

DEAN WILCOX: Mr. Chairman, thank you.
EXAMINATION
(By Dean Wilcox)
Q. Judge, you mentioned several times sort of the code of being a gentleman, if you will, or the concept of being a gentleman and I noticed you have what
appears to be a Citadel necktie on today.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And I assume you're proud of the men and women who graduate from the Citadel?
A. Very proud, sir.
Q. I'm going to go back 20 years and ask you a question and I do it given the comments in the ballot box regarding the gender aspects. Am I correct, were you a rising senior at the Citadel when Shannon Faulkner was admitted?
A. Yes, sir. I was in class with her.
Q. That was a fairly emotional time around the Citadel, I assume.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Were there cadets, at that time, who wanted her out of the Citadel?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You mentioned you were in class with her. Did you have contact with her?
A. I spoke to her, sir. When I was there, if you want me to elaborate, she was -- the Supreme Court case was still pending -- the VMI case was pending. She was allowed to attend classes with us, but not allowed to be a member of the Corps until, as you indicated, my senior year and she resigned --
Q. Very quickly.
A. -- before I got -- yes, sir, before I got back.
Q. But did you personally observe conduct or hear comments made by other cadets suggesting that she would be treated differently because of gender?
A. Dean Wilcox, I don't recall hearing those, but I'm absolutely certain that there were. I never participated in any type of comments like that.
Q. That was going to be my next question.
A. No, sir.
Q. Twenty years removed from that, regardless of -and I'm not concerned about your viewpoint as to whether the Supreme Court decision was right or wrong because $I$ know that is a different issue.
A. I think it was right if you want to know my answer, Dean.
Q. Fair enough. Do you think the treatment that some suggested for women was an appropriate response to their being admitted, or?
A. Do I think it was appropriate?
Q. Yes.
A. No, sir. Is it appropriate to treat them differently?
Q. Yes.
A. No, sir. And again, when I graduated, no ladies
had been admitted, other than Ms. Faulkner.
Q. Right. She had been there like four days, as I recall.
A. Like I said, we had classes and then she came in for Cadre, which is the training portion and I wasn't on Cadre that year. So she resigned before I ever returned to campus.
Q. And you are clear that you did not participate in activities or efforts to have her removed?
A. No, sir. I wasn't even there.
Q. And I don't mean to stress by my questions I thought he was. I just wanted to be clear on that. So thank you, those are my questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Dean
Wilcox. Senator Malloy.
SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION
(By Senator Malloy)
Q. Judge, thank you for being here and thank you for answering all of the questions that you have and $I$ recall your last race. We had lots of interaction and I do recall it being somewhat contentious along the way. I want to go back. When you were a young lawyer, you did a lot of work in the Public Defender's Office; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And how many years were you in the Public Defender's Office?
A. Seven years, sir. I believe I started before the implementation of the circuit Pee Dee system, when it was just the Tri-County corporation. I did it for about a year and then six more as -- I worked under Mr. Madison out of Lexington.
Q. Did you have a pretty heavy workload?
A. Senator, we had approximately 1,000 clients a year. I think the AVA recommends 250 indictments. As you know, every client has multiple -- or most clients have multiple indictments. The caseload was absolutely overwhelming. I was the only attorney. I did all the juvenile defense in Magistrate Court, Municipal Court, and General Sessions in three counties. So yes, sir, it was overwhelming.
Q. And what counties were those?
A. McCormick, Saluda, and Edgefield Counties, sir.
Q. All rural counties?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And so in representing those juveniles during that time, you come to the Family Court bench after your other years after that and now you have juveniles that come into your courtroom.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you think that you now have a perspective from that representation as to how the court is handling the juvenile cases in South Carolina and are you of the belief that we need to have alternative sentencing and those kinds of things to keep children from being behind the fence?
A. Yes, sir. I do agree with that.
Q. Okay. And do you all have a program over in your county that will offer some alternative sentencing in issues as it relates to children?
A. Sort of like Drug Court?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. No, sir. We did before I started, but at this stage, we do not. Myself and the other judges in our circuit are currently trying to get the funding to do that because I believe it's absolutely necessary, as you indicated, to avoid an MEC evaluation or a determined or indeterminate sentence at the Department of Juvenile Justice.
Q. And when you were a Public Defender and you were trying cases and there was a rush to the courtroom, did you ever have an opportunity, without going into names, did you ever have the opportunity to be before a judge or anyone that was disrespectful to
you?
A. Yes, sir. Yes, sir, I have.
Q. And you remember how that felt?
A. I certainly do.
Q. And in knowing that, was that a good learning experience for you as something that you would end up taking to the bench and if you had not taken it to the bench, that you will from now on?
A. Absolutely, Senator Malloy. As I indicated earlier, I've been, just as I assume all attorneys here, have been disrespected before at some stage. It's embarrassing, not only for you as a professional, but in front of your client as well. I assured myself, when I started this, that I would never intentionally be rude or disrespectful to any lawyer or litigant for any reason.
Q. And when you were in the old Public Defender's system, we had 39 non-profits that had no real accountability and the Public Defenders were overworked and were often times not as prepared as they would like to have been whenever they would get to court and they were not in charge of the docket, yet still you would end up having to go into court -- and I've been a witness as well, when you were in front of a judge that could be a little
bit harsh and I just want to make sure that -- I know that, in general, that would've had to happen to you being a Public Defender and I just want to make sure that if you had that feeling then, that you carry that onto the bench so that those individuals that will be before you would not make you feel like what you obviously state that you felt being a Public Defender. That's a terrible question. It's long. It is long, but $I$ just want you to get the gist of what I'm trying to end up saying.
A. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
Q. I would go further as to saying is that the temporary hearing process that you all have, do you allow the lawyers to make comments and make arguments in addition to the affidavits?
A. I do, Senator Malloy. I can't speak for all of my colleagues, but $I$ do know a number of them do not. As you know, the rules don't require that we allow arguments from counsel, but I do. My policy as I call a case, ask each attorney to please submit the documentation or affidavits that they intend on submitting on behalf of their client and once they hand those up, I'll ask the moving party's attorney, ma'am or sir, do you have anything you'd
like to say on behalf of your client in regards to the relief you're requesting today. And I'll give Defendant's counsel an opportunity to make comments as well in response to that. And then once the Plaintiff's attorney and the Defendant's attorney make their statements, I tell them please, bear with me. Give me a few minutes. I'm going to go back in my chambers and review your affidavits. So that's a long answer, Senator Malloy, but yes, sir, I do allow -- and quite frankly, often times I'll allow the Plaintiff to respond to what the Defendant's counsel said and then the Defendant's counsel also another additional opportunity. That's why sometimes it causes delays. In Lexington County, we have temporaries scheduled every 15 minutes. It could be from 9:30 to 1:00 or 1:00 to 5:00 and, as you know, Senator Malloy, if you get behind on every 15 minutes, it's hard to catch up. And we're under tremendous volume of cases, not only in Lexington, but up in Greenville, it's very busy. Charleston is very busy. York County is very busy. It's just difficult to do, but I still allow the lawyers to talk, yes, sir, basically as long as they want to within reason.
Q. Now, when you were in your course of being a Family

Court judge, you'd carry on a full load. Do you know approximately how many cases that you heard during your first year?
A. No, sir.
Q. How many cases that you had before you?
A. No, sir. No, sir, I don't.
Q. And you work a full week?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And your office is physically located where, in what county?
A. I have an office in the McCormick County Courthouse and also one in the Lexington County Courthouse.
Q. How far is that apart?
A. Sixty-two miles.
Q. And do you allow lawyers to come before you without a scheduled hearing if they have an agreement?
A. Absolutely. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you do that in both counties?
A. Yes, sir, anywhere I am. If somebody calls and says we want to work in an agreement on a trial we've got scheduled I'll certainly do it.
Q. And I'm not going to get into the details, but I think I was introduced to you during your last election, probably by Representative Vick or Senator O'Dell.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. That was correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. I recall that you and I had a long conversation then about demeanor and temperament and respect and that kind of thing as it relates to the court over here and the court in the courthouse. Do you remember that?
A. Yes, sir. Not vividly, Senator, but --
Q. And you had indicated then that you would work your very best at doing that and continuing.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And I would hope that going forward that this line of questioning you've had, and this discussion, wherever you are that you would be cognizant of those discussions and the questions that you've ended up having here today, okay?
A. Absolutely, Senator. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Mr. Hitchcock, I believe you had a question, sir. (No response.)

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Are there any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge

Seigler, thank you for being with us and responding to a difficult line of questioning. We appreciate it. As you know, this record will remain open until the report is published. You possibly may be called back to testify should that need arise. I will remind you of the 48-hour rule. Whether there is a finding today or not, the 48 -hour rule applies. If anybody should contact you about reaching out to any member of the Commission or any member of the General Assembly, please advise them against that based upon the 48hour rule. We thank you for your service to South Carolina and your desire to continue to serve in the state. Thank you so much, Judge Seigler.

JUDGE SEIGLER: And thank y'all for your service, as well. I hope y'all have a good day.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir.
JUDGE SEIGLER: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Do we have a motion for executive session?

MR. HITCHCOCK: So moved.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: So ordered. Staff and security, please secure the room.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We're back on the public record. We've just risen from executive session to discuss qualifications. No votes were taken. No decisions were made. We now stand at ease for a five minute break. (Off the record.)

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge, we appreciate you being with us today. Judge, would you please raise your right hand and be sworn?
(The judge is sworn in.)
EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge, you gave us a very detailed response to our personal data questionnaire that we provided early in the process. Have any conditions changed so that that would warrant an amendment to that or is it current and correct as it stands?
A. It's relatively current. There has been a change in -- I'm looking at Page 6 of the PDQ and that has to do with the lawsuit in which I described as PCS versus Ross Development Corporation.
Q. Yes, sir.
A. At the time that $I$ submitted this in August of this year, I was subject to a substantial judgment for breach of fiduciary duty rising out of this CERCLA litigation case in federal court. In August of this year, a judge vacated that order and then issued a new order, which we corrected in September. The amount of the judgement was reduced -- well, vacated the jury verdict on breach of fiduciary duty, instituted a judgement as to all shareholders of the corporation, of which I'm one. So the current amount of the judgement is $\$ 64,000$. This is for a violation of the Statute of Elizabeth. The allegation being that we, as directors, conveyed to shareholders funds when the corporation was apparently insolvent.
Q. Judge, we'll go into that --
A. Okay.
Q. -- in greater detail, but with regard to the personal data questionnaire, as it was just orally amended by you, are there any other changes, or --
A. I don't believe so.
Q. -- or amendments?
A. No, sir.
Q. Given that, do you have any objection to our
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including your responses, as now amended, to your personal data questionnaire to be included in the record of your sworn testimony?


A. That would be fine. Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there an objection by any Commission member?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: There being none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 4, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE MIKELL ROSS SCARBOROUGH, DATED AUGUST 6TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge Scarborough, this Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our investigation has been focused on the nine statutory evaluative criteria. As a result of that process, we are here today and there are no witnesses to testify other than yourself and no affidavits have been filed against your re-election. With that, we would ask you to direct your attention to Mr.

Maldonado and respond to any questions he has. JUDGE SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, sir.

MR. MALDONADO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Maldonado)
Q. Judge Scarborough, you have before you your sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments that you would like to make at this time today?
A. No, sir. Not other than what I've already mention to you.

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Are there any objections?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 5, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE MIKELL ROSS SCARBOROUGH, DATED AUGUST 6TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
(By Mr. Maldonado)
Q. Judge Scarborough, after serving almost 12 years as a Master-in-Equity, why do want to continue to

## serve?

A. Well, I really love my job. I enjoy working for the citizens of Charleston County. I enjoy what I do. I find that $I$ can help some people. There's some people I've learned you just cannot help, but I like what $I$ do and $I$ do it on a daily basis. I look forward to going to work every day, to be quite frank about it. It's just been a very enjoyable experience for me.
Q. Thank you. Although this has been covered in your previous screenings, can you briefly explain to the Commission, for the benefit of some of the new members here, the circumstances regarding your simple possession of marijuana charge and your simple assault and battery?
A. Sure. In 1980, when $I$ was in college in Tennessee, I was arrested and charged with simple possession of marijuana. I pled guilty. I think that the record was expunged, but one of the themes that you'll see in my reports is I'm better off disclosing something that happened than not disclosing something. That was one of my professors that taught me that in law school. John Freeman always said disclose or abstain. So disclose or abstain and so I've just disclosed that
stuff. In '88, I think, I got into a barroom brawl with somebody and got arrested. That got dismissed as well, eventually. Okay?
Q. Thank you. The Commission received 436 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 32 additional comments. The surveys, for example, contained the following positive comments. Judge Scarborough is an outstanding jurist who is fair, pleasant, and accurate. A super judge, we're lucky to have him on the bench. Finally, another smart judge who is prompt with his rulings and is decisive, a very fine Master. Two of the written comments expressed concerns. One comment indicated that you were lazy and that you did not understand the law. What response would you offer this concern?
A. Well, I don't always understand the law, but I seek to learn what it is. I'm certain that was somebody that I'd ruled against, otherwise, they wouldn't be saying that. But as far as being lazy, I don't know what the basis for that is. I try to be there and spend my time and effort doing what I need to do every day.
Q. Second concern indicated that you tend to play home-field advantage to lawyers that frequently appear before you and let those attorneys in a case

## play too much of a role. What response would you offer?

A. Well, my response to that, Mr. Maldonado, is that when $I$ was a young lawyer, I often felt that way myself and so I have tried to be conscientious not to do that. And so rather than playing homefield advantage, by virtue of the nature of the legal affairs that $I$ see, $I$ get a substantial number of lawyers coming in from Columbia because that's where the foreclosure Bar is centrally located. So I have to treat everybody, and I do try to treat everybody the same, whether they're from Greenville or Columbia or Florence or Charleston.
Q. As you have already mentioned in the beginning, and also in your PDQ, you have a lawsuit that was filed against you in the U. S. District Court by PCS Nitrogen, Incorporated. Can you please explain the nature and the disposition of that lawsuit?
A. Well, the genesis of the lawsuit is what we refer to as CERCLA liability, which is Contamination Environmental Remediation Clean-up Act. The factual basis for it is there was some property my family owned up until 1966 when we sold the property. I was seven years of age. In 1980,

CERCLA legislation was passed by Congress. The courts have determined that environmental contamination is an ongoing tort for which there is essentially strict liability. If you own the property, you're going to have to pay. In 2006, we closed the family corporation, which was the successor and interest to what was then called Planters Fertilizer and Phosphate Company. After we closed the family business, --
Q. Just to clarify, when you say we, who is --
A. I'm just talking about the board. I was a board member. I was president from '93 until, I believe, 2001. I remained on the board. When I went on the bench, I was not particularly active. I was neither president nor vice president, but I did remain on the board. I think if I'd have known then what $I$ know now about CERCLA liability, I probably would have never gotten on that family board. But with families being what they are, you do what you can to try and help people out. So anyway, 2006 we were brought into the CERCLA litigation. In, I believe, early 2009 the verdict was rendered that the corporation was going to 45 percent liable for the clean-up costs. We didn't know what the clean-up costs were. As I said
earlier today before you, I still don't know what the clean-up costs are. But in late 2009 PCS, which is the world's largest nitrogen and fertilizer company out of Saskatchewan, Canada filed suit against me and the other directors and shareholders and that case went to trial in July of 2014 in U. S. District Court in Charleston, the result of which was very disconcerting.

That was a five and a half million dollar judgment against the directors. The amount has nothing to do with the clean-up costs. The amount was every penny that the corporation had paid out to its shareholders. Up until the time of that trial, I thought the corporate directors fiduciary duty was to the shareholders, not to some unknown creditor which we didn't know existed until after, in fact, we'd closed the doors of the corporation, but Judge Seymour saw that differently.

That's been a ruling. She has, since the initial ruling in -- she didn't enter the order until February of this year. February of 2015, she did enter the order as to both the shareholders and the directors. The directors, again, was on breach of fiduciary duties. The shareholders was on receiving these distributions. In August of
this year, she reversed her position, vacated the verdict, and then reinstated against the directors and the shareholders the amounts that they received in contributions -- in distributions from the corporation for the sale of -- was basically a real estate holding company, sale of real estate over that time period.

So, as it stands today, the case is on appeal, but it's stayed pending another post-trial motion before her from PCS on the vacating of the five point five million dollar verdict.
Q. I believe you have a written explanation, also, that you'd like to provide?
A. I do. First, I've got from -- I submitted to you yesterday -- I don't know if the committee has gotten it. I've got an original letter from my attorney who's Trenholm Walker from the PrattThomas Firm in Charleston. So I'd like to present his letter. This is an eight page letter that he wrote, trying to describe, in detail, what happened in that case. Mr. Clemmons, I'm not sure how to present that to you, but.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Would any member have an objection for the documents just mentioned to be received into the record along with a
copy of the order? Is there any objections here?

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy.
SENATOR MALLOY: I think that letters -we can receive those as -- my view would be received as information because we don't get a chance to talk to Mr. -- to the lawyer.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Walker, Trenholm Walker.

SENATOR MALLOY: Right.
JUDGE SCARBOROUGH: I will say this. I brought with me today Mr. John Linton, Jr. He's an associate with the firm. So he's here and he might could answer some questions if you've got questions of Mr. Linton. This just came Monday, so first I heard of it.

SENATOR MARTIN: It is certainly explanatory and it illuminates his side of the issue very well.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: There being no objection, then the documents are received as an exhibit to the record. Is that one letter?

JUDGE SCARBOROUGH: Just one letter. I
know I submitted it yesterday by email. It
should be an eight page letter. This is the original.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: It's the eight page
letter from Trenholm Walker; is that correct? JUDGE SCARBOROUGH: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: An eight page
letter from Trenholm Walker?
JUDGE SCARBOROUGH: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: The eight page letter
from Trenholm Walker is admitted as an exhibit to the record, along with a copy of the order.
[EXHIBIT 6, LETTER 11/19/15 TRENHOLM
WALKER TO JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMITTEE, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 7, AMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION OF LAW, DATED SEPTEMBER 22, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Go ahead, please, counsel.

MR. MALDONADO: Thank you.
(By Mr. Maldonado)
Q. And just for the record, the letter establishes your position with regards to the lawsuit and your explanation of the situation surrounding the lawsuit?
A. Yes, sir. I'm happy to answer any questions anybody may have, but that's my counsel's position on that.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We'll get there in
just a few minutes. Thank you.
Q. I'll finish up with some housekeeping issues before members are going to question you. Have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered a conditional pledge of support of any legislator pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf?
A. No, sir.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of the process on your behalf?
A. No. 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.
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 not be fined more than $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I am.

> MR. MALDONADO: I would note that the Lowcountry Citizens Committee found that Judge Scarborough was qualified as to the constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. He was found well qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today.
> CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Maldonado. Are there any questions by Commission members for Judge Scarborough?

SENATOR MALLOY: I have a question.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy.
SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION
(By Senator Malloy)
Q. Judge Scarborough, thank you for coming before the committee and thank you for your service that you've had for a period of time. My questioning goes into a -- so being a Master, this is a fulltime position for you, correct?
A. It is. Yes, sir.
Q. And in your capacity as being a Master, do you have a lot of partition actions that will come before you?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're familiar with heir property?
A. Very much so.
Q. And that kind of thing?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you followed the legislation that we've had over here on heirs property?
A. The current pending legislation or what was passed in 2006?
Q. Both. Obviously the one in 2006 is the one that you adhered to?
A. Correct. It is.
Q. Have you been following the one that we had here? 3225, I think it is, of the heirs property that we're discussing now?
A. I have reviewed it. Not recently, but I have reviewed it. Yes, sir.
Q. And so whenever you say that a lot of those cases come before you, tell us about what percentage of those that would go to a forced sale; do you know?
A. Very few will go to a forced sale, in my opinion. Senator Malloy, I would have to tell you that probably since the 2009 economic debacle, I've had very few of these cases even come in my courtroom. Typically, now what I'm seeing is much more quiet titles than partitions. Partitions, the goal -the law is a three ranking order.

First and foremost is if you're going to partition, than you partition in common, divide the property amongst the family. That is always the first goal if there's enough land and not so many heirs that you can't do it. The second one is an allotment. An allotment is where we try to get one family member to perhaps buy out the interest of the other family members. That keeps the property in the family and then finally, you've got the
partition by sale. It is my practice, generally, to try and have a partition by private sale, again, some member of the family and/or the general public, if they can all come together on that.
Q. And that goes to my question. I was trying to see if the partition actions that we have when you divide the property by allotment or in kind instead of putting it up for sale in order to keep it into the family whenever you could.
A. Many more. I'd say easily 75, 80 percent of them are divided amongst the family in some fashion or another.
Q. Do you think that their having a separate partition procedure will be helpful in dealing with the heirs property or do you think that would be more confusing?
A. No. In fact, the way I do this typically, it comes in as a quiet title action. You've got to figure out who owns the property and go to the quiet title. I, invariably, bifurcate my hearings. I do the quiet title hearings. I issue the order. I determine who is going to be in the case and I generally add a line and say "All right, the partition hearing is going to take place at such and such a date." So that when notice and
service of the order is rendered under quiet title, they know that there's going to be a subsequent hearing on partition alone. I don't like doing them together because $I$ find that it creates more problems than it solves.
Q. And do you often times have to appoint an appraiser because I know that sort of drives up the cost and sometimes on most of those actions, they'll have folks that will do agreed upon the appraised values?
A. Appraised values are usually not agreed upon. It depends on the family and the nature of the argument. But as a general rule, $I$ find that each side can get their own appraisal and only when I'm asked to get a third appraiser do I need to do that and, again, that's in a much smaller number of cases.
Q. And you see where I'm going. The thing is that some folks think that it's a bit optimistic to try to address the issue of heirs property over here, but I have an interest in doing that. I always like to ask a Master every time I get an opportunity to your thought process. As we go forward, I hope that you'll be involved in that process because I am interested in how they happen
now in their courtrooms and then how we think that procedure could end up making it better so it'll be fair to our citizens.
A. Glad to do it. You've got a bunch of Master's sitting back there in that room.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator Malloy. Representative Mack.

MR. MACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Judge Scarborough, good to see you. I just wanted to say for the record, you've served our community well in Charleston and you're well thought of and have gotten a lot of good comments from folks that have gone through the process.

JUDGE SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ms. Wall.
MS. WALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
(By Ms. Wall)
Q. Judge Scarborough, how do you address the concern that may be out there based on what is currently Judge Seymour's finding that a fraudulent conveyance occurred when these distributions or the distributions she concluded constituted fraudulent conveyance? And the fact that as Master, you are daily or weekly -- in your work -- you deal with
the issue of fraudulent conveyances? The fact that you are now a party to a serious lawsuit that has that as a central issue. Address for this Commission, please, how your involvement in the lawsuit may or may not affect your approach to cases in which you are not a party, but you are the judge making determinations concerning fraudulent conveyance.
A. I think that's clearly a very valid question. Let me start here. The Statute of Elizabeth, which is what this judgment is rendered under, is not the type of fraud that I generally think about when I think about civil fraud. It doesn't have anything to do with the nine elements of fraud in an attempt to deceive. In the facts of this case, we had the benefit of a Monday morning quarterback in looking at what happened during the course of time that we were running the corporation.

It was the testimony of the expert witness was that we were insolvent at all times -- all times, despite the fact that we had over a million dollars in the bank. That's based upon the projected costs to clean up the property. So my first resolution is, realistically, you only know about creditors when you know about creditors. I
didn't know about this particular creditor. When someone comes to me in my courtroom and they're asking to disgorge or reclaim clawback -- let's say distributions, I'm generally looking at the facts of the case to see whether or not there's proof that it was there. And did they have knowledge, were they on notice, and did they continue to do something they should not have done. I think that's the standard. Had I been a judge on this one, I think I would have ruled differently, but that's just me and the standard of law.

The other thing that $I$ think is significant about this case is there was a burden shifting. The plaintiff didn't have to prove the violation of the Statute of Elizabeth. The court found because it was a family corporation that the burden was on the defendants to disprove the violation.

The only case law that I'm aware of that talks about that involves a husband and wife corporation because there were two people, a small closely held corporation, but this was a C corporation with over 70 shareholders. So I just don't think it fits into that criteria, but again, that's my legal position.

Back to the appearance, I think that's really
what you're getting at. I think the appearance is, you know, it has brought to light for me something which I never ever thought about until this jury verdict came down and that was how you provide for an unknown creditor. I don't know the answer to that question. I'm telling you, we did not know about this creditor until the claim was made. I'm usually looking for proof. I'm usually looking for the plaintiff to have the burden of proof, the plaintiff to prove that the violations were unlawful, an attempt to hinder, delay, or defraud creditors. That's what I'm looking for.

There are cases in which the presumption is if it's a closely held corporation, or husband and wife corporation, that they would've talked about that and not done it in some sort of, you know, board meeting for which they have minutes. In our instance, we always had board minutes. We always had meetings and everything was of record, so.
Q. Maybe I should be a little bit more direct in my question and that is this. Having gone through this, and it's an ongoing process, will this affect your ability to be fair and impartial, apply the law to matters that appear before your court that involve a claim of fraudulent conveyance?
A. It would be my position that I can still be fair and impartial and I'm going to decide whatever cases come up to me in the same fashion I've decided them before, based on whatever's presented to me. Fair and impartial and based upon the law as I understand it to be. I can tell you there was a light went off in this particular case when the jury came back. I can assure you and that was how did we get to this point. I mean, how did this happen. It was novel for me.

EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Judge Scarborough, do you have any policy in your office with regard to how long is acceptable or unacceptable between final hearing and an order in foreclosure?
A. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. It's my practice, if I can, if I'm clear on the facts and I'm clear on the law, I will rule from the bench every chance I get. I did that just yesterday in a case. It was a tough case, relatively novel, but I was able to get pre-trial briefs and study the law before the case and then listen to the facts and rule. If I'm not clear on the facts, and I'm not clear on the law, one or the other, it's my practice to request
proposed orders from each side and I generally give 30 days for that to happen. And then I tell the lawyers that I'm going to give you a response within 30 days. So that is my practice to do that. So I'm trying to get answers out, clearly, within 60 days if it's something I need to take under advisement.
Q. Would you be surprised if you were to learn that there is at least one matter where a final hearing was held when proposed orders were sent to you and it's been more than a year and no order yet?
A. They're still waiting on an order?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. There probably are a case or two like that. I couldn't even tell you what they are at this point in time, but if I'm sitting on orders, it's not my practice to hold them to that length of time.
Q. If, as you say, there probably are, would you not want to take the necessary action to dispose of those matters?
A. Absolutely. Absolutely.
Q. If it required a new hearing or a change in orders --
A. I'm not aware of the particular case in which you refer to, but $I$ will definitely go back to my
office and look for that today if I'm sitting on something that's been over a year because that is too much time. I agree with that. Some of these cases are harder than others. Most of the time, the cases that last and linger in my courtroom, I'm usually sending the lawyers back to go do some homework, typically get an appraisal, get a survey of property if that's what the case is all about.
Q. I would encourage you to stay closely in tuned to those time ones. It makes a real difference to people on both sides, plaintiff and defendant.
A. Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Dean Wilcox.

DEAN WILCOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, I need to disclose on the record that I have known Judge Scarborough for a long time. In fact, he worked for and with, I believe is the right way, my brother-in-law, Gordon Garrett back in the 1990's in North Charleston.

EXAMINATION
(By Dean Wilcox)
Q. Judge, the distributions that came out of the family business, was that a series of distributions
over time or was it a single distribution?
A. No. No. It was a series over time. Absolutely.
Q. And I gather a key piece of evidence is this telephone message that was left from Ms. Rike is it, I believe?
A. She's a cousin. Yes, sir.
Q. Did the distributions occur both before and after that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there any pattern of acceleration in the rate of distribution after that time?
A. No, sir. The only time that the judge made a lot of hay about the fact that after that telephone message was left, there were two distributions that year and then there were two distributions in the final year, 2006. What was going on in 1998 to 1999 was the real estate market was really hot and we were selling property faster than we'd ever sold it before. So as money came in, we would take a little bit of the bank balances and then we would make distributions to the shareholders, again, paying any creditors that we knew about and then distributing the funds. So '98 and '99 were really high market years for the real estate business and then in 2006, what we were clearly looking to do
was to close the corporation.
It was one distribution, I believe, in the spring and then, if memory serves me right, our final meeting as a board was in July that year. And at that time, having approved the final distribution, we moved whatever money was left over after creditors and said that money's got to go out to the shareholders. It was like $\$ 30,000$ amongst 70 shareholders. Thirty-six thousand shares -- it was something -- it was pennies on a dollar.
Q. And I don't want to ask you a question that, because this is still in litigation, is inappropriate. So if it's something you cannot answer, tell me. Do you know at what point in time or do you recall when you became aware of this message that supposedly said something along the lines of let's liquidate?
A. It was presented to me in my first deposition. I had two depositions taken and it was sometime in January of '10, I think it was -- 2010.
Q. So it was not a message directed to you that you got at the time it occurred?
A. The message was directed to cousin Heyward Carter, who is a tax lawyer in Charleston, and Heyward did not receive the message. It went into an email
correspondence and dropped into a spot.
Q. In the judge's ruling, and I can tell you it's page 45 of the copy I have. The judge finds "Ross Director Rike called her fellow directors Carter and Scarborough to communicate that her thoughts were to completely drain all the accounts." You disagree with the "and Scarborough" on that?
A. I did not get -- I did not get that message.
Q. Okay. That's what I wanted to clarify because I know in the letter from your counsel, he said, "There's no proof remotely suggesting that Judge Scarborough was aware of these events." And I just wanted to clarify that with -- your statement is that you did not get that message from Ms. Rike in 1999?
A. Had I gotten that message, I would've told her that's not how we do business. Had I gotten that message. That's not the way we would operate.

DEAN WILCOX: Okay. Those are my questions. Mr Chairman, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Dean Wilcox. Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none. Judge
Scarborough, we want to thank you for being
with us today and for your forthright answers to questions that have been put to you. That will conclude this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is published. You could be called back prior to that time if such need should arise. We, again, are grateful for your service to South Carolina and for being with us today.

JUDGE SCARBOROUGH: Thank you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Campsen moves that we move into executive session and so ordered. Could security and staff please secure the room and turn off the microphone? (Off-the-record executive session.) CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We are rising from executive session and are back on the public record. We discussed qualifications of Judge Scarborough and took no vote, made no decisions. However, we are now prepared to take a vote with regard to qualification. So those that would find Judge Scarborough -- we have a motion by Senator Campsen that we find Judge Scarborough qualified and seconded by

Senator Malloy. All those in favor, please raise your hand.
(Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Those opposed, please raise your hand.
(Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: By acclamation, Judge Scarborough is found qualified. Moving on, let's bring in our next judge candidate, please.

MS. WALL: This is Judge White.
SENATOR MALLOY: Can we let the record reflect that $I$ jumped the gun. Representative Mack wanted to second that motion.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Excuse us, Judge White. We have a little matter of business to take care of. With regard to the last vote, Judge Malloy seconded the motion of Senator Campsen in the last vote. Representative David Mack seconds the motion of Senator Campsen. And let's, again, show by raised hands those who are in favor of the motion.
(Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Those opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Again, the result is the same. By acclamation upon motion of Senator Campsen, as seconded by Representative Mack, Judge Scarborough is now qualified. Thank you very much. Judge White, thank you so much for being with us today.

JUDGE WHITE: Certainly.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you also for your patience.

DEAN WILCOX: Mostly for your patience. JUDGE WHITE: I'd like to tell you my middle name is Job, but I can't. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Many of us should share that name today. We have before us The Honorable Thomas H. White, IV, Family Court, 16th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1. Judge White, can you kindly raise your right hand and be sworn?
(The judge is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Judge, you've provided this Commission with very detailed responses to your personal data

## questionnaire. Are those responses current and correct today?

A. Yes, sir. They are.
Q. Thank you. Would you have any objection to us including those responses as an exhibit to your sworn testimony?
A. No objection, Mr. Chairman.
Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there an objection by any Commission member?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 8, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE THOMAS H. WHITE, DATED JULY 24 TH , 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge, this
Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. We have focused our inquiry upon the nine evaluative criteria set out by law in South Carolina. We received no affidavits file in opposition to your election, nor are there any witnesses present today to testify other than
yourself. We would ask that you turn your attention to Mr. Maldonado and respond to any questions he may have. Thank you.

MR. MALDONADO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.

EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Maldonado)
Q. Judge White, you have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments that you'd like to make at this time to that statement?
A. No, sir.
Q. Can you please state for the record the city and circuit in which you reside?
A. I live in Union, South Carolina and I'm the 16th Judicial Circuit.

MR. MALDONADO: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that Judge White's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Without objection, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 9, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION

COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE THOMAS H. WHITE, IV, DATED JULY 23RD, 2015, ADMITTED.]
(By Mr. Maldonado)
Q. Judge White, why do you want to continue serving as a family court judge?
A. Well, as I said in my personal statement, I've always, in my 30 years of practice and even before I became an attorney, I've always enjoyed a good challenge. I think challenges help you grow as individuals and I can say that anyone who's seeking a challenge, they need to be a family court judge because every day you're dealing with challenges of many different varieties and I feel that I have grown. There was some transition from being an advocate to being an arbiter, but I feel that I've grown in this position. I feel that I certainly enjoyed figuring out better ways to render justice in a fair and impartial manner and I just look forward to the opportunity to continue to do so.
Q. Thank you. Judge White, the Commission received 134 ballot box surveys regarding you with four additional comments. The surveys, for example, contained the following positive comments. Judge White is an excellent judge of the highest personal
integrity, and pleasant, and professional
temperament, excellent knowledge of the law. Finally, excellent person, excellent judge. One of the written comments expressed concerns. The comment indicated that you talk too much, play favorites, and bring too much bias to the bench. What response would you offer this concern?
A. Well, I was a little perplexed when you had advised me of that response. I maybe do talk too much. I don't know. I come from a long line of relatively loquacious folks. Storytelling has always been kind of a part of my background.

However, what concerned me about that was I don't think if you pulled transcripts of every hearing I've ever had, I don't think you would've heard me doing that on the record. So that concerned me a bit because $I$ just don't know who that may have been, in any way, shape, or form.

Second, as far as bias and impartiality, honestly that concerns me and $I$ have to recall a circumstance of one of my partners stories before I was elected to the bench. He indicated he had gone to a roster meeting, I believe in Spartanburg County, and some of the lawyers there when it was imminent that $I$ was going to be elected to the
position, they said, "Well, we guess that you're going to be pushing your chest out and you and Sammy are going to be going around talking about what wonderful home cooking you're going to get when Tom is on the bench. And my former partner just looked at them and said, "Well, you don't know Tom very well, do you?"

So I honestly can assure this Commission that I am impartial. I do not play favorites in any way, shape, or form. I, you know, quite frankly, would simply think that that comment may have come from someone who just simply didn't like a ruling that I made. But I certainly want to earn the respect of each and every person who may even say a negative comment, but I'm going to be myself and I'm going to act the way that $I$ know how to act and that's fair and impartial and be courteous to all who appear before me.
Q. Judge White, you've indicated in your PDQ that a lawsuit was filed against you in 2009 by Douglas and Virginia Braun. Can you please explain the nature and disposition of that lawsuit?
A. Yes. That was a situation when $I$ was in general practice. One of the realtors who had used our firm before had come to me and asked if I could do
a quick title examination for some folks who were buying a home in a residential neighborhood. I did that title examination. I provided closing services in that, including providing them with copies of restrictive and protective covenants for that particular neighborhood.

The matter ended up -- and I did not know, I thought it was just a pure residential transaction. This lady wanted to put in a daycare in the neighborhood. I was not advised of their desire of putting a daycare in their home in the neighborhood. I provided them with the restrictions and protective covenant. I did not go into any great detail about them, but I provided copies. And when she started setting up for her daycare services, some neighbors shut her down and she then filed suit against the realty company, the City of Union, and me as the closing attorney. The matter was dismissed against me on summary judgment.
Q. Thank you. I'll finish up with some housekeeping issues. Have you ever sought or received any pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you sought or 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 the process on your behalf?
A. I am not aware of anything of that nature.
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. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. I have. Yes, sir.
Q. As a follow-up, 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 $\$ 1,000$ or imprisonment of not more than 90 days?
A. I am aware of that. Yes, sir.

MR. MALDONADO: I would note that the

Upstate Citizens Committee reported that Judge White is qualified as to the constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. He was found well-qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. I would note for the record that any concern that was raised during the investigation regarding this candidate was incorporated in the questioning of this candidate today. I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Maldonado. Do the Commission members have questions?

SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I've got a comment.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Martin is recognized.

SENATOR MARTIN: Judge, I noticed from your biography you were a walk-on at Clemson in both football and baseball.

JUDGE WHITE: Yes, sir.
SENATOR MARTIN: Congratulations.
JUDGE WHITE: Well, thank you. It
also was put on there that $I$ walked off.
SENATOR MARTIN: I wasn't going to bring that up. I think the fact that you just tried out was good.

JUDGE WHITE: Well, I had some success with both, but by the time -- as far as the baseball team was concerned, former Governor Beasley and I were good friends and --

SENATOR MARTIN: How fast did you run, by the way?

JUDGE WHITE: Not nearly as fast as David, but I told him once when he was telling people at law school one day in the lobby, he had indicated to them that he had to make a decision between major league baseball and politics and I stopped and I said, "Well, David, I said, that's interesting. I said I believe that Coach Bill Wilhelm made that decision for both of us." But anyway, thank you, Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN: Very well spoken.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: At least you walked off and were not carried off.

JUDGE WHITE: I take some solace in that, Senator. I do.

P R O C E E D I N G S - final
Page 97

SENATOR MARTIN: Thank you, judge.
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy is recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Being a Senator from Darlington and with the former governor being one of my constituents, I appreciate your relationship with him. He's also a friend of mine. I also appreciate your candor in your PDQ saying that you served without distinction. Most people would fail to admit and a lot of times the story grows as we grow older as opposed to stories being further validated. So I think if we look back, I think that the record will be void of a person's name that may would say without distinction whenever they said it and so that adds to your credibility. I can tell you that for certain.

JUDGE WHITE: Thank you, Senator.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Senator, I beg to differ that with time, instead of growing some people's hundred meter diminishes over time instead of grows.

JUDGE WHITE: I'll make a further comment
about that.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: I think it would be a good move. Judge White, it's good to have you here with us. Thank you so much for your service on the bench and for offering for reelection. 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 as such time should that need arise. Again, thank you so much for your service to South Carolina and for being with us today.

JUDGE WHITE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I thank all of you for the time and effort that you put into this process. I'm still convinced that this is the best judicial screening process in the nation. I'm glad I'm not having to go out there knocking on doors and for public election this time. So thank you all for your service to the state, as well.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is this really Judge Emery before us?

JUDGE EMERY: It is. It is.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ladies and gentlemen,
we have before us the Honorable Melissa Johnson Emery of the Family Court, 15th Judicial Circuit, Seat 2. Judge, can you please raise your right hand and be sworn?
(The judge is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much.
EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Judge, you provided a very detailed response to the personal date questionnaire that staff sent you early in this process. Is that response that you provided still current and correct or is it in any need of change or amendment at this time?
A. It would still be current and correct.
Q. Thank you very much. Would you have any objection to us including that as an exhibit to the record of your personal testimony today?
A. I do not.
Q. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Are there any
Commission members that would object?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing no objections, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 10, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION

COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE MELISSA JOHNSON EMERY, DATED JULY 31ST, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 11, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE MELISSA JOHNSON EMERY, DATED OCTOBER 28TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our inquiry has been focused on the nine statutory evaluative criteria. In that process, as resulted in the screening hearing today. There are no witnesses here to testify against you and no affidavits have been filed in opposition to your election. If you would, please, at this point, turn your attention to your screening attorney and respond to her questions. Thank you.

EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Anderson)
Q. Good afternoon, Judge Emery.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. You have before you the sworn statement you
provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?
A. No, ma'am.

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there an objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 12, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR MELISSA JOHNSON EMERY, DATED JULY 31ST, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Emery, after serving on the Family Court since last February, why do you want to continue serving as a Family Court judge?
A. I love my job. I mean, I was a Family Court attorney for 18,19 years before $I$ went on the bench. I practiced exclusively in Family Court. That's been the passion of my career and while it has been different going from one side of the bench to the other, it has been something that I have
enjoyed, I think I have done well at. I've gotten a lot of positive feedback from my peers, from the litigants in front of me and it's just a job I absolutely love. Worked hard to get it and would really like to keep it because $I$ really enjoyed it.
Q. The Commission received 123 ballot box surveys regarding you with nine additional comments. The ballot box surveys, for example, contained some of the following positive comments. Excellent judge with a wonderful temperament. She is fair and patient to all. New to the bench and doing a very good job, hardworking. Three of the comments expressed concerns and they were related to judicial temperament. Would you like to respond to that?
A. Well, I remember in my conversations with you earlier on, one of them was concern that I might show partiality. I don't believe that to be true. I go out of my way to make sure that there is not partiality shown to the point that I've never had anyone ask me to recuse myself or not hear a matter. If it was a situation, for example, I went through a divorce and the person that represented me, I had taken care of that. So I do my best to make sure that that's not the case. I will tell
you in the 18 months that I've been on the bench, they traveled me a good bit, and so a lot of the counties $I$ go into $I$ don't know anybody that comes before me. As far as the temperament, I think I've had good responses. I will say that I am surprised sometimes by the temperament of younger attorneys or attorneys that come in front of me, sometimes they don't have the respect and I will say that I am one that you're going to have respect for one another and you're going to have respect for the bench. That's how I was taught. That's how I was raised in court and that's what I insist on. Some people don't care for that and so I imagine that might be the basis for a couple of those comments, but I demand respect. Everybody's going to respect and I will continue to do that.
Q. And with the background investigation, the SLED check showed a lawsuit from 2011, which was Chase Home Finances versus Victor Johnson. You were a named defendant along with a number of other defendants on this lawsuit. Can you please explain the nature and disposition of this matter?
A. I had represented Mr. Johnson's wife and sometime during the course of the case, he was required to pay me attorney's fees. I think it was
two or $\$ 3,000$ worth of attorney's fees. And for some reason, when that order got filed with the clerk's office, it was coded as a judgment. I mean, he satisfied his fees. I would've ruled him in if he didn't, but he satisfied his fees. I think that it was filed and $I$ was dismissed within a week or two when it was determined that that was an attorney fee award and not something that I had filed a judgment against him. But I think that's why I was named.
Q. I have a few housekeeping issues. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered a 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 the 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, ma'am.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules, that is, it is a misdemeanor and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. ANDERSON: I would note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee reported that Judge Emery 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 also like to note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Emery were incorporated in today's questioning. Mr.

Chairman, I have no further questions.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Judge Emery, before we go on to see if there are any questions, I just peeked around the podium and saw that you have a special guest with you. Would you like to introduce him? JUDGE EMERY: I do. That's my fiance, Thomas Buckhannon. I will say that is a wonderful thing that comes from my job. He was my first deputy my first week of court in Charleston and he took care -- and then Judge Martin did a little matchmaking. So he took care of me my first week and a few months later, it became a permanent job for him, so. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is that
fraternization?
JUDGE EMERY: No. I'm from Horry County. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Great to have you with us today.

JUDGE EMERY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy, question?

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, I want to say that I know Judge Emery and had a chance to appear in front of her and

I think that she's done a very good job, has a good disposition on the court. She was very tolerant of me when $I$ almost lost my cool in her courtroom over a young lawyer that I thought was out of order and $I$ will just say that she handled matters very well. I'd also like to applaud her for what I believe to be the highest score on the test.

JUDGE EMERY: Thank you.
SENATOR MALLOY: And I think that that goes to a young judge and shows that they're still working hard to end up maintaining and understanding the law and I wanted to congratulate you on that.

JUDGE EMERY: Thank you. I didn't know that, but $I$ appreciate you saying that. SENATOR MALLOY: I'm sure the staff -MS. ANDERSON: I can't tell her that. SENATOR MALLOY: Oh, she can't tell that. Can I? I mean, I expect that $I$ can do it, but that doesn't mean that I'm supposed to. JUDGE EMERY: I appreciate it, though. SENATOR MALLOY: So I just wanted to use that as an opportunity to show that we understand that this was a very difficult test
and for you to achieve the way that you have on it shows that you are taking it very seriously in preparation and understanding and performance on the test and I observed personally how you handle the bench and I want to thank you for that.

JUDGE EMERY: Thank you, sir. Thank you. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge Emery, I just want to let all the Commission members know that Judge Emery is in Horry County and that she is highly respected by all, including myself, as the kind of judge that makes us proud to serve. I wish that we had many great jurist serving on the Family Court bench. If those coming along could all be like Judge Emery, it would be a wonderful world. Judge Emery, thank you for your service. JUDGE EMERY: Thank you so much. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Are there any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge, that will conclude this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the report is
published. You could be called back at another time if that need should arise. We, again, thank you for your service to South Carolina and your service on the bench.

JUDGE EMERY: Thank you. And thank you, as well.
(The judge is excused.)
(Off-the-record discussion.)
VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: He may take over, but I'm going to go ahead and get started. Can you raise your hand and take the oath?

JUDGE LENSKI: Yes, I will.
(The judge is sworn in.)
VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: Thank you very much.

## EXAMINATION

(By Vice-Chairman Martin)
Q. Have you had the opportunity to review your PDQ?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Personal Data Questionnaire. Everything in order? You need any amendments?
A. No, sir.
Q. Do you object to us making this part of your sworn testimony today?
A. No.

VICE-CHAIRMAN MARTIN: It will be done at this point in the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 13, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE SEBASTIEN PHILLIP LENSKI, DATED AUGUST 10TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Of course, you're aware of the nine evaluative criteria we've used in this process. We have no affidavits in opposition to your election. We have no witnesses here to testify. Do you have any opening comment you'd like to make?
A. I'm just happy to be here and answer any questions that you have. Thank you.
Q. Thank you very much. Will you answer the questions of our able counsel?

MR. PEARCE: Thank you, Senator. EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Pearce)
Q. Judge Lenski, you have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions regarding judicial conduct, statutory qualification, office administration, and temperament. Do you have any amendments you'd like to make at this time to your sworn statement.
A. No, I do not. Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: I think there are no objections, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 14, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE SEBASTIEN PHILLIP LENSKI, DATED AUGUST 7TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Lenski, after serving since 2010 on the Administrative Law Court, why do you want to continue to serve?
A. Well, first of all, $I$ want to say that it has been a great honor to be a member of the Administrative Law Court. I was very honored to have been elected to the seat and I've had a tremendous experience over the last five years serving on that court. I've learned a tremendous amount and each year that I'm on the court, you know, I'm more intrigued by what $I$ do. I love my job and I think I definitely would like an opportunity to continue serving and to apply what I've learned for another term.
Q. The Commission received 137 ballot box surveys regarding you with 25 additional comments. The
ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. Truly thoughtful, fantastic jurist, utmost character, excellent temperament, and needs to be the Chief Administrative Law judge. Of those 25 written comments, approximately 11 indicated some concerns. One concern was the timeliness in rendering decisions and issuing orders. What response would you offer to that concern?
A. Well, I would say that if there was one thing that I have been working hardest on to improve is the timeliness with which I've gotten out some of my orders. I have had some interesting things happen over the five years that $I$ was on the bench. First of all, it was my first term. Second of all, six months after I was elected to the bench, I was notified by the United States Army that $I$ was being mobilized. My entire reserve unit was mobilized and so less than a year after I'd been on the bench, in December of 2010, I went to Fort Bragg and I didn't come back until February of 2012. It was a 12 month mobilization, but they put us on orders before to get trained up to do our job and then we had to stay a little bit longer to come off of active duty after the XVIIIth Airborne Corps
returned from Iraq to kind of resume their duties because they took some leave and took their time getting back to work.

So during that period of time, I'd barely gotten a full caseload going and was up to speed and then I got notified $I$ was leaving and $I$ was gone for 14 months. I had hoped that I would be able to continue to do some things while I was there, but the job was an unbelievable amount of work. It basically started at six o'clock in the morning with running and push-ups in the good ole Army style and then we were usually leaving the office around eight o'clock at night because the entire legal force for the Corps had gone over to Iraq so this unit of mine, we were responsible for all the day to day administrative operations.

There were legal issues going on at Fort Bragg, which is a huge military instillation. So when $I$ came back off of active duty, I was already behind. Then I was trying to catch up on some things and I lost my law clerk because he was also in the Reserves and he was mobilized and left thereafter. I tried to hold the job open for him for a period of time, but he ultimately took another position when he came off of active duty.

So he didn't return to me and then I had my next law clerk. She worked for me, but she had a difficult pregnancy and was out for a good bit of time. I found myself a good bit behind on things and I've been working to catch up.

I have a fantastic staff attorney and a fantastic law clerk working for me now and I don't anticipate having as much difficulty getting orders out in a timely fashion. But $I$ do have to say that there was a period of time there where I fell behind and I wasn't happy about that, but I've made some changes to things so that $I$ hope that that won't be an issue going forward.
Q. A second concern in the ballot box responses questioned your understanding of the law, specifically saying that they believed you were making findings of fact in an administrative law matter instead of remanding the case for additional findings and facts. What response would you offer to this concern regarding your approach to administrative law cases?
A. Well, without knowing more specifically about the matter, it's difficult for me to address that specifically. I think I have a good understanding of the jurisdiction of the Administrative Law Court
and certainly if $I$ ever have question about the jurisdiction of the court or about the duties, I consult the law in that regard. But $I$ know that in contested case matters where my responsibility is to make findings of fact and, of course, our court hears both contested cases and cases on appeal from administrative agencies -- in those cases where there are contested cases, I do have to make findings of fact.

There would be an appropriate time where matters sometimes do need to be remanded back to the agency, but if it's a de novo hearing -- if my duty is to hear the case in its de novo capacity, then it is my duty to make findings of fact and I can accept findings of fact from the administrative agency if there were any that were made.

Sometimes they don't make too many of them and in a de novo setting, I have to make them myself. So without knowing, I can only address generally what my duties are as a judge on the court and how I would handle situations and that's the best I can do as far as answering that criticism.
Q. And in an additional matter, the SLED report the Commission received showed that an inmate filed a petition against you in the Common Pleas Court in

Richland County in 2013. That case was shown as dismissed under the Rules of Civil Procedure 41 (a). It was filed by an inmate, Gregory Cleveland. Do you have any recollection of that particular case?
A. In all candor, no. I do not. I'm sorry. I didn't even know that had happened.
Q. It is shown as dismissed on the SLED report.
A. Yes, sir.

MR. PEARCE: I do, Mr. Chairman, have some housekeeping issues.
Q. Judge, if I might --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- go through those with you 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 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. I have not.
Q. Are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in any part of this process on your behalf?
A. No, 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. Yes. I'm aware of that.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes.
Q. As a follow-up, are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules of a condition of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction, the violator must be fined not more than $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I am aware of that. Yes, sir.

MR. PEARCE: I would note that the Midlands Citizens Committee reported that Judge Lenski was qualified regarding constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. He was found well qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. They also added this particular
comment to their report that Judge Lenski is an excellent judge and very qualified for his position. I would just note for the record that any concerns raised in the background work that we did during his candidacy interview were incorporated into the questioning that $I$ have done with the candidate today. Mr. Chairman, I would have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Pearce and thank you, Mr. Lenski.

JUDGE LENSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Mr. Hitchcock is recognized.

MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to disclose for the Commission that Mr. Lenski is a good friend of mine. He used to work for me. He worked for me for two years in the Senate, a year of which he was actually deployed to Iraq for his first deployment during Operation Iraqi Freedom. We also served in the same Reserve unit together. He was in my wedding. So I know Judge Lenski very well, which does make me call into question the test results.

It's my understanding that he, I think, got the highest score of anyone potentially, or something close to that.

In all seriousness, I think that's demonstrative of Judge Lenski's legal knowledge and ability. I can tell you that from knowing him for so long, I've met few people who have dedicated so much of their life and time to serving not only our state, but also our country. I don't think you could have a better representative on the Administrative Law Court.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr.
Hitchcock. I believe you were correct. His test scores were the highest of all the ALJ candidates that we are screening this cycle.

DEAN WILCOX: All candidates --
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: He's the only one. That was an attempt at a joke. I recognize my shortcomings. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN: I'm only going to add, and then the Senator from Charleston wants to make a comment, that Judge Lenski also worked with Senate Judiciary Committee after working for Senate Research and just very able. We
were lucky to get him. We just appreciate so much his service and knew that he would do well in this position and he has. We're just so very appreciative of your outstanding service, both on the court and to our country. JUDGE LENSKI: Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Campsen. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Chairman, I just would concur with what Mr. Hitchcock and Senator Martin have said, that Mr. Lenski performed outstanding service, has a very good legal mind. In fact, I'm not even going to question him about the separation of powers doctrine because I know that he's very conversant with it, having learned at the feet of Mr. Hitchcock over there.

JUDGE LENSKI: Absolutely.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: He knows the proper role. Actually you were a member of the executive branch as opposed to the judicial branch.

JUDGE LENSKI: That's true.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: But, nevertheless, he's a very good legal mind that's provided great service for the Senate and he has been and
will continue to be an outstanding jurist. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much, Senator Campsen. Senator Malloy. Let's hear from the third of the Senate delegation -forth of the Senate delegation.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chair and I, too, worked on the committee that Mr. Lenski worked with and I think it goes a little bit further. I think that we heard from the Administrative Law Court in one of these last hearings. What we learned and what I found out, too, is Judge Lenski, a lot of times he gets some more difficult cases over there and I think that adds to their confidence in his intellect and his ability as a judge. I do have one question that I think that the committee needs to know. I think that we need to know who his favorite cowboy is, who his hero was, and so he can tell them that and then I have another comment I need to make. Who's a cowboy that you wanted to be like?

JUDGE LENSKI: Well, Senator, the name that I wanted was -- I was very upset with my mother because she didn't name me Buck. There
was a particular cowboy whose character was Buck in a movie that $I$ saw as a child and I definitely thought that that's who I should have been named after. I was very upset that my mother named me Sebastien Phillip. As you can imagine, that's a far cry from Buck, so. SENATOR MALLOY: I have a brother who has a nickname Buck. They call him Buck because my sister was calling him Brah, but she was trying to call him brother, but she started calling him Buck and so that nickname has stuck. So if you ever go up there and try to buy a suit, if you were to say Buck, he'll know who you're talking about.

But I do want to say this and I think it's worthy of saying the second part of this. Back in my earlier life, Judge Lenski had a very good floor leader to end up becoming a judge and he got unanimous approval from the Senate right away. But $I$ will say this, in one of the most humbling times that we've had over here in our earlier life, Judge Lenski was involved in a race and $I$ think it's very fitting for this committee to end up knowing that in a race that $I$ thought that he would
win, but he did not win. He was running for the ALJ. He came to my office and said, you know, says I really want to talk to you about something. He said, you know, we really got to make certain we have some diversity on the bench and I've just been thinking about it, and it was a race that I thought he would obviously win, and he then made a decision to withdraw so that, at the time, that Judge Shirley Robinson could get on the ALJ bench because we had no African Americans on the bench. I just think that, during that time, which I knew was a race that he was most likely going to win, and he said I'm willing to wait my time. I think it's just worthy of this Committee to end up knowing the kind of compassion that a person would have. He didn't put himself first. He put others in our state first in making that kind of decision when he really didn't have to. So I'll always appreciate that, Judge. JUDGE LENSKI: Thank you, Senator. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge, the point's been well-made that you worked long and hard for the Senate and I feel like I should make
the point that the only reason he didn't work for the House is because he wouldn't leave the Senate, so. We all look up to you and are grateful for your service, not only on the bench, but also your military service. We all think the world of you. Thank for being here. Are there any other questions or comments?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, this concludes this portion of the screening process. Judge Lenski, we would remind you that the record will remain open until the report is published. You may be called back should that need arise. Again, we thank you for your service on the bench and your service to the state of South Carolina.

JUDGE LENSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank all of you for what you do on this Committee.
(Candidate is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ladies and gentlemen, our lunch is here and I have suggested, through staff, to the judges that are waiting to be heard that if none of them would be offended, we would eat while we question
them and they are all in happy agreement with that. Bring in the next judge.
(Brief pause.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you for your understanding allowing us to work through lunch.

JUDGE FUGE: You got it.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: I also want to say thank you for your patience. Judge Fuge, will you kindly raise your right hand and be sworn?
(The judge is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much.
EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Judge, you provided this Committee with the responses to your personal data questionnaire. Are those responses still current and correct today or are they in any need of amendment?
A. They would be current.
Q. Thank you. Do you have any objection to us including those responses in our record today of your sworn testimony?
A. No. No.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Are there any objections by Commission members?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 15, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE PETER L. FUGE, DATED AUGUST 4TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge, the Judicial Merits Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our inquiry's been focused on the nine evaluative criteria and that process has resulted in our presence here with you today. There are no witnesses present to testify and there no affidavits filed in opposition to your election. If at this point, you would please turn your attention to Mr. Goldin and respond to his questions.

JUDGE FUGE: Yes, sir.
EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Goldin)
Q. Good afternoon, Judge. You have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments you

## would like to make at this time to that sworn statement?

A. No, sir.

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Are there any objections?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Without objections, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 16, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE PETER L. FUGE, DATED AUGUST 4TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge, after serving for six years, why do you want to continue to serve on the Family Court bench?
A. It's all I've done, really. I love it. I'm very fortunate. It sounds a little bit -- I don't want to be -- but I really think this is God's will. I was the middle kid in an Irish family so $I$ wound up doing a lot of domestic relations law because I'm used to a little bit of friction and it all just worked out. And then when it was my time to be on
the bench, I got to do that. I hope I've helped people out because I've tried.
Q. Thank you, Judge. The Commission received 258 ballot box surveys regarding you with 28 additional comments. Some of the surveys contained the following positive comments indicating you're a good lawyer, good judge, very smart and knows the law, and best judicial temperament of all the Family Court judges. There were 14 written comments that expressed some concerns. The theme of those comments concern your treatment of parties and the attorneys who appear before you. Respondents state that you have poor judicial temperament and demeanor. What response would you offer to these concerns?
A. Well, I don't know what to say. You know, it's a straw man situation. The concern about being -- I hope I'm not abusive to anybody. Sometimes, you know, Family Court has really changed. It's interesting -- a really interesting phenomenon. What's happened is, with mediation and arbitration, you don't see a lot of the same type of Family Court cases you got about 10 or 15 years ago. I think over the years, you have many, many more pro se litigants or pro se litigants against an
attorney. So it's really changed and I apologize to anyone if I've ever offended them. You know with domestic relations people get angry because they want their way. It's really very important to them. It's the most important thing in their life and I understand that. And sometimes, I think, you just have to pick. You have to do what you think is right. Sometimes, they get bitter and feel that way about it; I hope not. I try not to do that.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Just some general housekeeping issues I want to go through with you. Have you sought or received the 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 this 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 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 are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you reviewed the Commission's guidelines on pledging?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. GOLDIN: I would note for the record that the South Carolina Bar Qualifications Committee found Judge Fuge to be overall qualified and that Lowcountry Citizens Committee found Judge Fuge to be qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health, 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 these evaluative criteria, that he meets the requirements in this area and any concerns discovered during the investigation were incorporated in the questioning of this candidate today.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Goldin. Any questions? Ms. Wall.

MS. WALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. By full disclosure for the Commission, I've known Judge Fuge actually long before he was a judge. So it's been many, many years that I've known Judge Fuge. I've known him to be a fine and upstanding person. I have not had the opportunity to appear in front of him as a judge in Family Court, but I am confident, as the majority of comments have been made, that he has done a very good job, that he is always compassionate and fair.

JUDGE FUGE: Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms. Wall. Dean Wilcox.

EXAMINATION
(By Dean Wilcox)
Q. Judge, frankly, there is a little bit of concern $I$ have. It's the number of people who responded. I think you had more responses suggesting you were unqualified in terms of temperament than maybe any other candidate we had. As you reflect on that, at this point, are there reasons why 47 people found you unqualified, or suggested you were in the
ballot box, as to judicial temperament?
A. Well, I think $I$ probably have an overbearing -- at times, you know, I can be -- because I'm a big guy and I was brought up with -- I have a brother that threw the shot discus at Carolina. It was a big house. Maybe that's a real fault I have. I hope not though. I really try not to. I think sometimes people can misperceive, you know, directness or -- I've never shown any disrespect to anybody. I really don't. I'm very disappointed in myself that I had those.
Q. And I note that at least several of the comments referred to differentiation of treatment of genders and I do urge you to, at least, think about that as you're going forward in this regard.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Let me ask you a specific question that was raised in the comments and it dealt with DSS jurisdiction and retaining jurisdiction over matters, which they said then you leave to go on the circuit and it causes problems and delays and things. Do you typically retain jurisdiction over a DSS matter yourself?
A. No. I do it occasionally because I'm so worried about the child and I'm so worried about the status
of where the child is. I may do that, but that's what I do. You know, you'll have a dynamic situation where I'll have a woman who's a drug addict and I think you all know that's not something you just stop overnight, you know, and I had to go call the -- that many people work with others that assist the Department of Social Services think you can send somebody off to the Lowcountry Counseling Center for three weeks and it's going to be okay and sometimes when I am really worried about a child and the health of the child and the welfare of the child -- a child that's born a crack baby or something like that. Yeah, I'll maintain jurisdiction and $I$ was proud of that. I do apologize. I mean, I try to make myself available. I've had DSS come to my house. I mean, anytime you want to have anybody sign an order, you know, a pick-up order or you've got a child that's in deep trouble and is being abused, I hope someone told you that. I've had a lot of DSS people come to my house on the weekend. So I'm sorry, but.
Q. I appreciate your answer to that, Judge. As to the other, I think we're fully appreciative of the difficulty responding to anonymous comments and we
struggle with that as well as you do, but I do urge you -- I think an important part of the process of being vetted again and going up is to at least reflect and take as perhaps some opportunity for some constructive evaluation there where that many people seem to have left the courtroom feeling unhappy and that's what $I$ just want to be sure --
A. But you're saying that there were 47 people that said I'm a misogynist?
Q. No. No. No. No. No. There were 47 people who spoke generally about temperament as unqualified. A few of those comments referred to gender.
A. Okay. If it's a fault of mine then $I$ will work on it, absolutely. You know, I mean, you see stuff now you've never seen before and it's just heartbreaking with some of the kids and I'm sorry. I apologize if I've given anybody, DSS or anybody, that impression. I just try to do the best interest of the child and I try to follow the statutes.

DEAN WILCOX: I appreciate it. Thank you. That's all I had, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Dean. Are there any other questions or comments?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge, again, we thank you for being with us today. JUDGE FUGE: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: That will conclude this portion of the Judicial Merit Selection screening process. The record will remain open until such time that the report is published. You could be called back at such time if that need should arise.

JUDGE FUGE: All right, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Again, we thank you for your service to South Carolina and your desire to continue to serve.

JUDGE FUGE: Thank you. I'm sorry if I, you know, gave anybody the impression that I'm abusive towards people because I don't -- you know, that's not what I'm working for.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We understand.
JUDGE FUGE: Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We appreciate you
looking after the best interest of the child.
JUDGE FUGE: Oh, thanks. Thank you, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir.
(The judge is excused.)

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Mr. Coffey, thank you for being here with us today. Forgive our indulgence as we eat our sandwiches while you speak.

MR. COFFEY: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ladies and gentlemen, we have before us Mr. Joseph King Coffey, who seeks appointment to Master-in-Equity for Clarendon County, 3rd Circuit. Judge, if you would please, raise your right hand and be sworn. Excuse me, you're not a judge yet. If you please raise your right hand and be sworn.
(The candidate is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you.
EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. You provided this Commission, upon our request, with detailed response to the personal data questionnaire we provided early on. Are those responses current and correct or are they in need of any amendments?
A. No. They're not in need of any amendment. They are correct.
Q. Very good. Thank you. Would you have any objection to having your personal data

## questionnaire responses included as part of the record of your sworn testimony today?

A. I have no objection.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Without objection by any Commission member, that is so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 17, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JOSEPH KING COFFEY, DATED JULY 29TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: This Commission has worked hard to investigate your qualifications for service on the bench as a Master-inEquity. Our inquiry's been focused on nine evaluative criteria provided by statute. As a result of that, we've had no affidavits file in opposition to your election, nor are there any witnesses, other than yourself, present to testify today. Would you, at this point in the process, turn your attention to your screening attorney Mr. Goldin. He has a few questions for you.

MR. COFFEY: Yes, sir.
EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Goldin)
Q. Mr. Coffey, you have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments you'd like to make at this time to that statement?
A. No, there's not.

MR. GOLDIN: Mr. Chairman, I would ask that Mr. Coffey's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the hearing record.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: So ordered without objection.
[EXHIBIT 18, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR JOSEPH KING COFFEY, DATED JULY 30TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Mr. Coffey, why do you now want to serve as Master-in-Equity?
A. I think it'd be a great opportunity to serve the community of Clarendon County.
Q. And although you addressed this in your sworn affidavit, could you please explain to the members of the Commission what you think the appropriate demeanor is for a Master?
A. Professionalism, being non-biased in the decisions, and making thoughtful, good decisions based on the evidence that's presented before you.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Coffey, the Commission received 75
ballot box surveys regarding you with four additional comments. The ballot box surveys contained only positive comments that indicate you'll likely do a good job as a Master-inEquity and received no comments that caused concern. One concern that $I$ did find during your investigation was a tax lien from years past. You want to explain that?
A. Yes, sir. I'll be glad to. Steve McKenzie and I purchased our law firm in February of 2014 from Ray Chandler. He was our partner that we bought out and there were some existing liens that were against the law firm and one of the obligations when we assumed the debt of the building and paid for the firm was that he was to address and retire because of none of those had accrued while Mr. McKenzie and I owned the firm and I do not have any personal liens against me.
Q. Have those been satisfied?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

MR. GOLDIN: The Pee Dee Citizens Committee found Mr. Coffey qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. The committee
found him well qualified in the criteria of professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. The committee did leave the ethical fitness box unmarked. I assume that was unintentional so I would just note for the record that and any concern about that I've addressed on the record today. That's all I have, Mr. Commission member? Ms. Wall.

MS. WALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Wall)
Q. Mr. Coffey, I'm looking for your -- and it may be answered in your PDQ, but $I$ have a question for you. Is Billy Coffey your father?
A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. WALL: Well, then let me just say I've known your father for many, many years and very, very fine lawyer, very fine human being and I'm sure he brought you up very well.

MR. COFFEY: Thank you.
SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Martin is recognized.

## EXAMINATION

(By Senator Martin)
Q. One of the few people I know in Manning would be Senator Land. So what would Senator Land say about you?
A. Well, since Ricci, his daughter isn't running, I would hope that he would speak highly of me.
Q. That's all we need to know. That's all we need to know.

```
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Are there any other questions or comments?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, this will conclude this portion of the screening process. The record will remain open until the report is published and you could be called back at such time if that need should arise.
MR. COFFEY: I understand.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We thank you for your service and your desire to serve South Carolina and for being with us.
MR. COFFEY: Thank you.
(The candidate is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge Chellis, thank
```

you for being with us today. Thank you for your patience.

JUDGE CHELLIS: No problem. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge, we want to begin. May we swear you in? Would you raise your right hand?
(The judge is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Judge Chellis.

EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Early on in this process, you provided this Commission with responses to the personal data questionnaire. Are your responses still correct and complete and current as of today?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Thank you very much. Would you have any objection to including those responses in the record of your sworn testimony?
A. No, sir.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any objection by any member?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so
ordered.
[EXHIBIT 19, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE JAMES E. CHELLIS, DATED AUGUST 10TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 20, AMENDED JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE JAMES E. CHELLIS, OCTOBER 26TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge, the screening commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. That inquiry has focused on the nine evaluative criteria dictated by South Carolina law and we find ourselves here today in this hearing as a result of that process. There have been no affidavits filed in opposition to your election and there are no witnesses present to testify other than yourself. At this point, we ask that you turn your attention to Ms. Simpson and respond to any questions she may have.

JUDGE CHELLIS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir.
MS. SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## EXAMINATION

(By Ms. Simpson)
Q. Judge Chellis, you have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments you would like to make at this time to your sworn statement?
A. None other than the ones that I was requested to make and have provided to you.

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms. Simpson. Is there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 21, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE JAMES E. CHELLIS, DATED AUGUST 10TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Chellis, after serving nearly two years as Master-in-Equity, why do you want to continue serving in this position?
A. I like it. It's fun.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Good answer.
Q. Thank you. Judge Chellis, the Commission received 170 ballot box survey regarding you with nine additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. He had implemented many new, efficient, and thorough procedures, very thoughtful and considerate in deliberation and ruling, one of the most thoughtful and intellectually vigorous Master-in-Equities in the state. One of the written comments expressed a concern. The comment indicated that you often advocate for pro se or absent litigants rather than ruling on the issues properly before the court. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. First of all, $I$ don't think it's a concern. And the second thing is I'm not sure what they mean by advocate. I will tell you that whenever I have a pro se litigant before me, I make sure that the pro se litigant understands the procedural state that they find themselves in and that they understand the rules of court at the point in time at which they appear before me. I try to make that as clear as I can. I suppose somebody who represents a big
corporation plaintiff might object to that because they think that I'm telling the pro se litigant too much about where they stand. I'm not really sure what they mean by advocate.

The other thing is about non-appearing parties that really I would like to address is the issue that $I$ think many, many, many of the plaintiffs -the foreclosure bar takes the responsibility of making sure that proper due process is given to defendants. So I'm very keen on making sure that the defendant has notice of the proceedings. I think what has happened in the practice of law is instead of it being a professional practice, sometimes it becomes simply a business and these people are pumping out documents that just need to be reviewed and I have reviewed them and I'll look at them and I'll say that's just not going to cut it. It's not good enough. It's not proper pro se. I mean, not proper due process for this party so I'll kick them back. So to that extent, yes, I do make sure the procedural -particularly matters that deal with due process of law are followed and followed somewhat strictly in my court.
Q. Thank you, Judge Chellis. I just have a few
housekeeping issues. Have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator prior to this date?
A. No.
Q. Have you sought or have you been offered a 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 in any part of this process on your behalf?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Have you contacted any members of the Commission?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report?
A. Yes.
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 no more than $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?

A. Yes.

MS. SIMPSON: I would like to note that the Lowcountry Citizens Committee reported that Judge Chellis is qualified in the criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, mental stability and well qualified to the remaining 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 Chellis were incorporated in the questioning of him today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms. Simpson. Are there any questions by members? Dean Wilcox.

DEAN WILCOX: Just very quickly because I know we're late on time, but given the one concern, I actually would like to commend Judge Chellis, without knowing how you do it exactly, but to take care of the pro se appearances in front of you. They do need
judicial help and I would not shy away from doing that because of this.

JUDGE CHELLIS: Thank you. Thank you. DEAN WILCOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Representative Mack. MR. MACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My district runs part into Dorchester County. JUDGE CHELLIS: Yes, sir. How are you today?

MR. MACK: Doing fine and I've gotten nothing but good reports back from you and it goes to Dean Wilcox's point that word gets back and it's been good.

JUDGE CHELLIS: Good to hear. Thank you. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: I have a question for you, sir. JUDGE CHELLIS: Yes, sir?

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is Converse Chellis your father? You can pass that along -JUDGE CHELLIS: I will let the Committee know that $I$ took a picture of two pictures in the waiting room in which he was the chairman of the Rules Committee and sent it to him and I was trying to type Blatt Building, Room 511 and I typed, by mistake, Blast Building, Room
511.
(Commission members laughing and talking over each other.)

JUDGE CHELLIS: But true to his accounting background, he quickly corrected me and said don't you mean Blatt Building?

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Please pass our best regards to him.

JUDGE CHELLIS: I certainly will. RE-EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. I practice a good bit of foreclosure law myself and I am curious. In your protection of pro se defendants, you are giving full faith and credit to publication by our publication service?
A. Oh, yeah. Absolutely. Service by publication, which was an informed constructive notice of service of pleadings, is perfectly fine. It's just that we have a case out there. It's called the -- it came from Judge Dukes's office, Wiquist versus Caldwell. In that case, there was -- the court actually looked behind the motion for the order of publication and said that the affidavit itself was defective because you can't just make a conclusory statement by you exercising due
diligence in trying to attempt to fine this defendant. Sure, you can repeat the statement that's contained in the language of the statute, but that doesn't tell you what facts you exercise or what were the factual bases the coalition decided that there was due diligence and you could make that representation to the court.

So I make sure that the affidavits are clean. You know, an affidavit's supposed to be something that you answer as if you were sworn before a court and we are stating truth and so forth. So yeah, I follow the rule of what an affidavit has to be and if it satisfies me that they have exercised due diligence, I'll make that judgment and grant the order of publication without a doubt.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. That's very appropriate. I follow that practice myself.

JUDGE CHELLIS: Good.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you for the clarification. Are there any other questions or comments?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge Chellis, this
will conclude this portion of the screening
process, but the record will remain open until such time that the report is published. You could be called back if that need should arise prior to the publication of the report. We thank you, sir, for being here with us and thank you for your service to South Carolina.

JUDGE CHELLIS: Thank you and I want to thank each and every one of you for what you do. Thank you. Take care. God bless.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: You, too. Be safe. (The judge is excused.)

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge, thank you for joining us and thank you for your patience today.

JUDGE BOOTH: Thank you. We've been quite content back there.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: The staff has taken care of you.

JUDGE BOOTH: They have.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Good. We have before us, ladies and gentlemen, the Honorable Richard Lauren Booth, Master-in-Equity for Sumter County, 3rd Circuit. Judge Booth, it's good to have you with us today.

EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. If you will recall, earlier on in this process, you responded to the personal data questionnaire the staff provided you.
A. Yes.
Q. Are those responses current and correct today?
A. To the best of my knowledge, they are.
Q. Thank you, sir. Would you have any objection to them being included as a part of the record of your sworn testimony?
A. No objection.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Is there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 22, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE RICHARD LAUREN BOOTH, DATED AUGUST 5TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly reviewed your qualifications for continuation on the bench. That process has used the nine evaluative criteria as set out by South

Carolina law. As a result of that process, we find ourselves here today with you, sir. There have been no affidavits filed in opposition to your election nor are there any witnesses, other than yourself, present to testify. We'd ask now that you turn your attention to Mr. Gentry, your screening attorney and respond to his questions. EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Gentry)
Q. Judge Booth, you have before you the sworn statement you provided the Commission. Are there any amendments you'd like to make to your sworn statement?
A. No.

MR. GENTRY: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that Judge Booth's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the record at this time.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Without objection, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 23, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE RICHARD LAUREN BOOTH, DATED AUGUST 5TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Booth, after serving over eight years as a

Master-in-Equity, why do you want to continue to serve?
A. Well, I enjoy the job. I feel like I do a good job and it's something that $I$ wish to pursue.

MR. GENTRY: I would note for the record that the Commission received 130 ballot box surveys regarding Judge Booth with seven additional comments, all of which were positive.
Q. Judge Booth, 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 part of the 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 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 $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes.

MR. GENTRY: I would note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee found Judge Booth 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. The committee commented, "Judge Booth is seen as a problem solver with extreme knowledge and experience." I'd also note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated in the questioning
today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much. Members of the Commission, do you have questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge, 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 could be called back as such time if that need should arise. With that, again, we're grateful for your presence and for your patience today. Thank you for your service to South Carolina.

JUDGE BOOTH: Thank you all very much. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Yes, sir.
(The judge is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Justice Moore, so good to have you with us today.

JUSTICE MOORE: Good afternoon.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We apologize in advance for your being kept waiting as you have today.

JUSTICE MOORE: I discovered what it was
like waiting in the jury pool room.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: I'm sure you did. We have before us the Honorable James E. Moore, South Carolina Supreme Court, Retired Justice. EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Justice Moore, early on in this process, you responded to the personal data questionnaire that staff provided you. Are your responses contained therein still current and correct?
A. They are.
Q. Thank you. Would you have any objection to them being included in the record of your testimony today?
A. Not at all.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Without objection of any member of the Commission, we will include that as an exhibit to the record.
[EXHIBIT 24, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE JAMES E. MOORE, DATED AUGUST 5TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Justice Moore, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications
for continuation on the bench. Our inquiry is focused on the nine evaluative criteria dictated by South Carolina law. As a result of that process, we have the pleasure of visiting with you today. There have been no affidavits filed in opposition to your reelection or to your continuation on the bench, nor are there any witnesses here today to testify other than yourself. Will you please turn your attention to Ms. Wells and respond to her questions? Thank you.

MS. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Wells)
Q. Justice Moore, you have also before you your sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments you want to make at that time?
A. No amendments.

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Are there any objections?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 25, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE JAMES E. MOORE, DATED AUGUST 5TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Justice Moore, could you explain why you want to continue serving as a retired Supreme Court Justice?
A. I retired in the year 2008, when I reached the mandatory retirement age of 72. I discovered rather quickly that $I$ was not going to be a very good retiree. I never developed the hobbies that perhaps I should have, but fortunately the court has called me on a rather regular basis to fill in when one is recused or is absent and that certainly gives me a little feeling of contribution and it helps my problem of the feeling of usefulness when you retire. I do enjoy my time with the court and I think it's a benefit to the court, too, because they don't have to call an active sitting judge off the bench somewhere when they have someone like me that's available.
Q. Thank you. How much time do you spend per month,

## do you say, and do you expect to change whatever you're doing with the Supreme Court?

A. It varies, of course, when one is recused. Sometimes I'll sit once or twice a month and sometimes more than that. For instance, this week I sat for the Chief Justice who has had a death in the family. I sat for her on three cases and then I sat for Justice Kittredge one day, who was out of state for that one day. So for this month, I've sat on six cases. So it varies, sometimes, I may not be called at all. It is a pretty good process in that I receive the briefs and the records about the same length of time as an active member would and, of course, I'm always usually the fifth vote so sometimes the decisions are made by the time -MS. WELLS: Members of the Commission and Justice Moore, for the record, I would like the Commission to know that you received 281 ballot box surveys regarding Justice Moore with 19 additional comments. There were no negative comments. Several mentioned your even temperament, your wise observations, your intelligence, and your continued willingness to serve as a retired justice as a valuable asset to the judiciary and to the South

Carolina Bar.
JUSTICE MOORE: Good to hear.
MS. WELLS: And I would note that the
Piedmont Citizens Committee reported that Justice Moore is well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament, and they found him qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. The committee stated in summary, "The Committee unanimously believes that Justice Moore is an excellent and well qualified Supreme Court Justice and we appreciate his continued willingness to serve." Mr. Chairman, I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today and I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms. Wells. Well done. Members of the Commission, do you have any questions for Justice Moore? Yes,
ma'am, Ms. Wall.
MS. WALL: I actually don't have a
question. I simply have a statement. I would like the Commission members to know I've had the extreme pleasure of arguing cases before Justice Moore before he retired and since he's been a retired justice being called back to the Supreme Court. Always, he was thoughtful, asked excellent questions, and held all of the qualities of judicial temperament that we look for and hope to find in all of our judges and justices. He is an asset and continues to be a great asset to the citizens of South Carolina and to the bench. Thank you, Judge. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Well said. Thank you, Ms. Wall. Senator Malloy.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I would also add into my experiences with Justice Moore and I would first say that to Chairman Martin -- he asked about frivolous proceedings and there was one case that I was a party to where I had asked for a sanction against a lawyer for doing something that I thought that he should not have been doing and that case came before the Supreme Court and

Justice Moore wrote the opinion on the sanctioning that filed the matter during one of my campaigns. I just let him know that that came about during that time and obviously, he got the decision right, but I would also add that during his time on the court that he has always been that balancing figure on the court. He was stable and gave more credibility to the court. I'll never forget going to his courtroom and they were swearing in the public defender. It might've been Mr. Charles Gross.

JUSTICE MOORE: In Greenwood.
SENATOR MALLOY: In Greenwood, yes. Just to see the reverent respect that he had around that courthouse and that courtroom was just incredible. They end up watching -- I guess that was probably about five or six, maybe six or seven years ago. I want to thank him publicly for his service and thank him for the mentorship he's given to lawyers around him. Also, thank you for continuing to serve because judges around the state, particularly young judges that we see that come before us, they can end up learning a lot from people
like you and your tutelage on the bench. So thank you for continuing to serve.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Also, well said. Thank you so much. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN: I would only concur, Justice Moore, in all that's been said and add that it's just been a real pleasure over the years to get to know you and I recall your election to the Circuit bench and to the Supreme Court bench and you've just done a terrific job. Has relatives in Pickens County, I might add.

JUSTICE MOORE: I married a girl from there, the big city of Six Mile.

SENATOR MARTIN: There you go. I read some of your decisions every now and then. I don't read them all like the lawyers would, but I do that occasionally and I'm just very proud of you.

JUSTICE MOORE: Thank you, sir.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Senator Martin. Any other comments or questions? Representative Bannister is recognized.

MR. BANNISTER: I would ask for unanimous consent that we waive the rules and find

Justice Moore qualified right now.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: I'd like that. I'll second it.

MR. BANNISTER: We did make you wait two and a half hours.

JUSTICE MOORE: I did get to eat a sandwich so it was good.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: All those in favor of finding Justice Moore qualified, please raise your right hand.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Those opposed?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Proxy by Senator Campsen is an "aye."

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: By acclamation, Justice Moore is found qualified for continued service on the bench. Thank you, Justice Moore, for your service over the years to South Carolina and many more to come.

JUSTICE MOORE: As I understand it, that'll give me four more years to the year 2020 --

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We'll look forward to seeing you come back.

JUSTICE MOORE: -- and I hope you ladies and gentlemen are here and I can come back.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you so much.
(The Justice is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge Alford, it's good to have you here today.

JUDGE ALFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you for being with us and thank you for your patience today. JUDGE ALFORD: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ladies and gentlemen, we have before us the Honorable Levy $S$. Alford, Circuit Court retired judge.

EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Judge Alford, you responded to the personal data questionnaire that staff provided you sometime ago. Are your responses current and correct today?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. Would you have any objection to us including your responses as a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?
A. No, sir. No objection.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much.
Are there any objections by Commission
members?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 26, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE LEVY S. ALFORD, DATED JULY 31ST, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN 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 set out by South Carolina law. As a result of that process, we are honored and pleased to have you before us and I'm please to report, also, that no affidavits have been filed in opposition to your election and there are no other witnesses present to testify today. Would you please now turn your attention to Ms. Dean and respond to any questions she may have? Thank you.

MS. DEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Dean)
Q. Judge Alford, you have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments you'd like to make to that sworn statement at this time? A. No, ma'am.

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there an objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 27, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE LEVY S. ALFORD, DATED JULY 31ST, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Alford, you are being screened for appointment as a retired judge on the Circuit Court bench. Why would you like to continue serving?
A. You know, I could answer that probably all day. I love the law. I'm teaching a course up at Charlotte Law School now and I talked to the Dean up there and we talked about maybe teaching it
again, but in preparation $I$ tell her I love the law. I love to sit down and read cases and I don't want to be disconnected from it.

When I was required to retire, I did not want to retire, but $I$ was required to retire. I think I'm in my prime and most comfortable serving as a circuit judge now, but I had to retire and I need to stay busy with doing something, something productive. I do not want to lose my association with the other circuit judges or the like and the court system and the justice system. I just want to stay connected to it.
Q. Thank you, Judge. This next question is a two part question so please forgive me. Judge Alford, how much time do you spend per month in your capacity as a retired judge, and if reappointed, do you wish to alter that workload?
A. Well, I'm open to altering it. Let me be honest with you about that. What I agreed to do when I retired -- the way it is, you've got to work three weeks a month to get any pay whatsoever. And in my case, I have 42 years of service credit in the judicial retirement so, obviously, I max it out and I draw 90 percent. So if I work three weeks a month, I get paid ten percent of my salary.

Three weeks a month is like full-time because by the time you take away your chambers time, holidays, and vacation, you're basically working full-time for ten percent of the salary and, you know, so I don't want to do that, okay. If I'm going to work full-time -- here's the other thing. You don't have a law clerk. You have no administrative assistant to do any typing or anything for you, to do some of that for you, and so you have to do all of that yourself and then you get paid ten percent of your salary.

I just didn't want to do that and so if you work less than three weeks a month, you don't get paid. So what I agreed to do was to do a fill-in role. Anytime they need a judge to fill in for somebody who's sick, out, that sort of thing, I'll do it. So she just simply sends me a request by email and I respond and will do it. I've done it quite a bit. I've filled in about 13 or 14 weeks so far this year and I'm scheduled to fill in for a judge that's having some surgery the week of November 30th; I'm filling for him. So that's what I agreed to do. Of course, I don't get paid and you not only don't get paid. You don't have a law clerk. You don't have an administrative
assistant and I don't have an office because York County just floated a bond issue to provide a lot more office space, but right now, they have no room for me. At the Moss Justice Courthouse downtown, Civil Court is closed down; they're renovating. So I'm having to work at home out of my office. I buy all my office supplies. They won't pay for my office supplies. I have to do that. My phone bill, long distance, that I've got to pay for myself.

So it costs me money out of my pocket to serve as a Circuit Court judge retired, although you get per diem if you travel. Obviously, you get reimbursed. At any rate, that's the role I agreed to play now. If the legislature -- this past year, there was a request that they pay retired judges on a pro rata basis per week or something like that and a bill passed. I mean, not a bill, but a proviso passed and got all the way passed the Joint Conference Committee and then it got to the Governor's office and the Chief Justice asked her to veto it and she did. So at any rate, that's where we are, but if something happens, I certainly would be open to holding more court. I'd be quite willing to do that.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge, the Commission received 217 ballot box surveys regarding you with 17 additional comments. The ballot box survey had very several positive comments that state things, for example, good judge, good man, excellent judge and an asset to the judiciary. Eight of the written comments expressed concerns regarding judicial temperament. What response would you have for those sorts of concerns?
A. Well, let me just say this. I was surprised when you told me that and disappointed by it. I don't think it was meant as constructive criticism by the person who made it, but I'll take it as constructive criticism and I certainly will be mindful of it and I have been mindful of it. However, you know, I've been a judge for 37 years. Obviously, somewhere along the way, you're going to hurt somebody's feelings. There are lawyers out there who are difficult. The judges know who they are and they can push your buttons a little bit sometimes.

I have very high standards for myself and I have very high standards for lawyers, as well. And I want to say that, you know, I usually try to talk to them in chambers if I'm having a problem with
them, but sometimes you can't do that because they're acting out in the courtroom and there's not much else you can do. I don't think I have a problem with that. Now, when I was holding status conferences as administrative judge, had some responsibilities, I had a little less patience. I've got a lot more patience now as a retired judge; I don't have those responsibilities. So I think I have a lot of patience. I've always been -- I believe if you check, you'd find I have been excellent with pro se's, that I take the time and patience and work with them. I think if you check with the clerk of courts, bailiffs, and people I work with, they'll tell you they loved working with me. They always want me to come back and hold court there and I have some great relationships.

Now, I'm thinking about why some attorneys would say that. I think it's just something they're holding on to with regard to something that happened maybe in the courtroom, but, you know, they can't criticize my knowledge of the law. I've been a judge for 37 years and I can count my reversals on these two hands. So I don't think that's a problem.

I've been a judge for 37 years and $I$ can count the days I've been absent for medical or any other reason on my two hands in 37 years. So they're not going to attack my work record. So if they're going to say something, what are they going to say. They can say well, we don't like his temperament. There are a few lawyers $I$ would like to think, if they would take the criticism constructively as I'm taking it now, maybe they can learn from it. That was the idea, but anyway, be as it may. I'm mindful of it. I will be mindful of it. It's much easier for me to have patience now. You know, the time that $I$ was in the $16 t h$ Circuit, we'd been number one in General Sessions caseload, the age of them, and number one in the state for all of that time. And Civil Court, we've been in the top four in the state all that time. And for most of that time, anyway, and we are now and had been when I left. So I think there's not a lot else to criticize except to say, you know, maybe he lost his temper at some point in time.

MS. DEAN: Thank you, Judge. I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee found Judge Alford qualified in the criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical
health, and mental stability. The committee found him well qualified in the remaining criteria. The committee stated, "The Committee unanimously believes that Judge Alford is and excellent and well qualified Circuit Court judge and we appreciate his continued willingness to serve." I note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into today's questioning. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Ms. Dean. Any members of the commission have any questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Okay. Thank you very much, Judge, for being with us today. This will conclude this portion of the screening process. The record will remain open until such time that the report is made final, Judge, and it is possible that you could be called back prior to that time. Judge, again, we are grateful for your past service, present, and future service to South Carolina on the bench. Thank you so much.

JUDGE ALFORD: Thank you and if you'd allow me one other thing to say. I know y'all have a long day; I'm not going to hold you. I would point out, the Charlotte Observer just had an article in the paper up there criticizing the election of judges by popular election where they're raising all this money. So it's finally come to their attention that that's not a good idea. And I'll tell you this, I was at a judicial conference when I was a young judge just starting out as a circuit judge and we had a group that met together. We had an advisor and he was guy that came out there frequently and met with us and he was an Appeals Court judge from Texas and they were talking to him. He was supposed to be kind of like a mentor to us. We're talking and they asked him about his election, something like that, how much money he had to raise and he said he had to raise like five or $\$ 6$ million for one state-wide campaign to get elected as a Appellate Court judge in Texas. And they said, "Where'd you get all that money?" Law firms mostly gave it to him and I was
appalled. And I said I was appalled and that then made some of my group not happy with me because they're all elected and two or three of them weren't even lawyers and they were popularly elected. I was appalled at that. I couldn't believe it. It made me appreciate this system and I think now North Carolina -I think we and Virginia have similar systems and they're the best. So I hope you all never do anything to change it as a legislator. It's the very best system. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy is recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Judge, thank you for that. I have been to the independents of the judiciary at the ABA and have shared comments with other judges and as I travel around the country, I tell them about our process and obviously, at first glance, they say oh, you get a chance to elect the judges. You're in the legislature, but once they understand the whole process, they see how in depth it is and they have great appreciation for it so thank you for your knowledge.

JUDGE ALFORD: Thank you. The Dean up at the law school -- one of the Deans that $I$ work with -- I taught a course at Charlotte Law School this fall. I just finished up and reviewed, they're going to take their exam now and I'm going to get to grade those exams. But I was talking to the Dean up there and she wasn't familiar with our system. She's from up north and I was telling her about our system and she was amazed by it. I was telling her what all was involved in it and how it works. So keep up the good work.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Judge. JUDGE ALFORD: Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Take care. (The judge is excused.)

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Welcome, Judge. Good to have you with us.

JUDGE GOLDSMITH: Great to be here. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you for being here and for your patience today. JUDGE GOLDSMITH: Certainly. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ladies and gentlemen, we have before us the Honorable Brooks P. Goldsmith, Circuit Court Judge, retired.

## EXAMINATION

(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Judge, you provided this Commission with your response to our personal data questionnaire and I understand you also provided an amendment to those responses today.
A. I have.
Q. Thank you. With that amendment, are your responses complete and correct and current?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you very much.
A. To the best of my knowledge.
Q. Do you have any objection to us including those responses, as amended, to be a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?
A. I do not have an objection.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Does any member have an objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Without objections, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 28, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE BROOKS P. GOLDSMITH, DATED AUGUST 5TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
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CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications and ability to return to the bench as a retired judge. Our inquiry is focused on the nine evaluative criteria and as a result of the process, we have the honor of being with you today. There have been no affidavits filed in opposition to your election and there are no other witnesses here to testify. With that, we would ask that you turn your attention to Ms. Dean and respond to any questions she may have. JUDGE GOLDSMITH: Certainly. MS. DEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Dean)
Q. Judge Goldsmith, you have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments you'd like to make to that at this time?
A. No.

MS. DEAN: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that Judge Goldsmith's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit to the hearing record.
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CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 29, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE BROOKS P. GOLDSMITH, DATED JULY 29TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Goldsmith, you are being screened for appointment as a retired judge on the Circuit Court bench. Why do you wish to continue to serve?
A. Actually, I didn't want to retire. The legislature decided I had to. I enjoy the job and didn't really want to quit.
Q. Thank you, Judge. How much time do you spend per month in your capacity as a retired judge and if you're reappointed, would you alter this workload?
A. I'm sorry. I didn't understand the question. How much time what?
Q. How much time do you spend as a retired judge now and if you're reappointed, would you want to alter that workload in any way?
A. Now, I'm working either two or three weeks a month, depending on what I'm assigned to do. I would like
to continue doing at least that much, if not more.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge, the Commission received 265 ballot box surveys regarding you with 18 additional comments. The ballot box survey included many positive comments, such as excellent judge, very fair, patient and fair, extremely smart, and well-reasoned. Two of the comments expressed concerns by disagreeing with your rulings. Obviously, this is not an Appellate commission, but could you please just explain to the Commission your process when going about making a ruling, how you consider the arguments?
A. Well, first of all, you have to listen to both sides. Usually, there are at least two sides to every argument. Not always, but most of the time there are. You listen to what they have to say. As for legal argument, use your own research on information about what the law is and apply the facts as you see them to the law.

MS. DEAN: Thank you, Judge. I would note that the Citizens Committee --
Q. In looking back at that question, I believe the concerns were staying up with Appellate decisions and in our earlier conversation, I asked you how you stayed abreast of Appellate Court decisions.
A. By reading the event sheets as well as other publications.

MS. DEAN: That's the way to do it. I would note the Lowcountry Citizens Committee report found Judge Goldsmith well qualified in all the criteria except for the constitutional qualifications, and physical health, and mental stability, which qualified is the highest choice in that option. I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into today's questioning and Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much, Ms. Dean. Are there any questions? Senator Malloy is recognized.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, I knew Judge Goldsmith back when he was practicing law and we had cases together on least one or two occasions. I've seen him in court and appeared before him. Judge, I would just add to say thank you for coming here and being a part of this process. I share a little bit of responsibility
for having everybody to come in here to be vetted. I think it adds credence to what we're doing now. In the same thing, I have filed a bill in the General Assembly in previous times saying that we need to extend the mandatory retirement or get rid of it and I think the fact that with you coming before us and the previous judges coming before us shows that -- of course, I didn't realize that you were mandatory retired because of your youthful appearance.

JUDGE GOLDSMITH: Yes.
SENATOR MALLOY: More youthful than what mandatory retirement states, but I think it adds credence to the fact that we also have wisdom and we have experience that is good for the process and I hope that the fact that you continue to serve and serve ably will add credence to the fact that we need to get rid of what $I$ think is an unconstitutional law.

JUDGE GOLDSMITH: Thank you, Senator Malloy.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you Senator Malloy. Any other comments or questions? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge Goldsmith, thank you so much for being here and thank you, again, for your patience today. That concludes this portion of our screening process. The record will remain open until such time the report is published. You could be asked to return to visit with us again if that need should arise. Again, we want to thank you for being with and thank you for your service to South Carolina.

JUDGE GOLDSMITH: It was my pleasure. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Have a good day, sir. DEAN WILCOX: Thank you, judge. JUDGE GOLDSMITH: Thank you all.

SENATOR MALLOY: And Mr. Chairman, I may want to change that a bit. I don't know if it's unconstitutional since it's tied to the retirement system, but I do think it is questionable and whether or not it adds credence to the fact that we need to continue revisiting in light of the obvious economy and what the last gentleman would end up bringing to the bench.
(The judge is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ladies and gentlemen,
we need to take a brief break for the benefit of the court reporter. We will return as soon as the court reporter returns.
(Off the record.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge Pyle, thank you so much for being with us this afternoon and thank you for your patience throughout the morning.

JUDGE PYLE: No problem.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ladies and gentlemen, we have before us the Honorable Charles Victor Pyle, Jr., Circuit Court Judge, retired. EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Judge Pyle, you responded to the Commission's personal data questionnaire that was forwarded to you early in this process. Are the responses that you provided complete, current, and correct?
A. To the best of my ability, yes.
Q. Thank you, sir. Would you have any objection to us making those responses a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?
A. Not at all. Not at all.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Is there an objection by any Commission member?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 30, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE CHARLES VICTOR PYLE, JR., DATED AUGUST 5TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge Pyle, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench as a retired judge. Our inquiry is focused on nine evaluative criteria and as a result of that process, we have the honor of being with you today. That process has resulted in no affidavits being filed in opposition to your continuation. There are also no witnesses present to testify today other than yourself. We'd ask that you now turn your attention to Ms. Dean and respond to her questions, please. Thank you.

MS. DEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Dean)
Q. Judge Pyle, you also have before you the sworn
statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments you'd like to make to that sworn statement now?
A. No.

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

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Is there any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 31, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE CHARLES VICTOR PYLE, JR., DATED AS AUGUST 6TH, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Pyle, you are being screened for
reappointment as a retired judge on the Circuit Court bench. Why do you wish to continue to serve?
A. I enjoy working very much doing what I do. I have been holding on the civil and criminal jury trials and it's my intention to stop that and to do just guilty pleas.
Q. Thank you, Judge. The Commission received 323
ballot box surveys regarding you with 23 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. One of the best of all times and needs to teach practical judging and a truly fine gentleman, attorney, and judge. Five of the written comments also expressed concerns. One of the concerns raised addressed judicial temperament. What response would you offer to that concern?
A. I would say that's probably true in some cases. I guess I have a problem with some attorneys who beat a dead horse in court, ask improper questions, and I get a little bit tired of that, but other than that, I don't think $I$ have any real big problems. MS. DEAN: Thank you, Judge. I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee found Judge Pyle qualified in the criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. The committee found him well qualified in the remaining criteria. I would note for the record any concerns raised during this investigation were incorporated into today's questioning and Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much,

Ms. Dean. Are there any questions by any member of the Commission? Senator Martin is recognized.

SENATOR MARTIN: Mr. Chairman and the Commission, I would only say that Judge Pyle is an institution in our circuit and in our region of the state. He served with distinction in the House, then went to the bench, and has been there ever since. What was the first year when you went to the bench and was elected Circuit Judge, in the 70's, wasn't it?

JUDGE PYLE: Yes. I started out as the county court judge when Judge Jim Price went on circuit. And then in 1979, they had six at-large circuit judges and that's when I decided to do that. He died and then I took his residency.

SENATOR MARTIN: You're just very well thought of and we're just delighted you're still there to give folks good advice and counsel.

JUDGE PYLE: Thank you so much.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Any other questions or comments?

P R O C E E D I N G S - final
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, Judge Pyle, that concludes this portion of our screening process. The record will remain open until such time that the report is published.

JUDGE PYLE: Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: You could be called back at such time if that need should arise. Judge, again, we are honored to have you with us. We're grateful for your years of service to the state and we look forward to your continued service.

JUDGE PYLE: Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, sir. JUDGE PYLE: I appreciate it. DEAN WILCOX: Good to see you, judge. (The judge is excused.)

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge Guess, thank you so much for joining us and thank you for your patience throughout the day.

JUDGE GUESS: Thank you for having me. I'm glad to be here.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: You have the unenviable position of riding tail point,
being the very last person to be screened today. Thank you so much.

JUDGE GUESS: You're welcome.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Ladies and gentlemen, we have before us the Honorable Robert E. Guess, Family Court, retired judge.

EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Clemmons)
Q. Judge, you provided this Commission with your responses to the personal data questionnaire some time ago. Are those responses still current and correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. Would you have any objection to us including those responses as a part of the record of your sworn testimony today?
A. No, I would not.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you. Does any
Commission member have an objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, it's so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 32, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. GUESS, DATED AUGUST 3RD,

2015, ADMITTED.]
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Judge Guess, the Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for continuation on the bench. Our inquiry is focused on the nine evaluative criteria dictated to us by South Carolina law. As a result of that process, we have the honor of having you before us today. Also as a result of that process, we have no witnesses here to testify other than yourself and no affidavits have been filed in opposition to your election or continuation. We would ask now that you turn your attention to our screening attorney, Ms. Simpson.

MS. SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Simpson)
Q. Judge Guess, you have before you the sworn statement you provided with detailed answers to over 30 questions. Are there any amendments you'd like to make at this time to your sworn statement?
A. No, there are not.

MS. SIMPSON: At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that Judge Guess's sworn statement be entered as an exhibit into the
hearing record.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Are there any objections?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, so ordered.
[EXHIBIT 33, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. GUESS, DATED AUGUST 3RD, 2015, ADMITTED.]
Q. Judge Guess, you are being screened for appointment as a retired judge on the Family Court bench. Why do you want to continue serving as a retired Family Court judge?
A. Well, I like to do it to stay in touch, for one thing, but $I$ also like to think that I'm making a contribution to a system that's been very good to me and to my family and to help out when I'm needed. It does keep me in touch with my fellow judges in the system and I get an opportunity to attend the seminars that are provided for judges and just to help out. Really, to keep my hand in, in case you need me.
Q. Thank you. Judge Guess, how much time do you spend per month in your capacity as a retired judge and
do you wish to alter this workload if you are reappointed as a retired judge?
A. Well, at this point, I'm doing minimal work. I really hold court only one week every three months and I'm on call when they need me. I have not chosen to work as a full-time retired judge and that's always subject to change. I've only been retired for two years so I'm just getting the hang of that status. So at some point, I may change the number of weeks that I work.
Q. Thank you. The Commission received 147 ballot box surveys regarding you with five additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. A most experienced family court judge, quiet, thoughtful, deliberate, and caring. He has been a solid judge throughout his tenure. Two of the written comments expressed concerns, indicating unpredictability and inaccuracy of your rulings. What response would you offer to these concerns?
A. Unpredictability -- it's always been my belief that I'm supposed to rule on the facts that I hear and I don't think there's a typical case. For a ruling to be predictable, the cases would have to be typical and every one is different. That's my
response to that. As to the inaccuracy of my rulings, I would suggest that in a trial there's always two sides and the side that loses considers that to be an inaccurate ruling. I think a review of the Appellate opinions that have been rendered as a result of me being appealed would indicate that the Appellate Courts have agreed with me much more often than they have disagreed.

MS. SIMPSON: Thank you, Judge Guess. I would like to note that the Piedmont Citizens Committee found Judge Guess well qualified in the criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, and reputation. They found Judge Guess to be qualified in the remaining criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, mental stability, experience, and judicial temperament. I would just note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Guess were incorporated into the questioning of him today. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you very much, Ms. Simpson. Are there any questions or
comments?
DEAN WILCOX: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Yes. Dean Wilcox.
DEAN WILCOX: As one as strives toward retirement, I would just like to acknowledge that we finally have someone who is actually not flunking retirement. He is apparently learning how to retire and $I$ think that is a remarkable testament to his good judgement. Thank you very much for your service.

JUDGE GUESS: Thank you, Dean Wilcox.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you, Dean
Wilcox. Judge Guess, that concludes this portion of our screening process. The record will remain open until such time that the report is published. You could be asked to revisit with us at such time if that need should arise. Judge, again, we want to thank you for your service to South Carolina, your service on the bench, and look forward to more years thereof. Thank you.

JUDGE GUESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your consideration.
(The judge is excused.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: As a matter of
housekeeping with regard to Judge Burch, is there a motion to carry that over until the spring?

MR. BANNISTER: Carry over until a later date.

SENATOR MARTIN: If we were to come back, then --

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Carry over --
SENATOR MALLOY: I think to carry over.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Senator Malloy, is
that your motion?
SENATOR MALLOY: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will move to carry over on Judge Burch's screening.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Thank you.
MS. WALL: Second.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: And a second. Those in favor, say aye.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Those opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: The ayes have it.
MS. WALL: Move to go into executive session.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: So ordered. Staff
and security, will you please secure the room.
(Off the record.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We have risen from executive session. We took no votes, made no decisions, discussed qualifications and sought legal advice. For the purpose of finding -- first of all, we are going to leave the record open with regard to final
determination, or we're going to vote on
leaving the record open with regard to final
determination on William Gregory Seigler,
Family Court, 11th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1 .
Do I have a motion?
SENATOR MARTIN: So moved.
MS. BELL: Second.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: By Senator Martin and second by Ms. Bell. Discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, all
those in favor, raise your hand.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: All those opposed?
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: The majority vote is
to leave the record open for final
determination. With regard to the following candidates: The Honorable Thomas H. White, IV, Family Court, 16th Judicial Circuit, Seat 1, The Honorable Melissa Johnson Emery, Family Court, 15th Judicial Circuit, Seat 2, The Honorable Sebastien Phillip Lenksi, Administrative Law Court, Seat 6, The

Honorable Peter L. Fuge, Family Court, 14th Judicial Circuit, Seat 2. With regard to those judges --

SENATOR MARTIN: Move they be nominated and qualified.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We have a motion to find them qualified and nominated.

SENATOR MALLOY: Second.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: If you agree, please raise your hand.
(The Commission members vote.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Senator Campsen votes "aye."

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Those opposed, raise your hand.
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: And Representative Bannister votes "aye." So by acclamation, the
judges that $I$ just published in the record are found qualified and nominated.

With regard to the following candidates: Joseph King Coffey, Master-in-Equity for Clarendon County, 3rd Circuit, The Honorable James E. Chellis, Master-in-Equity, Dorchester County, 1st Circuit, the Honorable Richard Lauren Booth, Master-in-Equity, Sumter County, 3rd Circuit -- the Honorable James E. Moore, Supreme Court, retired -- I'm sorry. We've already handled the Honorable James E. Moore. Strike that name from your list.

The Honorable Levy S. Alford, Circuit Court, retired judge, The Honorable Brooks P. Goldsmith, Circuit Court, retired judge, The Honorable Charles Victor Pyle, Jr., Circuit Court, retired judge, The Honorable Robert E. Guess, Family Court, retired judge. That will conclude the list.

SENATOR MARTIN: May they all be qualified.

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: We have a motion by
Senator Martin to find all of them qualified.
MS. WALL: Second.
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: And we have a second
by Susan Wall. Any discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Hearing none, those in favor, raise your hand.
(The Commission members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: Any opposed?
(No response.)
SENATOR MARTIN: Senator Campsen votes "aye."

CHAIRMAN CLEMMONS: And Bannister votes "aye." By acclamation, the list that $I$ just published are all found qualified. The purpose for which this hearing for the last five days having been called now being accomplished, I thank each and every one of you for your service and time, especially the service and time of our staff getting everything together and with that, we will stand adjourned.
(There being no further questions, the proceedings adjourned at 4:29 p.m.)
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