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Court Reporter's Legend:
dashes [--] Intentional or purposeful interruption
... Indicates trailing off
[ph] Denotes phonetically written
[sic] Written as said

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Welcome, Judge Short. JUDGE SHORT: Thank you.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Would you please raise your right hand.

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

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Judge, have you had an
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

JUDGE SHORT: Yes, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Are there -- are they
correct?
JUDGE SHORT: Yes, to the best of my
knowledge.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be changed?

JUDGE SHORT: Nothing that $I$ know of, sir. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Do you object to making
these documents, and any amendments thereto, a part of the record of your sworn testimony?

JUDGE SHORT: No, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: It will be done at this
point in the transcript. If we could get his sworn
statement entered into the record.
(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE PAUL EDGAR SHORT, JR.)
(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE PAUL EDGAR SHORT, JR.)

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Judge Short, the Judicial
Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, a check for economic conflicts of interests. We have received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, and no witnesses are present to testify.

Do you have a brief opening statement that you would like to make at this time?

JUDGE SHORT: No, sir. I'd just like to thank the Legislature for allowing me to serve for the last twenty-five years. It's been a great experience. I've done my best. I hope I've done a good job. And I'd like to continue serving on the Court of Appeals.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Judge, would you please answer Counsel's questions.

JUDGE SHORT: Yes, sir.
EXAMINATION BY MS. BENSON:
Q. Judge Short, I think I've miscounted, but I had you serving eight years on the circuit court and twelve years on the Court of Appeals. Why is it that you want to continue serving as a Court of Appeals judge?
A. Well, I find the work very challenging. And I served thirteen years as a circuit court judge.
Q. Thank you, sir.
A. And at that particular time in my life, it was a good change, I thought. And it turned out that I was right in that respect. From going to the circuit to the court of Appeals, because of the experiences I'd had as an lawyer for twenty -- practicing law twenty years, and then thirteen years on the circuit court, going to the Court of Appeals presented a new challenge.

It's certainly very different, but I've enjoyed every minute of it. A lot of my fellow circuit court judges used to kid me, because you lose contact with people when you go on the circuit court, as far you don't interact with the lawyers and the clerk of courts and the law enforcement officers and the bailiffs and the parties, like you did when you were a circuit court judge.

But I like to read. And I do a lot of reading. In fact, my wife says I read all the time. But I've just found it very challenging, and I'd like to continue to do that until my retirement.
Q. Thank you. Judge Short, please explain one or two brief accomplishments that you feel that you've completed during your tenure, and then a goal that you would like to achieve upon reappointment.
A. Well, I would -- if reappointed, I would like to continue to work to bring the court together. We just had a new chief judge elected less than a year ago, and I think we are more collegial over there now. We're certainly working more together. He seems to be -- want to include everyone in making policy decisions for the court.

I've tried to assist him with -- since I'm the second senior member over there, of all the other members of the court I hope I've been able to kind of assist him in -- in that endeavor. And I'd like to continue to do that.
Q. Thank you. Judge, although you addressed this in your sworn affidavit, could you please explain to the members of the Commission what you think is the appropriate demeanor for a judge.
A. Well, I think that a judge should treat all of the lawyers and litigants with dignity and respect and kindness. I try to do that. I hope I've done that in my
twenty-five years on the bench. And I plan on continuing to do that.
Q. Judge, the Commission received 354 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 19 having additional comments. Many of the comments were very positive, including:
"Highly qualified. Excellent. Experienced.
Wonderful. A keen mind and a heart for service."
One of those 19 comments expressed some concerns, and those were concerns about your legal knowledge and a display of irritation on the bench. How would you respond to that concern, sir?
A. Well, I certainly am sorry that any attorney, I suppose, had felt that way. I certainly try to treat everyone with dignity and respect. But if it's just one out of that many -- in 25 years, you have to make some very difficult decisions. And as a circuit judge I've imposed a lot of sentences; a lot of people weren't happy with those sentences. I also made a lot of decisions, and I've written a lot of opinions as a Court of Appeal judge, and I'm sure everyone hadn't agreed with those opinions.

So sometimes you have a disgruntled litigant or attorney. And I would certainly hope that I have never treated anyone that way. But if I did, I'm sorry. Certainly, I try and treat everyone with dignity and respect and kindness.
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Q. Thank you. Judge Short, on your PDQ, you indicated one pending case since your last screening that had been filed against you, and it had also been filed against all the members of the court. Is that still pending within the Supreme Court?
A. No, ma'am. The last information I was given at our last agenda meeting, that case has been resolved, I think.
Q. Thank you, sir. Could you tell us how it's been resolved?
A. No, ma'am. They didn't tell me. I think it was dismissed.
Q. Okay.
A. They didn't -- they didn't give -- they didn't -they just told us it was over.
Q. Thank you, Judge. And a few housekeeping issues. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator either prior to this date or 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, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the commission about your candidacy?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Do you understand that you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment, directly or indirectly, until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's Report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules; that it is a misdemeanor, and a conviction the violator must be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than ninety days?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Thank you.

MS. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, I would note that
the Piedmont Citizens Committee reported that Judge Short is one of the most senior members of the Court of Appeals, and his deep experience is evident. He also brings a practicality and common sense to his position, for which he received particular praise.

I would also note that -- for the record, that any concerns raised during the investigation have been incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today. And I have no further questions.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you, Ms. Benson. Do any members have any questions for Judge Short?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Silence is golden. All
right. So Judge, thank you for being with us today. That concludes this portion of the screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of qualifications, and you may be called back at any such time if the need arises.

I thank you for offering. And thank you for your service to the State of South Carolina.

JUDGE SHORT: Thank you Mr. Chairman.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Welcome, Judge Williams.
JUDGE WILLIAMS: Good morning.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Good morning. Please raise your right hand.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE HARRIS BRUCE WILLIAMS, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

JUDGE WILLIAMS: I have. It appears to be the one I reviewed last night.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Are they correct?

JUDGE WILLIAMS: Yes, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be
changed?
JUDGE WILLIAMS: No, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Do you object to our making these documents, and any amendments thereto, a part of the record of your sworn testimony?

JUDGE WILLIAMS: No, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: That will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE HARRIS BRUCE WILLIAMS)
(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE HARRIS BRUCE WILLIAMS)

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Judge Williams, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused upon nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, a check for economic conflicts of interests. We have no affidavits
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filed in opposition to your election, and no witnesses are present to testify.

Do you have a brief opening statement you would like to make at this time?

JUDGE WILLIAMS: No, sir. Just to thank Ms.
Brogdon and Mr. Cohl for their courtesy in the process. I've dealt with them in the last number of months, and $I$ appreciate their courtesy and kindness during that time.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Please answer
Mr. Cohl's questions.
EXAMINATION BY MS. COHL:
Q. Good morning, Judge.
A. Good morning.
Q. Why do you want to continue serving as a Court of

## Appeals judge?

A. I think it's a way for me to contribute to our state. I've been a judge, I guess, now for almost twentytwo years; nine years with the family court and twelve years in the Court of Appeals. And I think it's a way to continue that service in the Court of Appeals.

But I also serve as drug court judge in the juvenile drug court, that $I$ started almost twenty years ago. And I probably will help a little bit with the adult and veterans courts in of Richland County. Justice Pleicones has been kind enough to sign an order, letting me
do that. So watching and learning a little bit may help out with that. So it gives me something to do, a little bit of night court on occasion. So I'd just like to continue my service to the state.
Q. Thank you. Please explain one or two brief accomplishments that you feel you have completed during your tenure, and then a goal you would like to accomplish.
A. I think what I mentioned earlier with being involved with the drug courts in South Carolina, I think I've been a part of -- hopefully, I've helped grow those across the state. And when we first started there were four drug courts in South Carolina, and I think now every circuit has at least one. And I think there are probably close to thirty drug courts in South Carolina, plus mental health courts as well as other types of alternative courts.

So I guess I'd like to see at some point, is a statute that institutionalizes these entities, more so than what we have at this point. And maybe I can contribute in that -- in that way at some point.
Q. Although you address this in your sworn affidavit, could you please explain to the members of the Commission what you think the appropriate demeanor is for a judge.
A. I think a judge needs to be patient and courteous, and show appropriate respect for everyone in the
courtroom. And I hope that I have done that over the years, in service to the family court bench as well as the Court of Appeals. But I think over the years, for me the lawyers and the litigants -- if you and they understand that you have respect for them and understand the importance of their case, I think it's returned to the court. And it makes everything in the courtroom just work better.
Q. Thank you, Judge Williams. The Commission received 720 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 47 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"Judge Williams is always fair and impartial with an amazing temperament. He possesses both a keen mind and well-founded sense of principle."

A written comment expressed concerns over integrity. Would you like to offer a response to this comment?
A. I guess I need to work harder. I think you indicated to me when we met, that there were a number of very positive comments, and some 47 who took the time to indicate those things, and that there were two that were negative.

And what that tells me is maybe I didn't do quite as good of job as I needed to do for them to feel like they
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were treated appropriately, or that what $I$ was doing was the right thing in those circumstances. So I guess I'll just work a little bit harder at trying to make sure that happens in the courtroom.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Now just a few housekeeping issues. Since submitted your letter of intent, have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
A. No, sir.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. No, sir.
Q. Do you understand that you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment, directly or indirectly, until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report? And are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. Yes, sir.

## Q. Thank you, Judge Williams.

MR. COHL: I would note that the Midlands
Citizens Committee report that Judge Williams is well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. The Committee found him qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. The Committee stated:
"Judge Williams is the epitome of what we want in a public judge to be. His long and distinguished service speaks for itself."

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

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you, Mr. Cohl. Any questions from members for Judge Williams? (Hearing none.)

SENATOR CAMPSEN: No questions? Judge, silence is golden. On that account, thank you for being with us. That concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of qualifications, and you
may be called back at any such time if the need arises.
Thank you for offering. And thank you for
your service to the State of South Carolina.
JUDGE WILLIAMS: Thank you for your
courtesy.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Have a great day.
JUDGE WILLIAMS: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Welcome, Mr. Hewitt.
MR. HEWITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's
a pleasure to be here.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Please raise your right
hand.
WHEREUPON :
BLAKE ALEXANDER HEWITT, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Have you had an
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

MR. HEWITT: Yes, sir, I have.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
MR. HEWITT: Yes, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be
changed?

MR. HEWITT: No, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Do you object to making these documents and any amendments, if applicable, a part of the record of your sworn testimony?

MR. HEWITT: No, sir. Please do.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: It will be done at this point of the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF BLAKE ALEXANDER HEWITT)
(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE AMENDMENT OF BLAKE ALEXANDER HEWITT)
(EXHIBIT NO. 3 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF BLAKE ALEXANDER HEWITT)

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Hewitt, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, a check for economic conflicts of interest. We have received no affidavits
filed in opposition to your election, and no witnesses are present to testify.

Do you have a brief opening statement you would like to make at this time?

MR. HEWITT: No, Mr. Chairman. I know the time constraints you're under. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Commission, and to thank your staff who you know are excellent. But that's it.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Please answer Counsel's questions at this time.

MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I note for the record that based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the record with the candidate's consent, Mr. Hewitt meets the constitutional and/or statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON:
Q. Mr. Hewitt, could you please explain to the Commission why you'd like to serve on the Court of Appeals?
A. It would be my pleasure. There are two reasons. The first is that $I$ am drawn to this work, and by that $I$ mean appellate work. I was lucky to discover this while I was in law school. And it is for that reason $I$ spent the majority of my professional career as an appellate lawyer.

I did this on purpose. I gravitated towards appellate work because I love it.

The second reason is public service. One of the truths in life, I'm convinced, is that we are at our best when were serving other people. I happen to believe that's because we were made that way by our Creator. I love my law firm. I'm blessed that they allow me to practice with them. But the attraction of the Court of Appeals for me is it's an opportunity to become a pure public servant, and continue to do the type of work, the appellate work that I find so motivating, and from which I derive so much enjoyment.

I'm sure it sounds cliche and a little trite, but for me the opportunity to marry those two things, public service and appellate practice, is almost too good to be true; it would be the honor of my professional life to serve the General Assembly, the Executive, and my fellow citizens in this way.
Q. Thank you. How do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be an effective judge on the Court of Appeals?
A. Well, as you know from my PDQ, I've spent the overwhelming majority of my professional career devoted to becoming the best appellate lawyer I could possibly be. And I can think of no better training or experience for the

Court of Appeals than that. I know the system well, because I've been a frequent user of it. I know the frustrations that users of the system experience, because I've experienced those frustrations myself. I know the expectations that clients have and that the public has, because I've had to counsel clients on those expectations.

As an appellate lawyer my clients demand that I produce a high quality written work product in a reasonable amount of time. And they have that same demand and expectation of the Court of Appeals. And justifiably so.

We're blessed in this state to have members of the appellate bench with a rich diversity of backgrounds. But I frankly think it might help the Court of Appeals to have the perspective of someone who is fresh from private practice, and who knows firsthand, the challenges, expectations and experiences I've tried to articulate.

## Q. Could you describe your general judicial

## philosophy please?

A. Well, I would consider myself, in the matters of statutory interpretation, a textualist. The primary purpose of the judiciary is to implement the legislation enacted by the General Assembly.

I consider myself a minimalist. And by that, I mean $I$ don't seek a ruling from an appellate court that goes beyond the requirements of a particular case. I can
go on and on, but those are the two verbs -- or two words that $I$ would use to describe a textualist and minimalist.
Q. Thank you. What is your vision for the future of the judicial -- of our judicial system? And what changes would you advocate, and why?
A. Well, I think the vision for the future of the judicial system, produce high quality -- at the appellate level, produce high quality written decisions in a reasonable amount of time, that honor the two rules that we had in Judge Anderson's chambers, which was: Treat every case as the most important case in the world, because for the people involved, it is the important case in the world. And make the right call for the right reasons.

As far as changes, you know, I haven't candidly given time on the front end to envisioning any specific changes. Although, I think that both appellate courts would do well to adopt a practice, if not an internal rule, of publishing written decisions in all cases argued the previous court term by the time they return from their summer recess.

You know, it's not the U.S. Supreme Court. The appellate dockets in this state are much large than at the federal level. But appellate cases have been worked up in advance before argument. Oftentimes a bench memo's been prepared and the record's been studied carefully, the
briefs have been studied carefully; there's been a robust discussion and oral argument, and then a conference with the judges. There's no reason not to go ahead and make a decision and use those dead months, July and August, when there is no court, to push the previous year's workload out. I think the public demands it. And quite frankly, they're in entitled to it.
Q. To what extent do you believe that a judge should or should not defer to the actions of the General Assembly?
A. Well, I think that a judge -- the judge's principle role is to interpret and enforce the public policy that the General Assembly has put in place, and statutory law. So great deference is afforded -- is to be afforded the General Assembly.

Statutes, if we're discussing an area -- excuse me -- a question of statutory interpretation are presumed constitutional, and must only be declared unconstitutional if their unconstitutionality is clear and inescapable.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Hewitt. The Commission received 293 ballot box surveys regarding your candidacy, with 60 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"Blake possesses the superior intellect, reasonableness, work ethic, and most importantly, a sound and reasoned decision-making necessary to make him a valued
asset to the Court of Appeals. His exceptional intellect, temperament and work ethic would serve the court well. He's one of the smartest and yet most grounded people I've ever met. A great person."

And lastly, "This attorney is the best appellate lawyer I've encountered in my long career."

However, three of the comments expressed concerns regarding experience, and each of them citing a lack of experience. What response would you offer to this -- to this concern?
A. Well, first of all, I am grateful for the positive comments. I've never considered myself someone who took compliments particularly well. But I appreciate those, and would strive very much to emulate those characteristics.

I've heard those same negative comments myself. As you know, I've run once before. Sometimes the comments are directed to my trial experience; they say I don't have trial experience. Which is not true, by the way. And other times it's a direct reference to my age.

People are entitled to their own opinion. And I certainly respect everyone's opinion. But I happen to believe that age and experience are two of the strengths of my candidacy. I've been told I look a little young, but I'm not as young as I might look. I'm 38. I'll be almost

39 by the time of the election. My age gives me an opportunity to have an extended career in public service, and provide some stability on an appellate court that's undergone a lot of transition recently, and frankly, could use some stability.

And what that court needs to succeed, in my view, are people who are committed to giving that work the best that they can, and who are committed to that institution. The Court of Appeals is not a stepping stone and it's not a retirement job; it requires people who are willing to give it their best. And that is my pledge to the Commission.

As far as my experience, I'm proud of my resume. It's heavy on appellate work, because I was lucky enough to discover in law school, that, that was my passion. If you have to defend a deposition, you wouldn't hire me. If you were crafting a discovery plan, you wouldn't hire me. I hope if you had big appellate litigation, and were -wanted high quality briefs and first-rate oral argument, then I would be on the list.

My firm chooses to advertise me as an appellate lawyer, because they believe that's my competitive advantage. And I can't fault them for that because, as I shared with you that's my passion, even though my partner and I are routinely hired to consult in trial-level litigation, and are on trial dockets now.

I hope that my experience as a practitioner would be an asset to the Court of Appeals as it tries to fulfill its essential mission. I certainly would not have offered as a candidate if I thought otherwise.
Q. Thank you. At this time I have four quick housekeeping questions to go through. Since submitting your letter of intent have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
A. No, sir.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. No, sir.
Q. You understand that you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment, directly or indirectly, until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. DAVIDSON: I would note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee reported that Mr. Hewitt is well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, and judicial temperament, and qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability, and experience.

The Committee stated in summary, Mr. Hewitt is well regarded for his appellate work; however, some concerns were voiced of his lack of trial experience. I note that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into my questioning today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any questions from members of the Commission for Mr. Hewitt? Senator Malloy.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Mr. Hewitt, how are you doing today?
A. I'm doing well, Senator. How are you?
Q. I'm doing good. So I just want to highlight a few questions that we have. On one I'll start off in general: What's been your greatest accomplishment?
A. The greatest accomplishment in my legal career?

I was particularly honored, early on in -- when I came into private practice, to do some appellate work on behalf of the South Carolina Bar. We wrote an amicus brief in a case with which I expect -- I know you're familiar because of our long work on behalf of indigent defense funding, and I expect other members of the General Assembly are aware as well, and ex parte Brown case which held that lawyers had a constitutional right to reasonable compensation for their services in appointed cases. That was a deep honor for me to represent my fellow lawyers.

You know, I've been privileged to consistently have cases where $I$ felt like $I$ could invest myself in -wholeheartedly in the advocacy. And a former justice, Robert Jackson, who is a hero of mine said that, "True investment by the advocate is the essential quality of real lawyering."

I am proud of -- of the work I did in the Diocese of South Carolina case, the Episcopal Church case -- which is still pending, and I may lose five-oh -- that was very challenging litigation.

The greatest accomplishment for me, personally, is marrying up. Even though you didn't ask about that.
Q. That was my next question. So the next thing is, do you believe you would encounter any problems moving from advocacy to the role as a judge? Because advocates for our
clients are even in appellate work. Tell me how you'd make the adjustment.
A. Well, I think a virtue of my experience in that I've had a significant amount of appellate experience, is I think the essential duties $I$ would be called on to fulfill as an appellate judge, are really the same things I've been doing every day for the last eleven years.

I mean, as an appellate judge, I would be called on to have complete mastery of the record. I do that every day. I would be called on to read briefs closely. I do that every day. I would be called on to scrutinize the language of statutes and the language of the constitution to determine the intent of the drafters. I do that every day when I'm trying the figure out the theory of the case that I'm going to present to the Court of Appeals and to the Supreme Court.

I'd be charged with producing a high quality work product. I spent almost all of my time either researching or writing as an appellate practitioner. So I think there would be very little adjustment in terms of how $I$ would move work. The adjustment for me will be getting used to being on that side of the bench as opposed to, you know, behind the lectern, or the podium.

But I'm hopeful that $I$ would make the transition easily. And I expect so.
Q. And do you have any expertise other than practicing law?
A. I don't know about that. You know, once upon a time I was an avid outdoorsman. I don't get to do as much of that as I used to, because my wife and I now have a two-year-old. And that's a demanding responsibility, but a great responsibility.

My past as an engineer maybe has resulted in me being a little bit more handy around the house than most. But that's nothing approaching expertise. My wife could probably give you a long list of my faults.
Q. So and I also want to just gather your views on our court system as a whole in South Carolina, as it relates to issues of diversity, do you believe that our bench is diverse enough? And give me your thoughts on diversity for the bench in South Carolina
A. Well, as a statistical matter, I haven't run -- I haven't seen the statistics lately. But $I$ know the last statistics $I$ heard were that our bench was neither reflective of the population distribution. I'm thinking in terms of, you know, general population, grouping people by ethnic classification, nor the -- it was fairly representative in terms of percentage of lawyers, but not in terms of the population. I stumble over that a good bit.

I mean, you know, for people to have competence in the court system, the court system needs to reflect the diversity that we have in this state. And that's a challenge. It's been a challenge for a long time. This Commission doesn't control the people who apply, you know. So if not enough minorities, or persons of a particular gender apply, you don't have control over that. All you can do is encourage people to go after it.
Q. Would it be such that -- in our state, that we create a culture so that we could end up having more -- for example, we just swore in the only judge of Spanish descent in our state, just this past year. And I think we have one of Asian descent. And I think that's -- for other minorities, $I$ mean, $I$ think that's -- that's it.

Which leads into my -- my next question is that the access to our courts. And I want you to speak to that. Because as an appellate lawyer, those individuals that are challenged financially, really don't have access to the appellate courts.
A. It is a significant challenge in trial litigation and appellate litigation, as you correctly identified. One of the things I like about -- have liked about my practice with my law firm is that we -- while we have to pay attention the bottom line, because my partners have to keep the doors of the business open, and they demand that I
produce for them, or at least don't cost them money, my partner and I do get to often represent people who don't have means. You know, a lot of my work is contingency work.
Q. I want to speak to that. Because, you know, in my early life $I$ did a good bit of criminal cases, and in my fee agreement I had language in there that said, you know, "I don't have to your appeal." And then so we have -- we have pretty much made the burden heavy on the appellate practice here in South Carolina.

As you know, I think there was some partnerships with some private law firms, and I know that some of the judges -- I know Judge Few had worked on it some, to end up having lawyers partner with appellate lawyers that were -that represented individuals.

And I just want to see if there is any inclination to end up having programs like that whenever you -- as a Court of Appeals judge. Because the people that can afford it can go out and hire you now, but there are people that -- that -- where we are doing access to courts now.

And they have a case in the lower courts, they maybe pro se, that doesn't go their way, and then they don't have the avenues to the appeal. I want to make certain that our court, as we go forward, with a growing

Spanish population, and with a large minority population, and a very large poor population in general, has access to our appellate courts.
A. It's a -- it's a tremendous problem. And you articulated the case very well, and forcefully. And the status quo is not acceptable. You know I -- I couldn't agree more. I don't know how you solve it, but I would certainly strive to be part of the solution. Because every -- because everybody deserves the opportunity to have their case heard.
Q. And that's what I'm looking for, for the people in this state that come before us, that asks to be on the Appellate Courts, to understand is that it's just not the pro se litigants; it's the people that are going up to the appellate level too. And we don't fund lawyers for free in this state, and so we're depriving our citizens, in a large way, of access to our court system.
A. It's great for me as a practitioner, when I get a case like that, that I can get my hands around, and really feel like, even though I'm not getting paid for it, I'm doing something that's meaningful in the law. But that person's case, even though it has a particularly important legal issue, an issue that's important to me, is not any more important than the pro se litigant whose legal issue isn't all that -- you know, it doesn't change the arc of
justice. But it's still the most important case in the world to that person.
Q. Thank you very much for answering my questions. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Representative Smith.

## EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE SMITH:

Q. Good morning, Mr. Hewitt. How are you doing today?
A. I'm doing well, Representative Smith. How are you?
Q. I'm fine. I was looking through some of your qualifications and your past experiences. And I know you're a candidate for the Court of Appeals, but one thing that's interesting to me, and I recall my time when I was on the judiciary, I would see you in committee's often, and you were the legislative liaison in addition to the Chief Justice's law clerk.

And so we questioned some candidates for Supreme Court, extensively about their philosophy with the Legislature and the General Assembly. And to some degree, that translate in the Court of Appeals, too, by interpreting the laws. I know the constitutional questions are resolved by the Supreme Court. But sometimes the intent of the Legislature on how we -- the interpretation of a -- statutes particularity, some new statutes have come up is before you court. Explain to me

## your philosophy on the separation of powers and the interpretation of legislative intent through -- through statutes that you may be called upon to rule.

A. I will be glad to do my best. In terms of separation of powers, I mean, I think everybody has to stay in their own area of authority. I'm against -- I do not believe in judicial activism. I think a judge's job is to interpret law and not make law.

I think Chief Justice Roberts put it very well in his confirmation hearings, when he said his role is an umpire is the call balls and strikes, and not to pitch or to bat. I think good appellate judging requires restraint, discipline and humility. And I've tried to be a restrained, disciplined and humble lawyer. I would do the same as a judge.

Now, as far as statutory interpretation, you know, we know from precedent, which is binding in most cases, that the principle endeavor of statutory interpretation is to ascertain the Legislature's intent. And we do that through scrutinizing the words that the Legislature enacts in statutory form.

So every statutory case I've ever handled as a law clerk, or as an appellate lawyer, has focused heavily on the precise words that appear in a statute, in an effort to ascertain what the General Assembly's intent was
in putting that statute into codified form.
I've described myself earlier as a textualist. I believe in -- I believe strongly in that. Because the way to encourage the General Assembly to use precise language is to focus on the precise language the General Assembly used. You're not there as a judge to enact your own public policy. If you do that, you know, you needed to file in March, and run in November.

I don't know if that's fully responsive, but that's my response.
Q. In regards to some of the criticism that you saw in your ballet box about experience, you know, one thing I note, the same as I noted with your law partner who was before us yesterday, is while you don't have any court experience being on the circuit court or any other court, you do have a unique perspective on working within the Supreme Court.

And, you know, I think the one thing I noticed, if you can expand on this a little bit, is you've worked inside the Appellate Court and you've worked on the outside of the Appellate Court, by being a litigant or an advocate -- a advocate in the court for your clients.

Tell me, you know, the perspective that gives you, and also things that you believe -- you know, strengths that you could bring to the Court of Appeals,
from having serve in both of those capacities.
A. Well, I was -- I was very gratified to have the opportunity to begin my career as a law clerk for three years at the Supreme Court. And I learned a great deal from the other clerks I worked with, and from all of the justices I worked with. I worked most closely with then Chief Justice Toal, and current Justice Pleicones, because they -- both of their office -- they were only Columbia judges, and their offices were right across the hall from each other.

You know, that -- the experience of writing for the court -- which that's really what $I$ was. I was one of the court's staff lawyers. So I would take the briefs that the parties presented, closely scrutinize the record, read all the cases in the briefs, and say, "This is what these people think this case is about. This is what their arguments are. This is what $I$ think the case is about, or who I think has the better arguments. And these are the arguments that are under the surface, that nobody presented to you, which you can't touch because they're not presented to you."

And so that experience was a formative part of my development as a lawyer, and I think helped me as I started a career as an appellate practitioner immensely. Because I knew how to file a motion with the Appellate

Court, and who would handle that, and how -- hopefully, how to write in a way that would make the issues interesting to them.

So I hoped that my experience as -- I've always viewed my experience as a law clerk as a foundation -part of the foundation for being an appellate lawyer. And I would hope both of those would help from a solid foundation to become an appellate judge. So I think sometimes the disconnect of appellate judges have, when a case is being presented, is not having had that experience as an advocate, trying to narrow down precisely the issue that is up for determination in a case. I hope those roles would marry very well.

As I said earlier, I certainly wouldn't have offered if I thought it would be counterproductive to move from the advocate's role into the judicial role.
Q. Thank you.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Hitchcock.
MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HITCHCOCK:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Hewitt.
A. Good morning.
Q. I wanted to ask you -- I'm just trying to get a little bit of a better idea. On question 6 of your PDQ, you indicated that -- it asked about military service.

You indicated that you were -- I guess, went to Marine OCS?
A. I did.
Q. And then declined a commission as a second lieutenant.
A. I did.
Q. Can you give me some -- a little bit more background on why you did that --
A. I'm happy to.
Q. -- and why you made that decision? Because I noticed that you're -- the characterization of your discharge is "administrative Separation." But did you get a Characterization of Service? Or was that the only --
A. I don't know. The explanation that $I$ was given at the time was that -- you know, you have to be -- and at the time I knew how long, but I've since forgotten, it's been so many years -- in for an amount of time to have either an honorable or dishonorable or anything. It was just an administrative separation.

The way that came about was, I had a grandfather who was a career Marine, my other grandfather was career naval officer, and so that was always sort of there, that interest was there. I thought when I got out of undergraduate school, that $I$ wasn't ready -- interested in going right into practice as a civil engineer.

My roommate in college had a similar background; his grandfather was a career Marine and a pilot. So we went together. He went with a flight contract and I went with a law contract. I was going to go be a JA for the Marine Corps. Well, halfway through boot camp, I found out that I didn't get into law school.

And so the question then was: Do you stay and accept a -- you know, a commission? And in my case, go be an infantry officer, because $I$ enjoyed boot camp after the initial shock wore off. I enjoyed boot camp very much. Or do you, you know, go home and try and get into law school, you know, the next year?

Because if I had stayed in the Service, they would have required me to wait for -- I think it was three years at the time. And so that was a real tough decision for me. I actually hadn't fully made the decision until a fellow platoon mate of mine, a fellow candidate in whom $I$ had confided, sort of told the platoon sergeant who then told the platoon commander that I wasn't sure about whether I was taking me -- taking my commission.

And so they called me -- this is five days before we had finished all of the training; we were just waiting to get commissioned. They called me before, you know, a board of the, you know, commander of OCS, and then all of my platoons' officer's staff, and said, you know,
"What's your problem?" You know, "Why are you wishywashy?"

I said, "Well, I'm just not sure," you know. And they sort of tried to put the real hard sell on me, and said something about my grandfather that I didn't like. And I said, you know, "What, you-guys, have a -have a good day. I'm going home."

I have thought a lot about that, as I think probably anyone would, and wondered how my life would be different. Because I did enjoy boot camp very much. And the honor -- you know, the opportunity to wear the uniform of my country would have been, you know, the deepest honor I ever would have had.

But my life would look very different. You know, I mean, my best friends -- I came home and took the LSAT again, got into law school here, the next year, and came here. I made some of my best friends in my life. My best friend at law school introduced me to my wife. You know, my life would just be on a completely different trajectory.

So I reflect on that experience with somewhatmixed emotions. I love -- I took a lot from my boot camp experience. But, you know, to have gotten so close to having that opportunity and not -- you know, not been commissioned and served, is, you know, something that I
carry with me all the time.
Q. Thank you.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Senator Malloy.
REEXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. That's an amazing story. I almost took the same track.
A. Yeah.
Q. And had Miles Burdine and Gunnery Sergeant Cofield, went to law school, and was getting ready to OCS and basic school and that kind of thing. I didn't go as far as you. But going up a little T34, the little propjets and that kind of stuff for the influence and -- you know, the influence to go and be a -- ultimately changed my mind. I didn't step foot there. I did go get my physical.

My only -- my only question as a result of that, though, just in having that background, is that in administrative separation they say that it isn't voluntary.
A. Yeah. And, you know, it's interesting that you bring that up. So when we were being processed out, they gave me the paperwork. And one of the fellows who was -who was staffing that part of, you know, the boot camp headquarters --
Q. That one being different too.
A. Yeah, I bet. This happened to me in August of 2001, so my life would have been real different. But, you know -- you know, was asking us why we were leaving so close to being commissioned, and I told him the story. And he said, "I wouldn't sign that form."

And maybe it was 'cause I didn't know administrative separation was involuntary. But he said --
Q. That's my understanding.
A. Yeah. Yeah.
Q. It's limited involvement in --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- you know, now we have these -- there's a lot of issues with veterans and, you know, honorable discharge, general discharge and separation means a lot. So --
A. Yeah.
Q. So that's the question. Administrative separation, $I$ knew that from something that's involuntarily. So you might want to go back and check and see -- see what your PDQ says --
A. I had performed -- and I don't -- you know, I don't particularly enjoy talking about myself. And I know your time is valuable, but $I$-- I don't know if it's possible to pull up my record from when $I$ was in boot camp, but I had performed very well in boot camp.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Any other questions?
Representative Rutherford.
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD:
Q. Good morning. Any thought -- and obviously, you have an appellate practice that has been your entire background, and Representative Smith and I were talking about this earlier, is it -- the track to the Appellate Courts seems, in the past, to have only gone through the circuit court bench. We can name one that has gone straight to, but it doesn't -- there don't seem to be a lot of people who have done it.

Have you -- we've met before. We've talked before. You have so much to offer. Was there any thought to looking at the circuit court first, just because you're gifted, we all know it, we want to see you succeed, we want to be a part of that. But somehow it gets difficult, seemingly, with all the other candidates. I know you see this. So any thought to that, just in matter of strategy?
A. Well, sure. And I'd like to take that in two parts, if I can. I want to be real brief, because I know you're short on time. The problem that I had was seeking -- the principle problem that I had, personally, with seeking to serve on the circuit court, the service component of that is very attractive to me, the opportunity to serve my fellow citizens, is that my
experience is just so out of balance; it's so heavily weighted on the appellate side.

And going in front of the Bar's judicial qualification process, and saying, you know, "This is where my heart is." You know, I have -- you know, a tremendous bulk of experience in the circuit. It's just not true, you know, for me. I mean, I have substantial circuit court experience, but my appellate experience dwarfs it. And this is where my heart is.

The second part $I$ would say is there are several people who have gone straight to the Court of Appeals. Alex Sanders, the Jean Toals, the Randy Bells, the Bert Goolsbys, the Bill Howards and at the federal level there's a substantial number of members on the circuit bench on the U.S. Supreme Court that were not trial judges before. I'm not telling you --
Q. -- exclude the federal level. And I didn't add in the caveat of those that had service in the General Assembly before they went on. But, you know, again, I think you're great. And I appreciate you coming in this morning.
A. Well, thank you. It's an honor to be here. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Safran.

MR. SAFRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
EXAMINATION BY MR. SAFRAN:
Q. Let me just ask a -- followup a little bit to what Senator Malloy was saying, and take it maybe one step further. As an appellate lawyer it's incumbent upon you to more or less filter cases that come in, and so as to avoid trying to pursue an issue or a claim that's not meritorious, correct?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And it's not just a matter of trying to maintain credibility with the court, but it's also part of your obligation as a lawyer not to advance a frivolous claim.
A. That's absolutely correct. I've always taken the position that the most important asset I have as an appellate lawyer was my reputation with the court for complete honesty and candor. And so I police that very judiciously.
Q. And certainly the ballot box shows that your peers have sensed that same quality in you. So let me ask this: Basically, you have been involved in cases that were ones that you felt like were correct in terms of the law, but not necessarily always the most popular, correct?
A. I'm thinking of a few of those cases.
Q. Well, I can -- I can think of one.
A. I'm sure you can.
Q. And basically, let me just ask this: In the Bone decision, you were involved in that, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Am I safe in saying that by pursuing what you felt like was the appropriate interpretation of the law, you caught a great deal of criticism from your peers.
A. I continue to.
Q. All right. And am I also safe in saying that, had Bone gone the other way, personally you would have benefitted a great deal more because your book of business would have increased because of the accessability to the court for appeals that currently aren't going there.
A. I think that's correct.
Q. All right. So in order to ultimately come to a determination that you felt as a lawyer was the right one, and pursue it the end, effectively, it was against your personal interest, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it was also one that really put you in some level of -- I wouldn't call it jeopardy -- but less than favor with other members of the bar.
A. That's correct. But it was driven by the statute.
Q. And that's my point. When you talk about advocacy versus sitting and trying to be a judge, ultimately, the judge has to make the right call regardless of the consequences, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And in doing that case you made the call based upon the law, as opposed to any personal benefit, or how your friends might feel; and then, ultimately, you were proven right. And as a result, you know, it was against, really, your personal interest. Fair?
A. Fair.
Q. All right. Thank you.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Any other questions?
(Hearing none.)
EXAMINATION SENATOR CAMPSEN:
Q. Mr. Hewitt, I want to followup on a question that Senator Malloy has asked a lot of candidates -- and maybe all, $I$ don't know. But the -- the cases in your career that you're the proudest of -- and I think you mentioned two, could you -- could you say those again and say why -- elaborate a little more on why they're your proudest -- among your proudest representations, or things you've done in your professional career.
A. Well, I'm particularly proud of the ex parte Brown decision, for a couple of reasons. I was honored to be hired by the Bar, the organization of my peers, fellow lawyers in the state. And I'm happy about it because we achieved a favorable outcome, an outcome that I think fulfills the law. The Bone decision, I'm proud of.
Q. And that one was --
A. I'm sorry, that was the --
Q. -- that lawyers needed to be compensated, they couldn't be forced to do pro bono work.
A. A lawyer's stock and trade is his time.
Q. Okay.
A. And, you know, it can require reasonable compensation for small cases -- small compensation; a big case, big compensation. I'm proud of the Bone decision, because that involved the Supreme Court settling an area of law where there had been a great deal of controversy. The Court of Appeals was following one track with respect to the appealability in a particular type of administrative case.

And it was costing litigants in the system a lot of resources because an unappealable order would get appealed, the opposing party would file a motion to dismiss, the Court of Appeals would not dismiss it; and then whether it was raised in a cert petition or not, the Supreme Court would vacate the Court of Appeals' decision, send everybody back two years, 'cause it's not immediately appealed.

The law needs to be stable. There need to be clear rules. So I'm proud of that decision, because it reversed several Court of Appeals' decisions that were
wrongly decided, and settle the rule -- which is not the best rule, but it's the rule put in place by statute.

I'm proud of the work I did in Episcopal Diocese case, regardless of how it comes out, 'cause I got the opportunity to argue a really important case, a case with constitutional questions, which every lawyer gets excited about. And I got the opportunity to work with really great co-counsel, Tom Tisdale, who's a lion of the South Carolina Bar, from Charleston. Very bright lawyers from out of state, who are in-house counsel for the Episcopal Church, brighter than $I$ will ever be. And, you know, you can't -- we're all influenced by our surroundings, so you can't help but be influenced when you're around great people.

You know, but as I say, you know, every case has been meaningful and important to me, if for no other reason than $I$ gave them my very best effort. Which is what I would, if elected to serve is give every case my very best effort. Every brief. Every record. Because every litigant deserves that.
Q. Another question: In your opinion, when does making rulings of law become -- cross the line into lawmaking?
A. Well, sometimes that's in -- sometimes that's in the eye of the beholder, when people don't win a decision
that think the court crossed the line. You know, when we're not -- if the court is acting contrary to language that's been expressed and articulated and enacted by the General Assembly, if a court is entertaining nonjusticiable political question -- which sometimes that's a nebulas inquiry, but we know what the different types of those non-justiciable political questions are. I think Baker versus Carr is the similar U.S. Supreme Court case on that.

You know, the court has a specific arena to play in. And it's a limited arena. Alxander Hamilton called it the least dangerous branch. And, you know, some people would take issue with that, and perhaps rightly so, in certain circumstances. The devil is always in the details.

The court needs to judicious in every case, to confine itself to its appropriate role. Because its role is not making policy. The General Assembly sets the public policy of this state. The court's role is to interpret the public policy, as enacted by the General Assembly, by the people through the General Assembly, and see that, that public policy is enforced.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Mr. Safran.
REEXAMINATION BY MR. SAFRAN:
Q. Just real quickly in followup. I think you just
heard from the Chairman, as well as we heard in prior hearings, the idea of kind of trying to respect what the Legislature does through the passage of a statute. And I think you said in Bone, even though it was something that may not have been as advantageous to you, personally, your position was the statute was clear and it needed to be respected. And that's been your mantra, I'm assuming, all the way through.
A. Absolutely.
Q. And would continue to be.
A. Absolutely.
Q. And I guess on the other side, as an advocate have you not been repeatedly put into a position to look at a case, and to potentially take a more creative or novel spin on maybe a statute that doesn't speak particularly to your circumstances? At least by prior case interpretation.
A. Oh, certainly. And I hope you'll tell me if I don't understand your question correctly. But when looking at a statute, you always have to consider not just the circumstances of the case that provide the context for that particular question, but you need to consider all the hypothetical cases that come later. Because the rule of law, you know, the construction of that statute for which you are advocating to an appellate court, will control not
just your case, but the hundred cases that the court of Appeals and the Supreme Court will never see. Is that what you're asking?
Q. I think that's part of it. And the other part is this: If you're going to look at a statute and necessarily say, all right, it may never have been construed in the context of what I'm saying, so that there is an open question, basically that's what you have to do to, at least to some degree, every day as a practitioner.
A. Oh, absolutely.
Q. And it may not be that there's a decision on point. But what you're trying to do is go and get a decision made, based upon maybe an argument that hasn't been advanced in the past. Has that happened?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And I guess my question is: Does your frequently doing that as a practitioner kind of give you maybe an advantage over somebody who's been sitting on a circuit bench, maybe, and being very reluctant to want to rock the boat or change precedent, as I've heard from a couple of these judges, leaving that for the Appellate Court? Are you more inclined to be able to kind of attack that type of situation because of the fact that you do it day in and day out?

```
A. I would think so. I mean, we have great trial
```

judges who have gone on to be great appellate court judges; they were just gifted that way. I think the advantage I have for my experience as an appellate lawyer is, I've been doing that sort of thinking every day. I've been in private practice. I haven't been -- you know, I've been trying to write with precision every day in private practice.

I don't know how much writing, you know, trial judges get to do, 'cause I've never been one, and am not likely to ever be one. And I didn't work for one except for at the federal level, which is different. The core stuff that $I$ would do in terms of thought process and moving work every day as an appellant judge, I think, is the same thing I've been doing for the last eleven years.
Q. And as I heard from Mr. Nichols, yesterday, not that in any way a negative way, but it's a different skill set to be an appellate advocate, or an appellate judge, than necessarily what the norm is to be a trial judge.
A. I think so. And I think it's also true at the practitioner level, it's very different. Some people can do both. I think it's rare that you find people who do both very well. But the skill sets required, in my view, for effective appellate advocacy, are different skill sets than effective trial advocacy.

You're playing to a jury on one hand, who can't
ask you questions. And then on the other hand, you're playing to a learned audience who are not just concerned about your case, they're concerned about the hundred cases that they'll never -- they'll never see, who are read up on the law, and who are skilled finding exactly where your weaknesses are and exploiting them.
Q. Thank you very much.
A. My pleasure. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Howard.

EXAMINATION BY MR. HOWARD:
Q. Good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. Just a couple of questions. This is more in followup to Representative Rutherford's question to you. And this is not any sort of reflection on you, or any reflection upon any of what you've stated, but do you see any value to circuit court experience and bringing that to the Court of Appeals?
A. Are you speaking as a judge?
Q. As a judge. If you were -- as judges coming forward, stepping up from Circuit Court to Court of Appeals, do you see value in that?
A. Oh, there are -- I think there's certainly value in that. And the wonderful thing about appellate judging is that the only things that you can do by yourself are
concur or dissent; you can't take any positive action unless you can bring other people with you.

I think we hear appellate cases in panels, because the idea is three heads are better than one at the Court of Appeals. At the Supreme Court, five heads are better than one. And to really have a full and robust exchange of viewpoints and ideas, you need people with a breath of experience.

So it's great to have people on there who have been circuit court judges, great to have people on there who have been family court judges. I think it's an asset to have people on there who are fresh from private practice and who have substantial appellate experience.

So I think it's great to have a variety of viewpoints and life experiences and diversity, there's certainly value in that. That's not what I bring to the table. The case I bring is the case of an experienced appellate practitioner.
Q. Just a quick followup to that. Not every matter that comes before the Court of Appeals is on an error of law; sometimes you're being asked to review something de novo.
A. Yeah, family court cases require that standard.
Q. Certainly, any sort of equitable decisions coming out in the circuit court, all equitable decisions
coming out of the family court. Explain to us what sort of experiences are you going to draw upon, when you're reviewing something de novo. And because, you know, that does require, in my view, a breadth of experience and some wisdom that goes into that, in reviewing evidence and applying the law to the evidence in those situations.
A. Well, I've worked on equitable cases, both as an appellate practitioner, and have consulted in family court matters in equitable cases in private practice at the trial level. I of course have experience from handling equitable cases when I worked at the Supreme Court for three years.

Notwithstanding, the de novo standard there are two principles that are often cited in equitable appellate decisions, which is that it is the appealing parties burden to prove error, and that the appellate court will not likely disregard the conclusions of the lower court, because the lower court had the opportunity to view testimony in person, and evaluate things like credibility.

You know, I may be able, if I'm on a panel of Court of Appeals with Judge Konduros, who is a family court judge, Judge Williams who is a family court judge. You know, I may view an equitable record one way, but they may say, "No, we were family court practitioners, and we were family court judges, and here's what was really going
on behind the scenes."
And I wouldn't have that. But what I would have is the perspective of someone who's been an appellate practitioner, who can say, perhaps, in that case, or another sort of case, "No, this is why the lawyer argued it this way on appeal; they were constrained by these principles."

So there may be situations where I would have to rely on my colleagues, but I think that's part of good appellate judging.

## Q. Thank you sir.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Any other questions?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt.
That concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of qualifications, and you may be called back at any such time as the need arises.

Thank you for offering. And thank you for your service to South Carolina.

MR. HEWITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank all of you.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Yeah, we'll take a quick break.
(Off the record from 11:10 a.m. to 11:28 a.m.) SENATOR CAMPSEN: Judge Hill, welcome. JUDGE HILL: Good morning. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Please raise your right hand.

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

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Have you had an
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

JUDGE HILL: Yes, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
JUDGE HILL: Yes, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be
changed?
JUDGE HILL: No, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Do you object to making
these documents and any amendments, if applicable, a part of the record of your sworn testimony?

JUDGE HILL: No, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: It will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION

COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE DAVID GARRISON HILL)
(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DAVID GARRISON HILL)

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Judge Hill, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused upon nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, a check for economic conflicts of interests. We have received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, and no witnesses are present to testify.

Do you have a brief opening statement you would like to make at this time?

JUDGE HILL: I'm aware of you-all's busy agenda. So, no, sir. Other than to thank the Commission and Ms. Brogdon and Ms. Legare for the professionalism through out this process.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Please answer Counsel's questions.

JUDGE HILL: Yes, sir.

MS. BROGDON: Good morning, Judge Hill. How are you?

JUDGE HILL: Good morning, Ms. Brogdon.
MS. BROGDON: I would note for the record that, based on the testimony contained in the candidates PDQ, which has been included in the record, with Judge Hill's consent, he meets the constitutional and/or statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.

EXAMINATION BY MS. BROGDON:
Q. Judge Hill, why do you now want to serve as a judge on the Court of Appeals?
A. Well, I want to be on the Court of Appeals because I'm committed to the preservation of the rule of law; it's what sets our country apart. And fifteen years as a lawyer in private practice, and twelve as a circuit judge, has given me a broad and, I think, unique perspective on our justice system.

The older one gets, and the more experience you accumulate, I think the more interested you become in contributing to things that are bigger and more enduring than you are. And a judge at his best is a bit like a finish carpenter; he works from a blueprint, a plan. He didn't write the plan. He didn't design the structure. He didn't decide what to build. But he gets to do
something that our Founders thought was essential to the process; and that is, to do something very simple and limited; and that is, to make sure the structure conforms to the plan, ensure the integrity of the work.

And to do that effectively, it takes more than just the ability to read the blueprint. You have to have actually worked inside of the structure and know what happens when you build it, and how it affects the people who use it, the lawyers and judges who are going to use it and the people that have to live with it, the public.

So you have enough practical things. And that's what makes the foundation firm, that's what makes the door swing true or a window hang right or a floor not buckle or creak.

So I'd like to be on Court of Appeals to use that experience that I've had for twenty-seven years in the justice system, to make things more practical and to have a broader perspective and to make the justice system work better for the lawyers and judges and the people that it ultimately serves.
Q. Thank you, Judge Hill. And you touched on this a little bit, but if you could elaborate on how you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be an effective judge on the Court of

## Appeals.

A. Well, I think from -- the Court of Appeals is generally designed to be a court that is for error correction; it's not a policy-setting body. And I think probably everybody in this room has read decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, that affect how trials and trial procedures run. And sometimes we get those, and we can see very easily that whoever wrote it probably had not spent a lot of time in a courtroom, either as a judge or lawyer.

And so I think if you're going to be on a court whose primary focus is to address those trial court errors, it's important that you have experience both as a lawyer representing clients, and as a judge who has to implement those decisions.

And again, it goes back to the practical common sense application of the law. Because ultimately, the litigants, the people who are sitting in the chairs at counsel table, are the ones we need to look out for most.
Q. Thank you. Judge Hill, how would you describe your general judicial philosophy?
A. Well, my philosophy is a little bit like I said in my earlier statement, I think that the judge's role is very limited, and I think it all has to do about how you approach a text. A text being a constitution or the statutes that we have to implement. My approach is, of
course, to be very differential to the Legislative Branch, because that's the branch that our Founders decided to commit the decisions about what the law should be to, not the judges.

So I view a judge's role as very limited. And insuring again that the Rule of Law is upheld, and that the structure of our Republic remains intact and is preserved.
Q. Thank you. Judge Hill, what is your vision for the future of our judicial system? And what changes would you advocate, and why?
A. Well, I think -- I'm an advocate of things being made more simple, if possible. And that means to me, personally -- in the twelve years as a circuit judge, I think there are things that I've seen. No example that's going to stick out to me at this particular moment. But there things that $I$ have seen, certainly, that could use streamlining and simplifying and eliminating some of the bureaucracy that is inevitable in some ways.

But I think anything can be done to kind of lessen the burden on the litigants, and make the law more simple and easy to understand and apply, is something I would advocate for.
Q. Thank you. Judge Hill, to what extent do you believe that a judge should or should not defer to the
actions of the General Assembly?
A. Well, $I$ touched on that a little bit earlier. But I think, you know, we are a government of laws and not of men. And it's interesting that, that phrase came from the Constitution of Massachusetts that John Adams wrote in 1780, and that phrase also came in the context of the separation of powers. And I'm a firm believer in a strict separation of powers. And as I said earlier, I believe in deference to the other branches to do what the Founders intended them to do. And the judiciary role is very limited, but it's important. So that would be my response.
Q. Thank you. Judge Hill, the Commission received 435 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 78 additional comments, none of which were negative. The ballot box comments contained, for example, the following positive comments:
"A tremendous judge, particularly in a difficult contested case. Will not be outworked. Exceedingly fair and loves the law. I have appeared before Judge Hill, regularly, for years. Judge Hill is always courteous to attorneys and litigants, and he has excellent technical skills and judicial acumen. Judge Hill is an astute legal scholar, and fair and impartial jurist and a consummate professional."

Judge Hill, you indicated in your PDQ, that a lawsuit was filed against you and your law school roommate in 1988, in magistrate's court, by the purchaser of an apartment complex. I didn't see this covered in your prior screening. So could you just explain the nature of the lawsuit?
A. I think I've always disclosed that since 2003, when I first applied to be a judge. My roommate, whose name should not escape responsibility either, is Derrick Quattlebaum. And we were sued in magistrate's court, because when we moved out of the apartment, the gentleman who purchased the apartment, the new owner who was not our landlord, evidently was having a bad day and claimed that we didn't properly clean out the apartment.

We counterclaimed against him in magistrate's court and we got our security deposit back. And that was the end of it. We didn't -- there was no finding against us, or anything other than the result that we got our security deposit. And he dismissed the lawsuit.
Q. Thank you, Judge Hill. And you're correct, you did disclose it in previous PDQs; it just wasn't in your transcript, so --
A. Oh, I see.
Q. -- that's the only reason I brought it up today, so --
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. You have that on record for the future.
A. Okay. All right.
Q. And your SLED report indicated that there was a lawsuit filed against you in 2003, in the Greenville County of Common Pleas, by a John Eric Stancil. You were sued as a personal representative of the Estate of a Roy Atkins, Sr . The records reflect that the case was dismissed. Do you want to provide any additional information about this case?
A. My memory of that is, that it was a situation where a fellow lawyer in Greenville asked me to serve as a personal representative, because he had a lawsuit against the decedent and an estate needed to be open. And he had to have somebody to serve as a personal representative, because nobody had opened an estate, there was nobody to open the estate.

So I agreed to do that and serve as personal representative, just for the purpose of opening the estate so he could commence his lawsuit. And once that was concluded, it was dismissed. So I guess that goes under the category of "no good deed goes unpunished."
Q. Thank you, Judge Hill.

MS. BROGDON: Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like that we request go into executive session.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you.
SENATOR MALLOY: Move
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Senator Malloy moves that we go into executive session. Senator Hembree seconds. Any discussion? (Hearing none.)

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Being no discussion, we'll move immediately to vote. All in favor indicate by saying "aye."
(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: The ayes have it. We are
now in executive session.
(Off the record from 11:40 a.m. to 12:05 a.m.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: We are coming out of
executive session. We took no action and made no
decision. And no votes were taken. Any further -- Ms.
Brogdon, housekeeping items?
MS. BROGDON: Thank you.
REEXAMINATION BY MS. BROGDON:
Q. Judge Hill, since submitting your letter of intent have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your hearing?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Do you understand that you're prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment, directly or indirectly, until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. BROGDON: I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee reported that Judge Hill is well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament, and also qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding Judge Hill were incorporated
into questioning today.
Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any members have any questions for Judge Hill? Representative Rutherford.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say again for the record, that it has been my short time on this Commission, to not see anyone with no negative comments whatsoever out of that many ballot box responses, and for him to have been a judge for as long as he has, and to have ruled over cases that have been controversial. I've driven up to Greenville to watch him preside. So that speaks volumes about his time on the bench and his time as a lawyer and as a human being. And I'd just like to applaud him for that on the record.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you, sir.
Representative Smith.
REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. And let me echo what Representative Rutherford said. I had the opportunity to appear in front of him. I also had an opportunity to read some of his orders that he writes up in Greenville, which is -- you know, we still refer to it in our law firm as "the deposition cat fight order," which he refereed two attorneys, and probably one of -- one of the well written, well reasoned, with an
injection of common sense than anything I've ever seen in dealing with what y'all routinely have to deal with, with lawyers fighting with one another over discovery or depositions.

And so, you know, I just cannot -- I cannot understate what a great job -- or overstate what a great job he -- he has performed on the bench. As a circuit court judge, I think you have excelled. And I think that's certainly something that we need to take in consideration as a Committee.

EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE SMITH:
Q. But could you help tell us, you know, ways that you've seen that the Appellate Courts -- and I know a lot of it's Supreme Courts, but ways that you believe your circuit court experience can help you in the Appellate Court and South Carolina Court of Appeals?
A. Well, I think it goes back to what I said earlier about trying to give simple and clear decisions. I think that the example that always sticks out to me is one from U.S. Supreme Court. They had a decision, seven or eight years ago, about punitive damages and there was some language in the decision about how judges are supposed to instruct juries about the effects of conduct on other parties, and how much the jury could take that into account. And it was just the most garbled, and
illogical in many ways, language in that decision. And it really confused -- confuses judges to this day. I can't imagine what it does to juries. But it's something we have to read to juries, essentially.

And I've tried to -- just in my own experience, try and break that down and make it more concise for people to understand. But I think it's just an awareness of what these decisions mean when you actually put them into practice, and what the average juror or the average client/litigant comes into court and has to grabble with. The more simple and clear you can make that, I think benefits everyone. And it's -- it's not hard to do that. But it is hard to do it if you haven't had the experience of seeing it in work and how it affects lives in a practical way.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Anyone else? Mr. Safran. MR. SAFRAN: Just very briefly. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Yes, sir.

EXAMINATION BY MR. SAFRAN:
Q. Judge, I hadn't had the pleasure of appearing in front of you. And one question I always have, and I've expressed to some of the other judges, is that I've run into -- or have run into, over the years, where you go to a circuit court who may be sitting in the appellate capacity, and the judges are reluctant to necessarily want
to take --
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Safran, will you
speak into the mic.
MR. SAFRAN: Oh, I'm sorry.
Q. The judges are somewhat reluctant to maybe take a new spin on a particular proposition of law, or potentially looking for an interpretation that might not have been one that's been expressed in the cases up to a certain point. And I think the reasoning is, is that, "Look, that's for you to do at the next level as opposed to me."

I've had others who said, "No, I'm happy to do that," and have made rulings that ultimately were affirmed at the next level, and may have carved out an area that wasn't previously identified.

Where do you feel like you sit in that? 'Cause I know you may -- I may just be completely oblivious to it, but you may have already been somebody that was very, I guess, willing to take those type of steps. Or maybe you've been the others who have said, "It's really not my role."

In terms of transitioning to an appellate court, how do you see any changes that would occur in terms of how your thought process would go in situations like that?
A. Well, it would have to be, in my view, some area
where there was ambiguity, there was no clear precedent, and there was some reasonable construction of whatever text it is that you're dealing with, that had not been addressed either by the Legislature or by a higher court.

I don't think my view of that would -- would change. I understand what you're saying that -- that has a lot to do with, I think, a judge's willingness and ability to listen. Because if you have a good lawyer who's making these arguments, and you don't listen and you just dismiss it, offhand, because there's no clear precedent, and you don't want to stick your nose out that far, I don't -- I don't -- I don't go along with that.
Q. Okay.
A. I go along with -- if the lawyers who know a lot more about the case than I do have a reasonable persuasive view that is sound, and $I$ would certain listen to it and consider it, and take it into account. And I wouldn't be afraid of making a decision in an area where there was none. But $I$ would be aware of the limited role I have and the confines a judge is supposed to work in.
Q. Sure. Thank you very much.
A. Yes, sir.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Howard.
MR. HOWARD: Good afternoon, Judge.
JUDGE HILL: Oh, good afternoon. Yes, sir.

MR. HOWARD: I just want to take one point. As a -- as a member of the Greenville Bar, and as a practitioner in Greenville, $I$ just want to echo what Mr. Smith and Mr. Rutherford -- Representative Smith, and Representative Rutherford stated earlier, which is you've been on the bench for as -- almost as long as I've been practicing. And I think I echo most of the Greenville Bar in stating that I've always found you to be an ethical, upright, patient, capable jurist, and somebody who exhibits exactly what I've always thought of when I think of a judge.

And I just want to --
JUDGE HILL: You're very kind.
MR. HOWARD: -- put that on the record.
Because as a practitioner from Greenville, who's sitting here on this committee, $I$ think it's worth noting that. And most definitely a friend to the bench and the Bar. So thank you for your service.

JUDGE HILL: Thank you, Mr. Howard.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Any other questions?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Judge Hill, thank you for being with us today. That concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of
qualifications, and you may be called back at such time if the need arises.

I thank you for offering. And thank you for your service to South Carolina.

JUDGE HILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you, Mr. Josey, for
being with us. Please raise your right hand.
WHEREUPON:
JON RENE JOSEY, being duly sworn and
cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Have you had an
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

MR. JOSEY: I have.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
MR. JOSEY: Yes, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be
changed?
MR. JOSEY: No, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Do you object to our
making these documents, and any amendments, if applicable,
a part of the record for your sworn testimony?
MR. JOSEY: Not at all.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Okay. It will be done at this point in the -- in the transcript?
(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF JON RENE JOSEY)
(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF JON RENE JOSEY)

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Josey, the Judicial
Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused upon nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, a check for economic conflicts of interest. We have received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, and no witnesses are present to testify.

Do you have a brief opening statement you would like to make at this time?

MR. JOSEY: I did jot a few notes down, Senator.

After thirty years of diverse, and, I
think, successful practice, I want to give something back to our profession and to the state. I've got partners that ask me why I put myself through this, and why I would want to, conceivably, work more and make less. And the fact that they even ask me that question is part of the problem with our profession, I think. Our profession has lost its service identity. And that's probably why we don't have more folks offer for office.

And I'm worried about our profession. There's a lot of things $I$ can't address, $I$ can't fix the market forces that affect the legal profession. But I would like to have a small -- play a small role by being a good mentor to law clerks, by writing clear opinions that provide guidance to the Bar, and helping give correct solutions to the cases that come before us.

Selfishly, I also seek this office because I think it will give me a greater degree of personal satisfaction. I enjoy analyzing facts and issues and looking for the correct solution. And I enjoy writing and trying to write a clear direction to those solutions. The understandable realty is, though, that most clients are more interested in controlling cost and getting results; and that's not always consistent with correctness or clarity.

And so I'm seeking greater personal
satisfaction. I try not to take myself seriously, but I do take my clients and their cases seriously. And I tend to get difficult cases with hard facts, and I try to have the wisdom and grace to advocate for them zealously but admit when I'm wrong.

I think I'm well grounded with a great deal of family support, extended family, close family. My wife of thirty-one years often has come with me. She's teaching a class this morning at Tech. But I've got great kids. I've got a great community of faith and I think that I have a lot to offer, and I sincerely ask for your consideration.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you.
MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Counsel will ask you some questions.

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

EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIDSON:

## Q. Mr. Josey, could you please explain to the
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Commission why you would like to serve on the Court of

## Appeals?

A. Well, I did a little in my opening statement. But I have both selfish reasons and service reasons. As I indicated, I think our profession needs people to offer for public service, because there are a lot of negative forces on our profession; we've got a lot of lawyers trying to do a little bit of work, and we've got market forces that are affecting the way we practice sometimes.

And so I want to give back and I want to add to the professionalism of our legal system. But selfishly, I get a lot of satisfaction out of solving problems and writing and trying to provide clarity. And so those are the reasons $I$ seek this office.
Q. Thank you. and I understand you briefly covered this in your opening statement, but could you -- how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be an effective judge on the Court of Appeals?
A. Well, and -- actually, I was chatting with Judge Lee upstairs. I'm often asked about not having judicial experience before. I think that my experience, having practiced in the appellate courts, but also in criminal court, civil court, family court, I've worked as a prosecutor, I've worked as a criminal defense lawyer,
that, that breadth of experience, all of which funnels through the Court of Appeals, makes me well suited, and will serve me well on the Court of Appeals.
Q. How would you describe your general judicial philosophy?
A. Well, I guess I would say that cases that -- I try to -- you know, there's a role for judges to play and there's a role for lawyers to play; sometimes judges like to be the lawyers. I don't think that way. I think that folks who would come before me would have a narrow issue that needed to be addressed and needed to be solved, and I would try to do it in the most direct way possible, based on the precedent that existed, and not go anywhere I didn't need to go.

So, you know, I kind of resist labels. But I would say it's a conservative philosophy, that, you know, if we have narrow issues that are brought to us, you address those issues, you try to provide clear guidance on those issues, and a resolution of those issues, and then you get out of the way.
Q. Thank you. What is your vision for the future of our judicial system? And what changes would you advocate, and why?
A. That's a tough question. And that's part of what separates me from the other lawyers who serve in this
room, is that $I$ don't see myself as a policy person -policy questions. I like narrow questions and not policy questions. I would say that $I$ think our judicial system needs to be funded better, because I think that's also a factor in a lot of folks not offering for service.

And you see overcrowded dockets in places, and so I guess I have a vision of -- an ideal vision of a more independent, fully-funded judiciary that does its part as the third branch of government, and stays out of the way of the other two branches.
Q. To what extent do you believe that a judge should or should not defer to the actions of the General Assembly?
A. Well, of course when the General Assembly has spoken on a -- made a policy decision, passed a statute, that statute needs to be followed. It's not the judge's place to question why or rethink the policy, but only to interpret and apply a particular statutory act to a set of facts.
Q. Thank you for those responses. Mr. Josey, the Commission received 277 ballot box surveys regarding your candidacy, with 26 additional comments. In the ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"His intellect, temperament, and true desire to
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serve our state will make him a great judge. He belongs in the Appellate Court. As a teacher for this and future generations, I cannot say enough about his great legal mind." And lastly, "Mr. Josey, an excellent, principled attorney, with an impeccable reputation, and would be an excellent addition to the Court of Appeals."

However, ten of the written comments expressed concerns. Two of the comments questioned your academic ability. What response would you offer to those concerns?
A. I don't think they're valid. I know that I don't know everything. And I think that's actually one of my strengths; I recognize when I don't know everything and need to study, or need to get help or seek guidance from other folks. You know, I can't explain why those folks thought that, or why they expressed that, other than an agenda on their part.
Q. Two of the comments questioned your temperament, one of which cited a short fuse. What response would you offer to those concerns?
A. Again, that I'm -- I'm not perfect. I have, I think, an appropriate judicial temperament. I'm not maybe always as patient with conduct that wastes time of litigants in the court. But $I$ also know that, you know, our profession depends on people keeping their cool and addressing issues in a guarded, cautious, structured
fashion. You know, I'm not perfect, but I think $I$ have an appropriate temperament.
Q. Thank you. Four of the written comments expressed concern over the number of times you have sought judicial office. What response would you offer to those concerns?
A. I'm ready to quit when -- when the Legislature's ready to quit. Well, it goes back -- and I don't -again, $I$ don't -- try not to take myself too seriously. But if I didn't feel called to do this, and if I didn't really think I would be good at it and enjoy it, I would quit trying. Because it's not -- nothing against the people in this room, but the process is arduous, and when you're trying to practice law and make a living it's even more arduous.

I know Mr. Safran's got other things he could probably doing back at his office. I've got other things. I've got clients texting me on the way over here. But it's important to me, and I think it's important to the system to have good people offer. And maybe this will be the right time.
Q. Lastly, one comment alleged that you were grossly inappropriate toward many while serving as U.S. Attorney. I note for the record -- and as you know, I contacted a member of your staff, and they verified that

## there's no basis to that comment. Nonetheless, what response would you offer to that comment?

A. Well, I know you contacted somebody, and also for the benefit of the rest of the Commission, one of my letters of five reference letters is from Scott Schools, who was an assistant U.S. Attorney, while I served as U.S. Attorney, and we tried cases together. An he's actually went on to serve in the Justice Department as a U.S. Attorney, and in several different districts as a Deputy Attorney General, and he came back to private practice and as of two weeks ago, he's gone back to the Justice Department.

But anyway, it doesn't have any validity. You know, when you serve in a capacity like that, you don't make everybody happy. I don't know what I made -somebody unhappy. But we take tough cases and prosecute folks who don't want to be prosecuted. We took civil cases against the Medical University, and all kinds of different defendants that made folks uncomfortable. You don't do it lightly, and it may have rubbed somebody the wrong way.

But I also have -- my gut tells me that, that's somebody who didn't even know me when $I$ was U.S. Attorney. That's what my gut tells me.
Q. Thank you. At this time I'm going to go through
four quick housekeeping questions.
A. Sure.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent have your sought or received the pledge of any legislator, either prior to this day or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. I have not.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
A. No.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the Commission about your candidacy?
A. I have not.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment, directly or indirectly, until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's Report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. I do understand that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Thank you.

Members -- any members have any questions?
(Hearing none.)
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR CAMPSEN:
Q. Mr. Josey, I have one question, since you're seeking an Appellate Court position. What is your personal opinion as to when making rulings of law crosses the line into lawmaking?
A. Well, it's actually sort of -- almost a strange concept to me. In a lot of my appellate work -- and I've had a number of cases where I have sought appellate decisions that applied the Legislature's statutes to a particular set of facts that my client brought to me, and I always tried to fall back on the rules of construction, and the rules that -- you know, when the legislative body has spoken in a particular area, it has spoken. And nobody else needs to speak.

And I guess the court goes too far, particularly if it says something contrary to what the Legislature has said, or if it tries to fill a gap that maybe is better filled by the Legislature. And I think sometimes maybe an activist judge maybe tries to fill a gap, when the appropriate thing to do is just step back and refrain from stepping into the gap, and let the Legislature fill the gap.

In private practice I've never had a case where I tried to get a court to legislate, because I didn't think it was appropriate. I always thought my best argument was try to use the legislation that exists, to fit facts in the way $I$ want them to fit. So I'm used to taking a narrow approach.

And again, I think the -- to answer your question, just anytime a judge tries to fill a gap it's not the judge's to fill, then he's going too far.

## Q. Thank you.

> SENATOR CAMPSEN: Any questions from
members?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Okay. Mr. Josey, thank you for being with us today. That concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of
qualifications, and you may be called back at such time if the need arises.

I thank you for offering. And thank you for your service to South Carolina.

MR. JOSEY: Thank you, Senator. Thank you, everybody.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Good morning, Judge Lee.
JUDGE LEE: Good morning.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Would you please raise your right hand.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE ALISON RENEE LEE, being duly
sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth
and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Have you had an
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

JUDGE LEE: I did. I have -- I have reviewed it.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
JUDGE HILL: Yes, they are.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be
changed?
JUDGE HILL: Not that I'm aware of, from
reviewing it yesterday and today.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Do you object to our
making these documents, and any amendments, if applicable, a part of the record of your sworn testimony?

JUDGE HILL: No.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: It will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE HONORABLE ALISON RENEE LEE)
(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ALISON RENEE LEE)

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Judge Lee, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, a check for economic conflicts of interest. We have received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, and no witnesses are present to testify.

Do you have a brief opening statement you
would like to make at this time?
JUDGE LEE: I've considered making an
opening, but I've decided not to make one at this time. Thank you for the opportunity.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Please answer Counsel's
questions.
MR. GENTRY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
note for the record, that based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the record with the candidate's consent, Judge Lee meets the constitutional and/or statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. EXAMINATION BY MR. GENTRY:
Q. Judge Lee, why do you now want to serve as a judge on the Court of Appeals?
A. First of all, I've been a licensed member of the Bar since 1982, and all but five of those years have been in public service. And so I'd like to continue my career in public service.

I think it's been a privilege to -- I've had the privilege to serve in both legislative and judicial and the executive branches of government. And I began my career as a law clerk, serving as a law clerk before two appellate judges.

I'd like to be able to return to the area where

I started. And returning to work on the Court of Appeals, I think it would give me the opportunity to go back to developing the research and writing that $I$ enjoy. And I think I'm ready for a new challenge. I've been on the -on the circuit bench for seventeen years, and I would like to be able to go and conclude my legal career on the Court of Appeals. And besides that, I think I'm qualified.
Q. How do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be an effective judge on the Court of Appeals?
A. As I've indicated, I started out as a law clerk, so that gave me the basic understandings of what it was like to be on the Appellate Court, through the research and writing I did with appellate judges. I also had the opportunity to practice law for five years.

Subsequent to that, I worked with the -- I just had a blank. I worked at the legislative council drafting bills, so that gave me the opportunity to understand from the legislative point of view what goes into drafting legislation, and the process for that.

Additionally, as an administrative law judge, I've had the opportunity to handle cases, many of which are the type of cases that are now before the Appellate Court, and the jurisdiction that the Appellate Court has.

Further, with the circuit court, I handled
appeals both from the lower courts, as well as some of the agencies that now report -- have their appeals go directly to the Appellate Court; for example, Workers' Comp Commission, the Employment and Workforce Commission, the zoning issues and some of the other areas that are now areas in which the Court of Appeals now handles those cases.

And so I think that has made me qualified in order to be able to handle those. I'm familiar with the jurisdiction that they've had, and I believe that I have the skills -- the legal research and writing skills that will enable me to be able to be on the court and consider those cases along with my colleagues.

## Q. How would you describe your general judicial

 philosophy?A. Generally, I think my philosophy is -- what I try to do is, I try to listen to everything that's presented to me. I try to ask questions when they are appropriate. I like to study the law. I like to do the research and the writing. I must admit that my time on the court of -- the circuit court, I've not had as much writing skills as I'd liked to have had, simply because of the volume of cases that we handle.

But my philosophy is that I have to follow the law that applies, I have to listen impartially to the
facts, and determine what issues are there, and to be able to address those issues fairly and impartially.
Q. What's your vision for the future of the judicial system? And what changes would you advocate, if any, and why?
A. In South Carolina, I think the judicial system is operating very well. There are some -- some things that I note, I guess because of my experience on circuit court, primarily with the case load that the circuit judges have, I'm not sure there's a way to change those. I know that with the development of specialized courts, it does alleviate some of the work load that the circuit judges have.

And I'm not sure that just adding additional judges will resolve that problem, based upon the resources that the various counties have in terms of being able to provide space in courtrooms for holding -- for holding court or base -- based upon the ability to be able to have the other resources, court reporters.

But I think that the circuit judges are somewhat overloaded in the work because of the workload. But I think that the judicial system, through the head of our judicial system, the Chief Justice is making strides to try and alleviate some of that. And I think the beneficial part of the specialized courts are there to
help in that matter.
Q. What extent do you believe that a judge should or should not defer to the actions of the General Assembly?
A. I don't believe in judicial activism. I think the General Assembly is designated to enact the laws, and that we are the official branch that interprets it and applies it. I think that -- you know, when I worked for legislative council on drafting bills, $I$ was instructed at the time not to talk about -- or not to discuss constitutionality of specific legislation -- specific legislation, unless I was asked about it.

I think it would be helpful to have additional lawyers as legislators to help understand the impact of what legislation may have in -- on the general public and handling cases. But I don't think there's a role for the judges to legislate or interfere with the legislative branch of government at all.
Q. The Commission received 596 ballot box surveys regarding your campaign, with 74 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"A conscientious, intelligent, and professional judge with an outstanding judicial temperament. She would make an excellent appellate judge."

## Page 100

Ten of the written comments expressed concerns. A couple of respondents complained that you may lack the legal abilities to serve on the Appellate Court. What response would you offer to this concern
A. As indicated, I believe that I have the ability to be able to be on the Appellate Court. I think I'm familiar with the -- doing legal research and writing. As I've stated, I think my time on the circuit court, I had less of an opportunity to spend a lot of time in order to be able to write. But $I$ still do my legal research.

As you probably -- as most of you are probably well aware, for a circuit judge you are often required to make decisions that are immediate, without the benefit of a lot of refection and thought, especially during jury trials.

I think that I do -- I do try to prepare in advance, and $I$ do ask for information ahead of time in an effort to try to address some of those issues that may come up during the course of the trial. And I try and do my research on those issues.

I think as far as the Court of Appeals is concerned, again I think $I$ have experience in handling those cases which will come before the Court of Appeals and the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeals.

I think the experience as a circuit court judge
gives me the opportunity to understand what the circuit judge faces during the course of a trial, and to be able to help -- or at least address those issues where there may be some confusion about the application of a particular point of law.
Q. Also, a couple of respondents expressed concern regarding your demeanor and temperament in the courtroom. What response would you offer to those concerns?
A. I heard the very same thing from the Bar Committee. And frankly, I'm surprised. I pride myself on being very impartial, that $I$ remain even-tempered and calm in court. I don't believe that there's a place to be angry or upset.

I must say that I do hold a standard for the litigants and for their attorneys in how they present themselves in court, and I try and be fair and impartial and I try to make sure that I have the appropriate demeanor and temperament in dealing with them.

So I am -- I'm a little bit surprised by those comments. I think that's probably the first I've -- this is the first time I've heard those comments. I do have expectations, as I stated, as to how the court runs -- the courtroom runs. And I apply that to everyone. And I apply that -- the same way across the board.

And I think it's not about my ego, or having
someone defer to me. To me, it's about decorum in the courtroom and what's expected and how to be able to -- to be able to manage the courtroom, and to handle the situations that come up.
Q. A couple of respondents were concerned that you might show bias for or against various parties. What response would you offer to those concerns?
A. I'm again surprised about that as well. You know, the judge is not to exhibit any bias towards either -- any party that appears. We are supposed to be impartial, and to rule and to judge impartially.

I would have to question further, exactly what they mean by "bias." I think sometimes people may misconstrue rulings as having a bias towards one side or the other. I know that in criminal cases, I do -- since the State has the burden, I do expect there to be a higher quality and a better argument in pursuing the prosecution of an individual because of the standards of -- that they have to prove.

But I don't think that, that creates a bias towards one side or another. And oftentimes a bias is just a personal view of what they perceived that I ruled, and how I've ruled.
Q. You indicated in your PDQ, that in 2016 you were named in a lawsuit in your capacity as a circuit court
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judge. What's the nature of this lawsuit and disposition, if any?
A. I was informed by the attorney who was appointed to -- hired to represent the Insurance Reserve Fund about the lawsuit. I know that it involves several prisoners within the Department of Corrections. As far as -- I've never been served with the lawsuit, so I have no idea as what the allegations are in the lawsuit.

As I said, I was informed about the lawsuit from them. As far I know it's still pending, but I cannot tell you -- I've not talked to the attorney or had any communications with the attorney as to the status of the case.
Q. Thank you. Judge Lee, since submitting your letter of intent have your sought or received the pledge of any legislator, either prior to this day or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in the process on your behalf?
A. Not that I'm aware of. No, I have not.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for the seat, have you contacted any members of the

## Commission about your candidacy?

A. I'm sure I have -- I've spoken to several members of the Commission, just to inform them that $I$ was a candidate. But beyond that, I've not had any conversations about my particular candidacy.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment, directly or indirectly, until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's Report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. Yes, I'm aware of that.

MR. GENTRY: I would note that the Midlands Citizens Committee found Judge Lee to be well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament, and qualified in remaining evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability.

The Committee commented, "Judge Lee has the necessary experience, temperament, and intellect to be an outstanding Appeals Court judge. She has served with distinction on the circuit court bench for many years. She has vast experience in both criminal and civil law, and acts as an appeals judge in matters appealed from summary court. Judge Lee is an outstanding candidate for
the South Carolina Court of Appeals."
Mr. Chairman, I would just note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning today. I have no further questions.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Do any members have questions for Judge Lee? Senator Hembree. EXAMINATION BY SENATOR HEMBREE:
Q. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, Judge Lee.
A. Good afternoon. How are you?
Q. I'm doing fine, thank you. I'm having a good day so far. Just a couple of quick questions, 'cause you covered several things that $I$ was interested in. You touched on some of the issues facing the judicial branch, and I think the question that Mr . Gentry asked you was about your vision -- sort of vision for the Court of Appeals. But you've had such great experience on the -on the bench and got to seen -- you kind of been there, done that, seen it all.

What recommendations would you give to us as legislators, or just generally as lawyers, to improve and build on -- as you said, our judiciary is strong in South Carolina, and I would agree with that -- but to build on that judiciary.
A. My colleagues are all very dedicated members of the judiciary, and I think we all work very hard in order to carry our load and do the things that we need to do. As I've indicated, I think that we are a little bit overloaded.
Q. Would it be on the criminal side or the civil side?
A. I think it's both.
Q. Okay.
A. I think -- I think because of mandatory mediation, the civil side, there's less going on. But there's certainly more than enough to handle on the criminal side. And most of the time, at least lately, I have been in Richland County --
Q. God bless you. Now I understand how your answer -- why you're answering. But keep going. I'm with you.
A. -- where we run, you know, two -- two criminal courts, two civil courts every single week. And usually we have a judge that's assigned to do pleas and judge that's assigned to do trials. And I think that works very well.

There are times, I think, when sometimes there's not the organization that's there. I think that there are some changes -- in the solicitor's office, I've been very mindful of that, and there are changes. A lot of the -- a
lot of the counties I have been to, outside of Richland County, are very well organize and they really keep the flow going.

I would suggest that, perhaps, a more -- and I'm not sure that the Legislature can do anything about that, but perhaps a more strenuous rotation system. Because I know there are counties that may have less -- less court, they have less work, or they may be a little bit more backlogged to be able to really manage sending judges to where the backlogs are.

Again, $I$ understand that, that's a factor of whether there's a courtroom available, whether there's courtroom staff. So I'm not sure I have a specific recommendation that $I$ can pass onto you at this particular point.

I think that everyone is quite aware of the challenges facing the judicial department, and I think, as I stated, the -- that the additional specialized courts have kind of helped to alleviate some of that.
Q. Is there -- I've heard some references to this in the course of our interviews in the last two days, but -- and I've heard these references in other contexts about -- concerns about the court reporters. Is there -- is it -- is that issue kind of -- I mean, it seems like I heard there were some problems with getting -- you know, you

```
could get a judge there, you couldn't get the court
reporter there. And I know -- I want to say it might be
the family court that was suffering from this problem,
more than circuit court. But is there a -- is that issue
resolved or --
```

A. I think it's an ongoing issue. I think that there's a shortage of court reporters, and that may have to do with the standards that the judicial department has for the court reporters, and what qualifications they have to meet.

I frequently hear from court reporters that there are a lot of qualified court reporters, but because of the licensing requirements, or the fact that they need to be certified in some form or fashion, that, that reduces the number that are available to them.

I've often wondered why we have court reporters for non-jury. Because generally, those are not records that go up on appeal; that generally while there -- while there may be some use of motion hearings in order to be able to -- to do the appeals, that by and large, the majority of what we do are motions that will not be a part of a record when they go up.

And so, perhaps, maybe for summary judgement motions, it may be more important. Perhaps for damages hearings, in order to have a record when you're taking
testimony. But there are lot motions, I think, that we really don't need a court reporter in that. And I know that the judicial department is talking about the digital system, digital recording system. I think that, that could work very well, as long as you've got the ability to be able to have a good record.

The problem I have with such recordings is what I get from the lower courts, oftentimes those digital recordings are transcribed by somebody else; that if they're the -- if you can't hear what they're saying --
Q. It's a quality issue.
A. The quality -- there is a quality issue. But I think if you work on those quality issues, I think it could be very effective. And I'm not advocating replacing --
Q. I understand.
A. -- the court reporters. I don't want them to think I'm -- because I think they are needed, but I just think they're -- there's some situations where they're just not needed for motions.
Q. Is it -- you know, and I'm -- and I'm just -I'm asking not to -- just to kind of get your expertise, kind of thinking about other issues. But it sounds like you're saying -- and it's -- that the docket issues, particularly the criminal docket, are -- it depends on
which circuit you're in.
A. It does.
Q. Okay. That's -- that's helpful.
A. That's been -- that's been my -- my experience, is that it really depends on the circuit.
Q. Are there any -- do you have any weaknesses as a judge, that you wish to share with us? We know a lot of strengths, but...
A. I would say -- and I -- and I hesitate to say -when I was an administrative law judge, I did almost all my own research and writing, and everything that $I$ did required some type of an order. I had to do the findings of fact and the conclusions of law.

I think being on circuit court in some ways dumbed me down, because the idea was that -- I started off trying to do the same things that $I$ did on the ALJ, and that caused a backlog in my workload, for which I've been criticized for, and which I understood that there was a process of slowing down the wheels of justice by trying to write an order on everything.

And so I learned that there are certain things that you just do a form order on, and you just say, you know, motion denied or whatever, and go forward; and that there are only certain cases, or certain types of motions that require a formal order.

And so I think in that way, I got away from a lot of that intellectual discussion in a written form. I still read the information, $I$ still may require and request information for me to consider, and I still do the research for that part, but I don't -- I'm not required to formalize and to express the reasons why I reached that conclusion.

And I -- and I think that's one of the things that $I$ would look forward to, in going to the Court of Appeals, and being able to -- to recapture that. And I think, you know, over time you -- I noticed that there's sometimes when I develop a little bit less patience.

And I have to remember I'm -- I'm -- I guess I'm trying to move things along because of the case load and because of the issues and the -- and I have to remember that everyone has their day in court. Everyone should have their day in court.

The jury often needs to be educated, and so I -I may let a lot more repetitive things go long than testimony and issues. But I think it's for the jury's benefit. I'm sure I have other bad habits, that someone else would be more than happy to point out. And I may agree with them, but those are the ones I --

## Q. I appreciate those responses. That's helpful.

 Are there -- and I've asked this question of everycandidate -- just about every candidates. But -- because I hate to leave the opportunity out there and not take it: Are there any legislative changes, particularly as it relates to the court -- but it could be any -anything that -- you know, you just sit back and you're -you know, like, "Why aren't these guys taking care of this?"

Other than judicial pay raises. And that -- I can imagine that might be one that's kind of easy. But other than that, are there -- you know, just some -- just things we're just not seeing or don't know about or just letting slide by?
A. I would say that there are some issues relating to criminal statutes. For example, I'm in the middle of a criminal trial this week. And the way the statute is written, it's not very clear. It has provisions in it, that if you compare it to other statutes that may have that same language, it's written differently. So there's a question about what elements the State has to prove in order to get a conviction in -- on some of those cases.

And I -- I think it's just a matter of not realizing, that when they're -- let me back up. When I worked for the legislative council there was a formula in -- in -- and I as taught that there was a way in which to write the statutes to provide uniform language, so that
basically all criminal statutes read similarly.
And I think that there's -- that there is an
attempt to either fix issues, or to address concerns that are there; that the writing of some of those statutes may have lost some of that quality, so that there's not a uniform standard, so that it's more difficult to be able to interpret them. It's not -- not my job --
Q. I understand.
A. -- to do anything about those, but it does -- it does create issues. And frankly, the issue I have this week is -- is kind of a compelling issue, but then $I$ have to fall back on statutory construction and those rules related to how to construe a criminal statute. And so that's -- that's what I'm doing. I'm not so sure -- I think at some particular point, it may be an issue that somebody will raise down the line. But it may not be this particular case.

## Q. Thank you.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Anyone else? Mr.
Howard.
EXAMINATION BY MR. HOWARD:
Q. Good afternoon, Judge.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Nobody's asked this, so -- and so I'm kind of curious to get your take on it: You've been experienced as
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a member of the ALJ, and as a -- and as a -- sitting on the circuit court. What about your experiences on the circuit court, and as a member of the ALJ, could you bring to the Court of Appeals, which may assist you in that role? What do you think is -- would be helpful in your experiences?
A. Primarily, the opportunity -- with the ALJ, it was primarily the contested cases that I had. So I'm familiar with the body of laws on, certainly, those cases. I think that would -- the fact that I've been at that particular level, as well as on circuit court, where I, you know, have kind of been in the trenches, that I -that I've seen the cases that have come forward.

I've seen he kind of evidence that's presented, and, you know, had the -- had the opportunity to address the issues, would be give a little bit more of an understanding of what issues may come up in appeal, how to handle those issues, you know, and -- and then the research and writing portion of it. Does that answer?
Q. Thank you. That does answer. Thank you.
A. You know, and -- and additionally, I've tried to -- to -- at least on circuit court go out and learn -learn additional things as well. For example, a couple of years ago I asked about being able to -- to -- to participate in business court, to give me the opportunity
to be able to learn more about the business cases, on issues that come up before business court, because I know that a lot of those issues come up in -- on -- on the Appellate Courts.

The only area I would say that I probably don't know much about, and that's family court, because I haven't had a reason to actually practice in that area. I haven't had -- had a reason to -- to participate in any hearings of law in the family court area. So that would require my own desire to -- to be able to learn that area, and be able to apply it in a particular case that may come up before the Appellate Court.
Q. Thank you.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Any other questions for
Judge Lee?
(Hearing none.)
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR CAMPSEN:
Q. Ms. Lee, I have one question.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Since you are seeking an Appellate Court position, this would be relevant in your rulings and opinions: What is your opinion as to when making rulings of law crosses the line into lawmaking?
A. Basically, when you've -- read something that's not written in the statute. There's a difference between
-- as an appellate court, not the Supreme Court -- we're talking about the circuit court and the Appellate Court, I'm bound by the Constitution, I'm bound by -- I'm bound by the legislation as it's written. There are certain principles that govern interpreting and construing the statute; I would be bound by following those. My job would be to apply the facts to that particular circumstance.

If there's an issue of law, then I'm not required to give any deference to the lower court, but I still have to follow those issues of construction and being able to apply the statute or the Constitution, as it's written, to those particular facts.

And I don't think that $I$ can read into something or create or interpret a statute or the Constitution, with language that's not present and not there. Even -- even with ambiguities, you have to look at the history, the legislative intent, other cases that may have interpreted the statute.

So there's still -- there's still a framework and a format to be able and go and to make those applications. But when you -- when you go beyond that, I think that, that steps into the legislative issues, and it oversteps.

> SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any other
questions?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Okay. Judge Lee, thank you for being with us today. That concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of qualifications, and you may be called back at such time if the need arises.

I thank you for offering. And thank you for your service to South Carolina.

JUDGE LEE: And thank you-all for the work that you do. And I would like to thank the staff for all the courtesies that they have extended to me, and the assistance that they've given to me in this process as well. And I appreciate the opportunity to be here before you, and to answer any questions that you had.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you.
JUDGE LEE: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Okay. That concludes the morning screening. And $I$ would entertain a motion to go into executive session, now, as we finish this.

REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: So move.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: So moved by
Representative Rutherford. Do we have a second?

MR. HITCHCOCK: Second.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Hitchcock. Any
discussion?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: If there be no discussion, all in favor indicate by saying "aye."
(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: The ayes have it. So we are in executive session.
(Off the record from 1:06 p.m. to 3:14 p.m.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Okay. We can lift the veil and come out of executive session. We took no action. We took no votes. Ms. Brogdon, if you could just review the voting procedure.

MS. BROGDON: Just a quick reminder, again
for everybody, the chairman will -- I will call the names of qualified candidates in alphabetical order. Each commission member has three votes to cast to find an individual qualified and nominated. Any candidate that receives six or more votes will be considered qualified and nominated at the end of that vote, unless there is a tie. Any candidate that does not get any votes will be removed from consideration on any subsequent ballot that
occurs. Does anybody have any questions?
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman, I would
respectfully move that we call each candidate, and vote first on their qualifications as to whether they are qualified. And we can do that by the members here. And then after that, then make a determination as to whether they're nominated.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Do I have a motion? We have a second.

MR. SAFRAN: I have a question prior to the motion.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Safran.
MR. SAFRAN: In the event you do not make an affirmative vote one way or another on qualification, if you were to abstain, does that prohibit you from voting ultimately on whether somebody gets passed down?

SENATOR CAMPSEN: No. I don't believe -I don't believe there's any precedent that would dictate that or rules of order that would dictate that.

MR. SAFRAN: Thank you.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: We have a second. We have a second of Senator Malloy's motion. Any discussion? (Hearing none.)

SENATOR CAMPSEN: No further discussion. All those in favor indicate by saying "aye."
(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: The ayes have it. So we will -- we will be taking votes on qualification. I'm ready -- yeah, Ms. Brogdon, you --

MS. BROGDON: Blake Alexander Hewitt. If you want to find him qualified, please raise your hand. REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Mr. Chairman, can the record reflect that I have a proxy of Representative Bannister and Representative Rutherford, and both of them are voting for him to be qualified.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's nine votes for
qualified.
The Honorable David Garrison "Gary" Hill. Let me clarify that's nine votes for -- back to Mr. Hewitt, nine votes for qualified, and one vote for unqualified.

Now as to the Honorable David Garrison Hill, please raise your hand if you want to find him qualified.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the same -- let the record reflect the same proxies for Representative Bannister and Representative Rutherford. (Commission members cast their vote.)

MS. BROGDON: That's ten votes to find Judge Hill qualified.

Jon Rene Josey. Please raise you hand if you want to find him qualified.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: The same -- you
know, the same for the record, Representative Rutherford and Bannister.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's six --
MR. SAFRAN: And I want to be marked as abstaining -- abstaining on that vote.

MS. BROGDON: That's six votes finding Mr. Josey qualified, three votes finding Mr. Josey unqualified, and one abstention.

The Honorable Alison Renee Lee. Will you please raise your hand if you want to vote her qualified.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the same thing for the proxies of Rutherford, Bannister, they vote "aye."
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's ten votes to find Judge Lee qualified.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: If you could recap what we just did.

MS. BROGDON: So Blake Alexander Hewitt had
nine votes as qualified, and one vote as unqualified.
The Honorable David Garrison Hill had ten
votes for qualified.
Jon Rene Josey had six votes for qualified, three votes for unqualified, and one abstention.

The Honorable Alison Renee Lee had ten votes for qualified. Mr. Chairman, are you ready for the
$\qquad$
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Ready for the vote.
MS. BROGDON: -- qualified and nominated vote? I'll read the names in alphabetical order. And then, please, by a show of hands, show whether you want to find the person both qualified and nominated.

Blake Alexander Hewitt. Please raise your hand if you want to find him qualified and nominated.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's six votes for Mr.
Hewitt to be found qualified and nominated.
The Honorable David Garrison "Gary" Hill. Please raise you hand if you want to find him nominated.

REPRESENTATIVE MR. SMITH: Rutherford and Bannister vote "aye."
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's eight votes to find Judge Hill both qualified and nominated.

Jon Rene Josey. Please raise your hands if you want to find him nominated.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's no votes for Mr. Josey as to nomination.

The Honorable Alison Renee Lee. Please raise your hands if you want to find her nominated.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the same for Representative Rutherford and Bannister.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's ten votes for Judge
Lee to be found both qualified and nominated.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Yes, please recount those votes.

MS. BROGDON: Blake Alexander Hewitt is now nominated with six votes. The Honorable David Garrison Hill is now nominated with eight votes. The Honorable Alison Renee Lee is now nominated with ten votes.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. There was only an abstention on qualified vote.

MS. BROGDON: There were no abstentions.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: There was only an
abstention on qualified. Yes, we also need to vote on the -- on Judge Short.

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman, I would move
that we find both Judge Short and Judge Williams qualified and nominated.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Do we have a second for
that motion --
SENATOR MALLOY: By acclamation.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: We have a second to do
that by acclamation. Any discussion?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Being no discussion,
we'll move immediately to a vote. All those in favor indicate by saying "aye."
(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
SENATOR CAMPSEN: All those opposed?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: The ayes have it.
SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Senator Malloy.
SENATOR MALLOY: I would respectfully
request a five-minute recess. I would like for the -- at least one of the House of Representatives to end up being back for this review.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Okay. We have a motion
for a five-minute recess.
MR. HITCHCOCK: Second.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: A second. All in favor,
say "aye."
(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
SENATOR CAMPSEN: The ayes have it. We are
in recess.
(Off the record from 3:24 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Ms. Knie, welcome.
MS. KNIE: Thank you, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Please raise your right
hand.

## WHEREUPON:

GRACE GILCHRIST KNIE, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Have you had an
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

MS. KNIE: Yes, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
MS. KNIE: Yes, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be
changed?
MS. KNIE: No, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Do you object to our
making these documents, and any amendments, if applicable, a part of the record of your sworn testimony? MS. KNIE: No, sir.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: It will be done at this point in the -- if you could hand your questionnaire, it will be done at this point in the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF GRACE GILCHRIST KNIE)
(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE AMENDMENT OF GRACE GILCHRIST KNIE)
(EXHIBIT NO. 3 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF GRACE GILCHRIST KNIE)

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Ms. Knie, the Judicial
Merit Screen Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, a check for economic conflicts of interest. We have received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, and no witnesses are present to testify.

Do you have a brief opening statement you
would like to make at this time?
MS. KNIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Quite frankly, based upon the application materials, the volume of those materials and the detail involved in those materials, I believe that you-all probably know more about me, or as much, than my spouse who is present.

And so in lieu of an opening, per se, that would be merely duplicative, $I$ would like to thank all of you for your service on this commission. You-all wear a lot of hats. And I know that this is time consuming and very demanding on you.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you.
MS. KNIE: And also further, I would like to express appreciation to Mrs. Brogdon, Mrs. Dean, and the members of their staff on the Commission. Sincerely, they, to a person, have been kind and receptive to questions, and informative. And I thank them for their help in this process. Thank you, sir.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you.
MS. KNIE: I'm happy to answer your questions.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: All right. And now -MS. KNIE: Or any of your questions.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Staff will ask you some questions. MS. DEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I note for the record that, based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the record with the candidate's consent, Mrs. Knie meets the constitutional and/or statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. EXAMINATION BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Ms. Knie, why do you now want to serve on the circuit court?
A. Thank you, Mrs. Dean. It is time for me to do this. And in saying that, it is time in my life -- in my professional and my personal life. I am 52 years old. I've been practicing now for twenty-seven years. And I have been truly blessed in my professional practice, and in my personal life; and feel that now that this opportunity has presented itself, it's time for me to give back and to commit myself to public service.

I have many class members who have far exceeded me in their public service to our state. Some are members of Congress. Some are senators. Some have been the president of our state Bar association. And so I have a very supportive spouse who joined me in this decision.

I have no children that I'm responsible for, and so, quite frankly, it's time.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Knie. How do you feel your legal

## and professional experience thus far will assist you in being an effective circuit court judge?

A. In my professional life I have held a vast and wide array of types of legal actions. And I started my career as a clerk to a circuit judge, and that was twentyseven years ago. And in that job, I accompanied that judge daily in court. I was his conduit of information to lawyers and anyone attempting to converse with him. I traveled with him regularly. I sat on the bench next to him, and then began a private practice.

And I've been a sole practitioner for twentyfour years. And in addition to being a sole practitioner, I have also served as city prosecutor for the City of Spartanburg -- an appointed position. I held that position for fifteen years. And in that position $I$ was in charge of all of the jury trials for the City of Spartanburg -- and those are criminal trials -- as well as appeals from city court to circuit court. And in my private practice I was allowed to defend criminal cases that did not conflict with my city position.

I have practiced extensively in family court and circuit court. In criminal court I have handled postconviction relief actions. I have handled appeals. I have done virtually everything that you can do in circuit court except be a judge or a court reporter.
Q. Thank you, Mrs. Knie. What do you perceive as the most important issues facing state courts today?
A. I think that a very, very important issue, whether perceived or real, is the concept that there is a backlog of cases, and that it is very difficult to have your day in court. And I -- did you want me to state a remedy for that, or what I would do to help solve the problem?
Q. However you feel comfortable answering.
A. And so I think that -- that, and a perception that possibly lawyers are very self-centered and that our judicial system does not serve the public. And in Spartanburg, particularly, we made -- when I was the president of our Bar association, I really intended to make students, young people, and members of the public, aware of our Bar association, and invited them to our Bar meetings.

I was our chairperson of our Cinderella Project, which is a prom dress project, and almost singlehandedly did that for seven years. And we not only serviced Spartanburg County, but Cherokee County, Union, Laurens, the smaller counties adjacent -- because they didn't have that program there -- and tried to get a lot of very good publicity about our Bar association, trying to help the community.

And so I think an issue would be the perception of lawyers, and also that there is a perception of a backlog of cases, and that it is very difficult to get a fair shake in the courtroom.
Q. Thank you, Mrs. Knie. Along the lines of the backlog that you were just talking about, if you were the person responsible for deciding what cases would be tried in what order, how would you split the courts time between the criminal calendar and the civil calendar?
A. Well, those are two very different things. And in talking even about backlog of cases, there are two -the reasons for the backlog, I think, are issues truly separate and distinct.

I would -- you have to look at each case individually, and decide. But in criminal cases, I think one issue would be, with regard to whether or not a defendant is incarcerated and waiting for trial, and -and the length of the backlog, the -- any negative impact on the victims.

And as well as in civil cases, I think that along the same lines you must look at parties that are not receiving their justice, and the reasons for the delays, and who -- who would benefit from moving those cases ahead.

If there were children involved, persons,
victims involved, that would always be a very pressing and important issue.
Q. Thank you, Mrs. Knie. If you became aware of unethical conduct on the part of trial advocate in a case in which you were presiding, how would you handle it? And do you believe judges should be required to report attorney misconduct?
A. Absolutely. And I think that it's very clear in the judicial canons, that judges are required to report any misconduct that they observe, either to -- either by fellow judges or by counsel, and that they're to due so to the proper agency or authority.
Q. Thank you, Mrs. Knie. Moving now to the ballot box questions. The Commission received 219 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 32 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"Based on her extensive knowledge, Grace would be an outstanding circuit court judge." Another comment was, "Excellent attorney." Another comment was, "Smart, kind, and very professional attorney."

Five of the written comments expressed concerns.
The comments indicated concern regarding your level of experience. What response would you have for this concern?
A. That if those comments were made -- and I'm assuming it was anonymous -- that possibly the -- the author of the comments did not know me well, and had never practiced against me. And by way of explanation, I have never advertised for business. And I'm very proud of that. I didn't even have a website until two or three years ago, because it has become almost, you know, impossible to operate now without one.

But I have built a practice on client relations and representing folks for twenty-seven years, that no one else really wanted to represent. I took those people in, and then $I$ started representing their family members, their friends. It's all word of mouth.

And there may be some perception that I am not as experienced in certain areas of courtroom experience. But I would, number one, deny that and take objection with that. I have twenty-seven years of experience. I have practiced in the criminal court, through the City of Spartanburg, and have been -- I have tried hundreds of cases in magistrate and municipal court, in front of a jury, sometime trying three and four a day during a term. And then also during the same week, trying twelve to fifteen family court hearings, and possibly having to appear in criminal court at the county, at the same time -- you know, during the same five-day period.

I don't know how anyone could be more experienced than $I$ am. And quite frankly, there were weeks that I spent more time at the courthouse, and the joke was the bailiffs told me I should be paying rent to the county rather than to my landlord, because I have litigated so much, and been in court so much of the time.
Q. Thank you, Mrs. Knie. There was one other ballot box comment expressing concern that you were fundraising for members of the General Assembly while you were seeking a judicial seat. What response would you have to that?
A. Thank you. I deny that. That -- that is not true, and again would point out that -- as I understand it from our prior conversation, that -- that is anonymous. I was not a judicial candidate at the time that $I$ hosted a -- not a fundraiser, but a meet-and-greet for a representative in my judicial circuit.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Knie --
A. Oh, and if I may say it was not a fundraiser. It was a meet-and-greet. There was no prerequisite for attendance. It was with my neighbors.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Knie, you have indicated in your PDQ, a lawsuit was filed against you in 2001, in Federal District Court, by a Ms. Ringler, I believe. Can you please explain the nature and disposition of that case?
A. Certainly. I was never served with these pleadings. And quite frankly, in preparation for completing this application, searched, myself, to see if my name would pop up as to any litigation being named as a party in litigation. And this -- this case showed up. And I did not want to not show it on the application. But apparently the case was dismissed by the judge before it was actually served on the parties.
Q. Great. Thank you, Mrs. Knie. You also indicated in your PDQ, a lawsuit filed against you in 1999, by -- and I'm going to butcher this name. I apologize. Mr. Cicele. Maybe C-i --
A. Shah-SHELL-ee [ph].
Q. Can you -- thank you. Can you please explain the nature and disposition of this lawsuit?
A. Yes. The plaintiff in that action sued not only me but his exwife, his daughter, counsel for his former wife. I think he might have also brought suit against counsel for his daughter, and appellate counsel, all stemming from a domestic relations case and divorce.

His civil action was dismissed prior to the 12(b) (6) motions filed on our defendant -- on our lawyer's behalf. He failed -- he contacted the judge, or the clerk's office, and stated he did not wish to go forward, and did not wish to appear at the motion hearing. And
case was dismissed with prejudice.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Knie. Please just bear with me here. You also indicated on your PDQ, a lawsuit by SC State Housing Finance, where you were named as an inferior lienholder, where the other party's name was Garner. Similarly, you listed two other cases titled First Citizens v. Garner, and both of these were also inferior lienholder cases. Can you please explain the nature of these cases and the dispositions?
A. Yes, ma'am. Thank you. During this period of time, I received phone calls from a lot of attorneys that handled mortgage foreclosure cases. And as an attorney practicing in family court in the -- any decree issued in family court in which attorney's fees were owed to me, these were showing up on a search conducted by counsel for the mortgage holder. And they named me as a defendant in the lawsuits, but they -- it was only because $I$ was an inferior lienholder to the mortgage.
Q. Thank you. And you also listed Regions Bank v. Christopher Green, and you indicated the same inferior lien --
A. Yes.
Q. -- situation, probably?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Thank you. Lastly, you listed Knie v. Knie, PA.

## You indicated that this was a workers' comp claim that you made?

Q. Okay.
A. Yes, ma'am. Thank you, ma'am. I listed this out of an abundance of caution, because in the questionnaire we were -- it was required that we list cases in which we were named defendants. And since I am my PA, I listed that. I was injured by a client, at a Social Security hearing, who was attempting to flee from his probation officers, who had shown to arrest him for a probation violation. And I ultimately brought a Workers' Compensation claim due to injuries of a torn meniscus and TMJ. That matter has been resolved by agreement against my carrier.

## Q. Thank you.

MS. DEAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to request that we now go into executive session.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Mr. Hitchcock moves to go into executive session. We have a second from Mr. Rutherford. Any discussion?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: No discussion. We'll
move immediately to a vote. All in favor indicate by saying "aye."
(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Oppose?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: That ayes have it. We
are now in executive session.
(Off the record from 4:19 p.m. to 4:24 p.m.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: We're back on the record.
No action. No votes.
MS. DEAN: Thank you.
REEXAMINATION BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Ms. Knie, I just have some housekeeping issues at this time. Since submitted your letter of intent, have you sought or received the pledge of any legislator, either prior to this date or 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, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of this Commission about your candidacy?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Do you understand that you're prohibited from
seeking a pledge or commitment, directly or indirectly, until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. DEAN: I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee reported that Ms. Knie is qualified in the three criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. The Committee found Mrs. Knie to be well qualified in the categories of ethical fitness, professional, academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. I would just note for the record that any concerns raised during this investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into today's questioning.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any members have any questions?

SENATOR MALLOY: Mr. Chairman.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Senator Malloy.
SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
First, I want to say that -- that Ms.
Gilchrist and I were in law school together, and I've done cases in the past with her husband. And he has supported my campaign. I just wanted to put that on the record.

And then I'll just ask her just a couple of questions. She talked about her experience.

EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. So you -- you tried hundreds of cases.
A. Yes, sir. Yes. Yes.
Q. So you were -- you were a prosecutor for fifteen years?
A. Yes. It was a part-time position in addition to my private practice. Routinely, we would have terms of court if not -- well, if not every other week, monthly, and I was the sole prosecutor for the jury trials for the City of Spartanburg.
Q. And you would also have had a civil practice?
A. Yes.
Q. How long have you been in practice by yourself?
A. By myself for almost twenty-five years.

Yesterday, was my 27th anniversary for being sworn into the Bar.
Q. And you had a family court practice as well.
A. Yes.
Q. And what else did you -- did you do workers' comp?
A. Yes. I still do plaintiffs -- claimants personal -- personal injury, workers' comp, sexual harassment, and some medical malpractice work. And I also
have handled some -- let's see, I handled the appeals from municipal court to the circuit court as well -- I was in charge of all that in addition to handling their jury trials, and then $I$ did some criminal defense work that didn't conflict with the city court work.
Q. And I've asked some of the other candidates about citizens having access to the court system. In your practice did you do pro bono work as well?
A. Oh, yes. I have done a tremendous amount of pro bono work. And sometimes it's a point of conflict at my household as to the amount of pro bono work that -- that I handle. And I get paid a lot in apples, tomatoes, butterbeans, pies and cakes at my office. And -- and that is one thing that $I$ will miss is the relationship with my clients.
Q. I don't have any other questions.
A. Thank you.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Anyone else?
Representative Smith.
REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE SMITH:
Q. Ms. Knie, I apologize. I was at freshman orientation, seeing some of your new legislators over there from Spartanburg County. But let me -- let me talk
to you -- you may have answered some of this. But, you know, at circuit court -- we've been screening Appellate Court judges, and now we're screening circuit court judges. And to me, the temperament, the demeanor of a circuit court judge, is probably one of the most -- one of the biggest attributes that need to be there.

And you're dealing with the public, you're on the front line as a judge, dealing with the public. You deal with the litigants. You're dealing with the lawyers, and how people treat and -- and -- and treat the public and the lawyers, is a reflection of the judicial system, in my opinion, in and of itself.

So, you know, I would like for you to tell me kind of what your -- what you believe -- the temperament you would -- you would have, if you were elected to the circuit court. And also what you would -- what -- you know, what you observe, and who you would model yourself after as a circuit court judge.
A. Thank you. I have -- I have had a lot of time -- spent a lot of time in courtrooms, and spent a lot of time with clients and victims and defendants, pro se litigants, children, throughout -- throughout my twentyseven years. And -- and I can tell you that I think that the appropriate demeanor -- because I've seen a lot of inappropriate demeanor in the courtrooms. You know, over
twenty-seven years you witness a lot. I think that a judge should be respectful to everyone that is in the courtroom, unless given a reason to be more stern. I'm not saying anger. But, you know, should begin being very respectful, very courteous, very patient, and should be firm and decisive.

On the patience part of this -- not -- not that patience means that there's a sign of weakness. But in my twenty-seven years of practice, I learned very quickly that a lot of times you can get a long way with people, if you just listen to them and let them tell their story. They want their day in court. Whether it is someone who has been hurt on their job, that feels like the employer who has fired them now, and let them go, isn't being fair to them; they want to tell a commissioner that. Or in a personal injury action, that want to say how they have lost days from work over their back injury.

In family court they want to talk about how they've been wronged, you know, by the loss of a spouse or the income or the -- what their life would be without their children.

And so whether it would be they get to tell their story at a guilty plea or in a trial testimony or in a deposition or in mediation, $I$ think that it is extremely important to be receptive and listen to people that are in
your courtroom, and let them feels as though they've had their day in court.

As far as a mentor, or someone that -- that $I$ see to be like, I have certainly been around judges with great temperament. The judge that I am seeking to replace has a wonderful judicial temperament. And the judge that I clerked for, Jim Steven, had a wonderful judicial temperament.

And again, $I$ think that it is also very important, having appeared in front of numerous judges, that a judge strive not to embarrass counsel in a courtroom, not to do so in front of the clients. And again to be polite and respectful if -- if there's a need for sidebar or conference in chambers to -- to handle it that way. Thank you.

## Q. Thank you.

SENATOR MALLOY: Anyone else have
questions? Mr. Rutherford.
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD:
Q. Ms. Knie, can you tell me -- and this is -again, people may disagree on this. But my experience is that a lot of judges, once they get elected, believe that they are merely an extension of the solicitor's office, and believe that lawyers appearing in front of them, appear at the pleasure -- in general sessions court, at
the pleasure of the solicitor, and whenever the solicitor says "jump," they should jump. And when lawyers request, for example, orders of protection, judges are saying that you have to get permission from the solicitor before you get it.

And so it is becoming more and more evident in a lot of the counties where I practice, that judges believe that they are accountable to the solicitors, and not at all accountable to the defense bar, and seemingly not at all accountable to the statements that they come in here and make as to how they're going to be when they get on the bench.

Can you address how you believe circuit court could -- should go, and your role as a judge in finding the proper balance between being in general sessions court and dealing with the solicitors and dealing with lawyers that are also appearing in front of you?
A. Yes. I think I understand your question. I believe that -- and this is more complex, I think -- or the way that I'm taking it may be more complex, because there have been some recent case law -- you know, cases coming down on the issues of whether a solicitor should -should control a docket, whether the court should control the docket.

And I think that there is a proper role for a
solicitor in each judicial circuit, and a proper role for a public defender and for the judge. And I don't think that the solicitor should control, necessarily, the cases that come before the court, entirely. But I do think that the solicitor and -- and the public defender do have a lot of insight as to the age of cases, which cases are ready for trial, and can assist in being more efficient in moving all of that along.

I'm aware of the Langford Case on the docketing issues, and am aware that there has been a push to take the cases out of control of the solicitors and put them in control of the circuit judges. And I think that there is -- there should be a -- I guess, a mix there, a hybrid if you will.

Because, you know, in different judicial circuits -- like, if you look at the 13th Circuit, Greenville/Pickens, versus the 14th Circuit which would be, you know, Hampton, Allendale, Beaufort, those are very diverse areas. And those dockets and the way that those courts are handled, I think, are very, very diverse, and should be handled differently.

I believe that there should be communication and accountability between the solicitor's office, the judge, and the public defender and the judge, to keep things moving, so that you don't believe that somebody is pulling
the cart, somebody's sitting on it and somebody then is trying to slow it down, if you will. I think that everybody needs to work together on those issues, and work very hard and communicate, but not let one party control completely. Did I answer you?

## Q. You did.

A. Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR MALLOY: Any other questions from
members of the committee?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR MALLOY: We're hearing none.
Ms. Knie, thank you so much. That
concludes this portion of our screening process. As you know, the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of qualification. And you may be called back at such time, if the need arises.

Thank you for offering. And thank you for your service here to South Carolina.

MS. KNIE: Thank you. Thank you-all.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Please raise your right hand.

## WHEREUPON:

THE HONORABLE JAMES DONALD WILLINGHAM, II, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the
whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Have you had an
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

JUDGE WILLINGHAM: Yes, sir, I have.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
JUDGE WILLINGHAM: Yes, sir, they are.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be
changed?
JUDGE WILLINGHAM: No.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Do you object to our making these documents, and any amendments, if applicable, a part of the record of your sworn testimony?

JUDGE WILLINGHAM: No, sir, I do not.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: It will be done at this point during the transcript.
(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE
HONORABLE JAMES DONALD WILLINGHAM, II)
(EXHIBIT NO. 2 - JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION
COMMISSION SWORN STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE
JAMES DONALD WILLINGHAM, II)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: The Judicial Merit
Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your
qualifications for the bench. Our inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria, and has included a ballot box survey, a thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, a search of newspaper articles in which your name appears, a study of previous screenings, a check for economic conflicts of interest. We have received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election, and no witnesses are present to testify.

Do you have a brief opening statement you would like to make at this time?

JUDGE WILLINGHAM: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that $I$ appreciate the opportunity to be here today. And I appreciate your service on this Commission. I know it can be a thankless job, so I want to go ahead and thank you in advance, at the beginning of it. I want to commend the staff; they have been nothing but absolutely wonderful since the beginning of this process. And I look forward to answering any questions that you may have.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Staff will ask you some questions at this point.

MS. BROGDON: Hi, Judge, Willingham. How are you?

JUDGE WILLINGHAM: I'm well. Thank you.

MS. BROGDON: I note for the record that based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the record with his consent, Judge Willingham meets the constitutional and/or statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.

EXAMINATION BY MS. BROGDON:
Q. Judge Willingham, why do you now want to serve as a circuit court judge?
A. A lot of people have asked me that. It all comes back to, I think, the one central reason is that $I$ want to try and help people. I think everybody has a purpose. And I think my purpose is to try and help people. And I've tried to do that through the justice system.

If you look at my packet, my entire legal career has been devoted to public service, from my time in the solicitor's office to my time in the magistrate's court. I would like to continue to help people. I would just like to do it at the circuit court level.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge Willingham, how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be an effective circuit court judge?
A. Well, I had the opportunity to serve as a deputy solicitor in Spartanburg and in Cherokee County for
thirteen years. And that position $I$ was able to try cases ranging from shoplifting cases up to capital murder cases.

For the past nine years, I've had the opportunity to serve in the civil division of the magistrate's court, and I'm hoping that the combination of the two, the criminal side and the civil side, that, that experience would make me an effective circuit court judge.
Q. Thank you. Judge Willingham, what do you perceive as the most important issues facing state courts today?
A. I think that perception is important. I think you have to instill trust in the community. I think the judiciary is critical side of that. I think people have to have confidence in their court system, they have to know that when they walk through the door they're going to have an opportunity to be heard, and that their case will be heard fairly, and that their case will be judged impartially, and a fair ruling based upon the law will be delivered to them. I think that is important to uphold the integrity of the government, and especially the judicial branch.
Q. Thank you, Judge. Judge Willingham, if you were the person responsible for deciding what cases would be tried in what order, how would you split the court's time between the criminal calendar and the civil calendar?
A. I think criminal cases would obviously have to take priority, especially if they're incarcerated. I think those are the cases that you start infringing on people's right, if you delay their opportunity to have justice. So those would obviously take priority. The incarcerated case would take the higher priority.

And then I think that you have to -- what we tried to do when $I$ was in solicitor's office, you try to get cases as -- resolved as efficiently as possible. In the criminal side we would try to resolve cases within a years time. Because once you get past a year, peoples' memory started fading, and people lose interest. People start moving. People start dying.

On the civil side, I think that you have to prioritize those as well. You can't just lay those cases forever. But again, people are entitled to justice on the civil side. But I do still believe that criminal cases would have the main focus.
Q. Thank you. Judge Willingham, if you became aware of unethical conduct on part of the trial advocate in a case in which you were presiding, how would you handle it? And do you believe judges should be required to report attorney misconduct?
A. It's a tough situation to be put in. But I think the rules require it. And if the rules require it,
and it comes to your attention, I think you're required to address it then. And if it is a violation of ethics, I think that you have -- you have to report it, as difficult as that may be to do.
Q. Thank you. Judge Willingham, the Commission received a 136 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 18 additional comments, two of which indicated concerns. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments:
"I have appeared as an attorney in front of Judge Willingham on several occasions. He was always very respectful of the litigants, especially the pro se litigants and the attorneys. He was prepared and very knowledgeable about the law. He also seemed very compassionate."

Another comment stated, "Judge Willingham has the experience as a prosecutor and magistrate that is needed on the Circuit Court bench. He is quick and thoughtful in his decision-making during cases. He has proven that he has the ability to effectively manage a docket. He has compassion for all litigants and their lawyers. He would be an excellent circuit court judge."

Two of the written comments expressed concern. One comment related to your attitude on the magistrate court bench. What response would you offer to this

## concern?

A. That is it a serious concern to me. I try to treat people like I want to be treated. I strived very hard to treat people with respect. Because I think if you treat people with respect, they give you the respect back. Any time that you -- especially in civil court, you have two parties there, they're going to be -- one side or the other's not going to be happy when they leave at the end of the day. A lot of times both sides aren't happy.

But I try my best to explain to them, the reason I made my decision, based as far the legal issues that have come up, or the credibility issues that I have with the case. So they may not leave happy, but I hope they leave understanding what's going on.

If someone left my courtroom thinking I had an attitude, then $I$ have failed in that regard. I try my best to treat everyone with respect. And the fact that there's even one -- out of all the cases that I've had, there's even one person that feels that way, then that is of serious concern for me.
Q. Thank you. Judge Willingham, the second comment expressed concern with a lack of civil practice experience. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Nine years ago I would have agreed with them.

Nine years ago -- a little over nine years ago, nine and a half years ago, I was a -- the deputy solicitor in Spartanburg and in Cherokee County. I had thirteen years of criminal experience and very limited civil experience from the solicitor's office.

I knew I wanted to be a circuit court judge. I knew that if $I$ wanted to be a circuit court judge, and I came here with only criminal experience, I wouldn't consider myself qualified.

So what I did when the opportunity came to be a magistrate, I took that opportunity. People thought I was crazy. I had one of the best jobs in the state. I could pick and choose any case in the office to try, and not have to worry about the politics that the elected solicitor had to -- had to deal with.

But I knew that I wanted to be a circuit court judge. And so when a -- the opportunity came to be a magistrate, they assigned me to the civil division, where I had presided over civil cases again for the past nine and a half years.

On jury trial weeks, I qualify the jury, I managed the docket, calls that we have three times a day. I handled all the dispositions. If their case is to be tried, I either assigned it to myself or another civil judge or a criminal side, assign them to other judges
there.
On non-jury trial weeks we have -- I'm not doing bench trials, I'm doing civil cases everyday. I realize that magistrate's court is different than circuit court. I realize that there are significant differences between the two. But the rules are the same. The rules of procedure, the rules of evidence, those are all on the same -- the same causes of action, just on a grander scale in the circuit court.
Q. Thank you. Judge Willingham, you indicated in your PDQ, that a lawsuit was filed against you in October of 1999, in the Cherokee County Court of Common Pleas, by an inmate named Robert Holland Koon. Would you please explain the nature and the disposition of the lawsuit.
A. Robbie Koon was a career burglar in Cherokee County. He had been prosecuted for a number of burglaries prior to my arriving as a -- as a resident solicitor in Cherokee County. He actually broke into -- he was on parole from one of the earlier burglaries. He actually broke into the Cherokee County Probation, Pardon and Parole Service office, and stole his probation file.

We noticed him, that he was -- if was convicted, based upon his prior record under 17-25-45, the "Three Strikes and You're Out" law, that if he were convicted we'd be seeking life without parole.

He was convicted, and the judge did sentence him to life without parole. After which, he sued me. He sued his lawyer. He sued the judge. He sued the Attorney General. He sued the director of the Department of Corrections. He sued Justice Beatty -- which to this day, I don't know why, 'cause he had nothing to do with that case.

That lawsuit was never served on me. But I kept up with it, because he was wanting ten million dollars and all my future earnings -- which would never amount to ten million dollars. But that case was ultimately removed to federal court where it was dismissed for lack of merit.
Q. Thank you. Judge Willingham, you also indicated in your PDQ, that there was lawsuit filed against you in 2012, in the U.S. District Court for the District of South Carolina, by a prisoner named Ed Garnado Valardo [ph].
A. Yes.
Q. Please explain the nature and disposition of that lawsuit.
A. That was a -- that was a drug prosecution in Spartanburg County. He was charged with trafficking of crack cocaine on warrants. We directly indicted him, not only for the trafficking of crack cocaine, but a count two which was a possession of a firearm during the commission of violent crime. He ended up pleading on those
indictments.
Because it was a direct indictment we dismissed the original charging warrants. He gets to prison. He looks at his file, and he sees that those warrants that he was originally -- originally arrested on were dismissed, and therefore, he thought he should not have been prosecuted, should never have plead guilty to those direct indictments.

So again, he sued me. He sued the investigator. He sued Judge Cohl. And that case was also dismissed for lack of merit.
Q. Thank you. And a few housekeeping issues. Judge Willingham, since submitting your letter of intent have your sought or received the pledge of any legislator, either prior to this day or pending the outcome of your hearing?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Have you asked any third parties to contact members of the General Assembly on your behalf, or are you aware of anyone attempting to intervene in this process on your behalf?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent to run for this seat, have you contacted any members of the commission about your candidacy?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Do you understand that you are prohibited from seeking a pledge or commitment, directly or indirectly, until 48 hours after the formal release of the Commission's Report, and are you aware of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. BROGDON: I would note that the Upstate Citizens Committee reported that Judge Willingham was well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament, and qualified in the remaining evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health and mental stability. I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Willingham? Senator Malloy.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you.
EXAMINATION BY SENATOR MALLOY:
Q. Judge, good to see you. I appreciate you staying late.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. This is somewhat unusual. And I know we're supposed to leave early, so we appreciate you being here. I wanted to talk to you a bit about your comment as it relates to a priority in court --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- with criminal and civil.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you believe that there is priority in hearing criminal cases before civil cases?
A. I do. And the reason I say that is because the longer a case is delayed, the longer justice is had, whether that be for the defendant, whether that be for the victim. So I think those have to be prioritized. I think when you have someone that is incarcerated, they're sitting there, pretrial incarceration, presumed to be innocent, and they're having the languish in jail until we make that case a priority and bring it up for resolution. Whether that be through negotiations with solicitor's office and defense bar, or whether that be a resolution through the trial.

The civil cases, they have to be resolved as well. But if you're asking me, which you did, between the two --
Q. I was going back to your statement. And your statement was that you would rank one higher than the
other.
A. I would think that $I$ would rank the incarcerated individuals at the top of the priority podium.
Q. As a judge?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would do that even if there is a civil case that may have a scheduling order, may had a day for trial, may have someone's financial well being that was still in dispute, and so we have a -- we have a civil trial and a criminal trial -- I'm just trying to make certain that when I see a person who wants to sit on the bench in South Carolina, and they're ranking case higher priority than another, that just -- maybe I'm wrong. But that concerns me.
A. Well, I think it's a legitimate concern. If there is a case that already has gone through and has a scheduling order, than that has the priority track. You wouldn't necessarily -- it would not be bumped for additional criminal cases. But the way I understand it is, you're either assigned to general sessions court or you're assigned to common pleas court. You can have the current jurisdiction do both, but you have a priority of what you're going to do that week. And if your priority is the criminal cases, then you are trying criminal court.
Q. And I understand that. I was just going over
your comment earlier in your statement, to say that one is higher than the other, and that sometimes it may not be a scheduling order, it may be just a -- it could be a small case in dollar value, but a big case to that individual. Maybe that person has been out of work for a period of time from an accident or something, and they need to have their case resolved, one way or another, so they can get their -- so they can get their day in court.

And I'm just trying to see -- I just want to be -- concerns that when a person that's been working in the criminal arena for a period of time in solicitor's offices, is that there's an inclination to have priority over a -- over one case over another. And I just want to make sure that's -- that, that's something you -- that you consider.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So let's go back for the last five years. I mean, you said there was -- I mean, I think you said nine years ago you would have said that you didn't have the requisite civil experience.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you made comments about what you've done to get yourself ready over the last nine years.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you tried cases, from start to finish, from
a -- in a jury trial for civil cases in the last nine years?
A. Every other week. Yes, sir.
Q. Every other week?
A. We have jury trials every other week.
Q. I'm talking about as -- as a lawyer.
A. As a judge.
Q. As a lawyer.
A. As a lawyer, I tried one in the solicitor's office. We had one case, it was a nuisance case, that as a representative of the State, I represented the sheriff, I represented the solicitor -- tried it too. But that was -- that was in the solicitor's office. That was prior to my time on magistrate's court bench.
Q. But as a -- as a lawyer -- as a lawyer, on one side or the other, maybe you haven't had the opportunity. Is it fair to say that you've never tried a civil case from start to finish from -- to a jury verdict?
A. No, sir, that's not fair. I did try that case in the solicitor's office.
Q. In the solicitor's office.
A. Yes, sir. It was -- it was a common pleas case on a nuisance action. We were shutting down the Tradewinds Bar in Cherokee County, as a public nuisance.
Q. And that's a -- and that was a jury of twelve?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And what was the verdict?
A. We shut it down.
Q. Shut it down.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So it was just a decisive action.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And I guess you've been in the solicitor's office and you've been in the -- in the magistrate's court.
A. Yes, sir. I left -- when I graduated law school, I worked for a year for a circuit court judge, Judge Clary, who's now in the Legislature. I left there and went straight to the solicitor's office, where I worked for thirteen years. I got a phone call on a Tuesday night, wanting to know if $I$ wanted to be a magistrate's judge. I never had considered it, but knew, as I said before, I needed to have civil experience that I did not have.

The understanding and the agreement was they would put me down in the civil division, one, to gain that civil experience; and, two, so I wouldn't look like the saint's advocate coming straight from the solicitor's office into the criminal side on the magistrate's court.

I have handled those civil cases daily for the
last nine and a half years.
Q. In the magistrate's court.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How many jury strikes in magistrate's court now, as a civil case?
A. Six and six.
Q. Six. Is that the same in circuit?
A. No, sir.
Q. The circuit is what: Four?
A. The circuit you have -- you pull a list of twenty and you strike down to twelve.
Q. And so the -- have you thought about what criteria you would use in the circuit court for -- to seal any records or to close out any hearings?
A. I think our courts should be open. I cannot imagine a situation that you would close a courtroom. I know those situations have been asked for, especially when you have minors that are -- that are testifying.

But again I think the preference is always to have open courtrooms. And in those situation with minors, there are other avenues there to protect their identity and keep them safe in the courtroom. I would not be in favor of shutting courtroom, or sealing records for that matter.
Q. So tell me your -- tell me your most proud legal
moment whether as a -- as a judge or as a solicitor, lawyer. What do you reflect back over your many years of practice, and say this is a moment that you want to share with us? And then maybe then you can go into a -- your most proud personal moment.
A. Proud, I guess, legal moment, you know, I've handled a number of different cases, both in magistrate's court and my time in the solicitor's office. If I had to pick one, which you're asking me to do, I would pick the State versus Wanda Mullinax. Wanda Mullinax killed her husband, Christmas night. She was then charged -- she then turned and shot herself, and claimed that her husband had shot her, had gone into the bedroom and committed suicide.

That fact situation did not work. The reason that's probably one of most memorable moments is not necessarily because of the facts of the case, or the conviction that was ultimately received, it's because I was going up at the time against John Delgado and Bill Nettles. And John Delgado had taught me trial advocacy in law school. And so it was the student going up against the teacher.

And I was -- the first time we tried it, it was to a -- to a hung jury. The second time we tried it, I was able to get a guilty verdict. So that is a -- is a
memorable moment for me. As far as a personal -- the best memorable time are the birth of my three daughters.
Q. How old are you daughters?
A. My oldest daughter is 18; she's a freshman at Wofford. My middle daughter is in the tenth grade. And my baby is 8 years old, and she's in the second grade.
Q. That's all.
A. Thank you.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Representative
Rutherford.
EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD:
Q. Judge, since you've come out of law school, have you ever had a client?
A. Other than the State of South Carolina, no, sir.
Q. And, you know, it's hard to ask the other question, 'cause it does concern me, that when somebody is trying to achieve the position of a circuit court judge, without ever having represented anyone in front of any tribunal. What about in law school, did you do one of those trial prep courses we --
A. I took every trial ad client that was available. Because I knew I wanted to be a litigator at the time. I wanted to be on my feet.
Q. All right. No further questions.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Any other questions? Mr.

Safran.

EXAMINATION BY MR. SAFRAN:
Q. Good evening, now.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Let me first say I've looked at the responses that we've gotten from the ballet box, and obviously you've got a lot of people who feel very comfortable in terms of how you handle things. You present well. You've got good academic background. You worked for, you know, a very good judge out of law school.

Is it safe to say that, basically as solicitor,
you pretty well controlled your docket and controlled your calendar, okay?
A. And I agree that it was, yes, sir.
Q. I understand. But more or less, you were the one that kind of choice when to do cases and how to proceed.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. As a magistrate you effectively kind of do the same thing.
A. I still do the same thing. Yes, sir.
Q. All right. And I guess, as you've heard questions from others, you've never really been out in a private practice, whether it be one that would have done criminal or civil or a combination of it.
A. That's correct.
Q. And I guess what I'd like to hear is, how do you respond to a large segment of the Bar who might say, "How can he empathize with what's going on with us, how we have to balance schedules, how we have clients that we have to more or less deal with, satisfy," when basically you've effectively worked for the state in every aspect since you left law school?

I mean, can you truly empathize with those, in terms of deadlines, in terms of demands, without ever having been in that out -- that element?
A. Yes, sir, I think -- I think I do. I think I've done that, like I said, every day for the past nine years. We're in control of the civil docket. That is something that I am very proud of.

When we -- when I started we had a huge backlog of cases. I had a tried a case, yesterday, that was filed August 2nd. So we have made significant headway in those -- in those backlog of cases.

I understand the headaches of scheduling. I understand the other priorities that lawyers have. Magistrate's court is the lowest rung of court in our court system. Anytime that other lawyers have cases in circuit court, in federal court, wherever, family court, that takes priority over us. So I am aware of what it
takes to get a case ready.
I am aware that there -- a lawyer has a ton of obligations, not just to be in court. I am aware that lawyers are probably losing money trying cases in a courtroom versus resolving the cases and working in the office. I am aware of all those factors. I am -- and I do my best to work with every lawyer that has come through. And I think the comments are a testament that I do try with them.
Q. Let me switch gears a little bit. As a solicitor -- and I'm not in any way trying to limit just how much a solicitor has to work, and how much they have to be aware of controlling authorities. But basically, it's trying cases, understanding the rules of evidence, and more or less getting results.

It's not a tremendous amount of having to go do the legal research, because a lot of what you get is repetition. I'm sure it comes up, but it's not -- it's more the exception rather than the rule. Is that a fair statement?
A. Maybe. But not for me.
Q. Okay.
A. And the reason $I$ say that is because anytime I tried a case, $I$ try it from the prosecution perspective -these are my witnesses, these are my -- check each one of
them off.
But I think to be a good prosecutor, or a good litigator, for that matter, whether you're doing prosecution or defense, you have to anticipate what the other side may do. And so I did a tremendous amount of research that was not the same every time. Because I would come up with potential issues and arguments, because I had to be prepared when the defense bar raised that.

So I don't know that -- there may be prosecutors out there that is -- you know, one right after the other, the whole mill of one case right after another; it's the same thing, you're just changing the faces of the witnesses. But that's not what $I$ did.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let me ask youm again along those same lines, as far as what you're doing in the magistrate's court, obviously there's a cap in terms of what the value of a case is.

How do you feel like you're going to be -- from a stand point of capacity of ability to transition into what a circuit judge is going to have to do dealing with legal issues, you know, having to more or less get into more depth in the areas that unfortunately because of just the nature of what your practice has been working in the -- in the capacity that you have, different new for you.
A. Sure it is.
Q. How do you anticipate, you know, your transitioning of that?
A. I work hard. I work hard to do the legal research, to understand the issues, to understand the causes of action. I harken back to my first time in -- my first week in magistrate's court. I started on Monday, I was trying my first civil jury case on Tuesday. That was outside of my comfort zone. Because the only civil law I knew was what I'd learned in law school.

Luckily, I paid attention fairly well there. So but I worked hard to overcome that deficiency, and the deficient. And any time that I had a deficiency, or a deficiency that I recognized, I worked hard to the research, to talk to fellow judges, to -- to get guidance from other folks that have been there before me, so I can effectively do that job.
Q. Thank you very much.
A. Yes, sir. Thank you. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Representative Smith. EXAMINATION BY REPRESENTATIVE SMITH:
Q. Judge Willingham, I just -- I think what I'm hearing -- and I just wanted to lay it out here, because this is obviously a concern that's being discussed over here, is you've practiced in the solicitor's office. And I was a public defender and I understand those are
probably some of the toughest jobs there are. Whether you're defending a case, or you're prosecuting a case, it's -- it's -- it's intense trial work. And you've got the demands of a victim, you've got the demands of police officers, and you've got to balance that. And now you're a judge.

And I think the concern that I'm hearing -- and, you know, I share in some of this is -- you know, you haven't had a private practice, and so you don't know -you know, you haven't had a judge telling you you've got to be in this court on that date, and you got a deposition that's got to be done this time, and you've got -- you know, you've got fifty or sixty clients, and you get the judge that we've all run into in our career, that says, "I don't care what your excuse is, you're going to be in courtroom. This case can be continued. I won't sit her to have cases continued. I will sit here to try cases and putting the lawyers in the bad position."

And, you know, I kind of want you to talk to me a little bit about your philosophy in that, how you will work with lawyers, and kind of lay some concerns that you haven't had that the -- probably I know you would have -you've been on the receiving end of an abusive judge. All of us sitting around here have been.

But what I'm more concerned about is not
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understanding the predicament that someone that's working in a law firm and is trying to juggle a number of balls and a number of cases faces everyday, especially when you got a judge that has -- that says my docket and the movement of my docket is an A-number one priority and I don't care whether you're on vacation this week or what happens.

And I mean, I can just tell you stories, and we've all seen them around here, of judges who have taken the position. And we just need to understand how you're going to balance that real life experience that someone brings to the bench with them that you have not had thus far.
A. Yes, sir. I understand that concern. And let me assure you I am not that judge. I work diligently not to -- because like you said I've been in front of those judges. And I've learned from the good judges and I've learned from the bad what not to do. When we have -- we have a docket and we -- on the criminal side we take the oldest to newest and try and do the same thing on the civil side. You work the oldest to newest cases.

Conflicts come up. Other things come up. Other issues. Other priorities come up. And I understand that. I get that. Even though I never was in a private practice, that's without dispute. I have not been in that
situation. But I understand what that's like. Because we had the same situation in the solicitor's office. Judge Markley Dennis said, "You're going to try this case on this day. And if you don't, I'm going to let the guy out of jail."

Well, you drop everything and you come in and you try that case. So I understand that. That is not the type of a judge that $I$ have been. That's not the type of judge that I will be.

Folks come into my courtroom and they will ask for continuances. And I am very generous in granting those, if it's for a good reason. I granted a first continuance for a good reason or a bad reason, because I understand there are other things that are going on in that practice or in that client's life.

If it's not an abuse and it's not a repeatedtype situation, then $I$ honor that -- those requests. It's not "you're going to me in my courtroom or else." That is not how I've ever operated my courtroom.
Q. It certainly -- and I've asked every judicial candidate, so I'm not picking on you about this -cause, you know, one of my big issues is quality of life for attorneys. And quality of life, as we all know, can be very difficult when you maintain a hectic schedule and case load. And judges can exacerbate those problems.

And so I want everyone -- I want the peoples perspective as they're coming here to talk to us about, you know, how they will balance attorneys who have family vacations or other obligations that are outside the law, and how you would balance that, viz a viz a docket that's got to get moved, or a solicitor over there or a public defender saying, "Judge, my client wants to get out of court," or a solicitor that says, "My victim wants justice" and somebody's got, you know, something going on with their child, or a vacation planned.

And inevitably you've probably seen that in the Solicitor's Office. You get in those fights, and they say, "Well, Judge, they shouldn't have been doing this. They knew this term of court was coming -- whichever way -- whoever's making that demand, how do you balance that?
A. I am very cognizant of that. As I said, I've got three daughters of my own, so I know how important that is. And I'm very easy to work with. Maybe I'm not coming across that way, but $I$ am. And it's one of those things if you let us know ahead of time, we won't even put you on the docket. It's when you come in on Monday, and we have a trial on Tuesday, and you say, "Oh, yeah, Judge. I've got to go somewhere else."

That is tougher to explain -- that's tougher to explain to the other side -- whether it be a civil case or
a criminal case, that's tough to explain that, why are they waiting until the absolute last minute to it. If we have ample notice, we do everything we can to accommodate everyone's schedule.

## Q. Okay. Thank you, Judge.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Any other questions?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Judge Willingham, thank
you so much for being with us this evening.
JUDGE WILLINGHAM: Thank you, sir.
SENATOR CAMPSEN: That concludes this
portion of the screening process. As you know the record will remain open until the formal release of the report of qualifications, and you may be called back at such time if the need arises.

I thank you for offering. And thank you for your service to South Carolina.

JUDGE WILLINGHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, members of the Commission.
(Candidate excused.)
SENATOR MALLOY: I move to go into executive session.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Do I have a second? We have a motion and a second to go into executive session. We will receive advice of Counsel. Any discussion?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Being no discussion, move immediately to a vote. All in favor indicate by saying "aye."
(At this time the members audibly say "aye.")
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(Hearing none.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: The ayes have it.
(Off the record from 7:23 p.m. to 8:06 p.m.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Okay. We have lifted the
veil and come out of executive session. We had no votes taken, no action taken. And now we're back on the record. And Judge Tripp Anderson is before us.

And, Ms. Brogdon, do you have some -- yeah.
Judge Anderson, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in.

WHEREUPON:
THE HONORABLE RALPH K. "TRIPP" ANDERSON III, being duly sworn and cautioned to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testifies as follows:

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Okay. Judge Anderson, we would like to ask you -- or Ms. Brogdon's going to ask you a series of questions that are precipitated by a communication that an attorney has sent out, with regards
to the race that you are a candidate in. And so we have brought you back before the Commission, to ask some questions with regard -- regarding whether you had any knowledge of this, or any involvement in -- in this -this communication that was advocating for your election. Ms. Brogdon.

EXAMINATION BY MS. BROGDON:
Q. Good evening, Judge Anderson. Judge Anderson, you are here for questioning regarding a potential violation of South Carolina code, Section 2-19-70, which provides that violations of that section are a misdemeanor, and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than one thousand dollars, or imprisoned not more than 90 days.

Because of the criminal nature of the potential violation under the statute referenced above, do you understand that you have a right against selfincrimination, and are -- and the right to an attorney?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Do you freely and voluntarily waive your right against self-incrimination and your right to counsel?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Judge Anderson, you have before you a letter that Mr. Burnett R. Maybank III, e-mailed to what appears to be a group of administrative law lawyers. Were you
aware that Mr. Maybank was sending this e-mail?
A. No.
Q. Did you, or anyone acting on your behalf, have a conversation with Mr. Maybank, about sending this e-mail?
A. No. I had -- we had discussed -- I'm in an organization called SCARLA, the South -- concerning regulatory lawyers. And it was brought up in that meeting, that Mr. Maybank may send out a list serve -- and I didn't know what a list serve was -- to let people know about upcoming events in my race. But I -- other than that, no, I'm not -- I haven't been involved in -- in it at all.
Q. Did you, or anyone acting on your behalf, direct Mr. Maybank to send that e-mail?
A. I didn't even -- no, I didn't even know about this e-mail. I'll even tell y'all, I talked to Mr. Maybank today. His father died. And I called him up to tell him how -- that $I$ was sorry to hear about that. We never even -- I never even told him that I'd been a -nominated. We didn't discuss it.
Q. Thank you, Judge Anderson.
A. I don't know, did it go out today? Or whenever it went out...

SENATOR CAMPSEN: It's dated November the 16th, today.
Q. Judge Anderson, I spoke with Mr. Maybank this afternoon, and he indicated that he also mailed a letter to members of the General Assembly regarding your candidacy. We do not have a copy of that letter. Were you aware that Mr . Maybank was sending a letter regarding your candidacy to members of the General Assembly?
A. No.
Q. Did you, or anyone acting on your behalf, have a conversation with Mr. Maybank about sending a letter to the General Assembly regarding your candidacy?
A. He sent one last time, in my last race, but he properly did it after the time frame that I'm -- but he did it two or three days after the -- the time frame to get commitments. I don't know if I talked to him about -I don't think I talked to him even about that.

The only thing that $I$ could have ever had in my mind, that he would do, it would be to do what he did last time, and the proper procedures. But not to send a letter out right now. So no, absolute not.
Q. Did you, or anyone acting on your behalf, direct Mr. Maybank to send a letter to the General Assembly, regarding your candidacy?
A. No.

MS. BROGDON: Mr. Chairman, those would be the only questions that $I$ have for Judge Anderson.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Any other members have any questions?
(No response.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: Would you like to make any additional statement, Judge Anderson?

JUDGE ANDERSON: I didn't know anything about this. I almost -- was so shocked, I almost fell out of my wheelchair when I -- when I heard about it. I don't want -- I like Mr. Maybank, but -- I don't want to say it was absurd, but it -- close to it. This is shocking.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: Okay. Thank you. We will stand in -- Judge Anderson, have you talked to Mr. Maybank since the e-mail was sent out?

JUDGE ANDERSON: No, I wasn't -- I wouldn't dare have wanted to do that, because I -- when I heard about this, I knew I needed to come over and address y'all.

SENATOR CAMPSEN: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Judge Anderson. I'll entertain a motion that we -- that we stand in recess. There may be some communications coming back from some candidates.

So we have a motion. A second. Any
discussion?
(No response.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: There being no
discussion, we'll move immediately to vote. All in favor indicate by saying "aye."
(At this time the members audibly say "aye.") SENATOR CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(No response.)
SENATOR CAMPSEN: The ayes have it.
(EXHIBIT NO. 1 - E-MAIL FROM BURNET R.
MAYBANK, III DATED NOVEMBER 16, 2016)
(Off the record from 8:14 p.m. to 8:33 p.m.)
MR. CHAIRMAN: We have now convened,
arising from our recess. And we'll now cast votes for the Circuit Court Seat -- 7th Circuit, Seat No. 2. And we have had one candidate who has withdrawn, and that is -okay. We have had one candidate withdraw. And I don't think we need to go over the voting process again, 'cause I think everyone's done it a few times. And so you'll have staff -- we will call the roll. Ms. Brogson.

MS. BROGDON: So I'll begin calling out the order to find if the candidate's qualified or not. The first candidate is Grace Gilchrist Knie. Please raise your hand if you want to find her qualified.
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. BROGDON: The next candidate is the Honorable James Donald Willingham, II. Please raise your hand if you want to find him qualified
(Commission members cast their vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's ten votes in favor of
Judge Willingham being found qualified. We now will move to a vote for qualified and nominated. I'll call the names in alphabetical order again. Raise your hand if you want to find the candidate nominated Grace Gilchrist Knie.
(Commission members cast their vote.) MS. BROGDON: That's ten votes to find Grace Gilchrist Knie nominated. The next candidate is The Honorable James Donald Willingham, II. Please raise your hand if you want to find him nominated.
(Commission members cast their vote.) MS. BROGDON: And that's ten votes to find Judge Willingham nominated. So the two candidates nominated, with ten votes each, are Grace Gilchrist Knie and The Honorable John Donald Willinghman, II. SENATOR CAMPSEN: Okay. There being no matters before the Commission, we've completed our work for today, so I would entertain a motion for adjournment. REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: So moved. SENATOR CAMPSEN: I have a motion. Do we have a second.

SENATOR MALLOY: Second. SENATOR CAMPSEN: A second. Any
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